









BR  
95  
S65  
1877  
V. 3  
pt. 2

Phalaeian hendecasyllabics. There are further traces in quotations by grammarians of a translation of the whole of the historical books (*Rheinisches Museum*, xxi. 123 sqq., 266 sqq.). In favour of attributing this poem to Juvencus may be urged the general similarity of style shewn in the usage of particular words, the fondness for compound epithets, the imitation of Virgil (cf. *Genesis*, 121, 1139, *Exod.* 248), the addition of explanatory comment to the narrative (cf. *Exod.* 468), and the use of a prevulgate version (cf. *Genesis*, 75, 1380). On the other hand, the style is less varied, exaggerates the love of archaic words, and takes greater licences in prosody; the treatment of the Evangelical canticles in the *Hist. Evang.* is not analogous to the lyrical translation of the Songs of Moses, and it is strange that St. Jerome, to whom the work would have been of great interest, should not have known it or not mentioned it, and that Bede, who does quote it, should never attribute it to Juvencus (cf. Ebert, *Christl.-Lat. Lit.* p. 115, note).

The *Liber in Genesis* may be found in Martene, *Collect. Vet. Script.* 1724, and Gallandi and Migne (*ubi supra*); the rest in Pitra, *Spicileg. Solesm.* i. p. 171 sqq.

(iv.) Some later writers attribute hymns to Juvencus, but there is no trace of any except the canticles in the *Historia Evangelica* and *Hist. Vet. Test.* Migne also attributes to him a poem published without an author by Fabricius, and entitled "De Laudibus Domini." Beginning with the description of a miracle which had lately happened, it passes on to a praise of God's work in the Creation and in the Life and Resurrection of Jesus. It resembles Juvencus somewhat in style, and professes to have been written in the time of Constantine, but there is no external evidence to connect it with him. Migne also prints a short poem, "Triumphus Christi Heroicus," a fanciful description of Christ's Descent into Hell, and of the trophies won by the Cross. It is much more pagan in form than anything in Juvencus, and Migne himself regards it as of a later date, intended as a supplement to the *Historia Evangelica*. [W. L.]

**JUVENTINUS (1)** (JUVENIUS, *Mart. Rom.*), Jan. 25. Martyr at Antioch, with Maximus, under Julian. St. Chrysostom celebrated them in his homily, *In Juventinum et Marimum Martyres* (in *Pat. Gr.* i. 571). The Basilian menology mentions him under Oct. 9. (*Theodor. H. E.* iii. 15; *Boll. Acta SS.* 25 Jan. ii. 619; *Fleury, H. E.* i. xv. s. 22; *Bas. Men.*) [G. T. S.]

**JUVENTINUS (2)**, bishop of Marona or Marovana, in Mauritania Sitifensis, banished by Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. *Notit.* 60; Morcelli, *Afr. Christ.* i. 214.) [R. S. G.]

**JUVENTINUS** (Ughelli, i. 1077; Cappell. xii. 398, 515; *Boll. Acta SS.* 8 Feb. ii. 152, *Mart. Rom.* Feb. 8, Sept. 12), reputed second bishop of Pavia, cir. 100-139. [INVENTIUS.]

**JUVENTINUS** (VIVENTIUS), prefect of the city, at Rome, when Damasus was elected pope in A.D. 366; he was also prefect in the earlier months of 367, and was succeeded by Praetextatus (Amm. Marcell. *Res Gest. Rom.* xxvii. 3, 11-13; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 467;

*Fleury, Hist. du Christ.* xvi. 8; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés*, iv. 608; Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 366). In *Cod. Theod.* iii. he is called VIVENTIUS. In Corsini (*Series Praefect.* p. 237) he is named Jubentius Pannonius. [J. G.]

**JUVIANUS**, bishop. [JOVIANUS (5).]

**JUVINIUS** (JUVENIUS), bishop of Vence, mentioned in a manuscript life of St. Veranus the fourth bishop, referred to by the Sammarthani, who place him cir. 410, the second bishop (*Gall. Chr.* iii. 212.) [C. H.]

## K

[Names commencing with K will sometimes be found under the initial C.]

**KAK**, bishop of Vanant in Armenia (St. Martin, *Mém. sur l'Arm.* ii. 367), present at the synod of Ardashad in 450. (Elisha Vartabed, *Hist. of Vartan*, p. 13, ed. Neumann.) [G. T. S.]

**KAKHU**, bishop of Duruperan (St. Martin, *Mém. sur l'Arm.* ii. 361), present at the synod of Ardashad in 450. (Elisha Vartabed, *Hist. of Vartan*, p. 13, ed. Neumann.) [G. T. S.]

**KALLINICUS** (CALLINICUS, GALLINICUS), exarch of Ravenna c. 598-c. 602. (He is called exarch by Gregory the Great, "patricius" by Paulus Diaconus.) Gregory the Great had various communications with him. (*Greg. Magn. Epist.* lib. ix. indict. ii. 9, 81, 95, 98; Migne, lxxvii. 948, 1013, 1020, 1023; Paulus Diaconus, iv. 12, 20.) [A. H. D. A.]

**KAMJESU** (i.e. JESUS HAS RISEN), maphrian of the Syrian Jacobites, 578-609. (Le Quien, ii. 1534.) [C. H.]

**KAMMARCH**, Welsh saint. [CAMMARCH.]

**KANANC**, given by Leland in a list of Brychan's children [BRYCHAN]. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 160; Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, July 6, i. 146 n. 148.) [J. G.]

**KANILLUS**, hermit of the Benedictine order, companion and disciple of St. Buo the Bard, and venerated in Argyle (Argathelia) and other parts of Scotland; he flourished A.D. 792. (*Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 418.) [J. G.]

**KANTEN**, CANNEN (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 36), son of Gwyddlew, Welsh saint of the 6th century, probably founder, as he is patron, of Llanganten, Brecknockshire. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 114, 268, 326; Williams, *Emin. Welsh* 62.) [J. G.]

**KARIUNDUS** (CARIUNDUS, CARMUDUS, CORVINDUS) appears in the lists as the eleventh bishop of Nantes, on the authority of old records of the see. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 797.) [S. A. B.]

**KARKH**, an Armenian martyr in the reign of Isdigerd II., king of Persia and Armenia.

(Elisha Vartabed, *Hist. of Vartan*, p. 6, ed. Neumann.) [G. T. S.]

**KARLOMANNUS (CARLOMAN)**, mayor of the palace and afterwards monk. He was the eldest son of Charles Martel and elder brother of Pippin (afterwards king of the Franks) and Grifo. In 741 he succeeded his father in the government of Austrasia, Alamannia, and Thuringia, Pippin receiving Neustria, Burgundy, Provence. The interregnum then existing terminated in 742 by the accession of Childeric III., the last of the Merovingian line. This year Karloman and Pippin crossed the Loire and reduced to submission Hunald duke of Aquitaine, who had rebelled against their authority. In this expedition the two brothers "divided the kingdom of the Franks between them at a place named *Vetus Pictavis*." In 742, 743, 744, 745, they conducted separately or jointly similar operations either in Alamannia, Bavaria, Aquitaine, or Saxony. In 745 many of the conquered natives of Saxony received baptism. In 746 Karloman intimated to his brother his intention to resign and devote himself to the monastic life at Rome. That year therefore there were no military undertakings, both brothers occupying themselves in preparing for Karloman's Italian journey. The *Annals of Fulda* (Bouquet, ii. 675) state that in this year Karloman and Boniface archbishop of Mainz united in founding the two episcopal sees of Wurzburg and Eichstadt, to which were appointed respectively Burchard and Willibald as bishops. There are extant two charters of Karloman, dated 746 and 747, granting lands to the monastery of Stavelo, in the diocese of Liège (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1307, 1310). In 747 Karloman accompanied by his son Drogo (Fredegar in Bouquet ii. 459) and attended by a large retinue of his nobles, formally quitted his dominions, and arrived at Rome with countless presents. Here he was tonsured, received the clerical habit from pope Zacharias, and built a monastery for himself. Becoming weary of the incessant admiration which his abdication attracted, he departed incognito with a companion to the Benedictine monastery of Mount Cassinus, then ruled by abbat Optatus. The *Annals of Metz* give a minute account of his introduction there and of the humiliations to which he submitted while his rank was unknown. He gave out that he was come to do penance for crimes of bloodshed and homicide. He next proceeded to erect a monastery on Mount Soracte, dedicating it to the memory of pope Sylvester, but eventually he returned to Mount Cassinus. In 753 (*Chron. Fontanell.* in Bouquet, ii. 663) his sons received the tonsure. In the same year (*Chronicles* in Bouq. ii. 663 A, 700 c) or else in 754 (*Annal. Mettens.* in Bouq. v. 336) he was commissioned by his abbat, acting through fear of the Lombard king Aistulph, who dominated in those parts, to the court of his brother Pippin, to thwart the scheme of pope Stephen for bringing the Franks into Italy. Pippin, however, crossed the Alps and Karloman remained at Vienne with queen Berthrada, awaiting his brother's return. Here after a long illness he died, in 754 according to the *Annals of Metz*, though other annalists say 755. The date is believed to be Dec. 4, 754, by Mabillon

(*Annal. Bened.* lib. xxiii. c. 13, t. ii. p. 173). The history of Karloman is gathered from Eginhard and numerous annals printed in Bouquet, especially those of Metz (ii. 685, v. 336). The earliest appearance of his name is in a charter of his father in 722 (Bouq. iii. 699). [C. H.]

**KARRANUS**, bishop. [CARAN.]

**KARVAN**, given by *Myv. Arch.* ii. 37, as patron of Llangarvan, Glamorganshire, but probably in error for Cattwg [CADOC] of Llangarvan. [J. G.]

**KATHAN (CATHAN, CATHEN)**, son of Cawrdaf, and founder of Llangathen, Camarthen-shire; the Hundred of Cathenog has probably its name from him. His feast is May 17. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 31; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 71, 103, 280, 330; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 69.) [J. G.]

**KATRIN (CATRIN)**, patron of "Eglwys, Sant y Catrin" (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 36), probably the Welsh form of St. Catharine, virgin martyr, of Alexandria. [CATHARINE.] [J. G.]

**KEBIUS (Cuby, see above s. v. CYBI), ST.**, a cousin of St. David (see the pedigree, i. 660). His Life (Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 37; it is printed in W. J. Rees's *Lives of Cambro-British Saints*) says that he was born in Cornwall, between the Tamar and the Linar. After refusing the crown of Cornwall, he settled in the land of king Ethelic of Edelygion, i.e. Eddlogan in Gwent, where he left his small handbell "parvum digiti sui cimbalum varium;" afterwards he visited Ireland, and on his return to Anglesey found Maelgwn ruling in North Wales, who died about 550. The Life mentions his returning from Ireland in a boat which had not the usual covering of hide. He was present at St. David's council of Brefi, about 569. The day of his death was "sexto Idus Novembris," 8th November (9th November is ordinarily given as his day). The Life mentions his "consobrinus" Kengar in Ireland as being very old; his disciple was St. Caffo. Besides his churches in Wales, Cuby in Cornwall was dedicated to him, and so that of Duloe. In the latter there is St. Keby's well. Duloe feast was on the 9th November. In the parish of Kea, also named after Kebi, the feast-day was on the first Sunday after Michaelmas (Norden, 57; Whitaker's *Cornwall*, ii. 38, 52, 57; J. Adams, in *Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall*, ii. 314-23). In some churches 25th April was kept as his day, perhaps the date of the translation of his relics. His Life is printed in W. J. Rees's *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*, 1853, p. 183-7. See Haddan and Stubbs, i. 9, 36, 159, and W. C. Borlase, *The Age of the Saints*, 1878, pp. 39, 45, 50, 92. [C. W. B.]

**KEDDAN**, bishop. [CATAN.]

**KELLACH (1).** [CELLACH.]

(2) Ceallach, son of Saran, abbat of Othanmor, now Fahan near Lough Swilly, bar. Inishowen, co. Donegal, died A.D. 658. (*Ann. Tig.*; *Four Mast.* A.D. 657; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 657, calling him son of Ronan; Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 38.)

(3) Kellach, eldest son of Eoghan or Owen Beul, king of Connaught, was early devoted to

religion under St. Ciaran (Sept. 9) of Clonmacnoise, but on his father's death in the battle of Sligo A.D. 543, *Ann. Tig.*; *Four Mast.* A.D. 537), he was induced to leave the monastery, against St. Ciaran's will, and become king. But soon wearying of the cares and intrigues of royalty, he returned to Clonmacnoise, and was reconciled to St. Ciaran, who afterwards promoted him to the priesthood and to the episcopate. From his see at Killaloe he was driven by Guaire Aidne, who had become king of Connaught, and who could not forget that Kellach was heir to, and had himself resigned, the throne of Connaught. Kellach retired to Oilen Edghair in Loch Conn, co. Mayo, where he lived as a hermit, but Guaire Aidne's jealousy urged him to procure Kellach's death by the aid of his four pupils, called also foster-brothers, who murdered him in a wood on the mainland between Loch Conn and Loch Cullinn, and were rewarded by a gift of the territory of Tirawley, where the deed was done. The murder was avenged by Muireadhach, more commonly called Cuchoingeilt, second son of Eoghan, who pursued and hanged the four murderers at a place overlooking the Moy, called Tulach-na-fairsiona (the hill of prospects), and afterwards Ard-na-riaghadh (the hill of executions). Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 99-100, 3rd ed.). The date of his death is not given, and he is not usually classed among the bishops of Killaloe. (*Geneal., &c., of the Hy-Fiachrach*, by O'Donovan, 33-5, with Add. Notes i. and q. pp. 415, 471-2; Keating, *Gen. Hist. Ir.* 351-2, giving St. Ciaran a specially vengeful spirit; Bolland. *Acta SS.* Maii i. t. i. (104) 106. [J. G.]

**KELLBIL** (CELLBIL, CELLBILEUS), abbat of Cluain-Bronaigh (now Clonbroney near Granard, co. Longford, but placed by Lanigan in Louth), died A.D. 765. (*Ann. Tig.*; *Ann. Ul.* A.D. 764; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 760, i. 364 n.r; 365; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. N.* iii. 192-3.) [J. G.]

**KELLENUS** (Bolland. *Acta SS.* Mart. 26, t. iii. (626), 623). [MOCHEALLOG.] [J. G.]

**KENAN.** Kenan Calod Lock is mentioned by Albert le Grande, in his *Life of St. Ivoa*, as appointed to administer the affairs of the church of Plon-Kernau, in Armorica. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 442, c. 14, 443 n<sup>11</sup>) tries to shew that he may have been Kenan or Cieran of Duleek, his parents, Ladanus or Ludunus, and Tagua or Tegua, according to Le Grande, being the Irish Sedanus or Sedna, and Ethnea. But it is doubtful (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils, &c.*, ii. pt. i. 87, calling him also KÉ; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 493 n.<sup>184</sup>). At Feb. 25, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 413) gives a memoir of St. Kenanus, abbas, who is commemorated on this day in the Irish annals as "Cianan, abbat," and whom Colgan identifies with the Kenan who succeeded laova at Plon-kernau, and with Cieran of Duleek (Nov. 24). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. 25, iii. 484-5) place him among their pretermitted saints, and doubtfully follow Colgan. [J. G.]

**KENANACH**, probably a form of **KENNETH** and **CAINNECH**. On the island of Irich Kenneth, off the west of Mull, in the Hebrides, there are the ruins of an old and small chapel, where, till the end of last century, there was preserved an old bell, probably St. Kenanach's bell. St.

Cainnech (Oct. 11), of Achadh-bo, the friend of St. Columba, gave its name to the island. (Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. Scotch.* 663; Reeves, *S. Adam.* 417, 432.) [J. G.]

**KENEBURGA** (KENBERG, KYNEBURGA), the first abbess of St. Peter's, Gloucester, according to the *Gloucester Chronicle* (ed. Hart, pp. lxxii. 4, 6). She is said to have been a sister of Osric and Oswald, the ealdormen or under-kings of the Hwicci, to have been blessed by Bosel bishop of Worcester, and to have governed the monastery for twenty-nine years, which, reckoned from the reputed date of foundation, 681, would fix her death in 710. She is also called the wife of Aldred (?) king of Northumbria (*Mon. Angl.* i. 531). She is said to have been buried beside her brother before the altar of St. Petronilla in her own church. [OSRIC.] [S.]

**KENEDLON** (CENEDLON), Welsh saint of the 5th century, daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog. (*Myr. Arch.* ii. 32; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 150-157; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 72.) [J. G.]

**KENET, ST.**, once the patron saint of Lesnewth in Cornwall, a church now dedicated to St. Michael. William of Worcester, 116, says, "translatio Sancti Keneth heremitae die 3<sup>o</sup> post nativitatem Sancti Johannis Baptistae; jacet apud ecclesiam villae Sancti Keneth in Gowerland," but it is uncertain whether this refers to the same saint. The first time a church in Wales is dedicated to St. Michael is A.D. 717 (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 203); previously they were only dedicated to their founders. See **KYNEDUS**. [C. W. B.]

**KENETHRYTHA** (CWOENTHRITHA, CYNETHRITHA), a daughter of Kenulf king of Mercia, and abbess of Winchelcomb. It is difficult to disentangle her history from the mass of legend and forgery that surrounds it; and it may be an error to attribute to one person the acts attributed to the persons bearing these names. According to the legendary history of St. Kenelm, that prince, who was son of Kenulf, was left under the guardianship of his sister, Quenthritha, who slew him in the hope of obtaining the throne. Kenelm was seven years old when Kenulf died, and his reign of a few months falls immediately after the death of Kenulf, and therefore within the years 821 and 822 (*Flor. Wig.* 819; *M. H. B.* 547). It would seem probable that Cynethritha was daughter of Kenulf by his first wife, Cynegitha, who is mentioned in a charter of 799 (Kemble, *C. D.* 177), and Kenelm of his second wife, Elfthritha, who occurs in 811 (*ib.* 196). Florence of Worcester, however, makes them, with another sister, Burgenhilda, all children of Elfthritha (*M. H. B.* 640). Whatever truth may underlie the legend of Kenelm, it is certain that his death left the inheritance of Kenulf in the hands of Cynethritha, and that Winchelcomb abbey, which he had founded or restored, was the monastic centre of the inheritance. As heir of Kenulf, Cynethritha engaged in litigation with archbishop Wulfred, who had had a great quarrel with Kenulf himself, and the reconciliation of the contest was a matter discussed in two councils, one at Clovesho about 824, and another at the same place in

825 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 594, 597). On the latter occasion "Cwoenthrytha abbatissa" accepted a compromise by which the church of Canterbury was freed from all future claims on the part of Kenulf's heirs, and the ancient writings at Winchelcomb, on which the dispute had arisen, were altered accordingly. That Cynethrytha was abbess of Winchelcomb appears from a later document of the reign of Alfred (K. C. D. 323), in which she is represented as granting lands for life to the father of the ealdorman Ethelwulf, and as succeeded by another abbess named Aelfaed. These lands were then in litigation between Worcester and Winchelcomb. Besides the authentic documents in which her name occurs, she is found in a charter preserved at Glastonbury, and recorded by William of Malmesbury, spurious, but not fabricated by him, for he confesses that he cannot explain it. There she confirms a privilege granted by Kenulf to Kenelm, accompanied by a long privilege granted by pope Leo III., and apparently in 799 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1017; Will. Malmesb. *Antt. Glaston.* ap. Gale, p. 315). Nothing can be inferred from this, except that Kenelm and Cynethrytha were connected in some other story besides that of Kenelm's martyrdom; but possibly they are the remnant of some part of the Winchelcomb history, and point to the fact that Kenelm's rights were obnoxious to Cynethrytha. In the foundation charter of Winchelcomb, dated in 811, there is no mention of either of them, but reference is made to a privilege granted by pope Leo III.; and Kenulf inserts a clause forbidding the alienation of the lands of his inheritance for more than one life (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 573), a point which is of importance in the later history (K. C. D. 323), and which was extended to monastic estates generally by a canon of the council of Clovesho in 816 (*ib.* p. 582). Possibly the charter was fabricated after the passing of the canon, but the latter is certainly genuine. The legend of Kenelm would of course be incomplete without the punishment of Cynethrytha. When the body of Kenelm was brought to Winchelcomb, she was looking out of an upper chamber, engaged in the remarkable employment of chanting the 108th psalm backwards; her eyes fell out of the sockets on the book (W. Malmesb. *G. P.* lib. iv. § 156).

Whether the abbess Cynethrytha, with whom archbishop Ethelheard in 798 exchanged lands at Cookham, in Mercia, for an estate in Kent, was the daughter of Kenulf or the widow of Offa, there is nothing to shew (K. C. D. 1019; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 512). Nor is it at all clear that the coins ascribed to the wife of Offa may not have been struck by the daughter of Kenulf after the death of Kenelm (Hawkins, *English Silver Coinage*, ed. Kenyon, pp. 38, 39).

[S.]

**KENT, KINGS OF.** The ancient kingdom of Kent may be roughly described as co-extensive with the modern county, or ecclesiastically with the two dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester. The inhabitants, according to Bede, were of the race of the Jutes, who, on taking possession of the country, assumed the name of Cantwara, or dwellers in Kent, Cantium, the district known by that name since the days of Julius Caesar. This limitation can be only approximately cor-

rect, the adjustment of the boundaries with Surrey and Sussex being no doubt a gradual work. The power of the Kentish king extended, at its maximum, over great part of Surrey, Middlesex, and even Essex, whilst Sussex, throughout the early history, seems to have been a debateable land between the kings of Kent and the West Saxons. It is probable, however, that since the final arrangement of the south-eastern dioceses, which occurred at a time when Kent was comparatively weak under Wihtred, and Wessex in the zenith of its power under Ine, the limits of the Kentish kingdom have not been much disturbed. It is more difficult to account for the divisions of Kent itself. It is peculiar in the early history as a kingdom divided from the first between two dioceses, and it has, moreover, besides the civil division into hundreds, an arrangement in "lathes," each containing a cluster of hundreds. The diocesan division does not coincide with the division into lathes, or hundreds; nor does the ecclesiastical division into deaneries correspond with either. But the uncertainty of the date at which these divisions were made prevents us from drawing any definite deduction from the variation. The importance of these questions lies in the fact that throughout a great part of Kentish history the kingdom is divided between several kings, who either are represented as kinsmen reigning conjointly, or may be regarded as the heads of different dynastic or tribal systems, which might be expected to coincide with the local divisions. Thus, if it could be shewn that there ever was a division between the East Cantwara and the West Cantwara, we might account for the division of the dioceses. This, however, cannot be shewn, for we have no evidence of a divided rule in Kent before the reign of Ethelbert, under whom the two dioceses were organized. The diocese of Rochester comprised that portion of Kent which bordered on the Thames, from the Surrey boundary to the mouth of the Medway, and a small border on the right bank; it ran inland to the boundary of Sussex, and formed a compact square, containing the four deaneries of Dartford, Mallinges, Shoreham, and Rochester. It was thus the western or smaller half of Kent, and may at the time of the division have been administered as a separate civil division, without having either the character of a kingdom, or any distinct tribal difference from the eastern half. The later history unfortunately having been written at a time when the whole of England was overshadowed by Mercian or West-Saxon supremacy, and when royalty in Kent itself was almost a secondary institution in comparison with the power of the archbishop, throws no light upon the earlier division, although the fact of the diocesan subdivision no doubt made it easier for the kingdom to fall into two parts. But we have no authority for ruling that the later subdivisions or conjoint royalty had any connexion whatever with the ecclesiastical divisions. The matter is very obscure, and the succession of the later kings is quite as difficult to ascertain. Many of these kings have an importance in ecclesiastical history, which entitles them to a separate article in this dictionary, and it is sufficient here to give the succession with approximate dates and cross references.

The royal house of Kent sprang from Hengest, the fourth in descent from Woden, and the leader of the Teutonic invasion. The date assigned to Hengest, who ranks as the first king of Kent, is A.D. 455 (Flor. Wig. *General.*). His death is fixed to the year 488. After him his son Aesc reigned twenty-four years (488-512); from him the direct line of the Kentish kings were called Aescings, or Oiscings. A hero named Octa, who is made the successor of Oesc, and is sometimes called the son of Hengest, followed; and Eormeric, the next king, was the father of Ethelbert. The pedigree, which is given probably in its oldest form in Bede (ii. 5), is simply a descent from father to son: "Aedilberct filius Irminrici, cujus pater Octa, cujus pater Oiric cognomento Oisc, a quo reges Cantuariorum solent Oiscingas cognominari, cujus pater Hengist." The whole is legendary, and any dates which may be assigned to these names are purely conjectural, on whatever apparent authority they rest. Ethelbert succeeded, and reigned from 568 to 616 [ETHELBERT]; Eadwald, 616-640 [EADWALD]; Earcomerht, 640-664 [EARCOMBERT]; Ecgberht, 664-673 [EGGBERT]; Hlothaere, 673-685, and Eadric 673-686 [HLOTHAERE, EADRIC].

Between Hlothaere and Eadric the kingdom was either by arrangement, or in hostility, or at different times in different ways, divided; and after the death of Eadric the division seems to have continued under Swebheard or Webheard and Wihtred until about 690, when Wihtred became sole king. [SWEBHEARD, WIHTRED.] He reigned 690-725. From the date of his death the succession becomes obscure, and continues so until the kingdom was absorbed by Wessex. Wihtred left three sons—Eadbert, Ethelbert, and Alric—of whom the two former, and possibly the last, reigned conjointly, and in survivorship, until about 762. [See EADBERT, ETHELBERT, ALRIC.] But before that year a king [EARDULF] had appeared on the scene, possibly as king of West Kent [EARDULF], and in quick succession or alternation we have the names of Egbert, Ethelbert, Eadbert, Sigraed, Eahlmund, and others. [See EGBERT, ETHELBERT, EADBERT, SIGRAED.] Eahlmund was king in the year 784 or 786, by which time Kent had begun a final struggle with Offa. [EALHMUND.] Eadbert Praen, who claimed the kingdom shortly before Offa's death, is the next distinct figure [EADBERT PRAEN], 796-798. After his subjection by Kenulf of Mercia occurs Cuthred, 798-807 (?) [CUTHRED], and after Cuthred (whether immediately or after a period of direct subjection to Mercia is not clear) Baldred, who was conquered by Egbert of Wessex, in or about A.D. 825. The Kentish coins which are extant are assigned mostly to these later and very obscure kings, Ethelbert II., Egberht, Eadberht Praen, Cuthred, and Baldred. (See Hawkins, *Eng. Silver Coins*, ed. Kenyon, pp. 30-35.) [S.]

KENTIGERN (CONTHIGERNUS, CONTHIGIRNUS, CYNDEYRN, KENTEGERNUS, KENTIGERNUS, KENTYERN, KIENTIERN, KYENTYERN, QUENTIGERN, MONGAI, MUNGHU, MUNGO, bishop of Glasgow and confessor, commemorated on Jan. 13. St. Kentigern shares, with St. Ninian and St. Columba, the highest place in the honours due by Scotland to the early evangelisers of her

children, and has also obtained with them a well-defined place in the history of his age. While St. Palladius's Scotie work is doubtful, and St. Serf's chronology is difficult and disputed, both the time and the sphere of missionary enterprise belonging to St. Kentigern are sufficiently recognised. He only falls short of St. Columba in the good fortune which has given the latter an Adamnan, almost a contemporary, to be his biographer. There is no *Life of St. Kentigern* extant earlier than the 12th century, but a concurrent tradition and the history of the period strongly confirm the main points in the biography.

Strictly speaking, there is only one *Life of St. Kentigern* known, that by Joceline of Furness, written probably about 1180, for bishop Joceline of Glasgow (A.D. 1174-1199), from two earlier memoirs, but there is a fragment which is older, and was probably one of the two which were used by him. From these all the others are derived (1.) *Vita Kentegerni Imperfecta auctore ignoto* (MS. Cott. Titus A. xiv. f. 76-80 b), said in the prologue to have been written at the instance of Herbert bishop of Glasgow (A.D. 1147-64), and now found in "a very careless and ignorant transcript in a hand of the beginning of the 15th century" (*Reg. Ep. Glas.* lx.). It was first printed in *Registrum Episcopatus Glasgowensis* (Bann. Club, Edinb. 1843), append. ii. pp. lxxvii. lxxxvi.; again, with translation and notes, by Bp. Forbes of Brechin, in *Lives of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern*, 123-33, 243-52. It contains eight chapters, closing with the birth of St. Kentigern. The text is very corrupt, and the story exhibits some of the worst features of the mediaeval legend. It is evidently the basis of the lectures in the *Officium S. Thenece* in the *Brev. Aberd.* ff. 24-36. (2.) *Vita Kentegerni, auctore Jocelino monacho Furnesensi* (MS. Cott. Vitell. c. viii. ff. 148-195; MS. Marsh, Libr. Dubl. v. 3, 4, 16). It was printed, but very inaccurately, by Pinkerton (*Vit. Ant. Sanct. Scot.* 195-297), and given, with translation and notes, by Bp. Forbes of Brechin, in his *Lives of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern* (Ser. *Historians of Scotland*, Edinb. 1874, pp. 29-119, 159-242). Capgrave (*Nor. Leg. Angl.* 207 sq.) has given John of Tinnmouth's *Life of St. Kentigern*, which is merely a slight shortening of Joceline's. This has been given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jan. 13, t. i. 815 sq.). Joceline's Life has also supplied the lectures in the *MS. Breiciary* of the latter half of the 13th century, belonging to the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, and quoted by Bp. Forbes (*Lives*. &c. pp. xciv.-c.), and also those in *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. ff. 27-30). Hector Boethius (lix. c. 14), though not strictly following Fordun (*Scotichron.* iii. c. 9-29, ed. Skene) has formed a version or series of additions, which the Scotch annalists (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 79 sq.; Dempster, *Hist. Ecol. Gent. Scot.* ii. 406 sq.) have followed, and Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Britt.* xi. 5, 20-24; xii. 2-5) has largely translated Capgrave's Life. For the bibliography, see Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 207-9; pt. ii. 804; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, &c. i. 144, 156, 157, app. E.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 31, 179, 444; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 362-3, and *Lives St. Nin. and St. Kent.* lxiii. sq. For mediaeval hymns to his honour and later poetical allusions, see Bp.

Forbes, *Lives, &c.*, pp. c. sq.; *Reg. Episc. Glasg.* i. lx. cix.

St. Kentigern, perhaps better and more popularly known as St. Mungo, was a Strathclyde Briton. Kentigern is the Welsh *Cyndeyrn*, latinised *Contigernus*, from *cyn*, chief, *teyrn*, lord, "Capitalis dominus," and *mungo* is *mwyn*, gentle, *cu*, dear (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 182-3, 459; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. &c.* 364-5, and *Lives, &c.*, 326-7, with the derivations given by Joceline in the text). His parentage is doubtful. Joceline's *Life* (c. iv.) cites only the mother's name, Taneu, as given her by St. Servanus, while the fragmentary *Life* (c. i.) calls the grandfather Leudonus, and mother Thaney, the father being "Ewen filius Erwegende," or more properly called in the bardic tales "Ewen filius regis Ulien" (or Urien). Thus, according to the Scotch authorities, he was son of Eugenius, king of Cumbria (or Scotia), who forced Thameta (Thaney, Thaney, Tenew, Theneu), daughter of Loth, king of the Pictish Laudonia. According to the Welsh, *Bonedd y Saint*, *Cyndeyrn* was son of Owain ab Urien Rheged, and Dwynwen (*Deny*) the daughter of Llewddyn Lueddag of Dinas Eiddyn (Edinburgh), in the North, was his mother (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 261; Bp. Forbes, *Lives, &c.* lxxxii. and *Kal. &c.* 364; Ritson, *Metz. Rom.* iii. 225-29). The infant was born at Culross in Perthshire, where it is said to have been brought up and educated by St. Servanus, but Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 31) disputes the connexion with St. Servanus as an anachronism. [SERVANUS.] From Servanus he received the names of Kentigern, and Munghu, or Mungo, the latter as a mark of special affection; and under his tuition he advanced greatly, being docile and intelligent, with a retentive memory, and a sweet musical voice. At this part his *Life* abounds in miracles. From his master at Culross he secretly departed, and holding westward, crossing the Forth, probably about Alloa, he arrived at Carnock, near Stirling, and thence was led by the oxen, which carried the corpse of Fregus, to Cathures, now Glasgow, where St. Ninian had already consecrated a cemetery. There he fixed his abode among the Strathclyde Britons, whose territory extended from the Derwent to the Clyde, and the upper waters of the Forth, and taking up the work unfinished by St. Ninian, not only preached the faith, but called back from apostasy and heresy, and illustrated the virtues of the Gospel by his own most humble and laborious example. Altogether the picture presented of the time and field of his labour is a deplorable one. He was consecrated by a single bishop, called for the purpose from Ireland (c. 11). This was entirely according to the early Celtic custom; and even according to the stricter rule requiring three bishops to assist in episcopal consecrations, it was valid, though irregular; and the story (c. 27) about St. Kentigern's visits to Rome, his consulting pope Gregory about his position, and his receiving from him the confirmation, and supplementing of his imperfect consecration is the invention of a later age. He was raised to the episcopate in his twenty-fifth year (c. 12), but there is nothing to mark the date, except that it was before his departure to Wales. Ussher places it in A.D. 540, which is accepted by Stubbs (*Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 157). At Glasgow

he formed a monastic school, and a beautiful account is given (cc. 12-18) of the man, his austere life and humble piety; his coarse garments, and periodical retirements from the world, his wise converse with all classes, and his exceeding reverence in celebrating the sacred mysteries. He had a wide province, which he traversed mostly on foot, and his message was to the lapsed from the faith and to the morally degraded, as well as to the ignorant pagans. But the disorders in the kingdom, and probably the increasing power of the pagan faction, induced the bishop to leave his see, and find refuge in Wales a few years after his consecration (A.D. 543, Ussher). As he proceeded he spent some time in Cumberland, where his work is marked by churches still dedicated to him (c. 23); thence he advanced as far as Menevia, where he visited St. David, and then appears to have returned northwards, settling for a time on the banks of the Clwyd, and building his church at the confluence of the Elwy and Clwyd, at a place called from that circumstance Llanelwy, and now St. Asaph's, in Flintshire (cc. 23-25), about A.D. 545 (Stubbs). Joceline says (c. 23) that he was allowed to choose a place for his monastery by king Cathwallain (Caswallawn), but it is more probable that he received the site from Maelgwyn Gwynedd, son of Caswallawn Law Hir, king of North Wales at this time, and apparently dividing his dominions ecclesiastically between Bangor and Llanelwy. The monastery which St. Kentigern erected at Llanelwy was soon filled with persons of all classes devoted to religion. Old and young, rich and poor, prince and peasant, flocked to the abode of peace and holiness, and we are presented with a very graphic picture of how monasteries were raised in ancient days before stone was used for such erections, and how the *laus perennis* was carried out in large communities, such as this must have been with its 965 brethren in their "threefold division of religious observance" (cc. 24-25).

Meanwhile a change had taken place in the person of the sovereign, and hence, as a direct consequence, in the religious feeling of the kingdom of Strathclyde. Rhydderch Hael, son of Tudwal Tudglud, had come to the throne; and at the battle of Ardderyd (now Arthuret, on the Esk, near Carlisle), had defeated the heathen party under Gwendolen, at Ceidio, whereby his kingdom was made to extend from the Clyde to the Mersey, and thus to the confines of St. Kentigern's Welsh see. This battle was fought in A.D. 573, and its first-fruits was the recall of St. Kentigern to his Cumbrian diocese by Rhydderch, who, himself of Irish extraction, had received the Christian faith during his exile in Ireland. This date is of vast importance in the biography of St. Kentigern, as it gives one fixed point in his chronology. Rhydderch's call he at once obeyed; and consecrating his disciple, St. Asaph, to fill his place in North Wales, he returned to Strathclyde, but went no farther than Holdelm (now Hoddam, Dumfriesshire), where for some years (probably eight) he had his episcopal seat. His leaving Llanelwy was a cause of great lamentation, and a great number of the monks accompanied him. At Hoddam the saint is laid of the joyous welcome given to the seene by king Rhydderch, who is represented (cc. 31-33) as going out with his people to meet



him, and as conceding to him all power over himself and his posterity. But it was at Glasgow, on the banks of the Mellindor and the Clyde, that the still more famous meeting took place between the two most famous saints of the period in Scotland (c. 39), St. Columba and St. Kentigern. Nothing seems more natural than that the two aged confessors should have direct communion in their work. The districts they evangelised were contiguous: both were zealous in the same cause: they had mutual friends; and at most, the intervening distance was but trifling. Their meeting was typical of the two currents of Christian faith and practice which were running alongside, and overflowing the land—namely, the Irish and the Welsh, which were to come in contact again at the great rampart of the Grampian range, and give their character to the Scotie and the Pictish churches. Yet we need not follow Boethius (lib. ix. c. 14) in making St. Kentigern a convert by St. Columba's preaching before king Brude, and his being his companion for some time at Dunkeld, where they preached to the Atholi, Calidoni, Horesti, and neighbouring nations; but on the other hand, the dedications to the north of Glasgow, and on Deeside in Aberdeenshire, would make it probable that St. Kentigern had extended his labours into the regions of the Southern Picts, and up, at least, to the dividing line between them and the Northern, not to mention the improbable statement of Joceline (c. 34) that he sent missionaries to the Orkneys, Norway, and Iceland. But at last his labours came to an end in the beginning of the 7th century. He attained an advanced age, though probably a century short of the 185 years imputed to him. The date of his death is variously given, from A.D. 601 to 614; the Welsh authorities generally adhering to A.D. 612, as given in *Annales Cambriae*, but the true date is probably A.D. 603. (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 197 n.; Bp. Forbes, *Lives*, &c. 369–70.) He died on Sunday, Jan. 13, and was buried where the cathedral of Glasgow now stands.

The favourite name in dedications is St. Mungo. There are no dedications to him in Wales, but in Cumberland there are at Aspatria, Bromfield, Caldbeck, Crosfield (in Kirkland), Crosthwaite, Grinsdale, Lethington, Mungrisdale (in Greystock), and Sowerby. In the south of Scotland, and probably connected with his stay at Hoddam, there are dedications at St. Mungo or Abermilk, and Kirkmahon in Dumfriesshire, at Lanark and Borthwick, or Lochwerweth, in Lanarkshire, at the town of Peebles, at Penicuik and Currie in Mid-Lothian, at Polwarth in Berwickshire, and at Hassenden in Selkirkshire; in the country of the South Picts, at Aloa in Clackmannanshire, and at Auchterarder in Perthshire; among the Northern Picts, at Kynore, now part of Huntley, Aberdeenshire, at Glegain, now united to Tullich and Glenmuick in the same county, at Inverness, where his hill is, and at St. Mungo's Isle in Loch Leven, facing the entrance to Glencoe. His chief dedication and episcopal seat, which, as in like cases, was near but not quite at the ancient civil capital, Alclwyd or Dumbarton, is the cathedral church of Glasgow; and there appears to have been a Little St. Mungo's kirk outside the city walls. (Bp. Forbes, *Lives*, &c. lxxxiii.–xci. and *Kal.* &c.

372; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 192, sq.; C. Innes *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 1, sq.; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* viii. 118.) [J. G.]

KENTIGERNA (CAENTIGERN, CAINTIGERN, CANTIGERN, CENTIGERNA, COENTIGERNA, KENTIGERNE, QUINTIGERNA, QUINTIGERNA), widow, commemorated in the Scotch kalendars on January 7th. She was daughter of Ceallach Cualann, regulus of Leinster; her brother was St. CONGAN of Turriff, and her sister, Muirenn, who died in 748 after marriage with Irgalach, son of Conang, lord of Cianachta, in Meath, who came under the ban of St. Adamnan for violence and murder (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, liii. iv.). St. Kentigerna was married to Feradach or Feriacus, prince of Monchestree, by whom she had a numerous family, of which the best known was St. FILLAN or FOELAN of Strathfillan, in Perthshire. On becoming a widow, she left Ireland with her brother, St. Congan, and with St. Fillan, her son. After spending some time at Strathfillan, she withdrew to Inch-Cailliach (called by Camerarius, *Inchelroiche*), on Loch Lomond, where, after a period of devout meditation as a recluse, she died A.D. 734 (*Ann. Ul.* 733; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 356). Bp. Keith, *Hist. Cat. Scot. Bps.* 375), following Adam King (*Kal.* in die), is evidently as much astray in placing her death in 560, as is Dempster (*Men. Scot.* in die) in locating her commemoration at Glasgow. The church at Inch-Cailliach appears to be her only dedication. Her legend, apparently from some Irish source, is given in *Breviarium Aberdonense* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. ff. xxiv.–v.), also by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 75), who is followed for the most part in the memoir given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 21 sq.). Bp. Forbes (*Kal. Scott. Saints*, 373) and O'Hanlon (*Irish Saints*, i. 94–5) present notices (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 384 and n.; Bp. Forbes, *Ib.* iii. 127, 141, 189, 233, lxi.) for her place in the kalendars and in the *Litany of Dunkeld* (C. Innes, *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 32; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 84). [J. G.]

KENTWINUS, king of Wessex. [CENTWINE.]

KENULF, king of Mercia, succeeded Egferth in December 796. He was the son of Cuthberht, and a descendant in the fifth degree from Cenwealh, the brother of Penda (*Flor. Wig. M. H. B.* 638). His first years were employed in the pacification of Kent, which had risen against the Mercian rule, even before the death of Offa, under Eadbert Praen. Eadbert was conquered, taken prisoner, and blinded by Kenulf in 798; and Kent was then bestowed by him on Cuthred, who held it until his death, nine years after 807. [EADBERT (+) PRAEN.] Kenulf's next achievement was the restoration of peace to the church by the abolition of the archbishopric of Lichfield and the restoration of estates alienated from the see of Canterbury, the particular steps of which are detailed under ETHELHEARD, and which was finally accomplished in the council of Clovesho in 803. In the year 801 Kenulf engaged in war with Eardulf, king of Northumberland; he had received some of Eardulf's enemies, and probably had given an asylum to archbishop Eanbald of York, who was consulted in that year by archbishop Ethelheard, and had, as we learn from

Alcuin, been driven from his see by Eardulf, in consequence of a quarrel arising from the king's adultery. (See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 534-536; Jaffé. *Mon. Alcuin*, p. 620.) Before a battle could take place, peace and alliance were concluded between the two kings. (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 672.)

The political history of the following years, and of the remainder of Kenulf's life, so far as it is illustrated by historians, is brief and scanty. The West Saxon kingdom under Egbert was gradually rising to supremacy, and although there was no conflict between Egbert and Kenulf, the power of Mercia was waning. In 805 Kenulf lost the support of archbishop Ethelheard, and his relations with Wulfred were not so friendly. In 807 (805 Chr. S.) Cuthred died, and Kenulf himself governed Kent from that time either directly or possibly by king Baldred (H. Hunt. *M. H. B.* 734). In 818 he ravaged South Wales (Ann. Camb. *M. H. B.* 834; Brut. *M. H. B.* 844).

Fortunately the domestic and ecclesiastical history of Kenulf during these years gains much light from charters. In 805, in a great ecclesiastical synod at Acleah, in which it is probable that archbishop Wulfred was chosen and consecrated, Kenulf bestowed on the new prelate an estate at Bockholt (Kemble, *C. D.* 190). In 808 at Tamworth, he granted to his thegn Eadulf a plough land and a half at Cooling in Kent (K. C. D. 194). In 811 he took part in the dedication of the family monastery, which he had founded at Winchelcomb, and emancipated Eadbert Praen as a part of the offerings of the day (K. C. D. 197, spurious; but see Will. Malmesb. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, p. 294; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 572-574). The same year, in a great council at London, he sold or gave to Wulfred a considerable estate at Rockingham (Rockinge) in Kent, and in the neighbourhood of Canterbury (K. C. D. 196), and land at Rochester on bishop Beornmod (*ib.* 198). In 812 he confirmed a purchase made by Wulfred and an exchange of lands with the archbishop (K. C. D. 199). In 814 he sold to Wulfred land at "Westanwilde," also in Kent (K. C. D. 201), and gave him an estate of ten ploughlands at Byxlea (*ib.* 204). At Tamworth this year at Christmas he made an exchange with Deneberht of Worcester (*ib.* 203), and made grants to Wulfred and Deneberht besides (*ib.* 205, 206, 207).

In 816 Kenulf with his witan was present at the council of Clovesho under Wulfred, the acts of which are extant (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579-585), and in which he made other gifts to Worcester. The following year, 817, Wulfred and Kenulf were still friendly, meeting twice in Mercian witenagemots. They quarrelled immediately after. The immediate cause of the quarrel seems to have been the seizure by Kenulf of two Kentish monasteries, Minster in Thnet, and Reculver. In consequence of this proceeding Wulfred is said to have put Kenulf's dominions under interdict, which lasted for six years, 817 to 822. About the year 820, the quarrel was discussed in a council at London, in which Kenulf declared that for neither pope nor emperor would he allow Wulfred to return to his possessions unless he restored another disputed estate, and paid a fine of 120*l.* Kenulf

offered, if his terms were accepted, to hold Wulfred harmless with the pope, whose authority, it would appear, had been some way invoked. The dispute continued during the rest of Kenulf's life, and was continued by his daughter Cynethritha, a final adjustment being arrived at in 825. [WULFRED.]

Kenulf died, according to the Chronicle, in 819; but this must be corrected to 822 or late in 821; his son Kenelm is said to have been murdered after a reign of a few months, July 17, and Ceolwulf, the next king, to have been consecrated by Wulfred Sept. 822 (K. C. D. 216; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 590).

It is probable that Kenulf was twice married, first to Kynegitha, whose name, however, appears only in a spurious charter of 799 [KENEDRITHA], and secondly to Elfthritha, who attests several of Kenulf's charters from 808 onwards (K. C. D. 194, 196).

His children were, according to the genealogies of Florence, three, all by Elfthritha—Kenelm, the son who succeeded him, and was slain by his sister, Kynethritha, the abbess of Winchelcomb, and Burgenhilda, of whom no more is heard (*M. H. B.* 630, 638). It is probable that Kynethritha was only half-sister to Kenelm.

Kenulf is the last great and independent king of Mercia; under him Cuthred first, and afterwards Baldred, ruled in Kent, and the title of king of the East Saxons was borne by Sigered (K. C. D. 196, 197). [S.]

**KENULPHUS**, first abbat of Crowland (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* 66). His successor Patrick was said to be living in 793. (*Monast. Angl.* ii. 89, 91, 107.) [C. H.]

**KERI, ST.**, son of Brychan of Brecknock, probably the patron saint of Egloskerry in Cornwall, but the parish church is now dedicated to other saints. There is a parish of Kerry in Wales. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 383.) [C. W. B.]

**KERO**, a monk of St. Gall, who lived in the reign of Pippin, the father of Charlemagne, and during the abbacy of Othmar. He was the author of an interlinear translation of the rule of St. Benedict, to which his monastery was subject, into the lingua Theotisca, the primitive German of the time and country. It was first published in 1726, at Ulm, in Schilter's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Teutonicarum* (tom. i. pars ii. p. 13 seq.), from a MS. of the monastery of St. Gall, with a preface and notes by J. G. Scherzizus, professor of law at Strasburg. Before this, however, Goldastus had inserted in his *Rerum Alamannicarum Scriptores* (tom. ii. 71-95), a glossary of barbaric—i.e. Allamanic, or German—terms formed from the writings of Kero. Besides the translation of the rule, Kero wrote in the same language a *confessio fidei*, and a short *expositio in orationem Dominicam*, also preserved in the library at St. Gall (Goldastus, *ib.* ii. 10). See Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs Sacrés*, xii. 110, and the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 134. [S. A. B.]

**KERTEN, KERTNUS.** [MACCARTHEN.]

**KESSOG** (KESSOGUS, MAKKESSAGE, MAKKESSAG, MAKKESSOGUS), bishop and confessor in Scotland, commemorated March 10. *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. ff. 66-67) gives his

legend in six lections which largely partake of the miraculous; the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* March 10, t. ii. 35 sq.) give his acts in a *Commentarius* Proevius of two sections, followed by the legend from the Breviary. Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 113) has a notice of Makkessogus Episc., and Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 419) treats of "S. Kessogus seu Bessogus," an Irish Scot, who flourished in Cathenesia (Caithness) in A.D. 700, and again (*ib.* ii. 454\*) of St. Makkessagus, a bishop in Lennox, chosen, he thinks, from the Culdees, and flourishing at the same time as the last: evidently they are the same person. Bp. Forbes (*Kal. Scott. Saints*, 373-4) has an elaborate memoir, which O'Hanlon (*Irish Saints*, iii. 285-6) has for the most part followed. What is known is clearly within a narrow range, and no ancient life is extant, but Dr. Todd (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 74 n.) identifies Kessogus of the *Brev. Aberd.* Mar. 10, with Moshenog of Beitheach (Mar. 11) in the Irish kalendars. [MOSHENOG.]

St. Kessog or Makkessog was born in Cashel in Munster, where his father was king, descended from the royal race of Ireland. He was early distinguished for virtue and miracles, and the legend opens with an account of his raising a child, who was drowned, to life. He appears to have come to Scotland and fixed his abode on Inch-ta-ranach, one of the islands of Loch Lomond, from which he evangelized the neighbourhood. According to one tradition, he suffered martyrdom at a place called Bandry, where a cairn and a large stone with his effigy were erected to his memory. This may be Carn-ma-Chesaig, in the parish of Luss, on the west side of Loch Lomond (*C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 30; *Old Stat. Acc. Scot.* xvii. 264; *New Stat. Acc. Scot. Dumbarton*, 161). According to another tradition he suffered abroad, and his body was embalmed and brought to Scotland, preserved in sweet herbs, which afterwards germinated and gave its name Luss (Gaelic) to the parish (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 374). The church of Luss was dedicated to him, and for his honour received important privileges; so also were the churches of Auchterarder and Callander in Perthshire, there being at the latter a conical hill or mount, apparently artificial, called Tom-na-Chessaig: there are Kessog fair at Cumbrae and Kessock ferry at Inverness (Bp. Forbes, *ib.*). Camerarius makes him a bishop in Boyne (Bodie) Banffshire, and Dempster (*Men. Scot.* in die) in the Lennox (Leuinia): the latter adds the curious information that he is specially venerated by soldiers, and is himself represented in military habit with arrows and a bended bow (ipse militari habitu cum sagittis arcu tenso depingitur). His bell must have been very highly valued, as so late as 1675 the *sacra campana* St. Kessogii was included among the feudal investitures of the earldom of Perth (*Retours*, Perth. 708, 880; Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. Scot.* 660; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* t. 18-22). Dempster (*Hist. &c.* ii. 454) says his Makkessagus wrote *Manipulum Precum*, lib. 1; *Cateches. ad Neophytos*, lib. i. (Tanner, *Bibl.* 502.) [J. G.]

KEURBREIT, Welsh saint, perhaps of the 5th century, but unidentified. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 122; Jones, *Brecknockshire*, i. 343.)

[J. G.]

KEVIL, patron of a church in Ballybrennan parish, bar. Forth, co. Wexford, but its bell and materials profaned. (*Journ. Kilt. Arch. Soc. iv.* 67.) [J. G.]

KEVIN. [COEMGEN.]

KEVOCA (KENNOCHA, KENNOTHA, KENOCA), virgin in Scotland, commemorated March 13. Her legend is given in the six lections of the *Aberdeen Breviary* (Prop. SS. p. hym. ff. 68-9), from which it is taken by the Bollandists (*Acta SS. Mart.* 13, t. ii. (338), 333), and in substance by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* liii. c. 4, p. 115; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, &c. ii. pt. i. 183; Duffus Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. ii. 619.) In the Scotch kalendars she is usually called Kevoca, and by the Scotch annalists Kennocha. Adam King (*Kal.* in die) says, "St. Kennoche, virg. (lived), in Scotland under king Malcolm II. 1007," and this date is usually accepted; while at the same date and day Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 412) connects his St. Kennotha with Brechin.

But though St. Kevoca, Kennocha, or Kennotha be thus located in Scotland, and given a local history, there can be little reasonable doubt but she is really an Irish saint and of the other sex, namely, Caemhog, Mochoemoc, Mo-Chaemhog, or Pulcherius. [CAEMHOG.] Mochoemoc died A.D. 655 (*Four Mast.*), and has his own distinct legend. [MOCHOEMOCUS.] There is no reason, from the meagre legend or otherwise, to imagine that the Scots knew whence they were borrowing. [CAEMHOG.] [J. G.]

KEW, ST. (see v. CIWG). The name of the parish of St. Kew in Cornwall represents the colloquial English form of St. Ciwg or Cwick, the patron of Llangwick on the Taff in Glamorganshire. The form of St. Kew in the Exeter Domesday is Lancichuc, according to one view, but this is a doubtful identification. There is also a village of Kewstoke on the Somersetshire shore opposite the mouth of the Taff. Another view derives Kew from Kywa (see v. CIWA), and in the *Exeter Martyrology* is the following note, "Festum S. Kywe virginis, 8 Feb." The feast day at St. Kew, however, is on the nearest Sunday to 25th July. There is a holy well in the parish. [C. W. B.]

KEYNA, see CENEU (1). and Kerslake's *Damnonia outside Cornwall*, 428. [C. W. B.]

KEYNWEN, ST., a daughter of Brychan of Brecknock, whose feast day is the 8th October (see above v. CEINWEN). There is a parish of Kenwyn in Cornwall, in which Truro is situated. See W. C. Borlase, *The Age of the Saints*, 1878, p. 87. [C. W. B.]

KHOROHPOUD (CHOROBUTUS), a Persian historian mentioned by Moses of Choren (*lib.* ii. capp. 69, 70 in Langlois, *Historiens*, vol. ii. p. 116). He was secretary of Sapor king of Persia, and fell into the hands of the emperor Julian at Ctesiphon. When Julian died Khorohpoud accompanied Jorian back to Greece, where having embraced the Christian religion, he was called Eleazar. He learned the Greek language and composed in it a history of the war between Sapor and Julian. He also translated into

Greek a volume of the history of early times written by one of his fellow captives Barsumas, called by the Persians Radssohoun. [G. T. S.]

**KIHUSRAU** (CHOSROES), deacon martyred under Sapor II., king of Persia. (Wright's *Syr. Mart. in Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1866, p. 432.) [G. T. S.]

**KIE-IHO**, Nestorian bishop of Sighanfu, 745. (Le Quen, ii. 1270.) [C. H.]

**KIERAN, ST.** (see v. CIARAN). The Cornish form of the name is Piran, which see; but the Irish form remains at St. Kerian, in Exeter, and St. Keverne, in Cornwall, which is Lan-achebran in Domesday. One of the fair days of the parish of St. Keverne is the 5th of March, which is St. Kieran's day, and the same day is kept at Perran Uthno in Cornwall. The change of the old letter K into the later Cymric P is noticeable, as in Cen Pen, but in the earlier Cymric K still existed. See W. C. Borlase, *The Age of the Saints*, 1878, pp. 40, 47. [C. W. B.]

**KILIAN (1)**, martyr in Franconia. [CILIAN.]

(2) Irish saint. [CILEN.]

(3) Feb. 10, patron of Killcullsheen, co. Kilkenny. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 455.)

(4) Kilian or Quilian, said to have been a disciple of St. Columbanus, and assistant to St. Vulganius in preaching to the Morini in the 7th century. He was buried at Montreuil in Picardy, where his relics were venerated. (Lanigan, *Ecc. Hist. Ir.* ii. 443.)

(5) Chillen or Kilian, an Irish bishop who stopped at Meaux on his way home from Rome, and was directed by the bishop of St. Faro to preach the gospel in Artois some time after A.D. 628. (Lanigan, *Ch. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 16, § 6.)

(6) bishop of Dol. [CHELIANUS.] [J. G.]

**KINAETHI** (CINAETH), son of Cumasgach, abbat of Dearmhach (now Durrow, co. Meath), died A.D. 793. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 792; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 788, i. 395; Lanigan, *Ecc. Hist. Ir.* ii. 202.) [J. G.]

**KINDASVINTH** (CHINDASVINTHUS), king of Gothic Spain from May 8 (?) 642 to Sept. 30, 653.

*Kindasvinth's Usurpation. Struggle with the Nobility and Clergy. The Seventh Council of Toledo.*—In 642 Kindasvinth, an old man of seventy-nine, "unus ex primatibus," succeeded in overthrowing the government of the young Tulga, KINDILA's son, and in establishing himself upon the throne ("per tyrannidem," Fredegar, cap. 82, apud Bouquet, ii. p. 444; Isid. Pac. p. 480). Tulga was tonsured and forced into a monastery, and Kindasvinth, at the head of a strong party of senators and others, immediately threw all his energies, as Leovigild had done before him, into a struggle with that rebellious and lawless Gothic nobility which throughout made a strong Gothic monarchy impossible, except during occasional intervals when some king of greater ability than his fellows succeeded temporarily in keeping the turbulent order in check. "When he had secured the whole of Spain," says the contemporary witness Fredegar, "knowing the evil habit which the Goths had of deposing their kings (for which purpose he had himself often in old days shared

in their plots), he ordered that all those among them whom he knew to have been concerned in the plots against former kings who had been driven from the throne (? LEOVA II. and SUNTHILA), should be executed, and others he condemned to exile, giving their wives, daughters, and property to his *fideles*. He is said in repressing this vice to have slain two hundred of the *primates*, and five hundred of the *mediocres*. And until Chindasvinth knew that this evil habit of the Goths was rooted out, he did not cease to slay with the sword those whom he suspected. So that the Goths dared not plot against him, as they were accustomed to do against their kings" (Bouquet, *l. c.* p. 444). By this wholesome and necessary severity, Kindasvinth secured a period of rest and development for the harassed Gothic state, and prepared the way for the great legislative ideas which mark his reign. It was not, however, by the secular nobility only that the very existence of the Gothic monarchy was at this juncture imperilled. The acts of the Toledan council of 646 (18th Oct. "in Toletanum urbem") were directed rather against ecclesiastical than lay rebels, and through them Kindasvinth struck at those intriguing and ambitious churchmen who had been the real rulers of the kingdom under the weak kings SISENAND and Chintila [KINDILA], and who from the expressions in the acts had evidently given great trouble during the first years of the new reign. The first canon, *de refugis atque perfidis clericis sive laicis*, is of great interest and importance, difficult as it now is to apprehend all its political bearings. The canon threatens with deprivation, excommunication, and life-long penance, all those ecclesiastics who either become themselves *tyranni* and *refugae*, or aid and abet others in rebellion or flight to foreign countries. No priest is to give such an one communion, even at the bidding of the king, for kings are not to be obeyed in matters which involve perjury, "lest, *quod absit*, a king should arise hostile to the Catholic faith, and a priest through fear or favour should be induced to desert the light of the true faith for darkness," a sentence which seems to betray the presence of Arianism as a distant but still possible danger in the state. (Conf. on this canon and on its relation to earlier legislation in Kindasvinth's reign, Helfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*, 89, 136. It is really an extension to the clergy of an edict published in the second year of his reign, *De his qui contra principem, vel gentem aut patriam refugiant, Lex Visig.* ii. 1, 6; Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, v. 194, vi. 458.)

The remaining five canons of the council are on strictly ecclesiastical matters. Canons two, three, and five are concerned (a) with cases of sudden illness during the celebration of mass, (b) with the burial of bishops, (c) with the discipline of *reclusi* or hermits. Canon four discusses the complaints of the Gallician presbyters against the rapacity and exactions of certain of their bishops. The council having examined the matter decrees that in future no bishop shall exact more than two *solidi* annually from each church, according to a decree of the synod of Braga (c. Brac. ii. 2, A.D. 572), a tax from which monastic churches are to be excepted. And no bishop shall visit his diocese with a train of more than fifty persons (? five, "nec unquam

quinquagenarium numerum evectiois excedat;" the passage is difficult and disputed, conf. Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 355; Gams, *Kirchengesch. von Spanien*, ii. [2] 125, n. 4), or remain more than one day in each parish. The sixth canon, *de conviciis episcopis in urbe regia commorandis*, is interesting, as bearing on the question of the growth of the ascendancy of the Toledan see. The bishops nearest to Toledo are to reside each for one month in every year in the capital, according to the summons of the metropolitan, a regulation which may be regarded as the first step on the road to the primacy of 681. By it Toledo was marked out from other metropolitan sees; her hold over her suffragans was made one of peculiar closeness and intensity, and that line of policy was inaugurated which was to culminate in the career of JULIAN, and the primacy canon of the twelfth council (see art. JULIAN).

Thirty bishops and eleven vicars signed the acts of c. Tol. vii. Orontius of Merida, to whom were dedicated the *Allegoriae quaedam* of Isidore, took the first place as the junior metropolitan. Toledo has not yet, be it observed, an inherent right of precedence.

*Kindasvinth's last Years.*—In 649 Kindasvinth associated his son Rekesvinth with him in the government, and, withdrawing himself more and more from the active business of the state, gave himself to good works, and possibly to the completion of his legislative work (see below). To these latter years of his reign are to be applied the expressions of later chroniclers concerning the peacefulness of Spain under him, which scarcely fit the troubled times before the council of 646, as described by Fredegar. Pleasant details still remain to us of his friendship with certain literary bishops, with Eugenius II. of Toledo, to whom he entrusted the completion and perfection of the poems of Dracontius (*SS. PP. Tolet. Opp. Lorenzana*, ii.; *Amador de los Rios, Hist. de la Literatura Españ.* i.), with BRAULIO of Saragossa (*Ep. Braulio. ad Chind. Esp. Sagr.* xxx. pp. 363, 367, 373; *Chind. Reg. ad Braul.* p. 365, l.c.) and with Braulio's successor, TAYO, whom the king sent to Rome with a commission to bring back thence certain books of Gregory the Great's MORALIA, not then to be found in Spain (*l. c.* p. 382; *Isid. Pac. Esp. Sagr.* viii. (see articles LEANDER and TAYO). On Sept. 30, 653, Kindasvinth died at the age of ninety, and his weaker son REKESVINTH was left to carry out alone the great plans of his father (Fredegar, l. c.; *Chron. Reg. Visig.*; *Arevalo, Isid. Op.* vii. 188). The libellous penitential epiphany put into his mouth after his death by his quondam friend Eugenius II. (*Lorenzana, l. c.*; conf. Dahn, v. 198), is a fair indication of the hostility felt towards him in his lifetime by the more ambitious and worldly of the Spanish clergy; yet strange to say in later centuries the king who had done his best to break down the undue influence of the church over the monarchy was venerated as a saint, and legend pointed him out in Philip II.'s time as the founder of the monastery of San Roman on the Douro, and the companion of the apocryphal saints, Roman and Otho (*Morales, Hist. de España*, vi. 158).

*Kindasvinth's Legislation.*—Kindasvinth's immense services to Visigothic law can hardly be better summed up than in the words of the German historian Dahn: "He with his son

Rekesvinth, first of all, by abolition of the Roman law as the breviary of Alaric had codified it for the Romanised population, and by the extension of the Visigothic law to the Romans, established a uniform law of the land for all subjects of the Gothic state. He then carried through a fundamental reform of judicial procedure, and of the law-courts themselves; he compelled the reluctant bishops and priests to present themselves to the secular judge; and breaking through the former close limitations of the county court (*Grafenschaftgericht*) he provided for the certain execution of judgments, apart from any extraordinary exercise of the royal prerogative. No fresh laws against the Jews, whom he protected against the effects of older legislation, disgrace his reign, and he is even to be credited with certain humane laws in favour of that most down-trodden and miserable class of the Gothic state, the serfs (Dahn, v. 196; see references to the *Forum Judicum* given in the notes; Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, v. 155).

Kindasvinth, however, is not to be regarded as the author of a special redaction of the Visigothic code. The codification of his laws and of those of older kings was left for the reign of Rekesvinth, by whom a new version of the *Forum Judicum*, embodying all his father's work, with additions of his own, was issued (possibly in 654, Helfferich, *Westgoth. Recht.* p. 181) to the final and formal exclusion of the *Lex Romana*. But Kindasvinth had prepared the way, and provided the material, his was the initiative idea, and his unflinching and energetic rule alone made the execution of it possible to his son. (Helfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*, pp. 80-140; conf. also Von Savigny, *Geschichte des Röm. Rechts im Mittelalter*, ii. 67, and Bethmann-Hollweg, *Der Germanisch-Romanische Civil-process im Mittelalter*, i. 215.)

*Original Authorities.*—Fredegar, l. c.; Acts of c. Tol. vii. Tejada y Ramiro, *Colecc. de Can. de la Igl. Españ.* ii. 350; Aguirre-Catalani, vii. 420; *Fuero Juzgo*, Madrid Academy edition, 1815; *Chron. Reg. Visig. and Chron. et Series Reg. Goth.* apud Arevali, l. c.; Isid. Pacensis, *Esp. Sagr.* viii. 280; letters of Braulio, Eugenius, and Tayo, 11 cc.; *Vita Sti. Baboleni*, Bouquet, iii. 569. Coins (eighteen types of Kindasvinth only, five of Kindasvinth and Rekesvinth together) in *Description Générale des Monnaies des Rois Visigoths d'Espagne*, par Alois Heiss, Paris, 1872, p. 118. Two inscriptions, apud Hubner, *Inscr. Hisp. Christ.* nos. 24, 175. (The date of the latter inscription is undoubtedly 652 and not 655 as now given.)

(The supposed donation to San Fructuoso's monastery of Compludo, Tamayo de Salazar, *Martyr Hisp.* ii. 677, is admittedly spurious; conf. Dahn, v. 198, n. 2. To the general references already given may be added, Lafuente, *Hist. de España*, ii. 418; Ferreras, d'Hermilly, ii. 317.) [M. A. W.]

**KINDILA (CHINDILA)**, king of Gothic Spain from A.D. 636 to 640.

*Sources.*—Our sources of information for this short reign are very scanty. A mere mention in Fredegar's contemporary chronicle (Bonquet, *Recueil*, &c. ii. 444), two sentences in the *Chronologia et Series Regum Gothorum* (Isid. *Opera*, ed.

Arevali, vii.), a short notice in the 8th-century chronicle of Isidorus Pacensis (*Esp. Sagr.* viii. 279), the acts of the fifth and sixth councils of Toledo, and about a dozen coins (*Description Générale des Monnaies des Rois Visigoths d'Espagne*, par Alois Heiss, Paris, 1872, p. 113) are all our material.

By what steps Kindila's election to the Gothic crown was brought about is unknown to us; but the haste, the small numbers, and the anxiously political canons of the fifth council of Toledo, held two months after his accession, seem to shew that his elevation was due to the influence of one party only in the party-ridden Gothic state, and that the early days of his reign were passed in insecurity and amid civil disturbances. His election, to judge from the tone of the chroniclers, was, if not instigated, at least approved and taken advantage of by the church, and he may certainly be ranked among the kings subservient to the hierarchy rather than among the more independent sovereigns, such as SUINTILA or KINDASVINTH. His accession may be placed about the end of March or beginning of April, 636 (Dahn, v. 190), almost contemporary with the death of the great Isidore of Seville, and towards the end of June the fifth council of Toledo, consisting of twenty-four bishops only, as against the sixty-six bishops of the fourth council in 633, met in the church of St. Leocadia. By far the majority of the twenty-four were bishops of Carthaginensis, headed by their metropolitan Eugenius of Toledo. To these were added a few bishops from Tarraconensis, one from Lusitania, and possibly one from Galicia or Narbonensis (to which belongs the unknown "sedes Vianensis" ?), while there is no signature from the important church province of Baetica. Hellferich suggests that advantage was taken of the presence of a few bishops from other provinces, notably of the famous BRAULIO of Saragossa, in the capital to give the appearance of a national council to what was really a provincial synod of Carthaginensis (*Westgoth. Recht.* p. 80). The fifth council, however, was recognised as "universalis," that is national, by the sixth council (638), and its place among the councils of Toledo has never been seriously disputed (see references to older objections in Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* vi. 169). Of its eight canons, one only, the first (*de institutione novarum litaniarum*), is for appearances' sake concerned with ecclesiastical matters. The seven following are levelled against the pressing political dangers of the time. The whole acts of this strange council betray the deep inner sores of the Gothic monarchy, its disunion, lawlessness, and the weakness of the central government. The fourth canon especially may very possibly have been levelled against Kindila's successor, Kindasvinth, whom we know from Fredegar's account (cap. 82) to have been a practised rebel and intriguer before his accession to the throne, and who must have been engaged during Kindila's reign in building up for himself that strong party which ultimately carried him to power in 642.

Eighteen months later the sixth council of Toledo met "in praetorio Toledano (i. e. in the capital city, the seat of government) in ecclesiâ Sanctae Leocadiae." By this time Kindila's rule was more firmly established, and fifty-two bishops obeyed the summons to the synod, of which five

were the metropolitans of Narbonne, Braga, Toledo, Seville, and Tarragona. Before the proper business of the synod commenced the cause of two rival bishops of Astigi—MARCIANUS and HABENTIUS—was heard in the presence of forty of the assembled bishops, and judgment was given in favour of MARCIANUS. The synod itself promulgated eighteen canons, the nineteenth being merely an *actio gratiarum*. Simony, alienation of church property, violation of penitential or monastic vows, cases in which dispensation from such is to be allowed, the conditions binding on the freedmen attached to the church estates, the legal status of an accuser, emigration to an enemy's country, the respect due to the palatini, or higher nobility, the irrevocable character of ecclesiastical donations—such are the subjects treated by the council. Most of the decrees are repetitions or alterations of earlier canons. In can. 17 eligibility for the office of king is still more closely defined than it had been in the fifth council, which had considered rather the electors than the candidates. Now, however, the bishops of the sixth council lay down plainly, "rege vere defuncto nullus tyrannica praesumptione regnum assumat, nullus sub religionis habitu detonsus aut turpiter decalvatus, aut servilem originem trahens vel extranae gentis homo, nisi genere Gothus et moribus dignus provehatur ad apicem regni." (Dahn, *Könige der Germanen* vi., *Verfassungsgeschichte der Westgothen*, p. 538.)

From the ecclesiastical point of view, far the most important canon of the council is the third—*de custodia fidei Judaeorum*—which is probably the foundation of Kindila's reputation for orthodoxy with later Spain. "At last," says the canon, "the inflexible perfidy of the Jews has been somewhat amended" (i. e. by the Jew-laws of SISEBUT and his successors). The most excellent and Christian prince, Kindila, is however determined to root out the remains of the Jewish prevarications and superstitions, "nor shall any one be suffered to live in his kingdom who is not a Catholic." The bishops then, with the consent of the *optimates* and *virii illustres* (no signatures of such appear in the MSS.; conf. however, Isid. Pac.), decree that no king shall ascend the throne in future without taking an oath, "inter reliqua conditionum sacramenta" (these sacramenta of the Gothic kings have not, alas! come down to us), not to tolerate Judaism, and not to suffer himself to be moved to favour it by any carelessness or covetousness—"neglectu aut cupiditate." (See Graetz, on the means by which the Jews had till now managed in some degree to elude their persecutors, *Geschichte der Juden*, v. 74, 155, 158.) The canon concludes with a confirmation of the Jew-laws of the fourth council of Toledo (cans. 57-66 inclusive, Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 304). By this canon, and the proceedings taken under it (see the *placitum Judaeorum* subscribed by the Jews under Rekesvinth, in which reference is made to a former *placitum* under Chintila, *Lex Visig.* xii. 2, 16), the Jews were hard pressed, and many were again forced into exile, as they had been under Sisebut. The situation at its worst, however, lasted only till the accession of Kindasvinth, under whose ten years' rule clergy and nobles were alike kept in control, and part of whose policy it was to protect the Jews who had

been the common victims with the monarchy of an ambitious and intolerant hierarchy.

(The whole history of the Jew-laws of the Visigoths has been most ably summed up by Dr. Graetz in a separate Dissertation, *Die Westgothische Gesetzgebung in Betreff der Juden im Seminar-Programm*, 1858.)

Kindila's services to the church were possibly rewarded by the succession in the kingdom of his son Tulga, "petitione patris," in 640 (Fredegar, cap. 82). But the rule of a weak youth was soon swept away by the stormy attack of KINDASWINTH, whose reign represents a reaction from the principles which had prevailed under Sisenand and Kindila. (Dahn, v. 192; Tejada y Ramiro, 318-347; Ferreras, ed. D'Hermilly, ii. 308-315.) [M. A. W.]

**KINEARDUS**, called by Dempster a Scot, monk and abbat in Gaul with Alcuin; said to have written *Vita Caroli Magni*, l. i.; *Epistolae*, l. i.; *De Translatione et Miraculis SS. Marcellini et Petri Martyrum*, l. i.; *Monita Gabrielis Archangeli, XII. capitulis comprehensa*, l. i. He flourished, A.D. 801. (Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 414-5; Tanner, *Bibl.* 457.) [J. G.]

**KINEDDA**, Welsh saint, son of Dinot and nephew of St. Oudoceus. (Rees, *Cambro-Brit. Saints*, Append. Suppl. Notes, p. 6.) [J. G.]

**KINEDUS**. [KYNEDUS.]

**KINOTHUS**, king of the Picts, with whom Ethelred king of Northumbria took refuge in 780. (Wend. Fl. H. ann. 780, ed. Coxe.) [C. H.]

**KIONITAE**. [STYLITAE.]

**KIUD** (KYUT, CHYUT, *Κιρός* in the Greek catalogue, CITO in the Latin version of it), catholicos of Armenia, from A.D. 465 to 475 according to the calculation of Langlois. The chief authority for him is Lazarus of Barb (§§ 54, 55, 56) translated by Langlois in his collection of Armenian historians (vol. ii. pp. 320-324). He is briefly noticed in the *Historia Armena* (Galanus, cap. 8) and in the Greek catalogue of Armenian patriarchs (Combesis, *Bibl. Graec. Lat. Patr.* t. ii. p. 289). See also Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* i. 1379), Langlois (*Disc. Prélim.* p. xiii. in vol. ii. of the *Historiens*), and Saint-Martin (*Mém. sur l'Arm.* i. 437). Kiud was a native of a town, the name of which is variously rendered Jotmuds (*Hist. Arm.*), Otmesou-Kiogh (Laz.), Atmesu (*Catal.*), in the canton of Vanant, in the province of Ararat. Lazarus describes him (§ 54) as of the province of Daik and the village of Arahez, very erudite in Armenian learning, and still more in Greek. He is called a disciple of St. Isaac (*Hist. Arm.*), and was one of the school of Mesrob trained in Greek learning. His pontificate occurred under the Persian domination, while Perozes was king of Persia and was vigorously continuing the policy of his father Isdigerd, of supplanting Christianity in Armenia by the magian religion. Kiud's period was a little after the church of his country had received a crushing blow by the death of prince Vartan, the catholicos Joseph, and the priest Leontius. He is stated to have removed the seat of the patriarchate to Thevin (*Hist. Arm.*), which

Le Quien identifies with Erivan; it had been hitherto fixed at Varshabad. Langlois (p. 320 note) says this removal had been made a little earlier by Mélidé of Manazguer. Kiud's high character and uncompromising firmness were a powerful support to the suffering Armenian church. For his efforts to recover the princes who had suffered themselves to be perverted, he was summoned before the Persian government and subjected to a menacing examination, the details of which are narrated by Lazarus and reveal a character of dignified mien and unflinching fortitude. He confessed that the Christian religion had had possession of his heart from infancy; he did not deny that he had relations with Greeks, for from Greece came all the learning of his country; Greeks had been the companions of his studies, and the very drapery worn by the Armenians was Greek. Perozes did not venture to take the life of Kiud, but contented himself with forbidding him the exercise of his office. While Kiud remained at the capital he was the object of general veneration to the Christians of those parts, among whom he ordained some bishops and several presbyters, while the very pagans solicited his prayers in their maladies. He at length returned honourably to Armenia, where he spent the rest of a long life in peace, and at his death was buried with his father in his native place. [L. D. & G. T. S.]

**KIRIANIS**, a bishop in Cyprus, one of those to whom the Paschal letter of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, in condemnation of Origenism, was addressed in the year 400. See Jerome's translation of the letter (*Ep.* 92, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

**KIRIANUS**, bishop, commemorated March 5 in Dempster, *Mem. Scot.* [CIARAN (4).] [J. G.]

**KIRITINUS** (QUERETINUS, KIRSTINUS, KYRINUS) occupies an important place in Scotch hagiography, as probably forming the connecting link in identifying St. Bonifacius of Rosemarky with the Irish Curitan of Ros-Meinn. In the Scotch kalendars and *Brev. Aberd.* we have uniformly Bonifacius bishop of Ross at March 16, and in the latter his legend at length. [BONIFACIUS QUERETINUS.] But from whatever source Boethius (*Scot. Hist.* l. iv. ff. 172-3; Bellender's *Boece B.* ix. c. 18, f. 124) gives the additional name Queritinnus, and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Mar. 16, t. ii. (449) 444) present an historical synopsis of Bonifacius Albanus Kiritinus, bishop in Scotland. Apparently from this foundation Dean Reeves (*Culdees*, pt. iii. § 5, p. 45) and Dr. Skene (*Celt. Scot.* i. 277 sq. ii. 230 sq.) have sought to identify this Scotch Bonifacius with the Curitan bishop of Ros-Meinn in *Mart. Doneg.* March 16, who in *Mart. Tal-laght.* and in Marian O'Gorman is called *Κυρι-ταν επροσβ ουρ abb Ρυρ ηνς Βαγγρενς*: by assuming the place to be really named *Ρορ, ηΒαγγρενς*, Curitan is bishop and abbat of Rosmarkyn, or Rosemarky. [CURITAN (1).] On this identification Dr. Skene proceeds to interpret the legend of St. Bonifacius as of a special mission from the south of Ireland. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. pt. i. 140.) [J. G.]



**KLEDWYN** (CLEWDWYN, CLYDWYN), son of Brychan of Brycheiniog, and at first a soldier. He is said to have conquered South Wales, but this may only be that he established his power over the Gwyddyl Ffichti, or Scottish Picts, who were left in Carmarthen and Pembroke. Perhaps he succeeded his father in the government of part of Brecknock, and may afterwards have devoted himself to religion. His feast is Nov. 1, and his dedication Llanglydwen, Carmarthen-shire. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 32; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 140, 141; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 76.)

[J. G.]

**KOLMAN, KOLMON** (GOLMAN), Irish saint in Wales in the 5th century, patron of Llangolman, subject to Maenlochog, and of Capel Colman, subject to Llanfihangel Penbedw, both in Pembrokeshire. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 190.)

[J. G.]

**KTENOLATRAE** (κτηνολάτραι, a name given by the Julianists to their opponents. (Nicetas Chon. *Theos. Orth. Fid.* lib. ix. cap. 10 in *Pat. Gr.* cxl. 48 B.)

[T. W. D.]

**KTISTOLATRAE.** [APHTHARTODOCETAE.]

**KYFLEFYR** (CYFLEFYR), called in the *Achan Saint*, son of Brychan; and in the *Cognatio*, son of Dingerd, and grandson of Brychan: said to have been martyred at Merthyr Cyfflefy, but everything is uncertain. (See Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 141, for references, and a discussion on his place, &c.; *Myv. Arch.* ii. 35.)

[J. G.]

**KYMORTH** (CYMORTH), Welsh saint in Emlyn, perhaps also called Corth, and wife of Brynach Wyddel. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 35; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 150, 157; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 50, 89.)

[J. G.]

**KYNEDUS, ST.** (KENEDUS), said to have been born in Brittany, and to have come to Wales in the time of St. David. (Capgrave, *Nova Legenda*, 205; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 160; Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 84; and see KENET.)

[C. W. B.]

**KYNIGYTHA** (KINIGITHE), queen of Kent, mentioned in a doubtful charter of Wihtrud king of Kent, dated July 17, 694 (Kemble, *Cod. Dip.* 37). In another of Wihtrud's charters, July, 696, and some later ones (*C. D.* 41, 42, 43, 47) the queen is Aedilburga (cf. Lappenberg, *Hist. Engl.* i. 285, ed. Thorpe). Kynigytha does not occur in the genealogies of Florence (*M. H. B.* 627).

[C. H.]

**KYNWAS**, son of Caw, not given by Rees (*Welsh Saints*), but is in Jones's list. (*Welsh Bards*, ii. 22; Lady Ch. Guest, *Mabinogion*, ii. 260.)

[J. G.]

## L

**LABAN**, ninth archbishop of Elusa, present at the fourth council of Paris, in A.D. 573, and represented at the second of Mâcon, in 585. In this latter year he died. (Mansi, ix. 867, 258; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 22; *Gall. Ch.* i. 970.)

[S. A. B.]

**LABDACUS**, a Persian with whom Terbinthus disputed concerning dualism. (Epiph. *Haer.* lxi. 3.)

[G. T. S.]

**LABES.** [HYSTEREMA.]

**LABU**, one of the chief citizens of Edessa who embraced Christianity after the example of Sharbil in the reign of Trajan. (Cureton, *Anc. Syr. Docum.* p. 45.)

[C. H.]

**LABUBNA**, a royal scribe or historiographer of Edessa in the reign of Abgar, at whose command he entered in the records the work entitled *The Doctrine of Addaeus the Apostle*, at the conclusion of which the fact is stated, and he is called the son of Senac the son of Ebedshaddai (translation in Cureton's *Ancient Syrian Documents*, p. 23 and note p. 166). He is mentioned by Moses of Choren (lib. ii. cap. 36) as having made a collection of all the transactions of the time of Abgar and Sanadroug depositing them in the archives of Edessa. In the translation of Langlois (*Historiens de l'Armén.* t. ii. p. 99) the name in this place is given as Lérubna the son of the scribe Apschatar, but Langlois in his note prefers Cureton's rendering of the names. In Le Vaillant's version it is Ghéroupna son of the writer Apchatar; in Capelletti's, Lernbnase son of the chancellor Afsadare. In an Armenian historical work translated by M. Brosset (in *Mém. de l'Acad. de St. Pétersbourg*, 1869, no. 5, p. 25) he appears as Ghéronbna and heads chronologically a list of Armenian authors.

[G. T. S.]

**LABYOLUS** (LABIOLUS, LAYBOLUS, LAYBLINUS, UBYOLUS, ÜBELINUS), twelfth bishop of Strasbourg, given by Magnebertus, and Gondaldus, perhaps towards the close of the 7th century. (*Gall. Christ.* v. 780.)

[S. A. B.]

**LACERIANUS**, bishop. [LASERIAN.]

**LACHINUS**, Irish saint. [MOLAGGA.]

**LACHNINUS** (LACHNAN), Irish saint, contemporary with St. Declan, and having his cell near Lismore, co. Waterford (Ussher, *Brit. Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 335, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 364; O'Flaherty, *Ogygia*, ii. c. 79, p. 292; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 601 (rectè 511), c. 3, and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 370). [DECLAN (2).] Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist.* *Ir.* i. c. 1, § 12) would identify him with St. Lactin or Lacteanus, contemporary of St. Senan in the 6th century.

[J. G.]

**LACHTAIN, IACHTAN, LACHTNAN** (LACHTEAN, LACHTEN, LACHTIN, LACTOCUS,



LACHTEIN, LACHTEN, MOLACTOCUS), abbat, perhaps bishop, of Achadh-úr, commemorated March 19. There is no ancient *Life* of St. Lachtain extant. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 655 sq. March 19) has compiled an account; the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 19 Mar. iii. (31) 32-4) give a fragment of a *Life* and closely follow Colgan; but much of it rests upon supposition.

Lachtain, usually classed among the saints of Leinster, was a native of Muskerry, co. Cork, and descended from Conaire, son of Moghlaíma monarch of Ireland. He was educated under St. Comgall at Bangor, and has his name associated with many Irish saints, as Mochaemog of Liathmore, Carthach of Rahen and Lismore, Molua of Clonfert, Senan of Iniscatheay, and Finnbar of Inis-doimble. From Bangor he proceeded to Achadh-úr (ager viridis seu mollis, *Vit. S. Moch.* c. 11), now Freshford in Ossory, co. Kilkenny, and founded his monastery. The fine old church at Freshford now occupies the site of St. Lachtain's foundation, but itself belongs to the close of the 11th or beginning of the 12th century. He also built a church at Bealach Feabhra (*Mart. Doneg.*) or Bealach-abhra, now probably Ballaghary or Ballaghawry, a townland in the parish of Kilbolane, bar. Orrery, co. Cork (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 244-5 n. 8), and is said to have had another at Lis-Lachtain in the north of Kerry, but Lanigan thinks the Lachtain of Lis-Lachtain and the friend of St. Senan was a different person from the present saint; so also was the successor of St. Molua, though Colgan tries to have them regarded as the same. Whether he was a bishop or not is uncertain, but he is often called such in the Hagiologies. Cumin of Connor (*Kelly, Cat. Ir. SS.* 169; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 180 n., 181) represents Lachtain as a strenuous champion of the men of Munster, but that may be the Lachtain in Kerry, though by some said to be the saint of Achadh-úr. *The Four Masters* give the obit of "St. Lachtain, son of Torben, abbat of Achadh-Úr," at A.D. 622, but the generally more accurate *Ann. Tig.* at A.D. 627, corrected by Dr. Skene (*Chron. Picts and Scots*, 69) to A.D. 625. He has only one feast, March 19, and Colgan mentions a holy well at Liosnasciath in the diocese of Cashel, which was much frequented for healing. A famous relic, of probably 12th century workmanship, is the shrine of St. Lachtain's arm and hand, which is similar in character to the "Hand of St. Patrick," and belongs to about the same date, A.D. 1121, which has (1878) been for many years in the possession of the family of A. Fountaine, Esq., of Narford Hall, near Swaffham, Norfolk. It is probably the "Arm of St. Lachteen," which is mentioned by Smith (*Hist. Cork*, i. 84) as preserved at Donoghmore, co. Cork, and used for swearing. (*Ulst. Journ. Arch.* ii. 215; for this and others of the same character and date, *ibid.* ii. 207 sq.; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* v. 461 sq.; *Trans. Roy. Ir. Acad.* xxiv. 450, *Antiq.*; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* xii. 144 n., 155 sq.) [J. G.]

LACHTAN (1) (LACTAN, LACTEAN), pupil and successor of St. Molua in the abbacy at Clonfert-mulloe, Queen's County (*Vit. S. Day.* c. 7). At Clonfert he was the instructor of St. Laidcenn his successor there (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 57 a, 58 n. 3, 585, c. 7, 656, c. 5). He is identified with Lach-

tain of Achadh-úr, but probably without sufficient reason, though he must have lived about the same time. (Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 12, § 7, iii. c. 17, § 5, n. 69; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 93.) [J. G.]

LACHTAN (2) (LACTANUS, LACTANTIUS), disciple of St. Fursey the abbat of Lagny, and companion in his missionary labours in Gaul. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 96, c. 6, 291, c. 12, 299 n. 12; Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 462; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 262, 285.) [J. G.]

LACHTAN (3) (LACTEANUS), friend and neighbour of St. Senan of Iniscatheay, and mentioned in the *Vita S. Senani* (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 525, c. 14). He lived at Lislachtin in the north of Kerry in the 6th century, and probably was different from Lachtain of Achadh-úr (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 180 n., 181, June 26). If he was the Lachnin, Lactinius, or Lactin among St. Declan's disciples he lived later, though Colgan (*Id. Ind. Chron.*) would place him at A.D. 370. (Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 1, § 12, iii. p. 27; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 251 b.) [J. G.]

LACTANTIUS (1), LUCIUS CAELIUS (or CAECILIUS) FIRMIANUS, a well-known Christian apologist of the beginning of the 4th century: "Rhetor erat ille, non theologus: neque inter ecclesiae doctores locum unquam obtinuit," as bishop Bull says of him more than once (*Def. Fid. Nic.* ii. 14, 4; and iii. 10, 20). From his name, Firmianus, it has been inferred by some that he was born at Fermo (Firmum, or Firmium) in Italy, but nothing that we know of him bears out this inference. Besides, in St. Augustine, "bellum Firmianum" and "Donatistae Firmiani" were phrases founded, not on Italian topography, but African history, like Sempronianus and Aemilianus on Roman. And there were no less than five Firmuses in Africa known to St. Augustine himself. Again, one of the bosom friends of Lactantius, and to whom his treatises, *De Ira Dei* and *De Morte Pers.*, are inscribed, was Donatus, another name celebrated in African history, if he was no more than a namesake, which we shall discuss presently. Again, Lactantius himself, in enumerating the Christian apologists that had preceded him, seems only conscious of three—Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian—but this is explained at once by supposing that he limits himself to his countrymen, viz. African apologists. We shall consider what St. Jerome says of his relations to Arnobius further on. Again, there is his style, which resembles, though it is superior, on account of his superior learning, to theirs. Lastly, St. Jerome mentions an *Itinerary* written by him, in hexameter verse, of his route from Africa to Nicomedia, as though he were then leaving home for the first time. We have thus in the African church what has been handed down to us from no other country, a regular catena, beginning with Minucius Felix and Tertullian, of learned advocates or rhetoricians, men of the world, who embraced Christianity from conviction—"nos qui sumus ex gentibus," as Lactantius says of himself (*Epit.* c. 48), and of his Divine Teacher, "Quo docente, liberati ab errore, quo implicati tenebamur, formatique ad veri Dei cultum, justitiam disceremus" (*De Ira Dei*, c. 2)—and wrote vigorously

in its defence, to culminate with St. Augustine: each employing Latin with all the freedom of a vernacular, and in the case of Lactantius with so much purity as to have procured for him to be called the Christian Cicero; while Italy, so far as Christian apologists are concerned, never once opened her mouth; and till St. Ambrose, who was a layman and a magistrate when chosen bishop, exhibited no greater turn for theology. Divines and men of letters, as well as emperors, had to be sought out in the provinces. In all his empire Constantine could find no better preceptor for his eldest son Crispus, then destined to succeed him at Rome, than this African Latin. This brought him to Gaul about A.D. 313, which is the first date that we can fix in his career on any tangible grounds. He had previously been invited to set up a school of rhetoric at Nicomedia, the old capital of the kings of Bithynia, and deriving its name from the first of them, when Diocletian selected it as his capital, and aspired to render it as superior in literary distinction and civic embellishments, as it was in natural beauty, to Rome. There, doubtless, he was converted on witnessing the superhuman constancy displayed by the Christians of that city, and of his "best beloved" Donatus in particular, on whose sufferings he dwells with so much tenderness (*De Morte Persecut.* c. 16, 35, and 52), in the tenth and savagest persecution under Diocletian. Donatus, he tells us himself, had lain in prison no less than six years when the edict of Galerius, published A.D. 311, procured his release. Now, could it have been this very Donatus, who was afterwards put forward in opposition to Caecilian for the see of Carthage by his sturdy countrymen, misled into believing that Caecilian had been ordained by "traitors," whereas Donatus had been a martyr in will? Authorities, ancient and modern, are both at issue with themselves, and with each other, as to when Donatus, who was called "Magnus," first appeared on the scene, some dating his election to the see of Carthage as many years before, as others after, the Nicene council. St. Augustine tells us himself frankly that he had been of the former opinion, which, however, in abandoning he merely represents the latter as the *more probable* of the two (Albasp. in *S. Opt. Observ.* iii.). Taking Clinton for our guide on the following points, we may perhaps elicit more light from them than he succeeded in eliciting for himself. A.D. 317, Crispus was, according to him, appointed Caesar, being then a young man. He must have finished, therefore, studying under Lactantius by then. Yet he could not well have commenced earlier than the joint edict of his father and Licinius in favour of the Christians, as Lactantius would seem from his own expressions to have been at Nicomedia when it was issued (*De Morte Persecut.* c. 48). His friend Donatus, the "Confessor," had been let out of prison three years before by that of Galerius, as we have seen. And if he was an African, as his name would suggest, and his intimacy with Lactantius also confirm, he would naturally return home with speed on his release, where he would be welcomed with open arms, and distinguished as "Magnus" from all other Donatuses for his glorious confessorship, and thus be just the man to set up, and himself to join, in opposition to Caecilian, whose consecrators were reported to

have failed in that respect. Just two years after, the council of Rome was held in the autumn of A.D. 313, at which the case between Caecilian and a Donatus was heard, three bishops from Gaul assisting, at the express petition of the party supporting the latter. What led to such a petition from them? Whatever other reasons may have been given, if this Donatus was really the beloved friend of Lactantius, it would have been only natural, Lactantius having just gone to Gaul as tutor to the heir of Constantine, sent thither, it may be, from Nicomedia by Licinius himself. True, St. Jerome says in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 331: "Donatus agnoscitur, a quo per Africam Donatiani;" and again, A.D. 358: "Donatus, a quo Donatianos in Africa dici memoravimus, Carthagine pellitur;" but nobody doubts the Donatists having got their name before A.D. 331. And what we want to know now is who the Donatus was who competed for the see of Carthage with Caecilian at Rome, in the council described by St. Optatus (*de Schism. Don.* i. 22-26), and commonly dated A.D. 313, for it is monstrous to suppose that any Donatus who was already bishop of another see, could have done this unchallenged. A new comer, on the other hand, like Lactantius, might easily fail in securing the good offices of the bishops of Gaul for a friend of his, a foreigner himself, and "in extreme old age" then, as we learn from St. Jerome (*de Vir. Illust.* c. 80). Even as a writer, Lactantius would seem to have confined himself in his leisure moments to revising, epitomising, or making additions to his already published works, subsequently to his arrival in Gaul, where, in the opinion of the learned, he died perhaps the year before his pupil was slain; that is, in the year of the Nicene council, A.D. 325. To judge from his writings that have come down to us, his character must have been cast in a somewhat austere mould; it may be, soured by failures, as he had, undoubtedly, no mean estimate of his own powers (*de Opif. Dei*, c. 1; *Inst.* v. 1-4): a man of few and warm, rather than of many friends; thoughtful as well as learned, conscientious and pure. Eusebius (*Chron.* A.D. 319) speaks of him as having never been otherwise than poor—so poor, as frequently to have been in want of the necessaries of life. St. Jerome, whether commenting on this or not, says it was his ill-success in getting pupils at Nicomedia, from its being a Greek city, that induced him to write. Perhaps his writings, therefore, were not a greater source of profit to him than his pupils. Of these St. Jerome has furnished a list, but whether in the order in which they were published or not he omits to say. The first named by him is his *Symposium*, which he calls a youthful performance; the second is his *Itinerary*, before mentioned; the third, a work entitled *The Grammarian*. Then comes the well-known treatise *De Ira Dei*, still amongst his extant works, and which St. Jerome calls *pulcherrimum*; next, his *Institutions*, in seven books, extant also, the work on which his fame principally rests; next, his own epitome of the same work, *In Libro uno accephalo*; that is, "a compendium of the last three books only," as Cave explains it: but the first half was claimed by Pfall to have been recovered A.D. 1712 from a Turin MS., and its genuineness, though disputed, is still maintained. He speaks in it at

starting of his larger work—"quos jam pridem ad illustrandam veritatem religionemque conscripsimus"—just as we might expect. The seventh work enumerated by St. Jerome was in two books, addressed to Asclepiades, who had addressed one to him, from which he quotes a remarkable passage on the providence of God himself (*Inst.* vii. 4), but both are now lost. The eighth, which had disappeared also, was claimed by Baluze, as another recovery from MSS. earlier indeed than that of Pfaff, and published by him A.D. 1679 at the commencement of his second book of *Miscellanies*, but with the title *Liber ad Donatum Confessorem de Mortibus Persecutorum*, instead of *De Persecutione Liber unus*, which is that of St. Jerome. Judged by its contents, the first is the more accurate title; nor can the identity between the "Donate carissime" of its first chapter and the "Donate carissime" of chapter twenty-two of the treatise *De Irâ Dei*, serve but to prove that both were addressed to the same person. Yet the genuineness even of this work is sometimes called in question, but it has been admitted practically by all his editors, from Baluze to Fritzsche. His four books of letters to Probus, two more to Severus, and two more to his pupil Demetrian, which St. Jerome regards as eight consecutive books in another place (in Gal. ii. 4), might have settled many more points in his history, were they now extant, than the twelfth and last work assigned to him by St. Jerome, *de Opificio Dei, vel Formatione Hominis*, inscribed to the same pupil, Demetrian, as his letters. Yet from the first chapter of this tract alone we may infer how warmly he could become attached to his pupils, and how soundly he could advise them; while from its last chapter we should be justified in concluding that, though it was written after his conversion, he was only then meditating his *Institutions*. We have thus a chronological catena to his extant works supplied by himself, of which this is the first link. His *Institutions* probably followed at no great interval, as he hints himself (*Inst.* v. 2), having all the materials for them at his fingers' end, and being impressed with their need. In the eighteenth chapter of the second book of his *Institutions* he announces his intention of writing *on the Anger of God* in a special work. This, again, consisting of only twenty-three chapters, need not have taken him long. There was a lapse of some time between the publication of his *Institutions* and their *Epitome*, as has been already pointed out. The tract *De Morte Persecutorum* ends with the joint edict of Licinius and Constantine, published at Nicomedia by the former, A.D. 313, at which the author lays down his pen in celebrating the triumph of God, with thankful joy, and prayers day and night for its continuance. He could not have written thus after the differences between Licinius and Constantine had commenced, and the former joined the ranks of the persecutors; he may therefore be well thought to have published it as he was in the act of shifting his own quarters from Nicomedia to Gaul. The precise date of his tract, *De Opificio Dei*, remains to be considered. Its first chapter at a glance shews it to have been written after his conversion; and the same chapter, more attentively studied, makes it probable that he had only just turned. "Quam minime sim quietus, et in summis necessitatibus," with which

it opens, are just the words that might be supposed to have been wrung from a recent convert in a heathen capital, where Christians were having to choose daily between death and the faith he had embraced, and his old pupils were falling off one by one on learning what he had become. Demetrian, it is evident, had been among the first to follow his master, yet it is in a very cautious and subdued tone that his master ventures to remind him that, even amidst public duties, "ferri non potest quin subinde in coelum respiciat mens sibi conscia recti . . ." It is in keeping also with this that he characterises Christian writers as "the philosophers of our sect," and elsewhere refrains from any more definite reference to the sect of which he speaks. Accordingly, supposing Lactantius to have been converted, about midway in the persecution under Diocletian at Nicomedia, to have been forsaken by his pupils on that account, and then betaken himself to writing, *penuriam discipulorum*, as St. Jerome says, though not for the reason assigned by him, there would have been abundance of time for him to have composed all his extant works during the remainder of his abode there, with the exception of his *Epitome*. His *Epitome*, then, and the confessedly later insertions in his *Institutions*, such as his appeals to Constantine (i. 1, ii. 1, vii. 26), his mention of the Arians, and of the Catholic church, his promise of a separate work on heresies (iv. 30), which it would seem he never fulfilled, would all naturally fall within the period of his removal to Gaul, and tutorship to the heir apparent, to whom he could have scarce failed to have dedicated any fresh work, had any such ever proceeded from his pen. Of his lost works, we may conclude, from the references made by others to his correspondence with Probus, that it turned upon metres, and from the reference made by St. Jerome to his correspondence with Demetrian, that it included theology. Of these, the first, like the work called *The Grammarian*, may well have been written before his conversion, and the second have grown out of the dedication to his pupil of the work *De Opificio Dei*. The 'Phoenix,' and other poems that have been assigned to him, not being recognised by St. Jerome, are not generally considered his, though he is credited by St. Jerome with having composed in verse, and by others with having written on metres. There is just one more point connected with his personal history which had best be discussed here. Was he the pupil or hearer of Arnobius in his younger days that St. Jerome makes him in one place (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 80), or contemporary with Arnobius, as we might infer from another (*Chron.* A.D. 326)? To judge from their respective works there is nothing literally to connect them with each other, though the mere fact of each having written a work in seven books against the adversaries of their common faith, without noticing the other, might suggest their having been rivals, if personally acquainted. But, with the end of his third book, Lactantius parts company from his supposed model, and goes off upon other lines of his own, as we shall see. Further, at the commencement of his fifth book, in specifying *ex his qui mihi noti sunt* (c. 1), those who had written against the assailants of Christianity, and exposed their errors, previously to himself, he comes to a standstill after naming Minucius

Felix, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian, all Africans, when it would have been inexcusable in him to have passed over the work of Arnobius, had it then been published, and doubly inexcusable had Arnobius, besides being an African, been his old preceptor too. Discarding this last hypothesis, therefore, we prefer following St. Jerome in his continuation of Eusebius, and making Lactantius and Arnobius independent of each other: Lactantius possibly the older of the two. Eusebius, it is to be observed, finds a place for Lactantius in his *Chronicon*, but none for his supposed master. Both the supposed master, again, and his pupil make Christianity 300 years old, but the first when he penned his principal work (i. 13), the second when he epitomised his principal work (c. 43) that had been published long since. If the work of Arnobius appeared when Lactantius was settled in Gaul, and in extreme old age, neither need have known anything of the other's work, as each work would alone suggest. The work of Arnobius is entirely limited to a refutation of the polytheism of the day, and the popular objections to Christianity, that is, it is elenctic throughout; the work of Lactantius, like the *City of God* by St. Augustine, where, by the way, Lactantius himself is honourably and approvingly cited (xviii. 23), divides itself into two parts, the first of which exposes the false religions, antagonistic to the true; the second expounds the true. It has been too often analysed to require that to be done for it now: by Cave briefly (*Hist. Lit.* i. 162), by Le Nourry thoroughly (ap. Migue, *Patrol.* vi. 825), by Dupin, who may be read in English, with his accustomed vivacity (*Ecol. H.* vol. i. 185-7, Eng. Tr. by W. W.), and by Rev. J. H. B. Mountain forty years ago (*Summary of the Writings of Lactantius*, i. 129), who dedicates his portable volume to the late bishop Kaye. Or it may be read at full length translated, with notes, in the Ante-Nicene Library by Messrs. Clark. Of his other works it may be said that the tract *De Opificio Dei* may challenge comparison with Cicero's *De Natura Deorum* in point of style, and is far superior to it in depth and originality. The tract *De Ira Dei*, directed against the Epicureans and Stoics, has for its object to prove that God is as capable of anger as of compassion and mercy. The tract *De Morte Persecutorum* is a collection of historical facts, tending to shew that all the emperors who persecuted the Christians died miserably, and may, for its moral, be compared with Spelman's *De non temerandis Ecclesiis* of our own times.

Objections have been taken to the style of this last work, and to the matter here and there of the others. It may be granted that Lactantius falls off in style when he relates how those who suffered for the faith were avenged: but this is explained by the simple fact that it is as a dialectician and philosopher that he shines most, and least whenever he touches history. Perhaps, too, this tract was a hurried performance, never afterwards revised. As for his theology, the same indulgence should be shewn him that all breakers of new ground may claim. Tertullian, again, was the model that he looked up to most: and no writer had as yet eclipsed Origen. We cannot read his account of the origin of all things (*Iust.* ii. 9) without being reminded of the speeches of Raphael and Abdiel in *Paradise*

*Lost* (v. 577 and 808). We cannot read his latest exposition of the Incarnation (*Epit.* c. 43), without discovering in it some well-known phrases of the Athanasian creed. "Lest by chance there should be any doubt in your mind," he says, "why we call Him Jesus Christ, who was born of God before the world, and who was born of man 300 years ago, I will briefly explain to you the reason. The same person is the son of God and of man, for He was twice born: first of God in the Spirit before the origin of the world; and afterwards in the flesh of man, in the reign of Augustus." St. Jerome charges Rufinus with a downright lie, for making Lactantius responsible for the opinions of Tertullian about the soul (*c. Ruf.* ii. 8 and 11, also iii. 30). Elsewhere, characterising him as a "flood of Tullian eloquence" himself, he adds "utinam tam nostra affirmare potuisset, quam facile aliena destruxit" (*Ep.* lviii. 10 *ad Paulinum*). Yet the only positive error that he attributes to him "occurs most" in a work now lost, and refers to a single subject, viz. that of the Holy Ghost, and he refuses peremptorily to be debarred reading his *Institutions* on this account, as though he judged his language to be more at fault than his faith (*Ep.* lxxxiv. 7, *ad Pam. ad Ocean.*, and in *Gal.* ii. 4, 6. *Comp. Ep.* lxii. 2, *ad Tranquill.*, and *Praef. in Ep. ad Eph.*). St. Augustine names him but once, and then with respect, as has been already said. Dupin sums up very justly for him, after having expatiated on his many merits, as follows: "He is accused of doubting whether the Holy Ghost was the third Person, and to have sometimes confounded him with the Son, and sometimes with the Father; but it may be alleged in his defence, that he meant nothing else, but that the name of the Spirit in Scripture is common to the Father and the Son. But whatever the matter is, we find no footsteps of this error in any of his works, what are now remaining; though in some places he takes occasion to speak of the Holy Ghost. He seems to be of opinion that the Word was generated in time; but it is an easy matter to give a Catholic sense to that expression, as we have seen it done to others: and we may be with justice allowed to do so, since he plainly establishes the Divinity of the Word in that very place. His opinion concerning angels—that, being sent to guard and protect men, they were afterward seduced by the temptation of the devil, and that falling in love with women, they begot terrestrial demons upon them, as it is properly peculiar to him, so it is an erroneous imagination without any grounds to support it. What he says about the end of the world, the reign of 1000 years, the fire of judgment which will prove men that have been sinners, is common to him with divers other authors, as also what he delivers about the state of the soul after death, being kept in a common prison, in expectation of the day of judgment, pretending that God created them all before the creation of the world. I take no notice of several errors of less consequence, and some harsh expressions, which may be interpreted in a favourable sense." Le Nourry says some critics judged so harshly of him "ut vix unquam alius scriptor tam saepe in tam paucis libris errasse videretur." This opinion, however, he was far from sharing himself; "at saltem Gelasius primus," he adds, "inquiet aliquis, in concilio

Romano opera Lactantii cum aliis, quae catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia non recipit, his rejecit verbis: *opuscula Lactantii apocrypha*. At plures olim dubitaverunt utrum ea verba genuina germanaque sint. . . . Non minus compertum habemus hoc Gelasii papae decreto plura veterum ecclesiae Patrum, uti Tertulliani, Eusebii Pamphili, et aliorum scripta, tamquam apocrypha amandari, quae nihilominus sana et orthodoxa esse omnes ultro fatentur" (Diss. c. iii. art. 4); the real fact being that this council is itself apocryphal. (DICTIONARY OF CHRIST. ANT., art. Roman Councils.) Dufresnoy says lastly: "Quamvis religionem sincere et candidè coluerit Lactantius, non diffiteor tamen, eum quibusdam obstrictum fuisse erroribus" (*Praef. ad Lact.* § 10). He adds: 1. A synthesis of his doctrine; 2. A critique on his errors from a Paris MS.; 3. A list of propositions found in his writings to be read with caution (ap. Migne, *Patrol.* vi. 82-94).

As to MSS. and printed editions of his works, they have this in common, that they both mark a revival of literature, and attest the estimation in which he was held at each epoch. The MSS., which are very numerous, range mostly between the 13th and the 15th centuries, while the earliest all belong to the 9th; printed editions between the 15th and the 17th. "Dufresnoy," says Dr. Mountain (Intro. p. 1, note), "enumerates no less than eighty-six editions of his entire works, besides the separate editions of his different treatises, from A.D. 1461 to 1739." He has also tabulated all the known MSS. of them, which fill about eight of his ample pages. His own edition, which appeared in A.D. 1748, having been commenced by Le Brun, is in 2 vols. quarto, and contains a collection of notes by learned editors besides his own. The Bipontine edition, which appeared in 2 vols. octavo, A.D. 1786, commences with a "notitia literaria," but has no notes. The 6th vol. of the Latin Patrologia by Migne contains everything worth culling from previous editions. The translation in the Antenicene Library by Messrs. Clark has been already noticed. A convenient, and probably the latest recension of the text will be found in vols. x.-xi. of the *Bibl. Pat. Eccl. Lat.* by Gersdorf, octavo, Leipsic, 1842. Montfaucon (*De Cr. Ital.* p. 409) was of opinion that the library of St. Saviour at Bologna contained a MS. of the works of Lactantius as old as the 6th or 7th century, and exhibits facsimiles of its letters both Greek and Latin. Dufresnoy, on the other hand, judging from those specimens, assigns it, but without having seen it, to the 9th. Montfaucon adds: "Vellem sane Lactantium ad hujusmodi codicem emendatum: ejus quippe nullus, ut aestimo, hactenus fuit usus." As this was not done by Dufresnoy, it has probably still to be done; so that, if we may trust Montfaucon, the best edition of Lactantius, after all that has been written on him, is perhaps a thing of the future. For further particulars respecting him and his works, see besides Cave, Du Pin, and other authorities already cited, Le Nourry (*Apparat. ad Bibl. Max. Vet. Pat.* tom. ii. diss. 3), Fabricius (*Bibl. Lat. lib. xi.*), Oudin (*de Script. Eccl.* tom. i. p. 307), Lardner (*Cred.* part ii. b. i. c. 65), Schramm (*Anal. Op. SS. Pat.* vol. vii. p. 250), Fessler (*Inst. Patrol.* vol. i. p. 328), *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* vol. xxviii. p. 611.

[E. S. F.]

LACTANTIUS (2), a priest, who visited the holy places of Gaul, and was the bearer of a letter from St. Nicetius of Trèves to the emperor Justinian. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 380; Ceillier, *Hist. générale des Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 204.) [S. A. B.]

LADEMUND, a pre-historic abbat of Glastonbury, standing fourth in the list given by William of Malmesbury (*Antiq. Glaston.* ed. Gale, iii. p. 328). His name was known to the historian only by the fact that it was painted up near the altar (*ib.* p. 308). [S.]

LADOCA, ST., the patron saint of the church of Ladock, near Truro in Cornwall. He was probably Irish. W. C. Borlase however (*The Age of the Saints*, 1878, p. 8) suggests that the name may be Docus, a form of Cadocus. [C. W. B.]

LAEBHAN (LAOBHAN, LEBAN, LIBAN, LOEBHAN), smith to St. Patrick (*Four Mast.* A.D. 448), and probably the founder of Domnach-Loebhain or Kill-Loebhan, which is said by Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 188, n. 129) to have been in the diocese of Clonfert, and is now evidently (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 137 n. 6) Killian, in the barony of Killian, co. Galway. In Evinus's *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* (c. 98, ap. Colgan, *ibid.* 167, c. 98) Maccetus (Macecht) and Fortchernus are his "duo fabri ferrarii," and the former is "de Domnach-loebain." In the Kalendars there are Laebhan or Leabanus of Cill-mor at Aug. 9, and Laebhan or Lehan of Ath-Eguis at June 1. (*Mart. Doneg.*; *Mart. Tall.*) [J. G.]

LAEGHAIRE (1), of Dun, perhaps Downpatrick in Ulster. He is given among the sons of Trichem and brothers of DICHU (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 114 n. 1), but is not to be found in the usual lists. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 61, c. 2, 307, c. 2, and *Tr. Thaum.* 100 (rectè 110) n. 35.) [J. G.]

LAEGHAIRE (2) (LAGERIE, LAOGAIRE, LOGIORE, LOGUIRE, LOGAIRE, phonetically LEARY), monarch of Ireland, was the son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, and succeeded Dathi, son of Fiachra Foltathanach, who was the last undoubtedly pagan king of Ireland, and is said to have been slain by a thunderbolt at the foot of the Alps in the year 428. Laeghaire married Aengus, daughter of a general, and had by her Lugaidh, who also became monarch of Ireland. He lived at Tara in the county of Meath, and the chief secular events of his reign appear to have been quarrels with the people of Leinster, his chief opponent there being Crimthan, son of Enna Censealach. But in the fifth year of his reign a new and unwarlike force invaded his kingdom. St. Patrick had spent the winter in the counties of Down and Antrim, and in the spring determined to hold his Easter festival in the neighbourhood of Laeghaire's palace. The monarch gave the Christian apostle no words or acts of welcome. Surrounded by his nobles who had assembled on affairs of state or to celebrate the pagan feast of Bealtinne, and also by his Druid priests, he saw with wonder and rage the distant light of the Christian paschal fire which was to quench the lights of heathendom, and rode over in force to Ferta-fer-Feic to expel the daring intruder upon the national religion and

laws. But mollified by the stranger's address, or frightened by his words of power, he allowed the Christian mission to be established, and may himself have been induced to regard its message with a certain amount of favour; we can hardly believe that he continued an obstinate persecutor while such progress was made in the spread of the Gospel around him and in his own family, or was ever a zealous convert or more than an external conformist. His queen may perhaps have become obedient to the faith, as his two daughters, Fedhelm the ruddy and Eithne the fair, were certainly converted and numbered among the saints [EITHNE (2)]. Several of his descendants (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 173) are beatified. (*Vitae S. Patricii*, ap. Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* pass.; Lanigan, *Ch. Hist. Ir. i. c. 5*; Moore, *Hist. Ir. i. c. 10*; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 163 sq.; Nennius, *Hist. c. 59*, ap. *Mon. Hist. Brit. pt. ii. 72*; Todd, *St. Patrick*, pass.; Keating, *Gen. Hist. Ir. B. ii. pp. 325 sq.*)

It is related that under his auspices a solemn assembly was held at Tara for examining the ancient annals and laws, and that a committee of nine was appointed to carry out the work. The body of laws thus revised is called the Seanchus Mór. But insuperable difficulties traverse this legendary account, and Dr. Petrie (*Tara Hill*, pass.), discussing the whole question with his usual learning and accuracy, arrives at the conclusion that the Seanchus Mór does not belong to the period of Laeghaire and St. Patrick, yet must have been compiled soon after the establishment of Christianity in Ireland. [SEANCHUS MÓR, Dr. Wm. Smith and Prof. Cheetham, *DICT. CHRIST. ANT.* ii.] (*Trans. Roy. Ir. Acad.* xviii.; *Ancient Laws of Ireland, Seanchus Mór*, pass. *Dubl.* 1865; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. c. 7*, § 15; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 483; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 132-4 n. 1; Keating, *Gen. Hist. Ir. B. ii. p. 340*; Wills, *Ill. Irish*, i. 59, 60; *Notes and Queries*, iv. 302, 2nd ser.)

His death, as related in the *Leabhar na hUídhre*, would prove that Laeghaire probably died a pagan. The *Four Masters* place Laeghaire's death in A.D. 458, but A.D. 463 is more likely (*Ann. Tig. eo an.*, ap. O'Conor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 111), and his reign thirty-five years. His body was carried back and buried at Tara, in the south-east side of the external rampart, with his weapons upon him, and his face turned towards the Lagenians, as if still fighting against them. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 144-5 n. 8; Wills, *Ill. Ir. i. 60*; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 100 sq. 428 sq.; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 436 sq.; Moore, *Hist. Ir. i. 239 sq.*; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 2nd series, 230-1.) [J. G.]

LAELIUS, deacon of Emerita (Merida) in Spain, A.D. 254, joined in the letter of FELIX of Saragossa. (*Cyp. Ep.* 67.) [E. W. B.]

LAETA, daughter-in-law of Paula, the friend of St. Jerome. She was the daughter of Albinus, a heathen priest, but her mother was a Christian. They had one daughter, for whom, even before her birth, the mother made a vow of virginity, and who was named Paula, after her grandmother. Her husband Toxotius appears to have left the education of the child to his wife, and then invited the advice of Jerome, who writes to her a letter (*ep.* 107, ed. Vall. A.D. 403) pre-

scribing the training suitable to form a virgin of Christ. [PAULA, Junior.] [W. H. F.]

LAETUS (1), brother of bishop Marcellus. (*Ambr. ep.* 82, § 8.) [MARCELLUS.] [C. H.]

LAETUS (2), a Christian who, having passed some time in the monastery of Hippo Regius, was induced by family troubles, his mother's entreaties, the illness of his brothers, and the general confusion of his home, to leave the monastery and resume his position in the world. He had written to the brethren of the monastery in much doubt and distress of mind, and expressed a wish to hear from Augustine, who at once wrote to exhort him to return to it. (*Aug. Ep.* 243.) [H. W. P.]

LAETUS (3), an African bishop, one of the proto-martyrs of Hunneric's persecution (Victor Vitensis, *Persec. Vandal.* ii. 18 in *Pat. Lat.* lviii.). This account, as Tillemont observes, would place the martyrdom about Feb. 484. Victor does not name Laetus's see, which was Nepte (Victor Tun. *Chron. ann.* 479 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 946; Isidor. *Hispal. Hist. Vandal.* aera 506, § 79, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1079). Victor Vitensis (*Notit.* 57), apparently by an oversight, includes Laetus Neptitanus in the general list of the bishops exiled after the conference. Victor Tununensis is widely divergent from Victor Vitensis in making the year of Laetus's martyrdom 479, and the day Sept. 24 (or as some seem to read, Sept. 20). The *Roman Martyrology* commemorates him on Sept. 6, on which day he is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Sept. ii. 681), who discuss the various statements. (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 242; Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 559, 567, ed. 1712; Ruinart's notes on Victor Vit.) [C. H.]

LAETUS (4), Nov. 5, a presbyter and confessor in the district of Orleans (*Mart. Usuard*). Surlius (*De Prob. SS. Hist.* Nov. 5, p. 161) gives his *Vita*, which calls him a deacon (laevita) in the monastery of Micicacus (Micy or St. Mesmin) near Orleans, A.D. 540. His popular name is St. Lié (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 111). [G. T. S.]

LAETUS (5), bishop of Faesulae (Fiesole), c. 578. (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xvii. 12, 70; Ughelli, iii. 212; *Acta Sanctorum*, Boll. Jun. i. 749-75.) [A. H. D. A.]

LAETUS (6), bishop of Lucca, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649. (*Mansi*, x. 867; Hefele, § 307.) [A. H. D. A.]

LAETUS (7), forty-fifth bishop of Milan from 745 to Apr. 6, 759 (Cappelletti, xi. 134, 302). Ughelli makes his period 755-769 (*Ital. Sac.* iv. 69). [C. H.]

LAFRIANUS. [LASERIAN (2).]

LAIIDGEN (1) (LADCHEND, LATHACAN), monk of Clonfert Molua (Clandonagh), Queen's County, commemorated Jan. 12. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 57) has a short and imperfect memoir with notes, and O'Hanlon (*Irish Saints*, i. 178-180) has reproduced it with additions, but there is no ancient life. He was son of Baith Bannach, and became a monk under St. Laetan at Clonfert-mulloe, where he appears to have remained till death, in the year 661 (*Ann. Tig.*), and never to

have been abbat, though so called by Archdall (*Mon. Hib.* 379) (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, pp. xii. 54; O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. 202, iv. 54; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 270 n. 7, 271; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 36 n. 103). In the *Annals of Ulster*, A.D. 660, he is called the Wise. Dr. Reeves, in a paper read before the Royal Irish Academy, upon the Monastery of Reichenau (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 91), gives an account of Laidgen's appearance, as Laidcend, Lathacan, and Ladkenus, in connexion with the authorship or transcription of some hymns published by Mone (*Hym. Med. Aevi*, i. 367 sq.), and with an abstract of the *Moralia of St. Gregory*, both being preserved at Vienna.

[J. G.]

**LAIDGEN (2)**, abbat of Saighir (Seirkeiran, bar. Ballybritt, King's County), was slain A.D. 744 (*Ann. Tig.*). He was son of Doineannach, and in the *Annals of Ulster* is called bishop as well as abbat (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 739, i. 341; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 743; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 473, c. 4; O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. 243, iv. 90; Cotton, *Fasti Eccl. Hib.* ii. 269, calling him Laigdene Mac Donennach, abbat, and placing him in the succession at Ossory, A.D. 739.)

[J. G.]

**LAI DRACHUS**, archbishop. [LEIDRADUS.]

**LAISRE (1)**. [LAISREN (2).]

**LAISRE (2)** (LASREAN, LASRIU), son of Colum or Colman, abbat of Druimliag, which is placed by Lanigan in that part of Kerry which adjoins Limerick. He belonged to the second half of the 6th century. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 383; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 70, c. 28, 72 n. 26; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 88, 89 n. 20.)

[J. G.]

**LAISREN (1)** (LASRIANUS), son of Nasc, commemorated in the Irish calendars on Oct. 25, and in the *Felire of Aengus* called Lairen the Great. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 283; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 272; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 631 n. 7, and *Tr. Thaum.* 183 n. 216.) His place appears to have been on Belfast Lough, probably at Holywood (see Dr. Reeves's important note in *Ust. Journ. Arch.* ii. 56), therefore he was probably not a brother of, and in residence with, St. Gobban, at Inispict, off the coast of Cork. [GOBBAN (1).] (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 363, n. 224; Colgan, *ib.* 631.) The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 25 Oct. xi. 657-8) regard him as first at Rahen under St. Carthach-Mochuda, and then at Inis Puinc or Inispict under St. Domangenus, and finally as dying at Ard-mic-nasca or Holywood, in Ulster; but they say they can give no distinct affirmation among so many called Lasrianus and Molassius. As he lived in the north of Ireland, and perhaps flourished about A.D. 650, it has been suggested by Colgan (*ib.* 17 n. 11), and accepted by Dr. Reeves (*Eccl. Ant.* 149 n. 8), that he is the Laistranus, a presbyter [LAISTRANUS], addressed with others in the paschal letter preserved by Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* ii. c. 19) [CRONAN (11)]; but the authority seems to be wanting for both date and identification.

[J. G.]

**LAISREN (2)** (LAISTRANUS), son of Feradhach, succeeded Baithen as third abbat of Hy, but is omitted from Ussher's list (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c.

15, wks. vi. 245), made up from the *Annals of Ulster*. His father Feradhach was cousin-german to St. Columba (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 375 n. 51). He was pupil of St. Columba, with whom we find him at Ardnamurchan in Argyleshire (Adamn. *Vit. S. Col.* i. 12), and during whose lifetime he was abbat, or at least in charge, at Durrow (*ib.* i. c. 29), and perhaps building the round tower (*ib.* iii. c. 15; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 212; Reeves, *St. Adamn.* 40, 57, 215). On the death of St. Baithen, A.D. 600, he succeeded to the abbacy at Iona (Hy), and ruled for five years, during which time we have no special events recorded (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 150 sq.).

Laisren died A.D. 605 (*Ann. Tig.*), and was succeeded by Fergna Brit. His feast is Sept. 16. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 408, c. 3, 449 b, and *Tr. Thaum.* pass.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 601, i. 228 n. 229; *Ann. Tig.* A.D. 605, and *Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 600, ap. O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. pt. i. 179, pt. ii. 10; *Grub. Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 70; Reeves, *St. Adamn.* 40, 57, 58, 267, 372; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 249, 433; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 68; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 16, 377; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 348 n. 165; C. Innes, *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. i. 287.)

[J. G.]

**LAISREN (3)**, Sept. 16, abbat of Menadrochit (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 251). He was of the race of Cathaoir Mor, monarch of Erin (*ib.*), and died A.D. 604 (*Ann. Tig.*; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 603; *Four Mast.* A.D. 600; *Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 598). Menadrochit is now Monarehid, a townland in the parish of Offerrilan, Queen's County, where remains of Laisren's monastery are yet to be seen. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 225 n. 8; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 376 n. 81.)

[J. G.]

**LAISRI**. [BOGHA and COLMA.] (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 25, 433.)

[J. G.]

**LAISTRANUS** (LASRIANUS), one of the Scotie presbyters whom pope John, in the year 640, addressed upon the paschal question in the well-known letter preserved by Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* ii. c. 19). [CRONAN (11).] Colgan (*Acta SS.* 17 b) adopting the form Lasrianus, Reeves (*Eccl. Ant.* 149 n.) that of Laisrianus, and Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 409, 414) that of Laistran, identify him with Laisren son of Nasc. [LAISREN (1).] Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 429) calls him Laustranus and a bishop. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 196, 377, makes the not improbable suggestion that he is Laserian abbat of Leighlin.) [LASERIAN (1).]

[J. G.]

**LAITNEUS**, abbat, follows Morcus parvus in O'Connor's version of the *Annals of Tigernach*, A.D. 763 (*Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. 256), but *Four Mast.* A.D. 758, has Beclaitnae abbat of Clonard, and *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 762, calls him Beclaitne.

[J. G.]

**LALOECEAN** (LAILOKEN, LALOICEAN, LLALLOGAN), "homo fatuus" in *Vit. S. Kentigerni* at the court of Rhodderch Hael king of Cumbria, and identified with Merddin Wylt or Merlin, in the days of his insanity, after the battle of Arderydd (Arthuret). (*Mye. Arch.* i. 132-54; Bp. Forbes, *Lives St. Kent. and St. Nin.* 118, 241, 364, 371 sq. note PPP.; Reeves, *St. Adamn.*, 44.)

[J. G.]



LAMALISSE, confessor, commemorated March 3; lived on Arran in the Firth of Clyde in the 7th century, and has given his name to Lamlash, or Holy Isle, and Lamlash Bay. (Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, March 3; *Scotch Mag.* 1853, p. 339.) [J. G.]

LAMBERTUS (1) (LANDEBERTUS), saint and martyr, thirtieth bishop of Maestricht (circ. 670-708). A number of lives of him survive. The first, by Godescalcus, a deacon of the church of Liège in the middle of the 8th century, who professes to have derived much of his information from one of Lambert's disciples (s. 4), is entirely trustworthy. The authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France* think that he wrote in 729 or 730. It was first published by Canisius, then by Chapeville, not very correctly (*Qui Gesta Leodiensium*, &c. i. 321-349); again by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* iii. 1, 69-76, Paris, 1668-1701); and by the Bollandists (*Acta SS. Sept.* v. 574-581). The second, by Stephanus, bishop of Liège about 903, is a mere reproduction of the first in more ornate language (Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 558). It is to be found in Surius, Sept. 17, tom. v. 289-301; Chapeville, *ibid.* 351-370; Boll. *ibid.* 581-9; and in the *Patrologia Latina*, cxxxii. 643. Another by Nicolaus about 1120 (in Boll. *ibid.* 602-617; Chapeville, 371-409), and a fourth, ascribed to Reinerus, but probably by Sigebertus Gemblacensis (in Chapeville, 411-434; Boll. *ibid.* 589-602; Pat. Lat. clx. 759 seq.), as also that of Anselm and others, draw everything trustworthy they contain from the original narrative of Godescalcus, their additions to it consisting of questionable tradition. On this subject, see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 57-60; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 558.

St. Lambert was a native of Maestricht, born of wealthy parents, whose names, according to Herigerus, were count Aper and Herisplendis. To familiarize him with clerical discipline and divine learning, his father entrusted him to Theodoardus, the bishop of the city, in whose palace he lived. Upon his preceptor's murder, Lambert was chosen as his successor, with the approval of king Childeric. In 673 Childeric was killed, and St. Lambert, as one of his adherents, was driven by Ebroin from his see, which was given to one Faramundus. Attended by two boys only he retired to the monastery of Stabulus (Stavelo), where he submitted himself to the full rigour of the monastic discipline for seven years (circ. A.D. 674-681). At the end of that period Pippin ejected Faramundus, and restored Lambert to Maestricht. Beyond somewhat vague laudations of his virtues, we know little of the remainder of his episcopate. It was probably in the year 708 that he suffered martyrdom (Mabill. *ib.* p. 78). Two misdoers, named Gallus and Rioldus, had plundered the church with such pertinacity that the bishop's friends had killed them. A near relative named Dodo, a wealthy servant of Pippin, collected an armed band to avenge the brothers, and attacked Lambert and his disciples while they were at Liège. The bishop met his death by a javelin aimed from the roof as he lay on the floor of his chamber with his arms extended in the form of the cross (Sept. 17). A few of his disciples

who escaped took the body by boat to Maestricht, where it was hastily and unceremoniously buried in his father's tomb in the church of St. Peter (A.D. 708). In the course of time another account of the martyrdom arose, according to which St. Lambert met his death at the hands of Pippin's courtiers, or even the brother of Alpaïs, for rebuking the adultery of that prince with Alpaïs. The growth of the story may be traced pretty clearly. Godescalcus plainly assigns as the motive of the murder private revenge only. Stephanus has the same account (s. 31 seqq. Patr. Lat. cxxxii. 656), as also Rabanus Maurus (*Martyrologium*, xv. Kal. Oct. Patr. Lat. cx. 1169). Alcuin again (*Carmen* lxxiv., Migne, Patr. Lat. ci. 747) speaks of him as a martyr, without mentioning the cause. Bede, however, attributed it to his reproof of the royal house (*Martyrologium*, xv. Kal. Oct., Patr. Lat. xciv. 947), and is followed by Regino (*Chronicon*, an. 635, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxii. 39), with whose account Ado (*Martyrologium*, xv. Kal. Oct. Patr. Lat. cxxiii. 369) and Notkerus (*Martyrologium*, xv. Kal. Oct., Patr. Lat. cxxxi. 1152) also agree. Sigebertus Gemblacensis is the first who assigns Pippin's adultery as the cause of the reproof, and makes Dodo the brother of Alpaïs (*Chronicon*, 698, Patr. Lat. clx. 133). And his account is repeated with adornments by Nicolaus (caps. xiv.-xvii., Chapeville, *ib.* pp. 397-407), Reinerus or Sigebertus (caps. xvi.-xxi. Chapeville, pp. 424-9) and Aegidius (*ib.* pp. 119-121). In the *Epilogus* of Reinerus or Sigebertus, the silence of Godescalcus is attributed to his fear of giving offence to the reigning member of the Carolingian house (Chapeville, p. 434). But, as is pointed out by Mabillon, who examined into, and distrusts, the story (*ib.* p. 77, cf. Rettberg, i. 560), no such fears or scruples deterred the clergy from vilifying Charles Martel while his descendant Charles the Bald was still on the throne.

The miracles which were ascribed to his tomb soon caused the erection of a church over it, but his successor St. Hubert in the twelfth year of his episcopate (A.D. 720), warned by a vision, resolved to remove the body to Liège, where another church was built for its reception (Mabill. *ib.* pp. 78-81). In 881 the Northmen destroyed Liège and burnt the church to the ground, but apparently the tomb remained unharmed. For his subsequent cult see Mabillon, *ib.* pp. 82-4.

St. Lambert is commemorated Sept. 17, on which day he appears in many of the martyrologies, both ancient and modern (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. v. 518 sqq.). [S. A. B.]

LAMBERTUS, of Lyons. [LANBERTUS.]

LAMBERTUS, of Sens. [LANDEBERTUS.]

LAMBERTUS (2), disciple of St. Gisenus, and his fellow labourer in Hannonia. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 9 Oct. iv. 1038.) The death of St. Lambertus is placed about A.D. 700, and his feast is May 30 and Oct. 9 in different martyrologies. [J. G.]

LAMBERTUS (*Monast. Angl.* i. 12), abbat of St. Augustine's. [JAENBERT.]

LAM-LUOC (LAMLUOC), identified with Lugaidh or Moluoc of Lismore in Loch Linnhe,



Argyleshire. (Reeves, *Culdees*, pt. iii. § 8; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 133.) [LUA, of Lismore.] [J. G.]

**LAMPADIUS (1)**, bishop of Utina, or Uthina, a town of Proconsular Africa, at the council of Arles, A.D. 314. (Plin. *H. N.* v. 4, 29; Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 643; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i. 95.) [H. W. P.]

**LAMPADIUS (2)**, a friend of St. Augustine, who wrote to him concerning the delusions of astrologers, or as they were then called mathematicians. (Aug. *Ep.* 246. See also *Confess.* iv. 3, vii. 6; and *Enarr. in Ps.* lxi. 23 [lxii.]) [H. W. P.]

**LAMPADIUS (3)**, bishop of Tisidium, Tidi-dium, or Tysedis, a town in Numidia, present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. (*Collat. Carth.* cognit. i. 135; Sall. *Jug. 62*; *Opt.* ii. 19; Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 646.) [H. W. P.]

**LAMPADIUS (4)**, an African bishop, present at the council of Milevis, A.D. 416. (Aug. *Ep.* 176.) [H. W. P.]

**LAMPADIUS (5)**, bishop of Raphanea in Syria Secunda, at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vi. 570; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 921.) [J. de S.]

**LAMPADIUS (6)**, bishop "urbis Albensis," present at the first synod under pope Symmachus in March 499. (Hefele, § 220; Mansi, viii. 235; Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* iv. 284; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, iii. 572; xiv. 162, 173.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAMPERTUS**, abbat of the monastery of St. Leo at Brescia, c. 770. (*Catalogus Rerum Langob. Brixiensis et Nonantulanus in Monum. Rerum Ital.* 1878, p. 503.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAMPETIUS (1)**. [EUCHITES, vol. ii. p. 260.]

**LAMPETIUS (2)**, a bishop of an unnamed see, an adherent of Chrysostom. (Pallad. *Dial.* cap. 20, p. 195, ed. Bigot.) [E. V.]

**LAMPETIUS (3)**, bishop of Cassium in Egypt, between the lake Sirbonis and the Mediterranean in the province of Augustamnica I. He was present at the third general council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he signed the condemnation of Nestorius (Mansi, iv. 1127). He was sent by Cyril, together with HERMOGENES bishop of Rhinocorura, as a delegate to pope Coelestinus, whose successor, Sixtus III., mentions the mission in an epistle to Cyril (ep. 1), and from this it appears that they arrived in time to assist at the ordination of Sixtus (probably on July 31, 432, Tillem. xiv. 260), to whom their presence, as representing the Eastern church, was especially grateful. Lampetius was one of the correspondents of Isidore of Pelusium, many of whose letters are addressed to him. (Xysti, *Epist. ad Cyr.* in *Pat. Lat.* l. 584; Isid. Pelus. *Epist.* ii. 71, 79, 122, &c. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 545.) [J. de S.]

**LAMPETIUS (4)**, a deacon addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (ep. 313, 390, 391, lib. iii., ep. 5, lib. iv. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.) [C. H.]

**LAMPETIUS (5)**, a monk addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (ep. 13, 52, lib. i. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxviii.) [C. H.]

**LAMPIUS**, bishop of Barcelona, next to Pacianus (Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xxix. 97). Paulinus bishop of Nola was ordained priest by him at Barcelona (Paulin. ep. 3, § 4, in *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 163; Aug. *Ep.* 24, 4). His episcopate probably began A.D. 393, and he is believed to be the Lampadius (marg. Lampidius and Lampius), present at the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400. (Mansi, iii. 1002; Bruns, *Concil.* i. 203; Tillem. *Mém.* xiv. 40.) [H. W. P.]

**LAMPO**, presbyter of Alexandria, an active adherent of St. Cyril. He is addressed in a letter of Cyril (*Ep.* 70 d. 53, p. 198), which gives him directions to present an anti-Nestorian explanation of the creed sent by Maximus the deacon to the emperor Theodosius. He had been before sent by St. Cyril with a letter to Nestorius, and had acted as St. Cyril's confidential agent in explaining and enforcing the meaning of the letter. (Cyril. *Ep.* 3, p. 21; Nestorii *Sermo* vii. § 9 in Marius Mercator, part ii., in *Pat. Lat.* xlvi. 804; Tillemont, xiv. 333, 641, 642.) [J. W. S.]

**LAMPONIANUS**, a presbyter in the jurisdiction of Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, excommunicated for chastising with blows a fellow presbyter. (Synes. ep. 67 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxi. 1426; Tillem. *Mém.* xii. 545, 546.) [C. H.]

**LAMPONIUS**, a presbyter of Karula at the council of Elvira, A.D. 305 (Mansi, ii. 29). Mendoza (*ibid.* 108 A) reads Lamponianus and identifies the town with Marchena in Andalusia. Bivar in his commentary on Dexter (*Pat. Lat.* xxxi. 423) reads Calduba, a town of the Tur-ditani in Baetica mentioned by Ptolemy. [F. W. D.]

**LAMPRIIDIUS**, a Gallic poet and rhetorician, who flourished in the latter half of the 5th century, and is known to us from the works of his friend and correspondent Sidonius Apollinaris. He was perhaps a native of Bordeaux, where he long professed rhetoric (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* ix. 13, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 630-1), and where he entertained Sidonius on his first visit there (*Epist.* viii. 11, *Patr. Lat.* col. 604). A close friendship existed between them, kept up by a frequent interchange of letters and verses (*Epist.* viii. 9, col. 600; cf. *Epist.* viii. 11, col. 604). He and Sidonius were two of the four poets brought together by the emperor Majorian at one of the Gallic towns, probably Arles, in 461. On this occasion, meeting at an entertainment, they engaged in a poetical contest, the theme of which was a work of Peter, Majorian's secretary (*Epist.* ix. 13, col. 630-1). Sidonius's composition alone remains (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 441-2). In the year 479 he met a violent death at the hand of his own servants. Some African astrologers, whom he had consulted as to his horoscope, had warned him that the day would be for him a critical and bloody one (*Epist.* viii. 11, col. 607). It may well be supposed that this prophecy tended to bring about its own fulfilment. None of his works survive; but his poetry apparently bore a high reputation. Among his friends he ranked next after Leo,

Euic's secretary, the "rex Castalii chori" (*Epist.* ix. 12, col. 630). Sidonius, indeed, in a criticism of his character and works, does not scruple to compare him to Horace and Pindar (*Epist.* viii. 11, col. 606-7). Some think, from an expression in the letter last cited, that he may have become an Arian after Bordeaux came into the power of the Goths (*Histoire Littéraire*, ii. 494-7; Tillem. *Mém.* xvi. 271). On a difficulty as to the time of his death see Tillemont's note 15, in *Mém.* xvi. 754. [S. A. B.]

LAMPROTATE, a young lady who presented herself to Ephraim the Syrian on his deathbed, and is mentioned at the end of his *Testament* (*Opp.* ed. Benedict, t. ii. p. 409, Syr. and Lat.). She requests permission to make a receptacle for his remains ("urnam" in this version, "exiguum loculum" in that of Voss, "cercueil" as rendered by Tillemont and Ceillier), and another for herself, which she might place at his feet, so that she might follow him into the grave beneath and into heaven above, never to be separated from him. The saint, after some expressions of humility and a useful caution for herself, granted the request, but only on condition that the material was not marble. Voss's translation of this singular scene, which differs at points from that cited above, will be found in his Latin version of Ephraim's works, p. 794. Voss makes her father great Aristides; in the other version it is great Strategus prefect of Edessa, and this is the most correct (*Assem. Bibl. Or.* i. 142). Tillemont (viii. 314) suggests that Lamprotate may be only a title of rank, like that of "Clarissima" borne by the wives and daughters of Roman senators. [C. H.]

LAMPROTATUS, a deacon of Constantinople, commended by Chrysostom with his fellow deacon Eusebius for the constancy with which they had shared the sufferings of the aged presbyter Hypatius. (*Chrysost. Ep.* 180.) [E. V.]

LAMPROTICHUS, archimandrite, counselled by Nilus on his appointment. (Nilus, ep. 108, lib. iii. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix. 334.) [C. H.]

LAMPYRUS, July 19, martyr at Synnada with Macedonius and others. (Wright, *Syr. Mart.*) [G. T. S.]

LAMWILL, bishop. [LOMTUL.]

LANBRIHTUS (Malm. *G. R.* i. § 87, ed. Hardy), archbishop of Canterbury. [JAENBERT.]

LANDBERTUS, ninth bishop of Strasbourg, perhaps about the middle of the 7th century. (*Gall. Christ.* v. 780.) [S. A. B.]

LANDEBERCHTUS (LANDOBERT, LAMBERT), twenty-sixth archbishop of Sens, was present at the council held in the palace of Morlaye, A.D. 677 or 678. (Mansi, xi. 171; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 10; Fisquet, *La France pontificale, Archidiocèse de Sens*, p. 15.) [S. A. B.]

LANDEBERTUS (1), twenty-first bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, in A.D. 666. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1183; *Gall. Chr.* ix. 863.) [S. A. B.]

LANDEBERTUS (2), fourteenth bishop of Angoulême, represented at the council of Narbonne, held in A.D. 788, if, as seems probable, the word "Eglinsium," following the subscription, is a contraction of Engolismensium. (Mansi, xiii. 824; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 982.) [S. A. B.]

LANDELINUS, ST., founder of the abbeys of Lobbes (Laubacens), Aulne, Valers, and Crespin, all in Hainault, in the latter half of the 7th century. An anonymous life of him was published by Surius with emendations of the style (*Jun.* 15, iii. 760-3), and is repeated by Mabillon in its original form in the *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* (ii. 873-7, Paris, 1669), and again by the Bollandists after a comparison of other MSS. (*Acta SS. Jun.* ii. 1064-5). The author only professes to derive his knowledge at second-hand, but the work is attributed by the authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, who characterize it as one of the best pieces of that time, to the early years of the 7th century (iv. 70-1). The Bollandists also publish another life (ib. 1067-8) from MSS. of the church of St. Saviour at Utrecht. The facts related are the same, but the greater simplicity and conciseness of the narrative have suggested that it was the earlier of the two (*Hist. Litt. ibid.*). A late life by Philippe de l'Aumône abbat of Bonne Espérance, and an indifferently poem, probably the work of Herigerus, may also be mentioned (*Hist. Litt. ibid.* vii. 202-3).

Landelinus was born in the neighbourhood of Cambray, in the reign of Dagobert I. (A.D. 622-638). His parents, who were of high rank, entrusted his education to St. Autbertus, bishop of Cambray, who had received him from the font. When he had grown up, his instructor counselled him to receive the tonsure, but yielding to the solicitations of some of his relations, he resolved to enjoy the world and his youth. Secretly leaving Cambray, he changed his name, and gave himself up to a life of recklessness and crime. The sudden death of one of his companions on an expedition of plunder, and a vision of his soul being dragged to hell by devils, brought him back to his teacher in tears and repentance. St. Autbertus placed him in a monastery, where he expiated his sins with austerities and prayer, and after a time, by his own request, received the tonsure. On his return from a pilgrimage to Rome, the bishop ordained him a deacon. Another pilgrimage to the Holy See followed, after which he became a priest. And then once more with two disciples, Adelinus and Domitian, he made the same journey. On his return, with St. Auctbert's concurrence, he and his two companions went to Hainault, and selecting a spot on the Sambre, which took the name of Laubacus, from a brook flowing into that river, built themselves cells. This was the beginning of the monastery of Lobbes (circ. A.D. 654). About three miles off he built another called Alna (Alne or Aulne), and in the same neighbourhood a third called Guaslarus or Waslerus (Valers), about eight miles from Lobbes. All these he enriched, but especially Lobbes. Having started his monasteries, he retired with his two disciples to a spot on the river Hon, near Valenciennes, and set to work to clear the wood and build a cell. A miracle reconciled the indignant owner of the land, and another sup-

plied the site with a spring, from whose gurgling waves (*crispantibus undis*), he called the place *Crispinum*. Disciples soon flocked around him, so that he had to retire to a short distance, to obtain the solitary contemplation he desired. Adelinus and Domitian he sent forth to form separate centres, placing the former at Crespin, and the latter at Lobbes. This is the last act recorded of him. On his death, which is thought to have happened about 686 (*Mabill. ib. 876-7 n.*), he was buried in his own monastery.

Baldericus adds a few facts to this narrative. Over Valers he set St. Dodo, and when he left Lobbes, to seek a more secluded life at Crespin, he entrusted that foundation to St. Ursmarus. Crespin, where he was buried, was in the time of Baldericus occupied by canons, and had become separated, in the lapse of years, from the church of Cambrai, to which it had formerly belonged (*Gesta Pontif. Camerac. ii. 33, 37, 41, i. 68, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxlix. 137-140, 70*). For Lobbes, Crespin, and Aulne, see also *Gall. Christ. iii. 79, 100, 1116*.

St. Landelinus's remains were twice translated, first in 770, then in 1105. His day of commemoration is June 15 (*Boll. ibid. p. 1062*).

[S. A. B.]

**LANDERICUS (1)** (**LANDRICUS**), 3rd bishop of Séz, perhaps towards the close of the 5th century, commemorated July 16. His name survives in the old catalogues. (*Boll. Acta SS. Jul. 121; Gall. Christ. xi. 675*.) [S. A. B.]

**LANDERICUS (2)** (**LANDRY**), twenty-eighth bishop of Paris, is chiefly known from the charter of privileges which he gave to the monastery of St. Denis at Paris in A.D. 653 (*Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 299*). It is usually supposed that the "papa" Landericus to whom the monk Marculfus dedicated his two books of *Formulae* (*Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 695 seqq.*) was this archbishop of Paris (cf. Ceillier, *ut supr.*). He is commemorated on June 10. (*Usuard. Mart.; Boll. Acta SS. Jun. ii. 292; Gall. Christ. vii. 24*.) [S. A. B.]

**LANDERICUS (3)**, bishop of Lisbon from c. 688 till after 693, and the last occupant of the see under the Goths. He subscribed the Acts of the fifteenth (A.D. 688) and sixteenth (693) councils of Toledo. (*Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 313, 333; Esp. Sagr. xiv. 186*.) [POTAMIUS.]

[M. A. W.]

**LANDO**, twenty-fourth bishop of Rheims, is said to have been brother of Erchenvald, mayor of the palace to Clovis II., and of St. Adalbold, the husband of St. Rictrude. The commencement of his episcopate is assigned to the year 645, and his death to 649. (*Floordoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem. ii. 9; Boll. Acta SS. Feb. i. 296; Gall. Christ. ix. 20*.) [S. A. B.]

**LANDOALDUS**, archpresbyter sent by pope Martin I. with the deacon Amantius to assist Amandus in his mission in the north-east of Gaul. Lambert, afterwards bishop of Maestricht, was his disciple. His feast was on March 19. (*Boll. Acta SS. Mart. iii. 34*.) [C. H.]

**LANDOARIUS**, thirty-sixth archbishop of Bourges, circ. A.D. 763-767. (*Gall. Christ. ii. 19*.) [S. A. B.]

**LANDRADA**, July 8, foundress and first abbess (669-690) of the monastery of Belisia (Munster-Bilsen) near the town of Bilsen on the west of Maestricht. (*Boll. Acta SS. Jul. ii. 619; Gall. Chr. iii. 996*.) [C. H.]

**LANDRICUS** (**LANDERICUS**, **LANDRY**, **ST.**), a bishop who has been variously assigned to Mettis (Metz), to Meldis (Meaux), and conjecturally to Castellum Meltis. Baldericus, in his *Gesta Pontificum Cameracensium*, states that Vincentius was buried at Sungeias (*i.e.* Sonegiae, Soignies, between Mons and Brussels) together with his son Landricus, "Meldensis episcopo" (ii. 46, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxlix. 142). But according to Colvenerius, while two MSS. had the word "Meldensis," in the third was added "alias Metensi" (*Boll. Acta SS. Apr. ii. 489*). The *Martyrologium* of St. Gudila at Brussels is also said to contain a notice of him as bishop of Metz (*Gall. Christ. viii. 1601*), and the Bollandists publish a biography collated from four MSS., in which he is assigned to the same diocese (*ib. 489-491*). The objections to this opinion are that he is omitted by Paulus Diaconus from his *Gesta Episc. Metensium* (*Migne, Patr. Lat. xcv. 719, 720*, and from the catalogue of the Metz bishops; there is no memory of him at Metz, and the long episcopate of Clodulfus, who died in 694, after sitting forty years, apparently leaves no interval for him. The Bollandists, however, contend that he followed Clodulfus at Metz, and account for the omission of his name in the catalogues by the fact that he retired from the see to Soignies, and did not die at Metz (*ib. 487-9*). Nor is the evidence in favour of Meaux much better, as he is equally unknown to the catalogues and calendars of that diocese (*Gall. Christ. ib.*), though he is retained in the *Series* of Gams as twenty-fourth of that see, following St. Ebrigrisilus, and succeeded by Edoldus (p. 575). The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* suggest that he may have belonged to Castellum Meltis, like St. Pirminius (viii. 1601, xiii. 702).

According to the Bollandists' biography he was the eldest son of St. Madelgarius, surnamed Vincent, and St. Waldetrudis. From his boyhood he desired to enter the ranks of the clergy, a course which his father opposed, wishing him to marry and become the head of his family. But his importunity at length carried the day, and he received the tonsure. By his merit he ascended till he became bishop of Metz. Meanwhile his father, who towards the end of his life had founded the monasteries of Altusmons (Hautmont, Omont, cf. *Gall. Christ. iii. 114*, for this foundation) and Soignies, and himself become a monk, sent for Landricus to be present at his death-bed. After St. Vincent's death, which is said to have happened about 660, Landricus did not return to Metz, but remained at Soignies and ruled the two abbeys till his death on April 17, the day on which he is commemorated. He was buried at Soignies. [S. A. B.]

**LANDRY**, of Paris. [LANDERICUS (2).]

**LANDULPHUS (1)**, nineteenth bishop of Soissons, cir. 620. (*Gall. Chr. ix. 337*.) [C. H.]

**LANDULPHUS (2)** (**LAUDULFUS**, **LAUD**, **LAOU**), seventh bishop of Évreux, about the

beginning of the 7th century. His day of commemoration is Aug. 13. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iii. 99; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 567; Charrant et Sauvage, *Hist. des Evêques d'Évreux*, pp. 11, 12.) [S. A. B.]

**LANDUS (1)**, May 5, alleged martyr at Iorta (Orte) in the sixth century according to local belief as recorded by Ferrarius. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. ii. 49; cf. Cappelletti, vi. 25 and Gams, *Sér. Episc.* 685.) [G. T. S.]

**LANDUS (2)**, bishop of Cosilinum (or Marcellianum), present at the Roman synod of 743. (Mansi, xii. 367; Ughelli, x. 127; Cappelletti, xxi. 237.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LANDUS (3)**, twenty-seventh or thirty-fourth bishop of Nola, some time between 786 and 843. (Ughelli, vi. 254; Cappelletti, xix. 586, 632.) [C. H.]

**LANFERTH**, bishop of Elmham. [EAN-FRITH.]

**LANFRIDUS**, bishop of Castro, present at the Lateran synod under Stephen IV. in 769. (Mansi, xii. 715; Hefele, § 343.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LANGUORETH, LANGUETH**, wife of Rhydderch Ilael, who ruled over the Cumbrian Britons. Through the prayers of St. Kentigern, she received a son, who was named Constantine, and succeeded his father in the kingdom, but beyond the *Viz. S. Kent.* (c. 33), both mother and son appear to be unknown (Bp. Forbes, *Lives St. Kent. and St. Nin.* 95, 219, 366). The legend connected with this queen's ring and its recovery from the Clyde through the prayers of St. Kentigern and the agency of a salmon, is one of the best known in that saint's life (c. 36), and is represented on the arms of Glasgow. [KENTIGERN.] (Bp. Forbes, *ib.* 99 sq.) [J. G.]

**LANTBERTUS (LANDEBERTUS, LAMBERTUS)**, saint, 39th archbishop of Lyons, circ. A.D. 678-689. His life was written by Aigradus, the monk of Fontenelle, who wrote the life of St. Ansbert; but it has been lost (*Vita S. Ansberti*, s. 17; Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 1053, Paris, 1669). What is known of him therefore has to be gathered from the fragment of a biography by an anonymous monk of Fontenelle (Mabill. *ibid.* iii. 2, 462), and the lives of St. Wandregisilus (*ibid.* ii. 534, 545), of St. Erembertus (*ibid.* p. 605), of St. Conedus (*ibid.* pp. 862-864), of St. Ansbert (*ibid.* pp. 1052-3), and of St. Hermelandus (*ibid.* iii. 1, 385-9). Most of the passages that bear on Lantbert's life are also collected in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 218-220. Though he was an abbat of Fontenelle his life is not to be found in the *Chartae Fontanellenses* (cap. x. Pertz, *Scriptores*, ii. 282-3).

He was born of a distinguished family in the district of Terouanne, his father's name being Erlebertus. The names of two of his uncles are also known, Hrotbertus, who was chancellor (referendarius) of the palace, and Haltbertus, whom St. Lantbert afterwards ordained. He was brought up as a soldier at the court of Clotaire III. (656-670), but in the eighth year of that monarch's reign he retired, with rich gifts, to the monastery of Fontenelle, where St. Wandregisilus was abbat, and received the

tonsure. The abbat on his death-bed recommended his monks to choose between St. Ansbertus and Lantbert for his successor. Their election fell upon the latter (A.D. 665). During the contention of Childeric and Theoderic for the crown, Lantbert is said to have maintained a judicious neutrality. From the latter he received a gift of a place in Provence, called Dusera, in aid of the revenues of Fontenelle, and built there a monastery, which in later times was destroyed by the Saracens. From the former too, when he had established himself on the throne, Fontenelle obtained endowments, and Lantbertus was high in his favour. After a residence at Fontenelle of thirteen years and eight months Theoderic and Pippin made him archbishop of Lyons. Of his acts in this office we know nothing, except that he consecrated his friend St. Ansbert as archbishop of Rouen. He is said to have died in 689 (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 48). He is commemorated April 14 (Mabill. *ibid.* iii. 2, 462.) [S. A. B.]

**LANTFRIDUS**, abbat and priest in Bavaria, to whom Ambrosius Autpertus, abbat of a monastery near Beneventum in the 8th century, is said to have sent his treatise, *de Conflictu virtutum et vitiorum* (Anonym. Mellicens. *de Script. Eccles.* li. Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiii. 975). But it is by no means certain that Ambrosius was the author of this treatise (Ceillier, *Hist. générale des Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 725). There was a Lantfrit present at a council in Bavaria, summoned by Tassilo in A.D. 772, who may well be the one above mentioned. (Baron, *Annales*, an. 772, n. xxiv.; Mansi, xii. 852.) [S. A. B.]

**LANTHECHILDIS (LANTILDIS)**, a sister of Clovis I., who appears to have been converted to Christianity before her brother, but had become an Arian. When St. Remigius baptized Clovis and his other sister Albofledis, he converted Lanthechildis to Catholicism. After making confession of the orthodox faith, she was anointed with the chrism (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 32; Ceillier, xi. 79). Some of the later annalists however speak of her as being baptized with her brother and sister (*Gesta Reg. Franc.* xvi.; *Gesta Francorum*, per Roriconeum monach., Bouquet, ii. 552, iii. 10; cf. *Vita S. Remigii*, *ibid.* iii. 377). She was afterwards sought and obtained in marriage by Theoderic, king of Italy, to whom she bore two daughters. One of these married king Sigismund the martyr. The other, after her father's death, desiring to marry a man of mean estate, and being prevented by Lanthechildis, poisoned her, and was put to death by the reigning king. (Roricone, *ibid.*, Bouquet, iii. 12.) [S. A. B.]

**LANTWALDUS (RUTHWALDUS)**, one of the early bishops of Mainz, cir. 620, according to some lists (Potthast, *Bibl. supp.* p. 353). He is omitted from the list of the *Gallia Christiana* (v. 433). [S. A. B.]

**LAODICIUS**, bishop of Clypea, present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. (*Collat. Carth.* cogn. i. 133; Morelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 144.) [H. W. P.]

**LAOU**, bishop of Évreux. [LANDULPHUS.]

**LARGUS (1)**, martyr at Aquileia, in the reign of Numerian; commemorated on March

16 according to Usuard and *Rom. Mart.*, on March 17 according to Notker. [C. H.]

**LARGUS (2)**, martyr at Rome, in the reign of Diocletian; commemorated on March 16. (*Usuard. Mart.*; *Wandalb. Mart.*; *Rom. Mart.*; *Tillem. Mém.* iv. 560, v. 120.)

[C. H.]

**LARGUS (3)**, a Christian, to whom Augustine wrote, expressing regret at the troubles with which he had met, but also that they had not yet convinced him of the vanity of the world, in which he exhorts him to put no trust (*Aug. Ep.* 203). He is assumed by Ceillier, with much probability, to be the same person as the proconsul of Africa in the years A.D. 415, 418, 419, in which last year Honorius wrote through him to countermand the attendance of the African bishops who had been summoned to meet in council at Spoletum concerning the matter of Eulalius [*BONIFACIUS*, Vol. I. 328]; and also to Aurelius and Augustine, desiring them to enjoin their episcopal colleagues to enforce the condemnation of Pelagius, and warning them of the consequences of neglect in this respect. (*Aug. Ep.* 201; *Morcelli, Afr. Christ.* iii. pp. 70, 81, 91, 92; *Ceillier*, ix. 169; *Tillemont*, vol. xii. pp. 393, 396, xiii. 260, 778; *Hist. des Emp.* v. 642.)

[H. W. P.]

**LASCIVUS (LAUSCIUS)**, ninth bishop of Bayeux, subscribed the third council of Paris (circ. A.D. 555). (*Mansi*, ix. 747; *Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc.* an. 563 n. ii., tom. ii. 22; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 349.)

[S. A. B.]

**LASERANUS.** [GOBBAN (1).]

**LASERIAN (1)** (MOLAIS, MOLASH, MULUSHES), abbat of Daimhinis, now Devenish island in Lough Erne. His commemoration is Sept. 12 in all the hagiologies; and by this, with other marks in tradition and general history, he is to be distinguished from Laserian bishop of Old Leighlin, who flourished in the following century. No ancient life of Laserian of Devenish is published or familiarly known. Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy (*Descript. Cat.* i. 156) gives an account of a life in MS., and "The Legend of St. Molaise, an Irish MS." of probably the 14th or 15th century, was acquired by the British Museum, July 3, 1850, and is classed MS. Add. 18,205 (*Notes and Queries*, 1 Ser. ii. 79, iii. 478, v. 38). Colgan appears to have had one which he was preparing for publication (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 485, vii. 374), and from which he quotes (*Colgan, Tr. Thaum.* 209, 461): probably to the same Ware (*Ir. Writ. B.* i. c. 13) refers with a short quotation. It appears to have been late in the mediæval period, and of no historical value.

His name has assumed a great variety of forms, its radical form being Laisre, amplified by the diminutive termination *an* and the honorific prefix *mo* ("little Laisre," or "my little Laisre"), with the hard sounds gradually softened by familiar use. His father was Nadfraech, son of Corc, his mother's name was Monua, and he was probably born in Connaught. He was educated at Clonard under St. Finnian, with the other famous saints of Ireland of the second class, and became with them one of the twelve apostles of Ireland (*Skene, Celt. Scot.* ii. 51, 63, on them

and their work). When he was born, or retired to Devenish, we do not hear; but in the *Life of St. Aedan* or *Maedhog of Ferns*, he is represented as going northward from him to found his monastery (*Colgan, Acta SS.* 208, c. 7). At Devenish he formed a school, which retained its fame and use long after his day, and he had also many monks under him (*Vit. S. Aidi*, c. 37, ap. *Colgan, Acta SS.* 421 b). If he formed a rule, as is said in the *Vit. S. Kiarani Cuan.* (c. 26, ap. *Colgan, Tr. Thaum.* 605, c. 16), no part of it is known, and his visit to Rome is more than doubtful: so also is his episcopate at Clogher, though Ware has him on his list of bishops. The year of his death is uncertain, as the *Annals of Ulster* give A.D. 563 and 570: the former is the date in the other Irish annals, and probably the true one. (*Lanigan, Ch. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 12, § 9; *Skene, Celt. Scot.* ii. c. 2; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* 61, 81; *Ussher, Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 15, wks. vi. 228 sq. 467 sq. and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 540, 563; *Reeves, St. Adamnan*, 248, 252, 287, 436; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 203 n. 4; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 54-5, 59 sq.; *Nicolson, Irish Hist. Libr.* 45, 47; *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* iv. 178 sq.; *Cotton, Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 72.)

[J. G.]

**LASERIAN (2)** (DOLAISSI, LAFRIANUS, MOLAISRE, MOLAISSE), abbat and bishop of Leithghlin (now Old Leighlin, in the barony of West Idrome, co. Carlow). His feast is April 18. His acts are much mixed up with those of Laserian of Devenish. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 18 Apr., ii. [543] 540-545) give a *Life* in three chapters, which was probably written by an Englishman about the 12th century, and was taken by the Bollandists from a MS. communicated by Henry Fitzsimon from a Salamanca MS. It is imperfect at the beginning, and altogether of little historical value (*Hardy, Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 229, pt. ii. 827, Append.; *Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 403). This was probably the *Life* in preparation by Colgan for April 18 (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 373).

St. Laserian or St. Molaise was of Ulster extraction, being son of Cairell, of the race of Fiatach Finn. His mother was Maithegm of Monadh, daughter of that Aidan, son of Gabhran, whom St. Columba solemnly inaugurated as king of the Dalriadic Scots in Alban. He spent his earlier years in the modern Argyleshire and among the islands on its coast, receiving his education from abbat Murin, who is unknown. His memory is preserved at Lamlash Bay and St. Mollo's Cave in Holy Island in the Firth of Clyde, which attest the tradition (*Bp. Forbes, Kil. Scot. Saints*, 407-9, and *Lives of SS. Nin. and Kent.* 265, 345). In the time of pope Gregory the Great (A.D. 590-604) he is found at Rome, where he is said to have spent fourteen years, and received the orders of both the diaconate and the priesthood. It must have been during this period that he learned that more correct method of calculating the time of the Easter festival of which he was afterwards to prove so zealous an advocate in his native church.

Returning to Ireland with, it is said, a gift of the Scriptures from Gregory, he came to St. Gobban's monastery at Leighlin, where Gobban the abbat resigned in his favour, and betook himself with a few monks to another

cell. At Leighlin (now better known as Old Leighlin), he established a monastery where 1500 monks are reported to have been under him (Ryan, *Hist. and Ant. Co. Carlow*, c. ii.). The Paschal controversy had now commenced, and Laserian headed the Roman party of the south as against the traditional national party of the north, whose leader was St. Finntan Munna (Oct. 21) of Taghmon. To compose the differences, meetings were held between the parties, but without effect. At one of these held at Campus Albus, or Whitefield near Carlow, in the year 630, St. Laserian was deputed with a few others to visit Rome, but with what special point for information or decision we are not told. There he was honourably received by pope Honorius I. (A.D. 626-638), and advanced to the episcopate as the reward of his zealous labours. The ideas of a much later date have invested him with the character of papal legate. When he came back to Ireland he was able to secure the conformity of the south as a whole to the new computation; but the north, with such places in the south as Taghmon, co. Wexford, under the personal influence of St. Finntan, was to abide for some time longer by the old tradition. [LEIGHLIN, SYNOD OF.] (Reeves, *St. Adaman*, 26-8; Lanigan, *Ch. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 15; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* iv. c. 9, vi. c. 17; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* c. 29.) Laserian died on April 18, 639, and was buried in his own church at Leighlin. His cross and well remain. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 409 b; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 170-2; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 126-7; Moore, *Hist. Ir.* i. 13; Wills, *Ill. Irish.* i. 133; *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, xlvii. n. 7.) [J. G.]

LASRAIN, son of Lughaidh, and one of the six sainted sons whom he had by Cainer of Cluain-da-saileach, their mother. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 213.) [J. G.]

LASREAN (1) (LASRENUS), abbat of Bangor, co. Down, died A.D. 646. (*Ann. Tij. eod. an.*; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 645, calling him Mac Laisre.) [J. G.]

LASREAN (2) (LASREUS), abbat of Armagh, died A.D. 623. (*Ann. Tij. eod. an.*; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 622, calling him Mac Laisre; *Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 616, calling him Mac Laisre, bishop of Armagh.) [J. G.]

LASREAN (3) (LASRENUS), son of Degillus and nephew of St. Columba by his sister Cumenia, Cuman, or Cuimne. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 491 n. 69; Reeves, *St. Adaman*, 246; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 219 n. 124.) [J. G.]

LASREAN (4) (LASREUS, LASZARUS), son of Ronan, descended from Conall Gulban and of the house of St. Columba. [COLMAN (10).] He is identified by Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 481 n. 26) with Laisrian, abbat, Dec. 26, in the kalendars. (Colgan, *ib.* 491 n. 26.) [J. G.]

LASREAN (5), son of Declan of Inis-Muireadagh, now Lishmurry, an island off the north coast of Sligo. He is commemorated as Molaise, i.e. Laisren, in *Mart. Doneg.* Aug. 12, and according to tradition he is the saint who attached to St. Columba the penalty of exile from Ireland (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 410, c. 5, calling him Molassius; Reeves, *St. Adaman*,

287 n. x; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 131-2). Colgan seeks to identify him with Lasrean, son of Degillus. [J. G.]

LASRENUS MAUMOIE (LAISRANUS), a pious gardener in the north of Ireland (Scotia) in the time of St. Columba, who died in sanctity in the monastery at Iona. (Reeves, *St. Adaman*, 47; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 342, c. 18, 376 n. 61, 426, c. 92, 490 n. 72 (giving him a feast at Dec 26), 502 a.) [J. G.]

LASSAR (1) (LASAR), virgin, daughter of Eoghán, of Maighin, commemorated April 18 (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 107; *Mart. Tall.* ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, pp. xxi. 19). Maighin is Moyne, co. Mayo. There is an Irish life of a "S. Lassar, Virgo," in the Burgundian Library, Brussels. (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 485.) [J. G.]

LASSAR (2), daughter of Ronan, and patron saint of Achadh-beithe, now Aghavea, in the barony of Maghera-Stephana, co. Fermanagh, and commemorated Nov. 13. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 309.) [J. G.]

LASSAR (3) (LASAR), virgin of Cill Arcalgach, on the brink of Loch Lebenn in Meath (Loch Leane, co. Westmeath), commemorated Aug. 20. She was of the race of Laeghaire, son of Niall. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 225; *Mart. Tall.* Aug. 20, ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xxxii.) [J. G.]

LASSAR (4) (LASSARA), virgin, daughter of Fergus, commemorated March 29. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 786-7) gives a short memoir, chiefly extracted from the *Acts of St. Finnian of Clonard*. She was niece of St. Fortchern, bishop of Trim (Feb. 17), and daughter of Fergus, and descended from Laeghaire and Niall of the Nine Hostages, monarchs of Ireland. In her desire for the spiritual life, from which she was surnamed Algasach and Desideriosa, she steadily declined all proposals of marriage, and took the veil under St. Finnian of Clonard and his sister Regnach or Regnacia, at Kilreynagh, near Baughner; she was taught by St. Ciaran of Clonmacnoise, and afterwards founded her own church at Doire-mac-Aidmechain in her native district. She flourished in A.D. 540. But even Colgan doubts elsewhere the accuracy of thus identifying the daughter of Fergus with the friend and pupil of St. Finnian and St. Ciaran (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 111, c. 3, 364, c. 3, 365 n. 8, 395, c. 22, 399 n. 29, and *Tr. Th.* 543 n. 21, making her the friend of St. Brigida; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, 108; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 77-80; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, 77 sq. 629; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 53). Lassar, Lassara, Lasrea, Laisre, or Lasra appears to have been an extremely common Irish name in the dedications of the kalendars and in the Acts of the Saints, so that much confusion and uncertainty are inevitable. [J. G.]

LASSARA, sister of St. Sedna of Killaney, and daughter of Neman, son of Aidus, son of Lorn (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 569 n. 4). From her connexion with Lorn, who came from Ireland to Scotland, she may be sister of the St. Brigida, who was venerated at Abernethy in Perthshire.

(O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 38 n. 58; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 612 b.) [BRIGIDA (4).] [J. G.]

**LASTIDIANUS**, a cousin of Augustine, present with others at the discussion on *Happy Life*. (August. *De Beata Vita*, cap. 1, § 6.) [C. H.]

**LATHACAN SCOTIGENA**, author of a Luirech, Loric, or Hymn for protection from evils, which is in Mone's *Hymn. Lat. Med. Aevi*, i. 367 (referred to by Todd, *Book of Hymns*, fasc. ii. 121). His Irish name was probably Laidgen or Laidhgenn. [LAIDGEN, monk of Clonfert-mulloe.] [J. G.]

**LATHARNAISC, LATHARNAIS**, commemorated with Itharnaisc at Achadh-ferta, Jan. 14 (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 15), but there is possibly some confusion. (*Mart. Tall.* Jan. 14, ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xii.; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 199.) [J. G.]

**LATHEN**, one of the maternal angels in the system of JUSTINUS. (Hippol. *Ref.* v. 26, p. 187.) [G. S.]

**LATINUS**, bishop of Brescia. [FLAVIUS (1).]

**LATINUS (1)**, Maximianist bishop of Muia, or Mugia, in Numidia, present at the council of Cabarsussis, A.D. 394. (Aug. *En. in Ps.* xxxvi. 20; Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 645.) [H. W. P.]

**LATINUS (2)**, second recorded bishop of Marcellianum or Cosilinum in Lucania, and previously a deacon of Grnmentum (Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* x. 128; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xxi. 237). He is mentioned in the acts of St. Laverius printed in Ughelli (vii. 494 B), and is the subject of two letters of Pelagius II. (578-590). (Gratian, *Decretum*, part. i. dist. 63, can. 14, dist. 77, can. 12, in *Pat. Lat.* clxxxviii.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LATINUS (3)**, twenty-seventh archbishop of Tours, represented at the first council of Chalon-sur-Saône (circ. A.D. 648). According to the chronicles, his episcopate lasted thirteen years. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 28; Mansi, x. 1194; Salmon, *Recueil de Chroniques de Touraine*, pp. 39, 176, 212, 213, 297.) [S. A. B.]

**LATIUS**, disciple of St. Patrick, and said to have been a Roman, whom St. Patrick sent to convert the Corco-Bhascinn in the south-west of the co. Clare; he was a deacon. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 612 (recte 530), c. 4, 539 nn. 5, 11, and *Tr. Thaum.* 208 a.) [J. G.]

**LATO**, bishop of Spires. [LUIDO.]

**LATONIUS**, bishop of Theneae, a seaport in Byzacene (Ant. *Iter.* 46, 2; Plin. v. 4, 25; Thaini, Shaw, p. 112), present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411 (*Collat. Carth.* cogn. i. 120; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 312), and at a council at Thusdrum in 417 (Mansi, iv. 379; Tillem. x. 734, xiii. 792). [H. W. P.]

**LATRO**, second bishop of Laon, about the middle of the 6th century. (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 510.) [S. A. B.]

**LATRONIANUS (1)**, corrector of Sicily. (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5.) [H. W. P.]

**LATRONIANUS (2)**, a learned Spanish poet of the latter half of the 4th century. He was a follower of Priscillian, and with him condemned at Bordeaux, and beheaded by command of Maximus at Trèves, A.D. 385. St. Jerome mentions several works of his, written in different metres, as extant in his time, but none have survived (Prosper. *Chron.* p. 736; Sulpicius Severus, ii. 51; Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 122). In the Greek translation by Sophronius, and in some MSS. of Jerome, he is called Matronianus, but the best MSS. support the other form). Petrus de Natalibus (*Catal. lib. xi. cap. 89*) calls him Latrocinianus, and a martyr (cf. Tillem. viii. 517). [W. L.]

**LATUINUS**, June 20, traditionary first bishop of Séez, said by Du Saussay (*Martyr. Gall.*) to have been sent into Gaul by St. Clement of Rome, but from what source he obtained the legend does not appear. Latuinus is assigned by the Sammarthani (*Gall. Chr.* xi. 675) to some period earlier than A.D. 500, and he is believed to be the saint popularly known as St. Lain. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jun. iv. 12.) [R. T. S.]

**LAUD**, bishop of Evreux. [LANDULPHUS.]

**LAUDANUS**, commemorated in *Mart. Tall.* (ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xviii.) at March 16, but probably a misreading of Aedanus, bishop of Lismore. (*Mart. Doneg.* eod. die.) [J. G.]

**LAUDATUS, ST.** (or Lleuddad), abbat of Bardsey Island (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 221). A chapel was dedicated to St. Laud in the parish of Mylor on Falmouth harbour, who was probably St. Laudatus (Lysons' *Cornwall*, 236; the day of St. Laud of Coutances was Sept. 21). Another Lleuddad of Bardsey was commemorated on Jan. 15 (Rees, 275). [C. W. B.]

**LAUDFRIDUS (LAUDTFRIDUS)**, said to have been thirty-first bishop of Mainz, early in the 6th century. (*Gall. Christ.* v. 435; Potthast, *Bibl. supp.* p. 353.) [S. A. B.]

**LAUDUS (LAUTO, LAUDO, LAUNUS**, popularly Lo), fifth bishop of Coutances (circ. A.D. 528). In 529, or the succeeding year, he was one of a conclave of bishops at Angers (*Vita S. Melanii*, c. iv., Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 330). He subscribed the canons of the second council of Orleans in 533, and the third in 538. At the fourth, in 541, he was represented by a priest Escupilio. At the fifth, in 549, he was present (Mansi, viii. 839, ix. 20, 121, 136). At this last he subscribed himself *Episcopus Constantinae vel Brioverensis*, which last word is said to refer to the place which has since taken his name, St. Lô. The year of his death is not known, but it probably occurred between the last date and 569. He is commemorated Sept. 21 in the French martyrology, and Sept. 22 in the Roman, and on these days his name appears in some of the *Auctaria ad Usuardum*. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 493-4, 496-8; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vi. 438-448; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Sept. 21, tom. vi. 281; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 864.) [S. A. B.]

**LAULFUS**, bishop of Barcelona from about 689 till after 694. He appears at the sixteenth council of Toledo under Egica (693), his signa-



ture being forty-seventh among fifty-nine. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 333; *Esp. Sagr.* xxix. 144.) [S. SEVERUS.] [M. A. W.]

**LAUNEBODES**, a duke of Toulouse, according to Venantius Fortunatus, of barbaric, i.e. probably Gothic, birth, who built a church in honour of the martyr St. Saturninus. He was assisted in this work by his wife Berethrudis, whose generosity to the church is mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 35), and who comes in for a share of the eulogies bestowed on her husband by Fortunatus. (*Miscell.* ii. 12; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 100; Tillem. *Mém.* iii. 301.) [S. A. B.]

**LAUNOBAUDUS**, third in the list of the bishops of Lisieux, present at the council of Châlons, about A.D. 650. (Mansi, x. 1194; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 764.) [S. A. B.]

**LAUNOMARUS** (**LAUDOMARUS**, popularly **LAUMER** or **LOMER**), ST., founder and first abbat of the monastery of Courgeon, or Corbion (Curbio), in the diocese of Chartres in the 6th century. Two lives of him are extant: first a short one published by Mabillon in the *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* (i. 335-8, Paris, 1668), which the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire* pronounce the unquestionable work of a disciple, and written soon after the saint's death. The other, composed probably at the close of the 8th century or later, by a monk of Courgeon (§§ 17, 25), is little else than a paraphrase of the older, in which the simple narrative is expanded for purposes of edification, with the result, in at least one instance, of grave historical inaccuracy. It was first published by Surius, with improvements of his own (*Jan. xix. tom. i.* 438-444), then accurately by Bollandus (*Acta SS. Jan. ii.* 230-5), to whom it was the only one known, and again by Mabillon after the original life (*ibid.* pp. 339-345). For a criticism of both works see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 411-412.

St. Launomarus was born at a place called Neuville-Lamar, in the diocese of Chartres, of Christian parents, while the Franks were besieging Chartres, or, according to the second life, in the reign of Clotaire I. (A.D. 511-561). He was educated among the pupils of a priest named Chirmirus or Cherimirus. Here he received the tonsure, and in time was ordained to the priesthood. After some further years spent at Chartres, he secretly withdrew into the wilderness of Le Perche, where he built himself a hut for solitary contemplation. But his sanctity soon drew around him a body of disciples, and the hut became a monastery (called afterwards Bel-lomarus, Bellomer, i. e. "quasi pulcher Launomarus," according to Mabillon). Many miracles attested his sanctity and the crowd of devotees became so great that he was compelled to migrate elsewhere, to the spot on which he founded the monastery of Curbio. The year of his death is given as 590 or 594.

Launomarus is commemorated Jan. 19, on which day his name occurs in the martyrology of Usuardus (*Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 670), and in many of the *auctaria* (*ibid.* 671-4; cf. *Boll. ibid.* p. 230). [S. A. B.]

**LAUNUS I.**, thirteenth bishop of Angoulême, was chaplain of king Pippin, and owed to him

his elevation to the episcopate. (*Annales Laurissenses*, Pertz, *Monumenta Germ. Hist.* i. 148; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 982.) [S. A. B.]

**LAURENTIA**, Oct. 8, martyr at Ancona, with another virgin, Palatias, in the persecution of Diocletian according to some ancient MSS. at Ancona. (*Mart. Rom.* ed. Baronius; *Boll. Acta SS.* iv. 47; Tillem. v. 135.) [C. H.]

**LAURENTINUS (1) (LAURENTIUS)**, Roman martyr. (Cyp. *Ep.* 39; Feb. 3, *Mart. Rom. Vet.*; *Mart. Adon.*, Usuard.) [CELERINUS.] [E. W. B.]

**LAURENTINUS (2) (LAURENTIUS)**, June 3, boy-martyr in Tuscany, in the Decian persecution. (*Mart. Hieron.*; *Mart. Adon.*, Usuard.; Ceillier, xiii. 308; Tillem. iii. 332; Peter Damian. *serm.* xxii. in *Pat. Lat.* cxliv. 623.) [G. T. S.]

**LAURENTIUS (1)**, bishop of Nola, recorded in the diptychs of the church. Remondini (*Della Nolana Eccles. Storia*, p. 601) argues that his period was cir. A.D. 260, and Cappelletti (*Le Chiese d'Ital.* xix. 573, 631) agrees, making him eighth bishop, succeeding Rufus. Ughelli (vi. 252) conjectures that he lived in the 6th century. [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (2)**, a bishop, to whom Rufinus, cir. 410, addresses his *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed*, calling him "fidelissime Papa Laurenti." It has been conjectured that the bishop's name is a copyist's error for Gaudentius, who was bishop of Brescia about that time (*Patr. Lat.* xxi. 335 and note). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (3)**, bishop of Senia, or Zeng, in Croatia, to whom the 41st letter of pope St. Innocent is addressed. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 607; Ceillier, vii. 525; Tillem. x. 630.) [S. A. B.]

**LAURENTIUS (4)**, bishop of Icosion in Mauritania Caesariensis, delegate of his province to the synod of Carthage A.D. 419 (Mansi, iv. 437, 438). He appears to have been afterwards interdicted from his functions (Morcelli, *Afr. Christ.* i. 189). Tillemont (xiii. 863, 1036, 1037) has some observations on this subject. [R. S. G.]

**LAURENTIUS (5)**, bishop of Arretium (Arezzo) A.D. 422. (Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* i. 410; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xviii. 71, 177.) [R. S. G.]

**LAURENTIUS (6)**, bishop. (Tillem. xvi. 21.) [LEONTIUS.]

**LAURENTIUS (7)**, Feb. 17, bishop of Sipontum after Felix I. (Ughelli, vii. 815; *Boll. Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 57). The story of Laurentius is discussed at length by Sarnelli (*Vescov. Sipont.* p. 37), who gives him the surname of Majorianus, stating that his father was Justus Valerius Majorianus. Cappelletti (xx. 579) dates his appointment by Zeno A.D. 488. [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (8) I.**, 25th bishop of Milan, c. 490. He was present at the council held at Rome by Symmachus A.D. 503 (Mansi, viii. 251). He died c. A.D. 512. (Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* iv. 77; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xi. 111; Ennod. *epig.* 8 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 336.) [R. S. G.]



**LAURENTIUS (9)**, bishop of Lychnidus in Illyricum, near the border of Macedonia, addressed by pope Gelasius I. at the beginning of his pontificate (Mansi, viii. 10), in a letter congratulating the Illyrian and Macedonian bishops on their conduct in refusing to hold communion with Acacius of Constantinople, A.D. 492. Marcellinus count of Illyricum, in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 516, says that Laurentius and other Illyrian bishops were summoned to Constantinople by the emperor Anastasius and detained there in exile from their sees; that Laurentius was healed of a complaint of above six years' standing in the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian; that he ultimately returned home, and died over the age of eighty years. (Migne, Patr. Lat. li. 939; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 285; Tillem. xvi. 643.) [L. D.]

**LAURENTIUS (10)**, antipope, elected on the same day with Symmachus as successor to Anastasius II. The latter is noted for his conciliatory attitude towards Constantinople with respect to the schism between the churches which had arisen in the matter of Acacius during the pontificate of Felix III. The patrician Festus, who had been sent from Rome to the emperor Anastasius, is said to have promised the latter that on his return to Rome he would persuade the pope to subscribe the *Henoticon* of Zeno (Theod. Lect. *Collectan.* l. 2; Nicephor. l. 16, c. 35). He found on his return the pope Anastasius dead. Those at Rome who, with Festus, were in favour of concession to Constantinople were naturally anxious to procure the election of a new pope who would support their policy. Those who approved of the uncompromising attitude of the popes before Anastasius could not but be equally anxious on the other side. Accordingly, only four days after the late pope's decease—which, according to Pagi (*Critic. in Baron.*), occurred on the 22nd of November, A.D. 498—two assemblies were simultaneously held; one in the church of Constantine, which elected Laurentius of Rome in the interests of concession; the other in the church of St. Mary, which elected Symmachus a Sardinian, in the interests of unbending orthodoxy. The fierce conflicts usually attendant on double elections of popes are said to have ensued in this case. The members of the senate as well as the clergy were arrayed in two parties. The ex-consul Faustus is mentioned as the leading supporter of Symmachus; Probinus, an influential senator, with Festus, led the party of Laurentius, which was further much strengthened by the adherence of the deacon Paschasius, whose saintly reputation gave him great influence over the people. This Paschasius, who is honoured as a saint and confessor in the Roman Martyrology, is said by Gregory the Great, who commends him highly for his sanctity and his orthodox writings, to have persisted in his adherence to Laurentius to the day of his death. But Gregory goes on to tell a story which he had heard in his youth about the saint having been seen after death by Germanus bishop of Capua, standing in the fumes of a hot bath, and his having been no longer there when the bishop visited the bath a second time. The conclusion is drawn that the otherwise saintly deacon underwent punishment in the next world for opposing

Symmachus, but was eventually pardoned as having sinned through ignorance (*Greg. Dialog.* l. iv. cc. 40, 41). Baronius, on the ground that he could not have gone to heaven at all had he died in opposition to the true pope, is driven to the shift of interpreting Gregory's expression "to the day of his death" as exclusive of his last moments (Baron. *Annal. and not. in Martyrol. Roman.* May 31). Our proper inference is that the persistent support of a man of saintly and orthodox repute like Paschasius may be taken to imply a better case for Laurentius than was afterwards conceded to him, no less with regard to the validity of his election than to the conciliatory policy that he was elected to uphold.

At length both parties agreed to refer the settlement of the disputed election to Theodoric the Ostrogoth, who now reigned at Ravenna as king of Italy. A deputation having been sent to Ravenna for this purpose, he adjudged in favour of whichever candidate could be proved to have been first ordained or to have been chosen by the greatest number. Consequently Symmachus was accepted as the lawful pope (Anastas.). Baronius, resenting the notion of a matter of this kind having been referred to and settled by an Arian king, contends that his intervention was resorted to only as a temporary expedient for the sake of peace, and that the real and authoritative settlement of the question was by a Roman synod subsequently held. But the synod he refers to (*Romana I. sub Symmacho*, A.D. 499; Labbe, tom. v. p. 441) is represented as convened by Symmachus as being the already acknowledged pope; nor is there any reference in its acts to the disputed election. The seventy-two bishops and sixty-seven presbyters of Italy, and the five Roman deacons who subscribed its decrees accepted his position; but there is no intimation of their having accorded it to him. The purpose of the synod was to provide against such scandal as had recently occurred in future elections of popes.

Among the signatures to the decrees of this council is that of "Coelius Laurentius, archipresbyter tituli sanctae Praxedis," which is supposed to be that of the antipope Laurentius himself, who is further said to have been disposed of by his appointment to the see of Nuceria. Anastasius (*in Vit. Symmachi*) says that it was Symmachus who appointed him; "intuitu misericordiae." Theodoros Lector (lib. ii.), Theophanes (*Chronograph.* p. 123, ed. Paris), and Nicephorus (lib. 16, c. 35), attribute his appointment, as well as the confirmation of Symmachus in the see of Rome, solely to the king Theodoric. If Laurentius at first acquiesced in the assignment of the popedom to his rival, and accepted Nuceria, his partisans at Rome did not allow him to be thus acquiescent long. He was sooner or later recalled by them to Rome, and during the three years after his original election was supported in opposition to Symmachus. Rome continued to be divided into two parties, headed by Festus and Probinus on the side of Laurentius, and by Faustus on the side of Symmachus, and the contest was accompanied by violence and bloodshed. Anastasius states that "those who communicated with Symmachus were slain with the sword; that holy women and virgins were dragged from their houses or convents, denuded and scourged; that there were daily fights

against the church in the midst of the city; that many priests were killed; that there was no security for walking in the city by day or night, and that the exconsul Faustus alone fought for the church." His account implies that the party of influential laymen on the side of Laurentius was the more powerful of the two, but that the clergy generally adhered to Symmachus. There has been discussion as to the dates of the successive stages of the contention and of its final settlement. Pagi (*Critic. in Baron.*), differing from Baronius, maintains that the synod called *Synodus Palmaris* (identified with *Romana III. sub Symmacho*), was not held till the year 503. The Bollandists, followed by Mansi, maintain against Pagi the earlier date, A.D. 501, that had been usually assigned to it, as being denoted by the consuls named in the extant acts of the council, and in the letters of Theodoric on the occasion, and as being consistent with the accounts elsewhere given as to the circumstances. According to them the course of proceedings was as follows. Festus and Probinus, with their party, failing otherwise to get rid of Symmachus, got up criminal charges against him, and sent to Theodoric at Ravenna, desiring him to send a visitor to the Roman church for taking cognizance of these charges. One was accordingly sent in the person of Peter bishop of Altinum, who arrived in Rome before the Easter of the year 501, when he celebrated the solemnities of the season. After Easter Theodoric summoned a council of Italian bishops at Rome, which seems to have separated in confusion without any definite issue, owing to Symmachus having refused to appear before it, and having, with his friends, objected on canonical grounds to the jurisdiction of the visitor. Consequently Theodoric, who appears to have acted throughout with the best intentions, ordered the reassembling of the synod on the Kalends of September in the same year. The matter was finally settled in the "synodus palmaris," the proceedings of which are supposed to be given under *Synod. Romana III. sub Symmacho*, the date of which is x. Kal. Novembris. At this Symmachus consented to appear in person, having procured the withdrawal of Peter from his position as visitor, and given his own authorization to the meeting of the synod, so as to satisfy canonical requirements. The assembled bishops then declared him free from all charges against him, and required all to embrace his communion under pain of being accounted schismatics. Laurentius is said in one account to have retired to a farm of the patrician Festus, and to have died there, "sub ingenti abstinencia." This is stated in a fragment of a catalogue of the popes printed from a remarkably ancient manuscript by Joseph Blanchinus in his edition of Anastasius. This account evidently emanated from the party of Laurentius, if not from Festus himself (cf. Pagi's note on Baronius, ann. 502 i.).

The authorities for the account given above are Anastasius (*in Vit. Symmachii*); the above mentioned *Fragmentum Catalogi Pontificalis* in Anastas. Bibl. ed. 1718-35, Rome, t. iv. *Prolegom.* p. lxi.; Theodorus Lector, Theophanes and Nicephorus (*in loc. cit.*); Acts of Councils under Symmachus; *Libellus apologeticus* of

Ennodius, written in justification of Symmachus after his final triumph. [J. B.—y.]

LAURENTIUS (11), a bishop designated as Bojanensis or Boensis, present at the 3rd Roman council of Symmachus, A.D. 501 (Mansi, viii. 252). Others read Bobiensis, which Ughelli (ii. 654) and Cappelletti (ii. 486, 518) refer to Bobio, and this they identify with Sassina (Sarsina) in Aemilia, west of Ariminum. [C. H.]

LAURENTIUS (12), bishop of Trevis, the ancient Trebia in Umbria, not to be confused with Treba in Latium. Present at the first synod under pope Symmachus, in March 499. (Mansi, viii. 234; Cappelletti, iv. 394, 395; Hefele, § 220.) [A. H. D. A.]

LAURENTIUS (13), bishop of Bergamo, at the third and sixth synods under pope Symmachus in October 501, and October 504. (Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, iii. 209; Mansi, viii. 252, 315; Ughelli, iv. 412; Cappelletti, xi. 457, 539.) [A. H. D. A.]

LAURENTIUS (14), 13th bishop of Reggio in Emilia, c. 500. (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xv. 361.) Ughelli (ii. 243) omits him. [A. H. D. A.]

LAURENTIUS (15), surnamed MELLIFLUUS, thought to have been bishop of Novara cir. A.D. 507. A certain Laurentius surnamed Mellifluus, from the sweetness with which he delivered homilies, is mentioned by Siebert (*Ser. Eccl.* cap. 120 in *Pat. Lat.* clx. 572) as the author of a treatise *De Duobus Temporibus*, viz. one period from Adam to Christ, the other from Christ to the end of the world. The opinion that this Laurentius was the presbyter [LAURENTIUS (37)] who instructed Gaudentius the first bishop of Novara, was maintained by Lazarus Augustine Cotta, an outline of whose arguments may be seen in the *Acta Eruditorum* (suppl. t. ii. pp. 525, 526, ed. Lips. 1696). La Bigne (*Max. Bibl. Pat.* t. ix. p. 465, Lugd. 1677) suspects that Laurentius Mellifluus was bishop of Novara, and subsequently that bishop of Milan (sc. Laurentius I. the 25th bishop) who is praised by Ennodius in his first *Dictio*. La Bigne grounds his opinion on certain allusions of Ennodius in his second *Dictio*, which was sent to Honoratus bishop of Novara (e. g. *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 269 n). Other corroborative passages have been adduced by Mabillon (*u. inf.*), as where Ennodius describes Laurentius bishop of Milan pacifying his haughty brethren by honeyed words of conciliation (*blandimentorum melle*, *ib.* 267 A). The historians of literature usually therefore designate Laurentius Mellifluus bishop of Novara, but he is not admitted by the historians of the see, as Ughelli (*Ital. Sac.* iv. 692) and Cappelletti (*Le Chiese d'Ital.* xiv. 526). Three extant treatises are ascribed to Laurentius Mellifluus, viz. two homilies, *De Poenitentia* and *De Eleemosyna*, printed by La Bigne in his *Bibliotheca*, and a treatise *De Muliere Cananea*, printed by Mabillon with a note on the author supporting the view of La Bigne in his *Analecta* (p. 55, ed. 1723). The homilies will be found in La Bigne (*Max. Bib. Pat.* t. ix. p. 465, Lugd. 1677) and the three treatises together in Migne (*Pat. Lat.* lxxvi. 87) with both La Bigne's and

Maillon's notices of the author. Cave says (i. 493) that the *De Duobus Temporibus* is lost. But he is mistaken, for it is evidently the same as the homily *De Poenitentia*, which opens with an exposition of the "duo tempora," which terms he employs somewhat in the sense of the two dispensations for the divine pardon of sin. The sin inherited from Adam is in baptism entirely put away through the merits of Christ. Christ the second Adam simply cancelled the sin derived from the first Adam. Original sin therefore corresponds, in a manner, with the pre-Christian period. For actual transgression each person is himself alone responsible, and is to be released from it by penitence. The treatise is mainly occupied with this last thought, and so has received the title it now bears. For other notices of the author see Ceillier (xi. 95), Dupin (*Ecol. Writ. t. i. p. 540*, ed. 1722), Tillemont (*Mém. x. 259, 260*). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (16)**, surnamed ILLUMINATOR, bishop of Spoleto (Ughelli, *Ital. Sac. i. 1257*; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital. iv. 338, 382*; Boll. *Acta SS. 3 Feb. i. 362*). Laurentius is said to have been one of those adherents of the Catholic faith in Syria who, when Eutychianism was dominant there in the reign of Anastasius, fled to Italy and to Rome. The year 516 is the calculated date. Hormisdas ordained him priest and sent him to preach in Umbria. Near Lake Velinus he built a monastery in which he resided twenty years, when cir. 541 he was elected by the Spoletines to succeed their bishop John II. His reputation for miraculous powers caused him to be known as ILLUMINATOR. In 552 he resigned, and was succeeded by Peter I. He then retired to a Sabine estate named Acutianum, where he built a monastery called Farfa after the stream Farfar near which it stood. Here he died Feb. 3, 576, but was commemorated in the city and diocese of Spoleto on Feb. 4. There is another account, which would identify him with the bishop of Foronovo [LAURENTIUS (17)]. Compare ISAAC bishop of Spoleto. [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (17)**, a bishop of the Sabine church, cir. 550, having his seat probably at Foronovo (Ughelli, x. 103; Maronius, *Episc. Sabines*, p. 14; Cappelletti, i. 557, 585). Maronius discusses his see and period. It is stated in the chronicle of Gregory, a monk of the 11th century, that he came from Syria, and after abdicating his see was the founder of the monastery of Farfa (*Constructio Farfensis* in Pertz, *Monumenta*, xi. pp. 520, 521). Petrus Damianus also relates in his epistle to pope Nicholas II. that Farfa was built by a Sabine bishop after his abdication (ep. 9, lib. i. al. *Opusc. xix. cap. 1*, in *Pat. Lat. cxlv. 425*). See the preceding article. [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (18)**, tenth bishop of Florence, A.D. 555 (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia. xvi. 446, 709*). He is not recognised by Ughelli (iii. 20), Lami (*Ecol. Flor. Monum. ii. 707*), or Cerracchini (*Vescov. di Firenz. p. 15*). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (19)**, bishop of Centumcellae (Civita Vecchia). He received a letter from pope Pelagius I. 555-560 (Gratianus, *Decret. pt. i. dist. 63, caus. 15* in *Pat. Lat. clxxxvii.* and in

Mansi, ix. 736). He is reckoned sixth in the series. (Ughelli, x. 56; Cappelletti, i. 532, 545.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (20) II.**, archbishop of Milan, c. 573. It seems probable that he resided at Genoa, whither his predecessor Honoratus fled on the invasion of Italy by the Lombards. (See Gregory's letter to John the subdeacon, lib. iii. indict. xi. 30 in Migne, lxxvii. 627.) It appears from letters of Gregory the Great that Laurentius had drawn up a document in which he condemned the Three Chapters, which caused much disturbance in the minds of the bishops of Northern Italy. But Gregory wrote to Constantius, successor of Laurentius, that in any case he was not bound by the acts of his predecessor. (Greg. Magn. *Epist. lib. i. indict. ix. 82, lib. iii. indict. xi. 26, lib. iv. indict. xii. 2, 39*; Migne, lxxvii. 535, 623, 670, 713.) See also a letter from Childbert king of the Franks to Laurentius (Troya, *Codice Diplomatico, i. p. 33*). [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (21)**, first bishop of Concordia in Italy, before 579, according to the authorities used by Gams (*Sér. Episc. 788*), but not recognised by Ughelli (v. 325) or Cappelletti (x. 473). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (22)**, bishop of Belluno, one of the ten bishops who (after a synod of bishops of Venetia and the district) signed a letter to the emperor Maurice, c. 590, justifying their refusal to condemn the Three Chapters (Hefele, § 281; Mansi, x. 466). He is also mentioned by Paulus Diaconus (iii. 26) as one of the bishops who would not communicate with Severus patriarch of Grado, because he had condemned the Three Chapters. (Ughelli, v. 146; Cappelletti, x. 110, 215.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (23)**, bishop of Arezzo 600 (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia, xviii. 71, 177*). Ughelli (i. 410) omits him. [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (24)**, bishop of Castellamare (Stabiae), c. 600. (Ughelli, vi. 656; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia, xix. 771, 811*.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (25)**, the second archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 604-619. He was one of the original company of missionaries who left Rome with Augustine in 595 and stayed at Aix, whilst their leader went back to St. Gregory for further encouragement in the work. After Augustine's return he accompanied him to Kent, and was employed by him, after the first successes of the enterprise and the consecration of Augustine, to carry the news to the pope. On his return from Rome he brought the letters in which St. Gregory answered the questions of Augustine, and was accompanied by abbot Mellitus and a fresh band of monks. In the letters by which St. Gregory recommends the mission to the good offices of the bishops and princes of Gaul, Laurentius is designated "presbyter," a fact which makes it probable that he was not a monk (Bede, *H. E. i. 27*; Greg. *Epp. lib. xi. 29, 55-62, 64*). This inference is disputed by Maillon (*AA. SS. O. S. B. saec. ii. p. 57*), but apparently on insufficient grounds, although the later Canterbury writers insist on the point (*O. Cant. Ang. Sac. i. 2*; cf.

Elmham, p. 127). Augustine, shortly before his death, consecrated Laurentius as his successor (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 4). The date to be taken for this event will of course depend on the date accepted for Augustine's death. That probably took place on May 26, 604. In a charter of Ethelbert, dated April 28, 604 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. no. 1), the king asserts that he acts by advice of bishop Laurentius. This is a grant to the newly founded church of Rochester, and is not, in the judgment of Kemble, open to the charge of fabrication which destroys the authority of many of the Canterbury charters. On the other hand, in a dated Canterbury charter of Jan. 9, 605, Laurentius is mentioned as a witness, and is still called "presbyter." In 604, then, or 605 at the latest, he succeeded Augustine, and administered the affairs of the little church with vigour and success as long as king Ethelbert lived. In 610 he must have taken part in the mission of Mellitus to Rome; in 613, according to the Canterbury historians (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, p. 131), he consecrated the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, the foundations of which had been laid by Augustine (Bede, *H. E.* i. 33). His zeal in the administration of this church is enlarged on by Elmham (p. 127), but the matter is either legendary or inferential. It is possible also that some of the conciliar legislation to which St. Boniface and pope Zachary allude, in connexion with the names of the early archbishops, was the work of Laurentius during this period (*Bonif. Epp.* ed. Jaffé, pp. 114, 185; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 51), but of this too nothing certain can be affirmed.

The growth of the church under Laurentius seems to have been very slow, his aim, like that of Augustine, being probably to reconcile the British Christians before attempting any great mission among the heathen kingdoms. The only extant and genuine document of his is the fragment of a letter preserved by Bede (*H. E.* ii. 4), addressed to the bishops and abbots of "Scotia." In the letter itself, as Bede tells us, was contained an earnest exhortation to peace and unity on the questions in dispute between the Celtic and Roman churches; but the fragment preserved is somewhat of a remonstrance against the unfriendly conduct of the Scottish bishops, one of whom, named Daganus, had refused to eat with the Kentish clergy, or even in the house where they were. Similar letters were likewise addressed to the British bishops. The latter had little or no success, but the overtures to the Scotch-Irish church were not altogether futile. The tradition preserved by Gotselinus affirms that Laurentius converted to the Catholic rule of Easter a certain Terenan, whom Ware identifies with MacLaisre, bishop of Armagh (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 62; Bright, *Early English Ch. Hist.* pp. 96-98). The date of this negotiation is fixed by Bede as nearly coinciding with the mission of Mellitus to Rome (*H. E.* ii. 4).

On the death of Ethelbert in 616, the whole of the newly founded church organisation was endangered. Eadbald, his son and successor, not only resisted the reception of Christianity but married his stepmother; and, at the same time the heathen sons of Seburt became kings of the East Saxons. Mellitus and Justus prepared to fly to Gaul, and visited Canterbury on their way in order to take counsel with Lauren-

tius. The archbishop lost heart under the circumstances, and as soon as they were gone made ready to follow them. In this intention he was hindered by a vision of St. Peter, who, appearing to him as he lay on his couch in the church of the monastery, rebuked him both with words and stripes. The stripes, according to Bede, were real stripes, and, being shewn by Laurentius to king Eadbald, had the effect of securing his conversion. Mellitus and Justus were immediately recalled and the downfall of Kentish Christianity prevented (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 6). It is useless now to enquire whether in a matter so obviously legendary Laurentius had had recourse to a pious fraud (Hook, *Archbishops*, i. 88, 89). The project of flight must be fixed to the years 617 or 618, and shortly afterwards Laurentius died. He was buried by the side of Augustine in the north porch of the church of St. Peter and St. Paul (St. Augustine's; Bede, *H. E.* 3, 7) on Feb. 2, probably in the year 619. [See MELLITUS.] A Latin epitaph is given by Elmham, p. 149, and Harpsfield, p. 60.

The name of Laurentius occurs in several charters, some of which have been already noticed. Most of these are connected with the history of the monastery of St. Augustine, and are of little authority. (See Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 4-6; *Mon. Angl.* i. 127; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 114, 119, 144.) One is a grant of Adisham to Christ Church, Canterbury, given by Eadbald after his conversion (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 983). The Rochester charter above referred to is the only one which has any claims for acceptance as genuine.

Later tradition at Canterbury and elsewhere has gathered a few legendary particulars of the life of Laurentius. Elmham states that Laurentius blessed two successive abbots of St. Augustine's, John and Rufinianus, but this seems to be a mere matter of inference. The Life by Gotselinus, described by Hardy (*Cat. Mat. Brit. Hist.* i. 217, 218), is still in MS. This Life ascribes to the archbishop a journey to Scotland, and the foundation of a church at Fordun. Nothing, however, of any authenticity can be added to the story as given by Bede. Hardy mentions (*l. c.* p. 219) two poetical Lives still in MS. Besides the biography in Capgrave, which is founded on Bede and Gotselinus, there are discussions on the history of Laurentius in Mabillon, *AA. SS. O. S. B. saec. ii.* pp. 56-58; and in the Bollandist Acts, Feb. 2, tom. i. pp. 289-294. Surius (vol. ii. p. 35) gives only extracts from Bede. See also Harpsfield, *Hist. Eccl.* p. 60. The list of archbishops given by Ralph de Diceto (*Ang. Sac.* i. 87; *Dicet. Opp.* i. 16; ii. 208) is of no authority. In it Laurentius is said to have received the pall from St. Gregory, but no such statement appears in Bede; Gervase (*opp. ii.* 331) supposes that he may have used one sent by Gregory to Augustine. The computation which assigns him a pontificate of only five years is also erroneous (*ibid.*), although, taken in conjunction with the misstatement which gives sixteen years to Augustine, it helps to correct itself.

Laurentius was never canonised, but he was held in great veneration in Kent; and out of the two hundred and fifty churches in England which are dedicated to St. Laurence the deacon, some few may be held to commemorate the

successor of Augustine, or to have been indebted for their names to the reverence inspired by the two conjointly. [S.]

**LAURENTIUS (26)**, bishop of Pavia, c. 628. (Ughelli, i. 1081; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xii. 402.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (27)**, bishop of Usula in Byzacene, signed the letter addressed to Constantine, son of Heraclius, by the council of that province A.D. 641. (Morcelli, *Afr. Christ.* i. 361.) [R. S. G.]

**LAURENTIUS (28)**, doubtful bishop of Lucca, reckoned by Ughelli (i. 795) 21st or 22nd before 649, but omitted by Cappelletti (xv. 556). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (29)**, bishop of Todi (Tuderum), present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649 (Mansi, x. 867; Hefele, § 307). He is reckoned 10th or 11th bishop. (Ugh. i. 1351; Cappell. v. 218, 242.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (30)**, 10th bishop of Perugia, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649. (Mansi, x. 866; Hefele, § 307; Ugh. i. 1157; Capp. iv. 466, 500.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (31)**, 23rd or 24th bishop of Tortona, c. 662, between Beatus and Audacius. (Ughelli, iv. 628; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xiii. 671.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (32)**, 13th or 15th bishop of Brixen or Seben, in the Tyrol, in the seventh century, according to a catalogue of the sec. (Hund, *Metrop. Salisburg.* i. 296; Sinnacher, *Geschicht. der Bischöf. Kirche Säben und Brixen*, i. 214; Resch, *Annal. Eccles. Sabionensis*, t. ii. p. 483.) [S. A. B.]

**LAURENTIUS (33)**, eighth or ninth bishop of Parentium cir. A.D. 700. (Ugh. v. 399; Cappelletti, viii. 786, 799.) [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (34)**, July 19, bishop of Naples. Cuper the Bollandist dates him cir. A.D. 717 and quotes an ancient inscription saying that he sat fifteen years and six months (*Acta SS.* Jul. iv. 644). Cappelletti (xix. 398, 523) reckons him the 38th bishop, between Julian and Sergius, A.D. 701-716, differing slightly from Ughelli (vi. 58) and *Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, pars i. in *Monum. Rerum Langob.* 1878, p. 421. [A. H. D. A.]

**LAURENTIUS (35)**, supposed bishop of Petinum (Pedena) in Istria, A.D. 804 (Cappelletti, viii. 775), not accepted by Ughelli (v. 471). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS**, martyr. [LAURENTINUS.]

**LAURENTIUS (36)**, Aug. 10, archdeacon of Rome, and martyr under Valerian, A.D. 258. Cyprian (*Ep.* 82 al. 80 *Ad Successum*) mentions the rescript of Valerian directing that bishops, presbyters, and deacons should forthwith be punished, and records the martyrdom of Xystus bishop of Rome, in accordance with it on Aug. 6. Laurentius, the first of the traditional seven deacons of Rome, suffered four days afterwards. The genuine Acts of this martyrdom were lost

even in St. Augustine's time, as he tells us (*Ser.* 302, *de Sancto Laurent.*) that his narration was gained from tradition instead of reciting the Acts as his custom was (*S. Ambr. de Off.* i. 41). He suffered by burning over a slow fire, the perfect thinking thus to extort the vast treasures which, as he believed, the Christians had concealed. He was buried in the Via Tiburtina in the cemetery of Cyriaca by Hippolytus and Justinus, a presbyter, where Constantine the Great is said to have built a church in honour of the martyr, which pope Damasus rebuilt or repaired. Few martyrdoms of the first three centuries are better attested than this one. St. Laurentius is commemorated in the canon of the Roman Mass. His name occurs in the most ancient Calendars, as Catalog. Liberianus, or Bucherianus of the 4th century, in the Calendar of Ptolemeus Silvius in the 5th century, and in the others described in Art. CALENDAR in *DICTIONARY OF CHRIST. ANTIQ.* (cf. Smedt, *Introductio ad Hist. Ecclesiast.* pp. 199-219, 514). He is commemorated by Prudentius in his *Peristephan.* (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*; *Mart. Adon.*, Usuard.; *Tillem. Mém.* iv. 38; Ceillier, ii. 423; Fleury, *H. E. vii.* 38; xi. 36; xviii. 33). Cf. Fronton, *Epist. et Desert. Ecclesiast.* p. 219, ed. 1720, where, in a note on Aug. 10, in *Rom. Kal.*, an accurate account is given of the churches built at Rome in his honour. [G. T. S.]

**LAURENTIUS (37)**, Apr. 30, presbyter and martyr at Novara. He is related to have come from western parts to preach to the pagan inhabitants, and to have been assisted by a reader Gaudentius, who subsequently became the first bishop of Novara [GAUDENTIUS (8)], and in whose *Vita* (cap. 2, *Boll. Acta SS.* 22 Jan. ii. 418) the account of Laurentius is contained. Laurentius was about to baptize a large number of children at a font which he had constructed some distance from the city, when the pagans went out and slaughtered both him and his catechumens. The period of this event is variously assigned to the reigns of Diocletian, Constantius, and Valentinian (*Boll.* Apr. iii. 763; *Tillem.* x. 259, 260). Tillemont states that Laurentius is regarded as one of the patrons of Novara, where there is a church bearing his name. [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (38)**, reader at Florence, son of JULIANA (7).

**LAURENTIUS (39)**, addressed by Augustine as "dilectissime tili," while inscribing to him his *Enchiridion* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xl. 231). Augustine left it to his discretion to call the treatise by that name (*Ench.* c. 122). In connexion with the same work, and as a brother of Dulcitus, he is again mentioned by Augustine (*De Octo Dulcitiis Quaestionibus*, § 10, *ibid.* p. 154). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (40)**, a solitary, addressed along with two others, Faustus and Epinicus, by St. Nilus (*opp.* 98, 99, 100, 101, lib. iii. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix. 430). [C. H.]

**LAURENTIUS (41)**, a martyr in Africa, whose monument, discovered at Setif in Algeria, is the subject of an investigation of M. Renier in the *Revue Archéologique* of Paris (1850, p. 369). The author interprets the date which

the inscription contains as indicating the period of martyrdom to have been the reign of Genseric king of the Vandals, and he is inclined to identify the martyr with the African Laurentius commemorated on Sept. 28, in the *Roman Martyrology*. [G. T. S.]

**LAUREOLUS**, 23rd bishop of Novara, between Probus and Leo, before A.D. 700. (Ughelli, iv. 695; Cappelletti, xiv. 448, 526.) [C. H.]

**LAURIANUS**, July 4, martyr in the territory of Bourges, according to Usuard, who states that his head was carried to Seville. To this statement Ado adds that the locality of his martyrdom was vicus Justinus, a name which appears in various other forms, the Bollandists adopting that of Vastinum, which will be found in Spruer. Later martyrologists designate Laurianus a bishop, which is his title in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Jul. iv. 35). In Spain he is known as San Laureano, and Florez has a dissertation (*Esp. Sag.* ix. 147) in opposition to the idea that he was ever bishop of Seville. The Bollandists conjecture the sixth century as his period. [C. H.]

**LAURUS (1)**, martyr with his twin brother Florus; commemorated on Aug. 18. In the reign of Constantine the Great their relics were found and removed to Constantinople, where they were preserved at the date of Basil's *Menology* (Basil. *Menol.* iii. 207). [C. H.]

**LAURUS (2)**, bishop of the "sedes Pacensis" (Pax Julia, now Beja in Lusitania), appears among the signatories of the doubtful synod of Toledo, placed under Recared in 597 (*Esp. Sagr.* xiv. 248; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*. ii. (2) p. 25). The name is omitted in the collections of Loaisa (p. 253), Aguirre-Catalani (iii. 305), and Mansi (x. 478). [M. A. W.]

**LAURUS (3)**, one of seven solitaries in the Arabian desert bordering on the Saracens about the 4th century. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* lib. iii. cap. 200; Tillem. x. 447.) [C. H.]

**LAURUS (4) (LERI, LERY)**, priest and abbat in the diocese of St. Malo in the 7th century. Mention is made of two accounts of his life, but neither is now accessible. One of them had been seen by the author of the MS. chronicle of the monastery of St. Julian at Tours (Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* saec. v. 134), but, with the exception of short passages from it preserved by the chronicle, it has been lost. The other consists of some MS. *Acta* of the saint formerly preserved in the church which bears his name, and employed by Lobineau in his life of St. Lery (*Vies des Saints de Bretagne*, ii. 85, ed. 1836). These *Acta*, from internal evidence, appear to have been written in the 9th century. Laurus was sprung "ex Britannia," but whether we are to understand Brittany or Great Britain is not clear. Lobineau says there is some reason to believe his birthplace was in the country of Broüerech, or Vannes, but there is another tradition that he belonged to a noble family of England. For love of God he deserted home and friends, and came to the king of Brittany, St. Judicael. By him he was presented with a cell, which had been occupied by a hermit, called

Elocan, and which is said to have lain on the banks of the river Doma or Doueff, on the northern skirt of the great belt of forest which extending from near the diocese of Rennes to that of Cornouaille, divided the pagus transylvanus, or in Celtic Poutre-coet (Porhoet), from the southern portion of the province. Here, with the king's help, he built a cell or small monastery, which afterwards bore his name, and passed the remainder of his life in good works. He died full of years, and was buried amid a large concourse of people, in a stone coffin he had himself prepared. The monastery disappeared in very early times, though a church and small village still retain the name.

St. Laurus is commemorated Sept. 30, on which day his name appears in some of the *Auctaria ad Usuardum*, in one of them, the *Editio Iubei-Coloniensis* (1490), erroneously as episcopus (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 524). His feast is also marked on that day in the old calendar of the abbey of St. Meen; but according to Mabillon (*ibid.* p. 145), at the monastery of St. Julian in Tours, it was formerly celebrated on Oct. 1, but was moved to the following day on account of the double feast of St. Remigius. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. viii. 692-97; Lobineau, *Vies des Saints de Bretagne*, ii. 85-94, ed. 1836.) [S. A. B.]

**LAUSCIUS**, bishop of Bayeux. [LASCIVUS.]

**LAUSTRANUS**. [LAISTRANUS.]

**LAUSUS (1)**, an imperial officer, sent by the emperor Julian to Basil, A.D. 362, with the view of intimidating him. (Basil. *Epist.* 41 [208]; Cotelier. *Ecl. Graec. Monum.* ii. 94.) [E. V.]

**LAUSUS (2)**, a primicerius reproved by Nilus (ep. 151, lib. ii. in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix. 271). [C. H.]

**LAUSUS (3)**, imperial chamberlain at Constantinople under Theodosius II., and friend of Palladius bishop of Helenopolis, whose *Historia Lausiaca* was named in honour of him. Prefixed to the *Historia* are two epistles addressed to Lausus, who is designated a praepositus, one of them by Palladius and the other by Heraclides, who was also a Cappadocian bishop. Cedrenus (*Compend.* t. i. p. 587, Bonn) mentions a Lausus among the eunuuchs who governed under Theodosius II., and this may have been our Lausus, since chamberlains were commonly eunuuchs. Codinus in his treatise on the statues of Constantinople (*De Signis*, p. 37, Bonn) describes those which adorned the mansion of Lausus, whom he calls patrician and praepositus, one who had held many posts of authority (*ἀρχάς*, magistratus), and had attained to high honour in the reign of Arcadius. He too may have been our Lausus, placed under a wrong emperor. The statues described by Codinus are pagan. The mansion is one of the palaces of Constantinople enumerated by Ducange (*Cpolis. Christ.* lib. ii. p. 132, ed. 1682); he calls it "palatium lausiaceum," cites other authors who mention it, and places it in the centre of the city, near the forum of Constantine. Ducange believes the owner of the palace to have been our Lausus. About the period of the council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) the name of Lausus is found in various writers, having characteristics re-

sembling those of the friend of Palladius, with the exception that he is not designated a praepositus. The identity is commonly acknowledged by critics, and if the title praepositus disappears, it need not have been a permanent one. Among the correspondents of Firmus bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, occurs an eminent one named Lausus, whose intercourse he had much enjoyed when visiting the "great city" where Lausus resided (Firm. ep. 9 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvii. 1487). Muratori in his note here identifies Lausus with ours, and the "great city" with Constantinople. It was about the same period that Theodotus bishop of Ancyra addressed to a Lausus (whom Tillemont identifies with ours) a treatise in six books which he had written against Nestorius, a fact stated by Epiphanius the deacon, in the sixth action of the seventh synod, 787 (Labbe, vii. 494; Mansi. xiii. 699). The same Theodotus, in his *Exposition of the Nicene Creed*, addresses an anonymous friend, whom towards the end he styles *φίλη κεφαλή* (*Pat. Gr.* lxxvii. 1313, 1348 D) and Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* x. 513, ed. Harles) conjectures that the friend is Lausus. Some little time after the council of Ephesus (in 432 or 433, Tillem.) there is a Lausus mentioned in a letter of archdeacon Epiphanius, the syncellus of Cyril, to Maximian bishop of Constantinople, the successor of Nestorius (*Synod. Adv. Tragod. Iren.* cap. 203 in Mansi, v. 989). In this letter, besides a cubicularius, there is more than one praepositus, and among them Chrysoretus. an active opponent of Cyril's doctrine, whose power therefore Cyril is anxious to destroy. Epiphanius accordingly urges Maximian to get the lord Lausus ("dominus Lausus") brought into the palace through Pulcheria and appointed praepositus in the place of the enemy of the church. If our Lausus is the person meant there is some difficulty in making him a candidate for a dignity he had been honoured with some ten years earlier. Tillemont meets it by suggesting that there is no reason why a person should not have held the chamberlainship twice. This view seems corroborated by our meeting with a Lausus praepositus very soon afterwards in connexion with Melania the younger. It was in 434 (Rosweyd) or 436 (Tillemont) that this lady visited Constantinople, and there she was hospitably received at the house of the illustrious Lausus, a good man, who had attained the dignity of praepositus. With Tillemont we may in this instance confidently admit the identity.

For Tillemont's remarks on some of the passages cited in this article see his *Mémoires*, xi. 508, 526, 527, xiv. 250, 540. See also Ceillier, vii. 486. The name of Lausus does not occur in the prosopographia of Gothofred's *Theodosian Code*. [C. H.]

LAUTO, bishop of Coutances. [LAUDES.]

LAVANUS, ST., the patron saint of St. Levan, a parish near the Land's End. He was probably Irish. The parish feast is on the Sunday nearest to Oct. 15. But he may be the Irish saint Livinus, the apostle of Brabant, who was martyred Nov. 12, A.D. 656 (Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 255). The parish was until lately always combined with Burgan, named from Buriena, also an Irish devotee. There was

a tendency to shift saints' days to the beginning of October. (See Dixon's *Hist. of Church of England*, i. 424.) [C. W. B.]

LAVERIUS, Nov. 17, martyr in the early part of Constantine's reign, according to his *Gesta* written in 1162 and printed in Ughelli (*Italia Sacra*, vii. 488). [C. H.]

LAZARUS, BOOK OF, an apocryphal writing ascribed to Lazarus of Bethany, who is said to have narrated his experience of the unseen world in four books, three of which were hidden by the apostles, the remaining one being carried to Rome. The title, with this description, appears in a catalogue of 174 books found among some antiquities of Constantinople during the Venetian occupation of that city, and printed by Du Verdier at p. 57 of his *Supplementum Epitomes Bibliothecae Gesnerianae* (which is appended to his *Bibliothèque*, Lyon, 1585). It is noticed in Ittig's *Dissertatio de Patribus Apostolicis* (p. 32) in his *Bibliotheca Pat. Apost.*, and by Fabricius in his *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* t. ii. p. 982. [G. T. S.]

LAZARUS (1), reputed by the church of Marseilles to have been first bishop of Marseilles, and the brother of Mary and Martha. The feast of this saint was celebrated at Marseilles in ancient times on Dec. 17, as in the Roman martyrology. Other authorities place it on Sept. 1. (*Gall. Ch.* i. 631.) [R. T. S.]

LAZARUS (2), Apr. 12, reputed deacon and martyr at Trieste in the age of the Antonines. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Ap. ii. 66; Tillemont, *Mém.* ii. 319, 629.) [C. H.]

LAZARUS (3), martyr in Persia under Sapor with Zanita and others, commemorated by the Latins on March 27. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mart. iii. 691; Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* i. 15; Tillem. *Mém.* vii. 38.) [C. H.]

LAZARUS (4), a bishop among the Grazer solitaries about Mount Sigoron (*τὸ Σιγόρων καλούμενον ὄρος*) near Nisibis. (Soz. vi. 38; Tillem. viii. 285.) [EUSEBIUS (121).] [C. H.]

LAZARUS (5), bishop of Aquae Sextiae (Aix in Provence) at the commencement of the 5th century. According to the Chronicle ascribed to Dexter (sub anno 400), he had previously been bishop of Veseo in Gallaeia. We first hear of him in Gaul as the accuser of Briccius bishop of Tours (c. 396-443), whom he falsely charged with adultery (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 1, x. 31). For this he was condemned by more than one provincial council (Zosimus, *Ad Africanos*, Sept. 21, A.D. 417 in Mansi, iv. 353; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* 27), but, notwithstanding, received from Constantine the see of Aix, in succession to a bishop in whose violent death he appears to have been implicated (*Gallia Christ.* i. 298). Briccius was expelled from Tours, and went to Rome to lay his case before the pope, and after an interval of seven years he returned with authority to resume his see. Zosimus, who finally decided in his favour, was excommunicated for the part which he had taken against him. In the meanwhile, apparently, Lazarus had resigned and joined his friend Heros



of Arles in Palestine, and was soon active there in the prosecution of Pelagius [HEROS (2)].

Gregory of Tours assigns the commencement of the troubles of Briceus to A.D. 430, which is certainly much too late. If, instead of "tricesimo tertio," we may read, "decimo tertio," all difficulty would be removed. The author of the article "Acqui" in *Gallia Christiana* makes Lazarus to be still bishop A.D. 417, which is clearly an oversight. (*Hist. Lit. de la France*, ii. 147.) [T. W. D.]

LAZARUS (6), deacon of Hippo, who at Augustine's sermon *De Vita et Moribus clericorum suorum* (serm. 356 in *Pat. Lat.* xxxix. 1574) cites a passage from the Acts of the Apostles in the early church. He was afterwards one of the presbyters present at the proceedings for appointing Eraclius to succeed St. Augustine. (Aug. *Ep.* 213; Tillem. xiii. 848, 853.) [ERACLIUS.] [H. W. P.]

LAZARUS (7), bishop of Milan. He held his see for about eleven years, probably from A.D. 438 to 449, though some authorities place his accession as early as A.D. 426, and others his death in A.D. 461. (*Acta SS.* 11 Feb. ii. 521; Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* iv. 72; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xi. 109; Tillem. *Mém.* xv. 626.) He is praised by Ennodius (epig. 83 in *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 350.) [R. S. G.]

LAZARUS (8), superior general of all the monks in and around Jerusalem under the charge of the patriarch Sallustius (ob. 493), as we learn from the *Life of St. Sabas*. (Surius, *Prob. SS. Hist.* Dec. 5, p. 165, § 38; Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 644.) [C. H.]

LAZARUS (9), Armenian historian, cir. A.D. 500, surnamed BARNEZI (Neumann) or BARETZI (Langlois), from his having resided at Barb or Pharbe, a little village in the province of Ararat. He was also surnamed RHETOR, on account of his learning. He belonged to a noble family in Armenia, and was one of those Armenian scholars of the 5th century, who under the direction of St. Isaac and Mesrob went to complete their studies in the schools of Greece. Returning home, he filled more than one responsible post, and at length was appointed administrator of the patriarchal see. This was in the latter days of John Mactacunes, whose pontificate ended in 487. Lazarus was indebted for the appointment (with the patriarch's consent) to a friend of his early days, prince Vahan, who in 485 was raised by the court of Persia to the office of marzban or governor-general of Armenia. Vahan's reforming views were zealously seconded by Lazarus, under whose care the monastery and church of Edehmiadzin, where the patriarch resided, recovered their ancient renown, having under the troubles of the period fallen into a state of great disorder. But his success aroused the jealousy of a portion of the clergy. They asserted that his doctrine was heterodox: in vain Lazarus appealed to the patriarch, and the opposition which he encountered obliged him at length to retire. Even the marzban at first seemed to have taken part with his enemies, but he at length extended to him his protection, and it was at Vahan's request, probably in his palace,

that Lazarus composed his *History of Armenia*. As Vahan ruled until A.D. 511, Lazarus is reckoned as engaged in this work at the latter end of the 5th century or early in the 6th.

His narrative commences with the division of Armenia, A.D. 387, into two provinces, the Greek or western, and the Persian or eastern; and thus continues where Faustus of Byzantium ends. He relates St. Isaac's vision of the downfall of Armenian independence. He gives many particulars of the sufferings of the Armenian church, as for instance the martyrdoms of the patriarch Joseph, the priest Leontius, and other victims of Vartan's rising in 452, the ultimate fate of whom is not described by Elisha Vartabed. He brings down his history to 485, the year in which Vahan became marzban. Lazarus is very interesting in the matter of his work, and his style is pronounced by Langlois as highly elevated, evidencing the influence of his Hellenic studies. The MSS. of his work are rare. In 1869, when Langlois wrote, there had been but one printed edition, viz. that of 1793, issued by the mechtarists of Venice. In 1869 it appeared in a French translation by Ghésarian, among the *Armenian Historians*, collected in two volumes by Langlois (vol. ii. p. 254). In no European language had it been known before, though an inelegant Italian version existed in the library of St. Lazarus at Venice. The Armenian original however had been made use of as early as 1824 by St. Martin for the annotations of his edition of Le Beau's *Le Bas Empire*. Langlois prefixes to the work of Lazarus in his collection a biographical account of the author (see also the *Preliminary Discourse*, p. xxiii. in his *Fragm. Hist. Græc.* t. v.). Scattered notices of Lazarus occur in the preface of Neumann's English translation of Elisha Vartabed, 1830 (pp. xi. xix. xxiv.), and in M. Brosset's *Histoire Chronologique par Mkhithar d'Aïrivanak* (in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. de St. Pétersb.* 1869, no. 5, pp. 65, 66). The introductory notice to Faustus of Byzantium (Langlois, *Historiens*, i. 203) should be consulted as to Lazarus's opinion of the work of that historian. [G. T. S.]

LAZARUS (10), bishop of Azotus in Palestine, present at the synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 1171; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 662.) [J. de S.]

LAZARUS (11), bishop of Luni, preceding Lucius, c. 603 (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xiii. 432, 483). Ughelli (i. 834) places him in 640. [A. H. D. A.]

LAZREANUS, LAZRENUM. [LASERIAN.]

LEA (1), a woman of low condition and of worthless character, one of the calumniators of India. (Ambros. ep. 5, § 20 in *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 897.) [C. H.]

LEA (2), a Roman lady of the latter part of the 4th century, one of the company who gathered round St. Jerome for purposes of asceticism and of the study of Scripture in 382-5. See Jerome's letter on the occasion of her death (23, *ad Marcellinum*). [W. H. F.]

LEA, confessor at Viguentia. [LEUS.]



**LEANDER (1)**, one of seven senators martyred at Trèves under Rictioverus in 286, according to the tradition at Trèves. (Sigeib. in *Pat. Lat.* clx. 216; Tilleim. iv. 456.) [C. H.]

**LEANDER (2)**, March 13, metropolitan bishop of Seville from (?) 575 to 600. His life covers the most interesting and important period of Visigothic Christianity, and with LEOVIGILD, HERMENIGILD, and RECARDED, he plays an indispensable part in that drama of conflicting interests and opinions—half-political, half-religious—which issued in the conversion council of 589. The following notice will be arranged under three heads: I. *Life and Character*; II. *Work*; III. *Authorities*.

I. All that is historically known of the origin of the famous family to which the three brothers LEANDER, ISIDORE, and FULGENTIUS, and their only sister FLORENTINA belonged, is derived from the opening sentence in Isidore's life of Leander (*De Vir.* III. cap. 41; *Esp. Sagr.* v. 463), and from the concluding chapter of Leander's *Regula*, or *Libellus ad Florentinum* (*Esp. Sagr.* ix. 355). The father of the three sons and Florentina was one Severianus "Carthaginensis Provinciae" (Isid. l. c.), presumably by his name of Roman origin. The Latin and Greek names of the family, however, are not conclusive, for it was the common practice of Goths coming from Arianism to Catholicism to exchange their Teutonic for Latin or Greek names on their admission to the church. Thus Hermenigild takes the name of Joannes (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 39). The traditions which connect Severianus with the great Theodorici (see art. ISIDORE), though quite worthless as to details, may preserve the memory of a possible Gothic origin of the family, and indeed the theory of Gothic descent, crossed by Catholic sympathies, would explain much that is now perplexing in the family history—the original flight before the invading Imperialists, the curious passage about the mother of the family in the *Regula*, which seem to point to a conversion from Arianism, and the strongly anti-imperial feeling, which makes the last chapter of Leander's *Regula* and portions of Isidore's *Hist. Gothorum*. On the other hand, Leander's negotiations with the Eastern empire during the Hermenigild rebellion are easily explained by the position of the Spanish Catholics, which forced them to merge differences of nationality in their conflict with Arianism. Of this necessary connexion of Spanish Catholicism with the Eastern empire up to the reign of Recared, the chronicle of Leander's contemporary, JOANNES BICLAENSIS, himself a Goth by descent, but Roman by cultivation and sympathies, is an excellent example.

At some unknown date, but when Florentina was a child, the whole family left their native place, of which the citizens had been "concessi extraneo" (*Libell. ad Florent.* cap. 21), and settled probably at Seville of which see the two brothers Leander and Isidore were afterwards bishops, and near which was Astigi (Eciga), where Fulgentius was bishop, and where also tradition places the convent of Florentina. The circumstances of this family exodus are nowhere precisely explained. The most probable conjecture is that Severianus and his family were

driven out of Cartagena by the Byzantine troops, which, in and about 554, under treaty with the Gothic usurper Athanajeld (hence the *concessi*), took possession for the empire of large tracts of the western and southern coast of the Peninsula, including the great harbour of Cartagena, and most of the other maritime towns between Cadiz and Valencia. (Cartagena has tradition, accepted by Florez, ix. p. 193, in its favour; see *v. Seti. Isid.* Lucas Tud. apud Schott. *Hisp. Ill.* iv.; conf. also *Ep. Licin. Episc. Carth. ad Greg. Magn. Pap. Esp. Sagr.* v. p. 424, with passage in cap. 21 of *Libell. ad Florent.* "Ego expertus loquor," &c.) In any case the "extraneo" within the boundaries of the Peninsula at that time can only be taken to mean the Eastern empire, so that Leander's words necessarily imply that the family came originally from territory which fell into the hands of Justinian in or shortly after 554, whether from Cartagena, or some other of the maritime towns then lost to the Goths, must always remain to some extent uncertain.

The same uncertainty attaches to the name of the mother of the family (see art. FLORENTINA), and to the date of the birth of each member of it. We may suppose, however, with great plausibility, that Leander was born somewhere between 535 and 540. He would then be a youth at the time of the family exile, and from fourteen to twenty years older than Isidore, to whom he afterwards stood in the position of a father (see concluding passage of *Regula*). Before 579, the date of the outbreak of the Hermenigild rebellion (see arts. LEOVIGILD, HERMENIGILD), he had become a monk, of what rule is quite unknown to us (the Benedictines of course claim him, Mabillon, *AA. SS. O. S. B.* i. 378), and had been thence raised to the metropolitan see of Seville. It is evident that the young exile must have shewn remarkable promise before he could have been thus promoted to one of the most important—perhaps at the time the most important—ecclesiastical post in Spain, at a moment when the Catholics under Leovigild had especial need of able and faithful leaders. His share in the conversion of Hermenigild ("Leandro Hispalitano episcopo—praedicante, conversus est." Greg. M. P. *Dial.* iii. 31, and Paul. Diac. *Warnef. Hist. Langob.* iii. 21) has been already discussed elsewhere (HERMENIGILD, LEOVIGILD). It is most probable that Leander's quick imagination saw the opportunity of the Catholics in Hermenigild's youth and the Catholicism of his wife Ingunthis, and it is a conjecture warranted by the evidence, that the persuasive and eloquent bishop, who afterwards led the conversion council, laid the first stone of his great work in the conversion and rising of Hermenigild. Hermenigild was baptized by Leander, and received the name of Joannes (Greg. Tur. v. 39). Then followed the split between the son and his father, Leovigild's Arian council of 581, and the outbreak of civil war between father and son in 582. Hermenigild, before meeting his father in the field, had endeavoured to strengthen himself by alliances with the Catholic Suevoi in the north and the Catholic Byzantines in the south and east. It is in connexion with this last alliance that we next hear of Leander at Constantinople, "cum—te illuc injuncta pro

causis fidei Visigothorum legatio perduxisset," says Gregory the Great, describing in after years (Pref. in *Moralia*, Patr. Lat. lxxv. 510) his first friendship with Leander.

The exact date of this mission is unknown (see Görres' summing up both of evidence and opinion in *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, i. 1873, p. 103); but we are inclined to place it in 583, just about the beginning of the siege of Seville, when effectual support from the empire might have given victory to Hermenigild. It would account also for the vagueness and meagreness of the Gregorian account of the revolt and death of Hermenigild, if we suppose that the informant from whom he derived the story of the conversion, namely, Leander, left Spain not very long after the outbreak of the struggle between the father and son, and was himself but scantily informed as to the further course of events during his stay at Constantinople. In any case Leander and Gregory must have met at Constantinople somewhere between the years 579 and 585, the ascertained limits of Gregory's residence at the court. That Leander returned at all to Spain before the death of Leovigild is extremely improbable. The "peregrinatio exilii," of which Isidore speaks (*l. c.*), may be applied as well to a forced continuance of his foreign sojourn as to an actual expulsion from the country by Leovigild. In 584 Seville fell, and Hermenigild was captured at Cordova through the treachery of his Byzantine allies. Thenceforward Arianism was triumphant, and that persecution of the Catholics by Leovigild, which is described by Isidore (*Hist. Goth. Esp. Sagr.* vi. 491), and by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* v. 39), was carried actively forward. Such a moment was scarcely favourable to the return of one of the most active promoters of the rebellion just crushed. (Conf. Görres, *l. c.* who comes to quite different conclusions as to dates, which seem to be at variance with the whole spirit, if not the actual letter, of the evidence; and Florez, ix. 162, who brings Leander back to Spain before 584, and supposes a banishment by Leovigild in that year.) According to Gregory the Great (*Dial.* l. c.) Leovigild, when dying, recommended his remaining son, Recared, to Leander, imploring him to do with him as he had done with Hermenigild. The story is in itself improbable (see art. LEOVIGILD); but even if true would not necessarily imply that Leander was in Spain at the time of the king's death. There can be little doubt, however, that he reached Spain very shortly afterwards. Ten months after his accession, Recared, his father's lieutenant in the struggle with Hermenigild, avowed his adhesion to Catholicism (in the council, or rather conference, of 587, *Joh. Biel. ad an. Maur. Imp.* v.; *Greg. Tur.* ix. 15). It had, however, been evident from the beginning of his reign that events were going for the Catholics (conf. Recared's opening speech at vol. iii.); and Leander, on receiving information as to the state of affairs, appears to have hurried home. (Conf. what Lucinian says of his "haste" on the journey homewards from Constantinople, *Ep. Lucin. ad Greg. Pat. Esp. Sagr.* v.).

In February, 587, the preliminary synod took place at Toledo, in which Recared and his nobles abjured Arianism, and notice of the step was

sent to the provinces. No express mention is made of Leander in connexion with it, but it is certainly most likely that he played a part in proceedings which were merely preparatory to the great council of 589, in which he was the moving spirit.

*The Conversion Council.*—In 589 a great gathering at Toledo of the king and queen, the *proceres* and *virii illustres* of the court, and sixty-two bishops, Arian and Catholic, not only changed the whole outer face of Visigothic history, but entirely shifted, so to speak, its centre of gravity. The causes which led to it had been long at work (compare Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, v. on the *political* causes); but when they have been to some extent unravelled, the third council of Toledo remains one of the most astonishing and interesting events in history. A detailed sketch of the proceedings is reserved for the article on RECARDED. Here we are only concerned with Leander's share in it. "Summa tamen synodalis negotii," says the contemporary bishop of Gerona, Joannes Biclarensis, "penes Sanctum Leandrum Hispal. ecclesie episcopum et beatissimum Eutropium monasterii Servitani abbatem fuit." We are therefore justified in attributing to Leander the main outline of the proceedings, and the wording of a large proportion of the acts. Recared's speeches are in all probability to be traced to him. They are quite in accordance with Leander's known style, especially with that of the homily which concludes the council, and which was avowedly written and delivered by him. The homily itself (*Homilia Sancti Leandri in laudem ecclesie ob conversionem gentis*) is an eloquent and imaginative piece of writing. The reader, who is already familiar with the history of Leovigild's reign, will easily distinguish in it an undercurrent of reference to the great semi-religious, semi-political struggle which marked the reign of the last Arian king. "Ergo materia gaudii nostri tribulationis præteritæ occasio fuit. Gemebamus dum exprobaremur sed gemitus illi id egerunt, ut hi qui per infidelitatem nobis erant sarcina fierent nostra per suam conversionem corona." And again: "Erigamur ergo tota mente in gaudia ut quia gentes studio decertandi perierant, sibi in amicitiam Christus unam ecclesiam procuraret, in qua eas rursus reduceret concordia caritatis." That no more special mention is made of Hermenigild confirms the view advanced elsewhere on other evidence (see art. HERMENIGILD) that Hermenigild was regarded by his countrymen and contemporaries—not as a martyr for the Catholic faith, but as a political rebel put to death for a political crime.

"The peace of Christ, then," says Leander in conclusion, "has destroyed the wall of discord which the devil had built up, and the house which division was bringing to ruin is united in and established upon Christ the corner-stone. It only remains that we, being made one people in one mind, should ask God in our prayers both to establish this earthly kingdom, and to grant to us the felicity of His heavenly kingdom, that the people and country which have glorified Christ on the earth may be glorified not only on earth but in heaven also." (*Tejada y Ramiro, Colecc. de Can. de la Igl. Española*, ii. 247-260; *Gams, Kirchen Geschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2), 6, 41; Dahn, v. 159, vi. 434; Helfferich, *Entstehung*

und Geschichte der Westgothen Recht, 33-46; Hefele, iii. 44-49.)

*First Synod of Seville.*—Eighteen months after the conversion council, Leander, as metropolitan of Baetica, and in obedience to the eighteenth canon of the council of 589, summoned the bishops of Baetica to a provincial synod in the cathedral church of Seville, "in ecclesia Hispaniensi Sancta Jerusalem" (conf. Florez, ix. on the use of "Sancta Jerusalem"). The acts are drawn up in the form of a letter to the absent bishop Pegasius of Astigi (Ecija). The first two canons are concerned with a case of illegal alienation of church property reported by Pegasius, while the third and last points out in severe terms, that in spite of the prohibitory canon on the subject in C. Tol. iii. certain presbyters, deacons, and clerks still allow women not related to them to live in their houses, and employ women-servants. If this is persisted in the women in question are to be sold as slaves, and the price paid for them is to be given to the poor. (Conf. the *judicium* given in the case of two rival bishops of Astigi, MARCIANUS and HUBENTIUS, in C. Tol. vi.)

*Leander's Friendship and Correspondence with Gregory the Great.*—Gregory and Leander, as we have already pointed out, first made friends at Constantinople between the years 575 and 585, when Gregory was acting as the Apocrisarius of Pelagius II. at the East-Roman court. In 590 Gregory was made pope, and in May 591 he wrote a long letter to Leander (*Ep.* lib. i. 43, apud Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 497) in answer to certain letters from his old friend, which seem to have had a threefold object—(1) congratulation to the new-made pope; (2) announcement of the Visigothic conversion, and a report of the third council of Toledo; (3) enquiry as to the form of baptism to be thenceforward observed in Spain, whether by single or threefold immersion. The pope begins by lamenting the anxious and disturbed life to which the holder of the papacy is necessarily subject, and asks for the help of Leander's prayers "in his fluctibus." He then expresses his own joy in the conversion of the Visigoths, declaring that Leander's accounts of Recared have made him love a man of whom he has no personal knowledge. Let Leander look to it diligently that the work which has been so well begun may be perfected. As to the form of baptism in a country where unity of faith had never been questioned, single or threefold immersion might be observed indifferently, as representing either the Unity or the Trinity of the Godhead, but as in Spain the Arian mode of baptism had been by threefold immersion it will be well henceforward to allow one immersion only, lest the heretics be supposed to have triumphed, and confusion ensue. Finally, the pope has sent Leander certain codices, not including, however, the whole of the *Homilies* on the book of Job, which he had asked for, as the *librarii* had not been able to finish copying the work before the departure of the messenger with the parcel of books. Gregory concludes with an expression of his earnest wish to see Leander, yet in a certain sense he does see him continually, "for the image of thy countenance is impressed for ever on my innermost heart."

Gregory's second letter is dated July 595. It is merely a note accompanying the gift of the

*Regula Pastoralis*, and the first and second parts of the *Moralia*. The third and fourth parts, he says, have been sent out to monasteries, and cannot be got hold of. (About 649 TAYO of Saragossa undertook a special journey to Rome to procure the missing parts.)

*The Pallium.*—In Aug. 599 Gregory sent three letters to Spain, addressed to Recared, Claudius Dux of Lusitania, and Leander, by the abbat Cyriacus, to whom also Gregory had intrusted the pallium for Leander. The letter to Leander is long and affectionate, and announces the gift of the pallium, which is to be worn at the celebration of mass, "solemnia Missarum;" while to Recared the pope writes "to our honoured brother and fellow-bishop Leander we have sent the pallium as a gift from the see of the blessed apostle Peter, which we owe to ancient custom (*antiquae consuetudini*), to your deserts, and to his dignity and goodness." What was the exact force of the gift of the pallium to Leander has been much disputed. Florez (ix. 167) maintains that Leander in receiving the pallium received a mark of honour and distinction, but nothing more, and that the gift did not carry with it the Apostolic Vicariate, which had however been bestowed on his predecessors in the see, ZENO and SALLUSTIUS, by the popes Simplicius and Hormisdas (Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 962, 1015). Pallium and Vicariate, he argues, were not necessarily combined, and he quotes in support of his supposition the case of bishop Auxanius of Arles, successor of St. Caesarius, to whom pope Vigilius gave the pallium in completion and recognition of the vicariate previously bestowed (*Vigil. Ep.* vii. apud Migne, Patr. Lat. lxi. 27). Gams, however, holds that in Gregory's mind at any rate the pallium carried with it the vicariate, and that the phrase *antiquae consuetudini* is to be taken as referring to the vicariates of Zeno and Sallustius, and as implying the recognition by Gregory of an ancient claim on behalf of the see of Seville to the representation of the apostolic see in Spain. The various other bestowals of the pallium on western bishops by Gregory, especially the cases of Augustine of Canterbury (*Ep.* xi. 64, 65), and Syagrius of Autun (ix. 108), should be studied in connexion with the case of Leander. (Cont. Walter, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts*, p. 308, 277, and Thomassin, *Discipline de l'Eglise*, ii. i. cap. 25, 26.)

Very soon after the arrival of the pallium, at latest in the year 600, Leander died, shortly before the king of whom he had been the constant friend and adviser. (See Florez's arguments as to the date of his death, drawn from the length of Isidore's pontificate as given by Ildefonsus on the one hand, and, on the other, from Isidore's statement that his brother "floruit sub Recaredo," l. c. p. 181). His name appears in Bede and in the 9th century martyrologies, and his festival is now observed by the Spanish church on the 13th of March.

ii. *Works.*—The *Libellum ad Florentinam* has been already largely quoted elsewhere. [See arts. FULGENTIUS and FLORENTINA.] It consists of an introductory letter and twenty-one chapters, which constitute the *Regula*. The style is easy and flowing, rising at times to real pathos and sweetness, as in the beautiful concluding chapter, where occurs the well-known reference to Isidore. The extravagant laudation of the celibate life and

depreciation of marriage which mark it are quite in the taste of the time, and, to judge from can. 5 of C. Tol. iii., seem to have been at the moment in Spain a distinguishing mark of the Catholic as opposed to the Arian clergy. A passage in the introductory letter, unnoticed by Leander's clerical biographers, would seem to shew that he had been married at some period in his early life (cp. Tamayo de Salazar, *Martyr. Hisp.* iii. 559, *sentis fratris animum tuos desiderare profectus, &c.*).

The description of the luxurious dress, the dyed eyes and whitened faces, of women of the world towards the close of the introduction is worth reading from the point of view of social history; so also is cap. 13, where it is laid down that "quae potuit honorari in mundo et dives fuit in seculo blandius fovenda est in monasterio: et quae reliquit in seculo vestem pretiosam, cultiorem in monasterio mercatur," a direction, however, which is modified by exhortation to personal charity and humility. Cap. 17 is interesting as referring to a class of semi-cloistered nuns, of which there are no later traces in Spain. It has been already noticed elsewhere [see art. FLORENTINA]. Altogether the *Regula* is a revelation of the character and cultivation of a man of genius, in whom a certain mixture of fire and tenderness, of southern impulsiveness and religious asceticism, seems to have attracted the love and admiration of his contemporaries, which we may be glad to possess. Gams's suggestion that it is a *Bearbeitung* of Hesius's lost treatise on Virginity is an ingenious conjecture, but nothing more (*l. c.* p. 44). There may of course be older work at the bottom of some of the more conventional parts of the *Regula*, but the personal tone of large portions of the book is not to be mistaken.

The *Homily* noticed above is the only other work of Leander now extant. Isidore, however, in his life of his brother (*De Vir. Ill.* cap. 41) speaks of three controversial treatises against the Arians, composed by him during his exile from Spain under Leovigild. Isidore's description of them leads to the conclusion that they were especially intended to meet the arguments and expose the pretensions of the Arian council of 581. The last-named was probably in categorical answer to the *libellus* issued after the synod by the Arian bishops, and expressly anathematized by the conversion council (Joh. Biel. ad an. 581; Tejada y Ramiro, ii. p. 224). "In ecclesiasticis officii," adds Isidore, "idem non parvo laboravit studio in toto enim Psalterio duplici editione orationes conscripsit: in sacrificio quoque, laudibus, atque psalmis, multa dulci sono composuit." (Conf. Lesley, *Ref. in Miscal Mixtum*, § 16: "An S. Leander aut S. Isidorus aut S. Julianus auctor fuerit Misalis Mozarabicae?") Of the "epistolae multae," of which Isidore speaks to Gregory, to his brother Fulgentius, and to many bishops, not one remains. In his letter of 599, however, Gregory gives an interesting description of the effect of one of Leander's letters at Rome, which is quite in harmony with all we know of the character of the man.

iii. *Authorities*.—Besides those already quoted: Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.* A.D. 583, 584, 585, 589, 591, 595, 599, vol. x. ed. 1741; Nicolas Antonio, *Bibl. Vet.* ed. Bayer, 1788, i. 290; *De Castri Bibl. Hispanica*, ii. 280; Aguirre, *Coll. Max. Conc. Hisp.* iii. 281-302; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.* iv. 252, ed.

1754; Mabillon, *Ann. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 287, A.A. SS. Bolland. March ii. 275; Amador de los Rios, *Hist. Coll. de la Lit. Españ.* i. 312, 323; Montalembert, *Moines de l'Occident*, ii. [M. A. W.]

LEANDER (3), bishop of Ilici. His signature is found to the acts of the eleventh council of Toledo, A.D. 675. His signature also appears to the acts of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth councils of Toledo, in A.D. 681, 683, and 684. The acts of the fifteenth council, in A.D. 688, are signed by Emmila as bishop of Ilici; so Leander must have died between A.D. 684 and A.D. 688. He signs the acts of the eleventh council as "Ecclesiae Illicitanae qui et Elotanae episcopus." Elotana is supposed by some to be another name for Ilici, but Florez maintains (*Esp. Sagr.* vii. 215) that it was a different town, and that the see was originally distinct from, but afterwards united to, that of Ilici. (*Esp. Sagr.* vii. 215, 232; Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 451, 481, 511, 526.) [F. D.]

LEARBHANNAN (LERBENBAN), airchinneach or praepositus of Cluain-boireann now Cloonburren, died A.D. 794. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 782, i. 209 n.<sup>w</sup>, 397; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 794, ap. O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 117.) [J. G.]

LEARGHAL (LERGAELIUS), wise man, son of Neimhith, abbat of Birar (now Birr, King's County), died A.D. 774. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 378 n.<sup>r</sup>, 379.) [J. G.]

LEARGHUS UA FIDCHAINN (LERGUS), a wise man of Cill-Maighnenn (now Kilmainham, near Dublin), died A.D. 787. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 782, i. 389; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 786, ap. O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 112.) [J. G.]

LEARY, king of Ireland. [LAEGHAIRE.]

LEBAN, Irish saint. [LAEBHAN.]

LEBORA (Λεβόρα, Δεβόρα, LAPHURA, LEBUDA, OWAIN), apocryphal daughter of Adam, twin sister of Abel, given in marriage to Cain, while Cain's twin sister Calmana was bestowed on Abel. Cain was dissatisfied, and desired to have Calmana, who was the fairest, and thence arose the quarrel between the brothers (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. V. T.* i. 109, ii. 44; Renan on *The Apocalypse of Adam* in the *Paris Journal Asiatique*, 1853, vol. ii. 457, 467). Fabricius quotes Methodius, Eutychius, and Barhaebraeus, as countenancing this fable. [ADAM, BOOKS OF, p. 38.] [G. T. S.]

LEBUINUS (1) (LOBOVINUS, LEOBINUS), reputed forty-first bishop of Lyons, towards the close of the 7th century, but the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* believe that the name should be expunged. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 49.) [S. A. B.]

LEBUINUS (2) (LEVINUS, LIAFWIN, LIEFWIN, LIEFUWYN), apostle of the Frisians and patron of Deventer on the Yssel in Holland, commemorated Nov. 12. He flourished in the middle of the 8th century, and died about A.D. 770, but the exact date is unknown.

The chief authority for his Life and Acts is the *Vita S. Lebuni*, written by Hucbald of Saint

**Amand** (A.D. 918-976), and given in the original Latin by Surius (*De Prob. Sanct.* iv. pt. ii. Nov. 12, p. 277 sq.) and by Pertz (*Mon. Hist. Germ.* ii. 361 sq.); it is translated and given in full by Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit.* xxiv. c. 7). Surius (*ibid.* app. vii. p. 839) presents also *Ecloga et Sermo de S. Lebuino Presb.* auct. S. Radbodo ep. Traject. It is suggested by Baring-Gould (*Lives of the Saints*, Nov. 12, i. 300 sq.) that the Life and Acts of St. Liafwyn or St. Lebuinus of Deventer form the real groundwork of the existence and legend of St. Livinus of Ghent [LIVINUS]. The life of St. Lebuinus is usually considered authentic and as giving a faithful picture of the period.

He was born of Saxon parents in England, and his original name was Liafwyn, afterwards Latinised Lebuinus. Early trained in the monastic discipline, and burning with the zeal which had already borne St. Willebrord, St. Swithberht, the Aewalds, and St. Boniface, with many more, to the continent, Lebuinus, after his elevation to the priesthood, set out to join the same band of preachers, and had his special missionary field in Friesland and eastward in Westphalia. He was warmly received by Gregory, bishop of Utrecht and disciple of St. Boniface, and sent by Gregory to the banks of the Yssel with a companion named Marcellin or Marchelm. There he lodged with a widow named Abachilda or Abachahild, and taught with great success among the pagans in Overysse, his first oratory being on the Wilpa or Wulpe, near to Deventer, and another added afterwards, but to the eastward of the Yssel. His most noted evangelistic triumph was on one occasion when he went to the national assembly at Marklo on the Weser. He had met with much opposition in his labours; his church had been burned and his people slain. He resolved, however, to be even bolder in the midst of his difficulties, and at last set out to meet the Saxons at their council and achieve a glorious victory by conversions or martyrdom. Arrayed in his priestly garments, with crucifix in one hand and a book of the gospels in the other, he entered the assembly and proclaimed the duty of instant submission to Christ, or, if they refused, the arrival of a king who would destroy and punish them for their obstinacy. (This was, no doubt, with a reference to the exploits of Charlemagne.) With some difficulty the tumult thus excited against him was calmed by the help of an aged chief named Buto, and he received permission to preach and teach everywhere. Trusting to the divine protection, he freely used this liberty, and the rest of his life was spent in spreading the gospel, with watching, fasting, and prayer. (*Fleury, Hist. Christ.* xlv. c. 11; *Colgan, Acta SS.* 436 b; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 257 n. b; *Mosheim, Eccl. Hist.* cent. viii. b. iii. c. 1.)

[J. G.]

**LECCAN**, bishop, commemorated April 27. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 113.)

[J. G.]

**LEDUARDUS**, thirteenth bishop of Mâcon, said to have been consecrated A.D. 769 (*Gall. Christ.* iv. instrum. 263; *Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc.* an. 802, n. cxv. tom. vi. 803). *Le Cointe* thinks he died in 801 (*ibid.* n. cxvii. p. 803; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 1043).

[S. A. B.]

**LEDUINA**, Irish saint. [LIADHAIN.]

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. III.

**LEFASTUS** (LEIFASTUS), twentieth bishop of Autun, about the close of the 6th century. (*M. bill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 334; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 346.)

[S. A. B.]

LÉGER. [LEODEGARUS.]

**LEGIO FULMINATRIX.** [THUNDERING LEGION.]

**LEGIO THEBAEA**, Sept. 22. A body of legendary martyrs under Maximian at Agaunum near Martigny. According to the story, the emperor, in 286 (Labbe), 297 (Baronius), was marching against the insurgent Bagaudae, who, under Aelianus and Amandus, two Roman officers, had burst into revolt, urged thereto by the load of taxation (comp. *Du Cange, Glossar. S. V. Bagaudae*, with Wallon, *Hist. de l'Esclav. dans l'Antiquité*, iii. 287; and *Finlay, Hist. of Greece*, ii. 53). Some, if not all, of the insurgents, are said to have been Christians. Maximian had summoned to his aid from the East a legion called Thebaean, because raised in the neighbourhood of Thebais in Egypt. They were all Christians. Before entering upon the war the emperor held a review of the troops, and called upon them to swear allegiance with all the usual heathen ceremonies. This the Thebaean legion unanimously refused, and, encouraged by the exhortations of their commander Mauritius, submitted to two decimations, and finally to wholesale massacre, sooner than obey the imperial command. The total number of those who suffered was 6666. The following names of Thebaean martyrs are commemorated by various writers in different places, and on very various grounds, viz. Mauritius, Exuperius, Candidus, Ursus, and two Victors in the Acts of the Thebaean Legion by St. Eucherius; Innocent, Vitalis, in *Ado's Martyrology*; Solutor, Adventor, and Octavius in the records of the church of Turin. This story, in former times, was accepted by such critics as Grotius, *de Jure Belli et Pacis*, i. 2; J. L. Fabricius in his *Dissert. concerning the Just Limits of Human Obedience*; Cave, *Præm. Christ.* p. iii. c. 4, and archbishop Ussher. Yet it is devoid of any sufficient evidence to justify its reception. It is unknown to all the writers of the two following centuries, even though living in the very neighbourhood where it is said to have happened. Lactantius belonged probably to Italy; in any case he was a North African, and was summoned across the Alps by Constantine to instruct his son Crispus. Yet, though he records the cruelties of Maximian, he never notes this one, which must have surpassed them all. Sulpicius Severus, "Vir fabulis addictissimus" (Dodwell), in Southern Gaul; Ambrose, in Northern Italy; Prudentius, in Spain, all writing within one hundred years of the event, know nothing of it, though ready enough to give credence to every tale of martyrdom. Again, it directly contradicts the statement of Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 4), who had every means of knowing the exact truth, that the military martyrs were very few in the years preceding the general persecution. The story first appears in a work—*The History of the Sufferings of St. Mauritius*—addressed to a certain Silvius or Salvius, by Eucherius bishop of Lyons in the 5th century, who received it from certain who had it from Isaac bishop of Geneva, who,

in turn, received it from Theodore bishop of Octodurum. Du Pin suggests that this treatise should be attributed to another Eucherius of Lyons, whom he would assign to the 6th century (cf. *Dissert. de S. Eucherio*, in *Nat. Alexand. H. E. v.* 119, ed. 1778). The Acts in Surius and Mombritius contain such glaring anachronisms as compel this conclusion. Fr. Chifflet published, A.D. 1662, *Paulinus Illustratus*, with a revised edition of these Acts, free from the worst mistakes, which he found in a monastery in the Jura. These revised Acts are, by some, attributed to Eucherius of the 5th century, while the interpolated Acts of Surius are ascribed to a writer of the 7th century, a conclusion which can now support itself with the authority of Mommsen in *Abhandlung. der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft*, A.D. 1857, p. 235, in a preface to a little work of Polemius Silvius, or Salvius, dedicated to Eucherius, and then first published. The whole story received a very thorough examination at the hands of J. Dubordieu, minister of the Savoy, in an *Historical Dissertation upon the Thebaean Legion*, London, A.D. 1696. He points out the various mistakes in the narrative, and remarks upon its rude style as inconsistent with their authorship by St. Eucherius, whose Latin, in his treatise *De Contemptu Mundi*, elicited the praise of such a critic as Erasmus, though, at the same time, a fact mentioned below proves that the story was in existence shortly after the date of St. Eucherius. Gieseler (*H. E. t. i.* p. 195, Clark's ed.) suggests that the legend arose from the misunderstood expression *Milites Christi*. The Latin Acts of those martyrs were boldly transferred by Symeon Metaphr. to a Greek martyr Mauritius, who, as *tribunus militum*, is said to have suffered with seventy other soldiers at Apamea in Syria by Maximian's command (*Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Adou., Usuard.; *Till. Mém.* iv. 421; xv. 120; *Ruinart, Acta Sanc.*; *Fleury, H. E.* viii. 18; *Jortin, Remarks on H. E.* ii. 331, ed. 1752; Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ. Ant. Const.* p. 565; *Ceillier*, ii. 471; viii. 451).

The firm hold which this legend gained over the German nation from the earliest times is manifest from the frequent references to it in every volume of Pertz, *Monumenta Germanicæ Histor.* The lance of St. Maurice became the ensign of the Burgundian kingdom (Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Hist. Script.* ix. 388), the emperor at his coronation was invested with the spurs of St. Maurice, according to the coronation order of A.D. 1191, in Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Hist. Leg.* ii. In the year 515, a monastery was erected at Agaunum in honour of the Thebaean martyrs by Sigismund king of Burgundy. In that same monastery Chlodoveus seized Sigismund some years later, A.D. 524. (Cf. *Ekkilhardi Chron. Univ.* in Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Hist. Script.* vi. 116; and *Greg. Turon. Opp.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxi. p. 1198; *Ceillier*, x. 746; *Gibbon*, cap. xxxviii. note 44.) [G. T. S.]

This narrative may be accepted as true in all its details, as is done by the Bollandists, by Alban Butler, and by a long list of Roman Catholic historians as well as by the eminent Anglican divines and foreign Protestants above named; or it may be regarded as a mere baseless legend, as by Dubordieu, by Voltaire, by

Gibbon, and by many more. But it is possible, while rejecting the narrative as set forth in the account ascribed to Eucherius, to suppose that a course of action on the part of certain Christian soldiers, which must to a Roman commander have seemed simply mutinous, may have really occurred, may have been ruthlessly put down, and have been exaggerated into the incredible dimensions which it subsequently assumed. Such a view of the case had presented itself to the mind of the present writer before he was aware of the powerful amount of support lent to it by Mosheim in the exceedingly able dissertation above named, by Canon Robertson (*Hist. of Church*, bk. i. ch. vii.), by Lichtenberger in the *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses* (Paris 1880. Tome viii. p. 89), in some degree by Gelpke in Herzog's well-known Dictionary (art. *Mauritius*), and by Amédée Thierry in his *Histoire de la Gaule sous l'administration romaine* (Paris 1840-47). Fully admitting it to be a question of evidence, which will affect different minds differently, the writer is permitted to state some additional considerations which, though they militate against the acceptance of the story of a martyred legion, yet seem to render the existence of a nucleus of fact far from impossible.

1. Voltaire certainly begins at the beginning. He denies that there was any such legion as the Thebaean. But in this respect he stands almost alone. Gibbon, in common with a host of authorities, accepts the truth of the existence of a Thebaean legion, called (like many other legions) from the district in which it was originally levied: namely, in this instance, the Thebais of Egypt. We cannot, however, lay much stress on the change of the name of Agaunum into that of St. Maurice. Such a name might only indicate a belief in the possession of the relics of a martyr, as in the case—to take one instance out of many—of the city of St. Andrews in Scotland.

2. The existence of a legion wholly composed of Christians at so early a date as A.D. 285 (or even 302) is highly improbable. Nor is the reply of Mosheim on this head a satisfactory one. He observes that, if about A.D. 175 the Melitene legion, afterwards known as *The Thundering Legion*, could be wholly composed of Christians, then *à fortiori* must it have been possible for a legion to have been similarly circumstanced a century later. But this reasoning is only a case of *incertum per incertius*. Not only is there a lack of proof that the Melitene Legion was wholly Christian, but the most ingenious pleading made of late years in favour of the miraculous character of the event (that of J. H. Newman in his *Essay on the Miracles of the first age of Christianity*) proceeds on the basis of that body being *not wholly Christian*.

Nevertheless that, in a given regiment, there should be a larger proportion of Christians than in the Roman empire taken as a whole, is by no means an unlikely circumstance. Anglo-Indians tell us, that the troops of the Rajah of Gwalior used to contain a number of Christians quite disproportionate to the scanty percentage of the converts in Hindostan; and residents in Malta, in 1878, found a larger average of Christians in the regiments brought from India in that year than a knowledge of the general state of Christianity in India would have led them to anti-

cipate. A similar observation would hold good in the British army as regards the number of Presbyterians or of Roman Catholics in a given regiment. It depends largely on the recruiting ground. The Egyptian Thebaid might very probably supply an unusually numerous contingent of believers.

3. The slaughter of a large body of soldiers accused or suspected of mutiny, is not, in itself, by any means an impossible event. Even within this century, in the month of June 1826, the Janizaries, 4000 in number, who formed so important an element of the Turkish army, all perished in one day at the hands of their fellow soldiers.<sup>a</sup> Similarly, Alban Butler is fully justified in citing, as one example out of many, the alleged destruction of 7000 praetorians by order of the emperor Galba in A.D. 69, as told by Xiphilinus in his epitome of history, usually subjoined as a continuation to that of Dion Cassius (*Vita Galbae*, ed. Basileae, 1577). But these examples only carry us a little way. No student of history can doubt but that a legion might be destroyed as mutineers by the rest of an army. But we are asked to believe an event, which stands alone in the world's annals; namely, that a legion not merely perished, but that its soldiers all died as martyrs. *Sic interfecta est*, says Eucherius, *illa planè angelica Legio*.<sup>b</sup> For the acceptance of such an unheard-of event we have a right to demand evidence of *extra* cogency.

4. It must be owned that contemporary evidence of this cogent character is wanting. The earliest reference to it is contained in the title of a sermon preached soon after A.D. 400, that is to say, 100 years after the alleged date of the event, by Romanus, abbat of a community in the Jura district of Burgundy. Romanus died about A.D. 450. His biography was undoubtedly written soon after his death by one of his companions, and is given by the Bollandists (*Acta Sanctorum*, Tom. iii. Februar. ad diem xxviii. p. 740). Romanus believed the story as subsequently narrated by Eucherius. He names 6600 as the number of martyrs, and refers to the urn of St. Maurice. A century later, soon after A.D. 500, Alcimus Avitus of Vienne [AVITUS, ALCIMUS EDCICIUS] preached on the subject. The sermon is lost, but its title has been discovered by Sirmond. It runs thus: "Dicta in Basilicâ Sanctorum Agaunensium in innovatione monasterii ipsius, vel passione martyrum." It may

possibly have been preached, as Mosheim thinks, before the publication of the narrative ascribed to Eucherius. That narrative does not claim to be of more than fourth-hand authority. His witnesses said that they learned it from St. Isaac bishop of Geneva, "who, *I believe*," adds Eucherius, "had received it from the most holy bishop Theodore of an earlier date." Assuming, with the late Sir G. C. Lewis (*Credibility of early Roman History*), that a man may be fairly considered as a virtually contemporary authority when he tells of events which happened some twenty or even thirty years before his birth, we have no such witness for the martyrdom of the Thebaean legion.

5. This argument from silence has been noticed above. Yet two points in this matter may deserve consideration. In the first place, Mosheim points out that the pressure of this reasoning may to some extent be fairly lightened. Sulpicius declares that he has left out many martyrdoms for the sake of brevity. Spain, the country of Prudentius and of Orosius, is really far from Savoy: and, indeed, Orosius does not tell us of any martyrdoms. Even Eusebius, so well informed of all that happened in the East, was not always equally well acquainted with the course of events in the West. The silence of Lactantius is perplexing. To these remarks of Mosheim it must be added, that the omission, however damaging to the story of a martyred legion, becomes far less unintelligible, if (with Canon Robertson and others) we suppose that there may have been a real slaughter of a few hundred soldiers, of whom all, or at least the majority, died unresistingly; and that this event in the course of the next century became grossly exaggerated.

The second point is this. It is difficult for the generations who have lived since the invention of printing, and much more for those who have become accustomed to cheap newspapers and telegrams, to realise the way in which important events might be passed *sub silentio* in earlier ages. It will probably be conceded that the overthrow of two considerable cities by a volcano—cities within 200 miles of Rome, where distinguished senators had villas—is an event not less remarkable than the ruthless putting down of a mutiny. Nevertheless, to prove the fact of the extinction of Pompeii and Herculaneum by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in August A.D. 79 by contemporary evidence is certainly by no means easy. The one sentence concerning it in Tacitus is utterly vague as to date; and standing alone, as it does, might naturally be regarded as an exaggeration. He merely says that within the period covered by his Histories (A.D. 68–96) "cities in the most fertile district of Campania were swallowed up or overwhelmed."<sup>c</sup> Read apart from the light let in by other evidence, or by modern excavations, these words might be naturally interpreted to mean that some cities in Campania had been swallowed up by an earthquake, or else overwhelmed either by a land-slip or by an inundation. This, which is the most obvious sense of the words,<sup>d</sup> would

<sup>a</sup> See the account in any history of the time, e.g. in Sir Archd. Alison's *History of Europe from 1815 to 1852* (vol. iii. chap. xv.).

<sup>b</sup> *En passant*, the present writer, having carefully read all the writings of Eucherius, is unable to perceive any such great discrepancy in point of style between this narrative and the other writings of the bishop of Lyons, as Dubordieu insists upon. He may be prejudiced, but Dubordieu is also exceedingly prejudiced. With Ceillier and numbers more he adheres to the opinion stated in the article EUCHERIUS (I). Mosheim suggests that such amount of truth as underlies the narrative may have been furnished by the account of an Oriental martyr who is said to have died under somewhat similar circumstances. But the Acts of this martyrdom are quite discredited; and the mere mention of a *Μαρτύριος* by Theodoret (lib. viii. *Græcarum affectionum*), in a brief list of prominent martyrs, is too slight a foundation to build upon.

<sup>c</sup> "Haustae aut obrutae urbes facundissimâ Campaniae orâ." Tacitus, *Hist.* lib. i. cap. 2.

<sup>d</sup> We are well aware that Lipsius (*not. ad loc.*) puts this interpretation on the phrase, and that a most distinguished living scholar and historian has written as



derive support from the fact mentioned by Tacitus himself (*Annal.* xv. 22), and also by Seneca (*Nat. Quæst.* vi. 1), that one city in Campania, namely, Pompeii, had suffered severely from an earthquake only thirteen years earlier, i.e. in A.D. 63. It seems, however, to be supposed, even by scholars, that we have contemporary evidence for the overthrow of Pompeii and Herculaneum by the action of Vesuvius in the letters of Pliny (*Lib.* vi. 16, 20). This is a pure delusion. Knowing what we do, we may, half unconsciously perhaps, read it into the account of the eruption furnished by Pliny in his letters to Tacitus. But it is not there. Sir Charles Lyell (*Principles of Geology*, bk. ii. pt. ii. chap. ii. London, 1835. Third edit.), and Mr. Bunbury (*Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, art. POMPEII) are perfectly correct in their emphatic assertions on this head. Indeed, the letters of Pliny might be fairly adduced on the opposite side. It might be argued, that even his affection for the memory of his uncle would not have allowed him to pass unnoticed the destruction of two cities, if it had really taken place. Plutarch may have an allusion to the event, and so has Martial; but the only approximation to distinctness on the part of a contemporary is to be found in the *Sylvæ* of the poet Statius (*Sylv.* lib. iv. carm. iv. 78-86). The evidence of Suetonius has the same negative force as that of Pliny; he makes an incidental allusion to the eruption, and speaks of relief being given by Titus to the sufferers, but is absolutely silent respecting the destruction of the cities. On a survey of the contemporary evidence, it may be asked whether the language of Lyell can be considered too strong. "We have no hesitation in saying that had the buried cities never been discovered, the accounts transmitted to us of their tragical end would have been discredited by the majority, so vague and general are the narratives, or so long subsequent to the event."

At length an historian does appear who really gives us some detailed account of the catastrophe and reveals the names of the lost cities. But if men are to reject the possibility of a nucleus of fact because the authority is not contemporary, and because he appears to exaggerate and introduce what is legendary, then, it would seem, we are bound to reject in this matter the testimony of Dion Cassius. He was not born until 76 years after the eruption; he seems only to have begun collecting materials in A.D. 201, that is to say, 122 years after the event, and to have published his history not less than 20 years later. In his account of the matter (*Hist. Rom.* lib. lxxvi. Titus, xi. § 21-23, ed. Reimarus, Hamburgi,

1752), a multitude of giant-like forms stalk upon Vesuvius, sounds of trumpets are heard, and Herculaneum and Pompeii are buried while all the people are sitting in the theatre. In A.D. 1755, at least 1533 years after the account of Dion Cassius, and 1676 years after the event, were commenced the excavations, which revealed the all but forgotten sites. But no corpses whatever were found in the theatres of either city; and there is every reason to hope that the vast majority of the inhabitants escaped. Nevertheless Dion Cassius was in his main assertion speaking the truth, although during a period of more than 15 centuries he remained liable to the charge of having tried to impose upon us a mere romance. The narrative of Eucherius respecting the Thebaean Legion does not, indeed, in all respects stand upon the same footing, and cannot be subjected to the same tests. But the silence of Eusebius and Lactantius in one case may be paralleled with that of Pliny and Suetonius in the other. Is it not possible, from such analogy as does exist between the two cases, to suppose that the exaggerations of the bishop of Lyons may likewise be based upon some real foundation of fact? [J. G. C.]

LEGITIMUS, a bishop who acted as messenger from Leo the Great in A.D. 443. (Leo Mag. *Ep.* 4, § 2 in *Pat. Lat.* liv. 615.) [C. G.]

LEGONTIUS (LEGUNCIUS), twelfth bishop of Metz, A.D. 446. The Sammarthani (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. 685) prefer this statement to that of the Chronicle of the bishops of Metz, which is adopted by Bolland (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 66) that he sat 34 years, died in 325, and was commemorated on Feb. 18. By some he is identified with Leontius of Trèves. [R. T. S.]

LEGONUS (LEGONTIUS), third bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, cir. A.D. 360. (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* i. 39; *Gall. Ch.* ii. 227; Tillem. viii. 424.) [R. T. S.]

LEIDRADUS (1), doubtful bishop of Urgel, A.D. 799-806. Villanueva (*Viaje Literario*, t. x. pp. 40, 225) is disposed, but with hesitation, to admit him as distinct from Leidradus bishop of Lyons. [C. H.]

LEIDRADUS (2) (LAIDRADUS, LAIDRACHUS, LIORADUS), forty-sixth archbishop of Lyons (A.D. 798-814), was a native of Bavaria ("Noricius hunc genuit," Theodulfus, *Paraenesis ad Iudices*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cv. 285), a deacon of Arbo bishop of Freising (Meichelbeck, *Hist. Frising.* i. 80-1), and appears at one time to have been in the service of Arno, afterwards bishop of Salzburg (Alcuin, *Epist.* 2, *Patr. Lat.* c. 141). Whether he was ever librarian to Charles the Great, as has been asserted, is uncertain, but that he was well known to and highly esteemed by him before his appointment to Lyons in 798 is evident (Leidradus, *Epist. ad Car.* *Patr. Lat.* xcix. 871). Alcuin addresses and speaks of him as "electum pontificem" in two of his letters (*Epist.* 89, 90, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* c. 286, 287). A letter of Felix bishop of Urgel, written in 799, designates him as episcopus. Immediately after his election, Charles named him, with Theodulfus, bishop of Orleans, missus dominicus for the province of Narbonne. Theodulfus has left a description of their mission

follows: "Haustae aut obrutae urbes: in the one case swallowed up in streams of lava; in the other overwhelmed by showers of ashes" (Merivale, *Hist. of Romans under the Empire*, chap. ix. note). But this is surely intended rather as a gloss than a translation. Tacitus may have meant this, but it is not the obvious meaning of his words. Pliny uses *haurio* in connection with earthquakes in the sense of "swallowed up," *hauriri urbes terrae hiatus* (xxxvi. 15, 24), but where is it ever found to imply streams of lava? In reference to the earlier catastrophe the language of Tacitus is as follows:—"Ex motu terrae celebre Campaniae oppidum Pompeii magna ex parte proruit." Seneca had heard that it had been actually engulfed by this earthquake, "Pompeios . . . desedisse terrae motu audivimus."



in verse (Migne, *Patr. Lat. cv.* 285). Charles soon conferred on him a new mark of his confidence. With Nebridium, bishop of Narbonne, and St. Benedict, abbat of Aniane, he was commissioned to investigate the charges of heresy brought against Felix, bishop of Urgel in Spain. Arrived at his see, they summoned a council of the higher clergy of the province, at which Felix promised to accompany the legates to Charles's court, and if without violence convinced of error by the testimonies of the fathers, to recant his opinions (*Confessio Fidei Felicis*, *Patr. Lat. xcvi.* 883). At Aix accordingly a public disputation was held, in which Alcuin, the principal champion of the orthodox party, was victorious, and the vanquished Felix, after confessing the true faith, was with his disciples readmitted to the Catholic communion (Alcuin, *adv. Elipandum*, lib. i. 16). It seems, however, that he was deposed from his bishopric (*Confessio Fidei Felicis*, *Patr. Lat. xcvi.* 882; Agobardus, *adv. Felicem*, i., *Patr. Lat. civ.* 33), and sent into exile at Lyons (Ado, *Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat. cxxiii.* 128). Leidradus, with Nebridium and Benedict, returned to Urgel to preach the true faith in the district which had been corrupted by heretical teaching (Alcuin, *Epist.* 117, *Patr. Lat.* 350-51). Twenty thousand are said to have been converted (Alcuin, *Epist.* 103, *Patr. Lat. c.* 329).

At the close of this mission he devoted himself to his own diocese, where Charles, on his appointment, had warned him to avoid and repair the evils which his predecessors' neglect had entailed (Leidradus, *Epist. ad Carolum*, Migne, *Patr. Lat. xcix.* 871-73). In 811 he was one of the witnesses who subscribed Charles's will (Einhardus, *Vita K. Magni*, cap. x. xxiii., Pertz, *Scriptores*, ii. 463). Three years later Louis the Pious, who had just ascended the throne, commissioned him to enquire into and settle a dispute which had arisen at Mâcon (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 54). The same year he resigned his diocese, and passed the remainder of his life in retirement at the monastery of St. Medardus at Soissons (Ado, *Chronicon*, *Patr. Lat. cxxiii.* 134). The year of his death is unknown.

Contemporary writers speak warmly in his praise. Alcuin, who was his intimate friend (*Epist.* 2, 89, 103, 108, *Patr. Lat. c.* 141, 286, 317, 329), and with whom he had stayed a year at St. Martin's while recovering from an illness (*ibid.*), commends his integrity, benevolence, and wisdom (*Ep.* 89, *Patr. Lat.* 286), while Ado mentions his serviceableness to the state (*Chronicon*, *ibid.* col. 129). For an account of his life see the *Gallia Christiana*, iv. 52-5, and the *Hist. Litt. de la Franc.* iv. 433-6.

Of his works very little survives. They are all collected in Migne's *Patr. Lat. xcix.* 853-86. For an account of their contents see the *Hist. Litt. de la Franc.* iv. 436-38. [S. A. B.]

**LENDIVORD**, bishop of Menevia, now St. David's, A.D. 810 (Godwin, *De Praesul. Angl.* 601; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 155), but the lists are imperfect; and by Girald. Camb. (*Itin. Kamb.* ii. c. i. wks. vi. 105) this bishop is called LEUDIWIIT. [J. G.]

**LENIN** (LEININ, LENINE), father of St. Colman of Clonyne [COLMAN (6)], and of Bright and the other "daughters of Leinin" who are commemorated on March 6 in *Mart. Doneg.*

[BRIGIDA (3)]. He was son of Garrchon, descended from Mogh Nuadhat, king of Munster. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Jr.* ii. 213; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 104, c. 2 and *Tr. Thaum.* 612, c. 1; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, iii. 196.) [J. G.]

**LENOGISILUS** (LONEGISILUS), ST., a priest in the diocese of Le Mans in the 7th century. The Bollandists publish a biography of him extracted from the archives of the collegiate church of St. Peter at Le Mans (*Acta SS.* Jan. i. 1120-2). It is of a legendary character, and probably worthless historically.

Mention of this saint, under the name of Lonegisilus, is also made in the life of St. Hadoindus (c. ii. s. 7, *Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 1141), where it is related that, drawn by the fame of the latter, he came to ask for the gift of the cell, then called Buxidus in the pagus Sagonensis, which was willingly granted.

Lenogisilus is commemorated Jan. 13 (*Boll. ib.* Jan. i. 1119). [S. A. B.]

**LENTHECORIUS**, thirteenth bishop of Luni, cir. 700, according to Ughelli (*Ital. Sac. i.* 834), but by others he is called Leodegarius. [LEODEGARIUS.] [C. H.]

**LENTULUS**, reputed author of an apocryphal letter to the Roman senate about Christ. It gives mediæval ideas as to Christ's personal appearance. (Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T. t. i.* p. 301.) [G. T. S.]

**LEO (1) I.**, emperor (surnamed the Great, the Thracian, and the Butcher), was born about A.D. 400 in the country of the Bessi, in Thrace. He was proclaimed emperor Feb. 7, 457, and crowned by Anatolius patriarch of Constantinople, being the first Christian sovereign who received his crown from the hands of a priest. Immediately upon the news of Marcian's death, religious troubles broke out in Alexandria, where the Monophysite party murdered the patriarch Proterius (Proteius), substituting for him Timothy Aelurus. Such a barbarous action caused a great sensation throughout Christendom. The orthodox bishops of Egypt fled to the emperor to lay their complaints before him. Anatolius, the bishop of Constantinople, reported their sad case to the pope Leo, who energetically seconded their efforts for redress. The emperor, distracted by the demands of the pope and patriarch on the one hand, and of Aspar and the heretical party on the other, addressed a circular letter to Anatolius, and all other metropolitans throughout the world, commanding them to assemble their provincial councils, and advise him—(1) whether the decrees of the council of Chalcedon should be held binding; (2) as to the ordination of Timothy Aelurus. He also consulted the three most celebrated ascetics of the time, Symeon Stylites, James the Syrian, and Baradatus. We possess in the *Codex Encyclicus*, embodying the answers of all the bishops and hermits consulted on this occasion, a most valuable monument of ecclesiastical antiquity. It was apparently composed, according to imperial orders, by some unknown Greek, translated into Latin, at the order of the senator Cassiodorus, by Epiphanius Scholasticus, and first published in modern times by Laurentius Surius. It will be found in all collections of the councils, but in

full only in Labbe and Coss. *Concil. i. 4*, pp. 890–980 (cf. Cave, *Scriptt. Lit. Hist. i. 495*; Till. *Mém. xv. art. 167*). The bishops, in August 458, replied, unanimately upholding the decrees of Chalcedon and rejecting the ordination of Timothy, who, however, maintained his position at Alexandria till the year 460, through the influence of Aspar and his faction. In that year he was exiled to Gangra in Paphlagonia, probably owing to the more energetic measures of Gennadius, the new patriarch of Constantinople. From thence he was removed into the Chersonesus Taurica, where he remained till his restoration in 476. [TIMOTHEUS.] Another Timothy, variously surnamed Basiliscus and Salofaciolus, was thereupon consecrated patriarch, and ruled the church during the rest of Leo's reign. The history of this struggle will be best studied in the epistles of St. Leo, from cxlv.–clxvi. in Migne, P. L. t. liv. The 65th Epistle, written Aug. 20, 458, is a very able dogmatic treatise, entering at large upon the whole question of Christ's twofold nature. In it he insists, against the Eutychians, that Christ has as real human flesh as we have, adopting a line of argument which afterwards became of critical importance in the iconoclastic controversy. (Cf. Nicephori *Antirrhett.* in Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm. t. i.*)

In Antioch, again, similar troubles broke out in the latter part of this emperor's reign. The Eutychian party was there specially strong. Its convictions were of course intensified by the near presence of the celebrated Nestorian school of Edessa, which was just then at the height of its fame (Renan, *Hist. des Lang. Sémitiq.*). The emperor having, A.D. 471, appointed his son-in-law, Zeno the Isaurian, governor of Antioch, he brought in his train from Constantinople Peter the Fuller, formerly a monk of Chalcedon, but expelled from his monastery for his Eutychian views. Under Zeno's protection, Peter usurped the see of Antioch, and though the patriarch Martyrius was restored by imperial authority, and Peter banished to an African oasis, yet Martyrius found his opponents so strong that he resigned his see, to which Julian was elected. [PETER THE FULLER; MARTYRIUS.]

In 468 Leo became embroiled with the Arian Vandals of North Africa, who were bitterly hostile to the Greek emperor on account of his orthodoxy. He sent an expedition against them under the command of Basiliscus, his brother-in-law. Aspar and Ardaburius secretly arranged with Basiliscus for its failure, as they feared any diminution of the great Arian power. The emperor, having discovered the conspiracy, put Aspar and Ardaburius to death, as some say, with great treachery when engaged in a banquet at the imperial table, after they had been lured from their asylum in the church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon. He banished Basiliscus A.D. 469. The Gothic guards, in revenge, raised a civil war in Constantinople, and under one Ostrys, a friend of Aspar, even attacked the palace, but were defeated. Leo in consequence issued a severe edict against the Arians, and forbade them holding meetings or possessing churches.

In another quarter, again, religious controversy burst forth. Gennadius of Constantinople died in 471, and was succeeded in the patriarchal throne by Acacius, who was such a

favourite with Leo that he admitted him a member of the senate, where no ecclesiastic had hitherto sat. Acacius obtained from Leo an edict confirming the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon, whereby Constantinople was raised to the same ecclesiastical level as Rome. The edict of Leo, indeed, seems to place it even higher, as the emperor styles it "the mother of his piety, of all Christians, and of the orthodox faith," and will have Acacius, and other bishops, his successors, to take precedence of other bishops, without restriction or limitation, in consideration of its being the royal city. The pope Simplicius resisted the claim, and a bitter controversy ensued, which lasted many years, and was most fruitful in divisions. (Milman, *Lat. Christ. lib. iii. cap. i.*)

Leo had a great reverence for the pillar saints of his time, Symeon and Daniel. To this latter, who lived in the neighbourhood of Constantinople, he had recourse when in grief for want of a son. The saint promised him one the following year. The prediction was fulfilled, though the child did not live long. The emperor presented the saint with a new column as a thank-offering, and followed up this gift with the further present of a double pillar connected by a platform, A.D. 465.

Leo was very active in church legislation. He made laws in 466 confirming the right of asylum to churches; in 468 forbidding any persons save Christians to act as advocates. In 469 he issued an edict against Simoniacal contracts, and another of an almost puritan strictness upon the observance of Sunday. He not only forbade judicial proceedings on that day, but also even the playing of any lyre or harp or any other musical instrument (*Chron. Pasch. A.D. 467*, where the words of the edict are given). In the same year he passed stern laws against paganism, and issued a fresh edict in favour of hospitals. In 471 a law was published, apparently elicited by the troubles at Antioch, commanding monks not to leave their monasteries. In Joan. Malalas (*Chronogr. lib. xiv.*) will be found a curious instance of the way in which the edicts against heathenism were carried out. He there tells us how Isoacasius, a philosopher and magistrate of Antioch, was forced by torture to accept baptism at Constantinople. The emperor seems to have exercised a personal superintendence over this conversion.

Leo was twice married—(1) to Leontia, who had two daughters, Leontia and Ariadne; (2) to Verina, who had a son Leo, who died before his father in infancy. Leo died, Feb. 3, 474, of dysentery, aged seventy-three. He was succeeded by his grandson Leo II.

*Authorities* besides those already quoted. (Evagrins, *H. E. lib. ii.*; Procopii, de Bell. Vandal.; Theoph. *Chronograph.*) [G. T. S.]

LEO (2) II., son of Zeno and Ariadne, daughter of Leo I., was made consul when three years old by his grandfather in January 474. On Feb. 3 he succeeded him as emperor. Zeno had himself also proclaimed emperor, as if by his son's command, in the same month. In the following November the death of the boy left his father the sole occupant of the throne. The same authorities may be consulted as for Leo I.

[G. T. S.]

LEO (3) III. (the Isaurian), emperor A.D. 716-741. Leo was a soldier of fortune, and sprung from a Monophysite stock. He was born at Germanicia, a city of Armenia Minor. Germanicia having been taken by the Saracens in one of their numerous invasions of Armenia towards the close of the 7th century, his father retired from Armenia to Thrace, probably in company with the Roman army, which Justinian II. had sent in 686 to meet the Saracens (Finlay, *Hist. of Greece*, ii. 387; Saint-Martin, *Mém. sur l'Arménie*, t. i. p. 338). He settled at Mesembria in Thrace, where he seems to have accumulated considerable wealth, as he was able to furnish Justinian II. with five hundred sheep for his troops when advancing with the Bulgarians upon Constantinople to regain possession of his throne, A.D. 704. This timely act made his son's fortune. Leo was appointed Spatharius, or a member of the royal body-guard, and given a high command on the Lazian frontier, whence, by his prudence and courage, he was raised by Anastasius II. to the command of the Anatolic Theme, one of the most important military commands in the empire, owing to the repeated Mahometan invasions. In 716 he relieved Armorium, thereby gaining the gratitude of its inhabitants to such an extent that the town stood faithful to the Isaurian dynasty in its darkest hours, and proved a haven of refuge to Leo's son when Constantinople was in revolt. He then concluded a truce with the Saracens, and was saluted emperor by the army and the inhabitants of Armorium. With the history of his civil administration for the next ten years we have nothing to do, save to mention that he occupied himself in rolling back the tide of foreign invasion, in establishing a firm government throughout the empire, a circumstance which, after the anarchy of the previous twenty years, as Mr. Finlay has well remarked, contributed in no small degree to make the commercial classes, fanatical image worshippers though they may have been, contented with the rule of a vigorous heretic. Here, however, we may explain one circumstance, which is at first sight puzzling to the student of the iconoclastic controversies. All through the struggles of the 8th century the army supported so firmly and consistently the side of iconoclasm, that even the empress Irene, fearless as she was, dared not convoke the council of image worshippers till she had removed the guards from Constantinople.

To one acquainted only with the method of recruiting under the Roman republic, or in free modern states, the total alienation of the army from the people, nay, rather their complete opposition to popular feelings and prejudices on this point, must seem unaccountable. The mere fact that the first iconoclastic emperor was a soldier of fortune and the army's own choice will not account for it. Armies before had often made emperors, and unmade them again when they displeased the soldiery. The real explanation of it must be sought in the policy of the Byzantine court established by Constantine. Space would fail us to explain it thoroughly. Those desirous of more information should study carefully the account of his municipal system in vol. i. c. ii. of Finlay's *History of Greece*. Suffice it here to say that Constantine established the caste system

throughout the empire. "The military class was separated from the landed proprietors by an insuperable barrier. No landed proprietor could become a soldier, and no soldier could become a member of a curia or municipality. When the free population of the empire was so much diminished that it became difficult to find recruits, the son of a soldier was bound to follow the profession of arms, but the Roman armies were generally recruited from among the barbarians who lived beyond the bounds of the empire." (See the two titles, *De Veteranis*, and *De Filiis Veteranorum*, in the seventh book of the Theodosian Code.) This passage contains the explanation of the attachment of the army during the 8th century to iconoclasm. It was just then almost entirely recruited from the Armenians, Mardaïtes of Lebanon, Isaurians, Manicheans, Paulicians, and other heretics of Asia Minor, all of whom were more or less hostile to the dominant church and its practices (Finlay, i. 387, ii. 27, 28, 29). An army once thus formed, the caste system stereotyped it.

Having thus pointed out some broad general principles which rule the whole inquiry, we may proceed to the particular steps which Leo took to carry out his purpose. A year or so before his first edict against images he compelled the Jews and Montanists to be baptized as Phocas and Heraclius had done a century earlier. [GEORGICUS (73).] The Jews accepted the sacrament, and mocked it. Some of the Montanists, who were probably Manicheans, burnt themselves with their churches sooner than submit. The emperor may have had the objections of these sects to the prevailing image worship forced more prominently on his attention by the conferences with their leaders, which decency, not to say common sense, would require on such an occasion. In the following year (726) appeared therefore the first edict on the subject, when the emperor at once met an opponent in the patriarch Germanus, who had been compliant enough upon an abstract point like Monothelism, but was immovable upon the practical question. [GERMANUS (26).] The emperor, however, found other bishops equally ready to support him, prominent among whom were Constantine, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia [CONSTANTINUS (7)], Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis, and Theodosius, archbishop of Ephesus, son of a former emperor, Tiberius II. Almost every writer who has treated this subject has a different theory upon the chronology of the first five years of this controversy, viz. 726-30. Hefele in his *History of the Councils*, t. iv. (cf. his dissertation, *Ueber das Erste Lustrum des Bilderstreits in the Tüb. Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1857, Heft iv.) has critically considered them all, and, taking his stand upon certain undoubted historical facts, puts forward, in our opinion, the most satisfactory solution. Hitherto it has been generally believed that the first edict of Leo in 726 merely ordered the images in churches to be raised higher, in order that the people might not kiss them, or do them religious reverence. Hefele, however, from the words of pope Gregory II. in his first letter (Mansi, t. xii. p. 960) to the emperor on this subject, has conclusively proved that the original edict of Leo authorised the destruction of images. As a matter of fact, it only took effect in those cases where the images

were exposed in public places, but, owing to the opposition of the patriarch Germanus, was inoperative in churches, save where, as in the case of bishops like those mentioned above, their convictions or their interest led them to engage in the work of iconoclasm. His line of proof for a view so opposite to that almost universally held by all previous writers, with the exception of Baronius, Fleury, and Mosheim, is the following. Theophanes, under the year 718 of his era, that is A. D. 726, mentions the indignation of the people at the emperor's new doctrines, and their mutiny, as some officials led by the Spatharius Jovinus proceeded to demolish the miraculous image of our Lord, over the Brazen Gate of Constantinople in the district of Chalcooprætaia according to Hefele (*Hist. des Concil.* t. iv. p. 263, ed. Paris), over the bronze portal of the imperial palace according to Neander (*H. E.* v. 293). The women upset the ladder, mounted on which the leader with a hatchet was smashing the image, and killed the officers [MARIA PATRICIA], for which the emperor executed some, exiled others, and dissolved the university, which had flourished from the time of Constantine the Great.\* To this event the pope in his first letter expressly alludes, telling the emperor that the first news he had of his hostility to the sacred images was from "certain persons of distinction, French, Romans, Vandals, Goths, and Moors," pilgrims or merchants, who had witnessed this act, and spread the news of it all through the West. Hefele confirms this view by a story which Theophanes tells concerning the siege of Nicaea, which was besieged by the Saracens in the summer of 727 (cf. Boeckh, *Corp. Inscript.* iv. 8664). A soldier, perceiving an image of the Blessed Virgin exposed in public, smashed it with a stone and ground it to powder under his feet. He then saw a lady standing beside him saying, "Thou seest how

scandalously thou hast treated me, that deed shall surely return upon thy head." Next day, rushing to the battlements upon a sudden alarm of the enemy, he was killed by a stone. Theophanes regards this as an immediate and miraculous judgment upon the iconoclast for his sacrilege. Hefele more naturally views it as a confirmation of his theory that the emperor's first edict authorised the destruction of images, as a common soldier would scarcely venture on such a daring act in a city devoted to image worship, unless he had public authority at his back. At the same time he points out that, as Theophanes equally records, since Nicaea was delivered by the intercession of the Fathers of the first council whose images were preserved there, the ecclesiastical authorities of the place must have disobeyed the emperor's mandate. In fact, his conclusion in general is this, that the first edict of 726 authorised the destruction of images, but was not put into vigorous execution till the deposition of the patriarch Germanus. This theory gains additional support from some facts which Hefele has not noticed. The earlier letters of Germanus, A. D. 726-28, for instance, which remain in the acts of the second Nicene council, to Constantine, John of Synnada, and Thomas of Claudiopolis, all refer to the destruction of images as an accomplished fact. Joannes Damasc. again wrote his second oration in defence of images about the month of February, 730. This date is deduced from the circumstance that he mentions the deposition of Germanus, Jan. 730, but not the accession of Anastasius, which took place a few weeks later. He had written another oration previously. The second was published because of the difficulty experienced by the faithful in getting copies of the first. That first *Apology*, whether written from Damascus or from the solitudes of the desert, must have taken a considerable time to get into circulation, and to cause, as it did, a great sensation even at the imperial court. This will throw its composition back at least to the year 728. Now in this first *Apology* all the arguments are addressed to persons totally opposed to the use of images, and presuppose an edict requiring their destruction, not their elevation merely to a loftier position on the walls of churches.

During the first five years of the controversy the emperor came in contact with three men who represent three distinct classes—with Germanus representing the Greek church within the empire, with pope Gregory II. representing the West, and with John of Damascus representing the Eastern church without the empire. The theory of Hefele with respect to the nature of the first edict is the only one which harmonises the documents which remain to us concerning all three. [GERMANUS (26).]

Germanus was nearly ninety years of age when the edict of 726 was issued. Constantine of Nacolia seems about that time to have been in the capital consulting with or advising the sovereign. The patriarch summoned him to his presence, expostulated with him, and sent him back to his see with a letter to his metropolitan, John of Synnada, wherein he defends the use of images of Christ on the ground that they shewed forth His real Incarnation as opposed to the docetic doctrine taught by heretics on that

\* As the attack on this image was followed by most important consequences, and was the declaration of war on Leo's part, it may be well to explain that it was the most highly valued of all the images by the populace of Constantinople. It was known by the name of *Χριστός ὁ ἀντιφωήτης* = *εγγυος*, the surety. This name was derived from the following legend. Theodore, a wealthy merchant, had lost all his property at sea. To obtain fresh capital he betook himself to a rich Jew named Abraham, who demanded adequate security for the sum he proposed to lend. Being devoid of any he offered an image of Christ before which he was accustomed to pray, which the Jew accepted. After losing two more vessels he prospered, became rich, and paid back what he had borrowed. This, with various other marvels, made such an impression on the Jew that he was baptized and became a priest. Theodore became a monk, as he resolved to do after his first loss at sea. These incidents, which are said to have happened under the emperor Heraclius, are related in a panegyric on this image which Combefis has published in his *Hist. Monothel.* or *Auct. Bibl. Patr.* Paris, LII. A. D. 1648. In place of the image Leo substituted the cross, to the use of which neither he nor the Monophysites in general were opposed. To this cross the following inscription was appended: "The emperor could not suffer a dumb and lifeless figure of earthly materials smeared over with paint to stand as a representation of Christ. He has therefore erected here the sign of the cross, a glory to the gate of believing princes" (Neander, *H. E.* v. 294, vl. 266; cf. Combefis, *Hist. Monothel.* p. 611; Codinus, *de Aedific. C. P.* ed. Bonn. p. 77; Du Cange, *Constant. Christian.* li. 113-117).

subject. Another letter to Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis, is most important, as the first formal controversial document of this period, and as proving that the controversy had already become a very hot one. It must have been written soon after the issue of the first edict, and before the emperor had shewn his determination to enforce compliance with his will upon all parties, lay and clerical alike. The patriarch exhorts the bishop of Claudiopolis to avoid all novelties, and above all when they would be an occasion of scandal to the faithful, and in opposition to long established ecclesiastical custom. He proceeds then to refute the objection (1) of Jews to images as contravening God's law, by retorting that they broke the same law by offering in all parts of the world those sacrifices which ought only to be presented at Jerusalem; (2) of Saracens, by retorting the cultus paid by themselves to the Khaaba, a square black stone at Mecca. He explains that reverence to images was merely intended to stir the people up to an imitation of their lives who were thus represented. Quoting St. Basil to the effect that a painting is an abridged history, he refers to the fact that so many councils had been held and none had forbidden images, and to the miracles said to have been performed by them, specially noting an image of the Blessed Virgin at Sosopolis in Pisidia, from whose painted palm a liquid perfume used to distil (*cf.* Du Cange, *Gloss. Med. Græc.* s. v. *μόψα*). He refers to the reputed statue of Christ erected at Paneas, but warns his correspondent that her example is not in one respect to be followed. Statues must not be erected after the custom of the heathen, only paintings and mosaics.

Germanus seems to have carried on this quiet but resolute opposition during the year 727 when the attention of the emperor was naturally taken up with the revolt of the Greeks, which resulted in an attack upon Constantinople, April 18, 727, and after their defeat with a formidable invasion of the Saracens, who laid siege to Nicaea, June 21 of the same year (*Boeckh, l. c.*). After the restoration of order Leo turned his attention again to the images. Perceiving the necessity for gaining over the patriarch to his views, he summoned him to a conference in the early part of the year, which began on March 25, 729, where by argument and threats he strove to change his resolution, but failed. Several months seem then to have elapsed, during which the emperor was laying his plans. In this interval the patriarch wrote to the pope acquainting him with Leo's demands and his own refusal. We do not possess the letter of Germanus, but the answer of Gregory, in which he encourages him to a brave resistance, has been preserved in the acts of the seventh council. (*Mansi, t. xiii. p. 91 sqq.; Hard. iv. 231.*)

On January 7 the emperor summoned a silentium or grand council of the empire in his palace, where he again called upon the patriarch to join in an edict against images. He replied in a long oration, wherein he defended his own views. Perceiving he availed nothing, he concluded by saying, "If I am a Jonah fling me into the sea, but without the authority of a general council the faith cannot be changed;" then, resigning his office, he retired to his own estate, where he

died in a short time, aged more than ninety years.

Into his place the emperor chose the patriarchal secretary Anastasius, who was consecrated Jan. 22. He immediately countersigned the emperor's edict, and thus lent it the force of ecclesiastical sanction. It seems to have been at once enforced with considerable success and without much opposition, though some executions and mutilations took place; the images were universally removed, and the painted walls were all whitewashed. Leo, however, had to reckon besides with two other antagonists, who were far more formidable because beyond his reach—with the pope and with John of Damascus. During the first ten years of his reign Leo maintained a good understanding with Gregory II., though there seems even then to have been considerable dissatisfaction at Rome, as also in Greece, with his fiscal arrangements (*Finlay, Hist. of Greece, ii. 37, 38*). Of this discontent the pope skillfully availed himself in his controversy with the emperor. Stepping forward as the champion of popular rights as well as prejudices, he commenced the struggle immediately upon hearing of the attack upon the image of Christ over the great brazen gate already referred to. His first letter on the subject from the pope to the emperor has been minutely examined by Hefele in his essay on Iconoclasm (*Hist. of Councils, t. iv. ed. Paris*). He shews that it was written some time in 727, and that out of it we can even collect the very words of the first edict against images. The chronology of this period was previously in a very confused state, but owing to the efforts of Hefele it has been reduced to an orderly sequence. Immediately after the receipt of the imperial edict of 726 the pope summoned a synod to consider it (*Mansi, t. xii. p. 267*). There the pope shewed that it was lawful to venerate images, citing the example of the cherubim, and of the workmanship of Bezaleel and Aholiab, an argument which we find more fully developed in the first letter of the pope to Leo, which resulted from the deliberations of this synod. This correspondence was for centuries lost, but in the 16th century was found in the library of the cardinal of Lorraine by the learned Jesuit Fronto, who translated ten letters from Greek into Latin. They were printed for the first time by Baronius (*Annal. 726, 31*). In the first letter the pope endeavours to parry the force of the second commandment, on which Leo in his edict had dwelt, by explaining that it was only of temporary force because of the existing idolatry, and further because that no man had then seen God. Since the Incarnation, however, the matter is different. Man has now seen God taking human nature, and therefore may make an image of His human form. He then explains the distinction between relative adoration and real worship (*ταύτας προσεκύνησαν οὐ λατρευτικῶς, ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς*), which, as we have already seen, Augustine reprobated three centuries before. He then takes high ground with the emperor, plainly threatening him with a revolt in the West if he persisted. He mentions one incidental circumstance which explains how these letters, thus lost for centuries, were finally found in a Western library. As an evidence of the unpopular nature of his present

course the pope tells Leo, "God is my witness that I have sent all thy letters to the kings of the West. They have also received and prized thy portraits before they heard of thy unfortunate attack upon images." Leo wished for the assembly of a general council, but Gregory tells him that as they could not find a God-fearing emperor to assist thereat according to custom, such an assembly could not be convoked. He announces that his portraits had been destroyed throughout the West and that Ravenna had been taken by the Lombards as the result of his iconoclasm. Finally, quoting the emperor's words, he proceeds: "But thou wishest to frighten me, and sayest: 'I will send men to Rome to destroy the image of St. Peter, and to lead pope Gregory prisoner, as Constantine led Martin.' Know that the bishops of Rome are as a wall between the East and West. If thou wilt pursue me, the bishop of Rome will simply retire twenty-four stadia from Rome into Campania. Then come and pursue the winds." Such language must have sounded strange upon the imperial ear, and proves that already the Roman see, strong in the support of the West, had made long strides towards its future greatness. To this letter the emperor replied in an epistle sent by the hand of a certain Rufinus, in which the emperor claimed to be priest as well as emperor in virtue of his imperial office. To this the pope replied: "Thou writest that thou art emperor and priest at once. Yes; thy predecessors were such in reality. Constantine the Great, Theodore the Great, Valentinian the Great, and Constantine (Pogonatus). They governed as religious emperors; they have held synods with the bishops. They have, in a word, proved by their works that they were emperors and priests; but thou, on the contrary, hast despoiled the churches." He then draws a distinction between temporal and spiritual jurisdiction and functions, summing up thus: "Doctrines are not the business of the emperor, but of the bishops," answering thus the emperor's query, how it is that the six councils say nothing about images; "Neither is anything said by them about bread and water, eating and not eating, these things being always connected with human life. The use of images was then general. The bishops themselves brought images to the councils, for no pious man ever undertook a journey without one." We have bestowed much space upon these letters, because they were epoch-making documents, which served to change the current of European politics. The careful study of them, as given in Baronius, Mansi, or Hardouin, will be most instructive. The theological arguments are probably drawn, as we have already remarked, from the work of Leontius of Cyprus, as the pope displays in these authoritative documents, when he ventures on independent reasoning, the most wonderful ignorance of Scripture and ecclesiastical history alike. He adopts, for instance, the story about our Lord sending His portrait to Abgarus of Edessa, and calls it expressly ἀχειροποίητον; while the following is a specimen of his proficiency in Holy Scripture. "I beseech thee," writes the pope to Leo, "lay aside thy wicked thoughts and save thy soul from the curses which the whole world are flinging at thee. The very children mock thee. Go into a school and say, I am an enemy

of images, they will fling their tablets at thee. Thou writest, just as after eight hundred years the Jewish king removed the serpent of brass out of the temple, so have I after eight hundred years removed images out of the church. King Uzziah was in truth thy brother, for he, like thee, did violence to the priest (2 Chron. xxvi. 16). David deposited the serpent of brass in the temple with the ark of the covenant. It was there an image consecrated by God to cure those who had been bitten by serpents" (cf. 2 Kings xviii. 4; 2 Chron. v. 10). The emperor, unconvinced by such reasoning and undaunted by the threat of excommunication, made several attempts to kill or arrest the pope, which were all unsuccessful, owing to the enthusiasm of the Romans, and the aid even of the Lombards. The chronography of the period is however so confused that every historian gives us a different narrative (see Milman, *Lat. Christ.* l. iv. c. ix. in t. ii. pp. 417-24, ed. 1867, for the best connected narrative of this troubled time; cf. *The Franks and their Metropolitans*, two papers in *Jour. Sacr. Lit.* ed. Burgess, viii. 271; ix. 298). Certain facts however serve as landmarks. Gregory II. died on February 11, 731, after repudiating all communion with Anastasius the intruding patriarch of Constantinople. Gregory III. was elected pope by acclamation at the funeral of Gregory II., and was consecrated on March 18, as soon as the consent of the exarch at Ravenna, as representing the emperor, could be obtained.<sup>b</sup> Up to this then the bishops of Rome had not openly broken with the imperial authority. The final breach was the work of that authority itself. Iconoclasm had now become a fanaticism with the emperor; or rather perhaps, a rude soldier, intoxicated with the possession of despotic power and inheriting the traditions of the Byzantine empire, considered himself bound to vindicate the dictates of authority against an insolent priest. The new pope sent messenger after messenger to the imperial court. They were all arrested, and cast into prison on the way. The pope, incensed at such conduct, convoked a synod, which met on Nov. 1, 731, and hurled an excommunication at the iconoclasts, without expressly naming the emperor, but evidently including him. To this he replied by sending a fleet against Rome under Manes, the general of the Kibyrraiot theme, which suffered shipwreck in the Adriatic, and defeat under the walls of Ravenna. Henceforth the Eastern empire almost acquiesced in the loss

<sup>b</sup> In the diary of the popes of the 8th century—the *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*—will be found the form of an application for such consent, addressed to the emperor, wherein it is said: "Lacrimabiliter cuncti famuli supplicamus ut dominorum pietas servorum suorum obsecrationes dignanter exaudat, et concessa pietatis suae jussione, petentium desideria, ad effectum de ordinatione ipsius praeceptat pervenire" (*Lib. Diurn.* cap. 2, tit. 3, in *Pat. Lat.* cv. 32). The application for the exarch's consent (tit. 4) runs—"Iterum atque iterum impensius, praecease et a Deo servate domine, supplicamus, ut celerius, Deo operante vestrisque praecordiis inspirante, apostolicam sedem de perfecta ejusdem nostri patris atque pastolorum ordinatione adornare praeceptatis." There is also a form of application to the archbishop of Ravenna (tit. 5), to the judges of Ravenna (tit. 6), and to the apocrisarius of Ravenna (tit. 7), to secure their friendly offices with the exarch, and prevent delay.

of Italy, but avenged itself by confiscating the large estates of the Roman see in Sicily and Calabria and by separating Sicily, Illyria, Greece, and Macedonia from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff. A nominal connexion however continued to exist between Rome and Constantinople till the coronation of Charlemagne by pope Leo III. on Christmas day, A.D. 800, finally severed the link and, making the bishop of Rome independent of the East, consummated the work begun by the iconoclastic movement [GREGORY II. AND III.]. (Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, c. iv.; Hallam, *Middle Ages*, c. i. p. 15, ed. 1868.) The emperor had also to contend with another adversary nearer home and yet beyond the reach of his power. John of Damascus, at the outbreak of the controversy, held high office at the caliph's court under the Saracens, whence he at once addressed his first oration in defence of images, which caused apparently such a great sensation throughout the empire that the emperor strove to prohibit its circulation. So great difficulty did the orthodox experience in obtaining copies, that, as we have already noted, upon the resignation of Germanus in January 730 he hastily compiled a second oration containing exactly the same arguments and quotations, which seems to have been in time followed by a third, though the authenticity of this last is doubted by some. A brief analysis of the first will sufficiently set forth the character of all. He teaches that the use of images necessarily resulted from the Incarnation, and is a testimony against a mere docetic view of Christ's humanity, which seems from the words of the second oration to have been rapidly developing itself. He then notices that the iconoclasts had adopted the Manichaean view of matter, abusing it as a vile thing, and of course there is then but a step to docetism. He distinguishes between five distinct kinds of adoration, and points out that the second commandment was abrogated by the Incarnation. In fact, he views iconoclasm as a return to the bondage of Judaism from the freedom of the Gospel, and asks if they observe the law on this point, why not upon circumcision and the Sabbath. (Upon this subject he enlarges still more in *Oratio II.*; cf. his work *De Fide Orthod.* iv. 15.) He retorts their inconsistency upon his opponents, as a century later did Theodor. Studit. in his *Antirhet.* against the epigrams of the Iconoclasts. They adored the Cross, the place of Calvary, the stone of the Sepulchre, the Holy Table and holy vessels; why not, then, the sacred images which serve like the stones taken out of the bed of Jordan to remind the faithful of God's past mercies, a point which he presses still more strongly in the second oration; asking pertinently enough, if I may adore the image of a cross to which He was affixed, why not the image of Him affixed to it? A compromise seems to have been suggested by some one, which Damascenus indignantly rejects. It was proposed that the images of Christ and His mother alone should be revered and all others abolished. "No," replied he, "if we paint an image of Christ why not of His saints, who form His body?" He makes a weak attempt to reply to the historical argument drawn from the iconoclastic act of Epiphanius, but of course fails, as the facts are too strong for him. His solution of the difficulty about Epi-

phanus is threefold. (1) Perhaps the story is a forgery, or perhaps (2) he tore the curtain because of some local abuses; at any rate, (3) one man's opinion is not to be set against the universal tradition of the Church, quoting the saying of Gregory the Great, "one swallow does not make spring." He then endeavours to retort the historical argument by shewing that some of the Fathers, as Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, the Pseudo-Dionysius approved of the use of pictures as means of teaching the ignorant. He answers the emperor's argument that no council had sanctioned images by retorting that none had condemned them, and silence in such a case was sanction. Each oration closes with almost the same citation of authorities, not omitting the memorable one of the hermit who was assailed by the daemon of uncleanness, and which was such a favourite with the council of Nice that it is repeated twice in *Acts* iv. and v. (cf. Dr. Whitby's treatise on *Image Worship* in Gibson's *Preservative* for an examination of this story, t. vii. p. 285; London, 1848). The daemon offered to leave the holy man at rest if he ceased to worship an image of the Virgin. The hard-pressed hermit made the rash vow, but in his distress of mind communicated his secret to a famous abbat, Theodore, his spiritual adviser. "Better," said the abbat, "that you should visit every brothel in the town than abstain from the worship of the holy image."

The result of the struggle between Leo and John was not beneficial to the cause of Christianity. It tended rather to the advantage of Mahomedanism, as it taught the adherents of image worship, led by the fanaticism of the monks, to view the Eastern empire as their more immediate enemy, contrasting therewith the toleration, contemptuous though it may have been, which they enjoyed under the rule of the caliphs. [JOAN. DAMASCENUS.] (Finlay, *Hist. of Greece*, i. 371, 387.)

From the year 733 till Leo's death in 741 we know nothing further of this contest. The emperor seems to have had plenty of civil business to engage him without trespassing on theology. The ever-increasing danger of the exarchate of Ravenna, the intrigues of the French monarchs, the incursions of Saracens and Bulgarians, culminating in a terrible earthquake, Oct. 26, 740, which destroyed a great part of Constantinople—all these gave him sufficient employment.\*

The reign of Leo determined the character of the whole iconoclastic epoch. The literary controversy was threshed out for the time being, as no new arguments were advanced on either side till the iconoclasts recognised more clearly the logical principles always latent in their system, and embodied them in formal anathemas at the council of 754. Then, in turn, we find new ground taken and new arguments brought forward on the side of their opponents in the discussions of the Nicene council, and in the writings

\* This last event caused the imposition of a tax, amounting to one-tenth of the census, called the *dikeration*, because generally paid in silver coins called *keratia*, which was applied to the restoration of the ruined fortifications. In this earthquake the statue of the empress Eudoxia, erected A.D. 406, was overthrown (Boeckh *Corp. Inscript.* iv. 8614).



of Nicephorus and Theodorus of Studita after the view of that council. The Protestant inquirer in viewing his reign naturally sympathises with the emperor, the Roman Catholic with his opponents. Thus it has been in history, with Spanheim and Basnage on the one side, with Mainbourg and Fleury on the other; and yet an impartial student like Neander, looking, not at the mere surface, but at the deeper principles which underlie human affairs, can find somewhat to balance in the one against the other. Leo seems certainly to have been animated with a genuine desire to restore the primitive simplicity of Christian worship. But he sought his object in a perverse way, which destroyed the rights of the individual conscience, and made the will of the magistrate the supreme law in spiritual matters. He sought to impose a spiritual movement by force upon mankind, and he failed, as all such attempts must fail. Spiritual movements must proceed from within, not from without, from forces and convictions residing within the human bosom, not from the mere dictates of external authority. The iconoclastic movement again, in one sense, saved the Eastern church by awakening in it a sense of spiritual independence which had been almost smothered under the weight of imperial favour and imperial despotism combined. Hitherto the Greek church had been the obedient slave of the empire, ready to change or modify its creed at the command of its imperial masters. A Germanus even was ready to adopt Monothelism or Dithelism, according to royal whim. Had the Eastern church been conquered by the Saracens while in that Erastian state, Christianity might have been utterly extinguished in the East, as the church would have been prepared to adopt the creed of its rulers. But this controversy infused a new spirit into church teachers and leaders. "Without the authority of a general council the faith cannot be changed," cried alike the monk of Damascus and the patriarch Germanus, taking up the still bolder cry of the pope Gregory II., "Church doctrines are not the business of emperors, but of bishops. Just as they ought not to mingle in affairs of state, so ought not the others to interfere in ecclesiastical matters."

These were unwonted sounds for a Byzantine emperor to hear, and they seem to have urged him and his successor forward on the path of vindicating the royal prerogative as against the spiritual power. [G. T. S.]

LEO (4) IV. (the Khazar), born Jan. 25, 750, crowned June 6, 751, ascended the throne Sept. 14, A.D. 775, died Sept. 8, 780. He was the son of Constantine Copronymus and Irene, daughter of the emperor of the Khazars. His father proposed at first to marry him to Gisela, daughter of Pippin king of the Franks, hoping to recover the exarchate of Ravenna by this alliance, but meeting with a refusal through the influence of the papal party he united him to a beautiful Athenian named Irene, who was devoted, though secretly, to image worship. (Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, ed. Sainct-Martin, t. xii. p. 269.) Under her influence at the beginning of his reign he showed some favour to the monks, whom his father steadily and fiercely persecuted. He even chose some metropolitans

out of the ranks of the abbats. In the fourth or fifth year of his reign he discovered a plot for the restoration of image worship, in which the empress seems to have been implicated. He imprisoned the chief conspirators, among whom were Jacobus Protospatharius, Papias, Strategius, Theophanes, Leo, and Thomas, chamberlains, but he put none of them to death [IRENE II.]. He displayed the same mild disposition when his half-brother Nicephorus, after swearing allegiance to Leo's son Constantine (Theophanes, 380; Zonaras, ii. 114), formed a conspiracy to render himself master of the government. Leo, feeling himself sinking into the grave, referred the question of his brother's guilt to a *Silentium*, which condemned all the conspirators to death. He pardoned his brother, and merely scourged and exiled his partisans. In the last year of his reign he seems to have taken more decided steps against image worship. He quarrelled with Irene when he discovered images beneath her pillow (Cedrenus, 469). His death is ascribed by Theophanes to this iconoclastic zeal. Having removed a crown out of the great church of Constantinople, and placed it on his own head, carbuncles immediately burst forth, and he died of the consequent fever. According to Mosheim and others he was poisoned by Irene, with whom he had not lived from the previous Lent, the period of their quarrel about the images. In 777 he persuaded Telerus king of the Bulgarians, who had taken refuge with him, to embrace Christianity. He made him patrician, and gave him in marriage Irene, a cousin of the empress. He continued his father's policy, not only about images, but also by encouraging the settlement of Oriental heretics in Thrace. In 778 he formed three settlements of Syrian Jacobites. (Flcury, *H. E.* xlii. 42, xliv. 16; Finlay, *Hist. of Greece*, ii. 50, 55; Theophan. *Chronograph.*) [ICONOCLASTS.] [G. T. S.]

LEO (5) I., the Great, saint, bishop of Rome, A.D. 440-461. We know but little of St. Leo before his elevation to the papacy. He himself and Prosper of Aquitaine call Rome his "patria" (Prosper, *Chron. Patol. Lat.* li. 599; Leo Mag. *Ep.* xxxi. 4, p. 85, Migne); and the tradition which makes him a Tuscan—of Volaterrae, as the inhabitants of that town add—does not seem worthy of credit. His father is said to have been called Quintian (Anastasius, *de Vitis Roman. Pont.*). Of the date of his birth we know nothing exactly, but it must have been about the last decade of the 4th century. He is said (Vig. Taps. *contra Eutyech.* lib. iv.) to have been baptized by Celestine; but if so, this must have been while Celestine was still a simple priest. As to his education, there is no trace in his writings that it comprised any study of pagan authors, and he was throughout life ignorant of Greek (*Epp.* cxxx. 3, p. 1258; cxiii. 4, p. 1194); but his elaborate style, characterised as it is by the literary merits and faults of his age, indicates considerable training in composition. In the year 418 we hear, in the letters of St. Augustine (*Epp.* xcvi. cxv. 1), of a certain acolyte Leo, who was the bearer of a letter from Sixtus, afterwards pope, to Aurelius of Carthage, and apparently also of pope Zosimus's letter in condemnation of Pelagianism, addressed to Aurelius, St. Augustine, and the other African bishops. The mention of Sixtus,



with whom Leo was afterwards connected, and the date of the occurrence, would lead us to identify this acolyte with Leo the Great. If so, it is interesting to think that he should have come in contact early in life with the greatest of Latin theologians. Under the pontificate of Coelestine (422-432) he was a deacon, or (according to Gennadius, *de Vir. Illustr.* 61) archdeacon of Rome. In this capacity he held a most important place in the church. This we may illustrate by two incidents. In 430 the treatise of Cassian, *de Incarnatione*, against the Nestorians, which had been written at Leo's exhortation, was dedicated to him by its author with every expression of respect: "Vicisti sententiam meam laudabili studio et imperiosissimo affectu, mi Leo venerande . . . Romanæ ecclesiæ et divini ministerii decus. Pareo observationi tuæ, pareo jussioni." (Cassian, *de Incarn. Praef.* Migne, Patol. Lat. i. p. 11.)\* In the following year, during the progress of the council of Ephesus, St. Cyril of Alexandria addressed a letter to Leo against the ambitious design of Juvenal of Jerusalem to obtain for his see the dignity of a patriarchate, begging that no sanction to such a design might be given from Rome. Leo himself, in later life, mentions this letter (*Epp.* cxix. 4, p. 1216), and it is a sign of the important position which he held as archdeacon. We find in a similar case, under the pontificate of Leo, Theodoret of Cyrus addressing himself not only to the pope but also to his archdeacon (Leo Mag. *Ep.* lii.; Theod. *Ep.* 118). On the strength of the close union between Celestine and Leo, Quesnel grounds a belief that the latter was the author of the collection of passages on grace, entitled "Praetertorium sedis apostolicæ episcoporum auctoritates de gratiâ Dei," which is attached to pope Celestine's letter against the semi-Pelagians, written in 431 or 432 (Coelestini, *Ep.* xxi. Migne). This collection of passages he thinks that Leo made especially in the hope of converting his friend Cassian, who is reckoned one of the chief of the semi-Pelagians; but the opinion rests only on conjecture. In the same cause he believes him to have written the anonymous books *De Vocatione Gentium*, and, at some date before his pontificate, the letter *ad Demetriadem* (*Dissert.* ii. iii. and iv. in Migne's edition of Leo's works; cf. DEMETRIAS, PROSPER). It is, however, improbable that St. Leo was the author of these works; there is almost no external evidence to support the suggestion, and the evidence of style, though there is sometimes undoubtedly a strong resemblance between the epigrammatic sentences of the *De Vocatione* and the style of St. Leo, is yet not convincing. This work, by whom ever written, while it makes no mention of St. Augustine, seems to represent a modified Augustinianism. (See Ceillier, x. 240; Migne, Patol. Lat. li. 647; Perthel's *Leo I., Leben und Lehren*, pp. 127-135.) Under the pontificate of Sixtus (432-440) the Acta of a Roman council, dated A.D. 433, attribute to St. Leo a prominent share in clearing the character of the pope, who was

accused of the violation of a virgin, but the Acta are recognised as untrustworthy. (Labbe, *Concilia*, iii. 1265; Patol. Lat. lv. p. 192.) In 439 the *Chronicle* of Prosper shews us Leo on the alert against the Pelagians, urging the pope to offer a vigilant resistance to the movements of Julian of Eclanum, who was seeking to obtain readmission to the church without any real recantation of his errors (Prosper, *Chron. Patol.* li. 598).

Very soon after this Leo was sent on an important civil embassy to Gaul. The Western empire at this date was in a condition of extreme weakness; while it was nominally governed by a woman, Placidia, the widow of the late emperor Constantius, and her youthful and feeble son Valentinian III., the real power lay almost wholly in the hands of the general Aetius, who was at this moment engaged in a quarrel in Gaul with another general Albinus. With the barbarian hosts threatening on all sides the tottering empire, such a quarrel must have fatal results; and it is a sign of the important civil position held by Leo the deacon that he was chosen to approach the rivals, and endeavour to bring about a reconciliation (Prosper, *Chron. Patol.* li. p. 599). Meanwhile, during his prolonged absence, the Roman people had an opportunity of shewing the esteem in which they held him. About the middle of August pope Sixtus died. Leo was in his absence promptly elected to fill the vacant see, and an embassy was sent to recall him to Rome. "More than forty days," says Prosper, "the Roman church was without a bishop, awaiting with wonderful peace and patience the arrival of the deacon Leo." On his return he was consecrated on Sept. 29, 440. The first of Leo's works preserved to us is his brief sermon on this occasion, *De Natali Ipsius*, in which, without any rhetorical profession of unwillingness to accept the office, he praises God and returns thanks to the people, asking their prayers for the success of his ministry. (For date of consecration see Ballerini's note, Patol. lv. 193; Tillemont, xv. note 2 on St. Leo.)

It was a difficult and trying moment in which Leo was called to the most important position in Christendom. The Eastern empire was in its normal state of "premature decay," the Western empire was tottering to its fall. On all sides the hosts of the barbarians were pressing upon it. Africa had already fallen a prey to Genseric and the Vandals. The devastation of the once flourishing African church was well-nigh complete. Sicily had suffered severely, and Rome in a few years would again be at the mercy of pitiless invaders. And, like the empire, the church was in evil case. Without, she was encompassed round by the Arian powers of the barbarians. Within, the Manichæans, the Priscillianists, the Pelagians and the semi-Pelagians, were disturbing her peace. In the East Nestorianism was still rife, and Eutyches, who was to give birth to the new dogmatic error with which Leo's name is specially connected, was already an old man. Add to all this the wretched condition of learning, especially in the West, and the extraordinary paucity of men capable of governing or leading, whether in church or state, and you have a crisis when the task which was laid on the shoulders of Leo I. on the day of his con-

\* On the fabulous tales of Leo and Cassian, given in Guesnay's life of the latter, see Quesnel, *Dissert.* i. in Leo Mag. Op. tom. ii. p. 187, Migne; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecl.* xv. note i. on St. Leo.

secration will be seen to be one which would try the best energies of the strongest and the most capable. There was wanted a man who could make the see of St. Peter take the place of the tottering imperial power: there was wanted a man capable above all things of disciplining and consolidating Western Christendom, so that it might present a firm front to the heretical barbarians, and remain in unshaken consistency through all that stormy period which links the ancient with the modern world. The church must be strong, while all else of that old empire was weak. The church, preserving her identity, must give the framework for the society which was to be. In order then that she might fulfil her function, large sacrifices must be made to the surpassing necessity for unity, solidity, and strength. And Leo was the man for the post: lofty and severe in life and aims, rigid and stern in insisting on the rules of ecclesiastical discipline; gifted with an indomitable energy, courage, and perseverance, and a capacity for keeping his eye on many widely distant spheres of activity at once; inspired with an unhesitating acceptance and an admirable grasp of the dogmatic faith of the church, which he was prepared to press everywhere at all costs; finally, possessed with, and unceasingly acting upon, an overmastering sense of the indefeasible authority of the church of Rome as the divinely ordained centre of all church work and life, Leo stands out as the Christian representative of the imperial dignity and severity of old Rome, and is the true founder of the mediæval papacy in all its magnificence of conception and uncompromising strength. His is a simple character, if regarded with sympathy, not hard to understand and to appreciate; representing strongly that one side of the developing life of the church which is especially identified with Rome—authority and unity; and a special interest attaches to the history of Leo from the fact that he stands so much alone, as almost the one considerable man in Christendom. "The dignity of the imperial name may be said to have died with Theodosius the Great." Among churchmen Augustine was just dead, Cyril very soon to die. The best known names are those of Theodoret, Prosper, Cassian, and Hilary of Arles. There was not even an imposing representative of heresy; "on the throne of Rome, alone of all the great sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety."<sup>b</sup> In such an age, and in such a position, a strong man like Leo could not but exercise an abiding influence. We proceed to consider his life and work:—i. in his relation to secular history; ii. in his conflict with the various heresies then troubling the West; iii. in his great struggle with Eutychianism; iv. as the "First Pope" asserting the authority of the Roman see; v. as maintaining ordinary ecclesiastical discipline; vi. as a theologian, preacher, and moralist.

I. Leo was born at a time when the interest of secular history in the West consists mainly in watching the tide of vigorous barbarism sweeping over the decaying life of the old empire. That in strengthening the framework of the church system, Leo was playing an important part in the reconstruction of civil society, has been said above. This undoubtedly is the chief

importance of his work viewed from the side of secular history. Besides this general work we find him standing out on more than one important occasion, which legend can hardly make more strikingly suggestive, as the representative of the imperial city over against the barbarian invader. In the year 452 Attila, having spread desolation over the plains of Lombardy, was encamped upon the Mincius (close probably to where it pours its waters into the lake Benacus), ready to advance towards Rome. The coward Valentinian had fled before him; Aetius, if not treacherous, at least was almost helpless. In this extremity, the emperor, the senate, and the people, intrusted the hopes of the city to a peaceful embassy. Leo, accompanied by the consular Avienus and the prefect Trigetius, undertook to meet the barbarian. They found him with an army enervated partly no doubt by the unaccustomed luxuries of Italian fare, partly, it would seem, by dearth of food, and his own mind wrought upon by a superstitious dread of the fate of Alaric, who "had not long survived the conquest of the eternal city." At the same time, if we may trust Idatius, some auxiliaries sent by the Eastern emperor Marcian had reached Italy, and Marcian's army was subduing, or said to be subduing, the Hunnish settlements beyond the Danube. With these motives for withdrawing acting upon him, it is highly probable that he was additionally impressed by the eloquence and sacerdotal dignity of the Roman pontiff. At any rate, the embassy was well received and was successful; for Attila, yielding to their persuasions, consented to withdraw beyond the Danube, though with threats that he would make Italy suffer more than she had suffered yet, if the princess Honoria, who had offered herself in marriage to the king of the Huns, was not handed over to him, with her rich dowry. (For the influence of the fate of Alaric upon Attila's mind, we have the testimony of Priscus, quoted by Jornandes, who mentions the threats with which Attila withdrew. Idatius, the contemporary Spanish chronicler and bishop, does not mention Leo's name at all in the matter, but attributes Attila's withdrawal to natural causes and to "disease and hunger, the strokes of heaven." Prosper, however, who was then probably in Italy, is a better authority: see Jornandes, cap. xlii.; Prosper and Idatius, *Chron. Patrol.* li. pp. 603, 883; Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, vi. 172; *Mémoires Eccles.* xv. 750, &c.)

The terms on which Attila was induced to withdraw were discreditably enough to the Roman empire; but that the confidence and courage of St. Leo in undertaking the duty of meeting the fearful Hun made a great impression on the Eastern as well as the Western world may be seen from the somewhat curious allusion to it made by the Eastern bishops in the appeal to pope Symmachus about the year 510 (*Patrol. Lat.* lxiii. p. 63). "If your predecessor, the archbishop Leo, now among the saints, thought it not unworthy of him to go himself to meet the barbarian Attila, that he might free from captivity of the body not Christians only, but Jews and Pagans, surely your holiness will be touched by the captivity of soul under which we are suffering." No doubt later ages have exaggerated the importance of Leo's action in the matter, as may be seen in Baronius's account and that of later Roman

<sup>b</sup> Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, vol. i. p. 228.

Catholic writers (*Ann.* 452, § 56, sq.). Later tradition has also introduced into the scene the well-known legend which represents Attila as confessing himself overawed by a miraculous presence, the apparition of St. Peter, and, according to another account, of St. Paul also, threatening him with instant death if he refused to yield. (Baronius boldly maintains the legend, which can plead no respectable evidence. See *Tillem.* xv. 751, &c.) Again, in 455, when Genseric and the Vandals were at the gates of Rome, the defenceless city, "without a ruler and without a standing force," found its sole hope in the dauntless courage of Leo. Unarmed, at the head of his clergy, he advanced outside the walls to meet the invader, and succeeded at least in making him consent to some restraints on the cruelty and licence of devastation. What exactly the barbarian promised, and how much of his promise he kept, is not quite certain, but at least "the mediation of Leo was glorious to himself, and, in some degree, beneficial to his country." (*Gibbon*; cf. *Prosper, Chron.* Patrol. li. 606, "ita lenivit . . . ut ab igne et caede et suppliciiis abstinereetur." *Tillem.* xv. 779, and note 65.) To neither of these two encounters between Leo and the barbarians do we find allusion in his extant writings. In a letter (*Ep.* cix.) dated November 25, 452, to Julian of Cos, which must have been written soon after his return from the meeting with Attila, we find no allusion to it. In the year 453 this Julian wrote condoling with Leo on the evils with which Italy had been visited, but Leo in his reply (*Ep.* cxiii.) makes no allusion at all to the part he personally had borne in averting these evils; and after expressing briefly a hope that "the woes which the Lord has willed or permitted us to suffer, may avail to the correction of those who have been kept safely through them," he passes at once to the Oriental troubles. Clearly, if Leo was the "Saviour of his country," he was not inclined to boast of it. During the period of the Vandal troubles we have no remaining letters of Leo. It is probable that in that time of desolation and dismay he wrote but little.<sup>c</sup> There is a sermon extant which refers probably to the Vandal invasions, but it deals only with the religious duty of gratitude for deliverance (*Sermon* lxxxiv. with *admonitio*, Migne). It remains to speak, under this head, of Leo's relation to the imperial power. We have no reference in his works to the rescript of Valentinian (452) restraining the civil jurisdiction of bishops, a rescript which excites the deep wrath of Baronius and for which he sees the divine punishment in the devastation of the Huns and its author's miserable death (*Baron. Ann.* 452, § 52). A much milder view of the document, which seems to have no very great importance, is taken by *Tillemont* (*Hist. des Empereurs.* vi. 245). At any rate Leo in general had little to complain of in the submissiveness of the Western emperor. Nothing can exceed the ecclesiastical authority which is recognised as belonging to the pope in the constitution of Valentinian, which accompanied Leo's letter into Gaul in the year 448, on occasion of the conflict between Leo and Hilary of Arles (*Leo*

*Mag. Ep.* xi.). This constitution, which has the name of the Eastern as well as the Western emperor at its head, speaks of the "merits" of St. Peter, the dignity of Rome, and the authority of a council as conspiring to confirm the primacy of the Roman bishops. It declares that it is necessary for the peace of all, that all the churches ("universitas") should recognise him as their ruler, and that his decree on the subject of the Gallic church would be authoritative even without imperial sanction; yet by way of giving this sanction, it asserts that "no bishops, whether of Gaul or of other provinces, are to be allowed, contrary to ancient customs, to attempt anything ("ne quid tentare") without the authority of the venerable man, the pope of the eternal city; but that the one law for them and for all is "quicquid sanxit vel sanxerit apostolicae sedis auctoritas;" and if any bishop summoned to Rome neglect to come, the provincial magistrate (moderator) is to compel him. Nothing could be stronger than this language; the document, however, must be considered entirely Western, the result no doubt of pressure put by Leo on the feeble mind of Valentinian. (See *Tillemont*, xv. 441, who calls it "une loy . . . trop favorable à la puissance du siège (de S. Léon) mais peu honorable à sa piété.") That Valentinian and his family were much under Leo's influence is proved also by the letters, which in the early part of 450 he induced him, his mother Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia, to write to Theodosius II. the Eastern emperor, in the interest of Leo's petition for a council in Italy, all which letters reiterate the views of Leo and assert the loftiest position for the see of Rome (*Leo Mag. Epp.* liv.—lviii.). Theodosius, however, was not so amenable to Leo's wishes. In the matter of the councils, the pope, as we shall see, had to submit to the emperor. It was the emperor who summoned the council of Ephesus in 449 (*Ep.* xxix. 840; xxx. 851), Leo the while speaking always respectfully of him<sup>d</sup> (xxxi. 856, 840), but being inclined to complain at least of the short notice which had been given of it (p. 857). The emperor decided the occasion, the place, the time, and the pope apologizes for not attending in person (xxxii. 857). Again after the disastrous termination of the Ephesine synod, Leo cannot obtain from the emperor his request for a gathering in Italy. The summoning of councils still depended on the "commandment and will of princes;" and Leo gives a constant practical recognition to the interference of the Eastern empire in ecclesiastical appointments and affairs generally (*Ep.* lxxxiv. cap. 3, &c.; cf. also *Ep.* cliii. 1, remembering that Aspar was an Arian, *Tillem.* *Empereurs*, vi. 366). In general Leo conceives of the right relation of the empire and the church as a very intimate one. "Human affairs cannot," he says, "be safe unless the royal and sacerdotal authority combine to defend the faith" (*Ep.* lx. 983). He tells the emperor Leo on his accession that his empire is given him "not only to rule the world, but to defend the church" (*Ep.* clvi. 1323). When he praises an emperor he ascribes to him a "sacerdotal" mind (e.g. *Ep.* clv. 1319). The civil power is constantly called upon, at any

<sup>c</sup> There are Collects in the Sacramentary for the month of October, §§ iv., v., praying for the protection of the "Roman name," &c., which may have been composed by Leo at the period of those dangers.

<sup>d</sup> We do not think, considering the tone of the official language of the day, that Leo could be accused of exaggerated flattery of the Eastern Court.

rate in the East, where Leo could not always depend on the ecclesiastical authorities, to do the work of the church (*Ep.* cxii. 1189, cxv. 1203, cxxxvi.), and he justifies the execution of Priscillian in the previous century on the ground "that though the lenity of the church, contented with a sacerdotal sentence, is averse from taking a bloody revenge, yet at times it finds assistance in the severe commands of Christian princes, because the fear of punishment for the body sometimes drives men to seek healing for the soul" (*Ep.* xv. 696). But we must turn from considering Leo as a character in secular history and in his relations to the emperors, and turn to the consideration of him in his more important character as an ecclesiastical ruler.

II. And first in his relation to the various heresies still rife in the West. We have seen reason to believe that Leo in his youth was brought into connexion with the opposition to Pelagianism, and even with St. Augustine, its mightiest foe. We have heard of him urging pope Sixtus to take diligent measures against Julian, and the earliest years of his pontificate seem to have directed his attention to the subject. Septimus, bishop of Altina, in the province of Aquileia, writes (*Ep.* i. Migne) to inform Leo that Pelagian ecclesiastics are being admitted to communion in that province without recantation of their errors, are being reinstated into their ecclesiastical degrees, and allowed, contrary to the canons, to wander from church to church. Leo on learning this writes to Septimus in gratitude (*Ep.* ii.), and at the same time to the metropolitan to complain, desiring him to summon a provincial synod, and extract from suspected persons a condemnation of Pelagian errors so full and unambiguous as to render impossible any craftily veiled retention of the error (i. 591). In these letters he speaks of the heresy as one which was already dead ("extincta dudum scandala," *Ep.* i. 592, &c.), but it seems by an accidental allusion in the work of *Promissionibus*, attributed to Prosper, that Leo was also engaged in conflict with this heresy, and especially with Julian, about the time of his struggle with Manichaeism; of this, however, we hear nothing elsewhere (see *Patrol.* li. 845; *de Prom.* iv. 6, p. 162; *Tillemont*, xv. 431). Of his struggle with the Manichaeans we know more. It appears that recent troubles, and especially the capture of Carthage by Genseric in 439, drove many of these heretics to Rome. They were to be seen there moving about with pale faces, in mean apparel, fasting, and making distinctions of meats. All the while they seem to have made profession of Catholicism, and to have done their best to escape attention (*Leo Mag. Serm.* xvi. 4, xxxv.; *Ep.* xv. 16, p. 708). The vigilance of Leo, however, was too much for them. Of this sect he had a particular horror. Their heresy is a mixture, he says, of all others, while it alone has no element of good in it (*Serm.* xvi. 4; xxiv. 5, "Nihil quod ex ulla parte possit tolerabile iudicari"). Accordingly, in the beginning of the year 444, Leo made a diligent search for them. A large number, both of teachers and disciples, were found, and among them their bishop was taken. A trial was thereupon held in presence of a large number of authorities, ecclesiastical and civil, a "senatus amplissimus," as Valentinian calls it, at which there can be no

doubt that confession was made of the most hideous immoralities in their secret assemblies (*Ep.* vii. p. 624; xv. 16, p. 708; *Serm.* xvi. 4, and *Constitutio Valent.*, *Ep.* viii.). After this those who remained impenitent were banished "in perpetuum" by the civil power, and a constitution of Valentinian reviving the previous laws against the sect, dated June 19, 445, put them under all kinds of civil penalties. Leo, by sermons (ix., xvii., xxiv., xxxv., xlii.) and a circular letter to the bishops of Italy (*Ep.* vii.), did all he could to publish their infamy, and prevent the sect lying concealed, and his exertions appear to have stirred up other bishops, both in the East and West, to similar activity (*Prosper and Idatius, Chron. Patrol.* li. 600, 882). Theodoret, writing in 449, counts this exhibition of zeal against the Manichaeans, one of St. Leo's greatest titles to fame (*Leo Mag. Ep.* lii. cap. 2). In 447 we find Leo sending an account of these proceedings to Turribius, bishop of Astorga (*Ep.* xv. 16, 708). It seems that at this period the Priscillianists were exercising a very disastrous influence in Spain. The state of disorder into which barbarian occupations and wars had thrown that country, preventing as it did the execution of the civil laws, and the combined action of bishops, had resulted in a sad decay of ecclesiastical discipline. The heretics were living as Catholics, and the bishops even were becoming corrupted with the heresy, or at least conniving at it (*Ep.* xv. p. 696, 697, cap. 16 and 17). Under these circumstances, St. Turribius (*q. v.*), the active opponent of the Priscillianists, wrote to Leo for help and advice, and Leo replies in July 447 (*Ep.* xv.). He views the heresy as a mixture of Manichaeism with other forms of evil, heretical and pagan, and exhorts Turribius to get together a synod of all the Spanish provinces to examine into the orthodoxy of the bishops; with this view he sends letters to the bishops of the various provinces; if, however, such a council is impossible, he urges that a provincial synod of Galicia should at least be held (*Ep.* xv. cap. 17). In effect we find subsequent allusions to a Gallician council, to which Leo is said to have written (*Labbe, Concilia*, v. 837 A; *Idat. Chron.* xxiii.), and to a council of various provinces at Toledo in 447, which is said to have acted "cum praecepto papae Leonis" (*Labbe*, ii. 1227 B; cf. *Tillemont*, xv. 555 seq.; *Ceillier*, x. 668). Though we hear still of Novatianism and Donatism in Africa (*Ep.* xii. 6), yet neither against these nor other heresies in the West did Leo take any special measures. We must now speak of his relations to the Eastern heresy of Eutyches.

III. Leo's introduction into Eastern disputes is a somewhat curious one. Eutyches, some time early in the year 448, wrote to Leo apparently deploring the revival of Nestorianism. Leo replies on June 1, applauding his solicitude, and assuring him of the divine assistance in his good work. Leo would seem to have heard no more of Eutyches till early in 449 he received two letters announcing his condemnation in the council of Constantinople—one from the emperor Theodosius, the other from himself. Eutyches's letter (*Ep.* xxi.) is a complaint of the conduct of St. Flavian, and a justification of himself similar to that which he addressed to other chief bishops, explaining his refusal to confess the "two natures," and contains an appeal to the judg-

ment of the Roman pontiff, an appeal for which he declares, but apparently not with truth (EUTYCHES, Tillem. xv. 517), that he could not obtain a hearing in the council, though he professed himself ready to abide by the decision of Rome. The emperor's letter appears also to have been favourable to Eutyches.

Leo, however, did not yield to the temptation of committing himself to the cause of the man who seemed so ready to recognize his authority. Eutyches's own explanation may well have made him hesitate. At any rate, he maintains a cautious attitude: writes to Flavian (*Ep.* xxiii.) complaining that he has sent him no information about the condemnation of Eutyches, that the appeal of the condemned to Rome was, according to his own account, not received, and he himself hastily condemned, though he professed himself ready to amend anything in his faith which should be found at fault. At the same time he writes to the emperor, lamenting his ignorance of the true state of the case (*Ep.* xxiv.). Meanwhile, it appears that Flavian had really written shortly after the conclusion of the council, to inform Leo of what had been done, as he had written to Domnus of Antioch and other prelates. His letter, however (*Ep.* xxii.), had not reached Leo in the end of February, 449.\* Had it arrived, it would have been calculated to give Leo a clearer view of the dogmatic question at issue. Flavian's second letter to Leo, in reply to his (*Ep.* xxvi.), contains no allusion to Leo's complaints of his silence and want of consideration; he characterizes Eutyches's representations as crafty and false, explains clearly the drift of his teaching, and urges the pope to send his subscription to the condemnation, and to keep the emperor on the right side (*Ep.* xxvi. p. 788); the matter, he adds, only needs his assistance to keep it all straight. Leo, by this time, was confirmed in his adhesion to the side of Flavian, and he writes a brief letter in May 449, assuring him of his sympathy (*Ep.* xxvii.). This is followed in June by "the tome" (*Ep.* xxviii.), one of the most justly celebrated of pontifical decrees—nominally a letter to an individual bishop, but really addressed to all the world, Western as well as Eastern;† that tome, which a story, resting professedly on the authority of St. Gregory, declares to have been corrected by the very hand of St. Peter himself, in which, as the Chalcedonian fathers declared, Peter spake by Leo, and which the Roman council assembled under Gelasius held so sacred that they pronounced anathema on him who disputes but one iota of it (Baron. *Ann.* 449, § 40; Labbe, iv. 1263 A). Of the theological aspect of this celebrated letter we will speak below. Suffice it to say now, that in it Leo, though he is a Roman, ignorant of Greek, and is defining points of Greek

theology for Greek-speaking bishops, yet expounds the doctrine of the two natures with great practical clearness and fulness, and lays down in broad lines a definition which steers as clear of Nestorianism as of Eutychianism.‡

We must notice, moreover, that however strongly Leo's letters condemn the doctrine, yet, considering the tone of the controversies of that age, they express considerable tenderness for the person of Eutyches, whom they characterize as "unskilful" and "imprudent," rather than as anything worse, and of whose repentance and restoration, they continually express hopes (*Ep.* xxix.; cf. "qui nulla maturitate cordis ornavit canitiem senectutis," *Ep.* xxxiii.; "qui in senectute carnis, mente sunt parvuli," *Ep.* xxxviii. 888; "error de imperitia magis quam de versutiâ natus," *Ep.* xxx. 848). At the same time with the tome, Leo also sent letters directed against Eutyches's doctrine, and calling attention to his tome, to Pulcheria,<sup>b</sup> to Faustus (*q. v.*), Martin and the other Archimandrites of Constantinople, to the Ephesine council itself, and two to his close friend and correspondent, Julian of Cos (*q. v.* see *Epp.* xxxi.—xxxv.). Meanwhile, Theodosius, at the instance of Eutyches, had directed the assembling of a council, which, professing to be aimed at Nestorianism only, excited much alarm in the minds of Eastern prelates, as well as in that of Leo, who, though he praises the emperor's zeal for religion, yet ventures to hint to him that there is no occasion for assembling a synod in a matter where there is no possibility of doubt—an opinion which he expresses more strongly to Flavian. He also complained of the short time which had been allowed for preparation (*Epp.* xxix. xxxvii. 887, xxxvi. xxxi. 4). Theodosius had sent a request that Leo would himself be present at the council. This, as he writes to Pulcheria, the circumstances of the city would by no means permit; there would moreover, as he tells Theodosius, be no precedent for such a course of action (*Ep.* xxxi. 857, xxxvii. 887). To supply his place he sent ("de latere suo") three legates, Julius bishop of Puteoli, Renatus a presbyter who however died on the road, and Hilary a deacon, afterwards the pope (*q. v.*); to these were joined Dulcitus, a notary, a man of proved fidelity. These legates were to represent on Leo's behalf the spirit at once of severity and of mercy (*Epp.* xxix. p. 841, xxxiv. cap. 2, xxxiii. p. 866). They seem to have left Rome before the 23rd of June. Before they left, Leo had written and sent by them another batch of letters to Theodosius and Flavian (*Epp.* xxxvi. xxxvii.), and we have two more letters very soon after these to Flavian, sent by different messengers, dated June 23 and August 11 (*Ep.* xxxviii. xxxix.). Leo had heard nothing, and his anxiety could not brook silence. Apparently at

\* Nor, indeed, is it certain when, if ever, it did reach Rome. Baronius (ann. 448, § 54) accuses Eutyches of getting Flavian's letter detained, but on no evidence whatever. The "gesta" of the council which Flavian sent with the first letter (xxii. 4) are apparently sent again with the second (xxvi. 786; see Tillem. note xvii.).

† See *Epp.* lxvii., lxviii., which shew us Leo circulating it in Gaul, and the Gallic bishops shewing all anxiety to have the most perfect and correct possible copy from the pope's own hand. *Ep.* lxxxviii., Leo sends his letter to Paschasius of Lilybaeum. Cf. *Ep.* xcvi., Epistle of the council of Milan, *Ep.* xcix., Epistle of Gallic bishops.

‡ Leo owns to a difficulty in expressing the mean between these extremes. In writing to the Palestinian monks (*Ep.* cxxiv. cap. 1), he expresses a fear that his meaning has been lost in translation, owing to persons "non valentes in Graecum eloquium apte et proprie Latina transferre, cum in rebus subtilibus et difficilibus explicandis, vis sibi etiam in sua lingua disputator quisque sufficiat."

<sup>b</sup> We have two letters of the same date to Pulcheria, similar to one another, *Epp.* xxx. xxxi., of which the latter is more theological than the former. See Ballerini's *Admonitio*.

the beginning of October news of the proceedings of this ill-omened council were brought to Rome by the fugitive Hilary (*q. v.*; for proceedings of council see DIOSCORUS). That the council had been packed and managed by Dioscorus; that his own tome had, despite the earnest solicitations of his legates, not been read; that Eutyches had been reinstated and St. Flavian and Eusebius condemned and deposed; finally, that of his own legates, one only had barely escaped to tell the tale—this was the news that Leo heard, and though he was ignorant of the crowning enormity of the murder of St. Flavian, his indignation boils over (*Epp.* xliii. p. 904, xlv. p. 912, xlv. p. 921, cxx. cap. 3, p. 1224, xlv. cap. 2). The proceedings of the council are characterized as a “*sceleratissimum facinus, quod cuncta sacrilegia excedit*”; it was no synod at all, but a “*latrocinium*,” a den of robbers: its acts are null and void: it cuts to the root of the Christian faith (*Epp.* xlv. i. p. 913, lxxxv. i. p. 1051, xcv. 2, xlv. 2, p. 923, xlv. 1, 913). Still he is more indignant than dismayed (*Ep.* xlviii.). The fearful and half-anticipated result of the synod only stirs his energies. There was sitting at Rome, at this time, a council, a “*frequens synodus*,” which seems to represent the whole West, and which appears to have been assembled to consider the present emergency (*Epp.* lxi. 1, xlv. 2, xlvi. 2, lxix. p. 1008). In his own name and that of the council, Leo addresses a number of letters to various quarters. The church of Constantinople and the Archimandrites (*Epp.* l. li.) are exhorted to be loyal to the faith and to Flavian, whose death was not yet known in Rome, and they are assured that no one who may usurp his place while he is alive can be in the communion of Rome or a true bishop (p. 934). There is another very brief letter of consolation to Flavian himself, written in Leo's name alone, promising him all the support he can give him (*Ep.* xlix.). There is another letter to Julian of Cos (*Ep.* xlviii.), also very brief, lamenting the result of the synod, but expressing the fullest confidence in God. Another (*Ep.* xlvii.) is addressed to Anastasius of Thessalonica, congratulating him on his absence from the council, and urging him to constancy for the faith. Besides those, there are three letters (*Epp.* xliii. xlv. xlv.), two to the emperor, and one to Pulcheria. The main topic of those to the emperor is an urgent and solemn request that a larger and more oecumenical council may be held in Italy. Till this has been done, Leo begs the emperor by all that can be named most sacred that everything may be allowed to remain as it was before the first decision at Constantinople (*Ep.* xlv. 2, 915). This request, which is made in the name of all the bishops and churches of the West (“*nostrae partes*,” xlv. 3), is accompanied by the strongest condemnation of the Ephesine council and is backed up by an appeal to the empress Pulcheria (*Ep.* xlv.). The ground of the request is found in the opposition offered in the council to the condemnation of Flavian by the papal legates and especially in the appeal of Flavian (*q. v.*) to Rome, an appeal for the justification of which Leo offers the authority of a Nicene canon (*Ep.* xlv. 916; *vid. infra*).

Later on in the year (Dec. 25), Leo, who is still surrounded by his council, presses his request in another letter to the emperor (*Ep.* liv.); and in March 450 he writes again to stir

up Pulcheria, the archimandrites (*Ep.* lxi.), and the clergy and people of Constantinople, to press his petition for a “*plenaria synodus*” and “*next to the divine assistance to aim at obtaining the favour of the Catholic princes*” (*Epp.* lix. 5, 981, lx. lxi.). Meanwhile, taking the opportunity of the Western emperor, Valentinian, being in Rome with his wife Licinia Eudoxia (Theodosius's daughter) and his mother, Galla Placidia, he gets them all to write letters urging the Eastern emperor to do what the pope wished (*Epp.* lv. lvi. lvii.). Galla Placidia wrote at the same time to Pulcheria, expressing detestation of the Ephesine synod, and describing how Leo, when solemnly asking their intercession with Theodosius, could hardly speak for grief (*Ep.* lviii.).

All this time, however, the “*Catholic prince*” was thoroughly in the interests of Eutyches. In his replies to Valentinian, Placidia, and Eudoxia (*Epp.* lxii. lxiii. lxiv.) he asserts his continued orthodoxy, but professes his complete satisfaction with the Ephesine synod. His reply to Leo is not preserved, but containing, as it did, an absolute refusal to do what he wished, it must have been galling enough to him. And he had another cause of anxiety. Anatolius (*q. v.*) had written to him in the end of 449, telling him of his election in the place of Flavian (*Ep.* liii.). Anatolius had been Dioscorus's representative at Constantinople, and what security had Leo for his orthodoxy? Moreover, he had simply announced his consecration, without asking for any consent to it on Leo's part. But Leo cannot let it pass thus easily. He writes in July 450 to Theodosius, whom he addresses still with the utmost respect, requiring that Anatolius should read the Catholic Fathers and the Epistle of Cyril, without overlooking his own Epistle to Flavian, and then make a public profession of adherence to their doctrine, to be transmitted to the apostolic see and all bishops and churches. This he demands at once and somewhat peremptorily, and sends the bishops Abundius and Asterius, and the presbyters Basil and Senator (*q. v.*) as legates to explain his views, at the same time renewing his request for an Italian council (*Ep.* lxxx.). This letter he backs up with others to Pulcheria, Faustus, and the archimandrites (*Ep.* lxx. lxxi. lxxii.). Leo appears even now to have been full of hope (*Ep.* lxxxiii. to Martin), yet indeed he had good cause for anxiety. Dioscorus had had the audacity to excommunicate him; the emperor was all against him. But before his legates could reach Constantinople, the chief cause of this anxiety was removed. Theodosius died in July 450, and was succeeded by Pulcheria, always Leo's friend, who united to herself as emperor, Marcian, equally zealous for his cause. Dioscorus's hopes were gone. The letter of the new emperor (*Ep.* lxxxiii.), announcing his election, promises also the council to be held specially under Leo's influence (“*te auctore*”) and the letter which follows the arrival of Leo's messengers at Constantinople, asks him either to come himself to the East to assist at it or, if that is impossible, to let the emperor summon the Eastern, Illyrian, and Thracian bishops to some place “*ubi nobis placuerit*” (*Ep.* lxxxvi.). But we hear nothing of Leo's requirement that the council should be in Italy, though he himself did not cease to wish that it should be there (*Ep.* xc. 1). Meanwhile Anatolius has willingly

signed the tome, and not only Anatolius, but "all the church of Constantinople, with a number of bishops:" it appears, moreover, that it was sent for signature to all the metropolitans (*Ep. lxxviii. 3*; Labbe, iv. 546 c): the bishops banished for adherence to Flavian are recalled, and all honour has been shewn to Flavian's body (*Ep. Pulcheria, lxxvii.*). At the same time a large number of the bishops who had been induced by fear to assent to the decrees of the Ephesine synod (by July 451 almost all) had testified their sorrow, and, though by the decision of the papal legates not yet admitted to the communion of Rome, were allowed the privileges of their own churches: Eutyches was banished, though not quite far enough to satisfy Leo, and the result of all this was that everywhere "the light of the Catholic faith was shining forth" (*Epp. lxxx. 2*; *lxxiv. 3*; *cxxxii. p. 1053*). The legates, who returned at once, carried back a number of letters to their master, and in April 451 we have a number of letters from him, expressing genuine satisfaction. He commends all that has been done, praises the "sacerdotal" zeal of Marcian, the diligent watchfulness of Pulcheria, and rejoices in Anatolius's adhesion to the truth (*Epp. lxxviii. lxxix. lxxx.*; cf. *lxxxv. 3*). At the same time he praises the conduct of his legates, and confirms their wish that the names of those bishops, Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Enstathius, who had taken a chief part in the crimes of the council of Ephesus should not be recited at the altar (*lxxx. 3*; *lxxxv. 2*). The really penitent he will readmit to his communion; at the same time he enjoins caution in the readmission of the lapsed (*Ep. to Julian, lxxxi.*). Finally, he commends to Pulcheria and Anatolius the cause of Eusebius (*q. v.*), who was now with him, of Julian, and the orthodox clerics (*Ep. lxxix. lxxx. 3, 4*). But now that orthodoxy was again triumphant, Leo's anxiety for a general council had somewhat cooled; perhaps it was that, since he could not have one in Italy, he did not want one elsewhere. At any rate, he writes to the emperor in April and June 451 (*Epp. lxxxii. and lxxxiii.*), begging him not to allow it to be supposed an open question "whether Eutyches's opinion was impious and Dioscorus's verdict monstrous:" all that is settled. The only question now is about the readmission of the penitent who had fallen into error almost without their own free will (*Ep. lxxxiii. 1*). To assist Anatolius in deciding their case, he sends envoys—Lucentius the bishop and Basil the presbyter, one of the former legates—the case of the heretical leaders being reserved for the "maturer counsels of the apostolic see" (*Ep. lxxv. 2*). As for the council, he wishes it postponed, the times being too unquiet to admit of bishops leaving their dioceses—besides which there is not time enough allowed for Leo to summon the Western bishops (*Ep. xcii. 1065*). In this respect, however, he has to yield to the emperor's wishes, and he writes to him in June 451 (*Ep. lxxxix.*), naming the legates whom he was sending to represent him at the council in addition to Lucentius and Basil, who had gone before, viz. Paschasinus of Lilybaeum and Boniface, a presbyter. To these was added Julian of Cos (*q. v.*), whose knowledge of Eastern affairs made him an important instrument (see *Ep. xcii.*). But though he yields, he makes it a point

that his legates should preside, and that the question of the true faith should not be treated as an open one. This is repeated in another letter to the emperor, written only two days later (*Ep. xc.*), and in an accompanying letter to the council, which it was at first proposed to hold at Nicaea (*Ep. xciii.*). If Leo, presiding in the person of his legates, secures the position of his see, and if the prohibition of maintaining heretical positions ("nec id liceat defendi, quod non liceat credi") gives security to the faith, there will be no cause of anxiety about the council. Only a caution is still needed that the condemnation of Eutyches must not be allowed to become an excuse for any rehabilitation of Nestorianism (*Ep. xciii. end*), and Leo keeps the East alive to the sacrifice he has made in assenting to the council in letters to Marcian and Pulcheria, dated July 20 (*Epp. xciv. xcv.*). At the same time, to secure that his views should be expressed, he armed his legates with written instructions ("commonitorium," cf. Quesnel's note, *Patrol. liv. p. 1226 D seq.*). When the synodal letter of the council of Chalcedon (*Ep. xviii.*) reached Leo, it was couched in terms highly complimentary to himself, and brought the best news as regards the question of faith. Eutyches had been finally condemned and Dioscorus deposed. On these points, Leo expresses his satisfaction (*Ep. to Marcian, civ.*). The faith of the church has been unmistakably asserted. In March 453 he tells Maximus of Antioch (*Ep. cxix.*) that "the glory of the day is everywhere arisen." "The divine mystery of the Incarnation," he tells Theodoret, "has been restored to the age;" "it is the world's second festivity since the advent of the Lord" (*Ep. cxx.*). But while on this score Leo had every cause for joy, there was one decree of the council against which his legates had protested, and which stirred his utmost indignation, viz., the twenty-eighth decree on the dignity of the see of Constantinople, which seemed to imperil the unique position of the see of Rome. But before treating of this matter, we will take a general review of the position and influence of Leo as bishop of Rome up to this point of his pontificate.

IV. It was remarked above that the character of the age into which Leo was born was one which demanded, above all else, a firm consistency and therefore centralisation in the church. The canon of the true faith which Vincent of Lerins had given but a few years before Leo's accession, "Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus," admits of more than one development. If, laying stress upon the "ab omnibus," we claim that every part of the church, individual or collective, is to be allowed to embody the truth in that aspect which is more especially congenial to its individual or national spirit and requirements, we may still have a Christian faith which is one—the same everywhere and the same throughout, but the unity of the faith will be a unity in and through the diversity of various characteristics—a unity which, while it is the fullest and the most comprehensive, carries with it always a tendency to separation and schism. This was not the aspect of the truth akin to Leo's mind. He was no philosopher. His energy was intensely practical and administrative. He does indeed say in one place (*Ep. cxx. § 1*) "that the merit of the sacerdotal office shines out in its strength



there where the authority of the highest is no bar to the liberty of the subordinate," but his policy certainly consistently sacrifices liberty to authority. He had no sympathy with differences of view. "The Catholic faith, which is true and one, may not be vitiated by any diversity"—"varietatem veritas, quae est simplex atque una, non recipit" (*Epp.* cxli. 1, clxxii.); and indeed, if we put aside the case of Hilary, the differences with which he met—such as the half scrupulous, half stupid obstinacy of Eutyche, or the soul-destroying impurities of the then Manichaeism—were not very worthy of consideration. This was an age of little intellectual energy, and was to be succeeded by ages of still less. The world wanted above all things unity and strength, and this was found in taking Rome for a centre and a guide both in faith and in discipline. And accordingly the papal supremacy made a great stride during Leo's life. He has been well called "the first pope," "the Cyprian of the papacy," for just as we associate with the name of Cyprian the formularisation of the equal (in the main) and independent authority of bishops, so now, when simple episcopal government had yielded to the system of metropolitans and patriarchs, we associate with Leo's name the first clear assertion that they too in their turn are subject in some way, still undefined, to Rome. The pyramid must have its apex. And what is Leo's own view of his position? In his sermons preached on his "birthday," i.e. the day of his consecration—an occasion on which a provincial council used annually to be assembled at Rome—he takes occasion to express his sense of his own insignificance indeed, but of the magnitude of his position, and of the presence of St. Peter in his see; "ordinatissima totius ecclesiae charitas" he says ("in Petri sede Petrum suscipit" (*Serm.* ii. 2; cf. iii. 3; v. 4). St. Peter is the rock; St. Peter alone has to "strengthen his brethren" (iii. 3; iv. 3). And not only has he the primacy (iii. 4), but also he is the channel through which is given whatever graces the other apostles have, and so, though there are many bishops and pastors, yet Peter governs them all by his peculiar office ("proprie"), whom Christ governs by His supreme authority ("principaliter"); thus "great and wonderful is the share in its own power which the divine condescension assigned to this man" (iv. 2). And, just as the faith of Peter in Christ abides, so also does the commission of Christ to Peter, and "Peter's care rules still all parts of the church" (iii. 2; v. 4). Thus the see of Rome is the centre of sacerdotal grace and of church authority; it represents Peter, "from whom, as from a head, the Lord wills that His gifts should flow out into the whole body, so that he should know he has no share in the divine mystery who has dared to retire from the solid foundation of Peter" (*Epp.* x. 1, in re Hilary of Arles). The see of Rome, again, occupies in the ecclesiastical world more than the position which the empire of Rome occupies in the secular—"gens sancta, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, caput orbis effecta latius praesidet religione divina quam dominatione terrena"—because the Roman empire uniting the world was just the divine preparation for the spread of the universal Gospel (*Serm.* lxxvii. 1 and 2). This, then, is his theory: let us see how he put it in practice. We see him standing in a watch-tower, with his eye on every

part of the Christian world, zealous everywhere for the interests of the faith and of discipline, and, wherever he sees occasion, taking the opportunity of insinuating the authority of his see, not only in the West, but in the East. The "authority of the apostolic see" to regulate discipline and depose bishops is asserted very absolutely to the bishops of Aquileia and of the home provinces in the beginning of his pontificate; as for the heretics, "obediendo nobis, prorent se esse nostros" (*Epp.* i. v. iv.). With something more of apology (though with the precedent of his predecessors), he asserts his authority—"in order to prevent usurpations" in Illyria (*Ep.* v. 1). As his predecessors had done, he appointed a vicegerent, Anastasius of Thessalonica, to whom he wishes the Illyrian bishops to submit as to himself. He is to be to the metropolitans as they are to the ordinary bishops, and a regular system of provincial administration is ordained, by which the assent of the papal vicarius is required for all episcopal elections, and by which metropolitans are to be ordained actually by him (*Ep.* vi. 4; but cf. xiv. 6, where the latter point is modified). Again, biennial provincial councils, summoned by the metropolitans, referring graver matters to a representative synod, summoned by the vicar, whence again difficult questions are to be referred to Rome—these are to maintain provincial discipline and provide a constant gravitation of graver questions up towards Rome (*Epp.* xiv. 7; xiii. 2). Moreover, any individual bishop can appeal from the metropolitan directly to Rome, as Atticus, the metropolitan of Epirus Vetus, actually did some years later, securing the pope's interference against the cruel treatment of Anastasius (*Ep.* xiv. 1, p. 685). This supremacy of the papal vicar, which is of great historical importance, seems to have been accepted without remonstrance by the Illyrian churches (*Ep.* xiii. 1). Meanwhile, in the year 445, a letter from Dioscorus of Alexandria, probably announcing his succession to St. Cyril, gave Leo an opportunity of dictating to the church of Alexandria (*Ep.* ix.). That church owned St. Mark for her founder, while Rome had been founded by St. Peter; hence should not the church of St. Mark, the disciple of St. Peter, be in complete accord with the church of his master? On the strength of this relation between the churches, Leo gives Dioscorus detailed directions about the days of ordination and the celebration of mass.<sup>1</sup> About the same time the restless energy of Leo was engaged in his famous controversy with St. Hilary of Arles. This controversy (for which see under HILARY), which is of special importance as being the first case in which "the supremacy of the Roman see over Gaul was brought to the issue of direct assertion on the pope's part, of inflexible resistance on the part of his opponent," arose out of an appeal of a bishop, Celidonius, to Rome against the judgment of Hilary. In this place it is only necessary that we should make a few remarks on its general features. And first we must observe that, however little we may be disposed to deny that some blame attaches to Hilary in the matter, we cannot doubt that Leo's conduct was

<sup>1</sup> It seems, however, that in fact Egypt retained its ancient customs (Tillem. xv. 440).



imperious, precipitate, unjust, and not over-scrupulous. The fact is he was tempted by the opportunity which the appeal offered of pressing a disputed claim of the Roman see and extending the Roman prerogative, and the temptation was too strong for him; his violent language about the saintly Hilary (*Ep. x.*), his high-handed treatment of Gallic rights, and his attempt to give a sort of primacy in Gaul to Leontius on the mere score of age (*q. v.*)—these parts of Leo's conduct cannot be defended. Indeed, he seems to betray a consciousness that he is treading on doubtful ground in the beginning of his letter to the Gallic bishops—he is so careful to assert that there is nothing new in his proceedings, and that he is only defending the Gallic bishops from the aggressions of Hilary. He professes, we observe, to consult them (*cap. 4*); he fortifies his own arm with an imperial edict, for which he must be held in the main responsible (*vide supra*); we notice too that, though he apparently excluded Hilary from his communion, he did not venture to depose him from his episcopal functions, and on his death speaks of him as "sanctae memoriae" (*Ep. xl.*; cf. Tillemont, xv. 80, 89). Lastly, we must notice that the peremptory orders of Leo seem to have obtained but inadequate execution in Gaul (Tillemont, xv. 86). This is seen in the election of Ravennius, Hilary's successor. Leo had desired (*Ep. lxi. 2*) that the privileges which he took from Hilary should be given to the bishop of Vienne; now this latter seems to have taken no part in the consecration of Ravennius, as he must have done if Leo's desires in this respect had been carried out, and yet Leo speaks of this consecration as constitutionally conducted and divinely inspired (*Epp. xl. xli.*), and he certainly appears in the directions which he gives Ravennius to recognise him as a metropolitan (*Ep. xliii.*; Tillemont, xv. 93). Of the mode in which Ravennius was consecrated, the bishop of Vienne seems to have made no complaint. He did, however, complain of the ordination by Ravennius of a bishop of Vaison (*Ep. lxi. 1*). This complaint was followed on the other side by a petition from nineteen bishops of the three provinces formerly subject to Arles, asking for the restoration to that see of its former dignity. Leo had now an opportunity to mediate. However imperfectly subservient to Leo's wishes the Gallic church had hitherto been, the tone of this letter is sufficiently abject. The pope's authoritative attitude and the imperial edict had done their work. They simply put themselves in Leo's hands. They ground the claim of Arles on ancient custom, civil dignity, and specially on the fact that in Trophimus that town had had the first Gallic bishop, and Trophimus had been sent by St. Peter; they even claim for Arles a certain authority over all Gaul as the viceroy of the Roman see. Having received this appeal, so satisfactory in its tone, and the counter-complaint from Vienne, Leo proceeded to divide the authority. He examined carefully, he says, the rival claims of Vienne and Arles, and ultimately assigned a limited authority over four churches to the bishop of Vienne, and the rest of the province of Vienne to Arles; of the claims of Arles to larger metropolitan rights, he says nothing (*Ep.*

*lxvi.*). This decision seems to have been acquiesced in by Ravennius, but did not succeed in finally stopping the disputes of the rival sees (Tillemont, xv. 95, 96). In company with the letter containing the decision, Leo sends his tome to Ravennius for distribution in Gaul and secret communications, "quae committenda litteris non fuerunt" by the mouth of the messengers.

Probably about the year 446 we find Leo correcting some scandals, and at the same time asserting his authority in what still remained of the church of Africa, too weak and disorganized now, from the devastations of Genseric and the recently concluded war, to resist interference as she had done in the days of Celestine. He had heard of violations of discipline there in the election of bishops, and had sent a representative to make inquiries into the facts; on receiving his report, he writes them a letter (*Ep. xii.* to the bishops of Mauretania Caesariensis), assuming complete authority over the administration of their church. It appears that he had even received an appeal from an African bishop, Lupicinus (*q. v.*), and had reversed the decision of the African church in receiving him to communion.\*

In 447 we have seen Leo entering into the affairs of the church of Spain, distracted like the African with barbarian invasions, and dictating the course to be pursued against the Priscillianist heretics; and in this same year we find him sharply reprimanding the Sicilian bishops for the alienation of church property, of which complaints had been laid before him in a Roman synod by the clerics of the churches so robbed (*Ep. xvii.*). He threatens with deposition all who had a share in such alienations, and in a letter of the same date, giving directions about baptism, he insists on their absolute conformity to the customs of the Roman church, "whence they receive the consecration of their office," and enjoins the attendance of three Sicilian bishops annually, "coram beatissimo Apostolo Petro" at the Roman council (*Ep. xvi. 1 and 7*). Some months after this he receives an appeal from a presbyter of Beneventum, and interferes with some irregular promotion which had taken place in that church (*Ep. xix.*). The course of events now brings us to consider the bearings of the Eutychiean controversy upon the authority of Rome. First, then, that controversy went far to aggrandise the position of Rome, because, while the church and empire of the Western world were centring more and more around the papacy, this controversy turned the eyes of all the East to Rome as the seat of dogmatic truth, and the refuge of oppressed orthodoxy. Rome's pretensions to a superior jurisdiction are older than her claims to be the source of dogmatic truth. The claim of infallibility is yet unheard, but it went far to lay the ground of this claim that in the last great controversy about the Incarnation it was Rome's utterance which became the standard of orthodoxy. The glory of being the safest dogmatic guide coalesced with increasing authority as the centre of discipline and government. No doubt, when the letter of Leo to Flavian went out for signature east and west, it went out on the authority of a council; no doubt, there is

\* Quesnel and others, however, have doubted the genuineness of this part of the letter (see *Admonitio* of the Ballerini in Migne).

† This is denied by the Ballerini and others.

no approach to a claim to dogmatic authority as bishop of Rome on Leo's part; still the letter was Leo's letter, and the stream of things was running in the direction of his exaltation. Moreover, the position of Rome at this period made Leo the recipient of appeal after appeal. Eutyches, Flavian, Eusebius, Theodoret, the presbyters Basil and John (*Ep.* lxxxvii.), made, or were supposed to have made, an appeal in turn, and gave Leo an opportunity of asserting an old claim. The council of Sardica had framed a canon, allowing appeals from discontented bishops to pope Julius (*q. v.*). This canon, with the others of this council, was in the Roman church included under the head of canons of Nicaea, and as such had been quoted by the popes; but that this it was not, the African church had shewn quite clearly in the time of Zosimus. Nevertheless, though Leo could not be ignorant of this fact, he still alleges the authority of Nicaea for the right of appeal (*Ep.* liv. p. 917, in the case of Flavian). No "custom of the Roman church" can justify this. (For the Roman canons, see collection in Migne's *Patrol.* lv. init.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* § 92.)

But to return. We must notice the relations between Leo and the Eastern bishops through the Eutychian controversy. And first Leo appears to make no exact or definite claim over the Eastern bishops. He professes his "universalis cura" for the welfare of the whole church (*Ep.* lxxv.), and he claims to be kept fully alive to what goes on in the East (cf. *Ep.* to Flavian, xxiii.), while the power of excluding from his own communion gave him a sort of hold on the episcopal elections. He requires that they should be notified to him, and that he should have satisfactory proofs of the orthodoxy of a new bishop (cf. his language at the confirmation by him of Anatolius's election); "nostra communico" all through his writings is an expression of much meaning and weight. Moreover, we have seen that he claimed a right of receiving appeals from all parts of the Christian world, and we shall see him trying to annul the authority of a canon of Chalcedon which displeased him. But when he comes to write his celebrated letter to Flavian, on the subject of the true faith of the Incarnation, he writes in a tone no wise different from that adopted by St. Cyril in his letters against Nestorius. The bishop of Ravenna (Peter Chrysologus), at the beginning of the Eutychian controversy, wrote to Eutyches recommending him to listen to Rome, because "the blessed Peter who lives and presides in his own see gives the truth of the faith to those who seek it" (*Ep.* xxv. ad fin.),<sup>1</sup> but there is nothing of this tone in Leo's own words. He classes his letter with that of Cyril (*Ep.* lxxvii. lxix. 1006): "non aspernetur Anatolius," he

<sup>1</sup> He goes on: "nos enim pro studio pacis atque fidei extra consensum Romanæ civitatis Episcopi causas fidei audire non possumus." In this there seems no more of submission than would have been practised towards the church of Alexandria by its subordinates (see notes *in loc.*), but we must notice that this second chapter of Peter's letter is omitted in most of the MSS. of Leo's letters (it is certainly omitted in the two Harleian MSS. of the British Museum, 3074, sæc. xi., 3268, sæc. xv.), and has to be supplied from another source. Milman doubts its genuineness, but probably without ground (see *Admonitio*, Migne).

says, "etiam meam epistolam recensere, quam pietati patrum per omnia concordare reperiet" (lxx. 1010). After the council of Chalcedon, when he commends his own letter, he commends it as confirmed by the council and witnessed to by patristic testimony (e.g. *Ep.* cxx. to Theodoret, cap. 4; cf. especially *Ep.* cx. 3, 117, where he fortifies himself by the authority of St. Athanasius; and *Ep.* cxxiii. 2, where he speaks of his tome simply as "synodalia decreta;" *Ep.* cxxxix. 4; Leo attached the "testimonia patrum" to his tome after the Robber council, *Ep.* lxxxviii. 3).

As regards the Eastern bishops, Theodoret (*q. v.*), in making his appeal (*Ep.* lii.), addresses him in language very reverential to his see, in language in fact which in another age or context might sound ironical. "If Paul betook himself to Peter that he might carry back from him an explanation to those who were raising questions at Antioch about their conversation in the law, much more do I," &c.; but it is notable that while he says it is expedient that the pope should have the first place (primas) in all things, he grounds this position of the Roman see on (1) the greatness of Rome; (2) the continuous piety of the church; (3) the possession of the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul: not, as we see, the sort of prerogatives on which Leo would ground his primacy. As for Flavian, he addresses Leo in a way entirely consistent with the dignity of his own see. He informs him of the condemnation of Eutyches (*Ep.* xxii.), but only that he may put the bishops subordinate to him on their guard, and when he asks for his subscription (*Ep.* xxvi.), asks it for an already canonically made deposition. At the council of Chalcedon, Leo was treated with all possible respect. He had required (*Ep.* lxxxix. to Marcian) that his legates should preside, "on account of the inconstancy of so many of his brethren." Certainly the doubtful orthodoxy of so many of the chief Eastern bishops, and the connexion of Anatolius with Dioscorus, would have made it difficult, even on the ground of orthodoxy, to find any one so fit as the Roman legates to preside. Besides this, all the influence of Marcian and Pulcheria was on the side of Leo, "giving him entire authority" (*Theodor. Lector*, lib. i), except in the matter of the place of the council; there would then have been reasons enough for giving him the presidency, even if Leo had not been Leo and Rome Rome. As he was, there was no direct opposition, and the influence of his legates was strong enough to enforce in a great measure his wishes as to Dioscorus (*q. v.*). When the synod proceeded to read Leo's tome, some Illyrian and other bishops raised doubts on certain expressions in it. Explanations were therefore given and conferences held, where those points were shewn by the legates and others to be in agreement with the doctrines of councils and the epistle of Cyril (Labbe, iv. 367 c d, 491 d). Finally, his letter was unanimously received, because it was in agreement with the decrees of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus, and the Epistles of St. Cyril (p. 471 sq.). "Peter," the bishops cried, "spoke thus by Leo! Leo teaches truly! Cyril taught so! Eternal the memory of Cyril! Leo and Cyril teach alike! This is the faith of the fathers!" (367, 368).

It will be seen, then, that Leo's letter was treated by the council like the letter of any other highly respected churchman; and in the eighth session of the council we find Leo's decision on the orthodoxy of Theodoret was not accepted till the bishop in question had satisfied the synod that he really was orthodox (Labbe, iv. 621 C, D). But there are one or two points in which especial reverence for Leo was shewn in the council. We notice that, according to the acts of the council, the form in which the papal legates expressed the condemnation of Dioscorus was, "The archbishop of the great and elder Rome, through us and through the holy synod now present, together with the . . . apostle Peter, who is the rock . . . has stripped Dioscorus of all sacerdotal dignity" (Labbe, iv. 426c). This "sentence" indeed exists in a widely different form, as sent by Leo himself to the Gallic bishops (*Ep.* ciii.), in which Leo is described as "head of the universal church," and condemns "by us his vicars with the consent of the synod." This and other more considerable differences in the two versions may make us doubtful as to what the original version may have been; but the *Acta* are probably the best authority, as we do not know exactly whence Leo's version may have come; and in any case, certainly the papal legates were regarded as *passing sentence on Dioscorus with the consent of the council* (cf. *Patrol.* li. p. 989, note b; *Evagr. Hist.* ii. 4).

It remains to observe that the title "oecumenical archbishop" is used of Leo in the plea of Sophronius against Dioscorus (411 D), and the title "bishop of all the churches," or "of the oecumenical church," by the papal legates.<sup>m</sup> It is, perhaps, in mistaken allusion to these expressions of individuals that pope Gregory I. states that the bishops of Rome were called "universales episcopi" by the council of Chalcedon (*Greg. Mag. Epp.* lib. v. ep. xviii. 743, Migne), and that the title thus offered to them had been consistently rejected (pp. 749, 771, 919).

The synodical letter (*Ep.* xviii.) which the assembled bishops wrote to Leo was highly complimentary to him. They speak of him as the "interpreter to all of the blessed Peter." He has presided by his legates as "the head over the members" (cap. 1). It is he who took away his dignity from Eutyches (cap. 2). They express their indignation at the monstrous attempt which Dioscorus made to excommunicate Leo, "he to whom the Saviour intrusted the care of the vine" (cap. 3); but all this language, so acceptable to Leo, serves to usher in a very unpleasant matter. The first council of Constantinople had decreed that the bishop of that place should have the primacy of honour after the bishop of Rome, because "it is itself new Rome" (Labbe, ii. 947c). Leo's statement, that this canon had never taken effect, is entirely untrue. On the contrary, the precedence of honour had become an extensive jurisdiction (Tillem. xv. pp. 701 sq.); and this jurisdiction had now been sanctioned by the 28th canon of the council of

Chalcedon, which professed to confirm the canon of Constantinople. "The fathers," they say, "gave with reason the primacy to the chair of old Rome, because that was the royal city, and, with the same object in view, the 180 pious bishops gave equal primacy (*τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεία*) to the chair of new Rome" (which phrase, however, is afterwards explained by the words "*being next after old Rome*"); this addition to the rank of new Rome is grounded on her imperial position; it is then further allowed that the see of Constantinople should have the right of ordaining the metropolitans of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and certain other bishops (Labbe, iv. 795 D sq.).

From the discussion on this subject in the council the papal legates had retired, saying they had no directions from Rome in the matter; but when the Eastern bishops had confirmed the canon, learning what had happened, they demanded and obtained another session, when they protested against what had been done, but protested in vain (Labbe, iv. session 12). Doubtless the bishops had been partly inspired by jealousy of Rome, whose presidency at the council would have seemed to them an example of her usual self-assertion. At any rate, Leo's oft repeated sneer, that they had been compelled to sign, was stoutly denied in session by themselves (Labbe, iv. 809, 813 B seq.). This canon the council announce to Leo: their object in making it was, they say, to secure order and good discipline, and it was made at the wish of the emperor, the senate, and the citizens (*Ep.* xviii. 1097): they therefore express a good hope that Leo will not resist it as his legates did. At the same time, Leo received letters from Marcian, Anatolius (*Epp.* c. ci.), and Julian, expressing joy at the successful suppression of heresy and endeavouring to conciliate him in regard to the 28th canon. Anatolius writes in as conciliatory a tone as possible, urging that the jurisdiction actually reserved for Constantinople is less than custom had sanctioned, repeating that it was at the wish of emperor, senate, and consuls, that the canon was passed, and complaining gently of the conduct of the legates after so much deference had been shewn them. It would seem from the words of the "Commonitorium" which he intrusted to his legates (Labbe, iv. 829 E) that Leo had had some inkling of what the council might do in this respect. Indeed, Eusebius of Dorylaeum stated in session that he had actually read this canon to Leo, when at Rome, in presence of some clerics from Constantinople, and that he had accepted it (815 B). Whatever this may mean, Leo is now extremely indignant. A very angry tone runs through the letters to Marcian, Pulcheria, Anatolius, and Julian (*Epp.* civ.-cvii.). He urges that when Anatolius's antecedents were so doubtful, an attitude of humility would have best beseeemed him (*Ep.* civ. cap. 2; cv. 3; cvi. 5), that secular importance cannot confer ecclesiastical privilege, "*alia enim est ratio rerum saecularium, alia divinarum*" (civ. 3), and that the canon is in flat contradiction to the unalterable decrees of Nicaea, alluding probably to the sixth canon, on the rights of certain metropolitans. He treats very scornfully the assent of the Chalcedonian bishops; it is an "extorta subscriptio;" what can it avail against the protest of the

<sup>m</sup> Lest we should attach too much importance to these flattering titles in the Eastern world, we should notice that the same title is applied to *Dioscorus* at Ephesus (Labbe, iv. 270, 472 A, 479 E; Tillem. xv. 564).

legates? (*Ep.* cv. 1055). He thinks just as little of the decree of Constantinople (*Ep.* civ. 2). He charges Anatolius with having diverted the council from its own proper object to subservise his ambitious purposes (*Ep.* cvi. 2), and finally he takes up the cudgels for Antioch and Alexandria, though the bishops of those sees, Theodoret and Maximus, had signed the decree—which indeed does not appear to interfere with the prerogatives which the canon of Nicaea assigned them (cf. Tillem. xv. p. 709), while not only had custom long allowed to Constantinople a position of superior dignity, but that position had been secured to her by a council, of the authority of which Leo has no right to speak so scornfully. It is not the place here to examine the complete accord of the Chalcedonian canons with the Nicene, nor the necessity of such agreement, but we cannot but ask whether these exhortations to avoid ecclesiastical ambition which Leo frequently uses, and such contention for the canons of Nicaea, came with a good grace from the mouth of a bishop of Rome. If anything can justify Leo's claims, surely it is not the council of Nicaea. In February 453 the emperor writes to Leo, begging him to send as soon as possible his confirmation of the acts of Chalcedon, that those who were disposed to shelter themselves under the excuse that he had not confirmed them might have this ground cut away from under their feet (*Ep.* cx.). Leo in answer to this writes, March 11, to the council and to the emperor (*Epp.* cxiv. cxv.), saying that, if Anatolius had shewn his letters, which he had motives for concealing, no doubt could have existed as to his approval of the decrees of the council, "that is, *as regards faith* (in sola videlicet causa fidei, quod saepe dicendum est), for the determination of which alone the council was assembled by the command of the Christian prince and the assent of the apostolic see" (cxiv. 1). In writing to the emperor, he sends his assent to the decrees concerning faith and the condemnation of the heretics as a matter of obedience to him, and begs him to make his assent universally known (cxv. 1204, cf. also *Epp.* cxxvi. cxxvii.). Meanwhile Leo has suspended all correspondence with Anatolius (*Epp.* cxvii. 5), and without directly alluding to the disputed canon finds another matter on which to vent his wrath on him. He has, under pretext of promotion to the care of a cemetery, set aside Aetius the Catholic archdeacon, and put one Andreas, whom he formerly deposed for Eutychnianism, in his place. (See Tillem. xv. § 127.) The rights and wrongs of the matter need not be here discussed. Clearly Leo is not in the mood to make the best of Anatolius's actions, and he writes bitterly against him to Marcian and Pulcheria (*Epp.* cxi. and cxii.), begging them to administer a stern reproof to the archbishop; this he writes word to Julian (*Ep.* cxiii.) that they have done. Meanwhile (*Ep.* cxvii. 4) he tells Julian that these wrongs must be patiently borne, "lest we seem to exceed the measure of our accustomed moderation." He expresses, however, his indignation at learning that Anatolius has summoned the Illyrian bishops in order to secure their subscriptions to his pretensions, and he writes to Maximus of Antioch, stirring him up to assert the true position secured to his see by the decrees of Nicaea, and takes the

opportunity of reasserting his view of these decrees as overriding and rendering null and void those of all subsequent councils which may contradict them (*Ep.* cxix. 4 and 5). In the same year (453) Leo seems to have appointed Julian of Cos (*g. v.*) to watch over his interests and those of the faith, as his apocrisarius at Constantinople. In March of the following year (454), in answer to a letter of the emperor's on behalf of Anatolius, Leo professes himself quite ready to be reconciled, if Anatolius will express penitence and keep the canons (*Ep.* cxxviii.). This produces an expression of penitence and self-humiliation from Anatolius (*Ep.* cxxxii.). In the matter of Aetius he does all that Leo could ask or wish; in the matter of the twenty-eighth canon, he appears to speak of it as "confirmed by the universal synod," only he shifts the responsibility off his own shoulders on to those of his clergy, and deprecates the charge of arrogance; besides he says that there too "the whole force and confirmation of what was done was reserved for the authority of your blessedness." With this Leo is satisfied. He takes it for a retraction of the whole claims of the church of Constantinople (*Ep.* cxxxiii. cap. 3). As such indeed it might be read, only whatever it may have meant, the canon as a matter of fact, and despite the opposition of the pope, did take effect (see Tillem. xv. 730), and that in Leo's own lifetime. It was no doubt one of the causes which helped towards the ultimate severance of East and West.

In leaving the subject of the council of Chalcedon and its twenty-eighth canon, we cannot do better than quote the words of Thorndike (*Works*, vol. iv. p. 457, Library of Anglo-Cath. Theol.). "To what effect is that disowned, which takes place without him who protests against it? Unless it be set up as a monument of half the church disowning the infinite power of the pope, the other half not pleading it, but only canonical pre-eminences by the council of Nicaea." Indeed, despite the reverential speeches of council, emperor, and bishops to Leo, neither this canon nor the attitude of the council towards Leo's tome, nor indeed Leo's own way of talking about it, gives modern Romanists any great cause for satisfaction with the council of Chalcedon. After this we have other letters from Leo to Anatolius expressing friendly relations, but Leo's constant interference in the affairs of his see could not allow his feelings towards him to be otherwise than somewhat jealous (cf. *Epp.* cxxxvii. cli. epistles to Julian at Constantinople and *Ep.* cxliii., the last which passed between them).

Meanwhile, in maintaining the cause of the faith, Leo was asserting his prerogative in many quarters. In 451 Leo's tome was approved in a council under Eusebius of Milan; this council addressed a highly complimentary letter to him (*Ep.* cxvii.), in which, however, we notice that the tome is commended as agreeing with the statements of St. Ambrose, just as it was by the council of Chalcedon as agreeable to the mind of St. Cyril. There is, however, nothing in this which could offend the feelings of Leo.

About the next year the East was troubled by the tumultuous proceedings of the Eutychnian monks in Palestine, headed by one Theodosius, who elected a bishop in place of Juvenal, seized Jerusalem, and committed all sorts of violences (cf. THEODOSIUS, MARCIAN, Tillemont, xv. §

138, &c.). These disturbances caused Leo great anxiety (*Ep.* cix.), and the letters of Marcian and Pulcheria to the monks, which went far towards restoring quiet, were highly praised by him (*Ep.* cxv. 2; cxvi. 2; cxvii. 2, where he speaks of their acting "divina inspiratione," and being "sacerdotalis sanctitatis"). He himself addressed them a letter some time in the course of this year, explaining the true faith (*Ep.* ccxiv.). He is afraid that the translation of his tome has misled them, and proceeds to a clear and admirable exposition of the faith, as lying between Nestorian and Eutychian error. About the same time, having received secret instructions from the emperor, he wrote the second of two letters of remonstrance to the princess Eudocia (*q. v.*), who was encouraging the revolt of the monks (*Ep.* ccxvii. 3; ccxiii.); the first to Eudocia is lost). His anxiety, meanwhile, was very great; but in January of the next year (454) he can congratulate the emperor on the restoration of order and orthodoxy; and in the same year he writes to congratulate Juvenal on his restoration to his see and to admonish him to keep soundness of faith in the reality of the divine Incarnation (*Ep.* ccxxv. ccxxvi. ccxxix.). The monks, however, were giving trouble elsewhere. One named George had stirred Cappadocia, and Leo is not satisfied with his bishop's attitude towards him (*Ep.* ccxviii.). Two others, Carosus and Dorotheus (*q. v.*), are spreading Eutychianism in Constantinople itself (*Ep.* ccxxvi. and ccxlii.). Besides this, more important troubles arise out of the violence of the Eutychian monks in the Alexandrian diocese, to which we must briefly refer. Proterius, who was elected in place of Dioscorus, had signified his accession in 452 to Leo in a letter which did not give him complete satisfaction. In 454, however, he received another letter entirely satisfactory on the subject of his faith, in return for which he promises to support the rights of his see, alluding again however to the relation of St. Mark, who founded the Alexandrian church, to St. Peter who founded the Roman (*Ep.* ccxiv. 3; ccxvii. ccxxix.). Meanwhile he suggests, in writing to Marcian, that readings of the Catholic Eastern fathers should be made in the ears of the Alexandrian people, and is very anxious that an accurate translation of his own tome should be secured to them (cf. *Ep.* ccxxx. ccxxxi. to Julian). All this anxiety was due to the very strong hold which Eutychian error still had in Egypt and Alexandria. Leo hoped much from Dioscorus's death, and imperial efforts, "Instabiles animos habeant quod paveant, non habeant quod sequantur;" still this anxiety of mind shews itself in constant letters, and on the death of Marcian in 457 Eutychian risings were attempted in Constantinople and Alexandria (*Ep.* cxi. cxliv.). The former was suppressed, but in the latter place they assumed dangerous proportions, and, among other enormities, Proterius was massacred and Timotheus Aelurus usurped the see. Leo (*Ep.* cxlv.), writing to congratulate the new emperor Leo on his accession, urges him to active measures against the heretics, and by constant letters does all he can to keep Anatolius and Julian, as well as the emperor, zealous for the Chalcedonian decrees and the suppression of heresy. He is urgent that the question of the faith should

not again be allowed to come into discussion. To impress his mind on the Christian world, he writes to Basil, the new bishop of Antioch, complaining by the way that he had not, "according to ecclesiastical custom," notified his consecration to him, and addresses other letters against Timotheus Aelurus to the bishops of Thessalonica, Jerusalem, Corinth, and Dyrhachium, which he sends for distribution to Julian (*Ep.* ccxlix. cl. clii.). At the same time, to strengthen the force of consent to his tome, he sends the expressions of agreement to it from the bishops of Gaul and Spain in a letter to Aetius, and writes (Oct. 11, 457) condoling with the refugee Egyptian Catholics now in Constantinople (*Ep.* cliv. clv. clx.). "They are not," he says, "exiles from God." Meanwhile, a circular letter from the emperor, asking all the metropolitans to summon provincial councils and collect the opinions of their bishops on the conduct of Timotheus Aelurus and the authority of the Chalcedonian decrees, gave Leo an opportunity of again impressing his views on the emperor, and urging him to make up by his zeal for any laxity in Anatolius (*Ep.* clvi. cap. 6). He had to resist at once all inclination on the emperor's part to listen to the suggestions which accused his doctrine of Nestorianism, and to oppose strongly the idea of assembling another council, which the emperor had entertained. When the emperor dropped the idea of a council, he proposed, wherever the suggestion may have come from, a conference between some of the Eutychian heretics and an envoy of the pope (*Ep.* clxii.). This again Leo cannot consent to, involving, as it would, the discussion of the faith which had been once for all determined, as if it were an open question ("patefacta quaerere, perfecta retractare, definita convellere"). He does send legates, not however to dispute, but to teach "what is the rule of the apostolic faith;" and some time in the same year he addresses to Leo a long dogmatic epistle (*Ep.* clxv.), which has sometimes been called the "second tome," closely parallel to the epistle which he had before sent for the instruction of the Eutychian monks of Palestine. To it is attached a collection of testimonies, more ample than that which he had previously sent to Theodosius. In the year 460, Leo saw his wishes realized in the expulsion of Timotheus Aelurus, who however was allowed to come to Constantinople. Leo writes in June to congratulate the emperor on his energy against Aelurus, and to impress on him the need of a pious and orthodox bishop for the see of Alexandria ("in summo pontifice," *Ep.* ccxix. cap. 2). At the same time he writes to Gennadius, the new bishop of Constantinople, who had succeeded Anatolius in 468, urging him to be on his watch against Aelurus, whose arrival at Constantinople he deplored. It appears that he would be likely to have a considerable following there. The bishop who was actually elected for Alexandria, Timotheus Solofaciolus, met with Leo's warm approval.

The letters which Leo wrote at this time (August 461) to Timotheus, his church, and some monks of Egypt (*Ep.* clxxi. clxxiii.) are the last public documents of his life. Before his death

<sup>2</sup> Leo does not fail to seize an opportunity of dictating to him on matters of discipline (*Ep.* clxxviii. March 489).

it was vouchsafed to him to see the peace of the church established and orthodoxy supreme, for a period at least of sixteen years, in the elevation to the throne of Alexandria of Timothy Solofaciolus. We have traced Leo's conduct through his lifetime; we have seen him occupied in the affairs of the world, exerting his paramount influence in Italy, in Sicily, in Gaul, in Spain, in Africa, in Illyria, at Constantinople, at Antioch, in Palestine, in Egypt, indeed over the whole Christian world; we have seen him striving everywhere to secure the supremacy of the true faith of the Incarnation, and with this faith, of the church of St. Peter, over which he presided. In pressing the authority of his see in Constantinople, in Africa, in Gaul, in Illyria, we must at least confess that he was heedless of the rights of national churches, harsh and violent in his treatment of Hilary, and not always very scrupulous in his assertions about the canons of Nicaea; but though we may not thus altogether acquit him of blame, we may at the same time urge that personal ambition in his case was wholly merged in the sense of the surpassing dignity of his see and that his zeal was always high-minded, and always inspired by an overmastering passion for unity in faith and discipline. And who can say how it would have fared with that faith and that discipline in those days of weakness and trouble if a man of Leo's persistence, integrity, piety, and strength had not been raised up to defend and secure both the one and the other?

V. We have considered Leo as exercising a general supervision on church discipline. It remains to consider a little more in detail the character of the discipline which he enforced. We shall find the notes of it to be authority, uniformity, and antiquity, the authorities to which he appeals being Scripture, tradition, and the decrees of councils or the holy see. His zeal for uniformity shewed itself in the beginning of his reign by the care he took that the whole of Christendom should celebrate Easter on the same day. In the year 444, according to the Roman calculation it would fall on March 26, according to the Alexandrian on April 23. In this difficulty Leo wrote to St. Cyril, who replied, of course, in favour of the Alexandrian computation. After this he consulted Paschasinus, his referee now and again on the subject, the bishop of Lilybaeum (*q. v.*), who gave the same reply. Whether the fragment given in Migne after *Ep. ii.* is Cyril's reply to *St. Leo* is not certain. It appears, as we have it, to be addressed to the West, but to a number of persons (*charissimi*, p. 604). Its tone, "praecipio vobis," is strikingly different from that of Paschasinus's letter, which is almost abject: "provolutus obsecro ut pro me parvitate, immo pro totius orbis statu, orare dignemini" (*cap. 4*). However, we must remember how even peculiarly indebted Paschasinus and his barbarian-harassed see were to Leo. In this matter, both on this occasion, and with regard to the year 455, Leo had to surrender his point: "non quia ratio manifesta docuerit, sed quia unitatis cura persuaserit," and the Roman cycle gave way to the Alexandrian (*Epp. lxxviii. xvi. cxxii. cxxxiii.* (from Proterius of Alexandria), *cxxvii. cxxviii.*). It was not often that love of unity led the pope to yield to another see. Generally, as we have seen, his

love of uniformity led to his pressing the will of Rome on the universal church. But as he supported the authority of his own see, so where it did not clash with his own he could support that of any bishop. We find him maintaining the rights of metropolitans and reposing a bishop for appealing to himself in a difficulty instead of consulting his metropolitan (*Ep. cviii. 2*). The bishop is to rule with a strong hand. He must know the law, and he must not shrink from enforcing it, for it is "negligent rulers who nourish the plague, while they shrink from applying to it an austere remedy," and the "care of those committed to us requires that we should follow up with the zeal of faith those who, themselves destroyed, would destroy others" (*Epp. i. 5, iv. 2, vii.*). Among the details of his disciplinary directions we notice regulations forbidding the ordination of slaves (*Ep. iv.*), which, though justified on the ground that they are not free for the Lord's service, are couched in language breathing more of the Roman patrician than is quite agreeable in a Christian bishop (*cf. "quibus nulla natalium dignitas suffragatur," "tanquam servilis vilitas hunc honorem capiat," "sacrum ministerium talis consortii vilitate polluitur"*). Moreover a second marriage, or the marriage of a widow or divorced woman, is a bar to orders (*Ep. iv. 2, 3; xii. 5*), and those who are in orders, even subdeacons, must abstain from "carnale conubium, ut et qui habent, sint tanquam non habentes, et qui non habent, permaneant singulares" (*Ep. xiv. 4, and clxvii. 3*). For the day of ordination and consecration, it is to be Sunday only (*Ep. vi.*), or the Saturday night (*Ep. ix.*). The proper antecedents of the consecration of a bishop are declared to be "vota civium, testimonia populorum, honoratorum arbitrium, electio clericorum" (*Ep. x. 4, 6*). On this Leo would strongly insist (*Ep. cxvii. 1*). Where there is a division of votes the judgment of the metropolitan must intervene, who is to be guided by the preponderance of supporters and of qualifications (*Ep. xiv. 5*). When ordained no cleric is to be allowed to wander; he must remain in his own church (*Ep. i. cf. xiii. 4, xiv. 7*). All must rise in due order from the lower to the higher grades (*Ep. xii. 4; cf. Ep. ix.*). Unambiguous condemnation of heresy is to be required before ordination from those who are suspected; and those who are reconverted are to give up hope of promotion (*Ep. xviii. cxxxv. 2*). The multiplication of bishops in small places where they are not needed is forbidden (*cap. 10*). As he insists on the relative dignity of different parts of the body of Christ (*Ep. cxix. 6*), so he reasons that each part should acquiesce in fulfilling only its own functions. Laymen and monks—*i. e.* those who are *extra ordinem sacerdotalem*—are not to be allowed to preach (*Ep. cxix. cxx. 6*). We have seen already how he would enforce local discipline by insisting on provincial councils. As for the sacraments, baptism is not to be given unnecessarily except at Easter or Pentecost (*Ep. xvi. and clxviii.*). For the Mass, the rule of the Roman church, which he would enforce on Alexandria also, is that where the church will not hold all the faithful it should be celebrated on the same day as often as is necessary for them all to "offer" (*Ep. ix. 2*). In regard to ecclesiastical penance, believing that "indulgence of God cannot be obtained ex-

cept by sacerdotal supplication," he gives rules for the reception of the penitent, &c. (*Ep.* cviii. 2, and clxvii. 2 and 7-14), and directs that in ordinary cases (*de penitentia quae a fidelibus postulat*) private confession first to God, and then to the priest should be substituted for the public confession, the scandals involved in which would be likely to deter people from penitence altogether (*Ep.* clxviii.). In regard to the laity, it may be noticed that those who are under penitential discipline are exhorted to abstain from commerce and the civil law courts (*Ep.* clxvii. 10, 11), and even those who have at any time been penitents are advised to abstain from marriage, and ordered to abstain from military service (cap. 12-13). We may also notice an answer given (*Ep.* clxvi.) to Neo of Ravenna, on the question whether persons returning from captivity who had no memory of baptism should be baptized. On this, as a "*novum et inauditum*" point, Leo consulted the synod, "that the consideration of many persons might lead more surely to the truth" (*Ep.* clxvi. p. 1406). He shews a great fear of appearing to sanction a repetition of baptism, but decides that where no remembrance is possible in the matter, and no evidence can be obtained, baptism may be given. The barbarian invasions and the consequent captivities common at this period gave rise to several similar difficulties in questions of ecclesiastical discipline (cf. *Ep.* clix.). Finally, we may notice that Leo has a strong opinion on usury. "*Fenus pecuniae,*" he says, "*est funus animae.*" "*Caret omni humanitate*" (*Serm.* xvii.), and it is forbidden to the laity as to the clergy (*Ep.* iv. 2, 4).

We may conclude this brief notice of Leo's rules of discipline by quoting some more of the brief epigrammatic sentences in which he expresses his mind on occasion of the various disciplinary questions which are presented to him. "Penitence," he says, "is to be measured not by length of time, but by sorrow of heart" (*Ep.* clix. 4); "not instituting what is new, but restoring what is old," is his canon of reformation (*Ep.* x. 2). Again, among rules for episcopal government which he gives, we may notice the following as characteristic: "*Integritas praesidentium salus est subditorum, et ubi est incolumitas obedientiae ibi sana est forma doctrinae*" (xii. 1), or this: "*sic est adhibenda correptio, ut semper sit salva dilectio.*" or this: "*constantiam mansuetudo commendat, justitiam lenitas temperet, patientia contineat libertatem.*" These specimens must suffice; we pass to consider Leo as a theologian.

VI. Leo's theology is to be gathered chiefly from some six or seven dogmatic epistles and from his sermons (*Opp.* xxviii. the tome to Flavian, xxxv. to Julian, lix. to the church of Constantinople, cxxiv. to the monks of Palestine, cxxxix. to Juvenal, clxv. the "second tome," to the emperor Leo, all written between 449 and 458). These epistles are wholly occupied with the controversial statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation. His others are devoted almost entirely to matters of discipline and organization. Of his genuine sermons ninety-six remain; five, "*de natali suo*" (*vid. supra*), on the see of St. Peter; six, "*de collectis,*" on the duty of almsgiving; nine, "*de dec. mens. jejuni,*" on the duty of alms-

giving, prayer, and fasting; ten, "*de Nativitate,*" theological and practical discourses on the Incarnation; eight, "*In Epiphaniae solemnitate,*" containing more of narrative than the Christmas sermons, and specially applicable to an age no longer tried by persecution; twelve, for Lent, on fasting and works of mercy; one on the Transfiguration; nineteen on the passion, preached on Sundays and Wednesdays in Holy Week, being devotional and practical commentaries on the Gospel narrative; two for Easter, preached on the eve; two for Ascensiontide; three for Pentecost, containing theological statements; four for the Pentecostal fast; four on the feasts of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of St. Lawrence; nine on the fast of the seventh month; one on the Beatitudes, and one against Eutyches on the occasion of the arrival of some Egyptian merchants, who had spoken in justification of the proceedings of the Egyptian Eutychians.

As for style, what applies to Leo's theological writings applies to all he wrote: it is generally forcible, and always to the point—business-like and severe, epigrammatic and terse in expression. No doubt the love of epigram and antithesis, which is characteristic of Leo's age, always tends to simple mannerism and obscurity, but in Leo the tendency is under control; he is almost always weighty and clear, and sometimes eloquent. In order to impress upon others his meaning, he has no objection whatever to repeating himself (*Serm.* xxv. *init.*). Some of his epistles (*Opp.* cxxiv. and clxv.) are extremely similar even in language. His sermons are in very much the same style as his epistles. Sozomen (vii. 19) says, "that in his day in Rome neither bishop nor any one else teaches the people in the church." This statement is denied and its meaning disputed (cf. notes *in loc.* and Migne, *Patrol.* lv. p. 197), but at least we should judge from Leo's sermons that there is no tradition of pulpit eloquence behind him. His tone is that of the Christian bishop, reproving, exhorting, and instructing with the severity of a Roman censor (Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, i. 233), while sometimes indeed he rises to eloquence, but generally speaks with a terse brevity, more adapted, but for its epigrams which would catch the ear, to be read than merely listened to. The sermons are, most of them, very short; but he must have impressed truth on his people by repetition, and the practical aspect of the truth as opposed to the speculative is in his sermons specially prominent. If Christ has renewed our nature, we must live up to the possibilities of the nature He has renewed. The mystery of the Incarnation is incomprehensible by the understanding; but for that let us rejoice, "*sentiamus nobis bonum esse quod vincimur*" (*Serm.* xxix.). Christ *must* be God and man—man to unite us to Himself, God to save us, "*Expergiscere igitur, o homo, et dignitatem tuae cognosce naturae; recordare te factum ad imaginem Dei, quae etsi in Adam corrupta in Christo tamen est reformata*" (xxvii. 6).

In theological statements he is always characterized by great clearness, fulness, strength, an intense reverence for dogma, and a deep conviction of its supreme importance. His theology is throughout of the *Western* type; we may illustrate this in two aspects. First, by the fact already noticed, that he is wholly on



the practical, not on the speculative, side of theology. Philosophical theory, speculation on the relation of the Persons in the Trinity, there is none, only a clear and powerful grasp upon the dogma as an inextinguishable truth of quite incomparable practical importance.<sup>o</sup> Secondly, his statement of the doctrine of the Trinity is Western, tallying with the Athanasian Creed, with none of the Eastern doctrine of "subordination" remaining, "In Trinitate enim divina, nihil dissimile, nihil impar est, ut omnibus existentiae gradibus exclusis, nulla ibi Persona sit anterior, nulla posterior" (*Serm.* lxxv. lxxvi. 2, cf. *Serm.* xxii. 2, where he interprets "My Father is greater than I" of the *Incarnate* Son only). Indeed, ignorant as Leo was of Greek, he could not be versed in Eastern theology; but we notice that in the "testimonia patrum" (*Epp.* ccxv.), more Greek than Latin fathers are quoted (of course from translations). We will proceed to examine somewhat more at length the main subjects of his theological writings: and first his doctrine of the Incarnation, which is produced in antagonism to Eutychianism and is coloured by this antagonism. And we must notice that the Eutychianism which he opposes is not so much the particular doctrine of the particular man as that which he represents,—namely, the denial of the real and permanent humanity of Jesus Christ. He presents a dilemma to Eutyches: either, he says, denying as you do the two natures in Christ, you must hold the impiety of Apollinaris, and assert that the Deity was converted into flesh and became passible and mortal, or if you shrink from that you fall into the Manichaean madness of denying the reality of the body and the bodily acts (*Epp.* cxxiv. 2). If he can escape from this dilemma, he is sure to be only veering to the opposite pole of Arianism. For Christ is spoken of as being "raised," "exalted," &c. What is exalted if the humanity is not real? You must assert the divinity of Christ to be an inferior one, capable of exaltation (*Epp.* lix. 3). Thus Eutyches is to Leo the representative of the "Manichaean impiety," as he is fond of calling it, which denies the reality of our Lord's manhood. This gives him his starting point to assert our Lord's true and perpetual humanity, while avoiding the contrary Nestorian error of abstracting from His perfect divinity, which was always being charged upon the anti-Eutychians, "in integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura versus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris . . . humana augsens, divina non minuens" (*Epp.* xxviii. 3). The human nature was really created and really assumed, and in such a way that it was created in being assumed (*Epp.* xxxvi. 3). There is the whole of human nature, body and soul, and the whole of the divine (*Epp.* xxxv. 2); each nature remains distinct in its operations, "glorificata permanet in glorificante, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscet miraculis, aliud succumbit injuriis;" "proprietas divinae humanaeque naturae individua permanet." All through the life he traces the duality of the operations in the unity of the Person (*Epp.* xxviii. cxxiv. 5). And so

perfect is this unity that what is proper to one nature can be ascribed to the other (communicatio idiomatum, cap. 5). The unity is not a mere inhabitation of the Creator in the created nature, but a real mingling of the one nature with the other, though they remain distinct (*Serm.* xxiii. § 1), and the result is "ut idem esset dives in paupertate, omnipotens in abiectione, impassibilis in supplicio, immortalis in morte" (*Epp.* xxxv. 2).<sup>p</sup> Just as the visible light is contaminated by none of the filth on which it sheds itself, so the essence of the eternal and incorporeal light could be polluted by nothing which it assumed (*Serm.* xxxiv. 4).

In proof of this doctrine of the Incarnation Leo appeals to several classes of evidence, sometimes to the analogies of reason—why, he urges, cannot the divinity and humanity be one person, when soul and body in man form one person? (*Epp.* xxvi. 2);<sup>q</sup> constantly to Scripture—the very source of heresy is that man will not labour "in the broad fields of Holy Scripture" ("in latitudine SS." *Ep.* xxviii. 1 and 2); constantly to the creeds and the past of the church (for he hates novelty)—it is the Creed which introduces us to Scripture (*Ep.* cxxviii. 1); we need not blush to believe what apostles and those whom they taught, what martyrs and confessors believed (*Ep.* clxv. 9, clii.); but over and above this Leo very often and very characteristically appeals to consequences, or looks at the heresy he is opposing or the truth he is supporting in the light of the necessities of the church's life. What becomes of the salvation of our human nature if Christ have it not? How can He be the head of the new race? How can He clothe our human nature with His divine? ("Caro enim Christi velamen est verbi, quo omnis qui ipsum integre confitetur induitur," *Ep.* lix. 4.) What is the meaning of the holy communion of His body and blood, the very purpose of which is that, receiving the virtue of the heavenly food, we may pass into ("transeamus in") His flesh who became our flesh? (*Epp.* lix. 2; cf. also *Serm.* xci. 3.) What becomes of the resurrection and ascension; nay, what becomes of His mediation? How does He reconcile man to God if He have not the whole of humanity, except sin? (cxxiv. 6, 7, and *Serm.* xxv. 5, &c.).<sup>r</sup> We may conclude our notice of Leo's theology of the Incarnation by quoting (*Ep.* lix. fin.) a passage in which he distinguishes off the true doctrine from all the heresies. "Thus we call Christ not God only, like the Manichaeans, or man only, like the Photinians, nor man in such a sense as that there should be anything wanting to Him

<sup>p</sup> This and other sentences in the Epistle are omitted in the Greek version, which is probably Julian's, possibly (see Admonitio in Migne) from motives of prudence.

<sup>q</sup> Here, as elsewhere, we find a close parallel between Leo's statement and that of the Athanasian Creed. Compare also this passage (*Ep.* clxv. 2):—

"Natura Unigeniti, natura est Patris, Natura est Spiritus Sancti, simulque impassibilis, simul est incommutabilis sempiternae Trinitatis indivisa Unitas, et consubstantialis aequalitas." "Nulla in essentia discretio, nulla in Majestate diversitas" (*Ep.* cxxiv. 7).

<sup>r</sup> We may notice in passing that he asserts absolutely "solus inter filios hominum Dominus Jesus innocens natus est."

<sup>o</sup> Cf. on this the interesting comments of Dörner on Leo's tome (*Person of Christ*, Period II. Epoch I. Clark's Foreign Theol. Lib.).

which certainly belongs to man's nature, whether soul, or rational mind, or flesh (which, some say, was not taken of a woman, but was produced by the conversion and transmutation of the word into flesh), which three falsities have produced the three sects of the Apollinarians; nor do we say that the blessed Virgin Mary conceived a man without Deity, who, when He had been created by the Holy Spirit, was afterwards taken by the Word upon Himself,—for preaching which we rightly and justly condemned Nestorius; but we say that Christ, the Son of God, very God, was begotten of God the Father without any beginning of time, and that same Christ, very man, was born of a human mother in the fulness of time; and that His humanity, in which He is inferior to the Father, diminishes nought from His nature by which He is equal with the Father. But this one Christ is both these, as He most truly said, 'I and my Father are one,' according to His divinity, and 'my Father is greater than I,' according to His humanity. This faith, which alone makes true Christians, do ye perseveringly hold and constantly assert."

As regards the atonement, he holds the view once prevalent, but now utterly abandoned, which may be stated out of his writings as follows. Man in his fallen state was in a condition of slavery to the devil, and as it was by his own free will that he had fallen, he was justly under the devil's power. The devil had certain rights over him, rights which he would retain unless that humanity which he had conquered could conquer him again. And in redeeming man, God chose to overcome the devil rather by the rule of justice than of power. The omnipotent God could have overcome him without recognising his (so to speak) just claims, but He preferred to defeat him as man in fair conflict. To this end He became man. The Incarnation deceived the devil. He knew not with whom he was matched. He saw a Child suffering the sorrows and pains of childhood; he saw Him grow, as other boys grow, by natural stages to manhood, and having had so many proofs that He was mortal, He concluded that He was infected with the poison of original sin. So he set in force against Him, as though he were only exercising a right upon sin-stained humanity, all methods and instruments of persecution. He spent his whole force upon Him, thinking that, if He whose virtues exceed so far those of all the saints, must yield to death, and His merits availed not to deliver Him, he would be secure of every one else for ever. But in persecuting and slaying Christ, whom was he slaying? One who was man, but sinless, who owed him nothing, in whom he had nothing; but thus, by exacting the penalty of iniquity from Him in whom he had found no fault, he exceeded his bond; he went beyond his right. The covenant which bound man to the devil was broken. His injustice in demanding too much cancelled the whole debt of man due to him; his rights are over. Man is free. (*Serm.* xxii. 3, 4; lxix. 3. The same theory is stated *Serm.* xvi. 1; lxi. 4. The nails which pierced our Lord's hands and feet transfixed the devil with perpetual wounds, lxiv. 2, 3.) Thus, to effect our redemption, Christ must have been both man and God; and it was necessary that He should suffer and die by the operations of the devil; and His death has a value different in kind from that of

all the saints (*Serm.* lxiv. 2, 3; lxix. 1). On the cross of Christ the oblation of human nature was made by a saving victim (v. 3). His death, the Just for the unjust, was a price of infinite value (lvi. 3; lvii. 4). But to whom was its price paid? According to this theory, to the devil. The devil "paid off," man is free; "redemptio aufert captivitatem et regeneratio mutat originem et fides justificat peccatorem" (xxii. 4). Here then there is nothing said about—there is hardly clear room left for—an oblation to God. Elsewhere, however, Leo speaks of Christ of course as the mediator between God and man, and of His offering a "new and true sacrifice of reconciliation to His Father." (*Serm.* lix. 5. See also *Ep.* cxxiv. 2, where the sacrifice is clearly conceived as offered to the Father. The language is repeated *Serm.* lxiv. 2, 3.)

Living, as Leo did, in a time when the doctrine of grace was still in dispute, and mixed up, as he had been, in part of the dispute, we may perhaps wonder that we have so little, in his genuine works, on the subject. He speaks of it indeed (*Ep.* i. 3) in orthodox terms, and of course his whole reputation places him on the orthodox side. "The whole gift of God's works depends upon the previous operation of God ("omnis bonorum operum donatio, divina preparatio est"), for no man is justified by virtue before he is (justified) by grace, which is to every man the beginning of righteousness, the fount of good, and the source of merit." Nothing in us, he implies, can antedate the operation of grace; all in us needs the salvation of Christ; but this grace of God which alone justifies was given, not for the first time, but in larger measure ("aucta non coepta") by Christ's birth, and this "sacrament of great holiness" (the Incarnation) was so powerful, even in its previous indications ("tam potens etiam in significationibus suis"), that they who hoped in the promise received it no less than they who accepted the gift" (*Serm.* xxii. 4). On this subject he often dwells; the Incarnation is the consummation of a previous presence and operation of the Son (*Serm.* xxv. 4). All along through the Old Testament men were justified by the same faith, and made part of the body of Christ by the same sacrament (*Serm.* xxx. 7; *Serm.* liv. 1). This same truth comes out in his sermons on Pentecost. There is perfect equality, he there says, in the Trinity. "It is eternal to the Father to be the Father of the co-eternal Son. It is eternal to the Son to be begotten of the Father out of all time. It is eternal to the Holy Spirit to be the Spirit of the Father and the Son; so that the Father has never been without the Son, or the Son without the Father, or the Father and the Son without the Spirit. Thus the unchangeable deity of the blessed Trinity is one in substance, undivided and inseparable in operation, concordant in will, alike in power, equal in glory." "What the Father is, that is the Son, and that is the Holy Spirit;" and what the Father does, that does the Son, and that does the Holy Spirit. There was no beginning to the operation of the Holy Spirit upon man since his creation. The descent at Pentecost was not the "beginning of a gift, but the addition of fulness" ("adjectio largitatis") (*Serm.* lxxvi. 3). The difference has lain not in the virtue and reality of the gifts, but in their measure (cf. on the unity of divine purpose and love, from first to

last of the divine economy, the end of the 3rd chapter of "the tome").

As regards the merit and cultus of saints, Leo holds that their "merits" can work wonders, and give aid to the church on earth (*Serm.* v. 4). He often speaks of St. Peter assisting his people with his prayers (*Serm.* xii. xiii. xvi., ad fin. &c.), and with his merits (lxxxii. 4). So also of St. Laurence (lxxxv.). He attributes the deliverance of the city from the barbarians to the "care of the saints" (*Serm.* lxxxiv. 1). The Leonine sacramentary, which certainly contains much of Leo's age, is full of such prayers as "adjuvanos, Domine, tuorum prece sanctorum, ut quorum festa gerimus sentiamus auxilium" (cf. *Ep.* lviii. init. ci. 3, for similar sentiments of Leo's age). But he never speaks of the blessed Virgin at all as aiding in any way of this kind, nor of any saints but St. Peter, St. Paul (*Serm.* lxxxii. fin.), and St. Laurence; nor does he invoke them, or direct them to be invoked. There is only present to him the consciousness that they are aiding the church by their patronage, prayers, or merits. Elsewhere, distinguishing the value of the deaths of the saints from that of Christ, he very zealously guards the prerogative of Christ, as the real source of merit: "acceperunt iusti, non dederunt coronas; et de fidelium fortitudine exempla nata sunt patientiæ, non dona iustitiæ" (*Serm.* lxiv. 7). "No man," he says, beautifully, "is good for himself alone," but the goodness of the martyrs aids us only by way of example: "plus est opere docere quam voce" (lxxxv. 1).

To relics we have no allusion in Leo's writings, except where he rejoices that the relics of St. Flavian had been brought back to Constantinople (*Ep.* lxxix. 2), and perhaps where, in writing to Eudocia and Juvenal, in Palestine, he endeavours to stir their faith through the local memorials of Christ's passion (*Ep.* cxxxix. 2; cxxiii.). Comparing Leo's works with those of Gregory, we are singularly struck by the total absence in him of the element of superstition. His sermons, as has been very well said, "are singularly Christian—Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ: His birth, His passion, His resurrection" (Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. p. 233). We have noticed also that Leo's whole bent of mind was practical; and so we find constant reference to the special dangers and wants of his time. He is constantly warning against the prevalent Manichæism. When he converted a number of Manichæans, at once he applies his sermon, regardless of saying what was old and repeating himself, to instruct them (xxv. 1). At another time he notices that the people are forsaking the commemoration of the deliverance of the city, probably from Genseric, which he had instituted on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul; they forsake it for games and spectacles; he reproves them, and exhorts them to the duty of gratitude to God (lxxxiv.). Elsewhere he reproves the idolatrous practices which troubled the church. Magic, charms, cabalistic doctrines, and even a worship of the rising sun, were in vogue. Christians, on their way into St. Peter's Basilica, would turn and bow to the sun (lxxxiv. 2; xxvii. 4). This worship, which, as he says, was half pagan, akin to that of the Priscillianists and Manichæans, and half due to ignorance in people who meant to worship, not

the creature but the Creator, but which in any case was akin to idolatry, he deeply deplores and earnestly prohibits.

Especially we find Leo applying himself to enjoin purity, strictness, and severity of life, in an age no longer troubled by persecutions. "Kings now," he says, "do not so much pride themselves on being born to empire as rejoice that they are re-born in baptism." External persecution for the time is over, but the devil tries by avarice and ease those whom troubles could not alienate (xxxvi. 3). Hence the interest of his sermons in Lent and at the other fasts of the "Quattuor Tempora" and those (on almsgiving) "de Collectis." \* Prayers, fasting, and alms-giving are, in his view, the three chief parts of Christian duty. "By prayer the mercy of God is sought; by fasting, the lusts of the flesh are extinguished; by almsgiving, our sins are atoned for—redimuntur." "The most effectual petition for pardon lies in alms and fasting, and the prayer which is assisted by such suffrages rises more speedily to the ears of God" (xii. 4; xvi. 2). He uses almsgiving in a large sense almost equivalent to love (xliv. 2). "Alms destroy sins" (*Serm.* vii., quoted from *Ecclus.* iii. 30), "abolish death, extinguish the penalty of eternal fire" (x.). It is a grace without which we can have no other (x.). "He who has cleansed himself by almsgiving need not doubt that even after many sins the splendour of the new birth will be restored to him" (xx. ad fin.). But we must look *how* we give, so as not, for instance, to overlook the retiring; we must "understand about" the poor (ix. 3; "Beatus qui *intelligit super*," Ps. xl. 1). Our gifts should go to those who do not yet believe, as well as to Christians (xli. 3), and special thoughtfulness is enjoined for slaves. Moreover what God looks to is, as he often insists, not the amount, but the spirit of the gift: "ibi censetur qualitas actionis, ubi invenitur initium voluntatis" (xciv. 1); "nulli parvus est census, cui magnus est animus" (*Serm.* xl. 4); and gifts given not in the spirit of faith, though they be ever so large, avail nothing (xliv. 2). Love, he insists, is the fulfilling of the law. Truth and mercy, faith and love, go together. "There is no love without faith, no faith without love" (cf. especially *Serm.* xlv.).

As for fasting, that too is constantly enjoined. Virtue is a very narrow mean (xliii. 2), and all through our Christian walk strict self-discipline is absolutely necessary. But fasting is a means, not an end. We must be careful not to let it proceed from any belief in matter as evil in itself. "No substance is evil, and evil in itself has no nature" (xlii. 4). The object of fasting is to make the body apt for pure, holy, and spiritual activity—it is, as he often says, to subject the flesh to the reason and spirit. "A man has true peace and liberty when the flesh is ruled by the judgment of the mind, and the mind is directed by the government of God" (*Serm.* xxxix. 2, xlii. 2). He insists strongly on this dominion of the mind. Otherwise "parum est si carnis substantia tenuatur et animæ for-

\* *I.e.* at that stated period of the year when offerings were made in the Roman church, by an old custom instituted in place of a still older pagan solemnity; cf. *Admonit.* In *Serm.* vi. Migne.

titudo non alitur;” “continentum est a cibus sed multo magis ab erroribus jejunandum” (*Serm.* xci. 2). Fasting having thus a directly moral object, there must always be joined with it works of mercy. The “abstinentia jejunantis” must be the “refectio pauperis” (*Serm.* xiii.); “sentiant humanitatem nostram aegritudines decumbentium, imbecillitates debilium, labores exulum, destitutio pupillorum et desolatarum maestitudo viduarum” (*Serm.* xl. 4). Fasting without such works of mercy is not a purification of the soul, but a mere affliction of the flesh (*Serm.* xv.). In Lent, prisoners are to be set free and debts forgiven (*Serm.* xli. 3). If a man cannot fast from bodily weakness, let him occupy himself in works of love (*Serm.* lxxxvii. 3). Through all Leo’s sermons in penitential seasons there runs a great sense of the unity of the church’s work and the co-operation of all her members in the penitential discipline and prayers. “The fullest abolition of sins is obtained when the whole church joins in one prayer and one confession” (lxxxviii. 3). The merit of holy obedience is the strength of the church against her enemies (*Serm.* lxxxviii. 2, 3). Public acts are better than those which are individual (lxxxix. 2). Further, on Leo’s penitential sermons, we need only remark that, though he is speaking of the remedies for sins—as well those of habitual laxity as the more venial and accidental—in preparation for the Easter feast, he yet makes almost no allusion to confession in any sacramental sense, or indeed in any sense at all, but only to self-examination, to penitential works, fasts, prayers, works of mercy and moral self-discipline as the means of purification (cf. l. 1, 2, lxxxviii. 3, xli. 1, xliii. 3). Forgiveness of injuries (xlili. 4) and the exercise of love (xlv.) are insisted on from this point of view: “qui potuit malitia pollui, studeat benignitate purgari” (xlv. 4)—all this seeming to indicate that in the life of the ordinary Christian, who was not under regular penitential discipline, penitence and progress were not separated in Leo’s mind as they are with us. The Christian is purified by moral effort and discipline and his sanctification is his purification (but cf. xcii. 1, l. 1, 2, lxxxviii. 5).

There is another aspect of Leo’s work as an ecclesiastical writer which remains to be considered. “The collect as we have it is Western in every feature; in that ‘unity of sentiment and severity of style’ which Lord Macaulay has admired; in its Roman brevity and majestic conciseness, its freedom from all luxuriant ornament and all inflation of phraseology” (Bright, *Ancient Collects*, append. 206); and not only is it undoubtedly Western, but there is no early Western writer to whose style it can bear a closer resemblance and with whose character it is more consonant than that of Leo, its reputed inventor. How much of Leo’s work the fragment of the Sacramentary attributed to him by its first editor in 1735, P. Joseph Blanchinius, actually contains, it is impossible to say. “Muratori holds it to be a series of Missae, clumsily put together by a private person at the end of the 5th century, containing much that he wrote.” Certainly it is Roman, certainly the oldest Roman sacramentary and certainly it contains much which seems to be in the style and express the doctrine of St. Leo. As certainly Leo’s work, Quesnel with pro-

priety specifies two noble “prefaces,” for the consecration of a bishop and a presbyter (“Deus honorum omnium,” and “Domine sancte,” § xxvii. 111 and 113, Migne) and an “Allocutio archidiaconi ad episcopum pro reconciliatione poenitentium” (at the end of the sacramentary in Migne’s edition). In the *Liber Pontificalis* the addition of the words, “sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam” to the canon of the mass is ascribed to Leo (Migne, *Patrol.* liv. p. 1233). Other slight alterations in the liturgy are also attributed to him (Migne, lv. 320). The following collects in the English Prayer-book are derived from the Leonine sacramentary: those for the third Sunday after Easter (referring originally to those who had been baptized on Easter Eve), the fifth Sunday after Trinity (suggested originally by the disasters of the dying Western empire), and the ninth, thirteenth, and fourteenth Sundays after Trinity. (See Bright, *Ancient Collects*, pp. 208, 209.)

Before concluding this notice of Leo as a theologian, we must mention a statement of Gennadius (*de Script. Eccles.* lxxxiv.; *Patrol.* Lat. lviii. 1107), that the letters of pope Leo on the true Incarnation of Christ are said to have been addressed to their various destinations, and dictated (“ad diversas datae et dictatae”) by Prosper of Aquitaine. It is also stated that one or two of Leo’s sermons are found in one manuscript assigned to St. Prosper.\* On this we may remark, first, that Gennadius himself attributes “the tome,” the chief of Leo’s letters on the Incarnation, absolutely to his own hand (cap. lxx.). Next we may remark that it is very probable that Leo should have brought this man, “doctissimus illorum temporum,” with him from Gaul to Rome, to assist him in his conflicts with heresy: he may have been secretary to him, as Jerome was to pope Damasus:† he may specially have exerted himself for St. Leo against the Pelagians. But the unity and individuality of style which run all through St. Leo’s writings, and which appear not least strongly marked in his dogmatic epistles, separate them off from those of St. Prosper, and forbid us to attribute to Prosper in any sense the *authorship* of these writings, though we cannot deny that he may have assisted in their composition. (Cf. Tillem. xv. p. 540, xvi. 25, and note 7 on St. Prosper; Arendt, *Leo der Grosse*, p. 417, &c.)

It remains to mention that Leo is said to have restored the silver ornaments of the churches of Rome, after the ravages of the Vandals, and repaired the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, placing a mosaic in the latter which represented the adoration of the four-and-twenty elders; he is also said to have built a basilica in honour of St. Cornelius, established some monks by the church of St. Peter, instituted guardians, called at first, “cubicularii,” and afterwards “capellani,” for the tombs of the apostles, and erected

\* Antelmus, in the 17th century, went furthest in attributing the works known as Leo’s to the authorship of Prosper.

† It appears probable that *Ep.* cxx. (to Theodoret) was written by a secretary, and that Leo’s personal salutation is added at the end. See concluding words, “et alia manu, Deus te incolumem custodiat, frater charissime.” Cf. conclusion of *Ep.* cxxxiii. (Proterius to Leo), and Marcian’s letter, *Ep.* c.

a fountain before the church of St. Paul, at which people might wash their hands before entering. (For authorities, see Tillem. xv. art. 73, and *Vita Anastasii*, Migne, *Patrol.* liv. 55, and 1234.) In the life of St. Valentine, bishop of Passau, it is recorded that St. Leo received him at Rome, and ordained him bishop for missionary work in Rhaetia (Tillem. xv. 175).

The death of Leo occurred in the year 461 (Marcellin. *Chron.* &c.), almost certainly late in the year, and possibly on Nov. 10 (Tillem. xv. note 73). He was buried in the church of St. Peter, where it is said that no previous pope not a martyr had been buried (*Anast. Vita Pontif. Patrol.* liv. p. 60, Migne). The tomb having become crowded up, his body was removed to a more honourable position by Sergius I. at the end of the 7th century (*Patrol. Lat.* lv. p. 329, Migne). The three succeeding Leos were subsequently interred in the same chapel. There his body was found in 1607, and transferred with great pomp to the new church of St. Peter. There was another translation in 1763. (Tillem. art. 74, and *AA. SS. Bolland.* April, vol. ii. p. 21; *Patrol.* lv. 333, where see also on supposed relics.) Leo has been honoured in the church as a *saint* and *confessor*. He has been also commonly known as "the Great."† Benedict XIV. in 1754 decreed him the title and cultus of a *doctor ecclesiae* (*Patrol.* lv. 835). He is commemorated in the Roman church on April 11, possibly the day of the first translation of the body; in the Eastern church on Feb. 18 (*AA. SS.* April. ii. p. 15).

*Opera Sancti Leonis. Editions.*—The genuine works of Leo which we possess are 96 sermons and 173 letters (including a few addressed to him or written about him). He is not known to have written any large treatises. On works ascribed to him (the *de Vocatione*, &c.), vide supra, and consult discussions of editors in Migne's *Patrologia*. For history of editions, vide Schoenemann's *Notitia Historico-Litteraria in S. Leonem*, prefixed to Migne's edition. The most famous editions of Leo's whole works are:

1. Quesnel's: which appeared in 1675 in Paris, a work of consummate learning and great fullness, placing the study of Leo on a wholly new basis: expressing, however, as it did, strong Gallican opinions, this edition was condemned by the popes, and all the commentaries, &c., were put on the Index in 1682. The work, however, was too valuable to be allowed to be suppressed, and by the injunction of the pope Benedict XIV. there was produced—

2. The edition of the Ballerini, which appeared in Venice, 1753–1757, and while reproducing all Quesnel's edition, re-edited it with remarks and discussions in the Roman interest on Quesnel's excursions. This is now the standard edition, and is reproduced in the *Patrologia Latina* of the Abbé Migne, vol. liv. lv. lvi. Vol. liv. contains introductions; brief life of pope Leo by Anastasius; all the sermons and letters, with fragments &c.; and the notes of Quesnel and of the Fratres Ballerini. Vol. lv. contains the *Liber Sacramentorum*, and the other works ascribed to St. Leo, together with the eleven very long dissertations of Quesnel's, and the observations of the

Ballerini on these dissertations. Vol. lvi. contains collections of ecclesiastical canons having reference to the period of St. Leo, with discussions by the editors, as before, and a few hitherto unedited sermons ascribed to St. Leo of no great value. Recently select sermons and letters of St. Leo have been edited by H. Hurter, S.J., in vols. xiv. and xxv. of *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta*. There is also an English translation of selected sermons of St. Leo with theological notes, and "the Tome," added in the original, by Dr. Bright, London, 1862.

*Materials and Authorities.*—i. Leo's own works; vide supra. ii. The contemporary chronicles of Prosper and Idatius, and others. The *Acta* of the council of Chalcedon, &c. iii. Lives of the Saint, church histories, &c., among which we may mention the following:—(1) The very brief life in the *Historia de Vitis Romanorum Pontificum* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (9th century), prefixed to Migne's edition of Leo's works, and given with very full commentary in the *Patrol.* vol. cxxviii. pp. 299 sq. (2) The elaborate *de Vita et Gestis S. Leonis*, being the first of Quesnel's *Dissertationes*, Migne's *Patrol.* lv. pp. 153 seq. (3) The exhaustive, accurate, and impartial *Mémoire* of Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* vol. xv. pp. 414–832, with notes. (4) The detailed account of Leo's works in Ceillier's *Auteurs sacrés*, vol. x. (5) The Bollandist Life by Canisius, of very little value, *AA. SS.* April. vol. ii. p. 15. (6) *La Vie et Religion des deux bons Papes Léon I<sup>er</sup> et Grégoire I<sup>er</sup>*, by P. Dumoulin, the Protestant theologian, Sédan, 1650. (7) *Histoire du Pontificat de Saint-Léon le Grand*, by Maimbourg, La Haye, 1687; a work written to convert Protestants by shewing them that the 5th century recognised the primacy of the pope and the authority of the church; dedicated to Louis XIV. (just after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes), whom it denotes as possessing "the soul of a great pontiff as well as of a great king." (8) *Leo der Grosse und seine Zeit*, by W. A. Arendt, Mainz, 1825; a book written from a Catholic point of view, as a prologue to a history of the middle ages; indicating especially the importance of Leo's position in the development of the papal authority. The author is too unwilling to admit faults in Leo's character. (9) *Papst Leo's I. Leben und Lehren*, by Ed. Perthel, Jena, 1843. A valuable part of this work is the accurate and elaborate account of Leo's doctrine, but complaining of the partiality of Arendt, the Protestant author goes to an opposite extreme, undervaluing alike the abilities and virtues of Leo. (10) *Histoire du Pontificat de Saint Léon le Grand*, by Al. de Saint-Chéron, Paris, 1845, a partial work from an extreme papalist point of view. Besides the above "Lives" &c. we may notice (11) some remarks specially on Leo's style in Bähr's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, Suppl.-Bd. II. Abth. pp. 354–366; (12) an admirable account and judgment of Leo's life and works, viewing him chiefly as the architect of the papacy, in Böhringer's *Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen*, i. 4, pp. 170–309; (13) Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. cap. 4, an excellent account of Leo and his time; (14) Bright's

† For the opinion entertained of him by mediæval preachers, see quotation in Arendt, *Leo der Grosse*, p. 423.

\* This book the writer of the above article has not been able to see.

*History of the Church*, cap. xiv. xv.; (15) Alzog's *Grundriss der Patrologie*, § 78; and (16) The article "Leo I." in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*. [C. G.]

LEO (6) II., pope A.D. 682–683, the second of that name, whose biographer, in the vivid strain of a contemporary, and with an instinct hardly less than prophetic, writes thus of him: "Vir eloquentissimus, et in divinis Scripturis sufficienter instructus, Græcâ Latinâque linguâ eruditus . . . linguâ quoque scholasticus eloquendi majore lectione politâ . . . Hic suscepit sanctam sextam synodum, quae per Dei providentiam nuper in regiâ urbe celebrata est, Graeco eloquio conscriptam . . . in quâ et condemnati sunt Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, et Pyrrhus . . . qui unam voluntatem et operationem in D. N. J. Christo dixerunt vel praedicaverunt . . . sed ut et nunc duae voluntates et operationes ipsius dispensatoris Christi et Salvatoris Dei nostri dicantur, sicut eadem synodus *studiosissime in Latinum translata* declarat . . ." Agreeably with which the fourteenth council of Toledo, meeting A.D. 684, under Julian their metropolitan, by command of their king Ervigius, acknowledge the receipt of the Acts of this council, accompanied by a letter from Leo, inviting their acceptance and publication of them (*Dict. of Christ. Ant.; TOLEDO, COUNCILS OF*). These Acts, accordingly, were gone through *seriatim*, and, having been examined thoroughly, were directed to stand next after the Acts of the council of Chalcedon, as being in perfect agreement with that council and its three great predecessors—a point to which we must return again. These Acts, it must be further said, had been conveyed from Constantinople to Rome by no other than John bishop of Porto, who had subscribed to them as first legate of the late pope Agatho, and afterwards became pope himself as John V. Lastly, to complete the survey, in their 12th action, the very document on which the condemnation of pope Honorius was grounded—his original letter in Latin to the late patriarch Sergius—was fetched from the patriarchal archives and put into the hands of the same legate to be compared with the copy that had just been read, so that it must have been genuine to have been accepted by him. On the whole, then, it would be scarcely possible to find the Acts of any council better authenticated in every way. Yet, strange to say, all the letters of Leo bearing upon this council (five in number), and the only pieces of his extant, were pronounced spurious by Baronius, and for no other reason, apparently, than because they testified to these facts, guaranteed to us, fortunately, from other sources. No. 1 is a reply to a letter from the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, announcing in general terms the results of the sixth council. The fictitious dates affixed to these letters supply Baronius with chronological arguments against both, which Pagi thus solves. The council sat from 7th Nov. A.D. 680 to 16th Sept. A.D. 681, which was the first month of the tenth Indiction, in which the following events happened. Pope Agatho died 10th Jan. A.D. 682. Leo was elected in his room 16th April ensuing. The legates of the former wintered at Constantinople, but set out at once on hearing of the election of his successor, bringing with them the Acts of the council, and the letter in question

from Constantine to Leo. This they delivered to him on their arrival in July; and John bishop of Porto was one of his three consecrators, 17th Aug. His reply to the emperor would naturally be one of his first acts after consecration in the tenth Indiction still proceeding, or just over. It contained this sentence, of which his biographer was no doubt well aware: "Pariterque anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, Theodorum Pharanitanum episcopum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium . . . necnon et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrinâ lustravit, sed profanâ prodicione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est" (Mansi, xi. 731. Comp. Pagi ad Baron. A.D. 683, n. 1 et seq. and A.D. 382, n. 2). This is plain enough, but it was not a synodical utterance. No. 2, on the other hand, is addressed to the bishops of Spain generally; and in expounding to them, "ex officio," the definition of the recent oecumenical council in dogmatic language for reception, it adds: "Qui vero adversum apostolicae traditionis puritatem perduelliones extiterant, abeuntis quidem aeternâ condemnatione mulctati sunt: id est Theodorus . . . Cyrus . . . Sergius . . . cum Honorio, qui flammam haeretici dogmatis, non ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit." He then explains how it was that he had no more than the definition at present to send, as the Acts, being in Greek, had to be translated into Latin, and were not yet finished, but they should have the remainder soon. Peter, his notary, would be the bearer of this portion of them.

Two more letters on the same subject, but of less importance, follow; one addressed to Quiricius, late metropolitan of Toledo, whom Leo must have supposed alive; the other to count Simplicius without further designation. No. 5 is to king Ervigius. In this Honorius is characterised as one "who had assented to the defilement of the immaculate rule, handed down from the apostles, and received from his predecessors, and who had been, as such, by a resolution of the late venerable council, condemned; that is, cast out of the communion of the Catholic church."

All these letters seem to have been penned simultaneously, the first thing after his consecration, as they have no special dates affixed to them; but all alike speak of the sixth council as having sat "*per nonam nuper elapsam Indictionem*," which was strictly correct. Unfortunately Leo died 3rd July, A.D. 683, not only before the translation of its Acts had been completed, but even possibly before what had been translated had been sent off, there being a short letter extant of Benedict II. the next pope, commissioning Peter anew, but only charging him with the same portion of the Acts over again that Leo speaks of having consigned to him (Mansi, xi. 1085). This document, however, short as it is, accounts satisfactorily for the reference to them in the fourteenth council of Toledo, A.D. 384, as having been sent by Leo, yet only then received, as an interval of eleven months and twenty-two days elapsed between the death of Leo and the consecration of Benedict, 26th June, A.D. 684 (Pagi ad Bar. A.D. 684, n. 2–12). Thus the chronological difficulties are plainly no more than might have been expected; on the other hand,

the condemnation of Honorius by Leo proclaims its own genuineness by the varied circumlocution in which it is expressed. Heretic is a term that is never applied by Leo to his erring predecessor. Not to have condemned him at all would have been dishonest, after the sixth council had spoken and been received by him. It took its place amongst the general councils everywhere by common consent, even in Spain, where the fifth council was still persistently kept out of sight (*Dict. of Christ. Ant.* II. 1968 and 1971). No exception had been taken to it anywhere by contemporaries for having anathematised Honorius. On the contrary, the *Liber Diurnus* of the Roman pontiffs proclaims its own contemporary composition, so far as relates to his condemnation, by designating the sixth council, in the exact words of the biographer of Leo, as having been "lately" held (ap. Migne, Pat. Lat. cv. 42 and 52). The Roman Breviary, M. Renouf tells us, contained his condemnation likewise "till the 17th century" (*Condemn. of Pope Hon.* p. 6). Pope Agatho doubtless abstained from urging it, though his legates subscribed to it; nor is it mentioned by his biographer. We might as well suspect the name of Honorius to have been erased dishonestly from the life and letters of pope Agatho as to have been inserted dishonestly in the Acts of the sixth council or the letters of pope Leo. History tells us that there were two parties at that time both at Rome and Constantinople. Just before the summoning of the sixth council there was a talk at the latter of erasing the name of pope Vitalian, and indeed of every pope in succession after Honorius, from their diptychs. Another party was in the ascendant there when the sixth council was held. Agatho was reticent about Honorius, so was his biographer. Pope Martin had been equally reticent in the Lateran council, A.D. 649, previously to which John IV. had openly defended him. Yet, in the same breath, he calls his betrayer Sergius "*reverendae memoriae patriarcha*" (Mansi, x. 683). Anastasius, the papal librarian, with the Acts of the sixth council before him, though no less apologetic, bears honest testimony to their contents (*ib.* 693). Leo, similarly, was too honest to tamper or to quibble with the Acts of a council that had become law, and of which he approved. Notwithstanding he minimises the fall of his predecessor, confessedly blameless in all other respects, as far as he can. Putting the best construction upon facts that tell against us is natural enough; suppressing, misrepresenting, or pronouncing them fictitious *on that account* is a crime. M. Rohrbacher has discussed the Acts of this pontificate learnedly, and with every regard for historic truth (vol. x. 378-81). Dr. Dollinger has passed over them "*sicco pede*." The comments of Binius, Labbe, Cenni, Baldini, Pagi, Sommier, Bencini, and Mafei, may be found collected in Migne, Pat. Lat. cxxviii. 851-66, following on the life of this pope in the work of Anastasius. Mansi (xi. 1045-58) says as little as he can; the authors of *L'Art de vérif. les Dates*, i. 254, still less; nor Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 598, much more. [E. S. Ff.]

LEO (7) III., pope, was, according to his biographer, a Roman by birth, of studious and devout habits, and unblemished life. The

same authority tells us that he was elected unanimously by all the Romans to succeed Adrian I., who died on Christmas Day, A.D. 795, the very next day after his decease; and being then a priest only, was consecrated bishop the day following, which was the feast of St. John the Evangelist, then as now. So far his biographer, who stops short at this point; throwing a complete veil over his acts and the events going on round him for the ensuing three years of his pontificate. This is the more noticeable for three reasons: (1) As being in marked contrast to the fulness with which the acts and events of the two pontificates immediately preceding his are noted down from their commencement. (2) For the disappearance of all his letters to Charlemagne previously to A.D. 806. (3) For the non-appearance of even these, but ten in number, as part of the *Codex Carolinus*. What that Codex professes to be may be repeated from Vol. I. p. 457, of this work. "In 791 he (Charlemagne) caused all the letters which had been directed by the apostolic see to his father, grandfather, and himself, to be collected and transcribed for the benefit of his successors." Their number, as given by Cennius, amounts to just one short of 100 (*Monum. Dom. Pont. Praef.* § 2). But according to the authority from which this statement was drawn—the description given of it in a supposed contemporary MS. (ap. Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Script.* iii. 602)—it should contain the letters "*de Imperio ad eos directae*," likewise; now only conspicuous by their absence. Further, why the papal epistles themselves should stop at A.D. 791 has never been explained. Certainly, there is one letter of Adrian to Charlemagne, writing three years after that time, still extant, which would have been a most inconvenient addition to this Codex, viz. the one defending the decrees of the 2nd Nicene Council against the author of the Caroline Books (Jaffé, *Regest. Pont. Rom.* p. 214—misplaced and misdated by Mansi, xiii. 759). Possibly we might have discovered, in the earlier letters of Leo, reasons equally strong for their exclusion from it, had they been extant. Cennius begins his first dissertation on those which have come down to us, with the following thesis: "Multo plures editis a Conringio adhuc latent." Who can doubt it? But, more than this: the biographer of Leo writes throughout as if under restraint. Annalists of the same date are not agreed in their accounts. The Laureshamensian pass over even the fact of his accession in silence. The Laurissensian state that he was no sooner installed, than he sent ambassadors to the king with gifts, and the keys of the confession, or tomb, of St. Peter, and the standard of the city of Rome, besides. Eginhard adds that he petitioned the king to send one of his chief men to Rome, to bind the Roman people to him in allegiance and fidelity by oath. The Saxon poet says the same. But there happens to be an authentic document extant which in some measure discredits all three. The answer of the king to a letter of his on his accession has come down to us among the letters of Alcuin. How it came to be found among them is easily seen. Angilbert the bearer of it was a bosom friend of Alcuin, who treated him with all the respect due to the name with which his royal master delighted to honour him, Homer. Yet Homer,



equally with his royal master, had recourse to Alcuin for advice now and then. Accordingly, we have, side by side with this answer of the king to the pontiff, among the letters of Alcuin, a copy—perhaps the original—of the secret instructions given by the king to Angilbert himself. It is headed: “Karolus gratiâ Dei Rex, et defensor sanctæ ecclesiæ, Homero auriculario salutem.” Homer was to admonish the pope on the irreproachable character of his life, and above all things, on the observance of the holy canons; on the pious direction of the holy church of God, as opportunity for mutual conference offered, and he found the pope disposed to listen; but oftener reminding him how shortlived was all honour that he had now; and how lasting the reward bestowed on good services hereafter. Another topic to be pressed on him energetically was the extirpation of the simoniacal heresy, then woefully deranging the holy constitution of the church in many places. “Et quicquid mente teneas sæpius querelis agitasse inter nos,” a sentence which had best be left untranslated, till the clue to it can be found. The rest is unimportant.

In writing to the pope, Charles styles himself as follows:—“Karolus gratiâ Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum ac Patricius Romanorum, Leoni papæ, perpetuæ beatitudinis, in X<sup>o</sup>. salutem,” intimating plainly to what source he ascribed those titles; but omitting another, which in writing to Angilbert he had assumed equally, though no previous letter of the pope’s extant had ever assigned it to him or his predecessors. Let us see now what he says to the pope. First, there is not a word about the arrival of ambassadors, keys, or standard from him; no hint that Angilbert had been despatched in compliance with any request of his. Charles merely states that having read his letter and listened to the instrument of his election (decretalis chartula), he was pleased at the unanimity testified in the latter, and the obedience and fidelity promised to himself in the former. Regrets for his dear predecessor had been alleviated by the glad tidings of his accession. Angilbert, the secretary, who was no stranger to him, and whom he had previously promised his predecessor, through Campulus and Anastasius, to despatch on a matter already discussed between them, was now sent with full power to negotiate the same with him, and had special instructions for that purpose. The pope was to be maintained in his honours, and the king in his patriate. Thus they would discuss how the pact entered into between himself and the late pope might best be carried out; so that the apostolic benediction, invoked by the prayers of the saints, might attend him everywhere, by the grace of God: and that the holy Roman church and see might also, by the grace of God, be defended at all times by his devotion. “It is ours,” he says, “with assistance from above, to protect the holy church of Christ everywhere from the inroads of pagans, and the ravages of unbelievers, with arms abroad and at home, to surround her with bulwarks by the acknowledgment of the Catholic faith. It is yours, holy Father, with hands uplifted, like Moses, to assist our warfare, and procure victory for us by your intercession. . . . Only, let it ever be the discretion of your authority to

follow the canons, to the end that a pattern of complete sanctity may be patent to all in your life.”

If Charles has here described aright the pact discussed between him and the late pope, we cannot be surprised that the death of Adrian should have intervened between it and its fulfilment. The pope was merely to have said his prayers, and adhered rigidly to the canons, and trusted for all the rest to the king. If this was what was to be implied in the title “defensor ecclesiæ,” we cannot be surprised at his suppression of it in his first letter to Leo. That his own theologians should have passed it only shews how they must have felt themselves his creatures. When Alcuin, for instance, makes him a present of “the two swords,” and says, “Hoc mirabile et speciale in te pietatis Dei donum prædicamus, quod tantâ devotione ecclesiæ Christi a perfidorum doctrinis intrinsecus purgare tuerique niteris, quantâ forinsecus a vastatione paganorum defendere vel propagare conaris. . . .” (*Ep. c. ed. Migne*), we might fancy we were listening to divines of the *Jacques premier* or *Louis quatorze* school; when Alcuin writes to Leo III. on his accession, “Qui sedem sanctorum tenes Patrum, eorum exemplis inhaereas semper, ut cum illis multiplici laboris mercede in Domini Dei tui gaudia intrare merearis. . . .” (*Ep. xxiv. ibid.*), we feel he must have been privy to the letter on which we are now engaged. Angilbert was the bearer of both letters; if he had brought back a complaisant reply to either, would it not have been preserved? Contemporary facts may perhaps help us to understand their full import. Almost all the kings of Spain had constituted themselves “ecclesiæ defensores” of late years, in the sense put upon that title now by Charlemagne. Almost all had formulated at the successive councils of Toledo dogmatic tomes or prefaces for their bishops to sign. Charles himself had taken advantage of their precedent to address a dogmatic epistle to archbishop Eliandus and the bishops of Spain from Frankfurt; nay, more, to publish his refutation of the second Nicene council at the same place, though it had been received by the late pope. Adrian, on this, had felt it his duty to defend the Nicene decrees against the king. One of the points which the king had dragged into controversy was the actual creed of the church, a point, strange to say, overlooked altogether by Dean Milman. This Adrian upheld in the form given to it at Chalcedon, and meant to be final, while Charles constituted himself champion of an unauthorised addition made to the article relating to the Holy Ghost in Spain. Was this one of the points “agitated with complaints between them” that Angilbert was instructed to bear in mind? Another point interwoven with this was the bond of union in which it formed almost the last link between old and new Rome. The second Nicene council had galvanised their relations into new life, which Adrian had fostered to the chagrin of the king. Could Leo be persuaded, or would he bear forcing, to be more pliant? Such we may fairly conjecture to have been the alternatives that presented themselves to the royal mind in despatching Angilbert. Angilbert was to try the first of them and report. Accordingly we have detailed accounts of the costly presents that he brought with him,

a portion of the spoils Charles had just had sent him from the palace of the vanquished king of the Huns. But Angilbert must have returned as he came, some say more than once, or we should have heard of his success. An ominous silence ensued, unbroken, save by an exchange of letters between king Kenulf and the pontiff on the privileges of the see of Canterbury, then in abeyance, which Haddan and Stubbs refer to A.D. 798, and, possibly, the ghost of a synod at Rome, condemning a tract of Felix against Alcuin, which, if it happened at all, must have happened in the first months of the year following (Mansi, xiii. 1030-32); and then, all of a sudden, Rome was electrified and horrified by an event which took place there, in which Campulus, already mentioned in the letter of Charles, as one of the bearers of the last communication between him and Adrian, was, with his brother Paschal, the prime mover, both holding high posts in that church at the time, which they had inherited from the late pope, their uncle.

"The pope," says Dean Milman, "was to ride in solemn pomp on St. George's day to the church of St. Lawrence, called in *Lucina*. On a sudden a band of armed men sprang from their ambush, the pope was thrown from his horse, and an awkward attempt was made to practise the oriental punishment of mutilation, as yet rare in the West, to put out his eyes and to cut out his tongue. Paschalis and Campulus, instead of defending the pope, dragged him to a neighbouring church, and there, before the high altar, attempted to complete the imperfect mutilation, beat him cruelly, and left him weltering in his blood . . . Leo recovered his sight and his speech . . . a faithful servant rescued him, and carried him to the church of St. Peter . . ." Thence he was removed to Spoleto, and thence to Paderborn, where Charles was then holding his court. "The reception of Leo was courteous and friendly. . . . But at the same time arrived accusations of some unknown and mysterious nature against the pope. . . . Charles did not decline, but postponed, till his arrival in Rome, the judicial investigation of these charges; but he continued to treat the pope with undiminished respect and familiarity. The return of Leo to Rome is said to have been one long triumph. . . . The journey of Charles to Rome was slow . . ." It was not till towards the end of the following year that he even crossed the Alps, nor till the end of November that he entered Rome. Even then "he did not appear at Rome as the avowed protector and avenger of the injured pope against those who had so barbarously violated his sacred person. He assumed the office of judge; a synod was held, and a long and difficult investigation of the charges made against Leo by his enemies proceeded, without protest from the pope. Paschalis and Campulus were summoned to prove their charges. On their failure, they were condemned to death—a sentence commuted by the merciful interposition of the pope to imprisonment in France." Banishment it was *only* from the first, according to his biographer, and banishment to where the court then was. Their "followers," according to the same authority, shared their fate. The bishops shrank from further proceedings. And then, and not before, was Leo permitted to avouch his own innocence. "This solemn judgment had hardly passed when

Christmas day arrived—the Christmas of the last year of the 8th century. . . . Charles and all his sumptuous court . . . were present at the high services of the Nativity. The pope himself chanted the mass. . . . At the close, the pope arose, advanced towards Charles with a splendid crown in his hands, placed it upon his brow, and proclaimed him Caesar Augustus. . . . His words were lost in the acclamations of the soldiery, the people, and the clergy" (*Lat. Christianity*, b. iv. c. 12). Dean Milman recognises no connexion between this event and the outrage committed on Leo, with his being carried off to Paderborn to be caressed and befooled there, and then tried at Rome, to say nothing of the mild sentence passed on his accusers and outragers. But suppose that Leo was to be frightened, if he could not be persuaded, into compliance when the time came. On this hypothesis the outrage committed on him hardly needs explanation. The nephews of Adrian had often negotiated matters of delicacy with him before as messengers of their uncle. They were not employed to commit a crime, but to act a part; to terrify, not to kill; to paralyse, not to maim, his successor. What could have prevented their doing either had they been so minded? His cure was instantaneous; in the eyes of the uninitiated a miracle, because no more was ever intended than to let as much of his blood flow as would put him in fear of his life. He was then taken from place to place, as though his would-be murderers were still pursuing him, till at last he was brought to the king as the only person who could ensure his safety. Then, after a short sojourn there, the pope was sent home with the charges against him still hanging over his head, till it was convenient to Charles to move. And then Charles so timed his move as to reach Rome just as Christmas was impending. Arrived there, care was taken that Leo should have to go through a long ordeal before his innocence was established, and that his accusers and assailants should get off the next thing to scot free, while he was called upon to avouch his own innocence to the general public, though it had been already proved. Lastly, with regard to the final scene not having been pre-arranged, the earliest account of it—that of the Laureshamensian annals—seems much preferable, which says: "It was judged by the same council that listened to his purgation, that is to say, himself and all the bishops and Christian people composing it, that as the Greeks had no longer an emperor, but a woman at their head, and as king Charles was in possession of Rome, the seat of the Caesars, and all the other places held by him in Italy, France, and Germany, he should be named emperor; for since God had put all these territories in his hands, it was only just that he should accept that title as from God at their request. Thus, on his not liking to reject their petition, but placing himself with all lowliness in the hands of God conformably with their wishes, he assumed the name of emperor on Christmas day, and with it received consecration from pope Leo." All present were privy to it. Alcuin had been earnestly pressed to be present by his royal patron, but had as earnestly begged to be excused. All present were consenting parties to it in their respective ways—the people in theirs and Charles in his; Leo, possibly least

of all, in his. Draw back he could not. It would have been only to kick against the pricks. He sought to make the best of a bad bargain he could. It has been called the transfer of the empire from the Greeks to the Franks; and the French reverted to it, as such, in the last century with enthusiasm. It would, notwithstanding, have been more truly called the division of Christendom into two sections—the Eastern and Western churches, as they were styled in formal documents on both sides all through the middle ages—each with a separate creed of its own, the work of Charlemagne, as we shall shew reason for believing, in the teeth of the pope. Again there is a break in the reported proceedings of Leo. Haddan and Stubbs, indeed, assign A.D. 802 as the year in which his letters to archbishop Athelard and king Kenulph, restoring all ancient rights to the see of Canterbury, diverted from it in favour of Lichfield by his predecessor, on a pressing request from king Offa, were written (iii. 536-9). Eginhard never once mentions his name from A.D. 801 to 804, when, according to him, Leo expressed his desire to spend Christmas with Charles, but with what object we are not told. He passed eight days at Aix accordingly, was complimented with costly gifts, and escorted as far as Ravenna on his return home. Two years afterwards, according to the same authority, Charles held a great meeting of his notables, at which he settled a tripartite division of his dominions between his sons in case of his demise. The instrument embodying this arrangement was brought by Eginhard himself to the pope for his assent and signature, which was readily given. And then, *with that year*, the ten extant letters of Leo to Charles commence, and are supposed to cover a period of seven years from that time. But, in point of fact, they break off abruptly with A.D. 809, the last three leaving a gap of three years from then, and having been all penned under circumstances of unusual excitement, accounting fully for the mis-statements with which the last abounds, between fear of the Moors and reports of troubles at Constantinople. Practically, therefore, the whole correspondence consists of seven letters, and the space covered by them of three years, after which they cease. Cennius prints them in a sort of supplemental code, ranged chronologically, like the letters of the previous code. Certainly they are complaisant enough to warrant their being placed in a code by themselves, as they are more explicit on the "donation" and the rights established by it, in many particulars, than the original code (Praef. p. xxvi. and Diss. i. § 3-4). The fifth and sixth relate solely to English affairs, and are concerned with the deposition of Eardulf king of Northumbria, who, crossing over the sea, presented himself in turn to the emperor and the pope, and through their joint offices is said to have effected his restoration. Letters from Eanbald archbishop of York, from king Kenulph and Wado, to Charles, were forwarded by him to Leo, from whose comments on them we may infer that Kenulph was on as bad terms then with his own archbishop Wulfred as Eardulf with Eanbald (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 562, note b). But the protest of the English bishops against the innovation imposed on their archbishops to go to Rome for their pall, which

is addressed to pope Leo, seems more likely to have been intended for the fourth of that name than for the third (*ibid.* 561, note a, though they leave the point open). Again it deserves to be noticed that none of the replies of Charles to these letters are forthcoming. The date which has been assigned to the seventh letter is A.D. 809. In that year Charles reopened the question about the creed. The papal biographer shrinks from hazarding a word on that delicate subject, beyond recording the protest of Leo, so far as it took the form of a votive gift, to which we shall return presently. Meanwhile this was the occasion of it. There was a Latin convent or congregation on Mount Olives—possibly the same that Rufinus of Aquileia frequented in his day—but Frank monks often lodged there now; and the very day on which the resolution was taken to crown Charles emperor, a monk named Zachariah, whom he had despatched to Jerusalem the year before with offerings to the holy places, opportunely returned with two more monks, bearing from the patriarch, in token of his benediction, the keys of the holy sepulchre and of Calvary, with a standard for Charles. All three monks were graciously received and entertained by him, remained to witness his coronation, and were sent back remunerated, as Eginhard says (*Annal.* A.D. 800). In 807 more monks arrived, including, this time, the abbat of Mount Olives and an envoy from the king of Persia. Two years afterwards a council was assembled at Aix in November to consider how the religious difficulty should be met that had occurred at Jerusalem. "A certain monk, named John," says Eginhard (A.D. 809), "first brought it on there." This authenticates both the man and the date. The monks of Mount Olives wrote their own account of it, in a letter that has fortunately been preserved, to Leo. They told him that one John, of the convent of St. Sabas, had accused them of heresy, and that the priests and people had assembled on the Sunday following over against the holy sepulchre, that is, in the space between it and Calvary, to question them on their faith and creed in consequence. "They replied that their faith was that of the Roman church, but that they knew that in their manner of saying the doxology . . . they used expressions which were not in the Greek; and that in the creed they spoke of the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son, which was the reason why John had called them heretics. . . They defended themselves to the pope by saying that one of their number, named Leo, before leaving the West had heard the creed thus sung in the imperial chapel; that the emperor had himself made them a present of a homily of St. Gregory and the rule of St. Benedict, where the same expression occurred; and that it was so likewise in the faith of St. Athanasius. They acknowledge that it was not so in the Greek; and, therefore, they beg the pope to ascertain from the emperor how the creed was sung in his chapel, and then instruct them how to act for the future" (*Christendom's Divisions*, part ii. 72).

This account, perhaps, is anything but the artless composition it might appear at first sight. To bid the pontiff ascertain from the emperor how the creed was sung in his chapel, when they had stated this already themselves, and then instruct

them how to act, was as much as to intimate that the only course open to him would be to uphold them on that point against the Greeks. When they stated that one of their number had been their informant, they must have well known that they could have confirmed his testimony by that of their abbat had they pleased. Indeed the probability would be, that they were aware the emperor had himself upheld his version of the creed against the late pope, who maintained the Greek version of it to be that of the church. Then, again, the works quoted by them, in support of the *chapel* version of it, call for remark. St. Gregory the Great had been apocrisarius at Constantinople; and at least three of his works were then circulating in a Greek dress, and extremely popular. A monastic rule like that of St. Benedict would be sure to procure respect in the East. Finally "*the Faith of St. Athanasius*," which they reserve to the last, on a subject so grave, might well be thought to leave the Greeks without reply. No other three works, in short, on the Latin side could have been chosen for their purpose so well. Some further remarks on the last of them, in reference to questions of our own times, may be not out of place. (1) By "*the faith of St. Athanasius*," as shewn by the subject on which it is quoted, must certainly be meant the creed called after him still. (2) This is, as certainly too, the first authentic mention of it in any known document with a name to it, whose date cannot be questioned. (3) Equally certain is it, in conclusion, that the first use to which there is authentic evidence that it was turned, was to be quoted against the Greeks on the procession of the Holy Ghost. Leo forwarded their letter to Charles, enclosed in a short one, which Cennius is pleased to omit, from himself. He there mentions having heard subsequently from Thomas patriarch of Jerusalem, advising that he should commend them to the emperor. "We have sent them," he says, "a profession of the Catholic faith, which should be held steadfast and inviolate by all members of our holy Catholic and apostolic church." His profession of faith, which is a long one, is stated to be that of the holy Roman Catholic and apostolic church, and is addressed to all the churches of the East (Mansi, xiii. 978). It speaks of the Holy Ghost as "proceeding from the Father and the Son" in one place; and as "proceeding equally from Both," in another—equally sent by Both, in other words—mission and procession being considered synonymous in those days, when not expressly distinguished. At the end of the whole we read: "Him that believes not according to this faith the holy Catholic and apostolic church condemns." This profession, he adds, he would send the emperor for perusal. Whether it ever reached the East we are not told. If it ever reached the emperor, Leo, so far as we know, never got thanked for it. Leo had become more tractable since the outrage, but there was still a point on which he was as unwilling as ever: and that point was the creed. Nothing short of his giving way on that point would satisfy Charles. Accordingly the letter which he had written to the emperor could have been barely received when a deputation started from Aix to Rome, consisting of the bishop of Worms, the abbat of Corbey, and the

abbat of St. Michael in Lorraine, Smaragdus, the best known of the three, who reports their proceedings at full length, proving that their whole mission was confined to this one point. The deputies made the most of the arguments which they had evidently been told to use. The pope admitted having authorised the singing of the creed, but was peremptory that he never had authorised the singing it with the "*Filioque*" clause, and also that he never would. The emperor was quite free to drop the singing of the creed in his chapel, if he liked. The comment on this finale by Eginhard is curt enough. "*Nec aliquid tamen definitum est, propter rerum, ut videbatur, magnitudinem.*" On their departure, Leo took steps to bind his successors for ever to the firm stand he had thus made; and this act of his the papal biographer takes care to report, though he omits all mention of what had led to it. Midway among his various gifts to churches it is recorded of him, that he caused two silver plates to be made, and affixed to the confession, or shrine, of St. Peter, in the basilica of that name; on one of which the creed was engraved in Greek, on the other in Latin; and in each case without those words "*and from the Son.*" The Greeks never forgot that act of Leo during the controversy which ensued. Photius appeals to it in writing to the patriarch of Aquileia (§ 4), St. Peter Damian, two centuries later, testifies to their being *in situ* then (*Opusc.* xxxviii.). Vecvus patriarch of Constantinople, two more centuries on, declares they were kept hanging up still (*Allat. Graec. Orthod.* i. 173). At length the successors of Leo yielded to the successors of Charlemagne, broke, as it appears to the present writer, with the church of the Fathers, by turning their backs upon its oecumenical creed, that had maintained its unity till then unscathed, and received as their reward the power of bestowing crowns in Europe, and of being crowned themselves. Benedict VIII., according to Berno, deferring to the urgent request of his benefactor Henry II. of Germany, sanctioned, A.D. 1014, the recital of the interpolated creed in the Roman Mass for the first time.

To finish with Leo. No more letters would appear to have passed between Charles and him for three years after his *ultimatum* had been delivered at Aix. Eginhard never again names him, during the lifetime of Charles, except to say that the ambassadors of the Greek emperor Michael having prevailed upon Charles to ratify the treaty drawn up between him and the late emperor Nicephorus, in which his own title was recognised, received it in duplicate from Leo in the church of St. Peter, A.D. 812, on their way home. But no message to him from Charles on that occasion is reported. One of the envoys, Michael metropolitan of Synnada, brought him a flattering letter, indeed, from the then patriarch of Constantinople, Nicephorus, which may have comforted him for his stiffness about the creed. For, though it flatters him, it is uncompromising in its orthodoxy: rehearsing the councils by name, and professing obedience to them all, asserting of the Holy Ghost too, distinctly, that He has His being from the Father, not indeed by generation, but by procession. The three letters addressed by Leo to the emperor in that and the following year

must have found the latter breaking up, as his death was expected A.D. 813, and actually took place A.D. 814. He had not been dead a twelve-month, before a fresh conspiracy was formed against Leo; but Leo, now free to act for himself, far from interceding for his enemies, put them all to death without scruple, and justified his severity to Bernhard king of Italy, whom the emperor Louis had despatched to investigate the matter, on hearing of it. But Leo fell ill soon afterwards, shewing that he had overtaxed his strength; and a fresh outburst might have proved more successful, had it not been quelled at once by Bernhard. The year following, A.D. 816, May 25, Leo died, having held office twenty years and five months exactly. M. Rohrbacher says he is honoured on June 12, but he has never been canonised. For more, see his *Hist. bks. liii.-v.*; Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. iv.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. iv.; Gieseler, per. iii. div. i. part ii. c. ii. § 5; Jaffé's *Regest. Pontif. Rom.*; Cennius, *Mon. Pontif. Dom.* 2 vols.; *Anastasius in Vit.*; Eginhard, *Annal. &c.*

[E. S. Ff.]

LEO (8), second bishop of Brundisium, A.D. 172-182 (Ughelli, ix. 11; Cappelletti, xxi. 115). Cappelletti thinks he may have been the martyr Leontius of Brundisium. [C. H.]

LEO (9), bishop of Sipontum (Siponto), acc. c. A.D. 256, died c. A.D. 293. (Sarnelli, *Vescovi Sipontini*, p. 23; Cappelletti, xx. 578; Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* vii. 814 and note.) [R. S. G.]

LEO (10), third bishop of Die, before A.D. 325. (*Gall. Ch.* xvi. 511.) [R. T. S.]

LEO (11), bishop of Samos; probably during the reign of Constantius, A.D. 337-61. (*Acta SS.* Boll. iii. April. 625; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 929.) [L. D.]

LEO (12) I., second bishop of Vicohabentia (Voghenza) A.D. 364. (Cappelletti, iv. 15, 224.) [C. H.]

LEO (13) II., eleventh bishop of Voghenza c. 611. (Cappelletti, iv. 21; Ughelli, ii. 518.) [C. H.]

LEO (14), bishop and martyr in the time of the Arian struggles under Constantius and Liberius. De Rossi discovered his inscription, which perplexed him much, as it purported to be erected by Laurentia his wife. De Rossi supposes that April 11, now dedicated to pope Leo the Great, was originally dedicated to this martyr. (De Rossi, *Bullett.* 1864, p. 84.) [G. T. S.]

LEO (15), generally supposed to have been bishop of Feretrum (Montefeltro) c. A.D. 368. It is doubtful, however, whether he was not only a presbyter of that place. (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* iii. 285.) Ughelli (ii. 844) omits him. [R. S. G.]

LEO (16), bishop of Horta (Orte), probably c. A.D. 384, and said to have held that see for twenty-three years. (Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* i. 734; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* vi. 33.) [R. S. G.]

LEO (17) I., 28th bishop of Salona (Spalato) in Dalmatia from A.D. 380 to 395. (Farlati, *Illyric. Sacr.* ii. 41.) [J. de S.]

LEO (18) I., tenth bishop of Acheruntia (Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* vii. 13). Cappelletti computes his period as A.D. 382-405 (*Le Chiese d'Ital.* xx. 420, 450). [C. H.]

LEO (19) II., seventeenth bishop of Acheruntia, c. 796-799. (Ughelli, vii. 13; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xx. 420, 450.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (20), third bishop of Troyes, in the 4th century. (*Gall. Ch.* xii. 484.) [R. T. S.]

LEO, bishop of Ancyra. [LEONTIUS (8).]

LEO (21), bishop of Mopte, or Moste, a town of Mauretania Sitifensis (Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 654), present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411 (*Collat. Carth.* cogn. i. 143, 223; ii. 53; iii. 2). He was also present at the council of Carthage, A.D. 418, and probably at that of Milevis A.D. 416. (*Aug. Ep.* 176; *Innoc. Ep.* 27; *Bruns. Conc.* i. 195.) [H. W. P.]

LEO (22), bishop of Oppinum in Mauritania Tingitana, delegate of his province at the synod of Carthage, A.D. 419. (Mansi, iv. 438; Morelli, *Afr. Christ.* i. 251.) [R. S. G.]

LEO (23), bishop of Psynchus in Egypt, at the council of Ephesus, 431, according to one reading (Mansi, v. 590 B), but the reading of other lists is Theon or Theonas (Le Quien, ii. 615). [C. H.]

LEO (24), bishop of Turiasso (Tarazona in Aragon), slain by the soldiers of the Roman general Basilius (Idatius, *Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* ii. 882). See Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xlix. 81. [C. H.]

LEO (25), seventh bishop of Teate (Chieti), apparently in the 5th century. (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xxi. 96.) [C. H.]

LEO (26), placed first among those present at the synod of Angers, A.D. 453 (Mansi, vii. 900 and Sirmond's note, 902 c), probably metropolitan of Bourges. The epistle which he and two other bishops addressed to the bishops and presbyters of Tertia Lugdunensis, and which was once reckoned ep. 96 of Leo the Great (Cave, i. 444; Tillem. xvi. 770), will be found in *Pat. Lat.* liv. 1239. [R. T. S.]

LEO (27), bishop of Sabrata in the Provincia Tripolitana, one of the bishops banished by Hunneric A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. *Notit.* 60; Morelli, *Afr. Christ.* i. 269.) [R. S. G.]

LEO (28), eighth bishop of Nantes, in the 5th century. (*Gall. Ch.* xiv. 796.) [R. T. S.]

LEO (29), sixteenth bishop of Sens, probably the prelate of that name addressed, together with Heraclius bishop of Paris and Theodosius bishop of Auxerre, in the third letter of St. Remigius, written about 512, in reply to one of theirs, which is lost (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxx. 966; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 159). During his episcopate king Childebert desired to establish a bishopric at Melun, which was within his territory, while Sens, its diocesan city, was in the kingdom of Theodebert. Leo strenuously resisted this diminution of his dignity in a letter to Childebert which is extant (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 11, 12; *Boll. Acta SS.* Apr. iii. 31; *Gall. Christ.* xii. instr. 1), expressing his wonder that this unprecedented step should be attempted

without the concurrence of Theodebert, whose subject he himself was. The project was never carried out, and Melun remained in the diocese of Sens. He is commemorated April 22 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 960; *Boll. Apr.* iii. 31). For his life, see *Gall. Christ.* xii. 6; *Boll. Apr.* iii. 31–2, and *Hist. Litt.* iii. 244–5. [S. A. B.]

LEO (30), thirteenth bishop of Tours for six months, cir. A.D. 526. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 31; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 18; *Tillem. Mém.* x. 782.) [S. A. B.]

LEO (31) I., twenty-fourth bishop of Nola, c. 533 (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xix. 583, 632). Ughelli thinks that this is the bishop Leo to whom Marcellus addressed his life of Felix the presbyter of Nola (*Boll. Acta SS.* 14 Jan. i. 946), but there is no actual proof of it, as is remarked by Bolland and Tillemont (*Mém.* iv. 227). [C. H.]

LEO (32) II., twenty-seventh bishop of Nola, A.D. 620. (Cappelletti, xix. 584, 632; but see Ughelli, vi. 253.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (33) III., 30th bishop of Nola c. 700 (Cappelletti, xix. 585, 632). Ughelli (vi. 253) reckons him the 25th. [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (34), fourth bishop of Agde, said to have been sitting in 541. Nothing is known of him except a story related by Gregory of Tours in the *De Glor. Mart.* i. 79. This story is put by Baronius under the year 583 (an. 583, xlvi.), but the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* believe that Gomacharius was ruling Agde about 540 (vi. 667). [S. A. B.]

LEO (35), fourth bishop of Volterra 566. (Ughelli, i. 1427; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xviii. 215, 263.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (36) of Capua, eighth bishop of Cales (Calvi) in Campania, 557–567. (Cappelletti, xx. 184, 193.) [C. H.]

LEO (37), a bishop in Corsica, to whom Gregory the Great in 591 committed the visitation and care of the destitute see of Saona. (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* lib. i. indict. ix. 78, 80 in Migne, lxxvii. 532, 534.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (38), seventh bishop of Catania; he was accused of crimes of which, after a personal investigation, Gregory the Great declared him innocent. He received several letters from Gregory (A.D. 592, 596, 600). (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* lib. ii. indict. x. 33, lib. vi. indict. xiv. 33, lib. x. indict. iii. 22 in Migne, lxxvii. 572, 824, 1081; Pirro, *Sic. Sac.* i. 517.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (39), bishop of Fano, A.D. 589–658. He received a letter from pope Gregory the Great in 596 desiring him to protect and provide for a certain monk Joannes (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* lib. vi. indict. xiv. 47 in Migne, lxxvii. 833). He is the 6th known bishop of the see, succeeding Eusebius after a long interval in 589 and preceding Fortunatus. (Ughelli, i. 658; Cappelletti, vii. 337, 431.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (40), bishop of Novara, the authority for whom is the life of Gaudentius the founder of the see (cap. iv. § 21 in *Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 421). Leo's period is still to be determined, and the chronology of the see of Novara is

very defective before the 9th century. Baronius (*Mart. Rom.* Jan. 22, note f) found from the records of the cathedral that he was contemporary with pope Paul I., i.e. cir. 760, and this date is accepted by Tillemont (x. 759). Lazarus A. Cotta in his *Museo Novarese* (p. 19) regards Leo as the twenty-fourth bishop, from a little after 680 until before 723, which reckoning is in the main that of Ughelli (iv. 695) and Cappelletti (xiv. 449, 526), who place him cir. 700, between Laureolus and Ambrosius. [C. H.]

LEO (41), bishop of Haran, an adherent of the orthodox faith, to whom Elias, a Jacobite bishop, addressed an apologetic letter which is still extant, c. A.D. 630 (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 467). Le Quien (*Oriens Christ.* ii. 977) supposes that both this bishop and his predecessor Constantine belonged not to the Haran (Charrae) in Mesopotamia, but to a little town of the same name in Coele-Syria. Ceillier (xii. 100) assigns this bishop to A.D. 740, because Elias cites and rejects the doctrine of John of Damascus who lived during the reigns of Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus, A.D. 717–775. [L. D.]

LEO (42) II., twelfth bishop of Catania, c. 778, surnamed THAUMATURGUS from his reputed miracles. There is a short account of him in Basil's *Menology* (Feb. 20). Narratives in greater detail are given by Pirro (*Sic. Sac.* i. 518) and Bolland (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 222). (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xxi. 636.) [C. H.]

LEO (43), bishop of Salerno, who subscribed a letter of pope Paul I. in June 761 (Mansi, xii. 649; Jaffé, *Regesta Pont.* 195). He is reckoned eighteenth bishop of the see. (Ughelli, vii. 328; Cappelletti, xx. 285, 324.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (44), bishop of Albano, who subscribed a letter of pope Paul I. in June 761 (Mansi, xii. 649; Jaffé, *Regesta Pont.* 195). He is placed tenth in the see between Tiberius and Eustasius or Eustachius. (Ughelli, i. 250; Cappelletti, i. 659, 678.) [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (45), bishop of Viterbo, c. 767, according to a single MS. record, which is relied upon by the Viterbians as a proof of the antiquity of their cathedral (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, vi. 79). Ughelli (i. 1401) makes no mention of this bishop. [C. H.]

LEO (46), bishop of Citta di Castello (Tiferium) in Umbria, present at the Lateran synod in 769 (Mansi, xii. 715; Hefele, § 343). Cappelletti (iv. 590, 746) reckons him the tenth known bishop of the see. Ughelli (i. 1318) does not give him. [A. H. D. A.]

LEO (47), archbishop and forty-fifth bishop of Ravenna (Cappelletti, ii. 73, 184). Anastasius in his life of pope Stephen III. relates that on the death of Sergius in 769, Leo, then archdeacon, was canonically elected to succeed, but that Maurice duke of Ariminum, in concert with Desiderius king of the Lombards, appointed the layman Michael, whom they requested pope Stephen III. to consecrate. Anastasius adds that Maurice carried Leo captive to Ariminum; that the pope not only refused to consecrate the intruder but sent messengers to Ravenna,

accompanied by the envoys of king Charles, who were then at Rome, and succeeded in putting down Michael, who was brought prisoner to Rome. In 770 Leo was consecrated by the pope, who delegated to him authority over the exarchate which Pippin had recently conferred on the Roman see, but of which the pope had no more than a titular possession. In 772 Stephen III. was succeeded by Hadrian I., and Charles was sole king of the Franks. In 773 Charles marched into Italy against the Lombard power, and, if the Ravenna writer Agnellus is to be credited, it was archbishop Leo who invited Charles, while the person who guided the Frank army across the Alps was Leo's deacon Martin, himself afterwards archbishop. There seems no reason why Leo may not have engaged in this scheme as well as Hadrian. In 774, when Desiderius was dethroned and the Lombard power broken up by Charles, Leo began to exercise independent authority of a civil nature in the territory he was appointed to administer for the pope, as appears from many bitter complaints in Hadrian's letters to Charles, A.D. 774, 775. Reviving the title borne by the Byzantine viceroys residing at Ravenna down to about 751 [EURYCHIUS (33)], Leo even styled himself exarch of Italy. As the temporal dominion of the Roman see was then springing into existence, Leo of Ravenna, evidently a dangerous rival, acquires a measure of historical importance. Ravenna, as the latest capital of the empire for the Italian dominions, had some advantages over Rome. The towns grouped around Ravenna had long been accustomed to look to that city as the central authority. Consequently on the downfall of the Lombard domination and the departure of Charles in 774, the archbishop had found no difficulty in obtaining recognition in his own name. Besides the familiarity of the old obedience, the territory itself was beyond the power of Rome, the Apennines lying between. There was every appearance therefore at this juncture that the pontiff of the Adriatic capital would be the first to constitute himself a territorial potentate. Hadrian's letter to Charles in 774 (ep. 52) is especially interesting for its information on the subject of this rivalry. It enumerates the towns in which Leo was confessedly acknowledged. They are found nearly all on the great road which, commencing at Ariminum, runs at the base of the Apennines in a straight course to Placentia. Commencing from the south there were Caesena (Cesena), Forum Popilli (Forlim Popoli), Forum Livii (Forlì), Faventia (Faenza), Forum Cornellii (Imola), Bononia (Bologna). These, with Ravenna itself and two others, Comaclum and Bobium, virtually comprised the exarchate. Comaclum (Comacchio) lay in the maritime marshes north of the capital. The position of Bobium is less certain, but this town is not to be supposed the Bobbio of Columbanus, which was quite unconnected with this district. Spruner's map puts Bobium at Galeata, far up in the Apennines near the source of the Vitis or Bidens (now Ronco or Bedese), a stream running down to Ravenna. Galeata (Galeata) according to Rampoldi (*Corografia dell'Italia*, s. v.) was once a fortified place. Besides this district there was another, the Italian Pentapolis, occupied by a chain of coast towns extending

from Ariminum (Rimini) to Ancona and Auximum (Osimo), which Hadrian claimed and Leo pretended to; but these were outside the exarchate and the pope allows were better affected to Rome. Hadrian's letter also shews that Leo's emissaries were then in France busily seeking to forward their master's projects at the expense of the Roman see. Ravenna however had neither the pontifical history nor the political associations that could compete with Rome, and the Petrine traditions in the church of Ravenna (*vid. Agnellus's Life of Apollinaris*) were no rival for those of the older capital. Leo died Feb. 14, 777, and was succeeded by John, who is variously reckoned John VI., John VII., John VIII. (Anastas. *Biblioth. Life of Steph. III.* §§ 282, 283, in *Pat. Lat.* cxxviii. 1158; Agnellus, *Lib. Pontif. Raven.* in *Pat. Lat.* cvi. 733; Hadrian. *Pap. Epp.* 52-55 in *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 283 sq.; Rubeus, *Hist. Ravennat.* p. 199; Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* ii. 343; Ceillier, xii. 118.) [C. H.]

LEO (48), the name of several bishops present at the seventh synod in 787, viz. the bishops of—

Aleus or Alii (Alini) in Phrygia Pacatiana. (Mansi, xii. 997 D, 1108, xiii. 148, 371 B, 394, 628; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 807.)

Algiza. (Mansi, xii. 996 A, where LEONTIUS is the Greek reading, 1097, xiii. 142, 367, 386, 626.)

Amisus or Pompeiopolis. (Mansi, xii. 997 A, xiii. 374 B, 391; Le Quien, i. 536.)

Andida, *vid. Sandida.*

Ariste, *vid. Neocaesarea.*

Aspendus in Pamphylia. (Mansi, xii. 996 E, xiii. 145, 370 C, 391; Le Quien, i. 1002.)

Baris or Bare, in Pisidia. (Mansi, xii. 1000 A, xiii. 149, 371 C; Le Quien, i. 1049.) The Moesian town Odysseus or Odessus on the Euxine, somewhere near Varna, was also called Bares, and Le Quien (i. 1226) repeats this Leo under the see of Odysseus.

Carpathus in the Aegean. (Mansi, xii. 1153, xiii. 141, 367, 628; Le Quien, i. 948.)

Cisamus in Crete. (Mansi, xiii. 146, 370 B, 391; Le Quien, ii. 272.)

Cius in Bithynia. (Mansi, xii. 1096, xiii. 141, 367, 372, 625; Le Quien, i. 634.)

Corydallus in Lycia. (Mansi, xii. 997 B, 1111, xiii. 147, 370 E, 394, 629; Le Quien, i. 980.)

Dida, *vid. Sandida.*

Decimium in Phrygia Salutaris. (Mansi, xii. 1108, xiii. 148, 371 B, 395, 628; Le Quien, i. 854.)

Eumenia in Phrygia Pacatiana. (Mansi, xii. 997 D, xiii. 148, 371 B, 394, 628 where, and at xii. 1105 the reading is LEONTIUS; Le Quien, i. 808.)

Heraclea in Thracia. (Mansi, xiii. 135, 379; Le Quien, i. 1109.)

Iconium (Cogni), the metropolis of the province of Lycaonia. (Mansi, xii. 1152, xiii. 137, 366, 382, 625; Le Quien, i. 1071.)

Limyra in Lycia. (Mansi, xii. 997 B where the Greek reads LEONTIUS, 1106, xiii. 147, 370 E, 394, 627; Le Quien, i. 972.)

Linoë in Bithynia. (Mansi, xii. 996 E where the reading is LEONTIUS, 1104, xiii. 145, 370, 627; Le Quien, i. 657.)

Madytus in Thracia. (Mansi, xii. 996 B, 1100, xiii. 143 where and at 367 the reading is LEONIDES, 626; Le Quien, i. 1141.) [LEONIDES (7).]



Mesembria in Thracia. (Mansi, xii. 1097, xiii. 142, 367, 386, 625; Le Quien, i. 1181.)

Minzus, also written Minizus, Mnzizus, Mizua, in the province of Galatia Prima. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 482; Mansi, xii. 996 c, xiii. 143, 367, 387.)

Neo-Caesarea in Bithynia, also called Ariste. (Mansi, xii. 996 d, 1104, xiii. 145, 370 b, 390, 627; Le Quien, i. 629.)

Odyssus, *vid.* of Bares.

Phocaea in the province of Asia. (Mansi, xii. 996 b, 1100, xiii. 141, 367, 386, 626; Le Quien, i. 736.)

Phoenix, on the southern coast of Crete. (Mansi, xiii. 146, 370, 392; *Or. Christ.* ii. 268.)

Poemaninus in the Hellespont (Mansi, xii. 996 c, 1101, xiii. 143, 367 c, 390 where the Greek reads LEONTIUS, 626); Le Quien (i. 769) recognises Leontius as the bishop.

Porthmus in Euboea. (Mansi, xii. 1109, xiii. 145, 370, 391, 629; Le Quien, ii. 204.)

Rhodes, the metropolis of the Cyclades. (Mansi, xii. 1152, xiii. 137, 366, 382, 623; Le Quien, i. 925.)

Sandida (also written Andida and Dida), in Pamphylia. (Mansi, xii. 1000 A, 1108, xiii. 149, 371 d, 395, 629; Le Quien, i. 1029.)

Sebaste in Phrygia Paeciana. (Mansi, xii. 1109, xiii. 147, 371 b, 629; Le Quien, i. 806.)

Sibela (also written Sibila, Sibilla, Sibylla). Le Quien (*Oriens Christ.* i. 1083) thinks that this is an error for Psibela in Lycaonia, although Anthimus bishop of Verinopolis, another name of Psibela, is also amongst the subscribers. (Mansi, xii. 1000 A where the Greek reads LEONTIUS, 1109, xiii. 144, 149, 374 A, 398, 629.)

Tracala. (Mansi, xii. 996 d, 1101, xiii. 143, 370 A, 390, 626.)

Trajanopolis (also written Tranopolis and Tranupolis) in Phrygia Salutaris (Mansi, xii. 997 d, 1108 A, xiii. 628 b; Wiltisch, *Handbook*, i. 448). Le Quien (i. 803) places Philip bishop of Tranupolis or Tranopolis (Mansi, xiii. 147, 394) at this Trajanopolis. Ughelli (*Ital. Sac.* vii. 891) on insufficient ground identifies the place with Trani in Italy, and Cappelletti (xxi. 49) copies him.

Troas in the Hellespontine province. (Mansi, xii. 996 c, 1101, xiii. 144, 370 A, 626; Le Quien, i. 779.)

Trocmada, also written Trocnada, in the province of Galatia Secunda. (Mansi, xii. 997 b, 1104, xiii. 146, 370, 391, 627; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 494.) [C. H.]

LEO (49), bishop of the island of Zacynthus. (Mansi, xiii. 146, 369, 391; Le Quien, ii. 232.) [C. H.]

LEO (50) (LEONTIUS), eighteenth bishop of Coutances, in the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xi. 866.) [S. A. B.]

LEO (51), a doubtful bishop of Toulon (*Gall. Christ.* i. 743), at the commencement of the 9th century. [S. A. B.]

LEO (52), one of the bishops who subscribed a placitum of 804 and believed to have been eleventh bishop of Trieste (Cappelletti, viii. 682, 716). Ughelli (v. 577) does not mention him. [C. H.]

LEO, confessor at Vignentia. [LEUS.]

LEO (53), a presbyter of Accinipus and another of Gemella, at the council of Elvira in 305. (Mansi, ii. 108.) [T. W. D.]

LEO (54), Roman priest who bore a letter from pope Coelestine, cir. 425, to Africa. (Coolest. ep. 2 in *Pat. Lat.* i. 423.) [C. H.]

LEO, Armenian martyr. [LEONTIUS.]

LEO (55), a priest in the diocese of Narbonne, who, together with Sabinianus, another priest, exceeded due measure in the punishment of an adulterer. A letter of pope Leo the Great on the subject is extant. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* liv. 1200; Ceillier, x. 200; Tillem. *Mem.* xv. 404.) [S. A. B.]

LEO (56), minister of Euric king of the Visigoths, and poet, principally known from the writings of his friend Sidonius Apollinaris. The date of his appointment to his office is unknown, but cannot have been previous to 466, the year of Euric's accession. He belonged to the city of Narbonne (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* ix. 15; Carm. xxiii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 656, 743), and counted among his ancestors the orator Fronto, whose eloquence he was thought to have inherited (viii. 3, col. 591). At the court of Euric he was "consiliorum principis et moderator et arbiter" (Ennodius, *Vita S. Epiphani*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxiii. 220), and exercised also quaestorial functions (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* viii. 3, col. 591). Though serving a zealous and persecuting Arian prince (cf. vii. 6, col. 569-572), he appears to have remained a Catholic, and on several occasions used his influence in favour of orthodox prelates. In 474 he lent his aid to Epiphanius the bishop of Ticinum in his embassy from the emperor Julius Nepos to the court of Euric (Ennodius, *vid.* col. 220-1). In the following year, when the Auvergne had fallen under his master's power, and Sidonius was imprisoned at Livia, Leo obtained his release (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* viii. 3, col. 591). He is mentioned as still living in one of his friend's letters written about 483 (ix. 15, col. 636), and if we may believe Gregory of Tours, he survived Euric and held the same post under his son and successor Alaric, for he relates that Leo was supernaturally punished with blindness for lowering the roof of the church at Narbonne, which contained the bones of St. Felix, to afford an unobstructed view from Alaric's palace windows (*De Glor. Mart.* cap. xcii.).

He had the reputation of being one of the most eloquent men of his age (Sid. Apoll. Carm. xxiii. col. 743; *Epist.* viii. 3, col. 591; Ennodius, *vid.* col. 220-1), and added an intimate acquaintance with the sciences (Carm. xiv. col. 710-11) and jurisprudence. As an historian he might have surpassed Tacitus (iv. 22, col. 527), as a legist Claudius Appius (carm. xxiii. col. 743), and as a poet Horace (*ibid.*). He was "rex Castalii chori" (ix. 13, col. 630), and is characterized, with reference probably to the ingenuity of his versification, by the epithet of "catus" (Carm. ix. col. 703). In character he was careless of riches, and led an abstemious and austere life at a most luxurious court (viii. 3, 591-2). See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 627-632; Tillem. *Mém.* xvi. 220, 256, 264, 484. [S. A. B.]

LEO (57), a monk of Oasis but a native of Cappadocia, visited in the reign of Tiberius II,

by John Moschus and Sophronius. (Joann. Mosch. *Prat. Spir.* cap. 112.) [C. H.]

**LEO (58)** (popularly St. LiÉ), abbat at Mantuniacum (Mantenay-St.-Lié), on the Seine, two leagues below Troyes. The monastery was founded by St. Romanus, and, as was said, received a charter from Clovis I. About the year 533 St. Romanus became bishop of Rheims (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 33), and thereupon Leo succeeded him in the government of the monastery. (Usuardus, *Mai.* 25; *Boll. Acta SS. Mai.* vi. 73-5; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 531; *Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 114, Paris, 1668.) [S. A. B.]

**LEO (59)**, ex-consul in Sicily, twice mentioned in letters of Gregory the Great, in 590 and 591 (*Epist.* lib. i. indict. ix. epp. 3, 72; Migne, lxxvii. 446, 527). [A. H. D. A.]

**LEO (60)**, the name of some monks and ecclesiastics at the seventh synod in 787, viz. :  
i. A presbyter representing the see of Side (Mansi, xiii. 366, 382, 625; Le Quien, i. 1000); an oconomus representing the see of Sozopolis (xii. 1000 A, where the Greek reads LEONTIUS, 1108, xiii. 629; Le Quien, i. 1044); an oconomus representing the see of Zoropolis (xii. 1109), which town is thought by Hardouin to be meant for Sozopolis in Thrace. Zoropolis and Sozopolis occur both in one list. There was a Euphemius or Euthymius bishop of Sozopolis at this synod (Mansi, xiii. 371 D), and Le Quien (i. 1182) assigns him to the Thracian Sozopolis.

ii. A presbyter of the apostolic church, ruler of monasteries and defender of the church (xiii. 135).

iii. The following hegumeni of monasteries, viz. of—

St. George of the Cells (xiii. 151, 631).

Leucus or Aqua Alba (151, 631).

St. Deipara of Saldala (154, 631).

St. Cyriacus (155, 632). [C. H.]

**LEO (61)**, a Gallic monk, who with several companions, Dominicus, Theodorus, Arimundus, Gregorius, Joannes, and others, retired in the reign of Charlemagne to Mount Olivet. (*Baluze, Miscellanea*, t. ii. p. 84, ed. 1761; Ceillier, xii. 218.) [C. H.]

**LEO (62)**, subdeacon, commemorated with the presbyter Corsicus, June 30 (Usuard. *Mart.*). The *Rom. Mart.* calls his companion the presbyter Caius. [C. H.]

**LEOBALDUS** (LETHBALDUS, LEBARDUS, LEOBARDUS), archbishop and twenty-fifth bishop of Tours, said in the chronicles to have sat six years, but Le Cointe assigns two years only for his episcopate, A.D. 622-624. His successor had certainly been consecrated in 625. (Salmon, *Recueil de Chroniques de Touraine*, pp. 89, 213; Le Cointe, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* ann. 622 vi., 624 ii.; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 27.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOBARDUS (1)**, Jan. 18 (popularly St. LIBERD), a recluse at Majus Monasterium (Marmoutier), near Tours, in the time of Gregory bishop of Tours, cir. 583. (Greg. Turon. *Vit. Patr.* cap. 20; *Boll. Acta SS.* 18 Jan. ii. 198; Ceillier, xi. 366, 382.) On Marmoutier, see *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 192. [C. H.]

**LEOBARDUS (2)**, Feb. 25, a disciple of Columbanus and founder of the monastery Cella-

Leoardi, afterwards called Maursmünster near Saverne or Zabern, in the north of Alsace, A.D. 586. He died in 618. (*Gall. Chr.* v. 866; Le Cointe, *Annal.* ann. 586 xlii., 618 xlix.) [C. H.]

**LEOBARDUS (3)**, nineteenth bishop of Nantes, present at the first council of Rheims, held probably in 625, and, according to Gams, at that of Clichy also, but his name does not appear among the list of the subscriptions in Mansi. (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 102; Mansi, x. 611-12; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 800; Gams, *Series Episc.* 581.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOBATIUS**, first prior of the monastery of Senaparia (Senevières), in the 6th century, appointed by Ursus the founder (Greg. Tur. *Vit. Patr.* cap. 18; Ruinart's note on the passage; *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 191). He was commemorated with Ursus on July 28. (*Boll. Acta SS. Jul.* vi. 563.) [C. H.]

**LEOBERICUS**, of Urgel. [LEUBERICUS.]

**LEOBERTUS**, thirty-fifth bishop of Chartres, succeeding Agatheus, and followed by Hado, said to have been in occupation of the see in A.D. 706. (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1102.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOBYTHA**. [LIOBA.]

**LEOBINUS** (LEUBINUS, popularly LUBIN), ST., seventeenth bishop of Chartres in the 6th century; he died about the year 556. A biography of him survives, which, though positive testimony as to its date is wanting, the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France* (iii. 357-8, 483), think was written some years after his feast had been publicly established, i.e. about A.D. 590, by one of the clergy of the church of Chartres. They attach a high value to its fulness of detail, order, precision, and sincerity, and reject the theories that it was the work of the author of the lives of St. Avitus abbat of Piciac and St. Maximin, or of Venantius Fortunatus, and allow but little weight to the damaging suggestion that expressions in it imply that St. Leobinus was familiar with the rule of St. Benedict, which was not introduced into France till after his death. Duchesne gave some fragments of this life, but it was first published in full by Labbe in his *Bibliotheca* (tom. ii.), then by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 123-8, Paris, 1668), and the Bollandists (*Acta SS. Mar.* ii. 350). It is one of the lives included in Baillet's *Vies des Saints* (March, xiv. tom. iii. 185-190). The circumstantial account of his wanderings while a monk affords an interesting picture of the country, though, perhaps, of a later time than is pretended.

Though his biographer does not mention it, Leobinus was present at the fifth council of Orleans in 549, and was one of the bishops who sat in judgment on Saffaracus the bishop of Paris, and whose sentence was confirmed at the second council of Paris, held about A.D. 555 (Mansi, ix. 136, 740). According to an old MS. codex of the church of Chartres, he was the first to define clearly the boundaries of the diocese, and sat about twelve years (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1096; Mabill. *ibid.* n.).

Leobinus is commemorated in the diocese of

Chartres on two days of the year, March 14 and Sept. 15, but in other churches on the latter only. [S. A. B.]

**LEOCADIA (1)**, Dec. 9, virgin and martyr at Toledo, in the reign of Diocletian, under the praeses Dacianus. Three churches are dedicated to her in Toledo, of which the basilica of St. Leocadia is the first and most famous. (*Esp. Sag.* vi. 309, 320; J. T. Salazar, *Mart. Hisp.* vi. 390; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 334; *Mart. Usuard.* Adon.; Tillem. v. 57.) [F. D.]

**LEOCADIA (2)**, grandmother of Gregory of Tours. (*Vita S. Greg. Tur.* i. Bouquet, ii. 129.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOCADIUS**, one of the principal senators of Gaul, a reputed descendant of Vettius Epagathus, the martyr of Lyon. (Greg. *Tur. Hist. Fr.* i. 29, *Glor. Confess.* cap. 92.) [C. H.]

**LEODARDUS (LETARDUS)**, fourth bishop of Amiens, cir. 416. (*Gall. Chr.* x. 1152.) [C. H.]

**LEODEBAUDUS (LEODEBALDUS)**, tenth bishop of Nevers, according to the *Gallia Christiana*, omitted in Coquille's series. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1170; Coquille, *Hist. du Nivernois*, sub fin., Paris, 1612.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEBERTUS**, thirtieth bishop of Orleans, about the commencement of the 8th century. (*Gallia Christ.* viii. 1417.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEBODUS**, first abbat of St. Anianus (St. Aignan), in the diocese of Orleans, and founder of the monastery of Fleury on the Loire in the same diocese, by his testament in the second year of Clovis II., i. e. A. D. 639. (*Gall. Chr.* viii. 1520, 1538; Ceillier, xiii. 148.) [C. H.]

**LEODEBOLDUS**, bishop of Lisieux, A. D. 662 or 663. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1181; *Gallia Christiana*, xi. 764.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEGARIUS (1) (LÉGER)**, ST., priest in the district of Perthé (Perta) in Champagne, and supposed to have lived in the 5th or 6th century. (*Boll. Acta SS.* Jun. iv. 485-8.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEGARIUS (2) (LÉGER)**, martyr, bishop of Autun, one of the most famous of French saints, was born about 616 of a family of high rank. At an early age he was taken to the court of Clotaire II., who soon afterwards sent him to Dido bishop of Poitiers, his maternal uncle, to be educated. At twenty this relative ordained him a deacon, and a little later promoted him to the office of archdeacon, and shared with him the government of the diocese. He was next given the abbey of St. Maxentius, in the same diocese, whence, after six years, he was summoned to the court of Clotaire III., and St. Balthildis, his mother. About 657, the bishop of Autun, Ferreolus, died, and for nearly two years the city was the scene of a fierce contest between aspirants for the office, only terminated by the murder of one, and the consequent flight of the other. By the influence of Balthildis Leodegar obtained the see (c. A. D. 659). Of the early years of his episcopate we know little, but the sequel proves they were not spent in idleness.

In 670 Clotaire III. died. The choice of his

successor was the signal for an outbreak of hostile forces, which had long been arrayed against each other. The central figure of this time in France was undoubtedly Ebroin, who had become mayor of the palace to Clotaire III. in Neustria, about the same time that Léger went to Autun. Amid the general lawlessness and violence of the times, it is possible to trace the opposition of two great parties representing adverse political principles. On the one side Ebroin stood forward as the champion of the partisans of the royal power, whose stronghold was in Neustria, where circumstances had favoured its growth. On the other side was the party of the nobles or great proprietors, whose ideal apparently was the reduction of the sovereign to his original position as the general of a military nation, and who were dominant in Austrasia and Burgundy. Upon Clotaire's death Ebroin of his own authority installed Theoderic III. as king. The Austrasians refused obedience, and demanded a king of their own, with a mayor of the palace of their own choice. Ebroin, not finding himself at that time strong enough to resist, sent them Childeric II., the second son of Clovis II., and they appointed Wulfoald duke of Champagne as mayor of the palace. Childeric now formed the rallying point of the nobles of Austrasia and Burgundy. But the latter kingdom furnished the only man who could at all cope with Ebroin on equal terms, the bishop of Autun. It was not long before the confederacy proceeded to measures of active hostility. Their design was that the united forces of the two kingdoms should fall unexpectedly upon Neustria, drive out Theoderic III. and Ebroin, and give the kingdom to Childeric. The plan was entirely successful. The king and the mayor of the palace were captured, the one being shut up as a monk at St. Denys, the other at Luxeuil, and Childeric II. became sovereign of the whole of France, with Wulfoald for mayor of the palace for Neustria and Austrasia, and Leodegar for Burgundy. (Ursinus, cap. v., Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. 338.)

It seems that before elevating Childeric to this supreme position the nobles had exacted pledges from him in their own interest and especially for the limitation of the royal power, and it was probably to keep him to their fulfilment that Leodegar now left his see and became a sort of prime minister to Childeric in Neustria, whither he had transferred the court. At first he was successful, as appears from the three ordinances directed to limiting the royal prerogative, which are imperfectly reported by one of his biographers (*Vit. Anon.* c. iv., Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. 350; cf. Fauriel, ii. 465-6), and from the statement of the other that he had restored the old order (Ursinus, cap. v., Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. 338). But once firmly established, Childeric found these restraints irksome, and soon came to view Leodegar as the obstacle to the free indulgence of his passions. First discarded from his counsels, he was finally sent back to his see. But here he seems to have become still more an object of the king's suspicion, and an occasion was sought for his downfall. The king at his invitation spent Easter of 673 at Autun. At the same time there came to that city one Victor, a patrician of Marseilles, ostensibly to present a petition to the king for the recovery of some lands which

he claimed in right of his wife from the church of Clermont, where St. Praejectus (Prix) was bishop. Patricius was a friend of Leodegar, and stayed with him. Whether the two were really engaged in plotting against Childeric II, or whether the accusation was merely a convenient pretext for the king and Wulfoald, is not clear, but in the result Victor and his attendants were killed, and Leodegar was arrested and shut up in Luxeuil, with his old opponent Ebroin. Freed from the last restraint upon him Childeric now gave free play to his lawless passions. A conspiracy was formed against him, and shortly afterwards he was killed, with his wife, and one of his children, in the forest of Bondi, by a Frank whom he had outraged. Though his panegyrists deny the fact, there is little doubt that Leodegar from his enforced retreat directed this conspiracy, and sent his brother Gairinus, or Gerinus, as his lieutenant, in its execution (cf. *Gesta Francorum*, xlv., Migne, Patr. Lat. xvi. 1460). At the news of the king's death, Leodegar and Ebroin sallied forth from Luxeuil. The old enmity, which had been dissembled during their imprisonment, soon declared itself again, and Ebroin was only prevented from laying violent hands upon his rival by the intervention of Genesius archbishop of Lyons, with a strong troop. At Autun the bishop made a triumphant entry, but hastened on to present himself before Theoderic III., who had also emerged from St. Denys, and, with Leudesius as mayor of the palace, had ascended the throne in Neustria, and was surrounded by a party inimical to Ebroin. But the aspect of affairs was soon changed. Ebroin, after collecting an army of adventurers in Austrasia, set up a pretender in the person of Clovis III., whom he asserted to be a son of Clotaire II., and fell upon and dispersed the triumphant party. Leudesius was killed; Clovis III., having now served his purpose, disappeared, and Theoderic III., with Ebroin as mayor of the palace, ruled over the whole kingdom. Almost his first step was to avenge upon Leodegar the reverses of the last few years. An expedition under the leadership of Waimerus duke of Champagne, and two dethroned bishops, surrounded Autun. The bishop and his people defended the city, but after a few days he gave himself up to save his flock. His eyes were put out, and he was carried away prisoner by Waimerus, whose orders from Ebroin, according to the biographers, were to starve him to death, but who was so wrought upon by his fortitude and patience that he and his wife were converted. Henceforth till his death Leodegar was confined in various places, and was made at times to endure terrible torments by the direction of his foe. After being deprived of his lips, cheeks, and tongue, and seeing his brother Gairinus stoned to death, he was finally brought before a council of bishops to answer for his share in the death of Childeric. Here his episcopal robe was torn up in sign of his degradation from the office, and he was committed to Chrodobert count of the palace to be executed. Ebroin ordered that his body should be hidden in a well, lest the honours of martyrdom should be paid it. Chrodobert disliked the task, and left it to four servants, who beheaded him in a lonely wood (A.D. 678). The body, contrary to his persecutors' intention, was conveyed by the direction of Chrodobert's wife

to Surcin, and there buried in a little oratory. After Ebroin's death, Theoderic III. seems to have admitted Leger's claims to martyrdom, and presided over the council where the possession of the body was disputed by Ansoaldus bishop of Poitiers, Hermenarius, Leodegar's successor at Autun, and Vindicianus bishop of Arras, in whose diocese the martyrdom was consummated. The *sortes* declared for the first of the three, and the body was transported by the abbat Audulfus amid numerous miracles to Poitiers, and after many ceremonies buried with great pomp in a new church at St. Maxentius (circ. A.D. 683).

Leodegar's character is well summed up by Fauriel. Though the church venerates him as a saint, history is more embarrassed on his score. His party could have found no leader more capable or more resolute. Renowned for his knowledge, allied by birth to the most powerful personages of his time, ambitious, enterprising, of great force of will, and quick to turn his sacerdotal character to the profit of his political designs, he possessed every qualification for the playing of a great rôle in the difficult times in which his lot had fallen. He was the most formidable adversary Ebroin could encounter in his path (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 463-4).

*His Writings.*—Three productions of St. Léger remain:

1. The canons of the synod of Autun held by him about 670. They are imperfect as we have them, and relate chiefly to points of monastic discipline. They were first published by Sirmondi, and may also be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. xvi. 377-380, and Labbe, *Sacr. Conc.* xi. 123, Florence, 1759-98.

2. His will, the authenticity of which has been doubted, but unjustly according to the authors of the *Hist. de la France*. It is given in Migne, *ibid.* 379-384.

3. A letter of consolation written to his mother Sigrada, who had entered the nunnery of Notre Dame at Soissons. The occasion of it was the death of Gairinus, whom Ebroin had just caused to be killed. It is to be found in Migne, *ibid.* 373-6, and Boll. Oct. i. 408-410. (See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 619, and Ceillier, *Hist. Gén.* xi. 781, for these writings.)

For the *cult* of St. Leodegar and an enumeration of the various churches and monasteries which claim the trunk, head, or limbs of the saint, see Baillet, *Les Vies des Saints*, Oct. 2, tom. vii. 27-30. His commemoration as a martyr on Oct. 2 began very soon after his death. (See Ado and Usuard, *Martyrologia*, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiii. 373, cxxiv. 529.)

*Authorities.*—The chief are two biographies of contemporary writers, one by an anonymous monk of St. Symphorian, who wrote at the request of Leodegar's successor, Hermenarius, soon after the translation to St. Maxentius (A.D. 682). He speaks usually as an eyewitness, but his acquaintance with the facts of Leodegar's life previous to his elevation to the episcopate is very limited. This life may be found in Mabillon's *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 680-698, Paris, 1669; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. i. 463-484; Bouquet, *Recueil*, ii. 611-627; and Migne, *ibid.* 345-374. A French translation of it appears in Guizot's *Mémoires*, &c. ii. 325, with a preface and notes. The second biography was written by Ursinus, prior or abbat of Ligugé, at the request of

Ansoaldus bishop of Poitiers, and Audulfus abbat of St. Maxentius. His knowledge was derived from trustworthy sources, but was not apparently at first hand. He gives fuller details of Leodegar's early life, but in the rest borrows considerably from his predecessor, whose style he has improved on. It is published by Surius with changes in the style (Oct. 2, tom. v. 545-553), and more correctly in Mabillon, *ibid.* ii. 698-705; then in Boll. *ibid.* 485-491; Bouquet, *ibid.* 627-632; and Migne, *ibid.* 335-346. These two biographies are the most important sources remaining of contemporary French history, but inspired as they are, especially the former, with passionate hatred for Ebroin and partizanship for St. Leodegar, it has not been easy to disentangle the truth. Scantier notices, but in some instances correcting the bias of the biographies, are found in the *Gesta Francorum*, xlv., Migne, Patr. Lat. xcvi. 1460; *Vita S. Praejecti*, Boll. Jan. ii. 631-32; Bouquet, iii. 594; Fredegarius, *Chronicon Cont.* xciv.-xcvi. There is a third life in verse attributed to Walafridus Strabo (Ceillier, xii. 416), now published from a MS. of St. Gall by Pitra (*Hist. de St. Léger*, 464-503). The ecclesiastical historians have accepted the partial story of the original biographies literally, and reproduced it. (See amongst others *Gall. Christ.* iv. 349-355; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. i. 355 seqq.; Baronius, tom. xi.; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* tom. viii. lib. xxxix.; Baillet, *Les Vies des Saints*, Oct. 2, tom. vii. 17-27; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 618-621; Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs Sacrés*, i. 780; Guettée, *Hist. de l'Eglise de France*, ii. 446 seqq.; Rohrbacher, *Hist. Univ.* v. 520 seqq.; Pitra, *Hist. de St. Léger*, Paris, 1846.) Among the moderns whose criticism has contributed to placing St. Leodegar's story in its true light are Fauriel, *Histoire de la Gaule Meridionale*, ii. 461-473, to whom this article is largely indebted; Michelet, *Hist. de France*, i. 276-8; Martin, *Hist. de France*, ii. 208-216; Bönnell, *Die Anfänge des Karolingischen Hauses*, pp. 154-6; Fehr, *Staat und Kirche im fränkischen Reiche*, p. 105 seqq.; and Richter, *Annalen*, p. 170 seqq.

**LEODEGARIUS (3) I.**, twenty-second bishop of Orleans, about the middle of the 7th century. (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 1186, 1189 n., 1191; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1416; Gams, *Series Episc.* 593.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEGARIUS (4) II.**, said to have been twenty-ninth or thirtieth bishop of Orleans, about the beginning of the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1417.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEGARIUS (5)**, bishop of Luni, c. 720. (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, xiii. 433, 483; Mabill. *Annales Ord. Bened.* t. ii. p. 154, lib. 22, num. 57.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LEODEGARIUS (6)**, doubtful bishop of Spoleto c. 747. (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, iv. 344.) Ughelli (i. 1257) does not mention him. [A. H. D. A.]

**LEODEGISILLUS**, twenty-first bishop of Orleans, in the first half of the 7th century. (Mansi, x. 759; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1416; Gams, *Series Episc.* 593.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODEGISIUS** ("cognomento Julianus"), from about 675 till about 678, metropolitan of

Braga, presided at the third council of Braga in 675. Seven of the eight suffragan sees of Braga (Porto, Tuy, Iria, Orense, Lugo, Britonia, and Astorga) were represented at the council. As there is no mention of the remaining see of Dumium—which only comprehended the famous monastery of that name, and was founded in honour of St. Martin (*q. v.*)—it is most probable that, as in the time of his predecessor St. Fructuosus (*q. v.*), and of his successor Liuva, the sees of Dumium and Braga were united during the pontificate of Leodigisius. A separate bishop of Dumium appears again in 688. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 262; Florez. *Esp. Sagr.* xv. 155, and xviii. 44.) [PATERNUS.] [M. A. W.]

**LEODENINGUS**, sixteenth bishop of Bayeux, known from his subscription to the *placitum* of Attigny in A.D. 765. (Mansi, xii. 675; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 351.) [S. A. B.]

**LEODRANDUS**, fifteenth archbishop of Tarentaise, perhaps about the commencement of the 8th century. The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (xii. 702), following Mabillon, suggest that he may be identical with the bishop Leudegandus, or Leudegangus, who is mentioned in the *Vita S. Bathildis* (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 783, Paris, 1668-1701.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOLINUS** (LEONINUS, LEONIUS), bishop of Patavium (Padua), said to have held that see from c. A.D. 232 to 244. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Jun. p. 483; Giustiniani, *Vescovi di Padova*, p. 16; Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* v. 398; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* x. 484.) [R. S. G.]

**LEONARDUS, ST.**, confessor in the 6th century, honoured at Corbiniacum (Corbigny), in the diocese of Autun. There is a short life of him published by the Bollandists, which, if we may believe its own testimony (§ 4), was written by an author almost contemporary. According to it Leonardus was one of a company of saints who came into the province of Le Mans during the episcopate of Innocentius I. (or Innocens, who sat circ. A.D. 496-542, cf. *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 344). Desiring to build a cell, he was directed by the bishop to a desert place on the Sarthe, which has since borne his name (S. Leonardus-de-Boscis, St. Leonard-des-Bois, on the right bank of the Sarthe, in the district of Le Mans. It was also called Vendopera, or Vendoeuvre). With Innocentius's help he built a church there in honour of St. Peter, and a monastery. After a long life, filled with good works, and not destitute of miraculous events, he died, Oct. 15, in the reign of Chilperic (A.D. 561-584), and was buried in his monastery by St. Domnolus, then bishop of Le Mans (A.D. 559-581, cf. *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 345), who ordained one of the monks as abbat in his place, who was still living when St. Leonard's biographer wrote.

The date of St. Leonard's death is variously given in 559, 565, and 570. According to Baillet the body remained at St. Leonard-des-Bois for more than three hundred years, and about 877 was removed to Corbigny, probably from fear of the Northmen. Here it remained finally, and became renowned for its miracles. The little abbey which he had founded became in after times a priory dependent on the monastery of St. Vincent (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 434). For Corbigny see *Gall. Christ.* iv. 475 sqq. It was

originally called after St. Peter, but later after St. Leonardus, when his cult there became famous. He is the first saint of the crown of France.

St. Leonard's name does not appear in the classical martyrologies or in the older hagiologists. Of the more recent ones the majority give him on Nov. 26, which Baillet thinks may have been the day of his translation to Corbigny (Usuardus, *Martyrologium Auct.* Nov. 26 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 739-742). The notice of the Bollandists and Baillet is on Oct. 15, the day of his death. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vii. 1, 45-9; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Oct. 15.) [S. A. B.]

LEONAS, a "famulus Dei," who brought St. Augustine for his perusal many things from Consentius. (August. *Cont. Mendacium*, cap. i. sub init.; Tillem. xiii. 811.) [C. H.]

LEONIANUS (LEUNIANUS), ST., abbat of the monastery of St. Peter at Vienne, who died about 510, and is commemorated Nov. 16. He is to be distinguished from the contemporary archdeacon Leonianus of the 65th and 77th letters of Avitus archbishop of Vienne. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 274, 278; Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 571, Paris, 1668.) [S. A. B.]

LEONIDES (1), April 22, father of Origen, martyr in 202 or 203. [ORIGEN.] [G. T. S.]

LEONIDES (2), April 16, martyr at Corinth, in the reign of Decius, mentioned by Nicephorus Gregoras in his *Life of Codratus* (cap. iii. § 11, in *Pat. Gr.* cxlix. 516); commemorated with Callistus, Charisius, and others. (Wright, *Syr. Mart.*; Boll. *Acta SS.* 16 Apr. ii. 402; Tillem. iii. 357.) [G. T. S.]

LEONIDES (3), Jan. 28, a martyr with Aclas in the Egyptian Thebaid in the Diocletian persecution. (*Mart. Rom.* ed. Baron.; *A. A. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. 832; Tillem. v. 360.) [G. T. S.]

LEONIDES (4), bishop of Bage in Lydia, subscribed the letter of his provincial synod to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 573; Le Quien, i. 889.) [L. D.]

LEONIDES (5), bishop of Athens, commemorated by the Greeks and Latins on April 15 (*Acta SS.* April. ii. p. 378; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 171). Le Quien places him, rather conjecturally, before the sixth synod, 680. [L. D.]

LEONIDES (6), bishop of Coele in Thracia, on the Hellespont; present at the seventh general council at Nicaea, A.D. 787 (Mansi, xiii. 387; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 1121). At this council there appears also a Leonides bishop of Madytus, according to one reading, another reading making the bishop Leo [LEO (48)]. The two towns Madytus and Coele may be the same according to one place in Mansi (xiii. 144), where Leonides is bishop, Μαδύτου ήτοι Κόλης. Le Quien discusses this point (i. 1141). [J. de S.]

LEONILLA, Jan. 17. Martyr in Gaul, in the country of the Lingones, during the persecution of Aurelian, together with her grandsons Speusippus, Elaspippus, and Melaspippus. They are said to have been disciples of a presbyter Benignus, whom St. Polycarp, the disciple of

St. John, sent into Gaul. The anachronism in this account is obvious. Polycarp died A.D. 156. Aurelian's persecution began in 272. The name of Aurelian may have been the mistake of a copyist for Aurelius, *i.e.* Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, who ascended the throne A.D. 161. This would fix this martyrdom during the time of the fourth persecution, when the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne suffered (*Mart. Adon.*, Usuard., Till. *Mém.* iii. 39-42, 605-609). Bede mentions Leonilla in his life of Ceolfred (*Vit. Abbat. fin.*). [G. T. S.]

LEONIUS (1), second bishop of Apt, suffered martyrdom in the invasion of the Alemanni under Chroco in 266 or 312. (Mansi, ii. 463; *Gall. Ch.* i. 349.) [R. T. S.]

LEONIUS (2), Feb. 13 (popularly St. LIENNE), presbyter of Poitiers, the "sacerdos ordinarius," or chaplain, of St. Hilary. He accompanied the latter into exile, and witnessed his death, A.D. 367 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. i. 91; Tillem. vii. 468). On the date of St. Hilary's death, see note in *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 79. [R. T. S.]

LEONORIUS, ST., a Briton, a disciple of St. Illutus, who passed over to Brittany in the time of king Childeburt, A.D. 575-96. (*Acta Sanctorum*, July 1, i. 121-4, and supplement, 161; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 160; ii. 88; Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 187; Tillem. x. 461.) [C. W. B.]

LEONTIA (Λεοντία in Cedrenus), Augusta, wife of the emperor Phocas. On Nov. 30, 602, seven days after her husband's coronation, she was crowned and named Augusta at Constantinople (Cedren. *Compend.* in *Pat. Gr.* cxxi. 773). In July 603 Gregory wrote his congratulations to Leontia, promising her his prayers and bespeaking her favour towards the Roman church (lib. xiii. ind. vi. ep. 39). [C. H.]

LEONTIUS (1), fifth known bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, between Lucius and Eulalius (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 370). It is supposed by Possinus (note on Nilus), *Oratio in Albanum*, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxxix. 704) that the Leontius presbyter, and afterwards bishop, mentioned by Nilus as the instructor of Albanus, was this Leontius, but Tillemont (xiv. 216, 744) argues that it must have been Leontius bishop of Ancyra. The earliest certain appearance of Leontius in history is as the consecrator of Gregory the Illuminator [GREGORIUS (7)] first catholicos of Armenia as recorded by Agathangelus (§§ 139, 140 in Langlois). The assigned date for this event is cir. A.D. 302.

The name of Leontius appears in 314 among the bishops present at the councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea (Mansi, ii. 534, 540; Tillem. vi. 198-200). It is also in the list of the Nicene fathers in 325 (Mansi, ii. 694, 699). The history of the council by Galasius shews Leontius taking a prominent part in the proceedings as the mouth-piece of the synod, being thus associated more than once with Eupsychius bishop of Tyana (Mansi, ii. 835, 858, 859, 863, 867, 870, 871). Thus the two "Cappadocian bishops" Leontius and Eupsychius mentioned among others of the Catholic party by Athanasius in his letter of A.D. 356 to the bishops of Egypt (§ 8 in *Pat. Gr.* xxv. 558 A) are identified.

Leontius is mentioned among the principal subscribers to the council, being described as "ecclesiae domini ornamentum." He undertakes to transmit the decrees to Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus Diospontii, Paphlagonia, Pontus Polemoniaca, Armenia Greater and Less (Mansi, ii. 882). The period of his death is not recorded.

[C. H.]

LEONTIUS (2), bishop of Antioch, A.D. 348-357. He was a Phrygian by birth (Theod. H. E. ii. 10), and, like many leading Arians, had been a disciple of the celebrated teacher Lucian (Philostorg. iii. 15). He became a presbyter at Antioch, where he had a virgin, Eustolium, probably a relation, living in his house. When the impropriety of this arrangement was objected to, he mutilated himself in order to be able to continue it without reproach (Ath. *De Fuga*, 26, *Hist. Ar.* 28). The bishop Eustathius deposed Leontius for his act; and as this bishop played an important part at the Nicene council, we may well believe that it was the case of Leontius which suggested the first and third Nicene canons against self-mutilators and against sub-introductae. Leontius would be about forty at the time of the council, so that the occurrence in question might easily have happened previously. The story of the deposition of Eustathius has been told vol. ii. p. 383. Whether on that event Leontius was restored to the presbyterate does not appear; but when afterwards the see of Antioch became vacant by the removal of Stephen, the emperor Constantius effected the appointment of Leontius. Leontius would seem to have belonged to what may be called the broad church party of his day, men not less hated by the strictly orthodox than avowed heretics, who, while themselves having no objection to sign orthodox formulae, sympathized with the Arians, and were anxious for their comprehension in the church. Leontius strove to avoid giving offence to either side. One of the party tests of the day was whether the doxology was used in the form universal among ourselves, or in the form which the Arians (Philostorg. iii. 13) maintained to be the more ancient, "Glory be to the Father, *through* the Son, *in* the Holy Ghost." Those who watched which form Leontius would use, could never make out more of his doxology than "world without end. Amen" (Theod. ii. 19). Among the orthodox members of the flock of Leontius the leading part was taken by two ascetics, Flavian and Diodorus, who, though not yet advanced to the priesthood, enjoyed the greatest influence on account of their holiness of life. To these men Theodoret ascribes the invention of the practice of dividing the choir into two and chanting the Psalms of David anti-phonically, a use of the church of Antioch which legend soon attributed to its martyr bishop Ignatius (Soc. vi. 8). They assembled the devout at the tombs of the martyrs and spent the whole night in singing of hymns. The devotion became so popular that Leontius could not forbid it, but requested its leaders to hold their meetings in church, a request with which they complied. Leontius foresaw that on his death the conduct of affairs was likely to fall into less cautious hands, and, touching his white hairs, predicted—"When this snow melts there will be much mud." Notwithstanding his apparent desire to hold the

balance even, the orthodox complained that he shewed manifest bias in the exercise of his episcopal functions, discouraging the orthodox and advancing unworthy Arians. In particular he incurred censure by his ordination to the diocese of his former pupil Aetius, who afterwards became notorious as an extreme Arian leader. However, on the strong protest of the above-mentioned Flavian and Diodorus, Leontius gave way and suspended Aetius from ecclesiastical functions. Philostorgius (iii. 27) relates that Leontius subsequently saved the life of Aetius by clearing him from false charges made to the emperor Gallus. When Athanasius came to Antioch, he communicated not with Leontius and the dominant party, but with the ultra-orthodox minority called Eustathians, who had refused to recognize any other bishop while the deposed Eustathius was alive, and who worshipped in private conventicles. Leontius was provoked to accuse Athanasius of cowardice in running away from his own church. The taunt stung Athanasius deeply. He wrote his *Apologia de Fuga* in reply to it, and always speaks of Leontius with the utmost asperity, seldom omitting the opprobrious epithet  $\delta$  ἀπόκοπος. In one painful passage (*De Fuga*, 26) he even accuses the aged bishop of criminality in his early relations with Eustolium. If there had been any proof of this charge Leontius would have been deposed not for mutilation but for corrupting a church virgin; and if his guilt had been believed in at Antioch the respect paid him by the orthodox members of his flock would be inconceivable. The censure of so great a man irretrievably damaged Leontius in the estimation of succeeding ages, and his mildness and moderation have caused him to be compared to one of those hidden reefs which are more dangerous to mariners than naked rocks. Yet we may charitably think that the gentleness and love of peace which all attest were not mere hypocrisy, and may impute his toleration of heretics to no worse cause than insufficient appreciation of the importance of the issues involved. What his own followers thought of him appears from a notice preserved in the Paschal Chronicle under the year 350 (Bonn ed. p. 535), where he is described as a man in every respect faithful and pious and zealous for the true faith. He is commended for the care he bestowed on houses for the entertainment of strangers, and a story is told how three of his agents in this work effected the conversion of a Jew by accepting his challenge to eat a dead serpent which they had found. The same chronicle, p. 503, quotes the authority of Leontius for the account it gives of the martyrdom of Babylas. Leontius died at the end of 357 or beginning of 358. Athanasius, writing in the latter year, *Hist. Ar.*, speaks of him as still living, but Leontius might have been then dead, though the news had not reached Athanasius.

[G. S.]

LEONTIUS (3), bishop of Tripolis, in the province of Lydia, a supporter of the Arians, present at the council of Seleucia, A.D. 359, and deposed by the majority of the bishops, the semi-Arians. (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 39; Mansi, ii. 324; Philostorg. vii. 6; Le Quien, i. 879.) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (4), bishop of Comana in Lesser Armenia, one of the Macedonians who presented



a petition to the emperor Jovian in 363 A.D. (Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 25; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 449; Tillem. vi. 529.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (5)**, a bishop of the Novatian sect at Rome in 388 A.D. (*Soc. II. E.* v. 14; Ceillier, vi. 368; Tillem. iii. 485.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (6)**, bishop of Perta in Lycania, present at the first Constantinopolitan council, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 570; Le Quien, i. 1087.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (7)**, bishop of Besançon, ob. 399. (Leo Mag. *Ep.* 10, cap. 9; *Gall. Chr.* xv. 8.) [R. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (8)** (LEO, LEONTINUS), bishop of Ancyra. He is mentioned by Sozomen (vi. 34) as one of the two most distinguished among the monks of Galatia and Cappadocia before he became bishop of Ancyra. Tillemont (xiv. 216-218) thinks that he was the Leontius presbyter and subsequently bishop mentioned by Nilus (*Orat. in Alban.* in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix. 704) as the instructor of Albanian. Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 27) speaks of him as bishop of Ancyra, adorned with many virtues, when Chrysostom succeeded Nectarius at Constantinople in 397. Yet in 403, at the synod of the Oak, Leontius was one of Chrysostom's foremost opponents (*Soc.* vi. 18; *Soz.* viii. 20). Palladius, who calls him Leontinus (*Dial.* cap. 9, in *Pat. Gr.* xlvii. 31), affirms that he was influenced by the threats and promises of the palace. Leontius was very severe in his treatment of the Novatians in his province, whom he deprived of their church (*Soz.* viii. 1; *Soc.* vi. 22; Suidas s. v. *Σιόντιος*). Leontius was succeeded in his see by Theodotus. (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 462; Tillem. ix. 218; xiv. 743, note 4.) [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (9)** (LEGONTIUS), eleventh bishop of Trèves (or thirty-eighth according to the Bollandists), cir. 407. (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 130; *Gall. Ch.* xiii. 378.) [R. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (10)**, bishop of Musertis, or Muster, probably in Proconsular Africa, perhaps the same as Muste, which Ptolemy calls a village, present at the Carthaginian conference in 411. (*Collat. Carth.* cogn. i. 133; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 415, ed. Oberthür; *Petil.* iv. 342.) [H. W. P.]

**LEONTIUS (11)**, Donatist bishop of Rusticiana, a town of Numidia (Böcking, *Not. Dign.* *Occ.* p. 646), present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. (*Collat. Carth.* i. 198; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 448, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

**LEONTIUS (12)**, Donatist bishop of Praesidia, a town of Byzacene (Böcking, *Not. Dign.* *Occ.* p. 649), present at the Carthaginian conference. (*Collat. Carth.* i. 208.) [H. W. P.]

**LEONTIUS (13)**, a bishop of about the period A.D. 431, addressed by Firmus bishop of Caesarea (ep. 36 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvii. 1506.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (14)**, an Egyptian bishop addressed frequently by Isidore of Pelusium, who calls him a shrine of purity (lib. iii. ep. 387.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (15)**, ST., third bishop of Fréjus, between Cyllinius or Quillinius and Theodoros, early in the 5th century. In A.D. 419 he is one of the Gallic bishops whom pope Boniface I. addressed on the subject of the accusations made against Maximus of Valence (*Epist.* iii. in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 756). Another letter was afterwards written to him amongst other provincial bishops by pope Coelestinus II. on various points of doctrine (*Epist.* 21 in *Pat. Lat.* l. 523-537; cf. Ceillier, x. 277, and *Gall. Christ.* i. 420). To a Leontius Cassian about 423 dedicated the first ten of his *Collationes* in terms of warm esteem (*Pat. Lat.* xlix. 477 seqq., cf. col. 770), and it is generally assumed that he was identical with this prelate (Boll. *ibid.* p. 242; Gazaeus, *Pat. Lat. ibid.* col. 769-72; Ceillier, viii. 161 seqq.). Numerous notices of Leontius occur in Tillemont (xii. 398, 468-470, 476, 480, 676-678, xiii. 1040, xiv. 179, xv. 81, 406, 886, xvi. 16, 17.) [S. A. B.]

**LEONTIUS (16)**, a Gallic bishop, whose see is unknown, to whom in 445 Leo the Great, in controversy with St. Hilary of Arles, assigned a prerogative which apparently had belonged to that latter prelate (Leo Mag. *Ep.* x. cap. 9, 641, Migne; see LEO THE GREAT; HILARY OF ARLES; Tillemont, xv. 81, 886; a note of Quesnel and the Ballerini in Migne's *Patrol.* liv. 1296). This bishop must not be identified with LEONTIUS (24) of Fréjus, who died in 432 (*Gallia Christiana*, i. 420). [C. G.]

**LEONTIUS (17)**, bishop of Ascalon; he took part in the Ephesine *Latrocinium*, A.D. 449 (Mansi, vi. 931), but recanted two years later at the council of Chalcedon. (Mansi, vi. 942, vii. 31, 120, 142, 403, 431; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 599.) [J. de S.]

**LEONTIUS (18)**, bishop of Magnesia on the Maeander in the province of Asia, present at the *Latrocinium* Ephesinum, A.D. 449. (Mansi, vi. 932, 1085; vii. 276, 293; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 699.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (19)**, bishop of Araxa in Lycia; his name is found both among the subscriptions of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and appended to the letter of his province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vi. 1086, where the reading is LONGINUS, vii. 153, 439, 580; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 973.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (20)**, bishop of Calinda in Lycia, his name is subscribed to the letter of the synod of Myra, the metropolis of Lycia, to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 580; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 991.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (21)**, bishop of Arles, to which see he was elected, apparently about A.D. 454, on the death of Ravennius. Leontius died, as nearly as can be ascertained, about 482.

*Authorities.*—1. Letters of Sidonius Apollinaris (see especially lib. vi. *Epist.* 3; lib. viii. *Epist.* 12). 2. Acts of a council of Arles held in A.D. 475 (Mansi, vii. 1007). 3. Sirmund, in his edition of Sidonius, Tillemont (*Mém.* xv. 58, 77, 96, 821, 825, x. 36-39, 42-45, 105, 224, 423, 424), and Ceillier, in his *Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés*, &c. (Tome x. chap. xv.), have gleaned a few other references to Leontius from the letters of

pope Hilary and of Ruricius. See also Cave, i. 449.

The council above named was summoned by him to condemn the errors of the presbyter Lucidus, to whose fatalist teaching attention was drawn in a letter addressed to Leontius by Faustus of Riez. [FAUSTUS (11), to which article the reader is referred for further information and evidence on this head.] A letter of Leontius to Hilary is extant, printed by D'Achery (*Spicil. t. iii. p. 302 ed. 1723*) and since by Migne among the letters of Hilary to Leontius (*Pat. Lat. lviii. pp. 20 sq.*). The letters belong to the years 462, 463, and probably 465; the one in reply to Leontius was written in Jan. 462. (*Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 48.*) [J. G. C.]

LEONTIUS (22), a bishop to whom, along with another named Rusticus, Arnobius junior in 460 addressed his *Commentary on the Psalms*. (*Max. Bibl. Pat. viii. 238; Pat. Lat. liii. 327; Ceillier, x. 330.*) [C. H.]

LEONTIUS (23), sixth bishop of Sedunum (Sitten, Sion) in 463. (Muellinen, *Helvet. Sac. p. 24.*) He is not given in the *Gallia Christiana* (xii. 735). [R. T. S.]

LEONTIUS (24), seventh bishop of Apt, is said to have been exiled by the Arian Euric the Visigoth, A.D. 474. (*Gall. Ch. i. 351.*) [R. T. S.]

LEONTIUS (25), a bishop of Burea in Numidia, and another of Decoriana in Byzacena, banished by Huneric A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. *Notit. 56, 57; Morcelli, Afr. Christ. i. 110, 150.*) [R. S. G.]

LEONTIUS (26) (LEGONTIUS, LEONUS), July 1, eighth bishop of Autun, in the 5th century. (*Gall. Ch. iv. 338; Boll. Acta SS. Jul. i. 54.*) [R. T. S.]

LEONTIUS (27), seventh archbishop of Elusa, present at the first council of Orleans, in A.D. 511. (Mansi, xiii. 356; *Gall. Christ. i. 969.*) [S. A. B.]

LEONTIUS (28), bishop of Sozusa in Palestine, signed a synodical letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 518. He also took part in the synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 1172; Le Quien, *Or. Christ. iii. 595.*) [J. de S.]

LEONTIUS (29), catholicos of Armenia, c. A.D. 530. The Greek catalogue (Combeis, *Græc. Lat. Bibl. Pat. Nov. Auct. ii. 289*) describes him as ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀπέρ and assigns him three years; the *Historia Armena* designates him AGHPIERANUS, from the town of Puocerestus, and assigns him two years. Both authorities place him between Christopher I. and Nerses II., as does Le Quien, who reckons him 24th patriarch. He is accounted by the Armenians of the Roman schism the last of the early orthodox patriarchs of their church, since his successor gathered together the council of Tiben [ARMENIANS]. (Le Quien, *O. C. i. 1381; Galanus, Hist. Arm. cap. 10, p. 79.*) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (30) I., bishop of Helenopolis (Drepanum) in Bithynia, present at the synod of Constantinople under Mennas, A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 1147; Le Quien, i. 623.) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (31) II., bishop of Helenopolis (Drepanum) in Bithynia, present at the sixth

general council, A.D. 680. (Mansi, xi. 680; Le Quien, i. 624.) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (32) I., the elder, appears as 8th or 9th in our lists of the archbishops of Bordeaux; but there is reason to suppose that three or four names have been lost [LEONTIUS II.] (*Gall. Chr. ii. 792*). There is an epitaph on him by Venantius Fortunatus (*Misc. iv. 9 in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 161-2.*) [S. A. B.]

LEONTIUS (33) II., the younger, appears as the ninth or tenth in our list of the archbishops of Bordeaux, but as Venantius Fortunatus apostrophises him in the words "tertius a decimo huic urbi antistes habebis," we must suppose that three or four names have been lost (*Misc. i. 15, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 78; cf. Gams, Series Episc. 519*). Leontius was a native of the district of Saintes. His father was a Roman senator (Venant. Fort. iv. 10), and he himself married a wife named Placidina, who was a descendant of Sidonius Apollinaris the poet. (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iii. 2, with Ruinart's note, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxi. 243; and Venant. Fort. i. 15.*) They apparently separated when he was made bishop (Venant. Fort. *ibid.*). As a young man he served in Childebert's expedition into Spain in 531 (Venant. Fort. *ibid.*; cf. Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc. iii. 10*). His episcopate is remarkable for the activity displayed in the building and restoration of churches.

From scattered odes of Venantius, we find that he built the church of St. Martin at Bordeaux (*Misc. i. 6*), repaired that of St. Vincent, near Agen, adding a leaden roof (*ibid. i. 8*), built another in honour of the last-mentioned saint at a place called Vernemetis (i. 9), rebuilt that of St. Nazarius (i. 10), enlarged that of St. Denys (i. 11), completed that of St. Bibianus at Saintes (i. 12), and rebuilt that of St. Eutropius at the same place (i. 13). Secular buildings also came in for his attention (see i. 18, 19, 20). According to Fortunatus's epitaph, he died at the age of fifty-four (iv. 10, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 163), probably about the year 564. He is commemorated at Bordeaux on Nov. 15. (Tillem. ii. 88, iv. 449, 547, 716, x. 820.) [S. A. B.]

LEONTIUS (34), bishop of Arabissus in Lesser Armenia. Photius (*cod. 272*) praises his sermon about the creation, and the resurrection of Lazarus. Cave (i. 551) assigns him to the 6th century. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ. i. 450; Ceillier, xi. 645.*) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (35), bishop of Arce in Lesser Armenia, present at the fifth general council, A.D. 553. (Mansi, ix. 392; Le Quien, i. 448.) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (36), bishop of Amadassa in Phrygia Salutaris, present at the fifth general council, A.D. 553. (Mansi, ix. 396; Le Quien, i. 850.) [L. D.]

LEONTIUS (37), thirteenth bishop of Orleans, present at the second council of Orleans, A.D. 563. (Mansi, viii. 838; *Gall. Christ. viii. 1414.*) [S. A. B.]

LEONTIUS (38), bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, an ecclesiastical writer whose *Apology* against the Jews, and concerning the images of the saints, was quoted at the fourth session of

the seventh general council (Mansi, xiii. 44-53). He flourished during the reign of the emperor Maurice, A.D. 582-602. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1062; Cave, i. 580; Ceillier, xi. 658.) His discourses *In Symeonem* (on Symeon Salus) and *In Festum Mediaepentecostes* are printed in Greek and Latin in Combefis's *Græc. Lat. Bibl. Pat. Nov. Auct.* i. 681, and in Latin in La Bigne's *Max. Bibl. Pat.* t. xii. p. 294. His *Fragmentum Contra Hebraeos*, in Latin, is given by La Bigne and by Canisius (*Thesaur. Momun.* i. 793), where also is given an *Observatio* on Leontius by Basnage. Migne (*Pat. Gr.* xciii. 1565) gives all the above, together with a life of Joannes Eleemosynarius, and a critical notice of Leontius by Fabricius. [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (39)**, bishop of Urbino, addressed by Gregory the Great in 593, 595, 596. (Greg. *Magn. Epist.* lib. iii. indict. xi. 24; lib. v. indict. xiii. 44; lib. vi. indict. xiv. 45; Migne, lxxvii. 622, 774, 832.) Cappelletti (iii. 169, 231) regards him as the first known bishop of the see, and Exhilaratus as the next. Ughelli (ii. 785) believes in one earlier than Leontius, Evander in 313. [A. H. D. A.]

**LEONTIUS (40)**, of Apamea, bishop of Cyrene in Libya Pentapolis, cir. 600. (John Moschus, *Prat. Spirit.* cap. 193; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 624.) [J. de S.]

**LEONTIUS (41)**, ST., 13th bishop of Saintes, succeeding St. Palladius, or in Gams's *Series* (p. 623) Audobertus, and followed probably by Bertarius, present at the council held at Rheims about 625 (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 102), and perhaps at the synod of Clichy about 628. (See *Gall. Christ.* 1060, ix. 337.) [S. A. B.]

**LEONTIUS (42)**, bishop of Faenza, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649 (Mansi, x. 867; Hefele, § 307). Ughelli (ii. 492) places him 4th in the see, Cappelletti (iii. 245, 304) the 6th. Cappelletti thinks he may be the bishop Leontius of the *Roman Martyrology*, March 19. [A. H. D. A.]

**LEONTIUS (43)**, 34th bishop of Naples, between Eusebius and Adeodatus, present at the Lateran synod in A.D. 649 (Mansi, x. 867; Hefele, § 307). He was bishop for four years. (*Gesta Episc. Neapol. in Monum. Rerum Langob.* 1878, p. 416; Ughelli, vi. 58; Cappelletti, xix. 398, 523.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LEONTIUS (44)**, bishop of Sebaste, the metropolis of the first province of Lesser Armenia, present at the Trullan synod (Quinisext), A.D. 692 (Mansi, xi. 989). After this date the bishops of Lesser Armenia disappear from the acts of the councils, their country having been conquered by the Mahometans. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 426.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS (45)**, bishop of Dorylaeum in Phrygia Salutaris, at the Trullan synod (Quinisext), A.D. 692. (Mansi, xi. 1001; Le Quien, i. 838.) [L. D.]

**LEONTIUS**, bishop of Coutances. [LEO (50).]

**LEONTIUS (46)**, bishop of Amiternum, who subscribed the constitution of pope Paul I. at the

Roman council of 761 (Mansi, xii. 650). He is the fifth known bishop of the see, following Cetheus, and without any known successor for two centuries. (Ughelli, x. 13; Cappelletti, xxi. 418.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS**, bishops of Algiza, of Eumonia, of Linoe, and of Poemaninus, A.D. 787. [LEO (48).]

**LEONTIUS (47)**, bishop of Bari, present at the council of Nice in 787, according to Ughelli (vii. 593) and Cappelletti (xxi. 10). [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (48)**, presbyter, A.D. 358, deputed, with others, to carry a message from the semi-Arian council of Ancyra to the emperor Constantius at Sirmium. (Hilarius, *de Synodis*, cap. 90; *Patr. Lat.* x. 542; Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 13 in *Patr. Græc.* lvvii. 1144; Ceillier, iv. 551.) [W. M. S.]

**LEONTIUS (49)**, a presbyter in whose behalf Gregory Nazianzen wrote to Olympius the governor of Cappadocia Secunda, A.D. 382. (Greg. *Naz. Epist.* 143 al. 175.) [E. V.]

**LEONTIUS (50)**, one of the solitaries of Nazianzus praised by Gregory Nazianzen in his poem addressed to Hellenius, *περὶ τῶν μοναχῶν*. (*Pat. Gr.* xxxvii. 1466, ver. 203.) [E. V.]

**LEONTIUS (51)**, addressed by Gregory Nazianzen, cir. A.D. 381. (*Ep.* 95 al. 103 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxvii. 167; Ceillier, v. 259.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (52)**, a presbyter sent by Silvanus to Jerome from Alexandria requesting him to translate the *Rule of Pachomius*. (Hieron. *Regul. Pachom.* praef. § 2, in *Opp.* t. ii.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (53)**, a deacon, probably of Arles, who carried a letter between Prosper of Aquitaine and St. Augustine; mentioned in a letter to the latter from Hilary, A.D. 428 or 429. (*Aug. Epp.* 225, 226.) [H. W. P.]

**LEONTIUS (54)**, a monk, to whom, along with three others, Jovianus, Minervius, and Theodorus, Cassian dedicated his seven last *Conferences*. (Collat. xviii. praef. in *Pat. Lat.* xlix. 1087; Tillem. xiv. 180.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (55)**, a priest sent by the bishops of Armenia, with another named Aberius, to Proclus bishop of Constantinople (cir. 434). (*Liberat. Breviar.* cap. 10 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 990; Tillem. xiv. 629). He may have been the celebrated Armenian martyr of 455. [LEONTIUS (74).] [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (56)**, deacon of Alexandria, agent of Cyril at Constantinople, mentioned in Cyril's letter to Theognostus, A.D. 433 (ep. 37 ol. 40). [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (57)**, one of the Eutychians who, as *ἐλάχιστοι ἀρχιμανδριταί*, appeal to the emperor Marcian in 451 A.D. headed by Carosus, asking for a general council (Labbe, iv. 524). The orthodox archimandrites in the council of Chalcedon did not recognise his claim to call himself an archimandrite, but described him as *ἀποαρκτηρόβος* (? Lat. ex ursario, i.e. as coming from a part of the town which got its name

from a place where bears were bred). (Labbe, iv. 521 A.) [C. G.]

**LEONTIUS (58)**, a monk in the reign of Zeno, much resorted to for his skill in declaring the hidden sense of Scripture. (Suidas, s. n.; Tillem. xvi. 372.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (59)**, monk, one of four deputies from the East, who from Rome, 520, addressed Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe and his brother exiles in Sardinia. (Fulgent. ep. 16 fin., ep. 17 init., in *Pat. Lat.* lxxv. 451; Labbe, iv. 1516.) [MAXENTIUS.] [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (60)**, presbyter at the council of Arles, aera 461, A.D. 524, representing his bishop Constantinus or Constantius. (Isidor. Merc. in *Pat. Lat.* cxxx. 382; Mansi, viii. 627.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (61)**, an abbat of a monastery near Rome, who cir. 579 accompanied Gregory of Agrigentum [GREGORIUS (33)] when a young man to Jerusalem (Leont. *Vit. Greg.* in *Pat. Gr.* xcvi. 573, 576 and n.); not, as remarked by Morcelli (*ib.* p. 534), the biographer of Gregory. [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (62)**, a scholasticus of Byzantium and afterwards a monk in Palestine who wrote cir. 610 a Greek treatise *De Sectis*. (*Pat. Gr.* lxxxvi. 1193; Cave, i. 543; Ceillier, xi. 666.) [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (63)**, a monk who wrote against John Philoponus (Niceph. Call. *H. E.* xviii. 48), and perhaps the solitary mentioned in the *Epistola Synodica* of Sophronius. (Phot. cod. 231 s.f.; Ceill. xi. 653.) [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (64)**, presbyter and hegumen of St. Sabas near Rome, cir. 680, author of the *Life of Gregory of Agrigentum* [GREGORIUS (33)]. He was probably the Leontius sent by pope Martin I. to John bishop of Philadelphia in 649, and the deacon Leontius who signed the libellus presented to the Lateran council of 649. (Mansi, x. 805 D, 910 D; Morcelli, *De Leont.* num. iv. ix. x. xi. in *Pat. Gr.* xcvi. 534, 543, 545.) [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (65)**, a monk of the Laura of St. Sabas near Jerusalem, cir. 800 (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* iii. 306), and author of a *Life of Stephanus Thaumaturgus*, a monk of the same Laura. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. iii. 531.) [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (66)**, June 18, soldier and martyr with Hypatius and Theodulus at Tripoli in Phoenicia Maritima under a president Hadrianus in Vespasian's reign. His martyrdom was celebrated from early times. Theodoret (*Orat. viii. de Martyr.* Migne, *Pat. Gr.* lxxxiii. col. 1034) reckons him among the chiefest martyrs with SS. Peter and Paul, Marcellus and Mauritius. (Bas. *Men.*; *AA. SS. Boll.* Jun. iii. 553; *Mart. Rom.* ed. Baron.; Tillem. ii. 153.) [G. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (67)**, Jan. 20, martyr at Nicomedia with Cyriacus and others. (Wright's *Syria Mart.*) [G. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (68)**, Aug. 1, martyr at Perga in Pamphylia, in the Diocletian persecution. (Bas.

*Menol.*; *Menol. Graec.* Sirlet.; *Acta SS. Boll.* Aug. i. 21.) [G. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (69)** (Oct. 17, Basil. *Menol.*; Sep. 27, *Mart. Usuard.*, *Vet. Rom.*, Adon., Wandalb.), brother of Cosmas, Damianus, Anthimus, and Euprepus, who suffered with him in Cilicia during the Diocletian persecution. [COSMAS.] (*AA. SS. Boll.* Oct. vii. 798.) [G. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (70)**, Aug. 30, martyr with Carpophorus at Vicentia in the reign of Diocletian. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iv. 35.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (71)**, July 10, martyr at Nicopolis in Armenia Minor, with Mauritius, Daniel, and certain others. They suffered under Licinius by order of the president Lysias, probably at the same time as the Forty Martyrs. [FORTY MARTYRS; HERACLIUS.] (Bas. *Menol.*; *Acta SS. Boll.* Jul. iii. 33.) [G. T. S.]

**LEONTIUS (72)** (LEUCIUS and LAURENTIUS being other readings), a martyr after whom a monastery near Rome, mentioned by Gregory the Great (lib. vi. ind. xiv. ep. 62 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 846), was named. Baronius thinks he may have been the same as Leucius bishop of Brundisium, commemorated on Jan. 11 (*Mart. Rom.* Jan. 11, note), but see Tillem. v. 537. [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (73)**, one of the martyrs of Saragossa. [SARAGOSSA, MARTYRS OF.]

**LEONTIUS (74)**, priest and martyr of Armenia in the reign of Isdigerd II. king of Persia. He acted a conspicuous part in the stand which the Armenian church made against the court of Persia, as related chiefly in the *History of Vartan* by Elisha Vartabed and in the historical work of Lazarus of Barb. In the original Armenian his name stands as GHÉVONT (Langlois, *Historiens de l'Armén.* t. ii. pp. 3, 202), or LÉVONT (Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas. Emp.* vi. 281, ed. Saint-Martin). In the English version of Elisha Vartabed by Neumann he appears as LEONT, and in the French version as LEONCE, i.e. LEONTIUS. In the French versions of Gorioun, Moses of Khorene, and Lazarus of Barb, the name is written LEON, i.e. LEO. He belonged to the town of Idchavan, in the canton of Vanant, in the province of Ararat (Langl. ii. 242). In early life he was one of the disciples of Mesrob, who placed him and his companion Enoch in charge of a mission at Sber (Moses of Khor. in Langl. ii. 167). Subsequently Leontius went with Gorioun to study at Constantinople, where they joined their fellow disciples Joseph of Baghin and Eznik, who had preceded them there (Gorioun in Langl. ii. 3, 12). He appears as an influential public man in the crisis of 450, when he was present at the synod of Ardshad (Laz. of Barb, § 22, in Langl. ii. 282) [JOSEPHUS (2)]. In the same year the prospect in Armenia looked so desperate that Vartan was abandoning it for the Roman dominions, and had already reached the frontier town of Aramana, when Leontius, believing in the hypocritical Vasag, whose protestations were entrusted to him to carry, came with some others and prevailed on him to remain in the country (Laz. § 22, p. 289). After this, in November 450, a

body of seven hundred magian priests, sent under escort to instruct the Armenians in their new religion, arrived at Ankes (written also Angeh or Angel in Saint-Martin's *Le Beau*, vi. 281) in the canton of Dsakhgodn, in the province of Ararat, and the centre of Armenia. There having lain encamped for twenty-five days, they at length one sabbath morning ordered the church to be broken open. This act was the commencement of the persecuting violence of Persia, and here Leontius again appears. Putting himself at the head of his people he attacked the magian party and put them to flight, after which divine service went on in the church unmolested through the day. A general rising followed, and in 451 sixty-six thousand Armenian Christians mustered under prince Vartan in the plain of Artass on the banks of the Dekhmdud to encounter the Persian army. Joseph and a large body of his clergy, including Leontius, were present to encourage the Christian forces (*Lazarus*, § 34 in *Langl.* ii. 296, 297; *Elisha*, u. *inf.*). Leontius, who is everywhere mentioned with Joseph, and is usually the orator, as he is the chief inspirer, of the whole movement, delivers a fervent address before the battle (omitted by Neumann, but given fully by Langlois), dwelling on the examples of Phineas, Elijah, Gideon, and the other famous believers under the Old Testament (*Langl.* ii. 218). The battle (June 2, 451, *ibid.* 298 note) was lost and a remnant found refuge in the stronghold of Pag. This too was taken and many of the clergy were put to death, but Joseph and Leontius, who had appealed to the Persian court, were for the present spared with a few others. The narrative of Elisha Vartabed, terminating about this period, but including some addresses of Leontius before Persian functionaries, has been thus far our principal authority (*Neum.* pp. 29, 51, 53, 60, 63, 66; *Langl.* ii. 202-242); for the sequel we have recourse to *Lazarus* (*Langl.* ii. 300 sq.). Joseph, Leontius, and their companions, were taken to the court of Persia, and put on their defence. Finally they and four others were executed on the 25th day of the month Hroditz, in the sixteenth year of Isdigerd (A.D. 455), in the province of Abar, near a village of the Mogs named Révan. The account of the martyrdom has every appearance of being a genuine coeval record, simple, natural, unlegendary. *Lazarus* himself wrote in the following generation, and his position gave him access to the best authorities, which he describes, especially assuring his readers that he faithfully reports the last words of the martyrs. The most severely dealt with was Leontius, he being regarded as the chief instigator of the Armenian resistance. The general history of these events may be read in *Saint-Martin's Le Beau*, t. vi. pp. 258-318. [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (75)**, a Roman officer, called by an anonymous Donatist writer count (comes), under whom some of the severities ordered by Constantine against the Donatists are said to have been carried out, A.D. 320. But there is some reason to think that the name is a satirical one, applied by the Donatists to Gregorius the prefect, as expressing the qualities denoted in the description of Dan. vii. 4, 5. Optatus mentions Leontius in a doubtful manner ("nescio

quis"), and we may add that the language of St. Augustine, in replying to the general and vague statements of Petilianus, is also of a doubtful kind; the bare mention, therefore, of the name by later Donatist writers adds no evidence in deciding the question of the existence of Leontius apart from Gregorius. A person of this name was consul A.D. 344; but there is nothing to shew his identity with the one here mentioned. (*Opt.* iii. 4, 8, 10; *Mon. Vet. Don.* No. 27, p. 219, ed. Oberthür; *Aug. c. Petil.* ii. 92, 202, 208, 209; *Praef.* vol. ix. p. 15; *Morcelli, Afr. Christ.* ii. 224; *Tillemont*, vol. vi. p. 107.) [HABETDEUS.] [H. W. P.]

**LEONTIUS (76)**, one of the judges appointed by the emperor Constantius in the dispute between Photinus and Basil of Ancyra (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxi. cap. 1, p. 829). He was prefect of Rome in 355 and 356 (*Amm. Marcell.* xiv. 11, xv. 7; *Corsini, Series Praef.* p. 214). An edict (*De Episcopis*, leg. 13) dated Oct. 29, 356, was addressed to him by Constantius. (*Cod. Theod.* t. vi. p. 39, ed. Gothofr. 1665; *Tillem.* vi. 333, 384.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (77)**, a gentleman near Milan at whose house Ambrose lay concealed for a time to escape being made a bishop. (*Paulinus, Vit. Ambros.* § 9.) [AMBROSIUS.] [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (78)**, a calumniator of INDICIA. (*Ambros. Ep.* 5, §§ 19, 24.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (79)**, a sophist, a friend and correspondent of Basil, who extols him as the most celebrated of all the Greek sophists he had known. Two letters of Basil to him are preserved (*Basil. Epp.* 20 (83), 21, (373)), written probably A.D. 364. [E. V.]

**LEONTIUS (80)**, sophist at Athens, father of the empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II. [*EUDOCIA* (+)]. (*Soc.* vii. 21.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (81)**, a gentleman of the Cappadocian Caesarea who shewed Chrysostom much kindness when passing through that city on his way to Cucus. (*Chrysost. Ep.* 83.) [E. V.]

**LEONTIUS (82)**, a prefect of Illyricum mentioned in two lives of St. Demetrius as having been healed at his tomb at Thessalonica, and having in consequence built two churches in his honour, one at Thessalonica, the other at Sirmium (*Boll. Acta SS.* 8 Oct. iv. 68, 94, 95, 102, 103). The Bollandist believes him to be the prefect of Illyricum of that name to whom edicts were addressed in 412 and 413. (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Gothofr. 1665, t. ii. p. 329, t. iv. p. 509.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (83)**, magistratorian, a man of probity and many virtues, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (*lib. iii. ep.* 229). [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (84)**, prefect of Constantinople, to whom Theodosius addressed his edict against Nestorius, dated Aug. 3, 435. (*Cod. Theod.* t. vi. p. 190, ed. Gothofr. 1665.) [C. H.]

**LEONTIUS (85)** (or **PONTIUS LEONTIUS**), a senator of Bordeaux, and friend of Sidonius Apollinaris ("Leontius meus facile princeps Aquitanorum." *Epist.* lib. viii. 12; *Carm.* xxiii.

Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 725). See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 409, 561. [S. A. B.]

**LEONTIUS I. and II.**, emperors. [DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY.]

**LEONTIUS (86)**, an unknown person to whom Basilus Cilius addressed his reply to the *Adversus Ecclesie desertores* of Joannes Scythopolita. He was probably a bishop, as Basilus, who was then a presbyter, speaks of him as "sanctissimum Deoque carissimum et Patrem." (Photius, *Cod.* cvii.) [JOANNES (565).] [T. W. D.]

**LEONTIUS (87)**, ex-consul in Sicily, an important personage in the time of Gregory the Great, who addressed or mentioned him in 598, 600, 601. Carl Hegel (*Städteverfassung von Italien*, i. 177) thinks that he may have occupied the position of the quaestor in Justinian's system. (Greg. *Magn. Epist.* lib. x. indict. iii. 51; Migne, lxxvii. 1106; also lib. viii. indict. i. 35; lib. ix. indict. ii. 23; lib. xii. indict. v. 15-16; Migne, lxxvii. 937-963, 1228; Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, ii. 49.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LEONTIUS (88)**, "vir clarissimus," sent by Gregory the Great to take charge of the city of Nepi. Gregory in 592 wrote "clero ordini et plebi," ordering them to obey him. (*Epist.* lib. ii. indict. x. 11; Migne, lxxvii. 547.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LEONTIUS (89)**, imperial secretary at the seventh synod 787. (Mansi, xiii. 158.) [C. H.]

**LEOPACHARIUS (LEOPARIUS, LEUPICARIUS)**, twenty-first archbishop of Tours, hospitably entertained St. Columban on his way to Nantes, A.D. 610. His episcopate seems to have lasted twelve years and a few months. (Jonas, *Vita S. Columbani*, §§ 42, 43; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1036; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 26; Salmon, *Recueil de Chroniques de Touraine*, pp. 88, 175, 213.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOPARDINUS**, Oct. 7, abbat of St. Symphorian of Vivaris, and martyr, in the 6th or 7th century. (*Boll. Acta SS.* Oct. iii. 914.) [C. H.]

**LEOPARDUS (1)**, Sept. 30, a domestic servant of the emperor Julian, martyred at Rome. (*Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. viii. 413.) See also Molanus in the *Auctaria* to Usuard, and Tillemont, vii. 352. [C. H.]

**LEOPARDUS (2)**, a priest sent with two others, Crescens and Alexander, by pope Siricius to Ambrose, cir. 389. (Ambros. ep. 42 § 13; Mansi, iii. 667; Tillemont, x. 228, 364.) [C. H.]

**LEOPARDUS (3)**, lector of church of St. Pudens. De Rossi has discovered his epitaph, on which he notes, as characteristic of the 4th century and later, that the name of the church to which he was attached is added to his record. Previously the title of lector simply is given. It is found on monuments of the 2nd century. (Northcote, *Epit. Catac.* p. 120; De Rossi, *Bullett.* 1871, p. 32, cf. 1867, p. 51; De Rossi, *Inscr. Crist.* num. 62, 164, 388.) [G. T. S.]

**LEOPARDUS (4)**, Nov. 7, first known bishop of Auximum (Osimo), of very doubtful date. Some authorities place him in the 5th century;

others early in the 7th century. (Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* i. 497; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* vii. 486, 605.) [R. S. G.]

**LEOPARDUS (5)**, abbat, who subscribed the thirteenth council of Toledo, A.D. 683, for Aurelius bishop of Asturia. (Mansi, xi. 1077.) [C. H.]

**LEOPARIUS**, of Tours. [LEOPACHARIUS.]

**LEOPERTUS**, twenty-first bishop of Grenoble, perhaps about the middle of the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 223.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOSINDUS (LEOVISINDUS, TEODESINDUS)**, bishop of Iria Flavia (Santiago), placed under Roderic, the last Gothic king, by the 12th-century *Historia Compostelana*, and by the *Chronicon Iriense Esp. Sagr.* xix. 61, xx. 7, 600. [ORTIGIUS.] [M. A. W.]

**LEOTHADIUS, ST.**, thirty-second bishop of Auch, or Aux, circ. A.D. 691-717, is said to have belonged to a noble family of Aquitaine. According to a tradition, believed to be supported by the evidence of ancient documents, he was abbat of the monastery of Moissiacum, in the diocese of Cahors, before his elevation to the bishopric of Auch (*Boll. Acta SS.* Oct. x. 123). But the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* believe the abbat Leutadus, or Leotadius, of Moissiacum, to have lived much earlier (i. 976, cf. 159). Though omitted by many martyrologists, his name may be found in some of the *Auctaria* to Usuard. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 612.) [S. A. B.]

**LEOTHERIUS**, seventh bishop of Bourges, A.D. 354-363. (*Gall. Ch.* ii. 6.) [R. T. S.]

**LEOTWINUS (LEODOWINUS, LUTWINUS, LUTWINUS, LUDWIN), ST.**, thirty-fourth bishop of Trèves (circ. A.D. 695-713). The story of his life, as we have it, is drawn from the life of St. Basinus, written by Nizo, an abbat who lived at the close of the 11th century (*Boll. Acta SS.* Mart. i. 315-320), and who admits that the sources had been destroyed, probably by the devastations of the Northmen in 882 (*ibid.* s. 2, p. 315), and from two lives of St. Leotwinus, one of which is sometimes ascribed to the same author (*Boll. ibid.* Sept. viii. 169-172). The other, by an anonymous writer, is somewhat fuller (*ibid.* 172-6), but they are equally untrustworthy (Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 480).

The biographers are plainly mistaken in placing his accession at Trèves after the death of Basinus, since three documents connected with the gifts of St. Irmina to Epernac, and dated in 698 and 699, are attested by both Basinus and Leotwinus with the subscription of episcopus (Hontheim, *Hist. Trevirensis*, i. 90-101, num. xxiv.-xxvi.; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. instr. 293-5).

His death is placed about 713 (*Boll.* p. 167). A rude epitaph is preserved, but its antiquity is very doubtful (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 387; *Boll. ibid.* p. 167). He is commemorated Sept. 29. [S. A. B.]

**LEOVA**, king of Spain. [LUBA.]

**LEOVIGILD (LEUVICHILD)**, Arian king of the Visigoths in Spain from 569 to April or May

586. His reign and that of his successor, the convert Recared, represent the crisis of Visigothic history, religious and political, and as such have a peculiar interest. We propose to divide the present period into five main sections:—i. Settlement and re-invigoration of the monarchy; ii. Hermenigild's rebellion; iii. War with the Franks; iv. Leovigild's character and aims; v. Hispano-Frankish relations under Leovigild.

*Early years of the reign. Military successes.*—Upon the death of Athanagild in the winter of 567, the Gothic throne remained unfilled for almost half a year, no doubt because of the discords among the electing nobles by which any accession to the Gothic crown was apt to be accompanied. For five months no decision could be arrived at. Then in 566 Leova, *dux* of the Septimianian province (so the 13th-century historians, Lucas Tud. and Rod. Tol.; Isidore says only “post Athanagildum Luiva Narbone Gothis praeicitur”) was made king by the magnates of Gallia Gothica. In 569, however, either because Spain proper would not acknowledge his election, or because he was already old and unequal to the task of governing the disturbed and half-subdued Peninsula, Leova made his younger brother Leovigild his partner in the kingdom, assigning to him the government of the Spanish portion. (“Sic regnum dios cepit dum nulla potestas patiens consortis sit,” says Isid. with characteristic learning, recalling Lucan, *Phars.* i. 92.) In the first year of his reign, Leovigild married Goisvintha, the widow of his predecessor, Athanagild, and a strong Arian. (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* v. 39.) By a previous marriage he had already two sons, Hermenigild and Recared, who were soon to play important parts in the history of his reign. (Some remarks on the vexed question of this first marriage will be found below.) The new king's first business was to provide for the bare safety of the Gothic state in Spain. The six months' interregnum, probably indeed extended to a much longer period within the boundaries of the Peninsula, had let loose all the chronic dangers threatening the Gothic kingdom. The Byzantines in the south-western provinces, with Cordova for their *point d'appui*, the Suevi, Basques, and Cantabrians in the north,—all were in movement; and for the heretical Gothic state, undermined by the discontent of the Catholic provincials, and threatened by the enmity of the orthodox Franks and Suevi, such a fatal moment seemed to have arrived as heralded the downfall of the kingdom of Toulouse under Alaric II. or that of the African Vandals. Leovigild, however, faced the situation with success. His iron will, his foresight and energy combined, succeeded in rescuing the Gothic monarchy from its perilous position, and in making it for the time a powerful instrument of government. His first campaign in the year of his accession, 569, was directed against the Byzantine settlers and garrisons of the Baza and Malaga districts; the country was ravaged and the enemy beaten, but it was not till 570 that the first substantial success was gained. The town of Assidona (not Medina Sidonia as Dahn and others still maintain, but unquestionably Xerez de la Frontera—see Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* x. 20, and Dozy's recent confirmation of his judgment, *Recherches*, &c. i. 313) fell by the treachery of one of its Gothic inhabitants, and from some similar cause Cordova herself succumbed in the

following year. For twenty years Cordova had refused to acknowledge the lordship of the Goths, and since Athanagild's rebellion when the troops of the Eastern emperor first entered Gothic Spain, the great town of the Baetis had been the head-quarters of the Imperialist and Catholic power in the Peninsula. Its fall (early in 572?) was a heavy blow to the imperial cause in Spain. Leovigild wreaked a cruel vengeance on the town itself, and on the *rustici* of the Andalusian mountains who had supported the rebellion (Joannes Biel. *Esp. Sagr.* vi. 377). The capture of other smaller towns and fortresses followed, and the Byzantines were thus driven back upon the coast districts, from which another generation would be needed finally to dislodge them. In 572 (573 according to J. Biel.) Luiva died, and Leovigild remained master of both divisions of the kingdom. After his southern campaign he turned northwards, took Sabaria (placed by Florez near Salamanca, *Esp. Sagr.* v. 406), subdued Cantabria, and seized the strong town of Amaya, and the destruction of which there is a possible allusion in the Life of San Millan (Braulio's *Vita Sti. Emiliani*, Tamaño de Salazar, *Martyr. Hisp.* v.). (See Florez's interesting account of the site of Amaya, which Dahn seems to have overlooked, *Esp. Sagr.* v. 408; also Masdeu, *Hist. de España*, x. 134.) Thence the king struck westward to the country of the Aregenses, bordering probably on Suevian territory, where one Aspidius, “*loci senior*,” had founded a local independent government. (Dahn, v. 131, note 1; conf. the Roman provincial nobility of which we hear under Euric, Isid. p. 485.) He with his wife and children were made prisoners, and his *opes* and *loca* taken possession of. No success, however, could really amalgamate the inhabitants of these northern mountainous valleys with southern Spain, and later Visigothic as well as all later Spanish history is full of instances of the separatist spirit of the country, to which the abolition of the *jueros* in our own day has scarcely dealt the last blow. From the Aregenses, Leovigild passed on to the Suevi, in whom most probably these local risings had found support, but Miro, the Suevian king, sued successfully for peace, and Leovigild retraced his steps southwards (Joannes Biel. l. c. p. 380). One more rebellion remained to be put down. The inhabitants of the province of Orospeña (the mountain country of Cuenca and Molina, *Esp. Sagr.* v. 413, Dahn, l. c. 131, note 2, and v. Sprüner's *Hist. H. Atlas*, no. 14) were attacked and subdued, the towns and strong places first, and the *rustici* of the mountains and remote districts later on.

In the preceding narrative the order of events given in Joannes Biel. has been preserved. Dahn, our great German authority on Visigothic history, follows a slightly different order, for the purpose apparently of reconciling Isidore's narrative with that of the abbat of Biclara. Such a reconciliation is, however, not necessary. Isidore's whole account of Leovigild's reign is of a vague general kind, and does not pretend to minute chronological accuracy. The sequence of names in the few sentences he gives to these early conquests of Leovigild has evidently no importance, whereas the case is quite different with Joannes's narrative, which is thrown into the form of annals, and is, with regard to these points, perfectly consistent with itself and with geography.



*The King's Treatment of the Nobles.*—The most formidable external enemies of the Gothic rule were now temporarily crushed, and Leovigild could turn his mind to building up and reforming the internal order of the state. In this period of success and prestige we may in all probability place his onslaught upon the Gothic nobility, that intractable order of which Gregory of Tours says naively, "The Goths have learned the detestable habit of killing their king whenever he displeases them, and putting another in his place" (*Hist. Franc.* iii. 30). And again (iv. 38), "Leovigild killed all those who had made a habit of killing their kings (conf. "cognito morbo Gothorum," Fredegar, 82), without leaving a male among them." Of this visitation of the nobles, Joannes Biclaensis, himself a victim of Leovigild's Arian persecution, speaks with evident approval. "Leovigildus rex, extinctis undique tyrannis, et pervasoribus Hispaniae superatis, sortitus requiem, propria cum plebe resedit" (*l. c.* p. 381). It remained for Leovigild's younger contemporary, Isidore, at a time when the church and the converted Gothic nobles were no longer in a state of necessary antagonism, to see in this strife with his turbulent and savage *palatini* only another proof of the cruelty and perversity of the Arian king ("Exstitit autem et quibusdam suorum perniciosus, etc." *l. c.* apud *Esp. Sagr.* vi. 491). To us, who are able to some extent to trace the effects and tendencies of the various social and political forces in the Hispano-Gothic state throughout its history, it is quite evident that Leovigild's stern treatment of the Gothic nobles was a necessary part of his scheme for the establishment of a strong monarchy, and must be taken together with his care to secure the succession to his sons, with his whole attitude towards the Catholic church, and with other legislative and social acts of his which must be noticed presently. The expression *cum propria plebe*, in the passage quoted above from Joannes Biclaensis, is worth notice as bringing home to us with unusual sharpness the differences of race and creed which still in Leovigild's time separated Goth from Roman provincial, *i. e.* Arian from Catholic, but which in the reign of the convert Recared were to begin to disappear as fast as they had already disappeared in Frankish Gaul, where the religious difficulty had been absent from the beginning. Of this religious difference and difficulty, with all the political complications dependent on it, the famous story of Hermenigild's revolt is the best and most instructive illustration which remains to us.

*Hermenigild's Rebellion.*—In 572 (or 73) the king had made both the sons of his first marriage "consortes regni" (*J. Biel.* p. 378). Gregory of Tours, deceived perhaps by Frankish custom, speaks of an equal division of the kingdom between them ("inter eos regnum aequaliter divisit," iv. 38), which the inaccurate Mariana (vi. 11) developed still further into a threefold division of Spain with three capitals, Toledo for Leovigild, the newly-founded Recopolis for Recared (see below), and Seville for Hermenigild. The words used by J. Biclaensis, however, imply nothing more than such a position as Tulga assumed later in the reign of Kindila ("petitione patris sublimatur in regno," *Fred. Chr.* 82), or Rekesvinth under Kindasvinth ("K. fil. suum

Rek. in omni regno Spaniae regem stabilivit," *ib.*), or Wittiza under Egica ("Egica in consortio regni Witzanem filium, sibi haeredem faciens Gothorum regnum, retemptat," *Isid. Pac.*). The object of these arrangements on the part of the Gothic kings was always one and the same—to win a triumph for the principle of hereditary succession which tended to strengthen the throne, at the expense of that of popular election which tended to weaken it. After the death of Amalaric, the last representative of the house of Theodoric I.—which possessed the crown, though always by right of election, from 451 to 531—none but the strong kings could thus secure the succession for their sons, or induce the *palatini* who elected, and the clergy who confirmed and anointed (Dahn, v. 172), to relinquish the electoral rights which gave them so much formidable political power. As Dahn well says, "Of the two forces which combine to make Germanic kingship—hereditary succession and popular election—the latter was always the stronger among the Visigoths, and at last won complete supremacy." The consortium regni may be looked upon as a compromise between these two forces. It does not appear to have carried with it necessarily any assignment of territory. As in the cases of Recared and Rekesvinth (v. Braulio's letter to Kindasvinth, *Esp. Sagr.* xxx.), the heir thus recognised—(ty election at the hands of the *palatini*?)—was his father's general and representative throughout the kingdom. To Hermenigild, however, eight years after he became consors regni, special territory was assigned, as Galicia was later to Wittiza, and perhaps for much the same reasons. Joannes Biclaensis enables us to judge of the real nature of the transaction as against Gregory's exaggeration. After Hermenigild's marriage, when it had become necessary to send the newly-married pair to a distance, "Leov. rex Hermenigildo filio suo, partem Provinciae (*i. e.* Prov. Hispaniae) ad regnandum tribuit," the partem Provinciae being, as subsequent events shew, Baetica, or as much of it as was free from the imperialists, with Seville for a place of residence. In this arrangement it is extremely probable that, besides the appeasement of family feuds, Leovigild had also in view the stability and defence of the southern frontier against the recently repulsed Byzantines, just as Wittiza was sent to Tuy later to overawe the half-amalgamated Suevi. Of any such assignment of territory to Recared there is no trace in the sources. (Dahn suggests, vi. 330, that Hermenigild may have been Dux of Baetica, as Claudius (see art. RECARDED) was Dux of Lusitania, or Paulus [WAMBA], Dux Narbonensis. See *l. c.* p. 329, for definition of the position and functions of the *dux* in the Gothic state.)

Sometime before 580 both Hermenigild and Recared were betrothed to Frankish princesses. (Five Hispano-Frankish marriages or projects of marriage occur between Amalaric and Witteric, all with more or less disastrous consequences.) Hermenigild was to marry his step-niece, Ingunthis, the daughter of Sigibert of Metz and Brunichild, and granddaughter therefore of Brunichild's mother, Goisvintha, now Leovigild's second wife, while Recared was betrothed to Ingunthis's first cousin, Rignunthis, daughter of Chilperic and Fredegonde. In 580

Hermenigild's bride, a girl of twelve or thirteen (Sigibert and Brunichild were married in 566), passed the Pyrenees, "cum magno apparatu" (Greg. Tur. v. 39), having been exhorted on her passage southwards by bishop Fronimius of Agde to hold fast her orthodox profession in the midst of the Arian family of which she was to become a member. Meanwhile it was no doubt the expectation of the Goths that Ingunthis would become an Arian as Brunichild or Gailsvintha (q. v.) had become Catholics (Dahn, v. 136). The newly arrived bride, however, stood firm, and dissension speedily arose between herself and her Arian grandmother. According to Gregory of Tours (v. 39), upon whose authority alone the details of this portion of the narrative rest, Goisvintha had recourse to personal ill-treatment when persuasion failed (see art. INGUNTHIS), and in order to secure family peace Leovigild assigned a town to Hermenigild and Ingunthis ("unam de civitatibus in qua residentes regnarent"). Gregory's notions of the geography of Southern Spain are throughout extremely vague, and he persistently confuses Seville with Cordova, if not also Merida with both these towns (cont. v. 39, vi. 18, and vi. 43). Here, viz. at Seville, the influence of his wife, says Gregory of Tours—of the famous Metropolitan of Baetica, Leander (see art. LEANDER), according to Gregory the Great, *Dial.* iii. 41—succeeded in converting Hermenigild to Catholicism (*Hist. Fr.* v. 39; Paul. Diac. W. iii. 21), and he was confirmed in the orthodox faith (not re-baptized, as Fredegar. *Ep.* 83) by Leander, taking the new name of Johannes ("ac dum christumaretur, Johannes est vocitatus"). We are here confronted with the strange fact that neither of the Spanish contemporary reporters, Joannes Biclarensis and Isidore, so much as mentions Hermenigild's conversion, "*H. factioe Goisvinthae Reginae* (conf. Florez, vi. and Görres, *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.* 1873, i. 11, on these difficult words), tyrannidem assumens in Hispali civitate rebellione facta recluditur," says the former; while one short sentence, "H. deinde filium imperiis suis tyrannizantem obsessum exuperavit," is all that Isidore gives to the whole matter. We are not here concerned with an explanation of this curious silence (see art. HERMENIGILD), but it may be as well to point out that, notwithstanding it, the fact of the conversion itself does not admit of question (conf. Görres, *l. c.* and Dahn, v. 147, note 4). Opinions, however, differ widely as to how the fact is to be interpreted. By this step the son placed himself in direct opposition to his father and to all the Gothic traditions, while at the same time it brought him into natural alliance with all the forces threatening the Gothic state, with the Byzantines in the south, with the Suevi in the north, and with whatever of disaffection was smouldering among Leovigild's provincial subjects. It is indeed most probable (as Helfferich has already partially suggested, *Entsteh. und Gesch. des Westgothen-Rechts*, p. 11) that Hermenigild's conversion was largely a political matter, although in the famous account of him in the *Dialogues* Gregory the Great has carefully, or perhaps unconsciously, kept out of sight all the political surroundings of the case. As the case stands in the documents, it is certainly open to any student of the time to conclude that

the conversion was the result of a combination between certain of the Catholic bishops under Leovigild headed by Leander and the Byzantine leaders, counselled perhaps by such eminent bishops within the Greek territory as Licinian of Cartagena—the Byzantine headquarters—and Severus of Malaga (q. v.). The share assigned to Leander in the matter by Gregory the Great, his subsequent exile and appearance at Constantinople, "pro causis fidei Visigothorum" (*Pref. in Moralia*), and his friendship for Licinian of Cartagena, together with the open alliance presently formed between Hermenigild and the imperial prefect, all seem to point in this direction. The young couple at Seville may well have appeared to the Catholics a pair of convenient instruments for dealing a deadly blow at the heretical Gothic monarchy; while in the case of the Byzantines a strictly political motive would have been also present. By Hermenigild's conversion to Catholicism the monarchy was to be attacked at its centre before the exceptional qualities of Leovigild should succeed in making it once more a powerful engine of government. (We are here at variance with Dahn, who calls the supposition of a Catholic and Byzantine conspiracy "eine dramatische construction," without, however, bringing forward any arguments against it.) Nor do we know anything of Hermenigild personally which should oblige us to place his conversion in a higher category of human action. To the Spanish reporters of his own time—both Catholic bishops—he is simply a "tyrannus" and a "rebellis;" even Gregory of Tours, for all his natural sympathy, has hard things to say of him, as we shall see presently. Nor in our own day has an Ultra-Catholic historian of Gothic Spain (Gams, *K. G.* ii. (2), p. 4) anything but a lukewarm defence to make of his general conduct, the chief point in the defence being that "martyrdom, like a baptism of blood, effaces all former sins."

The peril was a grave one. "Quae causa in provincia Hispania tam Gothis quam Romanis majoris exitii quam adversariorum infestatio fuit," says Joannes. Leovigild, however, when the news reached him, behaved, as in earlier dangers, with an extraordinary combination of energy and prudence. In the first place Gregory tells us of a correspondence between father and son. "Veni ad me," writes the king. "quia extant causae, quas conferamus," et ille "non ibo, quia infensus es mihi pro eo quod sim catholicus." Then Leovigild assembled a council of Arian bishops (581, mentioned in C. Tol. iii. as occurring in the twelfth year of Leovigild), and they drew up a formula designed to facilitate the conversion of Catholics to Arianism. Re-baptism was no longer demanded by the Arian bishops as heretofore. They laid down that all "*de Romana religione* ad no-stram catholicam fidem venientes non debere baptizari sed tantummodo per manus impositionem et communionis perceptionem abluí, et gloriam Patri per Filium in Spiritu Sancto dari." (The Gloria Patri plays an important part in the history of Spanish Arianism. Conf. Greg. of Tours' conversation with Leovigild's envoy, the Arian Oppila—*Hist. Franc.* vi. 40, and C. Tol. iii.) A *libellus* containing the decisions of the council was issued and widely circulated (C. Tol. iii. 16, Tejada y Ramiro, ii.). At the same time other

temptations were offered to the Catholic bishops and clergy, and Isidore and Joannes mournfully confess that many among them yielded to the strain of the situation. Vincent of Saragossa, for instance, consented even to re-baptism: "tanquam a coelo in infernum projectum." The king also began to pay the most scrupulous respect to Catholic feeling and belief, to shew respect to Catholic saints (see the strange story of Masona and the tunic of St. Eulalia in the *De Vit. et Mir. Patr. Emerit. Esp. Sagr.* xiii.), and to pray in Catholic churches (Greg. Tur. vi. 18). "I believe," he is reported to have said, "with firmness that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, equal to the Father, but I do not at all believe that the Holy Ghost is God, since in no book of Scripture do we read that He is God." By such means as these Leovigild endeavoured to secure the Catholic party within the territory outside Hermenigild's influence. It is plain that although according to Gregory he was looking out for means to destroy his son (coepit causas quaerere qualiter eum perderet), he did not for some time feel himself strong enough to make an open quarrel, and meet Hermenigild in the field. Precautions had to be taken on all sides, and first and foremost in the direction of the Franks. Here Recared's betrothal to Chilperic's daughter Rigunthis formed a useful point of departure. Accordingly, from 580 to 584, we find constant embassies on the subject of the marriage passing between Leovigild and Chilperic; and thus any combination of Chilperic of Soissons with Ingunthis's brother, the boy-king Childebert, and with her other uncle Gunthramn of Burgundy, the covetous neighbour of Gallia Gothica, was skilfully warded off. (For the threatened attack on the Spanish north-eastern frontier by Chilperic and Gunthramn, which Dahn places in 581, there is no authority in the sources. Rather it may be shewn that in that year Chilperic was in alliance with Leovigild and at variance with Gunthramn; and that, moreover, the hands of the latter were tied by an alliance between Chilperic and Childebert. For a general sketch of the political relations between Spain and Gaul during this reign, see below.)

One more difficulty remained to be met before Leovigild could meet his rebellious son. In 581 the Basques again rose in revolt. Leovigild overran part of their country, and built the town of Victoriacum (Vittoria) as a symbol of his victory and a protection for the future. Then, secure from attack in the north-east (the Suevi meanwhile were advancing from the north-west), Leovigild at last "exercitum ad expugnandum tyrannum filium collegit" (Joh. Bicl. p. 383) (A.D. 582).

During these two years Hermenigild had assumed a more and more formidable position. He struck coins inscribed with his bust and the royal title (see engraving of the unique example extant in Florez's *Medallas*, iii. 190, "Ermenigildi Regi a Deo Vita"), and aimed openly at his father's place and life, "nesciens miser," says even the hot partisan Gregory of Tours, "judicium sibi imminere divinum qui contra genitorem, quamvis hereticum, talia cogitaret" (vi. 43). Many "civitates et castella" in Baetica had declared for him; and Cordova, after eight years of submission to Leovigild, had again

revolted, and invited a Byzantine garrison. The large and important town of Merida, within a dangerously short distance of Toledo itself, was for him, and his followers are described as numbering many thousands (*Hist. Franc.* vi. 43). Upon the approach of Leovigild's army, Merida apparently was the first of the revolted towns to fall. (See coin in Florez's *Medallas*, iii. 182, "Leovigildus Rex pius Emerita victor," and *Hist. Franc.* vi. 18.) That Merida, the capital of Lusitania, should have declared for Hermenigild, sufficiently proves the extent to which the rebellion had spread. The fact is probably to be attributed to the influence of bishop Masona, who appears at the conversion council of 589, and may well have been at the head of the Catholic resistance in the town at this moment, though the conjecture cannot be verified from the almost unusable but most curious life of him in the *De Vit. et Mir. Patr. Emerit.* (see art. MASONA, and *Esp. Sagr.* xiii. Append.) in which the capture of the town is not mentioned. From Merida the king marched southwards to the siege of Seville. At the same time, Miro, king of the Suevi, was advancing thither in aid of his natural ally Hermenigild. Leovigild, however, met and surrounded him, obliging him to purchase a safe return by such an oath of submission as his son Eburic took later (*q. v.*). On his arrival in his own territory Miro died from the effects of the bad air and water of southern Spain. (So Gregory; Joh. Bicl. describes the Suevian king as dying before Seville.) The siege of Seville lasted through 583 into 584. Leovigild pressed the besieged town from all sides, and by all available means, "nunc fame, nunc ferro, nunc Baetis conclusione." The walls of the ancient Roman town of Italica, near Seville (founded by the elder Scipio, Cortez y Lopez, *Dicc. Geog. de la Esp. Antigua*), were restored by him, and made use of in the general system of environment, and at last the town was taken by storm. Hermenigild had previously escaped to the Byzantines at Cordova (Hermenigildo *ad Rempublicam* commigrans, Joh. Bicl.), where his wife Ingunthis had apparently been already placed for safety. After the fall of Seville Leovigild reduced the neighbouring towns and strong places which had espoused his son's cause, among them, in all probability, the fortress of Osser (or Ossetum? conf. Dahn v. 145 n. 4), with its garrison of 300 picked men, although in Gregory's narrative the fall of Osser precedes the Suevian treaty. Then the king marched up the valley of the Guadalquivir to Cordova. Here the rebellion collapsed. The imperial prefect (? Comitiolus: v. arts. LICINIAN of Cartagena, and SEVERUS of Malaga) was persuaded to give up Hermenigild and the town by a bribe of 30,000 solidi. Hermenigild was found in a church where he had taken refuge, and from which he was tempted by the promises of his father and brother. Leovigild embraced and pardoned him within the church, but as soon as he was drawn thence is reported to have ordered him to be despoiled of his garments (no doubt the royal dress, in imitation of his father who had been the first of the Gothic kings to adopt it) and of his servants (*Hist. Franc.* vi. 43). He was then conveyed to Toledo, and thence exiled to Valencia (A.D. 584) (Joh. Bicl. *l. c.* p. 383). Leovigild struck two

medals in commemoration of the capture of Seville and Cordova, the first bearing the inscription, "Cum Deo obtinuit Spalim;" the second, "Cordubam bis obtinuit." (*Medallas*, iii.)

*Conquest and Incorporation of the Suevi.*—Upon this brilliant success, won against formidable odds, and under most critical circumstances, followed the final incorporation of the Suevi with the Gothic state in 585 (see *EBURIC*). "Suevorum gentem, thesaurum et patriam, suam in potestatem redigit, et Gothorum provinciam facit" (Joh. Bicl.), "Regnumque eorum in jura gentis suae mira celeritate transmisit," says Isidore, thus rendering with a stroke the vigour and force which were Leovigild's characteristics. "Thus," he continues, "he possessed himself of the greater part of Spain, whereas before him the people of the Goths were confined within narrow limits (gens Gothorum angustis finibus arcebatur), upon which, indeed, follows the inevitable qualification, "sed obfusavit in eo error impietatis gloriam tantae virtutis."

*Persecution of the Catholics.*—By caution and daring combined, Leovigild had succeeded in crushing the Catholic and Byzantine conspiracy against his throne, of which Hermenigild had been the instrument. The result of his triumph was an outbreak of that savage and fanatical temper which seems to have been the peculiar and disastrous possession of the Visigothic race, which, after the fusion of the Roman and Teutonic elements under Recared, infected the jubilant Catholic church, dictating the Jew-laws, which are the disgrace of the later councils of Toledo, and which, intensified by centuries of Mohammedan occupation, has left its fatal mark on all subsequent Spanish history. The persecuting temper of the Arian kings, however, it must in justice be remembered, had always some political justification. Under Euric (*q. v.*), placed between the orthodox Franks and his own disaffected Catholic subjects, under the Vandal kings of Northern Africa, where the Byzantines take the place of the Franks, or under Leovigild, the situation with its tendencies is always the same. The Catholic church, acting as the leader of the Romanised populations, is the natural foe of her Arian rulers, and the natural friend of their enemies, and when her attempts to shake them off fail, it is inevitable that the penalty of failure should fall most heavily on her, and on her guides and officers—the bishops. Sidonius Apollinaris has left us a vivid account of the church's sufferings under Euric. They were no doubt largely repeated at this particular moment in the reign of Leovigild, though the exact extent of the persecution is very hard to determine. Isidore's words are well known: "Denique Arianae perfidiae furore repletus, in Catholicos persecutione commota, plurimos episcoporum exilio relegavit. Ecclesiarum redditus et privilegia abstulit, multos quoque terroribus in Arianam pestilentiam impulit, plerosque sine persecutione illectos auro rebisque deceptit" (these last words referring to the time previous to the suppression of the rebellion). We may perhaps suspect this account of a touch of the author's favourite rhetoric (conf. Dahn, *sehr übertrieben*, v. 141). Still many scattered facts can be gathered in confirmation of it. Leander of Seville was banished, and in his exile at Constan-

tinople made friends with the papal Apocrisarius, afterwards Gregory the Great, the biographer of Hermenigild. Fronimius of Agde was obliged to fly into Merovingian territory (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 24), an Arian bishop was sent to Merida, and Masona, after various ineffectual attempts on the part of the king to win him over to Arianism, was imprisoned (Paulus Emerit. *Esp. Sagr.* xiii. p. 369). From the signatures at the conversion council it is evident that in many sees (see art. *FROISCLUS*), especially in those within the newly annexed Suevian territory, a large but indefinite number of Catholic bishops were replaced by Arians, the Catholics returning to their sees under Recared, but, except in the case of metropolitans, occupying them thenceforward jointly with their converted Arian supplinters. To the list of eminent exiles the names of Fulgentius of Astigi, Leander's brother, and Licinian of Cartagena are commonly added (Dahn, v. 139). For the banishment of the first, however, there is no authority but a statement in Rod. of Toledo (lib. ii. cap. xiv.), which is either a misunderstanding of or an addition to his sources, and the second was certainly not exiled by Leovigild. Cartagena was at that moment the headquarters of the Byzantine power in the peninsula, and its bishop could scarcely have been under the jurisdiction of the Gothic king. Indeed for Licinian's death at Constantinople (*Isid. de Vir.* III. cap. 42) a quite other explanation is forthcoming (see art. *LICINIAN*). (On the general subject of the persecution, conf. Greg. Tur. v. 39, and for various doubtful details of it, see Greg. Tur. *Glor. Conf.* xii.; *Glor. Mart.* lxxxii.; and *De Vit. et Mir. Patr. Emerit.* cap. xi.)

*Failure of the Rigunthis-Recared Marriage.*—In 584, the year of the suppression of the rebellion, Rigunthis, the bride elect of Recared, had reached Toulouse on her way to Spain. There the news of her father Chilperic's murder threw her plans into confusion. She was detained there by Chilperic's enemy, the Dux Desiderius, robbed of her treasures, and finally escorted to her mother Fredegonde, "after many affronts and humiliations" (*Hist. Franc.* vi. 45, vii. 9, 15, 33, 39). That Recared and his father made no effort to avenge or recover her, shews that after Chilperic's death the marriage had no further importance for them and was easily relinquished.

*Death of Hermenigild.*—In 586, Hermenigild met his death at Tarraco in the hands of Sisebert. "In urbe Tarraconensi a Sisberto interficitur" is all the notice which the contemporary Spanish witness, the abbat of Biclara, gives to the event. The circumstance of his death and his claim to the dignity of martyrdom will be found shortly discussed under his name. Whether his death is to be considered as an execution ordered by Leovigild, or as the half-authorised act of a fanatical Gothic noble done in the practical certainty that it would be acceptable to the father, and for the sake of removing a public danger, can scarcely now be determined. (Conf. Joh. Bicl.'s short entry under Recared, "Sisbertus, interfector Hermenigildi, morte turpissima perimitur.") In any case, however strongly our sympathies may go with the son, the father's standpoint must not be disregarded. To Leovigild and those surrounding him, Hermenigild's life as a Catholic must

have appeared a perpetual menace to the safety of the Gothic state and monarchy. Chilperic's death had changed the position of affairs in France, and at any moment a combination of Childebert and Guntchramn with the Imperialists might have carried the son to the throne at the expense of his father's life, and of the principles by which it had been guided. What precipitated the final catastrophe, which does not seem to have been contemplated when the rebel was first captured at Cordova, can never be certainly known, though it is a plausible conjecture that it may have been owing to the discovery of some fresh intrigues between Hermenigild and the national enemies. His place of exile, Valencia, was close upon the Greek border, and his murder at Tarraco looks like a flight northwards to the Franks, stopped by a successful pursuit. However this may be, it is certain that the reasons for the execution given in the famous account of Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iii. 31) can never be considered exhaustive by any non-Ultramontane student of the time. In the same year, Ingunthis, the bride of 580, died in Africa in the hands of the Imperialists on her way to Constantinople, at the age of nineteen, leaving an infant son, Athanagild (see art. *INGUNTHIS*). Thus ends one of the most tragic stories of this violent and dramatic time, a story which may almost be regarded as summing up for us the whole political and religious situation of the century.

*Attack of the Franks on Septimania.*—"Quibus causis commotus" (i.e. the deaths of Hermenigild and Ingunthis) Guntchramn of Burgundy, Ingunthis's uncle, gathered an immense army for the invasion of Spain, and made his long-meditated attack on Gothic Gaul, while at the same time he sent a fleet to Galicia, no doubt with the object of rousing the recently annexed Suevian districts. "First bring under our rule the Septimanian province which borders upon the Gauls," he is reported to have said to his army, "for it is a disgrace that the boundary of these horrible Goths (indignum est horrendorum Gotthorum terminus) should extend unto the Gauls" (*Hist. Franc.* viii. 30). Reinforcements flocked to him from beyond the Saone, the Rhone, and the Seine, and the huge miscellaneous army marched in two divisions upon Nismes and Carcassonne. Both divisions were equally unsuccessful. Carcassonne first admitted and then repulsed the invaders, killing their leader Terentius, count of Limoges, and exposing his head on the walls. Ambuscades outside the city cut down the flying troops, and as their scattered remains made their way home, the inhabitants of the friendly towns they had plundered on the southward march inflicted still further damage on them. The Nismes division ravaged the open country, but could do nothing against the fortified places, and they too were forced to retreat, finding in their march through the desolated province, a fit retribution for the excesses of plunder and licence they had permitted themselves when first passing through it to Septimania (*Hist. Franc.* viii. 30; Dahn, v. p. 150). Guntchramn, "with bitterness in his heart," was holding a kind of inquiry into the causes of this disastrous campaign with his duces at Autun, when Leovigild struck his return blow. Recared crossed the Pyrenees, took the fortresses of Caput Arietis (? Cabarède, Jacobs, *Géographie de*

*Gregoire de Tours*, p. 100), and of Ogernum (? Beaucaire, l. c. 138), and shut himself up in Nismes. After this success Leovigild sent ambassadors to Guntchramn, proposing peace (*Hist. Franc.* viii. 35). But Guntchramn had been still further incensed by the news of the ill success of his naval expedition to Galicia (from which only a few survivors escaped in open boats to tell the story of its destruction), and Leovigild's offers were refused. Again and again the peace-offertures were repeated by the Gothic king, but with no effect upon the ageing and embittered Guntchramn, and hostilities were still continued. But Leovigild's work was done. Perhaps the eagerness for peace he had displayed throughout this unvaryingly successful war (*Hist. Franc.* viii. 35, 38, 45) may be taken as an index of failing health and strength. At any rate he died in April or May of this year at Toledo, according to some reports constant to the beliefs and principles by which he had lived, according to others—less trustworthy—a repentant convert to Catholicism, mourning over the unrighteous death of his firstborn son.

*Leovigild's character and aims.*—"Leovigild's reign," says a German authority, "represents the last attempt to maintain the Gothic state in its traditional aspects and character by the strenuous use of all possible weapons against its traditional dangers—war with Catholicism, chastisement of the nobility, reinvigoration of the monarchy, and defence of it against its hostile neighbours" (Dahn, v. 150). It was one of the last outbursts of Gothic pride and Gothic nationality in the face of the superior civilisation destined inevitably to absorb both forces,—forces which did indeed accept their defeat, though not a final defeat, at the hands of Leovigild's son Recared. An Arian monarchy, strong in all directions—towards its own pillars and supporters, the Gothic nobles, towards foreign outsiders, and towards its natural enemy Catholicism—this appears to have been Leovigild's ideal. To its influence may be traced most of the spontaneous actions of his government, the association of his sons, his treatment of the rebellious and murderous nobles, his attitude towards the Catholic bishops, and, above all, certain alterations in the outer aspects of Gothic kingship which mark out the reign, and shew that the king was prepared to accept just so much of Roman custom as would further his own ends. "Primusque etiam inter suos," says Isidore (*Hist. Goth.* p. 491), "regali veste opertus in solio resedit. Nam ante eum et habitus et sessus communis, ut populo, ita et regibus erat" (conf. coins of Leovigild and Leova I. Florez. *Medallas*, iii.). To him Toledo owed its permanent elevation to the rank of capital and royal residence (comp. Dahn, v. 834; Helf. *W. R.* 8). He also first endeavoured to place the heavily-taxed royal treasury on a level with the private accumulated wealth of the great noble families. "Fiscum quoque primus iste locupletavit, primusque aerarium de rapinis civium, hostiumque manubiis auxit." Nor was he lacking in some of the works of peace, though his reign was passed in the midst of war, and, as Dahn points out, he was rather remarkable for what he prevented than for what he accomplished. But the building of the towns of Victoriacum and Reccopolis, which last, "miro opere et moenibus et subur-

banis adornans, privilegia populo novae urbis instituit" (Joh. Bicl.), and the legal improvements and alterations of which Isidore speaks must not be forgotten: "In legibus quoque ea quae ab Eurico incondite constituta videbantur, correxit, plurimas leges praetermissas adiciens plerasque superfluas auferens" (see Helfferich, *W. Recht*, 15, on the relationship of Leovigild's legislation to that of Eurico on the one hand and Recared on the other; also Dahn's *Westgoth. Studien. Gesetzgebung*). The supposed fact which, though it has been much disputed, is brought forward even by Dahn to prove Leovigild's early moderation and freedom from prejudice towards the Catholics, viz. his marriage with Theodosia, daughter of Severianus, and sister to Leander, Isidore, and Florentina, will not long, we imagine, be allowed a place in sober history. It appears first in the 13th century, fathered by Lucas of Tuy, to whom, in spite of cardinal Arevalde's arguments (*Isid. Opera*, i.), it is impossible not to attribute a good deal of the legendary growth around the Isidore family. The "tribus superstitibus germanis" of Leander's *Regula* (see art. LEANDER), may be quoted against it with almost conclusive force. But it is sufficient to say that had Leander really been the maternal uncle of Hermenigild, whom he converted, and Recared, of whom he was the adviser and minister, it is simply incredible that we should have had no notice of the fact from any of the contemporary witnesses, from Isidore, Leander's brother and Recared's panegyrist, or from Gregory the Great, Leander's intimate friend and correspondent, and the founder of Hermenigild's saintly reputation (Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* ix.; Helfferich, *Arianismus* p. 52).

The other report, which attributes to Leovigild a death-bed repentance for his Arian errors and for the death of Hermenigild, has far better authority to shew for itself, but is in reality scarcely less doubtful. (Conf. with the well-known passages in Greg. Magn. *Dial.* iii. 31, and Greg. Tur. viii. 46, the silence of the Spanish authorities, *Isid. l. c.*, Joh. Bicl. *l. c.*, and the direct testimony to the contrary furnished by Paulus Emerit., *De Vit. et Mir.* &c. cap. xvi.). We may indeed hope that some remorse for the fate of an eldest son softened the successful king's last hours; but the state of the evidence does not justify us in concluding more. In all probability Leovigild died as he had lived, the champion of an old-world cause, doomed to ultimate failure in the interests of advancing Christian and national unity, and Isidore's well-known antitheses are substantially true—"ille (Leovigild) irreligiosus et bello promptissimus, hic (Recared) fide pius et pace praeclarus; ille armorum artibus gentis imperium dilatans; hic gloriosius eandem gentem fidei trophaeo sublimans" (*Hist. Goth.* l. c.).

*Hispano-Frankish Relations under Leovigild.*—In 570, the second year of Leovigild, Frankish Gaul was ruled by three grandsons of Chlodwig, Chilperic of Soissons, Sigibert of Austrasia, and Guntchramn of Burgundy. Sigibert's wife, married in 566, was the notorious Brunichild, daughter of Athanagild and Goisvintha, and Leovigild's stepdaughter, while Chilperic, having murdered his young wife Galesvintha, Brunichild's sister, at the instance of Fredegonde, was now married to Fredegonde. Some time before

572 (*Hist. Franc.* iv. 38), the two betrothals, of Hermenigild to Ingunthis, Sigibert's daughter, and Recared to Chilperic's daughter Rigunthis, had taken place. The latter betrothal may have been intended as a sign of peace between Leovigild and Chilperic, and of condonement of the murder of Galesvintha; both had probably, in Leovigild's mind, the important political end not only of securing the Frankish alliance in general, but also of warding off from Gallia Gothica and the Spanish frontier the coveted attacks of Guntchramn of Burgundy, who would thus be liable to find himself checked by his two brothers in any hostile enterprises he might embark upon. In 575, Sigibert was murdered (*Hist. Franc.* iv. 52), and his young son Childebert (born 570) succeeded him. Thenceforward a careful study of the last five books of the *Historia Francorum* will enable the student to disengage the following lines of policy. Chilperic is throughout Leovigild's firm ally. Guntchramn of Burgundy, on the other hand, is his natural enemy. As the neighbouring state to Gallia Gothica, Burgundy pursues the policy of a "natural south-west frontier," and is throughout aiming at the expulsion of the Goths from Septimania. After the murder of Sigibert in 575, his son Childebert represents an important determining influence on Hispano-Frankish relations. According as he is allied with Chilperic or with Guntchramn, Leovigild's prospects in Gaul grow dark or bright. From 581 to 584 he is allied with Chilperic, with perhaps some intermission in 582 (*H. F.* vi. 19). Guntchramn's hands are thus tied during the whole of the critical period of the Hermenigild rebellion, and Leovigild's north-eastern border is secured from attack. In 584 Childebert goes over to Guntchramn, and as a consequence shews hostility towards Chilperic and Leovigild (vi. 45). In the same year Chilperic dies, and nothing but a quarrel about the same time between Childebert and Guntchramn saves Leovigild from attack. Chilperic's widow, Fredegonde, pursues her husband's policy of friendship with the Goths in defiance of Guntchramn, her son's nominal guardian. At last in 585, after the death of Ingunthis and the defeat of Childebert's army by the Lombards, Guntchramn ventures his attack on Septimania. Childebert throughout shews great indifference to the fate of his sister Ingunthis, in spite of his mother Brunichild's arguments (*H. Fr.* viii. 21), and is evidently only influenced by considerations of Frankish policy in his attitude towards the West Goths. Upon Leovigild's death he willingly receives Recared's advances, while Guntchramn remains to his death, in 593, the implacable, but for the most part powerless, enemy of the Visigothic state.

There are many details in the accounts of these relations given by Gregory of Tours which are worth notice from an ecclesiastical point of view. The conversations which Gregory reports between himself and Leovigild's Arian envoys on their way through Tours to Soissons or Paris (*H. F.* v. 44 and vi. 40), are especially valuable as throwing light upon the every-day social relations between Arianism and Catholicism at the time. [See art. OPPILA.]

I. *Spanish sources.*—Joannes Biclarenis, abbat of Biclaro and bishop of Gerona, a contemporary

of Leovigild (see art. under his name), his *Chronicon*, apud Florez. *Esp. Sagr.* vi.; Isidore of Seville, born about 560 (?), and writing about 630, *Hist. Goth.* ib.; Paulus Diaconus Emeritensis, flor. 650, *De Vit. et Mir. Patr. Emeritensium Esp. Sagr.* xiii.; Coins, in Florez. *Med. Illas.* iii. and in Heiss. *Descr. Gen. des Monnaies des Rois Wisig. d'Espagne*, Paris, 1872, p. 80; *Inscr. Hisp. Christ.* (Hubner, No. 76).

11. *Foreign sources.*—Gregory of Tours (died 594), *Hist. Franc.* iv. viii.; Gregory Magn. *Pap. Dial.* iii. 31; Paul Warnf. *Diac. Hist. Longob.* iii. 21.

*Later Spanish accounts.*—Chron. Albeld. (A.D. 881), *Esp. Sagr.* xiii.; Lucas Tud. *Chron. Mundi*, and Rod. Tol. *De Reb. Hisp.*, both in Schott, *Hisp. Illustrata*, Frankfurt, 1603; *Cronica General*, ed. 1604, cap. 38, 39; Mariana, v. 11; Morales, *Cron.* v. 507, ed. 1791; Ferreras, ed. D'Hermilly, ii. 192, &c. All uncritical, but interesting from Luc. Tud. onwards, as shewing the growth of the Hermenigild cultus.

*General Literature.*—See list prefixed to Dahn's *Könige der Germanen*, Vte. Abth. Dahn's account of the reign remains the best in point of insight and treatment, in spite of certain minor inaccuracies, but the most recent work on Leovigild and Hermenigild, as well as the most minute and exhaustive discussion of all the moot points, is to be found in certain articles by Prof. F. Görres, "Kritische Untersuchungen über den Aufstand und das Martyrium des westgothischen Königssohnes Hermenigild," in *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.* (1873), i.; "Leovigilds Stellung zum Catholicismus," *ib.* p. 533; "Ueber die Anfänge des Königs der Westgothen Leovigild," in *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, xii. (1872), p. 591, and xiii. (1873), p. 633. Conf. also *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*, by Adolf Helfferich, Berlin, 1858; and *Westgothischer Arianismus*, Berlin, 1860, by the same. [M. A. W.]

LEOWALDUS, an early bishop of Mainz. [LUPOALDUS.]

LEPIDUS, prefect of Smyrna at the trial of St. Pionius in the Decian persecution. (*Acta Alia Pionii*, cap. 4, in Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. i. 45.)

[C. H.]

LEPORINUS, bishop of Le Mans. [LIBORIUS.]

LEPORIUS (1), a presbyter of Hippo Regius, who having been possessed of large worldly means, induced, as it seems, the members of his household to adopt with himself a monastic life, which he carried on with them in a building situate in a garden at Hippo. Of this establishment he defrayed the expenses, till he was persuaded by St. Augustine to give up his property and the temporal care of the monastery, and live in it as one who had renounced the world. Previously to this he had, at St. Augustine's suggestion, erected a house of refuge for strangers, *xenodochium*, not entirely at his own expense, but out of money given in alms by the Christians of the place, and from the same source he built a church in memory of the "eight martyrs," who were probably natives of Hippo (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 267). This was about the year 425 A.D. (*Aug. Serm.* 356, 10). He was also present on the occasion when Eraclius was appointed to succeed St. Augustine, A.D. 426 (*Aug. Ep.* 213 al. 110).

A question has arisen whether this person was or was not the same as one of the same name, on whose behalf Augustine wrote a letter to some of the bishops of Gaul, to inform them of his recantation of certain doctrinal errors which he had published in that country (*Aug. Ep.* 219).

If this identity be accepted, his history is as follows:—He was a native probably of Treves, and in course of time, having become a monk, perhaps at Marseilles, fell into mistakes of doctrine, partaking both of a Pelagian and a Nestorian character. His opinions are gathered both from his own recantation and from the letter of Augustine mentioned above, and among them he argued that our Lord was made Christ in virtue of His baptism, that He associated the divine with His human nature in such a manner as virtually to make two Christs, and that He became free from sin by the exercise of His own free will. Having been rebuked for these errors by Cassian, he refused to abandon them; and having been severely censured by the Gallic bishops, he quitted that country and crossed, together with his friends Bonus and Dominus, to Africa, where he was received kindly by St. Augustine, who convinced both him and them of their errors, and induced them to recant them publicly. It is right, however, to mention that Leporius alone is mentioned by Augustine, and not his two companions. This recantation has been preserved, and bears strong marks of St. Augustine's influence, if not of his composition, and has been sometimes quoted as his. In the letter in which he announces the happy change in the opinions of Leporius, while he allows the propriety of the course adopted by the bishops of Gaul, Augustine recommends him warmly to their favour, as having retracted his errors. It is addressed by Aurelius, Augustine, Florentius, and Secundinus to Proculus and Cylinnius, the former of them probably bishop of Massilia, the latter perhaps of Fréjus. Proculus ceased to be bishop, either by death or deposition, about A.D. 419, and a bishop of Fréjus named Quillirius, a name which may well stand for Cylinnius, is mentioned as having preceded Leontius in that see, whose episcopate began about the same date. The recantation therefore must have taken place before 420, and cannot have been earlier than 415, about which time Cassian first came into Gaul. These dates would agree fairly enough with the circumstances mentioned in the former part of this article, and with the manner in which Augustine speaks of Leporius in his sermon, for he may well have returned to Gaul after his recantation, as the letter of Augustine seems to imply that he intended to do, and come back afterwards to Africa; and thus the identity of the presbyter of Hippo with the monk of Marseilles seems to be fairly established, an identity which Cassian himself, his opponent, and Gennadius assume as certain, but which is doubted by Tillemont, though the grounds of his doubts do not, in the opinion of the writer of this article, appear conclusive. The recantation (*Leporii Libellus Emendationis*) was printed by Sirmond in 1630 (*Opuscula Dogmatica*, p. 1), and reprinted in his *Opera Varia* (t. i. 345, ed. 1696, t. i. 203, ed. 1728). It will also be found in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, vol. vii. p. 14; in Labbe,



*Conc.* ii. p. 1678; in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xxxi. 1221. (Tillemont, x. 699, xii. 558, 676, xiii. 850, 878-885, 1039; Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 49; Ceillier, viii. 232; Cassian, *de Incarn.* i. 4; Gennadius, *de Scr. Eccl.* c. 59; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 402.) [H. W. P.]

LEPORIUS, bishop of Le Mans. [LIBORITUS.]

LEPORIUS (2), bishop of Angura (?) in Numidia, was one of the bishops banished by Huneric A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. *Notit.* 56; Morcelli, *Afr. Christ.* i. 87.) [R. S. G.]

LEPORIUS (3) (LEBORITUS), third bishop of Maurienne, present at the council of Chalons, about A.D. 650. (Mansi, x. 1194; *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 616.) [S. A. B.]

LERENIUS, bishop, "de Secoro." (Hilar. *Fragm.* ii. in *Pat. Lat.* x. 643 A.) [IRENÆUS (4).]

LERTHAN, LERTHANA, abbess of Kildare, A.D. 773. (*Four Mast.* A.D. 768; *Ann. Ul.* A.D. 772; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 629 a, 666 b.) [J. G.]

LESMO, Dec. 9, abbat in the mountains of Argyll, A.D. 781. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scot. Saints*, 221, 378.) [J. G.]

LETATIUS (Ussard.), LAETANTIUS (Baron.)—July 17. One of the martyrs of Scillita. [FELIX (212).] (Ceillier, i. 543.) [G. T. S.]

LETOIUS (1), bishop of Melitene, the metropolis of the second province of Lesser Armenia, to whom Gregory of Nyssa wrote his *Epistola Canonica*, c. A.D. 390. (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xlv. 221; Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 52; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 441; Tillem. viii. 534, ix. 607, 608, xiv. 449.) [EUCHITES.] [L. D.]

LETOIUS (2), bishop of Libyas (Livia, Bethara) in Palestine; present at the second general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1126, 1223, 1368, v. 590, 617, 716; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 655.) [J. de S.]

LEU. [LUPUS.]

LEUBERICUS (LEOBERICUS), bishop of Urgel, subscribing the 13th, 15th, and 16th councils of Toledo, A.D. 683, 688, 693. (Mansi, xi. 1076, xii. 22, 85; Villanueva, *Viaje Literario*, x. 18.) [C. H.]

LEUCADIUS (1) (LEUCADAS), bishop of Ilium, in the convention at Philippopolis, A.D. 344. (Mansi, iii. 139; Le Quien, i. 775.) [L. D.]

LEUCADIUS (2), superior of a community of female solitaries at Sannabadaa. On his death Gregory Nazianzen wrote a consolatory letter to the sisterhood. (Greg. Naz. *Epist.* 180; Tillem. ix. 548.) [E. V.]

LEUCADIUS (3), a magistrate who turned apostate from Christianity to Mithraism during the revival of Paganism under the usurper Eugenius at Rome, A.D. 392-394. His name occurs with those of Hierius, Marciannus, and Symmachus in a previously unpublished poem of cent. iv. first printed from a Parisian MS. by Ch. Morel

in the *Rev. Archéol.* 1868, t. xvii. p. 451, xviii. 44; cf. De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1868, p. 49, *Bullet.* 1877, p. 114. It is a very important and interesting document for the reign of Eugenius. It gives an original description of the ceremonies of the Taurobolium, vv. 57-67. [G. T. S.]

LEUCADIUS (4), an archdeacon addressed by Nilus (*ep.* 188-190, lib. i.) [C. H.]

LEUCADIUS (5), bishop of Mnizus in the province of Galatia Prima, at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 481.) [T. W. D.]

LEUCADIUS (6), eighth bishop of Bayeux, subscribed the third council of Orleans in A.D. 538, and was represented at the fourth and fifth in 549. (Mansi, ix. 10, 121; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 349.) [S. A. B.]

LEUCHERUS, ST., bishop of Dol in the 7th century. (Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 185, Paris, 1668; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 1041.) [S. A. B.]

LEUCIUS (1), the reputed author of large apocryphal additions to the New Testament history, which originated in heretical circles, and which, though now lost, were much current in early times. The fullest account is that given by Photius (*Cod.* 114), which we therefore place first out of chronological order. He describes a book, called *The Circuits of the Apostles*, which contained the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul, and which purported to have been written by Leucius Charinus. This second name Charinus is peculiar to Photius, earlier writers calling the author simply Leucius, a name variously altered by transcribers, as will presently be mentioned. Photius characterises the book as in style utterly unlike the genuine New Testament writings, and as full of folly, self-contradiction, falseness, and impiety. It taught the existence of two gods—an evil one, the God of the Jews, having Simon Magus as his minister, and a good one, from whom Christ came. It confounded the Father and the Son; it denied the reality of Christ's Incarnation, and gave a docetic account of His life on earth and in particular of His crucifixion; it condemned marriage, and regarded all generation as the work of the evil principle; it denied that demons were created by God; it related childish stories of miraculous restoration to life, not only of dead men but of dead cattle; and in the Acts of John it used language which the Iconoclasts regarded as favourable to them. From this description we can identify as the same work a collection of Apostolic Acts, from which extracts were read at the second council of Nicaea (*Actio* v., Mansi, xiii. 167), the story of LYCOMEDES (*g. r.*) being that which was made use of by the Iconoclasts, and the docetic tales being those of which we have given a summary (Vol. I. p. 870). In the council was next read a citation from Amphilocheus of Iconium, denouncing certain heretical Acts of the Apostles, and in particular arguing against the truth of a story, evidently the same as that to which we have just referred, on the ground that it represented the apostle John as on the Mount of Olives during the crucifixion, and so contradicted the gospel, which relates that the apostle had been close to the cross. With

this evidence that the work read by Photius was in existence before the end of the 4th century, we may probably refer to the same source a statement of Epiphanius (*Hæc.* 51, p. 427), that Leucius was a disciple of John, and that he joined his master in opposing the Ebionites. It was common enough with church writers to content themselves with rejecting the doctrine of heretical apocrypha, and to accept stories told in such documents as true, provided there were no doctrinal reason for refusing assent to them. The doctetic Leucius, who denied the true manhood of our Lord, was at the opposite pole from the Ebionites, who asserted Him to be mere man, and therefore the Acts of John might well have contained a confutation of Ebionism. The Acts of Leucius were in use among the Manichees in the time of St. Augustine. Faustus the Manichean (book 30, c. 4, vol. viii. p. 447) appeals to Acts of the four Apostles mentioned by Photius (Peter, Andrew, Thomas, and John), charging the Catholic party with wrongly excluding them from their canon. In several places Augustine refers to the same Acts (*Cont. Adimant.* 17, viii. 137, 139; *Cont. Faust.* xxii. 79, p. 409; *Cont. adv. leg. et proph.* i. 20, p. 570), and he names as the author Leutius, the name being written in some MSS. Levitius or Lenticius (*Act. cum Felice*, ii. 6, p. 489; see also *De Fid.* cc. 5, 38, App. pp. 25, 33). In the passage last cited, the writer, who is supposed to be Evodius of Uzala, a contemporary of Augustine, quotes from the Acts of Andrew a story how Maximilla, the wife of the proconsul Egeas, under whom that apostle suffered, in order to avoid having intercourse with her husband, without his knowledge substituted her maid in her own place; and how, on another occasion, when she and her companion were engaged hearing the apostle, an angel, by imitating their voices, deceived the husband into the belief that they were still in her bedchamber. This story, which agrees with what Photius tells of the author's condemnation of sexual intercourse, is much softened in the still extant Acts of Pseudo-Abdias, which shew themselves to be an orthodox recasting of a heretical original. We find still the names of Maximilla and Egeas; but Maximilla does not refuse intercourse with her husband, and only excites his displeasure because, on account of her eagerness to hear the apostle, she can be with him less frequently; and, without any angelic deception, providential means are devised to prevent Egeas from surprising his wife at the Christian meeting. These Augustinian notices enable us to infer that it was the same work Philaster had in view when he stated (*Hæc.* 88) that the Manichees had Acts purporting to be written by disciples of St. Andrew, and describing the apostle's doings when he passed from Pontus into Greece. He adds that these heretics had also Acts of Peter, John, and Paul, containing stories of miracles in which beasts were made to speak; for that these heretics counted the souls of men and of beasts alike (see Epiph. *Hæc.* 66, p. 625). In the Gelasian decree on apocryphal books we read: "Libri omnes, quos fecit Leucius discipulus diaboli, apocryphi," where we have various readings, Lucianus and Seleucius (Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.* 463). In the spurious correspondence between Jerome and Chronatius and Heliodorus (vol. xi. p. 279), Jerome is represented as giving

an orthodox version of certain authentic additions to St. Matthew's narrative, of which a heretical version had been given by Leucius (or as it is printed Seleucus), the author of the Acts already mentioned. In the letter of Innocent to Exsuperius (Mansi, iii. 1041) he condemns documents bearing the name of Matthew, of James the Less, of Peter and Paul written by Leucius, of Andrew written by Xenocharis and Leonidas the philosophers, and of Thomas. It has been conjectured that in Xenocharis an adjective has been joined with a proper name, and that we have here a corruption of Charinus. It is to be mentioned that in the Latin version of the apocryphal *Descensus Christi ad inferos* (Tischendorf, *Evan. Apoc.* p. 369), two sons of the aged Simeon, named Leucius and Charinus, are represented as having died before our Lord, and as miraculously returning to bear witness to His triumphs in the under world. It is plain that the writer borrowed these names from the apocryphal Acts, and the question arises, Did he there find warrant for regarding them as the names of distinct persons, or was Photius right in reporting both names to have been given to the same person? It would seem that only the Acts of John and perhaps of Peter named Leucius as their author; the necessities of the fiction would require the Acts of Andrew to be attested by a different witness, possibly Charinus, and it is conceivable that Photius may have combined the names merely from his judging, no doubt rightly, that all the Acts had a common author. Concerning the Acts of Paul in use among the Manicheans see the articles LINUS and THECLA. Besides the authorities already cited, the Acts of Leucius are mentioned by Turribius, a Spanish bishop of the first half of the 5th century, from whom we learn that these Acts were used by the Priscillianists, and that the Acts of Thomas related a baptism, not in water but in oil, according to the Manichean fashion; and by Pseudo-Mellitus (Fabric. *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* ii. 604), who acknowledges the truth of apostolic miracles related by Leucius, but rejects and argues against his doctrine of two principles.

It remains to mention one other reference to Leucius. Pacian (*Ep.* i. 2; Migne, *L. P.* iii. 1053) says, "Phryges nobiliores qui se animatos a Leucio mentiuntur, se institutos a Proculo gloriantur." On this passage Zahn (see *infra*) mainly relies for holding that the Acts of Leucius are earlier than A.D. 160. But no other writer mentions a Montanist use of the Acts of Leucius, and on this subject the authority of Pacian does not count for much. The context does not indicate that he had much personal knowledge of the sect, and his heretical notices appear to be derived from the Syntagma of Hippolytus, where we have no reason to think that he would have found any mention of Leucius. It is highly probable that Pacian, as well as others of his contemporaries, believed that Leucius was a real companion of St. John, and therefore no doubt earlier than Montanus; but that Pacian had any means of real knowledge as to the relative priority of Leucius and Montanus we have no reason to believe. Besides those authorities which mention Leucius by name, there are others which speak of apocryphal Acts, and in which the same literature is in all probability referred to. Thus the *Synopsis*

*Scripturae* ascribed to Athanasius (ii. 154) speaks of books called the travels (*περίοδοι*) of Peter, of John, and of Thomas; and by the second the Leucian story is likely to be intended. Eusebius (iii. 25) tells of Acts of Andrew and of John; Epiphanius (*Haer.* 47) states that the Encratites used Acts of Andrew, John, and Thomas; (*Haer.* 61) that the Apostolici relied on Acts of Andrew and Thomas; (*Haer.* 63) and that those whom he calls Origeniani used Acts of Andrew. And it is worth remarking that it is of the three apostles, Thomas, Andrew, and John, whose travels were written by Leucius, that Origen (*ap. Eus. H. E.* iii. 1) is able to tell the countries where the lot of their preaching had fallen, viz. India, Scythia, and Asia respectively.

The testimonies we have cited are not earlier than the 4th century, and several of them speak of Leucius as a Manichæan; but Grabe, Cave, Mill, Beansobre, Lardner, and other critics, are of opinion that he lived in the 2nd century; and, as he therefore could not have been a Manichæan, was probably a Marcionite. Some have identified him with the Marcionite LUCANUS (*q. v.*). But we may safely say that no Marcionite would have chosen for the heroes of his narrative the Jewish apostles, John, Thomas, and Andrew. Beansobre (*Manichæisme*, i. 350) gives six arguments for the early date of Leucius, not one of which is conclusive, all being vitiated by the tacit assumption that Leucius was a real person, and not, as we hold, merely the fictitious name of an imaginary disciple of St. John, whom the forger chose to make the narrator of the story.

Zahn (*Acta Johannis*, 1880) has lately published some new fragments of Leucius, which increase our power of recognising as Leucian things which different fathers have told without naming their authority. The Leucian character of the new fragments is verified by various coincidences with the old. Names recur, as for instance that of Lycomedes. Again, there is a story of a miracle performed on one Drusiana, who had submitted to die rather than have intercourse with her husband. This agrees with the story already told of Maximilla and Egeas in revealing the violently Encratite principles of the author; compare the story told in the *Acts of Thomas* (Tischendorf, *Acta Apoc.* p. 200). There is also an amusing story of bugs who kept the apostle awake for half a night, but then at his command retired and left him unmolested, returning next morning to their habitation when he had given them permission. Zahn has also argued the case for the early date of Leucius in a much more scientific way than previous supporters of the same thesis. He tries to shew that there are statements in earlier writers which are really derived from Leucius, though his name is not given. All Zahn's arguments do not seem to us conclusive, yet enough remains valid to induce us to regard the Leucian Acts as belonging to the same age which produced the travels of Peter (which are the basis of the Clementines), and the Acts of Paul and Thecla. When a writer, who in one place quotes Leucius, elsewhere makes statements which we know to be Leucian, we may safely conclude that he derived them from Leucius, though he does not there name his authority. For example, Epiphanius names Leucius only once, in a passage already cited. But we may safely count as additional instances

of his use of Leucius, his reference to the manner of John's death (*Haer.* 79, 5), and to John's virginity (*Haer.* 28, 7; 78, 10). Further, in the immediate context of the passage where Epiphanius names Leucius, he names other heretics of the apostolic age, and the presumption that he found these names in Leucius is turned into almost certainty by the fact that in one of the new Leucian fragments one of these names, CLEOBIUS (*q. v.*), is found, as that of a person in John's company. Among the other names in the same context are CLAUDIUS, MERINTHUS, and the Pauline Demas and Hermogenes; concerning whom see the Acts of Thecla and also the so-called Dorotheus (*Paschal Chron.* ed. Dindorf, ii. 124). The Augustinian and Hieronymian notices may be treated similarly. We can identify as Leucian several statements\* which are described as found "in ecclesiastica historia" or "in patrum traditionibus" and thence a presumption arises that other things reported with the same formulae of citation are derived from the same source.

We go on then to enumerate some of the statements which may be characterised as Leucian, naming some of the early writers who have repeated them. (1) A Leucian fragment (Zahn, p. 247) tells how John's virginity had been preserved by a threefold interposition of our Lord, breaking off the Apostle's designs each time that he attempted to marry. There is a clear reference to this story in a sermon ascribed to Augustine (*Mai, Nor. Pat. Bib. I.* i. 378), and it is probably from this source that so many of the fathers have derived their opinion of John's virginity, concerning which the canonical Scriptures say nothing (Ambros. *de inst. Virg.* viii. 50; vol. iii. 324; Ambrosiaster on 2 Cor. xi. 2, vol. iv. 2, 232; Jerome, in *Isaiam*, ch. 56, vol. iv. p. 658; *adv. Jovin.* l. 26, vol. ii. 278; August. *cont. Faust.* xxx. vol. x. 535, in *Johan. c.* 21, vol. iv. 1082; Epiph. *Haer.* 58, 4). The Leucian Acts, in conformity with their strong Encratism, seem to have dwelt much on the apostle's virginity, describing this as the cause of our Lord's love to him, and as the reason for his many privileges, in particular as the reason why to a virgin the care of the virgin mother was committed. In *Pistis Sophia* the name of the apostle John has usually the title *ὁ παρθένος* appended, and we may therefore set down *Pistis Sophia* as post-Leucian, but the uncertainty as to the date of that book prevents us from drawing any further inference. But the earliest mention of John's virginity is found in the epithet "spado" given to that apostle by Tertullian (*De Monog.* 17), whence Zahn infers that Tertullian must have used the Acts of Leucius. We think he does not sufficiently allow for the probability in the case of one who is said to have lived so long, that a true tradition that he never married might have been preserved in the churches of Asia. Zahn contends that because Jerome in a passage quoted above uses the word "eunuchus," not "spado," he is not copying Tertullian, but that both writers took the epithet from a common source,

\* In particular may be named an account of a hymn supposed to have been sung on the night before the crucifixion by the apostles holding hands and forming a circle about our Lord (see Aug. *Ep. 237 ad Cerecium*, vol. 2, p. 849).

viz. Leucius. But when the passage in Tertullian is read in connexion with the rest of the treatise, it will, we think, be thought more likely that the epithet is Tertullian's own.

(2) But further evidence of Tertullian's acquaintance with Leucius is found in his story of the apostle's having been cast into burning oil. Speaking of Rome he says, "ubi apostolus Johannes, posteaquam in oleum ignem demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." What authority for this story had Tertullian? Now, though none of the extant fragments of Leucius relate to this matter, yet that these Acts contained the story is made probable from the following evidence. Jerome (vol. vii. p. 655) commenting on Matt. xx. 23 states on the authority of "ecclesiasticae historiae" that the apostle had been "missus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad suscipiendam coronam Christi athleta processerit, statimque relegatus in Pathmos insulam." Now Abdias, whose work is notoriously based on Leucius (*Hist. Ap.* v. 2, Fabric. *Cod. Ps. N. T.* ii. 534), has "proconsul jussit eum velut rebellem in dolio ferventis olei mergi, qui statim ut conjectus in aeneo est, veluti athleta, unctus non adustus de vase exiit." On comparing these passages the second will be seen to be the original, Jerome's use of the word *athleta* receiving its explanation from Abdias. This conclusion is strengthened by another passage in Jerome (*Adv. Jovin.* i. 26, vol. ii. 278), where, though he names Tertullian as his authority, he gives particulars not found in Tertullian, viz. the "dolium ferventis olei," and that the apostle came out fresher and more vigorous than he had entered. We feel ourselves forced to believe that Jerome, who certainly used Leucius, found in it the statement about the boiling oil; and then there is a strong case for suspecting that this was also the authority on which Tertullian made his statement. But though Tertullian names Rome as the scene of the miracle, it may be doubted whether this was so in the Greek Leucius. The mention by Abdias of a "proconsul" suggests that Asia was the place. Hippolytus, however, agrees with Tertullian in placing John at Rome (*De Christo et Antic.* 36). It ought to be mentioned that some of the earliest fathers who try to reconcile our Lord's words to the sons of Zebedee (Matt. xx. 23) with the fact that John did not suffer martyrdom, do not mention this story of the baptism in oil (Origen, *in loc. De la Rue*, iii. 719). A later story makes John miraculously "drink a cup" of poison with impunity.

(3) An acquaintance with Leucius by Clement of Alexandria has been inferred from the agreement of both writers in giving on John's authority a Docetic account of our Lord (see Vol. I. p. 870). We had conjectured the "traditions of Matthias" as likely to have been Clement's authority; but the fact that it is John who is appealed to, no doubt gives probability to the conjecture that Clement's source is the Acts which treat of that apostle.

(4) This conjecture gains probability on an examination of the story told by Clement (*Hypotyp.* ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 14) as to John's composition of the fourth Gospel, urged by the request of his friends. A very similar story is told in the Muratorian fragment, in which the request is urged by the apostle's fellow bishops in Asia; he

asks them to fast for three days, begging for a revelation of God's will, and then it is revealed to Andrew that John is to write. The stories told by Clement and the Muratorian writer are too like to be independent; yet it is not conceivable that one writer copied from the other; therefore it may be believed they used a common authority, and that authority was not Papias, else Eusebius, when he quotes the passage from Clement, would scarcely have failed to mention it. Now several later writers (Jerome in the preface to his commentary on St. Matthew, a writing published as St. Augustine's—*Mai, Nov. Pat. Bib. I.* i. 379—Victorinus in his *Scholia* on the Apocalypse, Galland. iv. 59; and others, see Zahn, p. 198) tell the same story, agreeing, however, in some additional particulars, which shew that they did not derive their knowledge from either of the two whom we have named. Thus they tell that the cause of the request that John should write was the inroads of Ebionite heresy, which made it necessary that the apostle should add something concerning the divinity of our Lord to what his predecessors had told about His humanity; and they tell how, in answer to their prayers, the apostle, filled with the Holy Ghost, burst into the prologue, "In the beginning was the Word." Other verbal coincidences, which it would be tedious to enumerate here, make it probable that this story was found in the Acts of Leucius, which we know from Epiphanius contained an account of John's resistance to the Ebionite heresy. And if so, Leucius is likely to have been the authority used by Clement also.

Combining the probabilities under the four heads we have enumerated, there seems reasonable ground for thinking that the Leucian Acts were 2nd century, and were known to Clement and Tertullian. It must be observed, however, that Irenaeus shews no sign of acquaintance with them, and that Clement must have had some other source of Johannine traditions, his story of John and the robber being, as Zahn owns, not derived from Leucius; for no later writer who tells the story shews any sign of having had any source of information but Clement.

We may add that we cannot follow Zahn in combining the two statements of Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 4) that the Quartodecimans appealed to St. John's authority, and that they used apocryphal Acts, and thence inferring that Leucius represented St. John as sanctioning the Quartodeciman practice. If this were so, we think some other traces of this Leucian statement would have remained. Theodoret would have found in Eusebius that the churches of Asia appealed to St. John as sanctioning their practice, and that may possibly have been a true tradition.

A brief notice will suffice of other probable contents of the work of Leucius. He appears to have mentioned the exile to Patmos, and as resulting from a decree of the Roman emperor; but that the emperor was not named is likely from the variations of subsequent writers. Zahn refers to Leucius the story of St. John and the partridge (see *Dict. Bible*) told by Cassianus, who elsewhere shews acquaintance with Leucius. A different story of a partridge is told in a non-Leucian fragment (Zahn, 190). The Leucian Acts very possibly contained an account of the death of Mary (see *Mellitus*). But the most important of the Leucian stories, which remains

to be mentioned, is that concerning the apostle's painless death. Leucius appears to have given what purported to be the apostle's sermon and eucharistic prayer on the last Sunday of his life. Then after breaking of bread—there is no mention of wine—the apostle commands Byrrhus (the name occurs in the Ignatian epistles as that of an Ephesine deacon) to follow him with two companions, bringing spades with them. They go to a friend's burying-place, there dig a grave, in which the apostle lays himself down, and with joyful prayer blessed his disciples and resigned his soul to God. Later versions improve the miraculous character of the story; in particular that of which Augustine makes mention (in *Johann. xxi. vol. 3. p. 819*), that the apostle lay in the grave not dead but sleeping, as might be seen from the dust heaped over him which admitted his breathing by its motions. For other Johannine stories, see PROCHORUS.

Besides the Acts which we have discussed, Leucius has been credited with the composition of a quantity of other apocryphal literature. If, as we believe, Leucius is only a fictitious personage, the question whether he wrote apocryphal gospels is as ambiguous as the question whether Jedidiah Cleishbotham wrote other novels than the *Tales of my Landlord*. That the author of the romance of Leucius wrote other fictions of like nature is probable enough, though our information is too scanty to enable us to identify his work. But there is no trustworthy evidence that he affixed the name of Leucius to any other composition than the Acts of Peter and John. From the nature of the case the martyrdom of an apostle must be related by one of the apostle's disciples, but such a one would not be regarded as a competent witness to the deeds of our Lord Himself, and accordingly apocryphal gospels are commonly ascribed to the authorship of one of the apostles, and not to one of the second generation of Christians. The only thing that looks like evidence for connexion of the name of Leucius with apocryphal gospels is the mention of the name in the spurious letter of Jerome to Chromatius and Heliodorus already quoted, a witness unworthy of credit even if his testimony were more distinct. It is likely that the orthodox, finding in the Acts which bore the name of Leucius, plain evidence that the writer was heretical in his doctrine of two principles, still accepted him as a real personage of the sub-apostolic age; and that when they met with other apocryphal stories, the doctrine of which they were constrained to reject as heretical, while they were willing to accept the facts related as in the main true, Leucius seemed to them a probable person to whom to ascribe the authorship. [G. S.]

**LEUCIUS (2)**, Jan. 11, confessor, commemorated at Alexandria with another confessor, (*Mart. Usuard.*) Other martyrologies (*Vet. Rom. Mart., Ado, Hieron.*) write LUCIUS and add the name of Severus. The *Rom. Martyrology* under the same day gives Leucius bishop and confessor at Brundisium. Bolland represents him as a bishop of Alexandria who came as the first missionary to Brundisium (*Acta SS. Jan. i. 669*). The *Acta* which he prints appear very untrustworthy. Leucius is placed by Ughelli (ix. 9) and Cappelletti (xxii. 114) as first bishop of Brundisium, from 164 to 172. [C. H.]

**LEUCIUS (3)**, Jan. 28, *Mart. Usuard., Vet. Rom.*, Adon. Jan. 18, 27 (Hieron.). Martyr in the Decian persecution at the city of Apollonia. The name is LUCIUS in *Hieron. Mart.*, in Surius, Dec. 14, and in Symeon Metaphrastes in *Pat. Gr. cxvi. 507*. [G. T. S.]

**LEUCIUS (4)**, an African bishop, at the council of Carthage against Pelagius, A.D. 416. The name, however, appears in one MS. as Leontius, in others as Eleutius. (*Aug. Ep. 175; Innoc. Epp. 16, 29.*) [H. W. P.]

**LEUCONIUS (LEUCO)**, ST., eighteenth bishop of Troyes. His day of commemoration is April 1. (*Boll. Acta SS. Apr. i. 12; Gall. Christ. xii. 488; Gams, Series Episc. 643.*) [S. A. B.]

**LEUDARDUS**, servant of Emmerus deacon of Nantes, cured of six years' blindness at the church of St. Martin at Tours, and on his festival. (*Greg. Tur. De Mirac. S. Martin. iv. 20.*) [C. H.]

**LEUDASTES**, a count of Tours during the episcopate of Gregory bishop of Tours, put to death by order of queen Fredegund, A.D. 583. Owing to his persecution of that historian we possess very full details of his career, which was that of a low-born adventurer. His story is interesting as a picture of the times, and as such forms the subject of part of the 5th and 6th of Augustin Thierry's *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*. (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 14, 48-50.*) [S. A. B.]

**LEUDEBAUDIS**, eighth bishop of Séz, who subscribed the second council of Tours, in 566, the fourth of Paris, in 573, and the letter addressed by the latter council to king Siebert. (*Mansi, ix. 805, 868, 870; Gall. Christ. xi. 676.*) [S. A. B.]

**LEUDEBERTUS**, twenty-sixth archbishop of Paris, present at the council of Rheims, held about A.D. 625 or 630. (*Flooard, Hist. Rem. ii. 5; Mansi, x. 594; Gall. Christ. vii. 23.*) [S. A. B.]

**LEUDEFREDUS (LEODEFRIDUS, LEUFREDUS, LAUDEFREDUS)**, bishop of Cordova, at the 4th and 5th councils of Toledo (633, 636). His vicar, Valentinianus, represented him at the sixth council (638). To him was addressed a letter of Isidore's on certain points of church organisation. (*Isid. Opp. ed. Arevalo, vi. 557; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 385, 413; Esp. Sagr. x. 235.*) [M. A. W.]

**LEUDEGISILUS**, twenty-second archbishop of Rheims. Le Cointe places his episcopate from 631 to 641. (*Flooard, Hist. Eccl. Rem. ii. 6; Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc. ii. 842, an. 613, xv.; Gall. Christ. iii. 6; ix. 19.*) [S. A. B.]

**LEUEMUNDUS**, fourteenth bishop of Sion, cir. A.D. 613. (*Aimoin, de Gest. Franc. iv. 6; Bouquet, iii. 120, 121; Gall. Christ. xii. 736.*) [S. A. B.]

**LEUDERICUS**, bishop of Urgel, A.D. 735-754. (*Villanueva, Viage Lit. x. 19.*) [C. H.]

**LEUDEVALDUS.** [LEODOVALDUS.]  
2 Z 2

**LEUDINUS BODO** (LEUDINUS), ST., seventeenth bishop of Toul. The date of the commencement of his episcopate is given as about A.D. 667. His day of commemoration is Sept. 13. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 838; *Gesta Episc. Tullens.* 17, Migne, Patr. Lat. clvii. 452; *Vita S. Salabergae*, Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vi. 522; Migne, Patr. Lat. clvi. 1226; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 963.)

[S. A. B.]

**LEUDIWIIT**, bishop of Menevia or St. David's. (Girald. Camb. *Itin. Camb.* ii. c. 1, wks. vi. 105.) [LENDIVORD.] [J. G.]

**LEUDOCUS**, Welsh saint. (Girald. Camb. *Itin. Camb.* ii. c. 3, wks. vi. 114.) [LEUDDAD.] [J. G.]

**LEUDOMERUS** (LUDOMERUS, LUMIER), ST., commemorated Oct. 2, eighteenth bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne. His episcopate, according to Le Cointe, commenced in 580, and lasted at the most eight years. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. i. 330-7; Le Cointe, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* an. 580, n. 3; 584, vi. tom. ii. 198, 256; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 862.) [S. A. B.]

**LEUDOVALDUS**, tenth bishop of Bayeux. (*Gall. Chr.* xi. 349). He was one of the envoys sent by Chilperic to Childebert in 581, to confirm the peace. (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vi. 3, viii. 31, ix. 13.) [C. H.]

**LEUFERTH, LEUTHFRIT**, a bishop whose appointment is mentioned by Simeon of Durham under the year 773. (*M. H. B.* 664.) He was the successor of Hadwin as "Migonsis ecclesiae antistes," bishop, that is, of the English colony at Mayo, off the west coast of Ireland. He must have died before 782. [S.]

**LEUNISIUS** (LEONISIUS, LINDEGASTUS, LUDEGASTUS, LEUDEGASTUS), thirty-fifth bishop of Mainz, cir. 612. (Fredegar, *Chronicon*, xxxviii.; Aimoin, *Hist. Franc.* iii. 98; Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 762; *Vita Columbani*, s. 52; Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 25, 26, Paris, 1668-1702; Serarius, *Rerum Moguntiacarum*, &c. i. 168; *Gall. Christ.* v. 436.) [S. A. B.]

**LEUPOLDUS** (LUPOLDUS), said to have been twenty-second bishop of Mainz. His death is put in the year 421. (Serarius, *Rerum Moguntiacarum*, i. 165; *Gall. Christ.* v. 435.) [S. A. B.]

**LEUS** (LEA, LEO), presbyter and confessor at Viguentia in the diocese of Ferrara, Italy, in the time of Diocletian, is commemorated Aug. 1. The Bollandist Sollierius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Aug. i. 48) has carefully analysed his legend, but the true facts remain obscure. [J. G.]

**LEUSIBORAS**, twice mentioned by Jerome (*Ep.* 75 al. 29, *ad Theod.* § 3, *Opp.* i. 453, and in *Isai.* 64, *Opp.* iv. 761), but by no one else, as an unintelligible name in use among Gnostic sects. [G. S.]

**LEUTFREDUS** (LEUFROY), ST., founder and first abbat of the monastery, which afterwards bore his name (Crux S. Leutfredi, La-Croix-St.-Leufroy, originally Monasterium Heltonis) in the pagus Madriacensis, on the Eure, near Evreux (cir. A.D. 690-738). Jacques du

Breul first published his biography, written by an anonymous monk, who apparently lived in the latter half of the 9th century. It was repeated by Surius and Barali, and later from fresh MSS. by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* iii. 1, 583-592, Paris, 1668-1701). A new edition is also to be found in the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jun. iv. 105 sqq.). The writer purports to draw his information, partly from monuments, partly from tradition (§ 1, Mabill. p. 583). The style is pronounced good for the age (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 275).

See the *Gallia Christiana*, xi. 632 sqq. St. Leutfredus is commemorated June 21 (Boll. Jun. iv. 104 sqq.). [S. A. B.]

**LEUTHERIUS** (HLOTHERE, LEUTER, LIUTHIARI), the fourth bishop of the West Saxons (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* 619). He was a Frank by birth, and nephew to Agilbert, who, when pressed to return to the West Saxon see, which he had left on his quarrel with king Coinwalch, sent over Leutherius in his stead. He was consecrated by archbishop Theodore, according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in 670 (*M. H. B.* 318), and ruled his diocese for about six years, dying during the time when Wessex was broken up among the several ealdormen (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 5). Bede mentions the fact that he ruled the bishopric of the Gewissae alone, "e synodica sanctione," which may mean that the maintenance of Wessex under one bishop, an exception to the favourite policy of Theodore, was permitted by some special synodal act. Leutherius was at the synod of Hertford in 673, where the question of subdividing the dioceses was waived (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 5). His name is attached to a charter of Osric, ealdorman of the Hwicci, dated Nov. 6, 676 (Kemble, *C. D.* 12), and the same year the *Chronicle* places the appointment of his successor Haeddi, and the termination of the anarchy in Wessex (*M. H. B.* 320). Among the Malmesbury charters is one, no doubt spurious or interpolated, in which Leutherius confirms to Aldhelm the possession of his monastic property. Although this is not genuine, Leutherius was bishop during a considerable part of Aldhelm's early career, and it was by him, according to the biographers, that Aldhelm was ordained priest, and appointed abbat of Malmesbury (*V. Aldhelmi*, Faricius, cap. i. ed. Giles, p. 359; Will. Malmesb. *G. Pont.* ed. Hamilton, pp. 334, 347, 363, 385). There is a Glastonbury charter attested by Leutherius (Kemb. *C. D.* 7). He probably retained his episcopal see at Dorchester, where he is said, on very late authority, to have been buried. (Rudburn, *Ang. Sacra*, i. 192.) But the ancient list given by Florence of Worcester places him among the bishops who sat at Winchester. [S.]

**LEVANGIUS, ST.** (LIVANIUS, LIVIANIUS, BEVAGIUS), commemorated Oct. 19; ninth bishop of Senlis, present at the first council of Orleans in 511 (Mansi, viii. 357). (Grevin. *Auct. ad Usuard.*; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. viii. 446; *Gall. Christ.* x. 1381.) [S. A. B.]

**LEVANUS, ST.**, the patron saint of St. Levan, a parish near the Land's End. He was probably Irish. The parish feast is on the Sunday nearest to Oct. 15. But he may be the Irish saint Livinus, the apostle of Brabant, who was

martyred Nov. 12, A.D. 656 (Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 255). The parish was until lately always combined with Buryan, named from Buriëna, also an Irish devotee. There was a tendency to shift saints' days to the beginning of October. (See Dixon's *Hist of Church of England*, i. 424.) Compare W. C. Borlase, *The Age of the Saints*, 1878, pp. 37, 51. [BURIËNA.] [C. W. B.]

LEVI (otherwise LEBES), bishop of Jerusalem in the 2nd century. He stands twelfth on the list given by Eusebius. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; Niceph. *H. E.* iii. 25.) [E. V.]

LEVIANUS, possibly bishop of Fulginium (Foligno), c. A.D. 175. (Jacobilli, *Città di Foligno*, p. 31; Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* i. 733; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* iv. 399.) [R. S. G.]

LEWINNA (LEVINA, LEUVINA), July 24, legendary martyr of Britain, assigned to the 7th century. The monk Drogo, who narrates her translation to St. Winoch's in 1058, gives an imaginary account of her (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. v. 613). Sanderus in his *Flandria Illustrata* (t. iii. p. 300, num. iv. ed. 1735), though he speaks of the relics of the English saints Ewald and Idaberga as being at St. Winoch's, is silent as to St. Lewinna's. [C. H.]

LIADHAIN (LEDUIN, LEDUINA, LIADAIN, LIADANA, LIADANIA, LIDUEN, LIEDANIA, LI-GHAIN, LIUEN), Irish saint, mother of St. Ciaran (March 5) of Saighir; she was converted by her son, who built a cell for her near to his own at Saighir or Seirkeiran [CIARAN (4)]. (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 346, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 402; *Misc. Celt. Soc.* 19-21.) It has since been called Killyon (Liadhan's church) in the barony of Fircall, King's County. See Joyce (*Irish Names of Places*, 142-3, 3rd ed.). Though placed before St. Patrick in the 5th century by Ussher and others, she probably did not flourish before the 6th. See also *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 217, 433; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 458, c. 1, 459, c. 10, 472, c. 2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 7. [J. G.]

LIAMHAIN (LIAMAIN, LIAMAINA, LIEMAN, LIEMANIA, LIMANIA), one of the five reputed sisters of St. Patrick and daughter of Calphurnius. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 259, c. 3, 261 n.<sup>8</sup>, 262 n.<sup>14-18</sup>, 716 sq. and *Tr. Thaum.* 4 n.<sup>8</sup>, 8 n.<sup>12</sup>, 224 sq.; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 364-5; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 448, i. 139; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 3, § 18; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 380 sq., *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 383; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 164-8 discussing the question of the Patrician relationships, and adding "it is nowhere stated that either Restitutus or Liëmania was ever in Ireland;" Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 437; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 361 sq. stating, without solving, the difficulties.) [J. G.]

LIBAN, LIBANA, LIBANIA (LIBHAN), Irish virgin saint, was one of those who assembled at or near Ballysadare, co. Sligo, to confer with St. Columba on one occasion of his visiting Ireland; she is named with Fortchern and probably both were of Odhba Keara in Partry, Connaught. See Colgan, *Acta SS.* 337, c. 7, 339 n.<sup>29</sup>; *Four Mast.* A.D. 558, by O'Donovan, i. 201 n.<sup>2</sup>; O'Beirne Crowe, *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch.*

*Ass. Tr.* ser. 4, vol. i. 94 sq.; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 327; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 741, c. 3 b and *Tr. Thaum.* 463, c. 55; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 457-9, ii. 558; O'Conor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* iv. 26. [J. G.]

LIBANIUS (1), a deacon from whom, in his passage through Caesarea, A.D. 378, Basil received tidings of Eusebius of Samosata. (Basil, *Epist.* 268 [9].) [E. V.]

LIBANIUS (2), a rhetorician of Antioch in the 4th century A.D., the friend of the emperor Julian, one of the most noteworthy and characteristic figures of expiring paganism. Libanius was born in Antioch in the year 314 A.D. His father died when he was ten years old, and the charge of himself and his two brothers then fell entirely upon their mother, who is described by him as a gentle, tender person, but somewhat wanting in the severity which cannot be quite dispensed with in education. Hence, up to his fifteenth year, Libanius was more engaged in open air country sports than in learning; but at that period a passion for eloquent discourses seized him; he took no more interest in horse-racing or in theatres; he abstained from witnessing the gladiatorial contests (which were always, he says, a great source of interest to him); and lastly, a loss which he speaks of with most feeling, he sold his pigeons. He then applied himself to the teachers of rhetoric in Antioch; but unfortunately the one competent instructor had recently died; of the others he speaks in his autobiography with small respect. Hence he was, in the main, self-taught. He devoted himself to the Greek classics, and to these exclusively; as to the Latin language, he appears never to have learned it at all. (Cf. *Epist.* 923, 956, 1241.) It is a curious proof of the Greek literary pride, that a man like Libanius (and he is not the only instance) should have assumed this attitude of contempt towards the language of the masters of the world. Hellenism, as opposed alike to the empire of Rome and to the Christian church, was the object of his passionate attachment.

In his early youth, while reading the *Acharnenses* of Aristophanes with his tutor, Libanius was struck almost blind by a flash of lightning; a pain in his head resulting from this, and, aggravated by neglect, proved an infliction to him all his life long. This, and an attempt on the part of his friends to induce him to marry (which failed on account of his determination to adhere entirely to his studies) were the most noteworthy circumstances of his early life. Libanius was twenty-two years old when he first left his home and went to Athens to study (cf. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius*, p. 43; from a passage near the beginning of his autobiography it might be thought that he was two or three years younger when this journey took place). At Athens Libanius remained four years; then, partly on account of a jealousy which he had involuntarily excited, partly at the request of his friend Crispinus, he took a journey to Heraclea in Pontus. Returning, he had an offer in Constantinople, from the rhetorician Nicocles, of the post of teacher of rhetoric; he accepted the offer, but having taken an oath to revisit Athens, he was detained so long on his journey thither



by stormy weather, that when he reached Constantinople again, he found the post occupied by another. Upon this he set up as a private lecturer, and was so successful, that whereas Niccles had promised him forty pupils, his audience now reached the number of eighty. This success brought envy upon him, and in the end accusations of having taken part in a disturbance in the city. Though no proof could be obtained against him, the prefect Limenius was unfavourably disposed towards him, and gave him an informal order to leave the city. This happened in the year 343 A.D. Libanius obeyed, and retired to Nicaea; but shortly afterwards was invited by the inhabitants of Nicomedia, in Bithynia, to deliver public lectures in their city. In Nicomedia he spent the five happiest years of his life. He was in the prime of life, his health was good, and his talents procured for him universal applause. "I seemed," he says, "like a man sitting by the side of fountains of clear water in secret, under the shadow of stately trees, with garlands on my head, and continually feasting; but my delight was not in eating and drinking, but in the suavity of discourse, and in the fact that Athens applauded Bithynia." His friend Crispinus visited him from Heraclea, and brought a cartload of books as a present, than which none more grateful could have been given. Here, too, as at Athens, he won numerous friends, of whom he mentions Aristenetus with especial tenderness. At Nicomedia, moreover, was studying at this time a youth afterwards celebrated, who, though prohibited from attending the lectures of Libanius, was his secret and ardent admirer—the nephew of Constantine, Julian, at this time about fourteen years old.

From Nicomedia, Libanius, whose fame had by this time spread far and wide, received a summons to lecture in Constantinople. He went; but among the haughty citizens of the new capital continually regretted his beloved Nicomedia. Twice he attempted to return there, but was driven back, the first time by a pestilence, the second time by a famine. After a time he received, but refused, the offer of a chair of rhetoric at Athens.

It was when he was approaching his fortieth year, that Libanius obtained leave to visit his home, Antioch, where he had not been for sixteen years. There he found his mother, his brother, his uncle Phasgianus, and many of his old companions. He tore himself away from them with reluctance; and though he again delivered lectures at Constantinople, he could never settle there. Partly from real, partly perhaps from feigned, illness, he obtained leave to visit Antioch a second time; and though his return to Constantinople was vehemently called for, he always contrived to evade the demand. It should be noted that this was no matter of free choice on his part, and that it needed the certificates of many physicians, and the influence of many courtiers, to enable him to escape the necessity of returning to an office of which he was thoroughly weary. For the remainder of his life—nearly forty years, if not even more—Libanius was a respected citizen of his native town, which he hardly ever left henceforth. Antioch could hardly be said to be in a peaceful state; famines, disturbances, and severities on the part of the imperial prefects, were alike fre-

quent. Libanius, as a noted advocate of the now decaying and unpopular worship of Jupiter and Apollo, would seem to have been in a dangerous position; yet he always escaped unhurt, and almost unsuspected. Probably the harmlessness and caution of his character were fully recognised; and his conceit, which was great, limited itself to attacks on rival rhetoricians, and to outpourings of regret for the decline of his party, which no doubt were not always submitted to the public eye. The most remarkable event of these forty years, as far as Antioch and Libanius were concerned, was the arrival of Julian at Antioch, his expedition against the Persians, and his premature death. The characters of Libanius and Julian were exactly adapted for one another. Each loved to dwell in a world of gods, goddesses, and heroes, which not only was wholly incredible in itself, but which was no longer a subject of belief to any but the extremely ignorant, or to those whose eyes were blinded by the pride of learning, race, and station, or, it must be said, by the more creditable feeling of the beauty and power of the ancient classical writers. If Libanius had not the force of character of Julian, neither had he the recklessness which marked, in so many respects, the practical conduct of the emperor. He seems, indeed, to have behaved towards Julian with marked prudence and integrity. When Julian arrived at Antioch, on his way towards the East, Libanius rather retired from than sought his society, even though he had been noticed amid the crowd which collected to witness the entry of Julian, and had been greeted with the words, so flattering from imperial lips, "When am I to hear you?" On the antagonism which subsequently arose between Julian and the people of Antioch, Libanius did his utmost to reconcile the opposing sides, to each of which he was so much attached. He looked on, of course, with admiring delight at the resuscitation by Julian of the ancient religion, at the rebuilding of temples, at the morning and evening sacrifices, at the renewal of the auguries, at the profound commune with Hercules or Apollo through oracles or dreams. To his credit, Libanius always advocated toleration, and restrained the precipitate zeal of the pagans in their temporary power (see especially the remarkable passages from *Epist.* 636, 669, 673, and 731, quoted by Neander in his *Church History*, vol. iii. p. 63, note, of the translation published by Clark, Edinburgh, 1852); he entertained the real though visionary belief that the gods of Greece would vindicate their own supremacy and assist their champion to victory. Confidently expecting the triumphant return of Julian from Persia, he was stunned when the news of his death arrived, and of the peace, on humiliating terms, concluded with the Persians. His grief and despair were increased by the fact that so few around him shared these feelings. Nor could they have been diminished, though his pride must have been flattered, by the words which, as was told him, Julian uttered after one of his most signal successes, "The Syrian orator has now material for an oration." But presently Libanius devoted himself to the task of celebrating the memory of his imperial friend, and collecting every fact relating to his last campaign from the lips of those who had taken part in it.

The remainder of the life of Libanius was passed under the reigns of Valens and Theodosius (if we except the short rule of Jovian). It could not be a happy time for him. The "wars and rumours of wars," the severities of prefects, the sense of uncertainty under which men sat, in which the anticipated displeasure of an emperor shook all hearts with terror and drove men to take refuge in the mountains for safety, the frequent scarcity of bread and the tumults roused thereby among the people: these calamities were shared by Libanius with others. But the disappointment of a cherished though vain ideal, the restoration of the ancient glories of Greece and the Greek religion and culture, belonged to him more, perhaps, than to any other man. Then, too, he had his full share of all the troubles of old age. Besides his severe headaches, he was afflicted with gout. He saw his relations and friends (among them his son Cimon) die before him; and as he either reached or approached his eightieth year, the end of his life was more than usually bereft of the friends of earlier days. Of the principal public event which occurred in the city of Antioch during these reigns, the tumult in which the statues of the emperor Theodosius, and of his wife and sons, were broken in pieces and dragged contemptuously through the streets, Libanius has left us an account in orations which may be compared and contrasted with the orations of his celebrated Christian pupil, John Chrysostom, on the same subject. Chrysostom has a worthy theme (of a kind that Libanius was not able to employ) for the offending citizens, in the consideration that a higher power than that of the emperor has been transgressed against, and that separation from God was more to be feared than the vengeance of Theodosius. To the same emperor Theodosius Libanius addressed his oration on behalf of the heathen temples, "Pro Templis Gentilium non excindendis"—an oration in which the course of the argument sufficiently proves the inanity of the religion for which the orator pleads. Libanius admits, and even takes as the basis of his pleading, that whatever the emperor enjoins is right; he submits entirely to the imperial prohibition of sacrifices, and only urges that the offering of incense and other rites should be allowed, because they had not been laid under a similar prohibition. The exact date of the death of Libanius is uncertain; it is not even quite certain that he did not survive Theodosius (whose death took place A.D. 395). When, shortly before his death, he was asked who should be his successor in his chair, he is reported to have answered, "Chrysostom, if the Christians have not stolen him" (Sozomen, viii. 2). Besides Chrysostom, St. Basil was also among his pupils. Libanius was never married; an engagement with his cousin, the daughter of Phasganius, was rendered vain by her death, which took place just before his final return to Antioch. Afterwards he lived in concubinage, and had a son Cimon; for whose sake mainly, no doubt, he induced the emperor Julian, and afterwards Valens, to issue a law by which certain advantages were granted to natural children. But Cimon died some years before his father, in consequence of injuries which he received from being thrown from his carriage in Cilicia, while returning home from Constantinople.

The principal writings of Libanius are—

1. *Προγυμνασμάτων παραδείγματα*, i.e. examples of rhetorical exercises. In many of them, historical characters, such as Demosthenes, or (more frequently) the heroes of the epos or the drama, such as Achilles or Medea, are introduced, speaking with reference to some circumstance of their real or traditional lives.

2. *Μελέται*, or declamations. These have a strong resemblance to the *προγυμνάσματα*, but on the whole rather take as their subject imaginary occasions or crises than special celebrated persons—e.g. the petition of a son to be disinherited together with a brother who was dear to him, the petition of a man condemned, under particular circumstances, to be exiled, &c.

3. *Λόγοι*, or orations (sixty-five in number in Reiske's edition). These relate to his own time, and, except his letters and his autobiography, constitute by far the most important part of his works. It is an interesting question, but one which cannot now be certainly solved, how far these orations were actually published. To whatever extent they were published (and it would be unfair to think that they, like the rhetorical exercises, were intended solely for a circle of admiring pupils), Libanius was a real actor in the events of his time. But even so, the unpractical character of his mind forces itself upon every reader; he perpetually forgets the present, even when most affecting and important in the past. The most judicious, and certainly not too unfavourable, characterisation of these writings is to be found in the twenty-fourth chapter of Gibbon, and may be quoted here: "The voluminous writings of Libanius still exist: for the most part they are the vain and idle compositions of an orator who cultivated the science of words—the productions of a recluse student, whose mind, regardless of his contemporaries, was incessantly fixed on the Trojan war and the Athenian commonwealth. Yet the sophist of Antioch sometimes descended from this imaginary elevation; he entertained a various and elaborate correspondence; he praised the virtues of his own times; he boldly arraigned the abuses of public and private life; and he eloquently pleaded the cause of Antioch against the just resentment of Julian and Theodosius." Eunapius calls his orations weak and lifeless; this is in the main true, though some of them have a certain rhetorical beauty; but it may be said in favour of Libanius that he never descended to the depth of puerility and superstitious belief in which Eunapius indulged. An adherence to paganism in those days could only be relieved from transparent weakness by the absolute excision of all the picturesque details of the religion, which to the common mind constitute its whole substance; and such an excision we find in Hierocles; but Libanius was too little of a real philosopher, and too much a lover of show, to attempt it. The deadness of paganism is nowhere more conspicuous than in his writings.

4. A life of Demosthenes, and arguments to the speeches of the same orator.

5. An autobiography, entitled *Βίος ἢ Λόγος περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τύχης*, or *De Fortuna sua*. This work contains much valuable information, and would have contained more, but for the allusive and indirect style of the author.

6. Ἐπιστολαί, or letters: the most valuable, probably, of the works of Libanius. No fewer than 1605 of these are extant in the original Greek. Besides these, Zambeccari published 397 letters in what purports to be a Latin translation; but the genuineness of these last is very doubtful (see especially Richard Förster's *Franccesco Zambeccari und die Briefe des Libanios*, Stuttgart, 1878). The letters are in many cases addressed to eminent and celebrated contemporaries of the author—e.g. the emperor Julian, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, &c. We have, also, a few letters extant addressed by the emperor Julian to Libanius. The intercourse of these two was alike honourable to both; they met on terms of such equality as is very rarely found between sovereign and subject; there was no arrogance on the one side, or servility on the other side. It may be mentioned, that a few of the writings of Libanius were translated by John Duncombe, and published together with the *Select Works of the Emperor Julian* (2 vols. London, 1784). On the whole, the impression left by the character of Libanius is a pleasing one, in spite of its weakness.

Those who wish to obtain a more minute knowledge of Libanius should consult, above all, Dr. G. R. Sievers's work, *Das Leben des Libanios* (Berlin, 1868) (a work to which the writer of this article is much indebted). Very judicious notices of him may be found in the third volume of Gibbon's history; where also is translated one of the most striking pieces in his orations, commemorating the valour of the emperor Valens in the fatal battle of Adrianople.

The best edition of the epistles of Libanius is that of J. Ch. Wolf (Amsterdam, 1738, fol.). The other works were published by F. Morellus (Paris, 1606, 2 vols. fol.), and subsequently, with some fresh additions, by J. J. Reiske (Altenburg, 1791-97, 4 vols. 8vo). Other works relating to Libanius will be found mentioned in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, art. "Libanius." [J. R. M.]

**LIBANIUS (3)**, a gentleman of rank of Antioch, an intimate friend of Carteria [CARTERIA], at whose instance he visited Chrysostom at Cucusus in 404. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 229, 230, 232.) [E. V.]

**LIBANIUS (4)**, bishop of Palaeopolis in Pamphylia, signed the protest against the opening of the council of Ephesus before the arrival of John of Antioch, A.D. 431. (Mansi, v. 768, 614.) [L. D.]

**LIBANIUS (5)**, bishop of Paralaus in Pisidia, present at the oecumenical council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. He also signed the synodal letter of his province to the emperor Leo A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 160, 571.) [L. D.]

**LIBANIUS (6)**, a deacon mentioned by Paschasius bishop of Lilybaeum. (Leo Mag. *Ep.* iii. 610, Migne.) [C. G.]

**LIBARIA (LIBERTA, LIBRARIA)**, martyred with her sister Susanna and brothers Eliphilus and Eucharius bishop of Toul, A.D. 362, according to Baronius (*Ann. Eccl. cod. an.*) and Usher

(*Brit. Eccl. Ant. c.* 16, wks. vi. 337, Ind. Chron. eod. an.), but A.D. 211 according to Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i.* 431). [J. G.]

**LIBELLUS SYNODICUS** (Vetus Synodicon or *Συνοδικόν*, Fabric.). A compendium of the proceedings of 151 councils from the time of the apostles until the eighth general council held about the union between the patriarch Photius and pope John VIII. A.D. 879. The history of this work is as follows. Towards the close of the 16th century a Greek from the Morea, Andreas Darmasius, sold it, with other MSS., to Johannes Pappus, a Protestant theologian at Strasburg. Sixteen years after, A.D. 1601, Pappus published the Greek text with a Latin translation, which, as he tells us in his dedication, he made when travelling to his own country to beguile the tedium of the journey. It will also be found in a complete shape in Voelli et Justelli *Biblioth. Jur. Canon. Vet.* ii. 1166-1213; Harduin. *Conc. Collect.* v. 1492; Fabricii *Biblioth. Graec.* ed. Harles, xii. 359; and in detached pieces under the synods to which they belong in Mansi's and in Labbe's *Concilia*. The author of the work lived in the latter half of the 9th century, and therefore in strictness it lies beyond our period, but as the documents and councils with which he dealt lie within it, it may clearly be regarded as belonging to the literature of the first eight centuries. The author is quite unknown. Pappus says in his preface that some have suspected it was Nicephorus the author of the *Chronicon*, but he can find no ground for this. Others have suggested a Cyril bishop of Jerusalem, but without any substantial reason. Pappus says we can only be certain of this, that the writer lived under the emperors Basil and Constantine and the patriarch Photius, about A.D. 880. The work is a compendium of a select number of councils, oecumenical and provincial. Such epitomes were by no means uncommon among the Greeks. Thus we have still those of Germanus, patriarch of C.P., dealing with the proceedings of the six general councils Voell. et Justell. *l.c.* ii. 1155; Harduin. *Concil.* v. 1458; Le Moynes's *Var. Sacr.* i. 81-123 [GERMANUS]; of Nicephorus patriarch of C.P. A.D. 806-815; of Photius patriarch of C.P. 877-886, and of an anonymous author treating of seven oecumenical councils. Several others also are mentioned by Fabricius, *l.c.* Lambecius discovered in the Imperial Library at Vienna several MSS. of the same character. One presents an epitome recited on the 1st Sunday in Lent, "Dominica Orthodoxiae," the feast observed in the Greek church in memory of the restoration of images, and another bears exactly the same title as the *Libellus Synodicus* of Pappus (cf. note of Harles, *Fab. Bib. Graec.* t. xii. 358). The *Libellus Synodicus* bears its character and design patent on its face. It was written by an opponent of the patriarch Photius, and a supporter of his rival Ignatius and the pope. Photius was the champion of the independence of the Greek church as against Rome. The writer of this work therefore sets himself to shew that the church of Rome has ever had precedence and authority over that of Constantinople. Thus in sec. 34 we are told, what no contemporary historian relates, that the presbyters Vito and Vincentius, the papal legates,

presided at Nice. In sec. 94 Leo the Great is described as equal to the apostles. In sec. 114, pope Hormisdas, A.D. 514-523, convenes a synod by his own authority at Constantinople. In sec. 115, pope Agapetus deposes the patriarch of C.P. Anthimus for Manicheism. There is the most wonderful confusion of facts and dates in these sections. Pope Hormisdas, for instance, is represented as succeeded by Agapetus, though in reality there were twelve years and four popes between them. Sec. 118 explains away the fact that the patriarch of C.P. presided over the fifth general council and not the Roman legate. Pope Theodore, A.D. 642, deposes by his own authority Pyrrhus the patriarch of C.P. In the sixth oecumenical council held at Constantinople the papal legates are represented as presiding, though as a matter of fact the emperor himself acted in that capacity. But though an advocate of the supremacy, the writer is no believer in the infallibility of the pope. The fall of Honorius is of course lightly passed over, as it is the object of the writer to represent the popes as the champions of orthodoxy as against the perpetually erring patriarchs of Constantinople. Yet in sec. 130 he calls Honorius a Monothelite, and relates the anathema pronounced against him at the sixth general council. The writer made large use of the early historians Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. In fact in some places he uses the very expressions of these writers, as for instance, in sec. 62, where describing the election of Ambrose he uses the exact words of Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 6. He was doubtless also acquainted with other early documents now lost. Thus he refers to the Canons concerning Easter, published by Anatolius of Laodicea, as existent in his day in their Greek shape. We now possess only the Latin version first published by Bucherius in the 17th century [ANATOLIUS]. In Hefele's *History of the Councils*, Book I. ch. i., there is a very good analysis and criticism of the *Libellus Synodicus* so far as it deals with the councils of the first three centuries. It adds however but very little to the narrative of Eusebius. In section 34, the following story is told about the way in which the council of Nice decided upon the canon of Scripture. All the books, spurious and genuine alike, were placed near the Lord's table. Then prayer was offered that the inspired books might come to the top and the spurious sink to the bottom, which happened in due course. [G. T. S.]

**LIBER (1) (LIBERIUS)**, "the Martyred," is commemorated November 2 (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 294, 433), and is identified by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 742, c. 6) with a Liberius whom he makes successor of Tigernach at Clogher about A.D. 550. [J. G.]

**LIBER (2) (LIBERIUS)**, Mar. 8, abbat of Aghaboe, Queen's County, died A.D. 619, has a short memoir given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 566), and is placed by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 8, Mart. i. 749) among their praetermissi. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, iii. 257-8; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, 90) [J. G.]

**LIBER (3)**, bishop, disciple of St. Barry. (Caufield, *Life of St. Fin Barre*, 18.) [J. G.]

**LIBER (4) (LIBERIUS)**, abbat of Maghfile (now Movilla, county Down), died A.D. 749. (*Ann. Tý.* eod. an.; *Four Mast.* A.D. 744; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 748; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 650, c. 9.) [J. G.]

**LIBER (5) (LIBERIUS, LIBERN, LIBERNUS)**, one of the three sons of Luissne, commemorated August 1. He had his cell at Inismor and appears in the *Life of St. Senan*. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 209; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* c. 26; *Mart. Tallaght*, Aug. 1, ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xxxi.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 533-4, cc. 24-7, 540 n.<sup>18</sup>.) [J. G.]

**LIBER PONTIFICALIS**, called also in the MSS. **LIBER EPISCOPALIS**, or else **LIBER DE GESTIS ROMANORUM PONTIFICUM**. This work in its present shape contains the lives of the popes from St. Peter to Nicolas I., who died A.D. 867, or even in later editions to Stephen VI. (A.D. 885-891). It gives brief sketches merely till pope Constantine I. (A.D. 708-715) is reached, when its narrative becomes much more diffuse. It narrates pontifical decrees, the building and endowment of churches, acts and monuments of the martyrs, and is very valuable for the purposes of Christian archaeology and the liturgiology of the 5th and 6th centuries. In modern times it has been attributed to Anastasius Bibliothecarius, but without any ancient authority. Till the end of the 14th century it was generally regarded as anonymous. It was evidently the intention of its original author, or some early reviser, to make it pass under the name of Damasus, as we find all MSS. thereof, no matter how old, prefaced by an apocryphal correspondence between Jerome and that pope, wherein Jerome asks Damasus for an authentic catalogue of the Roman bishops down to his own time. Thus we find it quoted under the title of *Chronica Damasi Papae de Gestis Pontificum* in the *Chronicon* of Martinus Polonus in the end of the 13th century, while in the 15th and 16th centuries it is always ascribed to that pontiff. Onufrius Panvinius at the end of the 15th century was the first to ascribe the authorship of the Lives from Damasus to Nicolas I. to Anastasius, a notion which Bellarmine took up without examination (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* art. Damasus), whence it has been handed down to our times, so that now in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* the *Liber Pontificalis* must be looked for under the name of Anastasius, tt. cxxvii. cxxviii. About the middle of the 17th century several learned men remarked that the *Liber Pontificalis* had been used by the forger of the False Decretals, and quoted by authors certainly anterior to Anastasius, as in particular by Bede. Pearson (*De Serie et Successione prim. Rom. Episcop.* 1687, Diss. i. cap. xii. p. 124) rejected the claims both of Anastasius and Damasus to its authorship. He suggested the close of the 6th century as the time of its publication. The reasons for assigning to it an earlier date than Anastasius are manifest. In the first place many manuscripts are of an older date. Again, the exarchate of Ravenna is often alluded to in the text as still existent, and the last exarch (Eutychius) was expelled from Italy by Aistulphus the Lombard king in A.D. 752, while again pope Leo II. is described as accepting the decrees of the sixth general council (A.D. 681) lately ("nuper") held in Constantinople, an

expression which could not possibly be used by Anastasius at the end of the 9th century. We shall now discuss (1) the date; (2) the sources; (3) the aim and influence of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

I. *Date*.—The book may be divided into two parts. The first extends from St. Peter to the death of pope Symmachus, A.D. 514. The second from that date to the death of Nicolas I., A.D. 867. The former part was probably compiled soon after the year 514, during the pontificate of Hormisdas, A.D. 514–523, by some converted Goth, who had ardently espoused the side of pope Symmachus, as appears from the rude and barbarous style of the Latin. The second portion was the work of several hands, generally contemporary with the popes whose lives are recorded, or else was compiled out of contemporary documents. This appears from the accuracy of consular, imperial, and regal dates, the full historical details, and from particular expressions in the text. The date of the earlier portion is determined thus. We possess a document variously called—*Catalogus Felicianus*; Second Catalogue (in reference to the Liberian Catalogue of 354); catalogue under Justinian, *Liber Pontificalis* of 530, giving a history of the popes to Felix IV., A.D. 530, in a more concise shape than our present *Liber Pontificalis*. It was first published by Henschen in *Boll. AA. SS.* April, t. i., and afterwards by Schelsträte in his *Antiquitates Ecclesiae Illustrata*. Two views have been taken of this document. Henschen, Schelsträte, Lipsius, Smeđt have regarded it as the germ out of which the first part of the present *Liber Pontificalis* was developed. The Abbé L. Duchesne, on the other hand, who has devoted a most exhaustive treatise to this subject, *Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis*, Paris, 1877, regards the *Cat. Felic.* as simply an abridgment of the first portion of the book. The former, therefore, assign the close of the 7th century or the early part of the 8th century as the date of its compilation. Duchesne, regarding the Felician catalogue of A.D. 530 as an abridgment of the *Liber Pontificalis*, fixes the date of the latter between A.D. 514 and 523. The reasons which lead Duchesne to this conclusion, so very different from all others who have discussed this question, will be found in liv. i. of his work. They depend upon a minute and thorough comparison of the texts of the *Liber Pontif.* and the *Cat. Felic.* and seem most conclusive. His argument, however, is too long for reproduction, while its nature forbids any attempt at compression. His strongest argument for his own view will be found in liv. i. ch. iv., where he treats of the use made of the Liberian Catalogue of 354 in the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Catalogus Felicianus* respectively. The *Liber Pontificalis* transfers to itself the whole of the Liberian Catalogue, while the author of the *Catalogus Felicianus*, not using the Liberian Catalogue directly, but abridging another document which contained it, has cut it up in the most arbitrary manner without troubling himself whether the points omitted were ancient and authentic, or legendary and modern. But as we have already said, and this instance will sufficiently shew, the force of such criticism cannot be adequately represented in the space at our disposal. Assuming, however, as a working hypothesis, the date 514–523 for

the compilation of the work, we shall find that all the phenomena of the book fall in with it. Thus the Liberian Catalogue of A.D. 354 gives the consular and imperial dates for the bishops of Rome. These dates are embodied in their completeness in the *Liber Pontificalis*. But after Liberius these dates cease, and only recommence—with the exception of one solitary notice of a consular date under pope Hilarius, A.D. 461–468—towards the close of the 5th century, when the synchronism of emperors and barbarian kings begins again under Felix III. A.D. 483, and the consular dates under Symmachus A.D. 498, from which time they were regularly inserted, shewing that the writer just used dates which came under his own personal knowledge without referring to consular Fasti or public tables. The author had at the same time access to the official archives of the Roman see. Thus he refers to a decree of Coelestinus A.D. 423, the letters and tome of St. Leo, and the works of Gelasius, as being in “*bibliotheca et Ecclesiae Archivum*.”

II. *Sources*.—A great many in the past and even still some few maintain that the *Liber Pontif.* was published by direction of the popes and compiled out of official documents. This theory has found its latest exponent in Watterich's *Pontif. Rom. qui fuerunt ab exæunte sæc. ix. usque ad fin. sæc. xiii. vitæ ab æqual. conscriptæ*, Leipzig, 1862. But this view is quite mistaken. The documents used in the compilation of the first portion of the *Liber Pontificalis* were—

(1) The so-called Liberian Catalogue of A.D. 354, which was founded on and embodied the *Chronicon* of Hippolytus [CHRONICON CANISIANUM; CHRONICON HOROSII]. In Migne's edition the comparison between the two can be made at a glance, as the text of the Liberian Catalogue is placed beneath that of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

(2) Documents out of the Roman archives, to which the author had access; inscriptions on churches and other public buildings, and tablets usually fixed to the gates of the churches enumerating the names of donors and their gifts. Several of these tablets have been discovered by De Rossi, Mai, and Marini (cf. *Bullet. 1870*, pp. 89, 113; 1873, p. 36; *Maii Script. Vet. Coll. t. v. p. 209*, &c.). It is evident from one instance alone that the compiler of the *Liber Pontificalis* must have possessed authentic documents concerning the Diocletian persecution. In the Liberian Catalogue we are informed at the close of the notice of pope Marcellinus, A.D. 304, that the Roman episcopate was thenceforward vacant for seven years six months and twenty-five days. This does not mean that there were no Roman bishops during that period, for Marcellus, Eusebius, and Miltiades acted as bishops from 308–311; but that the Roman episcopate was not legally recognised during those seven years as it had been during the years prior to the outbreak of persecution. In the *Liber Pontificalis* we find therefore the following expression concerning Marcellus (A.D. 308–310) which could proceed only from an authentic document. “*Hic coarctatus est et tentus, eo quod ecclesiam ordinare, comprehensus a Maxentio, ut negaret se esse episcopum*.” This effort on the part of Maxentius to force on the pope not a denial of his Christianity but of his episcopal office which the

State did not recognise, is quite in keeping with the time, and could not have been devised by a 7th-century writer. The long lists of foundations and adornments of churches contained in the *Liber Pontificalis* render it specially valuable about the archaeology of the 4th and 5th centuries.

(3) The apocryphal Acts of pope Sylvester, which originated in the East, and most probably in Armenia (Duchesne, *l. c.* p. 168) at the beginning of the 5th century, and the equally apocryphal Acts of Cyriacus, the Jew who discovered the true cross, which is the source of pope Eusebius's biography in the *Lib. Pontif.* The Acts of Sylvester will be found in Surius *A.A. SS.* Dec. 31, and in Combefis. *Ilust. Mart. Triump.*; those of Cyriacus in the Bollandists on May 4th.

(4) The Apocrypha which sprang up so abundantly in connexion with the quarrel between Symmachus and Laurentius in the first years of the 6th century. They were—

- (1) The *Constitutio Sylvestri*, containing report of a pseudo-council held at Rome previous to Nice.
- (2) The Acts of the pseudo-council of 275 bishops held at Rome to confirm the decrees of Nice.
- (3) *Gesta de Xysti purgatione et Polychronii episcopi Hierosolymitani Accusatione.*
- (4) The Acts of the pseudo-council of Sinuessa.
- (5) *Gesta Liberii Papae.*
- (6) *Acta Eusebii presbyteri.*

All these documents, save the *Acta Eusebii*, will be found in the Appendix to Coustant's *Epist. Roman. Pontificum*, where the reasons for regarding them as spurious are also set forth. The *Acta Eusebii* are published in the *A.A. SS.* Boll. Aug. t. iii. p. 167. They all bear upon their face marks of their apocryphal character. They betray a period, a way of thinking, and circumstances later than the 4th century; while the barbarous Latin in which they are composed shews a decay of that language which had not taken place at the date of the Nicene synod. (Cf. farther about these apocryphal documents Döllinger's *Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages*, Plummer's edit.; Hefele's *Councils*, t. i. pp. 442-444, Clark's edit.; Mansi, ii. 720, 1082 *passim.*)

Coustant thinks that all these documents must have been forged early in the 6th century. He has treated particularly of the *Constitutio Sylvestri*, and in his preface suggests that it was composed in support of pope Symmachus, who had been unjustly accused of several crimes, but was acquitted by a synod which met in 501 or 503. At the same time the principle was asserted that the pope could not be judged by other bishops. The compiler of the *Lib. Pontif.* refers also to other forgeries and documents of the 5th century, as the pretended correspondence between SS. Clement and James, the Acts of S. Clement (cf. Greg. Turon. *de Gloria MM.* capp. xxxv., xxxvi.; Till. *Mém.* ii. 159, 160), and to the so-called *Canones Apostolorum*, first translated from Greek into Latin by Dionysius Exiguus in the beginning of the 6th century. This reference will be found in the apocryphal letter of Jerome to Damasus. While again in the notice of pope Victor there is a clear reference, as Duchesne (p. 29) shews, to the contro-

versy raging at the beginning of the 6th century about the Victorian cycle and the true time for observing Easter. [DIONYSIUS (19).]

III. *Aim and Influence.*—The aim of the author is manifest. Like the writer of the *Libellus Synodicus* he strove to exalt Rome as against Constantinople, and to represent the pope as exercising an universal supremacy from the beginning. For this purpose he does not hesitate to ascribe decretals to early popes containing expressions and ideas of his own time. Thus he attributes to pope Alexander (A.D. 109-119) a decree that any bishop summoned to the apostolic see should not be received back into his diocese unless he brought with him a commendatory letter technically called *Litterae formatae*, a term first found used in the beginning of the 5th century. [LITTERAE FORMATAE, *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*] He supports the claim of the pope to exemption from responsibility to any tribunal save that of his own judgment; and the claim of the clergy to exemption from the jurisdiction of lay tribunals by forged decretals of popes in the beginning of the 4th century. But it is unnecessary to multiply these instances, as all authorities are now agreed that this work, in one shape or other, was the production of a partisan of pope Symmachus. But while he maintained the supremacy of Rome, the writer knew nothing of papal infallibility. He records quite naturally, and without any apology, the apostasy to heathenism of pope Marcellinus in the Diocletian persecution, which very apostasy, however, forms the foundation on which the *Gesta Synodi Sinuessa* are made to build a favourite tenet of our author, "Summum Pontificem a nemine nisi a se judicandum esse" (Coustant, *l. c.* App. p. 29). He tells, too, of the Arianism of Liberius, and represents Felix II., his competitor, as the true Catholic bishop, which is in direct contradiction to modern Roman doctrine [FELIX (2), LIBERIUS (4)]. But indeed with the repeated instances of competing popes during the 6th century, and their notorious subjection to and even election by the Arian Gothic princes, the doctrine of infallibility could scarcely find a place in the mind of the most devoted papal partisan. The influence, however, of the *Liber Pontificalis* helped much towards the development of that doctrine through the publication of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which incorporated it, and to which, in turn, the *Liber Pontificalis* gave an appearance of genuineness. (On this see *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus, cap. iii. sec. 7.)

*Bibliography.*—The *Liber Pontificalis* is found in very numerous manuscripts. Duchesne gives a list of one hundred and ten of them found in various libraries of Europe, and out of this number he had himself consulted ninety-eight. Crabbe embodied the greater portion of the *Liber Pontificalis* down to Eugenius II., A.D. 827, in his collection of the councils, Cologne, 1538. The *Editio princeps* is that of Busaeus, Mayence, 1602, republished by Fabrotus, Paris, 1647, and again at Venice in 1729. It was also published by Schelsträte and Bianchini, Rome, 1718-1735, and reprinted in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cxxvii. cxxviii. Muratori included the *Liber Pontificalis* in t. iii. *Scriptorum Rerum Italicarum*, Rome, 1724, accompanied by Bianchini's preface and the dissertations of Schelsträte (*Antiq.*

*Eccles. Illust. t. i.*), and of Ciampini (*Examen. Lib. Pontif.* Rom. 1688). Another edition was published at Rome, the first volume by Vignolius, librarian of the Vatican, in 1724, and the second and third by his nephew (P. Ugolinus) in 1753 and 1755 (cf. Potthast's *Biblioth. Hist. Medii Aevi*, p. 422). Dr. Pabst was preparing another edition for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, but he was killed in the Franco-German war of 1870 before it appeared. Lipsius exhibits a synopsis of the MSS. employed by Pabst, *Chronol. der Römischen Bischöfe*, p. 83 sqq.

*Authorities.*—For learned discussions of this subject the reader should consult among moderns the works of Lipsius, Mommsen (*Abhandlung der Königl. Sachs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1850), Piper (*Einleitung in die Monument. Theolog.* Gotha, 1867, pp. 315–349), Smedt (*Introductio ad Histor. Ecclesiast.* pp. 198–230), De Rossi (*Roma Sotteranea*, i. 123, et passim), and, latest and most elaborate of all, the work so often quoted of Duchesne (*Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis*, Paris, 1877), published in the Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, under the direction of the Minister for Public Instruction.

Among older writers this subject is discussed in Constant's *Epistolae Roman. Pontificum*, Paris, 1721, and Dodwell's *Dissert. Singularis de Pontif. Roman. primæva Successione* contained in Pearson's *Opera Chronologica*, Lond. 1688, as well as by Schelsträte, Bianchini, and the others mentioned under the head of *Bibliography*.

[G. T. S.]

**LIBERALIS (1)**, African bishop of an unknown but important see; was with Cyprian at Adrumetum, *Ep.* 48; one of the forty-one in Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. 2, *de Pace*, *Ep.* 57; one of the eighteen who send Syn. Ep. Conc. Carth. *de Bapt. Haer. Ep.* 70.

[E. W. B.]

**LIBERALIS (2)**, a martyr, probably under Diocletian. He had been consul. A monument, with an inscription in his memory, was erected by pope Damasus. His name is absent from all the martyrologies, as it was unknown till the tablet was discovered. The epitaph will be found in Gruter (*Corp. Inscriptt.* p. 1171, num. 9), and in Mai (*Scriptt. Vet. Coll.* v. 389).

[G. T. S.]

**LIBERALIS (3)**, Ap. 27, confessor cir. 400. He belonged to Altinum, and attached himself to Heliodorus, bishop of that city [**HELIODORUS (7)**]. (*Boll. Acta SS.* Ap. iii. 489.) [C. H.]

**LIBERALIS (4)**, Donatist bishop of Nasaita, perhaps in Numidia (Ptol. iv. 2, 9), present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. (*Collat. Carth. Cognit.* i. 187.) [H. W. P.]

**LIBERALIS (5)**, Donatist bishop of Milidia, perhaps in Numidia (Ptol. iv. 3, 24), present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. (*Coll. Carth.* i. 208.) [H. W. P.]

**LIBERALIS (6)**, a bishop, present at the council of Vannes in A.D. 465, and conjectured to be bishop of Aleth. (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 73.) [C. W. B.]

**LIBERANTIUS**, Donatist bishop of Tisania, perhaps in Numidia, present at the Carthaginian

conference, A.D. 411. (*Collat. Carth. cognit.* i. 206.) [H. W. P.]

**LIBERATA**, Jan. 16, a virgin of Ticinum (Pavia), stated by Ferrarius, but on insufficient grounds, to have been a sister of Epiphanius, the bishop of that city. [**EPIPHANIUS (13)**]. (*Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 32.) [C. H.]

**LIBERATUS (1)** (**LIBERALIS**), presbyter of Eliocrota (Lorca in Murcia), at the council of Elvira, cir. 305 (Mansi, ii. 29, 108), his bishop Successus being also named as present (*ib.* 5, 96). [T. W. D.]

**LIBERATUS (2)** (**LIBERTUS**, **LIBERIUS**), a poet who wrote some acrostic lines in praise of the poet Sedulius. They occur at the end of Sedulius's metrical *Opus Paschale* (La Bigne, *Max. Bibl. Pat.* t. vi. p. 472, ed. Lugd. 1677; *Pat. Lat.* xix. 470, 784; Ceillier, viii. 108). The lines run to the letters of "Sedulius Anulinus Antistes." [C. H.]

**LIBERATUS (3)**, Aug. 17, cir. 450, abbat and martyr at Carthage, A.D. 483, in the Arian persecution of Hunneric. (*Mart. Adon.*, Usuard.; Victor Vit. *de Persecut. Wandal.* lib. v. 10, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lviii. p. 250; Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*; Ceillier, x. 462.) [G. T. S.]

**LIBERATUS (4)**, March 23, physician and confessor in the Arian persecution under Hunneric in North Africa, A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. *de Persecut. Wandal.* lib. v. cap. 14; Ceillier, x. 461.) [G. T. S.]

**LIBERATUS (5)**, bishops exiled by Hunneric in 484, viz. of Amudarsa in Byzacene, of Aquae Regiae in Byzacene, and of Mullita in the proconsular province. (Vict. Vit. *Notit.* 55, 57, 58; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 76, 81, 234.) [R. S. G.]

**LIBERATUS (6)**, primate of Byzacene, A.D. 524, in which year he presided at the council of Junca, and wrote a letter in its name to Boniface bishop of Carthage. (Mansi, viii. 633; Ceillier, xi. 828.) [W. M. S.]

**LIBERATUS (7) DIACONUS**, archdeacon of Carthage, a Latin writer on the Nestorian and Eutychnian heresies, an account of which he composed under the title, *Breviarium Causae Nestorianorum et Eutychnianorum*. In the course of this work he records some circumstances of his life. He had visited Rome in the pontificate of John II. on the affair of the Acoemetæ order of monks (c. 20). In 535 he was deputed to Rome, with the bishops Caius and Peter, by the council of Carthage, in order to consult John II. on the question of how conforming Arian bishops should be received. They arrived about the time of the pope's death (he was buried May 27, 535), and his successor Agapetus (consecrated June 3, 535) replied to the synod by the three envoys (Mansi, viii. 849). Liberatus was an ardent defender of the *Three Chapters*, and undertook many journeys in that cause. On his return home he composed his *Breviarium*, which he so named as being an abridgment in twenty-four chapters of a history of events which, beginning with the ordination of Nestorius in 428, reached to the meeting of the fifth synod in 553. From the latter date it may be inferred that the work was written cir. 560. The author



intimates in his preface that he collected his materials from the *Ecclesiastical History* which had been recently translated from the Greek into Latin (as Garnier thinks, the *Historia Tripartita* of Cassiodorus), from the Acts of the councils, and from episcopal letters. The text of the *Breviarium* was first printed in Crabbe's *Concilia* (t. ii. p. 98), 1551. Mansi gives it (ix. 659) with a few notes by Binius. It was edited with copious notes and dissertations by Garnier in 1675 (8vo, Paris), and this edition has been reprinted by Galland (*Bibl. Patr.* 1765, t. xii. p. 119), and Migne (*Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 969). Accounts of Liberatus will be found in Dupin (*Ecl. Wr. t. i. p. 558*, ed. 1722), Ceillier (xi. 303), Cave (i. 527), Fabricius (*Bibl. Lat.* t. iv. p. 272, ed. Mansi, 1754). Fabricius in his *Bibl. Græc.* (t. xii. 685, ed. Harles) gives an index of all the writers and heretics mentioned by Liberatus. [C. H.]

**LIBERIANUS**, martyr with Justin. (*Acta Just. Mart.* Otto, ii. 274.) [G. S.]

**LIBERIUS (1) I.**, bishop of Ravenna, cir. A.D. 200. (*Acta SS.* 29 Apr. iii. 614; Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* ii. 328; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* ii. 22.) [R. S. G.]

**LIBERIUS (2) II.**, bishop of Ravenna, between either Agapetus or Severus, c. A.D. 349, and Probus, A.D. 351. (Ughelli, ii. 330; Cappelletti, ii. 26.) [R. S. G.]

**LIBERIUS (3) III.**, bishop of Ravenna, between Florentius, A.D. 374, and Ursus, A.D. 379. (Ughelli, ii. 330; Cappelletti, ii. 26.) [R. S. G.]

**LIBERIUS (4)**, ordained bishop of Rome May 22, A.D. 352 (*Catalog. Liber.*), as successor to Julius I.\* He is described (*Catal. Felic.*) as "nacione romanus ex patre Augusto." During that trying period of the Arian controversy when the heterodox were split into sections on the ground of subtle distinctions as to the relation of the Son to the Father; when synod after synod was held, creed after creed prepared; when depositions of bishops, excommunications, and persecutions were continual; and when the emperor Constantius was endeavouring to stamp out Nicene orthodoxy in the West, as it had already seemed almost to have disappeared in the East,—few were found able to stand against the pressure of power; and Liberius, among others, is memorable as having yielded to it, being one of the few popes that can be charged with heresy. Before commencing a review of his life, a glance at the condition of the empire and of theological parties may conduce to a clearer view. The empire having been divided, on the death of Constantine the Great in 337, between his three sons, Constantine II., Constans, and Constantius, the death of the first of these in 340 left Constans sole emperor of the West, and Constantius of the East. Constans upheld in the West the creed of Nicea, while in the East Constantius favoured the party called, from Eusebius of Nicomedia, that of the Eusebians, who, while they held with the orthodox the eternal generation of

the Son, repudiated the term *Consubstantial* (*ὁμοούσιος*), thus occupying a midway position between orthodoxy and Arianism, though often called Arians by the orthodox. The attempt of the two emperors to reconcile the disputants by means of a general council at Sardica (343) had failed, the Easterns having seceded from it, and held one of their own simultaneously at Philippopolis. But one result had been a division in the ranks of the heterodox. For after this the party called that of the Semi-arians, who desired to minimise as far as they could their divergence from orthodoxy, appeared in marked distinction from that of the genuine Eusebians. Their symbol was the *ὁμοούσιον*, by which they acknowledged the Son to be of like substance with the Father, though not of the same substance. Hence they were called *Homoeustians*, as well as *Semi-Arians*. Their most noted leaders were Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and Mark of Arethusa; all men of piety, and commended as such even by Athanasius and Hilary. Cyril of Jerusalem and Eusebius of Samosata, both saints in the Roman calendar, were also connected with the Semi-Arian party. Eventually there appeared another party, founded by Acacius of Caesarea, and known as that of the *Homoeans*, who rejected altogether the use of the word substance, and contended for the simple assertion that the Son was like (*ὅμοιος*) to the Father, with or without the addition of the words 'in all things.' But this variety, which in the end was adopted by the old Eusebian party, came into notice after the accession of Liberius, though during his reign. There remained also the party of decided Arians, called now Anomoeans in distinction from those who held intermediate views, or designated after the names of their leaders, Aetius, Eunomius, and Acacius. For the last of these, named above as the founder of the Homoean party, afterwards declared himself an Anomoean, though eventually, under Jovian, he signed the symbol of Nicea.

It remains to be noticed that Athanasius, the original champion of orthodoxy, the exculpation or condemnation of whom was proposed to synods and bishops as a test of faith as much as creeds and confessions, having been twice deposed and banished, and having during his second banishment resided three years in Rome supported by pope Julius, had been a second time recalled. Constantius, at the instance of his orthodox brother, had been induced for a time to take up his cause, and the result had been his triumphant return to Alexandria, A.D. 346, where he was in possession of his see when Liberius became bishop of Rome. But now it was that the assassination of Constans (A.D. 350) in consequence of the rebellion of Magnentius, and the subsequent defeat of that conspirator in 351, had left Constantius sole emperor, without any rival to fear or conciliate. The first symptom of the turn of the tide was before the death of Magnentius, when Valens, the Eusebian bishop of Mursa in Pannonia, and Ursacius his former colleague in resolute opposition to orthodoxy, having both, on the return of Athanasius to his see, denounced Arianism and declared themselves on his side, now recanted their recantation, and persuaded the emperor that it had been made only through fear of Constans. Soon

\* For xi. Kal. Jun. (*Lib. Cat.*) Pagi suggests xi. Kal. Jul. (i.e. June 21), on the ground that the latter day would be a Sunday, on which day of the week it was usual to ordain the popes.

after this new charges against Athanasius were sent to the emperor and Julius the pope, the latter of whom died before they reached him, so that the hearing of them was reserved for his successor. These charges were to the effect that Athanasius had influenced Constans against Constantius, had corresponded with Magnentius, had used an unconsecrated church in Alexandria, and had disregarded an imperial summons calling him to Rome (*Athanas. Apol. ad Constantium*). They were considered, together with an encyclic of seventy-five Egyptian bishops in behalf of Athanasius, by a council under Liberius at Rome. It is on this occasion that the first charge of compliance with heresy is alleged against Liberius. Among the fragments of Hilary (*Hil. Fragm. IV.*) there is a letter purporting to have been addressed by him to his "beloved brethren and fellow bishops throughout the East" at this time, in which he declares that he agrees and communicates with them, and that Athanasius, having been summoned to Rome, and having refused to come, is out of communion with himself and the Roman church. Bower (*History of the Popes*), Tillemont (*Vie de S. Athan. t. viii.*; art. 64, note 68), and Milman (*Lat. Christianity*, B. i. c. 2), accept this letter as genuine. Baronius, the Benedictine editors of the works of Hilary, Hefele (*Concilien-geschicht. B. v. sect. 73.*),—the last very positively,—reject it as an Arian forgery; the principal, if not only, ground for its rejection being the improbability of his having written it. It does certainly seem unlikely that he should have done so at that particular time. For (1) in all extant accounts of his career, his rejection of Athanasius afterwards when he was in exile at Berœa (which will be mentioned below) is spoken of as the first instance of unfaithfulness. For instance, Athanasius himself (*Hist. ad Monach. c. 35*) describes him as having been his firm supporter till, on the occasion above referred to, he yielded to threats. (2) The same authority (*l. c. c. 36*) represents him as having said to the eunuch Eusebius (when sent, as will be seen hereafter, to Rome by the emperor to confer with him) that he could not desert Athanasius who had been left in peace by the Roman church, and whom he himself had loved and received into communion in the time of Julius, no allusion being made to any interruption of such love and communion. (3) Almost immediately after the time assigned to the letter in question, there is no doubt that his whole action was singularly resolute on the side of Athanasius, even when strong imperial pressure was put upon him, of which there is no evidence at the commencement of his reign. (4) Other letters of his, written later than this supposed one, seem inconsistent with the supposition of its genuineness. In one to the emperor (*Hilar. Fragm. V.*) he refers to the Roman synod, at the time of holding which the letter in question is supposed to have been written, and gives no intimation of his having wavered in his support of Athanasius. He only rebuts the charge of having suppressed the letters of accusation against him which the Easterns had sent, declaring that he had honestly laid them all before the council, as well as the letters in his defence from the Egyptian bishops, and adds

that he had found it impossible to withhold his assent to the verdict, which had been given by the great majority of the council, in favour of Athanasius. Again, in the later letter given in the Fragments of Hilary (*Fragm. VI.*), as addressed by him to the Eastern bishops, at the time when he did undoubtedly seek communion with them, and when it would have served his purpose to allude to the former one if he had really written it, he makes no mention of it, but on the contrary excuses his early support of Athanasius on the ground that his predecessor Julius had set him the example. (5) The supposition of a spurious letter having been attributed to him is not in itself improbable, since Athanasius accuses the Arians of that time of circulating several false letters (*Apol. ad Const. Imp. 6, 11, 19*), and one such is said to have been read at the synod of Sardica (cf. *Hilar. Fragm. II.*). Still the insertion of this letter among the fragments attributed to Hilary is in itself strong external evidence in favour of its genuineness; and it may be argued on the other side of the question that the undoubted weakness of Liberius at a later period greatly reduces the improbability of temporary vacillation at the beginning of his career; that there may have been some peculiar pressure, of which we know nothing, brought to bear on him at the time, under the influence of which, or of annoyance at the refusal of Athanasius to come to Rome at his summons, he did write the letter in question, though further knowledge of facts, or the strong feeling of the Roman synod, soon led him to change his attitude. And it may be observed that, in his letter to the emperor above referred to, he speaks as if he had not fully made up his mind when the synod began, and in some sort apologises for having been unable to refuse assent to the verdict of the majority.

The death of Magnentius in the autumn of 353 having left Constantius entirely free to follow his own heretical bent, or the counsels of his advisers, whose influence was always great with him, Liberius certainly stood forth as a fearless champion of the cause under imperial disfavour. His first step was to send Vincentius of Capua, with Marcellus, another bishop of Campania, to the emperor, requesting him to call a council at Aquileia for the settlement of the points at issue. Constantius, being himself at Arles, summoned one there, which was attended in behalf of Liberius by his legates above named. The main object of the leaders of the council, in which Valens and Ursacius took a prominent part, was to extort from the legates a renunciation of communion with Athanasius. After a fruitless attempt to obtain from the dominant party a simultaneous condemnation of Arius, the legates at length complied. Paulinus of Treves is memorable on the contrary for his refusal, and consequent banishment (*Sulpic. Sever. l. 2*; *Hilar. Libell. ad Constantium*; id. in *Fragm.*; *opp. Liber. ad Constantium et Eusebium*). Liberius, on hearing the result, expressed himself in a letter to Hosius of Cordova much distressed by the weakness of his messenger Vincentius. "I had hoped," he said, "much from Vincentius, as one who had often sat as judge with your holiness in the same cause; yet he has not only gained nothing, but has also himself been led into that dissimulation: after which deed of his, consumed by

a double sorrow, I have determined that it were better for me to die in the cause of God, lest I should seem to be his last accuser" (Hilar. *Fragm. VI.*). He wrote also on the same subject to Caecilianus, bishop of Spoletum (*ib.*).

Subsequently (A.D. 354) most of the Western bishops having meanwhile, under fear or pressure, expressed agreement with the East, Lucifer bishop of Cagliari, in Sardinia, who was at that time in Rome, was, at his own suggestion, sent by Liberius to the emperor, with a priest, Pancratius, and a deacon, Hilary, to demand another council. The mission was accompanied by an earnest letter to the emperor (Hilar. *Fragm. V.*), and another to Eusebius, the orthodox bishop of Vercellae, to whom he had also written previously, requesting his support (*ap. Act. Euseb.*). The result was the summoning of a council at Milan in the beginning of the year 355, which, though attended by 300 Western bishops and but few Eastern, again yielded to the pressure of imperial power. Eusebius of Vercellae at first refused to attend it, probably anticipating the almost inevitable result; but was induced to do so by pressing letters from the council itself, from the pope's legates, and from the emperor. It was opened in the cathedral, where the emperor, as being still only an unbaptized catechumen, was not present. The Catholic bishops demanded that the Nicene creed should in the first place be accepted by the council: but the dominant party resisted the proposal, insisting that the emperor's letter with regard to Athanasius should be at once read. The populace, present in the church, having hereupon raised a clamour, the meeting was adjourned to the palace, where lictors were in attendance, and where the emperor himself took part in the proceedings, rising and saying, "I myself am the accuser of Athanasius." The result was that, in spite of the bold remonstrances of Eusebius, Lucifer, Dionysius of Milan, and others, the condemnation of Athanasius was decreed, and required to be signed by all under pain of banishment. The pope's three legates (though Pancratius and Hilary are said to have been beaten to enforce compliance), Eusebius of Vercellae, Maximus of Naples, and, after a temporary concession, Dionysius of Milan, were among the few who stood firm, and were condemned to exile. (See Sulpic. Sever. l. 2; Athanas. *Hist. Arian. ad Monachos.*) Notwithstanding this forced acquiescence of the greater part of the Western bishops, and persecution brought to bear against recusants, Liberius at Rome still stood firm. He addressed a letter to Eusebius of Vercellae (*ap. Act. Euseb.*) congratulating him on his firmness, and an encyclical one (*ib. et Hilar. Fragm. VI.*) to all the exiled confessors, sympathising with and encouraging them, and expressing his expectation of soon having to suffer like them. The emperor endeavoured in vain to win him over by threats or bribes. The eunuch Eusebius, who was the emperor's chamberlain, was sent to Rome with gifts. Liberius refused them. They were offered at St. Peter's church. Liberius rebuked the keeper of the church for not casting out the unholy offerings. Eusebius returned to Constantius, having effected nothing. At length violent measures were resorted to. The gates and harbours of Rome were guarded against Catholics desirous of visiting the refractory bishop; and finally Leontius, the

prefect of the city, was ordered to apprehend him and convey him to the court. He was accordingly seized by night, and taken to Milan. (See Athan. *Hist. Arian. ad Mon. c. 35 et seq.*) Theodoret (l. ii. c. 13) gives a detailed account of his interview with the emperor there. The eunuch Eusebius, and Epictetus bishop of Centumellae, were present, and took part in the proceedings. "I have sent for you," said Constantius, "the bishop of my city, that you may repudiate the madness of Athanasius, whom the whole world has condemned." Liberius continued to insist that the condemnation had not been that of a fair and free council, or in the presence of the accused, and added that those who had condemned him had been actuated by fear, or regard to the emperor's gifts and favour. Eusebius distinguished himself by asserting that the Nicene council had declared Athanasius alien to the Catholic faith. Epictetus said, "Not for the faith's sake, emperor, does Liberius talk, but that he may be able to boast to the Roman senators of having beaten the emperor in argument." "Do you, Liberius," asked Constantius, "comprise in yourself so great a part of the world that you dare alone to support that impious man, and disturb the whole world's peace?" "Be it that I stand alone," was the reply: "three only were found of old to resist the commands of a king." "Do you make our emperor a second Nebuchadnezzar?" asked Eusebius. "By no means," replied Liberius; "but you condemn a man without a trial no less rashly than did he of old." He then offered his proposals, which were in advance of what he had demanded previously; viz. that all bishops should be required to subscribe the Nicene creed, that those exiled for the faith should be recalled, and that all should then resort to Alexandria, and there hold a free council for the trial of Athanasius. Epictetus objected that beasts of burden and carriages would be lacking for the conveyance of so great a multitude. Liberius replied that each church would provide for the journey of its own bishop; and went on to intimate that the emperor's strange inveteracy against Athanasius seemed as if due to private hatred. "He has indeed injured many," said Constantius, "but me more than any. For, after the death of my brother Constantine, he continually incited Constans against me. Wherefore, after my glorious victory over Magnentius, I made less account even of it than of the deposition of that man from ecclesiastical administration." Liberius having warned the emperor against making use of bishops, whose time ought to be devoted to spiritual matters, for the avenging of his own enmities, the latter finally cut short the discussion by saying, "There is only one thing to be done. I will that you embrace the communion of the churches, and so return to Rome. Consult peace, then, and subscribe, that you may be restored to your see." "I have already," Liberius replied, "bid farewell to the brethren at Rome; for I account observance of the ecclesiastical law of more importance than residence at Rome." "I give you three days," the emperor said, "to make up your mind: unless within that time you comply, you must be prepared to go where I may send you." Liberius answered, "Three days, or three months, will make no difference with me: wherefore send

me where you please." Two days having been allowed him for consideration, he was banished to Beroea in Thrace (A.D. 355). The emperor sent him, on his departure, five hundred pieces of gold, which he refused, saying to him who brought them, "Go and tell him who sent me this gold to give it to his flatterers and players, who are always in want because of their insatiable cupidity, ever desiring riches and never satisfied. As for us, Christ, who is in all things like unto the Father, supports us, and gives us all things needful." To the empress, who sent him the like sum, he sent word that she might give it to the emperor, who would want it for his military expeditions; and that, if he needed it not, he might give it to Maxentius (the Arian bishop of Milan), and Epictetus, who would be glad of it." Eusebius the eunuch also offered him money, to whom he said, "Thou hast pillaged the churches of the whole world, and dost thou now bring alms to me as a condemned pauper? Depart first, and become thyself a Christian." The banishment of Liberius was followed by a general triumph of the Arian party. In Alexandria Athanasius was superseded by George of Cappadocia, and, after cruel persecutions (according to the account he gives) of the orthodox there, was compelled eventually to take refuge among the hermits and Coenobites of Egypt. In Gaul, in spite of the fearless protest of Hilary of Poitiers, the orthodox were persecuted and banished, and there also heresy triumphed. With regard to what occurred at Rome after the banishment of Liberius, and after his return, we find traces of two conflicting stories. The account given below is gathered from the essentially unanimous testimony of contemporary and other ancient writers of repute, some of whom have been our authorities so far;—viz. Athanasius (*Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* 75), Jerome (*Chron. in ann. Abram. mcccix.*), Rufinus (*H. E.* x. 22), Socrates (*H. E.* ii. 37), Sozomen (*H. E.* iv. 8, 11), Theodoret (*H. E.* ii. 14), together with Marcellinus and Faustus, two contemporary Luciferian presbyters of Rome, in the preface to their "libellus precum," addressed to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, during the pontificate of Damasus, the successor of Liberius. The stories which conflict with these authorities are those contained in the Pontifical and in the Acts of Martyrs, of which mention will be made below. From the writers above enumerated we learn that immediately

<sup>b</sup> This speech is given, not by Theodoret, but by Sozomen (*H. E.* iv. 11), who gives a shorter summary of what took place, in the main agreeing with Theodoret's detailed account. The expression "like unto the Father," attributed on this occasion to Liberius, if correctly reported, would seem to imply that, however firm in his refusal to condemn Athanasius unheard, he was himself at this time somewhat vague or unsettled in respect to doctrinal expressions. His readiness to agree with the Easterns on a later, and possibly (as aforesaid) on a former occasion, renders this not improbable.

Though Athanasius and Socrates are silent about the disputation with the emperor at Milan, there seems to be no reason for discrediting Theodoret's account of it. He introduces it thus:—"Mihî vero Liberii summa laude digni liberam pro veritate disputationem, et admirabilem sermonem quem habuit cum Constantio intertexere hic placet. Hæc enim pii ejus ætatis viri litteris providerunt quod ad acendos excitandosque rerum divinarum studiosos vim habeant."

after the exile of Liberius all the clergy, including the deacon Felix (archdeacon according to Marcellinus and Faustus) swore before the assembled people to accept no other bishop during the life of Liberius. The populace, who appear throughout to have been strongly on his side, debarred the Arians from the churches, so that the election of a successor, on which the emperor was determined, had to be made in the imperial palace. The deacon Felix, above named, was there chosen and consecrated, three of the emperor's eunuchs representing the people on the occasion, and three heretical bishops, Epictetus of Centumellæ, Acacius of Caesarea, and Basilus of Ancyra, being the consecrators. It seems probable from a combination of the accounts that there was a considerable party among the clergy at least who concurred in this consecration. Marcellinus and Faustus say that the clergy ordained him, while the people refused to take part; and Jerome states that after the intrusion of Felix by the Arians very many of the clerical order perjured themselves by supporting him. Felix appears to have been himself orthodox, no distinct charge of heresy being alleged against him by his accusers; only that of connivance with his own unlawful election by Arians in defiance of his oath, and that of communicating with them. [FELIX (2).] Two years after the exile of Liberius (A.D. 357) Constantius went to Rome. Theodoret gives the following account of what took place on this occasion. The wives of the magistrates and nobles requested their husbands to plead with the emperor for the return of Liberius, threatening, if they refused, to desert them, and fly to their banished pastor. The husbands declined this dangerous mission, but suggested that the ladies might themselves undertake it with better chance of success, or of impunity in case of failure. The ladies accordingly, splendidly arrayed after their manner, waited on the emperor, deeming that the splendour of their attire, betokening their illustrious rank, would inspire in him reverence towards themselves, and clemency. They then besought him to have pity on the city bereaved of its shepherd, and exposed to the snares of wolves. On the emperor replying that they had no need of a second shepherd, having one already to look after them, they averred that none of the inhabitants of Rome would enter a church where Felix was. Constantius was so far moved by their representations as to consent to the return of Liberius on condition of his presiding over the church jointly with Felix. When the emperor's order to this effect was read publicly in the circus, the people jocularly exclaimed that the decree was just; for that, inasmuch as the spectators of the games were divided into two parties, distinguished by the colours they wore, it was right that each party should have its bishop; after which pleasantry burst forth the unanimous cry, "One God, one Christ, one bishop!" There appears to have been some delay before the actual return of Liberius. He was required meanwhile to satisfy the emperor by renouncing orthodoxy and Athanasius. This he was by this time but too ready to do. His conduct now is in strange contrast to his former firmness. It appears that bishop Fortunatian of Aquileia had been employed by the Eusebians to persuade him (Jerome, *Catalog. Scriptor.* 97), and that Demophilus of Beroea had personally

moved him to compliance (*Ep. Liber. ad Orient. Episc. ap. Hilar. Fragm. VI.*). Hilary (*Fragm. VI.*) gives letters written by him from Beroea at this time. One is to the Eastern bishops and presbyters, from which extracts are given below, together with the parenthetical comments of Hilary. "I do not defend Athanasius: but because my predecessor Julius had received him, I was afraid of being accounted a prevaricator. Having learnt, however, that you had justly condemned him, I soon gave assent to your judgment, and sent a letter to that effect by bishop Fortunatian of Aquileia, to the emperor. Wherefore Athanasius being removed from the communion of us all (I will not even receive his letters), I say that I have peace and communion with you and with all the Eastern bishops. That you may be assured of my good faith in thus writing, know that my lord and brother Demophilus has deigned in his benevolence to expound to me the true Catholic faith which was treated, expounded, and received at Sirmium by many brethren and fellow bishops of ours. (*This is the Arian perfidy:—This I have noted, not the apostate:—the following are the words of Liberius.*) This I have received with a willing mind (*I say anathema to thee, Liberius, and thy companions.*) and in no respect contradict; I have given my assent, I follow and hold it. (*Once more, and a third time, anathema to thee, prevaricator Liberius!*) Seeing that you now perceive me to be in agreement with you in all things, I have thought it right to beseech your nobilities to deign by your common counsel and efforts to labour for my release from exile and my restoration to the see divinely entrusted to me." Another letter is to Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, begging their good offices, and excusing his apparent delay in writing, as above, to the Oriental bishops. Before sending that letter he had already, he says, condemned Athanasius, as the whole presbytery of Rome could testify, to whom he seems to have previously sent letters intended for the emperor's eye. He concludes, "You should know, most dear brethren, by this letter, written with a plain and simple mind, that I have peace with all of you, bishops of the Catholic church. And I desire you to make known to our brethren and fellow-bishops Epictetus and Auxentius that with them I have peace and ecclesiastical communion. Whoever may dissent from this our peace and concord, let him know that he is separated from our communion." In giving this letter, Hilary again expresses his indignation in a note: "Anathema, I say to thee, prevaricator, together with the Arians!" A third letter is to Vincentius of Capua, the same bishop whose defection at Milan he had once so much deplored. In it he announces that he had given up his contention for Athanasius, and had written to say so to the Oriental bishops; and he requests Vincentius to assemble the bishops of Campania and get them to join in an address to the emperor, "that I may be delivered from my great sadness." He concludes, "God keep thee safe, brother. We have peace with all the Eastern bishops, and I with you. I have absolved myself to God; see you to it: if you have the will to fail me in my banishment, God will be judge between me and you."

There is no sufficient ground for doubting the genuineness of the fragment of Hilary which

contains these letters, or of the letters themselves. It is true that it is resolutely denied by Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, B. v. sect. 81), as it had been especially by the Jesuit Stilling in the work of the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Sept. t. vi. on Liberius). But the arguments adduced are weak, resting chiefly on alleged historical difficulties, and on the style of the letters. All the great Protestant critics accept them; and among the Roman Catholics Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Fleury, Dupin, Ceillier, Monttaucon, Constant, and Möhler. Dr. Döllinger does the same. Dr. Newman also (*Arians of the Fourth Century*) quotes them without any note of suspicion. Baronius accepts the letters to the Eastern bishops and to Vincentius, but rejects that to Valens and Ursacius, though only on the ground of the statement contained or rather implied in it that Athanasius had been excommunicated by the Roman church. A refutation of Hefele's arguments is contained in P. le Page Renouf's treatise on the *Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (Longmans, 1868), from which an extract, bearing on the subject, is given in *Appendix* to the English translation of Hefele's work (Clark, Edinb. 1876).

Even if the fragment of Hilary could be shewn to be spurious, the general fact of the fall of Liberius would remain indisputable, being attested by Athanasius (*Hist. Arian.* 41; *Apol. contr. Arian.* 89), by Hilary (*contra Const. Imp.* 11), by Sozomen (iv. 15), and by Jerome (*Chron. et De Vir. Illustr.* 97). It was never indeed questioned by any till comparatively recent times, when a few papal partisans—especially Stilling above referred to (*in loc.*), Franz Anton Zaccaria (*Dissert. de Commentitio Liberii lapsu*), Professor Palma (*Praelect. Histor. Eccles.* t. i. P. ii. Romae, 1838)—have been bold enough to take up his defence, relying in the first place on the silence of Theodoret, Socrates, and Sulpicius Severus on the subject of his fall. Others, as Hefele, content themselves with endeavouring to extenuate its extent and culpability.

In the first of the letters above quoted it will be observed that Liberius speaks of having already accepted the exposition of the faith agreed upon "by many brethren and fellow bishops" at Sirmium. There is some uncertainty as to the particular confession here referred to. There had been so far two noted synods of Sirmium, both of which had issued expositions of doctrine. The first had been in 351, assembled by the Eusebians, their main purpose having been to justify themselves from false charges against them of heresies that they did not hold. The confession of faith adopted by them asserted against Photinus and Marcellus of Ancyra the pre-existent divinity of the Son before His human birth, and, but for its omission of the term *Consubstantial*, was not heretical. Hilary of Poitiers (*De Syn.* 38 sqq.) allows it to be orthodox. Baronius, and the Benedictine editors of the works of Hilary (with whom agrees Dr. Döllinger in his *Papst-fabeln des Mittelalters*) maintain that this was the creed accepted by Liberius at Beroea. But the indignant remarks of Hilary, above cited, with reference to the confession accepted by Liberius on this occasion, are against the supposition of its having been one that he himself has elsewhere allowed to be

unobjectionable. The second Sirmian synod was held in 357, assembled by Constantius at the instance of the Anomaeans, who at this time persuaded him that the best way of reconciling disputants was to forbid, in any connexion, the use of the word Substance. Accordingly the second Sirmian formula, on that occasion issued, prohibited alike the definitions, *homousius* and *homoeousius*, as being both beyond the language of Scripture, and declared the Father to be in honour, dignity, and majesty, greater than the Son, and, by implication, that the Father alone may be defined as without beginning, invisible, immortal, impassible. The doctrine expressed was essentially that of the Homoeans, though the phrase "like unto the Father," from which they got their name, was not yet adopted.

This may have been the creed accepted by Liberius at Beroea. His credit is not much saved by supposing it to have been the former one, since his letters are sufficient evidence of his pliability. Whichever it was, his acceptance of it at Beroea was not enough to satisfy the emperor, who, having gone from Rome to Sirmium, summoned him thither, where he was required to sign a new formula, apparently prepared for the occasion. This was, according to Sozomen, concocted from three sources: first, the creed of the old Antiochene council of 269, in which the term *consubstantial*, alleged to be used heretically so as to compromise the Son's Personality by Paul of Samosata, was condemned; secondly, one of the creeds issued by the Eusebian council at Antioch in 341, which fell short of orthodoxy by the omission of the term *consubstantial*; and thirdly, the first Sirmian creed, above described. Sozomen adds that he signed also a condemnation of those who denied the Son to be *like* the Father according to Substance and in all respects. It is to be observed that when Liberius is said by some writers to have been summoned from Beroea to the *third* synod of Sirmium, and to have signed the *third* Sirmian confession, those are not to be understood which are sometimes so called, viz. those of May, A.D. 359, when a distinctly Homoean formula, prepared by bishop Mark of Arethusa, was subscribed. If the compilation from former creeds assented to by Liberius at Sirmium be called the *third* Sirmian formula, that of 359, which was subsequent to his return to Rome, ought to be spoken of as the *fourth*.<sup>c</sup>

Liberius was now allowed to return to Rome, the bishops of Sirmium having written to the Roman clergy bidding them receive him back to reign jointly with Felix.<sup>d</sup> But the Roman populace, with whom Liberius was popular, would not allow this compromise. Either at once after his return (as Marcellinus and Faustus intimate) or not long afterwards (as other accounts imply) Felix was compelled to retire from the city after tumults and bloodshed. Having attempted afterwards to get possession

of a church beyond the Tiber, he was again expelled.

The accounts of the election of Felix and of the subsequent occurrences at Rome which differ from those above given are contained in the lives of Liberius and Felix in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and in the Acts of St. Felix and St. Eusebius. They shew evident signs of compilation in a later age, and in some respects contradict each other. They may be supposed to owe their origin to the party of Felix, which became dominant on the election of Damasus to the papacy, being desirous of clearing his reputation at the expense of that of his rival. For a review of them see Art. on FELIX II. It may be remarked, however, that these stories, however untrustworthy, probably contain elements of truth, suggesting especially the probability that, among the clergy at least, the party of Felix was more numerous than might otherwise have been supposed, and his rivalry more formidable. We may gather from them that, after the compliance of Liberius with heresy, the presbyter Eusebius (honoured afterwards as a saint and martyr) was successful, on the ground of this compliance, in inducing a large party of the orthodox to renounce his communion.

Two ways have been resorted to of excusing, in some degree, the compliance of Liberius. One, taken by Baronius and Hefele, is that the formulae he subscribed were capable of being understood in an orthodox sense, and so subscribed by him, though otherwise intended by the emperor: that, in fact, "Liberius renounced the formula *δμοούσιος*, not because he had fallen from orthodoxy, but because he had been made to believe that formula to be the cloak of Sabellianism and Photinism" (*Hefele*). Baronius, however, condemns him so far as to say that his envy of the fortune of Felix, and his longing for the adulation to which he had been used at Rome, were the Delilah that deprived this Samson of his courage and strength. The other way of saving a pope from the imputation of error on matters of faith is with Bellarmine to acknowledge his external but deny his internal assent to heresy: a view which saves his infallibility at the expense of his morality. The fact remains that in his letters from Beroea he proclaimed to the world his renunciation of Athanasius and his entire agreement and communion with the Easterns, and that at Sirmium he signed a confession drawn up by Semi-Arians, which was intended to express rejection of the orthodoxy for which he had once contended.

It has been observed above that Athanasius, Sozomen, Hilary, and Jerome, all allude to his temporary compliance with heresy in some form as a known and undoubted fact. Athanasius, however, unlike Hilary, speaks of it in a spirit of noble tolerance. He says, "But they (*i.e.* certain great bishops) not only supported me with arguments, but also endured exile; among them being Liberius of Rome. For, if he did not endure the affliction of his exile to the end, nevertheless he remained in banishment for two years, knowing the conspiracy against me" (*Apol. contra Arian.* 89). Again, "Moreover Liberius, having been banished, after two years gave way, and under fear of threatened death subscribed. But even this proves only their (*i.e.* the Arians) violence, and his hatred of

<sup>c</sup> It has been suggested by Mr. Ffoulkes that the creed accepted by Liberius was in fact what is commonly called the third Sirmian, which he conceives to have been drawn up at Sirmium in 358, and to have had the date of May 27, A.D. 359, appended to it afterwards, when it was recited and approved at Rimini.

<sup>d</sup> His return may be assigned with probability to the year 358.

heresy; for he supported me as long as he had free choice." (*Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* 41.)

When once in possession of his see, and surrounded by his orthodox supporters, he appears to have resumed his old position of resolute orthodoxy. In the year 359 were held the two councils at Ariminum in the West and Seleucia in the East, the result of which was the almost universal acceptance for a time of the Homoean formula, which at this time Constantius was persuaded to force upon the church in the hope of reconciling disputants. This was the result that called forth the famous expression of Jerome (*Dial. adv. Lucifer.* 19), "The whole world groaned, and wondered to find itself Arian." Liberius was not present at Ariminum, nor is there any reason for supposing that he assented to the now dominant confession. It is true that Jerome, in the expression above cited, speaks of the whole world, without excepting the bishop of Rome, as having become at that time Arian. But his language is rhetorical, and on the other hand, Theodoret (*H. E.* ii. 22) gives a letter from a synod of Italian and Gallican bishops held at Rome under pope Damasus, in which it is stated that the Ariminian formula had the assent neither of the bishop of Rome, whose judgment was beyond all others to be expected, nor of Vincentius, nor of others besides. And Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xxi. 24, Benedictine edition) says that all at the time referred to temporised, "except a very few, and these such as were passed over on account of their insignificance, or such as stood out on account of their virtue, who must needs be left as a seed and root to Israel, that it might again shoot forth and revive by the influences of the Spirit." In the Acts of Liberius, quoted by Baronius, it is said that he escaped compulsion by hiding himself in the catacombs; a circumstance not in itself improbable, though the authority for it is of no great weight. But even without such concealment it is conceivable that Constantius might shrink from using force a second time against a popular Roman bishop at the risk of provoking renewed insurrection of the populace: or he may have been satisfied with his previous compliance on the occasion of his return to Rome.

The death of Constantius (A.D. 361), and the accession of Julian the Apostate, having left the orthodox free from direct persecution, Athanasius returned once more in triumph to Alexandria (A.D. 362). In connexion with the council held in the same year at Alexandria, famous not only for its reassertion of orthodoxy, but especially for the liberal terms offered to those who had accepted heresy, and with the measures taken for restoring peace to the church elsewhere, Liberius seems to have taken no prominent part. There is indeed a letter of his written at this time to the bishops of Italy (*Hilar. Fragm. XII.*), in which he recommends the condemnation of the authors of the compliance at Ariminum, but the sparing, on condition of recantation, of such as had been seduced or compelled into error; thus expressing sentiments in accordance with those that prevailed at the Alexandrian council. There are also two others, purporting to have been written by him to Athanasius and the other bishops assembled at Alexandria, in which he defines the faith and

gives them directions; and a third from them to him, in which they seek his support, and acknowledge his authority. But these have no claim to authenticity, and are generally rejected as spurious. The glory of restoring orthodoxy and peace to the church at this crisis is mainly due, not to the bishop of Rome, but to Athanasius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Vercellae, and Hilary of Poitiers. A theory of Baronius (*ad ann.* 362) that to the letter to Athanasius (which he considers genuine) was originally joined a now lost portion empowering him to convene the council at Alexandria, and appointing Eusebius of Vercellae and Lucifer of Cagliari as papal legates, rests on no ground but the assumption that the bishop of Rome must have taken the lead. In disproof of any such leadership may be adduced a letter from the Italian bishops to the Illyrians, congratulating them on having returned to the true faith (*Hilary, Fragm. XII.*), in which there is no special mention of the bishop of Rome.

Liberius comes next under our notice in the last year of his episcopate, and during the reign of Valentinian and Valens, who, after the death of Julian in 363, and the short reign of his orthodox and tolerant successor Jovian, became, at the beginning of the year 364, emperors of the West and East respectively; of whom Valentinian was a Catholic, Valens an extreme and persecuting Arian. His persecutions extending to the semi-Arians, as well as to the orthodox, caused the former to incline more and more to union with the latter, and to the position that the difference between them was one rather of words than of doctrine. The former (who came about this time to be called Macedonians, from Macedonius, their principal leader, who had been deposed, at the instance of the Anomoeans, from the see of Constantinople, to make room for Eudoxius) now turned to the Western emperor and the Roman bishop for support in their distress, thinking it better to accept their faith than to communicate with Eudoxius. They accordingly sent three bishops, Eustathius of Sebaste, Sylvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala, as a deputation to Valentinian and Liberius, with instructions to communicate with the church of Rome, and to accept the term "consubstantial." Valentinian being absent on a campaign in Gaul, Liberius alone received them (A.D. 366). At first he rejected their overtures on the ground of their implication in heresy. They replied that they had now repented, and had already acknowledged the Son to be in all things like unto the Father, and that this expression meant the same as "consubstantial." He required a written confession of their faith. They gave him one, in which they refer to the letters brought by them from the Eastern bishops to him and the other Western bishops; anathematise Arius, the Sabellians, Patripassians, Marcionists, Photinians, Marcellianists, and the followers of Paul of Samosata; condemn the creed of Ariminum as entirely repugnant to the Nicene faith; and append the Nicene creed, to which they declare their entire assent. They conclude by saying that if any one had any charge to allege against them, they were willing that it should be heard before such orthodox bishops as Liberius might approve. Liberius now admitted them to communion, and dismissed



them with letters in his own name and that of the other Western bishops to the bishops of the East who had sent the embassy. Having first gone to Sicily, where a synod of bishops accepted the Nicene faith and the letters of Liberius, they thence returned to the East, where an attempt was made to assemble a council at Tarsus for the reception of Nicene orthodoxy, which was however frustrated by the opposition of Eudoxius (Socrat. *H. E.* iv. 11, 12; Sozom. vi. 11).

Liberius died in the autumn of the same year, A.D. 366 (Marcell. and Faust.), having thus had a notable opportunity of atoning by his latest official act for his previous vacillation.

The extant writings of Liberius are the letters which have been referred to above. In addition to the spurious correspondence between him and the Alexandrians that has been spoken of, there is a letter purporting to have been addressed by him to all bishops, which is also undoubtedly spurious. There is also a discourse of his given by St. Ambrose (*De Virginitas*, lib. iii. c. 1) as having been delivered when Marcellina (the sister of Ambrose, to whom he addresses his treatise) made her profession of virginity. The discourse is interesting as containing at its commencement the earliest known allusion to the keeping of the Christmas festival, while the way in which Ambrose introduces it shews the estimation in which Liberius was held, notwithstanding his temporary fall.

The name of Liberius is omitted from the *Martyrologium Romanum*, as revised by Baronius, but appears in the older one attributed to St. Jerome:—"Sept. 23. Romae depositio sancti Liberi episcopi;" also, "May 17. Liberi episcopi." He is commemorated also on the 27th of August in the Greek *Menology*. [J. B.—y.]

**LIBERIUS (5)**, fifth bishop of Dax, present at the fifth council of Orleans in 549. (Mansi, ix. 137; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 31; *Gall. Christ.* i. 1039.) [S. A. B.]

**LIBERIUS (6)**, bishop of Cumae; his death and the destitute condition of his church are mentioned by Gregory the Great in 592 in a letter to Benenatus bishop of Misenum. (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* ii. indict. x. *Epp.* 25, 45; Migne, lxxvii. 561, 582.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LIBERTINUS (1)** (LIBERTUS), provost of the monastery of Fundi, in the time of Totila king of the Goths. (Greg. Magn. *Diad.* lib. i. 2 in Migne, lxxvii. 157; Ceillier, xi. 473.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LIBERTINUS (2)**, ex-prefect of Sicily, also called ex-pretor (cf. Carl Hegel, *Stätteverfassung von Italien*, i. 177). Gregory the Great from 593 to 600 wrote several letters to him (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* lib. iii. indict. xi. 38; lib. ix. indict. ii. 21; lib. x. indict. iii. 31; Migne, lxxvii. 635, 962, 1088). Libertinus appears to have offended Leontius the ex-consul, and Gregory wrote to Leontius to remonstrate with him (*Epist.* lib. vii. indict. xv. 22; lib. x. indict. iii. 51; Migne, lxxvii. 876, 1106). [A. H. D. A.]

**LIBERTINUS (3)**, a bishop in Sardinia, to whom Gregory wrote in 598, and in 602. (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* lib. ix. indict. ii. 8; lib. xiii. indict.

vi. 4 in Migne, lxxvii. 947, 1257; Matthaeus *Sard. Sacr.* 116, 132.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LIBORIUS** (LEPORIUS, LEPORINUS, LIBERIUS), ST., fourth bishop of Le Mans, said to have been buried by St. Martin of Tours in 397 after a rule of forty-nine years. He was commemorated on July 23. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. v. 407; *Gall. Ch.* xiv. 341; and numerous works in Potthast, *Bibl. Hist.* 784.) [R. T. S.]

**LIBOSUS**, African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. iv. A.D. 254, *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 67 (omitted by *Morcelli* as) bishop of Vaga (or Vacca) in Prov. Byz. *Sentt. Epp.* 30, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bapt.* 3. His memoria was known, "Conf. et Mart. in novis areis positus Libosus." Cod. veron. l. c. (another more famous Vaga in Numidia.) [E. W. B.]

**LIBRANUS ARUNDINETUS** has the story of his life related by St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Columbae*, ii. 39) with special fulness and with a vivid representation of the manners of the time. He is probably the Libhran called abbat of Ia in the kalendars at March 11. (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 156-163; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 360, c. 39, 384 n.<sup>3</sup>, 491 n.<sup>7</sup>; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 378.) [J. G.]

**LICENTIUS (1)**, a native of Tagaste, perhaps a relation of St. Augustine (Poem. l. 137), and son of the Romanianus to whom Augustine dedicated his *Libri c. Academicos* and *De Vera Religione*. He was himself a pupil of St. Augustine, first at Carthage and then in Italy, where he accompanied him when he retired to the Ager Casiacus to prepare for baptism, A.D. 386. He appears as one of the interlocutors in the *Libri c. Academicos*, *De Ordine*, and *De Beata Vita*, written during that year. (He is also mentioned in some MSS. as the discipulus who argues in the *De Musica*, but his name does not occur in the text.) In these dialogues he appears as an industrious, affectionate, enthusiastic, but rather vain pupil, so devoted to poetry and especially to Virgil, that Augustine finds it difficult to attract him to philosophy (c. *Acad.* ii. 4, iii. 1, 4; *De Ord.* i. 2, 3). In the course of the latter dialogue, however, he is quite won over, and admits the superiority of philosophy to the study of the loves of Pyramus and Thisbe, and Venus and Adonis. We do not hear of him from this time till A.D. 395. He seems to have remained in Italy on Augustine's return, and in this year writes, asking him to use his influence in favour of some request which is not specified, and enclosing a poem, in which he begs a copy of St. Augustine's *De Musica*. Augustine answers in an anxious strain, begging him to give up the world and devote himself entirely to Christ. At the same time Augustine writes to Paulinus of Nola, commending Licentius to his care (Ep. xxvi. xxvii.). Paulinus in answer (Ep. xxxii.) writes to Romanianus, and in the course of his letter addresses to Licentius an affectionate appeal to obey Augustine, and "as a poet to a poet" renews his appeal in a short elegiac poem, from which it appears that it was the desire of marriage and of political office at Rome which was enthralled Licentius. What effect these letters had is unknown, as Licentius is not mentioned afterwards.

**Works.**—His only extant work is the poem addressed to Augustine, and is of no permanent interest. In it he says that he has tried in vain to understand Varro's treatise on music, that he longs to have Augustine with him, and would come to him if he was not thinking of marriage; he admits that his life is drifting aimlessly at Rome, asks for Augustine's advice and prayers, and after a praise of the close communion of Christian friends, begs him to send his treatise *De Musica*. The poem is fairly correct in prosody; it shows a knowledge of classical writers, as of Virgil (50, 52, 132, 141), Ovid (130), Persius (47, 70), Claudian (98), but it is frigid and ambitious, full of mythological allusions, which are introduced in tasteless confusion with Christian thoughts. It will be found in Augustine's works (*Ep.* xxvi. ed. Benedict. ii. p. 29, ed. Migne, ii. p. 104), and in Fabricius (*Bibl. Med. et Inf. Lat.* xi. p. 809); Pithaeus (*Epig.* p. 471); Wernsdorff (*Poet. Lat. Minores*, with *Introd.* and notes, iv. p. 516). [W. L.]

**LICENTIUS (2)**, bishop of Jactera, Zactera, or Zattara, in Numidia (Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 647), present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411 (*Collat. Carth. cognit.* i. 128).

[H. W. P.]

**LICERIUS (1) (LIZIER), ST.**, fifth or sixth bishop of Conserans, according to the lists of the *Gallia Christiana* (i. 1226), and Gams (*Series Episc.* 540). The Bollandists, however, following Le Cointe, identify him with Glycerius, the second bishop of this see, who was present at the council of Agde in 506 (*Acta SS. Aug.* vi. 46). A life of him was published by Labbe, and is repeated in the notice of the Bollandists (*ib.* pp. 47-9). It was written or preserved by Bernardus Guido bishop of Lodève, at the end of the 13th century. According to Dom Rivet in the *Hist. Litt. de la France* (vi. 209), it abounds in anachronisms and commonplaces, and is one of the bad productions of the early years of the 10th century. But the more recent editors, adopting the view of the Bollandists, would vindicate it from these charges (p. 693, note). His episcopate lasted forty-four years. He is commemorated Aug. 27.

[S. A. B.]

**LICERIUS (2)**, the second recorded bishop of Orlon, the first being Gratus, more than half a century earlier. He was present at the fourth council of Paris, and in 573, at the second council of Maçon in A.D. 585. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 1264; Mansi, ix. 868, 870, 958; Gams, *Series Episc.* 590.)

[S. A. B.]

**LICERIUS (3)**, twenty-third archbishop of Arles, consecrated A.D. 586, and died A.D. 588. (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* viii. 39, ix. 23; *Gall. Christ.* i. 540.)

[S. A. B.]

**LICERIUS (4)**, twelfth bishop of Carpentras, present at the council of Châlons, held about A.D. 648. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 299; *Gall. Christ.* i. 898; Mansi, x. 1194.)

[S. A. B.]

**LICINIANUS (LUCINIANUS)**, the fourth known bishop of Carthage, a Latin ecclesiastical writer, cir. 584. Isidore of Seville (*De Script.* cap. 42 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1104), calling him Lucinianus, states that he flourished

in the reign of Maurice and was reported to have died at Constantinople, poisoned by jealous rivals. His writings, adds Isidore, were various, including numerous epistles, one in particular on the Sacrament of Baptism, and several addressed to the abbat Eutropius, who was afterwards bishop of Valencia [EUTROPIUS (13)]. The one on Baptism may have been an answer to the letter of Eutropius (*Isid. De Scr.* cap. 45), asking him the reason why chrism was administered to infants after baptism. Three epistles of Licinianus are extant, one *De Libro Regularum* addressed to pope Gregory the Great; another to Epiphanius the deacon, arguing that angels and human souls are incorporeal; a third to Vincentius bishop of Ivica against the figment of certain epistles of Christ having descended from heaven. The epistle to Gregory was edited by D'Achery in his *Spicilegium* (t. iii. p. 313, ed. 1723). The other two were, says Cave, first edited by cardinal De Aguirre (*Collect. Max. Concil. Hisp.* t. ii. 427). But the epistle to Vincentius was printed as early as 1640 by Ramirez de Prado in his edition of Liutprand's Works (p. 529). Ramirez prints (p. 530) another letter ascribed to Licinianus (but reckoned spurious), addressed to the same Vincentius, as to whether the canonical Epistle of St. James was written by the brother of our Lord or by the son of Zebedee. All the three epistles are to be found in Catalani's edition of Aguirre (t. iii. p. 315, ed. 1753), and in the *Patrologia Latina* of Migne (lxxii. 687). Notices of the author will be found in Cave (i. 540), Ceillier (xi. 428), Fabricius (*Bibl. Lat.* t. iv. p. 274, ed. 1754).

[C. H.]

**LICINIUS (1)**, emperor. See the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* and the article CONSTANTINUS I. in this Dictionary; also Görres, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Licinianische Christenverfolgung*.

**LICINIUS (2)**, ninth archbishop of Tours, subscribed the first council of Orleans, in 511, and, after an episcopate of twelve years and a few months, was buried in the church of St. Martin, probably in the year 515. (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* x. 31; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 16; Mansi, viii. 356.)

[S. A. B.]

**LICINIUS (3)**, bishop of Patara in Lycia, present at the synod held at Constantinople by the patriarch Mennas, A.D. 536 (Mansi, viii. 973). (*Liberatus, Breviarium*, c. xxiii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 1039; Le Quien, *O. C.* i. 978.)

[L. D.]

**LICINIUS (4) (LUCINIUS)**, fourth bishop of Évreux, subscribed the third council of Orleans, in 538, and the fifth, in 549. (Mansi, ix. 23, 137; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 566; Chamart et Sauvage, *Hist. des Évêques d'Évreux*, p. 8.)

[S. A. B.]

**LICINIUS (5) (LEZIN, LESIN)**, fifteenth bishop of Angers (A.D. 592-605). His *Life* is narrated by an anonymous author who professes to have derived his information from the disciples of the saint, and his own letters and works. It was published by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 678), together with another life by Marbodius (*ibid.* p. 682), who lived in the 12th or end of the 11th century, and has altered the work of his predecessor only to obscure it. For

both lives see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 551-2. He is commemorated Feb. 13, but is mentioned by Ado on the 8th of June. (Tresvieux, *Hist. de l'Église d'Angers*, i. 56 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 549; *Boll. Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 675; Ado, *Martyrologium*, vi. Id. Jun., Migne, Patr. Lat. cxliii. 282; Le Cointe, *Ann. Ecol. Franc.* tom. ii. an. 585, n. lxix. lxxi. an. 585, n. xiv. 590 n. xxxv. 592 n. v. 598 n. iii. 605 n. ii.) [S. A. B.]

**LICONTIUS (LEONTIUS)**, twenty-seventh bishop of Lyons, said to have been consecrated in A.D. 542, and to have sat for two years. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 32.) [S. A. B.]

**LIDORIUS (LITHORIUS)**, Sep. 13, second bishop of Tours and a citizen of that town, A.D. 337 or 340-370 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* x. 31, 2; see also i. 43; *Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 61; *Gall. Ch.* xiv. 5.) [R. T. S.]

**LIFARDUS (1) (LIPHARDUS, LEIFARDUS, LAIFARDUS, LEOPARDUS)**, June 3, abbat of Magdunum (Meung on the Loire, below Orleans, *Gall. Chr.* viii. 1513) about 520-550. (*Mart. Usuard.*, *Hieron.*, *Wandalb.*, *Notker.*, *Flor.*; *Boll. Acta SS.* 3 Jun. i. 298; Bulteau, *Hist. de l'Ordre de St. Benoist*, t. i. p. 226.) [C. H.]

**LIFARDUS (2) (LIETPHARDUS, LIPHARDUS)**, reputed archbishop of Canterbury, martyred in Gaul cir. 640, and commemorated at Honnecourt on Feb. 4. His history, as contained in some late *Acta* printed by the Bollandists with comments of Henschen (*Acta SS.* 4 Feb. i. 495), appears to belong to a class of fabrications not uncommon in the 10th century, when the Benedictine revival made relics in great request, and led to their pompous removals from obscure spots. The legend of Lifardus seems to have been made up out of the histories of bishop Liutard, queen Bertha's chaplain at Canterbury, and Caedwalla king of Wessex. [C. H.]

**LILIOIUS (1)**, bishop of Acci (Guadix), subscribed the acts of the conversion council under Recared (A.D. 589). Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 21. (Hübner, *Inscr. Hisp. Christ.* No. 115; *Esp. Sigr.* vii. 33; Juarez, *Historia del Obispado de Guadix y Baga*, 1696, p. 121.) [M. A. W.]

**LILIOIUS (2)**, bishop of Pampelona, A.D. 589, appears among the sixty-eight bishops whose signatures are found appended to the third council of Toledo, and in 592 attended the second council of Saragossa. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 262; Sandoval, *Catal. de los obispos de Pampelona*, p. 7.) [M. A. W.]

**LIMENIANUS**, bishop of Taphrura, a name which probably represents τὰ φρούρια, in Byzacene (Ptol. iv. 3, 10; Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 650); represented at the Carthaginian conference of 411, by Bonifacius bishop of Vallita (*Collat. Carth.* i. 135.) [H. W. P.]

**LIMENIUS (1)**, bishop of Vercellae at the council of Aquileia in 381. (Mansi, iii. 599; Ughelli, iv. 761; Cappelletti, xiv. 362, 426.) [C. H.]

**LIMENIUS (2)**, bishop of Settae (Satta, Sitae) in the province of Lydia, present at the general

council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1225; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 879.) [L. D.]

**LINGUINUS**, stated to have been buried in the church of St. Venerandus at Claremont in Auvergne (*De Eccles. Claromont.* lib. i. cap. 10, in Savaron's *Orig. de Clairm.* p. 349). He is thought to have been the LEGONUS bishop of Claremont mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*H. F.* i. 39 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 182; cf. *Boll. Acta SS.* Mart. iii. 769). Tillemont (iv. 226) thinks the name may be a corruption of LIMINIUS. [C. H.]

**LINIANUS I. (LINCINUS)**, bishop of Beneventum (Benevento), probably c. A.D. 369. (Sarnelli, *Vescovi di Benevento*, p. 23; Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* viii. 6; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* iii. 14.) [R. S. G.]

**LINIANUS II.**, bishop of Benevento, c. 591. (Cappelletti, iii. 23.) [A. H. D. A.]

**LINUS (1)**, accounted the first bishop of Rome after the apostles, and identified by Irenaeus (iii. 2) with the Linus from whom St. Paul sent greetings to Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 21). The question of the order of succession of the alleged earliest bishops of Rome, and of the positions held by the persons named, has been discussed under CLEMENS ROMANUS. With respect to Linus there is no difference of opinion, since in all the lists he comes first in order.

Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 13) assigns 12 years to the episcopate of Linus; the Liberian Catalogue 12 years 4 months and 12 days, from A.D. 55 to A.D. 67; see Vol. i. p. 554. The Felician Catalogue gives 11 years, 3 months, and 12 days. These dates cannot be accepted as historical, nor can the statements of the last-named catalogue that his father's name was Erculanus, that he died a martyr, that by the precept of St. Peter he ordered women to have their heads covered in church, and that he was buried on the Vatican beside the body of St. Peter on the 24th of September. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on the 23rd of September as "Pope and martyr, the first after St. Peter."

[J. B.—y.]

Under the name of Linus are extant two tracts purporting to contain the account of the martyrdom of Peter and of Paul. These were first printed in 1517 by Faber Stapulensis as an appendix to his *Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistles*, and were reprinted in 1577 by De La Bigne (*Bibl. Pat. Max.* ii. 67). These Acts are in Latin, but profess to be a translation from a Greek account sent by Linus to the Oriental churches; and that they are with more or less alteration derived from a Greek original need not be doubted. Tischendorf (*Act. Apost. Apoc.* p. xx.) describes a MS. of a Greek martyrdom of Peter at Rome which he saw at Patmos, and the opening sentences which he gives have some names in common with the Acts of Linus. Photius (*Cod.* 114) has described a volume of Gnostic Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul. Of these we have given an account in the article LEUCIUS, a name which we believe to have been especially connected with the Acts of John. On examining these Acts of Linus, they are found to have so many features common

with the Leucian Acts that the question arises whether we have not in Linus either a translation of a portion of the collection described by Photius or at least a work for which that collection supplied materials. If we can ever rely on the argument *ex silentio*, we may confidently say that the Leucian Acts did not bear the name of Linus, of which no mention is made by any one who speaks of the Leucian collection. But this name is found only in the title of the Latin Acts, the Acts themselves containing nothing to mark the individuality of the narrator. The name therefore may easily have been prefixed by the person who first published the martyrdoms as a separate story. For Linus does not profess to give a complete account of the acts of the two apostles. He begins by briefly referring to (as if already known to his readers) the contest of St. Peter and Simon Magus, his imprisonments and other sufferings and labours, and then proceeds at once to the closing scenes. It is to be remarked that the stories of the martyrdom of the two apostles are quite unconnected with each other, there being no mention of Paul in the first, nor of Peter in the second. Thus then there is no mention of what is told in other legends of a joint opposition of the two apostles to Simon Magus, and of the provocation thereby of the emperor's anger. The apostles' death is immediately brought about, not by Nero himself, but by his prefect Agrippa, a name, we may well believe, transferred by a chronological blunder from the reign of Augustus to this reign. This name, as well as some others mentioned by pseudo-Linus, occur also in the orthodox Acts of Peter and Paul published by Tischendorf and by Thilo. The alleged cause of Agrippa's animosity exhibits strongly the Encratite character common to Linus and the Leucian Acts. Peter, we are told, by his preaching of chastity had caused a number of matrons to leave the marriage bed of their husbands, who were in consequence infuriated against the apostle. Amongst these is Albinus, a near friend of the emperor, who loses the company of his wife Xandippe, and who seeks revenge from Agrippa, himself a fellow sufferer; for the prefect's four concubines had been induced by Peter to separate themselves from sexual and all other intercourse with him. In Tischendorf's *Acts*, p. 13, it is Agrippa's wife Agrippina who separates from him, and this may have been the older form of the story, for it is not uncommon for Encratite stories of the desertion by a wife of her husband to receive an orthodox recasting in which the woman is not a wife but a concubine. Tischendorf's *Acts* also relate that the emperor Nero himself in like manner loses the company of his wife Livia, converted to chastity by Peter's preaching. The name Livia, like that of Agrippa, is evidently a chronological transposition from the reign of Augustus. This story is recognised in the correspondence between Paul and SENECA (*q. v.*), and it is likely to have furnished an account of the resentment of Nero against Peter more ancient than that which other Acts derive from the conflict with SIMON Magus (*q. v.*).

The intention to destroy Peter is revealed to him by MARCELLUS and other of his disciples, who pressingly entreat him to save himself by withdrawing from Rome. Among those who thus urge him are his jailors, MAR-

TINIANS and PROCESSUS, who had already received baptism from him, and who represent that the plan to destroy Peter is entirely the prefect's own, and has no sanction from the emperor, who seems to have forgotten all about the apostle. Then follows the well-known story of *Domine quo vadis*. Peter yields to his friends' entreaties, and consents to leave Rome, but at the gate he meets our Lord coming in, who, on being asked whither He is going, replies, to Rome in order to be crucified again. The apostle understands from the divine admonition that it is in his own person his Master is to be crucified, and returns to suffer. In the version of this story as told elsewhere (Tischendorf, *Act. Pet. et Pauli*, p. 36) Peter's departure is not so completely cleared of the imputation of cowardice, and Christ's words to him are made to present a different aspect; namely, as shaming the faint-hearted disciple with the threat that if he shrank from his appointed lot his Master must come to suffer in his stead. We naturally ask, is it really true that this celebrated story is of Gnostic origin? The early date which Zahn assigns to Leucius would make a Leucian origin compatible with the fact that the story is recognised by Origen (*in Joann.* t. xx. 12, II. 222 *Lomm.*); but Origen cites the story as from the Acts of Paul, and if there be no error in the reading, we are led to think that the Acts known to Origen, like those published by Tischendorf, relate the deeds at Rome both of Peter and Paul. Linus goes on to tell of the apprehension of Peter, and lays the scene of the crucifixion at the Naumachia near Nero's obelisk on the mountain. The agreement of the orthodox Acts with this particular is one of several indications that notwithstanding their many differences, they have a common original. Peter requests to be crucified head downwards, desiring out of humility not to be crucified in the same way as his Master. A further reason is given, that in this way his disciples will be better able to hear his words spoken on the cross. And a mystical explanation is given of the inverted position which bears a very Gnostic character. An alleged saying of our Lord is quoted having a strong resemblance to a passage from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, cited by Julius Cassianus (*Clem. Al. Strom.* iii. 13, p. 553, see also *Clem. Rom.* II. 12), "Unless ye make the right as the left, the left as the right, the top as the bottom, and the front as the backward, ye shall not know the kingdom of God." It is explained that the inverted position is that in which man is born into the world, right being thus left to him and left right. There seems to be here also a reference to Gnostic accounts of the first creation of man. By the cross Christ places man in his proper upright position. In fact on the whole subject of the mystery of the cross extremely lofty language is used. Linus relates how during Peter's crucifixion God, at the request of the apostle, opened the eyes of his sorrowing disciples, and so turned their grief into joy. For they saw the apostle standing upright at the top of his cross, crowned by angels with roses and lilies, and receiving from our Lord a book, out of which he reads the words which he speaks to his disciples. This story has a good deal of affinity with that told by Leucius of a vision of our Lord during His crucifixion, seen by

St. John on the Mount of Olives. The story of Peter's crucifixion head downwards was contained in the Acts known to Origen, who refers to it in his Commentary on Genesis (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1).

Linus proceeds to relate that Marcellus takes down Peter's body from the cross, bathes it in milk and wine, and embalms it with precious spices; but the same night as he was watching the grave, the apostle appears to him, and bids him let the dead bury their dead, and himself preach the kingdom of God. Nero is represented as enraged with Agrippa on account of his unauthorised crucifixion of Peter, but only because the apostle was thus rescued from the greater torments which he had intended for him. Agrippa is deposed from his prefectship, and comes to a dishonoured end. Nero is about to gratify his vengeance by a bloody persecution of Peter's disciples, but in a fearful vision is so admonished and chastised by the apostle, that he is forced to abandon his intention. So the brethren have peace, and are rejoiced and strengthened by frequent appearances of Peter.

Thus far the first book. The second, which treats of Paul, relates the success of his preaching at Rome, amongst his hearers being the emperor's teacher, who forms a close friendship with him, and when he cannot converse with him corresponds with him by letter [SENECA]. The emperor's attention is called to the matter by a miracle worked by Paul on his favourite cupbearer, Patroclus, of whom a story is told exactly reproducing that which is told of Eutyches in the Acts of the Apostles. Patroclus, on being recalled to life and returning to the emperor, rouses his master's jealousy by professing his allegiance to the eternal king, Jesus Christ, who had restored him to life, and who was to destroy all kingdoms under heaven. Several other of the emperor's servants join him in this profession. Nero has Paul brought before him, and hearing similar threatenings from him, orders his servants to be burned, Paul to be beheaded, and a general search for Christians, who are all to be brought to execution. But this leads to so many victims that the populace, impatient of the slaughter of so many Roman citizens, break into rebellion, and Nero is compelled to withdraw his edict. But Paul being brought before him a second time, Nero breaks into rage again (it is not explained why) and again orders him to be beheaded. This time the execution takes place. On his way the apostle meets a Christian matron, Plautilla, whose veil he borrows in order to bind his eyes with it. She is much mocked by two of Nero's soldiers for giving it. At the place of execution, Paul turns his face to the east, offers a prayer in Hebrew, blesses the brethren, binds his eyes with Plautilla's veil, and presents his neck to the executioner. From his trunk there flows a stream of milk; a circumstance referred to by Ambrose and by Macarius in a work not later than about A.D. 400. A dazzling light makes the soldiers unable to find the veil with which his eyes had been bound, and on their return to the gate, they find that Plautilla has already received it back from Paul, who has visited her accompanied by a band of white-robed angels. The same evening, the doors being shut, Paul appears to the emperor, foretells to him his impending doom, and terrifies him into

ordering the release of the prisoners whom he had apprehended. The story ends with an account of the baptism of the three soldiers under whose charge Paul had been, and who, having been converted by him, after his death go by his direction to his grave, where they find Luke and Titus praying, and receive baptism at their hands.

The Acts of Linus have been well studied by Lipsius (*Quellen der römischen Petrus-Sage*, pp. 108 sq.), who has carefully collected illustrative references. Thus various coincidences, either with Linus, or with a story derived from the same Gnostic original, are to be found in Chrysostom (*Hom.* 46 in *Act. App.* vol. ix. p. 391, ed. Paris, 1839; *Adv. oppug. Vitae Monast.* 1, 3, vol. i. p. 59; *Hom.* 10 in 2 *Tim.* vol. xi. 781; *Hom.* 16 ad *Antioch.* 5. Pseudo Chrys. *Orat. in Princ. Apost.* vol. viii. 621). And Linus, as we now have it, seems clearly to have been known to Ambrose (*Sermo de basil. non trad. haer. cont. Auxentium*, vol. v. 99. See also the doubtful *Serm. ii. ad Pet. et Paul.* v. 138). Lipsius, indeed, infers from the coincidences of the tolerably numerous New Testament citations in Linus with the Vulgate, that our present Latin Linus must be later than Jerome; but he does not seem to have appreciated the conservative character of Jerome's revision, or to have consulted the older versions. We have found no coincidence with the Vulgate which is not equally a coincidence with an older version; and in one case, "relinque mortuos sepelire mortuos suos," the text agrees with the quotations of Ambrose, Jerome's translation being "dimitte." Taking into account what Lipsius has also noted as to the agreement of a Latin Linus with the so-called HEGESIPPUS (2), who, if not Ambrose, was not later than Ambrose (see Vogel, *de Hegesippo*), we think that our Latin Linus cannot be later than the middle of the 4th century. It is a more difficult question what was the date of the Greek original, and how far that original is fairly represented by the Latin translation. We have already said that the so-called Latin Linus in all probability only reproduces the closing chapters of the Gnostic Acts of Peter and Paul; for, not to speak of the conflict at Rome with Simon Magus, there are things which we know to have been related in the Leucian Acts of Peter, which do not appear here. It seems then more likely that whoever wished his account of the martyrdoms of the two apostles to pass as the work of Linus, would re-write and ornament the older story, than that he would copy without alteration a work which might be known to his readers. That our Linus was founded on a Greek original may be pronounced certain; that the work as we have got it is a translation from the Greek we do not venture to say. We conjecture the compiler to have been a Manichean, but it is to be noted that he is quite orthodox in his views as to the work of creation, the point on which Gnostic speculation was most apt to go astray. He says of our Lord: "Propter hoc in terram descendit qui caelum et terram fecit, et ad hoc factus ipse est homo qui fecit hominem." But the proofs that Lipsius offers, in order to shew that the compiler was post-Nicene, are open to an objection similar to that which we have urged in the case of the quotations from the Latin Bible, namely, that the instances he brings for-

ward can be paralleled by passages in ante-Nicene writers. With regard to the original form of the first Acts of Peter and Paul, there are important points in which we dissent from the views of Lipsius; but in the absence of documentary evidence, controversy on the subject can be brought to no decisive termination. Some of the most important points will be noticed in the articles PETER and SIMON MAGUS.

[G. S.]

**LINUS (2)**, bishop of Calaris (Cagliari). His date has been stated as A.D. 201 to 210, but the real period is very uncertain, and his name only is known. (Cossu, *Città di Cagliari*, p. 56; Martini, *Storia Eccles. di Sardegna*, ii. 316; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xiii. 48.)

[R. S. G.]

**LIOBA (LEOBA, LEUBA, LEOBYTHA, LEOBGID, TRUTHGEBE)**, Sept. 28, abbess of Bischofsheim, cir. 748-779. She was an English lady, who went out to Germany to assist in the missionary labours of Boniface, to whom, through her mother, she was related. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 28 Sep. vii. 748; Jaffé, *Monum. Mog.* 83; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Britt.* xxiv. 4 § 5; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 485.)

[C. H.]

**LISMORIENSIS MONACHUS**, noticed by Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 441), as having written *Conversio Scotorum*, perhaps in the year 530. (Tanner, *Bibl.* 441.)

[J. G.]

**LITAREDUS (LITHAREDUS)**, sixth bishop of Séz, subscribed the first council of Orleans, in A.D. 511, as "episcopus Oximensis," Oximum being probably the original seat of this bishopric. (Mansi, viii. 357; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 675.) But a person of the same name was first bishop of St. Pol-de-Léon, in Brittany, according to the compilers of the *Gallia Christiana* (xiv. 971). See Le Cointe (*Ann. Eccl. Franc.* 502, iv. 511, xxxviii. tom. i. 214, 288), and Gams (*Series Episc.* 625).

[S. A. B.]

**LITHGHEN (LEITHGEN)**, of Cluainmor, commemorated Jan. 16. Shearman (*Loca Patriciana ap. Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4th ser. vol. ii. 558-9, iii. 24, 39) regards him as one of the seven presbyters buried at Killeen Cormac, near Dunlavin, co. Wicklow. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 292; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 626.)

[J. G.]

**LITORIUS (1)**, bishop of Suaba or Suava, in Numidia (Böcking, *Not. Dign. Occ.* p. 646); present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. (*Collat. Carth. cognit.* i. 133; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 415, ed. Oberthür.)

[H. W. P.]

**LITORIUS (2)**, bishop of Oca (Burgos), at the eighth council of Toledo (A.D. 653). Florez believes the signature *Citorius*, at the tenth council of Toledo (Dec. 1, 656), to belong to him also. (*Esp. Sagr.* xxvi. 36; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 448, iv. 158.)

[M. A. W.]

**LITTEUS**, bishop of Gemellae, a station on the frontier between Numidia and Mauritania. *Sentt.* 82, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bapt.* 3; *Ep.* 76; one of the eight confessors with Nemesian. (Ussard, *Mart.* Sept. 10; Tillem. iv. 154, 171, 173.)

[E. W. B.]

**LITTORIUS (LICTORIUS, also written VICTORIUS)**, an African bishop, present at the council of Milevis, A.D. 416. (Aug. *Ep.* 176.)

[H. W. P.]

**LIUDGERUS (LUDGERUS), ST.**, first bishop of Münster (Mimigerneford, Mimigardeford—see Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, ii. 428-9, for this name; the name of Münster is first found about 1040), founder of the monastery of Werden on the Ruhr in Westphalia, and also called the "Apostle of the Saxons." His is a name of considerable importance in the annals of the evangelization of Friesland and Western Germany.

Three 9th-century biographies, all more or less valuable, survive of him. The first was written by Altfridus, the 3rd bishop of Münster (m. A.D. 849), at the request of the monks of Werden. Though he had never seen St. Liudger, he drew his information from his nearest relations, his brother and disciple Hildigrimus, bishop of Châlons, his nephew and successor at Münster, Gerfridus, and his sister Herburga, the nun. It was published by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Mar. iii. 642), then by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* iv. 1, 18-35, Paris, 1668-1781), again by Leibnitz from an older and more perfect MS. in the *Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium* (i. 85-100), which last edition with its notes is reproduced in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (xcix. 769-796). But the most perfect edition is probably that published by Pertz in the *Monumenta Germaniae* (ii. 403-19). The second was written by an anonymous monk of Werden after 864, and contains some errors and anachronisms. It was first published in 1616, by Broucher in the *Sidera Illustrium* (p. 36, Mainz, 1616), then fragments of it by the Bollandists (p. 652), and lastly by Mabillon (*ibid.* 35-61). The third was also written at Werden, probably between 890 and 900, and is less accurate than the second. It is printed in Surius's *de Sanctis Probatas* (Mart. 26, tom. ii. 412-36). Finally fragments of a rhythmical life, composed about 1140, have seen the light (Boll. *ibid.* p. 660). Perhaps the most absolutely trustworthy sources of all are the charters published by Leibnitz (*ibid.* 101-120), Migne (*Patr. Lat.* xcix. 795-820), Lacomblet (*Urkundenbuch für die Geschichte des Niederrheins*, bd. i. pp. 2-15), and others (see Rettberg, ii. 425-6; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 57-9).

St. Liudger was a Frieslander. His grandfather, Vursingus, driven out of Frisia by duke Ratbodus, had taken refuge with Grimoald, mayor of the palace in Austrasia. His son, Thiatgrimus, was recalled by the tyrant before his death, and when Charles Martel added Frisia to his kingdom, he established Vursingus, who, with his family, had been converted to Christianity in France, near Utrecht as a helper of St. Willibrord. Liudger was a son of Thiatgrimus and Liafburch, and was probably born about 744, as he could remember seeing St. Boniface, white-haired and bowed with age (*Vita S. Gregorii*, § 16, *Patr. Lat.* xcix. 763), on his last mission to Frisia, which was probably undertaken in 754 or 755 (Rettberg, ii. 426). From the first he manifested a studious disposition, even in his childish games. His parents, at his own desire, placed him with St. Gregory, the administrator of the church of Utrecht, St. Boniface's disciple,

whose school contained many of the future bishops and missionaries of those parts (cf. *Vita S. Gregorii*, § 16, Patr. Lat. 764). Here he diligently studied the Scriptures, and won the love of master and fellow-pupils. He had already laid aside the secular garb, when Gregory sent him and an elder pupil named Sigibodus to York as companions of the Englishman Alubert, whose consecration to the episcopate Gregory desired. Here he was ordained a deacon, and became one of the scholars of Alcuin. A year's sojourn was all that was allowed him on this occasion, but after his return to Utrecht, his ardent entreaties for permission to return and continue his studies conquered at length the reluctance of Gregory and his parents. Alcuin received him warmly, and for three and a half years more watched over his studies. A blood-feud between the English of the province and the Frieslanders, arising out of the death of a count's son in a quarrel with a Frisian trader, compelled Alcuin to insist upon his return to his own country. Reluctantly he yielded, but carried back with him a store of books. On the death of Gregory (A.D. 781), Albricus, his nephew and successor, sent Liudger on his first mission. The scene of it was Deventer, where an Englishman, St. Lebuinus, had established a church, which, upon his death, the Saxons burnt, for the second time. Liudger's task was to rebuild it over the saint's body, and restore the mission. A vision warned him of the true spot, and the church and mission were permanently established. Albricus next sent him with others to destroy the temples of the false gods through Friesland. The shrines yielded considerable treasure, of which the emperor took two-thirds, and gave the remainder to Albricus for the needs of his church. Albricus was now made bishop of Cologne, on which occasion Liudger was ordained a priest, and soon after appointed to the care of the church of Dockum in the Ostergau, where Boniface had met his death. But for three months in the year he was to repair to Trajectum, to take charge of the monastery school there, the other nine months being similarly apportioned between Albricus himself, Adalger, and Thiatbrat. After about seven years his labours in the Ostergau were brought to an abrupt close by an inroad of Saxons under their heathen duke Wutukint or Widukindus, who burnt the churches, expelled the ministers, and forcibly reconverted the Frieslanders to paganism. The death of Albricus happened about the same time. Liudgerus was compelled to flee with the rest. Taking for companions his brother Hildigrimus and his nephew Gerbertus, he made his way to Rome (circ. A.D. 782), and thence to St. Benedict's monastery at Monte Cassino, where he set himself to learn the famous rule, with a view to the government of the monastery which he hoped some day to found, a wish afterwards accomplished at Werden. Here he spent two years and a half, and then went back to his country (A.D. 785). His fame had now come to the ears of Charles, probably through the recommendation of Alcuin (*Vita tertia*, i. 13, Sur. ii. 419), who appointed him as missionary to the Frieslanders, and allotted him five *pagi* to the east of the river Labekus (Lauwers), as the field of his labours. Here he at once set about teaching the new religion and destroying the temples; and,

with the emperor's concurrence, even crossed the water to Heligoland. As the bark neared the island, and Liudger stood at the prow, praying and praising God, his companions saw a thick cloud rise from the land and sail away, leaving a serene sky in its wake. Accepting the omen, they urged their course to the shore, overturned the shrines of the island-god, Fosete, and built churches in their place. The converts were baptized in a fountain once before used for that purpose by St. Willibrord, and about which a superstitious awe still lingered.

It was perhaps at this time that St. Liudgerus desired to extend his mission to the Northmen, but could not obtain Charles's consent (see Altrifridus, ii. 6, Patr. Lat. xcix. 783). His labours in Friesland were interrupted by another wave of infidelity which swept over the eastern portion of it. The churches were again destroyed, and the priests driven away, but this time less than a year sufficed to restore them. The abbey of Leuse (Lotusa) near Tournay, which Charles granted to him, was probably to serve as a retreat in his difficult position among the Frieslanders (Altrifridus, i. 21; cf. Rettberg, ii. 427). The document in Lacomblet (i. No. 26, pp. 14-15), which purports to be a gift to him of this monastery from Charles, is spurious (Rettberg, ii. 428).

St. Liudger had long cherished the desire of founding a monastery. With that view he had made his stay at Monte Cassino, and had obtained relics from the pope at Rome (Altrifridus, i. 18, iii. 24, coll. 778, 792). For its endowment he zealously sought donations, which were sometimes made to him, sometimes to the relics (Lacomblet, *ibid.* bd. i. p. 2 sqq.). The place he finally selected for its foundation, and where he had acquired lands by purchase and gift, as early as 793, was on the left bank of the Ruhr, called originally Tiefenbach or Diapanbeci, but afterwards Werden or Werethinum. This name, which first appears in a document of 799 (Lacomblet, *ibid.* No. 11, p. 7), was perhaps, as Rettberg suggests, borrowed from Friesland (ii. 421, cf. Altrifridus, ii. 3, col. 781). The spot was at first covered with thick wood, which his disciples despaired of clearing, but a great storm in answer to St. Liudger's prayers made place for his buildings in a single night (iii. 25, col. 792-3). The earliest document which contains his name as abbat is dated March 31, 796 (Lacomblet, *ibid.* No. 7, p. 5), and this was very probably the year of its foundation (Rettberg, ii. 422).

Meanwhile Charles had conquered the Saxons, and selected Liudger for the evangelization of the eastern portion of them, whose chief settlement was Mimigerneford. Here he erected a large monastery as a centre, whence he sent out his emissaries to build churches, to preach and stamp out the still prevalent idol-worship. The want of a bishop to ordain clergy soon made itself felt. Liudger, like his master Gregory, would have had one of his disciples consecrated, but it was manifest that he himself was the man. With difficulty his reluctance was overcome, principally by the arguments of Hildebald, bishop of Cologne, and he became the first bishop of that region (circ. A.D. 805). His see he fixed at Münster, and his diocese contained not only the surrounding country of the East Saxons, now a



part of Westphalia, extending from the Lippe to the middle course of the Ems, but the above-mentioned five cantons of Friesland, which remained attached to Münster till the 16th century, when Philip II. founded a new bishopric in the Netherlands (see Rettberg, ii. 425, for the boundaries of the diocese). How long he had laboured at Münster before he became bishop is not plain, but the assertion of his third biographer that he had ruled there twelve years is certainly incorrect (i. 21, Sur. ii. 422, cf. Rettberg, ii. 428). Of the rest of his actions we only know that he accompanied Charles on several of his expeditions, one of which, through the country of the Hessi, is incidentally mentioned by Altfrid. (iii. 22, col. 791). It was usually supposed that on this journey he baptized on the Öcker and the Elm, and founded the monastery called after him at Helmstädt, to the east of Brunswick (cf. Eckhart, *Franciæ Orientalis*, i. 735). But Rettberg has apparently demolished this claim, pointing out that none of the three biographers make mention of it, or know anything of a mission to those parts, and that the earliest mention of such a proceeding occurs in the *Chronicon* of Thietmarus, who died in the year 1008 (iv. 45, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 1277), while the foundation of Helmstädt is just ascribed to him in the 12th-century rhymical life (Boll. Mart. iii. 636; Pertz, ii. 424). He suggests that Helmstädt may have been a colony from Werden, and this connexion of the two places might well account for the tradition of its being one of his foundations (*Kirchenjgeschichte*, ii. 479-483).

During the illness which preceded his death St. Liudger relaxed nothing of his labours. On the Sunday, the evening of which saw his end, he had preached at the two churches of Billerbeck and Coasfeld, separated by two hours' journey. His wish had been that he should be buried at Werden, but the people at Münster refused to give up the body, and a decree of Charles was requisite to enable his brother Hildigrimus to carry his remains to Werden, and bury them, in accordance with Liudger's directions, outside the church. The day of his death was March 26, 809.

His feast was established as early as the middle of the 9th century, on March 26. About 1076 the body was raised, and translated to the great altar of the church, which ceremony was also commemorated April 24 (Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, iii. 337-8).

One work only remains of St. Liudger—the biography of his instructor St. Gregory of Utrecht—but we learn from Altfridus that he had also composed a life of Albricus (ii. 6, col. 783). The same passage has generally been supposed to imply that he wrote a continuation of Willibald's biography of St. Boniface (Retth. i. 333; Ceillier, xii. 218), but Wattenbach believes it to refer only to the supplementary information about St. Boniface contained in his life of Gregory (*Geschichtquellen*, i. 184 n.). For the surviving work see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 361-2. The pretended letter of St. Liudger published by Surius at the end of the *Acta S. Sriberti* (Mart. i. tom. ii. 29-30), and that of St. Rixfredus (*Ibid.* pp. 28-9), to which it purports to be an answer, are allowed to be spurious (*Hist. Litt. Ibid.*). The life of St. Gregory is to be found in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, xcix. 749-770. [S. A. B.]

LIUDHARDUS (LETARD, LETHARDUS, LETALDUS, LUIDHARDUS), the Frank bishop who attended queen Bertha of Kent when she came to England (Bed. *H. E.* i. 25). According to the Canterbury tradition, preserved by Thorn (ap. Twysden, c. 1767) and Elmham (ed. Hardwick, p. 132), he was bishop of Senlis, but his name does not appear in the received lists of bishops of that see (*Gallia Chr.* x. 1382). He was buried at Canterbury, in the porch of St. Martin (Elmham, p. 132). Nothing is really known about Liudhard beyond the statement of Bede, and it is not certain whether he was alive or dead at the time of Augustine's mission. Among the additions to Bede's *Martyrology* (ed. Smith, p. 341) occurs under Feb. 4, "Ipso die passio S. Liphardi Cantorbeiae archiepiscopi;" this notice has been referred to Liudhard, but it probably belongs to a Flemish saint. The Canterbury obituary contains under Dec. 3, "Obiit pie Memoriam Lotarius Archiepiscopus," but there seems little reason to refer this to Liudhard. On the other hand the Bollandist fathers, following Capgrave (*Acta SS.* Feb. vol. iii. pp. 468-470), place the commemoration of this prelate on Feb. 24. [S.]

LIUTARDUS, bishop of Padua, c. 793. (Capelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, x. 489.)

[A. H. D. A.]

LIUTHERICUS (LIUDERICUS, LEUTERICH, LUDERICH), fourth bishop of Würzburg, or Herbigolis, between Bernwelf and Egilwald. He was present with Charles the Great as chaplain at Rome at the time of his consecration as emperor, and the see of Würzburg having become vacant he was there appointed to it by Charles, and consecrated by Leo (A.D. 801). In the following year he was present at the council assembled by the emperor at Aix, where the higher clergy were invested with extended judicial functions in their dioceses. About this time, too, Charles committed to him the fourteen churches of the Slavi Winidi settled in Bavaria between the rivers Rednitz, or Regnitz, and Main, which had been established in the time of his predecessor. (See the *diploma* of king Arnulfus in 808, in Eckhart, *Franciæ Orientalis*, ii. 711.) According to the *Annales Wirziburgenses* (Pertz, ii. 240) he died at Würzburg Feb. 27, 802, but as the same source states that his episcopate lasted three years and five months, and that Bernwelf, his predecessor, died in 800, there must be an error in the year. Eckhart would place his death in 803; while Gams puts it in 804, and his consecration in 801. (Eckhart, ii. 10-11, 18; Gams, *Series Episc.* 324; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, ii. 320-1; Himmelstein, *Reihenfolge der Bischöfe von Würzburg*, pp. 30-32.)

[S. A. B.]

LIUTPERT, the young son of Cunipert, king of the Lombards, is included in the list of Lombard kings (700-702). Some light is thrown on this obscure period of Lombard history by the life of St. Bonitus. (Cf. note, p. 171, in *Monumenta Rerum Langob.* 1878; Paulus Diaconus, vi. 17-20; *Catalogus Regum Langob.* &c. in *Monum. Rerum Langob.* 492.) [A. H. D. A.]

LIUTPRANDUS (I) (the form LUTPRANDUS is often found, but the former according to Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*,

i. 2, 54 n. is the correct spelling), the greatest of the Lombard kings, A.D. 712-744.

Throughout Liutprand's reign the Lombard kingdom kept steadily encroaching upon the remains of the Byzantine dominions in Italy, and this process was much assisted by the alienation between the pope and emperor caused by the Iconoclastic controversy, an alienation of which the Lombard did not fail to take advantage.

From A.D. 726, the date of Leo's first edict, to A.D. 730, Italy was a labyrinth of intrigue, in which the pope, the exarch, Liutprand, the great Lombard feudatories at Spoleto and Benevento, and the people of the territories that still belonged to the empire, were perpetually entering into fresh combinations with and against each other. A sufficient account of this tangled web will be found under GREGORIUS II. (vol. ii. pp. 793-4). It may be remarked that the gift, miscalled the restoration, of Sutrium to the pope by Liutprand in A.D. 728 or 729 was the germ of the Papal State, and that when Liutprand submitted to the pope he threw away what was probably the fairest chance that was to present itself for eleven centuries of uniting the fragments of Italy under Rome their natural head. Had he pushed on and taken Rome, there was a reasonable prospect of his founding a kingdom comprehending at least the greater part of Italy; probably neither the Western empire would have arisen, nor the papal power attained its great development, and the whole course of the history of the world would have been different.

During the next ten years there seems to have been desultory fighting between Liutprand and the imperialists, in which he had the advantage with the exception of a single defeat at Rimini (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 54). The Saracen invasions of Aquitaine and Provence produced an alliance between Charles Martel and Liutprand. The former sent his son Pepin, the future king, when he grew to manhood, to have his hair shorn by Liutprand, an act by which the relation of father and son was established between them, and a Lombard army under Liutprand in person crossed the Alps in A.D. 739, and assisted the Franks to recover Arles, which had been taken by the Saracens.

In A.D. 736, Liutprand being very ill and supposed to be dying, the Lombards made his nephew Hildebrand king. When Liutprand recovered, though much discontented, he associated Hildebrand with himself in the kingdom.

In A.D. 740, Trasemund, the duke of Spoleto, who had previously ceded Gallese to the pope, rebelled against Liutprand. The latter, however, drove him out of Spoleto, making Hilderich duke in his stead. Trasemund took refuge with the pope, and Liutprand plundered the patrimony of St. Peter, and captured four towns belonging to the duchy of Rome, Ameria, Hortae, Polimartium, and Blera. The first three are on the upper Tiber, and gave him the command of the river. In the opinion of Gregorius (*Rom im Mittelalter*, ii. 279) he did not actually besiege Rome itself or plunder St. Peter's. These events were the cause of Gregory's pathetic appeals to Charles Martel [GREGORIUS III. vol. ii. 797], but Charles does not seem to have been inclined to take any active steps against

his ally of the year before. Liutprand returned homewards in August, and in December Trasemund, with the assistance of the Romans, re-entered his duchy, killed Hilderich, and recovered Spoleto and Rieti. The price of the Roman assistance was the restoration of the four towns, but Trasemund hesitated to fulfil his promise. Liutprand, on hearing the news, marched on Spoleto. In the woody country near Fano he was attacked by the enemy, and sustained some loss. Apparently the papal court, finding there was little help to be hoped for from the Franks, and disgusted at Trasemund's breach of his engagement, deemed it best to come to terms with Liutprand. A letter of Gregory's, written six weeks before his death (*Ep. viii.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 585), is preserved, addressed to the bishops of Lombard Tuscany, in which he requests them to mediate with the king in order to procure the restoration of the towns. Zacharias, who succeeded Gregory early in December A.D. 741, followed the same policy. He sent an embassy to Liutprand, and in consideration of a promise to restore the four towns, the Roman troops in Trasemund's service went over to the enemy. Trasemund surrendered and was obliged to take orders. The state of the duchy of Benevento next demanded the attention of Liutprand [GISULPHUS II., GODESCALCUS]. His settlement of the affairs of that duchy took place between February and September 742.

As he delayed to restore the promised towns, the pope determined to seek an interview with him. He set out from Rome, accompanied by a large body of clergy, to Terni, where Liutprand was. The king sent his officers to escort him, and came himself to meet him at the eighth milestone from Narni. Their solemn meeting took place at the basilica of St. Valentine at Terni. The pope's arguments and the admiration which Liutprand felt for his courage had such an effect upon him that he not only restored the four towns, but also regranted to the Roman see its lands in the Sabine country, as well as Narni, Osimo, Ancona, and some other places, and made peace for twenty years with the duchy of Rome. The pope stayed five days with the king, and returned to Rome by way of the four towns, which were duly delivered to him.

The following year Liutprand once more invaded the exarchate, took Cesena, and threatened to besiege Ravenna. The exarch Euty chius, the archbishop John, and the people of Ravenna itself and the other towns of the Emilia and Pentapolis wrote imploring the pope to hasten to their assistance. The mission of bishop Benedict and Ambrose, the primicerius of the notaries, proving fruitless, the pope resolved to try again what his influence with the king would do. After visiting Ravenna on the way, he entered the Lombard territory at Imola. Though the king refused to receive the persons he had sent before to announce his coming, when he arrived at Pavia, on the eve of St. Peter's day, he asked him to celebrate mass at the festival, and the next day invited him to come to the palace, and at last was induced, though reluctantly, to restore the territory which had formerly belonged to Ravenna, and also two thirds of the territory of Cesena, retaining the remaining third up to the following 1st of June

as a pledge, till his ambassadors should return from Constantinople. The king accompanied the pope as far as the river Po, and sent some of his chief men with him to deliver up the surrendered territory.

In the following January (A.D. 744) Liutprand died, after a reign of thirty-one years and seven months.

The laws of Liutprand, promulgated between A.D. 713 and 724, are given by Muratori (*Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 1, 2, 51-84).

Paulus Diaconus describes him as a wise, sagacious, and pious ruler, mighty in war though a lover of peace, as chaste and merciful, as constant in his prayers and liberal in his alms, and says that, though unlearned, he was a match for the sagest philosophers. (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 17-58 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xc. 636-672; Anastasius, *Vitae Gregorii II., Gregorii III., et Zachariae*, in *Patr. Lat.* cxviii.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book iv. ch. 9 & 11; Gregorovius, *Rom im Mittelalter*, book iv. ch. 1, 2.)

[F. D.]

**LIUTPRANDUS (2)**, duke of Benevento, c. 751-758. He was in submission to king Aistulph as his ancestors had been to king Liutprand. But at Aistulph's death he commended himself with his people to the pope and the Franks (*Codex Carolinus*, ed. Jaffé, *Ep.* 11, p. 65). He resisted the hostility of the new king Desiderius to Rome in 758, and upon the approach of the king he betook himself to Otranto, where he remained, and on his refusing to yield, Desiderius made his son-in-law, Aregis, duke of Benevento in Liutprand's stead. (*Codex Carolinus*, *Ep.* 17, p. 79; Oelsner, *König Pippin*, excurs. i. p. 442; "Catalogus Regum Langob. et Ducum Benevent." in *Monumenta Rerum Langob.* 1878, p. 494.)

[A. H. D. A.]

**LIVUA**, bishop of Braga and Dumium from about 678 A.D. He signs the twelfth and thirteenth councils of Toledo (681, 683) in person, and is represented at the fourteenth council (684) by his two vicars, Bonita and Reccisuidus. The see of Dumium was united to that of Braga during his pontificate, as it had been in the time of his two predecessors, ST. FRUCTUOSUS and LEODEGISIUS (*q. v.*). (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 270, 287; *Esp. Sagr.* xv. 155 and xviii. 44.)

[M. A. W.]

**LIVINUS (1), ST.**, called the apostle of the Brabant, and a reputed bishop, or archbishop, and martyr. A biography of him remains, purporting to be written by Boniface, but very divergent opinions have existed as to its true authorship and date. It was first published by Serarius at Mainz in 1629, at the end of the letters of St. Boniface of Mainz (*Epistolae S. Bonifacii Martyris*, pp. 233-252), and next in a revised form by Mabillon, in the *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* (saec. ii. 449-461, Paris, 1669). The former edition was repeated without alteration in Giles's *Patres Eccl. Anglic.* (S. Bonifacius, ii. 117; see pp. 269-270 n.); and lastly, the editions both of Serarius and Mabillon appear in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, the former among the works of Boniface (lxxxix. 871-888), the latter by way of preface to Livinus's letter (lxxxvii. 327-344). That it was not written by Boniface of Mainz nearly all critics are agreed. First, the chrono-

logy makes it impossible, for the author professes to obtain his information from three disciples of Livinus (prologus) who had accompanied him on a visit to St. Augustine of Canterbury (§ 13). Now the date of the latter's death is at latest 608, while Boniface did not enter Friesland till 716. Secondly, the style, which is full of affectation and obscurity, and teeming with barbarous and Greek terms, and the character of the narrative, which is a tissue of prodigies, and occupied with kings and prelates unknown to history, are equally alien from the genius of Boniface (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 546-8). As to its epoch there is considerable difference of opinion. Mabillon ascribes it to a Boniface older than the archbishop of Mainz (*ibid.* 449-450), and is apparently followed by Ceillier (*Hist. Gén. des Auteurs Sacrés*, xi. 741-2, xii. 57). On the other hand Ghesquière (*Acta SS. Belgii Selecta* iii. 100) attributes it to the 11th century. Rettberg decides that it cannot be placed earlier than the middle of the 11th century (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, ii. 509), and the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, after first ascribing it to the 12th or 13th (iv. 120), finally adjudge it to the end of the 10th or beginning of the 11th century. If we follow the majority we must, therefore, deny it all historical worth, unless we believe with Ghesquière (*ibid.*) that its author founded it upon respectable documents as well as oral tradition, a theory, however, which the character of the work hardly sustains.

Its story in brief is that Livinus was born (apparently in Ireland, cf. Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Ireland*, chap. xvi. vol. ii. 467-473) in the time of Colomagnus (*i. e.* Colman Rimke, A.D. 599-605), rex Scotorum, of noble parents, named Theagines and Agalmia, the latter being a daughter of Ephigenius, king of the Irish. He was baptized by Augustine, bishop of the Angli, and his paternal uncle Menalchius, an archbishop. He was instructed by a priest named Benignus, and retired into the desert with three disciples, where, amongst other employments, he wrote books. At the bidding of a vision he went to England to visit St. Augustine, who ordained him a priest. After a sojourn there of a little more than five years he returned to Ireland, and in time succeeded his uncle, Menalchius, as archbishop in his own country (see Lanigan, *ibid.* as to this pretended archbishopric). After a time he was seized with a desire to preach the gospel in foreign lands; and having entrusted his flock to one Silvanus, he crossed the sea, and came to St. Bavo's monastery at Ghent, where Floreburtus was abbat. After a rest of thirty days he set out on a missionary journey through Brachentisia (in Mabillon, but in Serarius Brabantia), and finally established himself at Holtem (now Hauthem, three miles from Ghent), close to which village, at a place called Escha, he suffered martyrdom with great tortures (circ. A.D. 656).

But whatever discredit has fallen upon the biography it was always assumed that a metrical epistle accompanying an epitaph on St. Bavo was the genuine work of St. Livinus, and the biographical facts to be gathered from it absolutely trustworthy. It purports to be written by Livinus while at Hauthem, in answer to a request

from his friend Florebert the abbat for an epitaph on St. Bavo, the latter's predecessor at Ghent, who had died in 650. It draws a moving picture of the fierceness and cruelty of the people amongst whom he was labouring, at whose hands he anticipates a speedy martyrdom, hints at his former rank in his own country, and speaks of his early devotion to poetry. It was first published by Usher in his *Veterum Epistolarum Hibernicarum Sylloge*, whence Mabillon adopted it (*ibid.* ii. 40-5). It is also to be found in Ghesquière (*ibid.* pp. 114-116), and Migne (*ibid.* lxxxvii. 345-6). The style of both letter and epitaph are considerably superior to the ordinary verse of that epoch (cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 585). Since, however, Rettberg's criticism on it, this production must be viewed with the greatest suspicion. He points out that not only does the writer clearly foretell his own martyrdom, but also, at the close, prophesies the fall of St. Bavo's monastery, which took place in the 9th century. And although it may be a mere poetic licence, it is noticeable that this carefully wrought poem and epitaph profess to be written while the messenger from the monastery who had come with a gift of provisions for Livinus was impatiently waiting for the answer (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, ii. 510). If this criticism is well founded it results that there is no testimony, except vague tradition, that Livinus was ever in Brabant.

The body, or supposed body, of St. Livinus was in the year 842 elevated by Theodoricus, bishop of Cambrai, at Hautthem, where it remained till 1007, when, for the sake of safety, it was translated to the church of St. Bavo at Ghent. The account of this ceremony by an anonymous monk of the close of the 11th century is to be found in Mabillon's *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* (saec. vi. 1, 64-70), and was probably composed to be read at the office on the festival of the saint (*Hist. Litt.* viii. 513).

St. Livinus is commemorated Nov. 12, and though omitted from the older martyrologies, is mentioned on that day in some of the *anctaria* to Usuard (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 687-690). The manuscript authorities for him will be found in Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 254-256. [S. A. B.]

**LIVINUS (2)** (LIVIVS), bishop of Dublin, but probably intended for Molibba bishop of Glendalough (Jan. 8); the confusion of names may have suggested the calling Livinus, patron of Ghent, also bishop of Dublin. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 453; Cotton, *Fasti Eccl. Hib.* ii. 7; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 303 n.) [J. G.]

**LIVINUS (3)**, fifteenth, or, in Gams's *Series*, seventeenth, bishop of Coutances, perhaps early in the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xi. 899; Gams, *Series Episc.* 542.) [S. A. B.]

**LIVIVS**, a contemporary of St. Hilary of Arles, described by the author of the life of that saint as a distinguished poet and orator. He is reported by the same writer to have admired the preaching of St. Hilary so much that he exclaimed, that St. Augustine, if he had come after him, would have been considered inferior to him (*Vita S. Hilarii*, c. 11, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* l. 1232). St. Hilary died about A.D. 450, so Livivus must have flourished in the first half

of the 5th century. He may have been the Livivus of Narbonne whose splendid house is mentioned by Sidonius (*Carm.* 23 in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 745), but there is no evidence either proving or disproving the identity of the two persons. (*Hist. Litt. de la Fr.* ii. 408.) [F. D.]

**LLECHEU, ST.**, one of the sons of Brychan, the saint of Llanllecheu in Ewyas, Herefordshire (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 144.) [C. W. B.]

**LLECHID, ST.**, the foundress of Llanllechid in Carnarvonshire. Commemorated on Dec. 2. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 223.) [C. W. B.]

**LLEIAN**, a daughter of Brychan; supposed to have founded Capel Llanlleian in Carmarthenshire. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 147-8.) [C. W. B.]

**LLEMINOD ANGEL**, Welsh saint in the 6th century. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 280; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 276.) [J. G.]

**LLES** ap Coel, British king and saint. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 83; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 276.) [LUCIVS.] [J. G.]

**LLEUDDAD.** [LAUDATUS.]

**LLEWELYN (Llywelyn)**, Welsh saint. [GWRNERTH.] (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 261; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 303; Skene, *Four Anc. Books of Wales*, i. 590, ii. 431; Stephens, *Lit. of the Kymry*, 85; *Myv. Arch.* i. 24, 162; Rees, *Cambro-Brit. Saints*, 595, giving the reading of the *Bonedd Sant Ynys Prydain*, which is erroneous in the pedigree, and in calling "Gwrnerth, daughter of Llywelyn, his mother." [J. G.]

**LLEWYR**, reputed bishop of Llandaff or Caer Leon. (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 623 n.; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 154.) [J. G.]

**LLIBIO, ST.**, the saint of Llanllibio in Anglesea, was commemorated on Feb. 28. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 308.) He and his brothers became saints after the sea had overwhelmed the plain of Gwyddno in Cardigan Bay. (Rees, 235.) [C. W. B.]

**LLONIO LLAWHIR (LLONIAW, LLONYAU)**, Welsh saint, early in the 6th century. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 25, 46; E. Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 497, 504, 535-6; Rees, *Cambro-Brit. Saints*, 597; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 165, 221; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 280.) [J. G.]

**LLUDDNEU (LUDNOU)**, abbat of Bolgros, in the 5th or early in the 6th century. (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 155-6, 409-410.) [J. G.]

**LLUDDON (LUDON)**, abbat of Bolgros in the 6th century. He may be the same as LLUDDNEU. (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 157, 411.) [J. G.]

**LLWCHAIARN, ST.**, the saint of Llanllwchaiarn in Montgomeryshire, and another church of the same name in Cardiganshire. His day was Jan. 11. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 275.) [C. W. B.]

**LLWDHWRF (LUDHURR, LUDHURB, LWDHURF)**, abbat of Docunus's monastery in the 6th century. (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 141, 143, 151, 392, 394, 404.) [J. G.]

**LLWNI, ST.**, the saint of Llanllwni in Carmarthenshire. His day was Aug. 11. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 308.) [C. W. B.]

**LLWYDIAN, ST.**, the saint of Heneglwys "old church" in Anglesea. His day was Nov. 19. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 308.) [C. W. B.]

**LLYNAB (LLYUAB, LUUAB)**, Welsh saint. (*Myr. Arch.* ii. 31 n., 46; E. Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 499; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 165, 221; R. Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 295.) [J. G.]

**LLYR, ST.**, a virgin saint, to whom Llanllyr in Cardiganshire and Llanyre in Radnorshire were dedicated. Her day was Oct. 21. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 161, 308; and see 169.) [C. W. B.]

**LLYR MERINI**, Welsh saint. (*Camb. Quart. Mag.* iii. 39; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 296.) [J. G.]

**LLYWEL (LONGUIL, LOUIL, LOVIL, LUHIL)**, Welsh saint, in the 6th century. (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 119, 120, 351, 365-6; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 253; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 14, wks. vi. 80, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 596.) [J. G.]

**LOARN (1) (LOARND, LOARNUS, LOCHARNACH)**, priest of Achadh-mór and commemorated Aug. 30. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 137, c. 57, 178 n.<sup>116</sup>, 267 a; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 507-8; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 229, 433; *Mart. Tall.* ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, pp. xxxiii. 19; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 245, 248.) [J. G.]

**LOARN (2)**, nephew of St. Patrick and bishop at Inreathan, Brettan or Bright, near Downpatrick. (For an account of Bright see Reeves's *Eccl. Ant.* 35, 142.) According to Colgan his feast is Sept. 11, where in *Mart. Doneg.* he is called bishop of Cillchunna, now Killooney, in the parish of Ballyclog, bar. Dungannon, co. Tyrone. He is said to have written *Acts of St. Patrick.* (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 245, 435; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 717, c. 5, and *Tr. Thaum.* 14, c. 31, 19 n.<sup>54</sup>, 39, c. 37, 49 n.<sup>30</sup>, 125, c. 52, 169 b, 172 n.<sup>57</sup>, 178 n.<sup>116</sup>; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 293 n.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 330 n. 8; Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 195.) [J. G.]

**LOARN (3)**, abbat of Cluain-Iraid, now Clonard, co. Meath, died A.D. 765. (*Ann. Tig. eod. an.*; *Four Mast.* A.D. 760; *Ann. Ult.* 764; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 192.) [J. G.]

**LOCANUS**, name of St. Barry. [BARRY.]

**LOCHAN**, Irish saint, brother of St. Fachtna, bishop of Ross about the 6th century. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 596, c. 7, and *Tr. Thaum.* 363 n.<sup>17</sup>; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 527, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 510.) [J. G.]

**LOCHEN-MEANN, LOCHENIUS-MENN**, surnamed the Wise, abbat of Kildare, is thought also to have been bishop; he died A.D. 696, probably by violence, and may be commemorated on Jan. 12 or June 12. (*Ann. Tý.* A.D. 696, and *Ann. Ult.* 695, ap. O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. 218, iv. 66; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 694, i. 297; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 219, ii. 639; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 629 a, 665 b; Cotton, *Fasti Eccl. Hib.* ii. 225.) [J. G.]

**LOCHENUS**, Irish saint. [MOLAGA.]

**LOCHINA, LOCHINIA**, Irish saint, virgin, sister of St. Enna of Aran (March 21), and of St. Fainche Garbh of Ros-airthir (Jan. 1) [FAINCHE (2)]. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* i. c. 1, 3 n.<sup>6</sup>, 704, c. 1, et al., and *Tr. Thaum.* 184 n.<sup>12</sup>; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 2 sq. ii. 443 n.<sup>5</sup>) [J. G.]

**LOCHINUS**, of Achadh-airaird, Irish saint, disciple of St. Barry at Loch Irce. (Canfield, *Life of St. Fin Barre*, v.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 607 a, 630 a.) [J. G.]

**LOGA, LOGHA (LUGHNA)**, priest of St. Patrick and his helmsman. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 448, i. 140 n.<sup>4</sup>, 141.) [LUGNAT.] [J. G.]

**LOGOS, THE WORD**; applied by St. John to our Lord (Gospel i. 1, 14; 1 Ep. i. 1; Apoc. xix. 13). There are several passages in the Old Testament where the Word of God, or the Word of the LORD, seems almost represented as a person, e.g. Gen. xv. 1, "The Word of the Lord came unto Abram;" 1 Sam. iii. 21, "The Lord revealed Himself to Samuel in Shiloh by the Word of the Lord." In these passages, however, as in many others, the Hebrew יהוה יְרַבֵּר is translated in the LXX ὁ ῥῆμα Κυρίου. In the later prophets the same Hebrew is translated λόγος Κυρίου. Thus it is in Psalm xxxii. 6, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens fixed;" cvi. 20, "He sent forth His Word and healed them." In the centuries immediately succeeding the Advent, the Israelites were led to personify this Word as they personified the Wisdom of God; and the Chaldee paraphrasts frequently interpolated their *Memra*, e.g. "They heard the voice of the Word of the Lord God walking in the garden." One reason for this is to be looked for in an unwillingness to represent, to every reader, the Almighty as holding direct communication with man. Instances of this unwillingness may be seen in the Greek translation of Exodus xxiv. 10, 11, "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood;" "They were seen in the place of God, and did eat and drink."

It cannot be questioned that the use of the word Logos in the Christian Fathers of the Alexandrine schools was most seriously affected by the language of Philo. And on Philo's usage volumes have been written. From him the phrases λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός, which we frequently meet with in the Alexandrine theologians, passed into their vocabulary, the former being the Word still residing in the mind—the unuttered thought; the latter, the Word uttered. Philo recognised the existence of both in man; it is said (Dorner, *Christology*, i. 339, note n) that Philo did not transfer the distinction to the Divine Logos.

The language of Philo as to the Divine Word is remarkable. He described the Logos as εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, as ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν γένειν εἰληφότων, πρεσβύτερος υἱὸς τοῦ τῶν ὄντων πατρὸς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἄγγελος πρεσβύτατος, δι' ὃ δὲ κόσμος κατασκευάσθη, even as δεύτερος Θεός; but yet it is questioned whether he regarded the Logos as a distinctly Personal Being. Grossman, Dähne, Gfrörer, Ritter, Lücke, held that he regarded Him as a real Hypostasis.

Others consider that Philo merely personified the Word and Wisdom of God. One of the latest writers, Dr. Henry Soulier (*La Doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Turin, 1876), doubts whether Philo ever put the question distinctly before himself. He draws attention to the fact that for years the Alexandrine divines had no definite word in their vocabulary which was recognised as connoting distinct personal existence. Indeed, we may well consider that the ordinary Greek and Latin writers were content to allow the question to be in abeyance, whether the deities generally worshipped were living beings inhabiting tree and stream and sea, or were personifications of the powers and beauties of Nature. Thus the controversies regarding Philo's conceptions of the Logos are sufficient to shew that, at all events, those conceptions were not clearly expressed; and it is probable that this want of clearness of expression was due to the want of decision on his part on the subject.

We pass, then, at once to the clearly defined teaching of St. John. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God: all things were made through Him, and apart from Him was nothing made . . . . And the Word was made Flesh, and tabernacled in us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father." The difference between Philo and the Apostle is immeasurable. We meet with the Logos again in that wondrous passage, Apoc. xix. 13, "Behold, a white horse, and He that sitteth upon it, called Faithful and True, and in righteousness doth He judge and war . . . having a Name written that no one knoweth save Himself, and clothed in a robe dipped in blood; and His Name has been called the Word of God."

In the Ignatian Epistles we meet with this Name once, or perhaps twice. In the address to the church at Smyrna, the church is described as being "in the blameless Spirit and the Word of God." The temptation is great to regard the Word and Spirit here as designating the two persons of the Trinity. But still this may be questioned; but there can be no doubt of the meaning in the *Epistle to the Magnesians* (c. viii.). The MSS. there read—"The divine prophets lived after [according to] Christ Jesus. For this cause also were they persecuted, though inspired by His grace for the assurance of unbelievers that there is one God, Who manifested Himself through Jesus Christ His Son, Who is His eternal Word, not proceeding from silence, Who, in all things, well pleased Him that sent Him." *Not proceeding from silence, οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν*. This, as we have said, is the reading of the MSS.; but the ancient Armenian version and Severus of Antioch (made bishop A.D. 513), read *ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν*, a reading which Zahn adopts. (See SEVERUS in Zahn's edition, p. 353, or in Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum*, p. 245.)

In the EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS (§ 7), we have a sufficient proof that at the time when it was written St. John's conception of the Logos was unhesitatingly accepted. "The Almighty, the all-Creator and invisible God Himself from heaven, placed among men the Truth and the Word, Holy and Incomprehensible, and fixed Him in their hearts; not, as some might suppose, as

a servant, or a messenger, or a ruler, or as one of those who regulate things of earth, or as one of those to whom have been entrusted the administrations in heaven, but the Maker and Demiurge of the universe, for Whom (ϕ) He erected the heavens," &c. Nor is JUSTIN MARTYR less clear. Whilst he recognises (as from John i. 9) that the seed of the Logos is planted in every race of men (Apol. ii. 8), he contends also that not only was Socrates taught by the Logos to convince the Greeks; but "barbarians," too, were instructed by the same Logos, "when He had taken form, and was made man, and called Jesus Christ" (Apol. i. 5). In his *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 61) he has the following passage: "God hath begotten a Principium before all created things, a kind of Reasonable Power (*δύναμιν τινα λογικὴν*) from Himself, which, by the Holy Spirit, is called the Glory of the Lord, and Son, and Wisdom, and Angel, and God, and LORD, and Word, Who calls Himself at one time Captain of the Host." Thus Justin appropriated such texts of the Old Testament as we have quoted, as distinctly referring to the Son of God, as Word or Logos, before His Incarnation.

THEOPHILUS of Antioch seems to have been the first who used the terms of Philo, *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λόγος προφορικὸς*, of the Son of God. He insisted that the Father cannot but be illimitable in space; so the Logos assumed the part of the Father in His relations to the world. Before the creation He was in God, His counsellor; as such He was *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*. When God willed to create, He begat this *λόγον* as *προφορικόν*. His teaching was open to the objection that it represented the Son as having no personal existence before God willed to create.

We now come to IRENAEUS. In his writings we have more distinctly expressed than before the opinions of the various sects of the Gnostics on the subject of the Logos. The Name henceforward stands out as the one Name appropriated by all\* to the Saviour, regarded as divine, as He was before the Incarnation. Opinions varied as to whether He were always Son of God; but that He was Word of God nearly all agreed. It was because of this understood use of the title that Simon Magus, when he claimed to be the Messiah, used the words quoted by Jerome on the passage in Matt. xxiv. 5, "Many will come and say I am Christ:" "Ego sum sermo Dei" (Migne, 26, 183). When some of the Ophites maintained that the serpent was "the Word of God," they accepted the term "Word" as they found it in St. John (Hippolyt. v. 16). In the genealogies of the Valentinians, where *Βυθός* and *Σιγή* were the primary Aeons, and *Νοῦς* and *Ἀλήθεια* the secondary; *Λόγος* and *Ζωή* intervened between them and the fourth generation—Man and the Church (Irenaeus, I. 1, and Mansel, p. 170). But Irenaeus contends uniformly that the church teaches, and the rule of truth teaches, that the Almighty God, by His Word, made all things (III. 11, 2); but the Word was made flesh (3); that the Word was one with Jesus and Christ and Saviour and the Only-begotten (IV. Praef. 3). In II. 12, 5, and 13, 2, we find clear indications that the terms *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λόγος προφορικὸς* were freely used

\* With one exception apparently. See below.

in the Valentinian controversies. He maintains (IV. 28, 2) that the Father and His Word are one and the same God, always standing by the human race and from the beginning saving those who are saved. In IV. 6, 7, he explains Matt. xi. 27, "to whom the Son will reveal Him," as including all time, before the Word was manifested and after. Yes, it is the Word Who is Son of God, always co-existing with the Father, Who, from the beginning, reveals the Father to angels and archangels and principalities and powers (II. 30, 9). He Who at the first formed Adam, with Whom the Father spake, "Let us make man after our image and likeness," in these last days manifested Himself to us.

From this time many of the questions regarding the Logos may be said to have been merged in the similar questions relating to the Son of God prior to His Incarnation. Thus we come in contact with the MONARCHIANS, the THEODOTIANS, the SABELLIANS. Tertullian claims that He Whom, because of His lowliness, the Jews presumed to be only a man, shewed Himself by His works to be the Logos of God, that is, the primordial Word, first begotten, associated with Power and Reason, upheld by Spirit, the same Who by a word both did and had done all things (*Lib. Apologet.* c. 21). In his work *Against Praxeas* (c. 5) he explains the introduction of the term into the Christian system. Origen (*Against Celsus*, iii. 41) calls on his adversaries to note that He Whom we consider to have been from the beginning God and Son of God is the *αὐτόλογος*, the *αὐτοσοφία*, the *αὐτοαλήθεια*. In St. John, tom. xxxii. 17, on the words, "Now was the Son of Man glorified," Origen says that he conceived that the glory spoken of does not refer to the Word, and Wisdom, and Truth; for the Word, being in the beginning with God, does not admit of further exaltation; it is the Son of Man who was exalted, in that He was no longer different from the Word, but was the same with Him. (Cf. INCARNATION.)

It is unnecessary for us to follow out these controversies; the questions now are almost identical with those raised in the struggles with Arianism. But as a proof of the continued influence of the school of Philo upon the Christian schools of Alexandria, we may mention that when St. Athanasius (*de Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, § 19; Migne, xxvi. p. 1017-708), said: "The Son is not a second God, but Logos of the one and only God," it seems clear that he had in his mind the words which Philo applied to the Logos in the last quotation we have taken from that author.<sup>1</sup> Renewed attention had been recently drawn to them by Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica*, vii. 13). In the *Exposition of the Faith*, attributed to Athanasius, we meet with two other of Philo's phrases, "We believe . . . also in one only begotten Word, Wisdom, Son, begotten of the Father without beginning and in eternity, *Λόγον δὲ οὐ προφορικόν, οὐκ ἐνδιάθετον*." The exposition repudiates their application to the Word of God.

But ere long the term was dropped out from the Creeds of the church.—We will first give

some of the instances in which it is found in symbolic teachings. In the "Preaching" of the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 11), we read *τὸν Χριστὸν οὐ ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁμολογοῦμεν ἀλλὰ Θεόν, λόγον καὶ ἄνθρωπον, μεσίτην Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου*. Victorinus, "Hunc esse manum Dei et verbum Patris ex Deo" (Hahn, p. 11). Gregory of Nazianzus, *πίστευε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν προαιώνιον λόγον* (Hahn, p. 12). So the letters of the synod of Antioch against Paul of Samosata spoke of the only "begotten Son as being Wisdom, and Word, and Power of God before [the] ages" (Hahn, 98). The creed adduced at Nicaea by Eusebius ran thus: *καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον*. The last four words were omitted by the council. The omission is significant. Once more in the fourth Lecture of St. Cyril of Jerusalem we have the following: "Believe that of the one God there is one only begotten Son, God, the Word, who was before all ages; the Word, οὐ προφορικός, not dispersed in air, nor yet resembling impersonal words, but the Word, the Son, Maker of reasonable beings (*λογικῶν ποιητής*), Word, hearing from the Father, and Himself speaking."

After this the creeds of the church, at least for some little time, avoided the use of the term *Logos*. The reason for the avoidance was probably this. The Apollinarians taught that in the Incarnation the Logos rendered the reasonable human soul unnecessary and in fact excluded it and took its place. But the council of Chalcedon was emboldened to reintroduce the term into its "definition," insisting that the Saviour was truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body, and that in the one Person and the one Hypostasis the two natures met, and that one and the same was Son and only begotten, God, Word. At the second council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, it was considered necessary to anathematize those who did not hold that there were two *γενήσεις* of the Word of God, or who said that the Word of God who wrought the miracles was one, and the Christ who suffered another. Indeed, there were several anathematisms denounced at this council against various errors on the subject. This is the one instance we have met with where the Logos is spoken of as born of Mary. At the third council of Constantinople, 681, the bishops returned to the older conception that "the Logos" represented the divinity in our Lord, the Body the humanity. "Each *μορφή*, though in union with the other, works its own proper work, the Logos performing that which is the work of the Logos, whilst the body executes the things which are the properties of the body."

*Literature.*—On Philo and his doctrines, the great authorities are Girörer, *Kritische Geschichte der Urchristenthum*; Grossmann, *Quaestiones Philonae*; Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der Jüd. alex. Religions Philosophie*. I have referred to Soulier, *La Doctrine du Logos*. On St. John's use of the word the commentaries give much information. The subject is treated in Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*. Dorner's work on *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ* appears to the writer as the most satisfactory work, for he refers his readers continually to original authorities. The creeds quoted are to be found in Hahn, 2nd edition.

[C. A. S.]

3 B

<sup>1</sup> It is possible that Arius may have taken the conception from Philo.



LOLLIANUS, an intimate lay friend of Gregory Nazianzen. (Greg. Naz. 182 al. 195.) [HELLADIUS (14).] [E. V.]

LOMAN (1) (LOMMANUS, LUMANUS, LUM-MANUS), bishop of Trim, co. Meath; commemorated Feb. 17 and Oct. 11. His legend uniformly connects him with St. Patrick, but its interpreters, led by Lanigan, would assign him to the 7th century as being the "Lomanus episcopus" in the third class of Irish saints given by Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant. c. 17*, wks. vi. 479). The early authorities are Tirechan, Joceline, and Evinus in their *Vitae S. Patricii* (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.*) and Colgan (*Acta SS.* 362-3) has gathered the material into the form of a memoir at Feb. 17. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 17 Feb. iii. 13 sq.) have a commentarius historicus in five sections upon Loman and Fortchern, bishops of Trim, and Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant. c. 17*, wks. vi. 372 sq.) treats of him in dealing with St. Patrick, and embodies numerous extracts from *Tirechan's Annotations* in the *Book of Armagh* (which are also collected from Ussher by Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 196); Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit. ix. c. 8*) translates from Ussher, and gives his date as A.D. 432. In connexion with the Patrician legend, Loman has a well-defined place, though allowance must be made for his late appearance in the *Lives* and for subsequent additions; apart from St. Patrick, he is an unknown later ecclesiastic, to whom is attributed the foundation of the church at Trim. On the whole it appears preferable to acknowledge a Patrician element as a basis of the legend, and to use Lanigan's suggestions to account for the form it has assumed in the hands of St. Patrick's biographers. But at the same time we must remember that we want the extraneous information which would enable us to draw a clear line between the ancient and the more modern in the *Life of St. Loman*.

(Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. c. 5*, § 4, ii. c. 14, § 11; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 191, 273, 341; *Mart. Tallaght*, ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, pp. xvii. xxxvi. 19, 75; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 111, c. 3, 259, cc. 2, 3, and *Tr. Thaum.* 6 n. 3, 75-6, 106, c. 186, 125, c. 55, 129, c. 1-3, 196, 216; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 150 sq. 257 sq. 260; Ware, *Ir. Writ. B. ii. c. 1*; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, &c. i. 44.) [J. G.]

LOMAN (2) (LOMMAN), of Lough Gill, co. Sligo, Irish saint; commemorated Feb. 4. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 337, c. 7, 339 n.<sup>33</sup>, 363 n.<sup>16</sup>, 713, c. 4; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 537-8; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 295 sq., giving also an interesting account of a recent visit to Lough Gill, and of the antiquities on Church Island in it.) [J. G.]

LOMCHU (LOMCHON), of Cill Lomchon in Ulster; commemorated Jan. 9. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 157, c. 41, 186 n.<sup>72</sup>, 226 b, 267 b; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 11; *Mart. Tallaght*, ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xii.; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 151; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 376.) [J. G.]

LONAN (1), of Cluain-tibrinne in Clann-Cheal-igh (*Mart. Doneg.*); commemorated Oct. 24. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 584 n. 14.) [J. G.]

LONAN (2), of Trefoit, now Trivett, in the county of Meath; commemorated Nov. 1. In

*Kal. Drumm.* Nov. 1 (*vid.* Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 27), he is called Confessor. (See *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc.* 4 ser. iii. 52-4, for another attempt at identification in Rev. John Sanarman's *Loca Patriciana*.) [J. G.]

LONGARADH, LON-GARADH, surname Coisfinn (of the white foot), is commemorated Sept. 3, and had his abode in the district of Slieve-Margy, Queen's County. He was celebrated in his day for learning, and in the *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin* (Introd. lxxi. lxxii.), Dr. Todd gives a curious legend about Columcille, Longaradh, and their books. It represents Longaradh as "a doctor in teaching, in history, in laws, and in poetry," but when St. Columba visited him he hid his books, probably unwilling that St. Columba should even copy any of them. For his want of deference to his guest, the latter pronounced a malediction on his books, which should be of use to none after his death; and it is added that on the night of Longaradh's decease all the book-wallets in Ireland (or as others say, in St. Columba's chamber) fell from the walls to the ground, and that his books, though long after extant, were entirely unread. The quatrain attributed thereupon to St. Columba is—

"Died hath Lon,  
And to Cill Garad—great misfortune!  
'Tis the destruction of the learning and schools  
Of Ireland's island to its extreme borders."

He must have died before St. Columba in the 6th century, and he is said to have been like, in habits and life, to Augustine. He is probably the same as LON, of Cill Gobhra. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 234 n. 235; Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 117, 359; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 565 n. 12; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, 155; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, Fasc. i. 70 sq.) [J. G.]

LONGIANUS, a bishop of Armenia or Pontus mentioned by Athanasius in 356 with others of the Catholic party. (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg.* § 8, in *Pat. Gr.* xxv. 558 A.) [C. H.]

LONGINIANUS, a philosophical heathen, who appears to have been a member of the pontifical college at Rome, to whom St. Augustine wrote to inquire as to the state of his mind in reference to Christianity. Being persuaded that his friend was convinced that God ought to be worshipped, and that a good life is the best foundation of knowledge, he ventures to remind him that this was long ago the doctrine of Scripture (Deut. vi. 5; Lev. xix. 18; Matt. xxii. 40); and to ask him in what manner he thought that God ought to be worshipped, and also what his notion was about Christ, and whether he thought that the way which he had pointed out was the sure way of life. (*Aug. Ep.* 233.)

In reply to these inquiries Longinianus expresses his profound respect for Augustine, and at the same time his difficulty in doing so as being still a pagan (paganus homo). He rejoices that they are so far agreed in their views, which he says are older even than the Jewish or the Christian, long before the time when Libya possessed so good a man as Augustine, of whom he is certain that no one ever sought God more earnestly. But so far as he can judge, the way

to God is that which is pursued by any man whose words and deeds are good and well proved, and who is surrounded by the messengers, angels if you will, of God, and whose mind and conduct are purified by the study and observance of the sacred precepts and expiatory rites of antiquity. As to Christ and the Holy Spirit he hesitates to give an opinion; but of one thing he is certain, viz. that for Augustine himself he entertains the greatest reverence, and will be deeply grateful to him to afford him further information. (Ep. 234.)

To this letter Augustine replies, rejoicing that the question about Christ is still an open one in his friend's mind, but asking for explanation on the following point:—viz. this, if a man of good life, in company with the inferior deities and protected by them, is able to reach the abode of Supreme Deity, why it should be needful for him to be purified by the rites of which he speaks? If he is pure enough to get there without them, what need has he of them; if not, how can he properly be called pure? (a) Does a man live well in order to obtain purification? or (b) is he purified by them in order that he may live well? or (c) is his mode of life insufficient without them? i. e. (d) is the reception of them a constituent element of a good life? To these queries Augustine requests his friend to reply, so that he may clearly understand the state of his opinions, and that thus no time may be wasted before entering on the main points of debate. (Aug. Ep. 235.)

No further account of the discussion appears in the works of St. Augustine, and we are thus left in ignorance of its result; but there seems to be good ground for believing that the Longinianus here mentioned was the same person as the friend of Mallius Theodorus, whose devotion to philosophy is commended by Claudian; that his name was Flavius Macrobius Longinianus, who at various times filled the offices of *procurator largitionum*, prefect of Rome, A.D. 400, and of Italy, A.D. 406, and who in 408 was murdered by mutinous soldiers at Pavia a few days before Stilicho. (Claudian, *de Mall. Theod. Cons.* 87-112; Zosimus, v. 32; Tillemont, vol. xiii. 272; *Hist. des Emp.* vol. v. 508; Gibbon, cxxx. vol. i. 60, ed. Smith.) [H. W. P.]

LONGINUS (1), bishop of Ascalon not long before the council of Nicaea, since a letter to him by Alexander patriarch of Alexandria is referred to by Epiphanius (*Haeres.* lxi. 4; Le Quien, iii. 597). [J. de S.]

LONGINUS (2), missionary bishop to the Nobadae (Nubians), cir. 568, a Monophysite. (John of Ephesus, *Eccles. Hist.* ed. R. Payne & Smith, pp. 276 sq.) [C. H.]

LONGINUS (3), March 15 (Usuard.), Sept. 1 (Adon.), Oct. 16 (Bas. *Menol.*), the traditionary soldier who pierced our Lord's side, subsequently converted by the apostles. His body was alleged to have been found by the Crusaders about A.D. 1098 in the church of St. Peter at Antioch. (See letter to pope Urban II. from the leaders of the expedition, in Baluze, *Miscell.* t. i. p. 415; Tillem. i. 47, 453; Ceillier, xi. 657, xiii. 528; *Mart. Vet. Rom.*; *Acta SS.* Boll. Mart. ii. 384; King's *Christ. Numismatics*, pp. 101, 102.) The name Longinus is found

also in the Acts of LINUS as that of a prefect charged by Nero with the execution of Paul.

[G. T. S.]

LONGINUS (4), Roman Novatianist. (Cyp. Ep. 44, 50.) [MAXIMUS (7).] [E. W. B.]

LONGINUS (5), DIONYSIUS CASSIUS. This celebrated critic and philosopher was born about A.D. 213. His native place is uncertain; there are some grounds for thinking he was born in Syria, in which country his ancestors lived; others suppose that Athens was his birthplace. A passage in Suidas (s. v. *Φρόντων*) may be held to support either hypothesis; for he says that "Phronton, a rhetorician of Emesa" (in Syria), "taught at Athens, and died there at the age of about sixty, and left as his heir the critic Longinus, who was the son of his sister Phrontonis." However this may be, Longinus was, as he himself tells us, a great traveller in his early life, visiting (in company with his parents) many countries, and enjoying the society of many illustrious men. He attended at Alexandria the lectures of Ammonius Saccas, the founder of Neoplatonism, and of Origen (the heathen): he was also acquainted with Plotinus and Amelius. In mature years he is generally said to have established himself at Athens; and certainly he would seem to have lived there for some time (see, besides the passage quoted above from Suidas, Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* x. 3, where an interesting account is quoted from Porphyry of a dinner given by Longinus to a body of litterateurs at Athens). But what was the duration of his stay at Athens we do not know. In any case the delivery of lectures, critical and philosophical, was the occupation to which he devoted himself. Of this part of his life a vivid description is given us by Eunapius, in his biography of Porphyry. "Porphyry," says Eunapius, "was a pupil of Longinus, and shortly became an honour to his teacher. Longinus at that time was a kind of living library and walking museum, and as such had been appointed to the post of critical lecturer on the classical writers. . . . In his native city in Syria, Porphyry had at first been named Malchus, which means a king; he was called Porphyry by Longinus, who converted the appellation so as to indicate that colour which is the royal token in garments. With Longinus then Porphyry received the very highest training, reaching, like his master, the summit of excellence in grammatical knowledge, and also in rhetoric (except in so far as he did not favour this branch), and took the impression of every form of philosophy on his mind. For in all such studies Longinus was far the most eminent of the men of that age. Very many of his books are still commonly read, and all that is read is admired. No unfavourable judgment on any ancient writer was held valid before Longinus had expressed himself thereupon, but his opinion when given was esteemed as absolute." It must be supposed that this high commendation given by Eunapius refers to Longinus as a critic; for the Neoplatonist philosophers, of whom Eunapius was the biographer, were of divergent opinions from Longinus in their own branch. "He is," said Plotinus, "rather a philologist than a philosopher:" and Proclus (and it would appear Porphyry also) assented to the remark

(Proclus in *Platonis Timæum*, p. 27, B; Porphyry. *Vit. Plot.* p. 116). Longinus, however, was himself of opinion that he could hold his own, even in this subject: "I think," he says, "that I have satisfactorily refuted Basileus the Tyrian" (*i.e.* Porphyry himself), "who left my guidance for that of Plotinus, and has written a treatise to shew that the views of Plotinus about ideas are better than my own." Longinus also wrote a treatise against Plotinus and Amelius. It will be of interest to quote what Porphyry says with reference to this controversy, in his life of Plotinus. "Had I been able," he writes, "to accept the invitation of Longinus, this great critic would certainly not have replied to me as he did, in a treatise which he wrote without exact knowledge of the doctrine he was refuting." It will be seen that the discussion between Longinus and his Neoplatonic contemporaries was carried on with good temper and mutual respect. Porphyry styles Longinus "the greatest critic of our times, who has refuted almost all the opinions of the other contemporary writers;" and at a later period Longinus invited Porphyry to pay him a visit at Palmyra.

It is evident, however, that Longinus was a man of too practical and versatile a mind for a professor of genuine metaphysical philosophy. In spite of the eulogium of Eunapius, he was no bookworm. What exact inducements took him in the latter part of his life to the far East we do not know. Whatever the reasons, he took the occasion of a visit to Syria (probably to Emesa, where his family had lived) to settle himself in a yet more remote region. He became the instructor in Greek literature of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra; and not only the literary instructor, but one of her ablest and most valued counsellors. Of the events which followed, and which proved fatal to Longinus, it is impossible now to form an exact or certain judgment. The services of Odenathus, the husband of Zenobia, to the Roman state had been so distinguished, that the senate and Gallienus had allowed him a practically independent rule, and the title of Augustus. After the death of Odenathus, Zenobia claimed a continuance of the same independence, and even, it would appear, sought to extend her power in Asia and Egypt. However that may be, the formation and consolidation of a rival empire on their borders could not long be tolerated by the senate and emperor of Rome. A temporary success attended the arms of Zenobia in the conflict which ensued. But her next adversary was the emperor Aurelian, an able soldier, and one already victorious in the German campaigns. To Aurelian Zenobia, by the advice (we read) of Longinus (Vopisc. Aurelian. 27), addressed a spirited letter; and knowing as we do the degree in which Longinus had brooded over the courageous democracy of Athens and the orators by whom that democracy had been inspired, we may well believe that such a letter was as exalted in tone, as it was, unfortunately, ill-suited to the real interests of Zenobia and her subjects at Palmyra. Zenobia was defeated in two decisive battles: Palmyra was taken by Aurelian; and Zenobia was unfirm enough to seek shelter for herself by pleading that she had been misled by her advisers, the foremost of whom was Longinus, and surrender-

ing them to the vengeance of the emperor. The execution of Longinus was immediately ordered; and he met his death with the highest firmness and constancy, consoling and encouraging his companions in misfortune (Zosimus, i. 56). The year of his death was A.D. 273, he being then sixty years of age.

The works of Longinus were very numerous. Probably the most important was a critical treatise called *οἱ φιλόλογοι*, which must have been of very considerable length, since the 21st book of it is quoted. Of the rest, we may note two original philosophical treatises: *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, or "on the principles of things," and *περὶ τέλους*, *i.e.* "de finibus bonorum et malorum;" both these works are referred to, and the autobiographical introduction to the latter work is quoted by Porphyry in his biography of Plotinus. Other of his works were critical and explanatory; the authors most commented on by Longinus are Homer, Plato, and Demosthenes: we may note especially that he discussed the question "whether Homer is a philosopher." His polemical treatises against Plotinus, Porphyry, and Amelius, have been already referred to. (A full list of his lost works, in so far as we know their titles, will be found in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, art. "Longinus.")

Fragments only are preserved to us of the great bulk of the works of Longinus, through the quotations from him by writers of his own or subsequent ages. The only one of his treatises which has reached us in anything like fullness, is that entitled *περὶ ὑψους*, or "on the Sublime." Even of this a good deal is lost, owing to the fact that entire pages have been torn out of the manuscript at Paris, from which all other extant manuscripts of the work were copied. It is a work of very great merit, full of fine observations on the style and substance of the great classical authors.

It will be of interest to refer to the relation of Longinus to Judaism and Christianity. He would appear to have had friendly dispositions towards both. The passage in his treatise *περὶ ὑψους* in which he refers to the first chapter of Genesis for an example of the sublime, is well known:

"Thus, moreover, the lawgiver of the Jews, no common man, since he worthily comprehended the divine power, described it; writing at the very beginning of his book of laws, 'God said, Let light be, and it was: let earth be, and it was.'" (*ἔλεπεν ὁ Θεός, γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο: γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο.*)

In a short fragment (no. 1 in Cod. Vat.) which has been preserved to us, Longinus mentions also the Apostle Paul:

"Let it then be laid down, that the culmination of Greek oratory and genius is found in Demosthenes, Lysias, Aeschines, Aristides, Isaeus, Timarchus, Isocrates, the rustic Demosthenes [*i.e.* Dinarchus], Xenophon: in addition to these Paul of Tarsus, whom I even affirm to stand foremost in the teaching of such doctrine as does not admit of proof." (*πρώτον φημι προϊστάμενον δόγματος ἀναποδείκτου.*)

The genuineness of this reference has been idly disputed: for what Christian would have limited his commendation of St. Paul in such a manner? And who but a Christian would have had any object in foisting St. Paul in?

The way in which Longinus regarded the moral condition of his own time is too striking for all mention of it to be omitted here. Distinctly he looked upon his age as degenerate, and yet he was wholly unable to suggest a remedy which should not be worse than the disease. The passage in which he most directly deals with this subject is the last chapter of his *Essay on the Sublime* (xliv.) :—

“A certain philosopher,” he writes, “very lately made the following remarks to me in conversation :—

“It is a matter of surprise both to me and others, why, among all the eloquent, persuasive, and ornamental orators or writers of the present day, so few are to be found who may justly claim to be called *sublime*. This dearth of genius is universal throughout the world. Are we then to believe that a democracy is the mother of wits, and the only form of government under which true genius is called into existence and thrives? Liberty, they say, fosters sublime sentiments in the hearts of the people, and is a mighty stimulant to exertion; inspiring men with a desire to excel. . . . But we, from our youth upwards, have been used to regard political subjection as just and natural, and are strictly conservative of old forms and customs, ignorant, alas! of the one true source of sublimity—Freedom’ . . .

“To this I replied :—‘It is easy, and, moreover, one of man’s idiosyncrasies to find fault with the productions of his own times. For my own part, I consider such a dearth of genius as you mention one of the results of a long and universal peace; or rather, perhaps, that war of our passions against our reason, which is gradually leaving us in entire and disgraceful subjection to all that is base and unworthy. It is avarice and debauchery which weigh our spirits down to earth: the two evils which have overrun the globe. Nor is it possible for men who thirst after, I may say *adore* riches, to keep themselves free from such vices as are consequent on the possession of their idol. Wealth and extravagance go ever hand in hand. . . . How then can we, who live in this degenerate age, who long for a friend’s death that we may inherit his fortune, who are ever risking our lives for a little gain, and are in fact slaves to money, hope to find any critic, whose mind, uninfected by the vices around him, is fit to give or withhold the immortality of fame? Is it not, therefore, better for us to submit to be governed as we are, than to seek that freedom, which if extended, as it would be, to our passions, must necessarily involve the whole world in the most terrible disorders?’”

The last sentence is truly predicted of what happened at the dissolution of the Roman empire: the nascent organising religious power, then in the world, was all that escaped Longinus’s notice.

The editions of the treatise on the *Sublime* best worth noticing are:—the first, by Fr. Robertello, Basel, 1554, 4to: that of Tollius, 1694, 4to, with notes and Latin translation: Hudson (Oxford, 1710, 8vo, and Edinburgh, 1733, 12mo): Pearce (London, 1724, 4to, in subsequent editions 8vo). J. Toupius edited all the extant works of Longinus, with notes, emendation, and a dissertation by Ruhnken de

*Vita et Scriptis Longini*: three editions of Toupius were printed at Oxford (1778, 1789, and 1806, 8vo). The more modern editions are those of B. Weiske (Leipzig, 1809, 8vo): A. E. Egger, forming vol. i. of the *Scriptorum Græcorum Nova collectio* (Paris, 1837, 16mo): and Otto Jahn.

There may besides be consulted with respect to Longinus, Sponberg, de *Commentario Dionysii Cassii Longini περί ὑψους expositio* (Upsala, 1835, 4to), and Westermann (*Gesch. der Griech. Beredtsamkeit*, § 98, notes 1–9). A meritorious translation of the *Essay on the Sublime* is that by Mr. Herbert A. Giles (London, 1870); from this translation the last extract in this article is taken. [J. R. M.]

LONGINUS (6), a presbyter mentioned by St. Basil in his epistle to Amphilocheus, *De Canonibus* (Ep. 188, canon x.). [C. H.]

LONGINUS (7), archimandrite of Doliche, who sent a consolatory letter to Theodoret on his having been deposed by the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus in 449. (*Theod. Ep.* 131.) [E. V.]

LONY, first (but doubtful) bishop of Kildare, according to the *Red Book of Kildare*. (Ware, *Ir. Eps.* “Kildare;” *Journ. Roy. Ir. Hist. and Arch. Assoc.* 4 ser. iii. 52–4; O’Conor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* iv. 71 n. 2.) [J. G.]

LOTHARIUS, tenth bishop of Belluno, 690 (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d’Ital.* x. 110, 215). Ughelli (v. 146) places him a century and a half earlier. [C. H.]

LUA (1), Scotch saint, abbat and probably bishop of Lismore in Argyleshire, commemorated in the Scotch and Irish calendars at June 25. The radical form of the name is Lua, commonly in Irish *Lugaidh*; by the addition of the honorific prefix *mo* and of the diminutive affix *oc* or *og*, and by Latinising and popular dialectic use, we reach the great variety which the name has in form assumed. *Lamluoc* is not properly a name, but accidentally arises from the union of the two distinct words *lam luoc* in *The Obits and Martyrology of Christ Church, Dublin* (Introd. p. lxx.). His Scotch legend is given in *Brev. Aberdon.* (prop. SS. p. Est. ii. ff. 5–8) in nine lectures with antiphon and oratio, calling him *Molocus*; *Camerarius* (*De Scot. Fort.* 160) has a notice of *Molonachus* or *Molochus*, and Butler (*Lives of the Saints*, June 25) has one of St. *Moloc Dempster*, in accordance with the double commemoration at April 16 and June 25 (*Men. Scot.*), has given in his History a memoir of St. *Molocus* (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. \*449), and also of St. *Molonathus* (*ib.* ii. 455), making them both disciples of St. Brendan and writers of his Acts, but dating the one A.D. 590, and the other A.D. 628. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 25 Jun., vii. 677–80 Append.) have *De S. Moloco seu Molonatho Episcopo in Rossia Scotiæ Hodiernæ provincie*, with a sylloge prævia, and his Acts taken from the *Brev. Aberd.*

Like so many Scotch saints of the 6th and following centuries, St. Lua was a native of Ireland, being the son of Lonnanus, son of Fintanus, and descended from Conall Gulban, ancestor of St. Columba. He was a contemporary of those who composed the second class of Irish

Saints, and probably laboured some time in Ireland before leaving for Scotland; his Irish church is Kildalkey in the barony of Lune, co. Meath, and his name is found in most of the Irish Annals and Martyrologies. According to the Scotch account he was educated under St. Brendan, but he probably came with St. Columba, and may be the Luguid Mócuthemne, his companion, mentioned by Dr. Reeves (*St. Adamnan*, 246). In the account of his acts there is no little confusion with his greater namesake at Clonfert, as in his being educated under St. Congall at Bangor, his being connected with Columbanus, his being mentioned by St. Bernard, and his having founded a hundred monasteries. His work in Scotland appears to have been among the Hebrides and along the western coast. Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, &c. i. 121 n. °) think he headed a special missionary effort from Ireland. The centre of his work was Lismore, not the town of that name in the county of Waterford, as imagined by Dr. O'Donovan (*Four Mast.* i. 213 n. °), and received by others on his authority, but the "Lissmor in Albain," as given in the ancient gloss on Aengus the Culdee. In the midst of his labours in Ross he died June 25, 592, and was buried in St. Boniface's church at Rosemarkie (*Four Mast.* A.D. 588; *Ann. Ult.* 591; *Ann. Tigh.* A.D. 592). But the Scotch annalists put his death about A.D. 629 (King, Dempster). His body or relics are also said to have been at Lismore, at a place still known as Portmaluag, where the saint or his relics were first landed, and where the remains of a building said to have been his church are shewn.

His bachul, or pastoral staff, was long preserved in the neighbourhood of Lismore by its hereditary keeper, who was popularly called the "baron of bachul," and had a small holding of land in virtue of his office. But the office having lapsed to the earl of Argyll, the pastoral staff, which was the symbol of office, went with it, and is now preserved in the muniment chamber at Inverary Castle. As figured and described by the late Mr. Cosmo Innes (*Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. i. p. 162-3) it is a plain black-thorn staff, thirty-four inches in length, with no prepossessing appearance, nothing approaching to the richness of the Quigrich of St. Fillan. (For further references to the bachul of St. Moloch, see *Cat. of Antiq. &c. in Arch. Inst. of Great Brit. and Irel. held in Edinburgh*, 1856, pp. 31-2, Edinb. 1859; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* ii. 12 sq. xi. 59; Wilson, *Prehist. Ann. Scot.* 665.)

(Bp. Forbes, *Lives of SS. Nin. and Kent.* 343; Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 213 n. 102; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 188, n. 4 and *Tr. Thaum.* 481 b; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 56, 133 sq. and *Chron. Piets and Scots*, 67, 346; *Book of Obits of Ch. Ch. Dublin*, lxx.; Leslaeus, *De Reb. Gest. Scot.* l. iv. p. 148; Boece, *Scot. Hist.* B. ix. c. 18; *Trans. Roy. Ir. Acad.* xxiv. 167, *Antiq.*; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* ii. 369; O'Conor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. 159; Martin, *West. Isl. Scot.* 28, 2 ed.; Keith, *Hist. Cat. Scott. Bps.* 377; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 72, 101, 117, 132, 155, 196, 203, 238 for the Scotch kalendars.) [J. G.]

LUA (2) (LUAID, LUANUS, LUGDACH, LUGDAIGH, LUGEUS, LUGHAIDH, LUGIDUS, LUGITH, MOLUA, MOLUANUS), abbat of Cluain-fearta-

Molua, now Clonfert, Clonfert-mulloe, or Kyle, at the foot of Slieve Bloom, in the barony of Upper Ossory, Queen's County. He is commemorated Aug. 4, and is regarded as one of the fathers and chief saints of the Irish church. The most popular forms of his name are Lua, Luan, or Luanus, and Molua, the last probably predominating.

The Lives of this saint are given by Fleming (*Collectanea Sacra*, 368 sq.) and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 4 Aug. i. [339], 341-54).

Ware (*Ir. Writ.* i. c. 13) quotes from a *Life of St. Molua* or *Lugid* of uncertain age, now in Trinity College Library, Dublin, and Colgan had in preparation for April 17 (and Aug. 4) *Vita S. Moluani de Druim Sneachda*, and for Aug. 4 (and April 17) *Vita S. Moluani*, probably the one *Life* for publication at either day (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 373, 374). Among the Irish MSS. in the Burgundian Library at Brussels is a most important volume containing Lives of Irish Saints in the Latin language and written in the 15th century; it contains *Vita S. Lugidi*, f. 94, and *Vita S. Moluae*, f. 202 (*ibid.* iii. 485). (For an account of ancient Lives and MSS. see Hardy, *Descript. Cat. i.* 178-9.) O'Clery (*Mart. Doney*, by Todd and Reeves, 211) has drawn together some particulars from Cuimín of Connor and other ancient Irish sources.

Lua or Mo-Lua of Clonfert belonged to the distinguished family of the Ui-Fidheinte in the county of Limerick. His father was Carthar or Carthach, and commonly called or surnamed Coche, but the entry in the *Four Mast.* A.D. 605, is "Molua, i.e. Lughaidh Mac hUi-Oiche," which would lead us to think that Coche was a corruption of the family name. The date of his birth is unknown, but he was educated first under St. Finian at Clonard, and then under St. Congall at Bangor, co. Down, and was special friend of the principal saints at the close of the 6th century.

In the *Vita S. Maidoci*, cc. 20, 42, 54 (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 210 sq.) he is mentioned with very great reverence and affection, and generally as the soul-friend; even in the 12th century his fame was known at Clairvaux (*Vita S. Malachiae*, c. 5) and hence the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 12 Jul. iii. 236) place among their *praetermissi*, "S. Luanus abbas, de cujus sanctitate agitur in *Vita S. Malachiae episcopi*," as a separate person. His foundations appear to have all been in the southern half of Ireland, and on leaving Bangor he probably returned to his native district and founded a house at Mount Luachra. But his chief foundation was at Clonfert-mulloe on the borders of Leinster and Munster, in Queen's County. For his monks he is said to have drawn up a monastic rule; this is probably true, as the want was beginning to be keenly felt, and the Benedictine rule had not yet reached to Ireland. His death took place and his remains were deposited in his chief monastery in the beginning of the 7th century, probably A.D. 609 (*Ann. Tigh.* eo. an.; *Four Mast.* A.D. 605; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 608).

The rule was probably his only work, but Bale says he wrote *Ad Britannorum Ecclesias*, lib. i. (Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 12, § 7; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 57 a, 193 a, 405 b, 585, c. 6, 7, 590, c. 11, 594, c. 31, and *Tr. Thaum.* 88 c, 96, 113 n. 109; O'Conor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* i. pt. i.

118 n., ii. 71 n. 2, 159, iv. 122; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. pp. x. 53, 178, 541; Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 143 n.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 56; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, 171; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 511, Ind. Chron. A.D. 608; O'Flaherty, *Ogygia*, ii. pt. iii. c. 81, p. 303; O'Reilly, *Ir. Writ.* xli.; Nicolson, *Ir. Hist. Libr.* 47, Lond. 1736.)

Lua founded Drumsneachta, now Drumsnat, in the barony and county of Monaghan, and there was probably compiled the ancient historical work on Ireland called the *Book of Drumsneachta*, which is now apparently lost, and is only known from the frequent allusions made to it as an authority for the remote events in Irish history. (*Misz. Celt. Soc.* 29 n. \*; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 2nd ser. p. 245.) [J. G.]

**LUBENTIUS** (LUPENTIUS, Du Saussay), Oct. 13, presbyter in the diocese of Trèves in the reign of Constantius. His tradition, as recorded in his *Acta* and in the lectures of the church of Trèves, is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 13 Oct. vi. 200) with commentary by Foonson. (Brower, *Annal. Trevir.* t. i. p. 235, ed. 1670; Tillemont, vii. 250.) [C. H.]

**LUCANUS (1)**, or **LUCIANUS**, Marcionite (LUCANUS, Pseudo-Tert. 18; Philast. 46, and so probably their source, the Syntagma of Hippolytus; Tertull. *De Resur. Carn.* 2; Λουκιανός, Orig. *Cont. Cels.* ii. 27; on the other hand, Λουκιανός, Hippol. *Ref.* vii. 37; Epiph. *Haer.* 43). The former is both the better attested form, and also the more likely to have been altered into the other. The Lucianites are reckoned as a sect distinct from the Marcionites, as well by Origen as by Hippolytus and his followers; but the absence of authentic report of any important difference between the doctrine of the two sects leads us to believe that Lucanus did not make any separation from Marcion, but rather that after the latter's death Lucanus was a Marcionite teacher (probably at Rome), whose celebrity caused his followers to be known by his own name rather than by that of the original founder of the sect. It may be that they were so called in contradistinction to the Marcionites of the school of Apelles, who approached more nearly to the orthodox. Origen's language (οἰμαι) implies that he had not any very intimate knowledge of the teaching of Lucanus, the point on which he will not speak positively being whether or not that heretic tampered with the gospels. Epiphanius owns that the sect was extinct in his time, and that he had a difficulty in obtaining accurate information about it. Tertullian alone (*u. s.*) seems to have direct knowledge of the teaching of Lucanus. He accuses him of going beyond other heretics, who merely denied the resurrection of the body, and of maintaining that not even the soul would rise, but some other thing, neither soul nor body. Neander (*Ch. Hist.* ii. 189) interprets this to mean that Lucanus held that the ψυχή would perish and the πνεῦμα alone be immortal; and possibly this may be so, though Tertullian's language would lead us to attribute to Lucanus a theory more peculiar to himself than this would be. Some commentators, who have taken a jest of Tertullian's too literally, have, without good reason, ascribed to this heretic a doctrine

of transmigration of souls of men into bodies of brutes. They have however the authority of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 42, p. 330) for regarding this doctrine as one likely to be held by a Marcionite. It has been conjectured that Lucanus was the author of the apocryphal Acts which bore the name of Leucius as their author [LEUCIUS]; and Lardner treats the identification as so certain that he gives but one article to Leucius and Lucanus, mixing up indiscriminately what is told of each. Even however if it were certain that the Acts of Leucius were Marcionite, not Manichæan, and that they are as early as the 2nd century, there is still no ground but the similarity of name for fixing on Lucanus as the author; and it is likely that the name Leucius was but a pseudonym suggested by the name of the author of the genuine Acts of the Apostles. [G. S.]

**LUCANUS (2)** (LUCIANUS *al.*), Carthaginian acolyte with Amantius. (*Cyp. Ep.* 77, 78, 79.) [E. W. B.]

**LUCANUS (3)**, July 20, second bishop of Brixen (in the Tyrol) before the see became Sabiona (Seben). (*Boll. Acta SS.* Jul. v. 70; Sinnacher, *Gesch. der Bischöfl. Kirche Säben u. Brixen*, t. i. p. 1.) [C. H.]

**LUCAS (1)** (LUCIUS), April 22, deacon, martyr in Persia with another deacon Mucius, and Parmentius, Helimenas, and Chrysotelus, priests (Baron. *Mart. Rom.*; *Boll. Acta SS.* Ap. iii. 11). Usuard and *Vet. Rom. Mart.* place the martyrdom at Cordula, *i. e.* Cordyla in Cappadocia, for which Baronius (note, *l. c.*) proposes Corduena, a city near the Tigris. This company of martyrs, with Polychronius bishop of Babylon at their head, is mentioned in the *Acta* of St. Laurence, the period being the reign of Decius. (Surius, *Prob. SS. Hist.* 10 Aug. p. 94, cf. *Boll. Aug.* 10, 511 A.) [G. T. S.]

**LUCAS (2)**, Feb. 6, deacon of Emesa and martyr, under Numerian according to the Greeks, with Silvanus bishop of Emesa and Mocius a reader (*Bas. Menol.*); but as remarked by Tillemont (*iv.* 570, v. 108) Eusebius (*ix.* 6) places the martyrdom of Silvanus under Maximinus. [G. T. S.]

**LUCAS (3)**, bishop of Dyrrachium, the metropolis of Nova Epirus, to whom, among the metropolitans of Illyricum, Leo the Great wrote in Jan. 444, urging them to accept the authority of Anastasius of Thessalonica as his representative (*Leo. Mag. Ep.* v. p. 618). He, among others, wrote a reply highly agreeable to Leo, who writes to them again in Jan. 446 (*Ep.* xiii. p. 677). In 449 he was present at the council of Ephesus, where he assents to the acquittal of Eutyches and the condemnation of St. Flavian and Eusebius (Labbe, *Concilii*, iv. 117 c, 264 c D, 310 D). But he was also present at the orthodox council of Chalcedon in 451 (Labbe, *iv.* 82 B). There the Illyrian prelate was among those who expressed penitence for their conduct at Ephesus (Labbe, *iv.* 323 B), and afterwards assented to the condemnation of Dioscorus, and the "Forma" of St. Leo. We have another letter from Leo to Lucas in 457 (*Ep.* cl.) on the subject of the Eutychian violence in Egypt, and in the same year he also received the circular letter

of the emperor Leo on the same subject, to which we have a reply from the bishops of New Epirus, headed by Lucas (Labbe, iv. 973 c). This reply is moderate in tone. In upholding the council of Chalcedon, it describes its doctrinal definition as only "an interpretation of the few syllables" of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan definitions. (Labbe, 974 D; Farlati, *Illyricum Sacrum*, vii. 343; *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 242.) [C. G.]

**LUCAS (4)**, a heterodox presbyter in the jurisdiction of Eusebious bishop of Thessalonica. (Greg. Mag. lib. x. ind. iii. ep. 42 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii.; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* num. 1321, 1424.) [T. W. D.]

**LUCENTIUS (1)**, bishop, legate of pope Leo the Great to the East (Leo Magn. epp. 83, 85, 86 in *Pat. Lat.* liv.). With Paschasius bishop of Lilybaeum for a senior colleague he represented Leo at the council of Chalcedon in 451 (ep. 90), and he also brought the *Gesta* of that council to Rome (ep. 101). The records of the council in three places (Mansi, vi. 1046 A, 1081 B, vii. 135 c) describe him as ἐπίσκοπος Ἐρкулανῶν, and as episcopus Esculanensis (and Erculanæ) ecclesiae, but in one of the letters (*Ep.* 103) he is designated Asulanus. Baronius (*A. E.* ann. 451, viii.) and others make him bishop of Asculum (Ascoli) in Picenum. (Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* i. 489; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* vii. 680, 793; Ceillier, x. 220, 682; Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. index.) On the opinion of his having been the continuator of Prosper, see *Liberat. Brev.* cap. 2, with Garnier's note, and Tillem. xvi. 733, 734. [C. H.]

**LUCENTIUS (2)**, bishop of Coimbra before the year 561 A.D. He is the first known bishop of the see, which was one of the Lusitanian bishoprics annexed to the province of Galicia during the Suevian rule, and subsequently restored to Lusitania after the fall of the Suevian kingdom. Lucentius subscribed the Acts of the first and second councils of Braga (A.D. 561, 572). (*Esp. Sagr.* xv. 110; Tejada y Ramiro, *Colec. de Cun.* ii. pp. 619, 630.) [M. A. W.]

**LUCHRAIDH** is enumerated among the members of St. Patrick's household in a poem of the 11th century preserved in the *Book of Lecan*, f. 44 b. St. Patrick's stonemason, who built the first damliags or stone churches in Ireland, were Caemhan, Cruithnech, and Luchraidh. (Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 141-2; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 141 n. 2.) [J. G.]

**LUCHTIGERN, LUCHTIGHERNA** (LUGHTIGERN, LUGHTIGHERN), Irish saint, disciple of St. Ruadhan of LORHA, and abbat of Inistymon, co. Clare. In the *Vita S. Itaë* (c. 28), he is found in company with Lasreanus or Laisre of Drumliag, but appears to have been different from Luchern or Luctigern, disciple of St. Comgall at Bangor. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 70, c. 28, 72 n. 28, 590, c. 11, 594 n. 14; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 88-9, iii. 28.) He must have flourished in the 6th century. [J. G.]

**LUCIA (1)**, Dec. 13, virgin and martyr at Syracuse, under the president Paschasius in the Diocletian persecution. (*Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Bedæ, Adon., Usuard.; Aldhelm. *Laud. Virginit.* num. xliii.; Bas. *Menol.*; Ceillier, xii. 867; Ruinart,

*Acta Sinc.* p. 620, note ed. A.D. 1713; Tillem. v. 142.) Her acts relate that having early taken a secret vow of celibacy, she rejected a pagan suitor whom her mother Eutychia desired her to marry, and was in consequence denounced to the governor as a Christian. Sentenced to outrage she baffled her persecutors, but under subsequent cruelties she expired in prison. Her intercession is sometimes sought for distemper of the eyes. [LUCIA (6) in *Dict. Chr. Ant.*]

[G. T. S.]

**LUCIA (2)**, companion and fellow martyr with St. Ursula in the 5th century. She is, perhaps, "Lucia the Happy," mentioned by Aægus in his Metrical Calendar (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, 155), and patron of Capel Bettws Lleicw in Llanddewi Brefi parish, co. Cardigan. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 52, 327; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 169.) [J. G.]

**LUCIANISTAE**, heretics. (Epiph. *Indic. Haer.* in *Pat. Gr.* xli. 579 and *Haer.* xliii. 1; John of Damascus, *Haer.* cap. 43 in *Pat. Gr.* xciv. 703.) [LUCANUS (1).] [C. H.]

**LUCIANUS (1)**, African bishop, Cyp. *Ep.* 70. (Syn. Carth. *de Bapt. Haer.* 1.) [E. W. B.]

**LUCIANUS (2)**, seventeenth bishop in Conc. Carth. iii. *de Pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; sixth bishop in Conc. Carth. iv. *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 70; forty-third Suffrage in *Sentt.* Cyp. Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bapt. Haer.* iii. bishop of Rucuma, Prov. Proc. [E. W. B.]

**LUCIANUS (3)**, bishop of Carthage following St. Cyprian, or, according to another reading, following Cyprian's successor Carphophorus (Optat. *Schism. Donat.* i. 19 in *Pat. Lat.* xi.; Morcelli, i. 53). It is stated in a letter of Montanus and others, disciples of Cyprian, that the martyr Flavian [FLAVIANUS (27)] before his suffering designated Lucian (*al. lec.* Lucinus), for the successor of Cyprian (Surius, *Prob. SS. Hist.* 24 Feb. p. 189, num. xiv.; Baron. *A. E.* ann. 262 xxix. xxx.; Tillem. iv. 11, 184, 269). His successor was Mensurius. [C. H.]

**LUCIANUS (4)**, Jan. 8, bishop (or perhaps presbyter) and apostle of Beauvais, said to have come to Gaul with St. Dionysius, and to have been martyred A.D. 290. (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 459; *Acta Fabulosa* of Dionys. Areop. §§ 4, 5, 6 in *Acta SS.* 9 Oct. iv. 792; *Gall. Ch.* ix. 694; Tillem. iv. 443, 537, v. 4.) [R. T. S.]

**LUCIANUS (5)**, a Donatist bishop who joined other Donatist bishops in a request to Constantine to grant that a trial of the affair of Caecilianus should be held before Gallic bishops, in order to ensure fairness, A.D. 314. (Opt. i. 22; Aug. *Ep.* 53, 5; 76, 2; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 211, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

**LUCIANUS (6)** (*al. lec.* LOLLIANUS), bishop of Phellus in Lycia, mentioned by St. Basil in a letter (*Ep.* 218, al. 403). [L. D.]

**LUCIANUS (7)**, one of the Donatist bishops of Rome, perhaps about A.D. 380. (Opt. ii. 4; Tillem. vi. 88.) [H. W. P.]

**LUCIANUS (8)**. Nearly the whole that we know of this famous satirist—the wittiest,



except Aristophanes, of all the extant writers of antiquity—is drawn from his own writings. Born (probably about A.D. 120) at Samosata on the Euphrates, not far from the confines of Cilicia, the son of poor parents, he was in the first instance destined to be a sculptor. Two circumstances contributed to this determination on the part of his parents: one, the skill with which he made little wax images (for making which, he tells us, he was often whipped at school); the other, the fact that he had an uncle who was a statuary of some distinction. But being apprenticed to this uncle, he was unlucky enough at his first trial to break a marble tablet by pressing too hard upon it. Being beaten for this, he ran away, and complained to his parents of the cruelty of his uncle; insinuating at the same time that he had been beaten through envy of his superior merit. His mother took his part, and he was not compelled to follow a distasteful profession. From the piece called *The Dream* (περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου), in which these particulars are stated, it would appear that at this moment he embraced the resolve to follow literature as his occupation. But the difficulties in his way were great. Apparently he did not at this time even speak the Greek language with accuracy; he was poor, friendless, and illeclad (δὲς κατηγορούμενος, § 27). In this condition he wandered about Ionia, in part applying himself to advocacy (in which capacity Suidas tells us that he practised at Antioch), but as his success in this branch was not remarkable, he gradually betook himself to the composing and reciting of rhetorical exercises. This he did with continually increasing success as he journeyed westwards. In Greece he became acquainted with some of the most noted persons in that country (as, for instance, Demonax, the philosopher); from thence he crossed over into Italy; and on his sojourn in Gaul, his success reached the highest pitch. But in course of time his rhetorical vein exhausted itself; others, he found, were preferred to himself (δὲς κατηγορ. § 32); and disgusted with a pursuit the artificiality of which was no longer compensated by his success in it, he betook himself to that style of writing—dialogue—on which his permanent fame has rested. This was when he was about forty years old. It must have been about the same time that he returned eastwards again, and settled for a time at Athens (cf. δὲς κατηγορ. l. c.); but he was by no means stationary there. We find him at Olympia in A.D. 165, when he saw the extraordinary self-immolation by fire of the sophist Peregrinus. A little later he visited Paphlagonia, where he vehemently attacked, and made a bitter enemy of, the impostor Alexander of Abonoteichos. Of the extraordinary success of this man in deluding the weak and credulous minds of the rude people of those parts, and even the cultivated senators of Rome, Lucian has left us an animated account in his piece entitled *The False Prophet* (Ψευδόμαντις). Lucian on one occasion had an interview with him, and stooping down, instead of kissing his hand, as was the custom, bit it severely. Luckily he had a guard of two soldiers with him, sent by his friend the governor of Cappadocia (a proof of Lucian's importance at this time), or he would have fared badly at the hands

of the attendants of Alexander. Alexander restrained his anger, and pretended reconciliation, and subsequently even lent Lucian a ship to return home in, but gave secret instructions to the crew to throw him overboard in the course of the voyage. The master of the ship, however, repented, and Lucian was landed at Aegialos, from which place he was conveyed to Amastris in a ship belonging to the ambassadors of king Eupator. He endeavoured to get Alexander punished for this piece of treachery, but the influence of the false prophet was too strong for him. Of Lucian's later years we know but little; he was, however, at last appointed by the emperor (probably Commodus) to a post of honour and emolument in Egypt. For accepting this he was accused by his enemies of servility, and of insincerity in those writings which he had directed against the parasites of the great; he defended himself with good sense and spirit in a pamphlet entitled, ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων, a "Defence of those who accept Service for Pay." The difference between private and public services was one, indeed, too obvious to be overlooked by any impartial person.

From the burlesque drama entitled *Tragopodagra*, it is no unnatural inference that Lucian suffered from the gout. The cause, manner, and time of his death we are ignorant of. The story handed down (or invented) by Suidas, that he was torn in pieces by dogs for his impiety, bears untrustworthiness on the face of it. Some writers have represented him as an apostate from Christianity; this is, however, very improbable, and rests on no good authority. Lucian was married, and had a son (Eunuchus, § 13); but beyond this we know nothing of his married life. Nor, indeed, do we know much of his personal character in matters of daily life; his writings are by no means free from lasciviousness; it is, however, obvious that he earned a good deal of esteem from his contemporaries. His writings, with all their brilliancy, do not convey the impression of a warm-hearted man; the *Peregrinus* is especially noticeable for the hard unconcern with which he describes alike the self-sacrificing love of the Christians, and the self-sought death, tragic as it certainly was in its main features, of the sophist. For cool common sense, and determination to see everything in its naked reality, apart from the disturbing influences of hope and fear, of enthusiasm and superstition, he has never in any age been surpassed. His character could not, indeed, in the most essential part of it, be better described than in his own words, in the dialogue entitled 'Ἀλιεύς, or the *Fisherman*: μισαλάων εἰμι καὶ μισογῆς καὶ μισοψευδῆς καὶ μισότυφος καὶ μισῶ πᾶν τὸ τοιούτωδες εἶδος τῶν μαρῶν ἀνθρώπων· πάνν δὲ πολλοὶ εἰσιν. "I am a hater of imposture, jugglery, lies, and ostentation, and in short of all that rascally sort of men; and there are very many of them" (§ 20). And shortly afterwards, he says very candidly, that there was some danger of his losing his power of esteem and love, for want of opportunities of exercising it; whereas opportunities in the contrary direction were ample and frequent.

For a complete analysis of Lucian's works, the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography* should be consulted (art. LUCIAN). Here it must suffice to indicate his relations to the

religious influences of his time; and, above all, to Christianity.

The progress of experience, the leisure of research, had, in the time of Lucian, shattered all real definite belief in the gods of ancient Greece and Rome, in the minds of cultured men. The startling void, which few men could fail to feel at this collapse of all that had been most honoured and revered in the simpler and better times of their forefathers, was seldom, however, plainly acknowledged. The vast crowd of deities, which the conflux of so many nations under the protecting shadow of Rome had gathered together, received, collectively and separately, a certain respect from the most incredulous. To the statesman, the gods of Rome were the highest symbol of the power of the imperial city; as such, he required for them external homage, to refuse which might be construed as rebellion against the state. Philosophers feared lest, if the particular acts of special deities were too rudely criticised, the reverence due to the gods in their remote and abstract sanctity might decay. Hence both these classes practically favoured the sway of religious beliefs to which they had themselves ceased to adhere. Meanwhile, the multitude were tossed about from religion to religion, from ceremony to ceremony, from rite to rite, in the vain hope that among so great an assemblage of supernatural powers, some might be found to lead men rightly in the path of safety and of happiness. The urgent need which the mass of men felt for guidance, and the actual deficiency of sound guidance, formed a combination most favourable to the designs of greedy impostors. The Stoic philosophers, it is true, had formed a moral system which was capable of impressing on intellectual minds a remarkable self-restraint, and large elements of virtue. But in hopefulness, the living sap which gives virtue its vitality, the Stoic was grievously deficient; and hence his philosophy was powerless with the multitude, and apt to degenerate into a hypocritical semblance even with its learned professors. In short, though the history of mankind shews eras in which single delusions have prevailed, more fatal in effect than any with which the 2nd century of the Roman empire can be justly charged, there probably was never a time when so great a variety of hypocrisies and false beliefs has prevailed among men.

Upon such a world Lucian turned the glance of a cold penetrating intellect, and expressed what he saw with an audacity that has seldom been paralleled. The ordinary method of his satire on the mythology of Greece and Rome consists in simply exhibiting the current legends as he finds them, stripping off the halo of awe and splendour with which they had habitually been surrounded, and presenting them as bare plain facts to the amused and critical reader. Sometimes his attack is more direct; as in the *Zeús Tragḗdōs*, Jupiter the tragedian, where the plain insinuation is that the general profession of belief in the gods was simply occasioned by the odium and alarm which a contrary assertion would excite. Not so absolutely sweeping in extent, but still more unreserved in the style in which the proceedings of the heathen deities are exposed, is the treatise *περὶ θυσῶν*, on Sacrifices. As from the *Zeús Tragḗdōs* we may

infer Lucian's disbelief in any divine governance of the world, so from the treatise *περὶ πένθους*, on Mourning, we see that he disbelieved in immortality. It must, of course, be remembered, that as the popular and picturesque aspect of these doctrines in his time was full of absurdity, so the philosophic defence of them was certainly inadequate. It does not, however, tell favourably for Lucian's impartiality or depth of mind, when we find him still more bitter in his attacks on the philosophers than in his attacks on the popular mythology. It is true that in his dialogue entitled *Ἀλιεύς*, the Fisherman, he represents himself as simply having attacked the degenerate and mock followers of the different sects, and even claims the support of the real chiefs of philosophy, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and Chrysippus, in his sarcasms on their pseudo-followers. But the defence will hardly hold; for no one who reads the very amusing satire of Lucian on Pythagoras or Chrysippus can possibly feel his estimate of those philosophers raised by such delineations. Nor can we avoid thinking that there is some overcharging of the picture, when we find Lucian attacking very nearly the entire body of the philosophers of his time (except the Epicureans) on the ground of lucre-loving hypocrisy. His biography of *Demonax* supplies, perhaps, the single exception to this remark; and one anecdote which he has recorded of that philosopher is both the kindest and most humane touch to be found in the whole of Lucian, and also notable as shewing that there were some even among the ancients who protested against the cruel gladiatorial shows. "The Athenians," he writes, "having some intention to build an amphitheatre for gladiators in imitation of the Corinthians, he (*Demonax*) went into the assembly and cried out, 'Before you determine this point, O Athenians, you should destroy the altar of mercy.'"

Lucian is, as Gesner justly observed, *ἠθικώτατος*—a most extensive observer of character; and few satirists have had a wider range or a more subtle wit. But as few, if any, satirists have had a temperament more absolutely devoid of enthusiasm; so few, if any, have been so sweeping, so unlimited in their condemnation of their own age. It is as natural to associate Lucian with the early Christians in the latter respect as it is to contrast him with them in the former. What was Lucian's attitude towards Christianity, which in his age was beginning to be known as no inconsiderable power in all parts of the Roman world?

Three dialogues have to be considered in giving an answer to this question—*Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ Ψευδόμαντις*, Alexander, or the False Prophet; *περὶ τῆς Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς*, concerning the death of Peregrius; and the *Philopatris*. Let us dismiss this last in the first instance, as pretty certainly no genuine work of its reputed author. The *Philopatris* is a distinct attack on Christianity; that is its sole motive; and it shews a knowledge of Christian doctrine so considerable, that were Lucian really its author, the suspicion would not be unnatural (though even then far from a proved certainty) that he had really been at one time a Christian. Nevertheless, of really interesting information respecting the early Christians the *Philopatris* is almost void; and by whomsoever written it

cannot be considered an important dialogue. The sole point, beyond the barest persiflage, which the writer urges against the Christians, consists in the prophecies of evil which, partly under the influence of dreams and visions, they would appear to have directed against the heathen empire. But since Gesner's dissertation *de Aetate et Auctore Philopatridis*, written in the middle of the last century, there has been a general consent among scholars that the dialogue is spurious. An imitation of Lucian it certainly is, for it abounds in his most peculiar and distinctive terms. But whatever argument for its genuineness might be drawn from this source is counterbalanced by the great inferiority of the dialogue in talent, and especially in dramatic talent. Whereas in Lucian's genuine dialogues, the characters are in every case clearly and sharply defined, here, on the contrary, there is no opposition whatever between the two speakers, Triephton and Critias; both are on the same side, both are absolutely agreed; it is impossible to know which is speaking, except by looking at the head of the speech. Then, too, the Philopatris has an optimistic, a patriotic tone, never found in the real Lucian. The historical allusions in the dialogue are indeterminate. But the strongest argument against the genuineness of the Philopatris is that drawn from the use of the word *ἐξισωτής*. The word signifies "an officer appointed to equalise the taxes;" and not only is the word unused, and the office in question unmentioned, before the time of Constantine; but we have in Eusebius an account of what appears to be the first appointment by that emperor of such officers, and the reason of the appointment. After the time of Constantine the word (and its Latin equivalent *peraequator*) is used not unfrequently. The argument from the use of this word is due to Gesner, and may be held to be almost decisive on the question. If, then, the dialogue was written after the time of Constantine, it cannot have been written at any other time than in the reign of Julian, and during his Persian expedition. Gesner suggests that it may have been written by that other Lucian who was a friend of Julian; there is nothing to necessitate our thinking so, but there is no impossibility in the supposition. It is worth observing that the MSS. call the Philopatris spurious: *οὗτος ὁ λόγος νοθεύεται τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ*, is written at the termination of it.

The allusions to the Christians by the genuine Lucian must now be referred to. The most sympathetic of these is in the "Alexander, or the False Prophet," where the Christians are joined with the Epicureans (whom Lucian much admired) as persistent and indomitable opponents of that fine specimen of rascality. But a much fuller and more interesting account of the Christians is that contained in the work *On the Death of Peregrinus*. This work (together with the Philopatris) was placed on the Index Expurgatorius, and hence does not appear in the first and second Aldine editions of Lucian (Venice, 1503 and 1522). Yet all that it says about the early Christians is very highly to their credit, except that it attributes to them a too great *εὐθραία*, a simplicity and guilelessness which rendered them liable to be deceived by worthless pretenders to sanctity. That this charge may have had some foundation cannot

be thought to be impossible. It will be worth while to quote the passage (which, it will be seen, contains one or two statements—that about the new Socrates, and the eating forbidden food—which it is difficult to think strictly accurate). Peregrinus Proteus, it should be observed, was a Cynic philosopher who flourished in the reign of the Antonines, and who, after a life of singularly perverted ambition, carried out the fanatical resolve of burning himself publicly at the Olympian games, A.D. 165. (Whether the accounts of his debauchery and parricide related by so bitter an enemy as Lucian are correct must be considered doubtful, especially in the view of the much more favourable view of his character given by Aulus Gellius.) The passage to which we have referred runs as follows in Francklin's translation:—

"About this time it was that he learned the wonderful wisdom of the Christians, being intimately acquainted with many of their priests and scribes. In a very short time he convinced them that they were all boys to him; became their prophet, their leader, grand president, and, in short, all in all to them. He explained and interpreted several of their books, and wrote some himself, insomuch that they looked upon him as their legislator and high priest, nay, almost worshipped him as a god. Their leader, whom they yet adore, was crucified in Palestine for introducing this new sect. Proteus was on this account cast into prison, and this very circumstance was the foundation of all the consequence and reputation which he afterwards gained, and of that glory which he had always been so ambitious of; for when he was in bonds the Christians, considering it as a calamity affecting the common cause, did everything in their power to release him, which when they found impracticable, they paid him all possible deference and respect; old women, widows, and orphans were continually crowding to him; some of the most principal of them even slept with him in the prison, having bribed the keepers for that purpose; there were costly suppers brought in to them; they read their sacred books together, and the noble Peregrinus (for so he was then called) was dignified by them with the title of the New Socrates. Several of the Christian deputies from the cities of Asia came to assist, to plead for, and comfort him. It is incredible with what alacrity these people support and defend the public cause—they spare nothing, in short, to promote it. Peregrinus being made a prisoner on their account, they collected money for him, and he made a very pretty revenue of it. These poor men, it seems, had persuaded themselves that they should be immortal, and live for ever. They despised death, therefore, and offered up their lives a voluntary sacrifice, being taught by their lawgiver that they were all brethren, and that, quitting our Grecian gods, they must worship their own sophist, who was crucified, and live in obedience to his laws. In compliance with them they looked with contempt on all worldly treasures, and held everything in common—a maxim which they had adopted without any reason or foundation. If any cunning impostor, therefore, who knew how to manage matters came amongst them, he soon grew rich by imposing on the credulity of these weak and

foolish men. Peregrinus, however, was set at liberty by the governor of Syria, a man of learning and a lover of philosophy, who withal well knew the folly of the man, and that he would willingly have suffered death for the sake of that glory and reputation which he would have acquired by it. Thinking him, however, not worthy of so honourable an exit, he let him go. . . . Once more, however, he was obliged to fly his country. The Christians were again his resource, and, having entered into their service, he wanted for nothing. Thus he subsisted for some time; but at length, having done something contrary to their laws (I believe it was eating food forbidden amongst them), he was reduced to want, and forced to retract his donation to the city, and to ask for his estate again, and issued a process in the name of the emperor to recover it; but the city sent messages to him commanding him to remain where he was, and be satisfied."

It would seem from the above passage that community of goods, in some degree or other, was practised among the early Christians up to a later date than is, perhaps, generally supposed. Lucian, it will be seen, confirms the general opinion as to the continual liability to persecution in which the Christians of those ages stood. Moreover, though considering them weak and deluded people, he brings no charge of imposture or falsehood against them; this, from an author so prone to bring such charges, is worth notice. In fact, did we know nothing else of the early Christians but what he here records, his account of them would raise our interest in them in a very high degree; even their too great simplicity is not an unloveable trait, though one that deserves note. Lucian, however, evidently looks at them from a distance; he has no special design of attacking them, but as it came in his way to mention them, he employs his keen pen in satirising their distinctive characteristics.

The *editio princeps* of Lucian's work was published at Florence in 1496, fol. The Aldine editions have been mentioned. The best edition is probably that of Hemsterhuis, published at Amsterdam in 1743, 3 vols. 4to. To this are attached notes by numerous commentators besides Hemsterhuis himself, and Gesner's dissertation on the Philopatris is appended to it. W. Dindorf published the text with a Latin version in 1840 (ed. Paris, 8vo). There is an excellent translation of Lucian by Wieland into German (Leipzig, 1788-9, 6 vols. 8vo), and one of great merit into English by Dr. Franklin (sometime Greek professor at Cambridge, and a translator of Sophocles), in 2 vols. 4to, London, 1780, and 4 vols. 8vo, London, 1781. In Dr. Franklin's translation seven of the pieces are omitted, but none of these are of any importance. Other editions and translations of Lucian will be found mentioned in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. [J. R. M.]

**LUCIANUS (9)**, African presbyter, who carried to Cyprian Quintus's letter of inquiry about baptism, which is replied to in Cyp. *Ep.* 71. [E. W. B.]

**LUCIANUS (10)**, Carthaginian confessor. He had prayed at night upon the ground (in terra

dormiens) that he might be captured, and so be able to minister in prison to the confessors who had been tortured (floridi). His sufferings in prison were great. He was the inventor of the circular of dispensation. Previously applications had been made to the bishop to examine into cases (*Ep.* 16; compare *Ep.* 27 and MAP-PALICUS and SATURNINUS). But Lucian circulated dispensations (gregatim) in the names of PAULUS and AURELIUS (*q. v.* as also CELERINUS), and was even applied to for them from Rome. He granted them without discrimination; only desiring that on the return of peace they should confess before the bishop, thus throwing on him the accumulated *invidia* of rejecting the petitions of penitents and martyrs at once. Cyprian's remonstrance (*Ep.* 27) he answered by issuing a libellus "Universis (lapsis) universorum (confessorum) nomine" (*Ep.* 23). This note and his ungrammatical letter (*Ep.* 22) to Celerinus bear out what Cyprian says, not only of his want of consideration of ecclesiastical order, but of his "want of grounding" and of "experience" in the reading of Scripture (*Dominica lectio*). See LIBELLUS, *Dict. Chr. Ant.* [E. W. B.]

**LUCIANUS (11)**, Oct. 26 (Baron.), Nov. 26 (Assem.), martyr with Marcianus and Florius at Nicomedia in the Decian persecution, A.D. 250. (*Mart. Rom.*; *Assem. Mart. Orient.* ii. 49; *Ruinart, Acta Sinc.* Ceillier, ii. 120, iii. 344; *Tillem.* iii. 338.) [G. T. S.]

**LUCIANUS (12)**, Jan. 7 (Usuard.), Oct. 15 (Basil. *Menol.*), priest of Antioch martyred at Nicomedia under Maximinus in 311 or 312. He was born at Samosata about A.D. 240, of respectable and religious parents, whom he lost by death at the age of twelve. He was educated at Edessa under a certain Macarius, a learned expounder of Holy Scripture (Suidas, *s. v.*). After a time Lucianus transferred himself to Antioch, which held a high rank among the schools of the East, and which then, owing to the controversies raised by Paulus of Samosata, was the great centre of theological interest. There most probably he was instructed by Malchion. This Malchion seems to have been the true founder of the celebrated Antiochene school of divines, of whom Lucianus, Chrysostom, Diodorus, Theodoret, and Theodore of Mopsuestia were afterwards some of the most distinguished. During the controversies which ensued upon the deposition of Paulus, Lucianus seems to have fallen under suspicion. Some have thought that he cherished sentiments akin to those of Paulus himself, which were of a Sabellian character, while others think that in opposing Paulus he used expressions akin to Arianism (cf. Newman's *Arians*, p. 7, and cap. i. sec. 5). This latter view is supported by the creed which was presented at the council of Antioch, A.D. 341, purporting to be drawn up by St. Lucian, which is extremely anti-Sabellian. He consequently lived separate from the communion of the three immediate successors of Paulus, Domnus, Timaeus, and Cyrillus. During the episcopate of Cyrillus he was restored to church fellowship, and became in union with Dorotheus the head of the theological school, giving to it the tone of literal, as opposed to allegorical, exposition of Scripture, which it retained till

the time of Chrysostom and Theodore of Mop-  
nestia [DIDORUS, CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORUS,  
DOROTHEUS]. Lucianus produced, possibly with  
the help of Dorotheus, a revised version of the  
Septuagint, which was used, as Jerome tells us,  
in the churches of Constantinople, Asia Minor,  
and Antioch, and which met with such universal  
acceptance that it received the name of the Vul-  
gate (Vulgata, *Kouh*), while copies of the Septua-  
gint in general passed under the title of Lucianea  
(Westcott, *Hist. of Canon*, p. 360). He also  
wrote some doctrinal treatises, and a commen-  
tary on Job. See Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* v. 3-17.  
Dr. Newman, in *Arians of the Fourth Century*,  
ascribes the rise of the Arian heresy to the  
Syrian school of biblical criticism. He says  
(p. 414), "If evidence be wanted of the con-  
nexion of heterodoxy and biblical criticism in  
that age, it is found in the fact that, not long  
after their contemporaneous appearance in Syria,  
they are found combined in the person of Theod-  
ore of Heraclea, an able commentator, and an active  
enemy of St. Athanasius. . . . It may almost  
be laid down as an historical fact that the  
mystical interpretation and orthodoxy will stand  
or fall together." (For another view of the  
Antiochene school, and its doctrine of the person  
of Christ, see Neander, *H. E.* iv. 108.)

In the school of Lucianus the leaders and  
supporters of the Arian heresy were trained.  
Arius himself, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris  
of Chalcedon, Leontius of Antioch, Eudoxius,  
Theognis of Nicaea, Asterius—these men  
appealed to him as their authority, and adopted  
from him the party designation of Collucianists  
(De Broglie, *L'Eglise et L'Empire*, i. 375). With  
the lapse of years Lucianus became more con-  
servative, and when the persecution of Diocletian  
burst upon the church, he encouraged the martyrs  
to suffer courageously, but escaped himself  
till Theotecnus was appointed governor of An-  
tioch, when he was betrayed by the Sabellian  
party, seized and forwarded to Nicomedia to the  
emperor Maximinus, where, after delivering a  
speech in defence of the faith, he was starved for  
many days, tempted with meats offered to idols,  
and finally put to death in prison, Jan. 7, 311 or  
312. His body was buried at Drepana in Bithy-  
nia, where his relics were visited by Constantine,  
who freed the city from taxes, and changed its  
name to Helenopolis. A fragment of the apology  
delivered by the martyr has been preserved by  
Rufinus, and will be found in Routh, *l.c.* Dr.  
Westcott, *l.c.*, accepts it as genuine.

The question has been raised whether Lucianus  
the martyr and biblical critic was the same  
person as Lucianus the excommunicated heretic.  
Ceillier, Fleury, and De Broglie take one side,  
Dr. Newman the other. The former contend  
that neither Eusebius, Jerome, nor Chrysostom  
mentions his lapse in early life. But as their  
notices are very brief, and none of them are  
professed biographies, we cannot depend much  
upon mere negative evidence. On the other  
hand we have the positive statements of Alex-  
ander bishop of Alexandria (in Theodoret, *H. E.*  
i. 3, and Philostorg. *H. E.* ii. 14 and 15; see  
also Epiphanius, *Ancorat.* cap. 33), which,  
together with the fact that the Arian party at  
Antioch sheltered themselves behind a creed said  
to have been "written in the hand of Lucian  
himself, who suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia"

(Soz. *H. E.* iii. 5), outweigh the improbability  
involved in the silence of the other. He may  
easily have been thirty years in church com-  
munion when he died, and with the Christians of  
the 4th century a martyrdom like his would  
more than make amends for his early fall.

The creed of Lucianus will be found in Hefele,  
*Hist. of Councils*, ii. 77, Clark's ed.; cf. Sozomen,  
*H. E.* iii. 5, vi. 12. Bishop Bull maintains the  
authenticity and orthodoxy of this creed (*Def.*  
*of Nic. Creed*, lib. iv. cap. xiii. vi. sec. 5).

(*Mart. Vet. Rom.*; *Mart.*, Adon., Usuard.;  
Wright's *Syriac. Mart.* Euseb. viii. 13, ix. 6;  
Chrysost. *Hom.* in Lucian, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.*  
tom. 1. p. 520; Gieseler, *H. E.* i. 248; Neander,  
*H. E.* ii. 498.) In the last will be found the  
numerous references to Lucianus in St. Jerome's  
writings. [G. T. S.]

**LUCIANUS (13)**, a Christian chamberlain  
to Diocletian about A.D. 282-300. A letter  
ascribed to Theonas, a contemporary bishop of  
Alexandria, is addressed to him. It is printed  
with comments by D'Achery (*Spicil.* iii. 297, ed.  
1723) and Migne (*Pat. Gr.* x. 1569). He was  
successful in inducing many officers of the  
palace to embrace the Christian religion (ep. § 1;  
Tillem. iv. 579, 582, v. 5, 180). [W. M. S.]

**LUCIANUS (14)**, a deacon of Cirta, associated  
with Silvanus in the Acts of "tradition," A.D.  
303 or 304, for which the latter was condemned  
by Zenophilus, A.D. 320. (*Aug. Exc. ad Don.*  
*Pert.* vol. ix.; App. p. 798; *Mon. Vet. Don.*  
p. 178, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

**LUCIANUS (15)**, presbyter of the church of  
Caphargamala, near Jerusalem, author of a letter  
on the reputed discovery (A.D. 415) of the relics  
of St. Stephen. It is printed in Surius (*Prob.*  
*SS. Hist.* t. iii. Aug. 3, p. 31), in Baronius  
(*A. E.* ann. 414 vi.), and in the appendix to the  
7th volume of St. Augustine's works, *Patr. Lat.*  
xli. p. 807, where a preliminary *Admonitio*  
gives information on the literature of the subject.  
Lucian is mentioned in Photius (*cod.* 171). For  
more about him and the letter see the note of  
Baronius at Aug. 3 of the *Roman Martyrology*;  
Ceillier, ix. 327; Tillemont, *Mém.* ii. 9-12, 27;  
*Dict. Christ. Ant.* STEPHEN. [W. M. S.]

**LUCIDUS (1)**, bishop of Leontium in Sicily,  
received a letter from Gregory the Great. (*Epist.*  
lib. iii. indict. vi. 48; Migne, lxxvii. p. 1252.)  
[A. H. D. A.]

**LUCIDUS (2)**, a Gallic presbyter accused  
of holding extreme opinions on the questions  
raised in the Prædestinarian controversies of  
the 5th century. Among the works of Faustus  
bishop of Riez is a letter addressed to him on  
the subject by that prelate, who was probably  
his diocesan. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* liii. 683;  
Mansi, vii. 1008.) [T. W. D.]

**LUCIFERUS I.**, bishop of Calaris (Cag-  
liari), in Sardinia, a confessor whose dogmatic  
zeal was too intolerant for Athanasius or Jerome,  
and led him to renounce communion with Catho-  
lics of the purest orthodoxy as tainted by com-  
pliance with Arianism. The earliest mention of  
him is in a letter of pope Liberius, addressed to  
Eusebius of Vercellæ. Moved by great anxiety

about the efforts that were then being made (A.D. 354) to procure a condemnation of Athanasius by the Western bishops, Lucifer had come from Sardinia to Rome to consult with Liberius, and had offered to go as an envoy of the bishop of Rome to the emperor Constantius to ask him to summon a council. Liberius accepted the offer, and sent him, accompanied by the priest Pancratius and the deacon Hilarius, on a mission to the emperor. They took with them a letter to Constantius, and another to Eusebius, asking this zealous orthodox bishop to join them on their way and to do what he could to bring anti-Arian influence to bear on the emperor. The council was granted, and met at Milan in A.D. 354. The Arian party, supported by the emperor, was strong in it, and a proposal to condemn Athanasius was immediately brought forward; but it was resisted by Lucifer with such vehemence that the first day's meeting broke up in confusion, and his opponents prevailed on the emperor to confine him in the palace. Some particulars of the subsequent history of this council are to be found in Lucifer's writings, in Athanasius, *Hist. Arian. ad Monachos*, and in a Life of St. Dionysius of Milan (Bolland. May 25, pp. 46, 47). This life, though probably belonging to a much later date, gives details which have an air of genuineness. It is said that on the second day the people missed Lucifer, and asked where he was. Dionysius replied that he was shut up in the palace, but that Jesus Christ could not be prevented from being there with him. On the third day a letter was brought from Lucifer to Dionysius and Eusebius, and the people asked that it might be read to them. But the Arians raised such a clamour that the letter could not be heard till nightfall. On the fourth day three eunuchs came from the palace to ask what Dionysius and his friends desired of the emperor. They replied that they wished for liberty of discussion with the heretics, and for the restoration of Lucifer to their company. This latter request was granted, and Lucifer was received with joy both by the bishops and by the people.

The subsequent discussions of the council were held in the palace, and Constantius himself appears to have taken part in them. The proceedings were irregular and disorderly, and the end of some personal altercations between Lucifer and the emperor was that Lucifer was sent into exile. His banishment lasted from A.D. 355 to A.D. 361; and the greater part of this time he spent at Eleutheropolis in Palestine, where he was subject to the persecutions of the Arian bishop Eutychius. (See the petition to the emperor of Marcellinus and Justinus, two Luciferian priests, in Sirmond, *Opera Varia*, tom. i. p. 234.) It was during his banishment, and probably at Eleutheropolis, that his successive books or pamphlets on the controversy in which he was engaged were written. The following are the titles of them:—*Pro sancto Athanasio Libri ii.*; *De Regibus Apostaticis*; *De non conveniendo cum Haereticis*; *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*; *Moriendum pro Filio Dei*. Lucifer addresses Constantius in these writings with a remarkable vigour of denunciation. It is evident that he courted persecution, and even martyrdom. He compares the emperor to the worst kings that ever reigned, and makes

him out to be more impious than Judas Iscariot. And he sent his vehement invective by a special messenger to Constantius himself. Astonished at this audacity, the emperor ordered Florentius, an officer of his court, to send the book back to Lucifer and ask him if it were really his. The intrepid bishop replied that it was, and sent it back again. Constantius, on his part, must be allowed to have shewn magnanimity in leaving these violent effusions unpunished. There may however have been some additional hardship in the removal of Lucifer from Palestine to the Thebaid, where he remained till the death of Constantius in 361. Hearing of his arrival in Egypt, Athanasius wrote him a letter from Alexandria, full of praise and congratulations, asking him to let him see a copy of his work. After receiving and reading what his champion had written, Athanasius replied, and thanked him in a second letter. In this he is still more laudatory. He tells him that he was called the Elias of the age, that he was truly a Lucifer, who had brought the light of truth and placed it on a candlestick that it might give light to all; that he had proved the words of the Arians to be nothing but phantasy, and had taught that diabolic gnashing of teeth was to be trampled under foot.

Very soon after his accession, A.D. 361, Julian gave permission to the exiled bishops to return to their sees. Lucifer and Eusebius of Vercellae were both in the Thebaid, and Eusebius pressed his friend to come with him to Alexandria, where a council was to be held under the presidency of Athanasius, and where it was especially intended to take measures for the healing of a schism at Antioch. Lucifer, however, preferred to go straight to Antioch, sending two deacons to act for him at the council. Taking a hasty part in the affairs of the much divided church at Antioch, where the Catholic party was itself broken into two sections, the followers of Meletius and the followers of Eustathius, Lucifer ordained Paulinus, the leader of the latter section, as bishop of the church. When Eusebius arrived at Antioch, bringing with him the synodal letter of the council, and prepared to settle matters so as to give a triumph to neither party, he was distressed to find that he had been thus anticipated by the action of Lucifer. Unwilling to come into open collision with his friend, he retired immediately; Lucifer stayed, and declared that he would not hold communion with Eusebius or any who adopted the moderate policy of the Alexandrian council. By this council it had been determined that actual Arians, if they renounced their heresy, should be pardoned, but not invested with ecclesiastical functions; and that those bishops who had merely consented to Arianism under pressure should remain undisturbed. It was this latter concession which offended Lucifer, and he became henceforth the champion of the principle that no one who had yielded to any compromise whatever with Arianism should be allowed to hold an ecclesiastical office. In the ardour of his orthodoxy he separated himself not only from those who had thus yielded, but also from those who consented to the policy which Athanasius put forth in the name of the council of Alexandria (Rufinus, lib. i. cap. 30; Socrates, lib. iii. cap. 11).

After remaining some time at Antioch, Lucifer returned to Sardinia, and continued, it would

seem, to occupy his see. Jerome (*Chron.*) states that he died in the year 371. To what extent he was an actual schismatic remains obscure. St. Ambrose remarks that "he had separated himself from our communion" (*De Excessu Satyri*, 1127, 47); and St. Augustine, "that he fell into the darkness of schism, having lost the light of charity" (*Epist.* 185, n. 47). But there is no mention of any separation other than Lucifer's own repulsion of so many ecclesiastics; and Jerome in his dialogue against the Luciferians (§ 20) calls him *beatus* and *bonus pastor*. (See a quotation from the *Mémoires de Trevoux* in Ceillier, vol. iv. p. 247.)

The titles of Lucifer's controversial pamphlets have already been given. They are marked by a peculiarly bitter and defiant treatment of Constantius, to whom they are addressed. The substance of them consists of appeals to Holy Scripture, and they contain a very large number of quotations from both Testaments. There are many variations from the received text in the passages quoted; but as it seems probable that Lucifer wrote them down from memory, the variations cannot be said to have any critical value. The first printed edition of the writings of Lucifer was that of Jean Tilly, Paris, 1568. They have been printed since in several collections, and will be found in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* tom. xiii. The followers of Lucifer, if they ever formed a distinct organisation, disappeared in a few years. Jerome's dialogue *adv. Luciferianos* purports to be the report of a discussion between an orthodox Christian and a Luciferian. The dialogue was written about 378, seven years after the death of Lucifer. Five or six years later an appeal was made to the emperor by the Luciferian presbyters. [FAUSTINUS (33).]

[J. Li. D.]

LUCILLA, a lady of Spanish origin, who resided at Carthage, described as very wealthy and of a strong partisan temper, "pecuniosissima et factiosissima." When Caecilianus was archdeacon of Carthage, he reproved her for her conduct respecting a relic. She appears to have become possessed of a bone belonging to the body of a martyr or supposed martyr, to which she paid so superstitious a reverence as to kiss it previously to partaking in the Eucharist, thus shewing, as Optatus expresses it, that she preferred it even to the bread and wine of salvation. This superstition is said to have been not uncommon among the Donatists. Deeply wounded at this rebuke Lucilla sought an opportunity of revenge, for which she had not long to wait. On the death of Mensurius, A.D. 311, Caecilianus was appointed to succeed him in the see of Carthage. As soon as he had taken his seat, a list was presented to him of church plate which during the persecution had been placed under the charge of the Seniors, a body probably of laymen, regarded with respect and probably possessed of some authority in the African church. As in duty bound he called on these persons to restore the articles committed to their charge; but instead of doing this they withdrew from communion with him, together with Botrus and Celestius, disappointed candidates for the episcopal dignity, and Lucilla. When the assembly of Numidian bishops was held at Carthage under the presidency of

Secundus bishop of Tigisis, for the purpose of deposing Caecilianus, the influence and, it is said, the money also of Lucilla were used to procure his condemnation and the appointment in his stead of Majorinus, one of her dependants, who had filled the office of reader under Caecilianus. Augustine speaks no doubt of Lucilla when he speaks of a single Donatist household, and that of a woman, sending bishops into Spain. But no more is heard of Lucilla after this time, except in the proceedings of the inquiry before Zenophilus, A.D. 320. (*Opt.* i. 16, 17, 19; *Aug. En. in Ps.* xxxvi. 19, 20; *Ep.* 43, 17; *c. Parm.* i. 5; *c. Cresc.* iii. 32, 33; *c. Petil.* ii. 247; *de Unit. Eccl.* 6, 46, 73; *Bruns. Conc. Cod. Afr. Eccl.* 91, i. 180; *Gesta apud Zenoph.* ap. *Aug. Opp.* vol. ix. p. 799; *Mon. Vet. Don.* pp. 168-182, ed. Oberthür; *Bingham*, ii. 19, vol. i. p. 277.)

The bribery appears to have been effected by diversion of some money which Lucilla professed to have given for the poor, but which the bishops or others of the faction divided among themselves (*diviserunt inter se*). The sum given by Lucilla and divided was 400 folles, besides 100 to Purpurius and twenty which Silvanus received from Victor as the price of ordination. Now the follis was either a coin in bronze, of very small value (*φολίς* a scale of a reptile) worth a little more than a halfpenny, or a sum of gold or silver, perhaps in very small coins, for we read of the money being contained in boxes (*cophini*). If it were of silver, which seems probable, and if we adopt the account given by Epiphanius in a much disputed passage, the value would be 250 denarii = £7 16s. 3d., or according to Waddington = £1 0s. 10d. The number of bishops who met at Carthage to condemn Caecilianus and elect Majorinus was about seventy (*Aug. Brev. C. U.* 26; *Mon. Vet. Don.* pp. 178, 179, 182). The reader may therefore calculate for himself the sums which each of these Simonists received, and may draw conclusions accordingly which it is not necessary to suggest. On the value of the follis see Hesy-chius (*φολίς*). (*Aug. Serm.* 390; *Civ. D.* xxii. 8, and notes on both places by Benedictine editor; *Cod. Theodos.* xiv. 4, 3; *Mommsen, das Edict Diocletians*, p. 56; *Ael. Lampridius, Heliogab.* 22, and note by Salmasius; *Hoffmann, Lex. Follis*; *Baronius*, who makes the sum much greater, vol. iv. pp. 235, 236; *Smith, Dict. of Ant.* p. 1241; *Waddington, Edit de Diocletien*, p. 3.) [H. W. P.]

LUCILLUS (1), a deacon of Hippo Regius. (*Aug. Ep.* 84, *Serm.* 167, 3; *Tillemont*, vol. xiii. p. 251, note 22.) [H. W. P.]

LUCILLUS (2), bishop of Castellum Sinitense in Numidia, c. A.D. 426. (*Augustine, de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, § 11.) [R. S. G.]

LUCILLUS (3), bishop of Melita (Malta), who in 592 received a letter from Gregory the Great advising him to take care that his clergy paid proper dues for their lands in Africa. He was in 599 solemnly deposed for some crime, which is not stated, by Gregory's orders in a letter to John bishop of Syracuse. (*Greg. Magn. Epist.* lib. ii. indict. x. 44 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii.; lib. ix. indict. ii. 63; lib. x. indict. iii. 1.) *Pirro (Sic. Sacr.* ii. 904) and *Cappelletti* (xxi. 650) make him the 4th of the received



bishops of Malta, between Constantine and Trajan. [A. H. D. A.]

**LUCINIUS**, a wealthy Spaniard of Baetica in the end of the 4th century. He was a man of influence and learning. He opposed the Zoroastrian opinions, which had been introduced into Spain from Africa by Marcus and propagated by Priscillian, Agape, and others (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxv. 3, ed. Vall.). In conformity with the ascetic ideas of his time, he had made a vow of continency with his wife Theodora (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxi. 2, ed. Vall.). He was also a diligent student of Scripture. Both these tendencies brought him into relations with St. Jerome, who was then living at Bethlehem. He proposed to visit him, perhaps even to take up his abode in his monastery. In the year 397 he sent several scribes to Bethlehem to copy the scriptural works of Jerome; and they returned in Lent 398, having fulfilled their task and bringing with them a letter from Jerome (71), in which he describes the works which had been copied out and thanks him for presents which he had sent, and answers questions of Lucinius about fasting on Saturdays and about the daily partaking of the Eucharist. Lucinius died in the following year, and Jerome wrote a letter of consolation to the widowed Theodora (75), in which he speaks of the Christian virtues and zeal of her husband, and of the great liberality shewed by him to the churches of Alexandria and Jerusalem. [W. H. F.]

**LUCIUS (1)** I., bishop of Rome, after Cornelius, probably from June 25, A.D. 253, to March 5, 254, or thereabouts, during eight months and ten days. These are the dates arrived at by Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischöfe*) after elaborate examination of conflicting data. He rejects the date commonly assigned to the death of Cornelius, viz. Sept. 14, 252, as not supported by the earliest catalogues, and inconsistent with other facts. The dates for Lucius are arrived at from a combination of the data of the Liberian Catalogue with the conclusions drawn from the letters of Cyprian. The Liberian Catalogue is, indeed, evidently in error in giving three years, eight months, and ten days as the duration of the episcopate of Lucius, and Valerianus III. and Gallienus II. (A.D. 255) as the consuls of the year of his decease; the same consuls being given in the same catalogue for the year of the death of his successor. He must have died before the year 255, since there is a letter of St. Cyprian to his successor Stephen, shewn by its contents to have been written before the controversy about heretical baptism had begun, the first Carthaginian synod on which subject cannot have been later than the aforesaid year. The Felician Catalogue follows the Liberian in assigning three years to the reign of Lucius, though differing as to the months and days. But it may be gathered from the contemporary letters of St. Cyprian that it was of much shorter duration. Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 2) seems to be nearer the truth in limiting it to about eight months. According to Lipsius the exigencies of the case are met if we reject the years of the Liberian Catalogue as an interpolation, and retain the eight months and ten days as the real duration of the reign of Lucius, taking it to have begun and ended at the dates given above.

The Decian persecution having, after an interval, been renewed against the Christians by Gallus, under which Cornelius had died in banishment at Centumcellae, Lucius, elected in his place at Rome, was himself almost immediately banished. His banishment, however, was of very short duration; for Cyprian, as aforesaid, in his one extant letter addressed to him, while alluding to his election as recent, congratulates him also on his return (*Ep.* 61). A large number of Roman exiles for the faith appear from this letter to have returned to Rome with Lucius. Both their banishment and their return are regarded as signs of divine favour; the former on the ground that they, rather than the adherents of Novatian, were thus shewn to be the objects of the devil's animosity: he had not cared to attack those who were his own already. Cyprian had previously pressed this point in writing to Cornelius. Their return he likens to the saving of the three children from the fiery furnace, and that of Lucius himself to the coming of John the Baptist, heralding that of Christ. Though the letter goes on to say that he had perhaps been recalled to suffer actual martyrdom openly in the midst of his flock, there is no sufficient evidence that his death, which occurred, as shewn above, so soon afterwards, was due to persecution. It is true that Cyprian, in a letter to his successor Stephen (*Ep.* 68), calls both him and Cornelius "blessed martyrs;" but he probably uses the word in the more general sense that includes confessors. For, though the Felician and later editions of the *Liber Pontificalis* say he was beheaded for the faith, the earlier Liberian Catalogue mentions his death only; and it is in the Liberian *Depositio episcoporum*, not *martyrum*, that his name is found. No further events of importance, after his banishment and return, marked his short reign. With regard to the then burning question of the reception of the *lapsi*, on which the schism of Novatian had begun under his predecessor Cornelius (NOVATIANUS, CORNELIUS, CYPRIANUS), he continued the lenient view which Cornelius, in accord with St. Cyprian of Carthage, had maintained (Cypr. *Ep.* 68). He is said in the Felician Catalogue to have been a Roman by birth, "ex patre purpureo," and to have ordained that the bishop should go about accompanied by two presbyters and three deacons. Anastasius describes him as a Tuscan, "de civitate Luca, ex patre Lucino," and says he was beheaded by Valerian. The Roman Martyrology gives the same account of his death, celebrating him as a saint and martyr on March 4. In common with the Felician, and other editions of the *Liber Pontificalis*, it rightly assigns the cemetery of Callistus as his place of burial, where De Rossi has discovered, in the Papal crypt, fragments of a slab bearing the inscription ΛΟΥΚΙΩ. Six decreta, addressed to the churches of Gaul and Spain, are assigned to him by the Pseudo-Isidore, and three others by Gratian; all undoubtedly spurious.

[J. B.—y.]

**LUCIUS (2)**, bishop of Castra Galba (? in Numidia, *Morcelli*); seventeenth Suffrage in *Sentt. Epp.* Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bapt. Haer.* iii. [E. W. B.]

**LUCIUS (3)** (LEUCIUS), bishop of Thebeste in Numidia. *Sentt.* 34, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de*

*Bapt.* 3, same as the Lucius of *Ep.* 76, 77; one of the nine martyr bishops of that synod who suffered at Sigua. [NEMESIANUS.] The place of his interment was observed, "Lucius conf. et mart. in Fausti positus," cod. Veron. in *Scntt. Epp.* [E. W. B.]

LUCIUS (4), African bishop, in Syn. iv. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Basil.* A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67; possibly the bishop of Membrasa on the Bagradas, about forty-four miles from Carthage; a confessor according to later MSS. Suffrage 62 in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

LUCIUS (5), bishop of Ausafa (? in Prov. Proc.) Suff. 73 Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

LUCIUS (6), African bishop, Cyp. *Ep.* 70 title. He may be either of the two last. [E. W. B.]

LUCIUS (7), bishop of Antioë on the right bank of the Nile. (Athanas. *Apol. contra Arianos*, in *Patrol. Gr.* xxv. 376; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 593.) [J. de S.]

LUCIUS (8), bishop of Verona, at the council of Sardica in 343 (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. in *Pat. Lat.* x. 642; Mansi, iii. 38, 42, 47). But a doubt arises as to whether the true form of the name is not Lucillus, for Athanasius in his *Apology to Constantius* states (§ 3, p. 235, in *Pat. Gr.* xxv. 599) that in an interview he had with Constans he was accompanied by Lucillus of Verona. Moreover in his catalogue of the bishops who subscribed the decrees of Sardica (*Apol. c. Ar.* § 50) he names Lucillus. Biancolini (*Vescovi di Verona*, p. 19) adopts the form Lucillus; Tillemont (viii. 90, 91, 94, 683) Lucius or Lucius; Cappelletti (x. 744, 813) Lucius; Ughelli (v. 693) Lucidus. [C. H.]

LUCIUS (9), bishop of Samosata, appointed by the Arians in place of Eunomius, who had retired cir. 375. (Theodoret, *Hist.* iv. 13, in *Patr. Graec.* lxxxi. 1152; Le Quien, ii. 933; Tillemont, vi. 593; Ceillier, v. 4.) [W. M. S.]

LUCIUS (10), bishop of Hadrianople in Thrace, persecuted to death by the Arian party in the reign of Constantius, somewhere about A.D. 335, as Tillemont judges (vi. 280). He succeeded Eutropius in the see (Athanas. *Apol. de Fug.* 3). Very soon after his succession, as Tillemont (303, 307, 339) thinks, he was banished from his see loaded with chains, and he was one of those recalled upon the death of Constantine, A.D. 337. Socrates (ii. 15) and Sozomen (iii. 8) mention him among the Catholic bishops who, driven from their sees by the Eusebians, went to Rome to obtain help from Julius. This would be about 340 (Till. vi. 307, 752). The Roman council under Julius in 342 absolved Lucius and decreed his restitution, sending him back to the East with letters to that effect; but it seems that the decree was resisted by the Eusebians, and Lucius in 343 appealed to the council of Sardica. His name occurs among those present there (Mansi, iii. 38, 42, 47). In accordance with the decision of this council the emperor Constantius ordered Lucius to be restored (Soc. ii. 233). The Eusebian party at Philippopolis in 343 asserted in their synodal letter (Mansi, iii.

130 c) that Lucius had cast the sacramental elements consecrated by them to the dogs. So provoked were they by the persistency and vigour of his attacks that they more than once caused him to be sent into exile bound with iron fetters and frequently to be loaded with chains; he was thus fettered in prison when he died (Ath. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* 19; Id. *Fug.* 3; Soc. ii. 26; Theod. ii. 12, al. 15). The date of his death is probably A.D. 348 (Tillemont, vi. 764). The *Roman Martyrology* commemorates him on Feb. 11. For other notices of Lucius see Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Feb. ii. 519; Baron. ann. 342 xlvii., 348 iii.; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 1172; Tillemont, vii. 272, 276, viii. 684, 688. [C. H.]

LUCIUS (11), the third Arian intruded into the see of Alexandria, was an Alexandrian by birth, and had been ordained presbyter by George [GEORGIUS (4)]. After the murder of that prelate he seems to have been regarded as head of the Arians of Alexandria; but Socrates's statement (iii. 4), that he was at that time ordained bishop, is corrected by Sozomen (vi. 5), and earlier authorities. At the accession of Jovian, according to the *Chronicon Acephalum* a Maffean Fragment, four leading Arian bishops put him forward to address the new emperor at Antioch, with a view to diverting his favour from Athanasius. Records of these interviews are annexed to Athanasius's epistle to Jovian, and appear to have been read by Sozomen, who summarises the complaints urged against the great hero of orthodoxy. The records are vivid and graphic. Lucius, Bernicianus, and other Arians, presented themselves to Jovian at one of the city gates when he was riding into the country. He asked their business. They said they were "Christians from Alexandria," and wanted a bishop. He answered, "I have ordered your former bishop, Athanasius, to be put in possession." They rejoined that Athanasius had for years been under accusation and sentence of banishment. A soldier interrupted them by telling the emperor that they were the "refuse" of "that unhallowed George." Jovian spurred his horse and rode away, but they obtained access to him again, presented regular memorials, asked to have any one rather than Athanasius as their bishop—in vain. Some of the people took hold of Lucius and led him before the emperor. "See, my lord, who it is that they wanted to make bishop." Lucius, unabashed, requested a personal hearing. Jovian vented his impatience in an imprecation of somewhat heathenish form against the ship that had brought him from Alexandria, and then finally broke off the conference. Lucius does not reappear until 367, when, having been consecrated, says Tillemont (vi. 582), "either at Antioch, or at some other place out of Egypt," he attempted to possess himself of the bishopric, and entered Alexandria by night on the 26th of Thoth (Sept. 23), and "remained in a small house" next the precinct of the cathedral. In the morning he went to the house where his mother still lived, but the news of his presence excited general indignation; the people assembled and beset the house. The prefect Latianus and the dux Trajanus sent officers to expel him, who reported that to do so publicly would imperil his life, whereupon Tatianus and Trajanus, with a large force, went

to the house, and brought him out at 1 P. M. on Sept. 24. The whole population, "Christians, Pagans, and men of all religions," followed the escort with vehement outcries, "Take him out of the city!" Trajanus found it expedient to lodge him in his own house, and to keep up a third guard. Next day he was delivered to the soldiers to be conducted out of Egypt. (*Chron. Prævium and Acephalum.*) This second failure, and its humiliating and alarming circumstances, were doubtless vindictively remembered by Lucius, when at last his hour of triumph came in the summer of 373. Athanasius had died on May 2, and had been succeeded by Peter; but the prefect Palladius had attacked the church, and Peter was either imprisoned or went into hiding. Euzoios, the old Arian bishop of Antioch, easily obtained from Valens an order to instal Lucius. Accordingly, Lucius appeared in Alexandria, escorted, as Peter said in his encyclical letter (Theod. iv. 25), not by monks and clergy and laity, but by Euzoios, and the imperial treasurer Magnus, at the head of a large body of soldiers; while the Pagan populace intimidated their friendly feeling towards the Arian bishop by hailing him as one who did not worship the Son of God, and who must have been sent to Alexandria by the favour of Serapis. Lucius, on his part, surrounded himself by Pagan guards, and caused some of the orthodox to be beaten, others to be imprisoned, or exiled, or pillaged, for refusing his communion, these severities being actually carried out by Magnus and Palladius, as representing the secular power. Gregory of Nazianzus calls him a second Arius, and lays to his charge the sacrileges and barbarities of the new Arian persecution (*Ora.* xv. 12, 13). He took an active personal part in the attack on the monks of Egypt; finding them immovably attached to the Nicene faith, he advised that their chief "abbats," the two Macarii, should be banished to a little Pagan island; but when the holy men converted its inhabitants the Alexandrian people made a vehement demonstration against Lucius, and he "thought it prudent" to send back the exiles to their cells (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 203). The impression produced by Lucius's conduct appears in the bold words of the hermit Moses, who, being sent to Alexandria to be consecrated as bishop of the Saracens, positively refused to allow Lucius to lay his hands upon him. According to Sozomen (vi. 38) Lucius replied with unexpected gentleness, "Do not judge of me before you know what my creed is." "Your creed," rejoined Moses, "is proved to be un-Christian by your deeds of violence against the servants of God," adding, according to Socrates (iv. 36), that he spoke, not on hearsay, but of what he had seen "with his own eyes." But Socrates goes beyond other authorities by introducing a reference to cases of persons "delivered to the fire" by Lucius. Theodoret (iv. 23) makes the answer of Moses less terse in its severity. When the Arian supremacy came to an end at the death of Valens, in 378, Lucius was finally ejected, and repaired to Constantinople, but the Arians of Alexandria still regarded him as their bishop (*Socr.* v. 3). He lived for a time at Constantinople, and contributed to the Arian force which gave such trouble to Gregory of Nazianzus during his residence in the capital, as bishop of the few

Catholics, from the beginning of 379. In the November of 380 the Arian bishop Demophilus was expelled, and Lucius went with him. Theodoret (iv. 21) confounds Lucius with another Arian prelate of that name, also a persecutor who usurped the see of Samosata. (Tillemont, vi. 593.) [W. B.]

LUCIUS (12), a bishop of an unnamed see, who had espoused the cause of Chrysostom (*Chrysost. Ep.* 85.) [E. V.]

LUCIUS (13), bishop of Reggio in Abruzzo, mentioned by Gregory the Great in 593 as the predecessor of bishop Boniface. (*Greg. Magn. Epist.* lib. iii. indict. xi. ep. 44 in Migne, lxxvii. 639.) [A. H. D. A.]

LUCIUS (14), Roman martyr. On witnessing a trial before the city prefect Urbicus, in which a man was sentenced to death on whose moral character no imputation was cast, merely because he acknowledged himself to be a Christian, Lucius expostulated with Urbicus on the injustice and unreasonableness of such a proceeding; was thereupon asked whether he were not a Christian himself, and on his confessing was at once himself ordered to execution (*Just. Mart. Apol.* ii. 2). He is commemorated by Usuard, Ado, and *Vet. Rom. Mart.* on Oct. 19. [G. S.]

LUCIUS (15), African martyr, who addressed St. Cyprian during the persecution (Cyp. ep. 78). Ruinart (*Acta Sinc.* p. 233, note 32) has no doubt that this is the Lucius or Leucius who with St. Cyprian was soon afterwards seen in a dream or vision by Montanus, another of the African martyrs of this period. [C. H.]

LUCIUS (16) (LLEIRWG, LLES, LLEUFERMAWR, LLEURWG), king and confessor, first Christian king in Britain. In the pages of William of Malmesbury (*Ant. Glast.* ii.), and more especially of Geoffrey of Monmouth (*Brit. Hist.* iv. v.), besides later writers, king Lucius is assigned a most important place in the Christianising of Britain.

I. As represented by Geoffrey of Monmouth, whose narrative has made the deepest impression on popular history, Lucius was descended from Brutus, the founder and first king of Britain, and succeeded his father Coillus, son of Meirig or Marius, on the British throne. He followed the example of his father in seeking and securing the friendship of the Romans. The fame of the Christian miracles inspired him with such love for the true faith, that he petitioned pope Eleutherus for teachers, and on the arrival of the two most holy doctors, Faganus and Duvanus, he received baptism along with multitudes from all countries. When the missionaries had almost extinguished paganism in the island, they dedicated the heathen temples to the service of God, and filled them with congregations of Christians; they fully organized the church, making the flamens into bishops, and the arch-flamens into archbishops, and constituting three metropolitans with twenty-eight suffragan bishops. Lucius largely endowed the church, and, rejoicing in the progress of the gospel, died at Gloucester A.D. 156, but without leaving issue to succeed him. Malmesbury says he died and was buried at Giastonbury (Baronius, *Ann.*

A.D. 183; Cressy, *Church Hist. Brit.* iii. iv. at great length and diffuseness; *Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 26, 65, 306, 309, but much shorter).

Here there is evidently much that will not fit in with authentic history, such as the one ruler in Britain in the 2nd century, and his independence of the Roman power, the hierarchy of flamens and arch-flamens, the metropolitanships at London, York, and Caerleon, the diocesan organization, and Geoffrey's appeal to Gildas as his authority. Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* v. cc. iii. sq.) mentions two coins, a gold and a silver, supposed to belong to the mint of king Lucius, and quotes the letter which pope Eleutherus is said to have returned to his application; the former of the two coins is preserved in the British Museum, and the letter, which is entirely upon the Roman laws and the principles of government, is given by Spelman (*Concil.* i. 31), and Wilkins (*Concil.* iv. app. 703), and translated by Collier (*Eccl. Hist. Gr. Brit.* B. i. cent. ii. 14). But to the legend thus far in progress under Geoffrey later authors added many details. On the one hand Lucius became a benefactor to the church and to the schools, especially about London, Cambridge, Canterbury, Winchester, and Glastonbury. On the other hand, his zeal was not confined to Britain; he abdicated the throne and became a priest, travelled through France and Germany, in company with his sister Emerita, and, after passing through many hardships and dangers, reached at last the Rhaetian Alps, where Chur, the capital of the Grisons, became the centre of his missionary labours. Lucius became bishop of Chur, and in the year 201 suffered martyrdom in the castle of Martiola. But in all this there is probably much confusion with a continental teacher of the same name (Ussher, *ut supra*, Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* B. i. cent. 2; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* iv. 16).

II. Parallel to the preceding, but never drawn out into such minute details, is the legend as it appears in the Welsh Triads and genealogies, which are of very uncertain date and authority. Lleirwg, Lleurwg, or Lles, also named or surnamed Lleufer-Mawr ("the great luminary," as all the names express the idea of brightness, corresponding to the Latin Lucius), son of Coel ap Cyllin ap Caradog or Caractacus ap Bran, was a Welsh chieftain of Gwent and Morganwg in the south of Wales. Two of the Triads (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 63, 68) state that he founded the church of Llandaff, which was the first in the island of Britain, and endowed it with lands and privileges, giving the same also to all those persons who first embraced the gospel. To this the Silurian *Achau y Saint* adds that, having conceived a desire to embrace the Christian faith, he had applied for teachers at Rome, and that pope Eleutherus sent him four holy men named Dyfan, Ffagan, Medwy, and Elfan. According to others, the messengers sent by Lucius were Elfan and Medwy, whom the pope made severally bishop and teacher (*Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 65, 310), and the Roman emissaries were Dyfan and Ffagan (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 4). Attesting the apparent truth of this tradition, there are three foundations in Glamorganshire, Llanfedwy, Merthyr Dyfan, and St. Fagan's, and one in Monmouthshire, Llanlleirwg, now St. Mellon's, near Cardiff. But this Welsh account supposes only a very small area eman-

gelized through Leirwg, and reduces the legend to a mere outline, shewing no acquaintance with a national tradition. The Welsh Triads would place the event about the middle of the 2nd century. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, c. 4; Williams, *Emin. Welsh.* 276; *Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 309 n.; Lady Ch. Guest, *Mabinogion*, ii. 130; Stephens, *Lit. Cymr.* 69.)

III. In tracing the rise and growth of the legend there is comparatively little difficulty. Gildas makes no allusion to it. The earliest English author who notices it is Bede (*Chron.* A.D. 180). "Lucius Britanniae rex, missâ ad Eleutherium Romae episcopum epistolâ, ut Christianus efficiatur, impetrat;" and again (*Eccl. Hist.* i. c. 4), "Cum Eleutherus vir sanctus pontificatus Romanae ecclesiae praesesset, misit ad eum Lucius Britanniarum rex epistolam, obsecrans ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficeretur: et mox effectum piae postulationis consecutus est, susceperatque fidem Britanniae usque in tempora Diocletiani principis inviolatam integramque quietâ in pace servabant" (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* i. 86, 111, 284). About the same period (by some placed in the 7th century, by others in the 9th), Nennius (*Hist. Brit.* c. 18) shews the Cambrian influence: "A.D. 164. Lucius Britannicus rex cum universis regulis totius Britanniae baptismum suscepit, missa legatione ab imperatoribus Romanorum, et a papa Romano Evaristo: Lucius agnomine Lever-maur, id est, 'magni splendoris,' propter fidem quae in ejus tempore venit" (*M. H. B.* i. 60, 82). The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 167, simply quotes from Bede's history, but calls the pope Eleutherius. Ethelwerd (*Chron.* c. 1), in the 10th century, gives Eleutherius the initiative in carrying Christianity to Lucius (*M. H. B.* i. 501), and Henry of Huntingdon (*Hist. Angl.* lib. i.), in the 12th century, quotes from Bede (*M. H. B.* i. 700).

The source from which Bede received the name of Lucius, and his connexion with Eleutherus, is shewn by Messrs. Haddan and Stubbs (*Counc. &c.* i. 25) to have been a later interpolated form of the *Catalogus Pontificum Romanorum* (ap. Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 April, i. p. xxiii. *Catalogi Veteres Antiquorum Pontificum*). The original *Catalogue*, written shortly after A.D. 353, gives only the name and length of the pontificate by the Roman consulships, but the interpolated copy (made c. A.D. 530) adds to the *Vita S. Eleutheri* "Hic accepit epistolam a Lucio Britanniae Rege ut Christianus efficeretur per ejus mandatum." Messrs. Haddan and Stubbs conclude: "It would seem, therefore, that the bare story of the conversion of a British prince (*temp. Eleutheri*) originated in Rome during the 5th or 6th centuries, almost 300 or more years after the date assigned to the story itself; that Bede in the 8th century introduced it into England, and that by the 9th century it had grown into the conversion of the whole of Britain; while the full-fledged fiction, connecting it specially with Wales and with Glastonbury, and entering into details, grew up between centuries 9 and 12."

Of the dates assigned to king Lucius there is an extreme variety, Ussher enumerating twenty-three from A.D. 137 to A.D. 190, and placing it in his own *Ind. Chron.* in A.D. 176, Nennius (as above) in A.D. 164, and Bede (*Chron.*) in A.D. 180, and again (*Eccl. Hist.*) in A.D. 156. But

the chronology is in hopeless confusion. Haddan and Stubbs, i. 1-26, give an exhaustive treatment of the question; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* cc. iii.-vi., enters minutely into the legend of Lucius, accepting his existence as a fact, as has generally been done by other authors. His festival is usually Dec. 3 in both the home and foreign calendars. [J. G.]

**LUCIUS (17)**, Cyp. *Ep.* 24; lapsed; confessed afterwards and was banished. [FELIX (228).] [E. W. B.]

**LUCIUS (18)**, Oct. 4, priest of Alexandria in the 3rd century. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. ii. 329; Tillem. iv. 249.) [C. H.]

**LUCIUS (19)**, one of nine excommunicated deacons of the Arian party mentioned by Alexander bishop of Alexandria before the council of Nicaea (Theod. *H. E.* i. 3 fin.). He was one of those who signed the letter of Arius addressed to Alexander. (Épiph. *Haer.* lxxix. 8; Tillem. vi. 246, 256.) [C. H.]

**LUCIUS (20)**, presbyter of Rome, sent by pope Liberius with two others, Paulus and Helianus, to Athanasius. (Hilar. *Frag.* v. in *Pat. Lat.* x. 679; Tillem. viii. 139.) [C. H.]

**LUCIUS (21)**, a deacon, one of the solitaries of Syria to whom Basil sent letters A.D. 376. (Basil. *Epist.* 256 al. 200.) [E. V.]

**LUCIUS (22)**, a prominent Donatist mentioned by Augustine with Gaius or Garus (*Serm.* 42, § 3), and with Gaius and Parmenianus (*Serm.* 158, § 3). [C. H.]

**LUCIUS (23)**, archdeacon of Pelusium, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium. (Isid. *Epp.* lib. i. ep. 29, lib. iv. 188.) [C. H.]

**LUCIUS (24)**, a solitary at Ennatus or Nonus near Alexandria. (*Vitae Patr.* ed. Rosw. lib. v. libell. 7, § 7, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiv. 893; Coteler. *Mon. Gr.* i. 460, 520, 522; Tillem. xii. 370-372.) [C. H.]

**LUCIUS (25)**, archdeacon, author of an account of the translation, cir. 556, of the relics of St. Stephen the protomartyr from Constantinople to Rome published by Mai (*Spicil. Rom.* t. iv. p. 285). Ceillier (xi. 811) assigns him to the 7th or 8th century. [C. H.]

**LUCULLUS**, Donatist bishop of Hospita in Numidia in 411. (*Coll. Carth.* i. 133; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 415, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

**LUDOWANUS, ST.**, the patron saint of Ludgvan, near Penzance, in Cornwall. He was probably Irish. The parish feast is on the nearest Sunday to Jan. 25. W. C. Borlase, however (*The Age of the Saints*, 1878, p. 89), suggests that the name may be a corruption of Lan Dwywnen. Now St. Dwywnen's day in Wales is Jan. 25, and Ludgvan feast is on the nearest Sunday to that day, and this makes the identification probable. [C. W. B.]

**LUGAIDUS (LATHIR)**, monk of St. Columba at Iona (Adamnan, *Vit. S. Col.* i. 22, ii. 5, 38). Dr. Reeves (*S. Adamnan*, 51, 111, 155) thinks that "lathir" is probably the Irish [lathir] "fortis."

Colgan (*Acta SS.* 452-3) in his confused article upon St. Lugadius, abbat of Cluainfinchuil or Cluain-fiacul, accepts Lugaidus Lathir as one with that saint, but again (*Tr. Thaum.* 377 n.<sup>67</sup>, 491 n.<sup>76</sup>) identifies him with Lugaidus of Tirdachraebh (Jan. 31), and Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, *Works*, vi. 527, A.D. 591) says he is the same as the Lugadius whom Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 432) makes founder of Rathlin monastery. [J. G.]

**LUGBEUS MOCUMIN (LUGNEUS MOCUMIN)**, friend and disciple of St. Columba at Iona, and in old age praepositus or prior of the monastery on the island Elena, now Eilean Naomh or Nave island, near Isla. Dr. Reeves follows Colgan in supposing that Lugbeus and Lugneus were brothers, but there is nothing in the text to shew or suggest it. (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 43, 53, 56, 77, 127, 141; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum. pass.*) [J. G.]

**LUGHAIDH (1) (LUGADIUS)**, Irish saint, commemorated Nov. 2. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 295; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 169, c. 2, 173 n.<sup>8</sup>, and *Tr. Thaum.* 131, c. 12, 171 n.<sup>41</sup>; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 441, 443-4, but very sceptically.) [J. G.]

**LUGHAIDH (2) (LUGADIUS)**, Irish saint, commemorated March 24. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 487, c. 9 n.<sup>4</sup>, 491 n.<sup>74</sup>, 502 a.) [J. G.]

**LUGHAIDH (3) (LUGADIUS)**, Irish saint, commemorated April 17. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 105; *Mart. Tall.* ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xxi., but in some confusion; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 780, cc. 1, 2, and *Tr. Thaum.* 86, c. 93, 113 n.<sup>104</sup>, 130, c. 9, 226 a.; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 16, wks. vi. 344; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 466.) [J. G.]

**LUGHAIDH (4) (LUGADIUS, LUGAIDH)**, bishop of Connor, co. Antrim, died A.D. 537 (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 179). Dr. Reeves (*Eccl. Ant.* 239) corrects the date to A.D. 543. (Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 246.) [J. G.]

**LUGHAIDH (5) (LUGADIUS, LUGHIDIUS, LUGUDIUS, LUGUDUS)**, son of Tailchan, of the monastery of Cluain-Finchoil (Clon-finchoil). He was the "quidam homo sanctus, senex Christi miles, justus et sapiens," said by St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Col.* iii. 23) to have had a vision on the night when St. Columba died. (O'Hanlon, iii. 91, 93; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 527, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 580; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 193 a, 449 a, 606 a, and *Tr. Thaum.* 330, c. 36, 370, c. 23, n.<sup>10</sup>, 483 n.<sup>50</sup>, 491 n.<sup>75</sup>.) [J. G.]

**LUGHAIDH (6) (LUGADIUS, LUGAIDUS)**, Irish saint, commemorated Jan. 31. He is descended from Laeghaire, the monarch of Ireland in St. Patrick's time (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 173); or he is descended from Niall of the Nine Hostages (*Mart. D. neg.*), and thus a relative of St. Columba. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 377 n.<sup>67</sup>, 491 n.<sup>74</sup>; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 607-8; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 33; Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 153, 173; *Mart. Tall.* Jan. 31, ap. Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, pp. xiv. 20, having the entry "Lug tire da craebh. i. mac Eachaich.") [J. G.]

**LUGHAIR** (LAEGHAIRE, LUGAR, LUGARIUS, LUGUIR), Lobhar, the leper, or infirm, Irish saint, commemorated May 11 in the Irish calendars. (Lanigan, *Echl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 211; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 125.) [J. G.]

**LUGIDUS**, Irish bishop, who ordained to the priesthood St. Coemgen and St. Comgall in the 6th century; he may have been at Connor. (Lanigan, *Echl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 44, 62, 65.) [J. G.]

**LUGNAT, LUGNA, LUGNAD, LUGNAED, LUGNATHAN, LUGNAUS** (LOGA, LOGHA, LUGHNAT, LUGHNATH), seventh son of Restitutus the Longobard, and Liamhain, sister of St. Patrick [LIAMHAIN]. He accompanied St. Patrick to Ireland in A.D. 432 (Ussher), and, as a priest, had his work in meditation and prayer in the west of Connaught; in *Four Mast.* (by O'Donovan, A.D. 448, i. 140, n. 4, 141) he is called Cruimther Loga, Logha or Lughna, St. Patrick's luamaire, helmsman or pilot, and in the Irish calendars is Lughnat of Loch Measca or Mask, where he is still regarded as one of the patron saints of Carra. His holy well, which is called Tobar-Lugna in MacFirbis's poem in the *Book of Lecan*, and now Toberloona, lies beside his old church, which is traditionally said to have been the third church built in Ireland. The church and its churchyard are in the demesne of Ballywalter, close to Cartoon Deer Park in the parish of Robeen, bar. Kilmaine, co. Mayo. But a still more interesting relic is found in Lough Corrib. In the centre of the Lough, midway between Oughterard and Cong, is the small island of Inchaguile, anciently Inisan-Ghoill-chraibhthigh, "the island of the devout stranger." Of the two little old churches whose remains are found on the island, the older is called Templepatrick, and its architecture, as described and illustrated by Dr. Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, 164 sq.), proves it to belong to the age of St. Patrick, or the 5th century. At a little distance in front of this church Dr. Petrie sketched from an upright pillar of dark limestone what he believes to be undoubtedly the oldest Roman letter inscription ever discovered in Ireland, and certainly not later than the 6th century; the letters, deeply cut and well preserved, are figured by him and read, **LIE LUGNAEDON MACC LMENUEH**, "the stone of Lugnaedon (or Lugnaed), son of Limenueh." There appears to be no reason for doubt but that this is the monument and inscription of St. Lughnath, Lugnat of Lugnad, nephew of St. Patrick, and son of Liamhain or Liemania, here called Limenueh, and that St. Lughnath was the devout stranger who has given the designation to the island, having probably been one of the Franks who received from their master, St. Patrick (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 136, c. 50), suitable places for quietness and retirement in this very quarter. (Petrie, *ib.* 164-168, very full and important; *Geneal. Hy Fiachrach*, by O'Donovan, 200; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 364-366; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 90-91, 3rd ed.; O'Donovan, *Irish Grammar*, li. lii. introd.; O'Flaherty, *Jar-Connaught*, by Hardiman, 187, add. note H, but suggesting a different identification for the "devout stranger;" *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* ii. 179-180; Ussher, *Brit. Echl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 383; Colgan, *Acta SS.*

259, c. 3, 262 n. 18, 716-718, and *Tr. Thaum.* 226 sq., 231 a, 226 a, 383 n. 17.) [J. G.]

**LUICELL, LUICHELL** (LUCELLA), virgin, Irish saint, daughter of Leinin, and venerated on March 6. [BRIGIDA (3)]. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, iii. 196; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 69; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4th ser. iii. 287 n.) [J. G.]

**LUICRIDH** (LUCHRAIDH, LUCHRAIDH), of Cill-luicridh (or Corcolig, *Ann. Tig.*), abbat of Clonmacnoise, died A.D. 753 (*Ann. Tig.*) and is commemorated on April 29. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 752, and *Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 740, ap. O'Conor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* ii. pt. i. 251, pt. ii. 21, iv. 95; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, A.D. 748, i. 351; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 113.) [J. G.]

**LUIDO** (LIUDO, LATO), fifth in the list of bishops of Spire. He is one of the bishops of Bavaria and Alemannia to whom pope Gregory wrote a letter, ascribed to the year 738, commending to them St. Boniface, and bidding them not fail to attend at the council he was about to assemble (*Epist.* iv. Patr. Lat. lxxxix. 580; *Gall. Christ.* v. 716; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 641.) [S. A. B.]

**LUIGHBHE** (LUGEUS), Irish saint, commemorated in *Mart. Doneg.* on Jan. 14. [J. G.]

**LUIGIDA**, Meic Coelboth, Irish saint, abbat of Clonfert. (*Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 558, ap. O'Conor, *Rev. Hist. Scrip.* ii. pt. ii. 7.) [J. G.]

**LULLA** (1), an abbat of the diocese of Winchester who attended the council of Clovesho in 803 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546; Kemble, *C. D.* 1024). The name appears as that of an ealdorman in Abingdon and Glastonbury charters of the same period; e.g. Kemble, *C. D.* 178, 180. [S.]

**LULLA** (2), priest of the diocese of Lichfield, who attended the council of Clovesho in 803. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546; Kemble, *C. D.* 1024.) [S.]

**LULLINGC**, a priest of the diocese of Rochester who attended the council of Clovesho in 803 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547; Kemble, *C. D.* 1024). The name appears in questionable charters: e.g. Kemble, *C. D.* 158, 174, 985. [S.]

**LULLO** (LUL), an East Anglian abbat, who visited Alcuin, and reported to him the good conversation of the bishops Alheard and Tidferth, some time between 798 and 804 (*Mon. Alcuin.* ed. Jaffé, p. 740; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 552). On his return he brought a letter from Alcuin to the ealdorman Heardbert, of whom he had heard from Lullo (*Mon. Alc.* p. 741). At the council of Clovesho in 803, Lullo appears as an abbat of the diocese of Dunwich, in company with bishop Tidferth. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547.) [S.]

**LULLUS**, bishop or archbishop of Mainz, successor of St. Boniface, 755-786.

Lullus was a native of England, a West Saxon by birth, probably noble, and, as is asserted by a biographer, a kinsman of St. Boniface. The names of his parents are not preserved, but Othlon, the biographer of Boniface (Jaffé, *Mon. Mog.* p. 490), mentions that Chunihilt (Gun-

hild), a lady who followed Boniface into Germany, was aunt, on the mother's side, to Lullus. Chunihilt, with her daughter Berthgith, settled as "magistrae" in Thuringia. Two letters of a lady named Berthgith are among the letters of Boniface and Lullus, both addressed to a brother named Balthard (*ib.* pp. 312, 313); possibly they were written by the daughter of Chunihilt after her mother's death, in which case Balthard also would be a cousin of Lullus. It is difficult to argue as to any distinct relationship from the language of early letters in which the line is not clearly drawn between spiritual and carnal kindred. There is, however, one letter which seems to refer to the family affairs of Lullus. It is addressed to the abbess Cuneburga, by Denehart, Lullus, and Burghard, and mentions the death of their father, mother, and other relations, in a way that seems to shew that they were brothers (*Mon. Mog.* pp. 109, 110). Lullus also asks that two boys, Beiloc and Man, whom he and his father had freed, sent to Rome, and commended to his uncle there, may be sent to him in Germany. Burghard is identified by Jaffé with the bishop of Würzburg of that name, who was an Englishman, but who is not elsewhere noticed as a kinsman of Lullus. The uncle at Rome is, by Mabillon, conjecturally identified with Theophylactas, the archdeacon (*Ep.* 78), who certainly regarded Lullus with great affection; but this also is incapable of proof. If Cuneburga, the abbess to whom the former letter is addressed, was the abbess of Wimburne, an additional link is provided which connects Lullus with Wessex. He seems also to have been related to Kynehard bishop of Winchester (*Mon. Mog.* p. 269).

He was brought up in the monastery of Malmesbury, under an abbat named Eaba, who used, as we learn from another letter (*Ep.* 133; *Mon. Mog.* p. 300), to distinguish him by the name "Lytel." According to his biographer he entered the monastery at the age of seven, and left England soon after he was ordained deacon. As his first appearance in the service of St. Boniface is conjecturally placed about the year 732, it must be inferred that his education at Malmesbury was in progress during the second and third decades of the century.

Whatever may have been the truth in these matters, there is no doubt that Lullus was attracted to Germany both by family connexion with Chunihilt, and by the report of the successes of Boniface as a missionary. He was welcomed by the great prelate, and in due time became his archdeacon. Some few of his letters still extant belong to this period of his career. In one (*Ep.* 75; *Mon. Mog.* p. 214) he writes to Eadburga abbess of Minster, asking her prayers, and sending presents by the bearer, Ceola; in another (*Ep.* 76; *ib.* 214, 215) he addresses Dealwin, once his master, now his brother, to the same purpose. He adds the name of Denewald, "our brother," as his messenger, and asks for the works of St. Aldhelm to be sent to him. Here we may, without rashness, infer that Dealwin was a monk or priest at Malmesbury. A third letter (*Ep.* 77), belonging to the same period, is addressed by the priest Ingalice to Lullus, thanking him for gifts, and returning by the messenger, Aldred, four knives, a pen-case, and a towel (*mappa*). This, likewise, was, as

is probable, written at Malmesbury. A fourth letter, written by archdeacon Theophylactas to Boniface (*Ep.* 78, p. 216), contains a warm encomium on Lullus, who is called archdeacon, and described as in constant attendance on the archbishop. The writer also calls Lullus his companion and brother, words scarcely compatible with the relation of uncle and nephew. If, as seems probable, the letter was written on the occasion of a visit paid by Lullus to Rome, it may be referred to the year 751, in which Lullus visited the pope on an errand from Boniface. Before that mission, however, he had been ordained priest. In a letter addressed to Leobgith or Lioba, afterwards abbess of Bischoffsheim (*Ep.* 97, p. 245), the date of which is difficult to fix, Lullus calls himself "exiguus, servus autem domni Bonifacii discipulorum," a description which might imply that he was either deacon or bishop. Lioba was an English woman educated at Wimburne under abbess Tetta, who, according to her biographer Rudolf, was sister to the king of Wessex (*Mab. Acta SS. saec. iii. p. i. p.* 223).

In 751 Lullus was sent to Rome by Boniface to consult pope Zachary confidentially on certain subjects to be discussed by word of mouth as well as by letters. The pope, whose answer is dated Nov. 4, 751, mentions some of the questions that Lullus had put to him, especially the number and place of the crossings to be made in the canon of the mass. The pope had marked them in their several places in a roll which Lullus had presented and sent back to Boniface (*Epp.* 79, 80). In another letter of the same date Zachary fixes Mainz as the seat of Boniface's metropolitan jurisdiction (*Ep.* 81, p. 226). It must have been on this visit that Lullus formed the acquaintance of Bregwin, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, who many years later wrote to remind him of their old intercourse (*Ep.* 113, p. 277). Another correspondent of Boniface, Benedict bishop of Nomentum, likewise mentions Lullus as the bearer of letters at this time (*Ep.* 83, p. 230). Lullus appears as a counsellor of Boniface in his contest with Adelbert (*Mon. Mog.* p. 474).

After several years' experience of the good qualities of Lullus Boniface determined to take measures to secure him as his successor, and for this end probably it was that he consecrated him as a "chorepiscopus," if that is the right reading of the letter in which he recommends him to Pipin (*Ep.* 85, p. 232); Mabillon, however, read "coepiscopus" (*Acta SS. l. c. p.* 357). In pursuit of this object he employed also the good offices of Fulrad abbat of St. Denys. The petition to Pipin is that Lullus might be appointed as preacher and teacher of both priests and people, so that, after the departure of his master, the sheep of the flock might not be dispersed, and the nations living near the march of the pagans might not lose the law of Christ. The petition was granted, and Boniface, when he left his see to go on the mission in which he was crowned with martyrdom, had the satisfaction of seeing Lullus in charge of the church of Mainz. Among other matters with which he especially charged him, the welfare of his English coadjutors was strongly commended to his care; in particular the abbess Lioba. In his company he travelled through Thuringia, introducing him to his flock (*Mon. Mog.* p. 477). The



completion of the buildings at Fulda was also urged upon him, and at Fulda the archbishop, who knew that his days were short, wished to be buried (*V. S. Liobaë*, Mab. *Acta SS.* saec. iii. pt. 2, p. 231; Willibald, *V. S. Bonif.* ib. p. 20; *Mon. Mogunt.* p. 462). Lullus, at the time of the death of Boniface, was in attendance on the king, and immediately gave orders that the body should be taken to Fulda, where, after some delay caused by the wish to bury the great missionary at Utrecht or at Mainz, he finally rested. The account of this event, given by St. Egil in the life of Sturmi, represents Lullus as opposing the removal until he was warned in a vision to forbear (Mab. *Acta SS.* saec. iii. pt. 2 p. 252).

According to the majority of authorities Lullus entered without any difficulty on the succession to Boniface. One author, however, the continuator of Bede (*M. H. B.* p. 288), asserts that a certain Redger was consecrated archbishop in St. Boniface's place by pope Stephen. As Redger is otherwise unknown, it has generally been argued that the continuator was mistaken. This is of course quite possible, but the authority of this writer is on every ground so great that it cannot be hastily set aside. It is certain that Lullus did not receive the pall at least before 775, and probably not at all, nor was usually denominated archbishop; and it was at a later period of his life brought into question whether he had been validly consecrated. It seems, therefore, by no means improbable that Lullus's consecration as "chorepiscopus" by Boniface might not at Rome be regarded as a full qualification for the succession, although when the pope found him well supported by Pipin he may have determined to let the matter rest. It is, however, on the whole most probable that the person here called Redger was Rutgang or Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, to whom pope Stephen in 754 sent a pall and gave the title of archbishop, having already, according to one of the biographers of Boniface, consecrated him in spite of remonstrance and a quarrel which was only appeased by the personal interference of Pipin (*Mon. Mog.* 478; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* no. 1771).

However this may have been, in England, where Lullus was better known and remembered than Boniface himself, he was immediately recognised as successor to the saint, and letters poured in upon him from the ecclesiastics of his native land, condoling with him on the loss of his master. In particular archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury wrote, telling him that the day of Boniface's martyrdom should be observed as a holy day in the English church, and exhorting him to try to rival his achievements (*Ep.* 108; *Mon. Mog.* pp. 261 sq.). Mildred bishop of Worcester also wrote a letter of consolation (*Ep.* 109; *ib.* p. 267). Kynehard bishop of Winchester wrote to him on his promotion (*Ep.* 110, p. 268), thanking him for letters received, reminding him of their relationship, and of their ancient and common friendship with Boniface and the bishops Daniel and Hunfrith, Kynehard's predecessors; the bishop further sends presents, asks for an arrangement for mutual intercession, and requests the loan of learned books, both theological and secular, especially on medicine. A letter of Lullus addressed to

Gregory abbat of Utrecht, belonging to this period of his life, is preserved; it contains an exhortation to piety and self-denial, and a warning against clerical luxury and finery. Lullus had intended to visit the abbat, but had been prevented by manifold troubles (*Ep.* 111, pp. 270-274).

This letter seems to indicate that the writer had not yet overcome the first difficulty of his administration. It shows, however, that he was intent on the task, which his biographer specially remarks, of visiting the churches of his great diocese. He made at the beginning of his episcopate a thorough visitation of his churches, and, as a result of the proceedings, became daily more religious and self-denying (*V. Lull. ap. Surium, Acta SS.* tom. v. fo. 297).

But few particulars of the administration of Lullus have been preserved; we know, however, that during the life of Pipin he enjoyed the royal confidence. In 764 Pipin addressed to him a letter directing litanies to be celebrated by way of thanksgiving for the recovery of the land after famine (Baluze, *Capit.* i. 133; *Mon. Mog.* p. 281; Pertz, *Leges*, i. 32). In 765 he was present at a council or synod at Attigny (Pertz, *Leges*, i. 30; Labbe, *Conc.* vi. 1702). From some of the Mainz letters we discover that study formed no small part of his employments, and that he continued to have much correspondence with England. Archbishop Bregwin of Canterbury (*Ep.* 113; *Mon. Mog.* 277) negotiated with him through a messenger named Hildebert, grieving that the troubles in both England and Gaul had hindered more frequent intercourse, sending presents, and recording the day of the commemoration of abbess Bugga. Eardulf bishop of Rochester, and Eardulf king of Kent, wrote, proposing mutual prayers (*Ep.* 120, p. 285), and Kynehard, of Winchester, acknowledged and made a return for small presents (*Ep.* 121, p. 287). Two or three only of the extant letters concern domestic events. In one of these Lullus writes to the pope against the intrusive priests Willefrith and Enraed, who had been introduced into his diocese without his permission, and had alienated the serfs and other property of churches (*Ep.* 114, pp. 279, 280). In another he orders Denehard and others to hold processions and fasts to avert a plague of rain (*Ep.* 116, p. 281).

This part, however, of Lullus's episcopate was signalled by his quarrel with Sturmi abbat of Fulda, a contest in which personal jealousy was probably mingled with the zeal which the two holy men felt for their own rights and jurisdictions. According to the biography of Sturmi they had already had an altercation about the burial of St. Boniface, but the true cause of their great quarrel is unknown. Lullus is said to have prompted three false brethren to lay before Pipin heavy charges against the abbat. Sturmi was sent into exile for two years in or about the year 764. After the period of exile he returned to Fulda, and was reconciled with Lullus, but relieved from obedience to him by a papal grant of immunity (*V. Sturmi, Mab. Acta SS.* saec. iii. pt. 2, pp. 254, 255).

In 768 Pipin died; Lullus seems to have retained with Charles neither more nor less influence than he had had with his father. He was on friendly terms with him without being one

of his chief advisers. This somewhat cool relation, which must have lasted for eighteen years, seems to imply that there may have been grounds of dislike between the king and the bishop, who certainly was not without enemies. If this was the case, we may identify Lullus with an unnamed bishop, a disciple of St. Boniface, to whom Charles addressed a somewhat severe letter of advice. The bishop under rebuke had devoted himself to the edification of his people, but had neglected the education of the clergy, and required a strong admonition as to the necessity of literary studies (*Epistolae Carolinae*, ed. Jaffé, *Ep.* 16, pp. 369, 370). This, however, is scarcely consistent with what we know of the personal habits of Lullus, and the many signs of literary interest which occur in his letters, and do not decrease in number as he grows older. At the beginning of Charles's reign we find him in correspondence with Guthbert abbat of Wearmouth and Ethelbert or Coena, archbishop of York, borrowing the works of Bede, and lending books on cosmography (*Epp.* 122, 123, 124, 125, pp. 288-292). Among other correspondents at this period were Botwin abbat of Ripon, Cynewulf king of Wessex, Alhed and Osgeofu, king and queen of Northumbria, all desiring mutual prayers and exchanging presents (*Epp.* 119, 129, 134, 138). The king and queen of Northumbria likewise ask him to use his influence to preserve for them peace and friendship with Charles. Megingoz bishop of Würzburg, and a priest named Wigbert, seem to be the chief of his German correspondents.

One part of his official work, on which some few particulars are preserved by the hagiographers, was the dedication of churches, or attendance on great ceremonies of translations of relics. Thus in 774 he was present at the consecration of the church at Lorsch (Pertz, xxi. 348). He took part in the translation of St. Goar (Mab. *Acta SS.* saec. ii. p. 276), of St. Ferrutus (*ib.* iii. pt. 2, p. 361), and St. Wigbert (saec. iii. pt. 1, p. 630), abbat of Fritzlar, who was removed a few years before Lullus's death to his favourite foundation at Hersfeld. Lambert of Hersfeld (A.D. 777) mentions the dedication of a church at Ordorf, by Lullus, in honour of St. Peter.

Lullus does not seem to have maintained the same close correspondence with the popes that Boniface had set on foot. But one letter addressed to the Roman pontiff occurs in the whole collection of his letters, that on the intrusive priests Willefrith and Enraed; and it is altogether uncertain to which pope it was addressed. It has been already observed that he had never received the pall, or exercised, so far as we know, any archiepiscopal functions. The churches which St. Boniface had founded remained nominally subject to Mainz as the metropolitan see, but the system of the episcopate was not developed by Lullus, and the records of the existing sees are too scanty to allow us to determine what hand he had in ordaining the prelates who filled them. Of the more ancient sees of Germany, Tongres, Cologne, Worms, Speier, and Utrecht had been, as part of the mission field of Boniface, subjected to his jurisdiction by pope Zachary; but Boniface's activity as legate had been shewn in regions far distant from his immediate province, and Lullus laid no claim to such a position. We find him then on terms of equality, rather than of superiority, with Megingoz bishop of

Würzburg (753-785), and Witta or Albinus of Buraburg (d. 786), who, of all the German bishops, were in closest intercourse with him. Albinus, like Willibald of Eichstaedt, was an Englishman, and both were old disciples of Boniface. The appointment of Willehad to the new see of Bremen in 787 may have taken place before the death of Lullus, but his consecration was performed in the year following, and the charter in which Charles mentions Lullus as advising the appointment does not call him archbishop, but bishop. He died before the measures taken by Charles for the strengthening of the church organisation had limited the extent of the metropolitan authority of Mainz, or recognised the rival archbishop-copate of Cologne.

Under these circumstances it is reasonable to suppose that Lullus was little known at Rome; it is only by a conjecture of the conciliar writers that he is brought to a Roman council in 769 (Labbe, vi. 1721), and this obscurity, rather than any direct hostility, may account for the extraordinary measure taken by Adrian I., who, about the year 775, when Lullus had been at least twenty years a bishop, issued a commission to Tilpin, the archbishop of Rheims, in conjunction with two other bishops, Viomadus of Trier and another named Possessor, missi of Charles, to examine into the faith, manners, and ordination of Lullus. The pope had heard something on the question of orders, which led him to make the enquiry; if, however, the result was satisfactory, he was prepared to confirm the orders, and to send, according to custom, the pall, and establish Lullus as archbishop in the church of Mainz (Labbe, *Conc.* vi. 1791; Mansi, xii. 844). It is clear from this that doubts had been thrown on the validity of the appointment by which Lullus had been placed in the see of Boniface, and the delay in demanding the pall had operated in a way that suggested a question as to the title which he might have to receive it. The result of the enquiry is not stated; we are not told whether or no Lullus received the pall from Adrian, and as he is not formally called archbishop, we may presume that he did not. On the other hand, as he continued until his death in possession of the see, we may infer that no flaw could be found in his orders.

In the absence of any evidence that Lullus took an active part in developing the work that Boniface had begun in the line of mission work and church organisation, it is not surprising to find that he was a monastic founder and patron of some eminence. The monastery of Hersfeld recognised him as its chief benefactor. The foundation of the house is placed by Lambert, its own historian, as early as 736; Sturmli had lived there as a hermit during the early part of his career. According to the biographer of Lullus, he had received the ground on which the monastery was built from St. Boniface, after it had been cleared by Sturmli. Lullus devoted himself to the building of the church, which he dedicated to St. Simon and St. Thaddaeus, and to which he was divinely directed to translate the remains of St. Wigbert of Fritzlar. It is quite possible, if this story be true, that the rivalry between Hersfeld and Fulda infected the two patrons, and was the cause of the enmity between Lullus and Sturmli (Mab. *AA. SS.* saec. iii. pl. ii. p. 363; Pertz, *Scriptores*, v. pp. 137, 139, 140). Hers-

feld was the place where he chose to be buried. His biographer gives the following account of his death. Having very definite warning that his end was near, although he was without bodily ailment, he sent for his friend and countryman, Witta or Albinus, bishop of Buraburg, and directed him to say mass in his presence. Albinus complied, and expired in the act of saying the final words. Lullus had the body of Albinus placed in a boat and carried on the Rhine to Hostod, whence it was brought by land to Hersfeld. He there buried his friend, and then fell sick and died on Oct. 16, 786 (Mab. *l. c.* p. 363; v. Lulli ap. Surium, v. 297). Sixty years after his grave was opened, and his remains found untouched by decay. On the occasion the foot of a bystander was crushed by the gravestone, but in the following night healed by the miraculous influence of the saint. He was again translated in the year 1040.

The year of his death has been doubted, as his name appears in the business of the appointment of Willehad to the see of Bremen in 787, and some later authorities, Marianus Scotus in particular, mention it under that year. But the overwhelming weight of ancient authority is in favour of the year 786. (See the several *Annales*, in Pertz, *Scriptores*, i. pp. 33, 116, 298, 350.)

The question whether Lullus was or was not a Benedictine may be explored in the Elogium of Mabillon (*l. c.* pp. 355-363). Whether he was or was not an archbishop is another question of minor importance. Mabillon, however, gives, from *Antiquitates Fuldenses*, lib. 8, c. 11, a grant in which, with the title of archbishop, he gives land in Thuringia to Fulda. If this is genuine, it will shew that Lullus, at least on occasion, claimed the dignity.

The Life of Lullus, which was known to Mabillon as the work of "anonymus Gemmelacensis," has not been printed, but a good deal of it is known by the extracts which he gives, and by the abstract which Surius drew from the Mainz breviary, derived from the same source. Mabillon does not speak of it with much respect, charging the writer with running into common-places and fables. The chief source of information about him is the collection of letters which were published by Serarius, Würdtwein, and Giles, as the letters of St. Boniface, and far more fully and critically by Jaffé, in the *Monumenta Moguntina*. The later Mainz writers, Serarius in his *Moguntiacarum Rerum Libri Tres*, and Johannes in the *Scriptores Rerum Moguntinarum*; the Bollandist fathers, *AA. SS.* Oct. tom. vii. 2, pp. 1083 sq., and Mabillon in the Elogium cited above, have done little more than collect the biographical notices which occur in the letters and in the biographies of St. Lioba, Sturm, Boniface, and Wigbert. [S.]

LUMINOSUS, abbat of the monastery of SS. Andrew and Thomas at Rimini. (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* lib. ii. indict. x. 41-42; Migne, lxxvii. 578.) [A. H. D. A.]

LUNAPEIUS, Welsh saint, disciple of St. Dubricius, and companion of St. Teilo on his return from Armorica (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 14, wks. vi. 80, Ind. Chron. A.D. 596; *Lib. Landav.* by Rees, 351). He was probably raised to the episcopate by St. Teilo, and stationed

in the ancient kingdom of Eryng, in the south-west of Herefordshire. Rees supposes that he is the same as Junabui, founder of Llandinabo [JUNABUI]. (*Id.* 409, 410, 624; Godwin, *De Praesul. Angl.* 622, in his list of prelates at Llandaff; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 156.)

[J. G.]

LUPELLUS, disciple and biographer of St. Frodobertus abbat of Cella (Moutier-la-Celle), near Troyes, who died about 673. His work, which is described as written with considerable brevity, is lost, but was used by Ado for the fuller life which he composed of the same saint. (Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 634, § 21, Paris, 1669; Ceillier, xii. 886; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 632-3.) [S. A. B.]

LUPENTIUS (popularly LOUVENT), saint and martyr, abbat of the church of St. Privatius at Javouls, the original seat of the Mende bishopric (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vi. 36; Le Coite, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* an. 584 n. v. tom. ii. 254-5). Queen Brunehilde summoned him to Metz to answer the charge of speaking evil against her, made, as was said, by Innocentius count of Javouls (afterwards bishop of Rodez, *ibid.* cap. 37). On enquiry the accusation was not substantiated, and Lupentius was permitted to depart. But on his way home on the river Aisne the count attacked and slew him.

Lupentius is commemorated Oct. 22 at Châlons-sur-Marne and Mende, at the former city from immemorial antiquity. (See the *Auctaria ad Usuardum*, Oct. 22, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiv. 607-610.) Much legend has grown up round the name, as may be seen from two lives published by the Bollandists which serve only to obscure the authentic narrative (*Acta SS.* Oct. ix. 610, 612). His death probably happened between 584 and 593. The body was translated from the place of its burial to the city of Châlons-sur-Marne. (Baillet, *Les Vies des Saints*, Oct. 22, tom. vii. 344.) [S. A. B.]

LUPERIANUS, bishop of Arezzo (Ughelli, i. 410; Cappelletti, xviii.), was engaged in 714 and 715 in a controversy with Adeodatus bishop of Siena as to the jurisdiction over fifteen baptisteries and two monasteries (Troya, *Codice Diplomatico*, part 3, pp. 158, 182, 185, 212, 222). The controversy is alluded to by pope Stephen III. in a letter to Stabilis bishop of Arezzo in 752. (Jaffé, *Regest. Pont.* p. 189. See Von Bethmann-Hollweg, *Der Civilprozess des gemeinen Rechts*, Beilage ii. *Der Diöcesanstreit von Siena und Arezzo*, pp. 537-549.) [A. H. D. A.]

LUPIANUS, confessor in the 4th century, said to have been baptised by Hilary of Poitiers, to have died a few days afterwards, "in albis," and to have been buried in the vicus Ratiatensis. (Greg. Tur. *Glor. Conf.* 54; cf. Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jul. i. 32, 13 Jan. i. 798 E.) [C. H.]

LUPICINUS (1) (LUPICIANUS). Epiphanius (*Haer.* 80, p. 1068) states that a general named Lupicianus put several Euphemites to death because they gave their heathen rites too close a resemblance to the Christian worship. Tillemont is no doubt right (viii. p. 528) in identifying this Lupicianus with the Lupicinus who was consul with Jovian in 367 and who had been appointed master of the horse by that emperor,

and had been entrusted by him with the defence of the eastern provinces (Ann. *Marcell.* xxvi. 5). We have then in the incident recorded a specimen of the manner in which some Christians used the power which reverted to them on the death of Julian. Ammianus describes Lupicinus as haughty, avaricious, and cruel. Through these vices he was the cause, in 377, of the revolt of the Goths which led to his himself sustaining a defeat, and which ultimately proved fatal to the emperor Valens. Tillemont is of opinion (*Empereurs*, v. 694) that the Lupicinus who commanded in Britain in 359 and who on his return was banished by Julian, is different from him who was promoted by Jovian, but his reasons do not convince us. [G. S.]

**LUPICINUS (2)**, bishop of Appiaria on the Danube, one of the three delegates sent by Chrysostom to answer Theophilus of Alexandria, A.D. 403. (Chrysost. *Innocentio Epist.* § 2, Pallad. *Dial.* cap. 8, in *Pat. Gr.* xlvii. 28, lii. 531; Le Quien, *O. C. i.* 1225.) [L. D.]

**LUPICINUS (3)**, a priest or bishop of Stridon in Dalmatia, the birth-place of St. Jerome. From the intimations in Jerome's letters (6, 7, ed. Vall.) we gather that he was a Spaniard, and that (probably from the same causes which in later times produced the conflicts between the regular and the secular clergy) he discouraged the rising monasticism with which Jerome was identified. Jerome describes his native town, under the ministry of Lupicinus, as sunk in worldliness, and with his usual vehemence speaks of Lupicinus as a foolish man, an ignorant pilot, a blind leader of the blind. A bitter controversy sprang up between them, which was probably one cause which made Jerome live so little at Stridon; but Thierry's account (St. Jerome, vol. i. p. 53) of a persecution, in which Jerome was driven from his native place, is based on a misunderstanding. Lupicinus continued to be the priest or bishop of Stridon while Jerome was in the desert, 374, and may have witnessed, and possibly died in, the destruction of Stridon by the Goths in 377. [W. H. F.]

**LUPICINUS (4)**, a bishop in the African province of Mauritania Caesariensis, who was deposed from his bishopric and excluded from communion for some offence before he had had a fair trial. He appealed to Rome, and Leo the Great, at his often-repeated request, restored him to communion till his case had been tried, and wrote on the subject to the bishops of the province in Aug. 446. (Leo Mag. *Ep.* xii. 668, Migne.) [C. G.]

**LUPICINUS (5)**, a magister officiorum, to whom Theodoret wrote entreating him not to give credence to the slanderous statements circulated against him. (Theod. *Epist.* 90; Tillemont. xv. 586, 299, 300.) [E. V.]

**LUPICINUS (6)**, abbat of the monastery of St. Claudius (afterwards known as the monastery of St. Eugendus and the monasterium Condatisense) in Mount Jura, cir. 480. He was the brother and successor of Romanus the founder, and was followed by Minausius. His life is narrated by Gregory of Tours (*Vit. Pat. cap.* 1), and after him by the Bollandists (Mart.

iii. 263) and Tillemont (xv. 72, xvi. 142). He was likewise abbat of Lauconne, a monastery built for him by his brother (Boll. 28 Feb. iii. 742). He is mentioned by Usuard (Mar. 21) as an abbat in the territory of Lyons. [C. H.]

**LUPITA (LUPAID, LUPAIT, LUPUIT)**, Irish saint, sister of St. Patrick, and said to have been carried into Ireland at the same time as her brother, but she to Louth and he to Dal-araidhe in the north. According to Aengus the Culdee, in his *Tract on the Mothers of the Saints of Ireland*, Lupita had seven children, who were saints; but Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 225 6, c. 4) thinks that as to this, Lupita stands in place of Liemanian [LIAMHAIN], and that she herself was a virgin. She lived at one time at Druincheo, on the west of Brileith (now Slieve Golry, co. Longford), and also at Ardagh with her nephew, bishop Mel, when Joceline (*Vit. S. Patr.* c. 102), followed by the *Tripert. Life* (ii. c. 29), tells an absurd story of their connexion (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 89, 133). She appears to have died at Na Fearta, to the east of Armagh, where she was buried, and a monastery for women raised on the spot to her honour. Her death for unchastity is said to have taken place under most unusual circumstances at the hands of St. Patrick (Colgan, *ib.* 163, c. 76, 187 n.<sup>163</sup>), and her body was supposed to be found in the last century in a place close to the wall of Armagh (Reeves, *Anc. Ch. Armagh*, 8, 10, 50-51). Her feast is usually Sept. 27, but her name is not found in the calendars, and Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 179) places it on Oct. 10. She is Lupait, one of St. Patrick's embroiderers in *Four Mast.* (A.D. 448). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 27 Sept. vii. 353) have "Lupita S. Patricii soror" among their praetermissi, and promise any additional information at Oct. 10, but none had been found. Ussher's dates are of no value, and uncertainty pervades the whole subject. (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 380-1; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* pass. and *Acta SS.* 259 sq. 716 sq.; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 125, 314 n.<sup>139</sup>, 405 n.<sup>114</sup>; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 90 n. 354, 361; Stewart, *Armagh*, 75 sq.; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* c. 26; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* i. 523 n. p.; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 168.) [J. G.]

**LUPULIANUS**, a friend, at whose request Jerome wrote his work on Hebrew names, A.D. 388. (Praef. in *Lib. de Nom. Heb.* in Hieron. *Opp.* t. iii. 1, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

**LUPUS (1)**, a Cilician bishop mentioned by Athanasius in 356 with others of the Catholic party. (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg.* § 8, in *Pat. Gr.* xxv. 558 A; Tillemont. vi. 640.) [C. H.]

**LUPUS (2)** (St LOUP), 8th bishop of Troyes, one of the most distinguished prelates of his time. He was born at Tullum Lencorum (Toul) of a noble family, and was brought up in the house of his uncle. Married to Pimeniola, sister of St. Hilary of Arles, he separated from his wife, after seven years of wedlock, by mutual consent, that both might devote themselves to a stricter religion. He followed Hilary to Lerins, which at that time was flourishing under St. Honoratus, and was in his turn followed thither by his brother Vincentius, who was probably the well-known writer of that name. After a year spent at Lerins, he em-

braced the monastic life, and coming to Matisco (Macon) to sell his property, he was there prevailed upon to accept the bishopric of Troyes, 426. As a bishop he still lived a life of monastic hardship. In a synod at Troyes he was chosen to go with St. Germanus to Britain, whence envoys had come asking aid against the Pelagians [GERMANUS]. In 453 he was enabled to preserve his city from an assault by Attila. In 453 we have a letter from him written in concert with EUPONIUS, and answering certain important questions concerning the marriage of persons in holy orders. During one portion of his episcopate he spent four years in ascetic retirement. He congratulated Sidonius Apollinaris on his elevation to the episcopate, and we have several letters of that writer which commend St. Lupus in the most laudatory terms (vi. 1, 4, 9; vii. 14; ix. 13). He died at the age of ninety-six, after an episcopate of fifty-two years, on July 29, 479. Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Confess.* 67) relates a miraculous death inflicted on a man who attempted to seize by force a slave who had taken sanctuary at the tomb of St. Lupus. He was commemorated on July 29. (*Mart. Usuard.*; Ceillier, *Ant. Sac.* x. 356; Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* iv. 25 seq.; *Gall. Ch.* xii. 485; *Boll. Acta SS. Jul. v. 72*; Cave, i. 411; Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 60-62; Tillem. iv. 513, xii. 675, xiv. 153, 154, xv. index, xvi. index.) [R. T. S.]

LUPUS (3) I. (LOUP or LEU), 19th archbishop of Sens, circ. A.D. 609-623. A biography of a very legendary character is extant, which the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France* would attribute to the close of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century, but believe that the author had access to trustworthy sources (iv. 191-2). It was apparently known to Usuard (*Martyrologium*, Sept. 1, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 423), and may be found in *Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. 1, 255-264. (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 7; *Boll. ibid.* pp. 253-4.) [S. A. B.]

LUPUS (4), poet and rhetorician of France in the 5th century. Our knowledge of him is mainly, if not entirely, derived from a long letter addressed to him by his friend Sidonius Apollinaris, in answer to one of his which is lost (*Epist.* viii. 11, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 603). From its playful opening we gather that he was born at Périgueux, and had married at Agen, which towns are represented as contending for his possession, and between which he divided his favours by teaching rhetoric in both (*Patr. Lat.* col. 608-4). He possessed a large library, and was devoted to the study of mathematics (col. 608). In his letter he had asked Sidonius for one of his old poems. The answer contains one formerly addressed to Lampridius, the poet and rhetorician (col. 604-606), who had just been murdered by his slaves. This event fixes the date of the epistle in 479. The remainder of the letter is chiefly occupied with a criticism of Lampridius's character and works (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 583-585; Ceillier, x. 393-394; Tillem. xvi. 271, 755). There is extant a letter of Ruricius, afterwards bishop of Limoges, addressed to a Lupus, whose eloquence the writer extols (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 75-76). The author of the *Histoire Littéraire* is inclined

to identifying him with the subject of this article (p. 585). [S. A. B.]

LURACH DUANAIRE, Irish saint, son of Cuana, descended from Colla Uais, monarch of Ireland (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 223, c. 4, 367 a); his mother is said to have been Darerca, sister of St. Patrick (*Jb.* 717, c. 5; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 53). He was perhaps bishop, lived at Doire-lurain, now Derryloran, on the borders of Londonderry and Tyrone, and commemorated Feb. 17; but the dedications of Luran, son of Conan, June 2, and of Luran bishop of Doire-lurain, Oct. 29, may also belong to him. Why he was called Duanaire "of the Poems," is unknown. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 223, c. 4, 367 a) places him among those belonging to the family of St. Maidoc of Ferns, and among the saints resting at Trim, but his Acts are not extant. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 604, 616.)

Before the see became settled at Derry, there were bishops at Ardstraw, co. Tyrone, and then at Maghera, co. Londonderry; the latter place, formerly called Rath-Luragh and Machaire-Rath, earlier Rath-Murbhuilg, and more extensively Machaire-Ratha-Luragh, is dedicated to St. Lurach, popularly St. Loury or St. Lowry, and his grave and well are still shewn. If St. Lurach lived where the old church of Derryloran now stands, near Cookstown, co. Tyrone, his relics and dedication had probably been removed to the neighbouring Maghera, in order to increase the honour due to the place when bishops came to live there, and got the title of "Episcopi Rathlurienses;" the feasts at June 2 and Oct. 29 may mark such a translation. (Cotton, *Fasti Eccl. Hib.* iii. 307; *County Londonderry*, 21, Ord. Survey; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 27, 241; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 12, § 3; Ware, *Irish Bishops*, "Derry;" Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 139, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

LUSCIUS, a name, real or fictitious, given by Jerome to one of his detractors, who had accused him of plagiarism (Praef. in *Lib. Heb. Quaest. in Gen.*). Jerome compares him to the Luscius Lanuvinus against whose accusation of pecculation Terence defended himself in the prologue to the *Andria*. Luscius is not to be identified with Rufinus, since the book of Hebrew Questions was written in 388 when Jerome was still a friend to Rufinus, and (as the preface shews) a champion of Origen. (Hieron. *Opp. t.* iii. 301, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

LYCOMEDES, legendary disciple of the apostle John. The apocryphal Acts which bore the name of Leucius related that John accused Lycomedes of relapsing into idolatry because he had at his house the picture of a man before which he burned lights, and to which he paid other honours. Lycomedes protested that he could worship no God but one, but declared that he thought it right to honour men from whom he had received benefits, and that this was the likeness of his greatest benefactor, the apostle John himself. The apostle, who had never seen his own face, at first could not believe that it was he who was represented, but, on a mirror being brought, owned the likeness, but said that Lycomedes had done ill. This story was read at the second council of Nicaea (*Act. v. Mansi*, xiii. 167) as an argument on the

Iconoclastic side, and was rejected by the synod as heretical. [LEUCIUS.] [G. S.]

LYONS, MARTYRS OF, June 2. Ado calls them Martyres Athanacenses from the name of the place Athanacus, where they suffered. The seventeenth year of Marcus Aurelius, whom Eusebius calls Antoninus Verus (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14, compared with preface to lib. v.), was marked by an outburst of persecution in Gaul, where the churches of Lyons and Vienne specially suffered. (On the possibility of such local persecutions even under friendly emperors, see F. Görres, *Die Toleranzedictie des Kais. Gallienus in Jahrb. Prot. Theolog.* 1877, pp. 607-608.) The story of the persecution is contained in the epistle of these churches to the Christians of Asia and Phrygia, as recorded in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1-4. The number of martyrs was forty-eight (Ado). The following are the only names recorded by the historian, but then it must be remembered that we possess only extracts from the epistle, the full list having been given in the original document which Eusebius transcribed into his lost "Collection of Ancient Martyrdoms" (*H. E.* v. 4); Vettius Epagathus, Maturus, Attalus, a native of Pergamus, and a pillar and foundation "of the church of that place" (στέλος καὶ ἐδραῶμα, cf. 1 Tim. iii. 15). Blandina, a female slave, Sanctus, born at Vienne, but deacon of the church at Lyons; Biblias, a woman; Pothinus, or Fotimus, the aged bishop [FOTIMUS]; Alexander, a physiciau; Ponticus and Alcibiades. In Ado's *Mart.*, however, we have the whole list, which seems a clear indication that in his time at least the Eusebian "Collection of ancient Martyrdoms" was still extant. The omitted names are Zacharias, a presbyter, Macarius, Silvius, Primus, Ulpus, Vitalis Cominus, Octuber, Philuminus, Geminus, Julia, Albina, Grata, Rogata, Aemilia, Potamia, Pompeia, Rhodana, Quartia, Materna, Helpes, Annas, Aristaeus, Cornelius, Zosimus, Titus, Julius, Zoticus, Apollonius, Germinianus, Julia, Ausonia, Aemilia, Jannica, Pompeia, Domna, Justa, Trophima, and Antonia. He classes them according to the kind of martyrdom they endured. The story of their sufferings is a very lengthened one. In contravention of the established principles of Roman law that a slave's testimony against his master could not be accepted (Gieseler, *H. E.* t. i. p. 132), their domestics were forced to charge the Christians of Lyons with the feasts of Thyestes and the incests of Oedipus, and other unnatural crimes. The martyrs were then racked, scourged, cast to the beasts, roasted in an iron chair, and finally those who were Roman citizens were beheaded according to the express command of Caesar, unless they renounced the faith, when they were dismissed. Finally the bodies were burned, and the ashes flung into the Rhone, in order, as the heathen said, "that they might not have any hope of rising again, in the belief of which they have introduced a new and strange religion, and contemn the most dreadful punishments, and are

prepared to meet death even with joy. Now we shall see whether they will rise again, and whether their God is able to help them, and rescue them out of our hands." The particulars of the individual martyrdoms will be found in connexion with each name as given above. The main interest of the narrative for our time is its theological aspect. Its early date (A.D. 177) is acknowledged. (Luthardt, *Authorship of St. John's Gospel*, p. 48, ed. Clark; cf. Scholten, *Die älteste. Zeugnisse betreff. die Schrift. des N. T.* pp. 110, 111.) We have therefore in it an authentic witness to the views and doctrines of the Christian church in Gaul, in Rome, and in Asia Minor, in the last half of the 2nd century, since the constant correspondence and communication between them (shewn by the instance of Attalus above) prove that there must have been practical unity of doctrine among these churches. A difference on a point of ritual like the paschal controversy served but a few years later to break up this unity (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23, 24). The author of *Supernatural Religion* (t. ii. c. ix. s. 4), criticising this epistle, and endeavouring to obviate the force of a plain quotation therein from St. Luke as an evidence for the existence and use of that gospel, proceeds then to make the further statement: "No writing of the new Testament is directly referred to in this epistle." As this writer ranges over a very wide field of patristic literature in his volumes we suppose he had not time to read the epistle very carefully. The following are some of its references to and quotations from the New Testament, which must strike any careful reader. In the beginning of the epistle Rom. viii. 18 is accurately quoted, and there are, more or less direct, references to, or quotations, more or less accurately, from the following passages:—Matt. xxii. 11; Luke i. 6; John xvi. 2, xix. 34; Acts vii. 60; 2 Cor. ii. 15; Phil. ii. 6; 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. xi. 35; 1 Pet. v. 6; Rev. i. 5, xix. 4, 9; and finally Rev. xxii. 11, which is quoted thus: *Ἰνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ.* We possess in Euseb. (v. 4) an extract from another epistle of the martyrs commending Irenaeus to Eleutherus bishop of Rome, while in the previous chapter he tells us they wrote to the same, and to the Christians in Asia and Phrygia, about Montanus and his followers, but to what effect is not certainly known [MONTANISM] (*Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Adon., Usuard.; Till. iii. 1; Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.*; Dodwell, *Diss. Cyprian.* xi. 36, supports A.D. 167 as the true date of this persecution; Wieseler, *Die Christenverfolg. der Cäsaren*, pp. 19, 68, 94, Gütersloh, 1878). Renan in his *Marc-Aurèle* (p. 329) identifies the execution of the martyrs with the meeting of the general assembly of the Gallic nations, which met annually in the month of August for the celebration of the worship of Augustus; a ceremonial with which the martyrdom of Polycarp in Asia Minor would also seem to have been associated. He also endeavours (p. 331) to identify the very localities of the martyrdoms (cf. *Rev. Critiq.* 12 Juillet, 1879; Aug. Bernard, *Le Temple d'August.*) [G. T. S.]

## NOTE.

For Martyrs and Confessors whose names fall under subsequent Letters, except where they are of special historic importance, the reader is referred to the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," in which, especially after the Letter L, they are fully enumerated, and references given to the Calendars and Martyrologies in which they occur.

## M

**MAARES**, one of twenty-two bishops known to Sozomen as having suffered martyrdom in Persia during the reign of Sapor II. (Soz. ii. 13; Tillem. vii. 90.) [G. T. S.]

**MABAN**, an eminent singer, who, having been trained in Kent by the successors of the Roman mission there, was invited by bishop Acca into his diocese of Hexham, where he remained twelve years instructing the bishop and his clergy (se suosque) in church music. (Bed. *H. E.* v. 20.) [C. H.]

**MABENA, ST.**, a daughter of Brychan, gives name to the parish of St. Mabyn near Wadebridge in Cornwall; where the parish fair is on or about 15th February. The parish of Mabe near Falmouth is called Landmabo in 1297, and perhaps refers to another name. [C. W. B.]

**MABON (1), ST.**, presumed to have been the founder of Rhiwfabon or Ruabon in Denbighshire. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 261.) [C. W. B.]

**MABON (2), ST.**, the old, the brother of St. Teilo. Llanfabon near Llandaff is dedicated to him. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 71, 99, 111, 251; Williams, *Dict. of Eminent Welshmen*.) [C. W. B.]

**MACARIA**, Valentinian aeon, the last of the decad. (Iren. i. 1.) [G. S.]

**MACARIOTES**, Valentinian aeon, one of the decad. (Iren. i. 1.) [G. S.]

**MACARIUS (1) I.**, bishop of Jerusalem, the thirty-ninth from the Apostles, Hermon being his predecessor. His accession is placed by Tillemont in 311 or 312. He is extolled by all the orthodox writers for the purity of his faith and the virtues which adorned his life. In the list of defenders of the faith given by Athanasius (*Orat. I. adv. Arian.* p. 291), he refers to Macarius as exhibiting "the honest and simple style of apostolical men." A letter addressed to him, among other orthodox bishops, by Alexander of Alexandria, is mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxi. 4, p. 730). He attended the council of Nicaea in 325 (Soz. i. 17; Theod. *H. E.* i. 15). That the seventh Nicene canon determining the subordination of the see of Aelia Capitolina (Jerusalem) to that of Caesarea "discloses a slight passage of arms" between him and Eusebius, in which Macarius endeavoured to assert the priority obtained for his see by Juvenal a hundred and twenty years afterwards (De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, ii. 56; Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 193), is a brilliant guess without historical authority. It deserves notice that Macarius signs fourth, next to the legates, in apparent violation of this canon (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 51, 76, 84, 101). But as Beveridge has remarked (Hefele, *Christian Councils*, Eng. transl. vol. i. p. 407) two other bishops of Palestine who were certainly the inferiors of the metropolitan of Caesarea, signed before Eusebius. It was during his episcopate, A.D. 326 or 327, that Helena paid her celebrated visit

to Jerusalem, which resulted in the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre, and, perhaps, though, as has been shewn in another article, this is very doubtful, in the so-called "Invention of the True Cross" [HELENA, Vol. II. p. 883 ff.]. According to the later form of the legend it was at the suggestion of Macarius that on the discovery of the three crosses the one on which our Lord had suffered was identified by their being applied successively to a lady suffering from a mortal sickness, who, after the others had failed to produce any effect, at the touch of the true cross was immediately cured (Soz. *H. E.* i. 17; Soz. *H. E.* ii. 1; Theod. *H. E.* i. 18; Rufin. *H. E.* i. 78; Paulin. Nolan. Ep. 31 [11]; see Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 36, Clark's transl.). Macarius was commissioned by the emperor Constantine, A.D. 326, to take the necessary steps for the erection of a basilica on the site of the Holy Sepulchre. The emperor's letter is given by Eusebius (*de Vita Const.* iii. 29-32), Socrates (*H. E.* i. 9), and Theodoret (*H. E.* i. 17). Constantine subsequently (c. 330 A.D.) wrote to Macarius with the other bishops of Palestine with regard to the profanation of the sacred terebinth of Mamre by idolatrous rites. He desires that the pagan altar may be overthrown, the idols burnt, and a basilica erected on the spot (Euseb. *u. s.* 52, 53). The emperor also presented Macarius with a vestment of gold tissue for the administration of the sacrament of baptism, as a token of honour to the church of Jerusalem. The subsequent sale of this robe to an actor was one of the charges brought against Cyril by Acacius (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 27). The date of the death of Macarius is not accurately known. It is placed by Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. 20) between the deposition of Eustathius, A.D. 331, and the council of Tyre, A.D. 335. He is commemorated in the Western church on March 10. Singularly enough, his name does not appear in the Menaea of the Eastern church. He was succeeded by Maximus. [E. V.]

**MACARIUS (2) II.**, bishop of Jerusalem, appointed in succession to Peter A.D. 544. His appointment was not confirmed by Justinian, by whom, on its being represented that he entertained Origenist tenets, his election was annulled, and Eustochius, oeconomus of the church of Alexandria, residing at Constantinople, was appointed to the see (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 37). In 563, according to Victor Tununensis (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxviii. 962 A), Eustochius was deposed, and Macarius, having previously anathematized Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus, was restored to his see (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 39). Moschus gives an anecdote of a blind Arabian monk of the monastery of St. Theodosius, near Jerusalem, who scrupled to communicate with Macarius (*Prat. Spirituale*, c. 96). He held the see, according to Evagrius, until Tiberius was made Caesar, i.e. till after A.D. 574 (*ibid.* v. 16). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 235; Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.* no. 90.) [E. V.]

**MACARIUS (3) I.**, second bishop of Anicium (Le Puy), between Georgius and Marcellinus. (*Gall. Chr.* ii. 688.) [GEORGIUS (6).] [S. A. B.]

**MACARIUS (4)**, an Egyptian bishop at the council of Tyre in 335. (Athanas. *Apol. c. Ar.* cap. 79; Mansi, ii. 1143.) [C. H.]



MACARIUS (5) (ARIUS, Ἀρειος), bishop of Petra in Palestine, who with Asterius, an Arabian bishop, forsook the Eusebian party and went over to the Catholics at the council of Sardica in 343 (*Ath. Apol. c. Ar. cap. 48*; *Id. Hist. Ar. ad Monach. cap. 15*; Theodor. *H.E. ii. 8*; Tillem. *Mem. viii. 98, 99*; Hefele, *Councils, ii. 100*). In the second passage of Athanasius the name is Arius, as also in the list of those who accepted the decrees of Sardica (*Apol. c. Ar. cap. 50*; Mansi, *iii. 39, 42*). Macarius and Asterius were banished by the emperor Constantius, through the intrigues of the Eusebians, into the interior of Libya, where they were contumeliously treated (*Hist. Ar. cap. 18*; Tillem. *vi. 340*). In this place Arius is again the name of the bishop, and here alone in Athanasius is his see mentioned. Besides the famous Arabian town of Petra in Palestina Tertia, to which Asterius is assigned (Le Quien, *Or. Chr. iii. 723*), there was another in Palestina Prima, which is believed to have been the see of Macarius (*ib. 667*). Wilsch (*Handbook, i. 222*) places it east of Sichem. The two Petrae in connection with these two bishops are fully discussed by Reland (in his *Palestina Illustrata, pp. 210, 926*), and by Le Quien (*Or. Chr. iii. 663, 721*). [C. H.]

MACARIUS (6), one of the Eastern semi-Arian bishops at the council of Seleucia in 359. (*Hilar. Frag. x. in Pat. Lat. x. 705.*) [C. H.]

MACARIUS (7), bishop at the synod of Alexandria in 362. (Athanas. *Tom. ad Antioch. in Opp. t. ii. p. 615*; Mansi, *iii. 346.*) [C. H.]

MACARIUS (8), bishop of Magnesia, by whom, at the synod of the Oak in 403, the charges against Heraclides bishop of Ephesus were brought forward (Phot. *cod. 59*; Le Quien, *i. 698*; Tillem. *xi. 166*); *vid. the following article, s. f.* [E. V.]

MACARIUS (9) MAGNES, a writer of the end of the 4th century. Some 400 years after, his name had sunk into almost complete oblivion, when in the course of the image controversy, a passage from his writings was produced on the iconoclastic side. Nicephorus, then or afterwards patriarch of Constantinople, had never heard of Macarius, and it was only after long search and labour that he was able to procure a copy of the work whence the extract had been taken. His account of it will be found, *Spicilegium Solesmense, i. 305*. He evidently knows no more of the author than he could learn from the book itself. The words Macarius Magnes may be understood as both proper names, or else may be translated either as the blessed Magnes, or as Macarius the Magnesian. Nicephorus understood Macarius as a proper name, and so he found it understood in the title of the extract which he discusses; but concerning Magnes he will not undertake to say whether it is a proper name or a geographical term. He concludes that Macarius had been a bishop, both because the title described the author as ἑπίσκοπος, and also because the very ancient MS. from which his information was derived contained a portrait of the author in a sacerdotal dress. He dates Macarius as 300 years later than the "Divine and Apostolic preaching;" but this he would have gathered from two passages

in the work. In one, a heathen objector asserts that our Lord's prediction "Many shall come saying I am Christ" had been falsified, seeing 300 years had passed since, and none such had come, unless we should so count Apollonius of Tyana: in the other passage the objector similarly comments on the disappointment of Paul's expectation that he should "be alive and remain" to the coming of our Lord, 300 years having passed without his ever having been caught up to meet his Lord in the air. We further learn that the work of Macarius was called *Apocritica*, that it was addressed to a friend of his named Theosthenes, and that it contained objections by a heathen of the school of Aristotle, together with replies by Macarius. Nicephorus finds that the extract produced by the Iconoclasts had been unfairly garbled, so as to misrepresent the real views of Macarius, the context shewing that he had only heathen idolatry in view, and that his words have no reference to the lawfulness of the use of images among Christians. But however free from error Macarius may be on this point, Nicephorus has no favourable opinion of him on the whole, thinking that he discerns in passages of his writings, Manichaean, Arian, or Nestorian tendencies, but especially because he finds him agreeing with "the impious and senseless Origen" as to the non-eternity of future punishments. After Nicephorus, Macarius again sank into obscurity, but not so complete as before; some very few extracts from his writings being to be found in MSS. of the succeeding centuries. It was near the end of the 16th century that he became again the subject of controversy, the Jesuit Turrianus, who had found a copy of the *Apocritica* in St. Mark's Library at Venice, adducing passages from it, which bore on the Eucharistic controversy, and on that concerning the relation of faith and works, and claiming for the author the antiquity of the sub-apostolic age. His Protestant opponents naturally refused to bow to an authority of which they had never heard before, and freely imputed fraud to the discoverer. Turrianus did not publish the MS. himself, and when it was sought for with a view to publication it had disappeared from St. Mark's Library. A like fate befel another work of Macarius, one on Genesis, which was found in the Ottomanian Library, and of which a transcript was made and sent to Boivin, who was in charge of the Royal Library at Paris. This work was not published, and now neither MS. nor transcript is to be found. Boivin's papers however had been seen by Magnus Crusius, who, in 1737, 1745, published dissertations on Macarius Magnes which may be read in Migne (*Pat. Gr. vol. x.*). At length in 1867 there was found at Athens what there is good reason to believe was the same copy as was read by Turrianus at Venice, and which afterwards, by theft or otherwise, found its way to Greece. This was prepared for publication by Blondel, a member of the French school at Athens, and on his premature death was actually published by his friend Paul Foucart (Paris, 1876). Shortly after, Duchesne, who had been a member of the same school, published a dissertation on Macarius (Paris, 1877), to which he added the text of all the fragments now attainable of Macarius's homilies on Genesis. The *Apocritica* consisted of five books: of these we have only the third complete: the Athenian MS.

already mentioned has also the second and fourth books, but the second mutilated by the loss of six chapters at the beginning, and the fourth somewhat mutilated at the end. The first and fifth books are altogether lost, except a short fragment of the first, preserved in a quotation by Nicephorus. Enough remains of the work to shew that it purports to contain a report of a *viva voce* discussion between the author and a Grecian philosopher. In form it is perhaps unique. It is not a mere dialogue like that known under the name of Adamantius, or the Eranistes of Theodoret; nor does it, like these, proceed in the Platonic method of short questions and answers; neither again does it, like Cicero's philosophic dialogues, contain a long speech on one side replied to by another continued discourse on the other side. But each speech of the heathen objector is in fact made up of some half-dozen short speeches, each dealing with a different objection, the objections often having no connexion with each other. To these objections Macarius severally replies, and then follow a few lines of narrative introducing a new set of objections. The arrangement would have been more convenient if each objection had been immediately followed by its answer. We need not doubt that we have preserved for us in this book a unique specimen of genuine heathen objections of the 4th century. The blows against Christianity are dealt with such hearty goodwill, and with so little restraint of language, that a Christian would certainly have regarded it as blasphemous to invent such an attack on his religion, and we have only to wonder that he did not scruple to write it down. Such scruples were certainly felt by copyists; and probably nothing but the revival of attention to this work in the image controversy saved it from the fate which befel not only the work of Porphyry, but also the works of all who formally replied to him. That Macarius did not invent the objections to which he replies may also be inferred from the fact that he sometimes misses the point of them, and that his answers to them are often very unsatisfactory. There is also a clear difference in point of style between the language of the objector and that of the respondent. On these grounds it has been inferred that Macarius reproduces the language as well as the substance of the arguments of a heathen, and then arises the question, "Are we to take it as literal fact that the dialogue records a real *viva voce* discussion between Macarius and a heathen objector, or are the heathen objections transcribed from a published work against Christianity, and if so, whose?"

The earliest Christian apologists have to defend their religion against men who have a very vague knowledge of it. Their business is to refute such accusations as that the eating of infants' flesh or promiscuous sexual intercourse took place at the Christian meetings. Justin Martyr quotes the Gospels as addressing men who would not be likely to know what the word Gospel meant. When we come somewhat later we find Celsus exhibiting some knowledge, but still only a superficial knowledge, of the Christian writings. But towards the close of the 3rd century a systematic attack was made on our religion by its most formidable adversary, Porphyry, founded on a careful study of our sacred books. It has been already said

that this attack was felt to be so malignant and dangerous, that not only it but all the systematic answers to it have perished. The few scattered notices of it which remain enable us to see that three or four of the Macarian objections have been at least ultimately derived from Porphyry. There is no appearance that they are verbally copied from him; and, as has been stated, the Macarian objector places himself 300 years after Paul's death, which, with every allowance for round numbers, is too late for Porphyry. On the other hand, with one or two exceptions to be mentioned afterwards, there is scarcely any resemblance between the objections in Macarius and what we know of those of the emperor Julian. Great part of these last is directed against the Old Testament, but those of Macarius almost exclusively against the New; and the Macarian objections are not attacks of a general nature on the Christian scheme, but rather attempts to find error or self-contradiction in particular texts, as, for instance, how could Jesus say in one place, "Me ye have not always," in another, "I am with you always even to the end of the world." The word Galileans, too, with which Julian loved to insult the Christians, is not found in the objections of Macarius. Intermediate in time between Porphyry and Julian was Hierocles [HIEROCLES (2)], and Duchesne ably advocates the view that the discussion in Macarius is fictitious, and that his book contains a literal transcript of parts of the lost work of Hierocles. We are ourselves inclined to believe that while no doubt Macarius or the heathen philosophers whom he encountered drew the substance of their arguments, and even in some cases their language, from previously published heathen writings, yet on the whole the wording is Macarius's own. The little pieces of narrative interspersed in the dialogue shew that the lost introduction must have contained in still greater detail a description of the circumstances of an actual dialogue. In one place a particular description is given of the winter season at which the discussion is said to have taken place. The literary morality of the time would not forbid the incorporation of some matter from previous treatises. But it would be inconsistent to copy all the heathen speeches verbally from a well-known work. Christian phrases occasionally slip from the mouth of the objector. Thus he speaks of "the Scriptures" (p. 198), of the Apostle, meaning Paul (p. 198). The language in which more than once (see p. 102) he speaks of the prerogatives of Peter is more that of a Christian than of a heathen: neither would a heathen be likely to be scandalized by Peter's carrying a wife about with him. Again, one so well informed as the objector on Christian matters could scarcely be quite ignorant of their eucharistic doctrine, and therefore it seems to us that the objection which merely expresses a rhetorical horror of literally eating flesh and drinking blood has not a genuine ring. But the personality of Macarius most plainly shews itself in one objection. In the story of the Gadarene demoniac Macarius solves the difficulty that Matthew speaks of two, Mark only of one, by the remark that Matthew speaks not of two men but of two demons, the chief captains no doubt of the "legion" mentioned by St. Mark. This seems to be founded on the fact that Matthew (viii. 31) makes the demons the

speakers; and it does not appear that he read *δαίμονας* instead of *δαίμονιζομένους* in ver. 28, yet his opponent anticipates this point, and speaks of Jesus as met not by two demoniacs but by two demons. We conclude that however much of materials and even of language Macarius may have drawn from heathen sources, his materials have been worked up by himself. The difference of style which has been noticed may be accounted for by the fact that Macarius did not bestow so much fine writing on the speeches of his opponent as on his own, in consequence of which the absence of rhetorical amplifications gives to the former speeches a force and liveliness which commends them more to the taste of our age. We give now a few specimens of the objections with Macarius's solutions, merely warning the reader that a certain injustice is done to Macarius in the selection, since it is precisely when his replies are what we should count bad that they are most tempting for quotation, and we do not care to copy his answers when they are exactly such as might be made by an apologist of the present day.

*Ob.* Jesus told His disciples "Fear not them who can kill the body," yet when danger was threatening Himself, He prayed in an agony that the suffering might pass away. His words on that occasion are not worthy of a Son of God, nor even of a wise man who despises death.

*Sol.* We must look below the surface, and see what it was our Lord really feared, when He prayed. The devil had seen so many proofs of His divinity that he dared not assault Him again, and so there was danger that that Passion which was to be the salvation of the world should never take place. He dissembles therefore and pretends to fear death, and by thus deceiving the devil hastened the hour of his assault; for when He prayed that His cup might pass, what He really desired was that it should come more speedily. He thus caught the devil by baiting the hook of His divinity with the worm of His humanity, as it is written in Ps. xxii., "I am a worm, and no man," and in Job xli., "Thou shalt draw out the dragon with a hook." The doctrine that the devil was thus deceived in his assaults on our Lord is taught by many of the Fathers, as, for instance, by Gregory Nyssen. So again Gregory the Great, in his commentary on the passage in Job just referred to, uses language strikingly like that of Macarius; but the source whence Macarius and the rest really drew was Origen's commentary on the 22nd Psalm, where the singular explanation is given which Macarius has borrowed. There is another instance of his use of the same commentary. Augustine has taken from Ambrose an explanation of the words "worship his footstool," proceeding by the steps: the earth, we are told, is God's footstool; man's body was made from earth: Christ assumed man's body: therefore it is our Lord's body which we are commanded to worship. When we find this explanation also in Macarius (iv. 16), being sure that he and Ambrose could not have borrowed one from the other, we know that both must have drawn from a common source; and this source plainly was Origen's commentary on the passage in question, of which, though only brief notes have been preserved, yet the fuller statements of those who have borrowed from him make his meaning clear. (See also *Hom. v. in Isai.* xiii. 266, Loum.)

*Ob.* How can Jesus say "Moses wrote of me," when nothing at all of the writings of Moses has been preserved. All were burnt with the temple, and what we have under the name of Moses was written 1180 years after his death by Ezra and his company.

*Sol.* When Ezra rewrote the books of Moses, he restored them with perfect accuracy as they had been before: for it was the same Spirit who taught them both.

*Ob.* In the story of the Gadarene demoniac, Matthew says that there were two demons, Mark does not scruple extravagantly to multiply the number, telling that when they were asked their name they answered "Legion," because they were many: and that they entered into 2000 swine. How could there be in Judea so many animals of a kind which the nation abominated? How could so many be drowned in what was really, not as the evangelist calls it a sea, but a small lake? If the story be true, how can Christ be justified for listening to the prayer of noxious demons, and instead of sending them to the abyss, permitting them to work further mischief? It is no work of mercy to relieve some at the expense of others. The case is as if a king, being unable to drive barbarians out of his country altogether, sent them from place to place, relieving one set of subjects and abandoning others to the enemy. If Christ made such a confession of inability to give complete deliverance, who can trust Him as a Saviour?

*Sol.* It was not out of ignorance\* that our Lord asked the demons their name, but that He might extort from their mouths the confession how deep had been their fall. They had been a legion once; they were so no longer now. Burned up by the flame of the Lord's presence, eager to cool themselves in the waters, yet, as immaterial spirits, unable to do so without some material vehicle, they try to move our Lord's compassion by reminding him how they had been once one of those "legions of angels" who did Him service. Now they have to ask as a favour to be permitted to enter these filthy beasts: for even that they dared not do without His leave. If He had sent them into the abyss, this degradation of theirs would not have been manifest: for they would simply have disappeared, and no one could have known that they had not gone off to work evil in some distant land.

The swine did not belong to the Jews, but to their Roman masters, of whom many were living in that country.

The objection that the name sea is improperly given to a lake is answered, not here, but in reply to the objection that it was incredible that the disciples could take till the fourth watch of the night to cross a little lake which a small boat could easily cross in two hours. This objection came from Porphyry (see Jerome, *Quaest. Heb. in Gen.*).

*Ob.* "If they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them." If this be so, candidates for bishoprics ought to be tested by offering them a cup of poison. If they do not venture to drink, they ought to own that they do not really

\* Here and elsewhere, through some carelessness of composition, Macarius answers an objection which his opponent has not made.

believe the words of Jesus; and as for the cures which it is said in the same context that they who believe shall be able to effect, as well as to remove mountains, it follows that at the present day not only none of ordinary Christians is a believer, but also none among the bishops or presbyters.

Macarius argues that Christ's words are not to be understood literally. Working cures is no test of faith: for such are often performed by unbelievers or atheists. It is not to be supposed Christ intended His disciples to do what He never did Himself, and He never moved a literal mountain. What he meant by mountains was demons, and we have an instance in Jer. li. 25 of the metaphorical use of this word mountain. Here we have another coincidence with Ambrose (in Ps. 36, 35; Migne, i. 1000), both no doubt being indebted to Origen.

It appears here that the Gospel of St. Mark, as read by the objector and by Macarius, contained the disputed verses at the end. The same appears from another place where mention is made that out of Mary Magdalen had been cast seven devils (see Orig. *Adv. Cels.* ii. 55). Two other of Macarius's readings may be mentioned. In Mark xv. 34, he reads, as does D, *ἀνείδισας* instead of *ἐγκατέλιπες* (p. 21); in John xii. 31, he notes that some copies have *κἀτω* instead of *ἔξω* (p. 37). Two objections are founded on passages in the *Apocalypse of Peter*. Macarius declines to offer the plea that that book is to be rejected, because the passages in question are also in substance to be found in the Old Testament. It therefore does not decisively appear what Macarius himself thought of that book. He speaks of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as the Apostle, no doubt intending Paul. He appears to have used the Second Epistle of Peter (see p. 180). The phrase "the canon of the New Testament" occurs p. 168.

We must not fail to include among our specimens the passages which have been appealed to in later controversies. And first with respect to polytheism and idolatry the heathen champion argues: You maintain the monarchy of God: now we do not call a shepherd a monarch though he rules over many; we give that title to an emperor such as Hadrian, ruling over many of the same species as himself. If, then, God be a monarch, it must be that there are other subordinate gods over whom He rules. And so yourselves acknowledge, for you ascribe the same kind of attributes to those whom you call angels as we do to those whom we call gods, so that it is a mere question of words; just as the Romans call Minerva her whom the Greeks call Athene. There are several passages in your own Scriptures where the name of gods is given to angels or to beings other than the Supreme. A king is not jealous when proper honour is paid to his officers, and we cannot think that the Supreme is more small-minded. As for the use of images, none of us supposes wood or stone to be God, or thinks that if a piece be broken off an image, the power of the Deity represented is diminished. It was by way of reminder that the ancients set up temples and images that those who come to them might think of God and make prayers according to their needs. You do not imagine a picture of your friend to be your friend; you keep it merely to remind

you of him, and to do him honour. Our sacrifices are not intended to confer benefit on the Deity, but to shew the love and gratitude of the worshipper. We make our images of Deity in human form because that is the most beautiful form we know. If any Greek is so weak-minded as to think that Deity does dwell in an image, it is a less absurd belief than yours, that Deity came to inhabit a virgin's womb, a place full of blood and other impurities. Christians imitate our temples by building very large houses for their religious meetings, though they might pray in their private houses, since the Lord no doubt could hear their prayers offered anywhere.

From this last sentence we gather that though the Christians at the time were so prosperous as to build large churches, they had not yet begun to ornament them with pictures or statues, else this would certainly have been urged by the heathen apologist. We may reasonably infer also that Christians had not yet found it necessary to use in defence of any practice of their own, arguments exactly the same as those which Macarius here puts into the mouth of a heathen. We have not space to give the answers of Macarius, though some of them are clever enough. For instance, it will have been observed that with regard to our Lord's birth as well as to His death the church made her boast of what her adversaries had counted her reproach, and that her "Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb" bids defiance to a common heathen objection. Macarius's answer is, If it was no shame to Him to have created the Virgin's womb, it was no shame to inhabit it. What would you think of an architect who built a house that he was ashamed to live in? On the subject of image worship he confines himself to shewing that the fact that angels had appeared in human form does not warrant us in so representing them, or in honouring them in any other way than by imitating their life. But it must be mentioned that in replying to the first of the heathen points, Macarius uses language, surprising under the Empire, which conveys the idea that it is but violence and injustice when one man rules over his equals, and that the only just monarchy is when one rules over beings of inferior nature to himself.

On the eucharistic controversy, it was courageous of Turrianus to produce Macarius as a witness on the Roman side, since we are obliged to give him largely the benefit of the *disciplina arcani* in order to save his line of defence from the charge of Zuinglianism. The heathen sets forth with much rhetoric the revolting character of a command to eat human flesh, and says in conclusion that even if an allegorical meaning is intended, it ought not to have been presented under so shocking an image. Macarius answers: It is in truth not so shocking to drink blood, for this is done by every infant. For what is its mother's milk but blood? The difference of colour proves no real difference; the white snow is in truth the same as the dark water of the fountain. And in the womb, on what is the child nourished but from its mother's flesh and blood? Christ gave power to those who receive Him to become the children of God, and whence shall these children be nourished but from the flesh and blood of the

mother who bore them? This is no other than the wisdom of God who "has prepared a table" for her children, pouring from her breasts, namely the two Testaments, abundant food for them. Christ is the same as wisdom, and the flesh and blood of wisdom are the words of the Old and New Testaments, which we ought carefully to eat and well digest, that we may draw from them not temporal life but eternal. But in the last times giving bread and the cup to His apostles He said, "This is my body and my blood." Learn the mystery of this: it is from earth that we all have had our being. It is by the flesh and blood of the earth, that is to say, by the dry and liquid food that comes from earth, that we are nourished, the earth itself sustaining no loss or injury. Now it was the Only-begotten who in the beginning made the earth, and who framed man, taking him from earth, who taking a body from man became incarnate. The bread and wine then are not the figures of Christ's body and blood, as some dull of understanding have said, but really His body and blood. For His body comes from earth, and bread and wine come from earth, and He is the maker of it. If Abraham or any other righteous man had dared to say, "My flesh is meat indeed," or "This is my body," it would have been false, for that could not be his the substance of which was the creation of another. Common bread, however, though it be the flesh of the earth, gives but a short-lived benefit to those who eat it, since without the divine Spirit its virtue soon expires. But that bread which has been tilled in the blessed land of Christ, being united with the power of the Holy Spirit, by the mere taste makes the man immortal by uniting him with the body of Christ. For as the tablet on which a teacher writes receives a power thereby which is communicated to the learner and unites him to his teacher, so the body and blood, that is the bread and wine, receiving the immortality of the undefiled divinity, communicate it to the recipient. Thus the Saviour's body though eaten is not destroyed, but he who eats receives increase of heavenly powers, but that which is eaten remains unconsumed. With this passage ought to be compared what Macarius says (p. 208) of the change made in the water of baptism by the invocation of the Saviour's name.

We have been obliged to omit many interesting points even in the examples selected, but enough has been quoted to exhibit the allegorical style of interpretation which Macarius used. It would be easy to add other examples, as, for instance, the clouds by which Paul expected to be caught up mean angels (p. 174); the three measures of meal (Matt. xiii.) mean time, past, present, and future; the thong (shoe-latchet) which could not be loosed is the tie between our Lord's humanity and divinity (p. 93);<sup>b</sup> the four watches of the night (Matt. xiv. 25) mean

<sup>b</sup> The language of Macarius here ought to have saved him from the charge of Nestorianism brought against him by Nicephorus. For if he has gone wrong it is in the opposite direction. In explaining our Lord's words on the cross to the penitent robber, he rejects the punctuation "I say unto thee to-day," and makes His presence in Paradise to be only a result of the omnipresence of His Divinity. See also his docetic account of our Lord's hunger, p. 69.

the ages of the patriarchs, of the law, of the prophets, and of Christ. Similarly in Elijah's vision the strong wind was the patriarchal dispensation which swept away the worship of idols; the earthquake was the law of Moses, at the giving of which the mountains leaped like rams; the fire was the word of prophecy (Jer. xx. 9); the still small voice was the message of Gabriel to Mary. As other specimens of his Old Testament interpretation we may mention that he finds the crucifixion prophesied in the words (Deut. xxviii. 66), "Thy life shall hang," and the nail-marks, in Hab. iii. 4, "He had horns coming out of his hand."<sup>c</sup> It is plain that Macarius is to be classed as belonging to the Alexandrian school of allegorical interpretation, as might be expected from the great use which he makes of Origen, not to the Syrian literal school (see DIODORUS, Vol. I. p. 838). Alexandria might also be suggested by the fact that Macarius has some tincture of scientific knowledge. He admires extremely (p. 179) the skill of geometers in being able to find a square equal in area to a triangle; he knows the astronomical labours of Aratus, and is aware that in the discussion of celestial problems the earth is treated as a point. On the other hand many indications point to the East as the abode of Macarius. He measures distances by parasangs (p. 138); when speaking (p. 7) of the diversities which exist among the population of a great city, Antioch is the example which he chooses. In the same context, speaking of the ascetic life, he gives the examples not of the celebrated solitaries of Egypt, but those of the East. In a short list of heretics the Syrian Bardesanes finds a place. The woman healed of an issue of blood is said to have been Berenice, queen of Edessa, a notion likely to have been derived from a local tradition. In a question of language which became the subject of much dispute in the East he sides with those who speak of *τριῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐν οὐσίᾳ μὴ*.

It has been mentioned that Macarius places himself 300 years after the death of Paul, and the question remains, with what allowance for round numbers we are to understand this statement. Several of the illustrations employed (see pp. 169, 170, 57, 208, 225, 41) tempt us to imagine historical allusions, yet baffle us by their vagueness. The most distinct is the contrast which he draws (p. 178) between the former state of things and the present, where having contrasted former wars with present peace, he says, an inhuman tyrant did torment the world, now it is comforted by royal humanity. This might suggest a time shortly after the accession of Constantine, or the inhuman tyrant might be Julian, or Macarius may be referring to times not immediately preceding his own. We must place Macarius before Julian if it be quite certain that his work contained no reference to that emperor's

<sup>c</sup> Macarius, however, is not entitled to the credit of inventing either of these interpretations. The first is in Irenaeus, iv. 10, v. 18. For its adoption by later writers see the note of Feuardentius, in Harvey, ii. v. 74. The second is in St. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 32 (see also Cyprian *Test. adv. Jud.* 21), but no doubt came from the East.

assault on Christianity. But considering that some of the work of Macarius has been lost, and that comparatively little of the work of Julian has been preserved, we could not safely assert such a negative; and not to speak of a point which Macarius and Julian might independently have derived from Porphyry, one Macarian objection has a striking coincidence with Julian. It is founded on St. Paul's words (1 Cor. 11), "Such were some of you, but ye were washed, ye were sanctified." The objector says, "Look what the word 'such' refers to: they had been guilty of adultery, fornication, drunkenness, theft, sodomy, and a number of other abominable crimes; and having done all these, merely by being baptized and calling on the name of Christ, they are freed from all their guilt more easily than a snake casts his slough. Who, then, would not venture on any wickedness intolerable or unspeakable if he knew he had only to believe and be baptized, and then get pardon from Him who shall judge the quick and the dead? This is sheer encouragement to sin; it overturns all discipline and all law, it obliterates all distinction between right and wrong, it teaches the impious man to feel no terror, if by merely being baptized he can clear off ten thousand iniquities." Julian (Cyr. Alex. *Cont. Jul.* vii.) makes quite similar use of the same words of Paul. He details in the same way what is indicated by the word "such," and goes on, "You see they were 'such,' but they had been sanctified and washed, having been cleansed by water, which it seems penetrates even to the soul. And baptism, which cannot heal leprosy, nor gout, nor dysentery, nor any other distemper of the body, takes away adulteries, extortions, and all other sins of the soul." It seems to us that the coincidence here is more than accidental. The text too, Ex. xxii. 28, "Thou shalt not revile the gods," which is used by the Macarian defender of polytheism in a passage already cited, is employed in the same way by Julian. Julian too, like Macarius, places himself (Cyr. Alex. *Cont. Jul.* vi.) 300 years after Christ. We have noted (Vol. II. p. 119) a coincidence between Macarius and Epiphanius. It is not merely that both give nearly the same list of countries where Encratites were to be found, but both give to these heretics the epithet *κεκαυμένοι*, introducing, however, the name in different ways. It seems to us that the introduction in Macarius (p. 151) is the more forced, and therefore that he may be supposed the borrower. Besides, it is intelligible that Macarius, who shews no interest in heresiology, might have dipped into Epiphanius, and borrowing from him once, not found occasion to use him again. But if we give an early date to Macarius, and suppose Epiphanius to have known his book, we cannot explain why so zealous an enumerator of heretics should not have taken from Macarius the name of Dositheus the Cilician, and of Drosorius the founder of a sect of Droserians. We read nowhere else of this Drosorius; it is probably only a chance agreement that this is the name of the Valentinian interlocutor in the dialogue of ADAMANTUS. Macarius does not mention Valentinus in his life of heretics; and he employs "Demiurgus" as his ordinary name for the Creator, without any apparent knowledge of the heretical

use of the word. On these grounds we place Macarius at the very end of the 4th century. The reign of Julian must have given a great impulse to assaults by heathen philosophers on Christianity, and the need of replying to them would naturally be felt by Macarius, as it was somewhat later by Cyril of Alexandria. Now Crusius pointed out, and the suggestion has been adopted by Möller (Schürer, *Theol. Lit. Zeit.* 1877, p. 521), that at the Synod of the Oak in 403, one of the accusers of Heracleidas of Ephesus was a Macarius bishop of Magnesia, who was probably the same as our Macarius. This identification seems to us highly probable. It is not a weighty objection that one of the charges brought against Heracleidas was Origenism, while Macarius, as we have seen, was largely indebted to Origen. He even adopts his interpretation of the "coats of skins" (see CASSIANUS, Vol. I. p. 413), which was one of the points reckoned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 64) among the errors of Origen. But Macarius had other grounds of hostility to Heracleidas, and we have no knowledge that his own admiration of Origen was such as to induce him to incur the charge of heresy for his sake, or to refrain from bringing the charge of Origenism against an opponent. Judging from their methods of Scripture interpretation we might have pronounced Epiphanius more of an Origenist than Chrysostom. We are willing then to recognize our author in the Magnesian Macarius who sufficiently satisfies the conditions of time and place.

Duchesne conjectures that Macarius may probably have visited Rome. Of the heroes of the Eastern church he names only Polycarp, telling of him a story found elsewhere. Of Westerns he names Irenaeus of Lyons, Fabian of Rome, and Cyprian of Carthage. He has the story told in the Latin Abdias (Fabric. *Cod. Ap. N. T.* p. 455) of the flow of milk instead of blood from the trunk of the decapitated Paul (p. 182). The duration of Peter's episcopate is made only of a few months (p. 102).

[G. S.]

MACARIUS (10), patriarch of Antioch, during the Saracen domination, succeeded Georgius towards the beginning of the latter half of the 7th century. The chronology and the succession of prelates at this period is very uncertain. According to Eutychius of Alexandria (*Annal. Migne, Patrol. Graec.* cxi. 1114) Georgius died at Constantinople c. 651 A.D., and was followed by Macarius. Le Quien, however, ignores Georgius altogether, and makes Macarius the immediate successor of Macedonius (*Or. Christ.* ii. 742) [GEORGIUS (12)]. Macarius, like his two predecessors, was a staunch Monothelite. Antioch and the whole of the province under the metropolitan sway of that see being in the hands of the unbelievers, the office of patriarch was a mere nominal honour, corresponding to that of the bishops of the church of Rome, "in partibus infidelium." Macarius and the two bishops before him were presbyters of the church of Constantinople, where they were appointed and ordained, and in which city they continued to reside, never even visiting Antioch.

Macarius is only known to us from the determined, and we may say heroic, stand made by him in defence of the doctrine of the single Will

in the sixth oecumenical council, held at Constantinople A.D. 680-681.

Constantine Pogonatus having been greatly troubled by the severance of the Eastern and Western churches, and being honestly anxious to bring them together again under one creed, made inquiry (as we learn from his epistle to pope Donus, A.D. 678) of the two chief patriarchs, Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch, as to the cause of the unhappy division (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 593 sq.). Those prelates replied that it was due to the introduction of novel modes of speaking of divine mysteries, either through ignorance or unrestrained curiosity, and that since the commencement of these controversies there had been no general assembly of Christian bishops to define the truth. An oecumenical council was the only remedy for these disorders. The emperor, therefore, resolved to summon a council at Constantinople, and wrote to Donus, announcing his intention, and requesting him to send delegates from Rome and representatives of the Western bishops—"serviceable and moderate men," furnished with the books and documents necessary for the purpose,—to consult with Theodore and Macarius, and come to a decision on the question that was separating them. Donus died before the letter reached Rome, and it was received by his successor Agatho, who at once complied with the emperor's request. Georgius, who had meanwhile succeeded Theodore (A.D. 678) as patriarch of Constantinople, and Macarius were commanded to summon the Eastern bishops and metropolitans to the council, which commenced its proceedings Nov. 7, 680 A.D. The place of meeting was a hall in the Imperial palace, called, from its domed roof, *Trullus*. In the first session, the papal legates, having denounced the theological terms introduced by the Monothelites as novelties, required the clergy of Constantinople to give an account of their introduction (Labbe, vi. 609). Macarius and his disciple, or rather as he is termed in pope Leo II.'s letter, "his master" (Labbe, vi. 1117), the monk Stephen, supported by his other bishops, denied that they were novelties (*ibid.* 612). They had learnt them from the oecumenical councils and approved Fathers, specially naming pope Honorius, and they were prepared to prove their assertions. The emperor called upon them to make their statements good, by producing and verifying their authorities. The dispute centred round the denial of the existence of any but a single Divine will in Christ, and the phrase *θεωδριική ἐνέργεια*, invented by the pseudo-Dionysius (*Epist. ad Caium Monachum*, 3, 4), denoting an operation in which God and man jointly, and as it were confusedly, acted, which was the keyword of the controversy. Three sessions were taken up with reading dogmatic documents from the Acts of the Councils, and the writings of the Fathers, and on the fifth and sixth sessions (Dec. 7, 680 A.D., and Feb. 12, 681 A.D.) testimonies were exhibited by Macarius and Stephen confirmatory of there being but one will in Christ, which is also that of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. These passages were pronounced to be spurious and garbled. To prevent their being tampered with, the rolls containing the extracts were commanded to be sealed up and committed to the proper officers, while authentic copies of the

works cited were ordered to be brought from the patriarchal library for the purpose of comparison. In the seventh session, Feb. 13, the papal legates produced their counter testimonies from the Fathers, demonstrating two wills and operations in Christ; with passages from the writings of heretics at variance with this doctrine. These also were ordered to be sealed up like those of Macarius. The eighth session, March 7 (Labbe, 729 sq.), was the most important as far as Macarius was concerned, and decided his fate. The passages adduced by Agatho and his synod presented by the papal legates in favour of two wills and two operations in Christ having been examined and proved authentic,—“the royal convert having,” in Gibbon's words, “converted the Byzantine pontiff and a majority of the bishops,”—the doctrine of the two wills was at once accepted by Georgius of Constantinople, together with nearly all the members of the council. Macarius was then called upon to declare his faith, and to state whether he accepted the letters of Agatho which had been recited. Undismayed by the rapidly-increasing solitariness of his position, Macarius persisted in a distinct denial of “two wills and two operations in the economy of the Incarnation,” asserting “one single will and one theandric operation” (Labbe, 739), that “as the mind moves the body, so in Christ the Divine Will moved the humanity, the humanity being in every respect the dependent or passive organ of the Divine Nature” (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii. vol. i. p. 187, Clark's transl., where see a fuller account of Macarius's teaching). This bold declaration was followed by the desertion of five of his own suffragans. Macarius then delivered a precise oral statement of his faith on the controverted points, and being called upon by the emperor to furnish it in a documentary form, he presented a lengthy “Ecthesis,” or Profession of Faith (Labbe, vi. 743-752; Mansi, x. 991 sq.). This document, although it was orthodox in the main, was explicit in its assertion of the single will. By the emperor's desire the passages adduced by Macarius in support of his tenets were compared with the originals, and found to be mutilated and garbled, and where correctly cited, misapplied. On being confronted with the genuine passages, he boldly acknowledged that he had purposely mutilated them, and defended his right to do so. The question was then solemnly put to him by the emperor, whether he would admit two natural wills and two natural operations in Christ? This in the most vehement terms he repudiated, declaring that he would never accept it, even if he were torn limb from limb or cast into the sea (Labbe, 751). On this the council rose and vociferously denounced him as “a new Dioscorus,” and pronounced an anathema and a sentence of degradation. This was immediately carried out. He was stripped of his pall by Basil, a bishop of Crete (Anastas. *Agathon*. § 145), and, with his presbyter Stephen, deposed as a contumacious heretic.

At the twelfth session, March 22, the emperor's officials put the inquiry in his name whether it would be possible for Macarius to be reinstated in event of his recanting his errors. This suggestion was vehemently negatived by the council, who recapitulated Macarius's crimes



to prove that such a thought could not be entertained. They called on the emperor to banish him; to which the suffragans and clergy dependent on the see of Antioch added their petition that the emperor would appoint a new patriarch in his room (Labbe, 937). The emperor made no difficulty in granting these requests. Theophanes was nominated to the patriarchate, and Macarius and the other condemned Monothelites, Stephen, Anastasius, Leontinus, Polychronius, and Epiphanius, were sent in exile to Rome, as the place where they were most likely to be converted from their errors. Anastasius and Leontius satisfied the expectations of their banishers and abjured their former creed, but Macarius "resisted alike all theological arguments, and all the more worldly temptations of reinstatement in the dignity and honours of his see" (Milman, *Lat. Christ.* ii. 139). Leo II. having succeeded Agatho on the papal throne, A.D. 683, Constantine addressed a letter to him, stating fully the case of the ill-named Macarius, ὁ μὴ μακάριος, informing him that it was at the urgent request of the members of the council that he and the others who had persisted in their open and contumacious resistance to the doctrine of the two wills had been despatched to the papal see, and that not until frequent warnings and exhortations had been used, and every way of conversion pointed out without effect (Labbe, vi. 1099 sq.). Leo's reply is not sparing of condemnation of Macarius, "the deceitful rogue" (ἀπαρῆνα), and Stephen, "his disciple, or, as he might be more truly called, his master" (ib. 1117). Benedict, who succeeded Leo the next year (684 A.D.), during his short pontificate laboured hard for Macarius's conversion. He assigned him a term of six weeks, during which he sent his chaplain Boniface daily to exhort him to repent of his errors. Macarius, however, remained deaf to all such exhortations; and we may take for granted that he died as he had lived, a consistent Monothelite. From this point history loses sight of him (Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* livre xl. p. 72, A.D. 685).

The only literary productions of Macarius extant are the "Ecthesis" already spoken of, and fragments of certain homilies or treatises; one addressed to a certain Lucas, an African monk, who had written to him as to the heresy of the Maximians, a public address (ἄλογος προσφωνητικός) to the emperor, and another, portions of which are found in the Acts of the sixth council. (Labbe, vi. 901-906.)

[E. V.]

**MACARIUS (11)**, deacon of Alexandria, who when at Constantinople wrote to inform Alexander bishop of Thessalonica of the iniquity of John Arcaph in spreading the false reports of the death of Arsenius (Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* cap. 66). Tillemont (viii. 28, 64) thinks he may be the priest Macarius who was at Constantinople in 336 when Arius died. [MACARIUS (13)]. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (12)**, presbyter of Athanasius. Early in his episcopate, perhaps in 329 or 330 (if his consecration was on June 8, 328, as according to Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 4), Athanasius was on a visitation in Mareotis, where he was informed that a layman named Ischyrras was exercising priestly functions. Macarius was

sent to summon the offender before the archbishop, but Ischyrras being ill, his father was requested to restrain him from the offence. Ischyrras on his recovery fled to the Meletians, who invented the accusation that Macarius, acting under the orders of Athanasius, had forced the chapel of Ischyrras, overthrown his altar, broken the chalice, and burnt the sacred books (Ath. *Apol. c. Ar.* cap. 63; Soc. i. 27; Hilar. *Pict. Fragm.* ii. § 18). Macarius is next found at the imperial court at Nicomedia, where he was on a mission with another priest, Alypius, when three Meletian clergy, Ision, Eudaemon, Callinicus, brought their accusation against Athanasius in reference to the linen vestments. Macarius and his companion were opportunely able to refute the calumny (Soc. i. 27; Soz. ii. 22). This may have been late in 330 or early in 331; Pagi's date 328 appears to be too early. Macarius and the three Meletians were still there when Athanasius arrived on a summons from Constantine, and while the Meletians brought against the archbishop the fresh charge of supplying money to Philumenus, Macarius was charged with the breaking of the chalice. This event also belongs to 331 [ATHANASIUS, vol. i. p. 184] (Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 13). The charge was easily disproved. Macarius is again found assisting Athanasius in his troubles when the archbishop was charged with the murder of Arsenius. As soon as this man had been found alive and John Arcaph had confessed the fraud, Macarius was sent to Constantinople to inform Constantine of the collapse of the whole calumny (Ath. *Apol. c. Ar.* capp. 65, 66). Macarius is afterwards found at the council of Tyre in 335, where all the charges against Athanasius were investigated. He was dragged before the council in chains, and when the commission was sent by the council to Mareotis to investigate the affair of the chalice, which was still insisted on, Macarius was not allowed to accompany it, but was left in custody at Tyre. (Ath. *Apol. c. Ar.* capp. 71, 72, 73; Mansi, ii. 1126, 1128, B, C; Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 14-23; Tillemont, viii. 19-23.) See the following article. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (13)**, a presbyter at Constantinople in 336, who informed Athanasius of the death of Arius in that year. He was present in the church uniting with Alexander the bishop of Constantinople, while the latter was praying, on the day before Arius intended to present himself and demand to be received into communion. The bishop's prayer, that either Arius or himself might be taken from the world, is recorded at length in the letter of Athanasius to Serapion (capp. 2, 3; Tillemont, vii. 36). Socrates (i. 37) states that Alexander, when he offered that prayer, was shut up alone in the church of Irene. Tillemont (viii. 64) thinks that this Macarius may have been identical with either MACARIUS (11) or (12). See also Baron. *A.E.* ann. 336, xi. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (14)**, a presbyter who with the deacons Martyrius and Hesychius came on a mission from the Eusebians in 339 to pope Julius to obtain his consent that Pistus should be placed in the see of Alexandria in the room of Athanasius. On hearing that envoys from Athanasius were on their way to Rome to oppose

this plot, Macarius, though ill, quitted the city by night to save himself from disgrace. (Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* capp. 22, 24; Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 46; Tillem. vii. 269.) [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (15)**, superior of the monastery of Pachum in Thebais Secunda, succeeding the abbat Surus, mentioned in the Life of Pachomius (§ 78 in Boll. *Acta SS.* in Mai. 326 and p. 48\* E at the end of the volume), the date being A.D. 349 according to Tillemont (viii. 574). See remarks in Till. vii. 481, 759. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (16)**, monk of Pisper, a disciple of Antony. Tillemont (viii. 574, 575) in his account of various saints of this name reckons Macarius of Pisper as the earliest. Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* capp. 25, 26), on the authority of the presbyter Cronius, who had visited the spot, describes Pisper as the locality of the monastery of St. Antony, which was by the Nile and on the mountain of St. Antony. The purpose of the monastery was to accommodate Antony's disciples, and those who came from distant parts to see him, his custom being to visit it for their benefit every five, ten, or twenty days. Macarius was in charge of it, and together with Amathas ministered to the saint during the last fifteen years of his life, which would be cir. 341-356, commencing when Antony was about ninety. See also Rufinus, *H. E.* ii. 8; Jerom. *Vit. Paul.* proleg. § 1, § 12; Athan. *Vit. Ant.* § 91. All that can be discovered as to Macarius of Pisper will be found in the discussions of Bolland on St. Antony (*Acta SS.* 17 Jan. ii. 11, § vi.) and on Macarius of Egypt (15 Jan. i. 1005, § i.). Tillemont's references to him will be found in his *Mém.* vii. 117, 118, 122, 132, 139, 140. At viii. 808 he remarks on the impossibility of his being identified with Macarius of Alexandria (*vid.* following art.). Ceillier (v. 599) notices that Possinus attributes to him the fifteen homilies which are printed as those of Macarius of Egypt. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (17)**. There were two hermits or monks of this name, both of the 4th century, both living in Egypt, whose characters and deeds are almost indistinguishable. The elder is called the Egyptian, the younger the Alexandrine, from having been born, the one in Alexandria itself, the other in some other part of Egypt. One of them (it is not quite certain which) is said to have been the disciple of Antony, and the master of Evagrius (q. v.), and one of them is said to have lived in the Thebaid. Jerome speaks of Rufinus (*Ep.* iii. 2, ed. Vall. A.D. 374) as "being at Nitria, and having reached the abode of Macarius." Yet Rufinus, who had lived six years in Alexandria and the adjoining monasteries, describes the residence of Macarius (*Hist. Mon.* 29)—which he names Scithium, and which he says was a day and a half's journey from the monasteries of Nitria—from the accounts of others rather than as an eye-witness. Rufinus, however, seems to have seen them both (*Apol. Ruf.* ii. 12). The stories about them are of a legendary character.

The name Macarius, like a double star, shines as a central light in the monkish history, and is enshrined alike in the Roman martyrologies and in the legends of the Greek church. Macarius is a favourite saint in Russia.

(Rufinus, *Hist. Mon.* 28, 29, and *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 4, 8; Palladius, 19, 20; Sozom. iii. 13; Socrates, iv. 18; Gennad. *d. V. Ill.* 11; *Martyrolog. Rom.* Jan. 5 and 15.) [W. H. F.]

**MACARIUS (18)**, presbyter and president of a ptochotrophium at Alexandria. He reached the age of one hundred years, and lived into the time of Palladius (*Laus. Hist.* cap. 6). This Macarius is mentioned by Cassian (*Collat.* xiv. cap. 4), who calls him a man of remarkable kindness and patience, but designates the hospital a xenodochium. Cassian's commentator Alardus Gazaeus identifies this Macarius with the eminent Macarius of Alexandria [MACARIUS (17)], but Tillemont (viii. 575) distinguishes them. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (19)**, homicide and solitary in Egypt about the end of the 4th century. Palladius is the first to relate his story (*Laus. Hist.* cap. 17), which is again told by Sozomen (vi. 29), and after him by Cassiodorus (*Hist. Tripart.* viii. 1) and Nicephorus Callistus (*H. E.* xi. 35). Sozomen calls him presbyter of Cellia, a desert spot seventy stadia from Nitria (l. c. and note of Valesius). See also Tillemont, *Mém.* xi. 508. Tillemont (x. 418) thinks he retired into the desert about the year 364. [C. H.]

**MACARIUS (20)**. He and his two sisters, Cornelia and Emerita, were Christians at Rome, A.D. 250, during the persecution of Decius; are mentioned in the letter of CELERINUS (*Cyp. Epp.* 21) and re-saluted as confessors by Lucian (*Ep.* 22) from Carthage, together with Calphurnius and Maria, Sabina, *Spesina, Januaria, Dativa, Donata* (the last four by their names apparently Carthaginian), as well as *Saturus*, Bassianus (clerics), *Uranus*, Alexius, Quintanus, Colonica, Alexius (*bis*), *Gaetulicus*. The italicised names are all familiar Carthaginian names: hence others of the group were possibly Carthaginian refugees belonging to the sixty-five mentioned in *Ep.* 21. This is no doubt the same Macarius who was one of the comrades of MAXIMUS both in Novatianising and in recanting. Fell makes him a bishop in his index, but he was a layman. *Ep.* 49: "Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere . . . caeteros recepinus." [E. W. B.]

**MACARIUS (21)**, a Roman officer, but whether a military man is not clear. He was a Christian, and was sent by the emperor Constans, together with Paulus, about A.D. 348, on the service of relieving the distress of the Christians in Africa, of providing ornaments for their churches, and in general of restoring peace in the country, disturbed by religious dissension, though this was not named in the commission. His proceedings did not prove acceptable to the Donatists, with whom there ensued a violent conflict, the blame of which they laid on Macarius. Affecting to identify the cause of their ecclesiastical opponents with his measures, they reproached the Catholics with the name of Macarians. He was also accused by the Donatists of acting the part of a bishop, of addressing the people in church, and even of celebrating the Eucharist, whereas they said he ought to have been excommunicated himself. He was also, together with his colleague, accused of an at-

tempt to place an idol on a Christian altar, but of this no evidence whatever exists, and Morcelli thinks that it was only a display of the imperial standard, the Labarum. His conduct in all these respects is defended both by Augustine and Optatus, both of whom shew that what took place had no bearing on the theological question at issue between the two parties, but that the commissioners acted only as carrying out the imperial orders; and Augustine, replying to the taunt of the Donatists—that the Catholics belonged to the party of Macarius—and taking advantage after his manner of the form of this name, μακάριος, admits willingly that they did truly belong to the Macarian party. (*Aug. c. Petil.* ii. 39, 92; 92, 202, 208; iii. 25, 29; *c. Cresc.* iii. 49; *Ep.* 23, 29; 44; 93, 43; *Com. in Joann.* Tr. xi. c. 3, 15; *Opt.* iii. 3, 4, 8, 12; vii. 6; *Mon. Vet. Don.* 27, p. 227, ed. Oberthür; Tillemont, *Mém.* vi. pp. 109–115; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* vii. 247, 251.)

[H. W. P.]

**MACARIUS (22)** (other readings being **MACRINUS** and **MACHRINUS**), a Christian layman to whom, in association with a friend named John, Basil wrote a consolatory letter, probably belonging to the time of Julian, A.D. 362. (Basil, *Epist.* 18 [211].)

[E. V.]

**MACARIUS (23)** (**MACHARIUS**), a distinguished Roman nobleman to whom Paulinus bishop of Nola, c. A.D. 409, wrote a long letter earnestly interceding with him on behalf of one Secundinianus (Paulin. *Nol. ep.* 49, in *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 399). This Macarius has been thought identical with the exaricarius mentioned by Palladius c. 419 (*Hist. Lausiaca.* c. 123); with the Macarius to whom Augustine wrote a consolatory letter on the death of his wife (*ep.* 259 al. 125); and also with the Macarius described by Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. 28, and Miraeus in *loc.*; Rosweyde's note 197 on Paulinus in *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 848; *Vit. Rufin.* lib. ii. capp. 1, 2, in *Patrol.* xxi. 115; Tillemont, *Mem.* xii. 203, xiv. 43, 133).

[T. W. D.]

**MACARIUS (24)**, a Christian of Rome in the end of the 4th century, who composed a work on divine providence in opposition to the heathen notions of fate and astrology. Being in some hesitation on account of the difficulties of the subject, he dreamed that he saw a ship entering the port, which brought relief to his doubts. He interpreted this dream of Rufinus, who just at that time arrived in Rome from Palestine, A.D. 397. He sought him out and asked what light he could give from the Greek writers, in answer to which Rufinus translated for him a eulogy on Origen by the martyr Pamphilus (said by Jerome to be really by Eusebius), and then, when Macarius urged him further, Origen's book named Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, the publication of which gave rise to a violent controversy, and to the well-known *Apologies* of Rufinus and Jerome (*Ruf. Apol.* i. 11). Jerome alludes to him by the pseudonym Ὀλβιος, and says "Tunc discipulus Ὀλβιος, vere nominis sui si in talem magistrum non impigisset." (*Ep.* 127, *Ad Principium*, ed. Vall.)

[W. H. F.]

**MACEDONIUS (1)**, the second known bishop of Mopsuestia, Theodore being the first.

His name is found among the Nicene fathers of 325 (Mansi, ii. 694, 699), his see being written corruptly in the second list, but there is some doubt as to the authenticity of his name in either (Tillem. vi. 640, 806) and he is ever afterwards found among the prominent Eusebians (Tillem. viii. 16). He and Maris of Chalcedon in particular are usually associated. In 335 he was one of the commission of enquiry sent by the council of Tyre to Mareotis (*Athan. Apol. c. Ar.* §§ 13, 72; Mansi, ii. 1125 D; Till. viii. 35, 42, 49). In 341 he was at the dedication council of Antioch and joined in the epistle to Julius bishop of Rome, in whose reply his name is mentioned (*Apol. c. Ar.* 20; Mansi, ii. 1308; Till. vi. 312). In 343 he and the four surviving commissioners of 335 were at the council of Sardica, as stated in the synodal letter of the Eusebians (Mansi, iii. 133 A; Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 92, n. 3), and he was one of the seceding synod of Philippopolis (Mansi, iii. 138; Till. viii. 95, 686), but his see is given corruptly in the subscriptions. The synodal epistle of this assembly informs us of another fact in the history of Macedonius (here styled "episcopus et confessor a Mopso"), namely, that he burnt the magical books of the Dacian bishop Paulinus (Hilar. *Fragm.* iii. in *Pat. Lat.* x. 674 c; Mansi, iii. 137 A; Till. vii. 32). In 344 he was deputed with Eudoxius, Martyrius, and others, to take the macrochist creed of the Antiochian synod into Italy (*Ath. De Synod.* 26; *Soc.* ii. 19; Phot. *cod.* 257 in *Pat. Gr.* civ. 126 B; Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 181). A letter of Liberius bishop of Rome states that Macedonius was present, along with the bishops Demophilus, Eudoxius, Martyrius, at a council of Milan (*cir.* 345, Hefel. ii. 189; Till. vi. 331), when they all four angrily quitted the assembly on being asked to condemn the opinion of Arius (Hilar. *Frag.* v. § 4 in *Pat. Lat.* x. 684 B; Hefel. ii. 189). Macedonius is recognised for the last time in 351, among those who drew up the first formula of Sirmium (Hilar. *Frag.* vi. § 7; Hefel. ii. 193; Till. vi. 351). In 360 the bishop of Mopsuestia is Auxentius (Tillem. vi. 491; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 889). See also Tillemont's remarks at xii. 438, xiv. 568.

[C. H.]

**MACEDONIUS (2)**, bishop of Constantinople. Alexander bishop of Constantinople is reported, when dying (A.D. 336), to have left it to the electors to choose as his successor one of two men. "If you desire," he said, "one competent to teach and of eminent piety, choose Paul"—a man whom he had himself ordained presbyter—"but," he continued, "if you will be content with one possessed of a venerable aspect and of an outward show only of sanctity, then appoint the aged Macedonius who has long been a deacon among you" (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 6). The story is repeated by Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist.* iii. 3), but without the sarcasm. Macedonius is described not as a hypocrite, but as one "conversant with public affairs, able to confer with rulers, and in these respects more qualified than Paul." So far as after events help to decide between these descriptions, Macedonius was far more of a man of the world than a religious hypocrite.

At the time of the bishop's death party feeling ran high. The orthodox followers of Alexander

at once supported Paul, the Arians rallied round Macedonius; and the former was ordained bishop. He did not hold his bishopric long. The emperor Constantius came to Constantinople, convened a synod of Arian bishops, banished Paul, and, to the disappointment of Macedonius, translated Eusebius of Nicomedia to the vacant see (A.D. 338). Eusebius lived only long enough to see the council of Antioch (A.D. 341) depose Athanasius, and to request pope Julius himself to examine and judge the decrees against the orthodox bishop of Alexandria. His death was the signal for the renewal of hostilities between the partisans of Paul and Macedonius. Paul returned, and was introduced into the *Irene* church of Constantinople; Arian bishops immediately ordained Macedonius in the church dedicated to St. Paul. So violent did the tumult become that Constantius sent his general Hermogenes to eject Paul for a second time. His soldiers were met with open resistance; the general himself was killed, and his body dragged through the city. Constantius at once left Antioch, and punished the people of Constantinople by depriving them of half their daily allowance of corn. Paul was expelled; and Macedonius was severely blamed for the part he had taken in these disturbances, and for the irregularity he had condoned in allowing himself to be ordained without the imperial sanction; but practically the Arians triumphed. Macedonius's ordination, if not ratified, was not dissolved, and he was permitted to officiate in the church in which he had been consecrated.

Paul went to Rome, and, together with Athanasius and other orthodox bishops expelled from their sees, asked restoration at the hands of Rome. Julius reinstated them, and sent them back to their sees with letters rebuking those who had deposed them. Paul resumed his episcopal functions only to be once more ejected. Philip the prefect executed the fresh orders of the emperor in hurrying Paul into exile to Thessalonica, and in reinstating Macedonius. The latter act was not carried out without bloodshed. Macedonius appeared seated with the prefect in his chariot and accompanied by a military guard. On reaching the church, the crowd was so great that there was no room for Philip and Macedonius to pass up. The soldiers construed the impossibility of moving into obstinate resistance, and with their swords hewed a passage to the altar. "After such distinguished achievements," says Socrates (ii. 16), "Macedonius was seated in the episcopal chair by the prefect rather than by the ecclesiastical canon, as if he had not been the author of any calamity, but was altogether guiltless of what had been perpetrated."

Macedonius held the see for about six years, while letters and delegates, the pope and the emperors, synods and counter-synods, were debating and disputing the treatment of Paul and Athanasius. In A.D. 349 the alternative of war offered to Constantius by Constans emperor of the West if he did not respect the decisions of Julius of Rome and of the council of Sardica in favour of Paul, induced Constantius to reinstate him; and Macedonius had to retire to a private church. It was only for a short time. The murder of Constans (A.D. 350) placed the East under the sole control of Constantius. Paul was

at once sent into exile, and—according to the statement of Socrates—strangled at Cucusus in Cappadocia. Imperial edicts followed, which permitted the Arians to consider and proclaim themselves the dominant faction in the church.

Macedonius is said to have signalled his return to power by acts which, if truly reported, brand him as a cruel bigot. It was perhaps natural that he should promote to ecclesiastical honours in the cities and provinces adjacent to Constantinople the men who had sided with and supported him. Among these was Marathionius, a man whom he had ordained deacon, and who had shewn great activity in founding monasteries, and Eleusius. The latter became bishop of Cyzicus, the former of Nicomedia. But it was an act of fanatical zeal to force by violence and torture the acceptance of Arian views. The Novatians, whose views were not altogether those of the Catholic church, suffered perhaps even more fearfully than the orthodox, and some of them were stung into a desperate resistance. The ecclesiastical historians recount with pleasure the act of the Novatians in Constantinople, who bodily removed the materials of their church to a distant suburb of the city; and they record the heroism of the sect at Mantinium in Paphlagonia who, armed with hooks and hatchets, dared to face and conquer the imperial soldiers sent to expel them from their home. "The exploits of Macedonius," says Socrates (ii. 38), "on behalf of Christianity, consisted of murders, battles, incarcerations, and civil wars."

The odium generated by such acts had already detached him from imperial favour; an act of presumption finally lost it to him (A.D. 358). The sepulchre containing the relics of Constantine the Great was in danger of falling to pieces, and Macedonius determined to remove them. The question was made a party one. The orthodox assailed as sacrilege "the disinterment of the supporter of the Nicene faith," the Macedonians pleaded the necessities of structural repair. When the remains were conveyed to the church of Acacius the Martyr, the excited populace met in the church and churchyard; a carnage ensued so frightful that the place was filled with blood and slaughtered bodies. The news reached Constantius, and his anger was great against Macedonius as the cause of the slaughter; but it was even greater because he had dared to remove the body of Constantine without consulting him.

The violence of the bishop's proceedings and the umbrage he had given to the emperor, combined in bringing about the fall of Macedonius. When he presented himself at the council of Seleucia (A.D. 359), it was ruled that being under accusation it was not proper for him to remain (Socrates, ii. 40). His opponents, Acacius, Eudoxius, and others, followed him to Constantinople, and, availing themselves of the emperor's indignation, deposed him (A.D. 360) on the ground of cruelty and canonical irregularities. Macedonius retired to one of the suburbs of the city, and died there.

It was in his retirement that he is said to have elaborated the views with which his name is connected [HOLY GHOST, p. 121]. His doctrine was embraced by Eleusius, Marathionius, and others; and the last named brought so much

zeal to the cause that not unfrequently the upholders of these views were better known as **Marathonians**. Their grave, ascetic manners, coupled with a pleasing and persuasive eloquence, secured many followers not only in Constantinople, but also in Thrace, Bithynia, and the provinces of the Hellespont. Under the emperor Julian they were strong enough to declare in synod at Zele in Pontus their separation from the Arians on the one hand, and the orthodox on the other. In A.D. 374 pope Damasus, and in A.D. 381 the council of Constantinople condemned their views, and they gradually ceased to exist as a distinctive sect. For authorities, consult the scattered notices in Socrates, Sozomen; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i.; the usual Church histories and the reff. under **HOLY GHOST**. [J. M. F.]

**MACEDONIUS (3) II.**, patriarch of Constantinople A.D. 495. For an account of his election see **EUPHEMIUS (4)**. Macedonius had been brought up in pious asceticism by his uncle, the patriarch Gennadius. He had even gone so far as to castrate himself. The innocence of his life and the purity of his faith had attracted to him the regard of the empress Ariadne, and of the principal dignitaries of the court. It was apparently at their instance, in order to make the deposition of Euphemius less odious, that Macedonius had been chosen to be his successor. Macedonius within a year or two (the date is uncertain) assembled a council, in which he confirmed in writing that of Chalcedon, and openly professed, as he always did, his adhesion to the orthodox faith. In 507 Elias patriarch of Jerusalem, who had been unwilling to sanction the deposition of Euphemius, united himself in communion with Macedonius. Anastasius employed all means to oblige Macedonius to declare against the council of Chalcedon. His efforts were useless. Flattery and threats were alike unavailing. An assassin named Eucolus was even hired to take away his life. The patriarch avoided the blow, and ordered a fixed amount of provisions to be given monthly to the criminal. The people of Constantinople had no less zeal than their patriarch for the council of Chalcedon, and this was pushed more than once to the point of sedition. To prevent unfavourable consequences, Anastasius ordered the prefect of the city to follow in the processions, and to be present in the assemblies of the church. In 510 the emperor made a new effort to make Macedonius condemn the council of Chalcedon. Macedonius replied that he would do nothing without an oecumenical council, at which the bishop of great Rome should preside. Anastasius, annoyed at this answer, and irritated because Macedonius would never give him back the engagement which he had made at his coronation to maintain the faith of the church and the authority of the council of Chalcedon, sought means to drive him from his chair. He sent him sometimes the Eutychian monks and clergy, sometimes the magistrates of the city, to load him in public with outrage and insult. This conduct caused such a tumult amongst the citizens, that the emperor was obliged to shut himself up in his palace and to have vessels moored hard by in case he should be obliged to take to flight. However, he sent messengers to

beg Macedonius to come and speak with him, although he had vowed that he would never see him again. Macedonius went to the palace, and reproached him with the sufferings which his persecutions caused the church. Anastasius pretended to be willing to change in this respect, but at the same time he made a third attempt to tamper with the orthodoxy of the patriarch. One of his instruments for this purpose was Xenaïas, a Eutychian bishop. He demanded of Macedonius a declaration of his faith in writing; Macedonius addressed a memorandum to the emperor in which he insisted that he knew no other faith than that of the Fathers of Nicæa and Constantinople, and that he anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, and those who admitted two Sons or two Christs, or who divided the two natures. This document had an unexpected effect on the monks of Constantinople. They were so offended because he had made no mention of Ephesus and Chalcedon that they separated from his communion. To disabuse them of this misunderstanding, the patriarch went to the monastery of St. Dalmatius, made the monks an address in which he accounted for his conduct, and announced that he held as heretics all who refused to receive him; after which he administered to them holy communion.

Xenaïas, seeing the failure of his first attempt, procured two infamous wretches, who, in an attainer brought before Marinus prefect of the city and Cellor master of the offices, accused Macedonius of an abominable crime, avowing themselves his accomplices. On this accusation Anastasius ordered Cellor to enter the episcopal residence and to arrest the archbishop. Macedonius vigorously protested his innocence, and it was easy for him to prove that a eunuch could not have committed the crime of which he was accused. They then charged him with Nestorianism, and with having falsified a passage in an epistle of St. Paul, in support of that sect. At last the emperor commanded him to send him by the hands of the master of the offices the authentic copy of the Acts of the council of Chalcedon signed with the autographs of the bishops. Macedonius refused, sealed it up, and hid it under the altar of the great church. On this refusal, Anastasius had him carried off by night and taken to Chalcedon, to be conducted thence to Eucaita in Pontus, the place of the exile of his predecessor. To prevent the consequences which sorrow for the expulsion of their patriarch might excite amongst the citizens, the emperor caused Timothy, presbyter and treasurer of the church of Constantinople, a man said to be without honour or religion, to take possession of the see the very next day. Then, to give some semblance of formality to the proceeding, he assembled a council, in which the accusers of Macedonius were at once witnesses and judges, and they condemned him, in his absence, to be deposed. He had not got farther than Claudiopolis in Pontus, when some bishops and a presbyter of Cyzicus overtook him, with the object of announcing his deposition. As soon as he saw them, he asked them whether they received the council of Chalcedon. As they would not explain themselves on that point he added: "If Sabbatianists and Macedonianists pretend to depose me, is that a ground why I should consider myself deposed?" The bishops, confounded at

his words, retired without accomplishing their object. Macedonius continued his journey to Eucaïta. In 515 pope Hormisdas worked for the restitution of Macedonius, whom he considered unjustly deposed; it had been a stipulation in the treaty of peace between Vitalian and Anastasius that the patriarch and all the deposed bishops should be restored to their sees. But Anastasius never kept his promises, and Macedonius died in exile. His death occurred not at Eucaïta, but at Gangra, where he had retired for fear of the Huns, who ravaged all Cappadocia, Galatia, and Pontus. He died about 517, and the event was said to be followed by a number of miracles. (Theod. Lect. ii. 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, in *Patr. Græc.* lxxxvi.; Mansi, viii. 186, 198; Vict. Tun. *Chron.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 948; Evagr. III. xxxi. xxxii. in *Patr. Græc.* lxxxvi. 2661; Theoph. *Chron.* 120, 121, 122, 123, 128, 130, 132; Liberat. vii. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 982.) [W. M. S.]

**MACEDONIUS (4)**, patriarch of Antioch. After a long vacancy of the see of Antioch, which was then in the hands of the Mohammedans, Macedonius was appointed and consecrated patriarch by Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 640 (Eutych. Alexandr. *Annal.* p. 270). Like Sergius, Macedonius was a determined Monothelite. After his appointment, he continued to reside at Constantinople, and never once visited his see. At the Lateran council of 649 A.D., summoned by pope Martin to check the rising Monothelite heresy, Macedonius was condemned and deposed, both for heresy and for his uncanonical ordination. Striking evidence of the zealous activity for the maintenance of the orthodox faith shewn by the ill-fated Martin—who six years later, A.D. 655, “expiated his audacity in daring to resist the will of the emperor on an abstruse theological point” (Gibbon), by a long imprisonment attended with every form of indignity, ending in his death at Cherson—is afforded by his letter to John bishop of Philadelphia, one of many sent to the Frankish kings, to Spain, Africa, and even to Britain—(*Ep.* 5, Labbe, vi. 20–26; Baron. ann. 649), in which he appointed him his legate in the East to supersede the heretical patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. We learn from the protest of Macarius of Antioch in the sixth general council (Labbe, vi. 749) that Macedonius was present at the synod summoned by Peter patriarch of Constantinople, and joined in the condemnation of Maximus. He must, therefore, have held his see till after 655 A.D. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 740.) [E. V.]

**MACEDONIUS (5)**, vicar of Africa A.D. 414, charged with the duty of enforcing the imperial decrees against the recusant Donatists. Augustine and some of the African bishops had written to him a letter, of which Bonifacius, probably bishop of Cataqua, was the bearer (Morcelli, i. 181), to intercede on behalf of these people. Macedonius at once granted the request, but desired to be favoured with the reasons for which the church thought fit to intercede on behalf of offenders who appeared to be incorrigible. He requested at the same time that Augustine would send him the books which he had promised to send, viz. the first three books of

his work *De Civitate Dei* (Aug. *Ep.* 152). Augustine replied at length, and the correspondence continued, Augustine exhorting Macedonius to continue the course of piety he is already following (*Epp.* 153–155; Possid. *Vit. Aug.* c. 20; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. art. 241, 242; Ceillier, vol. ix. pp. 134–138). [H. W. P.]

**MACEDONIUS (6)**, a Christian of Hippo Regius, from whom Augustine borrowed seventeen solidi\* (*Ep.* 268). [FASCIVS.] [H. W. P.]

**MACEDONIUS (7)**, Jan. 24, surnamed CRITOPHAGUS, priest and solitary near Antioch and well known in Phoenicia, Syria, and Cilicia. He is one of the worthies of Theodoret's *Historia Religiōsa* (cap. 13 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxxii. 1399). He lived to a great age. Tillemont (xii. 487, 681) examines his chronology, fixing his birth at about 330 and his desert life cir. 360–430. Some time after 381 (Tillem. x. 533) Flavian bishop of Antioch induced him to accept ordination to the priesthood. Macedonius by his counsels did much to rescue the citizens of Antioch from their peril at the time of the sedition about the statues in 387. Theodoret makes fresh mention of this circumstance elsewhere (*E. H.* v. 19 al. 20). Chrysostom also refers to it (*Hom.* 17 § 1), but without naming Macedonius. [C. H.]

**MACHAEUS**, Roman Novatianist, see MAXIMUS (7) the Novatianist. (Cyp. *Ep.* 44, 50.)

[E. W. B.]

**MACHUTA**, a virgin martyr mentioned in the life of St. Tathan (*Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*, 261–2). A virgin martyr, Maches, daughter of Gwynllw, gave name in the 6th century to Llanfaches in Monmouthshire (R. Rees, 233). A pagan Saxon mendicant is said to have stabbed her with a knife. How early did any Saxons reach this district? [C. W. B.]

**MAC LAISIR** (Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 5), bishop and abbat of Armagh, A.D. 610–623. His feast is Sept. 12 (*M. Doneg.*). He is often regarded as the Terenannus bishop of Armagh, whom archbishop Laurentius attracted to Canterbury and converted to the Catholic Easter (Ussher, *Syll. Ep.* vii.); but Haddan and Stubbs (*Counc.* iii. 61) think it most improbable. [J. G.]

**MACLIAVUS**, bishop of Vannes, brother of Chanao count of Brittany. Chanao in A.D. 553 murdered three of his brothers, but the fourth, Maclivus, was hidden by count Conaber, and then protected by his bishopric. On Chanao's death he seized the countship, resumed his married life, and held the countship with his bishopric, in spite of excommunication by the Breton bishops, until he was himself assassinated before A.D. 577. (Gregory of Tours, iv. 4; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 75.) [C. W. B.]

**MACLOVIUS, ST.**, or Machutus, son of Derwela, a sister of Amwn Ddu, became bishop of Aleth in Brittany, now called from him St. Malo (R. Rees, 256). His life was compiled in

\* Seventeen solidi = £15 14s. 1½d. (Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 1241.) In the Article on FASCIVS the amounts are by a mistake given respectively as 15 and £17 19s. 1½d., and the ref. to *Dict.* as p. 1240 instead of p. 1241.

the 12th century by Baldir bishop of Dole (Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum*, i. 217-22). A previous life, by Sigebert of Gembloux, written between 1076 and 1099, is in Surius, *Vit. SS.* 15th Nov. p. 349, and see the life in the Bibliotheca Floriacensis, 1605, pp. 485-515.

[C. W. B.]

MACNISI, founder and first bishop of Connor, co. Antrim (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. 3, i. 662-6). A.D. 514 appears the most probable for his death, and Sept. 3 is his feast. (Reeves, *Ecccl. Ann.* 95 sq., 237 sq.; Cotton, *Fest.* iii. 245-6; Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 140, 147, 267.)

[J. G.]

MAC RIAGAIL, bishop, and abbat of Birr, died A.D. 722, identified by O'Connor (*Ep. Nun.* 211, 231) with the writer of the *Book of Mac Regol* or Codex Rushworthianus, a copy of the Four Gospels in Latin, with an interlinear Anglo-Saxon version, in the Bodleian Library. (Wanleius, *Cat.* 81-2.)

[J. G.]

MACRINA (1), THE ELDER, the paternal grandmother of Basil and Gregory Nyssen, a resident at and probably a native of Neocaesarea in Pontus. Both Macrina and her husband, of whose name we are ignorant, were Christians, and of a very high order of piety. Macrina had been trained on the precepts of the celebrated bishop of Neocaesarea, Gregory Thaumaturgus, by some who had been his hearers. Baronius in his Martyrology (Jan. 14) erroneously speaks of her having been instructed by Gregory himself, which is negated by the dates, and is at variance with Basil's own description of her religiously storing up the holy man's words which had been preserved by memory and come down to her, *ἅσα πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀκόλουθῶς μνήμης διασωθέντα* (Basil. *Epist.* 204 [75] § 6). Both Macrina and her husband were sufferers in the persecution of Galerius and Maximin. To save their lives they left their home with a slender equipment and escaped to one of the hill forests of Pontus, where they are said to have lived in safe retirement for seven years. It is no cause for surprise that in the exaltation of feeling natural at such a time, ordinary events assumed a marvellous character, and that the stags which from time to time provided the family with food in straits of hunger were regarded as sent by miracle (Greg. *Naz. Orat.* 20 pp. 319-321). On the cessation of the persecution, A.D. 311, Macrina and her husband returned to Neocaesarea. On the renewal of the persecution they appear to have been again sufferers. Their goods were confiscated and Macrina and her husband obtained the right to be reckoned among the confessors of the faith (Greg. *Nyss. de Vit. S. Macr.* tom. ii. pp. 178, 191). In due time their son Basil married Emmelia, and became the father of a numerous family of ten children, of whom the eldest bore her grandmother's name Macrina, and the second that of his father Basil. This boy, who afterwards became the celebrated bishop of Caesarea known as Basil the Great, was brought up from his infancy by his grandmother Macrina, at her country house at Annesi, to which she seems to have retired after her husband's death (Basil. *Epist.* 204 [75] § 6; 223 [79] § 3). Her death cannot be placed before 340 A.D.

[E. V.]

MACRINA (2), THE YOUNGER, the elder sister of Basil the Great and Gregory Nyssen, born c. 327 A.D. Macrina was the eldest child of her parents Basil and Emmelia, and by her position in the family, and still more by her force of character, high intellectual gifts, and earnest piety, she proved the well-spring of good to the whole household, and so contributed largely to form the characters of her brothers. To her brother Basil in particular she was ever a wise and loving counsellor. [BASILIUS OF CAESAREIA, GREGORIUS (15), NAUCRATIUS, PETRUS OF SEBASTE.] Basil was born in or about the year 329 A.D., and we cannot be far wrong in placing Macrina's birth about 327 A.D. She received the name of Macrina from her paternal grandmother [MACRINA (1)], and by this she was commonly known. But in obedience to a dream her mother had had shortly before her child's birth, she was given the second name of Thecla, as a title of consecration in honour of the celebrated virgin martyr of that name (Greg. Nyssen, *de Vit. S. Macrinae*, ii. p. 178). Macrina was very carefully educated by her mother Emmelia, who was more anxious that her child should be familiar with the sacred writers than with the heathen poets. Under her mother's instructions she committed to memory the moral and ethical portion of the books of Solomon, as well as the whole of the Psalter. Of the last she was so completely mistress, according to their then ecclesiastical arrangement, before she attained her twelfth year, that at each hour of the day she was ready with the Psalm belonging to it (*ib.* 179). As she grew into womanhood her personal beauty, in which, according to her brother Gregory's statement, she surpassed all of her age and country, and her large fortune, attracted many suitors. Of these her father Basil selected a young advocate, of good birth and position. Macrina's influence at once began to make itself felt. The young man, that he might be the more worthy of such a bride, devoted himself with redoubled earnestness to his legal studies, and was gaining reputation as an advocate when he was cut off by a premature death. Having been affianced to him by her father, and their marriage having been only prevented by his decease, Macrina regarded herself as still his wife in the eye of God, and affirming that marriage was an act that could no more be repeated than birth or death, and that her betrothed husband was still living, though in a distant land, and that the resurrection would reunite them, she resolutely refused to listen to any further proposals of marriage (*ib.* 180). After her father's death, which occurred c. 349, she devoted herself entirely to the care of her widowed mother, the bringing up of her infant-brother Peter, and the supervision of the interests of her family. Emmelia was left burdened with a large and extensive property, and the maintenance of and provision for nine children. Of the greater part of this load Macrina relieved her. Chiefly through her wise management, her four sisters formed satisfactory marriages, after which we hear no more of them. The family estates being spread through three different provinces, the demands for taxes and other state payments to be made to



three governors and their officials would have caused considerable harassment to the widow but for her daughter's resolve to undertake the whole of the difficult business herself. Macrina was also her mother's exclusive personal attendant, being better to her, her brother says, than many maidservants. She often made and baked the bread, and prepared her mother's other food, with her own hands (*ib.* p. 181). Their residence at this time, or soon afterwards, was on the paternal estate near the village of Annesi, Ἀνησοί, on the banks of the Iris, near Neocaesarea, which Macrina never left, and where she subsequently established the religious community of which she was the head. About 355 A.D. Basil returned from Athens elated with his university successes, and full of hopes of a grand career as an advocate and rhetorician, looking down with contempt from his intellectual eminence on men of rank and official station. Macrina reduced the young man's self-conceit and infused into him the disregard of all earthly wealth and distinctions, and the enthusiastic love for an ascetic life of perfect poverty, which ruled in her own breast (*ib.* 181). The brother and sister planted themselves on different portions of their paternal estate on opposite banks of the Iris. The premature death of her brother Naucratus, the most dearly loved of all her brothers, on a hunting expedition, 357 A.D., strengthened her resolution to separate altogether from this world and its pursuits, and under the influence of the same sorrow, she persuaded her mother also, who was nearly broken-hearted at her loss, to embrace the ascetic life. The nucleus of the sisterhood was formed by their female servants and slaves. Devout women, some of high rank, soon gathered round them, while the birth and high connections of Macrina and her mother attracted the daughters of the most aristocratic families in Pontus and Cappadocia to the community (*ib.* 184, 186). Among its members were a widow of high rank and wealth, named Vestiana, and a virgin named Lampadia, who is described as the chief of the band (*ib.* 197). Macrina took with her to her retreat her youngest brother Peter, who was "all in all to his mother and sister, labouring with them towards the attainment of the angelical life" (*ib.* 186). The elevation of her brother Basil to the see of Caesarea, 370 A.D., filled his relations with joy, and became a stimulus to a higher pitch of asceticism and separation from the world. It was probably the next year, 371 A.D., that Peter, who had barely attained the canonical age, was ordained presbyter by his distinguished brother (*ib.* 187). Two years later, 373 A.D., Emmelia died between her two children Macrina and Peter, holding their hands, and offering them to God with her dying breath, as the first-fruits and tents of her womb, and was buried by them in her husband's grave at the chapel of the "Forty Martyrs." Macrina sustained her third great sorrow in the death of her brother Basil, whom she had long regarded with the highest degree of reverential affection, January 1, 379 A.D. Her grief had an injurious effect upon her health, already much enfeebled by her austerities. Nine months after Basil's death, her brother Gregory Nyssen, on his return from the council of Antioch, paid her a visit. Owing to his banishment under Valens and his other

trials and persecutions for the faith, it was eight or nine years since the brother and sister had met, and they were looking forward to the interview with the keenest anxiety. Gregory's arrival was one of disappointment. He had missed his brother Peter, who had started four days before to meet him by another road; Macrina was hopelessly ill of fever. After evensong in the nunnery chapel, he went to his sister's chamber, where he found the aged invalid with her medical adviser by her side, parched with fever and drenched with cold sweats, stretched on a couple of planks on the ground, the wood barely covered with a bit of sackcloth. One of the planks was a little sloped to raise her head and shoulders. The pallet was carefully arranged to face the east. On her brother's approach she made a vain effort to rise to do him honour as a bishop; Gregory prevented her, and had her placed on her bed (*ib.* 189). His narrative of what followed is very pathetic. With great self-command Macrina, ἡ μεγάλη, as he delights to call her, restrained her groans, checked her asthmatic pantings, and putting on a cheerful countenance endeavoured to divert him from the present sorrow by inquiries after relatives and common friends and other ordinary topics. At last she ventured to speak of Basil's death. On this Gregory completely broke down. She, in spite of her own grief, comforted him, and when her consolations proved unavailing, rebuked him for sorrowing like those who had no hope for one who had fallen asleep in Christ. Gregory defended himself by the common topics of the preciousness of life. Macrina, forgetting her pain, rebuked him for the doubt, and bid him argue out the point with her. After a somewhat prolix controversy, Macrina, as though under divine inspiration—καθ' ἃπερ θεοφορομένη τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι—her words pouring out without stay, like water from a fountain (*ib.* 189), delivered the long discourse on the resurrection and immortality of the soul which Gregory has recorded—more probably in his own than his dying sister's words—in the "*De Anima ac Resurrectione Dialogus*," entitled τὰ Μακρίνα (*Opp.* tom. iii. pp. 181–260). On the conclusion of this remarkable discourse (in which the purificatory nature of the fire of hell is unmistakably set forth, being caused by the separation of the evil from the good in each man, the anguish being in exact proportion to the rootedness of the sinful habits,—μέτρον τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἢ τῆς κακίας ἐν ἐκάστῳ ποσότης ἐστίν, p. 227), noticing that her brother was weary she sent him to rest awhile in an arbour in the garden. Towards the close of the same day, he revisited her bedside. She began a thankful review of her past life, recounting God's mercies to her; "she had never been compelled to refuse any who asked of her, nor to ask of others herself" (*ib.* 191, 192). Gregory beginning to talk of his labours for the church and his sufferings under Valens, she checked him, reminding him that he owed all he had been enabled to do to the education he had received from his parents and to their prayers. On the following morning she employed her little remaining strength in consoling, raising, and instructing her brother. Gregory records her words as long as they were audible. At

last her voice failed, and it was only by the motion of her lips, and her outspread hands—*διαστολή τῶν χειρῶν*—that she was known to be praying. She signed her eyes, mouth, and breast with the cross. Dusk came on; lights were brought in; Macrina immediately attempted to chant the *ἐπιλύχνιος εὐχαριστία*—but “silently with her hands and with her heart.” She once more signed herself on the face with the cross; gave a deep sigh, and finished her life and her prayers together (*ib.* 195). Round her neck was found an iron cross, and a ring containing a particle of the true cross (*ib.* 198). She was buried by her brother in the grave of her parents in the chapel of the “Forty Martyrs” already mentioned, about a mile from her monastery. Gregory was assisted in carrying the bier by Araxius, the bishop of the diocese (probably Iborra), and two of the leading clergy. After her death many miracles said to have been performed by her were reported to Gregory (*ib.* 199, 202–204). Macrina is commemorated both in the Menaea of the Greek Church, and in the Roman Calendar on the 19th of July. (Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.* ix. 564–573.) [E. V.]

**MACRINUS**, bishop of Jamnia, one of the Palestinian bishops whom Alexander bishop of Alexandria in his encyclical letter warned against Arius (Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxi. 4; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* iii. 587). Three bishops of this name were present at the council of Nicaea in 325, viz. of Jamnia, of Eleutheropolis in Palestine, and of Helenopolis. See Mansi, ii. 693, 698; but the two lists shew several discrepancies as to the names of sees, especially in the case of the Palestinian bishops. [C. H.]

**MACROBIUS (1)**, fourth Donatist bishop of Rome, said by Optatus to have been contemporary with Siricius, A.D. 384–398 (*Opt.* ii. 3, 4). He is said by Gennadius to have been originally a Catholic, and to have written an exhortation to Christian confessors and virgins in Africa during a time of persecution. But there was no general persecution of Christians later than A.D. 362, and thus, if Gennadius be correct, the Christians in question may have been such as suffered, or were in danger of suffering, during the period of Arian ascendancy under Constantius, A.D. 355–361, or during the Donatist revival under Julian A.D. 362, 363. If so, Macrobius must have changed sides later than this latter date, and accepted the episcopate among his new allies. But Gennadius may have been mistaken, and the so-called Catholics have been really Donatists. In this case the author of the exhortation may have been the writer of the piece called the “Passion of Isaac and Maximian,” A.D. 349, and who thirty-six years later became Donatist bishop of Rome. But the exhortation itself is lost, and all argument founded upon it must be little more than mere conjecture. (Tillemont, *Mém.* vi. 87, 710, note xxi.; Morcelli, *Afr. Christ.* ii. pp. 222, 249, 251; Ceillier, v. 106.) [MONTENSES.] [H. W. P.]

**MACROBIUS (2)**, Donatist bishop of Hippo Regius, having succeeded Proculianus, about A.D. 405 or 406. When he entered the town to take possession of his see, he was attended by a

mob of shouting Circumcellions, of whose conduct he approved so little, that he afterwards addressed to them, through an interpreter, a rebuke so severe, that they left him in an uproar of indignation (*Aug. Ep.* 108. 14). Rusticianus, or Rusticanus, a Catholic subdeacon, having grossly misconducted himself, and been punished by his presbyter with excommunication, seceded to the Donatist party, and was about to be re-baptized, under the sanction of Macrobius, and advanced to the office of deacon in the Donatist community. Hearing of this, and believin Macrobius to be, as the circumstance above-mentioned seemed to shew, a man of temperate and peaceable disposition, Augustine wrote to him to remonstrate on the gross irregularity. At first Macrobius refused to receive the bearers of the letter, but afterwards, in replying to its appeal, declared that having been only lately appointed to the see he felt bound to follow the practice of his predecessor. To this Augustine replied in a second letter, in which he went over the chief grounds of his general argument against the Donatists. Macrobius appears to have paid no attention to this appeal, and on a later occasion to have made use of the Circumcellions in forcing open Donatist churches, closed by order of Honorius, and to have rebaptized one Donatus who had been concerned in the murder of a Catholic presbyter. He also appeared at the Carthaginian Conference as Donatist bishop of Hippo Regius, A.D. 411. (*Aug. Epp.* 106, 108, 111, 139; *de Rustic.* 5; *Carth. Conf.* i. 138, 201 in *M. V. D.* p. 451, ed. Oberthur; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 976; Ribbeck, *Aug. und Don.* pp. 512, 514.) [H. W. P.]

**MADERN, ST.**, saint of the parish in which Penzance in Cornwall is situated. William of Worcester (126) says, “Sanctus Mortanus martir est in parochia Sancti Mortani, distat ultra villam Pensans per 4 miliaria super litus maris.” The well of the saint was famous for its cures down to bishop Joseph Hall’s time, who has recorded one of them in his book called *The Great Mystery of Godliness*, p. 169. Some would identify this saint with St. Maternus (*Acta Sanctorum*, 18th July, iv. 364–70), others with St. Paternus bishop of Vannes (*Acta Sanctorum*, 15th April, ii. 379–82). St. Madern’s bed is mentioned, which resembles St. Patrick’s bed and that of St. Aidus (in which St. Molling suffered so much [*Lives of Cambro-British Saints*, 573]); and he was more probably one of the many Irish saints who settled in the west of Cornwall; but see also MADRUN. [C. W. B.]

**MADOG, ST.**, son of Gildas, the founder of Llanfadog in Wales in the sixth century. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 257.) [C. W. B.]

**MAEDHOG.** [MAIDOC.]

**MAELOG**, son of Caw and brother of Gildas. The Fleury life of Gildas says that he left his father and came to Lyuhes in the district of Elmail, where he built a monastery, in which he rested in peace, illustrious for his virtues and miracles. This refers to Llowes in Elfael, Radnorshire. Several churches called Llandyfaelog were founded by him (R. Rees, 230–1). His day was 31st Dec., but there was also a Meilig, son of Caw, commemorated 14th Nov.,

and a cross in the parish of Llowes is called Croes Veilig, Meilig's Cross. Maelog was a disciple of St. Cybi. (*Lives of Cambro-British Saints*, 496, 498.) [C. W. B.]

**MAELRUAIN, MAOLRUAIN** (MELRUAN, MOELRUAN, MOLRUAN), abbat of Tallaght, co. Dublin, called "bishop and soldier of Christ" in *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 791. (For his pedigree, see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 741 c. 3.) Of his acts up to the founding of the monastery at Tallaght we know nothing; his later work is only known in connexion with St. Aengus the Culdee, who came to Tallaght while Maelruain was abbat. On ground given him by Donnchadh king of Leinster, Maelruain built his church about A.D. 769, and dedicated it to Michael the Archangel (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 364); connected with this was a famous monastery over which Maelruain presided till his death in A.D. 792 (*Four Mast.* A.D. 787). He may have been bishop as well as abbat, and is often so called. His feast is July 7, and his name is still held in special veneration at Tallaght. He was associated with St. Aengus in compiling the *Martyrologium Aengussii filii Hua-oblenii, et Moelruanii*, better known as the *Martyrologium Tamachtense*, or *Martyrology of Tallaght*, from the place of its compilation; but additions were made to it after the death of the compilers, the names of both being inserted. The oldest copy of this work is in the Burgundian Library at Brussels, and a compilation or catalogue of Irish saints from it is published by Dr. Kelly in his *Calendar of Irish Saints*, 1857 (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 232 sq.; O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 353, 362 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. p. xii. sq.). A copy of his Rule (*Ṛḡḃḃḃḃ ḡḃḃ ḡḃḃ ḡḃḃ ḡḃḃ ḡḃḃ*) is preserved in the *Leabhar Breac* or Speckled Book, in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, and given with full translation and illustrations by Reeves (*British Culdees*, 84 sq.). It is an Irish tract in prose, more a canonical than a monastic rule, and analogous to Chrodegang of Metz's *Regula Canonicorum* [CHRODEGANG]. In his account of the extant Irish monastic rules, O'Curry (*Lect. Ir. MS.* 375) thus summarises Maelruain's: "It contains a minute series of rules for the regulation of the lives of the Celiidh   D  , their prayers, their preachings, their conversations, their confessions, their communions, their ablutions, their fastings, their abstinences, their relaxations, their sleep, their celebration of the mass, and so forth." (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 254-5, 358; O'Hanlon, *St. Aengus the Culdee*, pass.) [COLIDEI, *Dict. Christ. Ant.* i. 402.] [J. G.]

**MAELRUBHA, MALRUBA, MALRUBIUS**, abbat of Bangor, co. Down, and patron of Applecross, &c., in Scotland. Little can be added to the learned and accurate article upon *Saint Maclrubha*: his history and churches, by Dean Reeves (*Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iii. 258-296), who gives forty forms of his name, and twenty-one dedications in Scotland. He was the most popular saint of the north of Scotland. Like so many other saints of the period, he has had both an Irish and a Scotch tradition, with scarcely a point in common beyond the places of origin and burial, feast and date being changed. He was born A.D. 642, and educated at the monas-

tery founded by St. Comgall at Bangor, where he became abbat. When twenty-nine years of age, he withdrew to Scotland (*Ann. Tig.* A.D. 671), and after two years founded Apurcrossan, where he ruled, but still in connection with Bangor, for fifty-one years, and died April 21, 722, at the age of eighty years. The Scotch legend (in *Brev. Aberd. Prop. SS.* p. Est. ff. 89-91) represents him as a martyr, slain at Urquhart by a body of Norwegians, and buried at Apurcrossan, which received special honour and privilege on that account. His feast is Aug. 27, and the date, given by King and accepted by Dempster, A.D. 1024. To account for these divergences Dean Reeves attributes something to invention, something to the incorporation of another saint's legend, and something to confusion with St. Rufus of Capua, whose feast is Aug. 27, and whose name partially coincides with that of Malrubius. Maelrubha's chief dedications are in Ross-shire, the Hebrides, Sutherlandshire, Argyllshire, Morayshire, Banffshire, Forfarshire, and Fifeshire; Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 440\*) foists upon him two works. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 382, 442; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 99; Reeves, *St. Adamn.* 138 et al.; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iv. 251, giving Dr. Mitchell's article upon St. Malruvius, his remains, and the uses made of his churches in cases of lunacy; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. ii. 402-3.) [J. G.]

**MAELRYS, ST.**, a cousin of Cadfan, and the patron of Llanfaelrys, a chapel under Aberdaron in Carnarvonshire. His day is 1st January. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 222.)

[C. W. B.]

**MAENNA, MAONNA, MAENU** (MAINUS, -NIUS, MOEN, -NA, -NIUS, -NNA, -NNIUS, MOINNE, MO-ODNA, MOUNE, MUINNI, MUNNE, -I), bishop of Clonfert, co. Longford, commemorated Feb. 26, is given a memoir by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 413). He died A.D. 571. (For speculations on his identity, see O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* ii. 706 sq.; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 30, 36; Cotton, *Fast.* iv. 158, 160.) He was a Briton, disciple of St. Brendan, who resigned Clonfert in his favour; but much is doubtful. [J. G.]

**MAETHLU, ST.**, the founder of Llanfaethlu in Anglesey. His day is 26th December. (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 270.) [C. W. B.]

**MAGLOCUNUS (MÆLGWN)**, son of Caswallawn, and king of Gwynedd or North Wales in 517. He is mentioned in several lives of the saints [see v. KEBI], since he favoured the college of Bangor and that of Caerybi or Holyhead in Anglesey. He is said to have resided at Dyganwy on the eastern bank of the Conway, and to have died about 550 in the adjoining church of Llanrhos, where he had shut himself up, to escape the Yellow Pestilence, and to be buried in Ynys Seiriol or Priestholm (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 44, 52, 121, 146, 159). Gildas in his epistle inveighs against Maelgwn as "insularis draco, multorum tyrannorum depulsor tam regno quam etiam vita," and says that he killed the king his uncle, and married his brother's wife. The Lives of St. Cadoc and St. Padarn mention his frequently ravaging South Wales. (*Lives of Cambro-British Saints*; in p. 605 his wife is said to have been Sanans, daughter of Brychan.) [C. W. B.]

**MAGLORIUS, ST.**, the successor of St. Sampson in the bishopric of Dole in Brittany. His parents were Umbralaf, a brother of Amwn Ddu, and Afrella, a sister of Anna; he was therefore doubly related to his predecessor, whom he accompanied to Brittany, after having been brought up together with him in the school of Ilututus (R. Rees, 256). A legendary life of him was compiled by Baldric of Anjou, also bishop of Dole, in the 12th century (*Acta Sanctorum*, 24 Oct. x. pp. 782-93). He is said to have died in Jersey 14th Oct. 575, and the hymn sung on All Saints' day, *Caelo quos eadem gloria consecrat*, has been attributed to him. (Williams, *Dict. of Eminent Welshmen*, 313.)

[C. W. B.]

**MAGNENIANUS**, a count, who wrote to Basil A.D. 374, requesting him to send him a written statement of his views as to the faith. (Basil. *Epist.* 175 [410].) [MAGNINIANSUS.]

[E. V.]

**MAGNENTIUS, FLAVIUS POPILIUS**, emperor, 350-353. It seems dubious and immaterial whether Magnentius was born in one of the German colonies settled in Gaul by Maximian, or a prisoner of Constantius Chlorus, as is stated by Julian (*orat.* i. p. 42, 5, ed. 1875). Zonaras says *πατὴρς γεγένητο Βρεττανουῦ*. He rose under Constantius to the rank of count; and Constans gave him the command of the Jovian and Herculian legions embodied by Diocletian and Maximian I. In this position, and at Autun in 349-50, he associated himself with Marcellinus, count or chancellor of the imperial exchequer; and on January 18th, 350, at a feast given by the latter, he retired, reappeared in imperial robes or armour, and was proclaimed emperor instead of Constans, then absent on a hunting expedition. Constans fled, but was murdered at Helena or Elve at the foot of the W. Pyrenees. Gaul and all the Western Empire, including Italy, Sicily, Spain, and Africa, submitted to the new emperor. Vetrico proclaimed himself emperor [VETRANIO] in Illyria; and NEPOTIANUS, nephew of Constantine, attempted to do so at Rome. He was overcome and slain by Marcellinus, now Magnentius's Magister Officiorum; and Vetrico, after recognising Magnentius, found all his soldiers attach themselves to Constantius, and willingly submitted to him. Socrates (*H. E.* ii. 26) says that the general confusion of affairs now encouraged the enemies of Athanasius to accuse him to Constantius; and Athanasius indignantly disclaims any correspondence or connection with Magnentius, in the apology to Constantius; some false charge of the kind may have been made (Migne, Athan. vol. i. p. 603 sq.). It is clear that in destroying Constans, the usurper deprived Athanasius of a friend, who might have been his effective protector in the Western church.

Magnentius at first proposed to recognise Constantius as chief Augustus, if he received the same title, with the hand of his sister Constantia. Constantius refused, and seems for a time to have detained his ambassadors, of whom Marcellinus was one; but as the latter was known to have perished or been lost in the battle of Mursa, it cannot have been for long. [See CONSTANTIUS, VETRANIO, GALLUS, DECEN-

TIUS, for operations eastward and westward.] The armies met in Pannonia. Magnentius obtained some advantages, which induced Constantius to offer him the transalpine provinces. This he refused, and on September 28, A.D. 351, the battle of Mursa on the Drave was fought, at which 54,000 men perished on both sides; and which deprived Magnentius of nearly all his provinces excepting Gaul. He seems to have made a successful stand near Pavia; but the imperial fleet secured Italy and Spain, he was again defeated in the Cottian Alps, and Treves revolted in his rear against Decentius, his brother or cousin, now Caesar. His last centre of operations was Lyons, and he fell upon his sword in August 353. Zonaras says he previously murdered his mother, and left his brother Desiderius for dead, but that the latter recovered of his wounds and submitted to Constantius (xiii. 9). As his mother seems to have been one of the warlike prophetesses of Germany, it may be unnecessary to impute a superfluous crime to him (Zosimus, lib. ii. ch. 41-54). He seems to have been at one time a skilful and brave officer, with a fine person, ready eloquence, and other good qualities, while under command. As an emperor, he shewed the vices of both Roman and barbarian. His cruelty, rapacity, and sensuality were outrageous; the two first, indeed, were necessary to his position as an usurper. Julian inveighs bitterly against his exactions and oppressive edicts; and the loss of trained soldiers in the battle of Mursa was irreparable to Rome. Even his personal courage is disputed in Victor's Epitome. He professed Christianity; or he no more thought it necessary to repudiate it than to practise its rules of life. His coins, however, as Tillemont says (*Hist. des Emp.* iv. p. 354), prove his profession: and he employed bishops in his negotiations with Constantius (Athanas. *Apol. ad Constant.* in *Opp.* t. i. p. 606). But his usurpation was the first of an unbroken career of crimes, which his physical and intellectual advantages only exaggerated, and Athanasius's somewhat pithy summary of him (*ibid.* 603) as *τὸν διάβολον Μαγνέντιον* is confirmed after their fashion by both Zosimus and Julian.

[R. St. J. T.]

**MAGNERICUS, ST.**, July 25, twenty-sixth bishop of Trèves, between St. Nicetius and Gundericus in the latter half of the 6th century. He was elected to the episcopate about the year 566, and appears from the history of Gregory of Tours, whose friend he was, to have occupied a prominent position in Austrasia (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 12, ix. 10; cf. GUNTRAMNUS Boso). He died about 596 (*Gest. Trever.* Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cliv. 1148). There is extant an ode in his honour by Venantius Fortunatus, praising his virtue, diligence in the government of his diocese, courtesy and generosity to the poor and the stranger. It may be found in Hontheim, *Hist. Treverensis*, p. 52; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 383, and in the collection of Fortunatus's works in Migne's *Patrologia* (*Misc.* iii. 13; *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 137).

The Bollandists publish a digressive biography of him by Eberwinus abbat of St. Martin's at Trèves (pp. 183-192), written, according to Rettberg, about 975 (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 464-5). [S. A. B.]

**MAGNES** [MACARIUS (9)] named by Germanus patriarch of Constantinople in his *De Haeresibus et Synodis* (§ 7 in Mai, *Spicil. Rom.* vii. 11 and *Patr. Graec.* xviii. 45) among those who took part in the council held at Antioch A.D. 265, against Paul of Samosata, calling him Ἱεροσόλυμον Μάγνης τῆς Ἱερουσολύμων. The synodical letter of the council (Mansi, i. 1092, 1096) does not name him. He may have been, as Cave infers, in attendance on his bishop Hymenaeus. Mai supposes Magnes an error for Hymenaeus. (Possevinus, *Apparatus Sacer.* tom. ii. p. 50, ed. Colon. Agrip. 1608; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. i. § 32, Art. 12; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 135.) [E. V.]

**MAGNINIANUS**, a friend and correspondent of Basil. (Basil. *Epist.* 325 [381].) The Benedictine annotator gives reasons for not identifying him with MAGNENIANUS. [E. V.]

**MAGNOBODUS** (popularly MAIMBOEUF or MAIMBEU), commemorated Oct. 16, 17th bishop of Angers between Chaidulfus and Nulphus according to the Angers catalogue, early in the 7th century. His date may be fixed from his own work, the Life of St. Maurilius, an earlier bishop of Angers, in the preface to which he declares that he composed it in the 10th year of his consecration and the 36th year of the reign of king Clotaire, i.e. the second of the name (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 72). This would give the year 609 or 610 for the commencement of his episcopate at Angers. Two biographies of him are extant, one by an anonymous author, supposed to be a contemporary, which is to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vii. 2, p. 940, and Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxi. 1548, the other by Marbodus, bishop of Rennes early in the 12th century, differing but little from the former. It was published by Beaugendre, and is to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* *ibid.* 1547-62 (cf. also Boll. *ibid.* *Comm. Praev.*). It is perhaps doubtful whether much credibility belongs to either. His parents were of high rank in Anjou. He was abbat of the Monasterium Colonense, the history and even site of which are now unknown, before he was consecrated to the see. He died on the 16th of October, according to some in 654 (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 574; Tresvaux, *Hist. de l'Eglise d'Angers*, i. 72), according to others in 660 (Boll. *ibid.* p. 940).

His life of St. Maurilius, who died more than two centuries before he wrote, purports to be founded on earlier records (v. prologus). It was retouched in the 12th century, and prefaced by a forged letter from Gregory of Tours to Germanus of Paris ascribing its authorship to Fortunatus and its correction to Gregory (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 574-5). See also *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 550; Tillem. x. 784. [S. A. B.]

**MAGNULFUS**, 9th bishop of Toulouse, between St. Germerius and Willgiselus in the latter half of the 6th century (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. 7). During his episcopate the pretender Gundovald approached Toulouse with a strong force and summoned the bishop to surrender the city. Magnulfus, who, it appears, had suffered in a former rebellion, counselled the citizens to resist and declare for king Guntram. The approaching army however proved too formidable to be

withstood, and was admitted to the city. But the bishop did not conceal his opinions, and after suffering blows and other personal indignities at the hands of Gundovald's generals, was driven into exile and his property forfeited (A.D. 584 or 585). His see was promised to Sagittarius bishop of Gap (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 27, 28). But it seems that after the death of Gundovald and the fall of his party, Magnulfus was restored to his diocese. He was represented by a deputy at the council of Mâcon, held in 585 (Mansi, *Sacr. Conc.* ix. 958). There is extant an ode addressed by Venantius Fortunatus to a Magnulfus, brother of Lupus, who, it is suggested in a note to Bouquet's *Recueil*, may be identical with this bishop of Toulouse (ii. 516). [S. A. B.]

**MAGNUS (1)**, bishop, an old friend of Chrysostom, who wrote to him from Cucusus in 404. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 26.) [E. V.]

**MAGNUS (2)** (MAGNO), 40th archbishop of Sens, between Ragembertus and Hieremias, was consecrated at Rome by Leo III. in 801 while attendant upon Charles the Great during his visit to the Holy See (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 15). He was one of that group of eminent ecclesiastics whom the emperor admitted to his confidence and employed on services of state (cf. *Hist. Litt.* iv. 426). The year following his consecration he was appointed, with Count Godefridus, missus dominicus for the districts of Orleans, Troyes, Langres, Besançon, and Autun (Bouquet, *Recueil*, v. 661). He received Charles's circular letter on the subject of baptism, which he forwarded to his suffragans, among whom was Theodulfus of Orleans. The treatise of the latter, *De ordine Baptismi*, was dedicated to Magnus, and may be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cv. 223-40. Magnus's own response to the emperor is also extant, having been published by Martene in his *de Rit. Eccl.* tom. i. from a MS. of the abbey of St. Aubin of Angers, more than 700 years old, under the title *Libellus de mysterio baptismatis*. It is reproduced by Migne (*ibid.* cii. 981-4). Magnus died in 818 (*Chron. S. Petri Vivi Senon.* Bouquet, *ibid.* 236). The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* publish *litterae formatae*, directed by Ebroinus archbishop of Bourges to Magnus in 810 with reference to a priest named Dodo-bertus (*Instrumenta*, ii. 2, also to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ccxix. 1389). His name is also mentioned in the untrustworthy Life of St. Severinus of Agaunum (St. Maurice) as the bishop at whose bidding the anonymous author undertook his work (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 547). Besides the above-mentioned treatise on baptism (for an account of which see Ceillier, xii. 250-1), Magnus was the author of some *notae juris*, or as he calls them in a dedicatory couplet to Charles, *juris σπουδαία*, which consist of a key to the abbreviations used in Roman jurisprudence. It was first published at Lyons in 1566, and may be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cii. 984-94. For the numerous intermediate editions see Ceillier, *ibid.* [S. A. B.]

**MAGNUS (3)**, African Christian to whom Cyprian addresses (as his son, i.e. as a layman), in Ep. 69, an elaborate reply to two questions on the validity of (1) Novatianist and other

schismatical, and (2) clinical baptism. The latter question he resolves with a sarcastic good sense which must have disposed for the time of the question. But to the first he answers in the narrow exclusive sense which separated the whole African church for some time from the unity of Western practice. This letter is Cyprian's first utterance on the subject, and is full of mystical and interesting interpretation of Scripture. [E. W. B.]

**MAGNUS (4)**, a Roman orator in the end of the 4th century, a friend of Jerome and Rufinus. He had been the means of recalling to his duty a young man named Sebesius, who had been unfaithful to Jerome. Both Magnus and Sebesius had written to Jerome, who replies with affection and gratitude. Magnus had however (as Jerome supposed at the instigation of Rufinus, who was then in Rome) asked a question, which appeared to Jerome an insidious one—why he in his writings constantly quoted heathen authors. This leads Jerome in his answer to shew that the Scriptural writers did this; and he gives a list of forty-four esteemed Christian writers who made use of heathen books. He compares heathen learning to the captive woman in Deuteronomy, who, when her nails were pared and her head shorn, might become the wife of a faithful Israelite. Jerome shews that he believes the question to have really been asked by Rufinus, to whom he gives the name of Calpurnius Lanuvinus. (Jerome, *Ep.* 70, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

**MAGNUS (5) ANTONINUS**, a presbyter and archimandrite of Constantinople, one of the orthodox abbots opposed to Eutyches and his party (*Theod. Epist.* 129). If the superscription of the letter is to be relied on, which is seriously questioned by the Ballerini, Magnus was one of the orthodox abbots addressed together with Faustus and others by Leo the Great in a synodical letter, Oct. 15, 449 A.D., exhorting them to steadfastness in the faith. (*Leo. Magn. Epist.* 51 [47].) [E. V.]

**MAGUS**, a literary friend of Alcuin, who in his epistles mentions him thrice under this name (Jaffé, *Monum. Alcuin.* pp. 526, 528, 675), once as Magus Adalbertus (*ib.* 750) and once as Aedilberctus (*ib.* 442). The epistles belong to the years between 798 and 804 (*opp.* 55, 76, 77, 89, 116, ed. Froben.). Magus was then under Arno archbishop of Salzburg, to whom Alcuin warmly commends him for advancement. He was afterwards ninth abbat of Ferraria (Ferrières-en-Gâtinais) in the diocese of Sens, a monastery over which Alcuin himself had presided. Adalbert was his name as abbat (*Gall. Chr.* xii. 158), and he is called a disciple of his predecessor Siculf, who was himself a disciple and the successor of Alcuin. [C. H.]

**MAHOMET.** [MUHÁMMAD.]

**MAIDOC, ST.**, *i.e.* Aeddan Foeddog, St. Aidus, whose life is given in the *Lives of Cambro-British Saints*, 232-50 (and see p. 340, 395, 436). He was the son of Sedia (Sethneus) and Eithne, of Connaught, and a contemporary of St. David, in whose school he learnt to read the Scriptures. The life is very late and  
CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. III.

legendary, but contains notices of some old customs, *e.g.* deciding what route to adopt by the direction in which two sticks dropt; "and the sticks fell to the ground, one northwards and the other southwards, that they might understand that Molassus should go south to the island of Boum, but Aidus to the right into Leinster." It is also mentioned that the saint came into contact with the Saxons, whom the Britons defeated with his aid. Traces of him remain in Pembrokeshire, as he is the reputed founder of Llanhuadain or Llawhaden, and the churches of Nolton and West Haroldston are ascribed to him under the name of Madog (R. Rees, 227). He is called the first bishop of Ferns, and his festival was 31st January, but the life speaks of "11 Kal. mart." as his feast day. See too *Liber Landavensis*, 337, and the life in *Acta Sanctorum*, 31st Jan. ii. p. 1112-20, and in a shorter form in Capgrave. These and similar lives may have been compiled in the 12th century. J. A. Turretin observes in his *Orationes*, no. vi. p. 162 (Geneva, 1737), "plusquam probabile sit quod a Valerio, Veronensium episcopo et cardinali, suo de Rhetorica Christiana libro, memoriae proditum est, plerasque illas martyrum vitas, quae hodie venditantur, ab adolescentibus, in coenobiis, declamationum loco compositas, postmodum in coenobiorum bibliothecis repertas, pro genuinis habitas esse." [C. W. B.]

**MAIGNENN (MAGNEN, MAGNEANDUS)**, abbat, perhaps also bishop, of Kilmainham, near Dublin, was son of Aedh, of the race of the Colla-daeríoch (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 584, 713, for his pedigree). He was a great friend of St. Fursens of Perrone, and flourished about the beginning of the 7th century. His feast is Dec. 18. Lives are mentioned by O'Curry (*Lect. Man. Anc. Ir.* i. p. cexl.) and Todd (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 223). [J. G.]

**MAILDUF**, the eponymous saint and probable founder of the monastic society at Malmesbury. Mailduf is mentioned by Bede in his account of St. Aldhelm, who was abbat of the monastery, "quod Maildufi urbem nuncupant" (*H. E.* v. 18); a correspondent of Lullus speaks of the monastery as being "in Maldubia civitate;" a form which comes even nearer than the form Maildufus to the written form of the Irish name Mael-dubh, pronounced Mailduf. That the founder of Malmesbury was a Scot or Irishman appears further to be proved by a letter written to Aldhelm by a Scottish pupil, who distinctly asserts that Aldhelm himself had been educated by a man of his own race (*Mon. Moguntina*, ed. Jaffé, pp. 34, 300). So much is learned from the age immediately following that in which Mailduf is supposed to have lived. The name of Maeldubh is common to many Irish saints, none of whom, however, can, in time or recorded history, be brought near enough to our Mailduf to be identified with him. Later historians and biographers of St. Aldhelm have added a good deal which may or may not be genuine. According to a history of Malmesbury, cited by Leland, and ascribed to William of Malmesbury himself, but not now forthcoming, Mailduf was a hermit who lived near the castle at Bladon or Bladow, called in Saxon Ingelborne castle, which had been built by Dunwallo Mulmutius, not far from the

royal residence at Brokenborough. Mailduf obtained from the people of the castle leave to build a hut, in which he set up a school, which grew into a convent. Of this school and convent Aldhelm was a pupil. After exhausting the stores which Mailduf possessed, he went to Canterbury to sit at the feet of Theodore and Adrian, and, when he returned to Malmesbury, he became a monk. Mailduf lived for fourteen years after Aldhelm received the tonsure, and died whilst Leutherius was bishop of Winchester (*Mon. Angl.* i. 257). This account, as may be inferred from the mention of Dumwallo Mulmuntius, cannot be much earlier than the middle of the 12th century, and contains particulars not adduced by William of Malmesbury in either of his larger works. Abbat Faricius, in his life of St. Aldhelm, does not refer to Mailduf personally. We thus come to the authentic works of the Malmesbury historian, who, in the *Gesta Pontificum*, represents Aldhelm as receiving his monastic habit in the ancient city, which, as he learned from the writings of king Alfred, was called Mailduberi. There, a certain Meldum or Meildulf, by nation a Scot, by erudition a philosopher, by profession a monk, a voluntary exile from his native land, had spent a hermit's life, and taught a school for a subsistence. The school had grown into a convent, and Mailduf was recognised in a privilege granted by pope Sergius to Aldhelm, as the founder (*W. Malmesb. G. P. lib. v. §§ 189, 221*). A small basilica erected by Mailduf had been in existence a few years before William wrote (*ib.* § 197).

Mailduf was buried in the great church at Malmesbury, from which his bones were turned out by the Norman abbat appointed by the Conqueror (*ib.* § 265).

Mailduf is otherwise unknown, but his existence, proved by the mention of him by Bede and Aldhelm's correspondents, shews that he formed a link in the long thin chain of traditionary Irish teachers who helped the conversion of southern England in the 7th century, and connected the half Irish church of central England with the Welsh border, Glastonbury, and Cornwall. Aldhelm, the pupil of the Scotie Mailduf, carries the Roman Easter to Devonshire and Cornwall, just as Wilfrid, the pupil of the Scotie monks of Ripon, carries it into the Northumbrian kingdom. [S.]

MAILLOCUS, bishop of Britonia in the diocese of Lugo, before 572. His signature occurs among those of the 2nd council of Braga held in that year under the presidency of St. MARTIN of Braga. The see of Britonia appears here for the first time. The town was situated almost due north of Lugo, and is now represented by the scattered mountain village of Santa Maria de Bretoña. The last appearance of the see is in 698. After the Saracen conquest, it, together with the ancient see of Dumium, was merged in the modern bishopric of Mondoñedo. On the confusion of the appellations *Britoniensis* and *Lamiobrensis*, see Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* xviii. 16; Gams, *Series Episcoporum* 50. See also *Esp. Sagr.* l. c. p. 1-9, 13; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, &c. ii. 99. [M. A. W.]

MAJORIANUS, JULIUS VALERIUS, declared emperor of the West April 1, 457 A.D., at Columellæ, six miles from Ravenna. Tille-

mont argues, however (*Emp.* vi. 634), that he did not become emperor till some months later. Majorian apparently remained at Ravenna till November A.D. 458, the year of his consulship, which was marked by a series of remarkable laws, which may be found among the 'Novels' at the end of the Theodosian Code. An outline of these laws is given by Gibbon; the seventh is the only one that calls for more detailed notice here. Its purpose was to lighten the burdens of the *curiales*, and also to check the modes by which persons belonging to that order tried to evade their responsibilities. Among other provisions with this object, it was enacted that a *curialis* who had taken orders to avoid the duties of his position, if below the rank of a deacon, should be at once reduced to his original status, while, if he had been ordained deacon, priest, or bishop, he was declared incapable of alienating his property. By the sixth law, which was intended to encourage marriage, nuns were forbidden to take the veil before attaining the age of forty. If a girl were compelled by her parents to devote herself to perpetual virginity, she was to be at liberty to marry, if at her parents' death she was under forty, the age before which it was illegal to take the veil. The whole of this law, with the exception of the restrictions on the testamentary power of widows, was repealed by Majorian's successor, Severus. It is remarkable that in the Catalogue of the Popes given by the Bollandists (*AA. SS. Apr. i. 33*) it is stated that Leo the Great forbade a woman taking the veil till she had attained the age of sixty, or according to a various reading forty, and that the nineteenth canon of the council of Agde (*Mansi*, viii. 328), following the law of Majorian, forbids a nun taking the veil before the age of forty.

On his arrival at Lyons on a subsequent occasion, before the close of A.D. 458, he was greeted by Sidonius with a long panegyric (*Carm. v.*), and thence probably proceeded to Arles, where he promulgated a law, *De Adulteris*, on April 17, A.D. 459. At Arles on March 28, A.D. 460, he issued a law by which he declared ordinations against the will of the person ordained to be null, subjected an archdeacon who had taken part in such an ordination to a penalty of ten pounds of gold to be received by the informer, and referred a bishop guilty of the same offence to the judgment of the apostolic see. By the same law parents who compelled a son to take orders against his will were punished by forfeiting to him a third part of their property.

The romantic story of his visit in disguise to Carthage and the destruction of his fleet are narrated under GENSERIC. Genseric, however, concluded peace with Majorian, who appears to have retreated from Spain to Gaul, where he stayed till the spring or summer of A.D. 461. On his return to Italy, Ricimer, jealous of the reputation and influence he had acquired, excited a mutiny in the army against him at Tortona, forced him to abdicate on the 2nd of August, and five days afterwards caused him to be assassinated on the banks of the river Ira.

In the next century the notice of Ennodius (*Carmina*, ii. 125 in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 359) was attracted by his humble tomb, unworthy of the man who was considered by Procopius (*De Bello*



*Vandalico*, i. 7) to have surpassed in every excellence all his predecessors, and whose character is summed up by him in the words, "that he was gentle to his subjects, and terrible to his enemies." [F. D.]

**MAJORINUS**, a man who, being a reader in the church of Carthage at the time that Caecilian was archdeacon, and filling some domestic office in the household of Lucilla [LUCILLA], was through her influence chosen by the party opposed to Caecilian as a rival bishop in the see, an act which Augustine and Optatus denounce as one of rebellion, and of setting up altar against altar, and which was no doubt one of the first steps which tended directly to establish the schism on a definite basis, A.D. 311. During his lifetime the party which had thus put him forward were called by his name, the party of Majorinus, but although he exercised episcopal functions, he does not appear to have possessed any special influence, and the party afterwards became called by the name of Donatus. One of his ordainers was Silvanus, Donatist bishop of Circa, whose guilt as a "traitor" was afterwards established at the enquiry before Zenophilus. Majorinus died about A.D. 315 [DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 882]. (*Aug. Ep.* 43; 3, 16; 89; *c. Parm.* iii. 11, 18; *c. Cresc.* ii. 3; iii. 30, 32; iv. 9; *de Haeres.* 69; *Opt.* i. 10, 14, 15, 19; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. ed. Oberthür; Tillemont, *Mém.* vi. 15, 19, 24, 699, 700.) [H. W. P.]

**MALALAS, JOANNES**, historian. The name Malalás has been variously spelled. Bentley, in his letter to Mill, wrote and defended Malelas; Hody, Selden, and Cave, Malala and Malela; Isaac Voss (*Lib. Var. Observ.*) Mallela; Joh. Tzetz., Meleles; and Dindorf, the latest editor, in his Bonn edition, Malalas, which is the usual form. The history of John of Antioch, surnamed Malalás, holds a celebrated place in English literary history. It was the only contribution made by English scholarship to Byzantine history till the publication by Canon Cureton of the Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus. But its fame rests primarily upon the fact that its publication rendered Bentley's scholarship and critical skill known to the public and made his name European. The *Chronographia* of Malalás was never printed till the end of the 17th century. It existed in one codex alone, which was found at Oxford among the MSS. of Francis Barocci in the Bodleian library. About 1640 it attracted the notice of several scholars, Ussher, Gregory, Selden. Ussher used the MS. in preparing his edition of the Ignatian epistles, A.D. 1644; Selden quotes it in his treatise *De Jure Naturali* (lib. v. cap. vi.); and Gregory, who was a man of great learning, was preparing an edition of it when his work was terminated by death in 1646. To Gregory is due the credit of discovering the name of the author. The Oxford MS. is deficient at the beginning and at the end. Gregory, however, in perusing the work lit upon a passage concerning the statue erected at Paneas by the woman with the bloody flux, which he found quoted by John Damascene in his *Orat.* iii. *pro Imag.* as from Malalás. He also found this work quoted in Tzetz. *Chiliad.* v. 29, 30, under the name of Meleles; references

which enabled him to identify his anonymous codex. The work of Gregory was next taken up by Chilmead, another Oxford scholar of that day. He translated it into Latin, and wrote notes upon it, but was expelled by the parliamentary visitors, A.D. 1648, before he could publish it. The MS. remained in that state till 1690. It was, indeed, consulted by many scholars in the interval. Pagi in his *Crit. Hist. Chron.* in *Annal. Baron.* Ann. 107, quotes it on the authority of Bishop Lloyd, and remarks that Bishop Fell of Oxford entertained the idea of publishing it, but refrained upon finding it full of puerile stories. Pagi published the first volume of his work in 1689, and the very next year the curators of the Sheldon press committed Malalás to the press with Chilmead's notes and version under the immediate superintendence of Dr. Mill. When partly printed they applied to Dr. Hody, requesting him to write the *Prolegomena*. Mill, about the end of 1690, shewed Bentley the leaves of the *Chronographia*, as they passed through the press, requesting him to write an appendix, which resulted in the famous letter of Bentley to Mill. In June 1691, the Chronicle appeared, with Bentley's letter as an appendix. This edition is a moderately thick octavo volume; first stands a note by Hody on the spelling of the chronicler's surname; then his *Prolegomena* filling sixty-four pages; the Greek text follows with Chilmead's Latin version in parallel columns and footnotes, and the last ninety-eight pages are occupied by Bentley's dissertation. This edition has been reprinted at Venice in 1733; in the *Bonn Corpus Script. Hist. Byzant.* A.D. 1831; and in t. xviii. of Migne's *Pat. Graec.* Bentley's letter is a wonderful performance. It will be found analysed in Jebb's *Bentley*, pp. 12-16. Malalás often quotes the classical poets, plays, &c., which are lost. Bentley takes his quotations, amends and explains them. The Chronicle often cites the Attic dramatists. This gives Bentley occasion to lay down the true laws of anapaestic metre. Malalás often defaces proper names. Bentley restores them. Thus the chronicler says that the earliest dramatists were Themis, Minos, and Auleas. Bentley shews that he meant Thespis, Ion of Chios, and Aeschylus. The letter ends with some remarks on the form of the name Malalás, Hody having found fault with Bentley for adding the final s, which no scholar had previously used. The student curious in the matter of literary controversies must be referred for further information on this subject to Hody's *Prolegomena*, Bentley's letter to Mill, Bishop Monk's *Life of Bentley*, pp. 19-23, to the correspondence between Bentley and Dr. Bernard in the *Museum Criticum*, t. ii. pp. 538-554, as well as to Professor Jebb's hook above quoted.

John, surnamed Malalás, i.e. rhetor or orator, in the church of Antioch, must be distinguished from another chronographer, John of Antioch, whose fragments were published at Paris, in 1634, by H. Valesius, and in modern times in Müller's *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* t. iv. p. 535. Of his personal history we know nothing. The time even when he flourished has given occasion to much controversy. Hody in his *Prolegomena*, (see xvi.-xxvii.) assigns him, mainly on the ground of style, to the 9th century, while all other writers place him in the 7th century. Cave

fixes his date at A.D. 601, pointing out that the Oxford MS. terminates at the thirty-fifth year of Justinian, and is deficient in a very few pages. He concludes, therefore, that the author lived during or soon after that period. Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Græc.* t. iv. p. 536, places him about A.D. 700. Modern criticism prefers the earlier to the later date, cf. Hesychii Miles. *Onomatolog.* ed. Johan. Flach, Lips. 1882; Proleg. p. xii. note 4; Mommsen in *Hermes*, vi. 381. The Chronicle is divided into eighteen books, of which the first and the beginning of the second is wanting in the Oxford MS., a defect which Chilmead supplied out of the Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolus, a writer of the 9th or 10th century. The printed book, therefore, begins with the creation, while the MS. begins in the midst of the fabulous line of Egyptian kings, with the death of Vulcan and the succession of his son Sol. The first nine books deal with the history of the world before the Incarnation; the last nine with subsequent history. It is the earlier part of his work which furnished Bentley with the greater portion of his materials. Its value, indeed, consists in this, that the writer, though very credulous and uncritical, copied many a precious fragment which would be otherwise lost. Thus, to omit all poetic fragments, of which Bentley sufficiently treats, Malalas gives us copious extracts from the ancient writer Palaephatus, which we no longer find in the work *περὶ ἀπίστων* now extant under that name. (Cf. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. ed. Harles. t. i. p. 186; t. vii. p. 447; Flach's Hesych. Miles. *Onomatolog.* pp. 158, 159; art. on Palaephatus in *Dict. of Classical Biography.*) As to his historical untrustworthiness on matters of Roman history particularly, Hody in his *Prolegomena* (sec. xxxvi.) gives ample proofs. Thus, to take but a few instances. Malalas calls Sallust and Cicero the wisest of the Roman poets, makes Julius Caesar seize and kill Pompey in Egypt, and represents Claudius Caesar as founding "Urbem Britanniam," not far from the ocean. The last nine books of his Chronicle deal with the history of the Roman empire and of the Christian church. Like the former portion it is of value simply because the writer was a diligent collector, and evidently had access to the archives of the city and church of Antioch. Like all other chroniclers of his time he made abundant use of the chronicles of Eusebius, Africanus, and similar works, a list of which, and of all the writers quoted by him, will be found in Fabricius (vii. 447). The latter part of the Chronicle is interesting for many details concerning the personal appearances of the Roman emperors, the various buildings with which they adorned Antioch, and similar information. It also represents the state of Christian tradition at Antioch about A.D. 600. Thus we are told by Malalas that it was the second bishop of Antioch, Erodian, who fixed upon the believers the title of Christians. [ΕΥΟΔΙΟΥS (1).] He preserves (lib. xi.) a tradition that St. John manifested himself to the church of Ephesus till the second year of Trajan and then disappeared, after which no one knew what became of him. He alone gives the letter of the president Tiberianus to the emperor Trajan concerning a persecution of the Christians in Palestine, which, however, Dodwell (*de Pauvit. MM.* sec. xxiii.) rejects as resting solely on

John Malalas, "auctore fabulosissimo:" cf. Neander, *H. E.* i. 138, Bohn's ed. In Malalas, too (lib. xi. p. 276), we find a very curious story concerning Trajan's persecution at Antioch. After arresting St. Ignatius, five Christian virgins were brought before him, when the emperor asked them—"Trusting in what hope, do you offer yourselves to death?" "We indeed being put to death by you will rise again in the same bodies unto eternal life," replied they. Whereupon Trajan ordered them to be burned to death, their ashes mingled with molten brass, and the mixture made into basins for use in the public baths, which he had just then built for the citizens of Antioch. As soon, however, as these basins were placed in the baths, every bather was seized with sudden vertigo, whereupon the emperor ordered them to be removed and five statues of the virgins to be made from the same brass, saying, "Lo! I and not their God have raised up these women." These statues, Malalas says, were still visible in his own time. This story may represent a true tradition, being very similar to the circumstances of two other 2nd century martyrdoms; the answer of the women being like to that of Justin Martyr, recorded in his *Martyrium*, and the misconception of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection to that which led the Pagans at Vienne and Lyons to scatter the ashes of the martyrs in the Rhone, "that they might not have any hope of rising again" (Eus. *H. E.* v. 1). See also for a very important article on Malalas, *Hermes*, t. vi. p. 323-383, where Mommsen publishes some hitherto unknown fragments of this writer out of the Escorial and other libraries. Cf. also for important articles *Hermes*, t. xv. pp. 230, 235, 356; Büdinger's *Untersuchungen zur römisch. Kaisergeschichte*, t. i. pp. 154, 176-180; for Von Gutschmid's critical estimate of the value and sources of Malalas's history, and specially its importance for the chronology of Trajan's reign and the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, cf. also iii. 373; Zahn's *Ignatius von Antioch*, pp. 66; Harnack's *Griechischen Apologeten* (1882) p. 291. [G. T. S.]

MALCHION, a presbyter of Antioch in the reigns of Claudius and Aurelian, conspicuous by the prominent part taken by him in the deposition of the bishop of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, in the year 272. He was famed as a rhetorician and was a learned man well acquainted with heathen writers, from whom he was accustomed to make quotations (Jerome, *Ep.* lxx. 4), and held, while a presbyter of the church, the office of president of the faculty of rhetoric (*σοφιστοῦ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας ἑλληνικῶν παιδευτηρίων διὰ τριβῆς προεστῶς*, Euseb. vii. 29). The bishop having announced or implied doctrines concerning the nature of Christ which appeared to Malchion and most of his co-presbyters to be identical with the heresy of Artemon, he engaged him in a public discussion, which was taken down by short-hand writers and published. He compelled Paul unwillingly to unveil his opinions, and exhibited him to the assembly as a heretic. A great council of bishops and presbyters having then been called together, and having passed condemnation upon Paul, Malchion was chosen to write the letter in which he was denounced as a heretic and a criminal to the

bishops of Rome and Alexandria, and through them to the world. The letter and the report of the discussion were known in the 4th and 5th century by Eusebius and Jerome, the latter of whom enrolled Malchion in his list of illustrious church-writers, while the former cites at length the principal portions of the condemning letter. (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 29, 30; Jerome, *de V. Ill. c.* 71.) [W. H. F.]

**MALCHUS (1)**, one of the earliest hermits in Syria, who in extreme old age was seen by Jerome in 374 and told him the story of his life, which was written down by Jerome sixteen years afterwards. He was born at Nisibis near Edessa, and was the only son of a proprietor of that district. He fled from his parents when they importuned him to marry, and joined one of the monastic establishments in the desert of Chalcis. As life advanced he desired to revisit his home, and proposed, if his father were dead, to divide the property between the poor and the monastery, keeping, however, one-third for himself. He persevered in this resolution—though the abbat declared that it was no better than the sow returning to her wallowing in the mire—and set out on his homeward journey. The caravan was surprised by Arabs, and he was made a slave, and set to feed his master's flocks. This, however, he took as a part of his ascetic service; he worked faithfully, and everything prospered in his hands. But a new trial was before him. His master required him to marry a woman who was his companion in slavery. Malchus pretended to comply, but he secretly told the woman that he would rather die by his own hand than break his vow of continency. He found that she was of the same mind, and indeed that she had a husband living. They agreed therefore, though living separately, to pass as man and wife. But, after a time, being reminded, by contemplating a swarm of ants, of the blessings of social life, they resolved to fly and escaped to the Roman settlements in Mesopotamia, where they gave themselves up to Sabinianus, who, as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus (B. xviii. c. 4), was sent there as governor by the emperor Constans (A.D. 359). Finding that the abbat of his monastery was dead, Malchus chose Antioch as his residence, and took up his abode in the neighbouring hamlet of Maronia, his reputed wife living with the virgins near. Maronia came by inheritance to Evagrius, afterwards bishop of Antioch, in whose company Jerome came from Italy in 374; and the story of the aged hermit confirmed Jerome in his desire for the life in the desert, on which he entered in the following year. (Jerome, *Vita Malchi*, *Opp.* vol. ii. 41, ed. Vall.)

[W. H. F.]

**MALCHUS (2)**, a layman to whom Chrysostom wrote a very beautiful and touching letter counselling him and his wife on the death of their daughter, which he calls a temporary departure, ἀποδημία. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 71.) [E. V.]

**MALCHUS (3)**, a Byzantine historian of probably the commencement of the sixth century. His great work was entitled, Βυζαντικά. Photius (*Cod.* 78) speaks of it as containing seven books, commencing with the death of the emperor Leo I. (A.D. 474) and concluding with that of

the emperor Nepos (A.D. 480), but adds that the first book mentions several books having been previously written by the author, and that the last promises others if his life should be spared. He also says that Malchus was a sophist of great distinction, and a native of Philadelphia, probably meaning the city of that name east of the Jordan, the ancient Rabbah. Suidas (s. v. Μάλχος) calls him a Byzantine sophist, and speaks of his history as extending from the reign of Constantine I. to that of Anastasius I. (A.D. 491), and these statements are repeated by Eudocia (Iωνιά, ap. Villoison, *Anecd. Gr.* i. 300). The inference would be that the work was published in parts and at different times, and that while Photius had only seen a portion of it, these later writers had seen the whole.

Among the events for our knowledge of which we are indebted to Malchus, is the burning of the great library at Constantinople during the usurpation of Basiliscus (475-477) when 120,000 volumes were consumed. Although he is occasionally inaccurate, his character as a historian deservedly stands high. Suidas very frequently quotes from him, and the *Byzantiaca* is one of the works from which the 'Εκλογαί περί πρέσβευων, compiled by order of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, were selected (Migne, *Pat. Gr.* cxiii. 755-791). Photius pronounces him to have been a Christian (u. s.). Niebuhr has printed the remains of Malchus in his edition of the *Excerpta de Legationibus* (*Corp. Ser. Hist. Byzant.* ed. Bonn. p. vi.) and a still more complete collection was published by Mueller in 1851 (*Fragm. Hist. Gr.* iv. 112-132). [T. W. D.]

**MALCHUS (4)**, bishop of Dalminium, the capital of Dalmatia, and rector of the patrimony of the Roman see in Dalmatia, known from the letters of pope Gregory the Great. In 591 Gregory requests him to see that certain differences between Stephen bishop of Scodra and George prefect of Italy are judicially determined (lib. i. ind. ix. ep. 38; Jaffé, *R. P.*, num. 742). In 592 Malchus is summoned by Gregory to Rome to account for his administration (lib. ii. ind. x. ep. 20, 46; Jaffé, 812, 833). In 593 a faction under the influence of Malchus intruded Maximus into the vacant see of Salona (Joan. Diac. *Vit. Greg.* iv. 9 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxv. 177). This greatly displeased Gregory, who deprived Malchus of his rectorate (lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 22, 47; Jaffé. 862, 887). Malchus, having arrived at Rome in obedience to the summons, died at the house of the notary Boniface, by whom he was being entertained. Maximus on hearing of his death complained to the emperor Maurice that Malchus had been put to death while in custody at Rome; whereupon Gregory in 594 directed Sabinianus, his representative at Constantinople, to explain the facts of the case to Maurice (lib. iv. ind. xii. ep. 47; Jaffé, 968). Cf. Baron. *A. E.* ann. 591 ix., 595 lxx.; Farlati, iv. 170. [T. W. D.]

**MAMAS (1)** (Μάμας. MAMMES in the Latin martyrologies), commemorated on Sept. 2 by the Greeks (Basil. *Menol.*, *Cal. Byzant.*, Daniel, *Cod. Liturg.* iv. 268) and on Aug. 17 by the Latins (*Mart. Usuard.*, Adon., *Vet. Rom.*, *Hieron.*, *Rom.*); a shepherd martyred at Caesarea in Cap-

padocia cir. 274 in the persecution of Aurelian. In the 4th century when Basil wrote the homily *On St. Mamas* (hom. 23 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxi. 589) the martyr's memory was fresh at Caesarea and the feast popular. No facts as to St. Mamas are furnished by this homily, and scarcely anything seems known. The brief account in the *Basilian Menology* is very legendary. Gregory Nazianzen at the close of his oration *In Novam Dominicam* (or. 44 al. 43 § 12 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxvi. 620) mentions St. Mamas. In a story of Sozomen (v. 2) about Julian and Gallus, in their early days at Caesarea, undertaking between them to erect a church above the tomb of St. Mamas, it is related how Gallus's share of the task continually prospered while Julian's was ever ruinous. Gregory Nazianzen in the first of his orations against Julian (or. 4 § 25 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxv. 552) introduces the same story without the name of Mamas. The *Mart. Hieron.* calls Mamas a monk. Daniel (*u. s.*) has a statement making him of Gangra and deriving his name from the exclamation 'Mama' which he uttered to his mother after having been dumb five years from his birth. Ado makes Alexander the name of the governor under whom he suffered. The identity, feast-days, relics, of St. Mamas are fully discussed by Pinius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 17 Aug. iii. 423), and at p. 432 he examines the question whether this St. Mamas is the St. Mammes whose relics were at Jerusalem in the story of queen Radegund (Surius, *Prob. SS. Hist.* Aug. 13, p. 122 § 13; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iii. 79 c). St. Mamas has been treated of by Tillemont (iv. 358, 686), Ceillier (iii. 398, v. 240), Dupin (i. 248 ed. 1722). See also Wright's *Cat. Syr. MSS.* pp. 1068, 1132.

[C. H.]

**MAMAS (2)**, archimandrite of a Eutychiean brotherhood dwelling around Eleutheropolis in Palestine. It was from him that Severus, afterwards bishop of Antioch, first received the Eutychiean opinions, and he subsequently accompanied Severus to Constantinople, where in the presence of the emperor Anastasius he openly declaimed against the orthodox faith. Mamas afterwards came under the influence of Sabas, who induced him to visit Jerusalem, communicate with the patriarch Elias, and embrace the Catholic doctrine (Cyril. *Scythop. Vit. Sab.* cap. 55 in Cotelier. *Ecol. Gr. Mon.* iii. 306, ed. 1686). He is briefly noticed as the teacher of Severus by Liberatus *Diaconus (Breviar.* cap. 19) and Evagrius (*H. E.* iii. 32 and note of Valesius). See also Tillemont. xvi. 715, 716; Ceillier. x. 106; Baron. *A. E.* ann. 512 xxix. [C. H.]

**MAMERTUS (1), ST.**, commemorated May 11, eighteenth bishop of Vienne and the founder of the Rogation Fastivals in the Western church. He was elder brother of Claudian the poet, whom he ordained priest, and who is said to have assisted him in his episcopal labours (Sid. *Apoll. Epist.* iv. 11, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 515). The year 463 marks the first authentic information about him. The see of Die had been included by pope Leo in the province of Arles, but Mamertus, apparently in an overbearing manner, had consecrated a bishop of it. Gundechus, or Gundioch, king of the Burgundians, complained to pope Hilary, who took up the matter warmly. On Oct. 10, 463, he wrote

to Leontius, the metropolitan whose jurisdiction had been invaded, bidding him summon a council to enquire into the matter. This was followed by another letter addressed to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne, Lyons, Narbonne and the Alps, strongly reprobating such practices, and a third written Feb. 24, 464, and addressed to various prelates, solemnly warning Mamertus, and ordering the appointment at Die to be submitted to Leontius for confirmation (Hil. *Epp.* ix., x., xi., *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 27-8; Ceillier, x. 338, 715). The council, which was attended by twenty bishops, was probably held at Arles (Mansi, vii. 951). It seems, however, that Die remained under the jurisdiction of Vienne. Mamertus was still alive at the death of his brother in A.D. 473 or 474 (Sid. *Apoll. Epist.* iv. 11, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 515), but how long he survived him is unknown.

Though not the inventor of Rogations or Litanies, Mamertus was, there can be no doubt, the founder of the Rogation Days. Litanies of the kind were, on the evidence of Basil, in use in the East, and on that of Sidonius, in the West, as hope or fear prompted, but it was undoubtedly Mamertus who first systematised them on the three days preceding Ascension Day. "Indixit populis jejuniun, instituit orandi modum, edendi seriem erogandi hilarem dispensationem" (Greg. *Tur.*) The story of their institution has been given by his contemporary Sidonius, by Avitus, Gregory of Tours, and others. Vienne, in what year is uncertain, but before A.D. 474, had been terrified by portents and calamities. To atone for the sins of which these calamities were thought to be the penalties, Mamertus, with the joyful assent of the citizens, ordained a three days' fast, with processions and an ordered service of prayer and song, which, for greater labour, was to take place outside the city. Its successful issue ensured its permanence, and from Vienne it spread all over France and the West. Already in A.D. 470 or 474 Sidonius had established these services at Clermont and was looking to them as his chief hope in the threatened invasion of the Goths. In A.D. 511 the first council of Orleans recognised them and directed their continuance (Mansi, viii. 355). For accounts of this institution see the homily printed under the name of Eusebius of Emesa in La Bigne, *Max. Bibl.* vi. 645, but ascribed to Mamertus himself; Sid. *Apoll. Epist.* v. 14; vii. 1, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 514, 563; Avitus, *Homilia*, Boll. *Acta SS.* 631-2, *Pat. Lat.* lix. 289-94; Greg. *Tur. Hist. Franc.* ii. 34; Sige. Gemblac. *Chronicon*, an. 468; Alcuin, ix. 23, in *Pat. Lat.* ci. 1225; Bar. an. 475, xiii. seqq.; Mabillon, *De Lit. Gallic.* ii. 152 seqq. in *Pat. Lat.* lxxii. 203; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 480 seqq.; Dupin, *Ecol. Writers*, i. 513, Dublin, 1722; Ceillier, x. 346; Bingham, *Antiquities*, iv. 281 seqq., 1855; Smith, *Dict. CHRIST. ANT.* art. *Rogation Days*; *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 15.

No writings of Mamertus survive, unless the homily on these litanies among the works of Eusebius of Emesa, and the following one on the Repentance of the Ninevites are to be ascribed to him from internal evidence. (La Bigne, *ibid.*, cf. *Hist. Litt.* *ibid.* 483.) [S. A. B.]

**MAMERTUS (2), CLAUDIANUS ECDICIUS**, a learned writer of the last half of the

5th century, forming one of the literary school of which Sidonius Apollinaris is the best-known member. He was a native of Gaul, and brother of the more famous Mamertus archbishop of Vienne. Trained from his earliest years for the monastic life, he was educated in all the stores of Greek, Roman, and Christian literature. During his brother's archbishopric he worked as a presbyter in Vienne, and served so effectually as his right hand, that some writers have represented him as a "bishop" under his brother. This however seems the result of a misinterpretation (cf. Sirmoudi, i. p. 539). As presbyter he was specially useful in training the clergy, organizing the services of the church, and arranging the order of Psalms and Lessons for the year, and perhaps we may attribute to his influence the regular use of Litanies upon Rogation days, which was established by his brother. But he was no less eminent for intellectual than for practical power. If we may trust the reading in Gennadius, cap. 67, Salvianus dedicated to him a volume of letters and a treatise on Ecclesiastes. And when about the year 470 Faustus bishop of Riez published anonymously a treatise asserting the corporeality of the soul, Sidonius and other friends applied to Mamertus as the person best qualified to answer it, and the *De Statu Animæ* was the result. Sidonius also mentions with warm praise a hymn that he had written, and represents him as a great centre of intellectual discussion, "hominum aevi, loci, populi sui ingeniosissimus," full of learning, eager for argument, patient with those who could not understand, and at the same time, in his work as a priest, thoughtful for all, open-handed, humble, not letting his benevolence be known, the adviser and helper of his brother in all diocesan matters. He died about 474 A.D. and his epitaph, composed by Sidonius, is the chief source of information about his life. (Sidon. Apollin. *Ep.* iv. 2, 3, 11, v. 2; Gennadius, *de Scrip.* iii. cap. 67 (?) and 83; and the Preface to his own work, *De Statu Animæ*.)

*Works.*—(i.) *Epistolæ*. Two letters of his have been preserved. The first, addressed to Sidonius, is a good-humoured complaint that he never hears from him, with a threat that he will inflict letters upon him until he answers. It is preserved in the correspondence of Sidonius (iv. 2, 3), with the answer of the latter, in which he lavishes every possible form of praise on the *De Statu Animæ*, declaring that it combines the excellences of all previous philosophers and orators, whether pagan or Christian. He also speaks with equal warmth of some hymn which Mamertus had written.

The other letter is addressed to a rhetorician, Sapaudus. It contains an interesting account of the decay of classical study at the time, praises the exception to this decay which Sapaudus shews in his declamations, and exhorts him to prefer the old classical writers to modern innovators. This was first published by Baluze, *Miscell.* vi. 535. It is to be found with the other in Gallandi and Migne (*ubi infra*).

(ii.) *De Statu Animæ*. The occasion of this book has been described above. The date is fixed by the title given to Sidonius, "C. Sollio, Praefectorio," i.e. after 467, when he was praefectus urbi, and before 472, when he was made bishop. It consists of a Preface and Epilogue addressed

to Sidonius, and the body of the treatise in three books. In the preface the writer gives an outline of his subject. In lib. i. after a vigorous protest against anonymous writing (cap. 2) he examines the question philosophically, and argues that the soul is incorporeal because made in God's image, and not to be classified under the categories of place and quantity. In lib. ii. he appeals to authority, Greek, Roman, and Christian. In lib. iii. he deals with certain objections which had been urged by his opponent. A convenient summary of the whole is given in iii. 14.

The lavish praise of Sidonius upon the work will be found in his letters iv. 3, v. 2, and modern estimates of its value in Guizot, *Civilisation en France*, cap. vi.; Ritter, *Christliche Philosophie*, ii. 2; and a full analysis in Ceillier, x. cap. 18.

(iii.) *Poems*. Sidonius (*ubi supra*) mentions with special praise a hymn by Claudian, but he does not give its name. One scholiast says that it was the well-known "Pange lingua gloriosi," and one MS. of Gennadius (*ubi supra*) states that that hymn was written by Claudian. It is however ordinarily found ascribed to Fortunatus (v. Daniel, *Theos. Hymnol.* iii. p. 285, iv. p. 68).

Fabricius has also attributed to him an hexameter poem of 165 lines, "contra vanos poetas ad collegam," which was found in a Paris MS. without the name of the author. It is addressed to some relation who had distinguished himself in his youth by writing poetry on heathen subjects. The author exhorts him to choose Christian subjects, as they will bring him fame and true life. He shews how the accounts of the creation by Moses and St. John give to human life its true dignity and eternity, and how the narratives of the miracles of the Old and New Testament shew that all nature is under the control of its Maker. The poem is written in a fluent style, with fairly correct prosody, and shews a knowledge of classical authors. This would be what we should expect from Claudian, but as we have no certainly genuine poems to compare it with, the authorship must remain doubtful.

Possibly also there are to be assigned to him a few smaller poems found among the works of the heathen poet, Claudian, viz. two short hexameter poems entitled *Laus Christi* and *Carmen Paschale*, some short epigrammatic praises of the paradox of the Incarnation, an elegiac account of Christ's miracles, an elegiac appeal to a friend not to criticise his verses too severely, and two short Greek hexameter addresses to Christ, *Εἰς τὸν σωτήρα* and *Εἰς τὸν δεσπότην Χριστόν*.

The works will be found in Migne, vol. liii.: *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* Lugd. 1677, vi. p. 1050; ed. Gallandi, x. p. 417. The poems in Fabricius, *Poet. Christ.* p. 777. The *De Statu Animæ* has been separately edited, notably by Peter Mosellanus, Basil, 1504; Earth, Cyneae, 1655. [W. L.]

**MAMMAEA** or **MAMAEA, JULIA**, the daughter of Julia Moesa, and niece of Julia Donna the wife of the emperor Septimius Severus. She played for a short time a conspicuous part in Roman history, not without some interesting points of contact with that of the Christian church. By her marriage with the Syrian Gessius Marcianus she became the

mother of Alexander Severus, and soon afterwards was left a widow. With her mother and her sister Soemias, the mother of ELAGABALUS, she went, at the command of MACRINUS after the death of CARACALLA, to reside at Emesa. On the election of her nephew as emperor, she went with him and her son Alexander, then thirteen years old, to Rome, and it speaks well both for her prudence and her goodness, that she continued to secure the life of her son from the jealous suspicions of the tyrant, and to preserve him from the fathomless impurity which ran riot in the imperial court. There are, as will be seen, sufficient reasons for assigning this watchfulness to, at least, the indirect influence of Christian life and teaching. Possibly, as in the life of Nero, there may have been disciples of the new faith among the slaves of Caesar's household, whom she learnt to respect and imitate. On the death of Elagabalus, A.D. 222, and the election of her son by the Praetorian Guard, she rose naturally to a position of great influence. The leanings, whatever they may have been, to the Christian society, which have been already hinted at, were shewn more distinctly when she was with the emperor at Antioch, and hearing that Origen, already famous as a preacher, was at Caesarea, she invited him to visit them with the honour of a military escort, welcomed him with all honour, and listened attentively to him as he unfolded to her the excellence of the faith of Christ (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 21). It does not appear that she ever made a definite profession of belief, and her religion, though it won from Eusebius (*l. c.*) the epithets of θεοσεβεστική and εὐλαβής, and from Jerome (*de Script. Eccles.* c. 54) that of "religiosa," was probably of the syncretistic type prevalent at the time, which shewed itself, in its better form, in Alexander's adoption of Christian rules of action, and in his placing a bust of Christ, together with those of Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius of Tyana, in his private oratory (Lamprid. *Vit. Sev.* c. 29, 43), and in its worst, when Elagabalus wished to build a temple on the Capitol in which Jews, Samaritans, Christians, and Romans were to unite in worshipping the Deity whose name he had adopted. It was, perhaps, natural that both mother and son should, in consequence of these tendencies, come under the lash of Julian, who sneers at the childish unwisdom of the latter in submitting his own will to Mammaea's, and gratifying her greed of gain (*De Caesarr.* p. 315), and represents him as weakly bemoaning his disaster. It remains only to add that she shared her son's fate when the troops rose against him and murdered him in Gaul, and that her last moments were embittered by her son's reproaches for the pride and avarice which had involved them in a common ruin (Gibbon, c. vi. and vii. and authorities cited in the text).

[E. H. P.]

MANACCUS, ST. (MANCUS), to whom the parish of Lanlivery in Cornwall is dedicated in conjunction with St. Dunstan. The two were also coupled together in a chapel at Lanreath, though the main church is dedicated to St. Sancedus. William of Worcester (114) says, "S. Mancus episcopus jacet in ecclesia Lanretho prope villam de Fowey, ejus festum agitur die

Jovis proxime ante festum Pentacosten." Mancus was probably Irish. The name of the parish of Manacian, on the other hand, probably refers to the monks of Glasney who held it, and the feast day is on the nearest Sunday to 14th October. St. Dunstan's day is 19th May, and the union of the two names probably shews the growth of English influence in Cornwall under Edgar.

[C. W. B.]

MANCHANUS, of Lemangan, King's Co., has the little known about him much obscured by the number of homonymous saints and the variations in ancient authors. On Tuaimn Eirc, granted to him by Diarmaid son of Aedh, about A.D. 649, he built his house, and the place retains his name, "Manchan's grey land." He died of the plague, A.D. 664, which carried off so many other saints, and his feast is Jan. 24. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 410 sq.; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4th ser. iii. 134-50 for a learned article by Dr. Graves on "The Church and Shrine of S. Manchan.") O'Reilly (*Ir. Writ.* xlv.) ascribes to him a book entitled *The Wonders of Scripture*; but Dr. Reeves (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 514 sq.) shews that this treatise *De Mirabilibus sacrae Scripturae*, ll. iii., included among the works of St. Augustine of Hippo (*Opp.* t. iii. App., ed. 1680), was written by Augustin, an Irish monk of the 7th century.

[J. G.]

MANES (called also MANI among Oriental writers, Μανιχαῖος and MANICHAËUS among Greeks and Latins; cf. a learned note on this name in Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* lib. v. cap. I. in t. vii. p. 310, ed. Harl.). In this article will be found the life of Manes, the exposition of his system in that on the Manicheans. The facts of his history can only be ascertained with some difficulty. The lives indeed of all ancient heretics have suffered much from the misrepresentations of their opponents. In the case of Manes there is the additional difficulty, that we have two opposing, even contradictory accounts in the Western and Eastern traditions. The Western story is derived from the Acts of Archelaus bishop of Caschar [ARCHELAUS]; the Eastern from the Persian and Arabian historians. The earliest authentic notice we have of Manes is that of Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 31), where he is described "as a barbarian in life, both in speech and conduct, who attempted to form himself into a Christ, and then also proclaimed himself to be the very Paraclete and the Holy Spirit. Then as if he were Christ, he selected twelve disciples, the partners of his new religion, and after patching together false and ungodly doctrines, collected from a thousand heresies long since extinct, he swept them off like a deadly poison, from Persia, upon this part of the world." The Western tradition derives itself wholly from the *Acta Archelai*, which were forged by some romancing Greek between the years 330 and 340 A.D., as we first find them quoted by Cyrill. Hieros. *Catech.* vi., written A.D. 348-350. This we conclude because Eusebius in his history, published A.D. 326-330, knows nothing of them. If genuine, it is scarcely possible that Eusebius, living but a few miles from Jerusalem and with all the imperial resources at his back, could have been ignorant of a dispute which must have made such a noise

all over Syria and Mesopotamia [ARCHELAUS]. According to these Acts Manes had been preceded in his heresy by Scythianus, who lived in apostolic times, and by Terebinthus. For their history we must refer to the articles on these names. Scythianus originally lived in Egypt. Thence he moved with Terebinthus into Judaea, whence after his death the latter went into Babylonia. Terebinthus according to Socrates, i. 22, Scythianus according to Cyril of Jerusalem and Epiphanius, wrote four books, which were published under the names of the Gospel, the Treasure, the Chapters, and the Mysteries. After the death of Terebinthus these books came into the possession of a widow with whom he lived. She purchased a boy of the age of seven named Cubricus, Corbicus, or Corbicus (Cyrill. Hieros., Epiph.), Urbicus (Aug. *de Haer.* ed. Ben. c. 46), to whom at her death she left all her property and these books, whence he derived his system. He took the name of Manes, and at sixty years of age began his work by choosing three disciples, Thomas, Addas, and Hermas, to whom he delivered the books he had inherited after he had enlarged them with a quantity of puerile stories. He sent Thomas into Egypt, Addas into Scythia, and retained Hermas with himself. Offering to cure the king's son, and failing, he was cast into prison, where he studied the Scriptures, from which he derived the idea of the Paraclete, a title which he assumed. With the aid of his disciples who had returned, he corrupted his guards and fled to a residence named Arabion, whence he went to Caschar to hold a disputation with Archelaus the bishop. After his defeat by the latter he fled back to Arabion, breaking his journey at a town called Diodoris to preach his errors, whereupon the local priest Diodorus wrote to Archelaus, who despatched to him an epistle refuting his views. Upon his arrival at Arabion he was seized by the king's officers, carried into Persia, flayed alive, his skin being stuffed and hung over the gate of the capital, and his flesh given to the birds. Such was Manes' history, according to the Acts of Archelaus. The bishop claims two disciples of Manes as his authorities, viz. Turbo and Sisinnius, the former of whom abandoned Manicheism for Christianity after the dispute. Sisinnius was the successor of Manes in the leadership of the sect, and could not therefore have given the alleged evidence, but it is not necessary to go farther into this story, which Beausobre, in his History of Manicheism, has shewn to be utterly false (liv. I. ch. xii. xiii.).

A very different story is told by the Syrian, Persian, and Arab historians and chroniclers known to Beausobre. It is however one upon which he places much more reliance than upon the Western tradition (Part. i. liv. ii. ch. i.-iv.). It runs thus: Manes was born about 240 A.D. He was descended from a Magian family. He was well educated in Greek, music, mathematics, geography, astronomy, painting, medicine, and in the Scriptures. Being very zealous for the faith, he was ordained priest while yet young, but becoming a heretic he went to the court of Sapor, whom he proselytized to his views, about A.D. 267. He retained his hold over him for a short time only, for as soon as he opened his views more fully the king resolved to put him to death. In fact a real revival of Zoroastrian

doctrine had taken place under his reign, and as soon as Manes disclosed his full plan it was seen to involve the overthrow of the national religion. He then fled into Turkestan, where he gained many disciples. He there used his talents to adorn a temple with paintings, and hiding himself in a cave for twelve months produced his Gospel in a book embellished with beautiful figures. Armed with this he returned to Persia, and presented it to king Hormizdas, who protected him and embraced his views. This king dying within two years, he was succeeded by Varanes I. A.D. 273, who was at first favourable to Manes. The national priesthood however, becoming alarmed at the power of his sect, challenged him to a disputation in presence of the king, after which he was condemned to die as a heretic. According to some he was crucified, according to others cut in two or flayed alive (Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Pers.* p. 283; Renaudot, *Hist. Pat. Alex.* pp. 40-49; Eutyeh. *Annal. Alex.* t. i. p. 387; Hotting. *Hist. Orient.* i. 3). Varanes instituted a general persecution of the Manicheans after his death. Eutyehus (*l.c.*) reports a savage jest of his on this subject. He put to death two hundred Manicheans, and caused them to be buried with their heads down and their feet projecting over ground. He then boasted he had a garden planted with men instead of trees. The persecution was so severe that the adherents of the sect fled into all the neighbouring lands—India, China, Turkestan, &c. This persecution was raised on the pretext that the multiplication of the sect was hostile to the human race through their opposition to marriage (Asseman. *Bib. Or.* iii. 220).

II. Since Beausobre's time the sources of Oriental knowledge have been much enlarged. We shall now present brief abstracts of the story of Manes as told by modern research which ever inclines, as Neumann fifty years ago noted in the preface to his translation of the Armenian historian Elisaeus, to lay more and more stress upon the concordant testimony of the Persian, Arabic, and Armenian historians, as opposed to the Byzantines, about the affairs of Western Asia. The publications of the Oriental Translation Fund, such as the Chronicles of Tabari, Makrisi, Masaudi, have thrown much light on this subject. Then again we now possess a history of Manes, his life and doctrine written at Bagdad by a Mohammedan annalist Muhammad ben Ishak, commonly called an-Nadim, about A.D. 987, a period when literature flourished brilliantly there as well as in those remoter cities of Central Asia, with which we now associate the idea of deepest barbarism. (Cf. Ousely's *Biog. Notices of Persian Poets*, p. 56; Vambéry's *Hist. of Bokhara*, p. 138.) It was analysed two centuries ago by Hottingerus in his *Hist. Orient.* i. 3, and is quoted from his MS. by Beausobre in t. i. p. 206, but he never seems to have seen the work itself. It was translated for the first time into German by Hammer Purgstall in 1840 in Bd. xc. der Wiener Jahrbücher, pp. 10-26, and was first published as a monograph with a translation and elaborate commentary by G. Flügel, Leipzig, 1862, under the title of *Mani, seine Lehre u. seine Schriften*. According to it Manes was the son of a certain Babylonian named Futtak (a name which may perhaps be identified with that of Patecius [Πατέκιος], Phatecius, or



Patricius in the formula for the abjuration of this heresy in Cotelierius or Tollius). His mother's name was Meis, or according to others Ūtāchīm or Mar Marjam, the Oriental shape for the Hebrew Miriam or Mary, pp. 83, 117-119 (Κάροσσα according to Tollius, *Insig.* p. 144). His father was originally from Persia, but removed to Babylon, where Manes was born. One day his father heard in a temple a voice saying, "Eat no flesh, drink no wine, and abstain from women," whereupon he founded the sect of the Mugtasila or the Washers, identical with the Sabians of the Marshes between the Tigris and Euphrates, found near Bassora to the present day. (Cf. Renan's Nabath. Agriculture, pref. p. vi. Eng. trans.; Chwolsohn's, *Die Ssabier*, i. 112; Flügel, 83, 132-135.) In this sect Manes was brought up, being instructed in all the knowledge of his time. At twelve years old an angel announced to him that when older he should abandon that sect. At twenty-four the same angel appeared again, and summoned him to found Manicheism in words which strikingly re-echo our Lord's call to St. Paul: "Hail, Manes, from me and from the Lord which has sent me to thee and chosen thee for his work. Now he commands thee to proclaim the glad tidings of the truth which comes from him, and to bestow thereon thy whole zeal." Manes, according to one tradition, Flügel, *l. c.* p. 84, entered on his office the day that Sapor, son of Artaxerxes, succeeded to the throne, Sunday, April 1, 238, as Flügel determines by a lengthened calculation (pp. 146-149). According to another (p. 85) Manes appeared in the second year of the emperor Gallus, A.D. 252 (pp. 150-162). Manes claimed to be the Paraclete promised by Christ, and derived his dogmas from Persian and Christian sources. Before Manes met Sapor he travelled for forty years through various countries. Upon his return he invited Firuz, the brother of Sapor and son of Artaxerxes, to accept his doctrines. By his means he was introduced to Sapor, who shewed him great respect, though he had previously intended to slay him. He promised him reformation of his own life and freedom to his adherents to preach their views. Already the sect had spread into India, China, and Turkestan. Manes was put to death by Varanes I. A.D. 272-276, and his body, cut in two, was suspended a part over each gate of the city Dschundisābūr, pp. 99, 329-334. Manes was deformed in his legs according to Flügel, pp. 83, 100. The latest version of his history which research has brought to light will be found in Albīrānī's *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, translated by E. Sachau, and published by the Oriental Translation Fund in 1879. It is one of the most important Oriental documents which has seen the light of late years, and well deserves the praise which the learned editor lavishes upon it in his introduction. In many particulars it strikingly confirms the narrative of an-Nadīm given by Flügel; both of them being indeed probably derived from Manichean sources. Albīrānī was a native of Khiva, A.D. 973-1048, in which neighbourhood he lived and wrote. This work proves him to have possessed vast literary resources no longer available to us, but some of which may yet be found in Central Asia. (Cf. art. by Thomas on *Recent Pehlvi Decipherments* in *Jour. Asiat. Soc.* 1871, p. 417.)

An interesting coincidence may here be noted. Almost all the narratives represent Sapor as converted to Manicheism for a time. (Cf. Masaudi, t. ii. cap. xxiv. p. 164.) Mr. Thomas in *Jour. Asiat. Soc.* 1868, pp. 310-341, in an art. on *Sassanian Inscriptions*, discusses the Hājīābād inscription, wherein, as he maintains, Sapor in A.D. 261 proclaims his adhesion to the debased Christianity of Manes. (Cf. however for a reply completely traversing Mr. Thomas's ground an art. by Mr. E. M. West in *Jour. Asiat. Soc.* 1870, p. 376, and for reply by Thomas, *l. c.* 1871, p. 416. This question, however, can only be decided by experts in the Pehlvi language.) It would not be right to pass from this point without noting that Chwolsohn in his *Die Ssabier*, t. i. pp. 123-136, severely criticises the narrative published by Flügel while accepting it to a large degree. At the same time he is inclined to attach much more importance than most writers to the Western tradition. He regards Scythianus and Terebinthus as historical characters, identifying Scythianus with Elkesai (cf. for opposite view Baur's *Manich. Religions-syst.* pp. 462-464). He grounds his theory on a statement of Suidas, s. v. Νέρβας, that Manicheism arose under Nerva, who recalled St. John from Patmos. It demands, however, not only an arbitrary rectification of the text of Suidas, but also extravagant chronological assumptions. As to the position which Manes claimed for himself, Beausobre maintains that he did not purport to be the Paraclete, but merely a simple man, the agent or messenger of the Paraclete (t. i. pp. 255-268). On the other hand, the Fathers generally, as Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 31, August. pass. and Albīrānī, p. 190, testify to the highest claims on his part. However, it is a point almost impossible to decide. The writings of Manes were very numerous. From Albīrānī's work, we learn that some of them were in existence so late as the eleventh century. They were written by him in Persian and Syriac, and, according to Muhammad ben Ishak, in a character peculiar to the Manicheans, derived from the ordinary Persian and Syriac. Of this alphabet Flügel in his commentary, p. 167, gives a copy. It contained more letters than the Syriac, and was chiefly used by the Manicheans of Samarkhand and Transoxania, where the Marcionites who still existed there in the 10th century used a similar character. The names of his books, according to Beausobre, are his Gospel; his Treasure of Life (θησαυρός ζωής), from which Fabricius distinguishes the Little Treasure (μικρός θησαυρός); Book of Chapters (κεφαλαίων βιβλίον); Treatise about the Faith (λόγος περί πίστεως), which Beausobre (t. i. p. 427) believes identical with his Mysteries (μυστήρια, Epiph. *Haer.* lxi. 14), of which too he gives an analysis, with which the very different one by Muhammad ben Ishak in Flügel, p. 102, should be compared; Book about the Giants (τῶν γιγάντων πραγματεία), which was known in Syriac at the court of Bagdad so late as the 9th century (*Jour. Asiat. Soc.* Mar. 1835, p. 260). According to Epiphanius he also wrote treatises on Astronomy, Astrology, and Magic. In the formula for the abjuration of Manicheism preserved by Timoth. C. P. Tollīus *Insig.* p. 142, two other works are mentioned, a Collection of his Epistles (τῶν

ἐπιστολῶν ὁμάς) and his Memoirs (βιβ. τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων). The former may have contained his Fundamental Epistle, to which Augustine replies in his treatise *Cont. Epist. Fundamenti*. This last seems to have been specially popular in Africa. In Fabric. *Bib. Græc.* lib. v. cap. i. will be found a collection of fragments from his epistles and a list of his works. In the *Acta Archelai* and in Epiphanius will be found a letter purporting to be from Manes to Marcellus. It may be a genuine fragment. Albrūnī mentions a work of Manes known to his followers in Central Asia under the name of Shābūrkan, which he describes as their religious code, noting it with great respect as "a book favoured by God with a long duration." In it Manes spoke of the coming of the prophet, referring apparently to himself, and giving details of his life. It was composed in Turkestan, and presented to the Persian king after his return. Beausobre speculates upon its contents, but says that he can find no fragment of it in either the Greek or Latin fathers. In Albrūnī there are several fragments of it. They bear out Beausobre's surmise that it was not a gospel in our sense of the word or record of the life of Christ, but a book of religious Meditations or pretended Revelations. The following extract from it found in Albrūnī, p. 190, is quite in character with the religious eclecticism which might find favour with a king distracted with the din of religious controversy. "Wisdom and deeds have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messenger of God. So in one age they have been brought by the messenger called Buddha to India, in another by Zaradūsch to Persia, in another by Jesus to the West. Thereupon this revelation has come down, this prophecy in this last age, through me, Mani, the messenger of the God of truth to Babylonia." On p. 191 of Albrūnī's work we find a list of his works as known to him, viz. Shābūrkan, Book of Giants, Treasure of Life, Book of Books, and many treatises. On p. 27 again, speaking of the gospels published by the followers of Marcion and Bardesanes, he mentions "The Gospel of the Seventy" as used by the Manicheans, but attributes it to one Balamis, not to Manes. There is one point which seems to identify the book Shābūrkan with the Book of Mysteries already mentioned. Albrūnī describes the former as arranged according to the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, being the precise account of the Book of Mysteries given by Epiphanius in *Haer.* lxvi. 13. In Flügel's book we find the Book of Mysteries described by the Bagdad historian, and placed at the head of six Syriac works attributed to him. He divides it however only into eighteen chapters, as follows:—First, Concerning the followers of Bardesanes (cf. Flügel. *l. c.* p. 160). Then two chapters, one about Hystaspes and the other about a certain Ja 'Kūl, of whom is nothing known. The fourth treats of the Son of the poor widow whom the Jews crucified, when his docetic views appear. The fifth sets forth the testimony of Jesus against the Jews. The sixth the testimony (to Manicheism) of a certain Jamūn after his victories (over self). The seventh and eighth chapters deal with the doctrines of spirits, the seven and the four. The ninth deals with the Paths (to life). The tenth

set forth Adam's witness to Jesus (cf. Flügel, *l. c.* p. 91; Renan, *sur Apocal. d'Adam* in *Jour. Asiat. Nov.*—Dec. 1853, p. 431—34). The eleventh deals with the corruption of religion. The twelfth treats of the doctrines of the followers of Bardesanes about the soul and the body; the thirteenth of the controversy with these last about the life of the soul; the fourteenth about the three destructions; the fifteenth about the preservation of the world; the sixteenth about the three days; the seventeenth about the prophets; the eighteenth about the resurrection. Dionysius of Telmachar, a Syrian historian of the 8th century, mentions "books which are found in the Cavern of the Treasures of hidden mysteries, or the conversation of Adam the father of our race with his son Seth." This was evidently a book of the same family, if not identical with the work of Manes (Renan, *l. c.* pp. 435, 455, 460). (Cf. Norberg's *Codex Nasaraeus* and Kaempfer, *Amoen. Exotic.* p. 439 sqq.) This teaching about Adam enters into every form of Manicheism and kindred heresies (cf. Albrūnī, p. 190), being probably derived from the weird speculations of the Babylonian Jews, to whom Manes was otherwise so hostile, and who then were at the very height of their intellectual activity (cf. Jost's *Judenthum*, t. ii. pp. 127—183; Kuenen's *Rel. of Israel*, iii. 297, Eng. trans.; Renan, *Nab. Agric.* p. 91, et *pass.*). The most powerful though most subtle influences are however often derived from our foes. We have already mentioned the leading authorities for the facts of his life. The additional authorities noted in the article MANICHEANS may also be consulted, specially Baur's work. For the English reader requiring a clear and full statement of the facts as known to his time, the narrative of Lardner in his *Credibility* may be commended, but the facts of the case cannot be ascertained without consulting those modern authorities we have quoted. Compare also Aug. Ant. Georgii *Alphab. Tibetanum*, pp. 267—293, 390—401 and *passim*, and his *De Miraculis S. Coluthi*, Praef. note on pp. cci.—ccvi. His views published in the middle of the last century correspond with the Oriental traditions, and completely anticipate the view taken by Baur as expounded in the article MANICHEANS. [G. T. S.]

MANICHEANS (Μανιχαῖοι, Epiph. *Haer.* lxvi., where they are also called Ἀκουανῆται, from Ἀκουας, one of their leaders, who carried the heresy from Mesopotamia to Eleuthropolis).

In a previous article we have discussed the personal history of Manes. It is now our duty to treat of the origin, principles, cultus, literature, and history of the sect called after him; subjects which we shall treat as concisely as possible; begging the reader always to remember that we are dealing not so much with the history of a definite sect as of a vast indefinite spiritual and intellectual movement, which makes itself felt more or less in the development of every thinking mind; and which, from its very vastness, eludes, or at least renders very difficult, definite historical treatment. 1. *Origin and principles of Manicheism.* For the fountain of the Manichean heresy we must turn to India. This point has been the subject of an elaborate memoir by

Baur, *Das Manichäische Religionssystem*, Tübingen, 1831, pp. 433-451, a view which has been largely confirmed by the investigations of later scholars. Our space however will not permit us to enter upon this question. We can only refer the student to Baur's work, where he will find satisfactory evidence proving that elements derived both from Buddhism and from Zoroastrianism are found in the Manichean system. One of the latest enquirers has indeed recognised the influence of the *Zend-Avesta* and Zoroastrianism upon Manicheism: cf. Darmesteter's *Zend-Avesta in Sacred Books of the East*, t. iv. Intro. p. xxxvii. We need scarcely say that a thorough exposition of this system, which has filled the two large works of Beausobre and Baur's volume of 500 pp., would surpass the limits of such an article as this. We can only refer the student to these works, or the English reader to an exhaustive discussion of the subject contained in Neander's *Church Hist.*, Bohn's ed., t. ii. pp. 157-195. We shall now content ourselves with sketching the leading principles of the sect. Manes probably at first merely desired to blend Christianity and Zoroastrianism together. From these two sources he could borrow on the one hand the Christian elements we find in his system, while from Zoroastrianism he took his Dualism, which consisted of two independent principles absolutely opposed to each other, with their opposite creations; on the one side God (Ahura-Mazda), the original good from whom nothing but good can proceed; on the other side original evil (Angro-Mainyus), whose essence is wild, self-conflicting tumult, matter, darkness, a world full of smoke and vapour. The powers of darkness were contending in wild rage with one another, when in their blind struggle they approached so near to the realm of light that a gleam from that hitherto unknown kingdom reached them for the first time, whereupon they strove to force their way into it. The good God, in order to guard His boundaries, produced the Aeon Mother of Life, by whom the first or spiritual man was produced, together with the five elements, wind, light, water, fire, and matter, to carry on the struggle; which however are not identical with the actual elements, but are the elements of the higher world, of which the mundane and actual elements are a copy framed by the Prince of Darkness, a view we find worked out by the Cathari of the 12th cent. (Gieseler, *H. E.* iii. 452).<sup>a</sup> The primitive man is worsted in the conflict by the spirits of darkness, who take from him some of his armour, which is his soul (ψυχή). In his danger he prays

<sup>a</sup> As to the creation of the visible world according to the system of Manes the critics differ; Beausobre (ii. 358-362) maintains that he ascribed it to the powers of the kingdom of Light; Neander (*H. E.* li. 175) to the power of darkness. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxi. c. 64) clearly states the latter. The Manicheans there are represented as quoting John viii. 44 thus: *οὐκ εἶμι υἱοὶ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶ ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ψεύστης ἦν*. Whence they conclude that the Devil's Father was the maker of the visible world. But it is impossible to reconcile all the discrepancies in Manes' system, made up as it is of so many diverse elements. Epiphanius constantly twits him with his contradictions. It certainly seems more consistent with his fundamental idea to ascribe the visible creation to the evil than to the good principle.

to the Light-King, who sends him the Spirit of life, who rescues him and raises him once more to the Light-Kingdom. But meanwhile the Powers of Darkness had succeeded in swallowing part of the luminous essence of the primeval heavenly man, which they proceeded to shut up in material bodies, as in a prison. At the same time this very violence is the means of their destruction. The Divine Spirit is only enclosed in the material prisons for a time, and with a view to final deliverance. To illustrate this Manes used a parable. A shepherd sees a wild beast about to rush into the midst of his flock. He digs a pit and casts into it a kid; the beast springs into the pit to devour his prey, but cannot extricate himself. The shepherd however delivers the kid and leaves the lion to perish (*Disp. e. Archel.* c. 25; *Epiph. Haer.* lxi. c. 44). The Spirit of life at once began his preparations for purifying the souls which had been mixed up with the kingdom of darkness. That part of the soul which had not been affected by matter he placed in the sun and moon, whence it might send forth its influence to release and draw back towards itself, through the refining processes of vegetable and animal life, kindred souls diffused through all nature; for the sun and moon play as important a part in the Manichean as they do in the Persian, Indian, and Mithraic systems (C. B. Stark, *Zwei Mithraeen*, Heidelberg, 1864, p. 43). In order to prevent this gradual despiritualisation the powers of darkness resolve to produce a being in whom the soul of nature, which was ever striving after liberty, might be securely imprisoned. This is man as he is now shaped after the image of the primitive man with whom they originally waged war. He was formed by the prince of darkness, and embraces in himself the elements of both worlds, the soul springing from the Light-Kingdom, the body from that of darkness. The powers of darkness now perceive that the light-nature by concentrating itself in man has become powerful. They therefore seek to attach him by every possible enticement to the lower world. Here comes in the Manichean story of the Fall, which is similar to that of the Ophites. The Powers of Darkness invited man to partake of all the trees of Paradise, forbidding only the tree of Knowledge. But an angel of light, or Christ Himself, the Spirit of the Sun, counteracted their artifices in the shape of the serpent, the parts of the Biblical narrative being thus reversed, God's share being ascribed to the devil and vice versa. Their standpoint with respect to the Fall determined their attitude towards the whole Old Testament, which they rejected as the work of the evil principle; while again their theory about the creation of the material part of man determined their view of the Incarnation, which they of course regarded as wholly doctetic; if a material body was a prison and a burden to the spirit of man, Christ could scarcely voluntarily imprison His divine Spirit in the same. "Moreover, the Son, when He came for man's salvation, assumed a human appearance, so that He appeared to men as if He were a man, and men thought He had been born" (*Epiph. Haer.* lxi. 49). This doctetic view of the Incarnation of course destroyed the reality equally of His life, His death, resurrection and ascension, and

in fact struck at the root of all historical Christianity, so that we find at last some of the later Manicheans maintaining a distinction between the mundane or the historical Christ, who was a bad man, and the spiritual Christ, who was a divine deliverer (Gieseler, *H. E.* iii. 407, note <sup>29</sup>). At the same time they attached a mystical signification to orthodox language about our Lord, whereby they could use it to deceive the unwary. Thus they could speak of a suffering son of man hanging on every tree—of a Christ crucified in every soul and suffering in matter. They gave their own interpretation to the symbols of the suffering Son of Man in the Lord's Supper (cf. Petrus *Sc. Hist. Man.* in Bigne's *Bib. P.P.* xvi. 760). We have already noted that Manicheism contains also elements drawn from Buddhism. A thorough exposition of the relations between these two systems will be found in Baur, *l. c.* pp. 433–451, where he points out Buddhist influence on the Manichean doctrines as to the opposition between matter and spirit, upon the creation and end of the world, and upon moral questions. The most striking points of contact between these two systems are metempsychosis (Baur, *l. c.* p. 440), and the stress laid upon gnosis. The former is the outer way, whereby souls can return thither whence they have descended. The latter is the inner and highest way (cf. Colebrooke's *Essays*, ii. 382, 389, for the universal influence of this view in India). In both the Manichean and the Buddhist system asceticism again was the practical result of the opposition between matter and spirit; the more matter could be crushed, the nearer the spirit came to its original source (cf. Lassen, *Ind. Alterthum.* iii. 408–415).

2. *Organization.*—Perhaps, however, it is on the practical organization of the system that Buddhist influence is most clearly seen. Manicheism differed from Gnosticism, in that the latter did not wish to alter anything in the constitution of the existing church. It desired only to add to the Confession of Faith for the  $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$  a secret doctrine for the  $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\iota$ . Manes, on the other hand, as the paraclete set up a new church instead of the old, which had been corrupted by Jewish traditions, from whose power not even the apostles were free. In the church of the Manicheans the gradations were similar to those among the Buddhists (cf. H. H. Wilson's *opp.* t. ii. p. 360, *Essay on Buddha and Buddhism*). There was first the great body consisting of the auditores, from whom a less strict course of life was demanded, and one of whose leading duties was to supply the other and higher class, the Elect or Perfect, with food and other necessaries. From these last an ascetic life was demanded. They should possess no property, were bound to a celibate and contemplative life, abstaining from all strong drinks and animal food. They should hurt no living thing, from a religious reverence for the divine life diffused through all nature. They should therefore refrain not only from taking life, but even from pulling up a herb or plucking fruits or flowers (Aug. *cont. Faust.* v. 6. vi. 4). Thus Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxi. c. 28) tells us that when their followers presented one of the Elect with food, he first addressed it thus: "I have neither reaped nor ground, nor pressed nor cast thee into the oven. All these things another has

done, and brought thee to me. I am free from all fault." Upon which he said to his disciple "I have prayed for thee," and let him go (cf. Von Wegnern, *de Manich. Indulgent.* p. 69 sq.). The most superficial study of the system on this point discloses its essential Pantheism, a tendency which it manifestly draws from Buddhism (Hodgson, *Jour. Roy. As. Soc.* 1835, p. 295; Matter, *Hist. du Gnostic.* t. ii. 357), and which we shall see developing itself further in the course of our history. St. Augustine indeed noted this very point in his reply to Faustus, ii. 5, xii. 13; cf. Aug. *Epp.* 165, 166, cap. iii. sec. 7; *Ep.* 74 ad Deuterium *Episcop.*; Toll. *Insig.* p. 137; Muratorii *Anecd. Ambros. Biblioth.* ii. 112. Manes derived from Christianity another element of his system. Manes claimed to be the paraclete promised by Christ. He therefore, after Christ's example, chose twelve apostles, in whom the government of the sect was placed. At the head of the twelve there was a thirteenth, representing Manes and presiding over all (Flügel's *Mani*, pp. 97, 298, 316; Baur, *l. c.* p. 305); subordinate to these there were seventy-two bishops, under whom were presbyters, deacons, and travelling missionaries, a constitution which lasted to the 13th century, and possibly may not be yet quite extinct.

3. *Cultus.*—The Manicheans had their own peculiar rites, though their mystical interpretation of language enabled them to hold the highest position in the Christian ministry, as in an-Nadim's time, A.D. 987, it enabled them to conform externally to the Mahometan system (Flügel's *Mani*, pp. 107, 404–408). Thus Eutychius, *Pat. Alex. Annal.* t. i. p. 515 (cf. Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarch. Alexand.* p. 101), tells us how Timotheus, *Pat. Alex.*, discovered the Manicheans among the Egyptian bishops at the council of Constantinople by permitting the bishops and monks to eat flesh on Sundays, which of course the Manicheans would not do. The worship of the Manicheans consisted in prayers and hymns. They had neither temples, altars, incense, nor images. They fasted on Sunday. They regarded Easter but lightly, as a festival which in their system had no meaning. They observed Pentecost, but not Christmas or Epiphany. Their great festival was that of Bema, held in the month of March in memory of their founder's death. On that occasion an empty chair or pulpit, richly upholstered, was placed in their Assembly, as a symbol of his presence, while one of his works, probably his *Fundamental Epistle*, was read, together with the records of his martyrdom (cf. Aug. *Reply to Fund. Epist.* c. viii.; *Cont. Faust.* xviii. 5). As to their sacraments, and first as to baptism, the authorities vary much. Beausobre, t. ii. *liv.* ix. ch. vi., maintains strongly that they baptized even infants, and that in the name of the Trinity. On the other hand Augustine, *de Haer.* cap. xlvi.; *Cont. Ep. Pelag.* lib. ii. and in other places cited by Beausobre, *l. c.* p. 714 note; Cedren. *Hist. Comp.* opp. t. i. col. 831, Migne's *P. G.* t. cxxi., expressly assert that they rejected baptism with water; and Timotheus C. P. in his *Form. Recep. Haer.* classes them among those heretics who must receive baptism on joining the church, a rule which seems to have prevailed from the 4th century (Beveridge, *Cod. Canon. Eccles. Primit.* lib. ii. cap. 12; S. Bas. *Ep.* clxxxviii.).

Certainly the practice of the Manicheans in the 12th century would support this latter view, as they then substituted their Consolamentum or laying on of hands—which they called the baptism of the Holy Ghost—for water baptism, which they scorned (cf. Gieseler, *H. E.* iii. 397, 410 note). If the Manicheans admitted baptism with water, it would seem to be inconsistent with their fundamental principle of the essentially evil nature of matter (cf. Tertull. *Cont. Marcion.* i. 23). But at the same time we cannot expect perfect consistency in their system, as in another respect they seem to have retained from the Zoroastrian system an exaggerated reverence for water, in common with other similar sects (as the Sampsaeans, Epiph. *Haer.* liii. cf. Philast. *Haer.* xvi.; Aug. *Haer.* lxxv.; Prædest. *Haer.* lxxv.), which led them to forbid the use of it for purposes of cleanliness, and to order the disgusting practice noticed in the following execration from the *Formul. Recept. Manich.* in Toll. *Insig. Itin. Ital.* p. 141:—"Exsecror eos qui propriâ sese urinâ inquinant, nec, ut sordes suae aquâ abluantur, sustinent, ne, ut inquinati, aqua polluantur" (cf. Epiph. lxi. 28); a custom which they plainly derived from the Persians, as is proved by the Zoroastrian proclamation to the Armenians of the 5th century, contained in Eliseus, *Hist. of Vartan*, ed. Neumann, pp. 27, 94, where a similar practice is mentioned by the Zoroastrians themselves as a proof of orthodoxy. The same fundamental idea still prevails among the Ansaires and Yezedees (Lyde's *Asian Mystery*, 293; Badger's *Nestorians*, i. 117). Beausobre defends them against this and all other similar charges; but in an-Nadim's narrative, as given by Flügel, which was most probably derived from Manichean sources, this reverence for water is laid down as one of the essential principles of the sect (Flügel's *Mani*, p. 95). As to their Eucharist there is the same diversity of testimony, and a similar accusation of filthy practices. They celebrated the communion, but substituted water for wine, the use of which they abhorred [HYDROPARASTATAE]. About the disgusting ceremonial of Ischas, which Cyril. Hier. (*Cat.* vi.), Augustine (*Haer.* xlvi.), and Pope Leo I. (*ser. v. De Jejun. x. Mens.*) accuse them of adding to their communion, see Beausobre, liv. ix. ch. 7-9 in t. ii. pp. 720-762. As to the nature of it the following extract from Aug. *l. c. sup.*, must suffice: "Coguntur electi corum veluti Eucharistiam conspersam semine humano sumere." With this may be compared the similar but even more horrible narrative about the Gnostic sacraments in *Pistis Sophia*, ed. Petermann, p. 241; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7; Epiph. *Haer.* xxvi. cap. 4; cf. J. de Hammer's *Mém. sur deux Coffrets Gnostiques du Moyen Age*, p. 23, Paris, 1832, and his *Mysterium Baphometis Revelatum* in *Mines de l'Orient*, t. vi. p. 22; in both which, from a study of the monuments, he proves the truth of those accusations which have been often attributed to the imaginations of the orthodox. In connexion with their ritual we may notice their magic. All the authorities agree as to their pretensions on this point. Magic was in fact common to all Eastern heresies, and was derived partly from heathenism, partly from Judaism (Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, iii. x.-xxviii.). Epiphanius indeed (*Haer.* lxi. 3) traces Manichean magic

back to Egyptian and Indian sources. Theurgical practices were, however, a common feature of the religious movements of the 3rd and 4th century.

4. *Apocryphal Literature.*—Manicheism has been the prolific parent of false Gospels. On this subject we must refer to the articles on LEUCIUS (I), GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, and MANES. Here we may however remark that the work of forgery is due not so much to Manes as to his followers. This is evident at once when Epiphanius's treatise upon Manicheism is contrasted with Augustine's Reply to Faustus. Epiphanius uses simply the early *Acta Archelai*, which represent Manicheism in its early stage. In it Manes rejects indeed the Old Testament, but accepts the New; and Epiphanius proves the falsehood of his views by quotations from all the Gospels alike. But Augustine discusses the system as it had been developed by a century and a half of controversy. Thus we find Faustus rejecting St. Matthew (lib. xvii. 1), accusing Christians of falsifying all the Gospels (*Cont. Faust.* lib. ii., xvi.-xviii., xxxiii. 3, cf. Aug. *Ep.* lxxxii. sec. 6; Beausobre, *l. c.* Part ii. liv. i. cap. 5), and appealing to apocryphal fables under the name of the Apostles; whereof Augustine gives us a specimen in a story about St. Thomas cursing and thereby killing a man who struck him (*Cont. Faust.* xxii. 79). The names of these books are mentioned by Faustus (lib. xxx. cap. 4) as the Gospels of Peter, Andrew, Thomas; the Form of making Virgins left by St. John, and the story of Paul and Thecla. (On the apocrypha of Manicheism, cf. Titus Bostr. iii.; Philast. *de Haer.* lxxxviii.; Epiph. *Haer.* 47, 61, 63; Timoth. C. P. *de Recept. Haer.*; *Apost. Constit.* vi. 16, Clark's ed.; Beausob. *Hist. Man.* part. ii. liv. ii.; Thil. *Apoc. Cod. Nov. Test.* Introd. pp. lxxv.-xc.) Yet, as the list just given will shew, containing, as it does, documents mentioned long before the time of Manes, it is almost certain that Manicheism merely adopted these apocryphal writings. In Flügel's *Mani*, pp. 103-105, we have a list of seventy-six epistles sent to various places and persons by Manes and the leaders of the sect after him, where also, pp. 166-168, will be found a specimen of their secret alphabet, which is similar to one ascribed to Bardesanes (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* 1864, t. vi. p. 465). For more on this subject see sec. 6.

5. *History after Death of Manes.*—We may divide this part of our subject into two. (1) As to the East. (2) As to the West. As to the East, where they originated, the Manicheans made rapid progress, spreading, as an-Nadim (Flügel's *Mani*, p. 105, cf. p. 394) tells us, into various lands. During the persecution raised against them upon the death of Manes, they fled into Transoxania, whence they maintained a constant communication with Babylon, their original seat, as the head of the sect always remained there till the Mahomedan invasion. They then returned to Persia, A.D. 661, but fled back again to the same region, A.D. 908-932, when a fresh persecution was raised by the Abbassid Chaliph Muktdar, and took refuge in the neighbourhood of Samarkand and Sogdiana. The spread of Manicheism towards the East is proved by an incident which occurred upon their second flight to Transoxania, where, as Renan has

pointed out (*Hist. Lang. Semit.* p. 281), they probably exercised an important literary influence upon the formation of the Ouigour, Mongol, and Calmuck alphabets, which through them or the Nestorians are derived from the Syriac Estranghelo. One of the Mahometan princes was about to persecute them, when the ruler of China sent a message to him that there were far more Moslems in his dominions than Manicheans in Samarkand, and that if he killed one of them, whose religion he himself professed, he would in return slay all the Moslems (cf. on spread of Manicheism into China from Turkestan, De Guignes, *Hist. gén. des Huns*, iii. 24; West's Pahlavi Texts, pt. i. p. 296 in *Sacred Books of the East*, t. v. Oxford, 1880). Chwolsohn (*Die Ssabier*, i. 123-130) has, indeed, thrown a doubt upon the narrative of an-Nadim, as derived, in his opinion, from Manichean sources only, and representing an effort to throw a halo round their history. It has, however, received a striking confirmation in the publication of Albirūni's *Chronology of Ancient Nations* (Orient. Trans. Fund. 1879), from which we have already quoted in treating of Manes. This book, written in the neighbourhood of Khiva, displays the most accurate acquaintance with the teaching and history of the sect, even to the charge of pæderasty, which it refutes in almost the very words used by Beausobre, t. ii. 742, when tracing the origin of this charge back to John Damasc. (*Dial. cont. Manich.*). Albirūni, A.D. 973-1048, testifies, p. 191, that Manicheans still existed in his time, scattered throughout all Mahometan lands, but were specially numerous at Samarkand, where they were known as Sabians. He also states that they were prevalent among the Eastern Turks, in China, Thibet, and India (cf. A. von Kremer's *Culturgeschichte des Orients*, ii. 171, Wien, 1875; Vambéry, *Hist. of Bokhara*, p. 16, and *Sketches in Central Asia*, pp. 261-266. On the value of Albirūni as an authority consult Sachau's *Introd. to the Translation*, and a paper contributed by him to the German Philological Congress, *Verhandl. der Versamml. Deutsch. Philolog.* 1872). The Manicheans again spread into southern Armenia and Cappadocia, where they found material ready to their hand in the Hypsistarii of that region [HYPSISTARI] (Matter, *Gnosticism*, ii. 392), whence they came into immediate contact with Europe. A proof of their activity in Armenia will be found in the work of Eznig, one of the leading writers of Armenia in the 5th cent., published by the Mekhitarite monks at Venice in 1826 under the title *Refutatio Errorum Persarum et Manichaeorum*. Their progress in this direction seems to have been intensified by the Mazdakite movement in the 5th century, which was only a revival of Manicheism. It displayed also the same missionary activity [MAZDAK], which manifested itself in an aggression upon the orthodox of Armenia, A.D. 590, noted by the Armenian historian Samuel of Ani. He gives us a list of Manichean works which they introduced into Armenia, among which appear the Penitence or Apocalypse of Adam (published by Renan in the *Jour. Asiat.* 1853, t. ii. p. 431), the Explanation of the Gospel of Manes, the Gospel of the Infancy, the Vision of St. Paul, and the Testament of Adam. A

fresh impulse to Manicheism in southern Armenia was given by Paulicianism in the latter half of the 7th century, while again another revival of it took place under a man named Sembat in the middle of the 9th century (Neander, *H. E.* vi. 342), about which period its adherents inhabited in vast numbers the mountain ranges and border lands between the Roman and Persian empires [PAULICIANISM]. During the iconoclastic controversy the emperors of the 8th century, beginning with Leo the Isaurian, who drew his origin from the same quarter, found in the Armenian Manicheans their most efficient allies, and transported them in large numbers to Europe to recruit their armies [LEO ISAUUR; ICONOCLASM], a practice which continued till A.D. 978, when John Zimisces transplanted a powerful colony to the valleys of Mount Haemus (Ann. Comn. *Alexiad.* ii. 298, ed. Bonn.), where, as Gibbon tells us, c. liv., they continued to exist in the last century, and from whence they spread all over Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thrace, and Epirus. We shall meet these colonists again in the course of our narrative (cf. on subject of this section Neander's remarks derived from Petermann in *H. E. t. vi.* pp. 340-344, ed. Bohn).

(2) *History in the West.*—The first notice of a Manichean advance in this direction is found in an edict of Diocletian, directed to Julian, proconsul of Africa, dated prid. kal. April. 287, wherein its leaders are condemned to the stake, and its adherents punished with decapitation and confiscation of all their goods, as following "a new and unheard of monster, which has come to us from the Persians, a hostile people, and has perpetrated many misdeeds." The genuineness of this edict has been challenged, but is defended by Neander, *l. c.* ii. 195, note. It is given in Gieseler, *H. E.* i. 228. The chief ground for disputing it is the silence of the Fathers, specially of Eusebius, about it. But the argument *e silentio* is never a safe one. Besides Ambrosiaster mentions it when commenting upon 2 Tim. iii. 7. This edict is addressed to the proconsul of Africa, where the Manicheans were making great progress. This coincides exactly with the fact, known to us already, that Manes sent a special envoy to Africa, where, during the fourth century, Manicheism flourished, both among the monks and clergy of Egypt and in proconsular Africa, ensnaring souls like St. Augustine; and where they must have been very numerous and powerful, since, notwithstanding the severe and bloody laws enacted against them by Valentinian, A.D. 372, Theodosius, A.D. 381, as may be seen in the code, they assembled and taught and debated in public in Augustine's time. We have, however, a sufficient proof that in some places these laws did not remain empty threats, in the fact that the heathen rhetorician Libanius appealed in behalf of the Manicheans of Palestine (Ep. 1344). Probably just as in the case of the pagan persecutions, the rigour with which the imperial rescripts were enforced varied with the dispositions of the local magistrates. From Africa the sect was propagated in this century into Spain, Gaul, and Aquitaine (Philast. *Haer.* c. 61, 84), where it may have originated Priscilianism (Muratori, *Anecd. ex Ambros. Biblioth. Codic.* ii. 113, ed. 1698). Still later we find the Arian king Hunneric persecuting them in

Africa, together with the orthodox, A.D. 477 (Vict. Vit. *Hist. Persec. Wand.* ii. init.). In another direction, again, we of course find the sect at Constantinople and at Rome. Constantine the Great commissioned a certain Strategius—who, under the name of Musonianus, rose to be praetorian prefect of the East,—to report upon it (Ammian. Marcell. xv. 13); while again, 200 years later, in the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century, Manicheism in the Mazdakite movement made a convert of the emperor Anastasius I. At Rome they were found from ancient times. Lipsius in *Jahrb. Prot. Theol.* 1879, art. on *Neue Stud. zur Papst-Chronologie*, p. 438, discusses a constitution of pope Anastasius I. A.D. 398, enacted on account of their immigration from beyond the seas at that date. After the barbarian invasion of Africa they fled to Rome in great numbers, when pope Leo I. proved himself very active in their repression. Leo says that the Manicheans, whom, with the aid of the civil magistrates, he arrested, acknowledged their dissolute practices; whereupon Valentinian III. published a very severe law against them. Notwithstanding all the papal efforts, renewed from age to age, we still find the sect existing at Rome in the 7th century, under Gregory the Great (cf. Greg. Mag. lib. ii. Ep. 37; Gieseler, *H. E.* t. ii. p. 491, Clark's ed.). But the great impulse to Manichean thought in southern Europe came in later times from the original sources of the system. We have already traced the connexion between the Manicheans of southern Armenia and their colonies in Bulgaria, established by the iconoclastic emperors, and maintained by their successors<sup>b</sup> (cf. on this point Petr. Sic. *Hist. Manich.*, who speaks with all the authority of an eye-witness, though probably a very prejudiced one). These colonists developed a fresh Manichean movement in the Greek church in the 11th century, whose followers were variously called Euchites, Enthusiasts, or Bogomiles [EUCHITES]; and which rapidly spread, partly through the crusades, but most chiefly through their own missionary activity, to Italy, Gaul, Germany, and England, to be in the former countries the founders of the Albigenian and Catharist systems. Through these latter, again, Manicheism developed its essential Pantheism, which displayed itself in the system of Abbot Joachim and the *Evangelium Eternum* of the 13th century; and the numberless other Pantheistic and mystic sects which sprang up during the two succeeding centuries.<sup>c</sup> On this interesting topic consult an article by Renan in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1866, t. lxiv. pp. 134–142; Hauréau, *sur Conc. de Paris*, A.D. 1210,

<sup>b</sup> An Armenian colony still exists in Transylvania. It supplied a head to the Armenian convent of St. Lazare at Venice in A.D. 1800, in the person of Archbishop Aceone Köwer (Langlois, *Sur le Couvent de St. Lazare*, Venice, 1863, p. 16).

<sup>c</sup> Like all pantheistic systems Manicheism reduced Christ and Christianity to a level with other great teachers and philosophical systems. This characteristic we find in all branches of the sect. Thus on the Mazdakite monument found sixty years ago at Cyrene Christ is enumerated in the same rank with Zoroaster, Pythagoras, &c. [MAZDAK.] Albiruni, *Chronol. of Ancient Nation*, p. 190, and the anathemas in Tollius, *Insig.* p. 135, witness the same.

in *Rev. Archéol.* 1864, t. ii. p. 428; Cahier, *Mel. d'Archéol.* t. i. pp. 137, 149; Hammer-Purgstall's *Mysterium Baphometis Revelatum in Mines de l'Orient*, t. vi. p. 4, Vienna, 1818. On the subject of the Bogomiles, and of medieval Manicheism in general, consult Wolf, *Hist. Bogomil.* and Gieseler, *H. E.* t. ii. pp. 208, 488, t. iii. 387–474, where abundant authorities will satisfy the curious student; and latest of all, Albert Réville, *Les Albigeois in the Revue des Deux Mondes*, Mai, 1874. Perhaps the most satisfactory proof of the historic connexion between the heretics of southern Gaul and the Manicheans of Eastern Europe is found in a fact mentioned by Gieseler (iii. 407–409) of the existence of a Romaic version of the New Testament, used by the Cathari, in the library of the Academy of Arts at Lyons (Fleck, *Wissenschaftl. Reise*, II. i. 90). Again, as pointing in the same direction, we may note that Benoist's *Hist. des Albigeois*, Paris, 1691, t. i. pp. 283–286, mentions the *Liber Apoc. Joannis aut Interrog. S. Joannis et Respons. Dom. Christi* as a secret book, brought by a certain Catharist bishop Nazarius out of Bulgaria into France. This relic of Bulgarian Manicheism will be found in Thilo's *Apoc. N. T.* p. 884.

6. *Remains of the Sect and of its Literature.*—It may be naturally asked, Are there now any remains of this once powerful and widely spread sect? We believe there are, and that in the Yezedees, or Devil-worshippers of Mosul, and the Ansaires of Syria, we have their direct representatives, while mingled with the doctrines of the Sabians or Hemerobaptistae, who still linger in the neighbourhood of Harran, we have a large Manichean element. A thorough examination of this point would however require a separate article. We can only refer to Badger's *Nestorians*, t. i. c. ix. x.; Lyde's *Asian Mystery*, and Layard's *Nineveh*, c. ix., as confirming this view by several interesting facts, cf. also *Notes sur les Sectes de Kurdistan*, par T. Gilbert, in *Jour. Asiat.* 1873, t. ii. p. 393. Cahier also maintains in *Mel. Archéol.* i. 148, that the Bogomili and the Massalians, branches of the same sect, still exist in Russia.

We still possess some specimens of their literature, and we are persuaded that a critical examination of Mahometan MSS., and that complete investigation of the interior state of Western and Central Asia which yet awaits us, will reveal them in still larger abundance (Beausob. *Hist. Man.* t. i. p. 366, and note \*). Thus to omit the Apocryphal Gospels, to which we have already referred, Renan, as mentioned above, published in 1853, in the *Jour. Asiat.* a document out of the Syriac, called the Apocalypse of Adam, which he shewed to be one of those brought by the Manicheans into Armenia in 590 A.D., and condemned in the celebrated Gelasian decree [GELASIVS]. This book was very widely spread in the East, was known to Eutychiuss, Elmacin, El-Kesai, and other historians, Christian and Mussulman, and may be traced in *Chronic.* of Dionysius Telmebar, published by Fullberg, pp. 79–83, and in the Armenian histories of Samuel of Ani, and of Mekhitar of Airwauk, written so late as the close of the 13th century (cf. Brosset, *Mém.* 5 in *Jour. Acad. St. Pétersb.* 1869, t. xiii.). Again, according to Cureton, *Spicileg. Syriac.* p. 79,



Colonel Chesney discovered a MS. of their *The-saurus Revivicationis*, mentioned by Tollius. It may have been identical with the *Spelunca The-saurorum* analysed by Assem. *Bib. Orient.* i. 498, iii. 281. Some of the latest inquirers too have recognised the influence of the sect upon Mahometan doctrines, literature, and ritual. See F. von Hellwald's *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 140, Augsburg, 1877; A. Kremer's *Culturgeschichte des Orients*, ii. 169, and *Culturgeschichtl. Streif-züge*, pp. 35-41.

A further discussion of this point would extend this article beyond its proper limits, and indeed the complete materials for such an inquiry are still wanting. We have already noted the leading authorities on the subject. Beausobre and Lardner amply represent the learning of the last century, and exhaust what can be said by investigating the Fathers. But no student can now be regarded as up to the knowledge of our times unless he has added thereto the study of the works of Neander, Baur, Gieseler (in his history, and more definitely in an article in *Stud. u. Crit.* i. iii. 599-620), Chwolohn, Lassen, Weber, not to speak of those of Rawlinson, Müller, and of our other great Orientalists. The work of Baur, so often quoted by us, has the merit of first during this century bringing clearly into view the Buddhist element in Manichæism, but it will be found to have been most strikingly anticipated by a monk in the last century, viz. in Aug. Ant. Georgii *Alphabet. Tibetan.* pp. 267-293, 390-401 *et passim*, and in *De Miraculis S. Coluthi*, præf. pp. cci.-cccvi. note. Flügel's *Mani*, to which this article owes much, is most exhaustive, and sheds the latest light on the question. For a comprehensive exposition and history combined of the sect the reader may consult Neander, *Eccles. Hist.* Bohn's ed. ii. 157-195, iv. 487-502, vi. 349-362. The chapters in Gieseler dealing with the subject are, of course, laden with authorities. Fabricius, in the *Biblioth. Græc.*, gives an almost complete list of the writers who have treated of the Manichæan sect, not only among the Fathers, but in later times. The works of Titus of Bostra, which are noted by Fabricius as defective, have now been completed, the missing books having been found among the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum. The reader may also consult Scheckenburger in *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1833, iii. 890; Jac. Matter, *Hist. du Gnosticisme*, t. ii. sec. iii. ch. 3; Kessler, *Untersuch. zur Genesis der Manichäisch. Religionssystem*, 1876. Bishop Lightfoot's *Colossians*, pp. 390-396; and Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, t. v. p. 278, take a different view of the influence of Buddhism from that advocated by Baur, Neander, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift*, x. 103. Le Page Renouf in *Home and Foreign Review*, iii. 143 sq. (1863), and in the *Academy*, 1873, p. 399, Lightfoot, and Zeller would apparently dispute any important Indian influence upon either Essenism or Manichæism or any other movement in Western Asia or Europe during the early centuries of the Christian era. They have overlooked the case of the Mithraic Cult, and also a series of articles which establishes this connexion by Colebrooke, *Life and Essays*, t. i. 309, t. iii. 399, when treating of decimal notation, astronomy, and algebra among Greeks and Indians (cf. a *Mém.* by Woepké on the Propagation of Indian Cyphers

in *Jour. Asiatique* for 1863, t. i. p. 247, 458; cf. *Mém.* par M. Martin, *Rev. Arch.* Dec. 1856, Jan. 1857). There it is maintained that Neo-Pythagoreans, like Porphyry, introduced the decimal notation from India centuries before the Arabs did so. If, then, they borrowed arithmetical and astronomical ideas from India, it is not likely they overlooked their philosophy. [G. T. S.]

**MANICHÆUS**, Hibernian, mentioned in the tract *De Mirabilibus Sanctæ Scripturæ* (l. ii. c. 4), written by the Irish monk Augustine, but often ascribed to St. Augustine of Hippo and included amongst his works (Ben. ed. 1679-1700, tom. iii. append.). The author, in treating of the cycle of 532 years, says the death of Manichæus "Hibernensium . . . inter caeteros sapientes" was coincident with the last year of the eleventh cycle, the tenth having ended 92 years after the crucifixion, i. e. A. D. 120. This emerges in A. D. 652, the year when Manchenus abbat of Meanadrocht died (*Ann. Tig.*) [MANCHENUS (1)] (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vii. 516; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* c. 3; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 543, *Ind. Chron.* A. D. 652; Lanigan, *H. Ir.* iii. 30.) [J. G.]

**MANSUETUS (1) (MANSUY)**, first bishop of Toul (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. 958; see also Tillem. iv. 501 and Ceill. xii. 886). He is represented as a Scot or Irishman, who became disciple of St. Peter, and was sent by him to be bishop of Toul, and to convert the Leuci; after much preaching and miracles he died about A. D. 89. If there be any truth in the legend, some Irishman had probably found his way to Toul in the 4th or 5th century, assumed a Latin name, and preached there, the Petrine mission being a natural mediæval idea. The chief authority is *Vita S. Mansueti*, by Adso, abbat of Montier-en-Der, in the 10th century, and printed by Bosquet (*H. E. Gall.* i. pt. ii. 23 sq.), the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 3 Sept. i. 615-658, with another Life, and long preface and appendices), and Calmet (*H. E. et C. de Lorr.* i. 86 sq., with dissertation in Pref. t. i. xxvii. sq.). He is probably to be distinguished from the British bishop Mansuetus, who assisted at the Council of Tours A. D. 461 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 72). His feast is Sept. 3, and Dempster ascribes to him *De Apostolicis traditionibus*. [J. G.]

**MANSUETUS (2)**, the first Breton bishop recorded; he was at the council of Tours in 461 (Mansi, vii. 947; Tillem. xvi. 399). He may have been bishop of Aleth (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 73, 289). [C. W. B.]

**MANSUETUS (3)**, bishop of Milan, an active opponent of the Monothelites. In 679 he presided in a council at Milan. The synodic epistle addressed in his name to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus has been assigned to Damianus bishop of Pavia (Paul. *Diac. Gest. Lang.* vi. 4). Baronius in his *Roman Martyrology* (Ap. 12, note on Damianus) takes exception to this assignment, but in his *Annals* (ann. 679, iv.; cf. *Pagi.* ann. 679. v.) his opinion appears modified. The epistle, which is accompanied by an *Expositio Fidei*, was cited at the council of Constantinople in 680 (Mansi. xi. 203) and is also printed among the works of Damianus (*Pat.*

*Lat.* lxxxvii. 1261). It severely reproves the Monothelites and praises the Lombard kings Percharit or Bertarid and Cunibert (as to whom *vid.* Paul. Diac. *G. L.* v. 33, 37, 39). In the same year Mansuetus attended Agatho's council at Rome (Mansi, xi. 306, 779). His accession is placed in 672, and his death 19 Feb. 681 (Ughelli, iv. 68; Cappelletti, xi. 133, 302). Cappelletti reckons him the 39th bishop of the see, and he stands between Ampelius and Benedict. He was honoured on Feb. 19 (*Mart. Rom.*) and commemorated locally on Sep. 2 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 19 Feb. iii. 135). Notices of Mansuetus occur in Cave (i. 595), Tiraboschi (*Storia d. Letterat. Ital.* t. iii. 188, ed. 1833), Ceillier (xii. 942). Bosca (*Mart. Mediol.* Feb. 19) gives his metrical epitaph. [T. W. D.]

**MANTHANEUS (1)** (MANTANIUS, MONTANIUS), a Christian imprisoned in Carthage under Decian persecution A.D. 250, who on his release went to CELERINUS at Rome. (Cyp. *Ep.* xxi.) [E. W. B.]

**MANTHANEUS (2)** (MONTANUS) (Fell), Afr. Bp. 2nd Syn. Carth. A.D. 252. (Cyp. *Ep.* 57.) [E. W. B.]

**MAPPALICUS**, Carthaginian martyr in Decian persecution; died under reiterated torture before the proconsul (Cyp. *Ep.* 10). In *Ep.* 22 is quoted by Lucianus as one of those who commanded the restoration of the lapsed; but, according to Cyprian, *Ep.* 27, only of his own mother and sister. Was commemorated in the African church: see ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

**MAPPINIUS** (MAPINIUS), bishop of Rheims, represented at the council of Orleans in 549 by his archdeacon Protadius (Mansi, ix. 138). Two undated letters of his are extant. One is addressed to Nicetius bishop of Trèves, explaining his absence from a council at Toul, cir. 550, viz. because he was not made acquainted with its object in time. It is printed in Mansi (ix. 147) and in the appendix to Gregory of Tours (*Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1165), and it is of importance as being our only information with respect to the council of Toul. The other, a eulogistic letter to Villicus bishop of Metz, is given by Duchesne (*Scriptor.* i. 860). Notices of Mappinius will be found in *Gall. Chr.* (ix. 14), Ceillier (xi. 206), Dupin (t. i. p. 699, ed. 1722), *Hist. Litt. de la Fr.* (iii. 306). [T. W. D.]

**MARA**, son of Serapion, a Syrian Christian of Samosata. In Cureton's *Spicileg. Syriac.* there is a letter addressed by him to his son Serapion, who is possibly the bishop of Antioch in succession to Maximinus, A.D. 190. Cureton hesitates for a date between the end of the 1st and the last half of the 2nd century. He inclines to the latter, as it was probably written when the Sibylline verses were currently quoted. It places Pythagoras and Christ much on the same level, a common view among the eclectic systems of Syria (cf. MANES). (See Cureton's *Spicil. Syriac.* and his notes for a full discussion of the subject; cf. Renan, *Jour. Asiat.* 1852, t. xix. 4 sér. p. 328; Wright's *Cat. Syr. MSS. in Brit. Mus.* p. 1159.) [G. T. S.]

**MAR ABBAS CATINA** (as Quatremère and Renan write the name, Catina meaning

subtil; MAR İBAS DE CATİNA, Fréret; MARİBAS CATİNENSİS), an early historian of Armenia, whose works are largely used by Moses of Choren in his *Hist. of Armenia*. He is represented as living about 150 years B.C., under Mithridates I. Some French critics have regarded him as a fabulous character, as Fréret (*Opp.* t. xii. p. 207-9) and Quatremère (in *Jour. des Savans*, 1850, p. 364). Langlois, on the contrary, regards him as a real historian, who lived however in the first centuries of our era. Renan goes further and maintains that he was a Christian of the school of Edessa. His works were known to Jerome and are cited by him in his *Commentary on Ezech.* cap. i. They were extant as late as the 9th century, as they are used to fill up blanks in the narrative of Moses Choren. by John cathol. of Armenia, in a history of Armenia, which was analysed for the first time by M. E. Bore, in a mém. *Sur l'action du Christ. sur la Société Armén.*, in the *Jour. Asiat.* 1836, t. i. p. 227; Saint Martin has since translated it; cf. p. 14 thereof with Moses Chor. i. 20. (Langlois, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* t. v. part. ii. p. 3-53; where his remains are elaborately edited; *Jour. Asiatique*, 1852, t. xix. p. 52; Karékin, *Hist. de la Litt. Armén.*; Renan's *Hist. des Lang. Sémit.* p. 262; Langlois, *Bull. de l'Acad. de St. Pétersbourg*, t. iii. p. 531-583; M. Brosset in *Mém. Acad. de St. Pétersbourg*, 1869, No. 5, p. 25.) [G. T. S.]

**MARANA** and **CYRA**, two ladies of birth and education of Beroea in Syria, who in their youth devoted themselves to a solitary life of the extremest austerity, which they had persevered in for forty-two years when Theodoret wrote his *Religiosa Historia*. According to Theodoret these ladies left their home, with some female servants whom they had inspired with the same ascetic fervour, and built for themselves a small stone enclosure, open to the sky, the door of which they closed up with mud and stones, their only means of communication with the outer world being a small window through which they took in their food. Only females were allowed to converse with Marana, and that only at Easter, —Cyra no one had ever heard speak. For their maidens a small hovel was constructed within earshot of their enclosure, so that they could encourage them by their example and by their words to a life of prayer and holy love. Theodoret states that he often visited these recluses, and that in honour of his priestly office they unrolled their door and admitted him into the enclosure, which he found devoid of any protection against the extremities of heat or cold, rain or snow. The heads and the whole of the upper part of the bodies of the holy women were enveloped in long hoods, entirely concealing their faces, breasts, and hands. They wore chains of iron round their necks, waists, and wrists, of such weight as to prevent Cyra, who was of weak frame, from raising herself upright. These instruments of torture they laid aside at Theodoret's request, but resumed them after he had taken his leave. Their fastings equalled in length those of Moses and David. Fired with a desire to visit holy sites, they made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, not eating once on the journey thither nor on their return, and only breaking their fast at Jerusalem. They practised the same rigid ab-

stinence on a second pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Thecla at the Isaurian Seleucia. Marana and Cyra are commemorated in the Greek martyrology on Feb. 28th, in the Roman on Aug. 3rd. (Theod. *Hist. Reliq.* c. 29; Basil. *Menol.* Feb. 28; Tillem. ii. 64; Ceill. x. 63.) [E. V.]

**MARANAS SCHOLASTICUS**, an advocate, probably of Constantinople, a warm and generous supporter of orthodoxy, who wrote to Theodoret in 449 expressing his sorrow at beholding the church oppressed and iniquity triumphant (Theod. *Epist.* 124). He may perhaps be identified with the Maranas who built and endowed a religious building, *θεῖος σηκός*, probably a monastery, in Theodoret's diocese. (Theod. *Epist.* 67.) [E. V.]

**MARATHONIUS**, eleventh bishop of Nicomedia, between Cecropius and Onesimus (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 587), and as Tillemont (vi. 397, 770) argues, in the reign of Julian. When paymaster of the pretorian guards, he amassed great wealth, which he employed in conducting institutions for the sick and poor, until at the suggestion of Eustathius bishop of Sebaste he gave up his secular employment and embraced the monastic life (Soz. iv. 27). As a deacon under Macedonius I. of Constantinople he was indefatigable in setting on foot monasteries as well as asylums for the poor (Soz. ii. 38; Soz. iv. 20). One of his monastic foundations at Constantinople long survived (Soz. iv. 27; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 47; Ducange, *Cypris Chr.* lib. iv. p. 110, ed. 1729). He was consecrated to his see by Macedonius, and he is said to have originally taught the opinions called after that prelate (Soz. ii. 45). His name thus occurs as a heresiarch in two works attributed to Chrysostom, *The Circus* and *The Sower* (*Pat. Gr.* lix. 569, lxi. 774). This use made of his name is attributed by Nicephorus (*l. c.*) to pecuniary support he gave to the propagation of the heresy (cf. Tillem. vi. 413). See further on Marathonium in Tillem. vi. 497, 527, 528, ix. 84; Ceillier, iv. 595. [C. H.]

#### MARBILIOTAE. [BARBELITAE.]

**MARCELLA**, a Roman lady in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, the friend of Jerome, by whose writings and especially from whose memoir of her (*Ep.* 127, ed. Vall.) she is chiefly known.

She was descended from the illustrious family of the Marcelli, and had great wealth. Her father died early, and her mother Albina was a widow when Athanasius came as an exile to Rome in 340. From Athanasius and his companions she heard of Antony and the monasteries of the Thebaid, and received her first impulse towards the ascetic life. She married, but her husband died after seven months, and she refused, with spirit and vivacity, a second marriage which was offered her by the distinguished and wealthy Cerealis, a man of consular rank but advanced in years. Her ascetic tendency was confirmed by the coming to Rome of the Egyptian monk Peter in 374. She was the first in the city to make the monastic profession. She continued to live with her mother in the palatial residence on the Aventine, but she denuded herself as far as possible of her wealth, giving the more costly

objects to her rich relations, and the rest to the poor, and living with the utmost simplicity. She was not, however, immoderate in her asceticism, and followed the counsels of her mother, from whose society she never departed.

When Jerome came to Rome in 382, she sought him out on account of his repute for biblical learning, and made him, at first against his will, her constant companion. A circle of ladies gathered round her, and her house became a kind of convent dedicated to the study of the Scriptures, and to psalmody and prayer. Marcella was eager for information, and would not accept any doubtful explanation, so that Jerome found himself in the presence of a judge rather than a disciple. At times also she took her teacher to task for his severity and quarrelsomeness (*Ep.* xxvii. 2, ed. Vall.). He wrote for her some fifteen different treatises on difficult passages of Scripture and church history; and on his departure from Rome in 385 hoped that she might have accompanied her intimate friends Paula and Eustochium to Palestine. The letter written to her by those two ladies on their settlement at Bethlehem (in Jerome, *Ep.* 46, ed. Vall.) invites her in glowing terms to come and enjoy with them the Holy Land; but she remained at Rome. After her mother's death in 387 she retired to a little house outside the city with her young friend Principia, and devoted her whole time to good works. She still had a keen interest in Jerome's theological pursuits, and when Rufinus came to Rome and disputes arose as to his translation of Origen's *περί Ἀρχῶν*, she threw herself eagerly into the controversy. Having, in conjunction with Pammachius and Oceanus, ascertained Jerome's view of the matter, she urged the pope Anastasius (400-403) to condemn Origen and his defenders; and, when he hesitated, went to him herself and pointed out the passages which, she contended, though veiled in Rufinus's translation, demanded the pope's condemnation. The result was that Anastasius completely yielded, and followed Theophilus of Alexandria in his condemnation of Origen and his upholders. "Of this glorious victory," says Jerome, "Marcella was the origin."

Marcella lived on till the sack of Rome by Alaric. The Goths, supposing her to be affecting poverty in order to conceal her wealth, treated her with personal violence, but at her entreaty spared Principia, and at last allowed them to take sanctuary in the church of St. Paul. Though her faith rose superior to her sufferings, so that she seemed hardly sensible of them, she only survived a few days, and died in the arms of Principia, leaving all that she had to the poor. (Jerome, ed. Vall. *Ep.* 23-29, 32, 34, 37-44, 46, 97, 127.) [W. H. F.]

**MARCELLIANI** (Soc. iv. 12), heretics. They were followers of Marcellus bishop of Ancyra [MARCELLUS (+)]. (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxii. *κατὰ Μαρκελλιανῶν*; St. Basil, *Ep.* 265 al. 293; *Ep.* 266 al. 321.) [C. H.]

**MARCELLINA** (1), a female teacher of the school of CARPOCRATES, who came to Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus (A.D. 156-167). She made many disciples, who wished to be known by the name of Gnostics, this being one of the earliest instances in which it is proved that a

sect claimed this title. Actually, however, they came to be known, like other sects, by the name of their chief teacher, and so are noticed by Celsus (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 62). They had pictures and images of Christ, said to have been copies of a likeness taken by Pontius Pilate. These they crowned, and in other ways honoured, in company with the images of Pythagoras, Plato, and other philosophers (Iren. i. 25). Epiphanius (*Haer.* 27, p. 107) copies what Irenaeus has said with one remarkable verbal change, that where Irenaeus speaks of Marcellina coming "to Rome," Epiphanius says "to us." From this it has been inferred (Lipsius, *Quellenkritik des Epiph.* p. 114, *der Ketzergeschichte*, p. 151) that Epiphanius has here made use of, besides Irenaeus, a document written at Rome, either the Syntagma of Hippolytus or else an earlier antiheterical treatise, from which Irenaeus himself had derived his information. [G. S.]

MARCELLINA (2), a sister of St. Ambrose, older than himself. His three books, "De Virginibus," were addressed to her, as having been written by her request. From iii. 1 we learn that she was admitted as a consecrated virgin at Rome on the feast of the Nativity, by pope Liberius, in the presence of a large concourse of virgins and others. The address made on that occasion by Liberius is recorded by Ambrose, from what Marcellina had often repeated to him. Ambrose praises her devotion, and advises her to relax the severity of her fasting. She is mentioned by him (*Ep.* v.) as having borne witness to the virginal purity of Indicia. It appears that a constant correspondence was kept up between the brother and sister. She is his "domina soror vitae atque oculis praefenda." Three of the most important of his letters are addressed to her: the first (*Ep.* xx.) describing the conflict of the bishop with Justina and her son, the younger Valentinian; the second (xxii.) announcing the discovery of the bodies of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius; the third (xli.) reporting a sermon in which he had reproved Theodosius on the subject of the punishment inflicted by the emperor on some Christians who had burnt a Jewish synagogue. In his discourse on the death of his brother Satyrus, Ambrose speaks of the warm family affection by which the three were bound together, and of the sister's grief (*De Excessu Satyri*, § 33, 76).

[J. Ll. D.]

MARCELLINA (3), a Roman lady, one of the circle gathered round Jerome during his stay at Rome 382-5. She is mentioned in his letter of farewell written from Portus to Asella. (Jerome, *Ep.* 45, ed Vall.) [W. H. F.]

MARCELLINUS (1), bishop of Rome after Caius from June 30, A.D. 296, to October 25 (?) A.D. 304, during 8 years, 3 months, and 25 days, elected after a vacancy of about two months. He is called Marcellianus by Jerome, Nicephorus, and in the *Chronogr. syntomon* (853). The dates above given are those of the Liberian Catalogue (354), and appear to be correct. In other records of the popes the chronology with respect to him is very uncertain, partly, it would seem, owing to a confusion between him and his successor Marcellus. He is omitted altogether in the Liberian *Depositio Episcoporum*, and *Depositio*

*Martyrum*. (See Lipsius, *Chronol. der röm. bisch.* p. 242.)

The main question about this pope is his conduct with regard to the persecution under Diocletian, with which he was contemporary. The Liberian Catalogue says only that it occurred in his time—"quo tempore fuit persecutio." Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 32) intimates only that he was in some way implicated in it,—*ὅν καὶ αὐτὸν κατελήφεν ὁ διωγμὸς*. The Felician Catalogue (530) has the following account. "In which time was a great persecution: within 30 days 16,000 persons of both sexes were crowned with martyrdom through divers provinces; in the course of it Marcellinus himself was led to sacrifice, that he might offer incense, which thing he also did; and having after a few days been brought to penitence, he was by the same Diocletian, for the faith of Christ, together with Claudius Quirinus and Antoninus, beheaded and crowned with martyrdom. The holy bodies lay for 26 days in the street by order of Diocletian; when the presbyter Marcellus collected by night the bodies of the saints, and buried them on the Salarian Way in the cemetery of Priscilla in a cell (*ubiculum*) which is to be seen to the present day, because the penitent (pope) himself had so ordered while he was being dragged to execution, in a crypt near the body of St. Crescentio, vii. Kal. Maii." As to the different parts of this narrative, the most probable view seems to be that the statements of his having offered incense and of the place of his burial are true, but that his martyrdom is at least doubtful. The evidence of his having yielded to the edict of Diocletian, which required all Christians to offer incense to the gods, is strong. This charge against him appears from Augustine to have been alleged afterwards as a known fact by the African Donatists. It is true that Augustine treats it as probably a calumny. His words are, in addressing the Donatist Petilianus, "You have bishops whom you are wont to accuse of having given up the sacred books; concerning whom we also are wont to reply, 'Either you do not prove your charge, and it affects no one, or you prove it, and it does not affect us.' For they bore their own burden, whether good or evil; we indeed believe it to have been good, but, of whatever kind it was, it was their own" (*Contr. lit. Petilian.* lib. ii. 202). Again, "What need is there to rebut the charges brought by him (i.e. Petilianus) against the bishops of the Roman church, whom he has inveighed against with incredible calumnies? Marcellinus, and his presbyters Melchides, Marcellus, and Sylvester, are accused by him of delivering up the sacred books and offering incense. But the charge is by no means proved by any documentary evidence."—And he goes on to contend that, the accusations being brought by enemies and unproved, it was the part of humanity to disbelieve them, even though they might be true (*De Unico Baptismo. c. Petilian.* c. 16, sect. 27). Further, Theoloret (*H. E.* i. 2) speaks apparently with praise of the conduct of Marcellinus in the persecution:—*τὸν ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ διαρέψαντα*. On these grounds Bower, in his history of the popes, having his reasons in this case for taking the line, with him unusual, of defending a pope, warmly maintains his innocence. But it is difficult to account for the introduction of the story into the pontifical annals

themselves, and its perpetuation as a tradition of the Roman church, unless there had been foundation for it. And it is to be observed that even Augustine, however anxious to rebut the charge, can only plead the absence of evidence; he does not deny the tradition, or even the possibility of its truth. The expression of Theodoret too, whatever its exact meaning, is too vague to count as evidence. It is different with the story of the martyrdom. There is indeed nothing improbable in the alleged fact itself, though it could not have been, as asserted, through the personal action of Diocletian himself that he suffered, since the emperor is known to have left Rome before the supposed date of the martyrdom, and Maximian to have been in command there. But he might very well have fallen a victim to the fourth edict of Diocletian, issued in 304, which initiated the bloodiest period of persecution, and the enforcement of which at Rome during that year appears from the martyrdoms of Parthenius and Calocenus, May 19, and of Blasilla, Sept. 22, mentioned in the Liberian *Depositio martyrum*. And it is quite possible in itself that Marcellinus might have recovered courage, and atoned for temporary weakness. But there is such a significant absence of early evidence of the alleged fact as to leave it not only unproved but improbable. His name does not appear at all in the Liberian *Depositio martyrum*, nor in Jerome's list. And, apart from the legendary complexion of the Felician narrative (including the statement of 16,000 having suffered within thirty days), the addition of the glory of martyrdom to popes in the later pontifical annals is of too frequent occurrence to have weight against the silence of earlier accounts. In this case there would be a natural motive in the desire to retrieve the credit of a pope whose fall could not be denied: and the expression in the earlier catalogue, "in which time there was a persecution," might easily suggest the addition that he suffered under it. Further, the omission of his name from the Liberian *Depositio Episcoporum*, as well as the *Depositio Martyrum*, might be due to his unfaithfulness, which had not really been atoned for by martyrdom. His burial in the cemetery of Priscilla instead of that of Callistus, where his predecessors since Zephyrinus (236) had been interred, may be accepted without hesitation, the Felician Catalogue being apparently trustworthy as to the burial-places of popes, and the place where he lay being spoken of as well known in the writer's day. But a reason for the change of place, independent of the alleged wish of the penitent pope himself, is given by De Rossi (*Rom. Sotteran.* ii. p. 105), viz. that the Christian cemeteries had been seized during the persecution, so that it had become necessary to construct a new one. It appears further (*Rom. Sotteran.* i. p. 203, ii. p. 105) that the Christians did not recover their sacred places till the time of pope Miltiades, to whom Maxentius restored them; and this circumstance accounts for the further fact, that of the two popes who intervened between Marcellinus and Miltiades, the first, Marcellus, was also buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, but the second, Eusebius, as well as Miltiades himself, again in that of Callistus (*Catal. Felic.*); though not in the old papal crypt, a new one, it is supposed, having been constructed by Miltiades. In recensions of

the pontifical annals later than the Felician the cemetery of Priscilla is said to have been acquired from a matron of that name by Marcellus, the successor of Marcellinus; but in the Felician account above given Marcellinus himself appears as having already secured a place of burial there. The cemetery itself was, according to De Rossi, one of the oldest in Rome; but he speaks of extensive workings in it at a deep level, which he supposes to have been made during the persecution, when the old burial-place of the faithful on the Appian Way was no longer available. It is to be observed that the Salarian Way, where the cemetery of Priscilla was, lies far removed from the Appian, being on the opposite side of the city, towards the north.

In the Roman Breviary (*in fest.* SS. Cleti et Marcellini, Ap. 26) a story is told of the self-condemnation of Marcellinus after his fall before a synod of bishops at Sinuessa, which is taken from the supposed acts of a council said to have been held there. According to these acts (of which there are varying editions, inconsistent with each other), the pope, having had a controversy with Urbanus, "pontifex" of the Capitol, was by him brought before Diocletian and Maximian, and accused of refusing to offer incense to the gods. Diocletian, having at first endeavoured to protect him, was at length induced to summon him to the temple of Vesta and Isis, where he consented to offer incense, having been seen doing so by many of his clergy, who had at first fled from the temple, but returned in time to witness the act. A synod of 300 bishops was subsequently assembled at Sinuessa (a town on the coast of Latium), in the "crypt of Cleopatra," where the witnesses above mentioned alleged the charge against him. At first he denied its truth, but, being urged by the synod to accuse and judge himself on the ground that the first see could be judged by no man, he at length did so, with ashes on his head; whereupon the bishops, accepting his judgment of himself, subscribed his condemnation. The lection on the subject in the Breviary modifies the story in the pope's favour, making him go of his own accord to the council (the number of bishops present being reduced to 180, which is again changed to "plurimi" in the modern editions), and openly confess his guilt with many tears; whereupon, it is said, no one dared to judge him, but all with one voice exclaimed, "Tuo te ore, non nostro iudicio, iudica; nam prima sedes a nemine iudicatur." Apart from the suspicious complexion of the whole story, the improbability of so many bishops having been able to meet in council during the heat of persecution, is apparent; and, further, the statement of Augustine that there existed in his time no evidence of the charge against Marcellinus, shews that he at any rate knew nothing of any synodal judgment. According to Von Döllinger (*Papst-Fabeln*, p. 50) the composition of this tale may be referred with tolerable certainty to the pontificate of Symmachus, 498-514. In the course of the violent contest between the party of Symmachus and that of the anti-pope Laurentius, heavy charges against Symmachus were laid before king Theodoric, who directed that they should be investigated by a council. The party of Symmachus denied the competence of any such tribunal to condemn a pope; and

the present is not the only document which there is reason to think was forged by the party of Symmachus in order to establish their principle.

The present document was made use of by pope Nicolas I., A.D. 862, in his letter to the Greek emperor Michael (Hardouin, *Concil.* v. 155), in order to prove the illegality of the deposition of a prelate by his inferiors. On the other hand this case, as well as that of Liberius, was appealed to by Gerson and others in order to shew the possibility that a pope might fall from the faith, and that in such a case a council might be assembled without or against his authority.

Two spurious epistles are assigned to this pope by the Pseudo-Isidore; one on doctrinal subjects, to a bishop Salomon, the other, on the usual subject of the immunity of clergy from lay judgment, to the Eastern bishops. No genuine writings remain. [J. B.—y.]

**MARCELLINUS (2)** (MARCELLUS, Usuard), Apr. 20, 1st bishop and apostle of Embrun. The principal authority for his life is an anonymous biography in *Boll. Acta SS.* 20 Apr. ii. 750-5, which Mabillon (*De Re Dipl.* p. 179) believes to have been written in the 6th century, and the authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France* (iii. 44) not later than the first years of it, basing their opinion upon internal evidence. (See also Tillem. vii. 561, 778.) Marcellinus was born in Africa. Landing at Nice with two companions, Vincentius and Dominus, he preached through the Maritime Alps and came to Embrun, where he prosecuted his mission with much success. Eusebius bishop of Vercellae, with Aemilianus or Camelianus of Valence, consecrated him to the episcopate. The year of his death is uncertain, but cannot have been later than 374, since his successor, Artemius, was present at the council of Valence in that year. (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 1054.) [S. A. B.]

**MARCELLINUS (3)**, a Luciferian presbyter, who, in conjunction with Faustinus, drew up the *Libellus Precum*, cir. 383, for an account of which *vid.* FAUSTINUS (33), and cf. Ceillier, v. 150, Tillem. viii. 395, Cave, i. 279. [C. H.]

**MARCELLINUS (4)**, an African deacon mentioned by Augustine, cir. 403, in a letter to Macrobius (*Ep.* 108 al. 256, cap. 6, § 19). He had been a Catholic and was excommunicated by his own presbyter, upon which he went over to the Donatists, whose bishop Proculianus rebaptized him and admitted him to their diaconate, soon after which he was slain in a nocturnal brawl. In the Benedictine edition the deacon thus described is unnamed, the clause which calls him Marcellinus being considered an interpolation from *Ep.* 139 al. 158, § 2. (*Val.* the Benedictine preface to tom. ii. on the chronological order of the epistles, at *Epp.* 106-108.) [C. H.]

**MARCELLINUS (5)** (MARCELLUS), consul, with Probinus, at the time of the Dedication council of Antioch (*Athan. De Synod.* § 25), *i.e.* A.D. 341. He is called by some authors the father, and by others the grandfather, of the elder Melania [MELANIA (1)]; the father by

Jerome (*Chron. ann. Chr.* 377) and Palladius (*Laus. Hist.* cap. 117, "Marcelli consularis"); the grandfather by Paulinus of Nola (*ep.* 29 al. 10, § 6, "eam consulibus avis nobilem," § 8) and Rufinus (*Apol. in S. Hieron.* ii. 6 in *Pat. Lat.* xxi. 605). The Life of Rufinus in Vallarsi's edition (lib. i. cap. i. num. 7, § 5, in *Pat. Lat.* xxi. 85) discusses the discrepancy and the readings. Tillemont (x. 821) notices that the consul's period makes him too old to have been Melania's father. [C. H.]

**MARCELLINUS (6)**, the historian. See AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS. The edition of the text by V. Gardthausen, 2 vols., Teubner, Lipsiae, 1874-75, is the best yet published. The same scholar promises a larger edition, which has not yet appeared (1880). [J. W.]

**MARCELLINUS (7)**, FLAVIUS, a tribune and notary, *i.e.* an officer who, having held in the army the rank of tribune, was afterwards employed in the civil capacity of notary, an office of high position (Böcking, *Not. Dig. Occ.* p. 408). Salazar, in *Martyrol. Hispanicum*, says he was born at Toledo, but of this there is no evidence. Cassiodorus calls him *primicerius notariorum*. The two offices were frequently combined (*Aug. c. Gaud.* ii. 12). He was brother to Apringius, afterwards proconsul of Africa, and appears to have usually resided in that country, if not to have been a native of it, for in a letter addressed to him and to Anapsychia, his wife, St. Jerome recommends him to consult St. Augustine, as his bishop, on the subjects on which he desired information. He was a Christian and a man of high character, and a devout mind, taking much interest in theological matters. The letter mentioned above is a reply to one addressed to St. Jerome by Marcellinus from Africa, asking for an introduction at Rome to Oceanus, whom he calls "father," *i.e.* perhaps his senior, and for a solution of his difficulties concerning the origin of the soul. It refers also to the exegetical works of St. Jerome on Scripture (*Hieron. Ep.* 126; *Aug. Ep.* 134, 2; 166). It was written A.D. 410, and from the circumstance mentioned above we may suppose that Marcellinus was then meditating a voyage to Rome, but in the course of that year he was appointed by Honorius to preside over a commission of enquiry into the disputes between the Catholics and Donatists, an office for which he was singularly well qualified, and which on the whole he discharged with great moderation, good temper, and impartiality, though not without giving offence to the Donatist party, who accused him of bribery (*Aug. Ep.* 141; *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 11, 5). For an account of the conference, A.D. 411, see Vol. I. pp. 893, 894. In letters written during the following year, both to Marcellinus and Apringius, then proconsul, Augustine, while he deploras and condemns the violence of the Circumcellions, shewn in the murder of Restitutus and mutilation of Innocentius, exhorts them to shew forbearance towards these misguided fanatics (*Aug. Epp.* 133, 134, 139). Between Augustine and Marcellinus an intimate friendship subsisted, which the behaviour of the latter at the conference no doubt tended to strengthen, and not only were several letters exchanged between them,

but Augustine addressed to him his three books, *de Peccatorum meritis et Remissione*, his book *de Spiritu et Littera*, and the first two books of his great work *de Civitate Dei*, which he says that he undertook at his suggestion (*Aug. Retract.* ii. 37; *de Civ. Dei*, i. praef. ii. 1). Excepting letters which refer to the conference (*Epp.* 128, 129) the correspondence appears to have been carried on chiefly during the year 412. It arose mainly out of the anxiety of Marcellinus on behalf of his friend Volusianus, who, notwithstanding the efforts of his mother to induce him to become a Christian, was swayed to a contrary direction by the worldly society in which he lived. In the year 413 occurred the revolt of Heraclian, followed by his defeat and execution at Carthage (*Oros. Hist.* vii. 24). Marinus, count of Africa, by whom Heraclian was defeated, either on the pretext that Marcellinus had taken part with the rebels, or being urged on by the Donatist party, and, as Orosius insinuates, bribed by them, arrested and imprisoned both Marcellinus and Apringius. Several of the bishops of Africa joined in a letter of intercession on behalf of the prisoners, whose prayer Caecilianus affected to support, and he even paid an express visit to Augustine, giving him the strongest hope that they would be released, with solemn asseverations of absence of all hostility on his own part. But on the following day, Sept. 15 or 16, they were both of them put to death. Augustine mentions the edifying behaviour of both the prisoners in their prison, of whom the elder had been a worldly-minded man, but the younger, Marcellinus, had lived a religious life (*Ep.* 151; *Hieron. adv. Pelag.* iii. 19). Marinus was deprived of his office and recalled to Rome, while the admirable behaviour of Marcellinus towards the Donatists was commemorated in an imperial decree (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 55). He is perhaps the person mentioned by Augustine (*De Unico Bapt.* ii. 30). He is regarded by the Roman church as a martyr, and his memory observed on April 6. (*Baronius, Ann.* A.D. 413, and *Mart. Rom.* Ap. 6; *Acta Sanct.* Ap. 6.)

[H. W. P.]

**MARCELLINUS (8)**, and his brother **MARCIANUS**, gentlemen of wealth and official rank at Antioch (*τιμωτάτοι καὶ εὐγενέστατοι*), intimate friends of Carteria [*CARTERIA*], and among those who were most warmly attached to Chrysostom. We have six letters addressed to them conjointly by Chrysostom. The Marcellinus to whom two letters are addressed (*Ep.* 31, 188) and the Marcian to whom there is one (*Ep.* 122) appear to have been different, but the point is open to question. (*Epp.* 19, 44, 65, 100, 129, 224, 226.)

[E. V.]

**MARCELLINUS (9)**, a lay friend of Chrysostom at Antioch, probably different from the above, from whom he wrote to announce his arrival at Cucusus in 404, speaking of the consolation he derived from the thought of his affection (*Chrysost. Ep.* 188); and again in 405, after a long silence, assuring him of his undiminished attachment (*Ep.* 188).

[E. V.]

**MARCELLINUS (10)**, a general in the government of Libya Pentapolis, to whom Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais in that country, addressed a letter in the name of his people.

Marcellinus was relinquishing the post, and Synesius testifies to his piety, his justice, and humanity (*Synes. ep.* 62 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvi. 1406). Tillemont (xii. 552, 553) thinks that the date was 413.

[C. H.]

**MARCELLINUS (11) COMES**, called by Cassiodorus (*De Instit. Div. Lit.* c. 17) "Illyricianus" and "patricii Justiniani cancellus," and said to have written four books on geography, which are not now extant, but are commended by Cassiodorus, has also composed a *Chronicon* from A.D. 379 to A.D. 534: a later hand has extended it to A.D. 557. He was evidently a Christian, and embodies many ecclesiastical notices in the secular annals of the empire, but of his own life nothing is known. It is inferred that he died after A.D. 534, when the *Chronicon* closes: the short preface recognises the work of Eusebius and Hieronymus, and in the *Chronicon* there is presented a fair conspectus of the chief events and persons in the church during the period. The principal editions are those of Schonhövius (Paris, 1546, 1575, with the recensions of Panvinius, Heidelb. 1588, and Scaliger, Lugd. Bat. 1606) and of Sirmondus (*Par.* 1619: *Bibl. Patr.* Lugd. 1677). The latter, as edited by Baunius (*Sirmond. Opp.* ii.), is published by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* li.) with Prolegomena. (*Cave, Hist. Lit.* i. 514, 1740; *Fabricius, Bibl. Lat.* v. 20, ed. Mansi, 1754; *Dupin, Hist.* i. 540, ed. 1722; *Ceillier*, xi. 98.)

[J. G.]

**MARCELLUS (1)**, African bishop at Syn. Carth. 4 sub Cyp. A.D. 254. (*Cyp. Ep.* 67.)

[E. W. B.]

**MARCELLUS (2)**, bishop of the famous Zama (Regia) in Numidia (made a colony by Hadrian); 53rd suffrage in *Sentt. Epp.* (Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 7.)

[E. W. B.]

**MARCELLUS (3)**, bishop of Rome probably from May 24, A.D. 307, to Jan. 15, A.D. 309, during 1 year, 7 months, and 20 days, the see having been vacant after the death of Marcellinus, for 2 years, 6 months, and 27 days (*Lipsius, Chronologie der röm. Bischöf.*). A vacancy of 7 years 6 months and 25 days, alleged by the Liberian Catalogue, is inconsistent with the dates given in the same catalogue for the death of Marcellinus and the accession of Marcellus, and on other grounds evidently erroneous. Lipsius accounts for the error by supposing a confusion in transcription of two distinct chronological statements in the original catalogues. In the existing edition we read,—

"Quo tempore fuit persecutio et cessavit episcopatum ann. vii., m. vi., d. xxv."

He conjectures that the original reading was,—

Quo tempore fuit persecutio ann. vii., m. vi., d. xxv.  
Et cessavit episcopatus ann. ii., m. vi., d. xxvii.;

and he holds that the duration thus assigned to the persecution, but supposed to have been transferred in transcription to the vacancy, may represent correctly the time from the first persecuting edict of Diocletian, Feb. 23, 303, to the edict of toleration issued by Galerius, which was probably between the months of July and November in 310, though it has been usual to



assign it to the following year. The duration of the episcopate of Marcellus given above, agrees with the Liberian Catalogue. The vacancy of more than two years may be well accounted for by the general state of confusion at Rome, when Maxentius assumed the purple in the interval, A.D. 306.

This pope appears as a martyr in the Roman Martyrology, and in the later recensions of the *Liber Pontificalis*, a story being told of him (which appears also in the Lectons of the Breviary for his feast, Jan. 16) to the effect that he was beaten with cudgels for refusing to sacrifice, by order of Maxentius, and afterwards condemned by him to tend the imperial horses as a slave; that, having been ransomed by his followers, he celebrated divine service in a house given him by a holy widow, called Lucina, which he had dedicated as a church; that, being discovered by Maxentius, he was again doomed to tend horses, clothed only in a sackcloth garment, in the church itself, which the tyrant had turned into a stable. No trace of this legend, or, indeed, of his being a martyr at all, appears in the earlier recensions of the Pontifical, including the Felician. But he is entitled "Confessor" in the martyrology of St. Jerome. The assertion of Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 14) that Maxentius, at the beginning of his reign, not only abstained from persecution, but even pretended to be a Christian himself, in order to gain favour with the common people, is strongly against the supposition of Marcellus having suffered under him on the ground alleged in the legend. But a light is thrown on the circumstances which probably led to his title of "Confessor" by the monumental inscriptions to him and his successor Eusebius, placed in their burial-places by pope Damasus. That to Marcellus (given in Pagi, *Critic. in Baron.* ad ann. 309; in *Actis S. Januar.*; and by De Rossi, *Rom. Sotter.* vi. p. 204) was as follows:

"Veridixit rector lapsi quia crimina flere  
Prædixit, miseris fuit omnibus hostis amarus.  
Hinc furor, hinc odium sequitur, discordia lites,  
Seditio, caedes; solvuntur foedera pacis.  
Crimen ob alterius, Christum qui in pace negavit,  
Finibus expulsus patriæ est ferite tyranni.  
Haec breviser Damasus voluit comperia referre  
Marcelli ut populus meritum cognoscere posset."

It would appear from these lines, together with those on Eusebius [see EUSEBIUS], that on the cessation of persecution at Rome conflicts had arisen in the Christian community as to the terms of readmission of the *lapsi* to communion; that Marcellus after his election had required a period of penance before absolution; that his stern discipline in this respect had evoked violent opposition, as was likely to be the case where the subjects of it were doubtless both numerous and influential; that the church had been split into parties in consequence, and riots, anarchy, and even bloodshed, had ensued; that "the tyrant" Maxentius had interposed in the interests of peace, and banished the pope, as the author of the discord. He was not really so, the inscription implies, but "another," for whose "crime" he suffered, *i.e.* the leader and instigator of the opposition, who had "denied Christ in time of peace" by condoning apostasy and subverting discipline after persecution had ceased. But Marcellus was made the victim, and thus was a

"confessor" (or, in the wider sense of the word, a "martyr"), if not strictly for the faith itself, at any rate for canonical discipline, and the honour of Christ. The "other" person referred to may be supposed with probability to have been the Heraclius spoken of in the inscription on Eusebius as having "forbidden the lapsi to mourn for their sins" (*vetuit lapsis peccata dolere*), and who, on the recurrence of riots and bloodshed among the Christians after the accession of Eusebius, was on that occasion banished by "the tyrant" as well as the pope—"Exemplo pariter pulsi feritate tyranni." It is not unlikely, from the way he is mentioned in this second inscription, that he had been elected as an antipope by the party of laxity after the death of Marcellus. As the last-named pope is not said in the Damantine inscription to have died in exile, as is said of Eusebius, and as he was certainly buried at Rome, like his predecessor in the cemetery of Priscilla on the Salarian Way (*Catal. Felic.*), he may be supposed to have been allowed to return to his see. He is said in some recensions of the Pontifical catalogue to have himself acquired the cemetery of Priscilla from a matron of that name. But see art. on MARCELLINUS. He is honoured as "pope and martyr" on Jan. 16, in the Roman Calendar. Two spurious epistles are assigned to him by the Pseudo-Isidore; one to the bishops of the province of Antioch on the authority of the Roman see; the other to Maxentius, warning him to desist from the persecution of Christians. [J. B.—y.]

MARCELLUS (4), bishop of Ancyra, believed to have been present at the synod held in that city, A.D. 315; but nothing can be proved from subscriptions doubtful in themselves. St. Athanasius, writing in A.D. 358 (*Hist. ad Mon.* 76), calls him an old man *then*; so that his age could have been no bar to his being *bishop* A.D. 315. He was certainly present, ten years afterwards, at the Nicene council, where he obtained a good report, as pope Julius tells the Eusebians (Mansi, ii. 1215), for having contended earnestly for the Catholic faith against the Arians. Later, in refuting the heterodox writings of Asterius, he was accused of falling himself into doctrines combining the errors of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata. Thus he taught, or appeared to teach, that the Son had no real personality, but was merely the external manifestation (*προφορικὸς λόγος*) of the Father: being called the Son of God, viewed as man only. But it is quite possible that his attachment to St. Athanasius, and to the orthodox cause, may have subjected his book to unfair criticism. Anyhow, the Eusebians, piqued at his absence, first from the synod of Tyre, and afterwards from the festivities at Jerusalem, A.D. 335, in honour of the dedication of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, called upon him then and there to render account of the opinions advanced in it, and to recant them; when, according to Socrates, they extorted a promise from him that he would burn the book that had given so much offence. For not having at once done this, he was deposed in the synod held at Constantinople by the chiefs of that party, the year following, in the month of February, by command of the emperor, when Eusebius of Nicomedia presided, and Eusebius of Caesarea was charged by the assembled bishops

with the task of refuting his work. Basil, who, in the words of Cardinal Newman, "united in his person the most varied learning with the most blameless life of all the semi-Arians," was appointed at the same time to the see vacated by him (Soc. i. 36). Condemned at Constantinople, Marcellus betook himself to Rome, and that, apparently, without loss of time. We can hardly be wrong in drawing this inference from his own words. In a letter addressed by him to his "blessed colleague Julius," and preserved by St. Epiphanius, though it bears no date, he tells the pope that, understanding he had been accused to him by letter, on the part of some that had been refuted by himself at Nicaea, and there condemned for heterodoxy, of holding opinions opposed to the teaching of the church, he had felt it his duty to come to Rome, and suggest to him to summon those who had written against him to confront him there, when he would be able to demonstrate their adherence to their old errors, and clear himself in the same breath. He had now passed a whole year and three months at Rome, waiting for their arrival in vain; although presbyters had been sent by Julius to engage them to come. He could wait for them no longer, but, before setting off, he was desirous of leaving with Julius a profession in writing of the faith he had learnt, and had been taught from the holy Scriptures, as proof that he had been falsely traduced. . .

Of his profession in due course. His letter would bring us past the death of Constantine—say, to A.D. 338, the year in which St. Athanasius was returning through north Italy from his first exile; and his returning would encourage Marcellus naturally to hope that he might get back also, all the more too from having been admitted to communion by Julius before leaving—the very thing which his letter was designed to effect. This, of course, we must not expect to find stated in his letter; but that letter throws so much light upon, as well as receives so much light from, all the subsequent events in which pope Julius figured, as an actor or otherwise, that we must not forget a word of it in passing to the account given of them in the writings of St. Athanasius, or by Julius himself in his well-known letter to the Eusebians, epitomised under art. JULIUS, in this volume, so far as relates to St. Athanasius and his opponents, with so much care: but with all that relates to Marcellus left out, as though more fitting to be supplied here. The fact is, Marcellus shewed himself an arch-intriguer unquestionably, whatever he may have been as a theologian. It must have been almost the first act of Julius, after his election, to receive Marcellus into communion; nor could he fail to be struck by the manner of his appeal. Marcellus could have scarcely left Rome when the Eusebian deputies, Macarius and two deacons, arrived, in the hope of persuading Julius to declare for Pistus, their nominee, and join them in unseating St. Athanasius, who had returned from exile, without having been synodically restored. They could have scarcely made known their mission, when presbyters arrived from Alexandria to unmask their artifices and defeat their aims. Taken aback, they beat a precipitate retreat; declaring, however, that they would be prepared at any moment to sub-

stantiate their charges against St. Athanasius, if a council were held. The word "council" had hardly been pronounced before St. Athanasius was informed of it by Julius, told it might meet where he would; and he set off at once for Rome to be ready for it (*Hist. ad Monach.* § 9-11), as might have been expected. Julius, on his part, was ready for anything that would bring grist to his mill. We must now go to his well-known letter for the rest; for, whenever it was written, it goes back to the arrival of St. Athanasius in Rome, and reports all the steps taken by himself from that point.

Taken as a whole, this epistle reads far more like the work of two persons than one. There are parts of it which may be read side by side with the natural and hearty letter of Julius to the Alexandrians (*Apol. c. Arian.* § 52), congratulating them on the return of their great prelate, and be pronounced conclusive testimony to their joint authorship. Again, there are parts of it equally which such juxtaposition alone suggests must have been inspired by a different spirit; though, very possibly, traced by the same pen. Anyhow, there are two things which it places beyond controversy: 1, that Marcellus was at Rome then, having been admitted by Julius to communion on a previous visit; and 2, that Julius had himself followed the exact precedent suggested by Marcellus at his previous visit, and adopted in his case, viz. that of sending presbyters to the Eusebians—this time we are told their names, Elpidius and Philoxenus—with the object of bringing them to Rome to confront an opponent who was already there. Nothing can be clearer, from his own words, than that the arrival of St. Athanasius at Rome, and the fixing of the synod to Rome, preceded the despatch of the first letter of Julius to the Eusebians by his two presbyters, announcing—not repeating—and announcing, not merely that their suggestion of a synod would be carried out, but that its time and place had been definitely fixed without consulting them. No wonder that their reply to this letter should have been—as even Sozomen admits it was—piquant in the extreme (*E. H.* iii. 8). But there is yet a further point in this letter of Julius, which more strictly concerns us here, and which perhaps has not been hitherto treated to the prominence which it deserves. St. Athanasius twice says that the synod of more than fifty bishops then assembled in Rome, indignant at the answer brought back from the Eusebians by his two presbyters, dictated to Julius the terms of his rejoinder, and that it was in fact more theirs than his (*Apol. c. Ar.* § 20, and then at the end of the letter). But Julius himself, strange to say (§ 26), assures his correspondents that he would not allow any to write but himself, though, he adds, he expressed the opinions of the Italian episcopate, and that in a strain of which they might well be supposed to have approved. Yet there is one passage towards its close which is couched in anything but an indignant tone, as it gives the Eusebians to understand that, even then, if they will but come forward and make good their charges, the whole question shall be re-opened, and the acquitted shall be re-tried, with their full assent (§ 34-5). If it could be proved that St. Athanasius had been shewn this epistle before it was sent off, we might have

been amazed that no word of comment on this passage should have escaped him. But the fact is, he nowhere deposes to having seen the original, and merely classes it with other documents, of which sooner or later he had obtained copies (§ 2, *ad f.*). In this way it need not have been actually perused by him till after his second return from exile, when adverse criticism of any part of it would have been unwise. Coming indeed from Julius himself, this proposal was natural enough, in spite of all the apparent bluster that precedes it. The bluster was for the fifty bishops at his back: the proposal was for adversaries who, without reference to the ally that they had in the emperor, had, in the letter that he was answering, beyond any question, hit him hard. The precedent of Marcellus they would have jeered at had it been invoked. Their precedents were facts of acknowledged weight. Cornelius had, in a large gathering of bishops at Rome, condemned Novatianism A.D. 251, and the East had acquiesced. The Easterns had, in a large gathering of bishops at Antioch, condemned the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, and the West had acquiesced, A.D. 269. But if he himself had invoked the last Roman synod, it would have covered him with confusion, for there, though Melchisedes gave judgment in strong terms for Caecilian, and all present shared his opinion, Donatus appealed from their sentence, and his appeal was allowed. Julius, as might have been expected, was not keen to refer to this precedent, yet neither was he forgetful of it. He took care to keep his acts within it if not his words. Neither he nor his bishops ventured to restore Marcellus or St. Athanasius to their respective sees. They merely gave their collective voice for admitting them to communion, and declared their innocence. Moreover, the precedent of the council of Arles was repeated, when the council of Sardica was convened. Let us now enquire what, more particularly, this council of Rome, and then afterwards that of Sardica, did for Marcellus. First, Julius, in his rejoinder to the Eusebians, tells them that he *had been*\* careful to tell them—in his former letter that is—that after they had written against him *ὡς ἀσεβούντος εἰς τὸν Χριστόν*, Marcellus had assured him on reaching Rome, that what they had written against him was false: nevertheless, that having been challenged by them (*παρ' ὑμῶν*, which is the reading of Mansi, confirmed by the letter of Marcellus himself, whereas *παρ' ὑμῶν*, which is the reading of Coustans and the Benedictines, is flatly contradicted by what Marcellus there states) to speak on the faith, he delivered himself with so much candour in words of his own, that he could not but feel certain of his holding nothing outside the truth, as he had in particular expressed himself about the Lord Jesus in exact harmony with the teaching of the church, and averred that these were views which he had long since held. Vincentius and Vito, moreover, the presbyters who represented his predecessor at Nicaea, and were still alive—the synod, indeed, on whose behalf he was then writing, met, as St. Athanasius tells us (*Apol. c. Arian. § 20*), in the church of the latter—“added their testimony to his, when he stated

that he had opposed the Arians then, and from that time forth. How, then, after all these proofs of his orthodoxy, should he have done otherwise than regard him as a bishop, as he had done, and not refuse him communion?” (*ib. § 32*). In this letter it is obvious Julius repeats what he had already told them in his previous letter: referring to the profession and explanations given him by Marcellus—as stated by Marcellus himself—on his leaving Rome, without any hint of a synod that had met, or was going to meet, in his case. Julius, it is clear, admitted him to communion at that time; and now the synod, in whose name he was writing, formally declared his innocence. Further, it was on this occasion that Marcellus testified to Julius and to the assembled bishops, that his attempt to return to Ancyra, A.D. 338–9, had only provoked the same flagrant scenes that had been re-enacted at Alexandria more recently, when St. Athanasius was expelled (*ib. § 33*, comp. *St. Hil. Frag. iii. 9*).

Passing from this letter to that of the council of Sardica, which St. Athanasius also transcribes at length, addressed to all bishops and ministers of the Catholic church in all lands, we may commence by noticing a statement made by St. Athanasius about Marcellus in his history to the monks (§ 6), which would seem as little consistent with the words of Marcellus himself already quoted, as with the words of the Sardinian bishops that are still to follow. “Marcellus,” he says, “went to Rome, made his apology, and then, at their request, gave them his faith in writing, of which also the Sardinian council approved.” It so happens that as Julius never once refers to his book, in like manner the Sardicans never once refer to his profession. They grounded their verdict in his favour on the book which Eusebius had maligned, but which they pronounced consistent with orthodoxy. They said, “they had read his book:” *who but Marcellus could have put it into their hands?* “and detected the cunning of Eusebius and his friends. For what he had put forward as queries, they had calumniated him as having professed. Hence, read by the light of what had preceded and followed, his faith was found to be sound. For he had not, as they affirmed, attributed to the Word of God a beginning from Mary, nor any end to His kingdom; but had stated His kingdom to be without beginning or end” (*Apol. c. Arian. § 47*). On these grounds they declared him faultless and free from taint. And St. Hilary, who says nothing of his profession either, tells us he had the same book that they examined by him, and bears them out in their decision on it; adding that Marcellus was never again tried or condemned in any subsequent synod (*Frag. ii. 21–23*). Against such testimony—living, competent, and explicit—as this, it is plainly not for moderns to contend, the book being no longer extant to speak for itself; and therefore we must—in spite of all Cave may urge to the contrary (*Hist. Lit. i. 202*), and after him, Cardinal Newman (*Library of the Fathers*, xix. 503), and after him, the learned writer of *Art. EUSEBIUS*, Vol. II. 342, of this work—conclude with Montfaucon (*Diatr. c. iii.*), that strong as the extracts from it may read in Eusebius, whose party bias betrays itself in every line, “read by the light of what precedes and

\* In the *Library of the Fathers*, vol. xiii. p. 52: this is translated as in present time.

follows," in the words of the Sardican fathers, they may all be interpreted in a sense not conflicting with orthodoxy. St. Hilary, moreover, speaks with unwonted weight, as he proclaims the fact loudly that Marcellus subsequently by some rash utterances of his, and evident sympathy with his former disciple, Photinus, the ejected from Sirmium, came to be suspected of heretical leanings by all at last; and notably, though privately, put out of communion by St. Athanasius, on which Marcellus abstained from church himself (*Frag.* ii. 23). What those rash utterances were, we shall probably never know; but it is just possible that one of them was in the mind of St. Hilary when he said of him frankly to Constantius: "Hinc Marcellus Verbum Dei cum legit, nescit." And then adds: "Hinc Photinus hominem Jesum Christum cum loquitur, ignorat," classing them both in the same category. In the work of St. Epiphanius against heresies, on the other hand, the Photinians rank first (71), and the Marcellians follow (72); yet even there the inference is, that the latter had been led astray by the former. St. Epiphanius makes no mention of the work of Eusebius against Marcellus, but he gives extracts from another work against him by Acacius, the successor of Eusebius at Caesarea—just to be fair, as he says, not because he thinks it a bit more conclusive than the Sardican fathers thought the work of Eusebius. But to the profession given by Marcellus in writing to pope Julius, he takes exception at starting—strange to say—on the principle that "Qui s'excuse, s'accuse." Then, after producing it, he still more strangely comments on it as follows: "Now whether this document be faultless or not, those who read it must judge for themselves; and those who can exactly fathom its contents must, in the latter case, point out its errors. For we are desirous of limiting ourselves to say no more than we know, or have been told. For though it be fair enough, as it stands, still persons coming across it will reflect that it could have been put together for no trivial or chance purpose, still less with the object of defending himself, had he never let drop any perplexing words, making it necessary for him to explain them. Thus it might be, that having gone wrong so far, he composed this document to set himself straight and regain confidence. Or, again, he may have drawn it up in these words, on purpose to divert attention from other expressions of his, and be the means of staying any synodical process against him, endangering his exclusion from the bench of bishops and the clergy-roll."

St. Epiphanius is here commenting on what both Marcellus himself and St. Athanasius call his "ἔγγραφοι πιστιν," which he says expressly that he gave to pope Julius before leaving Rome, and which St. Epiphanius here gives at full length. St. Athanasius says it was exhibited to the Roman and Sardican councils as well; but of this, beyond his assertion, we have no distinct proof in either case. Meanwhile, before testing it on its own merits, let us invite special attention to this fact, that far from standing alone, it is but one of three different professions exhibited at different times on behalf of Marcellus—all characterized by the same suspicious surroundings, as will be shewn in due course. The two first are given by St. Epi-

phanus;<sup>b</sup> the third was exhumed by Montfaucon. Having dealt with the first on a former occasion, it will be perhaps allowed me to repeat, in the interests of creeds in general, what I there said ('Athanasian Creed,' pp. 168-75). Dr. Heurtley extracted this creed from Epiphanius, and found a place for it in his excellent little work *De Fide et Symbolo*, p. 24, as the earliest specimen of a Western creed, having been the first to call attention to its being cast in that mould. But exception may be taken to the title prefixed to it—'Symbolum Romanum'—as such distinctions do not seem customary at that time among local creeds. St. Augustine calls his own work, *De Fide et Symbolo*—not *Symbolo Africano*. St. Maximus of Turin entitles his homilies, *De Traditione Symboli*. St. Nicetas of Aquileia, writing after Rufinus, his comment: *Explanatio Symboli*. By "the creed" was meant, in all these cases, the baptismal creed. And this creed, produced by Marcellus, was as certainly the baptismal creed of the West, as it was not that of the local church of Rome (*ib.* pp. 89-133). Into this question, indeed, this is not the place for further inquiry; but, in point of fact, this very case dispenses us from further proof. For, had it been the creed of the church of Rome, would not St. Athanasius have characterized it as such; would not Julius have recognised and applauded the adoption of his own formula? No doubt Marcellus picked it up in the Danubian provinces, or at Aquileia, in his way to Rome. It is identical with the creed, commented upon by St. Augustine, which follows it in the work of Dr. Heurtley, saving in the expression τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, &c., which is suspiciously peculiar, and may well have excited misgivings in the mind of St. Epiphanius. Now this creed, it should be noticed, Marcellus never ventures to call the creed of his own church, yet in designating it "what he had been taught by his spiritual fathers, had learnt from holy Scripture, and preached in church," he must have meant that Julius should gather it was; and he begs Julius to enclose copies of it to those bishops with whom he was corresponding, in order that any to whom he was unknown might be disabused of every wrong notion they might have formed of him from hostile statements. By way of preface to it, he recites the principal errors held by his enemies to condemn them; and affirms several points on which his own faith had been questioned. Yet, strange to say, whether by his own contrivance or otherwise, this profession of his was never made public, or appealed to by him again. It satisfied Julius, and Julius may have communicated it to those bishops of the West with whom he was corresponding, and to St. Athanasius on his arrival in Rome: but it cannot be proved to have been formally brought before the fifty bishops afterwards assembled there, and there is no proof that it was so much as named at Sardica. In dealing with Easterns, anyhow, the creed in which he professes his faith was that of Nicea. This profession of his is extant as well as the other, and was being employed by his disciples in their own justification, when it was placed in the hands of St. Epiphanius. It is headed 'Inscription of the faith of Marcellus.' Yet it can hardly be thought accidental that his

<sup>b</sup> *Haer.* lxxii.

own assent is not explicitly given by subscription either to this or the third formula, produced on his behalf.

Montfaucon has fallen into a singular, though by no means inexplicable, mistake respecting it. Preoccupied with his own discovery, he seeks to connect it with this second profession, with which it has nothing whatever to do; and actually quotes a long passage from a letter addressed by St. Basil to three bishops of Egypt<sup>c</sup> on the subject of his own discovery—the third profession—as though it had been addressed to those Diocæsarean bishops, for whose enlightenment this second profession was intended. This oversight has led him into wild confusion about its date. St. Epiphanius nowhere speaks of it as a *recent* utterance. He merely gives it the place which it occupies in his own work, that it may serve for an antidote to the hostile criticisms of Acacius immediately preceding it; and prefaces it by saying it had been put into his hands by some friends of his, who had obtained it from certain disciples of Marcellus that had survived him, being a vindication of his faith by himself. Internal, in default of external, evidence, would suggest its date to be close upon that of his first profession: 1, because Marcellus, being absent, is nowhere named in it; 2, because it reads like the effusion of a widowed church; 3, because it speaks of being in possession of communicatory letters from St. Athanasius, which the church of Ancyra was of course then; 4, because the first signature to it is that of Photinus, presbyter of the church of Ancyra, which he, who shortly became bishop of Sirmium, then was. Against this it might be urged, 1, that the name of Photinus occurs among the heretics also, who are disavowed. But in answer to this it may be rejoined, that there is a second Photinus named among the Ancyran presbyters at starting, whose name has dropped out among the signatories, and therefore may have been *misplaced* among the heretics; 2, that it condemns those who speak of the Holy Ghost as a creature. But this had already been done more than once by Eusebius in his work against Marcellus.<sup>d</sup> It must be remembered, too, that this profession was addressed to the Diocæsareans, all near neighbours of the Ancyrans; and then, apparently, fellow-sufferers in the same cause. Looking at both professions, then, as having emanated from Marcellus about the same time, we see plainly that he aimed at being an Eastern to the Easterns, and a Western to the Westerns.

Finally, neither of these professions would seem to have sufficed for him in extreme old age, but he must construct a third, intended this time for St. Athanasius himself. The date fixed for it by Montfaucon is A.D. 372, not earlier, to give time for some letters that passed on the subject of Marcellus in A.D. 371, between St. Athanasius and St. Basil, elected to the see of Caesarea the year before: not later, because St. Athanasius died A.D. 373, and Marcellus himself A.D. 374. But if Montfaucon had dated it one

year later, he would have got rid of the very difficulty which perplexed him most, viz. the absence of the name of St. Athanasius amongst its countersigners (*Diatr. c. vi. 4*). For if St. Athanasius was already dead, when it arrived, the omission of his name would be natural enough. Besides, St. Basil must have noticed it, had his name been affixed, in the letters addressed by him to his successor Peter, praising him, A.D. 377, for his continued reserve: and to the exiled suffragans of Peter of the same date, cautioning them in the strongest terms against being induced to depart from that reserve towards the disciples of Marcellus, by the specious overtures lately made to them on their behalf (*Ep. 265-6*, Ed. Ben.). Far from having been received by St. Athanasius and his colleagues, the signatures affixed to this "aureum opusculum," as Montfaucon in his enthusiasm calls it, are such as go far towards impeaching its genuineness, or else depriving it of the least weight. Surely the signatures to it should have been *not* of those to whom it was delivered, but *from whom* it emanated! St. Athanasius in any case could not have possibly let his name stand at the head of a list of names of this description. The document itself purports to be the work of a gathering of the church of Ancyra under their father Marcellus; and it may well have been dictated by a man of his advanced years, recapitulating and repudiating all the various errors, amid which his chequered life had been passed. Indeed, as no other name is given but his own, and that of his deacon Eugenius, who was charged with its delivery, we may well doubt whether any third person had a hand in it. The reference which it contains at starting to the commendatory letters given to the bearer of it by the bishops of Greece and Macedonia, seems consistent with its having been addressed, and expedited through their good offices, at that time to St. Athanasius (*Diatr. ib. § 2*). Yet it recalls forcibly, when read side by side with his former professions, the cutting remarks made by St. Basil on a very similar personage to Marcellus—Eustathius of Sebaste—and we may well doubt whether this was not the exact estimate which he had formed in his own mind of Marcellus, and the secret of his disparagement of him to the last. Indeed what two bishops should have known each other better than the occupants of the sees of Ancyra and Caesarea? "Our faith," then, says the great bishop of the latter, "is not one thing at Seleucia, another at Constantinople, another at Zele, another at Lampsacus, and another at Rome . . . but one and the same everywhere" (*Ep. 252*). And in other letters (*Ep. 59, 125, 239, 265*, Ed. Ben.), he is just as disgusted at Marcellus having been received into communion in the West under Julius, as at Eustathius having been received into communion in the West under Liberius (*Ep. 226, 244, 263*). He looked upon both as trimmers of the first water, which their acts prove them to have been; and heterodox at heart, in spite of their repeated disclaimers. Neither, in his opinion, was deserving of any trust. There was just one point of which Marcellus never lost sight; and he traded upon it through life, with whatsoever errors he was charged. "Se communione Julii et Athanasii, Romanae et Alexandrinae urbis pontificum, esse munitum"—as St. Jerome

<sup>c</sup> Ep. 293 (265 Ben. ed.).

<sup>d</sup> See Mont. on *De Eccl. Theol.* iii. 6, ap. Migne, Pat. Gr. xxiv. 1014: "Apertè Spiritum Sanctum in albo reponit creaturatum: Eunque a Filio perinde atque caetera productum disertis verbis repetit, quod et statim blasphemus repetit."

puts it (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 86). Some may, possibly, consider that he duped them both; and the second more, by a good deal, than the first. All that remains to be said of Marcellus is, that although restored at Sardica, and included in the general letter of recall issued subsequently by the emperor Constantius, and preserved by St. Athanasius (*Apol. c. Arian.* § 54), he never seems to have regained his see. Basilus certainly was in possession of it at the second council of Sirmium A.D. 351, when he refuted Photinus; and either he, or Athanasius his successor, with whom St. Basil corresponded in A.D. 369 (*Ep.* 25), was in possession A.D. 363, and joined in the petition recorded by Socrates (iii. 25) to the emperor Jovian. St. Athanasius, according to Cardinal Newman, upheld him "to about A.D. 360," but attacked his tenets pointedly, though without naming him, in his fourth oration against Arians. The short essay demonstrating this is of the highest interest—*Introd. to Disc. iv. p. 503 et seq. of vol. xix. of the Library of the Fathers.* Also, vols. viii. and xiii. (p. 52, note l.) of the same. *Comp. Montfaucon, Diatr. de causâ Marcelli*, vol. ii. collect. *Nov. Pat. Præf.* 41 et seq.; *Newman's Arians*; *Art. ATHANASIUS and EUSEBIUS* in this work; *Rettberg's Preface* in Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xviii. 1299; *Wetzer's Restit. Ver. Chronol.*; and *Larrouque's Diss. de Phot. Haeret.* [E. S. Ff.]

**MARCELLUS (5)**, one of the eleven orthodox bishops of Macedonia, to whom a letter of thanks was addressed by Chrysostom. (*Chrysost. Ep.* 163.) [ANYSIUS.] [E. V.]

**MARCELLUS (6)**, a priest, addressed by Ambrose in his eighty-second Epistle. The letter describes a settlement effected by Ambrose as arbitrator in a matter of family property. It was arranged that Marcellus should give up his rights to his brother Laetus and their sister.

[J. Ll. D.]

**MARCELLUS (7)**, a deacon and solitary of Nazianzus, whom Gregory Nazianzen appointed, with his brother deacon Gregory and Eustathius, the executors of the part of his will relating to his bequest to the poor. (*Greg. Naz. Test.*)

[E. V.]

**MARCELLUS (8)**, the archimandrite of a convent of Acoemetæ at Constantinople, one of the nineteen orthodox abbats who united to oppose the heresy of Eutyches and his followers. Two of Theodoret's letters to him remain to us, belonging to the time of his troubles after the *Latrocinium*, A.D. 449 (*Ep.* 141, 142). In the latter he commends Marcellus for the resolution with which he had defended the faith, undaunted either by the authority of the emperor or the crowd of bishops who had abandoned the faith. Before the council of Chalcedon he joined the other orthodox abbats in presenting a petition to the emperor Marcian, that he would stop the impieties of Eutyches and his crew, and eject them from their robbers' cave (*Labbe, Concil.* iv. 531). At the session of Oct. 17 Marcellus appeared with his companions to give the council trustworthy information with regard to Carosius, Dorotheus, and the other Eutychian abbats who were invoking the intervention of the emperor in their behalf. (*Labbe*, iv. 517.) [E. V.]

**MARCELLUS (9)**, priest of Nola, author of a history of Felix bishop of Nola, inscribed to Leo bishop of Nola, about the middle of the 6th century. (*Boll. Acta SS.* 14 Jan. i. 946, § 1; *Tillem.* iv. 227.) [C. H.]

**MARCELLUS (10)**, a monk of Gregory the Great's monastery at Rome. His impending death was revealed in a vision to Gerontius, a monk of the same monastery, when on his death-bed. (*Greg. Mag. Dial.* iv. 26.) [C. H.]

**MARCELLUS (11)**, legendary disciple of St. Peter, said to have been originally a disciple of Simon Magus and to have been converted by Peter (*Tischendorf, Act. Apost. Apoc.* p. 37). He plays an important part in the Acts of LINUS, where he is both the bearer of information to Peter of his intended execution, and is also the chief agent in the apostle's burial. Under the name of Marcellus was current a Latin version of Acts substantially the same as those printed by Tischendorf, the name of Marcellus however being wanting in several MSS. The Latin version was printed by Nausea in 1531, and by Fiorentini (*ad Martyrol. Hieron.* p. 103), and later by Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* iii. 632.

A letter under the name of this Marcellus is to be found in the Acts of Nereus and Achilleus (*Bolland, Acta SS.* May iii. 9). The letter gives particulars of the conversion of Marcellus from belief in the pretensions of Simon Magus. Simon had fastened a great dog at his door in order to prevent Peter from entering. Peter by making the sign of the cross makes the dog tame towards himself, but so furious against his original master, that he is obliged to leave the city in disgrace. For a different story of Simon and dogs see *Tischendorf, Act. Apost. Apoc.* p. 20. The letter contains other stories of Peter to be found also in the Acts of Linus and in other sources. The Acts containing this letter are referred to the first half of the 5th century by Lipsius, *Petrus-Sage*, p. 153, who on the whole subject ought to be consulted. [G. S.]

**MARCIA**. In the year 183 a conspiracy against the emperor Commodus was detected and put down, in which the emperor's sister Lucilla and his cousin Quadratus had been prime movers. On the execution of Quadratus and the confiscation of his property, two members of his household, his chamberlain Electus and his concubine Marcia, passed into corresponding positions in the household of Commodus, and obtained the highest favour with him. Marcia was granted all the honours due to an acknowledged empress, save that of having the sacred fire borne before her. The emperor's coins displayed her figure in the garb of an Amazon, in which he delighted to see her. He himself took the title Amazonius, and gave the same title to a month of the year. She was all-powerful with him, and her place in this Dictionary is due to the fact that she used her influence on behalf of the Christians, and obtained for them many benefits. This fact, stated by Dion Cassius (or possibly by his epitomiser Xiphilinus), has led to the suspicion that she was a Christian herself, a suspicion not disproved by the position of concubine which she filled; for the Christian code of the time dealt tenderly with the case of a female slave unable

to refuse her person to her master, and provided she observed the fidelity of a wife towards him, did not condemn her because he did not observe the fidelity of a husband towards her (*Const. Apost.* viii. 32). Yet unless the accounts of the profligacy of Commodus have been grossly exaggerated, one, the business of whose life was to keep such a man in good humour, must have witnessed and taken part in scenes incompatible with membership in the Christian society. We now know from Hippolytus (see HYACINTHUS) that the eunuch who brought Marcia up, and who retained a high place in her confidence, was a Christian presbyter. This sufficiently accounts for her Christian sympathies; but the epithet *φιλῶθεος*, which Hippolytus applies to her, would have been different, if, besides being friendly to the Christians, she had been a Christian herself.

Marcia, whose intimacy with her fellow-servant Eclectus had given occasion for remark, ultimately became his wife. She appears to have been a woman of resolution and spirit corresponding to her favourite Amazonian dress. The story went that when Cleander's administration had given rise to insurrection, it was Marcia who had courage to make known to the emperor his danger, and to obtain the sacrifice of the unpopular minister. All agree that it was she who planned and carried out the murder of Commodus. There is nothing incredible in the common story of the circumstances which made known to her that it was only thus she could rescue her own life; but in any case we may be sure that nothing but a sense of imminent danger could make her wish to overturn a rule in which she and her friends enjoyed supreme power. She was put to death in 193 by Didius Julianus, who thought proper to avenge the death of Commodus.

On some unsuccessful attempts to illustrate the history of Marcia by inscriptions and medals, see Aubé, *Revue Archéologique*, March 1879. For the original authorities, see the references in the article ECLECTUS. [G. S.]

### MARCIANI. [EUCHITES, p. 261.]

**MARCIANUS (1)**, bishop of Arles A.D. 254 (*Cyp. Ep.* 68). He was an adherent of Novatian, and refused to re-admit the lapsed. Faustinus bishop of Lyons, having in vain requested Stephen bishop of Rome to excommunicate him, appealed to Cyprian; who in a dictatorial letter desired Stephen to excommunicate him in pursuance of the discipline adopted by himself, Cornelius, and Lucius, and to acquaint himself and other bishops with the name of the successor. The date of this letter is manifestly earlier than that of the baptismal controversy, and as Cyprian speaks of "years" having elapsed under his discipline, whereas Novatianism only began in A.D. 251, we must date the letter rather late in A.D. 254, Stephen's second year. The episcopate of Marcian with its undoubted date disposes of the episcopate and apostleship of Trophimus, the patron saint of Arles, sent according to Gregory Turon. by Fabian from Rome A.D. 249. [E. W. B.]

**MARCIANUS (2)**, bishop of the Novatianists at Constantinople. He had originally belonged to the palace guard, and was afterwards a presbyter of the Novatianists. From the high

character he bore, the emperor Valens selected him as the preceptor of his daughters Anastasia and Carosa, and out of respect to him shewed favour to the Novatianist party (*Soc.* iv. 9; *Soz.* vi. 9). Marcian, who was very popular with the Novatianists, was ordained by their bishop Agelius as his successor in 384. His subsequent admission of SABBATIUS to the Novatianist presbyterate occasioned him much grief and produced a schism in the body (*Soc.* v. 21). He died 27 Nov. 395, and was succeeded by Sisinus. (*Soc.* vi. 1; *Tillem.* vi. 433, 538, iii. 484, 486, 487.) [C. H.]

**MARCIANUS (3)**, Nov. 2 (*Menol. Græc.* Sirlot. and *Mart. Rom.*), a celebrated solitary in the desert of Chalchis in Syria (*Theod. Rel. Hist.* cap. 3). He was a native of Cyrrhus and of good family. Betaking himself to the desert, he built himself within a narrow enclosure a cell in which he could neither stand upright nor lie at full length. In course of time he admitted to his society, but in separate dwellings, two disciples—Eusebius, his successor in the cell, and Agapetus. At some distance off he established an abode, under the care of Eusebius, for those who desired to pursue a monastic life under regulations framed by him. Agapetus retired and became bishop of Apamea. Towards the end of his life Marcian allowed himself to be visited by all who pleased, women excepted, but only after the festival of Easter. About 382 he was visited by Flavian, the new bishop of Antioch, in company with four of the most eminent bishops of Syria—Acacius of Berhœa, Eusebius of Chalchis, Isidore of Cyrrhus, and Theodotus of Hierapolis—besides some religious laymen of high rank. They came to listen to his wisdom, but he persisted in humble silence, and only observed that such as he could not expect to profit men while the word and works of God were so continually appealing to men in vain. Living in the Arian reign of Valens, Marcian's great influence was steadily exerted on the side of orthodoxy, and he was an uncompromising opponent of all the prevailing heresies. He also zealously upheld the Nicæan rule of Easter, and broke off communion with the venerable solitary Abraham in the same desert, until he gave up the old Syrian custom and conformed to the new one. His public receptions after Easter must likewise have helped to popularise the correct rule. Tillemont (viii. 483, xiv. 222) places his death about 385 or 387. The *Roman Martyrology* commemorates him on Nov. 2. His disciple Agapetus founded two monasteries, one called after himself at Nicerta in the diocese of Apamea, and another called after Marcian's disciple Simeon. From them sprang many others, all observing the rules of Marcian. His disciple Basil erected one at Seleucobelus. (*Tillem.* viii. 478, x. 533, xi. 304, xii. 20, xiv. 222, xv. 340, 349; Dupin, i. 455, ed. 1722; Ceill. x. 52; Baron. *A. E.* ann. 382, lxviii.) [C. H.]

**MARCIANUS (4)**, Jan. 10, presbyter and oeconomus of the great church of Constantinople. The authorities for his life are Theodorus Lector (*H. E.* i. 13, 23, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxxvi.), the *Basilian Menology*, Jan. 10, and a *Vita* from Simeon Metaphrastes (*Boll. Acta SS.* 10 Jan. i. 609).



There are also notices of him in the Bollandist lives of St. Auxentius (14 Feb. ii. 770), St. Isidore the martyr of Chios (15 Mai. iii. 445), and St. Gregory Nazianzen (9 Mai. ii. 401 c, note n). Tillemont (xvi. 161) devotes an article to him. He was originally a layman of the Cathari or Novatians (Theod. L. i. 13), and was then intimate with Auxentius, who was a Catholic (*Vit. Auxent. u. s.*). Marcian's own life is silent on this point. He was appointed oeconomus by the patriarch Gennadius, therefore after 458; and on entering upon the office made it a rule that the clergy of Constantinople should retain for their own churches the offerings made in them, and no longer pay them over to the great church (Theod. L. i. 13). His erection of the remarkable (*βαυλαστόν*) church of the Anastasia or Holy Resurrection and of the church of St. Irene is mentioned in the *Basilian Menology* and by Codinus (*Aedif. Cp.* p. 88, ed. Bekker), the latter adding that he also built a hospital for the sick. The church of Irene (transformed from an idol temple) was on the shore (*Vit.* § 14) at "the passage" (Codin.). The Anastasia was (Codin.) a re-foundation of the humble oratory in which St. Gregory ministered, and Marcian bought the site (then occupied by dealers in materials for mosaic work) because there had been found St. Gregory's commentaries (*ἰσομνήματα*), wherein he had, fifty years before, predicted the restoration of the building in greater size and beauty. The adornment of Marcian's church was subsequently completed by Basil the Macedonian, who added the golden ceiling. How Marcian saved his new church in the conflagration of Sept. 2 by his prayers and tears, while mounted on the roof with the Holy Gospels in his hands, is related by Theodore Lector (i. 23), the *Vita*, the *Basilian Menology*, Theophanes (A. C. 454), and Cedrenus (p. 348, ed. Bekker, p. 610). The year as fixed by Clinton (*F. R.* i. 666) was 465. Codinus's mention of fifty years makes the rebuilding of the Anastasia about A. D. 425, as the Bollandist Life of St. Gregory (*u. s.*) and the Bollandist account of St. Isidore (*u. s.*) say, long therefore before Marcian became oeconomus. Marcian is stated to have placed the relics of St. Isidore in the church of St. Irene (*ib.*). An account of the two churches, very full as to the Anastasia, will be found in Du Cange (*Cp. i. Chr. lib.* iv. pp. 98, 102, ed. 1729). In the Byzantine calendar Marcian was commemorated on Jan. 10. His death is placed in 471 by Tillemont, who has some minor notices of him at ii. 231, iii. 354, v. 98, ix. 416, xvi. 59, 70.

[C. H.]

**MARCIANUS (5).** This name occurs as that of a heretic in an extract from a letter of Serapion of Antioch given by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 12). For want of the context we cannot determine whether this is the name of an otherwise unknown member of the church addressed, or whether Marcian may not be intended. [G. S.]

**MARCIANUS (6),** the friend to whom a work of Irenaeus was inscribed. (*Eus. H. E.* v. 26.) [G. S.]

**MARCIANUS (7),** a tribune at Antioch (*Chrysost. Ep.* 211), conspicuous as the common friend and patron of widows and orphans, and all who were in distress, to whom Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus, commending him for his great

liberality to the suffering population during a recent dearth. (*Chrysost. Ep.* 122.) [E. V.]

**MARCIANUS (8), FLAVIUS,** emperor of the East 450–457 A. D. For the civil history of his life and reign see *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.*

On Marcian's accession, he found the world distracted by the Eutychian controversy. Theodosius had taken the part of Eutyches, and upheld the decision of "the Latrocinium" of Ephesus. His death caused a complete revolution in the church in the East. Pulcheria had always been on the side of Leo and orthodoxy, and naturally chose for her husband a person who shared her views. Marcian, in his very first letter to Leo (*S. Leonis, Epist.* lxxiii, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 900), speaks of the assembling of a council under Leo's influence. For the correspondence between Marcian, Pulcheria, and Leo relating to the proposed council see LEO I. The disturbed state of the ecclesiastical atmosphere was probably the motive of Marcian's law of July 12, A. D. 451, against brawling in churches and holding meetings in private houses or in the streets (*Codex*, lib. i. tit. xii. 5). In the same year Eutyches was banished (though not so far from Constantinople as Leo (*Epist.* lxxxiv.) wished), and orders were issued by the emperor convening a council. It was originally intended to meet at Nicaea on Sept. 1, but as the pressure of public business prevented the emperor, who was then in Thrace, from going so far from Constantinople, the bishops who had assembled at Nicaea were directed to repair to Chalcedon (*Mansi*, vi. 552, 558). A detailed account of the proceedings of the Council is given under DIOSCORUS and EUTYCHES. Marcian and Pulcheria were present only at the sixth session on October 25, when the emperor made short speeches in Greek and Latin to the assembled bishops, who received him and the empress enthusiastically as a new Constantine and a new Helena. A full description of the scene is given under EUTYCHES (*Vol.* II. 411).

After the council separated Marcian proceeded to enforce its decrees by a series of edicts. The first two, dated February 7 and March 13, A. D. 452, confirmed the decisions of the council, and prohibited public arguments on theological questions that had been settled by them once for all, as thereby the divine mysteries were exposed to the profane gaze of Jews and Pagans (*Mansi*, vii. 475–480). A third, of July 6th, repealed the constitution promulgated by Theodosius at the instigation of the Eutychians against Flavian and his adherents Eusebius and Theodoret (*Mansi*, vii. 497–500). Finally, by a fourth, dated the 28th of the same month (*Mansi*, vii. 501–506), Marcian imposed heavy penalties and disabilities on the Eutychians. This law is fully given under EUTYCHES (*Vol.* II. 411). Another law dated August 1, A. D. 455, re-enacted the same provisions as the last with trifling variations, and further declared the Eutychians subjected to all the penalties imposed upon the Apollinarists by the laws of former emperors (*Mansi*, vii. 517–520).

The emperor likewise wrote to the monks of Alexandria by Joannes the Decurio (*Mansi*, vii. 481), exhorting them to abandon their errors and to submit to the decrees of Chalcedon. The

troubles at Alexandria, however, were too great to be appeased by words. The arrival of Proteus, the bishop appointed in the room of Dioscorus, was the signal for the outbreak of violent riots. The soldiers were stoned by the mob, and some, who had taken refuge in the Serapeum, were burnt along with the building itself. Marcian was obliged to send a reinforcement of 2000 troops, and even then the tumults were only appeased by the judicious conduct of Florus, the prefect of the city (Evagrius, 292, 293).

Palestine was likewise in a disturbed state. Some of the monks, who had attended the council, and had been on the defeated side, on their return, headed by Theodosius, a monk of violent character, who had been their leader in the council, stirred up an insurrection of the whole body of monks of the Desert (Evagrius, 293). Juvenalis bishop of Jerusalem had, after his return, to fly for his life. Severianus bishop of Scythopolis was killed by an assassin sent in pursuit of Juvenalis; Jerusalem was seized by the infuriated monks; houses were burnt, murders were perpetrated, the prisons were broken open and the criminals released, and finally Theodosius was elected bishop in the room of Juvenalis [THEODOSIUS]. Marcian, on hearing of these outrages, wrote to the archimandrites, monks, and inhabitants of Jerusalem, rebuking them sharply for their conduct. He contented himself, however, with ordering the punishment of those guilty of murder or arson, sent count Dorotheus to investigate who were guilty, and placed a garrison in Jerusalem under his command (Mansi, vii. 487-495). Juvenalis was subsequently restored to his see, Theodosius fled to Mount Sinai, and all the bishops he had consecrated were deprived of their sees. Marcian wrote to bishop Macarius and the monks of Mount Sinai demanding the surrender of the fugitive (Mansi, vii. 483-488).

While Marcian thus endeavoured to enforce the decision of the council, he took measures to suppress the last remnants of paganism. By a law of November 12, A.D. 451 (*Codex*, lib. i. tit. xi. 7), he forbade, under pain of death, the reopening of the temples which had been closed, and the offering sacrifices, libations, or incense in them, or even adorning them with flowers, and at the end of the above-mentioned law of August 1, A.D. 455, is a clause directing that the laws already enacted against paganism should be strictly enforced.

In the April of 454 he passed a law, granting to nuns, deaconesses, and widows, the power of making testamentary dispositions in favour of the church or clergy, and repealing all previous enactments to the contrary.

In April, A.D. 456, Marcian passed a law, preserved in the *Codex* (lib. i. tit. iii. 25, and tit. iv. 13), by which proceedings against the othonites or other clerics of the churches in Constantinople were to be taken at the plaintiff's desire either before the archbishop or the prefect of the city, and no oath was to be tendered to a cleric, as they were forbidden to swear by the laws of the church and an ancient canon.

He died in January, A.D. 457 (Theodorus Lector, 565), at the age of 65, after a reign of six years and six months. He was buried in the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople (Cedrenus, 607, in *Patr. Gr.* cxxi. 659). [F. D.]

MARCION (9), son of the emperor Anthemius and grandson of the emperor Marcian, from whom he derived his name, was married to Leontia, the younger daughter of the emperor Leo. On the ground that her right to the throne was superior to that of her sister Ariadne, who had been born before her father's accession, he revolted in A.D. 479 against the emperor Zeno, the husband of the latter. After a contest in the streets of Constantinople, he was beaten, and was forced to take sanctuary in the Church of the Apostles. He was dragged from the church and exiled to a monastery at Caesarea in Cappadocia. Making his escape to Galatia, he caused some further trouble in the neighbourhood of Angora, but was taken prisoner, and exiled to Tarsus, being obliged to shave his head and become a priest (Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 26, in *Patr. Graec.* lxxxvi. 2, 2649). According to Theophanes (109, *Patr. Graec.* cviii. 313) and Candidus (p. 477, Bonn) his forced ordination took place before his first banishment, and according to the latter he was finally exiled to Isauria. [F. D.]

MARCION (10), a Messalian heretic. [EUCYTES, Vol. II. p. 275.]

MARCION, one of the most noted and most permanently influential of the heretics of the second century.

*Life.*—Justin Martyr in his *Apology* (cc. 26, 58) mentions Simon and Menander as having been instigated by the demons to introduce heresy into the church, and goes on to speak of Marcion as still living, evidently regarding him as the most formidable heretic of his own day.\* He states that he was a native of Pontus, that he had made many disciples out of every nation, and he refers for a more detailed refutation to a separate treatise of his own, one sentence of which has been preserved by Irenaeus (iv. 6). Justin's work against Marcion seems to have been extant in the time of Photius (*Cod.* 154). Irenaeus also states that Marcion came from Pontus. He adds that thence he came to Rome, where he became an adherent, and afterwards the successor, of Cerdo, a Syrian teacher, whose relations with the church were unsettled. Sometimes he would make public confession and be reconciled; but he would go on privately teaching heretical doctrine, be betrayed by some of his hearers, and be separated again. Irenaeus places the coming of Cerdo to Rome in the episcopate of Hyginus, which lasted four years, ending, according to Lipsius, 139, 140, or 141. Irenaeus places the activity of Marcion at Rome under Anicetus (invaluit sub Aniceto), whose episcopate of 12 years began in 154. He tells (iii. 3) that Marcion meeting Polycarp at Rome claimed recognition from him, on which Polycarp answered, I recognize thee as the firstborn of Satan. Though Irenaeus does not expressly say so, this meeting is most naturally referred to the visit of Polycarp to Rome, which, according to the now received date of Polycarp's death, must be placed in 154 or at latest 155. The story makes probable a previous friendly

\* Though the form of the name *Μαρκιανός* (*Trypho* 35) suggests rather followers of Marcus than of Marcion, we think the latter is what was intended.

acquaintance of Polycarp with Marcion. Irenaeus contemplated (iii. 12) a separate treatise against Marcion. There is no direct evidence of his having carried out this design, but as its proposed method is stated to have been the confutation of Marcion by means of his own Gospel, and as this is precisely the method followed by Tertullian, who is elsewhere largely indebted to Irenaeus, there is a fair probability that the work of Irenaeus may have been written and been known to Tertullian. It has been stated under HIPPOLYTUS (p. 93) by what process the contents of the lost *Syntagma* of Hippolytus are inferred. It appears to have named Sinope as Marcion's native city (Epiph. 42, Philast. 45), of which city his father was bishop; and to have stated that he was obliged to leave home on account of having seduced a virgin and being thereupon excommunicated by his father (Epiph., Pseudo-Tert. 17). Epiphanius singly then tells, but apparently on the same authority, that Marcion having in spite of frequent entreaties failed to obtain absolution from his indignant father, went to Rome, where he arrived after the death of Hyginus, that he begged restoration from the presbyters there, but that they declared themselves unable to act in the matter contrary to the decision of his venerated father. The mention of presbyters as at the time the ruling power at the church of Rome, and their professed inability to reverse the decision of a provincial bishop, indicate a date earlier than that of Epiphanius; but Epiphanius further states that Marcion's quarrel with the presbyters was not only because they did not restore him to church communion, but also because they did not make him bishop. This has been generally understood to mean bishop of Rome, and possibly Epiphanius intended this, but he does not say so. His words are *ὡς οὐκ ἀπέληψε τὴν προεδρίαν τε, καὶ τὴν εἰσόδον τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. It is absurd on the face of it that an excommunicated foreigner should dream of being made bishop of a church from which he was asking in vain for absolution. We must then believe that Epiphanius misunderstood some expression which he found in his authority, or else that Marcion had been already a bishop (possibly one of his father's suffragans), had been deposed, and was seeking at Rome at once restoration to communion and recognition of his episcopal dignity. The only authority who directly countenances the latter view is Optatus, who speaks of Marcion (iv. 5, p. 74) as "ex episcopo factus apostata." But there is some indirect confirmation in the fact which we learn from Adamantius (i. 15; xvi. 264, Lommatz.) that Marcion was afterwards recognized as bishop by his own followers, and was the head of a succession of Marcionite bishops continuing down to the writer's own day. The Marcionites appear to have had no difference with the orthodox as to the forms of church organization. Tertullian's words are well known, "faciunt et favos vespae, faciunt et ecclesias Marcionitae" (*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 5). We may conclude that episcopacy was the settled constitution of the church before the time of the Marcionite schism, else Marcion would not have adopted it in his new sect, and it seems more likely that Marcion had been consecrated to the office before the schism than that he either obtained consecration afterwards, or that by his

own sole authority he took the office to himself and appointed others to it, a thing unexampled in the church, of which we should surely have heard if Marcion had done it. Many critics have believed that the statement as to the cause of Marcion's excommunication took its origin from the misunderstanding of a common figurative expression, and that what was originally meant was that Marcion by heresy had corrupted the pure virgin church. We are inclined to adopt this view, not on account of the confessed austerity of Marcion's subsequent life and doctrines, which are not inconsistent with his having fallen into sins of the flesh in his youth, but because the story goes on to tell of Scripture difficulties propounded by Marcion to the Roman presbyters, and of his rejection of their solutions. If the question at issue had been whether pardon were to be given for an offence against morality, it is not likely that either party would have chosen to enter into theological controversy, whereas such discussion would naturally arise if the cause of excommunication had been heresy. Add that the charge of youthful incontinence is never brought against Marcion by Irenaeus or Tertullian.<sup>b</sup> Tertullian, who expends all the resources of his rhetoric in vituperation of Marcion, has no word of reproach against the purity of his sexual relations, but on the contrary contrasts his austerity in this respect with the alleged frailty of his disciple Apelles.

We are led to infer that Tertullian when he wrote against Marcion had not seen the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, and this conclusion is otherwise made certain. Irenaeus had merely named Pontus as the birthplace of Marcion, and Tertullian understands this of the northern shore of the Black Sea, and rhetorically classes Marcion with the monsters of Scythia. He could not have known the more definite and more probable account which named Sinope, a place likely enough to have been a hotbed of heresy, as its eastern position and its commercial relations with many countries subjected it to the influence of various forms of religious thought. An important work against heresy could not be published at Rome and Tertullian long remain ignorant of it. It follows, therefore, that we cannot assign the *Syntagma* an earlier date than 208, the year when the first book of Tertullian against Marcion was written.

The story of Marcion's interview with the Roman presbyters goes on to tell that he asked them to explain the texts, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit," and "No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment," texts from which he himself deduced that works in which evil is to be found could not proceed from the good God, and that the Christian dispensation could have nothing in common with the Jewish. Rejecting the different explanation offered him by the presbyters, he broke off the interview with a threat to make a schism in their church. This story represents Marcion as from the first out of communion with the Roman church; but here again Tertullian's account is different. He tells that Marcion was originally in communion, and had brought in 200 sesterces

<sup>b</sup> We attach no weight to the repetition of the charge by Esnig, whose historical notices have the appearance of being taken from Epiphanius.

as his contribution to the church fund; that falling into heresy he was expelled, and the money returned; that he afterwards begged for restoration, which was only offered him on condition that he would bring back those whom he had led astray, and that before he could do this he was overtaken by death. This has so much resemblance with what Irenaeus has told of Cerdo, that we are disposed to think with Tillemont that Tertullian has made a confusion and told of Marcion what was true of Cerdo. It might well have been made a condition of Cerdo's final restoration that he should bring back his pupil Marcion. If we adopt the opinion that Marcion was never in communion with the Roman church, we are free to believe that he did not learn his heresy at Rome from Cerdo, but had taught and propagated it before his coming to the city. The limits of permissible speculation concerning the origin of evil were probably then not sharply defined, and Marcion might have hoped to obtain toleration for his system in the Roman church. Disappointed in this expectation he might have joined himself to Cerdo, with whom he might have had relations in the East. The fact is, the beginning of Marcionism was so early that the church writers of the end of the 2nd century, who are our best authorities, do not seem themselves able to tell with certainty the story of its commencement; and so anything we can say on the subject must be conjectural. But this we know, that the heresy of Marcion spread itself widely over many countries. Epiphanius names as infected by it in his time, besides Rome and Italy, Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Syria, Cyprus, and even Persia. Its diffusion in the latter half of the 2nd century is proved by the number of antagonists it met in different countries; Dionysius in Corinth writing to Nicomedia, Philip in Crete, Theophilus in Antioch, Modestus (Eus. iv. 25), of whose place of writing we are not sure, besides Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Rhodo, Tertullian already mentioned. Its diffusion in the East is also proved by the fact that Bardesanes wrote against the heresy in the Syriac language (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 30), as did Ephrem Syrus later.

Now Marcion would seem to have travelled much. Ephrem Syrus speaks of him as wandering like Cain, but possibly he only refers to his leaving his country for Rome (Hymn. 56, *Asseman. Bibl. Or.* i. 119). Tertullian constantly applies to him the epithet "naulerus;" Rhodo (ap. Euseb. v. 13) calls him *ναυτης*, according to a reading which we believe to be right, though the word is wanting in some MSS. Whether Marcion had any commercial object in his voyages or not, we may gather that he did travel; and he probably used his journeys to propagate his doctrines. Now his travels seem more likely to have preceded than to have followed his settling in Rome under Anicetus. Unless, therefore, the story of the interview with the Roman presbyters is to be rejected altogether we think it must be taken, date and all. The interview must be placed immediately after the death of Hyginus, and we must suppose Marcion then to have left Rome on his travels and only to have settled there permanently some years later, first as a member of Cerdo's school and afterwards as his successor.

The authorities as to the chronology of Marcion's life are very conflicting. The statement on which we can most rely is that he taught in Rome during the episcopate of Anicetus. We have no good warrant to extend his activity later, for we can give no credit to Tertullian, who names Eleutherus (*De Praesc.* 30) in connexion with the excommunication of Marcion. If Marcion did not survive Anicetus he might have been born about A.D. 100, and this would harmonize well enough with the fact that towards the close of the century Rhodo found Marcion's disciple Apelles then an old man, who had outlived all inclination for controversy. Philaster, who (*Ilaer.* 45) states that Marcion was driven from Ephesus by the apostle John, may be set aside as having blundered together the story of John and Cerinthus. It is more difficult to deal with a passage of Clemens Alex., which has much puzzled his commentators. Having stated that it had been alleged that Valentinus had been a hearer of Theodas, a disciple of Paul, he goes on to say that Marcion being of the same age lived with these as an elder with younger, after whom Simon heard for a little the preaching of Peter. In all the early anti-heretical treatises Valentinus is placed before Marcion, who is here not only made his elder contemporary, but is even made to precede Simon Magus. In Potter's note (p. 898) may be seen the various expedients by which it has been tried either by emendation of reading or by less obvious interpretation to relieve Clement from the responsibility of an opinion which it is very unlikely that he really held. A different solution is that of Volkmar and Lipsius, that what Clement says of Marcion is ironical; but whatever way we take of reconciling Clement with himself, the context clearly shews that he does not ascribe to Marcion an earlier date than the reign of Antoninus or at earliest that of Hadrian. It seems at first as if Tertullian fixed for us with great accuracy the date of Marcion's schism, which he says (*Adv. Marc.* i. 19) was placed by his followers themselves one hundred and fifteen years six months and a half after Christ. Taking the year of the Passion as A.D. 29, this gives for Marcion the by no means improbable date 144, but the passage in Tertullian, though relied on by Lipsius, is really useless for our purpose. Tertullian's object is to shew that Marcion is much later than Christ, and his argument runs as follows: "I care not to enquire in what year of Antoninus Marcion came; it is enough for my purpose that under Antoninus it was. Now Christ came in the fifteenth year of Tiberius; between Tiberius and Antoninus are one hundred and fifteen years, six months, fifteen days. That is the interval between Christ and Marcion." It is surely a misunderstanding to regard the last sentence as an independent statement and not as the conclusion of the argument. It is true that the real interval between Tiberius and Antoninus is not what is here stated; but it is safer to accuse Tertullian of bad arithmetic than of bad logic. He might easily have erred in his addition of lengths of emperors' reigns, but he was incapable of using an argument in which the conclusion does not follow from the premisses, and is only what his opponents concede without any argument. Add that the chronicles give lengths of emperors' reigns with months and

days, but there is no reason to think that any one pretended to name the month or day on which the interval between Christ and Marcion began or ended. The Chronicle of Edessa [CHRONICON EDESSENUM] names the year 138 as that of the beginning of Marcionism, and with this agrees the date, the first year of Antoninus, given by the Fihrist (Flügel's *Mani*, p. 85). This date is not improbable, if we suppose an oriental preaching of the heresy to have preceded its establishment at Rome; A.D. 150 is a not unlikely date for Justin Martyr's *Apology*, and a dozen years of growth is not too much to allow before Marcionism could have assumed the formidable dimensions which that work indicates. If Justin Martyr's work is to be dated earlier, the date of Marcionism will be similarly affected.

Eusebius in his Chronicle gives a date for the arrival of Cerdo at Rome, but none for that of Marcion. In fact, these two heretics were regarded as belonging to the same school, and the accounts of their doctrines are so much mixed up together that it is not possible now to distinguish with certainty what Marcion learned from Cerdo from what he added of his own. Jerome states (*Ep.* 130, *ad Ctes.* vol. i. p. 102) that Marcion sent on a female disciple before to Rome, to prepare the way for him, but he is not supported in this by any other authority. Possibly Jerome was thinking of Marcellina. The time of Marcion's death is unknown, but he probably did not survive Anicetus. The only works which he is known to have left are his recension of the Gospel and of Pauline Epistles, of which we shall speak further on; his *Antitheses*, in which by a comparison of different passages he tried to shew that the Old Testament contradicted the New, and also itself; besides which Tertullian also refers to a letter of his, then extant, as proving that he had originally belonged to the Catholic church (*Adv. Marc.* i. 1; iv. 4; *De Carn. Christ.* ii.). We learn from Rhodo (Euseb. v. 13) that after his death his followers broke up into sects, among the leaders of which he names Apelles, who only acknowledged one first principle; Potitus and Basilicus, who counted two; and Syneros, who counted three (*Ref.* vii. 31). Other Marcionite teachers are mentioned: Prepo, an Assyrian, by Hippolytus, Lucanus by Tertullian; Pitho and Blastus (the latter probably erroneously; see Vol. I. p. 319) by Theodoret (*Huer. Fab.* i. 25). Epiphanius tells us (*De Mens. et Pond.* 17; Vol. II. p. 171) that Theodotus, the translator of the Old Testament, had been a Marcionite before his apostasy to Judaism, and Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.* 56) states that Ambrosius had been a Marcionite before he was converted by his friend Origen.

These sectaries were formidable to the church, not only by their numbers, but by the strictness of their life.\* They were ascetics of the severest kind, refusing the use of flesh meat, of wine, or of the married life. And unlike the members of some Gnostic sects who taught that it was no sin to escape persecution by disguising their faith, the Marcionites vied with the orthodox in the number of their martyrs. In particular

Eusebius tells (iv. 15) that the same letter of the church of Smyrna, from which he drew his account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, told also of the martyrdom of a Marcionite presbyter, Metrodorus, who, like Polycarp, suffered at Smyrna by fire, and in the same persecution. When at a later period the Montanists appealed in proof of their orthodoxy to the number of their martyrs, they were reminded that this argument would be equally conclusive in favour of the Marcionites, who had very many martyrs (Euseb. v. 16). Other Marcionite martyrs mentioned by Eusebius are a woman who suffered under Valerian at Caesarea in Palestine (iii. 12), and a Marcionite bishop Asclepius, who in the Diocletian persecution was burned alive at Caesarea on the same pyre as the orthodox Apelamus (*Mart. Pal.* c. 10). The strictness of the Marcionite discipline is proved by the unfriendly testimony of Tertullian, who tries by their practice to convict of falsity the Marcionite theory, that a good God could not be the object of fear. "If so," he says, "why do you not take your fill of the enjoyments of this life? Why do you not frequent the circus, the arena, and the theatre? Why do you not boil over with every kind of lust? When the censor is handed you, and you are asked to offer a few grains of incense, why not deny your faith? 'God forbid!' you cry; 'God forbid!' Then you fear sin, and you shew that He who forbids the sin is an object of fear." (*Adv. Marc.* i. 27.) We are apt to overlook that as in bodily disease one organ may receive dangerous injury, while others continue in healthy action; so in the Marcionite heresy, while some fundamental truths were rejected, a firm hold was kept of others. God's work of creation was denied by the Marcionites; the Old Testament rejected, and a large part of the New given up; but they believed that He whom Christ revealed was a good God, the proper object of men's love, whose will it was their duty to do; they had faith in Christ and His work, and for that faith were willing to die. Apelles in his old age declined controversy with Rhodo on their points of difference, expressing his belief that faith in the Crucified, accompanied with a holy life, might suffice for the salvation of either. We may charitably hope that he was right, and that those to whom Christ gave grace to die for Him were not left without a share in His salvation.

At the end of the Diocletian persecution the Marcionites had a short interval of freedom of worship. An inscription was found not long since, which had stood over the doorway of a house in a Syrian village (Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscriptions*, No. 2558, vol. iii. p. 583) which runs as follows: *Συναγωγῆς Μαρκιωνιστῶν κώμης Λεβάβων τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (sic) προνοία Παύλου πρεσβυτέρου τοῦ Λχ' ἔτους.* A Syrian date of that age would be reckoned in the era of the Seleucidae, in which the year 630 corresponds to the year commencing Oct. 1, A.D. 318. This is more ancient than any dated inscription belonging to a Catholic church. At the time in question Constantine was ruling in the West, but Licinius in the East, and a general toleration prevailed. It is noteworthy that the Marcionites, anti-Jewish as they were, should call their place of meeting by the name of synagogue. With

\* See Origen, in *Ezek. Hom.* vii., where it is remarked that the most dangerous heretics are those whose lives are good.

the complete triumph of Christianity Marcionite freedom of worship was lost. Constantine (Euseb. *de Vit. Const.* iii. 64) absolutely forbade their meeting for worship either in public or private buildings. Their churches were to be handed over to the Catholic church; any private houses used for schismatical worship were to be confiscated. But the dying out of Marcionism was probably less the result of imperial legislation than of the absorption of the older heresy by the new wave of oriental dualism which in Manicheism passed over the church. The Theodosian code (xvi., Tit. v. 65) contains a solitary mention of Marcionites. The sect was not extinct in the 5th century, for Theodoret, writing to pope Leo (*Epp.* 113, p. 1190), boasts that he had himself in the course of his ministry converted more than a thousand Marcionites. (See also *Epp.* 81, 145.) In the latter the number of converts rises to ten thousand; in the former they are said to be the inhabitants of eight villages. In his Church History (v.) Theodoret tells of an unsuccessful effort made by Chrysostom for the conversion of these same people. It is probable that this survival of Marcionism was but a local peculiarity. But as late as 692 the council in Trullo thought it worth while to make provision for the reconciliation of Marcionites, and there is other evidence of some lingering remains of the sect so late as the 10th century (Flügel's *Mani*, pp. 160, 167).

*Doctrine.*—There is a striking difference of character between the teaching of Marcion and that of others commonly classed with him under the name of Gnostics. The systems of the latter often contain so many elements derived from heathenism, or else merely drawn from the fancy of the speculators, that we feel as if we had scarcely any common ground with them, and are disposed to class them not as Christians but as heathen eclectics. With Marcion, on the contrary, Christianity is plainly his starting point, and the character of his system harmonises with the story that he was the son of a Christian bishop, and had been brought up as a Christian. But he has been perplexed by the question of the origin of evil, and is disposed to accept the solution, much prevalent in the East at the time, that evil is inextricably mixed up with matter, which therefore could not be the creation of the Supreme. He tries to fit in this solution with his Christian creed and with the Scriptures; but naturally it is only by a mutilation of both that he can force an agreement. Indeed, he is sometimes obliged to resort to still more violent measures. Thus he has to alter the text, "I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil," into "I am not come to fulfil the law, but to destroy." Still the arbitrary criticism of Marcion has more points of contact with modern thought than the baseless assumptions of other Gnostics. A modern divine would turn away from the dreams of Valentianism in silent contempt, and not deem them worthy of serious refutation; but he could not refuse to discuss the question raised by Marcion, whether there is such opposition between different parts of what he regards as the word of God, that all cannot come from the same author.

The fundamental point of difference between Marcion and the church was concerning the

unity of the first principle. Marcion in express terms asserted the existence of two gods, a good one and a just one. What he meant to convey by these words Beausobre well illustrates by a passage of Bardesanes, preserved by Eusebius (*Praep. Evan.* vi. 10). He says that animals are of three kinds: some, like serpents and scorpions, will hurt those who have given them no provocation; some, like sheep, will allow themselves to be injured and not attempt to return evil for evil; others will hurt those that hurt them, and those only. These three may be called evil, good, and just respectively. Marcion then thought the infliction of punishment to be inconsistent with perfect goodness, and would only concede the title of just to the God of the Old Testament, who had distinctly threatened to punish the wicked. The God, he said, whose law was "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," was a just God, but not the same as that good God whose command was, "If any smite thee on the one cheek turn to him the other also." The command, "Thou shalt love him that loveth thee and hate thine enemy," was that of a just God; "Love thine enemy" was the law of the good God. Further, the God of the Old Testament had said of Himself, "I create evil;" but since from a good tree evil fruit cannot spring, it follows that he who created evil cannot himself be good. The God of the Jews could not be the Supreme, for He was a being of limited intelligence, who could not find Adam when he hid himself, and was obliged to ask, "Where art thou," and who was obliged to come down to see before He could know whether or not Sodom had done according to the cry of it. The God of the Jews claimed that the hearts of kings were in his hand. He cannot then be the same as the God of the Christians, whom the rulers of this world persecute. Once more, Christ has said, "No man has known the Father but the Son;" but of the Creator it is written (Ezek. xx. 5): "I was known to your fathers in the wilderness." Hence that God who was well known to the Jews cannot be the same as He whom only the Son knew. Marcion's theory then was that the visible creation was the work of the just God; that the good God, whose abode He places in the third or highest heaven, and whom apparently he did acknowledge as the creator of a high immaterial universe, neither concerned Himself with mankind, nor was known by them, until, taking compassion on the misery into which they had been brought by disobedience to their Creator who was casting them into his hell, He interfered for their redemption. The Marcionite denial of the unity of the first principle was variously modified. Some counted three first principles instead of two, namely, a good Being, a just one, and a wicked one. The good Being rules over the Christians, the just one over the Jews, the wicked one over the heathen. In the theories of others, again, since the world was supposed to have been made out of previously existent matter, it was held that matter deserved to be ranked as a fourth self-originated principle. Marcion himself only counted two ἀρχαί, but then the word ἀρχαί must be understood in the sense of ruling powers, for it does not appear that he regarded matter as the creation either of his good or his just God, and therefore it should rightly have been

reckoned as an independent principle. Tertullian, indeed, tries to make out that Marcion ought in consistency to have counted as many as nine gods. Once, again, since in all these systems the good Being was acknowledged to be the superior of the others, it was not a violent change in the system to assume that from this principle the others were derived; and so Apelles and his school drew near the orthodox and taught that there was but one self-originated principle. In all these systems the ascription of the works of creation and redemption to different beings enabled the church writers to convict the Marcionite deity of unwarrantable interference with what did not belong to him.<sup>4</sup> This interference was the more startling from its suddenness, for Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament obliged him to deny that there had been any intimation of the coming redemption, or any sign that it had been contemplated beforehand. His God then suddenly wakes up to trouble himself about this earth; stoops down from his third heaven into a world about which, for thousands of years, he had given himself no concern; there kidnaps the sons and servants of another, and teaches them to hate and despise their father and their king, on whose gifts they must still depend for their sustenance, nay, without whose help their new friend cannot receive any worship, for the Creator must furnish the ground on which this new God's worshippers are to kneel, the heaven to which they are to stretch out their hands, the water in which they are baptized, the very eucharistic food over which thanks must be offered to a God to whom it had never belonged.

Marcion's rejection of Old Testament prophecy did not involve a denial that the prophets had foretold the coming of a Christ; only it was said the Christ of the prophets could not be our Christ. The former was to come for the deliverance of the Jewish people; the latter for that of the whole human race. The former was to be a warrior, Christ was a man of peace: Christ suffered on the cross, the law pronounced accursed him that hangeth on a tree; the Christ of the prophets is to rule the nations with a rod of iron, kings are to set themselves against Him. He is to have the heathen for His inheritance and to set up a kingdom that shall not be destroyed; Jesus did none of these things, therefore it follows that the Christ of the prophets is still to come. Tertullian successfully shews that if Jesus was not the Christ of the prophets, He must have wished to personate Him, coming as He did at the time and in the place which the prophets had foretold, and fulfilling so many of the indications which they had given. What Marcion supposed his own Christ to be has been disputed. Some have supposed that he did not distinguish him from his good god, for Marcion's Gospel was said to have commenced: "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius God came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught on the

<sup>4</sup> Some of the later Marcionites endeavoured to escape this imputation by incorporating with their system a fable of the older Gnostics; and taught that only the  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  had been breathed into man by his original Creator, and that the good God, taking pity on man's grovelling condition, had afterwards inspired the  $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , which spirit as being his own he rightfully endeavoured to redeem from the power of the Demiurge.

Sabbath days" (Tert. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 7); but we believe that here the true reading is "eum" not "deum," and that Marcion held his Christ to be a saving spirit (i. 19), but did not confound him with the Supreme. It will be observed that Marcion's Gospel, beginning as has been stated, told nothing of the birth of Christ; and Marcion's "came down" has a very different meaning from what it has in the original passage (Luke vi. 31); in Marcion's use meaning "came down from heaven." In fact, the story of Christ's birth would represent Him as a born subject of the Demiurge, deriving from his bounty the very body in which He came; and so it was preferred to tell the improbable tale of a divine teacher, of whom no one had ever heard before, making a sudden appearance in the synagogue. That Christ had a real earthly body Marcion of course could not admit. In the article DOCTINISM (Vol. I. p. 869) an account is given of Marcion's doctrine on this subject, as also of that of his disciple Apelles, who on this point as well as on others approached more nearly to the orthodox.\* It was an obvious argument against the Docetic theory that if our Lord's body were not real we could have no faith that His miracles were real; neither could we have faith in the reality of those sufferings and death of his, which Marcion was willing to regard as an exhibition of redeeming love; nor in the reality of His resurrection. Marcion, like the orthodox, taught that the death of our Lord was followed by a "descent into hell;" but Irenaeus tells us that he taught that there Cain, the people of Sodom, and others of those condemned in the Old Testament as wicked, received Christ's preaching and were taken up by Him into His kingdom; but that Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, the prophets, and other righteous men imagined that the Demiurge was tempting them as he had done on other occasions, and so being afraid to join themselves to Christ and accept deliverance from Him, were left behind by Him in the underworld. Christ's salvation, according to Marcion, affected the soul only, and did not affect the body, of which he held there would be no resurrection. In fact none of those who regarded matter as essentially evil, could believe that evil would be made eternal by a material resurrection. Tertullian points out that sin originates with the soul, not the body, and pronounces it unfair that the sinful soul should be redeemed and the less guilty body punished. On unredeemed souls no punishment would be inflicted by Marcion's good God; he would merely abandon them to the vengeance of the Demiurge; but Tertullian shewed that if direct punishment were inconsistent with perfect goodness, such abandonment must be equally so.

In the preceding statement of Marcionite doctrine we have not used an account different in character from that given by the other authorities, namely, that of Esnig (see Neumann's translation from the Armenian, *Zeitschrift für histor. Theol.* vol. iv.). The system described by Esnig has more of a mythic than of a rationalistic character, and if we accept this as the original form of Marcionism, Marcion owed more to the older Gnostics than we should otherwise have

\* Concerning Apelles may be consulted Harnack's thesis *De Apellis Gnosti Monarchica*, Leipzig, 1874.



supposed. (Compare in particular JUSTINUS.) We give a summary of Esnig's account without determining whether it may not represent a later modification of the system; Esnig himself regarded all that we are here about to quote as belonging to the primary form.

Marcion, then, is said to have taught that there were three heavens: in the highest dwelt the good God, in the second the God of the Law, in the lowest his angels; beneath lay Hyle, or matter, having an independent existence of its own. By the help of Hyle, which played the part of a female principle, the God of the Law made this world, after which he retired to his heaven; and each ruled in his own domain, he in heaven and Hyle on earth. Afterwards the God of the Law, beholding how goodly this earth was, desired to make man to inhabit it, and for this purpose requested the co-operation of Hyle. She supplied the dust from which man's body was made, and he breathed in his spirit, and made him live. He named him Adam, gave him a wife, and placed him in Paradise, as the Scriptures relate. There they lived, honouring and obeying their Maker, in joy and childlike innocence, for as yet they had no children. Then the Lord of Creation, seeing that Adam was worthy to serve him, devised how he might withdraw him from Hyle and unite him to himself. He took him aside, and said, "Adam, I am God and beside me there is no other; if thou worshippest any other God thou shalt die the death." When Adam heard of death he was filled with terror and gradually withdrew himself from Hyle. When Hyle came after her went to serve him, Adam did not listen to her, but withdrew himself, and came not nigh her. Then Hyle recognised that the Lord of Creation had supplanted her; and she said, "Seeing that he hates me and keeps not his compact with me, I will make a number of gods and fill the world with them, so that they who seek the true God shall not be able to find him." She did so, and filled the world with idolatry; men ceased to adore the Lord of Creation, for Hyle had drawn them all to herself. Then was the Creator full of wrath; and as men died he cast them into hell, both Adam on account of the tree and the rest. There they remained twenty-nine centuries. At length the good God looked down from the highest heaven, and beheld what misery men suffered from Hyle and the Creator. He took compassion on those who were plagued and tortured in the fire of hell, and he sent down his son to deliver them. "Go down," he said, "take on thee the form of a servant, and make thyself like the sons of the law. Heal their wounds, give sight to their blind, bring their dead to life, perform without reward the greatest miracles of healing; then will the God of the Law be jealous, and will instigate his servants to crucify thee. Then go down to hell, which will open her mouth to receive thee, supposing thee to be one of the dead. Then liberate the captives whom thou shalt find there, and bring them up to me." This plan was carried out. Hell was deceived and admitted Jesus, who emptied it of all the spirits that were therein, and carried them up to his Father. When the God of the Law saw what had been done, he was enraged, he rent his clothes, tore the curtain of his palace, darkened his sun, and veiled his world in darkness. After that,

Jesus came down a second time, but now in the glory of his divinity, to plead with the God of the Law. When the Creator saw Jesus thus appear, he was obliged to own that he had been wrong in thinking that there was no other god but himself. Then Jesus said, "I have a controversy with thee, but I will take no other judge between us than thine own law. Is it not written in thy law that whoso killeth another shall himself be killed; that whoso sheddeth innocent blood shall have his own blood shed? Let me, then, kill thee and shed thy blood, for I was innocent and thou hast shed my blood." Then he recounted what benefits he had bestowed on the Creator's children, and in return had been crucified; and the Creator could make no defence, seeing himself condemned by his own law, and he said, "I was ignorant, I thought thee but a man, and did not know thee to be a God; take the revenge which is thy due." Then Jesus left him and betook himself to Paul, and revealed to him the way in which we should go. All who believe in Christ will give themselves to this good and righteous man. Men must withdraw themselves from the dominion of Hyle; but all do not know how this is to be done.

Though this mythical story differs much in complexion from the other ancient accounts of Marcionite doctrine, we cannot absolutely reject it; for there is nothing in it inconsistent with Marcion's known doctrines, or such as a Gnostic of his age might not have taught. It strikes us, indeed, as much such a system as he might have learned from the Syriac Gnostic Cerdo. But Marcion must have given the mythic element little prominence in his own teaching, else it would not have so disappeared from the other accounts.

*Discipline and Worship.*—From the fact that Marcion exercised great freedom of private judgment on the church tradition, Neander unwarrantably inferred that he must have aimed at Protestant simplicity of worship. This was not the case; in rites Marcion followed the church model. Thus (Tert. *Adv. Marc.* i. 14) he had baptism with water, anointing with oil, a mixture of milk and honey was given to the newly baptized, and sacramental bread represented the Saviour's body. Only wine was absent from his Eucharist, for (see ENCRATITES) his principles entirely forbade the use of wine or of flesh meat. Fish, however, he permitted to be eaten. He commanded his disciples to fast on Saturday, in order to mark his hostility to the God of the Jews, who had made that his day of rest. Marriage he condemned. A married man who offered himself as a disciple was received as a catechumen, but not admitted to baptism until he had agreed to separate from his wife (*Adv. Marc.* i. 29, and iv. 10). This probably explains the statement of Epiphanius that the Marcionites celebrated the mysteries in the presence of unbaptized persons. The sect could not have flourished if it discouraged married persons from joining it; and if it admitted them only to the class of catechumens, that class would naturally be granted larger privileges than in the Catholic church.<sup>f</sup> Nor need we disbelieve the

<sup>f</sup> They justified their practice by an appeal to Gal. vi. 6 (see Jerome, *in loc.*).

statement of Epiphanius that a second or a third baptism was permitted. If a member of the sect married, or if one who had put away his wife took her back, it is not incredible that on repentance a second baptism was necessary before restoration to the full privileges of membership. Again, since the baptism of a married person was only permitted in *articulo mortis*, it would sometimes happen that catechumens were surprised by death before baptism, and it is not incredible that in such cases the device of a vicarious baptism may have been resorted to, as Chrysostom tells in speaking on the passage in Corinthians about being baptized for the dead (vol. x. 378). Epiphanius states that Marcion permitted females to baptize. The Marcionite baptism was not recognised by the church. Theodoret, cited above, tells that he baptized those whom he converted. (See also Basil, *Can. 47, Ep. 199.*) The serpent worship which Theodoret tells that he found among the Marcionites of his own district was probably a mere local superstition. He tells also that he had met an aged Marcionite who, in his hostility to the works of the Creator, refused to wash his face in water, but used his own spittle. It was easy to shew that refusal to use the works of the Creator was a principle which could not possibly be carried out consistently. On the whole we cannot but pity the austere and melancholy life to which the principles of Marcion condemned himself and his followers. Giving up, for Christ's sake, as they fancied, almost all that other men value, they only earned the reprobation of the great mass of those who bore Christ's name; and so Marcion addresses a disciple as his partner in tribulation, and fellow sufferer from hatred (*συμμοιούμενον* and *συνταλαπύρον*, *Adv. Marc. iv. 9*).

*Canon of Scripture.*—It has been already stated that Marcion rejected the Old Testament; this involved the rejection of great part of the New which bears witness to the Old. He only retained the Gospel of St. Luke (and that in a mutilated form), and ten Epistles of St. Paul, omitting the pastoral epistles. In defence of his rejection of other apostolic writings, he appealed to the statements of St. Paul in the epistle to the Galatians, that some of the older apostles had not walked uprightly after the truth of the gospel, and that certain false apostles had perverted the gospel of Christ. Marcion's Gospel, though substantially identical, as far as it went, with our St. Luke's, did not bear that Evangelist's name. The later Marcionites said that it had been written by Christ, and when asked how then could it contain the history of Christ's death and resurrection, answered that these portions had been added by St. Paul. That Marcion's Gospel was, however, an abridgment of St. Luke was asserted by all the fathers from Irenaeus down, and not doubted by any until quite modern times. Then notice was taken that in some cases where Marcion is accused by Epiphanius or Tertullian of having corrupted the text, his readings are witnessed by other ancient authorities. In such cases we can see that the orthodox critics were wrong in regarding every variation from their own text as heretical corruption. Then the question suggested itself, May not Marcion have been really in possession of the older and better text? Irenaeus and Ter-

tullian in good faith accused him of mutilating St. Luke, because his form of the Gospel was shorter than that current in their own day, but may not Marcion's shorter form have been the original and the enlarged form a later corruption? We have the means of restoring Marcion's Gospel with sufficient exactness. Tertullian undertook to confute the heretic out of his own Gospel, and accordingly goes through it in minute detail; Epiphanius also has made a series of minute notes on Marcion's corruptions of the text; some notices are also found in the Dialogue of Adamantius. Combining these independent sources of information we obtain results on which we can place great confidence. It clearly appears that Marcion's Gospel and our St. Luke's in the main followed the same order and were even in verbal agreement, except that the latter contains much not found in the former. So that the affinity of the two forms is certain, and the only choice is whether we shall regard the one as a mutilation or the other as an interpolated form. The theory that the shorter form was the original was for some time defended by Ritschl and Baur, who, however, were obliged to yield to the arguments of Hilgenfeld and Volkmar. In the work of the latter, *Das Evangelium Marcions*,<sup>κ</sup> the differences between the two forms of the Gospel are examined in minute detail, especially with reference to their doctrinal bearings; and it is found that the only theory which will explain the facts is that Marcion's is a mutilated form. His form, in fact, exhibits a hostility to Judaism, to the Mosaic law, and to the work of the Creator, of which there is not a trace in genuine Pauline Christianity. The question has been treated from a different point of view by Dr. Sanday (*Gospel in the Second Century*, p. 204). He has made a careful linguistic comparison of the portion of our St. Luke which Marcion acknowledges with that which he omits, the result being a decisive proof of common authorship; the part omitted by Marcion abounding in all the peculiarities which have been noted as distinguishing the style of the third evangelist. The theory therefore that Marcion's form is the original may be said to be now completely exploded. Dr. Sanday notes further that the text of St. Luke used by Marcion has some readings which are recognised by some other ancient authorities, but which no critic now accepts. The inference is that at the time when Marcion used St. Luke's Gospel it had been so long in existence, and had been copied so often, that different types of text had had time to establish themselves. It has been argued that Marcion could not have known our Fourth Gospel, else he would have chosen this, as being more strongly anti-Jewish, in preference to St. Luke's, as the basis of his own Gospel. But the Fourth Gospel is not anti-Jewish in Marcion's sense, and he would have had even more trouble in mutilating this before he could have made it suitable to his purpose. At the very outset Christ's relation to the Jewish people is described in the words, "He came unto His own;" the Jewish temple is called His

<sup>κ</sup> Those who do not care for so minute an examination will find the chief peculiarities of Marcion's Gospel noted in Kirchofer's *Quellensammlung*, or in the English work founded on it, Charteris's *Canonicity*.

Father's house; salvation is said to be of the Jews; contrary to Marcion's teaching, Christ is perpetually identified with the Christ predicted in the Old Testament; the Scriptures are "they which testify of me," "Moses wrote of me," "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me." Great importance is attached to the testimony of John the Baptist, who, according to Marcion, like the older prophets, did not know the true Christ; and if there had been nothing else, the story of the miracle of turning water into wine would have condemned the Gospel in Marcion's eyes. In short, if the Fourth Gospel can be called anti-Jewish, it is still more strongly anti-Marcionite.

Marcion's *Apostolicon* consisted of ten Epistles, in order as follows:—Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, wanting the last two chapters, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, called by Marcion the Epistle to the Laodiceans, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. Concerning the order of the last two, Tertullian and Epiphanius differ. It will be seen that the Acts as well as the pastoral Epistles are rejected. Marcion's *Apostolicon* was known to Jerome, who notes two or three of its readings. The most careful attempt to restore it is by Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschrift f. histor. Theol.* 1855). It becomes apparent that Marcion struck out from the Epistles which he acknowledged some passages which conflicted with his theory. He appears to have made some few additions besides. He may possibly have made these alterations in the sincere belief that they were necessary to restore the genuine text of Paul, who, he thought, could not but have held the same doctrine as himself. But the arbitrary character of such criticism would destroy all claim to originality for Marcion's text of the Gospel, even if that claim had not otherwise been sufficiently refuted. [G. S.]

MARCULPHUS, a Gallic monk, author of *Formulae* in two books, still extant. He compiled the work when past seventy, and his period is known from his dedicating it to bishop Landericus, who may be assumed to be the bishop of Paris, cir. 660. The *Formulae* were first edited by Bignonius at Paris in 1613. In 1618 they were included in La Bigne's *Mag. Bibl. Pat.* (vii. 564, Cologne) and in 1677 in his *Max. Bibl. Pat.* (xii. 767, Lyons). In 1780 Baluze printed them in his *Capitularies* (ii. 369), and added his own notes to those of Bignonius. They are also to be found in Bouquet (t. iv.) and in the *Patrol. Lat.* (lxxxvii. 691). They are noticed by Cave (i. 591), and fully described by Ceillier (xi. 739) and Dupin (ii. 22, ed. 1722). They consist, says Mr. Smith (*u. inf.*), of drafts or forms for every species of legal writing, whether they relate to the appointment of counts and bishops by the king or to the most ordinary traffic between man and man, throwing therefore much light on the condition of society in France in the 7th century. Dupin examines those of the *Formulae* which relate to ecclesiastical matters and believes them to be very ancient. Mr. Smith concludes from them that under the Merovingian dynasty ecclesiastical appointments were entirely in the hands of the king and his council of great barons, without any reference to Rome. (Thomas Smith, F.S.A., of Stonygate, *Marculfus*, Leic. 1836.)

[C. H.]

MARCULUS, a Donatist presbyter, who with Donatus, bishop of Bagai, suffered death during the persecution, so called, under Macarius, A.D. 348. The account, as given among the collection of Donatist memorials, states that he was apprehended at Vegesela, in Numidia (*Fouganah*), between Theveste and Lambese (Ant. *Itin.* 33, 5), and, having been there cruelly beaten, was taken to a fort situate on a precipitous rock, called Castellum novae Petrae (*Ouled Sultani*), on the road from Lambese to Sifti (Ant. *Itin.* 34, 4), where, four days later, he was thrown from the rock and perished. But St. Augustine, though he does not absolutely deny the fact of his death, appears to doubt the manner of it, as being a punishment unknown to Roman law, and in so doing to throw doubt also on the fact itself. (Aug. *c. Petil.* ii. 14, 32; 88, 195; *c. Cresc.* iii. 49, 54; in *Joann. Evang.* xi. 2, 15; Opt. i. 6; *Collat. Carth.* Cogn. i. 187; Morelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 246; *Mon. Vet. Don.* xxviii. pp. 226-236, ed. Oberthür; Tillem. vi. 113, 711.) [MACARIUS (21).] [H. W. P.]

MARCUS (1), bishop of Jerusalem, the first gentile bishop of Aelia Capitolina, *πρωτων ἐξ ἔθνων ἐπίσκοπον* (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12), A.D. 136. He stands sixteenth on the catalogues of bishops of Jerusalem. According to the Roman Martyrology he was martyred under Antoninus A.D. 155. He is commemorated Oct. 22nd. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6, 12; Niceph. *H. E.* iii. 25, iv. 19; Epiphani, *Haer.* lxxi. 20; *Mart. Usuard.*, Adon.) [E. V.]

MARCUS (2) (MARCIANUS), bishop of Alexandria, succeeded bishop Eumenes in the autumn of A.D. 143, the sixth year of Antoninus. Eumenes having held the office thirteen years (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11), from the fifteenth year of Hadrian, or A.D. 130 (Euseb. *Chronic.*). Eusebius calls him Marcus, and it has been conjectured that the name of Marcianus, by which Egyptian writers call him (as Eutychius, *Annal.* p. 356, and compare Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 17), was substituted for his own "out of reverence to the Evangelist" (Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* i. 15). He sat ten years, according to Eusebius, and dying on the 6th of Tybi or 1st of January, in 153 (Renaudot, Neale), or 154 (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 390), was succeeded by Celadion.

[W. B.]

MARCUS (3), African bishop in Syn. Carth. (sub *Cyp. de Bapt. Haer.* 1, *Cyp. Ep.* 70). Bishop of Macthar, prov. Byz. (f. l. Mazara *Itin. Anton.*); 38th in *Sentt. epp.* in Syn. Carth. sub *Cyp.* 7 (*de Bapt. Haer.* 3). [E. W. B.]

MARCUS (4), addressed along with Miltiades by Constantine, who desires them to assemble a council at Rome for the unity of the Church (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5). Valesius (*ib. note*), rejecting a conjecture of Baronius (*A. E. ann.* 313 xxv.), thinks he is a Roman presbyter who succeeded Silvester as bishop. (Tillem. vi. 30.)

[C. H.]

MARCUS (5), bishop of Pelusium, who although deprived of the presbyterate had been ordained to that see by Athanasius, according to the charge brought against the latter in the council of Tyre in 335. (Soz. ii. 25; Tillem. viii. 39; Le Quien, ii. 531.) [C. H.]

**MARCUS (6)**, bishop of Rome, probably from Jan. 18 to Oct. 7, A.D. 336, during 8 months and 20 days, having been ordained eighteen days after the death of his predecessor Sylvester. The above dates, those of the *Liberian Catalogue* and *Depositio Episcoporum*, are confirmed by St. Jerome (*Chron.*), who gives him a reign of eight months, and are consistent with historical events. The Felician and other later catalogues, giving him a reign of more than two years, are manifestly erroneous. His time was an eventful one. Shortly before his accession Athanasius had been deposed for the first time, and was in exile at Treves, Constantine the Great being still alive: during his pontificate Arius died, and the council was held at Constantinople, at which Marcellus of Ancyra was condemned. But no action of Marcus is recorded. He is said (*Catal. Felic. and Anastasius*) to have been a Roman, and the son of Priscus, to have ordained that the bishops of Ostia should consecrate the bishops of Rome and bear the pallium, and to have been buried in the cemetery of Balbina on the Via Ardeatina, "in basilica quam coemiterium constituit." Baronius notices the above as being the earliest mention of the pallium. The custom of the bishops of Ostia ordaining those of Rome, is alluded to by Augustine as an ancient one (*Brevic. Collat. cum Donat. die 3, c. 16*); and long before the time of Marcus, Dionysius of Rome is said to have been consecrated by Maximus bishop of Ostia (*Surius, de S. Laurent. Martyr. Aug. 10*). The cemetery of Balbina, called also that of St. Mark from this pope's interment there, which is variously spoken of in old itineraries as on the Ardeatine and Appian Ways, has been identified as lying between the two by De Rossi, who supposes the "basilica" spoken of to have been a chapel, or *cella memorie*, built by Marcus at the entrance of an existing cemetery, and intended as a place of burial. Interment near the surface of the ground seems about this time to have begun to supersede the use of subterranean catacombs. Marcus appears in the Roman Martyrology as a saint and confessor: "Oct. 7. Romae Via Ardeatina depositio S. Marci papae et confessoris." A letter supposed to have been addressed to him by Athanasius and the Egyptian bishops with reference to the Nicene council and his reply to it are both supposititious.

[J. B.—y.]

**MARCUS (7)**, the name of two bishops who with a number of others were ordained by Alexander of Alexandria and banished by Constantius, the Marci being sent respectively to Ammoniac and the upper Oasis (*Athan. Apol. de Fug. § 7 and Hist. Ar. § 72*). In the *Tome to the Antiochians* of Athanasius, A.D. 362 (title and § 10), they appear again, their sees being here mentioned, viz. Zygra and Philae, having returned under Julian's edict and attended the Alexandrian council. One of these two Marci, and not Diadochus bishop of Photice, is believed by Galland to be the Marcus Diadochus whose *Discourse against the Arians* in Greek is printed, with a Latin version, in Galland's *Vet. Pat. Biblioth.* (t. v. p. 242) with observations on the author (Proleg. p. xxiv.). The whole is reprinted by Migne (*Pat. Gr. lxx. 1141*), who, believing like some others that Marcus Diadochus is Diadochus of Photice, places the works

of both together. (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 613, 635; Tillem. viii. 206, 697; Cave, i. 217; Ceillier, vi. 329, xii. 297.) [C. H.]

**MARCUS (8)**, bishop of Arethusa and confessor in Julian's reign. During the reign of Constantius he demolished a magnificent temple, which enraged the populace against him. On the accession of Julian he was ordered to rebuild it, whereupon he fled from the city. Hearing however that the Christians were suffering persecution on his account, he returned, and was cruelly tortured by the mob. Yet he survived all, and was protected by Julian from further violence (*Liban. Ep. 730; Soz. H. E. x. 10; Greg. Naz. or. iv.; Neander's H. E. ed. Bohn, iii. 72, 86*). According to some Marcus was the bishop who saved Julian's life when six years old, amid the massacre of the rest of his family. Gregory questions whether Mark's sufferings were not a great though imperfect retribution for his misplaced act of humanity (*Rendall's Julian, 35, 167*). Valesius in *Soz. v. 10* has distinguished him from another Marcus of Arethusa, a leader of the Arians from Constantine's time, but apparently without sufficient reason. In *Socrat. H. E. ii. 30* (cf. *Valesii Annot.*) he is expressly mentioned as the author of the creed of Sirmium A.D. 351, which the historian there sets forth in full (cf. *Till. Mém. vii. p. 226; Ittig. Hist. Phot. p. 454; Fab. Bib. Graec. lib. v. 24; Ceill. v. 199*). He was present on the Eusebian side at Sardica A.D. 344; cf. *Soc. ii. 18; Hef. Hist. of Councils, lib. iv. sec. 60; v. 72; Fleury, H. E. lib. xii. 26 et pass.; Hil. Frag. xv. in Migne, P. G. x. col. 721 note*. [G. T. S.]

**MARCUS (9)**, bishop of Hydruntum, author of a short hymn *On the Great Sabbath*, extant in Latin (*Pat. Lat. xevi. 1345*), but originally composed in Greek acrostics. He is supposed to have lived cir. 750 (Cave, i. 630; Ceillier, xii. 130) or later (Ughelli, ix. 55; Cappelletti xxi. 300). [C. H.]

**MARCUS (10)**, Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria, called by the Copts "the new Mark," or Mark II. (the Marcus of the 2nd century being known as Marcianus), succeeded to the Monophysite primacy in 799. On hearing that he was elected, he hid himself among the monastic cells in the "desert of St. Macarius." The Jacobite bishops obtained the "prefect's" leave to consecrate him; his name was duly inscribed on the tablets of the divan: but he was not forthcoming, until the bishop of Misra (once the Egyptian Babylon), who had jurisdiction over the monasteries, ordered that he should be brought from his retreat, "if necessary, in chains." He was consecrated on Sunday, Jan. 27 (Mechir 2). At his enthronement he read, as was usual, a statement of his faith, in which he attacked the council of Chalcedon and its adherents, as if they ascribed to Christ a separate *human* personality, and thereby became worshippers of a mere man. He also censured the extreme or Eutychian Monophysites, whose theory in effect made the Passion unreal. He spent the ensuing Lent in Nitria. After Easter he obtained from the emir permission to rebuild the ruined churches. He had a friendly correspondence with Cyriacus the Jacobite patriarch of

Antioch; and he received overtures from the remnant of the Barsanuphius sect, which had arisen 300 years before among the discussions caused by the inconsistent policy of Peter Mongus, and was in fact a subdivision of the Acephali. There were two so-called bishops of this party; and Mark, on receiving their abjuration of schism, frankly told them that he could not recognize their episcopal character. "The Holy Spirit, who descends on bishops, did not descend on you." "All we ask," they meekly answered, "is that you will pray for us." Touched by this humility (somewhat as Theodore had been moved by the "soft answer" of Chad), Mark himself consecrated them according to his own rite, and arrayed them in episcopal vestments at a church in the Mareotis; and when two sees fell vacant, installed them therein. The rest of the Barsanuphites asked Mark to visit them; he hallowed their churches and monasteries, gave them liturgies according to the "ecclesiastical law," administered the Eucharist to them, and so brought this schism to an end. He exerted himself against a theory which was advocated in the Antiochene patriarchate by one Abraham, and which apparently denied the real presence in the Eucharist. It was not until Cyriacus had been succeeded by Dionysius that these "Abrahamites," to the great satisfaction of Mark, were won over. Mark had sore troubles to bear amid the intestine warfare which harassed Egypt. Various insurgents held parts of the country, while two Abbasside princes, the sons of Haroun-al-Raschid, were fighting for the khalifate. The Omniads reigning in Spain invaded Egypt; Alexandria was besieged, and many foreign prisoners were taken, whom Mark ransomed to the number of 6000, sending home, with due "provision for the way," those who wished to return to their own country, and instructing others in the Monophysite creed. The Spanish-Arabian forces, aided by the Egyptian "rebels," took the city: the allies then quarrelled, the Spaniards were victorious, but in their turn were attacked by the citizens: their comrades, in revenge, perpetrated an indiscriminate massacre. In the midst of the city stood a grand Monophysite church "of the Saviour," which Mark's flock had constrained him to enlarge, in spite of his warning that "it might provoke the envy of the adversaries." Some of the slain Spaniards lay stretched at its gate, and an old Moslem falsely denounced Mark as having killed them with his own hand. It was enough. The church was instantly set on fire, and Mark, in bitter grief, escaped into the desert, where he remained for five years, until he found an abode in the valley of Habib. Hither, at last, the Arab forayers made their way, and Mark, utterly crushed by his sufferings, succumbed to a fever. On Easter Eve, 819, the bishops in attendance on their dying patriarch—who, although a heretic in the eyes of the Catholic East and West, was to them the representative of "the Evangelist" and of Athanasius—"brought to him," at his own request, "the chalice, and he received communion of the body and blood of Christ," *i. e.* in the Eastern method, the Sacrament in both kinds being administered with a spoon. He died on the 22nd of Pharmuthi, or 17th of April, after a pontificate of twenty years, leaving behind him a justly honoured name. See Renaudot, *Hist.*

*Patr. Alex.* p. 246 ff.; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 463; Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* ii. 136 ff.

[W. B.]

MARCUS (11), a presbyter who had some kind of pre-eminence and authority among the monks of the Chalcidian desert in Syria when Jerome lived among them, A.D. 375-9. He is called in some editions of Jerome, Teledensis, from Teleda, a city of Chalcis. He wrote to Jerome, though he had frequently seen and conversed with him on points of faith, to inquire as to his views in reference to the questions about the Trinity which then disquieted the monks in connection with the disputes about the see of Antioch. Jerome in reply complains of the condemnatory spirit of the monks, who from their caves and in their sack-cloth passed sentence on the world and all its best bishops. He begs that the hospitality of the desert may be allowed him and that he may be left free till the spring, when he will retire. He appeals to "the holy Cyril," Zenobius, and Marcus himself, as the witnesses of his faith. (Jerome, ep. 17, ed. Vall.)

[W. H. F.]

MARCUS (12), deacon, ordained by Porphyrius bishop of Gaza, whose life he wrote. He was ordained deacon cir. 395 and soon after 421 composed his work, which contains personal notices of himself. It is one of the Greek manuscripts described by Lambecius in the imperial library of Vienna (*Bibl. Cæs. Vindob.* lib. viii. p. 93 ed. 1679, p. 198 ed. Kollar, 1782). A Latin version is extant with notes by Heuschen (*Boll. Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 645; *Pat. Gr.* lxx. 1211), who considers this biography historically valuable. (Tillem. x. 704; Cave, i. 403; Ceillier, vi. 329.)

[C. H.]

MARCUS (13), a celebrated monk of Scetis in Lower Egypt (*Soz. H. E.* vi. 29; Niceph. *H. E.* xi. 35; Cassiod. *Hist. Trip.* viii. 1 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxix. 1108). Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* cap. 21) tells us that about the year 390 he was 100 years old. In the *Menologia* of Basil (March 2) there is a story of a certain Marcus deeply versed in the Scriptures. This same story occurs in Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* cap. 20), but is told of Macarius. Tillemont is probably right in his opinion that for Macarius we should in this place read Marcus (*vid.* for his reasons *Mém. Ecclés.* vol. x. p. 801). This Marcus has been very commonly identified with Marcus Eremita, whose works have come down to us [MARCUS (14)]; but on insufficient grounds, for none of our authorities speak of any works as written by him, and Nicephorus, who mentions both, gives no indication that they are the same person.

[M. F. A.]

MARCUS (14), surnamed EREMITA, mentioned by Nicephorus Callistus as *ὁ πολυθράλλητος ἀσκητής*, and said to have lived in the reign of Theodosius II. and to have been a disciple of St. Chrysostom (*Niceph. H. E.* xiv. 30). This is the only indication which we have of his date, if he is not to be identified with No. (13). Later in the same book we are told of the works of a *Μάρκος ἀσκητής*, apparently the same man. Of these Nicephorus himself had seen a collection of eight and also another of thirty-two, dealing with the ascetic life (*H. E.* xiv. 54). Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 200) gives an account of eight works

of Marcus the monk, all of which have come down to us with one doubtful exception (vid. below). He characterises the style as clear though not Attic, except in certain passages where the nature of the subject renders it necessarily obscure. Dorotheus (*Doctr.* i. 9, viii. 2, in *Patr. Gr.* lxxxviii. pp. 1627, 1707) refers to the writings of ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάρκος, but in such general terms, that it is quite impossible to say whether he means our author or not. His works are published in *Patrol. Gr.* lxxv. 905, preceded by two disquisitions on the author by Gallandius and Fessler. The works are from the edition of Remondini, published at Rome in 1748: the order being slightly different from that given in Photius. They are as follows:—

(1) *περὶ νόμου πνευματικοῦ*, a collection of short aphorisms, inculcating especially the duties of humility and constant prayer.

(2) *περὶ τῶν οἰομένων ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι* shews that, as being slaves of God, we have no wages to expect. All is of grace, which is given *τελεία* in baptism, and afterwards in fuller or scantier measure according to our obedience.

(3) *περὶ μετανοίας* shews repentance to be necessary for all.

(4) *ἀπόκρισις πρὸς τοὺς ἀποροῦντας περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ βαπτίσματος*, is an important treatise on the doctrine of baptism. It states distinctly that by the grace of baptism original sin is put away, and the baptized are in exactly the same condition as Adam before the fall.

(5) and (9) *πρὸς Νικόλαον* and *περὶ νηστείας* are ascetic treatises.

(7) *ἀντιβολή πρὸς σχολαστικόν*. A defence of the monastic life against a man of the world. The virtues most dwelt upon are again those which have been noticed.

(8) *συμβουλία νοδὸς πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆν*—dwells on a thought which recurs constantly in the treatise on Baptism, that the root of evil is in ourselves.

(10) *εἰς τὸν Μελλισεδέκ*. This work was not included in the earlier editions of our author, and seems hardly to answer to the description of Photius. It is directed against those heretics who argued from the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews that Melchizedek was the Son of God. Photius (l. c.) says that in this treatise Marcus attacked his own father, who was tainted with the heresy; but of this there is no indication in the work as we now have it.

We have reserved till the last the treatise (6) entitled *κεφάλαια νηπτικά*. Though generally included among the works of Marcus, it is not mentioned by Photius, and is in general treatment wholly different from the others. It is highly mystical, describing as perfection the state of spiritual rapture, above both sense and intellect, in which the soul is absorbed in God, and man even becomes God. It is admitted that no men maintain this state uninterruptedly throughout life, and therefore absolute perfection is not attained here below. Judging both from external and internal evidence, it would seem that this work is wrongly ascribed to Marcus.

In two passages very precise language is used on the relation of the Persons in the Trinity and of the two natures in Christ, as “*οὐ σύγχυσις*

*ἀλλὰ ἑνωσις*,” “*ἐκ δύο ἡνωμένων ἀδιαρέτως ἀσυγχύτως*” (Migne, pp. 1009, 1100). These, especially the latter, it is difficult to explain, on the supposition that our author is the person mentioned by Nicephorus as a pupil of St. Chrysostom, except as later interpolations.

[M. F. A.]

MARCUS (15), called CASSINENSIS, a monk of Mount Cassinus, cir. 606, author of a short metrical life of St. Benedict (*Pat. Lat.* lxxx. 183) founded on the life by Gregory the Great, with a few additions of his own. (Sigebert. *Gembl. Scr. Ecol.* cap. 33 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 533; Petrus Diac. *Cassin. Vir. Ill. Cassin.* cap. 3 in *Pat. Lat.* clxxiii. 1013; Ceill. xi. 634.)

[C. H.]

MARCUS (16), an abbat whose name appears in the record of the council of Clovesho in 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024) among those in attendance on Ealhmund bishop of Winchester. [S.]

MARCUS (17), a Gnostic of the school of Valentinus, who taught in the middle of the 2nd century. His doctrines are almost exclusively known to us through a long section (i. 13–21, pp. 55–98), in which Irenaeus has given an account of the teaching of him and his school. It has been stated (Vol. II. p. 148) that another passage (i. xi. 3, p. 54) which Irenaeus quotes without mention of the author's name, is really an extract from Marcus; and possibly one or two passages where Irenaeus describes the opinions of anonymous Valentinians may also be referred to Marcus. Both Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 39–55, pp. 200–220) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 34) have copied their account of Marcisian doctrine from Irenaeus; and, notwithstanding some small differences between the present texts of Hippolytus and Irenaeus, there appears no good reason to think that either Hippolytus or Epiphanius had any direct knowledge of the writings of Marcus. Still less reason have we for attributing such knowledge to any later heresiologist. But Clement of Alexandria, whose sympathies were very strong with the Gnosticism which he combated, and who makes such use of preceding authors that his writings would have been full of inverted commas if that mode of acknowledging obligation had been usual in his time, clearly knew and used the writings of Marcus. We have noted one case (Vol. II. p. 161) where Clement adopted as his own some fanciful speculations of Marcus; and possibly if the writings of Marcus had survived other similar instances would have been found.

Although Jerome describes Marcus as a Basilidian (Ep. 75 *ad Theod.* i. 449), what Irenaeus reports of his teaching clearly shews that he is correctly described as a follower of Valentinus. Thus his system tells of thirty Aeon, divided into an Ogdoad, a Decad, and a Dodecad; of the fall and recovery of Sophia, of the future union of the spirits of the chosen seed with angels as their heavenly bridegrooms. We may note in passing that in this system these angels have the technical name “Greatnesses;” in other Valentinian systems (Epiph. *Haer.* 31, p. 168) “Greatness” is specially the name of the First Principle. What Marcus may be regarded as having added of his own to the teaching of his predecessors, is perhaps the most

worthless of all that passed under the name of "knowledge" in the 2nd century. It does not contain, like some of the Gnostic theories, attempts to solve problems which thinkers of every age have found difficult, but merely either magical formulæ, which the disciples were to get by heart and put trust in, or else puerile speculations, such as were in vogue among the later Pythagoreans, about mysteries in numbers and names. Sometimes Marcus counts the number of letters in a name, sometimes he reckons up the sum total, when to each letter is given its value in the Greek arithmetical notation: sometimes he uses a method which enables him to find still deeper mysteries. He points out that if we take a single letter, Δ, and write its name at full length, δέλτα, we get five letters; but we may write again the names of these at full length and get a number of letters more, and so on *ad infinitum*. If the mysteries contained in a single letter be thus infinite, what must be the immensity of those contained in the name of the Propator. Concerning this name he gives the following account:—When the first Father, who is above thought and without substance, willed the unspeakable to become spoken, and the invisible to become formed, He opened His mouth and emitted a Word like Himself, which being the form of the invisible, declared to Himself what He was. His name consisted of four syllables successively uttered, of four, four, ten, and twelve letters respectively. It might appear as if we were to understand as the first of these the word ἀρχή, but on the whole we cannot see that Marcus had any actual names of ten or twelve letters in his mind; and this name of four syllables and thirty letters seems to be nothing but an artificial description of the system of thirty Aeons divided into two Tetrads, a Decad, and a Dodecad. Each letter is one of the Aeons, and, as has been already explained, contains within itself an infinity of mysteries. Each letter makes its own sound, it knows not the sound of the adjacent letter, nor of the whole, but the restitution of all things will take place when all the letters are brought to make the same sound, and then a harmony will result of which we have an image in that made when we all sound the Amen together. This comparison shews an interesting point of agreement in liturgical usage between the heretics of the second century and the Roman church of the time of Jerome, whose well-known words are "ad similitudinem caelestis tonitruī Amen reboat." What is stated about the limited knowledge of each Aeon may be compared with what Hippolytus tells of the Docetae (viii. 10, p. 268). Marcus pushes into further details his designation of the Aeons as letters of the alphabet. There are twenty-four letters in the alphabet, and twenty-four is the sum of the letters of the names of the first tetrad: Ἀβήητος, σειγή, πατήρ, and ἀλήθεια, as also of those of the second tetrad, λόγος, ζωή, ἄνθρωπος, ἐκκλησία. Again, the alphabet consists of nine mutes, eight semi-vowels, and seven vowels. Now (not taking into our account the two primary Aeons of the Ogdoad), the mutes belong to the first pair of Aeons, Pater and Aletheia, which made no direct revelation to man; the semi-vowels to the next pair, Logos and Zoe; and the vowels to the last,

Anthropos and Ecclesia, since it was a voice coming through Anthropos which gave power to all. For the seven heavens, we are told, utter each its own vowel sound, the first A and so on; and it was the sound of their united doxology borne to the earth, which gave generation to all things on the earth. By the descent of Him who was with the Father from the nine into the seven, the groups of Aeons were equalized and perfect harmony produced. Further, it is to be observed that in the Greek arithmetical notation eight letters are used to denote units, eight tens, and eight hundreds: total 888; but this is exactly the numerical value of the letters in the name Ἰησοῦς. Similarly, the A and Ω is identified with the περιτερά which descended on our Lord, the numerical value being in both cases 801. Other mysteries are found in the six letters of the name Ἰησοῦς [see EPISEMON], the eight letters of χριστός, which again added to the four of τίς make twelve. These, however, are only the spoken names known to ordinary Christians; the unspoken names of Jesus and Christ are of twenty-four and thirty letters respectively. Either Hippolytus, or an early copyist of his, makes an attempt to solve the mystery of the unspoken names by writing at full length the letters of the name χριστός; χεῖ, ρώ, εἰ, ἰώτα, σίγμα, ταῦ, οὐ, σάν; but we have here only twenty-four letters instead of thirty, and an attempt by Harvey to mend the reckoning cannot be pronounced successful, so we must be content to remain in ignorance of what would seem to have been one of the most valuable secrets of this sect. We give one or two specimens more of the arithmetical trifling in which Marcus gave instruction. To understand the generation of the thirty Aeons from the Ogdoad, we have only to take the first eight numbers and add them up, leaving out six, which is not denoted by a letter of the alphabet, and the sum will be thirty. Again, we find the fall of the twelfth Aeon, Sophia, indicated in the alphabet; for Δ, which arithmetically denotes 30, the number of the Aeons, is only the eleventh letter in the alphabet. But it set about to seek another like itself, and so the next letter is Μ or two Λ's. Again, add up the numerical value of all the letters of the alphabet ending with λ and we have ninety-nine; that is deficiency, a number still counted on the left hand, which they who have "knowledge" escape by following after the one which, added to ninety-nine, transfers them to the right hand. The reader will remember Juvenal's "jam dextera computat annos."

We have related more than enough of these puerilities, and we need not detail how Marcus found in Scripture and in Nature repeated examples of the occurrence of his mystical numbers, four, six, eight, ten, twelve, thirty. Under COLARBASUS (Vol. I. p. 594) has been copied the account which Marcus gave of the manner in which these mysteries had been revealed to him. If so great mysteries were contained in names, it naturally followed that to know the right name of each celestial power must be a matter of vital importance; and such knowledge the heretical teachers promised to bestow. They had formulæ and sacraments of Redemption. They taught that the baptism of the visible Jesus was but for the forgiveness



of sins, but that the redemption of Him who in that baptism descended, was for perfection; the one was merely psychical, the other spiritual. Of the latter are interpreted the words in which our Lord spoke of another baptism, Luke xii. 50; Matt. xx. 22. Some conferred this redemption by baptism with special invocations; others added or substituted various anointings; others held that these applications to the body had no efficacy in procuring spiritual redemption; and that it was only by knowledge such redemption could be effected. This knowledge included the possession of formulae, by the use of which the initiated would be able after death to become incomprehensible and invisible to principalities and powers, and leaving their bodies in this lower creation and their souls with the Demiurge, to ascend in their spirits at the Pleroma. It is likely that it was the Egyptian religion which contributed this element of Gnosticism. Some of these Marcossian formulae were in Hebrew, of which Irenaeus has preserved specimens much corrupted by being transcribed by copyists who did not understand them, if indeed Irenaeus understood them himself. Besides teaching his followers to put trust in the knowledge of such formulae, Marcus, as Irenaeus tells us, used other juggling tricks by which he gained the reputation of magical skill. A knowledge of astrology was also among his accomplishments. He appears to have had some chemical knowledge, which he employed to astonish and impress his disciples. The eucharistic cup of mingled wine and water was seen under his invocation to change colour and become a purple red; and his disciples were told that this was because the great CHARIS (*q. v.*) had dropped some of her blood into the cup. Sometimes he would hand the cup to women, and bid them in his presence pronounce the eucharistic words—that women should have been allowed to do this, even in a heretical sect, is worth taking notice of)—and then he would pour from their consecrated cup into a much larger one held by himself, and the liquor, miraculously increased at his prayer, would be seen to rise up and fill the larger vessel. He taught his female disciples to prophesy. Casting lots at their meetings, he would command her on whom the lot fell boldly to utter the words which were suggested to her mind, and such words were accepted by the hearers as prophetic utterances. He abused the influence he thus acquired over silly women to draw much money from them, and, it is said, even to gain from them more shameful compliances. He is accused of having used philtres and love charms, and at least one, if not more, of his female disciples on returning to the church confessed that body as well as mind had been defiled by him. Some of his followers certainly claimed to have been elevated by their knowledge, and by the Redemption which they had experienced above the need of complying with the ordinary rules of morality. If we are sometimes tempted to be indulgent to Gnostic theories as the harmless dreams of well-meaning thinkers perplexed by problems too hard for them, the history of Marcus shews how, when these closet speculations were turned into a practical religion, they at once became a degrading superstition. Everything elevating and ennobling in Christ's teaching disappeared;

the teachers boasted of a sham science, having no tendency to make those who believed it wiser or better; the disciples trusted in magical rites and charms not more respectable than those of the heathen; and their morality became of quite heathen laxity.

Marcus appears to have been an elder contemporary of Irenaeus, who speaks of him in the present tense, as though he were still living and teaching. But Irenaeus more than once speaks of the resistance made to Marcus by a venerated elder, from whom he quotes some iambic verses, written in reprobation of that heretic. It has been conjectured that this elder may have been the revered Pothinus, bishop of Lyons. But though we learn from Irenaeus that the Rhone district was much infested by followers of Marcus, it does not appear that Marcus was there himself, and the impression left by the section is that Irenaeus knew the followers of Marcus by personal intercourse, Marcus himself only by his writings. We are told also of Marcus having seduced the wife of one of the deacons in Asia (*διακόρον τινα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ*), and the most natural conclusion therefore is, that Asia Minor was the scene where Marcus made himself notorious as a teacher, and probably before Irenaeus had left that district; that it was a leading bishop of that district who resisted Marcus, and that the heretic's doctrines passed on into Gaul as a consequence of the extensive intercourse which it is well known then prevailed between the two countries.

The use of Hebrew or Syriac names in the Marcossian school may induce us to ascribe to Marcus an oriental origin. The only grounds for believing him to be of Egyptian extraction are these:—Sulpicius Severus, and others who give the history of the origin of Priscillianism, tell that one Marcus of Memphis (*q. v.*) brought the Gnostic doctrines into Spain, from whom Agape and Elpidius learned them. Jerome certainly (*u. s.*) identified this Marcus with the subject of the present article, his notion being that Marcossian doctrine, which we know from Irenaeus to have been prevalent in Southern Gaul, naturally passed on to the adjacent province of Spain. It is not quite clear whether Jerome felt the chronological difficulties of his theory, which, however, could be easily got over by supposing that the first Priscillianists were to be regarded as having learned from Marcus, not because they had been taught by himself personally, but because they had learned from men who revered him as the founder of their sect. But since Priscillianism contains none of the points which distinguish Marcus from other Gnostics, it is safer to regard Marcus of Memphis as a distinct personage. [G. S.]

#### MARCUS AURELIUS. [AURELIUS.]

MARCUS (18), the Marcionite interlocutor who defends the doctrine of two principles in the dialogue against the Marcionites (Sect. ii.). [ADAMANTIUS (2).] [G. S.]

MARCUS (19), a native of Memphis, brought the Manichaean doctrine from Egypt and introduced it into Spain, in the latter part of the 4th century. His chief converts were Agape and Helpidius. (Sulp. Sev. ii. 46; Tillem. viii. 491, 791.) [PRISCILLIANUS.] [M. B. C.]

MARCUS (20), the son of Basiliscus, appointed by the latter soon after his usurpation of the empire in A.D. 475 first Caesar and then Augustus (Candidus, p. 475, ed. Dindorf). His name appears in conjunction with his father's in the encyclic letter, condemning the council of Chalcedon, and also in the retraction preserved by Evagrius (*H. E.* iii. 4 and 7, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxvii. 2600, 2609) [ACACIUS (7)]. On Zeno's re-entering Constantinople in the summer of A.D. 477, Marcus, with his father and mother, took sanctuary in the great church, but they were given up to Zeno by Acacius, who deemed that heretics were undeserving of the right of sanctuary (Procopius, *Bell. Vand.* i. 7), or, according to Candidus, were persuaded by Armatas to surrender themselves to his mercy, or finally, according to the *Chronicon Paschale* (326, in *Patr. Gr.* ccii. 836), and Theophanes (*Chronographia*, 107, in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cviii. 309) were induced to leave the church by Zeno's promising that blood should not be shed. Basiliscus, with his wife and family, were banished to a place in Cappadocia named Limnae, near Cucusus, where they were all put to death. (Procopius, *ubi supra*, *Chronicon Paschale*, Theophanes.)

[F. D.]

MARIA (1). See MACARIUS (20). (Cyp. *Ep.* 21, 22.)

[E. W. B.]

MARIA (2) (Cyp. *Ep.* 21 and 22), mentioned by Celerinus and Lucian with Calphurnius, Christians at Rome in Decian persecution; and by the latter as confessors.

[E. W. B.]

MARIA (3), known by the title of MERETRIX, niece of St. Abraham. [ABRAHAM (4.)]

[J. G.]

MARIA (4), surnamed AEGYPTIACA, has her life written by Sophronius bishop of Jerusalem in the 7th century; it embodies a tradition of the 5th, and is not historical. It is given by Migne (*Patr. Lat.* lxxiii. 671 sq.; see also Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. 2, i. 68-90; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 38 sq.; Wright, *Cat. Syr. MSS.* p. 1108). Maria was in Egypt, and in youth was devoted to a life of infamy in Alexandria. But going with a company to Jerusalem, where the rest intended to celebrate the feast of the Holy Cross, Maria also was converted from the ways of sin, and retired to solitude beyond the Jordan, where Zosimas the monk at last met her, administered her last eucharist, and buried her in the wilds where she had lived. Her feast is April 2. In Migne her date is A.D. 521, under Justin I.; in Fleury, A.D. 421, and in Boll. A.D. 321.

[J. G.]

MARIA (5). According to William of Tyre (*Hist. Rer. Transmar.* i. 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cci. 214) Chosroes II. of Persia was married to a daughter of the emperor Maurice named Maria, and for her sake became a Christian and a friend of the Romans. The same statements are found in certain Arabic writers (D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* 789, 997, 998), who identify this Maria with Schirin, the famous wife of Chosroes [CHOSROES II. Vol. I. p. 487]. On the other hand must be placed the fact that no trace of such a marriage, or of any daughter of Maurice of that name, is to be found in any Greek writer. Theophylact Simocatta (v. 13),

who actually mentions the marriage of Chosroes with Sira or Schirin, who, he states, was a Christian, and a Roman by birth, could hardly have passed over so remarkable a fact, had she really been the daughter of the emperor. It seems therefore most probable that the Arabic writers whom William of Tyre copied were mistaken.

[F. D.]

MARIA (6), a patrician lady of Constantinople who took a prominent part in defence of images, under the emperor Leo the Isaurian, in company with Gregorius, the commander of the imperial guard, and other companions—Julianus, Marcianus, Joannes, Jacobus, Alexius, Demetrius, Leontius, Photius, Petrus; all of whom were commemorated with her in the Greek and Latin churches on the 9th of August. The account is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 434) from an ancient Greek MS., which is one of those procured by Busbequius at Constantinople cir. A.D. 1562, and presented by him to the Imperial Library at Vienna. Jovinus appears from a letter of pope Gregory II. (*Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 518) to have been the name of the soldier who was killed. According to Paulus Diaconus (*Historia Miscella*, xxi. in *Patr. Lat.* xc. 1083), more than one soldier was murdered.

[F. D.]

MARIA (7), the descendant of an Armenian or Paphlagonian family, and according to Zonaras (xv. 10, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cxxxiv. 1344) the daughter of St. Philaret, selected by the empress Irene as the wife of her son Constantine (Constantine VII. Porphyrogenitus, *al.* Constantine VI. Flavius). The marriage, which was celebrated in Nov. A.D. 788, proved unhappy. The emperor divorced Maria in January A.D. 795, and forced her to retire to a nunnery (Theophanes, *Chronog.* 391, 396, in *Patr. Gr.* 932, 943). A letter of Theodorus Studita to Maria is preserved (*Epistolae* ii. 181 in *Patr. Gr.* xcix. 1560), condoling with her on her misfortunes. [F. D.]

MARIAMNE. Hippolytus (*Ref.* v. 7, p. 95) tells of the sect of the Naassenes that they professed to have derived their peculiar doctrines from Mariamne, to whom they had been communicated by James, our Lord's brother. With this agrees Celsus, who (*Orig. adv. Cels.* v. 62) knows that there were some Christian sects who claimed descent from Mariamne, others from Martha. In Gnostic circles a gospel of Philip was current, and this apostle was supposed to be the channel through which some of their secret doctrines had been handed down. Now the Gnostic acts of Philip (Tischendorf, *Act. Apoc.* xxxii.) represent him as accompanied by his sister Mariamne: it is likely therefore that it was she who was represented as in possession of traditions of her own. On the question with which of the Scripture Maries it was intended to identify her, we may refer to *Pistis Sophia*, where a Mary is the principal interlocutor with our Lord. Although she is called blessed above all women (p. 28), she is not the mother of our Lord, who first appears (p. 116), and she proves to be Mary Magdalene (p. 182), who is represented (p. 231) as holding, together with John the Virgin, the highest place among our Lord's disciples. It seems likely that the writer identified Mary Magdalene with the sister of Martha,

who is mentioned several times, and this would harmonize with the collocation of names in Celsus. She is not described as the sister of Philip, but possibly a recognition of this relationship may be implied in the phrase "all her brothers" (p. 26). [G. S.]

**MARIANUS (MAURIANUS)**, an Italian bishop, probably the same with the bishop of Apulia to whom Innocent wrote his seventh epistle (Labbe, ii. 1261). One of the unfortunate deputation of Western prelates despatched by the emperor Honorius to his brother Arcadius to remonstrate on the treatment of Chrysostom, and urging the calling of a general council. Marianus refusing to give the imperial letters, of which he was the bearer, into any hands but those of Arcadius, they were violently wrested from him by an officer named Valerianus, and Marianus's thumb was broken in the struggle. He shared in all the subsequent ill-treatment which the deputation met with. (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 32, 33, ed. Bigot.; Tillem. xi. 313, 322-325.) [E. V.]

**MARINA (1)**, converted and baptized by St. Januarius at Rome A.D. 362, with her husband St. Gordian [GORDIANUS (3)], and their household of fifty-three persons. When Gordian was deposed and imprisoned, and before he was put to death, Marina was given as a slave to peasants at the Villa of Aquae Salviae. (*Marf. Adon.*, May 10; Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Mai. ii. 492 B, 552.) [A. B. C. D.]

**MARINA (2)**, the youngest daughter of the emperor Arcadius. She was born on the 10th of February, A.D. 403 (*Chronicon Paschale*, 307, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xcii. 780). She and her other sisters were induced by Pulcheria to join her in taking vows of perpetual virginity (Sozomen, ix. 1). They devoted themselves to visiting the churches and relieving the poor (Soz. ix. 3). Marina built the palace at Constantinople, called after her (*Chronicon Pasch.* 306), which existed as late as the time of Basil the Macedonian, A.D. 867 (Leo Grammaticus, 469, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cviii. 1084). She died in the year 449 (*Chronicon Paschale*, 317, where, by a gross blunder, she is described as the wife of Valentinian III.). [F. D.]

**MARINA (3)**, July 17, virgin martyr of Antioch in Pisidia (Bas. *Men.*) at Alexandria, June 18 (Usuard.), in Spain July 18 (*Rom. Mart.*). Herm. Usener has written a treatise, *Legend. der Heilig. Pelagia*, Bonn. 1879, to prove that this saint, St. Pelagia of Antioch, and St. Arethusa of Selencia were merely transformations of the Semitic divinity Aphrodite, whose worship was spread by the Phoenicians all over the shores of Asia Minor. Usener has published two Greek texts of the Acts hitherto unknown. The legend was composed at Edessa in the second quarter of the fifth century, under the title of *μετάνοια τῆς ὁσίας Πελαγίας*. It was written by James, deacon to Nonnus bishop of that city, and may be found in Rosweyde's *Vitae Patrum*: cf. *Acta SS.* Boll. Mai. i. 747; Ceillier, x. 582; Potthast's *Biblioth. Hist.* p. 844, s. v. Pelagia; *Revue Historique* Sept.-Oct. 1880, p. 131. In Bas. *Men.* Marina's death is encircled with miracles; she killed a dragon by the sign of the cross, was baptized by a heavenly dove when

flung into a lake, and was at last beheaded, *Acta SS.* Boll. Jul. iv. 278-288. Some MSS. of Usuard's Martyrology write by mistake Margaret for Marina, cf. Till. *Mem.* v. 562, xvi. 167. [G. T. S.]

**MARINA (4)**, ST., patron saint of St. Merryn in Cornwall, where there is a holy well dedicated to St. Constantine and there is a ruined church dedicated to the same saint. Maryansleigh in Devon seems also to be dedicated to St. Marina. Sir H. Nicolas gives "Marina and Ethelburga, virgins, 7 July." A St. Merin occurs in R. Rees, 236. [C. W. B.]

**MARINIANUS (al. lec. MARIANUS)**, one of Chrysostom's lay friends at Constantinople to whom he wrote a cheerful letter from Arabissus in the spring of 406. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 128.) [E. V.]

**MARINUS (1)**, bishop of Arles; present at the Roman synod under Melchisedech or Miltiades, A.D. 313, as we learn from St. Optatus (*Dict. of Chr. Ant.* ii. 1811); and possibly present at the council of Arles, A.D. 314, held by order of the emperor Constantine: though it was Chrestus bishop of Syracuse who was charged with directing it, and who subscribed first, if we may trust the subscriptions as now given. In these, the names of Merocles of Milan, and Proterius of Capua, from Italy: and of Marinus, Reticus, and Maternus, from Gaul—who had all been present at Rome—appear likewise. But it is difficult to say what value should be attached to these subscriptions in their present shape. Two presbyters and two deacons subscribe fifth, representing Silvester bishop of Rome; who was only represented by two presbyters at the Nicene council, like Julius afterwards at Sardica. Marinus himself appears attended by one presbyter and four deacons—as no one else. Verus bishop of Vienne, then capital of that province, follows attended by a single exorcist. All the subscribing bishops amount to no more than thirty-three; though Constantine tells Chrestus, he had ordered "plurimos ex diversis ac prope infinitis locis episcopos," to meet at Arles on that occasion. The oldest MSS. accordingly make this council to have consisted of 600 bishops, to keep pace with his intentions. In the synodical letter attributed to the council, on the other hand, and addressed, "*Dilectissimo papae Silvestro,*" Marinus occupies the first place, and thirty-two names follow—as though identical with the number of subscribing bishops. But when looked into, two are found to be the names of subscribing presbyters, a third of an attendant deacon, a fourth was no subscriber at all. Moreover, this epistle refutes itself by its contents. "Placuit etiam a te, qui majores dioeceses tenes, per te potissimum omnibus insinuari" is an anachronism every way, that ought not to have imposed on Bingham (ix. 2, 2), nor indeed any part of it on the learned in general. We might as well contend for the genuineness of a similar letter to Silvester from the Nicene council. The Sardican bishops in their letter to Julius, preserved by St. Hilary, "thought it right," only thirty years later, "that their brethren in Italy, Sardinia, and Sicily, should learn their decrees through him." In short, the subscriptions, letter, and canons, of this council fall to pieces as soon as they are touched; though the

council remains: and whatever its dimensions, and its acts—of which we have really no record—Chrestus, not Marinus, must have been its controlling head. Mansi (ii. 463–512) has but these two remarks on it: “I. Neque plenarium, neque universale fuisse hoc concilium late probat Pagius ad Baron. A.D. 314, n. 1, & seq. II. Baronii sententiam asserentis ducentos episcopos huic concilio interfuisse tuctur et confirmat Pagius, *ib.* n. 22–3.” Hefele rightly points out (i. 181, Eng. Tr.) that this last assertion is based on a false reading in St. Augustine, since abandoned (c. *Ep. Parmen.* i. 5, note, Ed. Ben.). But then, in the very next page, he says himself: “It cannot however be denied, that St. Augustine in his forty-third letter (c. vii. n. 19), in speaking of the council of Arles, calls it ‘*plenarium ecclesiae universae concilium*.’” which is either as gross a misconception, or as willful a mis-statement as ever proceeded from a learned man. What St. Augustine really says in that section is, that “granting those bishops who passed sentence at Rome were not good judges, *there remained still* a plenary council of the universal church where those judges might themselves be impleaded: so that, if convicted of having judged wrongly, their sentence might be annulled. Let the Donatists prove whether they have done this: for we can easily prove that they have not,” &c. Then, in the next section, he shews, from letters of the emperor, what they *had done*. Instead of ever conferring with others of their own order, they had gone straight with their complaint to the emperor. And what had *he* done? “*Dedit aliud Arelatense concilium, aliorum scilicet episcoporum.*” This is, accordingly, what St. Augustine calls the council of Arles—not a plenary council at all, but—a council of other bishops, a pendant to that of Rome. In all his writings he never once calls it by a more exalted name. [E. S. F.]

MARINUS (2), an Arian and a Thracian, whom his party set up as bishop of Constantinople after the death of Demophilus cir. 386. They expelled him for his extreme views, and chose Dorotheus in his stead. Marinus and a knot of followers then kept up a conventicle. Between him and Agapius, whom he had made bishop of Ephesus, sprang up a schism, which resulted in many of his followers returning to the Catholic church. (Soc. v. 12; Tillem. vi. 631, 803; Le Quien, i. 212 E.) [C. H.]

MARINUS (3), bishop, companion of Anianus, went as missionary to the continent in the 7th century; they were Irishmen, though Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Scot.* ii. 468) calls Marinus a Scot. (For an excellent account of the two missionaries by Dean Reeves, see *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 295–300.) In the time of pope Eugenius I. (A.D. 654–7) they left Ireland for the continent, reached Rome, and, travelling northward, built their cells in the desert of Boicaria, or Boiodurum, on the north side of the Noric Alps, Marinus being a bishop, and his nephew Anianus archdeacon. They were successful in teaching the inhabitants, until a horde of barbarians cruelly murdered Marinus, while Anianus died a natural death the same day, Nov. 15. After resting a century in a common

tomb, their remains were translated, first to Aurisium, and then to Rota on the banks of the Inn, where a Benedictine monastery was founded to the honour of SS. Marinus and Anianus. Reeves says the name “Marinus is beyond all question a Latin translation of *Ἐμμη-ἡαχ* which is derived from *μμη* (*mare*), and signifies ‘belonging to the sea.’” [J. G.]

MARINUS (4), March 3, a military martyr in the reign of Gallienus, at Caesarea in Palestine, under a judge named Achaeus, A.D. 262. He was distinguished by his birth, riches, and services. When about to receive promotion to the post of centurion, another aspirant declared that he was a Christian, and unable therefore to conform to the ancient practice of sacrificing to the emperors. The judge granted him three hours to make his choice between death and compliance. As soon as he came out of the Praetorium, Theotecnus the bishop drew him aside in conversation and conducted him to the church. Placing him within by the altar, he raised his cloak, and pointing to the sword that was by his side, at the same time presenting him with the book of the gospels, told him to choose either of the two as he wished. Without hesitation he extended his hand and took the book. “Hold fast then, hold fast to God,” said Theotecnus, “and strengthened by Him mayest thou obtain what thou hast chosen; go in peace.” He was immediately executed and buried by a Christian senator named Astyrius. The narrative of Eusebius was probably that of an eye-witness, perhaps the bishop. It is a moot question whether this martyrdom resulted from persecution or from military law. Dr. F. Görres in an art. in the *Jahrb. Prot. Theologie*, 1877, p. 620, on “Die Toleranzedict des Kaisers Gallienus,” suggests that Marinus could not legally have suffered under Gallienus as he had already issued his edict of toleration, but that it must have taken place by command of Macrianus, who had revolted from Gallienus and taken possession of Egypt, Palestine, and the East. He was, as we learn from Euseb. vii. 10, 13, 23, cf. Trebell. Pollio, ed. H. Peter., *Scriptt. Hist. Aug.* t. ii. Gallieni duo. c. i.–iii., xxx. Tyranni, c. xiii. xiv., the moral author of the Valerian persecution. He naturally, when possessed of imperial authority, was glad to vent his hate on the Christians whom Gallienus favoured. (Euseb. vii. 15, 16; Neander, *H. E.* ed. Bohn, i. 194; Ceill. ii. 394; Tillem. iv. 21; Pagi, *Crit.* i. 276, nr. x. xi.) [G. T. S.]

MARINUS (5), the Bardesane interlocator in the dialogue against the Marcionites (Sect. iii.). [ADAMANTIUS (2).] [G. S.]

MARINUS (6), a correspondent of Eusebius of Caesarea. (Vol. ii. p. 338.) [C. H.]

MARINUS (7), a Syrian by birth, was pretorian prefect in the reign of Anastasius. It was by his advice that Anastasius transferred the duty of collecting the taxes from the *curiae* of the towns to newly appointed officials, who bore the title of *Vindices* (Ev. *H. E.* iii. 42 in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvi. 2693). Marinus, with Plato the prefect of Constantinople, by the emperor's order, on November 4th, A.D. 512,

caused the Trisagion at the church of St. Theodore to be chanted with the Eutychian addition of the words "Who was crucified for us." A disturbance ensued in which many were killed in the church itself. This was followed two days afterwards by violent rioting. According to the biographer of St. Saba (Coteler. *Eccl. Graec. Mon.* iii. 304-305), Marinus was warned by the saint in the previous month of May that these calamities would come upon him as a retribution for influencing the emperor to refuse a remission of taxes to Jerusalem (Marcellinus, *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 937-8; *Ev. H. E.* iii. 44; Theoph. *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cviii. 136). In A.D. 514, Marinus, after the defeat and capture of Cyril, commanded the forces of Anastasius against the rebel Vitalian, and defeated him in a sea-fight at Bytharia. (*Ev.* iii. 43.) [F. D.]

**MARION (MAURION)**, bishop of Cynopolis or Cynon (miswritten Cotenopolis, Labbe, iv. 1843), in the province of Aegyptus Secunda; one of the orthodox Egyptian bishops who, with some Alexandrian clerics, fled to Constantinople in A.D. 457, to escape from Timotheus Aelurus and the Eutychians. [NESTORIUS, bishop of Phragones.] His name occurs in their petition to the emperor Leo (Labbe, iv. 1843), and in the letter of sympathy from the pope St. Leo (*Leo Mag. Ep.* clx. 1336). He subscribes the synodal letter of a council held at Constantinople in 459 against simony. (Labbe, v. 51; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 567.) [C. G.]

**MARIS (1) (MARES, MARI)**, first bishop of Seleucia on the Tigris, ob. A.D. 82, regarded by the Nestorians as their first patriarch, and with Thaddaeus the author of their liturgies (*Assem. Acta Mart.* i. pp. lxxi. 4; *Assem. Dissert. de Syr. Nest.* p. iv. in *B. O.* t. iii. par. 2; Le Quien, ii. 1102; Badger, *Nestorians*, i. 136). Either he or his companion Agis is reputed to have been the first bishop of Edessa. (Le Quien, ii. 955.) [G. T. S.]

**MARIS (2) (MARES, MAGNUS, MARIUS)**, bishop of Chalcedon, a prominent Arian (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 599). He is said to have been a disciple of Lucian of Antioch, the martyr (*Philost. H. E.* ii. 14; Tillem. v. 770, vi. 253, 646). He wrote in support of Arian opinions before the council of Nicaea (Athanas. *De Syn.* § 17; Tillem. vi. 646). At the council he joined with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, Ursacius, and Valens against Athanasius (Soc. i. 8, 27), and was one of five who were unwilling to subscribe on account of the term *ὁμοούσιον* (i. 8). Maris at length gave his approval (Soz. i. 21; Nicet. *Chon. Thesaur.* v. 8; cf. Vales. note 71, ad Soz. i. 21). He was one of the seventeen who held out against the council and supported Arius, according to Gelasius (Mansi, ii. 818; cf. 878 B). His name occurs among the subscribers (Mansi, ii. 696). Philostorgius states (in Nicet. *Chon. Thes.* v. 8) that Maris, Eusebius, Theognis went to the emperor and expressed their repentance for having signed, stating that they had complied only through fear of him, and that the emperor indignantly banished them to Gaul. Maris assisted at the council of Tyre in 335, and was one of the commission to Mareotis (Ath.

*Ap. c. Ar.* § 13, 72; Theod. *H. E.* i. 28; Mansi, ii. 1125 D, 1130 B, 1143 D; Tillem. viii. 35, 42, 49). In 335 he was one of the deputies sent to Constantinople against Athanasius (Soc. i. 35; Tillem. vi. 290). He was one of those who frequently wrote to pope Julius against Athanasius (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. § 2, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 632, here written Marius; Theod. *H. E.* ii. 6 al. 8; Tillem. vii. 270). In 341 he attended the council of Antioch, and is named in the epistle of Julius (*Ap. c. Ar.* § 20; Tillem. vi. 312). In 342 he was one of the party who secured the appointment of Macedonius to the see of Constantinople (Soc. ii. 12; Tillem. vi. 323, 493). In the same year he was one of the four bishops deputed by Constantius to Constans (Soc. ii. 18; Ath. *De Syn.* § 25; Tillem. vi. 326; Hefele, *Counc.* ii. 80, 83). Sozomen (iii. 10) omits Maris here. That he was present at the council of Sardica (343-4) appears certain, although his name is not among the signatures (Tillem. viii. 95, 636, 688; Hefele, ii. 92, note 3). At the council of Philippopolis his name is again absent, and among the subscriptions occur Thelaphas as bishop of Chalcedon (Mansi, ii. 138), probably by a clerical error. In 359 he defended the doctrine of the Anomoeans against Basil (Philostorg. iv. 12; Tillem. vi. 483). In that year he was at the council of Ariminum (Soc. ii. 41; Soz. iv. 24), and in 360 at the council of Constantinople (*ib.*; Hefel. ii. 271; Tillem. vi. 487). In 362 Maris, then advanced in age and blind, at an interview with Julian, severely rebuked him for his apostasy, whereupon the emperor tauntingly observed, "Thy Galilean god will not heal thy sight." "I thank God," retorted Maris, "for depriving me of the power of beholding thy face" (Soc. iii. 12; Soz. v. 4; Tillem. vii. 332). Maris was living in the reign of Jovian (Philostorg. viii. 4; Tillem. viii. 764), and he must be the Magnus of Chalcedon at the council of Antioch in 363 (Soc. iii. 25; Mansi, iii. 371, 372, 511). In an anonymous life of Isaacius abbat of Constantinople (iii. 12 in Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. vii. 254 B), Maris is said to have been present at the council of Constantinople in 381, a statement which may safely be rejected. [C. H.]

**MARIS (3)**, a bishop of an unnamed see, friendly to Chrysostom, who wrote to him from Cucucus in 404. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 86.) [E. V.]

**MARIS (4)**, called PERSIAN, bishop of Haddascir. He attended the council of Ephesus, wrote against the Magi, was the author of *Commentaries on Daniel* and an *Exposition of the Epistles of Acasius*, and received a letter from Ibas of Edessa. (*Assem. B. O.* i. 197, 203, 350; *Assem. Acta Mart.* i. 40; Le Quien, ii. 1315; Tillem. xii. 442, xiv. 564, 627; Ceill. x. 143-148.) [G. T. S.]

**MARIS (5)**, a Christian and confessor at Rome in Decian persecution (Cyp. *Ep.* 22). Saluted by LUCIAN of Carthage. Maris would be the vulgar form of Marius (as Lucius for LUCIUS), and he is mentioned with Collecta and Emerita. The salutation is in answer to Celerinus, who had sent Lucian the remembrances of Macarius and his sisters Cornelia and Emerita. As Lucian was a very poor scribe his Maris and Collecta may be misnomers for Macarius and Cornelia. [E. W. B.]

MARIS (6), a presbyter and solitary of Apamea in Syria, to whom, in conjunction with a brother solitary, Symeon, Chrysostom wrote from Cucus in 405, relative to the mission to the pagans in Phoenicia. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 55.)

[E. V.]

MARIUS (1) MERCATOR, a writer, of whom, until the last quarter of the 17th century, nothing was known except indirectly through the writings of St. Augustine, who in his work *De octo Quaestionibus Dulcitii*, mentions him as his son, *i.e.* his friend or pupil, and who addressed to him a letter, containing a long passage identical with one in that work (*Ep.* 193, *De oct. Quaest. Dulc.* qu. 3). At present only two MSS. of his works are known to exist, one in the Vatican Library, which was formerly at Heidelberg, and which was examined and partially transcribed by the learned librarian of the Vatican, Lucas of Holstein. After his death in 1661, this transcript was sent to father Philip Labbe, then engaged on his great work on the Councils, in the second volume of which it was published in 1671 after his death in 1667. But before this took place he had discovered a second MS., entitled "Synodus Ephesiana," belonging to the cathedral library of Beauvais, which, besides other matter, contained all that had been found in the transcript above mentioned, and which he intended to publish, an intention which the same cause prevented him from carrying into effect. The work of publication, however, was carried out by his intimate friend and fellow-labourer, father John Garnier, in 1673; and in the same year a portion of the works contained in the Vatican MS. was published at Brussels by father Gabriel Gerberon. In 1684 an edition of the works of Mercator, based on a careful collation of the two MSS., was brought out by Stephen Baluze, by whom the Vatican MS. was considered to be superior in authority to the one of Beauvais, regarded by Garnier with a parental and somewhat partial preference. This edition was included in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, vol. viii. 1772; and the collection of the Abbé Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xlviii., contains a full account of all that is known of the author, of the works which pass under his name, and of the manner in which they have been published.

Of the man himself almost nothing is known. He was probably a native of Africa, was in Rome in 417 or 418, and is thought by Baluze to have outlived the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. When Julian was lecturing at Rome in 418 in favour of Pelagianism, Mercator replied to him, and sent his reply to St. Augustine, who at the time was too much occupied to be able to acknowledge its receipt. Not long afterwards Mercator forwarded to him a second treatise, complaining, as we learn from the reply of Augustine, very bitterly of the neglect with which the former one had been treated. To this appeal Augustine replied at length, expressing his regret at his inability to take earlier notice of his friend's work, and hinting that he had been somewhat unreasonably severe in his reproaches. Whether these two works of his exist or not is doubtful, but a treatise called Hypognosticon, or Hypermesticon, in six books, included in the tenth volume of the works of St. Augustine (ed. Migne, p. 1611), has been thought to be the one

in question. Five of the books treat of Pelagianism, and the sixth of Predestination. The letter of Augustine, which he forwarded by Albinus, A.D. 418, expresses admiration of the learning displayed by his friend, and discusses certain points submitted by him to his consideration.

The works of Marius Mercator, which consist chiefly of translations, some of them from his own writings in Greek, appear in the volume of Migne in the following order, but in conjunction with a large amount of other matter more or less relevant to the principal subject. Part I. 1. *Commonitorium super nomine Coelestii*.—A memorial against the doctrines of Coelestinus and Julian, disciples of Pelagius, written in Greek, and presented by Mercator to the emperor Theodosius II. and to the church of Constantinople, A.D. 429, translated by himself into Latin. It contains a history of Pelagianism and an account of its doctrines, and an appeal to Julian to abandon them. 2. A treatise, to which the *Commonitorium* is a preface, against Julian, entitled *Subnotationes in verba Juliani*, written after the death of Augustine, A.D. 430, at the request of Pientius, whom he calls a presbyter, but who was probably not an ecclesiastic. It shews that the real author of Pelagian doctrine was Theodore of Mopsuestia, that it was brought by Rufinus, a Syrian presbyter, to Rome, and there communicated to Pelagius, a native of Britain, and by him to Coelestinus, who was followed by Julian. Mercator discusses the doctrine, and refutes it by quotations from Scripture, but mixes up his argument with some coarse personal remarks on his opponent's origin. 3. Translations of various works relating to Pelagianism. (a) Three letters, translated from Greek, of which the third only may be attributed to Mercator, as a translator, addressed by Nestorius to Celestine bishop of Rome. (b) Four treatises by Nestorius against Pelagianism, with a preface by Mercator. (c) The creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia, with a preface and a refutation of the creed by Mercator.

Part II. Concerning the Nestorian heresy. Book I. A. Translation of thirteen discourses by Nestorius, with a preface by Mercator; including also incidentally the following pieces:—(a) A letter by Mercator on the doctrines of Nestorius and their difference from those of Paul of Samosata and others. (b) A discourse by Proclus bishop of Cyzicus, translated by Mercator, with replies by Nestorius. (c) A letter (1) of Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius, with a reply by him. (d) Another letter (2) of the same. (e) A letter (3) of the same to the clergy of Constantinople. (f) A second reply by Cyril to Nestorius. (g) A letter (4) of Cyril to Nestorius, being a synodical epistle with twelve heads of condemnation. (h) A letter of Nestorius to pope Celestine. (i) A letter of Nestorius to Coelestinus.

B. Extracts relating to Nestorius, in four parts. (a) Extracts presented to the council of Ephesus, probably translated by Mercator, with the signatures of 193 bishops who attended the council. (b) Extracts by Cyril from books by Nestorius, translated by Mercator. (c) Extracts by Cyril from works by Nestorius contained in Cyril's book entitled *Ἐλεγχος*. (d) Extracts from writings of Nestorius contained in various parts of the works of Cyril.

Book II. (a) Twelve chapters of Nestorian

doctrine, entitled *Nestorii Blasphemiarum Capitula xii.*, in which Nestorius replies to the letters of condemnation from Celestine of Rome, and Cyril, with replies by Mercator, and an appendix by him. (b) Defence by Cyril of his twelve heads of condemnation—addressed to the Eastern bishops, in whose name Andrew of Samosata had written, objecting to them—set forth by him in the form of statement and reply. (c) Apology of Cyril against Theodoret, and reply to his remarks on the anathemas, addressed to Eupotius. (d) Discourse by Cyril on the Incarnation, probably the work entitled *Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti*, existing, as far as known, in this translation only, made probably by Mercator, in thirty-five chapters.

Book III. (a) Extracts from works of Theodore of Mopsnestia, with preface and refutations by Mercator. (b) Extracts from works of Theodoret bishop of Cyrus, against Cyril, and from his letters, with remarks by Mercator. (c) Fragment of a discourse by Eutherius bishop of Tyana, against Cyril, on behalf of Nestorius, with remarks by Mercator [EUTHERIUS (2)].

Marius Mercator appears to have been a layman, but an able theologian. His style, which perhaps may be called provincial, aims more at accurate rendering than at elegance, and is somewhat disfigured by personal invective; but his learning, zeal, and ability entitle him to a respectable place among ecclesiastical writers. (Migne, *Patrol. Coursus*, vol. xviii.; Ceillier, vol. viii. c. 36.) [H. W. P.]

MARIUS (2), ST., 3rd bishop of Lausanne, whither he is said to have transferred the see from Avenches, between Chilmegisilus and Magnertus (Gams, p. 283), or Arricus (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 329). He is better known as Marius Aventicensis, the chronicler. But few details of his life have come down to us, and most of them resting upon the somewhat doubtful authority of the thirteenth-century chronicle of the bishops of Lausanne (*Société d'Histoire de la Suisse-Romande*, vi. 29-32). He was born at Autun, probably about 532, of parents of high rank. At about the age of forty-three he was made bishop (A.D. 575). He constructed a church at Paterniacum (Payerne) on his own property, and made various donations to it (*ibid.*). In 585 he was present at the 2nd council of Mâcon (Mansi, ix. 958), and after an episcopate lasting twenty years and eight months died on the last day of the year 596, in the sixty-fourth year of his age. If he transferred the see from Avenches to Lausanne, it must have been after the council of Mâcon, held in 585, since he signed himself on that occasion "episcopus ecclesiae Aventicae." The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (*ibid.*) publish from the above-mentioned chronicle a metrical epitaph of unknown date, which represents him as fabricating with his own hands the sacred vessels for his church and ploughing his own glebe.

His *Chronicon* is a work of some historical importance. Though extremely brief it furnishes information with reference to Burgundy and Switzerland during the period embraced by it, which is found nowhere else, and serves to correct the bias of Gregory of Tours against the Arians of Burgundy. It takes up the

chronicle of Prosper of Aquitaine in the year 455 and carries it on to 581, continuing his method of marking the years by consulates, and commencing the indictions with the year 523. An anonymous author has carried it on till 623. (For an account and criticism of it see *Hist. Litt.* iii. 401; Cave, i. 538; Ceillier, xi. 399-400; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, i. 47; Richter, *Annalen*, p. 37 and the references there given.) This work was first published by Duchesne from a MS. discovered by Chifflet. It may be seen in Bouquet, *Recueil*, ii. 12-19, and Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 791-802. The authors of the *Hist. Litt.* (*ibid.*) attribute to him the *Life of St. Sigismund*, published in *Boll. Acta SS. Mai.* i. 86-7, but there is no evidence beyond resemblances of style. Though usually given the title of saint he has no day of commemoration. [S. A. B.]

MARMENIA, a Roman lady, who, with her daughter Lucinia, buried pope Urbanus after his martyrdom, A.D. 230, in a tomb immediately beneath her house in the cemetery of Praetextatus, for which the prefect Almachius put them to death (*Acta SS. Boll. Mai.* vi. 13, 14; Tillem. iii. 687-689). De Rossi (*Bullet.* 1872, p. 68) suggests that her name was Armenia, not Marmenia. He discovered in the cemetery they constructed for the pope's body, an inscription to a certain Armenia Felicitas. The family of Armenius was a celebrated one at Rome in the second and subsequent centuries, and continued to be pagan till the fourth century. Thus we find that Armenius was prefect of Egypt when the edict of Diocletian arrived, ordering the destruction of the churches and the rebuilding of temples everywhere. The family of Armenius claimed to be descendants from Pelops by Orestes and Agamemnon, and were the hereditary priests of Bellona at Comana in Cappadocia. His hereditary office no doubt quickened his zeal against the church in Egypt. (Dio Cassius, xxxv. c. xi.; Champollion, *L'Égypte sous les Pharaons*, i. 164; P. Georgi, *De Miraculis S. Couthi*, pref. p. cviii.; Leironne, *Ins. de l'Égypte*, ii. 312; North and Brownl. *Rom. Sott.* i. 136.) [G. T. S.]

MARNAN (MARNACH, MARNOCH, MARMAN, MARRANUS, MERNANUS, MERNOCHUS), bishop and confessor. Identical with the Irish Erwin of Rathnoi [ERNIN (3)], he has received a Scotch legend, and is probably divided into three or even four different saints, Marnan or Marnoch, two Marnocks, and Marnochdubh, with various dates and feasts. The *Brev. Aberd.* (*Prop. SS.* pt. i. hem. f. ix.) at March 1, gives his legend in six lectures, commending his virtues, and relating the account of his death at Aberkerdoure (Aberchirder, in the parish of Marnoch, Banffshire), the weekly washing of his head and the miracles thereon attendant, with other wonders and observances (*Coll. Sh. Aberd. and Banff.* ii. 189; *View of the Dioc. Aber.* 597-8; *Reg. Episc. Morav.* pp. xxx. 247-9). To this Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 108-9) adds the efficacy of his prayers for king Aidan, and consequent victory over the Northumbrian kings, and his death at Annandale in the 14th year of king Eugenius, A.D. 620. He belongs to the beginning of the 7th century, but Dempster (*E. H. Scot.* ii. 454\*, 456, 457, 469), in multiply-



ing the persons, places two in the 4th century, one in the 9th, and one in the 10th. His feast is March 1 or 2. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 392-3; O'Hanlon, *Jr. SS.* iii. 59-62, 98; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Mar. i. 63-5, criticising Dempster and Camerarius, and again 25 Oct. xi. 649-50, having a learned and recent criticism by De Buck.)

[J. G.]

## MARNOKUS. [MARNAN.]

MARO (1), Feb. 14, a Syrian anchorite near Cyrus, of whom an account is given by Theodoret (*Rel. Hist.* cap. 16; Tillem. xii. 412, 671, xv. 225). A monastery erected in his honour in the fifth century became the leading one of Syria Secunda (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 766; Fleury, *H. E.* lib. xvii. 7, xxxi. 32; Ceill. x. 58). The Maronites are said to derive their name from him, because probably they assembled at first about a monastery of St. Maro in the Lebanon. [MARONITES.] [G. T. S.]

MARO (2), reputed the first patriarch of the Maronites, A.D. 701. [MARONITES.] [G. T. S.]

MARONITES. This is the name of the only distinct sect which the Monothelite controversy produced. [PERSON OF CHRIST.] It is said to have been derived from the monastery of St. Maro, where they at first assembled. They are also said to have elected, as their first patriarch, a certain Maro about A.D. 701, who assumed, as his successors do still, the title of patriarch of Antioch. They continued to hold Monothelite dogmas till the time of the Crusades, when A.D. 1182 they united to the Roman communion (cf. Willelmus Tyrensis Archiep. xxii. 8). As late, however, as the council of Constance, A.D. 1445, a section of them retained their own dogmas in the island of Cyprus (*Hard. Concil.* ix. 1041; cf. Hefele's *Concilgesch.* Bd. vii. s. 815). They have been sometimes confounded with the Mardaites, a warlike people of Armenia, who were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantinus Pogonatus, A.D. 676, cf. Aug. Duperron in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* t. 50, p. 1. On the whole subject consult the exhaustive treatise of Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* iii. 2-99; J. S. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 496; Walch's *Ketzerhist.* ix. 474; Gieseler, *H. E.* ii. 181, which as usual gives a very full list of authorities. J. S. Assemani in the work just cited, and S. E. Assemani, in *Acta SS. M.M. Orient. et Occid.* ii. 405-410 as Maronites themselves defend the orthodoxy of Maro, after whom they are called. Who really was their founder is a point involved in much obscurity. Maro the ascetic of cent. v. is out of the question, as he lived two centuries before the Monothelite controversy arose. But they, the Maronites, may have availed themselves of his name upon their separation after the sixth general council, A.D. 680, to justify their dissent from orthodoxy by claiming to hold the same views as such an eminent saint. Renaudot, in his *Hist. Patriarch. Alexand.* pp. 149, 150, 548 (cf. his *Liturg. Orient. Collect.* passim), refutes the absurd attempt of certain modern Maronites to prove the original orthodoxy of the sect, as maintained by, for instance, Abraham Echellensis and Faustus Naironus in *Dissert. de Maronitis*, Rom. Ed. 1679, and in another *Eupolia Fidei Cathol.*

*Roman.* Ed. 1694. St. Joan. Damasc. twice at least reckons them heretical, cf. opp. Ed. Le Quien, i. 485. For another version of their origin cf. Eutyech. Alexand. *Anal.* ii. 190, which is plainly incorrect, as he places Maro their founder and the origin of Monothelitism under the reign of the emperor Maurice. [G. T. S.]

MAROVEUS, 19th bishop of Poitiers, appears to have headed the rebellion of his city against the authority of Guntram in 585. The force which reduced it to subjection, consisting of citizens of Bourges and Orleans, were so exasperated against the bishop that he was compelled to ransom himself and the citizens by the sacrifice of part of the church plate. In 587 Poitiers obtained its desire, and came by the treaty of Andelot under the rule of Childebert, who two years afterwards, on the bishop's petition, sent a commission to readjust taxation in accordance with changes in the population. He appears to have soon regained Guntram's favour, as in this year he was appointed with Gregory of Tours to appease the quarrel which had arisen between queen Ingeltrudis and her daughter Berthegund. As bishop of Poitiers he was intimately connected with the disturbance raised in 589 by Chrodieldis at the monastery of the Holy Cross near that city. [CHRODIELDIS.] Though he appears in this transaction in a doubtful light, Gregory on another occasion speaks of him in terms of praise. He probably died about 590. (Greg. *Tur. Hist. Franc.* vii. 24, ix. 30, 33, 39, 40, 41, 43; *De Glor. Mart.* ii. 44; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1145-8.) [S. A. B.]

MARRUTIUS (v. MARRUCIUS, MARUSCIUS, MARRACIUS), African bishop in Syn. Carth. (sub *Cyp. 2 de Pace*; *Cyp. Ep.* 57; sub *Cyp. de Bap. Haer.* 1; *Cyp. Ep.* 70). Does not appear at the third synod. [E. W. B.]

MARSIANUS, Sethite prophet. (Eph. *Haer.* 40, p. 297.) [G. S.]

MARTIADES, Sethite prophet. (Eph. *Haer.* 40, p. 297.) [G. S.]

MARTIALIS (1), ST., June 30, first bishop of Limoges, sometimes called the apostle of the Limousin and Aquitaine. Though he has been the subject of a vast amount of controversy, there is perhaps nothing authentic known of him. The earliest occurrence of his name is in the works of Gregory of Tours, who speaks of him as being one of seven bishops who in the time of Decius were sent from Rome to preach in Gaul (*Hist. Franc.* i. 28, iv. 16; *De Glor. Confess.* 27-29; *Vita Arid.* xi., xxxv. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1125, 1140). This account makes his date about 250 A.D., or more than 300 years before Gregory wrote. This was apparently the general belief till the 9th century, when the legend arose that St. Martial was one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, and had received his mission from St. Peter himself. Though not undisputed, the new story became, on the whole, the accepted account till the 17th century. In support of the legend were forged, probably in the last years of the 10th century, the *Acta* of St. Martial, palpably spurious, but satisfying the uncritical sense of that and many

succeeding ages. They purported to be by St. Aurelianus, a disciple of Martialis. Two letters, not improbably by the same author, were also attributed to St. Martial, one addressed to the people of Bordeaux, the other to those of Toulouse. These saw the light in 1521, being published by Josse Bade at Paris, who found them buried in an urn under the sacristy of St. Peter's church at Limoges. They were accepted as genuine, and passed through many editions, which are enumerated in Ceillier, viii. 125-6, and the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, i. 408. They were challenged, and fell into disrepute with the *Acta* in the 17th century. It must not be omitted however that there is an ode discovered in quite modern times and ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus (*Misc.* ii. 21, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 115), which, if it were genuine, would prove that the story of the *Acta* was known to him in the 6th century. But though its style resembles his, its authenticity is more than doubtful (Ceillier, xi. 404-5). See, however, the abbé Arbellot's *Dissertation sur l'Apostolat de St. Martial* (Paris, Limoges, 1855).

The middle ages gave birth to another and distinct controversy as to St. Martialis, whether he was to rank as an apostle or simply as a confessor. (For this controversy refer to Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* xii. lix. 23, 24; Dupin, i. 135, ed. 1722; Ceillier, xiii. 90, 103, 104, 179; xiv. 1042; *Hist. Litt.* vii. 301, 347; Arbellot, 186-224.) [S. A. B.]

**MARTIALIS (2)** and **BASILIDES** (*Cyp. Ep.* 67), Spanish bishops; libellatics in the persecution of Decius. Their two sees were Merida and Leon with Astorga; Martial being of Merida, according to Tillemont, iii. 318, iv. 133; Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 133, xvi. 70; and Ceillier, i. 326, 422, 562, 563; but of Astorga,\* according to Baronius, *Ann.* 258, § 1; Fleury, l. vi. c. 23; Peters, p. 482; Gams, p. 6: and Basilides interchangeably of the other see. The epistle does not, however, enable us to say which belongs to which see. If Tillemont and those who agree with him were led (as might seem natural) by the order in which the names of cities and bishops occur in pairs, it would be necessary on the same principle to assign their successors Felix to Leon and Sabinus to Merida; but Sabinus succeeded Martial and Felix Basilides. It is indeterminable. Basilides "in some sickness blasphemed God." He abdicated his position, to which Sabinus was then elected and consecrated. Martial, besides his lapse and publication of the fact, further joined a *Collegium*, addicted himself to its banquets, and buried his sons in its ground. (The passage *Ep.* 67, vi., is an interesting example of Renan's description of such institutions: *Apôtres*, ch. xviii. p. 359.) The two men afterwards, and probably together, visited Rome, and requested the bishop, Stephanus, to restore them; which carelessly he attempted to do, and some bishops communicated with them. However, FELIX, a presbyter, with the congregations of Leon and

Astorga, and Aelius (*al.* Laelius), a deacon, with that of Merida, presented an appeal (through their new bishop) to Cyprian against that decision. Felix (? bishop) of Saragossa wrote also separately to Cyprian on the matter. The synod of the autumn of A.D. 254 at Carthage addressed an epistle to the Spanish congregations affirming the validity of the consecration of Sabinus and of Felix, only exculpating Stephanus as far as possible on the ground of ignorance. [E. W. B.]

**MARTIANUS (1)**, bishop of Astigi (Ecija), one of the suffragan sees of Seville, some time before the year 633. His name is only known to us from a certain *judicium* delivered by the bishops assembled at the 6th council of Toledo in 638, which does not appear in any of the nine MSS. used for the standard edition of the Spanish councils in 1821, but which was discovered by Florez in a Leon MS., from which other valuable matter has been gleaned, and of which an account is given in *Esp. Sagr.* xv. pref. From this judgment, which is signed by five metropolitans, thirty-five bishops, a presbyter, and an archdeacon, it appears that a certain bishop Marcianus of Astigi, had been, at some time previous to C. Tol. iv. in A.D. 633, and at some council of Seville, of which no other memorial survives, deprived of his office and see, on various accusations, some political, some ecclesiastical, and that his principal accuser, one Habencius, had been made bishop in his stead. The name of Habencius, as bishop of Astigi, appears among the signatures of C. Tol. iv. in 633. Martianus, however, appears to have immediately appealed from the provincial council of Seville to the national council sitting at Toledo. His case was heard, and partly decided, at C. Tol. v. in 636. He was then restored to the rank of bishop, but according to the *judicium* of 638 time was wanting at the council of 636 to proceed further with the case, and Habencius remained in possession of the see of Astigi. In 638, however, on Martianus's further appeal, the bishops investigated his whole case *de novo*, carefully examining all the witnesses and documents concerned, with the result that Martianus was declared innocent of all the charges brought against him, while Habencius was pronounced guilty of *fratria*, or conspiracy against the fame and fortune of his brother bishop, and was ordered to restore the see and lead a life of penitence under episcopal supervision.

The charges against Martianus appear to have been twofold: he was accused on the one hand of practising divination concerning the life of the king, an offence denounced in C. Tol. iv. 4, and on the other of admitting women to his apartments, contrary to the canons. Habencius and the other principal witnesses for the prosecution had made written agreements, ratified by oath, to support each other in these charges, and it was the discovery of these agreements (*placita*), coupled with a re-examination of the surviving witnesses, which mainly determined the judgment of 638.

The whole document is an interesting and valuable piece of Visigothic church law. The large number of personal names with Latin and Gothic quoted in it deserves notice. They are as follows: Martianus and Habencius, bishops; Eulalius Joannes and Timotheus, deacons; Gre-

\* The value of some of Fell's work is illustrated here. He observes that Astorga and Leon are united "ex vicinia non minus quam ex querela, ut et Emerita urbs adjacens," and that Saragossa was interested as *isdem auspiciis structa*.

gorius and Tonantius, presbyters; Loaila, subdeacon; Trasvarius Stefanus Adeodatus Hospitalis, cleric; Gondere Nepotianus, Ricesvindus Dormitius, Scivila, Gundulfuss Velearius; and of women, Franca, Honorata, Ustania, Bonella, and the *divina* or sorceress Simplicia. It is to be regretted that Dahn makes no use of the piece in his remarks on the church history of this time, *Könige der Germanen*, vi. 455.

The *judicium* was first printed, Tejada y Ramiro, by Florez, l. c. 1759, then by *Coll. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.*, Madrid, 1850, ii. 326; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 121. [M. A. W.]

MARTIANUS (2) (MARCIANUS), bishop of Pampeluna some time before 693. In that year Vincomalus Diaconus subscribed the acts of the 16th council of Toledo held under Egica, in behalf of "Marciani Pampilonensis sedis episcopi." The 17th council held in the following year has no signature, and we have no further historical information concerning Marcianus. Legend, however, seized upon him as the last bishop known to history before the Moorish invasion, and later generations naively turned him into a martyr of Moslem intolerance. (See Sandoval, *Catalogo de los Obispos de Pamplona*—Pamplona, 1614, p. 8; Tejada y Ramiro, *Colecc. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 587; Mansi, xii. 85.) [M. A. W.]

MARTIANUS (3), the oldest friend of Augustine, who wrote exhorting him not to delay his baptism. (Aug. ep. 258 al. 155; Tillem. xiii. 47.) [H. W. P.]

MARTINIANUS (1), legendary martyr with PROCESSUS at Rome, commemorated July 2. According to the Acts of LINUS, these were the two soldiers into whose charge Peter had been given. They are converted by him in the prison, and in order to their baptism, Peter, by making the sign of the cross, causes a fountain miraculously to spring from the rock. This fountain is still shewn in the Mamertine prison. After their baptism, the two soldiers give Peter as much liberty as he desires, and when news comes that the prefect Agrippa is about to put him to death, they earnestly urge him to withdraw. Peter at first complies, but returns to custody in consequence of the well-known vision *Domine quo vadis*. It would appear from a notice in *Prædestinatus* (*Hæc.* 86) which has the air of being more historical than the bulk of the stories resting on the authority of that author, that the cult of these two martyrs was already in vogue in the reign of the pretender Maximus, that is to say, before the end of the 4th century. According to this story Montanists got temporary possession of the relics of these martyrs and claimed them as belonging to their sect. Lipsius conjectures that the cult of these martyrs began in the episcopate of Damasus, during which great exertions were made to revive the memory of the saints of the Roman church. To this period may be referred the Acts of Processus and Martinianus (Bolland. *A.A. SS.* July i. 303). They are clearly later than Constantine, containing mention of the names of offices which did not exist till his time. They are evidently based on the Acts of Linus, but the story receives considerable ornament. For instance, in company with the two soldiers are

baptized forty-seven fellow-prisoners, commemorated in the Roman church (March 14). It is not worth while to copy the fabulous details of the trial, tortures, and execution of the two martyrs. Their day of commemoration is fixed in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great (vol. ii. 114), who also mentions the church dedicated to them, and tells a story of a miraculous appearance of them (*Hom. in Evang.* ii. 32, vol. i. 1586). On the whole subject, see Lipsius (*Petrus-Sage*, p. 137 sq.). [G. S.]

MARTINIANUS (2), a gentleman of station and influence in Cappadocia, to whom Basil wrote a long letter at the time that the emperor was proposing to divide the province into two parts, A.D. 371, entreating him to employ all his influence to get the obnoxious decree annulled, by which the unhappy province was in danger of being torn in pieces, as Pentheus by the Maenades. (Basil. *Epist.* 74 [379]; Tillem. ix. 669; Ceillier, iv. 443.) [E. V.]

MARTINIANUS (3), poet, rhetor, judex, famous by land and by sea, the glory of Cappadocia, one who held Sicily and Africa by his arms, and whose sepulchre is highly venerated (Gregory Naz. epitaph. 40-53 in *Patr. Gr.* xxxviii. 29). Ceillier (v. 298) endeavours to identify him among the various Martiniani of the period. [C. H.]

MARTINIANUS (4), a friend of Jerome, only known to us from a mention of him in his letter from Antioch in 374 (*Ep.* 4, ed. Vall.) to Florentinus at Jerusalem. Martinianus was then at Jerusalem. He was known also to Evagrius. Vallarsi in his note mentions a hermit who, according to the Greek traditions, lived at that time near Caesarea, and who may be identified with him. (Vallarsi's *Jerome*, i. 14.) [W. H. F.]

MARTINUS (1), ST., bishop of Tours in the latter portion of the 4th century; hence frequently styled St. Martin of Tours (*S. Martinus Turonensis*). Of all the prelates of that age the one who made the deepest impression upon the heart and imagination of France, and of a considerable part of Western Christendom beyond its limits.\*

*Authorities.*—The authorities practically resolve themselves into one, namely, *Sulpicius Severus*. This author mentions Martin in the second book of his *Sacra Historia* (lib. ii. cap. xlv. *et seq.*), in connection with the important case of Priscillian [PRISCILLIANUS]. Of three dialogues composed by Sulpicius, the two latter treat *De virtutibus B. Martini*. An epistle, addressed to a presbyter named Eusebius (some say addressed to Desiderius), is composed *Contra aemulos virtutum B. Martini*; and two more, written respectively to a deacon named Aurelius, and to the author's mother-in-law, Bassula, narrate the

\* Sulpicius would regard this as an under statement. In his *Dialogus de Virtutibus Monachorum Orientalium*, he writes with reference to the superiority to all the monks and all the bishops of his age: "Hoc Aegyptus fatetur, hoc Syria, hoc Aethiops comperit, hoc Indus audivit, hoc Parthus et Persa noverunt: nec ignorat Armenia. Bosphorus exclusa cognovit et postremo si quis aut Fortunatas Insulas, aut Glaciæm frequentat Oceanum." (Cap. xix.)

circumstances of Martin's death. Finally, we have a biography *De Beati Martini Vitâ Liber*. In the edition of Sulpicius put forth by Horn (Amsterdam, A.D. 1665, the date of its third issue), an octavo of some 570 pages, including notes, at least a sixth part is occupied with the career of St. Martin. 2. St. Gregory of Tours [GREGORIUS TURONENSIS] has occupied three books out of his seven on miracles, with an account of those wrought by the relics of St. Martin. This work must be noticed below, but it cannot be said to give any important information respecting Martin's life. The references to Martin contained in the *Church History* of the same writer, tend to justify the remarks already made on the large space in the mind of France occupied by the bishop of Tours. 3 and 4. We possess two versified biographies of St. Martin. For an estimate of the earlier one, in four books, by Venantius Fortunatus, see FORTUNATUS (17). As it is merely adapted from the writings of Sulpicius, it has no claim to be considered as an independent authority. The same verdict must be passed upon the later poem, in six books, by Paulinus [PAULINUS]. It is more elegant than that of Fortunatus, which it may easily be, but is simply based on the same authority. 5. Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History (lib. iii. cap. xvi.) has a brief account of Martin.

*Life.*—Martin was not a native of the country which became his own by adoption, having been born at Sabaria in that part of Pannonia which is now identified with Lower Hungary. His parents were respectable, but there hardly seems sufficient warrant for the assertion of Sozomen, that they were a family of distinction.

As the life of Martin appears to have been extended to at least eighty years (A.D. 316–396) it seems convenient to treat it in separate divisions, into which it naturally falls. These are (A.) from his birth to his eighteenth year (316–336); (B.) from his quitting the army to his second visit to St. Hilary of Poitiers (336–360); and from that date (C.) to his consecration as bishop (360–371); (D.) the period of his episcopate (371–396).<sup>b</sup>

A.D. 316–336. We do not know the names of either of Martin's parents, but they were certainly heathens. His father was a soldier in the Roman army, and rose to the rank of a military tribune. Martin's infancy was passed at Pavia in Italy, where his father was for some time stationed, and there he received his education, apparently a purely pagan one. But even in boyhood his real bent of mind was made manifest, and at the age of ten he fled to a church and got himself enrolled as a catechumen. This was done against the wish of his parents, and his father succeeded in checking for a season the desire of the boy for a monastic career. An imperial edict ordered the enrolment of the sons of veterans, and Martin, who had become a wanderer among churches and monasteries, was,

through the action of his father, compelled to serve. He was allowed to have a servant, whom however he treated like an equal; and though free from the vices but too common in the profession, and living with much austerity, he thoroughly won the affections of his fellows during his three years of service in the army. It is during this period, between Martin's fifteenth and eighteenth year, that we must place a well-known incident, which, however we regard it, is thoroughly characteristic of the man. Being with his regiment at Amiens in Gaul, in the depth of a winter of unusual severity, he met at one of the city gates a poor man naked and shivering. His comrades did not heed the sufferer's petitions, and Martin's purse was empty. But Martin with his sword divided his cloak and gave one half of it to the beggar. Many derided the half-clad officer, but some regretted that they had not done likewise. That night Martin dreamed a dream. He saw in sleep Christ Himself clad in that half cloak, and heard a voice addressed by his Lord to a crowd of angels standing round him: "Martin, still a catechumen, has clothed Me with this garment." The biographer here cites the words: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." Martin, he adds, was not elated, but regarded his dream as a call to baptism, which he straightway received, being now eighteen years of age.<sup>c</sup> At the request of a superior, the military tribune under whom he served, he stayed in the army for two years after his baptism. His retirement is said to have been preceded by a refusal to accept a donative on the eve of an expected battle and to fight. The taunt of cowardice was met by Martin with an offer to stand unarmed in front of the ranks. The enemy, however, came in with proposals of peace, and Martin quitted the profession of arms the next day.<sup>d</sup>

A.D. 336–360. The next important event in the career of Martin was beyond doubt his first visit to St. Hilary of Poitiers [HILARIUS PICTAVIENSIS]. Martin was the guest of Hilary for a considerable time, and his host was anxious to ordain him deacon. To this proposal Martin resolutely refused his consent on the plea of un-

<sup>c</sup> The apostrophe of Paulinus to the famous cloak is not devoid of spirit:

O vere pretiosa chlamys—quid tale vel ostro  
Vel ducto in filum pensis rubilantibus auro  
Insignes meruere habitus? quid serica tactû  
Laevia, vel doctè expressis viventia signis.

This scene lends itself so naturally to artistic representation that it has become very common on canvas. We have even heard the sentiment expressed that it has consequently obtained an exceptional and undue celebrity.

<sup>d</sup> The chronology is at this point painfully confused. If Severus really took pains to inquire into the point, and is right in naming Julian as the commander under whom Martin served in Gaul, we are compelled (with Alban Butler) either to think that Gregory of Tours has placed the birth of Martin several years too early, or that he remained in the army for a longer period than that commonly assigned. J. H. Newman in his *Church of the Fathers* (chap. x.) quietly assumes an interval of fourteen years between Martin's withdrawal from the army and his first visit to St. Hilary. This assumption cuts the knot if it does not solve it. But Sulpicius gives no hint of such an interval. Indeed his language virtually contradicts any such supposition.

<sup>b</sup> Although some of these dates are well established, it must be owned that considerable uncertainty prevails respecting others. Thus though his length of life seems unquestioned, its exact commencement and end are not quite settled. It is difficult to reconcile some of the statements of Severus with the chronology set forth by Gregory of Tours.

worthiness, but he did not refuse the more lowly office of exorcist. Soon after the acceptance of this position, he was influenced by a dream concerning his parents, of whom he very naturally thought much, and conceived it to be his duty to visit them and convert them from the paganism which they still professed. Hilary fully approved of this step, but implored Martin that he would return. Martin departed in a somewhat dejected frame of mind, having a conviction that his journey would not be an easy or a pleasant one. His apprehensions proved correct. The journey from Gaul to Pannonia was in those days far from safe, and in crossing the Alps Martin fell in with a band of robbers. He was seized, and an axe was brandished over his head, but was arrested in its descent by one of the company. With hands bound he was brought before the chief. To the question who he was, he answered, "A Christian;" to the further query whether he feared, he promptly replied that he never felt more secure, but that he grieved for the condition of his captors. The robber is said to have been converted, and to have told the story of his own conversion.

As in some other instances on record, Martin found it easier to impress the mind of his mother than that of his father. His mother, with many more in Illyricum, became a convert to Christianity; his father remained a heathen. But Arianism, then in great force in many quarters, was particularly prevalent in these regions, and Martin stood forth as an almost solitary confessor for the faith. He was publicly scourged and compelled to depart. Having learnt that Gaul was in a state of confusion in consequence of the exile of Hilary, Martin betook himself to Italy, and for a short time found a safe retreat at Milan, where he made for himself a place of retirement. But the bishop of that city, Auxentius, a leader among the Arians, severely persecuted him, and at length drove him away. He retired, in company with a presbyter of high character, to the small island of Gallinaria (now called Galinara) off the coast of the Riviera, near Albenga.

A.D. 360-371. The news that Hilary had been permitted to return home (inasmuch as Constantius found him more successfully effective against Arianism in the East than in his own country) determined the next step of Martin. He kept his promise and returned to Gaul, an attempt to meet his friend at Rome having failed. Having settled in the neighbourhood of Poitiers, some five miles off, Martin founded what is looked upon as the earliest of monastic institutions in Gaul. Hilary gave him the site. The name of the spot was Locociagum. It is now known as Lugugé.

If, as seems to be implied by Sulpicius, Martin returned to Gaul immediately after Hilary, this fact gives us the date of A.D. 360 as the commencement of his monastic life. After eleven years in his monastery, the reputation of Martin caused his election to the see of Tours. It required what is called a pious fraud to entice him from his monastery; a leading citizen of Tours, having pretended that his wife was ill, begged Martin to come and visit her. A crowd, not only of the people of Tours, but collected also from neighbouring cities, had been gathered together; and the one all but unani-

mous desire was for the election of Martin. The few opponents objected that his personal appearance was mean, his garments sordid, his hair unkempt. One of the objectors was a bishop named Defensor. At service on that day the reader, whose turn it was to officiate, failed, through pressure of the crowd, to arrive in time. A bystander took up a psalter and read the verse which in the A. V. stands thus: "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength because of Thine enemies, that Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." But in the version then employed in Gaul, the concluding words ran as follows: "ut destruas inimicum et defensorem." It is characteristic of the age, that at this point a loud shout was raised by Martin's friends and that his enemies were confounded, the reader's choice of the verse being regarded as a divine inspiration. Opposition thenceforth ceased, and Martin was duly consecrated.

A.D. 371-396. To a great extent the new bishop of Tours continued to be the monk, though not in such wise as to neglect the duties of his office. He built a monastery two miles out of the city, where no less than eighty scholars, some of them noble and educated in softness, pursued a severe discipline. It has been noticed that the art of transcribing was cultivated by the younger brethren, perhaps the only direct recognition on Martin's part of the value of books and learning. In time several cities demanded and obtained bishops from this institution.

Unlike his friend Hilary, whose controversies with Arians and with semi-Arians form the main features of his polemical work, Martin as bishop was especially called upon to do battle with paganism. Despite the apparent recognition of some ten or eleven towns in Gaul as episcopal sees, the country people were still to a large extent heathen.

Another feature of difference between our records of the two friends runs throughout their career, but emerges specially at this point. The biography of Hilary of Poitiers is largely constructed out of his own writings, and it would not be easy to name any miracle recorded of Hilary by a contemporary.\* But Martin, as portrayed by his friend Sulpicius, simply lives in an atmosphere of marvels. It is impossible to ignore this characteristic, and it will be commented on below. At present we merely call attention to it, and remark that at least on one occasion the supernatural insight attributed to the bishop of Tours was exerted to check the veneration exhibited at the supposed tomb of a saint, which proved to be that of a robber executed for his crimes. During the first years of Martin's episcopate the record of miracles is specially abundant, though his biographer declares he is restricting himself to a few specimens.

The law of the land was thus far with Martin, that it had forbidden heathen sacrifices; nor did paganism produce any martyrs or confessors on

\* It is true that Hilary (in his *De Trinitate*, lib. xi.) does speak, as do several Fathers, of miracles wrought at the tombs of martyrs. But the main authority for any wrought by himself is Venantius Fortunatus, who was born in A.D. 530, when Hilary had been dead more than 160 years.

its behalf. But although there may be room for difference of opinion on the degree of stress to be laid on the political aspect of the case, on the character of Martin, or on the supernatural agencies believed to aid him, there can be no doubt that he must be regarded as the great evangeliser of the rural districts of Gaul, especially within the bounds of that considerable and not very defined diocese of which Tours was the recognised centre. There are prelates whose work seems to lie almost outside the domain of secular history. But Martin is not one of these. His work and influence are facts which no historian of France can fail to notice: and accordingly he has his place in the pages of a Gibbon, a Sismondi, or a Michelet, as well as in those of a Tillemont or a Fleury. Twice, indeed, he came across the path of emperors, namely, Valentinian I. and Maximus.

Valentinian, whose rule in the West lasted twelve years (A.D. 364-375), his brother Valens ruling in the East, for a time (in 368) fixed his seat of empire at Treves.<sup>f</sup> Martin repaired thither, for what reason is not specified, but probably for some confirmation of rights conceded by the laws. Moved by his Arian wife, Justina, the great opponent of St. Ambrose [AMBROSIUS], the emperor refused an audience. Martin had recourse to his usual weapons, asceticism and prayer, and within a week made his way into the palace at a time when the guards seem to have been careless. The emperor, indignant at the intrusion, declined to rise, until his chair caught fire and compelled him to move forward. Convinced of the divine aid, Valentinian granted all his requests, and took him into favour. Martin accepted the royal hospitality, but declined all personal presents.

Somewhat different were the relations of Martin with the emperor Maximus. The purple had not devolved on Maximus, as it had on Valentinian, by fair election to a vacant throne, but as the result of a revolt among the troops in Britain, where Maximus was at that time (A.D. 385) in command. Sulpicius is the chief witness for the apparently plausible view, that the diadem was all but forced upon Maximus, and that he was not at first personally responsible for the crimes by which he profited.<sup>g</sup>

Maximus, after the flight of Valentinian,<sup>h</sup> fixed his capital also at Treves. Many bishops at once accepted the *de facto* ruler, with a degree of adulation severely condemned by Martin's biographer, who declares that the bishop of Tours stood alone in the preservation of apostolic dignity in regard to the usurper. Martin declined at the hands of Maximus such invitations as he had accepted from Valentinian, declaring it impossible to banquet with one "who had dethroned one emperor [Valentinian] and slain another" [Gratian, Valentinian's brother].

<sup>f</sup> We must here have recourse to the second Dialogue of Sulpicius (capp. vi. vii.).

<sup>g</sup> The actual words of Sulpicius respecting Maximus are: "Vir omni vitæ merito prædicandus, si ei vel diadema non legitime, tumultuante milite, impositum repudiare, vel armis civilibus abstinere licuisset" (l. c. cap. vii.). Cf. also the chapter in the *Life of Martin* (cap. xxiii.). This last-named chapter records the scene of the feast.

<sup>h</sup> i.e. Valentinian II., son of Valentinian I. by Justina.

The excuses of Maximus, however, so far wrought upon Martin, that he at length consented to appear at the imperial board. This concession, if we may credit Martin's biographer, was a real source of joy to the emperor. Nor can such a sentiment on the part of Maximus be regarded as improbable. On the lowest ground, the *quasi* sanction given to his own position might naturally be welcomed as a source of strength and of progress in popular favour; while on higher grounds, the strange mixture of some measure of conscientiousness with ambition and ferocity might really be soothed and elevated by the recognition thus accorded by a representative of unworldly piety. The banquet was attended by guests of the highest distinction, and included Evodius, the consul, and an uncle and brother of the emperor. The seat assigned to Martin was among the very highest. In the middle of the feast the proper functionary offered, according to custom, a goblet to the sovereign. Maximus, however, ordered that it should first be given to Martin, in the expectation that he himself would in this way receive the cup from the bishop. But Martin handed the goblet to his chaplain, holding it wrong to allow that the emperor or his noblest guests had a higher claim to honour than a presbyter. The bishop's conduct was admired, though no other prelate had acted thus even at the repasts of secular dignitaries of inferior rank.

On another scene of intercourse between Martin and a person of high social position, Sulpicius employs the language of apology in reply to some half-hostile criticism. The wife of Maximus was completely entranced by the discourses of Martin, and in order to shew her reverence, persuaded the bishop to partake of a repast, which she herself prepared with her own hands and at which she acted as the chief attendant. Even the remains of his feast were gathered up and apparently consumed by the empress, as something better than any imperial banquet. An objector is represented as suggesting the danger of such an example, which might induce future ascetics to relax their rules against feminine ministrations. The biographer replies that this was an exceptional case; that Martin must have been seventy years old at the time; that the empress was not a youthful maiden, but a matron of mature age acting with the full consent and approbation of her husband. From this time Maximus, with what sincerity we have no means of judging, acted as a penitent.

The intercourse of Martin with Maximus involved the bishop in the difficulties which troubled the church in connection with the error of the Priscillianists. For details respecting the heresy fostered by Priscillian, the reader is referred to the article PRISCILLIANUS. In this place it must suffice to say that Priscillianism is usually, and it would seem justly, considered as a phase of Gnosticism. Its birth-place was Spain, and its partisans were treated with great severity by the authorities both of the church and the state. The leading opponent of the Priscillian (who from his good [social station, character, and ability, was a formidable foe) was another Spanish bishop, named Ithacius. Ithacius is not a favourite of Sulpicius, but is honourably mentioned by Isidore. That Ithacius was wrong in accusing Martin of heresy will be seen as we

proceed; but the mere circumstance of his venturing on such audacity would be enough to ruin his reputation with Sulpicius, and this element of the case must be taken into account when we weigh the evidence for the character of Ithacius.

Priscillian, though condemned by a local council, was supported by some bishops, who consecrated him to the vacant see of Avila. The members of the council thereupon had recourse to the civil power; while the friends of Priscillian sought the aid of Damasus the bishop of Rome. Failing to obtain it, they betook themselves to Milan, where the great Ambrose [AMBROSIVS] was then bishop. But St. Ambrose shewed them no more favour than Damasus.

In A.D. 384 we find Ithacius journeying to Treves (*Treviri*), and seeking an interview with Maximus. From this emperor Ithacius obtained the summoning of a council to be held at Bordeaux (*Burdigala*). Thus much was on all hands recognised as within the fair limits of imperial authority. But Priscillian, on his arrival at Bordeaux, instead of defending his cause by argument, appealed to the emperor. The Ithacians, as his opponents were called from their leader, had already committed themselves to the permission of a considerable amount of state interference. It was probably the consciousness of their admissions which made them feel the difficulty of making any consistent objection to Priscillian's appeal.

Priscillian now came in person to Treves and Ithacius followed him. Whether (as Sulpicius implies) Ithacius had an innate dislike both to students and to ascetics, or whether, as seems more probable, the difference between Martin and himself in the particular case before them was the main ground of the dissension, must be left doubtful. But they were at variance on a twofold issue. Martin objected to a case of heresy being left to the decision of a secular tribunal, and implored Ithacius not to press the charges against Priscillian before such a court; while at the same time he besought Maximus not to allow of any other punishment of the accused beyond excommunication. Finding that he must needs leave Treves and return home, Martin obtained a promise from the emperor that there should be no bloodshed. But the trial of Priscillian, which had been delayed until Martin's departure, was now eagerly pressed on, at the instance of two bishops named respectively Magnus and Rufus. The emperor seems to have been sincerely convinced that the heretical teaching of the Priscillianists involved gross immoralities; and, accordingly, in A.D. 835, Priscillian was executed. Several of his adherents shared the same fate, others were exiled for different periods, having reference to their importance and degree of complicity.

This event, the first instance of the capital punishment of a heretic, blends together the name of St. Martin with that of his great contemporary, the archbishop of Milan, St. Am-

brose. It is a noble conjunction. Both protested against the sentence, and announced their determination not to hold communion with the bishops who had been instrumental in procuring it. According to Sulpicius, this sentence was, in its immediate results at least, a conspicuous failure.<sup>1</sup> The heresy was spread more widely; the victims honoured as martyrs, and their bodies interred with solemnity. To swear by Priscillian became among his adherents a mark of true religion; discord raged for the next fifteen years, and the dissensions of the bishops brought disgrace and scorn upon the church.

Somewhat later these two allies pursued, to a certain extent, a divergent course. So strongly did Ambrose feel upon the subject of the execution of Priscillian, that on a second visit to Treves, in A.D. 387, he persisted in his refusal to communicate with the Ithacians, though he was made aware that this refusal would entail the failure of the object which he had in view, the recovery of the body of the assassinated emperor Gratian. But meantime the case had come before Martin entangled with a more difficult and graver responsibility. Martin had also paid another visit to Treves, but it was in order to save life, to plead that some of Gratian's officers might be spared. He had found there a number of bishops gathered together for the consecration of a new bishop, Felix, to the vacant see of Treves. These prelates had, with one exception, communicated with the adherents of Ithacius; and they had endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to prevent the entrance of Martin into the city. The attentions of Maximus had no effect upon Martin's resolution; but the information that those for whose lives he came to plead were doomed, and that a sort of raid against Priscillianism was contemplated, induced him to change his mind, especially as he feared that the charge of sympathy with heresy might plausibly be imputed to himself, and to others of ascetic life who had taken the same line.

It is evident that Martin considered himself on this occasion to have been placed in a situation which involved a cruel and perplexing question of casuistry. Felix was himself a good man and well fitted for the vacant see. Still Martin would not have communicated, but for the impending dangers to the lives of innocent men and to the cause of religion. On his journey homeward, which he commenced on the day after this communion, he sat down, while his companions went onward for a while, in the vast solitude of a forest, near the village of Andethanna, and again debated with himself the anxious question whether he had acted aright or not. It seemed to him that an angel appeared and told him that his compunction was right, but that he had had no choice. Henceforth he must be more careful. Martin believed that his power of working miracles and of relieving the oppressed was diminished ever after this unfortunate event. In order to escape such risks in the future, he

<sup>1</sup> For the discussion of this question see art. PRISCILLIANUS. The account of Sulpicius must be sought not in his *Life of St. Martin*, but in his *Sacra Historia* (lib. II. capp. 61-66) and in the third of his *Dialogi* (§ 15).

<sup>2</sup> Two of them to the Scilly Isles ("in Syllnam insulam quae ultra Britanniam sita est," *Hist. lib. II. cap. 65*).

<sup>1</sup> The emphatic language of Sulpicius on this point seems to deserve citation in the original: "Caeterum Priscilliano occiso, non solum non repressa est haeresis quae illo auctore proruperat, sed confirmata, latius propagata est. Namque sectatores ejus, qui eum primum in sanctum honoraverant, postea ut martyrem colere coeperunt."



never, for the remaining sixteen years of his life, attended any synod or gathering of bishops. Sulpicius believes that in due time he regained his supernatural powers.

The remainder of Martin's career was spent in the conversion of his diocese, amidst constant prayer and toil. His death was calm, pious, and edifying. The date of his decease must probably be fixed as A.D. 397,<sup>m</sup> on the 11th of November, a date well known throughout the north of England as the term-day of Martinmas.

Of the honours paid to Martin's memory only a few can be mentioned here. His funeral is said to have been attended by two thousand monks. He is specially named among confessors in the mass of pope Gregory, with Linus, Cletus, Hilary, Augustine, and thirteen more. One of the oldest churches in England is that of St. Martin at Canterbury; and the earliest apostle of Scotland, St. Ninian [NINIANUS], having heard of Martin's death while he was labouring in Galloway, dedicated to him the first stone church of the country, *Candula Casa*. He became (about 997) the patron saint of Norway, by the choice of its first convert king, Olaf Tryggvesen. His abbey near Tours, which was secularised in the 7th century, had, from the time of Charles-le-Chauve, the king of France for its abbat and first canon, with a long list of ecclesiastical and lay dignitaries among the honorary canons, including the patriarch of Jerusalem, the archbishop of Cologne; the counts of Flanders and Dunois, and (before the Reformation) the earls of Douglas in Scotland.

It must here be added that the one solitary writing attributed by some to St. Martin, the short *Confessio Fidei de Sancta Trinitate* (given by Schönemann, *Bibliotheca Patr. Lat.* vol. i. § 19, and in some other patristic collections), is of doubtful authenticity. We are not aware of any modern historian or biographer who has laid any stress upon it.

Two questions seem to call for some attempt at reply before we close. 1. What is to be said of that atmosphere of the supernatural in which St. Martin is reported to have lived? 2. What is the value of that popular favouritism which places Martin so completely in the front rank of his country's objects of veneration?

1. A considerable number of divines in our day would probably describe their own mental attitude towards physical science in some such language as the following: "We are compelled to own with regret that theology has but too frequently adopted towards physical science (and, indeed, at times, towards mental science also) a position of antagonism which has not been worthy of her own dignity. Christian teachers have allowed themselves to be betrayed into a state of excitement, of irritation, and distrust in relation to this or that assumed scientific discovery, often without waiting to see

whether it is a real discovery or not, or whether, if proved, it will affect the essence of the Christian faith. We have, it is true, some generous admissions from votaries of physical science, to the effect that their leaders have occasionally adopted language quite as unreasonable and needlessly aggressive as that of any theologian; but we ought, at least, to try to set a good example." There is, however, another element of the case which seems to be greatly overlooked. It is this, that the lack of that special culture which has been given to the human mind by the progress of physical science, must be regarded as a serious defect in the composition of a large portion of patristic literature.<sup>n</sup> In our own day, to say nothing of a considerable list of theologians who are also men of science, even divines who would not claim to be physicists are at least aware of what physical science means. They can talk with distinguished cultivators of astronomy and zoology, of chemistry and geology, and even the indirect training thus obtained must colour, and ought to colour, their ideas of the value of evidence. And the result would be an inability to accept, as objectively true, a great deal that is put forth in the large class of works, of which the *Life of St. Martin* by Sulpicius is a specimen.

It may be thought that this is only a Protestant sentiment. This is not the case. It would not be easy to name better examples of the cultivated Roman Catholic of the age than the present Duc de Broglie or than Möhler. M. de Broglie speaks thus of the narratives of the 4th century respecting the hermits of the Egyptian desert: "No doubt that, aroused by the sight of so many undeniable prodigies, a rather credulous enthusiasm embellished, enriched, and sometimes even grotesquely travestied the truth. It must be observed that these simple narratives, which have all the charm and vigour of a childlike faith, were by their special character marvellously fitted to exercise a happy moral effect on the interior discipline of Christian life. The prodigies narrated are never mere *tours de force*, useless demonstrations of power, calculated only to captivate the senses by a surprising *prestige*. They are usually external representations, under a living and sensible form, of the struggle of the Christian soul against passion and sin. It might be described as the inward drama of the soul displayed in broad daylight. It was thus for each Christian the living history of his inner life, and of his struggles of conscience. It is thus that in a more modern age, a dissenter in Great Britain described all the Christian combat against sin by a long allegory, in which every virtue and every vice was personified."<sup>o</sup> Möhler had substantially anticipated this language, both in his *Athanasius der Grosse*, at the close of the fourth book, where he criticises the biography of St. Antony, and in one of his minor works, where he is speaking of the marvels attributed to St. Jaco-

<sup>m</sup> Mr. Fynes Clinton adopts this date (*Fasti Romani*, vol. i. p. 513). He makes the latest visit of Martin to Treves occur in 386, and his death eleven years later. This requires, it must be owned, a somewhat bold emendation of the text of Sulpicius, in whose third dialogue (*cap. xv.*) the ordinary reading runs "*Sedecim* (not *undecim*) postea vixit annos." Canon Robertson (*Ch. Hist.* bk. ii. chap. v.) seems hardly prepared to accept the proposed emendation, in which case the dates become respectively 384-400 instead of 386-397.

<sup>n</sup> The writer considers himself bound to mention that this conviction was strongly impressed upon his mind by one of the most deeply-read students of the Fathers and of church history whom he has known, the most learned Presbyter of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the late George Hay Forbes of Burntisland.

<sup>o</sup> *L'Église et l'Empire au IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1859), tome iii. pp. 110, 111.

mius. There does appear to be real ground for the observations of Mr. J. A. Froude in a recently published essay on *The Lives of the Saints*, that "in certain conditions of mind the distinction between objective and subjective truth has no existence."<sup>p</sup>

Of course, as has been remarked, the effect on a given person remains untouched, whatever be thought of the character of a particular vision. If the account given by Dr. Doddridge of the appearance which converted Colonel Gardiner be correct, it would matter little to the gallant soldier if the vision could be proved to have originated from within rather than from without.<sup>q</sup> This remark holds good as regards many of the visions of the Fathers of the desert, and also of St. Martin. There is, for example, the celebrated one related by Sulpicius in his biography (cap. 25) where the Evil One appears to Martin clad in royal robes, and with a diadem, and asks for the homage due to Christ. Martin's spiritual instinct, undeceived, declines to acknowledge him, and when rebuked, he replies that it is not in this guise that he looks for Christ, but with the show of the wounds of the Cross. And Satan vanishes, filling the cell with smoke and stench. Whatever judgment be passed upon the narrative, there are few Christians who will not recognise the singular force and beauty of the reflections made by the (then Anglican) commentator, who some forty years ago made the following application of the story. "The application of this vision to Martin's age is obvious: I suppose it means in this day, that Christ comes not in pride of intellect or reputation for philosophy. These are the glittering robes in which Satan is now arraying. Many spirits are abroad, more are issuing from the pit; the credentials which they display are the precious gifts of mind, beauty, richness, depth, originality. Christian, look hard at them with Martin in silence, and ask them for the print of the nails."<sup>r</sup>

Where so much is subjective in its origin, shall we say that all is so? The present writer is unable to take this step. Fully recognising the inaccuracy of a Bede's account of physical phenomena, and the strangeness of temper, according to modern ideas, which could make an Adamant represent a common-sense warning uttered by St. Columba into a distinct prophecy;<sup>s</sup> admitting that credulity is not faith, and that mediæval license of belief has operated (as the Roman Catholic M. Nicolas grants<sup>t</sup>) to the prejudice of the gospel narrative, he is for his part

<sup>p</sup> *Good Words* for June 1881, p. 411. The way in which Sulpicius would silence objectors is highly characteristic of his age. Our Lord has promised that what Martin accomplished (*implevit*) should be wrought by all the faithful. Therefore he who does not believe that Martin did these marvels, does not believe that Christ thus spoke.

<sup>q</sup> Sir Walter Scott, in Note D subjoined to *Waverley*, cites a plausible passage from Dr. Hibbert in favour of a subjective origin of Gardiner's vision. The rejection of the entire story by Carlyle of *Inveresk* is little worth.

<sup>r</sup> *The Church of the Fathers*, by John Henry Newman (Martin and Maximus).

<sup>s</sup> Columba simply warned a monk to take care not to drop a book into a vessel of water. The monk was careless and did let it fall into the vessel.

<sup>t</sup> *Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christianisme* (tome v.). "Les Miracles."

with Edmund Burke and with Dr. Arnold,<sup>u</sup> still prepared to believe that "not only at the beginning of the gospel, but in ages long afterwards, believing prayer has received extraordinary answers; that it has been heard in even more than it might have dared to ask for." It is obvious that, if any real miracles were vouchsafed, the tendency to multiply instances and to see the supernatural where it was not truly manifested would be largely increased. It must be added that the popularity of these narratives must have proved a temptation even to an honest narrator like Sulpicius. The booksellers, his friend Posthuanus told him, were delighted with the demand for his works, which they found most profitable; and there was a craving to hear more about Martin.<sup>v</sup> May not Sulpicius unconsciously have anticipated the well-known comment of M. Guizot on some of the marvels which he told: that they formed *un véritable soulagement moral . . . peu importerait la vérité matérielle de l'histoire.*<sup>w</sup>

A similar verdict must be passed on the miracles in connection with St. Martin's tomb and relics recorded by St. Gregory of Tours. We read in Holy Scripture of the restoration to life effected by the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21), and divines seem justified in pointing out that the selection of a perfectly new tomb for the Saviour was not only a part of the reverence due to His sacred body, but also a preservative against any theory of the Resurrection which should assign it to the influence of some saint's remains. The miracle wrought by Elisha's bones may have had its parallels under the Christian dispensation; and any instances allowed would be largely multiplied by credulity.

2. Thanks in part at least to Sulpicius, the impress made by Martin's life and career was wonderful. As has been already remarked, secular historians, as e.g. Michelet, do him full justice. Sismondi is a partial exception. But Sismondi, most fair and generous to opponents of the three last centuries, whom he can at least understand, is rendered utterly incapable, by his want of imagination, of entering into the mind of mediæval champions of the faith. Sismondi can denounce with unsurpassed vigour a crime like the partition of Poland. That was to him a reality. But the abominations of paganism were not to him a reality. He wrote before the days of Guizot, Vogt, Thierry, and their school, and he cannot make allowance for any fierceness against the rites of heathendom, and all that they involved. One important admission he does however make, namely, that paganism, when attacked, furnished no martyrs.

As regards, however, the popularity of Martin,

<sup>u</sup> *Lectures on Modern History*, by Thomas Arnold, D.D. (Lect. II.).

<sup>v</sup> *Dialogus* I. cap. 16.—The friend is represented as speaking of the volume on *The Life of Martin* by Sulpicius: "Cum tota urbe raperetur, exultantes librarios vidi, quod nihil ab his quaestuosius haberetur, siquidem nihil illo promptius, nihil carius venderetur." In our list we have reserved the biography until the last, as this passage shews, the dialogues were subsequent compositions.

<sup>w</sup> *Civilisation en France*, 17ième Leçon. Canon Liddon has some remarks on the dangerous side of this theory in his recent volume of *University Sermons* (Second Series).

we must not lay too much stress on this feature of his life. Without going to the length of the slightly morbid sentiment of Pascal, that a good deed becomes less beautiful by the mere fact of its being known, there does seem real force in the theory that the honours paid to champions of the faith must be regarded as being an accidental glory, which falls to one and does not fall to another, who yet deserved it as well. The tradition of some charm of manner may have permeated after ages. Martin possessed this gift. His fame is deserved. Of the acts in Martin's career which may be legendary, many have a brightness peculiarly their own. Of some it may be fairly said that the narrative carries conviction with it. It is no light praise to have protested against the first capital punishment for heresy; not the less so because France has heard but few such protests, though we do not forget the inconsistent wail of the elder De Thou over the massacre of St. Bartholomew, or the generous (and consequently highly censured) outburst of the closing days of Montalembert. Even the weakness—for it surely was a weakness—which kept him from all gatherings of his brother prelates during his later life, sprang out of an amiable fear lest he should again be entangled in some moral difficulty. Fascination is not in itself piety; though some holy men have possessed it. The list of its possessors must include Hannibal, C. Julius Caesar, Mary Queen of Scots, Fenelon, Bishop Heber, with numbers more. Contemporaries of St. Martin may have rivalled him in devotedness and in zeal for the faith. They are unknown, or but little known; partly from the lack of a biographer (*caerent quia vite sacro*), partly because, with all their gifts, the fragrant aroma of a winning sweetness was apparently not blended with their sternness.

[J. G. C.]

**MARTINUS (2)**, bishop of Dumium in Galicia, and afterwards metropolitan bishop of Braga, died about 580; a person of importance, about whom our information is far too scanty.

*Sources*.—The sources for our knowledge of Martin's life are—(1) the life of him by Isidore in the *De Vir. Ill.* cap. 35, and a mention of him by the same author in the *Hist. Suevorum, Esp. Sagr.* vi. 505; (2) the passages concerning him in Gregory of Tours—(a) *De Mirac. Scti. Martini Tur.* i. 11; (b) *Hist. Franc.* v. 38; (3) the Acts of the 1st and 2nd councils of Braga. A.D. 561 and A.D. 572, *Coll. de Can. de la Iyl. Esp.* Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 606, 620; (4) a passage in the Acts of the 10th council of Toledo, l. c. p. 421; (5) a letter and poem addressed to him by Venantius Fortunatus (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii.); (6) his works collected and edited by Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* xv. To these original sources may be added the notices of him in Siebert, cap. 117, Trithemius, cap. 221. Anonymus Mallicensis, cap. 38, Honorius Augustodunensis, iii. 76, all in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*.

*His Life*.—According to Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus, Martin was a native of Pannonia, of Roman Pannonia, "Pannonia Quiritis," according to Venantius. He had travelled from his native country to the Holy Land, and had in the East acquired such a knowledge of letters that he was held to be second to no scholar of his day. Thence (*ex Orientis partibus*) on

what errand none of the original accounts explain, he came to Galicia, arriving "ad portum Galliciae" (? Portucale) on the same day as the relics of St. Martin of Tours, for which Ariarius or Theodoric I., king of the Suevi, had shortly before petitioned the guardians of the saint's shrine. Already the conversion of the Suevi had been half effected by the supernatural agency of the elder Martin (see the story of Theodemir's conversion under THEODEMIR), and now another Martin was to complete it. Among the Suevian people converted "from the Arian impiety to the Catholic faith," he established, according to Isidore, the "rule of faith and holy religion." Immediately after his arrival he seems to have founded the monastery of Dumium, close to Braga, and to have been then made bishop of a see of Dumium, constituted for the occasion, and comprising probably only the monastery and the royal household (*Esp. Sagr.* xviii. 32). In 561, about eleven years after his arrival in the country, he attended the first council of Braga, presided over by Lucretius metropolitan bishop of Braga. In all probability the Acts of the council, which are thrown into an unusual and highly artificial shape, were compiled by Martin, who would then be the person of the greatest literary pretensions in Galicia. Lucretius opens the proceedings with a long speech, recalling the letter of pope Leo to Turribius against the Priscillianists, and quoting the decrees of a council supposed to have been held by the bishops of Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Lusitania, and Baetica, under the presidency of Balconius bishop of Braga, and in the pontificate of Leo.

The tradition of this council, of which no record remains, and which is not mentioned by Leo's zealous Gallican contemporary Idatius, probably sprang from a confusion of two events—of the first council of Toledo in 400, which was concerned with the Priscillianists, with Leo's letter to Turribius (A.D. 448), in which he recommends that a general synod of the Spanish bishops should be assembled to deliberate on the spread of this heresy, or failing a general synod, that a council of Gallican bishops should at least be held. But whether this be so or no, the silence of Idatius, who was deeply interested in the Priscillianist controversy, and reports minutely all the episcopal proceedings in Galicia with regard to it, is conclusive against the reality of such a council. The political troubles of the time probably made it impossible to follow Leo's advice.

The first council of Braga evidently marks an era of revival and reformation in the church of Galicia, under the auspices probably of the orthodox and energetic Martin. The only mention of Arianism in it throughout occurs in a letter of pope Vigilius which was read. Probably this indirect handling, and the penalties decreed generally against intercourse with heretics, were all that the bishops felt themselves at this moment strong enough to venture against a creed which had been shortly before the religious confession of the Suevian nation, and had no doubt still many friends in high places. Eleven years later another council was held at Braga, and we now find Martin occupying the metropolitan see as successor to Lucretius. His position of superiority throughout the council is very clearly marked, the bishops addressing him in unusually

submissive terms. Eleven bishops were present from the two synods of Lugo and Braga, which here appear as two distinct metropolitan dioceses for the first and only time in authentic history.

The history of the metropolitan dignity of Lugo is very obscure, and is connected with that of various forged documents. An investigation of it will be found under the head of *NIBIGIS*.

Some time between 572 and 580, the year, according to Gregory of Tours, of Martin's death, we may probably place the correspondence between Martin and Venantius Fortunatus. Martin's letters are not extant, but we have a letter of the most extravagant and meaningless eulogy addressed to him by Fortunatus, and also a poem in his honour. A passage towards the end of the poem evidently refers to a society of nuns of whom Martin was the founder and guide. In 580 Martin died, followed by the grief of the people of Galicia (Greg. Tur. *l.c.*). His memory is celebrated on the 30th of March.

*His Works.*—(1) *Formula vitæ honestæ*, as he himself calls it in the preface, otherwise *De Differentiis Quatuor Virtutum* (so Isid. *l.c.*), or *De Quatuor Virtutibus Cardinalibus*. This little tract was extremely popular in the Middle Ages, and was frequently printed during the 15th and 16th centuries at Leipzig, Paris, Deventer, London, Venice, and elsewhere. In the early editions it was always ascribed to Seneca, and it is mentioned as Seneca's in the *Speculum* of Vincent of Beauvais. Aguirre even found it attributed to Cicero in a Vatican MS. (*Coll. Max. Conc. Hisp. ii.*). It occurs in the MSS. in three forms, of which an account is given by Dr. Lightfoot in *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 3rd edit. p. 330, note. The preface, addressed to Miro king of Galicia, seems to have been first printed at Poitiers, by Elie Vinet, in 1544 (D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, 2nd ed. 1723, iii. 312, note), then with many variations by Boxhorn in one of the notes to his edition of Ammianus (Lugduni Batav., ex officina Joannis Maire, 1632), and for the third time in the 1st edition of D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, where it appears as "hitherto unpublished," and whence it was transferred to other collections. Of this tract the present writer has examined eight 15th- and 16th-century editions, and there are no doubt others, besides early German and French translations. The best edition is that, by Haase in *Sen. Op.* iii. 468, where he describes the *Formula* as more frequently read and quoted in the Middle Ages than any of Seneca's genuine works. There is an edition by A. Weidner, Magdeburg, 1871. (Conf. Fabricius, *Bibl. Med. Ac. Inf. Lat.* iii. and *Bibl. Latina*, ed. 1773, ii. 119.)

*De Moribus.*—A tract consisting of a series of maxims gathered from various sources. Seneca's works were probably used in compiling it, though it is not easy to discover actual verbal agreement (Haase, *l.c.* p. xx.). It may contain fragments of some of the lost works of Seneca; it certainly contains one fragment from Lactantius. In it, according to Orelli, are sentences from "the Pythagoreans, the Seven Sages, and other ancients," while some are probably taken from the Proverbs of Solomon. A sentence from it is quoted as Seneca's at the 2nd council of Tours, A.D. 570, can. 15. It is also quoted by Lupus abbat of the monastery of Ferrara, in the diocese of Sens, in the latter half of the 9th century, as

belonging to "secular," *i.e.* non-Christian, literature. Like the *Formula* it was frequently printed in the 15th and 16th centuries, at Leipzig, Paris, and elsewhere. The reasons for its attribution to Martin are not very plain. It does not apparently occur in the numerous Spanish MSS. which contain Martin's other works (Florez at least had not seen it in MS.), and its quotation under Seneca's name at a council held during Martin's lifetime would seem to shew that it was the work of the compiler of an earlier generation. In Boxhorn's Ammianus, the address to Miro, which is properly the preface to the *Formula*, is given as the preface to the *De Moribus*, Boxhorn finding it so placed in a MS. in his own possession. Can a copyist's mistake of this kind be the foundation of Martin's connexion with the *De Moribus*? On the other hand, Martin was no doubt a diligent student and imitator of Seneca and other moralizing writers, and upon internal grounds alone may easily have been its author. (Conf. Orelli, *Opuscula Graec. Vett. Sentent.* p. 269, Leipzig, 1819; Mansi, ix. p. 795; Lupus Servatus, *Opera*, ed. Baluze, cap. lxiv. and note, p. 401; Fabricius, *l.c.*; Erasmus in *Sen. Opera*, most recent edition; also in Haase, iii. 462.)

*De correctione Rusticorum*, a curious sermon, of undoubted authenticity, addressed to the bishop Polemius of Astorga, whose signature appears among those of C. Brac. II. Florez found a mention of it in various ancient breviaries, and at last discovered it among the Toledan MSS. (*Esp. Sagr.* xv. 127). His edition, however, is extremely careless, and the MS. used by him does not seem to have contained the introductory address to Polemius. This was first published by Aug. Mai, *Classici Auctores*, iii. 379, who also reprinted the greater part of the text in a far better form from a Vatican MS. In this interesting tract Martin discusses the origin of idolatry, and denounces the heathen customs still remaining in Galicia. His theory is that the fallen angels or demons assumed the names and shapes of notoriously wicked men and women who had already existed, such as Jove, Venus, Mars; that the nymphs, Lamias, and Neptune are demons with power to harm all who are not fortified with the sign of the Cross, and who shew their faithlessness by calling the days of the week after the heathen gods. The observance of kalends, the propitiation of mice and moths by presents of bread and cloth that they may be so kept away from the store cupboard and the chest, auguries, the observance of the New Year on the 1st of January instead of on the March equinox, when in the beginning God "divided the light from the darkness" by an equal division, the burning of wax tapers at stones, trees, streams, and crossways, the adornment of tables, the pouring of corn over the log on the hearth, the placing of wine and bread in the wells, the invocation of Minerva by the women at their spinning, the worship of Venus, the incantation of medicinal herbs, divination by birds and by sneezing, all these are denounced as pagan superstitions, offensive to God and dangerous to him who practises them. The sign of the Cross is to be the remedy against auguries and all other diabolical signs. The holy incantation, viz. the Creed, is the Christian's defence against diabolical incantations and songs.

This tract ought to be compared with the 72nd, 73rd, 74th, and 75th *Capitula* of Martin's canons. It has not yet been pointed out that at least can. 74 and 75 are indisputably connected with certain passages in the *De correctione Rusticorum*, and thus furnish one more evidence of Martin's authorship of the tract. The connexion does not help us to determine the date either of the tract or the *Capitula*, for either may have preceded the other.

*De trina Mersione*, a letter to a bishop Boniface on the subject so often debated within the Arian Germanic kingdoms of the threefold immersion in baptism. Martin refers to the letter of pope Vigilius to Profuturus, quoted in the 1st council of Braga, and mentions incidentally the presence of Suevian legates at Constantinople, who had seen the ceremony of baptism performed by the bishop of Constantinople in the manner prescribed by Vigilius. Vigilius's letter is spoken of as a "formula," "certissimae auctoritatis," "ab ipsa beatissimi Petri cathedra." The *De trina Mersione* was first published by Aguirre from a Toledan MS. Florez claims to have produced an amended text in his edition of Martin's works.

*Pro Repellenda jactantia, De Superbia, Exhortatio Humilitatis, De Ira, De Pascha*, are five small tracts, first published by Tamayo de Salazar in vol. ii. of his *Martyrol. Hisp.* There is, however, no ground for suspecting their genuineness because of their connexion with the untrustworthy Tamayo (so Gams, ii. (1) 473), since Florez reprinted them from two MSS., one at Madrid and one at Toledo (*Esp. Sagr.* xv. 127). The *Exhortatio Humilitatis* is apparently addressed to a king, perhaps to Miro (Theodemir II.), with whom Martin seems to have had close relations, while the *De Ira* is addressed to bishop Witimir of Orense, whose name occurs among the signatures of C. Brac. ii. This last piece is a mere abridgment of Seneca's treatise on the same subject. Martin incorporates whole passages from his original, compressing Seneca's long treatise into matter equivalent to eight small quarto pages, and dividing his tract into three parts, in imitation of the three works of Seneca. There is not a word throughout of the author's debt to Seneca, either in the body of the tract or in his prefatory address to Witimir.

*De Paupertate* is a short tract, consisting of excerpts from Seneca, sometimes attributed to Martin, but not mentioned by Florez or by Nicolas Antonio (*Bibl. Vat.* Bayer's edit. Haase, l.c. xx. 458).

*Martin's Translations.*—Besides these adaptations of Latin stoical literature, Martin produced or superintended a good deal of translation from the Greek, some of which had important consequences. Foremost among these translations appear the *Capitula Martini*, a collection of eighty-four canons, which had great vogue and influence in the middle ages. Martin addressed the collection to that Nitigis bishop of Lugo who appears at the second council of Braga, and by proxy at C. Tol. III. in 589, and to the whole "concilium" of the church of Lugo, to the dioceses, that is to say, subject to her metropolitan jurisdiction. He declares in the short preface that his object has been to clear up passages which were originally incorrectly or obscurely translated from the Greek, and also to restore passages corrupted by the ignorance or carelessness of

copyists. For convenience of reference he has placed the canons relating to the clergy first, and has then gathered together those relating to the laity. To the first class Martin assigns 68, to the second 16.

These "capitula sive canones orientalium antiquorum patrum synodis a venerabili Martino episcopo, vel ab omni Bracarensi synodo excerpti," were incorporated into the earliest form of the Spanish *Codex Canonum*. With it they passed into the pseudo-Isidorian collection, and so obtained a widespread influence. "From the 10th century onwards," says Maavin (*Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, Gratz, 1870, p. 802), "there are few systematic collections in which they are not used." The sources of the collection cannot be exhaustively ascertained. In the *Bibliotheca Juris canonici veteris*, Paris, 1661, Doryat, in editing a new text of the *Capitula* based on a careful comparison of the text as contained in the first edition of the genuine *Collectio Hispana*, published by Loaysa in 1593, with that of the pseudo-Isidorian collection, attempted to assign each canon to its sources. Some of the canons, however, he failed to trace; others he traced wrongly. His text and notes were afterwards incorporated with all the later collections of councils. A new edition, with some corrections, will be found in Brun's *Canones Apostolorum*, l. c. Berlin, 1839, ii. 43. In any case the canons are not exclusively drawn from Greek sources. Many canons of C. Tol. I., some from the 3rd and 4th councils of Carthage, and one from C. Brac. i. (can. 10 in cap. 41) have been made use of. In the remaining *Capitula*, canons of Nicaea, Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Gangra, Antioch, and Laodicea can be traced. "The interpretation, however," says Maaven, "is by no means that of literal translation. Some parts are expanded, others omitted. Even the Latin canons are not exactly reproduced." We have already pointed out the connexion between cap. 74 and 75, and certain passages in the *De correctione Rusticorum*. The collection seems to have been conceived in a high ecclesiastical spirit. The canons selected define the relative position and modes of appointment of metropolitan, bishop, presbyter, and deacon. Popular election to bishoprics, which is admitted, though in somewhat vague terms, by the well-known C. Tol. iv. 19, is here expressly prohibited in a canon drawn from C. Laod. xii. 13. A canon of Ancyra, which allows the deacons who had declared before ordination that they could not remain unmarried, to retain their offices after marriage, is altered by Martin in an exactly contrary sense (conf. C. Tol. II. A.D. 527). The whole appears, like the canons of the 1st council of Braga, to have been directed towards the tightening of those bonds of church discipline which the troubled condition of Gallicia and the Arianism of its Teutonic governing class had tended to weaken. By arranging them in this short and systematic form Martin hoped to bring the disciplinary canons of the past to bear practically on the present, and to clothe them with new force and working power. (Spittler, *Geschichte des canonischen Rechts*, Opp. i. 802, 1827; Schroeckh, *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, xii. 215, 230, 243, 695.)

*Interrogationes et repositiones plurimae*, sct. *Aegyptiorum Patr.*, translated from an unknown

Greek source by a certain deacon Paschasius in the monastery of Dumium, with a preface addressed by him to Martin, at whose command the work had been undertaken. (Rosweyde, *Vitae Patrum*, lib. vii. p. 505, and Prolegomenon xiv.; Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* xv. 433.)

To these prose works and translations may be added certain poems of doubtful authenticity, published by Sirmond, *Opp.* ii. p. 907 (they should be read, however, in connexion with the mention of certain poems by Martin in Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* l. c.), and an epitaph composed by himself, which has the authority of long tradition and may be genuine (*l.c.* and *Esp. Sagr.* xv. 449).

*Was Martin a Benedictine?*—This question is unhesitatingly answered in the affirmative by the great Benedictine writers. (So Mabillon, *Annales O. S. B.* and *Bibliothèque Générale de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît*, ii. 203.) "Martin is famous in the order of St. Bened.," says the *Bibl. Gén.*, "as having been the propagator of it in Spain." The only possible evidence for this assertion is contained in the general expression of Isidore, "monasteria condidit," in the fact of Martin's foundation of Dumium; and, say the Benedictines, in a letter addressed by pope Boniface IV. to certain Angli who objected to the appointment of monks as bishops, in which "Martinus Pannoniensis" is spoken of in the same breath with the English Augustine and Gregory the Great, as illustrious examples of a contrary theory. If the "Martinus Pannoniensis" here spoken of could be identified with Martin of Braga, the Benedictine case would be arguable. But it is abundantly plain that Boniface is here thinking of Martin of Tours, also "Pannoniensis," and not of Martin of Galicia. The words used, "cujus fama longe lateque totus personat mundus," apply legitimately to Martin of Tours; they would have been ridiculous applied in 614, or, indeed, at any time, to Martin of Braga (Harduin, ii. 543). It is on the whole most probable that Martin adopted one of the various older rules still current in the contemporary monasteries of Southern Gaul, with some of which we know him to have had relations. About one hundred years later his illustrious successor in the sees of Dumium and Braga, St. Fructuosus, drew up a monastic rule for his monastery of Compludo, which was for the most part an abstract and abbreviation of the Benedictine rule, but contained also provisions not to be found in that rule. This is the only piece of historical evidence connecting the Benedictine rule with Visigothic Catholicism. Everything else commonly brought forward to prove such a connexion is mere inaccurate guess-work. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1096; Yepes, *Chron. del Ord. de S. Benito*, i. for the ultra-Benedictine view. On the general subject of monasticism in Gothic Spain compare Dahu's summary, *Könige der Germanen*, vi.)

*Martin's Personality.*—That Martin played an important and commanding part in his generation all that remains of him suggests. His life appears to have been greatly influenced by the parallel so often drawn by his contemporaries between himself and the greater Martin of Tours. We may also regard him to some extent as a piece in a political game. As the conversion of the Suevoi to Arianism under Remismund in the middle

of the 5th century was originally a political move, and the price paid by the Suevoi for the West Gothic alliance, so their conversion to Catholicism under Theodemir I., about the middle of the sixth, was probably a political move, and the price paid by them for Frankish and Byzantine support against those same Arian West Goths who had originally drawn them into heresy. The presence at Constantinople of Suevoian legates, mentioned in one of Martin's letters, and the whole history of Leovigild's early years, and of the relations between the Suevoi and the West Goths and the Suevoi and the Franks during his reign (see art. LEOVIGILD) seem to point to some such conclusion. If so, the career of Martin the missionary, "ex Orientis partibus," who effected the Suevoian conversion, is one element in a scheme of European politics which can be traced through the greater part of the 6th century, and in which the destruction of the Suevoian kingdom by Leovigild five years after Martin's death, and the West Gothic conversion to Catholicism under Reccaro, are important incidents. (Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 471.)

[M. A. W.]

MARTINUS (3) I., elected bishop of Rome as successor to Theodore, July 5, A.D. 649, after a vacancy of fifty-two days as stated by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in his life of Martin. (See also Pagi, *Critic. in Baron. ad ann. 649.*) He is described as "patria Tudertina quae est civitas in Tuscia." Entering office during the heat of the Monothelitic controversy, he became memorable for his resolute defence of the orthodox doctrine, and for his sufferings in consequence. The question whether two wills, and two operations of will (*ἐνέργειαι*), divine and human, were to be attributed to Christ had been thrown into the arena of controversy about the year 626 by the emperor Heraclius, in the hope, it is supposed, of suggesting a middle ground of agreement between the orthodox and the Monophysites. It was conceived that the latter might accept the doctrine of two natures, if that of a single will and a single operation were conceded. Theodore bishop of Pharan is credited with having originated the doctrine of one will only, which was countenanced by Cyrus of Phasis (promoted by Heraclius to Alexandria), by Sergius patriarch of Constantinople, and even by pope Honorius of Rome. [HONORIUS.] On the other hand, Sophronius, an Alexandrian monk, who became patriarch of Jerusalem, had been the leading champion of the contrary, or orthodox, view. In the year 639 Heraclius, under the advice of Sergius, had issued the edict known as the *Echthesis*, in which the doctrine of one will was asserted, but all future discussion of one or two operations was forbidden. For it seems that some of those who could not accept the view of two distinct wills in the one person of Christ, still allowed that His one will might operate in a twofold manner, divinely and humanly. The object of the *Echthesis* was to allow this supposition; to leave it as an open question, on which there was to be no more controversy. The edict had been approved by synods, at Constantinople under Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, and at Alexandria under Cyrus, but had been condemned at Rome under pope John IV. Theodore also, after John, had urged the emperor to withdraw it, and had ex-

communicated Paul, who, having superseded Pyrrhus as patriarch of Constantinople, had given his adhesion to it. Thereupon Paul had overthrown the altar in the pope's chapel, and forbidden his envoys to celebrate the divine mysteries in the imperial city. As to Pyrrhus himself, having been driven from Constantinople on political grounds during the troubles that ensued after the death of Heraclius, and having been, as aforesaid, superseded by Paul, he had fled to Africa, when he was persuaded by the orthodox monks, and especially by one Maximus, to pay a visit to pope Theodore at Rome. He had done so, and had been received to communion on his profession of orthodoxy. Soon after, however, he had at Ravenna returned to his former heresy, and had been excommunicated by Theodore in a peculiarly solemn manner. The sentence had been pronounced at the tomb of St. Peter, and written with the contents of the consecrated chalice. In the meantime the emperor Constans II., the grandson of Heraclius, had, under the advice of Paul, issued a new formula called the *Type*, which was intended to supersede the *Ecthesis*. Its object was to close the entire controversy. It forbade, under heavy penalties, any future assertion on either side of the question at issue; the public maintenance either of one will and one operation, or of two wills and two operations. It failed entirely of its purpose, as such attempts must always fail, unless followed up by exterminating persecution; attempts to stamp out religious ideas that have taken hold of men's hearts by secular authority. It only stimulated the resolution of those who were zealous for their faith, and invested them with the dignity of martyrs.

Such then was the position of the controversy, and such the relation of the see of Rome to Constantinople and the emperor, when Martin entered on his career as pope. He was at once assailed by the orthodox from Africa, Greece, and elsewhere, urging him to take measures in defence of the true faith. He was especially instigated by Maximus, the zealous monk and controversialist of Africa, who had been prominent previously in persuading the patriarch Pyrrhus to resort to Theodore, and who had now come from Africa to Rome (Theophanes, *ad ann. 19 Heraclii*, "cum papam Martinum ad aemulationem accendisset"). Being himself resolutely orthodox, he was not slow to act. He assembled without delay a council consisting of 105 bishops,\* from Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, with a few from Africa—at which many presbyters also and other clergy were present—known as "the first Lateran council." It met on the 5th day of October, A.D. 649 (being the ninth year of the emperor Constans, and the first of Martin's pontificate), in the Basilica of Constantine, adjoining the Lateran palace, and had five sessions, called *secretarii*,<sup>b</sup> the Acts of which are extant at great length, both in Greek and Latin. In the first session, the purpose of the council having been declared by

Theophylact the first notary of the apostolic see, Martin opened the proceedings by a long and learned address. He supported by the authority of Scripture and the fathers, as well as by argumentation, the doctrine of two wills and operations in Christ, as essential to the perfection of His two natures, human and divine; he reviewed the history of the Monothelitic controversy; he dwelt on the impious conduct of Pyrrhus and Paul in their relations to the see of Rome, and their excommunication by its authority; he strongly condemned both the *E thesis* and the *Type*, representing the last as by its prohibition denying the existence of any will or operation in Christ at all; and finally called on the assembled fathers to take such measures under divine inspiration as might best promote the glory of God and the stability of the faith. His speech being ended, Maurus bishop of Caesarea rose, as, along with Deusdedit, a presbyter of Ravenna, representing Maurus the bishop of Ravenna, who had been unable to attend the council. He presented a letter from the absent bishop, which the pope ordered to be read. In it the writer explained the reason of his absence: he had been detained by the clergy and people of Ravenna for security, in the exarch's absence, against hostile incursions of the Slaves; he expressed full concurrence with the see of Rome in its denunciation of Monothelitism, the *Ecthesis*, and the *Type*; he deputed his two envoys to act in his name, and ended with the words, "Pray for me, holy and most blessed lord, and in all the world apostolical pope." This letter having been entered among the Acts of the council, Maximus of Aquileia, seconded by Deusdedit of Cagliari, after a speech of his own in exposition of the faith, proposed the course to be pursued, viz. that some of the accusers of Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, should be first heard, and then the writings of the accused should be examined. This proposal being unanimously agreed to, the first session closed.

At the second, which was held three days later (Oct. 8), the pope, having ordered the charges against the accused to be made, either by the accusers in person or by the notaries who had the custody of the archives of the Roman see, Theophylact the chief notary announced that Stephen bishop of Dora and first suffragan of Jerusalem was at the door and craved admittance. At the pope's proposal he was admitted, and a letter prepared by him two days previously was read. It gave an account of the origin and progress of the existing troubles; it set forth further how Sophronius of Jerusalem (mentioned above as the leading original opponent of the Monothelitic heresy) had taken the writer to Calvary, and conjured him by Him who had been there crucified, and as he hoped to answer at His second coming, to resort to Rome, and never rest till he had obtained from the pope a condemnation of the new heresy:—how he (Stephen) had twice visited Rome on the subject in the time of Theodore, and how the latter had constituted him his legate in Palestine, superseding one Sergius of Joppa, who had uncanonically usurped the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem after the death of Sophronius;—how he had acquitted himself of his charge, and submitted an account of his doings to pope Martin;—and how he consequently appeared now as representing the

\* One hundred and ten according to Theophanes (*ad ann. 19 Heraclii*), but 165 only subscribed the decrees of the council.

<sup>b</sup> *Secretarium* denoted a vestry or sacristy adjoining a church. It being usual to hold synods in the apartment so called, the sessions of synods were themselves also called *secretarii* or *secretarii* (Du Cange).



patriarchate of Jerusalem, in the name of which, and of other Eastern bishops, he implored the pope and the synod to vindicate the cause of truth, which he further set forth and defended in his letter. The see of Rome is addressed as the supereminent and ruling see of Christendom in virtue of the keys delivered to St. Peter, and of the charge to him to feed the sheep of the universal church. This letter having been ordered to be entered among the Acts of the council, Theophylact notified the attendance at the door of several Greek abbats, monks, and priests, some of whom had recently arrived at Rome, others being residents. They were admitted, and their petition was read. In it the synod was earnestly entreated, and even solemnly adjured, to anathematize not only the doctrine complained of, but also its authors and abettors;—to wit, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, with all who in any way, at any time, or anywhere, had assented to them, it being alleged to be contrary to the law of canonical procedure to meet a written complaint against persons by a general judgment against no one in particular. It was also demanded that the *Type* (which the most pious emperor was said to have been cajoled by Paul into issuing) should be especially condemned, as reducing Christ, through its prohibition of the assertion of either one or two wills, to the likeness of an inanimate idol without mind or soul. It has been mentioned that a similar misrepresentation of the drift of the *Type* had been made by Martin in his opening speech. Of course the document had never been intended to imply that Christ had no will; only to bar from future controversy the question whether He had one or two. It is worthy of notice that, though the petitioners in this case are not behind Stephen of Dora in their exaltation of the office of the pope, calling him “the priest of priests, the father of fathers, preeminent over all, our lord the thrice most blessed pope,”—yet they do not express themselves as ready to accept his synodical judgment, whatever it might be. On the contrary, they intimate that if the synod should not accurately define the faith in all respects (which, however, they can hardly believe possible), they would hold themselves free to withhold their assent. And a further assertion of their own independence seems implied in their final request, that the definitions of the council should be translated with the utmost accuracy into Greek, in order that they might know fully what they should be called upon to accept. The petition, signed by thirty-seven abbats, priests, deacons, and monks, was entered among the Acts. Theophylact then notified that there were in the archives of the see many formal accusations against the heretics in question, some of which were produced and read; to wit, one that had been presented to pope Theodore in 643 by Theodore archbishop of Cyprus, and others to the same pope in 646 by the bishops of Africa. These having been entered among the Acts of the council, the formal accusations were deemed sufficient, and the pope announced that at the next session the synod would proceed to examine the writings of the accused.

At the third session, held five days later (Oct. 13), Martin, after making another long speech, ordered the production of the writings of the accused. At the suggestion of Sergius bishop of

Tempsa (or Temesa), those of Theodore of Pharan, as having been accused by Stephen of Dora as the original heresiarch, were first examined. Objectionable passages, previously marked, were read from them; whereupon Martin again delivered a long speech, in which he refuted the doctrine of these passages, first by arguments, and then by citing in opposition to each the utterances of Cyril of Alexandria, of Gregory Nazianzen, of Dionysius the Areopagite, of Basil, and of the synod of Chalcedon. In the next place, at the instance of Benedict of Corsica, the seventh of the nine chapters of Cyrus of Alexandria, and the letter to him of Sergius, approving the views therein expressed, were read. The chapter of Cyrus was found to contain a reference to Dionysius the Areopagite as having taught the doctrine of a single operation. Had the latter really done so, it would have been an embarrassing fact for the council, the so-called Areopagite being an accepted authority on the faith. The writings of Dionysius were therefore examined, at the suggestion of Sergius of Tempsa, by way of seeing whether they bore out the conclusion of Cyrus. The passage relied on by him, contained in the letter of Dionysius to Gaius, was found to run as follows, Christ being the subject of the sentence:—“And, in fine, not having done divine things after the manner of God, nor human things after the manner of man, but having displayed to us a kind of divine-human (*theandric*) operation of God-made man.”<sup>o</sup> After the reading of this passage, Martin delivered a long and subtle disquisition, designed to shew that both Cyrus and Sergius had fraudulently misquoted and misrepresented the expression of Dionysius, which was really against their position; for that Cyrus had quoted Dionysius as speaking of “one theandric operation,” instead of “a new kind of theandric operation,” and that Sergius had omitted the word “theandric” altogether. The work of Themistius, an acknowledged heretic, which had been previously marked for the purpose, was then read from, by way of shewing that it was from heretical sources, and not from the orthodox Dionysius, that Cyrus had got his doctrine; after which Martin resumed his argument. He contended that Dionysius’s “new kind of theandric operation of God made man” necessarily implied a double, not a single, operation, the compound word “theandric,” prefixed to a singular noun, having been devised to express the new idea of a twofold operation of one and the same Person, in whom the divine and human natures were perfectly united. “For (said he) it is the property of perfect union that each nature should operate wonderfully in the way of interchange (*κατ’ ἐπαλλαγὴν*), i.e. that the same Person should do what is divine humanly, and what is human divinely.” Hence, he argued, Cyrus and Sergius had entirely misrepresented the intention of the word “theandric” in saying under the leading of the heretic Themistius that it implied singleness of operation rather than singleness of the Person operating in accordance with His twofold nature. Bishop Deusdedit of Cagliari rose next, and proceeded to accuse Pyrrhus, the successor

<sup>o</sup> Καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οὐ κατὰ θεὸν τὰ θεῖα δράσας, οὐτὰ ἀνθρώπινα κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ ἀνδροθέιτος θεοῦ καὶ καινὴν τινα τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡμῖν πεπολιτευμένος.

of Sergius, of having maintained the same heresy, of having in like manner misrepresented Dionysius, and having been reprehended by Sophronius for so doing; and he demanded that the *Ecthesis* should be in the next place read. It was read by the pope's order, and also extracts, previously prepared and marked, from the Acts and writings of Cyrus, Sergius, and Pyrrhus, proving their assent to the document. And thus the third session closed.

The fourth (held Oct. 15) was opened by another lengthy speech from Martin, in which he reviewed, in no gentle terms, the heresies that had been proved in the previous session against Cyrus, Sergius, and Pyrrhus, and enlarged on their condemnation of themselves in supporting the *Ecthesis*, which forbade the assertion of their own previously expressed views. But before passing judgment, he proposed that the decrees of the fathers and of the five general councils, to which the heretics had appealed in support of their views, should be read before the synod. The doing of this was, however, interrupted by the demand of Benedict of Acacius (in Corsica, *Harduin.*), supported by the rest of the bishops, that the heresy of Paul of Constantinople should also be considered, so that a common condemnation might be passed on all the guilty. Martin thereupon ordered that the dogmatic epistle of Paul to pope Theodore, together with the *Type*, should be read. There follows in the Acts of the synod a pronouncement on the latter document, probably prepared beforehand for adoption at this stage of the proceedings, and given simply in the verdict of the synod—"Sancta Synodus dixit." In it the *Type* is not so unreservedly condemned as it had been by Martin in his opening speech at the first session. A desire is evident to avoid offence to the emperor personally. The document is allowed to have been issued with a good intention, that of allaying dissensions, but said to have been badly framed for its purpose, inasmuch as it put truth and error on an equal footing. But Paul himself is severely censured for inconsistency and self-condemnation in advising its issue after he had committed himself to the *Ecthesis*. Further, whereas Martin, as well as the Greek monks and clergy in their petition, had previously represented the *Type* itself as implying by its prohibitions that Christ was without any will or operation at all, this absurdity is not now attributed to the document itself, but only to Paul and his followers personally, "sicut audivimus, et manus nostrae palpaerunt de verbo novitatis eorum." The reading of the definitions and decrees of the five general councils, and a long speech from Maximus bishop of Aquileia, occupied the rest of the session.

At the fifth and last, held on the 31st of October, the pope having ordered the reading of the utterances of the orthodox fathers on the questions at issue to be proceeded with, Leontius of Naples requested that the synod should first hear what the fifth general council had decreed as to the binding authority of the fathers' writings on all Christians. This request having been complied with, passages from the fathers, which had evidently been carefully extracted and arranged beforehand, were read. Twenty writers were referred to. After this, extracts from the writings of a number of condemned heretics were

also read; and then Martin, after another speech, compared their writings with those of the Monothelites, setting passage against passage; his purpose being to shew how the latter were the true descendants of the earlier heretics, and not, as they boasted, of the orthodox fathers. After three more long speeches from Maximus, Deudedit, and again from Martin, the synod finally issued a definition of the faith with respect to the Incarnation, and 20 canons. The doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ was set forth as follows:—"We believe . . . that one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, is to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably, the difference of the natures being in no respect removed on account of their unitedness, nay rather the property of each nature being preserved without diminution, and concurring into one Person and Subsistence;—not separated and divided into two persons, but one and the same Only-begotten Son, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ:—and that of Him there are, as two natures united without confusion or division, so also two natural wills, divine and human, and two natural operations, divine and human;—and that, in perfect and complete certainty, the same is truly perfect God and according to the truth perfect man, one and the same, our Lord and God Jesus Christ, divinely and humanly willing and operating our salvation." A definition essentially the same with this, though with some additions, was adopted, and thus received full ecclesiastical sanction, at the 6th oecumenical council (A.D. 680). Of the twenty canons, the first sixteen condemn all who do not confess with the "holy fathers" various specified truths with respect to the Trinity and the Incarnation, or who with the "wicked heretics" profess the contrary views. The 17th condemns generally all who do not confess, in word and mind, in every single point, whatever has been handed down and preached to the holy Catholic Church by the holy fathers and the five oecumenical councils. The 18th similarly condemns all who do not utterly reject and anathematize all whom the holy Catholic Church—to wit, the five councils and the approved fathers—rejects and anathematizes; giving a long list of heresiarchs to be thus anathematized, and including in the number Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, with all who should hereafter persist in the doctrine of one will and operation. The "most impious *Ecthesis*," and the "wicked *Type*," with all who had either framed or favoured them, are also to be rejected and anathematized. The two remaining canons, in like manner, condemn any one who should in any way defend the heresies referred to as being in accordance with traditional orthodoxy, and end with the words, "If he should continue to the end thus impiously acting without penitence, let him be condemned for ever and ever, and let all the people say, Amen, Amen." The signatures of 105 bishops follow, headed by that of Martin, which in the Latin copy is given thus:—"I, Martin, by the grace of God bishop of the holy and apostolic church of Rome, have subscribed with my own hand this definition, for the confirmation of the orthodox faith, and for the condemnation of Sergius, sometime bishop of Constantinople, of

Cyrus of Alexandria, of Theodore of Pharan, and also of Pyrrhus and Paul, bishops of Constantinople, with their heretical writings, and the impious *Ecthesis* and the impious *Type*, by them unlawfully promulgated."

On the Acts, above summarized, of this the famous 1st Lateran council, Fleury remarks with truth, "Ces actes ne sont pas du stile des anciens, rédigés mot pour mot par des notaires à mesure que l'on parlait. On ne voit ici ni exclamations, ni interruptions, ni discours vifs et naturels : ce sont des discours étudiés, ordinairement très-long, remplis de quantité de passages de l'écriture, dont l'application est souvent tirée de loin." He adds, "Ainsi il est vraisemblable que l'on apportait ces discours tout écrits, et qu'on les lisait dans le concile. Les études étaient alors fort tombées à Rome, on ne savait plus parler simplement et précisément. Peut-être même l'art d'écrire en notes y était-il perdu : et peut-être aussi le latin vulgaire était-il déjà si corrompu que l'on avait honte de l'écrire tel qu'on le parlait" (Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiast.* lib. xxxviii. c. 53).

Though for this last supposition there may be no sufficient ground, it is evident that the whole proceedings of the council had been preconcerted : the accusers were ready at the door when wanted ; the passages from authors and from the Acts of councils were all prepared and marked for reading ; and the speeches shew signs of having been prearranged both as to their sequence and their purport. The result was also a foregone conclusion ; there was not, as in the general councils before and after, any advocacy of conflicting views ; all present were of one mind, having met, not for discussion, but for the simple purpose of condemning heresy and especially of individuals charged with it. As to the speeches, though they were (as Fleury intimates) wordy, reiterative, and discursive, yet they evince on the other hand a clear comprehension of the points at issue, and of the grounds of the orthodox position, on the part of Martin and his associates. And though, as was usual in that age, the dicta of approved fathers as well as of general councils were exalted to something of the position of infallible oracles, yet the speakers by no means confined themselves to the argument from authority : they appealed to reason also, shewing how the doctrine of two wills and operations was a necessary logical sequence of that of two perfect natures united in the Incarnate Word.

This council was one of great celebrity and importance. It was not oecumenical, though Martin, in his letter to Amandus (to be mentioned presently), calls it *concilium generale* ; for no churches but those of Italy, Sardinia, Sicily, and Western Africa were actually represented at it : but it was soon accepted and assented to both in the West and by the orthodox elsewhere ; it served to fix the definition of the faith till the same was finally endorsed by the 6th general council ; and, even after the time of the latter, it continued to be specially named after the oecumenical councils in the third of the professions of faith made by the popes at their ordination : "quinque synodos generales, ac *præterea sextam super congregatum*, . . . set etiam cuncta Decreta Pontificum apostolicæ sedis ; præsertim quæ a sanctæ memoriæ Martino universali Papa ad confirmationem prædictarum quinque

Synodorum definita sunt et decreta" (*Lib. diurn. Rom. Pontif. c. 2 tit. 9*). It is to be observed that no mention was made at the council of Honorius of Rome as having been implicated in the heresy condemned, though in the 6th general council, held afterwards, he was anathematized by name along with Sergius and the rest. Bellarmine (*de Roman. Pontif. l. iv. c. 12*) makes this omission one ground of his contention that the pope in question had not really assented to the heresy of Sergius, and that the 6th council condemned him under an error as to fact, or else that its Acts have been corrupted. But see art. on HONORIUS.

Copies of the Acts of the council are extant, both in Greek and Latin, many having been sent, in one language or the other, to the various provinces of the East and West (Anastas. *in Vit. Martin. ; Ep. Martin. ad Amandum*). They were accompanied by an encyclic letter from Martin and the synod, addressed to all the faithful. It is, in the style of the speeches delivered, a long and tedious document, abounding in Scripture quotations, more or less relevant. To the emperor also a special letter was sent, which begins thus : "To Christ, the heavenly King, who, being God, appeared on the earth through flesh, intelligently animated and hypostatically united to Him,—to Him the magi zealously offered earthly gifts, not as being worthy of His divine glory, but rather as expressive of their zeal. . . . But to you, most serene one, who reign through Him upon the earth, and through your virtues are hastening to Him,—we, who through His grace are His priests, with much boldness offer precious gifts which are from heaven and carry up to heaven those who receive them, . . . for the true manifestation of our heartfelt love towards Him, our Lord and God, and towards you His sincere servant." After a little more in this highflown strain, the writers inform the "pious and serene emperor" how they had met in his God-loving and God-worshipping city of Rome, and with one consent had defined the truth, and condemned the heresies which they proceed to set forth and refute. They repeat also their condemnation of the *Ecthesis* and the *Type*, which they represent Sergius and Paul as having cunningly cajoled the emperors into issuing, so as to throw on others the blame of their own guilt. They expatiate further on the danger to the church from the least admission of heresy, and declare how the apostolic see, at the earnest request of the pious clergy and laity, had convened the synod to avert this danger, and indeed to defend the reputation of the emperor himself, whom the heretics represented as having issued the *Type* of his own will and motion. They conclude, "Wherefore we, flying for refuge to your Piety, that we may clearly exhibit to your Might the difference between the decrees of the pious fathers and the dogmas of impious men, send these our synodical Acts, with a Greek translation, praying and exhorting your divinely wise Serenity to deign to read them diligently, and to condemn by the laws of your Piety the aforesaid heretics, and sanction the confession of the holy fathers, for the settlement of holy church and the safety of the republic," &c. This letter, carefully worded with a view of conciliating the emperor, failed entirely of its purpose, as will be seen hereafter.

Several other letters, accompanying the Acts and the encyclic, were sent by Martin himself to various churches. One is to the Catholic church of Carthage, and the clergy and people dependent on it (*Ep.* iv.). Another is to the churches ecclesiastically subject to Jerusalem and Antioch (*Ep.* xi.). It has been mentioned how Stephen bishop of Dora had appeared at the council as representing the patriarchate of Jerusalem, having been appointed to superintend it during the occupation of the patriarchal see by a heretical bishop. Martin had now commissioned John bishop of Philadelphia, recommended to him by this Stephen and others, to supervise the patriarchates both of Jerusalem and Antioch, one Maximus having been lately placed in the latter see by the Monothelite party. Martin, in his letter to these churches, warns them against heresy and heretics, and especially against communion with the aforesaid Maximus, or with Peter the Monothelite bishop of Alexandria; he enjoins them to aid and submit to John of Philadelphia, whom, "according to the power given us by the Lord through St. Peter the prince of the apostles, we have appointed our vicar to supply our place in all ecclesiastical matters in the Eastern parts." He wrote also a long letter to John himself (*Ep.* v.), conferring on him vicariate jurisdiction, transmitting to him the Acts and the encyclic for publication, and enjoining him to fill the churches with faithful pastors, to reconcile returning heretics, but to allow no compromise with heresy. In support of him and his mission he sent letters also to Theodore bishop of Esbus, to Antonius bishop of Bacathus,<sup>d</sup> to George archimandrite of the monastery of St. Theodosius, and to Peter, designated as "illustrious," who appears to have been some layman of power in the East (*Epp.* vi. vii. viii.). There is another letter also, written at this time, to one Pantaleon, with reference to charges that had been sent to the pope against Stephen of Dora in connexion with his late administration in the East. Martin, having examined these charges, defends Stephen against them, and reproves Pantaleon for having entertained them (*Ep.* ix.). All these letters intimate a lamentable state of things in the Eastern churches. In addition to the older heresies that had long distracted them Monothelitism had now introduced a new element of discord: the patriarchal sees themselves, and the imperial court, being infected with heresy, there was in the East no central authority for rallying the orthodox; while the recent conquest of Arabia and invasions of Africa and Palestine by the Moslems had increased the general disorganization. Hence Martin's frequent complaints of flocks being left without pastors, as well as of heretics being in possession of the leading sees. He did what he could to meet the evils of the time by assuming authority over all the churches in virtue of his position as St. Peter's successor, which he asserted in the fullest terms. Whatever the legitimacy of his claims, and whatever his success, there can be no doubt that he was actuated by a sincere zeal, as well as consistent, fearless, and uncon-

promising in the cause of truth and order: and his resolute attitude and firm grasp of definite doctrine, thwarted though he might be in his own day, may be regarded as one of the main causes, humanly speaking, of the eventual triumph of orthodoxy at the sixth general council.

Not only in the generally infected East, but in one region also under his acknowledged jurisdiction, he felt called upon, from a like cause, to take vigorous action. The see of Thessalonica had long been ecclesiastically subject to Rome, its bishops having, since the time of pope Damasus, been constituted the pope's vicars over Eastern Illyricum. Paul, recently appointed to Thessalonica, had sent, according to custom, his profession of faith to Martin, who had not been satisfied with it, finding it tinged with Monothelitism. But, being assured by Paul's envoys that the defects complained of had been due to inadvertence only, and would be amended when pointed out, he refrained from exercising his right to summon Paul to Rome, sending him only a correct confession of faith, which he was required to adopt. Paul therefore handed to the papal legates an amended profession, but one not identical with what the pope had sent. He had omitted the distinct assertion of two natural wills and operations in Christ, and also the appended anathema against all who were anathematized by Rome. The legates, however, accepted it as sufficient, for doing which they were made afterwards to do penance in sackcloth and ashes. To Paul Martin wrote a very severe letter, in which he suspended him from all ecclesiastical dignity and ministry till he should, without any omission, confirm in writing whatever had been synodically defined at Rome, and anathematize all heresies and heretics, including Theodore, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, with the *Ekthesis* and the *Type* (*Ep.* xii.). To the Thessalonian church also Martin wrote, forbidding all communion with Paul, and authorising the celebration of divine offices by the orthodox clergy, till either he should be reconciled, or another bishop be appointed (*Ep.* xiii.). One more letter remains to be mentioned, addressed by Martin to Amandus (the bishop of Maestric in Austrasia, known as St. Amandus) in reply to one received from him, in which he had complained of the difficulties of his position, and the vices of the clergy under him, and had expressed a desire to retire from his see. He had also asked for some relics to be sent to him from Rome, and some books from the pope's library. Martin, after exhorting him to persevere in the duties of his episcopate, and by no means to relax discipline, takes the opportunity of sending him a copy of the Acts and encyclic of the Lateran council, gives him a short account of the circumstances of its convention, and desires him to assemble a synod for the acceptance of its decrees. He also bids him admonish and entreat the Frank king Sigebert (who then reigned in Austrasia) to nominate bishops who might come to Rome, and go thence as a legation from the pope to the emperor, carrying with them the assent of their church to the Lateran decrees. He concludes by acceding to the request for relics, but refusing that for books, on the ground that the library was already exhausted, and there was no time

<sup>d</sup> Esbus and Bacathus were sees in the province called Arabia, or Arabia Philadelphæ, under the metropolis of Bostra, in the patriarchate of Antioch. (See Bingham, Bk. ix. ch. ii. sect. 7.)

to make copies (*Ep. ii.*). It appears from Audoenus (*St. Owen*) of Ronen, in his life of St. Eligius, that a legation carrying the confession of faith and the encyclic of the council was also sent to Clovis, the half-brother of Sigebert, who reigned over Neustria and Burgundia, with a request similar to that which was made to Sigebert, and that St. Audoenus himself and St. Eligius of Noyon (whose biography he writes) had been prepared to go to Rome, but were prevented by some cause which is not explained (Audoen. *Vit. S. Eligii*, c. 33; *ap. Surlus, de 1 Decemb.*; and D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, t. v. 190). Audoenus, in the work referred to, speaks in high praise of Martin and of the confession of the Lateran council, thus shewing its favourable acceptance in the kingdom of Clovis. We have no evidence of the decrees and encyclic having at the same time been sent to Britain; but we find from Bede (*Hist. Gent. Angl.* iv. 17) that at the synod of Haethfeld (*Bishops Hatfield*), under archbishop Theodore, September 17, 680, the first Lateran council was fully accepted in addition to the five general ones previously held.

Martin had evidently calculated on the influence which the concurrence of the Frank kings, through the proposed legations, might have on the heretical emperor. If, however, he had hoped, either through such influence, or by the thunders of the Lateran council, or through the tone of his synodical letter, to convince, or awe, or conciliate Constans, the event proved the vanity of such a hope. While the council was still sitting, Constans had sent a new exarch to Italy, Olympius the chamberlain, with orders to cause all the clergy and proprietors there to subscribe the *Type*, and, in case of his finding the army favourable, to seize the pope. Having arrived at Rome, and found it impossible to carry out the latter part of his orders, Olympius is said to have formed the design of having the pope assassinated in the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe while in the act of administering the communion to himself, and to have given orders to that effect to his bodyguard (*sputharius*). The latter, however, is further said to have failed to carry out his orders, and to have alleged afterwards on oath that he had been seized with blindness at the moment when he should have done the deed (Anastas.; *in Vit. Martin.*). What really occurred at Rome during this visit of Olympius is uncertain. Martin (as will be seen) was afterwards accused of having concurred with him in some treasonable designs against the emperor, but repudiated the charge as a baseless calumny. Olympius before long departed for Sicily to oppose the Saracens, and there met with disaster and death (Anastas. *ib.*). After him Theodore (surnamed and spoken of as Calliopas) was sent to Rome as exarch, accompanied by Theodore the chamberlain, whose surname was Pellurus. Of the events that followed we have the advantage of a graphic account from the pen of Martin himself, in two letters written to another Theodore, whom he addressed as "beloved brother" (*Epp. xiv. xv.*). The style of these letters is in contrast with the worldly-tediousness of his theological effusions. From them we learn that three charges had been brought against him to justify his apprehension:—1st, that he had written letters with a treasonable intent to the Saracens; 2dly, that

he had sent them money; 3rdly, that he had shewn disrespect to the Blessed Virgin. He indignantly denies them all, except that, with regard to the second, he had given alms to some "servants of God," who had come to Rome; but he says that they were of small amount, and were not transmitted to the Saracens. As to the third (which was probably worth no more than the usual charge of Nestorianism alleged by both Monophysites and Monothelites against the orthodox) he expresses himself thus:—"As to our glorious Lady, the Ever-virgin Mary, who brought forth our God and Lord Jesus Christ, whom all the holy and Catholic fathers call the Mother of God, as having brought forth the God-man; wicked men have testified falsely against me, nay ratched against their own souls. For whosoever does not honour and adore her who is blessed above every creature, and above every human nature, excepting Him who was born of her, let him be anathema in this world and in the world to come." It appears that Calliopas and the chamberlain Theodore, with an army from Ravenna, entered Rome on Saturday the 15th of June (A.D. 653). Martin, who had been ill since the previous October, foresawing what would happen, had meanwhile taken refuge with his clergy in the church of Constantine near the Lateran palace, in which the council had been held. But he sent some of the clergy to receive the exarch, who, perceiving that the pope was not among them as he had at first supposed, expressed his intention of paying his respects to him on the following day. But this being Sunday, when a great crowd was assembled, he deferred his visit till the Monday, pleading fatigue. At daybreak on Monday morning he sent his secretary (*chartularius*) with others to the pope, charging him with having armed men and a collection of arms and stones concealed, and protesting against any need of such precautions. Martin disapproved the charge by causing the messengers to be conducted through the whole of the Lateran so as to see for themselves. He thus describes what next ensued: "Now I had my bed on which I lay before the altar of the church; and lo! before midday was past, an army entered the church, carrying their lances and their swords and their bows strung, with their shields; and things not even to be spoken of were done. For as in the winter season, when the wind blows hard, the leaves fall shaken from the trees, so the sacred candles of the church were struck down by the weapons of the soldiers, and rebounded from the pavement; and a horrible soundlike thunder was heard in the church both from the clashing of arms and from the multitude of candles broken by them." An imperial order was then handed by Calliopas to the clergy present, commanding the deposition of Martin, as having been irregularly intruded into the see, and being unworthy to occupy it, his removal to Constantinople, and the substitution of another bishop in his place: "a thing," Martin adds, "which has never yet been done, and I hope never will be done, since in the absence of the pontiff the archdeacon, the arch-priest, and the primicerius represent him." To avoid useless bloodshed he gave himself up quietly and forbade resistance, notwithstanding the remonstrances of his friends, who, as he left the church, ex-

claimed with a loud voice, in the presence of Calliopas and the chamberlain, "Anathema to every one who has said or believed that Martin has changed or will change the faith on any single point; and anathema to those who abide not in the orthodox faith even unto death." Calliopas, on hearing this, deemed it expedient to declare that he too held the same faith with Martin, whom he also promised that as many of his friends, bishops or others, as he might wish for should accompany him to Constantinople. "With him we live, and with him we die," exclaimed several of the presbyters. Thus assured, he allowed himself to be led to the imperial palace on the Palatine. Next day (Tuesday) he was visited there by clergy and others who had prepared themselves for leaving Rome with him, and who had already sent their effects to the boats. But towards midnight he was hurried away suddenly, being allowed to take with him only five attendants and one drinking cup (*cauculum*); and the gates of the city, after he had passed them, were closed against his followers. Thus hastily embarked in a boat on the Tiber, he reached the port about the tenth hour on the Wednesday morning, and was made to take ship on the same day (June 19), the baggage which his friends had sent on in boats being left behind. On the 1st of July the vessel arrived at Messina, during its stay at which place, and on the coast of Calabria, and at several islands in the Aegean, during three months, he remained a prisoner on board, suffering all the time from painful illness. The only alleviation of his sufferings was at Naxos, where the vessel remained a whole year. There he was permitted to live on shore, and to bathe three times. "And at the present time," he continues in his letter, writing probably from Constantinople after his arrival there, "it is forty-seven days since I have been allowed to moisten myself with either warm or cold water, and I have been all over affected with flux and shivering, since the flow of my bowels both by sea and land has allowed me no rest to the present hour; and in the very hour of my necessity, when I would have tasted food, my whole body was convulsed, and I had none of the things necessary for comforting nature, since what I have I cannot take for loathing." It is stated by the writer of a letter to be presently referred to (*Commemoratio eorum, &c.*) that whenever faithful Christians anywhere brought him food, it was snatched from them by his brutal guards, the bringers being driven away with blows, and told that if they loved him they were enemies of the state. Martin continues: "But I believe in the goodness of God who sees all things; for, when I shall be withdrawn from this present life, my persecutors will be called to account for all these things, that at least being brought to penitence they may be converted from their iniquity."

What took place after Martin's arrival at Constantinople is related in the letter above referred to from a Christian unnamed to "the orthodox fathers in the West, whether in Rome or in Africa," entitled *Commemoratio eorum quae saeviter, &c.* The writer professes to have been an eye-witness of all that he relates, or to have heard it from eye-witnesses. It appears that Constantinople was reached on the morning

of September 17, A.D. 654. The pope was left all day lying sick on a couch in the ship, exposed to many insults. About sunset a scribe called Sagolera, with a detachment of guards, came and removed him in a chair to a guard-station called Prandearia, where he was left in close custody for ninety-three days. He was then taken to the apartment of the imperial treasurer (*sacellarius*), where the members of the senate were in attendance. He was brought before them carried in a chair, being still ill; the treasurer, who presided, ordered him to rise, and, though told by the bystanders that the prisoner was too weak to stand, angrily repeated his order, whereupon the pope was supported on each side in an erect position. "Wretched man," said the treasurer, "what harm has the emperor done thee? Has he ever taken anything from thee? Has he ever oppressed thee?" The pope was silent. "Answerest thou not?" resumed the treasurer; "So now thy accusers enter." The principal witness was Dorotheus, patrician of Cilicia, and with him came several soldiers and others, some of whom had been at Rome with Olympius, the exarch who had been sent there before Calliopas, as above related. Seeing accusers of this class enter, Martin said with a smile, "So these are the witnesses! This is then the order of things!" Dorotheus declared on oath, "If he had fifty heads, he ought not to live, in that he alone has subverted and ruined the whole of the West; and, indeed, he was confederate with Olympius, and the enemy of the emperor and of the state." The charge seems to have been one of some treasonable conspiracy with Olympius at Rome, when the latter had failed, as has been seen, to carry out the emperor's designs against the pope. The religious question was purposely kept out of court. When other witnesses were about to be sworn, Martin exclaimed, "I implore you by God, do not let them swear, but let them say what they will without an oath, and do ye what ye will; for why should they lose their souls by swearing?" Another witness having, however, confirmed on oath what Dorotheus had alleged, Martin, being called upon to reply, began by saying, "When the Type, concocted and sent to Rome by the emperor"—; but he was interrupted by the prefect Troilus, who exclaimed, "Introduce nothing about the faith: you are now being examined for treason: we too are Romans, and Christians, and orthodox." "Would you were," replied Martin; "but you will find me in the dreadful day of judgment a witness against you even in this." After more altercation,—Martin having set forth how powerless he had been to hinder anything that Olympius might have done when at Rome, and having also recriminated on Troilus,—the treasurer closed the proceedings. Refusing to hear any more witnesses, or to allow the interpreter to report any more of what the accused might say, he rose and departed to make his report to the emperor. Martin was carried in his chair to a neighbouring open court, which adjoined the imperial stables, and thence to what is supposed to have been a terrace (*solarium expositiois*) in front of the emperor's dining-room (*triclinium*), whence the latter could see him through the grated gates (*cancelli*) of the apartment. He was there again propped up in a standing position, sur-

rounded by the members of the senate and a large crowd. The treasurer, coming out through the opened *cancelli*, and dividing the crowd, said to him, "See how God has delivered thee into our hands! What hope was there for thee in contending with the emperor? Lo! thou hast deserted God, and God has deserted thee." Then, having ordered one of the guards to cut off his pontifical *psachnion*, and the latchet of his shoes,<sup>o</sup> he delivered him to the prefect of the city with the words, "Take him away, Sir Prefect, and immediately cut him to pieces." The bystanders were told to anathematize him; some twenty did so; the rest (says the narrator) retired with dejected countenances and great sadness. He was next stripped of his sacerdotal *pallium*, and left with no covering but his tunic, which was torn up on both sides so as to expose his naked flesh; chains were put about his neck, and he was thus dragged through the city, a drawn sword being carried before him, amid the jeers of some, but the commiserating tears of others, to the praetorium, and thence to a prison approached by a flight of steps, called "the prison of Diomed." His limbs were lacerated through the violence that had been used, and his feet bled as he ascended the rugged stairs. He was thus left, loaded with irons, and (as was usual with persons condemned to death) chained to his guard, only one young ecclesiastic being allowed to attend him. Two women, a mother and her daughter, who kept the keys of the prison, moved to compassion by his sufferings, and seeing him shivering with cold, would have brought him some covering had they dared. After a few hours, however, the head gaoler having been called down by some one in the court below, one of these women removed him to her own bed, and covered him with clothes. He remained there speechless till evening, when the prefect of the city (a eunuch Gregory who had been the emperor's chamberlain) sent him some slight refreshment, with a message bidding him be of good comfort, for that his life would be spared. This message caused him distress rather than comfort. His irons were then removed.

On the following day, Paul the patriarch being at the point of death, the emperor went to visit him, and told him what had been done to Martin. "Woe is me!" said Paul, groaning and turning his face to the wall, "and this has been done to fill up the measure of my judgments!" Questioned by the emperor why he spoke thus, he replied, "Is it not miserable, sir, that pontiffs should suffer such things?" The emperor promised with an oath to do the pope no further injury; on getting news of which promise Martin grew the more sad; "for he was in haste to finish his good fight and to depart to Him whom he desired." After Paul's death the ex-patriarch Pyrrhus, seeking restoration to his see, was opposed by many on the ground of the confession of faith which he had made at Rome before Theodore, and of his having been excommunicated by Paul. The emperor therefore

sent Dorotheus the treasurer's secretary (re-scriptor et collaborator) with a notary, to examine Martin as to what had passed at Rome between Pyrrhus and Theodore. The following conversation ensued. "Did Pyrrhus go to Rome of his own accord, or by invitation?"—"Of his own accord."—"Did he sign the confession of faith under compulsion?"—"No, voluntarily."—"How did Theodore receive him? As a bishop?"—"Certainly; why not?"—"Whence did he get the necessaries of life?"—"Manifestly from the Roman patriarchal palace" (*patriarchio*). "What kind of bread was given him?"—"Know ye not, my lords, the Roman church? For I tell you that whatever wretch comes there for hospitality all his needs are supplied, and St. Peter sends no one away without a share of his gifts; but the finest bread and various wines are given both to him and to those who belong to him. If, then, this is done to any wretched person, what sumptuous entertainment must one coming in the honourable position of bishop receive!"—"We have heard that Pyrrhus signed the confession under compulsion, was put in the stocks, and suffered many grievous things."—"Nothing of the kind took place. There are many here now at Constantinople who were then at Rome, and know what was done. There is the patrician Plato, who was then exarch: ask him whether I lie. But why enquire further? Behold, I am in your hands; do with me what you will; by God's permission it is in your power; though even if you cut my flesh in pieces—as you ordered to be done when you delivered me to the prefect, I do not communicate with the church of Constantinople."

After lying eighty-five days in the prison of Diomed, Martin was again visited by Sagovela the scribe, who told him that he had orders to remove him to his own house, to be thence transported to such place as the treasurer might choose. He begged in vain to be allowed to remain where he was till the time of his exile. Towards evening he addressed his fellow-prisoners thus, "Come, brethren, let us take a farewell, for he who is to remove me hence will soon be here." All then partook of a parting cup. To a beloved brother who was among those who had come to visit him, he said serenely, "Come, sir brother (*domine frater*), give me the kiss of peace." The brother, unable to contain himself, "roared like a lion, and with him all who were present lamented with a terrible lamentation." Martin, retaining his own composure, bade them all restrain their feelings, and putting his hands on the beloved brother's head, said with a smile, "Is this good? Is it in place, sir brother? Ought you to act thus, when on the contrary you should be rejoicing over me?" All having saluted him and retired, Sagovela came presently, as expected, to carry him to his own house; whence a few days later, he was taken by sea to Cherson (or Chersona), a town in the Tauric Chersonesus (*Crimea*), where after four months' more suffering he died.

For a view of his condition during this concluding period of his life we have again the advantage of his own pen in two extant letters written from Cherson. From the first (*Ep. xiv.*), addressed to a friend (*ad quendam sibi carissimum*), apparently at Constantinople, we learn that, having sailed on March 26, A.D. 655, being

<sup>o</sup> *Corrigiam campagorum*. Campagus was a kind of shoe or buskin worn by emperors, and also by patriarchs and other persons of distinction. The obscure word *Psachnion* is supposed to denote an outer robe worn by popes. The derivation is uncertain. (See Du Cange.)



Thursday in Holy Week, he reached Cherson on May 15. Thirty days later the person whom he employed as the bearer of his letter had arrived there; "And (he writes) we rejoiced greatly, supposing him to be the bearer of supplies that had been sent from Italy for our consolation. But, having interrogated him, we found that he had brought nothing; and I wondered, though glorifying my God even in this, since He dispenses our afflictions as He knows to be best, especially as the famine and destitution in this land are such that bread is spoken of but never seen. Indeed, unless provisions be sent us from those parts or from the parts of Pontus, we cannot live here at all. For the spirit is willing, but the flesh weak, as you yourself also know . . . Wherefore, if (as has been reported) corn and wine, or oil, or anything whatever, has been sent for us from those quarters, make what haste you can to send it on to us. For, indeed, methinks I did not so maltreat the saints that are there, and the Roman church, that they should pay no regard to the Lord's command, especially as the apostle wrote to the Philippians giving them thanks that they had sent once and again to his necessity, and added, 'I have all and abound.' . . . I send a list of articles that ought to be procured there (*i.e.* in Italy), and I beseech you, after your accustomed manner and as you know how, to see to their being bought and sent to us because of our many necessities and frequent infirmities."

In his second letter (*Ep.* xv.) he again complains bitterly of his destitute state, which his friends seem to have still taken no measures to relieve. He says that the natives of the region where he is are all heathens, and that those who have settled there have adopted the ways of heathens, having no charity at all such as human nature often inspires even among barbarians; that no corn whatever can be got there, except very rarely from ships which come there to be laden with salt; that he has thus been able up to the month of September, when he writes, to buy three or four bushels, and no more. He wonders greatly at the want of thought and compassion among his old friends, who seem not to care to know whether he is dead or alive. He wonders most of all at the clergy of the most holy church of St. Peter for their utter neglect of him. "For (he says) though the church of St. Peter has not gold, yet by the grace of God it is not without corn and wine and other necessities, so that they might at least have provided me with a moderate maintenance. What is the dread that has fallen on men that they should not fulfil the commands of God, and fear where no fear is? Have I been such an enemy to the whole body of the church? Nevertheless may God, who wills all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth, through the intercession of St. Peter, establish their hearts in the orthodox faith, and strengthen them against every heretic and adversary of our church, and especially the pastor who is said now to preside over them." The allusion here is to Eugenius, whom the Roman church under the emperor's orders had elected in Martin's room [EUGENIUS]. "For the Lord will take care of this poor body as it pleases Him, either in unceasing tribulations or in some slight refreshment. The Lord is at hand; why should

I be anxious? I hope in His mercies that He will not delay to finish my course according to His will. May the High God protect you with His powerful hand from all temptations, and save you for His kingdom."

The release so longed for was not long delayed. He died on Sept. 16, A.D. 655 (*commemor.*), the same month in which he had written the letter, a real martyr for the faith of which he had been so resolute a champion. For, though he was not put to death by violence, the hardships he endured for conscience' sake must have hastened his end; and though political grounds were assigned for his persecution, there can be little doubt that its real cause was his resistance to imperial domination in matters of theology. St. Audoenus (in *Vit. S. Eligii*, c. 34) warmly vindicates for him the crown of martyrdom, his claim to which had been denied by his enemies because he had died a natural death. He expresses the highest admiration of his faithfulness and endurance, declaring martyrdom for orthodoxy to be even more glorious than that which is suffered under heathen persecution, since, in the former case, the martyr suffers not only to save his own soul but in behalf of the universal church.

Martin was buried in a church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin under the title of *Blacherne*, situated about a stadium from the town of Cherson (*commemor.*). His remains were said to have been afterwards translated to Rome, and were there venerated (*Martyrol. Roman.*). But Baronius, from the fact that even to his own day the saint's sepulchre in the Chersonesus was visited by the faithful, and that cures were wrought there, concludes that some part of his body must have been left behind. One of the letters of pope Gregory II. to the emperor Leo Isauricus contains evidence that in the 8th century his remains were still believed to be at Cherson, and to possess miraculous powers;—"But that Martin is blessed and holy all Chersonesus and all the inhabitants of the north testify, who flock to his tomb, and experience cures of their diseases." Audoenus speaks of one miracle said to have been wrought by him in his lifetime; the restoration of sight to a blind man at Constantinople. He is commemorated as a confessor by the Greek church on April 14, and as a martyr by the Roman church on Nov. 12:—"Natalis S. Martini pap. et martyri, qui . . . multisque miraculis claruit; cujus corpus postea Romam translatum in ecclesia ejus nomine dedicata conditum fuit" (*Martyrolog. Roman.*).

Martin is one of the popes whom the Magdeburg Centuriators accuse of heresy on the ground of a passage in his letter to Amandus, where he is said to be guilty of Novatianism in directing that sinful priests and deacons, after deposition, are not to be readmitted to penitence. But Bellarmine (*de Roman. Pontif.* l. iv. c. 12) defends him with success by saying that it is not absolution, but restitution to ministerial functions that he is speaking of in his letter. The authorities for his life and his extant writings have been intimated above. [J. B.—y.]

MARTINUS (4), a cancellarius addressed by Nilus in three letters (lib. ii. epp. 316, 317, 318 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxix. 353), one on Eccl. x. 14, the other two cautioning him against Manichean errors and the society of fair women. [T. W. D.]

**MARTINUS (5)**, presbyter and archimandrite, opposed to Eutyches at Flavian's council at Constantinople in 448 (Mansi, vi. 751). At his monastery Eutyches endeavoured to get his tome subscribed (Mansi, vi. 719). With Faustus, Peter, and others he addressed the emperor Marcian (Mansi, vii. 75). He and Faustus were addressed by pope Leo (epp. 32, 61, 74, 75 in *Patr. Lat.* liv. 795, &c.). In ep. 32 the note observes that other readings of the name are Marcianus, Marcellinus, Marcellianus. [FAUSTUS (28).] [C. H.]

**MARTINUS (6)**, Oct. 24 (Usuard), founder and patron of the monastery of St. Martin at Vertavum (St. Martin at Vertou), near Nantes, believed to have been at that time abbat of St. Jouin de Marnes, and to have been the Martianus or Marcianus to whom Fortunatus dedicated his *Life of Paternus*. (Le Cointe, *Annal.* ann. 565 xii.; *Boll. Acta SS.* 24 Oct. x. 794; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 1274; Fortun. *Vit. Pat.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 487; Tillem. x. 353.) [C. H.]

#### MARTYRIANI. [EUPHEMITÆ.]

**MARTYRIUS (1)**, a bishop deputed by the Eusebians, with Eudoxius, Macedonius, and Demophilus, to carry their new creed into Italy (Athan. *De Syn.* § 26). They attended the council of Milan. (Hilar. *Frag.* vi. § 4 in *Patr. Lat.* x. 684; Tillem. vi. 331.) [C. H.]

**MARTYRIUS (2)**, bishop of Antioch, raised to the patriarchal throne A.D. 460. After he had enjoyed his see for ten years he was forcibly deposed by the turbulent Monophysite Peter the Fuller, who, by the help of Zeno the son-in-law of the emperor Leo, had made himself master of his seat A.D. 470. Martyrius fled to Gennadius at Constantinople, whose influence with Leo secured for him a kindly reception, and his ultimate restoration. The violence of Peter rendered Martyrius's position so uncomfortable that before long he abdicated his bishopric, and it was a second time seized by the Fuller. An appeal was again made to the emperor, who deposed Peter, and Julian was appointed the orthodox successor to Martyrius (Theophan. *Chronogr.* sub ann. 456 [468 A.D.]; Theod. *Lect.* p. 554; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 75). Nicephorus (*Chronicon*) asserts that a letter was written by pope Simplicius to the people of Antioch denouncing Martyrius as a Nestorian, but it is believed by Tillemont to be a forgery for the purpose of blackening Martyrius's character (*Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 290). The celebrated pillar-saint, Simeon Stylites, died during the episcopate of Martyrius, who on hearing of his decease repaired to the Mandra with a retinue of six bishops, accompanied by a large number of troops and a vast concourse of people, and conveyed the sacred remains to Antioch (Evagr. *H. E.* i. 13; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 724). He was the author of *Panegyricum S. Joann. Chrysost.* (Tillem. xi. 547; Mai, *Pat. Bibl. Nov.* ii. 545; *Pat. Gr.* xlvii. p. xli.) [E. V.]

**MARTYRIUS (3)**, bishop of Jerusalem, successor to Anastasius, A.D. 478. He was a Cappadocian by birth, who had embraced a solitary life in the Nitrian desert. The violent proceedings of Timothy Aelurus drove him and

other orthodox monks from Egypt, and he took refuge, A.D. 457, together with his fellow solitary Elias, also subsequently bishop of Jerusalem, in the house of St. Euthymius. The aged anchorite received the two friends with great favour, admitted them to close intimacy, and took them as his companions in his periodical retreats, predicting that they would both become bishops of Jerusalem (Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 94, 95). After a time Martyrius retired to a cave two miles to the west of the laura, which became the site of a considerable monastery (*ib.*). Martyrius and Elias were present at the death and burial of St. Euthymius, A.D. 473, after which, to divert them from dwelling on their loss, Anastasius, who had come from Jerusalem for the translation of the holy man's remains, took them back with him and ordained them presbyters, attaching them to the Church of the Resurrection (*ib.* cc. 105, 110, 112). On the death of Anastasius, A.D. 478, Martyrius succeeded him as bishop of Jerusalem (*ib.* 113). His church was then rent asunder by the Eutychian Aposchistæ, or schismatic monks, of whom Gerontius was the head. As narrated in another article, Martyrius, A.D. 486 or 481, sent his deacon Fidus to Constantinople, with letters to Zeno and Acacius, asking for their intervention to heal this schism (*ib.* 113) [FIDUS (3)]. On the conversion of the laura of Euthymius into a monastery, the church of the establishment was dedicated by Martyrius with great pomp (*ib.* cc. 119-122). He succeeded in bringing back the schismatic monks to the unity of the church (*ib.* 123-124). Evagrius records, as a departure from strict orthodoxy, that he received synodical letters from Peter Mongus, and sent back a reply; though afterwards he refused communication with him (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 16). Cyrillus Scythopolitanus tells us that he died in the eighth year of his patriarchate, A.D. 486 (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 19; Eutych. tom. ii. p. 103). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 171; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 332 sq.) [E. V.]

**MARTYRIUS (4)**, the archdeacon of Constantinople whose deposition by Chrysostom, acting as "accuser, witness, and judge" all in one, was one of the charges specified at the council of the Oak (Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 56). As deacon of Constantinople, he accompanied Peter the presbyter to Rome, conveying Theophilus's letters to Innocent informing him of Chrysostom's deposition and the Acts of the council, and brought back Innocent's indignant reply. (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 23, 24, ed. Bigot.) [E. V.]

**MARTYRIUS (5)**, presbyter addressed by Isidore of Pelusium on modesty (lib. iii. 162 in *Patr. Gr.* lxxviii.); on purity (iii. 163); consolatory (iii. 309); on the Incarnation (iii. 355); on Dan. vi. 3 (iii. 356). [T. W. D.]

**MARTYRIUS (6)**, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium on the subject of pride (lib. i. ep. 164, in *Patr. Gr.* lxxviii. 292); on Matt. xviii. 3 (ii. 207); on opportunity (v. 399); on instability of character (v. 443). [T. W. D.]

**MARTYRIUS (7)**, a presbyter to whom Theodoret wrote stating that a certain rhetorician, Athanasius by name, a native of Egypt, had paid him a visit of some days, probably at

Martyrius's suggestion, hoping to obtain some profit from his intercourse with him. Theodoret modestly deprecates the idea commonly entertained of him, and begs Martyrius to pray for him that what is said of him may be verified by facts. (Theod. *Ep.* 20.) [E. V.]

**MARUTHAS (1)** (called by the Copts **MARUNAS**), bishop of Tagrit, otherwise Martyropolis or Maipheracti in Mesopotamia. He flourished at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century. He is sometimes confounded with another Maruthas, bishop of the same place, who was one of the Nicene fathers. Maruthas the younger was a friend of St. Chrysostom (Chrysost. *ep.* 14, § 5), and assisted at the council of Constantinople. He was the author of the following works: (1) the acts of the martyrs who suffered in Sapor's persecution, and odes in their honour; (2) a history of the council of Nice; (3) a Syrian liturgy or anaphora (Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.* t. ii. p. 261); (4) commentaries on the Gospels (Assem. *Bib. Orient.* i. 179). He also translated the canons of Nice into Syriac, and is said to have published twenty-six canons, passed A.D. 410, in the council of Seleucia, whose authenticity, however, is very doubtful. They are printed in Mansi, iii. 1167, vii. 1181, Renaudot, *l. c.* p. 272; and Assem. (*Bib. Cod. Orient. Flor.* p. 94) says that a codex with these canons exists at Florence, cf. Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* cap. 117. He had the reputation of working miracles among the Persians. His relics were preserved in the convents of Scete. Assemani, *Acta Mart.* t. i. pp. xlvi.-lxv. of his general preface, describes his works; he also mentions him on pp. 2, 4, 73, 171, 208. In the *Rom. Mart.* he is commemorated on Dec. 4, as a restorer of the churches destroyed in the persecution of Isdegerdes; cf. G. Hoffmann's *Auszüge aus Syrioch. Akten Persischer Martyrer in Abhandlung für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1880, vii. 3, 41. [G. T. S.]

**MARUTHAS (2)**, first maphrian or primate of the Jacobites in Mesopotamia, was elected and consecrated at the monastery of St. Matthew in Mosul to be the primate of the East, when Athanasius Camelarius, patriarch of the Jacobites, on the plea of obedience to the Nicene canons, had refused his consent and aid. He fixed his see at Tagrit, and had the Eastern Jacobites divided into twelve dioceses under the primacy of Tagrit. This city Maruthas adorned with churches and monasteries, and is said to have, for the safety of the inhabitants, handed over the citadel to the Saracens when they overran the country. Under his rule the Jacobites increased largely in Persia, and for them he consecrated bishops. Evidently one of the most influential bishops of the East, he was consecrated A.D. 629, and died A.D. 649. (Assemani, *B. O.* ii. 418-420; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1534.) [J. G.]

**MASBOTHAEI**. This name occurs in the earliest list of heresies, that given by Hegesippus (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 22); and, as Burton edits, these heretics are said to have been called after their founder Masbotheus; but this addition is weak in MS. authority. The earliest commentary on this is to be found in the statement of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 6), that among

Jewish sects were the Basmotheans who denied Providence, said that the world was formed by spontaneous motion, and took away the immortality of the soul. The Indiculus of Pseudo-Jerome and Isidore of Seville (*Orig.* viii. 5; Oehler, i. 283, 303) state that the heresy of the sect was that Christ taught His disciples in everything to keep Sabbath. Modern commentators have found an origin for the word in the last word of Lam. i. 7, translated in our version, "Her adversaries did mock at her Sabbaths;" and it has been suggested that the nickname "despisers of Sabbaths" may have been used among the Jews for the Christians themselves. With somewhat more probability Renan (*L'Eglise chret.* p. 228) translates the word "apostates," deriving it from the phrase "backsliding Israel" (כִּמְצַבֵּר, Jer. iii. 8). All these explanations are mere guess-work; our real knowledge is limited to the occurrence of the name in Hegesippus, and there is no reason to think that any of those who have undertaken to explain it knew more about the matter than ourselves. [MAZBERCHTENSES.]

[G. S.]

**MASCEZEL** (Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, vol. v. p. 64; Orosius, vii. 36; Zosim. v. 11; Claudian, *de Bello Gildon. & Laud. Stilich.* i.; Gibbon, c. 29. **MASCEZAL**, **MASCIZEL**, **MASCEZIL**, and by Zosimus **Μασκεδῆλος**). Mascezel's name occurs, probably for the first time of mention in history, in Ammianus Marcellinus, xxix. v. 11, as acting on the part of his brother Firmus [**FIRMUS (7)**, **GILDO**, **NUBEL**] in his revolt against Romanus, count of Africa under Valentinian I. (373). Their father, Nubel, whom Ammianus mentions as one of the most powerful chiefs of Mauritania, left several other sons, including Zamma, Gildo, Dius, Salmacis, Muzuca, and Dius; and a daughter named Cyria. The murder of Zamma by Firmus, and the action taken against him in consequence by Romanus, drove him to revolt, and he was supported by all his brothers except Gildo. Mascezel took the command of two lightly armed tribes called the Tyndenses and Massinenses, and was twice defeated by Theodosius. He seems, however, to have shewn some military capacity. But at the time of Gildo's own revolt against Honorius in 397, Mascezel fled to Milan. Being a baptized Christian, as Tillemont suggests, he may have objected to a rebellion against the son of Theodosius I., grandson of his old conqueror. His life is said to have been attempted by Gildo (Claudian, *de Bello Gild.* i.), and on his flight his two sons were put to death by him. Stilicho not unnaturally placed Mascezel at the head of an expedition to quell this dangerous rebellion, which threatened a stoppage of the corn-supply of the Roman market. Zosimus says Mascezel was entrusted with a large army, Orosius and the chronicle of Marcellinus that there were only 5000 men. As Claudian names their legions or cohorts, they may have been picked soldiers. As Mascezel felt or professed great devotion, it is probable that Zosimus would be inclined to depreciate and Orosius to exaggerate his victory. He sailed at all events from Pisa, passed along the east coast of Sardinia, touched at the isle of Capraja or Capraria, then tenanted only by monks, and the wild goats from which its name is derived.

He persuaded some of these solitaries to accompany him (Augustin, *Ep.* 81, 141, 142). Gildo was a pagan in conduct, and probably in creed, if he had any; and had shewn favour to the Donatists and other heretics; so that Mascezel's expedition must have been felt as closely affecting the interests of the Catholic church. He landed in Africa, and was met between Thebete in Numidia and Metridora in Africa Proper, by Gildo, at the head of an irregular army of 70,000 revolted Romans and native auxiliaries. Being encouraged by the appearance of St. Ambrose (who had been dead about a year) in a dream, he gave battle and obtained a decisive victory; determined, it appears, by the fall of a standard with its bearer, whom Mascezel cut down, on his defiance and refusal of pardon on submission. This caused a panic in the tumultuous host of his opponents, and is consistent with Zosimus's account of a hard struggle; which may not have lasted long. Gildo was defeated, and escaped to the sea, but was driven into the port of Tabraca and taken. He destroyed himself in prison. Mascezel was received by Stilicho on his return with apparent cordiality; which is not surprising, as all Africa seems to have been recovered by his victory without further operations. The view taken by history of the 4th and other centuries is impartial only in attributing the greatest wickedness to the greatest number; and Tillemont takes it as agreed that Stilicho contrived his successful lieutenant's death soon after, by having him jostled over a bridge near Milan, while riding in his train, and giving no orders to attempt his rescue while he struggled in the torrent below. This he gives on the authority of Zosimus; and leans on the other hand on Orosius for Mascezel's having deserved his fate, by pride and arrogance, by giving up the company of the monks to whose prayers he owed his victory; and even in violating sanctuary, by dragging some accused persons out of a church. It is possible that soon after the murder of his children, and in view of possibly personal encounter in battle with his brother their murderer, described and perhaps known to him as the pagan tyrant of Africa, he may have used severities which he did not continue in the camp or palace of Stilicho. That great general's views on rights of ecclesiastical sanctuary are known to have been loose, and were rebuked by St. Ambrose. It is also known of him that he used intrigue and violence against enemies as unscrupulous as himself. But the deliberate murder of a trusted subordinate is very unlike any other recorded action of Stilicho's; and Zosimus's expression about a *tessera* or token given by him to the attendants to crowd Mascezel over the bridge, and of his laughing openly at the deed, seem to go far more than they are worth. Had Mascezel lived to be count of Africa instead of Heraclian, Stilicho himself might have lived to defend Rome from Alaric, and the miserable episode of Heraclian's invasion of Italy would have been spared the Roman world. [R. St. J. T.]

MASONA (MASSONA, MAUSONA, Mansi, ix. 1000, x. 478), bishop of Merida from about A.D. 571 to about 606.

*Sources.*—(1) *Joannes Biclari*. ad ann. 573, *Esp. Sagr.* vi. 378. (2) Acts of the third council of Toledo, *Colec. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 252. (3) *De Vita et Miraculis Patrum Emeritensium*, a series of lives attributed to Paulus Diaconus, a supposed writer of the 7th century, printed by Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* xiii., by Aguirre, *Coll. Max. Conc. Hisp.* ii. 639, and elsewhere. (4) Letter of Isidore to Masona published by Arevali, *Isid. Opera*, vii. 563.

*Life.*—Our information concerning Masona, outside that which we derive from the 3rd source mentioned above, is extremely scanty. Joannes Biclarenis says of him under the year 573, the fifth year of Leovigild, "Masona Emeritensis Ecclesiae Episcopus in nostro dogmate clarus habetur," and among the signatures to the third council of Toledo, the famous conversion council of 589, that of Masona "*Ecclesiae Catholicae Emeritensis Metropolitanus episcopus provinciae Lusitaniae*" is found at the head of all the episcopal signatures, and immediately following that of Recared, Masona presiding at the council as the senior metropolitan present. Between these two dates sixteen years of great importance to the Gothic state had elapsed. The rebellion of Hermenigild, while it had brought out the personal vigour and ability of the last Arian king Leovigild, had also made the political force of catholicism, and the necessity of conciliating it, plainly manifest to the ruling Gothic class. The submission of Recared to catholicism on the death of his father marked the close of a long struggle, and the Catholic church remained the dominant power in the state. During the rebellion of Hermenigild, Merida declared for the Catholic sun against the Arian father, and was only reconquered by Leovigild in 582 (or early in 583?) (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vi. 18). We have no mention of Masona's name in connexion with these events, but from the notice of him by Joannes Biclarenis nine years earlier, it is evident that at the outbreak of the rebellion he was one of the most prominent Catholic bishops in southern Spain, and it is therefore natural to suppose that, as in the kindred case of Leander at Seville, he had considerable influence upon the position assumed by Merida in the contest. In 589 the great aim of the Catholic party was achieved, and the Visigothic state became, at least officially, Catholic. Eight years later a gathering of bishops, of which record is preserved in only one MS. of the Spanish *Codex Canonum* (Cod. Emil. Maassen, *Lit. des Canon. Rechts*, 1870, pp. 219, 709), met at Toledo under the presidency of Masona, and passed two canons, one insisting upon the celibacy of bishops, priests, and deacons, the other reserving the endowments of a church to the use and benefit of the priests and other clerks attached to it, as against possible exactions from the bishop. This assembly has no place in the list of Spanish national councils (comp. however, Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* vi. 156). On the other hand, it cannot be regarded as a provincial synod of the bishops of Carthaginensis (so Maassen, *l.c.*), a supposition sufficiently disproved by the presidency of Masona, the metropolitan of Lusitania, and by the presence of bishops from Tarraconensis, Baetica, and Gallia Narbonensis. It was, perhaps, the result of the chance gathering of a number of bishops in the capital, who took advantage of

the circumstance to formulate agreement on two important disciplinary points, or if it were a duly summoned national council, the Acts must have been purposely or accidentally omitted from the original redaction of the Spanish *Codex Canonum* made within the first forty years of the 7th century. Our last notice of Masona occurs in a letter addressed to him by Isidore in answer to an inquiry from Masona on a matter of discipline. The date of the letter is Feb. 28, A.D. 606. In 610 his successor, Innocentius, signs the *Decretum Gundemari* [GUNTIMAR].

The third source catalogued above remains to be considered. If it be received as what it professes to be, viz. a genuine piece of 7th-century biography, it would offer us not only full and valuable information on the life of Masona, but also on the general condition of the Spanish church in the 6th and 7th centuries. The document known as *De Vita et Miraculis Patrum Emeritensium*, attributed by an untrustworthy and late tradition to one Paulus Diaconus, contains the lives of five bishops of Merida, Paulus, Fidelis, Masona, Innocentius, and Renovatus, and three introductory chapters concerning the martyrdom of the abbat Nunctus, the conversion of a gluttonous monk of Cauliana, and the vision of the boy Augustus. The author, according to internal evidence, was a Levite of the church of St. Eulalia at Merida, and was brought up by Renovatus, the last bishop whose life he chronicles. Florez, Mabillon, and others, relying on certain expressions as to time in the work, place it about the middle of the 7th century. The document was first published in 1633 by Barnabas Moreno de Vargas, a man who also produced a history of Merida, his native place, and was mixed up with the circle of ecclesiastical forgers who at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries produced and propagated the "false chronicles" (Ticknor, *Hist. of Span. Lit.* iii. 185 n.). The MS. history of the work before it reached his hands is now impossible to ascertain, unless after fresh examination on the spot. Florez based his edition entirely on printed texts with the exception of the preface, for which he said he possessed independent MS. authority (*Esp. Sagr.* xiii.). In recent times the Père Gams has made an attempt at investigating the matter, but the attempt was so perfunctory that nothing has been gained by it (*Kirchenesch. von Spanien*, ii. [2] p. 115). He came to the conclusion, however, in Spain that the first three chapters were probably spurious, and one of them most likely the deliberate invention of Moreno de Vargas, that the name of Paulus Diaconus rested upon no substantial authority, but that the five episcopal lives were undoubtedly early and genuine biographies. One portion of the section which he rejects was, however, made use of by Ambrosio de Morales more than sixty years before the publication of the document by Moreno de Vargas, so that if it be spurious, other and earlier forgers must have been concerned. The episcopal biographies according to Gams exist in certain ancient sanctorales, one of which, of the 14th century, now in the possession of the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, contains the lives of the bishops Paulus and Fidelis, and, separated from them, the life of Masona. A copy of the document is preserved in a precious

collection of historical materials made by the well-known bishop and antiquary, Joann. Baptista Perez, about 1595. But Gams appears to have made no collation of this copy or of any other MS. with the printed text, so that we are still altogether in the dark as to the exact MS. history of the work, even as it results from the sources hitherto available. A reference to lives of holy *Emeritenses* in a letter of Alfonso III. (A.D. 906), quoted by Gams, belongs to a class of documents—viz. those connected with the privileges and antiquities of the shrine of Santiago—too imperfectly sifted as yet by critical examination to supply a sound basis for argument.

With regard to internal evidence, the Latin of the first three chapters would seem to make it impossible to refer them to the 7th century. The legendary and marvellous character of the remainder, and the desire apparent throughout to exalt the ecclesiastical importance of Merida, is, on the other hand, no argument against genuineness, as contemporary parallels might easily be quoted.

The facts offered us by the life of Masona are briefly: his Gothic extraction, his education in the church of St. Eulalia, his persecution at the hands of Leovigild, who sent two Arian bishops, Sunna and Nepops, at different times, to undermine Masona's influence and oust him from his church, his intercourse with Leovigild at Toledo, where his resistance to the king's demand brought upon him the penalty of exile, and his final restoration to his see after various supernatural warnings had befallen Leovigild. Under Recared, after the new king had publicly embraced catholicism, a struggle took place in Merida between Masona and Sunna. Sunna joined with two Gothic Comes, Segga and Witteric, in a plot for murdering Masona, but the plot was miraculously frustrated, and Witteric, afterwards the Gothic king of that name, confessed all to Masona, who, however, was not only protected by miracles, but by the strong arm of the Catholic Claudius Dux of Lusitania (known to us from other sources, as are Sunna and Segga, comp. *Isid. Hist. Goth.* ap. *Esp. Sagr.* v. 492; *Joann. Bicl. Ib.* 385, 386; and ep. Greg. Magn.; Aguirre Catalani, *Coll. Mar. Conc. Hist.* ii.). Recared, on being appealed to, decided that Sunna should either recant his Arianism or go into exile. He chose the latter alternative, retired into Mauritania, and there came to a miserable end. Masona lived on to an honoured old age, procuring in his last hours the miraculous punishment of his archdeacon Eleutherius, who had abused the additional powers entrusted to him by the failing bishop. The whole document is embroidered with supernatural occurrences, some of them of a truly ludicrous character.

It is not at all improbable that this life represents the tradition of the 7th century on the subject of one of the heroes of the Catholic struggle against Leovigild. As to Masona's exile, Isidore expressly mentions the exile of bishops among Leovigild's measures of persecution (*Hist. Goth.* l. c. p. 491), and it is most likely that he was sent into exile about 583, after the fall of Merida, and that he was restored, not during the lifetime of Leovigild, as his enthusiastic biographer would have us believe, but upon the accession of Recared, whose object it was to reverse his father's policy.

The historical material embedded in the life of Masona will be found discussed in the article on Recared, to which we also relegate an account of the proceedings of the conversion council. See also arts. SUNNA, SEGGA, WITTERIC. It is greatly to be wished that the interesting document, in which the biography we have summarized occurs, may before long receive the critical attention it deserves, and which is specially due to any work known to have passed through the unscrupulous hands of the "false chroniclers." (Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, v. 141; R. de Castro, *Biblioteca Españoles*, ii. p. 348; Nicolas Antonio, *Bibl. Vet.* Bayer's ed. i. p. 373; note by Morales to the *Memoriale Sanctorum* of St. Eulogius apud *Hisp. Illust.* iv. 282.)

[M. A. W.]

## MASSALIANI. [EUCHITES.]

MATERNUS (1), ST., a legendary bishop of Trèves, Cologne, and Tongres, said to have been sent to these cities by St. Peter from Rome; not to be confounded with the historical bishop of Cologne in the first quarter of the 4th century. His fabulous story does not seem to be earlier than the 9th century. It is to be found in Harigerus, in Chapeville, *Gesta Pontif. Leod.* i. 9-22, and the *Gesta Treverorum*, in *Patr. Lat.* cliv. 1127 seqq. It is rejected by modern writers. See the elaborate examination of the subject by the Bollandists, *Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 354-400, who conclude that there was only one Maternus, the historical bishop of Cologne of the councils of Rome and Arles, and cf. *Gall. Christ.* iii. 807-8, 620-2; Grandidier, *Hist. de l'Église de Strasbourg*, diss. ii. tom. i. 45 seqq., and Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 74 seqq. But on the other hand see Hillar, *Vindiciae Hist. Trev. Metz*, 1763. Maternus's day of commemoration is Sept. 14 (*Boll. ibid.*). His successors are given as St. Agraetius at Trèves and St. Navitus at Tongres. [S. A. B.]

MATERNUS (2), the first bishop of Cologne whose name is known, succeeded by Euphrates. The Donatist controversy of the early years of the 4th century in Africa is the occasion of his appearance in history. The schismatics had appealed to Constantine to appoint impartial judges from among the Gallic bishops of the charges made by them against the bishop Caecilianus. The emperor complied, and Maternus of Cologne, Marinus of Arles, and Rheticius of Autun were deputed to proceed to Rome. Here, in a synod presided over by the pope, Melchides, they decided against the Donatists (A. D. 313). The latter however were dissatisfied with this decision, and demanded a larger tribunal. This also was conceded, and the important council of Arles held the following year, at which Maternus was also present, affirmed the judgment in favour of Caecilianus [DONATISM, CAECILIANUS].

The writers who have adopted the medieval fable of a Maternus sent from Rome by St. Peter to the churches of Trèves, Cologne, and Tongres have been compelled to regard the historical Maternus of the councils as the second of the name at Cologne. The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (xiii. 373-5), while rejecting the mission from St. Peter, think it probable that the historical Maternus was bishop of Trèves originally, and resigned that see to preach at

Cologne and Tongres. But this belief is entirely without evidence. For Maternus see Mansi, *Sacra Conc.* iii. 433-442, 463-512; Ceillier, ii. 624-7; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 620-2; *Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 354-400; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 200-1. [S. A. B.]

## MATERNUS (3), JULIUS FIRMICUS.

Two writers of the fourth century are known by this name. They are generally regarded as distinct; but some would identify them, and there are circumstances that favour that view. They had the same name. They lived at the same time, under the reigns of Constantine the Great and his sons Constantius and Constans. They both enjoyed the title V. C., which would indicate senatorial or consular rank. Yet they are distinguished by all critics on the ground of diverging styles, as well as because the work of one was purely pagan, the work of the other thoroughly Christian. Let us take them separately. Julius Firmicus Maternus the Christian writer was an acute critic of pagan rites and doctrines, as well as a vigorous apologist for the Christian faith. Baronius and others make him at one time bishop of Milan during the Diocletian persecution, at another time, identify with a certain Julius whose signature appears to a pretended Roman council in the *False Decretals*. In fact there is nothing known of him beyond the date of his literary activity, which can be clearly deduced from his treatise *de Errore Profanarum Religionum*. This date must be fixed between A. D. 343—since he refers to the expedition of Constans into Britain A. D. 343—and the murder of that prince by Magnentius in 350, as the work is addressed to him and to his brother Constantius. As to the character of the work, it is very valuable for its details of the secret rites of paganism. It takes up every leading form of idolatry then current and gives us information that we shall seek in vain elsewhere. It discusses the idolatry of the Persians, Egyptians, Assyrians, the Greek mysteries, the ceremonies and formulae used in the Mithraic worship. Some of the details given on this last subject are very curious, some liturgical fragments being preserved for us. These will be found in capp. xx. xxi. and xxvii. In opposition to the heathen orgies he presents the pure mysteries of Christianity in his preface, which is now almost completely lost, and from cap. xxiv. to the end. He concludes with an earnest exhortation to the emperors, bidding them suppress paganism by force; thus giving one of the earliest specimens of the forthcoming Christian intolerance. This work is valuable for some other reasons. It is an interesting illustration of the small amount of philological and etymological science possessed by the ancients. Maternus strives to prove his case against paganism by the derivation of the names of the gods. Thus, arguing against the Egyptians, he declares that Sarapis was originally the patriarch Joseph converted into a god by the gratitude of that nation for rescuing them from famine. This he proves by deriving the name Sarapis from *Σαράπης ἁγῶς*, because Joseph was the descendant of Sarah. This must suffice, but many similar instances will be found in our writer. This idea about Joseph was not, however, confined to him. It is also found in

Paulin. Nolan. *Nat.* xi. *S. Felic.* v. 100; cf. Suidas, s. v. *Σάπωνις*. This work again is valuable for Biblical criticism, as in it are found quotations from the versions of Holy Scripture used in North Africa in St. Cyprian's time, a point which we cannot stop to prove, but which will be found discussed in the dissertation referred to below. Again in this work there probably are embodied some fragments of the ancient Greek writer Evemerus, whose work upon Paganism though now lost was largely used by all the apologists for Christianity. Some fables are mentioned by Maternus which are found nowhere else. It is therefore concluded that they are due to Evemerus. Cf. art. on Evemerus in *DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY* and in the *Biographie Générale*. The work of Maternus was first published by Matthias Flaccus at Strasburg in 1562. It has since been frequently reprinted. It is unnecessary to give the complete list of editions, which will be found in Ceillier, iv. 313, and also in Migne's *Patrolog. Lat.* t. xii. In that volume there has been reprinted an edition of our writer, published by Munter at Copenhagen in 1826, with an introductory dissertation discussing the whole subject in all its bearings. Oehler also published it in 1847 at Leipsic, but the best critical edition is by Halm, Vienna, 1867. See also *Philologus* for 1880, t. xxxiv. p. 720. As for the pagan Julius Firmicus Maternus, usually styled Junior, he wrote a work between A.D. 330 & 360 on judicial astrology, which is mentioned by Sidon. Apollin. in *Ep. ad Pont. Leont.* It was first published at Venice in 1497 under the title *de Nativitatibus sive Matheseos*, lib. vii.; about subsequent editions see Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire* s. v.; upon this work also see dissertation quoted above. [G. T. S.]

**MATIDIUS**, priest of Suedra in Pamphylia, who, with Tarsinus, a priest of the same church, requested Epiphanius to write in defence of the Catholic faith. Epiphanius, in compliance, wrote his *Ancoratus*. (*Patr. Gr.* xliii. 13; Tillem. x. 503; Ceill. vi. 414.) [C. H.]

**MATTARII**, an ascetic sect of Manichaeans who slept "in mattis"—on mats. (*August. Haer.* 46 in *Patr. Lat.* xlii. 36, where one reading is Macarii; *Id. Contr. Faust.* v. 5, *ib.* 223; Tillem. iv. 374, 403, xiii. 39.) [C. H.]

**MATTHIAS, GOSPEL OF.** [*GOSPELS, APOC.* Vol. II. p. 716.]

**MATTHIAS, TRADITIONS OF.** A book was in the second century in use among the Basilidians purporting to contain traditions of discourses privately held with Matthias by the Saviour (*Hippol. Ref.* vii. 20, p. 230, *Clem. Al. Strom.* vii. 17, p. 900). Clement, whose custom with Gnostic writings is to use them when they make for his purpose without raising question as to their authority, three times cites these traditions (*Strom.* ii. 9, p. 452, iii. 4, p. 523; vii. 13, p. 882). It appears to us that in the second passage λέγουσι is used impersonally as in the third, and that the citation is made by Clement himself and not by his Gnostic opponents. It is probably from the same "traditions" that were derived the docetic stories told in the "Hypotyposes," p. 1009 (see Vol. I.

p. 870). At *Strom.* iv. 6, p. 579, one suspects a confusion between Matthias and Matthew.

Clement is the only writer that gives us any fragments of these traditions, but the work is mentioned by several other authors, commonly under the name of the Gospel according to Matthias. (*Origen, i. in Luc.* vol. iii. p. 932; *Eus. H. E.* iii. 25; *Innocent. ad Euseb.* Mansi, iii. 1041; *Gelas. Decret., Theiner, Epp. Rom. Pont.* p. 462; *Anastas. Sinait., Coteler. Pat. Ap.* 197.) [G. S.]

**MATTHIAS (MATTHAEUS)**, Jan. 30, bishop of Jerusalem in the 2nd century. He stands eighth in the list given by Eusebius, between John and Philip. (*Euseb. H. E.* iv. 5; *Epiph. Haer.* lxxvi. 20; *Niceph. H. E.* iii. 25; *Mart. Usuard.*; *Boll. Acta SS.* 30 Jan. ii. 1025; *Tillem.* ii. 1895.) [E. V.]

**MATTIDIA**, legendary mother of Clement of Rome (*Rec.* vii. 8, ix. 35, *Hom.* xii. 8). The Clementine romance represented its hero as related to the emperor of his time, and the name chosen for his mother was probably selected on account of the dignity then attached to the name which had been borne by the niece of Trajan, whose daughter became the wife of the emperor Hadrian. [G. S.]

**MAUDUITUS, ST.**, saint of St. Mawes, on the east side of Falmouth harbour. Sir H. Nicolas gives "S. Maudiut 17 Nov.," but Whitaker (*Cornwall, i.* 309) identifies him with Machutus bishop of Aleth in Brittany, now St. Malo. (*R. Rees, Welsh Saints*, 256; see *Leland, Itin.* iii. 19, 29, 30.) [C. W. B.]

**MAUGANIUS**, bishop of Silchester, a legendary or fabulous person, whom Geoffrey of Monmouth (*Hist. Brit.* ix. 15) mentions as made bishop by king Arthur, after the death of Dubricius. At the same time Diwanus was appointed to Winchester, and Eledanius to Dumbarton. The whole story is apocryphal, but the name may represent a genuine British name; that of Magonius was given by St. Germanus to St. Patrick (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 523, note). There is no evidence that Silchester was an episcopal see. [S.]

**MAUGANUS, ST.**, the saint of two parishes in Cornwall, Mawgan Meneage in the Lizard district, and Mawgan on the Bristol Channel. In the latter, the parish feast is on the nearest Sunday to St. James's day, 25th July. A St. Meagan occurs among the saints of Bardsey (*R. Rees, Welsh Saints*, 123, 219, 269). The name Maugantius is found in Geoffrey of Monmouth, v. 18. [C. W. B.]

**MAUNAN, ST.**, the saint of St. Mawnan by the Helford river on the south coast of Cornwall. "Mwynen" is given as one of the daughters of Brychan (*R. Rees, Welsh Saints*, 142; see *Leland, Itin.* iii. 24), but the Welsh devotees mostly settled on the north coast of Cornwall opposite Wales (above, Vol. I. p. 317, v. BERWYN). A dedication to St. Stephen was added on later to that of Maunan, and the parish feast is now on St. Stephen's day, 26th December. [C. W. B.]

**MAURIANUS**, a monk addressed by Nilus in five letters of a hortatory character (lib. ii.



ep. 53, lib. iii. epp. 58-61, in *Patr. Gr.* lxxix.). A letter on the death of Christ (i. 329) was addressed to a Maurianus. [T. W. D.]

**MAURICIUS (1)**, July 10, martyr with forty-five others, led by Leontius, Daniel, and Antony, at Nicopolis in Armenia, under Lysias the president. This martyrdom has been a subject of much debate. Some have placed it under Licinius, A.D. 319-323; others during the Diocletian persecution in A.D. 307. Görres, in his *Licinianische Christenverfolgung*, Jena, 1875, pp. 146-154, has bestowed upon it an elaborate analysis. He shews that the martyrs involved therein could not possibly have suffered during the Licinian persecution, and that their historical reality at any time is a matter of much doubt. To this view there are opposed—*Boll. A.A. SS.* 10 Jul. iii. p. 36; Baronii *Annal.* iii. p. 132, § 46; Till. *Mém.* V. pt. 3, p. 208. Our martyrdom may have arisen from a confusion between thirty-six martyrs of Alexandria, commemorated Jul. 10 in *Mart. Hieron.* ed. D'Acher. *Spicileg.* t. ii. p. 14, and some martyrs who suffered at Nicopolis, commemorated by Ado Jul. 11, cf. *Vict. Rom. Mart.* and Görres, *l. c.* p. 152. This would account for the mention of the president Lysias, who was one of the most active persecutors in Egypt under Diocletian, and put Marclarius to death in Armenia during the Diocletian persecution. [G. T. S.]

**MAURICIUS (2), FLAVIUS TIBERIUS**, emperor A.D. 582-602.

The reign of Maurice was occupied by continual wars against the two enemies that threatened the empire on the east and west, the Persians and the Avars. A detailed account of these wars will be found in the **DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY**.

Maurice in his attempts at reform had the misfortune to come into collision with pope Gregory the Great. Maurice, it appears, had in A.D. 593 enacted a law forbidding soldiers or persons who had public duties to perform to retire into monasteries (compare MAJORIANUS). Gregory complied with the order to publish the law, but wrote in terms of respectful remonstrance to the emperor, who appears to have modified the law in consequence. (S. Gregorii *Epist.* iii. 65, 66, viii. 5, pp. 675, 898, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 662, 909.) [GREGORIUS I. Vol. II. p. 782.]

Another cause of dispute between the pope and emperor was the support given by the latter to John the Faster in his assumption of the title of oecumenical bishop. (See Vol. II. 785, 6.) It is probably on account of these quarrels that so unfavourable a view is taken of Maurice by Gregory (Vol. II. 787) and his biographer John the Deacon. His private character seems to have been without reproach, the account of his death proves his justice and piety, while the curious story of Paulinus the wizard (Theophylact, i. 11) shews that he was a humane man and superior to some of the prejudices of his time, though he was obliged to yield to the impertinence of the bigoted patriarch. In public affairs he seems to have been unequal to the difficult position in which he was placed, obliged as he was to defend the empire against two formidable enemies with

a mutinous army and with generals who were for the most part incompetent. Maurice wrote a work in twelve books on military tactics, which has been edited by Scheffer and published at Upsala in 1664. (Eragrius, v. 19-24 & vi. in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvi. 2, 2829-2886; Theophylact Simocatta; Theophanes, 213-244; Gibbon, ch. xlvi.; Finlay, i. 297-308.) [F. D.]

**MAURILA (MURILA)**, bishop of Palencia 589 A.D. (Hildefonsus, *De Viris Ill.* cap. xi. apud *Esp. Sagr.* v. 479; see also *Esp. Sagr.* viii. 20, and Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 227, 253.) [M. A. W.]

**MAURILIUS, ST.**, Sept. 13, fourth bishop of Angers, between Prosperius and St. Renatus, or René, circ. A.D. 397-427 (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 546). The Bollandists publish a life of him, the preface to which asserts that it was written in 619 by St. Magnobodus (Maimbeuf), seventeenth bishop of this see, from records left by a priest Justus (*Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 72-6). The MS. of the abbey of Vendôme, from which it was taken, is stated to be more than 600 years old (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 574-5). Another biography, apparently the one above mentioned, with alterations and additions, is published by Surius (Sept. 13) and others with the name of Venantius Fortunatus as the author. In some of the MSS. there is prefixed a spurious letter of Gregory of Tours to St. Germanus of Paris, forged to support the idea of Fortunatus's authorship. Both the life and the letter are supposed to have been the work of Raino bishop of Angers at the beginning of the 9th century (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 482-3, 574-5). This biography, though without the letter, is reproduced in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, lxxxviii. 563-76, among the works of Fortunatus, but considered by him to be apocryphal (see *Praemonitio*, col. 561-2). There also exists a metrical life of Maurilius in two books by Marbodius bishop of Rennes, to be found in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, clxxi. 1635-48. For an uncritical account of his legend, see Tresvaux, *Hist. de l'Église d'Angers*, i. 18-26. [S. A. B.]

**MAURINUS**, bishop of Alexandria, who wrote concerning the three days before the creation of the luminaries. (Alcuin. *De Bissert.* in *Opp.* ii. 366, ed. Froben.) [C. H.]

**MAURUS (1)**, bishop of Utica, in proconsular Africa, who is said to have purchased his bishopric, perhaps by obtaining for money a certificate of having satisfied the demands of the inquisitors in time of persecution. He was a friend of Ingentius, and took part with him in his attempt to deceive Alfius Caecilianus in the case of Felix of Aptunga. (FELIX, Vol. II. p. 487; *Gesta Purg.* ap. *Mon. Vet. Don.* iii. p. 164, ed. Oberthür; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. p. 362.) [H. W. P.]

**MAURUS (2), ST.**, founder and abbat of the Benedictine monastery of Glanfeuil or St. Maur-sur-Loire. He is better known, as Herzog says, to tradition than to history, but the primary authority is Gregorius Mag. (*Dial.* ii. cc. 3 sq.). His life, written by Faustus Cassinensis, and rewritten with alterations by Odo or Eudes, at one time abbat of Glanfeuil, is given by Mabillon

(*Acta SS. O. S. B. saec. i. 274 sq.*) and the Bolland. (*Acta SS. Jan. i. 1039 sq.*) [FAUSTUS (31)]. St. Maurus, better known in France as St. Maur, was at the age of twelve years entrusted by his father Equitius, an Italian nobleman, to the charge of St. Benedict at Subiaco, or as some say, at Monte Cassino, and trained in monastic rule. By St. Benedict he was sent into Gaul about A.D. 543, and established his monastery on the Loire by the favour of King Theodebert. He carried with him the Benedictine rule, and was the chief means of its acceptance in France, but the details of his work are not given. He died A.D. 584, and his feast is Jan. 15 (Odo, Usuard., and Florus, *Marit.*). His monastery, though secularised in the 16th century, was in the middle ages one of greatest influence, and the "Congregation of St. Maur" has done much from the 17th century to elevate the tone of the monastic orders. The relics of the patron have often been translated, and the genuineness of his life in all its stages has been disputed. (Ceillier, *Sacr. Aut.* xi. 157, 170, 610; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* ix. 201; Cave, *Lit. Hist.* i. 574; Mosheim, *Hist. Ch. Ch. cent. xvii.* § 2, pt. i. c. 1.) [J. G.]

MAWRON, a bishop, whose name is added to a forged Glastonbury charter of 601, which may perhaps record or refer to a fact. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 121.) [C. W. B.]

MAXENTIUS (1), M. AURELIUS VALERIU, son of Maximianus I. (Herculius) and Eutropia, a Syrian lady; Roman emperor A.D. 306-312. The principal events in the life of this emperor are fully given in the DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY AND MYTHOLOGY. His career seems to have but little bearing on Church History, as he did not use any special severities against Christians as such, but inflicted the miseries of chronic persecution on his subjects of all opinions. His wickedness seems to have transcended description, and to have been absolutely unredeemed by any saving feature. His death is described by Lactantius, or the author of the *Liber de Mortibus Persecutorum*, as that of the last of the enemies of God (Migne, *Lactant.*; *Bibl. Lat.* vol. vii. p. 257, ch. xliii.-v.). Milman thinks (ii. p. 28) that his paganism grew more intense in his later years, after the fire in the temple of the Fortune of Rome, and the tumultuary persecution which ensued. He certainly paid great attention to divination and magic, particularly towards the end of his life, using the most hideous means of inquiry into the future. (Euseb. *Vita Const.* i. 36.) [R. St. J. T.]

MAXENTIUS (2), commemorated by Gregory Nazianzen (*Epitaphia*, num. 126, 127, in *Patr. Gr.* xxxviii. 77). He gave up a position of high rank on becoming a Christian, and ended his days in sufferings. [C. H.]

MAXENTIUS (3) (MAIXENT), ST., June 26, second abbat of the monastery on the Sèvre in Poitou, which afterwards bore his name (circ. A.D. 447-515). Gregory of Tours mentions a life of him (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 37) which does not appear to have come down to us, but one is extant which may be founded on it. The Bollandists incline to place it in the 7th century

at earliest (*Acta SS. Jun. v. 169*). It is to be found in Mabillon's *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* i. 578-80, Paris, 1668, and in the Bollandists' collection, *ibid.*

According to an anonymous work of the 11th century, he was the author of a Life of St. Viventius, a priest in Poitou. We have no trace of it, but the editors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France* think it quite possible (iii. 81). [S. A. B.]

MAXENTIUS (4), JOANNES, presbyter and archimandrite. The name of his monastery is unknown (*Sugg. Diosc.* in Labbe, iv. 1520), but it appears to have been situated within the jurisdiction of Paternus bishop of Tomi (Köstendje) the capital of Scythia Minor (Dobrudschia), who subscribed the synodical letter of the council held at Constantinople, A.D. 520, as "Provinciae Scythiae Metropolitanus" (Labbe, iv. 1525).

About A.D. 517 a controversy arose at Constantinople, in which the credit of the council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) was considered to be seriously involved (Hormisd. epp. 15, 16 in Mansi, viii. 418 and Labbe, iv. 1454-5). In this controversy an active part was taken by certain Scythian monks, with Maxentius as their leader. These monks earnestly contended for the position "unus de Trinitate in carne crucifixus est" as essential to the exclusion of the heresy of Nestorius on the one hand and that of Eutyches on the other (*Suggestio Dioscuri*, Labbe, iv. 1513, May 13, 519; Desprez, *Proleg. Fulgent. Rusp.* in Migne, lxxv. 109). The dispute was at its height in 519, when Germanus bishop of Capua, bishop Joannes, Blandus a presbyter, Felix and Dioscurus deacons, arrived at Constantinople from Hormisdas bishop of Rome, to negotiate a reconciliation of the two churches [HORMISDAS, p. 158 a] (Baronius, s. a. lxxxvii.). At the same time the writings of Faustus the semi-Pelagian bishop of Riez [FAUSTUS (11)] were also the subject of fierce debate at Constantinople, the Scythian monks contending that they were heretical. Among the chief antagonists of the monks were a deacon named Victor, Paternus bishop of Tomi, and other Scythian bishops (*Sugg. Germ. Joann. Fel. Diosc. et Bland.* in Labbe, iv. 1514). Both parties had influential supporters in the imperial court, the monks being vigorously upheld by Vitalianus, who was then apparently in great favour with the emperor Justin, and held the office of magister militum (Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 3; *Suggest. Diosc.* u. s.), and their opponents no less so at first by Justinian, who already held high office under his uncle (Vict. Tunuensis. s. a. 518; Justinian, *ad Hormisd.* Labbe, iv. 1516).

Soon after the arrival of the Roman legates at Constantinople the Scythian monks appealed to them to interfere on their behalf, and Maxentius, in their name, drew up "De Christo Professio," explanatory of their faith, which they sent with the appeal (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvii. 75, 79). They protest that it is from no disrespect to the council of Chalcedon, but in its defence that they contend for their position on the subject of the Trinity, and declare that they anathematize all who either oppose that council or hold its decisions to be imperfect. They also denounce the teaching of Pelagius and Coelestius, and the followers of Theodore of Mopsuestia, as "contra-

dictory to that of the apostle." They further pray the papal legates to hear the accusations which they are prepared to bring against Victor and Paternus (May 30, A.D. 519, Labbe, iv. 1509; *Suggest. Legat.* u. s. 1514, June 29, A.D. 519; Hormisd. *Suggest. Diosc. et al.* May 30, A.D. 519; Labbe, iv. 1519; *Suggest. German. et al.*, June 29, A.D. 519; *ib.* 1514; Hormisd. *Ep.* 67, *ad Justinian.*; *ib.* 1518). At first the legates refused to entertain their appeal; at length however, at the urgent request of the emperor Justin and of Vitalianus, they consented to hear the case, but without taking upon themselves to pronounce a decision. Vitalianus summoned the monks to appear before him and John II, the patriarch of Constantinople, but with what result does not appear (*Suggest. Diosc.* u. s.; *Suggest. Germ. et al.* June 29, 519, u. s. 1514; *Suggest. Diosc.* Dec. 1, 1519; Hormisd. *Ep.* 67, *ad Justinian.* u. s.). Failing to obtain any satisfaction at Constantinople, the monks determined to send four of their number, Achilles, John, Leontius, Mauritius, to lay the whole case before Hormisdas at Rome (Justinian, *Ep. ad Hormisd.* Labb. iv. 1516). The substitution of Maxentius for Mauritius by Baronius (s. a. 519, xcvi.) seems to be purely conjectural; there is no evidence whatever that the archimandrite then left Constantinople. The four departed for the West early in the May of A.D. 519, and the fact of their departure was daily notified to Hormisdas both by Justinian and the Roman legates as soon as it was known. Justinian then speaks of them as persons "quibus magis discordia in studio est, quam caritas et pax Dei," and both he and the legates pray that Hormisdas would reject their appeal.

Hormisdas delaying to hear the four envoys, others were sent to join them, Maxentius, as it would appear, being one. In the meanwhile Justinian changed his opinion of the monks, and became their advocate (*Justinian. ad Hormisd.*; *Hormisd. Ep.* 66, *ad Justinian.* Sept. 2, A.D. 519, u. s. 1518). The controversy seems to have extended so as to embrace a considerable number of the clergy of the East, especially those of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Syria Secunda (Justin, *ad Hormisd.* u. s. 1520, Jan. 19, A.D. 520; *Deprec. et Supplic. ab Hieros. et al.* u. s. 1542). An active correspondence soon followed between Constantinople and Rome, in the course of which Possessor, an African bishop who had been driven into exile by the Arians, wrote to Hormisdas, especially requesting his opinion as to the orthodoxy of the writings of Faustus, and urging his request by alleging that Vitalianus and Justinian were equally anxious with himself to hear from him on the subject (*Possess. Ep. Afr. Relat.* Labbe, iv. 1530, received at Rome July 18, A.D. 520). Shortly after the despatch of this letter Vitalianus was put to death, not without suspicion attaching to Justinian as the instigator of the deed (*Procop. Hist. Arc.* 6, *Op.* ed. Bonn, iii. 46; *Vict. Tununens.* s. a. 523). Baronius does not scruple to say that his unhappy end was a divine punishment for his patronage of the Scythian monks ("luit poenas de patrocinio Eutychnianis monachis praestito adversus apostolicæ sedis legatos," s. a. 520, i.).

The deputation at Rome, finding that notwithstanding the influence which Justinian was now exerting in their behalf, the Roman legates at Constantinople were too strong for them, and

there was therefore little hope of their success with Hormisdas, resolved upon an appeal to the African bishops who were then in exile in Sardinia, some of whom enjoyed a high reputation for ability as well as orthodoxy. In drawing up the appeal they again appear to have employed Maxentius. The document was subscribed in the name of their brethren by "Petrus Diaconus, Joannes monachus, Leontius monachus, et Joannes lector," and was addressed to Dacianus, Fortunatus, Albanus, Orontius, Boethus, Fulgentius, Januarius, and their fellow confessors. It was divided into eight chapters. In the first they state the object of their appeal to be to evoke an expression of opinion from the African bishops as to the orthodoxy of their faith, which they afterwards expound at some length. In the fourth they elaborately defend the position which they had maintained at Constantinople ("... Deus verbum, etiam cum propria carne, unus est ex Trinitate: non quod caro ejus sit de substantia Trinitatis, sed quia caro Dei verbi est, qui est unus ex Trinitate... Quapropter et Deum verbum passum carne, et crucifixum carne, et sepultum carne secundum beatum Cyrillum profiteremur dicentem." At the close of the fifth they solemnly protest their acceptance of the councils of Nicaea (A.D. 325), Constantinople (A.D. 381), Ephesus (A.D. 431), and Chalcedon (A.D. 451), as also of the letters of Leo, anathematizing all who "thought differently from the doctrines of the church, and, at the same time, all the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius his disciple, as well as all those who agreed with Nestorius, and all writings which were opposed to the twelve chapters of the blessed Cyril, which he published against the same Nestorius; and, in addition to these, Eutyches and Dioscorus, with their associates, and all whom the apostolic see has rightly and regularly ('juste ac regulariter') condemned." At the close of the appeal they further anathematize "Pelagius and Coelestius, as also Julian of Eclanæ, and those who were of similar opinion, especially the books of Faustus bishop of the Gauls, . . . which were unquestionably written against the doctrine of predestination" (*Petr. Diac. De Incarnat. et Gratia*, Migne, *Patrol.* lxv. 442-451). This appeal was responded to by Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe in his well-known *De Incarnatione et Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. This reply, in which the exiled bishops express the great joy and thankfulness with which they had received the letter of the monks, and their hearty approval of the confession of faith which it contained, is addressed to the four subscribers of the appeal, and "the other brethren who had been sent to Rome from the East in the cause of the faith" (*Fulgent. Ep.* 17, *Op.* u. s. 451-493). By this time the monks, who had now been detained at Rome for fourteen months, had returned to the East. According to Maxentius, they had been driven out of the city by force, and at the instance of Hormisdas (*Resp. ad Ep. Hom. u. infr.* 101); but according to Hormisdas they left surreptitiously and contrary to his will (*Hormisd. Ep.* 66, *ad Justinian.* Sept. 2, 519; Labbe, iv. 1518; *ep.* 63 *ad Legatos*, Dec. 3, 519, *ib.* 1511). Before they left, however, they drew up a further protestation of their faith, which they caused to be affixed to the statues of the emperors (*Hormisd. Ep.* 70, *ad Possessor.*; Labbe,

iv. 1531, cf.). This, probably, was the "contra Nestorianos capitula" of the collected works of Maxentius. The title, however, hardly corresponds to the contents, which consist of twelve anathemas, the ninth of which is directed against the Eutychians, and the remaining three against Pelagius and Coelestius and their followers (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvi. 86). Considerable agitation followed this virtual appeal to the Roman people, and it seems to have induced Faustus the prefect of the city (Cassiodorus *Var. saepe*) to write to Trifolius, a presbyter at Constantinople, on the questions in debate. The letter of the prefect is not extant, but the reply of Trifolius survives, though not in its entirety. From that it appears that Faustus had asked him whether such a position as that for which the monks contended was maintained by the fathers. His reply is that that teaching issued from the fountain of Arius, and was in accordance with all heresies, and he proceeds to argue against it accordingly. (Labbe, iv. 1590-1592.)

When they returned to the East, Maxentius and his friends came again to Constantinople, and from thence they sent a copy of the writings of Faustus of Riez to Fulgentius and the other exiles in Sardinia, with a request that he and his brethren would also send them their opinion as to these (Migne, *Patrol.* lxxv. 145). The letter containing this request is lost; we only know it from the reply which the African bishops returned to it some time afterwards. In the meanwhile Fulgentius wrote his *De Veritate Prædestinationis*, which he addressed to Joannes presbyter and Venerius deacon, two of the Scythian monks (Migne, lxxv. 603-671). In this also the bishop of Ruspe speaks of the monks in the highest terms: "Deo gratias ago, sancti patres . . . cujus ope tales estis, ut pro gratia qua salvamur magno spiritu ac fervore certetis" (l. i. c. 1).

On the 13th of August, A.D. 520, Hormisdas sent a reply to the letter which he had received from Possessor on the 18th of July previously. He greatly commends the faith of his correspondent, but speaks of the monks in no measured terms of reproach. They are monks "only in name, not in fact; in profession only, not in deed;" they are scatterers of "poison under the pretence of religion," who only "loved strife," hating the united body of the church, sowing sedition, and, instead of the obedience which rules in monasteries, loving the "obstinacy of pertinacious pride," and are just such men as those of whom the apostle says, "In the last days troublous times shall come, and men shall be lovers of themselves only, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof" (2 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 5). He adds that he now writes about them as he does lest, if they should return to Constantinople, they might deceive those who did not know how they had conducted themselves at Rome. He does not, however, commit himself to any opinion as to the position ("unum de Trinitate"), but only refers to it in very general terms, saying, "The reverend wisdom of the fathers has defined what is Catholic doctrine . . . what need, therefore, to raise any further controversy, when the Christian faith is limited by canonical books, synodical decrees, and the constitutions of the fathers within fixed and immovable limits ("sta-

bili et inconcusso termino [*marginally* limitatur]?) Nor is he much more explicit as to the writings of Faustus. He says, indeed, that he does not receive him, neither does he any one who has not been approved by the authority of the fathers, but adds, that if he agrees with "right faith and sound teaching" he is to be admitted; if not, he is to be rejected, and concludes with telling Possessor that "although what the Roman, that is the Catholic church, follows and maintains on the subject of free-will and the grace of God may be gathered from various books of the blessed Augustine, and especially from those addressed to Hilary and to Prosper; nevertheless, there are certain special documents preserved in the ecclesiastical archives, which, if Possessor has not, and wishes to see, he will send him" (Hormisd. *Ep.* 70, *ad Possessor.* Labbe, iv. 1530-1532). This letter was widely circulated as an encyclic, and when it came into the hands of Maxentius he at once replied to it in his *Ad Epistolam Hormisdæ Responsio*. Migne, lxxvii. 94-112. The reply is an every way remarkable document. The archimandrite refuses to believe it can have been written by Hormisdas, but argues that whether it was so or not, its author was "unquestionably a heretic," as he considers that to "maintain that Christ, the Son of God, is one of the Trinity is to contend about words." He also takes the writer of the letter to task for having virtually decided that, although the writings of Faustus were not authoritative, they were still to be read, and even charges him with Pelagianism for having said "proficiemus inter adversantes propriis bonis," on which he comments with some bitterness. As a further reason for ascribing the letter to another rather than to Hormisdas, he alleges the fact that when they were at Rome Hormisdas had communicated with him and his brethren, which he certainly would not have done had he entertained such an opinion of them as that which is there expressed. Throughout he quotes abundant evidence from the fathers that what was alleged to be heretical in him and his brethren was only contention for Catholic truth. Of course the ascription of the letter to another than Hormisdas was ironical, as its authenticity is beyond doubt.

We hear nothing more of Maxentius and the Scythian monks until after the death of Hormisdas, which occurred in the August of A.D. 523. By this time the encyclic of Hormisdas had reached the exiled bishops in Sardinia, though there is no reason to believe that they had also seen the *Responsio* of Maxentius, and they had had ample leisure for the mature consideration of the second appeal which had been addressed to them from Constantinople. They accordingly met in council, and sent the monks a reply in the form of a synodical letter. It is addressed to "Joannes presbyter and archimandrite, Venerius deacon, and the faithful men whose subscription is contained in your letter," and is subscribed by "Datianus, Fortunatus, Beethus, Victor, Scholasticus, Orontius, Vendicianus, Victor, Januarius, Victorianus, Photinus, servants of Christ." They acknowledge the receipt of the letter of Maxentius and his brethren, and say they rejoice that they "hold a right opinion on the grace of God, by whose light the free will of the human mind is illu-

minated, and by whose aid it is controlled," and at the same time express their sorrow that some should call in question the Catholic faith on the subject (c. 2). They also exhort them to be "steadfast and unmoveable," and, while holding the "true faith," to shew "all charity to brethren who think otherwise, not despairing of any one, inasmuch as he that does not hold the faith in anything to-day may know it to-morrow, God revealing it to him," adding, "let us pray for them that the Lord may work in them" (c. 26); and recommends them to urge such to "read the books of Augustine which he wrote to Prosper and to Hilary, and of which Hormisdas, the bishop of the apostolic see, of blessed memory, makes mention" in his letter to Possessor (c. 27). They then say that one of their number has already responded to their appeal in three books addressed to them by name, and that he had also written seven books in reply to the two of Faustus (c. 30). The three books have been already mentioned; the seven are no longer extant (*Ep. Synod. Episc. Afric.* Labbe, iv. 1591-1600; Deprez, *Prolegom. Opp. Fulgent. u. s.* 115).

The position for which John Maxentius and his brethren contended was afterwards formally approved by a council at Rome in 532 (Labbe, iv. 1761). It was also elaborately defended in 534 by John II. bishop of Rome, who argued that it had always been held by Catholics and in the very form in which it was maintained by the Scythian monks, quoting Proclus patriarch of Constantinople and others (*Ep.* 3 in Labbe, iv. 1751; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* 73; Pagi, *Crit. s. a.* 533). The council of Constantinople of 553 also anathematized all who questioned it (*collat. viii. anath.* 10, Labbe, v. 575). Yet Baronius (*s. a.* 519 *ci.*) is unsparing of his condemnation of the monks as impugners of the Catholic faith. But they have found an able defender in cardinal Noris, who expends several of his most elaborate pages in refutation of the great annalist and in demonstration of the orthodoxy of John Maxentius and his friends (*Hist. Pelagiana*, ii. 18, in *Op.* i. 474-596; especially c. 20, pp. 498-504; *Hist. Controv. de Univ. ex Trinit. passe*, c. 4-8; *Op.* iii. 800-854, and Pagi (*Critic. s. a.* 519, vi.) accepts the vindication as conclusive.

Archbishop Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* c. 14, ed. 1687, p. 256), Cave (*i.* 505), Bellarmine (*Scr. Eccl. s. a.* 520), and others suppose John Maxentius to have been a presbyter of Antioch. Ussher's mistake arose through his confounding the Flavian who is mentioned in the *libellus fidei* quoted in the *De Christo Professio*, and who was Flavian of Constantinople (Labbe, iv. 15, 1769), with Flavian patriarch of Antioch. Cave confounds John Maxentius with the John Scholasticus Scythopolita of Photius (*cod.* 95) [JOANNES (565)].

Besides the works above mentioned, Maxentius also wrote—

1. A brief *Professio Fidei*, but under what circumstances does not appear.

2. *Adnotationis Verbi Dei ad propriam carnem Ratio*, also very brief.

3. *Contra Accephalos Libellus*, in which he strenuously maintains the position, "Constat duas, id est Divinitatis et humanitatis, in Filio Dei post adunationem esse naturas, ex quibus, et in quibus subsistit una et singularis Christi persona," against the Eutychians.

4. *Dialogorum contra Nestorianos* (Forbes, *Instruct. Historico-Theol.* III. xxi. 7, VIII. iii. 11; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. II. i. 126, ed. Clark, 1861). The *Scholæ in Dionysii Areopagitæ Opera*, which Cave ascribes to John Maxentius, were written by the John Scythopolita of Photius. [F. W. D.]

MAXIMIANUS (1) I., M. AURELIUS VALERIUS (HERCULIUS), emperor of Rome A.D. 286-305 with Diocletian, 306-308 with Maxentius or Constantine; compelled to strangle himself Feb. 310, supposed in his 60th year. (Tillemont, "Diocletian," vol. iv. p. 7, *Hist. des Emp.*)

A Pannonian soldier of humble birth but great military ability and unresting activity. He was created Caesar in 285 by Diocletian, and Augustus next year; and the principal events in his history will be found under DIOCLETIAN, CONSTANTINE, and MAXENTIUS in the *Dictionary of G. and R. Biography*. The Diocletian persecution began A.D. 303, and Maximian joined in it. He is said to have been the worthy brother of Diocletian in the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, and Eusebius speaks of him and of his death in the same retributive tone as of the other emperors with the exception of Constantius and Constantine (*H. E.* viii. 13).

There can be no doubt that the military talents and activity of Maximianus were of the greatest value to the Western empire and in Africa, or that while under Diocletian's influence or direction, he seconded him honestly and well. But he could not bear to resign his power; and it certainly seems a pity that he could not retain it, as Italy and Africa would then have escaped six years of his son's tyranny; but he would have been a more formidable antagonist to Constantine. He was a barbarian soldier without honour, principle, or education; crime was familiar to him, though he seems not to have practised cruelty for its own sake. He is accused of the usual sensual excesses, though not to the same extent as Maxentius. The coin from Eckhel, vol. viii. p. 15 (given at p. 981 of the *Dict. of Biography and Mythology* vol. ii.), may probably be a likeness, as the head seems to combine fierceness with active restless intelligence in no common degree. The low but wonderfully broad forehead, deep wrinkles, large well-opened eye, and short bull-neck, are highly characteristic. [R. St. J. T.]

MAXIMIANUS (2), the man from whom a special sect among the Donatists derived its name, that schism within a schism, which rent it asunder, and helped to bring about its ultimate overthrow. He is said to have been related to Donatus, called the Great, and was a deacon in the church of Carthage at the time when, at the death of Parmenian, Primian was appointed bishop of the Donatists there in his room, A.D. 391. For reasons of which we know little or nothing, Primian, whose conduct appears to have been in many respects very reprehensible, found fault with four of his deacons, described as young men of blameless character, Maximian, Rogatian, Donatus, and Salgurius, but it was Maximian whom he appears to have disliked most. He endeavoured to persuade the "Seniors" of Carthage to condemn them all, but they refused to

do so, and Primian then proceeded to excommunicate Maximian, who was ill at the time and unable to appear. The Seniors called Primian to account for this arbitrary behaviour, and requested him to meet them in order to explain it, but he refused to do so. They then sent a letter to the bishops of the district, entreating them to meet and enquire into the case. Of this letter, Maximian, who is said to have been supported by female influence in his resistance to Primian, and is accused by St. Augustine of having endeavoured to raise a hostile feeling against him among the bishops, was the bearer (*Aug. c. Emer.* 9). Forty-three in number they met at Carthage, but Primian not only refused to receive or meet them, but gathered a number of rough barbarians to oppose their meeting, and having prevailed on the civil authorities to station some of the police at the doors of the church, at which they were to join in the celebration of the Eucharist, prevented them from entering. They met, however, and their proceedings, notwithstanding the violence of the supporters of Primian, who was not himself present, resulted in his condemnation. In June or July of the same year, 393, a second meeting of Donatist bishops was held at Cabarsussum, a town of Byzacene, to consider the same subject. At this council Primian was again condemned in a more formal manner, and his deposition pronounced, and a resolution appears to have been passed that Maximian should be appointed in his place. He was accordingly ordained at Carthage as rival bishop by twelve bishops, of whom the foremost was Victorianus of Carcacia, while leading parts were taken by Felicianus and Prætextatus. But Primian was not crushed by this move, for at a council of three hundred and ten bishops, held at Bagai, April 24, A.D. 394, at which he himself presided, the supporters of Maximian, of whom none were present, were condemned, and the most opprobrious language applied to them. [*FELICIANUS* (4).] The Donatists of Primian's party persecuted the supporters of Maximian; a church belonging to them was destroyed by their opponents, who said that it was no church but a den. By means of legal proceedings, in which, with the connivance of the judge, and of a heathen priest, the consul's deputy, though on this matter the language of Augustine is very carefully guarded, Primian succeeded in depriving his rival of a house belonging to him, on the pretext of its being under the ban of ecclesiastical censure. Yet notwithstanding the defection of the Maximianists, who appear to have re-baptized those who joined them, the validity of their baptism was not denied by the other Donatists, a point of which Augustine makes frequent use in his controversy with them. The unremitting persecution carried on against the Maximianists induced many of them at length to return to the Donatist community, but of Maximian himself we hear little or nothing subsequently. Other names and not his are the most prominent in the history of the party. (*DONATISM*, Vol. I. p. 887; *Aug. c. Cresc.* iii. 16, 59, iv. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 53, 57; *En. Ps.* 36, 19, 20, 23, 29; *Ps.* 124. 5; *Ep.* 43, 26, 76; 44, 71; 53, 3; 141, 6; 185, 17; *de Gest. Emer.* 9; *c. Parm.* i. 9; Tillemont, *Mém.* vi. 65-72; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* vol. ii. p. 310-326; Ribbeck,

*Aug. und Don.* p. 206-236; Augusti, *Arch.* vol. x. p. 237.) [H. W. P.]

**MAXIMIANUS (3)**, Donatist bishop of Bagai (al. Vaga, *Morc.* i. 91), who, as well as his brother Castorius, left the sect and became a Catholic, but in order not to give offence, resigned his see, which was given to Castorius A.D. 402 [*CASTORIUS*] (*Bruns. Conc.* i. 178; *Cod. Eccl. Afr.* 88; *Aug. Ep.* 69). He has been supposed by Baronius and Tillemont to be the same person as Maximianus who was ill-treated by the Donatists [*MAXIMIANUS* (4)], but this is shewn not to be the case by the language of St. Augustine, who says that at the time of the outrage, the edict of Honorius inflicting capital punishment on Donatist excesses, instead of fine or banishment as heretofore, had not been published. This was done in Jan. or Feb. A.D. 405, in consequence of the request of the council of Carthage A.D. 404 (*Morcelli, Afr. Chr.* iii. p. 26; *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 5, 38; *Aug. Ep.* 185, 26, 27). But it must be confessed that the accounts of the two transactions resemble each other in more than one striking particular. (*Tillem.* xiii. 388-390.) [H. W. P.]

**MAXIMIANUS (4)**, Catholic bishop of Bagai, a town of Numidia, A.D. 404-406 (*Procop. B. V.* ii. 19), who reoccupied a church which had been seized illegally by the Donatists, but restored to Catholic use by imperial decree. The Circumcellions, however, attacked him at the altar, and after inflicting on him serious wounds, threw him from a high tower, but his fall was broken by a dung-heap, and through the care of a poor man and his wife who found him lying there he recovered, though with great difficulty. (*Aug. c. Cresc.* iii. 43, 47; 88, 72; *Ep.* 185, 26.) [*MAXIMIANUS* (3).] [H. W. P.]

**MAXIMIANUS (5)**, archbishop of Constantinople, A.D. 431. Some months after the deposition of Nestorius at the council of Ephesus Maximian presbyter of the church of Constantinople was elected to fill his see. The action of the council of Ephesus had thrown the churches of Constantinople into the direst confusion. A large proportion of the citizens held strongly to the side of Nestorius. The clergy, with one voice, agreed in the anathema. But when the deposition became a fact which could no longer be disputed, the excitement was continued about the election of his successor. Philippus, who had been mentioned as a successor to archbishop Atticus, was now again a favourite. But a larger number supported the candidature of Proclus, who had also been mentioned at that election, and who afterwards became archbishop. After the lapse of four months agreement was arrived at in the election of Maximian. He had led a monastic life, and had entered presbyteral orders; his action in building, at his own expense, monumental tombs for the reception of the remains of such holy men as might from time to time be called to their rest, had long obtained for him a reputation for holiness. In speech and address he was rude and unskilled, and he preferred a quiet life to business. In principles he followed the former archbishops, Chrysostom, Atticus, and Sisinnius. Pope Celestine wrote to him in highly complimentary terms on his elevation,

consoling him in a candid manner for the contrast which his address presented to that of Nestorius. The appointment was made by the unanimous vote of clergy, emperor, and people. The letter of Maximian in which he announced his succession to the pope is lost, but that to St. Cyril remains. He pronounces a high eulogium on Cyril's constancy in defending the cause of Jesus Christ, and the patience with which he had overcome the attacks of the devil. He implores him to help him with his prayers and advice in the episcopate to which he has been called; they are now brothers, and the good done by the one will belong to the other. Although he had written, conjointly with Firmus of Caesarea and Theodotus of Ancyra, to the clergy of Ancyra, to prevent them from admitting the Eastern schismatics to their communion, he did all he possibly could to procure reunion. It was the custom for the occupants of the principal sees on their election to send round a synodical letter to the most considerable bishops of the Christian world, asking for the assurance of their communion. Maximian sent this his synodical to the Easterns as to the others. Communion was refused by Heladius of Tarsus; we may conclude that it was also refused by Eutherius of Tyana, Himerius of Nicomedia, and Dorotheus of Martianopolis, as Maximian deposed them. John of Antioch approved the refusal of the bishop of Tarsus, and praised him for having declined to insert the name of Maximian in the diptychs of his church. All this did not extinguish in the breast of Maximian his earnest zeal for reunion. Pope Sixtus wrote to him several times with the object of urging him to extend his charity to all whom he could possibly regain. Maximian spared no effort, and although he was in the closest harmony with St. Cyril, he pressed him strongly to give up his anathemas, which seemed an insurmountable obstacle to reunion. He even wrote to the emperor's secretary, Aristolaus the tribune, a person who interested himself very much in the question of peace, almost complaining that he did not press Cyril enough on the point, and to his archdeacon Epiphanius. Harmony being restored, John of Antioch and the other Eastern bishops wrote Maximian a letter of communion, assuring him that they consented also to his election and to the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril wrote to him on the same subject, attributing the blessed result to the force of his prayers. A letter written to Maximian by Aristolaus, and which Maximian caused to be read aloud in his church in the presence of his people, was pronounced to be spurious by Dorotheus of Martianopolis, evidently because it took the side of Maximian so decidedly. Maximian held the see of Constantinople from October 25, A.D. 431, to April 12, 434. Of all his letters, that to St. Cyril is the only one extant.

(Mansi, v. 257, 259, 266, 269, 271, 273, 286, 351; Baluz. *Nov. Coll. Conc.* 581 sq. ed. 1681; Soc. vii. 35, 40; Liberat. *Diac. Brer.* 19; Ceill. viii. 394.) [W. M. S.]

MAXIMIANUS (6), bishop of Pudentia, a town in Numidia (Böcking, *Not. Dig. Occ.* p. 646). He was accused by two of his deacons of having been bribed by the Donatists to allow a bishop of their sect to be established in his own see. This proceeding was condemned by pope

Gregory the Great, who desired that a council should be summoned to consider the case, and that if convicted Maximianus should be deposed, A.D. 592. (Greg. Mag. lib. ii. ind. x. ep. 48 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii.; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 611, ed. Oberthür; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 341.)

[H. W. P.]

MAXIMIANUS (7), bishop of Syracuse and previously abbat of Gregory the Great's monastery at Rome, the authority for some of the anecdotes related by Gregory (*Homil. in Evangel.* lib. ii. hom. xxxiv. § 18, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvi. 1257; *Dial.* i. 7 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 105, 177; lib. iii. ind. xi. *Ep.* 51 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 661). He was Gregory's vicar in Sicily in 591 (lib. ii. ind. x. *Ep.* 7). His preservation from shipwreck is mentioned in *Dial.* iii. 36, and his death in 594 in lib. v. ind. xiii. *Ep.* 17. He is addressed or mentioned besides in several places of Gregory's works (*Dial.* iv. 32; lib. iii. ind. xi. *Ep.* 50; lib. iv. ind. xii. *Epp.* 11, 12, 14; lib. v. ind. xiii. *Epp.* 17, 22, 32; lib. viii. ind. i. *Ep.* 3; lib. xiii. ind. vi. *Ep.* 28; Jañé, *R. P.* 796, 890, 891, 915, 916, 918, 974, 1001, 1125, 1513; Ceill. xi. 430, 431.) [C. H.]

MAXIMILLA (1). [MONTANUS (1).]  
(2). [LEUCIUS (1).]

MAXIMINUS (1), ST., an early bishop of Besançon, third in the list of the *Gallia Christiana* (xv. 4), fifth in the *Series* of Gams (p. 514), following after St. Germanus. According to an old codex, he was consecrated by pope Caius (A.D. 283-296), and occupied the see of Besançon six years. But yearning for the solitary life (or, according to others, driven away by the inroads of Germans), he retired to a wood six miles from the city (probably Foucherans), where he shone by the sanctity of his life and his preaching. His day of commemoration at Besançon is May 29, the same as that of his more famous namesake of Trèves. (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 4, 5; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. vii. 35, 36; Richard, *Hist. des Diocèses de Besançon et de Saint-Claude*, i. 15-17; Tillem. iv. 733, x. 464.) [S. A. B.]

MAXIMINUS (2) I., Roman emperor, A.D. 235-238. C. Julius Verus Maximinus is conspicuous as the first barbarian who wore the imperial purple, and as one of the emperors whose names are connected with the ten persecutions recorded by ecclesiastical historians. Born in Thrace of a Gothic father and an Alan mother, eight feet high and of gigantic strength, he attracted the notice of Septimius Severus by throwing sixteen of his strongest soldiers in wrestling combats, and running at full speed so as to beat the emperor's horse, was enlisted by him, and rose under Caracalla to the rank of a centurion. Under MACRINUS and ELAGABALUS he withdrew from public life, but rose into favour with ALEXANDER SEVERUS, and was made a senator and tribune of the fourth legion. His strength and stature and rough soldier-like qualities made him the idol of the army, and in their common speeches he was known as their Hercules, their Milo, or their Ajax. When that emperor, partly through attempting to enforce a more rigid discipline, partly through the parsimony of his mother Mamaea, who persuaded him to reduce their pay, fell into disfavour with



his troops, Maximinus seized his opportunity, and organized a conspiracy, which ended in the murder of Alexander and his mother at Mayence in A.D. 235. The praetorian guards elected him as emperor, and their choice was confirmed by the senate.

The hostility of Maximinus to his Christian subjects probably had its origin in the favour which they had enjoyed from the eclectic or syncretic sympathies of Alexander Severus. They were his friends, and therefore the foes of his successors. They would appear to him, as to other emperors, a secret, and therefore a dangerous, society, the natural focus of conspiracies and plots. The persecution was however limited in its range, and probably was effectual chiefly in removing the restraints which the leanings of Alexander had imposed on the antagonism of the populations and governors of the provinces.

Pontianus bishop of Rome was banished with the presbyter Hippolytus to Sardinia, and died there in A.D. 235, and, according to Baronius (*Ann.* 137, 138), his successor Anteros shared the same fate in A.D. 238. A yet more illustrious teacher, though he did not suffer, was at least affected by the persecution. Origen thought it expedient to seek safety with his friend Firmilianus, bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea. That province was under the government of Serenianus, whom Firmilianus describes (*ap. Cyprian, Ep. 75*) as "*acerbus et dirus persecutor.*" Frequent earthquakes had roused the panic-stricken population to their usual rage against the Christians as the cause of all disasters (*Orig. in Matt. xxiv. 9*), which was all the more keenly felt after the comparatively long tranquillity which they had enjoyed under Alexander Severus and his predecessors. From this retirement Origen addressed two treatises *On Martyrdom* and *On Prayer* to his disciple Ambrosius, a deacon of the church of Alexandria (*Euseb. H. E. vi. 28*) and Protocletus a presbyter of Caesarea, both of whom were taken as prisoners to Germany (*Orig. Exhort. ad Mart. 41*).

The tyranny of Maximin brought about its natural result in the revolt in Mauritania, which for three short months raised the two GORDIANS to the throne of the Caesars. On their murder and the election of Balbinus and Maximus by the senate as their successors, Maximin, whom the tidings of the African revolt had roused to a ferocious frenzy, and who had been proportionately elated by its apparent suppression, made preparations for his defence, and marched from the Danube to the Julian Alps. The obstinate resistance of Aquileia compelled him to turn his assault into a siege, and his troops, suffering from famine and disease, became disaffected. A party of praetorian guards rose against him, and he, with his son and the chief ministers of his tyranny, were slain in his tent. Their heads were cut off and exhibited to the gaze of the citizens of Aquileia on the battlements of its walls, and Maximus and Balbinus were acknowledged by the army as his successors. (*Gibbon, ch. vii. ; Capitolin. Maximini ; Herodian, vii. viii. ; Zonar. xii. 16.*) [E. H. P.]

**MAXIMINUS (3) II. (JOVIUS).** emperor A.D. 305-314. Galerius Valerius Maximinus, to give the full title which supplanted his original name of Daza, played a somewhat prominent part

in the complications that followed on the abdication of DIOCLETIAN and MAXIMIANUS I. Those emperors were succeeded as *Augusti* by GALERIUS, who had married Diocletian's daughter, and CONSTANTIUS, the son-in-law of Maximianus, who had before been Caesar. They in their turn appointed Caesars, and Daza, the nephew of Galerius, was chosen by him, under the name of Maximinus, with Severus as his colleague. On the death of Constantius (A.D. 306) Galerius assigned the provinces beyond the Alps to Constantine, but conferred the vacant title of *Augustus* on Severus, leaving that of Caesar to Constantine and Maximin. Severus, defeated by Maxentius the son of Maximian, was put to death A.D. 307, and the old emperor welcomed Constantine as an ally, gave him his daughter Fausta in marriage, and raised him to the Augustan rank. Galerius, after invading and devastating Italy, invested Licinius with the same imperial title, and assigned Illyricum to his government. Maximin, who was in charge of Syria and Egypt, jealous of this promotion of others to a higher position than his own, and not satisfied with the intermediate title of *Fili Augustorum* offered by Galerius to himself and Constantine by way of compromise, assumed, under the convenient plea that his troops compelled him, the title of Augustus, and added to it the epithet of Jovius, which had been borne before by Diocletian (*Euseb. H. E. viii. 13, ix. 9*). The long list of titles, as Germanicus, Aegyptiacus, Thebaicus, Sarmaticus, which appears in his decrees (*Euseb. H. E. viii. 17*) indicates the same insatiable vanity. The death of Maximin in A.D. 310, and of Galerius in A.D. 311, cleared the stage of two of the six emperors who had together claimed the homage of the Roman world, and left room for new combinations. The first of these, as most natural from their present connexion, was a treaty between Maximin and Licinius, by which their rival claims were for a time adjusted, Maximin receiving the provinces of Asia Minor in addition to Syria and Egypt, and Licinius those of Eastern Europe. Their alliance was, however, but of short duration. Licinius had the wisdom to recognise the superior abilities of Constantine, while Maximin concluded a secret alliance with Maxentius (*Euseb. ix. 6, 10 ; Pseudo-Lactant. De Mort. Pers. i. 36*). The decisive defeat of the latter by Constantine at the battle of the Milvian Bridge in A.D. 312, and the betrothal of Constantine's sister to Licinius, alarmed Maximin, and he determined on immediate action, and marched from Syria to the frontiers of Bithynia. It was still in the early spring, and his army was much weakened by the difficulties of its march. He attacked Byzantium, which yielded after a siege of eleven days, and then led his troops against Heraclea. Here he was encountered by the army of Licinius, and, after a fruitless attempt at negotiations, a battle followed, in which that of Maximin was utterly routed. Christian historians related how they had prepared for battle, the one by vowing to Jupiter that, if successful, he would blot out the name of Christian from the earth, the other by prayer to the God of the Christians that he would bless and prosper him (*De Mort. Pers. c. 46*). The tyrant fled with the haste of panic in the disguise of a slave, and in twenty-four hours reached Nicomedia, 160 miles distant from

the scene of his defeat, and, with his wife and children and a few chosen friends, sought the East, and halted to collect the remnant of his army in Cappadocia (*De Mort. Pers.* c. 47). Licinius followed up his victory by publishing a decree of toleration for the Christians, and followed on the track of Maximinus, who made no attempt at resistance, but crossed the passes of the Taurus and made his way to Tarsus. There, after a few days of despair, which he sought to drown by intoxication, he ended his days by poison. His wife escaped to the further East, but his son and daughter were put to death by Licinius (*De Mort. Pers.* c. 49, 50). As a final insult to his memory all inscriptions to his honour were destroyed and his statues disfigured and thrown from their pedestals (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 11).

The character of Maximin stands forth as pre-eminent for brutal licentiousness and ferocious cruelty, "just hard by hate." No woman, however high her rank, was safe from the former, and in the madness of his passion he sought to force the empress Valeria, the widow of Maximian, who had sought refuge with him after her husband's death, to yield to his desires, and, on her refusal, drove her and her mother, the widow of Diocletian, into exile, confiscated her property, and put her attendants to death (*De Mort. Pers.* c. 38, 39). With these vices there was joined an abject superstition which enslaved him to the counsels of soothsayers and sorcerers, without whose advice he would not stir a step (*Euseb. H. E.* viii. 13). The provinces of Asia, Syria, and Egypt groaned for six years under his oppression, and of all the persecutors who were conspicuous in that last great struggle between the old and the new religion none were so infamous for their cruelties. If he joined for a time, on the advice of the dying Galerius, with Constantine and Licinius in a decree of toleration in A.D. 311, it was only to renew the persecution with greater vigour within a few months (*Euseb. H. E.* viii. 17). The sufferings of the Christians in Alexandria drew the hermit ANTONIUS from his seclusion in the desert to exhort them to steadfastness in the faith. Of the martyrs of Palestine, to whom Eusebius dedicates a whole book of his history, most of them suffered by his orders, and many in his presence. Heralds were sent through Caesarea ordering all men to join in sacrifice to the gods, and on his refusal, Applan, a youth of twenty, was tortured and slain. Ulpian and his brother Aedesius were slain at Tyre, Agapius was thrown into the amphitheatre at Caesarea to fight with a bear, and was so lacerated in the conflict that he died the following day. Theodosia, a virgin of Tyre, was drowned, Silvanus tortured, and the confessors of Phaeno in Palestine sent to the mines (*Euseb. de Mart. Palest.* c. 4). Silvanus, the aged bishop of Emesa, was thrown into a den of wild beasts. Peter bishop of Alexandria, with many others holding the same office, was beheaded (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 6). The church of Antioch supplied yet more illustrious martyrs. On the application of an embassy from that city, headed by Theotecnos, which he himself had prompted, he forbade the Christians to hold their wonted meetings in its catacombs (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 2). Hesychnus and Lucian, the latter a presbyter of the church, famous for his learning and

his saintly life, were summoned to the emperor's presence at Nicomedia, were half starved to death, and then tempted with a luxurious banquet as the price of their apostasy, and on their refusal to deny their faith were thrown into prison and put to death (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 6). In Damascus women of ill repute were seized in the market-place and compelled, under threats of torture, to confess that they were Christians, and had polluted the very churches with their impurities, and their confession was published to excite popular hatred (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 5). Decrees, which Eusebius (*H. E.* ix. 7) copied from a pillar in Tyre, were issued, ascribing the famines and earthquakes and pestilences to the wrath of the gods at the spread of the creed which was denounced as atheistic, and decreeing, as it was alleged, at the request of the Syrians themselves, perpetual banishment against all who adhered to their denial of the state religion. Even the Armenians, though outside the emperor's dominions, and old allies of Rome, were threatened with war, because they too were Christians (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 8), and this at a time when thousands were dying of starvation in consequence of a prolonged famine followed by pestilence. From Nicomedia itself and the neighbouring cities the Christians were banished by an imperial edict, issued, here as elsewhere, as at the request of the citizens themselves (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 9). It was not till after his defeat by Licinius that the tyrant, in the rage of his despair, turned against the priests and prophets and soothsayers who had urged him on, and, as a last resource, within less than a year after his edicts of extermination, issued a decree of toleration, and ordered the restitution of property that had been taken from the Christians and brought into the imperial treasury (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 10).  
[E. H. P.]

MAXIMINUS (4), ST., fifth archbishop of Trèves, between St. Agræcius and St. Paulinus (circ. A.D. 332-349), is known to us from the part he played in the history of Athanasius. In Feb. 336 the latter was banished by the emperor Constantine to Trèves, then the seat of government of his eldest son Constantine II. Maximin received him with honour, became his zealous partisan and friend, and was thenceforth numbered among the champions of orthodoxy in the West (Hieronimus, *Chronicon*, an. 346, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xxvii. 682; Athanasius, *Epist. ad Episc. Aegypt.* § 8; *Apologia ad Imp. Const.* § 3, ed. Benedict. i. 278, 297; Hilarius, *Hist. Frag.* ii. ed. Maff. ii. 634, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 644). For the probable influence of Athanasius's sojourn on the struggle between Arianism and orthodoxy, and the growth of monasticism in the West, see Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 187-8. Athanasius left Trèves in June 338, and two years later Maximin was called upon to entertain and assist in like manner Paul, the banished bishop of Constantinople. His efforts resulted in the restoration of the exile to his see in A.D. 341. The following year a deputation of four Arian bishops arrived at Trèves with the design of winning over Constantine to their views. They brought a creed of compromise, which they hoped would find acceptance, but Maximin, meeting them with inflexible hostility, refused them communion, and was mainly instrumental in

securing the rejection of their proposals (Hilarius, *Hist. Frag.* iii. ed. Maff. ii. 662-663, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 674-675). In 343 Maximin was present at the council of Milan (*Hist. Litt. de la France.* i. B. 111). Whether he was also at the great council of Sardica, held in 343 or 344, is not quite certain, but he was among the number of those who assented to its decisions (Athanasius, *Apol. contr. Arianos*, § 50, ed. Benedict. i. 168; Hilarius, *ibid.* ii. 647 in *Patr. Lat.* 659. As to the date of this council see ATHANASIUS, tom. i.). The prominent part he bore in the conflict with Arianism is manifest from the special excommunication pronounced against him at the heretical council of Philippopolis held by the seceders from that of Sardica (Hilar. *Hist. Frag.* iii. 27, ed. Maff. ii. 662-3). Nothing later is known of his life unless, which is improbable, he was the Maximus who, with Servatius and others, was sent by Magnentius, the murderer of Constans, on a mission to Constantius in 350 (Athanasius, *Apol. ad Imp. Const.* § 9, ed. Benedict. i. 300; Baron. *Ann.* 350, xxviii.; Rettberg, i. 187).

Maximin's cult was established from very early times. On the 29th of May his name appears in the martyrologies of Hieronymus (*Patr. Lat.* xxx. 459), Bede (*ibid.* xciv. 930), and many others, ancient and modern (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. vii.). Though most of them commemorate it as the day of his death, it really represented that of the supposed translation of his body from Aquitaine to Trèves. Sept. 12 is that assigned to his death (Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Mai. 29). To Gregory of Tours he was the patron and guardian of the city of Trèves (*Hist. Franc.* i. 35; *Vitæ Patr.* xvii. 4), and his shrine in one of the suburbs was famous for its miracles, especially those wrought to vindicate the sanctity of oaths and for the punishment of the perjured (*De Glor. Conf.* xciii.; *Vitæ Patr.* *ibid.*). The legends that collected round his name are embodied in two biographies, one written by an anonymous monk of St. Maximin in the 8th century, and to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. vii. 21-25, the other by a Lupus usually believed to be the abbat of Ferrières in the 9th century, but in the opinion of Ceillier (xii. 511) and others, Lupus bishop of Châlons. It has been published among others by Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxix. 665-680. According to their story, Maximin was a native of Poitou, and had for brothers Maxentius bishop of Poitiers, Maximus, and Jovinus, and for sister Maxima. Drawn to Trèves by the favour of St. Agriculus, or Agræcius, he was ordained by him, and on his death succeeded him in the see. Against the Arian heresy, then in the ascendant, he boldly contended and suffered much persecution, and particularly he summoned a council at Cologne, which judged and condemned Euphratas, the bishop of that city, who denied the divinity of Christ. (This council, always suspected from the fact that the condemned bishop figures among the orthodox prelates at Sardica about a year afterwards, is now admitted to be fictitious; see Baron. *Ann.* 346. vii. seqq.; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 131.) After many years, filled with miraculous works, he visited Rome in company with St. Martin, who on their return commended to him for instruction a youth named Lubentius (afterwards canonized, Oct. 13). At length, seized with the desire of revisiting his

kindred, he died in Aquitaine after an episcopate of seventeen years and thirty days, and was buried there. His successor, Paulinus, and his fellow-citizens of Trèves, sent a deputation which brought back the body amid numerous miracles to Trèves, where it was buried in the church of St. John.

The early history of the famous monastery of St. Maximin is unknown. The earliest authentic information relating to it, after the allusions of Gregory of Tours, is the assertion of Maximin's anonymous biographer that Hildulfus, archbishop of the see, moved the coffin from its original crypt to the place where it rested in his time, owing to an influx of water, and enlarged the monastery to hold one hundred monks (cap. ii. § 9; Boll. *ibid.* p. 23; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 386). The first unimpeachable document is a grant of property by king Arnolphus, cir. Jan. 23, 888 (Hontheim, *ibid.* p. 226). For the history of this monastery see *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 523 seqq.; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 474).

The passage above cited from Athanasius's *Epistola ad Episc. Aegypt.* § 8, i. 278) has been thought to imply that Maximin was the author of some writings against the Arians. If it was so they have not been preserved, nor is there found any other allusion to them (*Hist. Litt.* i. B. 112). [S. A. B.]

**MAXIMINUS (5)**, Donatist bishop of Sinita, or Castellum Sinitense, a town in Numidia, not far from Hippo Regius, of whom St. Augustine, who was then only a presbyter, heard that he had rebaptized a young deacon of Mutugena, a small town near Hippo. In order to ascertain the truth of the story, Augustine went to Mutugena, and heard on enquiry that the young man had been admitted to the diaconate among the Donatists, but not certainly that he had been rebaptized. He therefore wrote to Maximinus, to ask whether it were true, entreating him in the most solemn way to send such an answer as he might read publicly to his congregation at Hippo. Of the result of this appeal we are ignorant. He appears to have been one of the delegates sent by the Donatist community to Italy for the purpose of pleading their cause before the emperor Honorius at Ravenna, A.D. 406, but soon after his return to have left them and become a Catholic, though retaining his see of Sinita. This change so exasperated his former associates, that they proclaimed in the town that the house of any one who communicated with him should be set on fire. He was a member of the council of Zerta, A.D. 412, by which a remonstrance was sent to the Donatist party in general. (*Aug. Ep.* 23; 88, 9, 10; 105, 4; 141; *Civ. D.* 22, 8, 6, 11; *Carth. Coll.* iii. 141; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 30; Ribbeck, *Aug. und Don.* pp. 319, 320.) [H. W. P.]

**MAXIMINUS (6)**, Arian bishop of Hippo Regius, who had come with the Gothic soldiers into Africa A.D. 427, 428, and held a discussion with St. Augustine on the subject of the Trinity. He said that he had come not to provoke discussion, but in order to promote peace, at the request of Segisvultus count of Africa, who had been sent by Valentinian to oppose Bonifacius. He had been challenged to discussion by Eraclius (Vol. II. p. 170), who called in the aid of August-

tine and now he wished to reply, but in so doing to confine himself to scriptural authority. The discussion was held in public, and at its conclusion Maximinus declared himself obliged to return to Carthage. Augustine therefore at a later time replied at length to his arguments in two books, which, as well as the one which contains the discussion, exhibit the arguments in favour of the Arian doctrine and against it. We might say that the line of argument taken by Augustine resembles so strongly that which is expressed in the formula which we call the Athanasian creed that if this were lost it might almost be supplied from the language of Augustine in this treatise. (Aug. *Coll. cum Max. and Contra Mar.* i. ii. *Opp.* vol. viii. p. 719–810, ed. Migne; *Vit. Poss.* 17; Ceillier, vol. ix. 359–361.) On the claims of Maximinus to the authorship of the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaicum* see PSEUDOCHRYSOSTOMUS. [H. W. P.]

**MAXIMUS (1), MARCUS CLODIUS PAPIENUS**, Roman emperor from cir. Ap.–Aug. 238, the colleague of Decimus Caelius Balbinus. [BALBINUS in *Dic. G. & R. Biog.*] [C. H.]

**MAXIMUS (2) (MAGNUS MAXIMUS)**, Christian emperor in the West, A.D. 383–388. There is apparently no authority for the names Flavius or Clemens sometimes given to him. On coins and inscriptions the name is simply Magnus Maximus. 1. *Authorities.* 2. *History.* 3. *Legend.*

1. *Authorities.*—Besides the narratives of the regular historians, of whom Zosimus (iv. 35–46) contains the most original matter, special notices are found in St. Ambrose, *Ep.* 24 (narrative of his embassies), 20, § 23, and 40, § 23; Symmachus, *Ep.* ii. 31; Sulpicius Severus, almost contemporary, *Chron.* ii. 49–51, *Vita S. Martini*, 20, *Dialogus*, ii. 6, iii. 11; in the heathen Pacatus, *Panegyricus Theodosio*, 24 foll. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* tom. xiii.); Ausonius, *Ordo nobilium urb., de Aquileia*, &c. Baronius, s. a. 387, §§ 33–36, gives the long letter of Maximus to Valentinian II., and §§ 65, 66 that to Siricius on the case of Agricus and on the Priscillianists. The part relating to Agricus is also given by Hänel, *Corpus legum ab inp. lat. extra codices* (Lips. 1847, s. a. 385, p. 230). As Maximus was considered a usurper, no laws of his appear in the codes, cf. *Cod. Theod.* xv. 14, 7, *de injurmandis his quae sub tyrannis aut barbaris gestu sunt*, Milan, Oct. 10, 388. Coins of himself and of his son Fl. Victor are not very scarce; but other monuments of the reign are rare. No public inscriptions with his name are found, it would seem, in Britain or at Rome, but milestones bearing it are extant in Spain and Northern Italy, and as far south as Meli (Mommson. *Inscr. reja. Neap.* 6300, 6301 a. = Wilmanns 824). The inscriptions of Gaul are not yet collected.

The best modern books are De Broglie, *l'Église et l'Empire au Vme Siècle*, Paris, 1866, vol. vi. and H. Richter, *Weströmische Reich*, Berlin, 1865, pp. 568 foll., cp. T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, Oxford, 1880, vol. i. pp. 147–155.

2. *History.*—Magnus Maximus was a Spaniard by birth (Zos. iv. 35) and a dependant of the family of Theodosius, with whom he served in Britain. It is said that envy of the success of his old comrade and chief excited his ambition. In the year 383 he was proclaimed emperor by

the soldiers in Britain, where he held some sort of command, but apparently not a very high one. He afterwards tried to cloak his usurpation under pretext of yielding to the pressure of the army (Oros. vii. 34; Sulp. Sev. *Vita S. Martini*, 20), but such protestations are generally not very trustworthy. At any rate, when once he attained power he shewed no desire except to increase it. He landed in Gaul at the mouth of the Rhine, and was met by the army of Gratian somewhere near Paris. The troops came over to him, and Maximus suddenly found himself in possession of the western provinces. Gratian was killed at Lyons, Aug. 25, and, as was generally reported, by the orders of Maximus himself [GRATIANUS, p. 724 b], and his generals Balio and Merobaudes also perished miserably. The Western empire was thus in great danger, since Valentinian II. was a mere weak boy, and Theodosius was occupied in the East. It shews the ascendancy of St. Ambrose, that he was chosen by the empress mother, Justina, to treat for peace at this difficult crisis (S. Ambr. *Ep.* 24, §§ 3, 5, 7). At the same time Marcellinus, brother of Maximus, was sent with politic clemency to the court of Treves. By these means a peace was made, and Maximus was acknowledged as Augustus and sovereign of the Gauls, side by side with Valentinian and Theodosius. The coins with the legend CONCORDIA AVGGG, i.e. trium Augustorum, struck at Treves and Constantinople, commemorate this peace (Cohen, *Med. imp.* vol. vi. pp. 463, 464).

This state of things lasted for some years, during which Maximus, who had been baptized just before his usurpation, busied himself much with church affairs, being desirous to obtain a reputation for the strictest orthodoxy. The character of the man is not clear. Richter paints him merely as a crafty, avaricious, and ambitious hypocrite, and this is not far from being the opinion of De Broglie. This is no doubt a view to which the facts easily lend themselves. It is remarkable, however, that the Western writers, Sulpicius Severus and Orosius, though treating Maximus as a usurper, give him, on the whole, a good character, Sulpicius making exception on the score of his persecution of the Priscillianists and his love of money (Sulp. *Dial.* ii. 6; Oros. vii. 34). It seems not unlikely then that Maximus was in general an able and popular ruler, at least in his own dominions, giving his subjects what they most wanted, some feeling of security and peace. With regard, however, to his treatment of the Priscillianists, we cannot be wrong in following the censure passed upon these proceedings by pope Siricius (Synod of Turin, A.D. 401, can. 6, Hefele, *Councils*, § 113), St. Ambrose, and St. Martin of Tours. Ambrose, indeed, was a political opponent, but Maximus courted Siricius, and was very obsequious to Martin. These heretics, who held a mixture of Gnostic, Manichaean, and Sabellian opinions (see the propositions condemned by the council of Toledo, Hefele, § 167), had been condemned by a synod held at Saragossa in 380. Gratian, in his last days, had shewn them some slight favour, by referring their cause to the vicar of Spain instead of the praetorian praefect of the Gauls, in consequence of a bribe administered to Macedonius master of the offices (Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* ii. 49). Their

opponents Ithacius bishop of Ossonuba, and Idacius, or Ydacius, bishop of Emerita, found in Maximus a more ready instrument of persecution. The Priscillianists were ordered to appear before a synod at Bordeaux in 384, where one of their chiefs, the bishop Instantius, was condemned as unworthy of the episcopal office. Priscillianus himself denied the competency of the synod, and appealed to the emperor. St. Martin besought him to abstain from bloodshed, and to remit the case to ecclesiastical judges. Ithacius, who was the most vehement of their accusers, did not hesitate to charge Martin himself with Priscillianism, but, for a time, the better influence prevailed, and Maximus promised that no lives should be taken. After Martin's departure, however, other bishops persuaded Maximus to remit the case to a secular judge, Evodius, and finally the emperor condemned Priscillianus and his companions, including a rich widow Euchrocia [EUCHROCIA], to be beheaded. Instantius and some others were exiled. A second synod, held at Treves in 385, approved by a majority the conduct of Ithacius, and urged Maximus to further measures of confiscation towards all members of the sect. St. Martin returned in order to intercede for some of his friends, and for the sake of gaining this good end communicated with the faction of Ithacius, who were then consecrating a bishop. It is perhaps at this time that we may place the curious anecdote of Martin's consenting to be fed and waited upon by the devout empress, the only instance in which he held near converse with a woman (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* ii. 6, cp. 7, § 2, "ut clausos carcere liberaret, exiliis datos restitueret, bona adempta rehiberet"). Whatever motives first dictated this injurious and fatal policy on the part of Maximus, there can be no doubt that he wished to be regarded as a champion of catholicity, and to use this merit as a political instrument. As early as the year 385 he seems to have written to pope Siricius, professing his ardent love of the Catholic faith, offering to refer the case of a priest Agricus, whom the pope complained of as wrongly ordained, to ecclesiastical judges anywhere within his dominions, and enclosing the acts or official reports of the case of "the Manichaeans," i.e. the Priscillianists. (This letter is only given at length by Baronius, s. a. 387, §§ 65, 66; cp. Tillemont, *Les Priscillianistes*, art. 10. The part about Agricus is given by Hänel, s. a. 385, from other MSS., thus confirming the genuineness of the letter.) At the beginning of the year 387, the struggle about the Basilicas gave him a pretext for interfering on the Catholic side with the court of Milan, a proceeding which he may well have thought would have gained him the sympathy of his old opponent St. Ambrose. He wrote a threatening letter to Valentinian II., which we still possess, bidding him desist from the persecution of the church (Soz. vii. 13; Theod. v. 14. This letter is given only by Baronius, s. a. 387, § 33-36 foll., cp. Tillemont, *Saint Ambroise*, art. 48. Its genuineness seems not absolutely certain). Justina, in this emergency, was again ready enough to use the political skill and intrepidity of St. Ambrose, whose loyalty was unshaken by the struggle through which he had passed, and whose disinterestedness was universally recognised. Ambrose went on a second embassy to Maximus, of

which he has left us a lively record in his 24th epistle. He set out, it seems, after that memorable Easter which witnessed the baptism of St. Augustine, and found the emperor at Treves. His high spirit and sincerity seems to have disappointed Maximus, who found fault with him for acting against his interest, and accused count Bauto of turning barbarians upon his territory. At the same time he refused to restore the remains of Gratian, which still remained unburied, thus clearly shewing that his mind was made up for war. The last offence was given by Ambrose's refusal to communicate with the Ithacians, and the emperor suddenly commanded him to depart (cp. *Ep.* 24, § 3, for his judgment on this party). On his return to Milan he warned Valentinian to prepare for war, but his wise councils were disregarded. A second ambassador Dominus was sent, and was entirely taken in by the soft words of Maximus, who persuaded him that Valentinian had no better friend than himself, and cajoled him into taking back into Italy a part of his army, under pretence of serving against the barbarians, who were invading Pannonia. Having thus cleverly got his soldiers across the Alps, he followed with all speed in person, and entered Italy as an invader (Zos. iv. 42). Justina and her son and daughters fled to Theodosius at Thessalonica. Maximus was thus left in possession of Italy, and shewed some change of religious policy, by the order sent to Rome to rebuild a Jewish synagogue recently burned by the Christians (St. Amb. *Ep.* 40, § 23). The fact that he listened readily to a panegyric pronounced by Symmachus is, however, no more proof that he had any leanings to heathenism, than the orations pronounced by other heathen panegyrists, such as Themistias and Pacatus, upon other Christian emperors (Tillemont's criticism on Baronius—*Theodose*, art. 43, *Empereurs*, vol. v. p. 293—applies by anticipation to De Broglie, vol. vi. p. 236, who cannot resist the temptation to make a point).

The details of the campaign that followed belong to secular history. Theodosius defeated the troops of Maximus at Siscia and Petovio, and seized the emperor himself at Aquileia, where he was put to death, after some form of trial (Zos. iv. 46; Pacatus, 43, 44) on 25th July, or 28th August, 388, after a reign of rather more than five years—the "lustrale justitium" of Pacatus's panegyric of this emperor.

His son Victor, whom he had named Augustus, was put to death shortly after. Andragathius, his able general, who was accused of the murder of Gratian, threw himself into the Adriatic. It is not said what became of Marcellinus, who had been defeated at Petovio.

3. *Legend.*—The connexion of Maximus with Britain is obscure, but it has given rise to a considerable aftergrowth of legend. He is called "Rutupinus latro" by Ausonius, perhaps merely because he started from Richborough to invade Gaul. Welsh tradition has incorporated him into its genealogies of saints and royal heroes, under the name of Macsen Wledig, or Guledig, a title considered to be equivalent to imperator. (See H. Rowland's *Mona Antiqua Restaurata* p. 166 foll., ed. 2, London, 1766, and cp. Skene's *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. i. pp. 45, 48, vol. ii. 405. He is usually called *Macsen*, which

rather suggests a confusion with Maxentius, but Skene quotes his Welsh name also as *Maxim*, i. p. 48.) The "dream of Maxen Wledig" in the *Mabinogion* (ed. Guest, vol. iii, pp. 263-294, Lond. 1849) represents him as already emperor of Rome, and brought to Britain by a dream of a royal maiden Helen Luyddawe or Luyddog, daughter of Eudav (= Octavius?) of Caer Segont, or Carnarvon, and then returning after seven years with his brother-in-law Kynan to reconquer his old dominions. Another mythical account describes Kynan as raising an army of sixty thousand men, who afterwards settled in Armorica. The desolation of Britain thus left the country exposed to the attacks of the Picts and Saxons (cp. *Mabinogion*, l. c. pp. 29 foll., R. Rees, *Essay on Welsh Saints*, pp. 104, 105, Lond. 1836; Nennius, *Hist. Brit.* § 23). A further development of the legend represents St. Ursula and her company of virgins as sent out as wives for these emigrated hosts. The term *Sarn Helen* applied to Roman roads in North Wales is also explained as referring to the wife of Maximus.

It is difficult to say what historical facts may be at the bottom of this. That the withdrawal of Roman troops by Maximus exposed Britain to invasion is an obvious fact, and is already asserted by Gildas (*Historia*, cc. 10, 11). The colonisation of Armorica by some of his auxiliaries is also possible enough. On the other hand, the name of Helen may merely be borrowed from the mother of Constantine, and *Sarn Helen* may be explained as *Sarn-y-lleu*, "the legion's causeway," just as the story of the cutting out the tongues of the women of Armorica by Kynan's soldiers appears to be only an etymological myth to explain the name Llydaw applied to that country. (For further references, see R. Williams, *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Welshmen*, Llandoverly, 1852, art. *Maxen Wledig*.) [J. W.]

**MAXIMUS (3), PETRONIUS**, emperor of the West, A.D. 455. He was a descendant of the Maximus who usurped the empire in the time of Gratian (Procopius, *Bell. Vand.* i. 4). He belonged to one of the noblest and wealthiest families of Rome, was three times prefect of the city and twice consul. To avenge the insult his wife had received from Valentinian III. (see Procopius above quoted), he caused him to be assassinated in the Campus Martius by two barbarians, officers of Aetius, though he himself is accused by Marcellinus (*Chronicon* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 929) and Procopius of having instigated the murder of that general. This event took place on March 16 or 17, A.D. 455. Maximus then seized on the vacant throne, and compelled Eudoxia, the widow of Valentinian, to marry him a few days after her husband's death, his own wife having died a short time before. She also gave her daughter Eudocia to his son Palladius, whom he created Caesar (Idatius, *Chronicon* in *Patr. Lat.* li. 884). The outraged Eudoxia summoned Genseric the king of the Vandals as her avenger and deliverer. Her invitation was gladly accepted by Genseric, who sailed with a mighty armament for Rome. On his approach Maximus endeavoured to fly, but the people and soldiery, headed by Valentinian's officers, rose against him, stoned him, tore him limb from limb, and flung his mangled body into the river. June 12, 455, was probably the date of his

death (*Chronicon Cuspinianum*), so that he reigned rather less than three months. The dates, however, of the duration of his reign given by different authors are irreconcilable, but the above seems the most probable conclusion. The whole question is discussed at length by Tillemont in a note (*Emp.* vi. 628). A fragment of one of Maximus's Novels, *De Summa Siliquatici*, is preserved in the Theodosian Code (iii. 266, Bonn ed.), but in so mutilated and corrupt a form as to be unintelligible. The *Siliquaticum* was a tax of a *siliqua* (1-24th of a *solidus*) levied on every sale in the markets and payable in equal shares by the buyer and the seller (Ducange, *Glossar.* s. v.) [F. D.]

**MAXIMUS (4)**. Eusebius, in his Chronicle, counts one Maximus 19th and another 26th bishop of Jerusalem. It appears to be only a transcriber's error that the second of these is omitted in the list (*Ecol. Hist.* v. 12). Eusebius owns himself unable to give the dates of these bishops. We may guess the former about 165 and the latter about 185. [G. S.]

**MAXIMUS (5) I. (MAXIMINUS, MAXIMIANUS)**, bishop of Antioch towards the close of the 2nd century. Eusebius places him seventh in order from the apostles, between Theophilus and Serapion (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 24). Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, places his accession A.D. 178. Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus*, ii. 702), who is followed by Neale (*Patriarchate of Antioch*), places it A.D. 186, and his death in A.D. 199. [E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (6)**, African lapsed schismatic of the party of Felicissimus—Cyp. *Ep.* 59 xiii. (11). He and Jovinus who accompanied PRIVATUS, the late bishop of Lambaese and "vetus haereticus," to ask for re-hearing at the council of A. D. 252 at Carthage, had been most likely bishops both, as they had been condemned first by nine bishops and then excommunicated by council of 251 A.D. Often confounded by narrators and indices with Maximus (7). [E. W. B.]

**MAXIMUS (7)**, Novatianist Roman presbyter, sent by Novatian with Augendus a deacon, Machaeus, and Longinus to announce to Cyprian and his colleagues the election of Novatian as antipope—Cyp. *Ep.* 44, which gives the account of their reception. *Ep.* 50: after this defeat Maximus is made Novatianist bishop of Carthage. *Ep.* 59: sent to Carthage *nuper* (A.D. 251), spoken of as consecrated *nunc* (*Ep.* 59 xi.) in a letter written after Id. Mai. A.D. 252, as appears by *Ep.* 59, xiii. [E. W. B.]

**MAXIMUS (8)**, Numidian bishop addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* 62 [JANUARIUS (1)] and Cyp. *Ep.* 70. (Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bapt. Haer.* 1.) [E. W. B.]

**MAXIMUS (9)**, bishop of Alexandria, fourteenth "successor of St. Mark," had been a presbyter under bishop Dionysius. During the Decian persecution, after Dionysius had been carried away by some Christians of Marcotis into Libya, Maximus with three other presbyters "kept themselves concealed in Alexandria, secretly carrying on the oversight of the brethren" (Dionys. to Domitius and Didymus, ap. Euseb. vii. 11). Familiar as they must have been with all the intricate "lanes" of the "vast

city," it is surprising that their ministrations were undetected by the inquisitorial severity of the local government, which found victims among the virgins of the church (see Euseb. vi. 41). Seven years later, when Valerian's persecution began, we find Maximus attending his bishop (who calls him his "fellow presbyter") to the tribunal of the prefect Aemilianus, as involved with him, and three deacons and a Roman lay Christian, in the charge of contumacious rejection of the gods who had "preserved the emperor's sovereignty," and whose worship was in accordance with "natural" law. He was included in the sentence of banishment which transported Dionysius to Cephro in the Libyan frontier, where he shared in the rough reception which the heathen inhabitants gave to the bishop, and also assisted him in the preaching which ere long won over "not a few" of them to "the word then sown among them for the first time." After a while, the party were removed to Colluthion, a place exposed to "molestations" of various kinds, as Dionysius well knew; and when for a moment his heart sank at the prospect, Maximus was probably the first to remind him that this unattractive spot was much nearer to Alexandria: "We shall see our dear friends of the city much oftener, and our services will be like those which might be held in one of the suburbs" (Euseb. vii. 11). Maximus would have shared in his bishop's sorrows amid the siege of that part of Alexandria which was held by Aemilianus—then in revolt against Gallienus, and suffered in consequence great scarcity—and amid the horrors of a pestilence which outlasted this civil war (Euseb. vii. 32, 21, 22), nor could he fail to partake in those other anxieties which were caused by the Sabellian controversy, and by the distressing news of the heresy of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch. When Dionysius, "worn out with years," died in the early part of 265 (in March according to Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 395; and February according to Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 39, 83), Maximus was appropriately elected to succeed him, and appears as holding the second see in the church—for as such the "Evangelical throne" was reckoned until the council of 381—in the address of the circular sent by the council of Antioch, in 269, to "Dionysius" (of Rome) "and Maximus, and to all our fellow ministers," after the final condemnation of the heretical Paul. A letter "of Felix bishop of Rome" (A.D. 269-274) "to Maximus," explicitly asserting that Christ was the Eternal Son of God, and God incarnate, not a distinct human person "assumed" by the Son or Word, was read in the first session of the council of Ephesus (Mansi, *Conc.* iv. 1188), and connects itself naturally with the same question. Maximus died on Sunday the 14th of Pharmuthi or 9th of April, 282 (Le Quien, ii. 396), and was succeeded by Theonas.

[W. B.]

MAXIMUS (10), bishop of Jerusalem, the fortieth in succession from the Apostles. He succeeded Macarius on his death, 336 A.D. He had been a confessor in one of the persecutions (*ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας διαρπέδας ἀγῶσι*) (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 26),—according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 12) that of Maximian—in which he had suffered grievous bodily mutilation, losing one

eye, and having the sinews of one arm and one thigh severed while still serving as a presbyter in the church of Jerusalem. According to Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. 20), Macarius his predecessor had appointed him to the see of Diospolis (Lydda); but Maximus was regarded with such reverence at Jerusalem, that on his appointment becoming known the feeling of dissatisfaction was so strong as to threaten a popular commotion. To still the excitement Macarius resolved to appoint another bishop to Lydda, and to retain Maximus at Jerusalem as his coadjutor and eventual successor. He was strengthened in this resolution by his conviction of Maximus's orthodoxy, and his fear that on his death Eusebius and Patrophilus would make a successful attempt to get an Arian appointed as his successor (Soz. *H. E.* ii. 20). Sozomen adds (but his authority without other support is but feeble) that these two prelates did make such an attempt in Macarius's lifetime, but that they were induced to abstain, at least for a time, by excommunication, or the threat of it (*ib.*). The whole story is discredited by Tillemont (*Mém. Ecclés.* vi. 747; *Note sur les Ariens*, xiv.), on the ground that there could have been no vacancy of the see of Lydda at that time; Aetius, who held that bishopric at the council of Nicaea, being certainly alive A.D. 332, and probably A.D. 349; and also from the unlikelihood of Macarius having, so soon after the passing of the seventh Nicene canon, usurped the rights of the metropolitan in consecrating a bishop in his province. Maximus appears to have been a man of no strength of character, honest but timid, whose simplicity made him the tool of the stronger and more designing. His career is consequently not marked with much consistency. He attended the council of Tyre, A.D. 335, being admitted to a seat, together with Marcellus of Ancyra, Asclepas of Gaza, and others, as among the least committed to the cause of Athanasius, whose presence would give an air of impartiality to its deliberations, whom, also for their close vicinity, it would not have been decent to exclude (De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, ii. 326).

The part he took at this council is variously represented. According to Socrates (*H. E.* ii. 8) and Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 6), he assented to the deposition of Athanasius; his simplicity and easiness of character having blinded him to the machinations of the enemies of orthodoxy, by whom he had been unfavourably prejudiced against its great champion. Rufinus, however (*H. E.* i. 17), records the dramatic incident that the aged confessor Paphnutius of the Thebaid, whose mutilated form had attracted so much attention at Nicaea, when he saw Maximus vacillating took him by the hand and led him over to the small band of Athanasius's supporters, saying that it did not become those who bore the tokens of their sufferings for the faith to consort with its adversaries. Sozomen, who here, as elsewhere, is not consistent with himself, records the same incident (*H. E.* ii. 25).<sup>a</sup> We know little of the part taken by Maximus in the Arian troubles between the council of Tyre, A.D. 335, and that

<sup>a</sup> Tillemont's careful examination of the whole question of Maximus's conduct at this council deserves to be referred to (*Mém. Ecclés.* vol. vi. pp. 747-8, *Notes sur les Ariens*, xv.).



of Sardica. But it is difficult to see how he could fail to be compromised when the solemn recognition of Arius was made by the two hundred bishops assembled for the dedication of Constantine's church at the council of Jerusalem. If he had refused complicity in these proceedings it could hardly fail to have been recorded. The silence of all historians throws doubt on Rufinus's statement that Maximus remained always faithful to the cause of Athanasius. A decided return to a better mind is manifested by his refusal to attend the council of the Dedication assembled by the Eusebians at Antioch, A.D. 341, at which the sentence of the council of Tyre against Athanasius, to which he had been an assenting party, was confirmed. On this occasion he had been put on his guard in time; and, conscious of his weakness, discreetly kept away, fearing lest he might, as at Tyre, be carried away (*συναρπαγείς*) against his will, and led to acquiesce in measures of which he would afterwards have cause to repent (*Socr. H. E. ii. 8; Soz. H. E. iii. 6*). At Sardica Maximus was once more found on the orthodox side, and his name stands first of the Palestinian bishops who signed the synodical letters (Athanas. *Apolog. I. ad Const.* p. 768). A little later he proved how completely he had repented of his former vacillation by the welcome he gave to Athanasius when passing through Jerusalem on his way to resume his seat at Alexandria. He summoned an assemblage of bishops to do honour to his distinguished visitor, by the whole of whom, with two or three exceptions, he was solemnly received into communion. Congratulatory letters on the recovery of their chief pastor were written to the Egyptian bishops, and Maximus was the first to affix his signature (*Socr. H. E. ii. 24; Soz. H. E. 21, 22; Athanas. Apol. I. ad Const.* p. 775; *Hist. Arian. ad Solit.* § 25; *Labbe, Concil.* ii. 92, 625, 679). According to the very questionable story given by Sozomen (*H. E. iv. 203*), the decided part taken by Maximus in support of Athanasius so extremely irritated Acacius, his metropolitan, and Patrophilus, that they succeeded in deposing him and placed Cyril, who at that time was little more than one of the better sort of semi-Arians, in his place. Jerome's statement is on all accounts to be preferred, that Maximus died in possession of his bishopric A.D. 350 or 351, and that it was then that Cyril was appointed to the vacant see. Cyril having been ordained deacon probably by Macarius, had been advanced to the priesthood by Maximus, by whom he was entrusted with the instruction of the catechumens and the delivery of catechetical lectures in the church of the Holy Cross [*CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, Vol. I. p. 760 b*]. A portion of a treatise, "Concerning Matter," written by a Maximus, who may probably be identified with the subject of this article, is found in the *Præparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius, lib. vii. c. 22, pp. 337-346. A translation is given in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Clark's Series), vol. xxii. [E. V.]

MAXIMUS (11), the Cynic; the intrusive bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 380. Ecclesiastical history hardly presents a more extraordinary career than that of this man, who, after a most disreputable youth, more than once brought to

justice for his misdeeds, and bearing the scars of his punishments, by sheer impudence, clever flattery, and adroit management of opportunities, contrived to gain the confidence successively of no less men than Peter of Alexandria, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, and to instal himself in one of the first sees of the church, from which he was with difficulty dislodged by a decree of an oecumenical council. His history also illustrates the jealousy felt by the churches of Alexandria and Rome towards their young and vigorous rival for patriarchal honours, the church of Constantinople; as well as their claim to interfere with her government, and to impose prelates upon her according to their pleasure. Alexandria, as the chief see of the Eastern world, from the first asserted a jurisdiction which she has never formally relinquished over the see of Constantinople, more particularly in a vacancy in the episcopate (Neale, *Patr. of Alexandria*, i. 206). The conduct of Peter, the successor of Athanasius, first in instituting Gregory Nazianzen bishop of Constantinople by his letters (*πρώτον μὲν ἡμᾶς ἐγκαθίστα γράμμασιν*) and sending a formal recognition of his appointment (*συμβόλαις ἐπίμα τῆς ἰδρύσεως*—*Greg. Naz. u.s.*), and then in substituting Maximus, as has been remarked by Milman (*History of Christianity*, iii. 115 note) and Ullman (*Greg. Naz. p. 203*, Cox's translation), furnish unmistakable indications of the desire to erect an Oriental papacy, by establishing the primacy of Alexandria over Constantinople and so over the East, which was still further illustrated a few years later by the high-handed behaviour of Theophilus towards Chrysostom.

Maximus was a native of Alexandria\* of low parentage. He boasted that his family had produced martyrs. He got instructed in the rudiments of the Christian faith and received baptism, but strangely enough sought to combine the Christian profession with Cynic philosophy. Gregory describes him as having had no regular occupation, but loitering about in the streets, like a shameless dog, foul and greedy (*κύνων, κυνίσκος, ἀμόδων ὑπέρτης*). More than once he earned a flogging for his misdeeds, and he was finally banished to the Oasis. We hear of him next at Corinth, with a high reputation for religion, leading about a band of females—"the swan of the flock"—under colour of devotion (*Carm. cxlviii. p. 450*). Soon after Gregory Nazianzen had taken up his residence in that city Maximus shifted his quarters to Constantinople. Gregory devotes a considerable number of the biting iambics of his poem, *De Vita Sua*, to this man, from which, as well as from his exaggerated panegyric, we gather that Maximus when he presented himself at the Eastern capital wore the white robe of a Cynic, and carried a philosopher's staff, his head being laden with a huge crop of crisp curling hair, dyed a golden yellow, and swinging over his shoulders in long ringlets. He represented himself as a confessor for the Nicene faith, and his banish-

\* Jerome tersely sums up the strange history of this episcopal pretender to philosophy and orthodoxy: "Maximus philosophus, natus Alexandriae, Constantinopoli episcopus ordinatus, expulsus, insignem de fide adversus Arianos scripsit librum quem Mediolani Gratiano principi dedit" (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 127).

ment to the Oasis as a suffering for the truth (*Orat.* xxiii. p. 419). Before long he completely gained the ear and heart of Gregory, who admitted him to the closest companionship. Maximus proclaimed the most unbounded admiration for Gregory's discourses, which he praised in private, and, according to the custom of the age, applauded in public. His zeal against heretics was most fierce, and his denunciations of them uncompromising. The simple-hearted Gregory became the complete dupe of Maximus. So blinded was the bishop to his real character, that he adopted the extraordinary step of delivering a panegyric oration, in the man's own presence, in full church, before the celebration of the Eucharist, inviting him to stand by his side and receive the crown of victory. This oration bears the name of Hero. Whether Maximus had this second name is uncertain. Jerome asserts that the editors of Gregory sought to hide the fact of his having thus fulsomely praised one whom not long afterwards he so violently denounced, by putting a false name at the head of the discourse (*Hieron. de Vir. Illust.* c. 117). Gregory apostrophized Maximus as the noblest of philosophers, nay, he would add, and most perfect of martyrs, who proved his philosophy by listening unmoved to his own praises, of which, as of all earthly honours, he was utterly careless. He was a glorious example of the union of philosophy and faith. After attributing to him every possible virtue, he appealed to him in impassioned terms to employ his eloquence in refuting Gentile superstitions and heretical subtleties, and setting forth the orthodox faith; and referring to Micah vii. 1, in allusion to the scantiness of his own congregation, he commended it to his care and entreated him to increase his vintage of souls (*Greg. Naz. in laudem Heronis philosophi Alexandrini ob fidem in exilium missi ac post biennium reversi. Opp.* i. 409-423). All this time Maximus was secretly maturing a plot for ousting his unsuspecting patron from his throne. He gained the ear and the confidence of Peter of Alexandria, and induced him to favour his ambitious views. Gregory, he asserted, had never been formally enthroned bishop of Constantinople; his translation thither was a violation of the canons of the church; rustic in manners, he had proved himself quite unfitted for the place. Constantinople was getting weary of him. It was time the patriarch of the Eastern world should exercise his prerogative and give New Rome a more suitable bishop. The old man was imposed on as Gregory had been, and lent himself to Maximus's projects. Maximus found a ready tool in a presbyter of Constantinople envious of Gregory's talents and popularity (*de Vit.* p. 13). Others were gained by bribes. Seven unscrupulous sailor fellows were despatched from Alexandria to mix with the people, and watch for a favourable opportunity for carrying out the plot. When all was ripe they were followed by a bevy of bishops, with secret instructions from the patriarch to consecrate Maximus.

The conspirators chose the night for the accomplishment of their audacious enterprise. Gregory they knew was confined by illness. They forced their way into the cathedral, and commenced the rite of ordination. By the time

they had set the Cynic on the archiepiscopal throne, and had just begun shearing away his long curls, they were surprised by the dawn. The news quickly spread, and everybody rushed to the church. The magistrates appeared on the scene with their officers; Maximus and his consecrators were driven from the sacred precincts, and in the house or shop of a flute-player the tonsure was completed. Maximus repaired to Thessalonica to lay his cause before Theodosius. He met with a cold reception from the emperor, who committed the matter to Ascholius, the much respected bishop of that city, charging him to refer it to pope Damasus. We have two letters of Damasus's on this subject. In the first, addressed to Ascholius and the Macedonian bishops, he vehemently condemns the "ardor animi et foeda presumptio" which had led certain persons coming from Egypt, in violation of the rule of ecclesiastical discipline, to have proposed to consecrate a restless man, an alien from the Christian profession, not worthy to be called a Christian, who wore an idolatrous garb ("habitus idoli") and the long hair which St. Paul said was a shame to a man, and remarks on the fact that being expelled from the church they were compelled to complete the ordination "intra parietes alienos." In the second letter, addressed to Ascholius individually (*Ep.* vi.), he repeats his condemnation of the ordination of the long-haired Maximus ("comatum") and asks him to take special care that a Catholic bishop may be ordained (*Migne, Patrolog.* xiii. p. 366-369; *Ep.* 5, 6).

Maximus returned to Alexandria, and demanded that Peter should assist him in re-establishing himself at Constantinople. But Peter had discovered the man's true character, and received him as coldly as Theodosius had done. Determined to carry his point he presented himself to the patriarch at the head of a disorderly mob, with the threat that if he did not help him to gain the throne of Constantinople he would have that of Alexandria. Peter appealed to the prefect, by whom Maximus was driven out of Egypt. The death of Peter and the accession of Timotheus are placed Feb. 14, 380. The events described must therefore have occurred in 379.

When the second oecumenical council met at Constantinople in 381, the question of Maximus's claim to the see of Constantinople came up for consideration. His pretensions were unanimously rejected, and the last of the original four canons of this council decreed "concerning Maximus the Cynic and the disorder which took place at Constantinople on his account, that he neither was nor is a bishop, nor they who have been ordained by him are in any rank of the clergy; all that has been done to him or by him being actually null" (*Labbe, Concil.* ii. 947, 954, 959).

In the face of this decree Maximus appealed from the Eastern to the Western church. In the autumn of the same year, A.D. 381, a synod was held either at Aquileia or at Milan, presided over by Ambrose, at which Maximus's claims were considered. Having only his own representation of the facts to guide them, and there being no question that Gregory's translation was uncanonical, while the election of Nectarius was open to grave censure as that of an unbaptized layman—(Ambrose might have re-

membered the almost parallel case of his own ordination—Maximus also exhibiting letters from Peter, the late venerable patriarch, to confirm his asserted communion with the church of Alexandria, and falsely explaining his ordination in a private house on the ground that the Arians were in possession of the basilicas—points which “*dilucida testificatione docuisset*”—it is not surprising that the Italian bishops should have pronounced decidedly in favour of Maximus, and refused to recognise either Gregory or Nectarius. A letter of Ambrose and his brother prelates to Theodosius (*Ep.* xiii. chap. i. § 3) remonstrates against the acts of Nectarius as no rightful bishop, since the episcopal chair of Constantinople belonged to Maximus, whose restoration they demanded, as well as that a general council of the Easterns and Westerns, to settle the disputed episcopate of that city and of Antioch, should be held at Rome. The following year a provincial synod was held at Rome, which, having received more accurate information, finally rejected Maximus's claims (Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, i. pp. 359, 378, 381, English Trans.). We learn from the passage of Jerome already quoted that Maximus sought to strengthen his cause by writing a work against the Arians, which he presented to Gratian at Milan. He appears also to have written something against Gregory, to which the latter replied in a set of caustic iambics (*Carm.* clxviii. p. 250), expressing his astonishment at one so ignorant venturing on a literary composition. The charge brought against him by Theodoret, that he was an Apollinarian, and that on that account the council of Constantinople annulled his ordination, seems quite unfounded (Theod. *H. E.* v. 8; cp. Soz. *H. E.* vii. 9). (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxii. xxviii.; *Carm.* 1. *de Vita sua*; *Carm.* clxviii.; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ix. 444–456, 501–503; Baronius, *Ann.* 380; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. 115; De Broglie, *l'Église et l'Empire*, v. 396–407, vi. 34 ff.; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils* (Engl. Trans.) ii. 341, 345, 354, 359, 378.) [E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (12)**, bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, and previously one of the scholars of Libanius the sophist, having Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom for his companions (Soz. vi. 3; Soz. viii. 2). He is mentioned in a work attributed to Basil of Seleucia (*Vit. S. Thecl.* ii. 15 in *Patr. Gr.* lxxv. 592). Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 27) repeats the notices of Socrates and Sozomen, defining the Seleucia as “a city near Mount Taurus,” and Le Quien (*Or. Chr.* i. 1053, ii. 778, 1013) gives Maximus under three Seleucias. (Tillem. ix. 370, xi. 9, 549, 552, xii. 436; Ceill. viii. 17.) [C. II.]

**MAXIMUS (13)**, one of the Oriental metropolitans of an unnamed see, personally unknown to Chrysostom, who writes to him from Cucusus in 406 to thank him for the zeal he has manifested in his cause. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 150.) [E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (14)**, ST. (vulgarly MASSE and MOSSE), second abbat of Lérins and second or third bishop of Riez. Attracted by the growing fame of Lérins under St. Honoratus, he entered that foundation as a monk. The abbat being summoned to the bishopric of Arles, Maximus was elected in his place in the year 426 and

under his rule the monastery prospered greatly. He was elected to Riez in 433 or 434, and was present at the councils of Riez in 439, and the first of Orange in 441. It is not certain whether he or his contemporary at Avignon is the Maximus addressed with other bishops in the 66th Epistle of Leo as to the disputed jurisdiction of Arles and Vienne (*Patr. Lat.* lix. 883). He died about 460, on Nov. 27.

The authorities for his life are the eulogy of his successor Faustus, published among the homilies attributed erroneously to Eusebius of Emesa (xxxiv. La Bigne, *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi.) and by Barralis in the *Chronologia Sanctorum Ins. Lerinensis* (ii. 115–119), and a life of him written by Dynamius, the patrician, about the end of the 6th century, also published by Barralis (*ibid.* 120–126), and Migne (*Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 31–40). He is twice mentioned with respect by Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. viii. ep. 14, *carm.* xvi. in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 612, 721). Modern accounts of Maximus are to be found in *Gall. Christ.* i. 390–391; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 357–360; Baillet, *Les Vies des Saints*, Nov. 27; see, too, Mansi, v. 1196, vi. 161, 441.

Some of the homilies printed under the name of Eusebius of Emesa have been ascribed from internal evidence to Maximus, notably the 12th to the 15th inclusive, on the Paschal feast, but the evidence is by no means conclusive (*Hist. Litt. ibid.*). [S. A. B.]

**MAXIMUS (15)**, patriarch of Antioch. After the deposition of Domnus II., patriarch of Antioch, by the “*Latrocinium*” of Ephesus, A. D. 449, Dioscorus, then complete master of the situation, persuaded the weak Theodosius to fill the vacancy with one of the clergy of Constantinople. Maximus was selected, and was ordained, in violation of all canonical orders, by Anatolius the bishop of Constantinople, without the official sanction of the clergy or people of Antioch. This high-handed procedure on the part of his rival, the bishop of New Rome, whose pretensions to equality with the bishop of the apostolic see were becoming inconveniently pressing, excited the grave displeasure of Leo (Leo Magn. *Ep.* 104 [78] § 5, *Ad Marcian.*). As the lesser of two evils Leo received Maximus into communion, and desired that he should be recognised as the canonical bishop of Antioch (Labbe, iv. 673, 682). Maximus, though owing his elevation to an heretical synod, was careful to gain a reputation for orthodoxy in the conduct of his diocese and province. He despatched “*epistolae tractoriae*” through the churches subject to him as metropolitan, requiring the signatures of the bishops to Leo's famous “*Tome*” and to another document condemning equally Nestorius on the one hand and Eutyches on the other (Leo Magn. *Ep. ad Paschas.* 88 [68], June 451 A. D.). Having thus discreetly assured his position he was summoned to the council of Chalcedon in the October of 451 A. D. and took his seat without question, and when the illegal acts of the “*Latrocinium*” were quashed and the deposition of the other prelates recalled, a special exception was made of the deposition of Domnus and the substitution of Maximus on the express ground that Leo had opened communion with him and recognised his episcopate (Labbe, iv. 682). The case of Athanasius of Perrha, one of the

suffragans of the see of Antioch, being opened, it was committed to him with his council to hear the charges and decide on their truth within eight months (*ibid.* 754). He pronounced for the orthodoxy of the celebrated letter of Ibas of Edessa to Maris (*ibid.* 678), and of the teaching of Theodoret, of whom he had been a frequent auditor, and gave his voice for the restoration of the latter (*ibid.* 623). He also acknowledged the orthodoxy of Flavian (*ibid.* 177), and joined in the condemnation of Dioscorus for his contumacious refusal to appear after the third citation (*ibid.* 423, 426). In the controversy between the rival claimants to the see of Ephesus, Bassianus and Stephen, he declared his opinion that the consecrations of both were uncanonical, but desired that it should be left to the bishops of Asia to determine which of the two they would recognise (*ibid.* 703). The most important controversy in which Maximus was engaged at Chalcedon was that between himself and Juvenal of Jerusalem regarding the limits of their respective patriarchates. The controversy was long and bitter; at last a compromise was arrived at—*κατὰ σύμβασιν μετὰ πολλὴν φιλονεκίαν*—which was accepted by the council, that Antioch should retain the two Phœnicias and Arabia, and that the three Palestines should form the patriarchate of Jerusalem (*ibid.* 614–618). [JUVENALIS (2).] We find Maximus among those by whom the Confession of Faith was drawn up (*ibid.* 539–562), and he stands second, between Anatolius of Constantinople and Juvenal of Jerusalem, in the signatures to the decree according metropolitical rank to the see of Constantinople (*ibid.* 798).

The next notice we have of Maximus is in a correspondence between him and Leo the Great, to whom he had appealed in defence of the prerogatives of his see, which had been infringed by some acts of other prelates sanctioned by the papal legates. Leo promised to help him to maintain his rights against either Jerusalem or Constantinople, exhorting him to assert his privileges as bishop of the third see in Christendom (i.e. only inferior to Alexandria and Rome). He tells him that he has found the autograph of the letter of Cyril, a copy of which Maximus had sent him to strengthen his case, and sends him in return a copy of his admonitory letter to Anatolius, dated May 22, 452 A.D. ("refrenantes illius cupiditatem"), and begs him to circulate it. Maximus's zeal for the orthodox faith receives a warm commendation from Leo, who exhorts him as a sharer in an apostolical see, "consors apostolicæ sedis," to maintain the doctrine founded by St. Peter "speciali magisterio" in the cities of Antioch and Rome, against the erroneous teaching both of Nestorius and Eutyches, and to watch over the churches not of his own patriarchate only, but of the East generally, and to send him frequent tidings of the state of things. The letter, which is dated June 11, 453 A.D., closes with a desire that Maximus will restrain unordained persons, whether monks or simple laics, from public preaching and teaching (Leo Magn. *Ep.* 109 [92]).

Two years later, 455 A.D., the episcopate of Maximus came to a disastrous close by his deposition. The nature of his offence is nowhere specified—Nicephorus in his chronicle says

simply, *διὰ πταίσμα*—and it is vain to speculate upon it. Leo, in a letter to his legate. Julian of Cos, March 11, 455 A.D., speaks of the sorrow it has caused him to hear of the charges brought against him; but even if, "quod absit," they should be proved by his accusers, he does not intend to exercise any jurisdiction, but leaves the settlement of the matter to the care and vigilance of the bishops, and to the justice and zeal of the emperor Marcian (Leo Magn. *Ep.* 141 [113]). We are left in ignorance how long he survived his deposition, and what became of him. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xv. passim; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 725.) [E. V.]

MAXIMUS (16), bishop of Turin, writer, reckoned as Maximus II. the third bishop, by Cappelletti (*Le Chiese d'Ital.* xiv. 12, 14, 76), who puts a Maximus I. in 390 as the first bishop. Ughelli (*Ital. Sac.* iv. 1022) counts them as one (cf. Boll. *Acta SS.* 25 Jun. v. 48). He was present at the council of Milan in 451 and signed the letter to pope Leo (Leo, *Ep.* 97; Labbe, iv. 583). He was also at the council of Rome in 465, where his name appears next after that of pope Hilary, apparently on account of his seniority (Labbe, v. 86). Gennadius of Massilia, who died in 496, gives us a sketch of his works, most of which are still extant, but tells us strangely that he died in the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, i.e. before 423. This has led some to think that there must have been two bishops of this name, but the early date given by Gennadius seems irreconcilable with the many allusions to Nestorian doctrines in the homilies on the Nativity, and the general opinion is either that he is wrong, or that "moritur" in his text is a false reading for "floruit." It may be observed that although nearly all his biographical notices end with "moritur," the one immediately preceding has "claruit" (Gennad. *de Scrip. Eccl.* c. xl. in *Patrol. Lat.* lviii. 1081). The works of Maximus are published in vol. lvii. of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. They consist of 117 homilies, 116 sermons, 3 tractates on baptism, two entitled respectively *Contra Paganos* and *Contra Judæos*, and a collection of expositions *De Capitulis Evangeliorum*. Many of the sermons and homilies were formerly ascribed to other authors, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Leo, &c., but a great uniformity of style is observable in them, and great confidence may be placed in the collection as being throughout the work of Maximus. The sermons and homilies are very short and simple in expression. Many of them are on the great church festivals. The homilies on the Epiphany celebrate especially the visit of the Magi, but also the miracle at Cana and the baptism of our Lord. In three of the sermons, on the other hand, it is to be noticed that the birth and manifestation of our Lord are spoken of together, in the Eastern manner, and that there is no allusion to the visit of the Magi (Serm. vii. viii. ix.). Yet there are certain expressions, common to these and the homilies, which seem to prove that they are all by the same author. Maximus here therefore seems to have followed the Eastern Fathers, as indeed he does in commemorating the three events above noticed at the Epiphany, whereas his Western contemporaries Augustine and Leo confine themselves to the visit of the Magi.

Among the points of interest in the homilies and sermons may be mentioned the following: the notice of fixed lections (*e.g.* Hom. 36 and 37): abstinence from flesh meat in Lent (Hom. 44): no fasting or kneeling at prayer between Easter and Pentecost (Hom. 61). In Hom. 62, on the other hand, he mentions that the vigil of Pentecost was observed as a fast. This custom therefore probably originated in his time. St. Leo, when he mentions the fast of Pentecost, makes it clear that he means the fast immediately following the festival. In Hom. 83 he comments on the creed, which is exactly the same as the Roman creed given by Rufinus.

Among contemporary events alluded to by Maximus may be noticed the synod of Milan in 389, at which Jovinianus was condemned (Hom. 9). The seven homilies (86-92) refer to the terror of the city with regard to an impending barbaric invasion, and seem to belong to the year of Attila's inroad, 452. Another homily (94) refers to the destruction of the church of Milan on the same occasion. He refers in several places to the superstition of the people of his diocese, their observance of the Calends of January (Hom. 16), their tumults during an eclipse (Hom. 100), the idolatry still lurking among the lower orders (Serm. 101, 102). There are homilies on the feast of the nativity of St. John the Baptist, on St. Lawrence, St. Cyprian, St. Agnes, and St. Eusebius of Vercellae. There are several also on the festival of SS. Peter and Paul, which are deserving of particular attention. In some of them he uses very decided language on the supremacy of St. Peter, *e.g.*, calling him the keystone of the Church (Hom. 54), the "magister navis" (Serm. 114); and speaking of him as entrusted with "totius Ecclesiae gubernacula" (Hom. 70). But in other places he speaks of St. Peter as supreme in discipline, St. Paul in doctrine, and remarks "inter ipsos quis cui praeponatur incertum est" (Hom. 72). In none of these passages does he make any allusion to the church of Rome as inheriting exclusively the supremacy of St. Peter. Gennadius mentions a work of Maximus *De Spirituali Baptismi Gratia*, and three treatises on this subject, formerly ascribed to St. Augustine, are published by Migne with the works of Maximus, on the strength of three ancient MSS. one of which belongs to the church of Turin. There seems to be nothing in their style which is against his conclusion. The first treatise dwells on the significance of the anointing of the ears before baptism; the second gives an interrogatory creed identical with the one mentioned above in the homilies, and alludes to the custom of baptizing on the third day after the profession of faith; the third speaks of the anointing of the head after baptism, by which is conferred the full regal and sacerdotal dignity spoken of by St. Peter, and also mentions the custom of washing the feet at the same time, after the example of Christ.

The three treatises, *Contra paganos*, *Contra Iulianos*, and *De capitulis Evangeliorum* are of very doubtful authorship. There is no MS. which ascribes them to Maximus, and the fact that a work by Maximus with the latter title is mentioned by Gennadius is not of much weight. The chief arguments urged in Migne

are the use of the Itala Versio, and the similarity of style. The latter is not very marked, no expressions occurring which are in any way peculiar and characteristic. Maximus is commemorated in the Roman calendar on June 25th. [M. F. A.]

**MAXIMUS (17)**, eleventh bishop of Geneva, commenced his episcopate in 513 or soon after. In 515, or the following year, he took a prominent part in the council held by prince Sigismund at Agaunum for the dedication of the new church built there (*Gall. Christ.* xii. instr. 421-424). A little later he dedicated a church which replaced a heathen temple, as we know from the still existing discourse of Avitus archbishop of Vienne, recently published (see *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 380). In 517 he was at the council of Epaon (Mansi, viii. 565), while the name of Maximus, which appears among the subscriptions without a see appended, at the first council of Lyons in 517 (*ibid.* p. 570), the fourth of Arles in 524 (*ibid.* p. 627), the second of Orange (*ibid.* p. 718), and the third of Vaison in 529 (*ibid.* p. 728), almost certainly belongs to this prelate. He is also said to have been present at a council held at Marseilles in 533. The sixty-fifth letter of Avitus is addressed to him (*Patr. Lat.* lix. 274). From a fragmentary discourse pronounced by the same prelate at the dedication of a new church at Geneva, it appears that the old one was burnt by enemies, probably a Frankish expedition (*Gall. Christ. ibid.*).

[S. A. B.]

**MAXIMUS (18) IV.**, bishop of Salona (Farlati, *Illyr. Sac.* ii. 246), mentioned in numerous letters of pope Gregory the Great between 593 and 599 (*vid.* from lib. iv. ind. xii. *Ep.* 10 to lib. ix. ind. ii. *Ep.* 125 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii.; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 919-1282). He was elected to the see on the death of Natalis, in opposition to Honoratus, the candidate favoured by Gregory. Summoned by Gregory to Rome to answer certain accusations against him, Maximus refused, but ultimately presented himself at Ravenna, where he cleared himself before Marinian the bishop, and in the presence of the papal notary Castorius. He was then admitted to communion with Gregory, and afterwards received the pallium.

[C. H.]

**MAXIMUS (19)**, bishop of Saragossa, from about 592 to about 619.

*Authorities.*—(1) The short notice by Isidore (*De Vir. Ill.* cap. 46). (2) The signatures to C. II. of Saragossa, A.D. 592 (?), C. II. Barc. A.D. 599, the *Decretum Gundemari*, A.D. 610, and the council of Egara A.D. 614,—all in Tejada y Ramiro, *Coll. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. p. 686, 690, 485, 701. (3) The marginal notes existing on the Toledan MS. of the chronicle of Victor Tununensis, found at Toledo by the Jesuit Andreas Schott, and first published by his brother at Frankfort, 1608, in *Hispania Illustrata*, &c., iv. 117, then by Roncalli, *Vet. Lat. Scrip. Chron.* ii. 337; commonly known as *Appendix Victoris Tununensis*.

*His Life.*—All that is known of Maximus personally, beyond the bare fact of his co-operation in the four councils quoted above, is contained in Isidore's notice, which is so short that it may be quoted entire: "Maximus Caesar-

augustanae civitatis episcopus multa versu pro-saque componere dicitur. Scripsit et brevi stilo historiolum de iis quae temporibus Gothorum in Hispaniis acta sunt, historicum et compositum sermone, sed de multa alia scribere dicitur quae necdum legi." From this it is evident that Maximus was alive at the time Isidore was writing the *De Vir. Ill.*, and it is also evident that Isidore had read Maximus's history, although he had read nothing else of his. With regard to the various councils at which Maximus appeared, it has been thought by some that the "Magnus" who signs the acts of the second council of Saragossa, held under Recared in 592, must be identified with the "Maximus servus ecclesiae Caesaraugustanae" who signs those of the second council of Barcelona in 599 (*Esp. Sagr.* xxx. 137). Magnus however is a distinct name, and appears elsewhere in Spanish church history, so that the identification must be regarded as an arbitrary one, and the signature of Maximus in 599 becomes the first which can with certainty be attributed to him. In 599 the thirteen bishops assembled at Barcelona passed four canons, of which can. 3, on episcopal elections, is important, and should be compared with C. Tol. IV. 19 and with the *Capitula* of Martin of Braga (see art. MARTINUS (2)). Among Maximus's co-signatories appears his brother-historian, JOANNES (185) BICLARENSIS. Eleven years later the name of "Maximus ep. Caesaraugustanae ecclesiae" occurs among the twenty-two signatories to the *Decretum Gundemari*, of which a full account will be found under GUNTIMAR. In 614 we have the last record of him among the signatories to the council of Egara, a council which is not to be found in the *Coll. Hispana* proper, and the memory of which is preserved to us in one MS. only (conf. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 62, Tejada y Ramiro, *l. c.*). In or about 619, according to Risco's calculation (*Esp. Sagr.* *l. c.* p. 140), we must place the death of Maximus.

*His Works.*—Of the various miscellaneous works in prose and verse which Isidore attributes by hearsay to Maximus we have now no remains. It is possibly otherwise with the *Historiola* itself. Up to the 16th century it was regarded as hopelessly lost. About 1590, as a consequence of the revival of historical study which marked the century, a daring attempt was made to circulate a forged chronicle representing itself as the lost work of Maximus, and attached to another forgery, the *Chronicon Dextri*. These and other historical frauds gave rise to endless disputes, until the whole question was set at rest by the learning and courage of the great antiquary Nicolas Antonio (d. 1688). From 1700 onwards the chronicle of Maximus was once more regarded as lost. About the very time however when the Jesuit forger Roman de la Huguera was concocting the pseudo-Maximus, another Jesuit had become possessed of a MS. at Toledo containing certain marginal notes which do in all probability represent a series of fragments from the lost chronicle. The Jesuit was Andreas Schott, the collector of the materials afterwards published by his brother in two vols. at Frankfurt under the title *Hispania Illustrata*, and the MS. was a MS. of the African chronicler, Victor of Tununa. These marginal notes relate entirely to Visigothic history, especially to the history of Tarraconensis,

and we may even say to that of Saragossa. That, on the one hand, they have been used by Isidore in the *Historia Gothorum*, and on the other that it is impossible they should have been derived from the *Historia Gothorum*, is conclusively shewn in the admirable Dissertation on the Histories of Isidore, in which Dr. Hugo Hertzberg first drew special attention to these notes; and to the use made by Isidore of some chronicler writing in north-eastern Spain and possessed of special information relating to that part, and to the coincidences between the notes and the statements concerning Tarraconensis in the *Historia Gothorum*. The identification of the author of the chronicle from which the marginal notes in Victor of Tununa and the Tarraconensian statements in Isidore are derived, with Maximus of Saragossa is a further step. But no student of the evidence can deny that such an identification has probability on its side. A critical edition of the notes is very much to be desired, and would render current a scanty but valuable supply of fresh information on Visigothic history during the fifth and sixth centuries. (Conf. *Die Historien und die Chroniken des Isidorus von Sevilla*, Inaug. Diss. von Hugo Hertzberg, Göttingen, 1874, pp. 65–72; Gams, *l. c.* p. 63; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, i. 73, ii. 396, Berlin, 1877; for the history of the "false chronicles," Nicolas Antonio, *Bibl. Vet.* i. 315, ed. 1788, and *Censura de Historias Fabelosas*, a posthumous work of the same author, Valencia, 1742; also Godoy, Alcantara, *Historia Critica de los Falsos Chronicones*, Madrid, 1868.)

[M. A. W.]

MAXIMUS (20), Roman presbyter and confessor (see MOYSES) A.D. 250, who took the lead among the confessors after Moses' death, and then Novatianised. Not the same as the Novatianist emissary and bishop with whom Rettberg confounds him. He was afterwards reconciled to Cornelius and became his strong supporter. One of the loculi in the catacomb chapel of Cornelius bears his name, MAEIMOT ΠΙΡ (De Rossi, *Roma Sott.* vol. i. Tav. xix. 5, p. 296). It is mentioned (*Ep.* 49) that at his restoration he resumed his seat among the presbyters at once. See Cyp. *Epp.* 27, 28, 31, 32, 37, 46 (the *Ep.* in which Cyprian urges their return), 49 (their reception), 51, 53 (their letter to Cyprian), 54 (his reply, sending them his *De Lapsis* and *De Unitate*), 55 (5). The statement that he was martyred under Valerian (Baron. ad Nov. 19, Baluz. ap. Routh, iii. p. 38) is answered by Tillemont, vol. iii. The Liberian catalogue, Mommesen p. 632, has this entry: "vi. Id. Jul. et in Maximi [sc. caemeterio] Silani." Hunc Silanum Novati furati sunt." There is no cemetery of Maximus. Did the Novatianists attempt to claim him still?

[E. W. B.]

MAXIMUS (21), Carthaginian acolyte with AMANTIUS. (Cyp. *Epp.* 77, 78, 79.) [E. W. B.]

MAXIMUS (22), deacon and archimandrite of Antioch, who in 438 refused to communicate with his bishop John on the ground that the Nestorians whom John had received were not genuine converts. He requests Cyril to put forth an exposition of the Nicene creed. (Cyril. Alex. *Epp.* 57 al. 49, 58, 69 al. 52, 70 al. 53, in

*Patr. Gr.* lxxvii.) He was also addressed by Proclus (*Ep.* 11 in *Patr. Gr.* lxx. 879). See also Ceillier, viii. 296, 364, 407; Tillem. xiv. 504, 620, 624, 626, 637, 640, 641, 792.

[C. H.]

**MAXIMUS (23)**, called among the Greeks Theologus, confessor and martyr, Aug. 13 (Mart. Rom.), was during the earlier part of cent. vii. the leader of the orthodox party as opposed to Monothelism. He was born of a noble family about the year 580 A.D., and attained the high office of first private secretary in the imperial court under Heraclius. His mind was more absorbed, however, in religious controversy than in the work of ordinary life. Upon the outburst of the Monothelite controversy under Heraclius, he left the imperial service and devoted himself to the support of the orthodox party. He entered the monastery of Chrysopolis (Scutari), where he became abbat upon the election of Pyrrhus to the bishopric of Constantinople A.D. 639. He travelled twice at least into the West, partly impelled by fear of Persian invasion, partly by orthodox zeal. Thus we find him in 633 present in Egypt with Sophronius, afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, and uniting with him in opposition to Cyrus patriarch of Alexandria, and the council held in that city to patch up a union with the Monophysites. [CYRUS (4.)] He again withdrew into Africa about A.D. 640, where he held a celebrated discussion with his predecessor Pyrrhus, who had been driven from his episcopal throne. This debate took place about 645 A.D. in presence of the African bishops and Gregorius prefect of Africa. It is well worth a careful study as the most elaborate exposition which we possess of the nature and tendencies of Monothelism. Upon the termination of the discussion, Pyrrhus acknowledged himself convinced, renounced the errors of Monothelism, and was received into communion by the pope. Maximus was present at the Lateran council in 649. In 655 he was arrested at Rome and carried captive to Constantinople, where, with the two Anastasii, one a Roman deputy and the other an attached disciple of Maximus, they were accused of various political crimes and ordered to sign the Type. Upon their refusal they were banished to Thrace. In 662 they were recalled to Constantinople, when another attempt was made to induce them to recant, after which they were flogged and their tongues and right hands cut off. They were then banished to the Lazian region, where Maximus died on August 13th, 662. His disciple Anastasius died a few weeks before him, while the Roman deputy Anastasius survived some years, and died in 666. To this latter we owe an account of the death of Maximus in an epistle addressed to Theodosius presbyter of Gangra, where he quotes some fragments of the writings of St. Hippolytus against Beron, which he had seen in manuscript at Constantinople (Du Pin, *H. E.* t. ii. p. 16, Dub. Ed. 1724). Maximus was a very able, learned, and acute thinker. He was one of the most voluminous writers of his age. Neander bestows a very lengthened notice upon him *H. E.* v. 236–266 ed. Clark, which will be found the best modern exposition of his teaching on the doctrines of the Trinity, Redemption, and Christ's nature,

as well as upon eschatological questions. Du Pin *l. c.* gives an analysis of his works, which Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, and Cave, *Hist. Litter.*, also describe. The Bollandists in August t. iii. 97–132 give a lengthened account of the life and sufferings of Maximus and the Anastasii. They make a most careful attempt to fix the chronology of his life, wherein they differ in some points from Cave. The works of Maximus have been often published. The best collected edition is that by Combefis in two volumes, Paris 1675, with his life and acts prefixed. Some treatises discovered in more modern times, dealing with the Monothelite controversy, will be found in Mai's *Vett. Script. Collect.* t. vii. p. 192. He also wrote a treatise on the Paschal Controversy, which Petavius published in his *Uranologion*, Paris 1630. Scaliger published notes on this in his work, *De Emendat. Temp.* lib. 7, p. 736 ed. 1629. Some minor treatises which escaped the notice of Combefis will be found described in Cave, and Du Pin *l. c.*; cf. also Ceillier, xi. 760–772 for an analysis of his works.

[G. T. S.]

**MAXIMUS (24)**, an ecclesiastical writer, placed by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 27) in the reign of Severus, and episcopate of Victor, that is to say, in the last ten years of the 2nd century. Eusebius there states the subject of his work to be the question much noised among heretics, what was the origin of evil, and whether matter had been created. Elsewhere (*Praep. Ev.* vii. 22) Eusebius names the title of the work, "Concerning Matter" (*περὶ τῆς ὕλης*), and preserves a long extract from it, from which it appears that the work was written in the form of a dialogue. The same fragment is given in the Origenian Philocalia (24), and there is a note, which we accept as by the compilers, Basil and Gregory, stating that the passage had been extracted by them from the work of Eusebius, and that it was also to be found verbatim in the dialogue of Origen against the Marcionites (see ADAMANTIUS). Actually we find in that dialogue (sect. iv.) the work of Maximus largely made use of, but not copied verbatim. Routh, who in his *Reliquiae Sacrae* (ii. 87) has given far the best edition of the remains of Maximus, pointed out that the same fragment is to be found in the dialogue on free will ascribed to Methodius, and further, that there are other things common to the work on free will and the dialogue against the Marcionites, which may be reasonably supposed to have been derived by both authors from Maximus. That Methodius should so largely appropriate another man's work without acknowledgment, is so contrary to modern ideas of literary morality, that one is tempted to inquire whether there may not be some error in the ascription of one or other of the works, and whether what we know as the dialogue on free will may not be only a larger fragment of the treatise *Concerning Matter*. But that the latter work is rightly ascribed to Maximus the testimony of Eusebius is decisive; and we have the testimony of St. Jerome in his *Catalogue*, that Methodius was the author of a work on free will, while Photius has preserved for us large extracts from what he knew as the work of Methodius on free will, which place beyond doubt that it incorporated much of Maximus. The style, moreover, of the



opening of the dialogue on free will resembles Methodius, and differs from that of the part concerning matter. We leave, then, Methodius in undisputed possession of the rhetorical introduction to his dialogue, but it seems to us that the context clearly shews that the part which belongs to Maximus begins earlier than the portion quoted by Eusebius and printed by Routh. It must include the statement of the views of the speaker who maintains matter to have existed from eternity, destitute of qualities, and also the announcement of the presence of the third speaker, who afterwards takes up the controversy, on the hypothesis that matter had been from the first possessed of qualities.\* In Methodius, the defender of the eternity of matter is apparently represented as a Valentinian, for his speeches are marked Val.; and so also in Adamantius. In Maximus he seems to be no heretic, but a sincere inquirer after truth. He propounds the difficulty concerning the origin of evil; if evil was at any time created, then something came out of nothing, since it is assumed that evil did not exist before; and God who created it must take pleasure in evil, which we cannot admit. He then offers the solution that, co-eternally with God, there existed matter, destitute of form or qualities, and borne about in a disorderly manner; that God took pity on it, separated the best parts from the worst, reduced the former to order, and left the latter behind as being of no use to Him for His work, and that from these lees of matter evil sprang. The most successful part of the orthodox speaker's reply is where he shews that this hypothesis does not relieve God of the charge of being the author of evil. He asks, Are evils substances or qualities? His friend answers, Qualities. Then since you say that matter was originally destitute of qualities, these must have come out of nothing, the thing which you are unable to conceive; and God must have been the author of them, and therefore of evil. The third speaker then takes up the discussion on the hypothesis that matter had from the beginning possessed qualities whence evil emanated. The orthodox speaker replies, If both substances and qualities existed from the first, what was there left for God to create? His friend answers, God is a creator in that He changed the qualities of part of matter, and changed them for the better. The orthodox speaker replies, Then what about the evil qualities which God did not change? Was He not able or not willing to change these also? That He was not able you will not dare to say. But if He willingly left uncorrected what it was in His power to make better, He becomes the author of evil. Nay, His interference with matter made things worse, since through His work consciousness of evil arose; for if He had not made man, there would have been no knowledge of evil.

Galland conjectures that Maximus, the author of the dialogue, is the Maximus who was 26th bishop of Jerusalem, and whom Eusebius, in his Chronicle, places about the reign of Commodus.

It does not absolutely disprove this conjecture, that Eusebius, in neither place where he speaks of the writings of Maximus, mentions that he was a bishop; but we think it likely that Eusebius found in the book which he used no mention of the author's dignity, and that he knew no more than ourselves whether or not he was identical with the bishop of Jerusalem. [G. S.]

**MAXIMUS (25) of EPHESUS.** A "master of theurgic science," commonly reckoned among the Neoplatonic philosophers. The interest of the life of Maximus consists not in any permanent worth of character or capacity as a philosopher, but in the fact that he supplied an essential link in the transit of the emperor Julian from Christianity to paganism. The account given by Eunapius, in his life of Maximus, enables us to see exactly how this was. Julian, while still under tutelage and in early youth, with the natural self-will of a vigorous mind, had already rebelled in secret against his Christian instructors, and betaken himself to Greek philosophy as a liberal and congenial study; and this bent was not disallowed by the emperor Constantius, who thought it safe when compared with political ambitions. But to suppose that philosophy at that era indicated nothing more than quiet intellectual research would be a very erroneous opinion. Philosophy was then a name of power, to which all whose sentiments flowed with a strong current towards the traditionary heathenism had recourse for self-justification; and it was perfectly natural that Julian, when once he had attached himself to this venerable study, should instinctively seek for more practical advantages from it than the mere increase of theoretical wisdom. Maximus, though flashy and meagre as a philosopher, was for that very reason better supplied with an ostentatious show of practical power than any of his philosophic rivals. The amiable rhetorician Libanius, the aged sage Aedesius, could please Julian, but evidently were lacking in the force which could move the world. But when Aedesius, compelled by increasing infirmity, resigned Julian to the tuition of his two followers, Chrysanthius and Eusebius, Julian began to be struck with the terms in which those two professors of philosophy spoke of their old fellow-pupil Maximus. Chrysanthius, indeed, alone of the two seemed to admire Maximus; Eusebius affected to depreciate him; but this feigned depreciation was better calculated than the loudest admiration to excite the interest of Julian in Maximus. For what Eusebius spoke of in this slighting manner was a certain miraculous power possessed by Maximus, of which he gave one or two casual instances. Wisdom, as Eusebius justly remarked, was without doubt more valuable than the power of making the statue of a goddess break into a smile, or the lamps in her hand kindle spontaneously. But Julian had imbibed plenty of abstract wisdom, and had never seen miracles like those with which Maximus was credited; so he bade Eusebius stick to his learning, gave to Chrysanthius a tender farewell, and hurried off to Maximus. That skilful adept, after a solemn preparation of his imperial pupil, in which he was aided by Chrysanthius, described to Julian the revered religious authority of the hierophant of Eleusis, whose sacred rites were among the

\* The former is the Platonic doctrine. Πλάτων τὴν ὕλην σωματωσεῖσθ' ἀμορφον ἀνείδεον ἀσχηματιστον ἄποιον ὄσον ἐπὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ φύσει, δεξαμένην δὲ τῶν εἰδῶν καὶ οἶον πύθην καὶ ἐκμαγείον καὶ μητέρα γίγνεσθαι (Stobaeus, *Ecl.* i. 11. See also Hippol. *Philos.* i. 19).

most famous in Greece, and urged him to go thither. He went, and was imbued with a teaching which combined a mysterious exaltation of the power of the Greek deities with hints of his own personal aggrandisement. By such acts as these, and by his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries, he distinctly and formally passed over to paganism, though his having done so was still unknown to the world. When Julian had assumed the purple, and, Constantius being dead, was sole master of the Roman empire, he did not forget the philosophers whose instructions had thus far guided him. He sent for Chrysanthius and Maximus; they consulted the sacrificial omens together; the signs were unfavourable, and dissuaded them from accepting the invitation. Chrysanthius trembled, and refused to go; the more ambitious Maximus declared it to be unworthy of a wise man to yield to the first adverse sign, and went. He was received by Julian with extraordinary honours, but by his haughtiness and effeminate demeanour in this access of prosperity, drew down upon himself the censure even of the heathen, among whom was the partial panegyrist Eunapius. After the death of Julian, he was severely and even cruelly treated by the emperors Valentinian and Valens, and though released for a time, was at last beheaded by order of Valens in the year 371, on a charge of having conspired against him.

However inconsiderable the value of Maximus as a philosopher, he must always be notable as a principal actor in one of the most curious episodes of ancient history. His personal appearance is described by Eunapius as impressive. The four extant letters of the emperor Julian to him (Nos. 15, 16, 38, 39) are composed in that strain of indiscriminate panegyric which tells so little about the real character or views of the man whom it concerns. For other authorities respecting the life of Maximus, besides EUNAPIUS, see the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*.

[J. R. M.]

**MAXIMUS (26)**, philosopher, addressed by Athanasius in 369. (*Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 1085; Ceillier, iv. 144, 428; Tillem. viii. 254, 413; art. MAXIMUS ALEXANDRINUS in *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii. 986.)

[C. H.]

**MAXIMUS (27)**, a philosopher; a correspondent of St. Basil, who addressed to him one of his earliest letters (*Ep.* 9 [41]), placed by Garnier (*Vita S. Basilii*, c. vii. § iv.) A.D. 361 or 362, before the ordination of Basil to the priesthood and when he was living in retirement. Basil regrets to be unable to send Maximus the works of Dionysius of Alexandria which he had asked for. This Maximus is distinguished by Garnier and Tillemont (SAINT BASIL, note xvi.) from the Maximus of the next article. Garnier identifies him with the cynic philosopher who intruded into Gregory Nazianzen's episcopal seat at Constantinople. [MAXIMUS (11).]

[E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (28)** (designated in the title of the letter *σχολαστικός*), certainly a different person from the preceding, though confounded with him by earlier editors. From the one letter to him extant (Basil, *Ep.* 277 [42]), evidently towards the close of Basil's life, we gather that he was at that time young, rich,

eloquent, and of high birth, and that he had embraced a life of Christian self-restraint and humility.

[E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (29)** (probably different from either of the preceding), to whom Basil addresses a letter of consolation on the death of his wife. (Basil, *Epist.* 301 [346].)

[E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (30)** (MAXIMINUS), governor of Cappadocia, succeeded by Antipater, A.D. 373. Although while in office he had persecuted the orthodox, assisted by one Palmatius, A.D. 372 (Basil, *Epist.* 98 [259]), when the next year he fell into trouble he had no warmer advocate than Basil. We have three letters of Basil in his behalf to laymen of influence, begging them to befriend him in his extremity; to Abargias (*Ep.* 147 [356]); to Trajan (*Ep.* 148 [376]), and one also inscribed to Trajan, but from internal evidence addressed to some other influential laymen (*Ep.* 149 [377]). From these letters we gather that Maximus having been removed from his governorship and accused of embezzlement of public funds by the new vicar who was his enemy, the unfortunate ex-governor had been stripped of all his property, both that which he had inherited from his father and that which he had acquired himself, had been forced to flee from Caesarea, and to wander from place to place, subjected to the greatest miseries and deprivations, and was in danger of losing his citizenship. At the time Basil wrote his calamities were brought to a climax by the arrival of the vicar with a troop of soldiers to apprehend him and put him on his trial. Basil therefore entreats those to whom he writes to use their powerful influence in behalf of one whom he describes as in every respect excellent, and his very reverend brother, when his trial comes on.

[E. V.]

**MAXIMUS (31)**, a literary man (grammaticus) of Madaura or Madauræ, a town of Numidia, not far from Tagaste, whither Augustine was sent as a boy for education (*Conf.* ii. 3). He wrote a letter to Augustine, when bishop of Hippo, to the effect that having discarded the old polytheistic superstitions, he had come to the conclusion that the same Deity was common to all religions alike, but that he could not endure with patience the notion that obscure Christian martyrs, with barbarous and uncouth names, men who had suffered death for their crimes, should be preferred to the immortal deities who were worshipped in public, while the God of the Christians was surrounded by mystery and hidden from public view. On this and other points he sought anxiously to Augustine for guidance and instruction, expressed not in such philosophical language as was sometimes his wont, but in plain terms (*Ep.* 16). Augustine's reply is an exquisite specimen of courteous rebuke to a worldly-minded and heartless pedant, A.D. about 390 (*Aug. Ep.* 17).

[H. W. P.]

**MAXIMUS (32)**, a physician of Theneæ, a town on the sea-coast of Byzacene (*Theinî*, Shaw, p. 112; *Ant. Itin.* 48, 8). He had been an Arian, but had returned to the Catholic faith, and St. Augustine, together with Alypius, wrote to him to express their pleasure at this change, but regret that his example had not been

followed by his family, and entreating him to set before them with all the force of his authority the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, which he describes in terms closely resembling those of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds (*Ep.* 170). There is also a fragment of a letter, probably addressed to Maximus, setting forth the seven steps, as he calls them, of Christian progress, viz. 1. Fear of God; 2. Submission to Scripture; 3. Course by which sin is acknowledged and its remedy found in Christ; 4. Denial of self; 5. Charity towards others; 6. Purification of heart and perfection of love towards God; 7. Peace of mind. (*Ep.* 171.) [H. W. P.]

**MAZABANES** (Μαζαβάνης. Μαζαββάνης, Μαζαβάνος), bishop of Jerusalem, standing thirty-fifth in order of succession, between Alexander and Hymenaeus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 39, vii. 5). The commencement of his episcopate is placed by Clinton A.D. 250. If this be correct he can have only held the office two years, according to Epiphanius, *ἔως Γάλλου καὶ Οὐλουσιάνου*, A.D. 252. (Epiphanius. *Haer.* lxi. 20; Niceph. *H. E.* v. 26.) [E. V.]

**MAZBERCHTENSES** (in one MS. MAZBUTHAZI), a name apparently for a sect of Nazarenes in a fragment attached to the commentary of Ephraemus Syrus on the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, published by Moesinger, Venice, 1876, under the title of *Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta a Sancto Ephraemo Doctore Syro*, see p. 288; cf. also Neander, *H. E.* i. 482, ed. Bohn. Hieron. *de Vir. Illust.* c. 3. The name is probably to be identified with MASOTHAETI, q. v. [G. T. S.]

**MAZDAK** (MAZDEK, MEZDEK), a native of Persepolis (Mirkhoud), or according to others of Nishapur in Khorassan, and Archmagus of Zoroastrism. He announced himself early in the reign of Kobad, A.D. 487, as a reformer of the Zoroastrian religion. His principles were in reality identical with those of Manichaeism, with a mixture of those asserted by the more advanced school of modern communism. Property, marriage, and rank were according to him mere human inventions. Adultery, incest, and theft were not really crimes, but necessary steps towards re-establishing the laws of nature. His views were embraced by vast numbers among the Persians. He numbered even the Roman emperor Anastasius I. among his converts, and extended his missions into North Africa, where an inscription was found at Cyrene in 1823, which proves that his teaching had been eagerly embraced by the remains of the ancient Gnostics. In it MazdaK was enrolled with Thoth, Saturn, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Epicurus, John, and Christ as the teacher of true Gnostic wisdom. (Mirkhoud, ed. De Sacy, p. 353; Hyde's *Relig. Vet. Pers.* cap. 21; Malcolm's *Hist. of Persia*, i. 104; Le Beau's *Bas-Empire*, vii. 322, 338; Gesenius, *de Inscript. Phoen.-Graec. in Cyrenaica*, 1825; Hamaker, *Lett. à Raoul Rochette*, Leyden, 1825; Rawlinson's *Seventh Monarchy*, pp. 342-346.) [MANICHAISM.] [G. T. S.]

**MECHELL, ST.**, son of Echwydd, and the founder of Llanfechell in Anglesey, was buried

in the churchyard of Penrhos Llugwy in the same county, where there was lately a stone with the inscription, "Hic iacit Maccui Decceti" (R. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 308; Hübnér, *Inscriptiones Britanniae Christianae*, no. 154 and p. 90; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 166). "Hic iacit" is the favourite British formula, while "requiescit in pace" is more common on the Continent. The inscription is probably of the 7th century. Mechell was commemorated 15th Nov.

[C. W. B.]

**MEDARDUS, ST.**, June 8, fourteenth bishop of Noyon, whither he transferred the see from Vermand, and first bishop of Noyon and Tournay combined, was born about the beginning of the reign of Childeric I., at Salency, in the district of Vermand. About 530 he succeeded Alomerus as bishop of Vermand, and in the following year, that town having been destroyed by irruptions of barbarians, he moved the see to Noyon. In 532 his friend Eleutherius bishop of Tournay died, and he assumed the government of the two bishoprics, which remained henceforth united until A.D. 1146. Though he is frequently alluded to in the works of Gregory of Tours, and Venantius Fortunatus has left two biographies of him, we know very little of his episcopate except the miracles which were ascribed to him in common with all the eminent ecclesiastics of the age. But passing allusions and his posthumous fame make it evident that he ranked high among the prelates of his time. When queen Radegund fled from her husband, Clotaire, resolved to forsake the world and become a nun, she repaired to Noyon, and begged Medardus to consecrate her and present her with the veil. But deterred by the fact that she was married, and the violent opposition of the Frank nobles, who even dragged him from the altar, he hesitated. Thereupon the queen entered the sacristy, put on nun's raiment, and addressed the bishop with words of such earnest exhortation that he was overcome, and laying his hands upon her head consecrated her as a deaconess. This took place shortly before his death, and nothing further is known of his episcopate unless we believe the late story of Clotaire's visit to him in his last illness. His death is usually placed in 545, but by some, with less probability, in 561. Faustinus succeeded him as bishop of the two sees. Gregory of Tours briefly notices his death (*Hist. Franc.* iv. 19).

The authorities for what is known of Medardus are allusions in Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* iv. 19, 21, 52; v. 35, 50; ix. 9; *Lit. de Glor. Conf.* xcv.; *Vitae Patr.* xix. 2); two lives by Venantius Fortunatus, one in prose (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 533-40; *Boll. Acta SS.* Jun. ii. 79), and the other in verse (*Boll. ibid.* pp. 78, 79), neither of them containing much of historical worth, a passage in the same author's life of queen Radegund (*lib.* i. 12; *Pat. Lat.* lxxii. 655), and the *Vita S. Radegundis* of Baudonivia i. 12, *Pat. Lat.* lxxii. 655). A supplement to Fortunatus's prose life was composed by an anonymous monk of the abbey of St. Medardus at Soissons, a little after the church had been destroyed by Northmen (A.D. 886). He may have been Rodoinus, prior in the time of Louis the Pious. It is printed in *Boll. (ibid.* pp. 82-6). See Ceillier, xii. 364, and *Hist. Litt.* v. 661, for a criticism of this pro-

duction, which adds nothing to our knowledge. Another life, longer, but containing small and doubtful additions to the older accounts, was written by Radbodus II. bishop of Noyon and Tournay, in the 11th century (Boll. *ibid.* pp. 87-94; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cl. 1490-1518; cf. *Hist. Litt.* viii. 457-9). This again was retouched with the like unfruitful results (*Hist. Litt. ibid.*). Mention also should be made of a little anthem in honour of St. Medardus and Gildardus, which has been attributed to Gregory of Tours, but is probably not genuine (Surius, Jun. 8; cf. Ceillier, xi. 384; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 389). Among modern accounts of him may be mentioned the long and digressive narration of Jacques le Vasseur, *Annales de l'Église Cathédrale de Noyon*, 296-408; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 210-12; ix. 979; Baillet, *Les Vies des Saints*, Juin 8, and the *Commentarius Præcius* of the Bollandists. Other literature pertaining to him, but valueless for historical purposes, is noticed in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 662; vi. 176.

Tradition makes Medardus the founder of the ceremony of crowning the *rosière* at Salency, to which Fortunatus is supposed to allude in these two lines of his metrical biography:

Te inter mundanos vepres gradiente, fatemur,  
Calcatis spinis, promeruisse rosas.

The ceremony still survives at the chapel of St. Médard at Salency (cf. Le Vasseur, *ibid.* p. 346, 351; Barthélemy, *Monographie de l'Église Notre Dame de Noyon*, p. 234). [S. A. B.]

MEDWINUS, MEDWY, MEDVINUS, one of the reputed messengers from king Lucius to pope Eleutherus, and returning as one of the evangelisers of Britain in the 2nd century. (Cressy, *Ch. H. Brit.* bk. iv.; Ussher, *Wks.* v. cc. 3, 4.) [ELFAN.] [J. G.]

MEGETHIUS, the Marcionite interlocutor who defends the doctrine of three principles in the dialogue against the Marcionites (Sect. i.). [ADAMANTIUS (2).] [G. S.]

MEGILDULFUS, a name assigned to an early abbat of Malmesbury in the Cotton MS. Vitellius A. 10, where he is made to succeed bishop Daniel of Winchester, who is named among the abbats. Forthre is made his successor. It would seem probable that the name really represents Mailduf, the founder, and that it has been confusedly mixed up with those of bishops and other abbats of the time, either from pure carelessness or from the desire of making up a list that would cover a long blank in the monastic history of Malmesbury. [MAILDUF.]

See a paper by W. de Grey Birch in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* for 1871, p. 318. The name does not appear in William of Malmesbury, or in the list given in the *Monasticon*, vol. i. [S.]

MEL, MELL, MELUS, MEIL (MAEL, MAELUS, MAOL, MOEL), first bishop of Ardagh, co. Longford, and usually said to have been nephew of St. Patrick by Conis, and Darcera St. Patrick's sister. His memoir, collected from the *Lives of St. Patrick*, is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 259 sq.), the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 4 Feb. i. 786 sq.), and O'Hanlon (*Ir. SS.* ii. 360 sq.). With

his brothers Munis, Melchuo, and Rioc, he came to Ireland with St. Patrick from Britain, and taught the faith. He founded his monastery at Ardagh and became bishop there about A.D. 454. He died A.D. 488 (*Ann. Tig.*), and his feast is always Feb. 6. [J. G.]

MELANIA (1), a Roman lady in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century. She was of Spanish extraction, and was daughter of Marcellinus, who had been consul. She was born about A.D. 350. She was married, but her husband died when she was only 22 years old, leaving her with three children, of whom two died immediately after their father. Being full of ascetic enthusiasm, she did not indulge either grief or maternal affection, but, rejoicing that she was now more free to serve Christ, she determined to make a pilgrimage to sacred places of Egypt and Palestine. She left her remaining son to the charge of the urban praetor, and, though the winter was beginning, sailed for the East (Jerome, *Ep.* xxxix. 4; *Chron. Ann.* 377, vol. viii. ed. Vall.). This was about the year 372. She seems to have been acquainted with Jerome and his friends, who at that time formed an ascetic society at Aquileia. Her slave Hylas accompanied Jerome to Syria (Jerome, *Ep.* iii. 3), and Rufinus, from whom Jerome had then recently separated (*ibid.*), was with her in 374 in Egypt, and possibly in Palestine (Jerome, *Ep.* iv. 2). During their stay in Egypt the persecution of the orthodox by the emperor Valens arose. Rufinus was imprisoned. Melania, who had only been in Egypt six months, went with a large body of exiled bishops, clergy, and anchorites to a place near Diocaesarea in Palestine, where she supported them at her own expense. It would seem that she was joined by Rufinus after a time, and that they went together to Jerusalem. There she established herself at the Mount of Olives, where, says Jerome (*Chron.* year 377, properly 375), she was such a wonderful example of virtues, and especially of humility, that she received the name of Thecla. She formed a community of fifty virgins; she was the means of reconciling to the church a large body of heretics called Πνευματομάχοι. Her house was open to all. Amongst those who visited her was Evagrius (q. v.), whom she persuaded to embrace the monastic life (A.D. 388). She had intimate relations with John bishop of Jerusalem, and no doubt shared with Rufinus first in the friendship of Jerome and Paula when they settled at Bethlehem in 386, and afterwards in his contention with them. In 397 she returned to Italy, Rufinus still accompanying her, the object of her journey being to confirm her granddaughter Melania the younger (q. v.) in the practice of asceticism. She visited Paulinus at Nola, and was received by him with great honour, and brought to him a piece of the true cross set in gold, sent by John bishop of Jerusalem. She then took up her abode at Rome, where she no doubt assisted Rufinus through the controversy relating to his translation of Origen's works. She lived probably with her son Publicola and his wife Albina and their two children, the younger Publicola, and the younger Melania, with her husband Piniarius. Palladius, when he came to Rome to plead the cause of Chrysostom,

stayed with them. She desired to induce her granddaughter Melania and Pinianus to break off the marriage tie, and to take vows of separation, and was much displeased that, though they were willing to take a vow of continency, they would not separate from each other's society. In her vehement enthusiasm she spoke of her conflicts with those who resisted her asceticism as "fighting against wild beasts." In the year 408, Italy being threatened with the invasion of Alaric, and her son Publicola having died, she determined to leave Rome. Rufinus went with her, having quitted Aquileia on the death of his father; and she was accompanied by her daughter-in-law Albina, the younger Publicola, and Melania and Pinianus. She had made a journey to Africa in 400, carrying a letter from Paulinus to Augustine (Aug. ep. xiv.), and it was now determined that she should go to Sicily and thence to Africa, in both which countries she had estates. In Sicily Rufinus died. She passed on to Africa with the others; and, after in vain attempting to induce Melania and Pinianus to embrace the monastic state, she went on to Jerusalem. There she returned to her former habitation on the Mount of Olives, and forty days after she died at the age of 60. (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* c. 118; Paulinus, ep. 29, 31, 45, 94.) [W. H. F.]

**MELANIA (2)**, granddaughter of foregoing, and wife of Pinianus. She was daughter of Publicola son of Melania, and was born at Rome about the year 383. She married when exceedingly young, yielding to the wish of her father, though she was already imbued with the ascetic teachings of her grandmother, then living at Jerusalem. Melania the elder having come to Italy in 397 with a view to breaking off the marriage, the young husband and wife were induced to take a vow of continence, but refused to separate. They accompanied the grandmother, when she left Rome (A.D. 408), to Sicily and Africa; but, when she returned to Jerusalem, they remained at Sagaste, attaching themselves to the bishop Alypius and enjoying the friendship of Augustine. On the death of the elder Melania the remains of her estates, which were still considerable, became the property of her granddaughter. She gave away those in Gaul and Italy, but kept those in Sicily, Spain, and Africa; and this led to the attempt of the people of Hippo to induce Pinianus to become a priest of their church. In the scene in which a promise was exacted from them to remain at Hippo, Melania shewed great courage [PINIANUS]. When through the rapacity of the rebel count Heraclian she was denuded of her property, and was thus set free from the promise to remain at Hippo, she accompanied her husband to Egypt, and, after staying for some time among the monastic establishments of the Thebaid and visiting Cyril at Alexandria, eventually went to Palestine, and, together with her mother Albina, settled at Bethlehem in the year 414. There they attached themselves to Jerome, and to the younger Paula, who then presided over the convent. By this time their ascetic convictions had so developed that they were willing to accept that separation which the elder Melania had in vain urged in her lifetime. Pinianus became the head of a monastery and

Melania entered a convent. By the settlement of Melania at Bethlehem, the feud was extinguished which had separated the followers of Rufinus from those of Jerome; and although in his letter to Ctesiphon (cxliii. 3, ed. Vall., date 415) Jerome still has a bitter expression about the elder Melania, in his last letter to Augustine (cxliii. 2, ed. Vall.) in 419, Albina, Pinianus, and Melania are joined with Paula in their reverential greetings. Their intercourse with Augustine was maintained, and it was in answer to their questions on the Pelagian controversy that Augustine wrote his treatise on *Grace and Original Sin*, A.D. 418. It would appear that Melania lived on for many years. She is said by Photius to have come to Constantinople in the year 437 and to have obtained his conversion, and his baptism at the hands of Proclus. (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 119, 121; Augustin, ep. 125, 126, and *De Grat. Christi.* ii. and xxxii., *Serius*, p. 380, Dec. 31; Photius, *Cod.* 53, p. 44.) [W. H. F.]

**MELANTIUS (MELANIUS)**, 18th bishop of Rouen (572-584) during the exile of Praetextatus, and (cir. 589-601) after the death of Praetextatus (*Gall. Chr.* xi. 11); believed to have been the accomplice of queen Fredegund in the death of Praetextatus (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vii. 19, viii. 31, 41). He was one of the Gallic bishops to whom pope Gregory the Great in 601 commended the monks whom he was sending to Britain to join Augustine (lib. xi. ind. iv. Ep. 58 in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii.; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 1408). [S. A. B.]

**MELANUS, ST.**, the saint of two Cornish parishes, St. Mellion and St. Mullyan. A St. Melanius, bishop of Rennes in Brittany, was at the council of Orleans, A.D. 511, and died after A.D. 530 (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 73, 87). There was also a chapel to him at Lamellion in Liskeard. [MELANIUS.] [C. W. B.]

**MELCHITES (MELCHITÆ)**, name given by the Monophysite party to those Oriental Christians who followed the decrees of Chalcedon. It signifies in Syriac royalist or imperialist, and was intended to suggest that the orthodox party were ruled in religious matters by the emperor's (Marcian) will alone. It is the name by which the orthodox Greek church is known in Arabic writers of the middle ages. Cf. Albiruni's *Chronicle*, p. 282; Neale's *History of Holy Eastern Church*, t. ii. p. 7; Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarch. Alexand.* p. 119. [G. T. S.]

**MELCHIZEDEK.** From the notices in Philaster (*Hæc.* 52), Pseudo-Tertullian (24), and Epiphanius (55), we gather (see the article on HIPPOLYTUS, p. 98) that the anti-heretical compendium of Hippolytus, next after the article on Theodotus of Byzantium, who denied our Lord's divinity, contained an article on another Theodotus, a banker, a disciple of the former. This Theodotus is also mentioned in the "Little Labyrinth" (*Eus. H. E.* v. 28). Like his namesake he held Jesus to have been mere man until at his baptism Christ descended on him, but he added the doctrine that Melchizedek was a heavenly power still higher than Christ. He insisted on the inferiority implied in the declaration

that Christ was a high priest after the order of Melchizedek, which he interpreted as indicating that the work of intercession and advocacy which Christ was to do for men, Melchizedek had been doing for angels and heavenly powers. He laid stress also on the declaration that Melchizedek was without father, without mother, without descent, whose beginning and end were incomprehensible. It is plain that Theodotus recognised the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, a fact worth taking notice of, since we know that the Pauline origin of that Epistle was not acknowledged at the time by Hippolytus and other members of the Roman church. This notice of the heresy of Theodotus is briefly repeated by Hippolytus in his larger work against heresy (*Iref.* vii. 36, p. 258). Epiphanius gives to the school of Theodotus the name of Melchizedekians, and the name accordingly figures in later works on heresy. "Prædestinatus" as usual (34) invents an orthodox champion (Dionysius bishop of Jerusalem) for the confutation of this heresy; but there is no real reason to think that Theodotus left any sect surviving him. There is clearly no historical continuity between his teaching and the people called Melchizedekians by Timotheus Presbyter (*Cotel. Mon. Ecc. Gr.* iii. 392), whose story is that their locality was Phrygia, that they were neither Jew nor heathen, for though they kept the Sabbath they did not use the rite of circumcision: that they were called Ἀθίγγανοι, for that they would not touch, or allow themselves to be touched by, one outside their sect; nor would they take anything directly from the hands of such a person, but insisted that the object should be placed on the ground.

Epiphanius in his article gives traditional names for the father and mother of Melchizedek (concerning whom see also Philaster, 148); mentions the opinion of HIERACAS (*q. v.*) that he was the Holy Spirit; of certain Samaritans, that he was Shem; and of some of the orthodox, that he was the Son of God. On these and other patristical opinions about Melchizedek see *DICTIONARY OF BIBLE*.

In the mythology of *Pistis Sophia* Melchizedek the great officer of light (παράλημπτωρ) plays an important part (pp. 35, 292, 327-9, 337, 365). [G. S.]

MELDANUS (MEALLAN, MEDAN, MEL-LANUS), bishop and confessor at Inchiquin in Loch Corrib, co. Galway. His fame rests on his connexion with the visions of St. Furseus [FURSEUS (1)]. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 269 sq.) has compiled a memoir from the ancient *Life of St. Furseus*. His feast is Feb. 7.

Meldanus, son of Ui Cuinn, and founder of a monastery on Inis-naac-ui-cuinn in Loch Oirbsen, was spiritual adviser of St. Furseus, who was educated at his monastery. There is no account of his accompanying St. Furseus to Gaul, but St. Furseus is said to have taken his relics with special veneration to Peronne, where he is still honoured. In the visions enjoyed by St. Furseus before he left Ireland (or in England, as Bede says, *E. H.* iii. 19), the two saints, Meldan and Beoan, appeared and spoke with him [BEOAN (2)]. He must have died before A.D. 627, as he was evidently amongst the beatified when St. Furseus saw him. (Baring-Gould, *Saints*, Feb. 7, p. 193,

saying he "died at Peronne;" O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 242 sq.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 79 c. 20, 90, n. 19; O'Flaherty, *Iar-Conn.* 22, by Hardiman.) [J. G.]

MELETIUS (1) (Μελέτιος, MELITIUS), a bishop in Pontus, highly spoken of by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 32), who calls him τὸ μέλι τῆς Ἀρτικής, having become acquainted with him in Palestine, whither Meletius had retired for seven years in the persecution of Diocletian. It is stated in Philostorgius (*H. E.* i. 8) that he was bishop of Sebastopolis, and attended the council of Nicaea in 325, but his name is not in the list of the Nicene fathers (Mansi, ii. 692). Nicophorus Callistus (*H. E.* viii. 14) and Nicetas Choniata (*Theol. Fidei Orth.* v. 7) make the same statement on the authority of Philostorgius, Nicetas making this historian assert that Meletius sided with Arius at the council. But this is scarcely credible from the manner in which Meletius (evidently the Meletius of Eusebius) is mentioned by St. Basil and St. Athanasius (Basil, *Spir. Sanct.* 29, § 74; Athan. *Epist. ad Episc.* ol. *Orat.* i. ad *Or.* § 8; cf. Tillem. v. 787, vi. 641, 647, ix. 684). Meletius of Sebastopolis, who died cir. 330, seems to have been confused with the later Meletius of Sebaste, afterwards of Antioch (cf. Tillem. x. 460). Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* i. 425) makes him the first known bishop of Sebastopolis, and Sebastopolis a suffragan see of Sebaste. [C. H.]

MELETIUS (2) (MELITIUS), bishop of Lycopolis. The council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) attributes to this man "rashness and levity of character," and blames him for "previous insubordination" (Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9; Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 9). The accounts of Meletius (or Melitius) and of the origin of his "insubordination" as given by three documents discovered by Maffei at Verona (see Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, iii. p. 381, &c.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. § 40) and by Epiphanius (*Haeres.* lxxviii. 1-4) vary considerably. Modern ecclesiastical historians have usually followed the first-named documents, which are supported as to their main statements by the independent testimony of Athanasius (*Apol. c. Arianos*, §§ 11, 59; *Epist. ad Episc. Aegypti et Libyae*, c. 22) and Socrates (i. 6, &c.); while the narrative of Epiphanius is considered too Meletian in its colouring and contradicting well ascertained facts.

Meletius was ordained bishop not long before the beginning of the Arian controversy. The see of Lycopolis stood next in rank to that of Alexandria, of which Peter, afterwards martyr, was then bishop (A.D. 300-311). Meletius took advantage of Peter's flight from persecution (Sozomen, *Ecll. Hist.* i. 24) to intrude into his and other dioceses, ordain priests, and assume the character of primate of Egypt. A protest was raised against his conduct, and sent to him by four aggrieved but incarcerated Egyptian bishops, Hesycheus, Pachomius, Theodore, and Phileas. They urged that his act—the act of one whom they term "dilectus comminister in Domino"—was unnecessary and uncalled for; that it had been carried out without consulting them or Peter; and that it involved a breach of that ecclesiastical rule which forbade one bishop from intruding into the diocese of another. Meletius took no notice either of the protest or of

Peter. The bishops were martyred, and Meletius went to Alexandria. There he was received by the two elders, Isidore and the afterwards famous Arius; probably at their instigation he excommunicated two visitors appointed by Peter, and replaced them by others. The archbishop of Alexandria then wrote forbidding his flock to have fellowship with Meletius until the character of these acts had been investigated. A synod of Egyptian bishops assembled under Peter, and deposed Meletius (A.D. 306) for his acts of irregularity and insubordination.

Athanasius and Socrates affirm indeed that the degradation of Meletius was specially due to his having "denied the faith during persecution and sacrificed;" but in this they probably express not so much a fact as the popular belief which could not otherwise explain why orthodox bishops were imprisoned and martyred, while Meletius passed through the length and breadth of the land unhindered. The council of Nicaea, however, in its comments upon, and condemnation of, Meletius, takes no note of impiety; and the statement of Epiphanius—Meletius "was orthodox in his belief, and never dissented from the creed of the church in a single point. He was the author of a schism, but not of alterations of belief"—is probably true of the bishop, if not of his followers.

Meletius retorted upon his deponents by separating himself and his followers. Peter, in his turn, is reported to have preached against the Meletians, and to have rejected their baptism (Sozomen, i. xv.); Meletius retaliated by abusing Peter and his immediate successors Achilles and Alexander (see Athanasius and Socrates, *op. cit.*).

Matters continued thus till the whole question was considered by the council of Nicaea. The second, fourth, and sixth canons have reference directly or indirectly to the Egyptian schism; and in a synodical epistle addressed by the bishops assembled there "to the holy and great church of the Alexandrians and to the beloved brethren throughout Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis," the "contumacy of Meletius and of those who had been ordained by him" is dealt with (Socrates, i. 9; Theodoret, i. 9). The line adopted was one of "clemency;" although Meletius is described as "strictly speaking wholly undeserving of favour." He was permitted to remain in his own city and retain a nominal dignity; but he was to exercise no authority either to ordain or nominate for ordination. In dealing with those who had received appointments from him, the council decreed that such persons should first be confirmed by a more legitimate ordination, and then be admitted to communion and retain their rank and ministry. Under the circumstances they were also to be counted inferior in every diocese and church to those who had been previously ordained and established by Alexander. The power of proposing or nominating whom they pleased was taken from them, nor were they to do anything at all without the concurrence of the bishops of the Catholic and Apostolical Church under Alexander. Should church preferments become vacant through death, then they who had been recently admitted to orders might be advanced, provided that they were worthy, and the popular election were ratified by Alexander.

To the recipients of these concessions and privileges there was one exception—Meletius himself; "To him," said the bishops, "we by no means grant the same licence, on account of his former disorderly conduct. If the least authority were accorded to him, he would abuse it by again exciting confusion."

It is doubtful whether Meletius was at the council or not; but he did not resist its decrees. At Alexander's request he handed in a list of his clerical adherents, from which it appeared that his followers included twenty-nine bishops, and in Alexandria itself four priests and three deacons. Meletius retired to Lycopolis, and during Alexander's lifetime remained quiet; but the appointment of Athanasius to the see of Alexandria was the signal for union of every faction opposed to him, and in the events which followed Meletius took a personal part. The uncompromising sternness of Athanasius was contrasted with the "clemency" of the council and of Alexander; Arian and Meletian, schismatic and heretic banded together against the one man they dreaded, and so pitiless and powerful was their hate that it wrung from him the comment on the pardon accorded to Meletius by the council of Nicaea—"Would to God he had never been received!"

The date of the death of Meletius is not known; but before his death he nominated, contrary to the decree of the Nicene council, his friend John as his successor (Sozomen, ii. 21), a rank accorded to him and recognised by that council of Tyre (A.D. 335) in which the Eusebians and others deposed Athanasius (*ib. ii. 25*). "In process of time," says Sozomen (ii. 21), "the Meletians were generally called Arians in Egypt." Originally, —differences of opinion in doctrinal theology parted them; but the adopting joint measures of attack or defence gradually led the Meletians to adopt Arian doctrines [see *ARIUS*] and side with Arian church politics. The Meletians died out after the 5th century; the monks described by Theodoret (i. 9) being among the latest and most eccentric of the sect: "They neglected sound doctrine, and observed certain vain points of discipline, upholding the same infatuated views as the Jews and Samaritans."

In addition to the authorities mentioned, consult Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*; Neander, Bright, and the usual Church historians. [J. M. F.]

**MELETIUS (3)**, bishop of Antioch. This man, at the time of his translation to Antioch bishop of Sebaste in Armenia (Sozomen, *Ecll. Hist.* iv. 28; Theodoret, *Ecll. Hist.* ii. 31), or—according to Socrates (*Ecll. Hist.* ii. 44)—bishop of Beroea in Syria, was held in high repute for his "exemplary life." "The sweet calm look, the radiant smile, the kind hand seconding the kind voice," were recalled after his death as features of one beloved by all (Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio in fun. Meletii*).

Meletius came to Antioch in troublous times (A.D. 361). The see had been vacated through the disorderly translation of Eudoxius to Constantinople (A.D. 360); and the city was still a focus for theological rancour and dispute. The Eustathians (see *EUSTATHIUS* of Antioch), under the venerated priest Paulinus, represented the orthodox party with whom Athanasius was in communion, the Eudoxians were Arian or semi-



Arian. Meletius owed his appointment to the joint application to Constantius of both parties. On the one hand the Eudoxians, believing him to be firmly attached to their tenets, looked to him "to attract the inhabitants of Antioch and of the neighbouring cities, to conform to their heresy" (Sozomen); on the other, the supporters of apostolical doctrine, "aware of his sound principles, as well as of his great virtues," took zealous measures to ensure the decree of his election being signed; and, when completed, entrusted it to the care of Eusebius bishop of Samosata, "a noble defender and champion of the truth" (Socrates). The imperial command was issued, and the arrival of Meletius was greeted by an immense concourse, curious, critical, and excited by hopes or fears. The report was spread abroad that he maintained the doctrines of the council of Nicaea; and he was desired to take part with other bishops "of rhetorical ability" in explaining to the multitude the words of Prov. viii. 22. George bishop of Laodicea delivered an unmistakably Arian address; Acacius bishop of Caesarea "steered a middle course between the impiety of the Arians and the purity of the apostolical doctrines, differing greatly from the one and yet not preserving the characteristic features of the other;" Meletius followed. He at first confined himself to moral subjects and the principles enforced by the ecclesiastical canons; avoiding all doctrinal questions, and "saying neither too much nor too little." He was listened to with general approbation; but the discussion of morals and canons was not what friend or foe wanted. He was entreated to give a brief synopsis of his doctrine; and his declaration "the Son is of the same substance as the Father," at once and unequivocally proclaimed him an upholder of the essential doctrine of Nicaea. A scene of great tumult followed; the applause of the Catholics was met by the cries of the infuriated Arians. The Arian archdeacon sprang forward and stopped the bishop's mouth with his hand. Meletius instantly extended three fingers towards the people, closed them, and then allowing only one to remain extended, expressed by signs what he was prevented from uttering. As the archdeacon freed his mouth to seize his hand, Meletius used his regained liberty of speech to exclaim: "Three Persons are conceived in the mind, but we speak as if addressing One" (Theodoret and Sozomen). Eudoxius, Acacius, and their partisans were furious; they reviled the bishop and charged him with Sabellianism; they met in council and deposed him; and they induced the emperor, "more changeable than Aeolus," to banish him to his native country, and to appoint Euzoios, the friend of Arius, as his successor.

The Catholics, of course, repudiated Euzoios, but they did not all become adherents to Meletius. The Eustathian section of their body could not conscientiously unite with one who, however orthodox in faith, had received consecration from Arian bishops; neither would they communicate with his followers who had received Arian baptism. Schism followed. The Meletians withdrew to the Church of the Apostles in the old part of the city; the followers of Paulinus met in a small church within the city, this concession being made by Euzoios out of personal respect for Paulinus.

The death of Constantius (A.D. Nov. 361), and

the decrees of toleration promulgated by Julian, permitted the banished bishops to return. An effort was at once made, especially by Athanasius and Eusebius bishop of Vercellae, to establish unity in the church as a means of resistance to the pagan emperor; and this was one of the principal objects of a council held at Alexandria in A.D. 362 (Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, i. 727). The schism at Antioch was there gravely considered. Finally, it was ordered that Paulinus and his followers should unite with Meletius; and that the church, thus united, should in the spirit of the fullest toleration receive all who accepted the Nicene creed and rejected the errors of Arianism, Sabellianism, Macedonianism, &c. Eusebius of Vercellae and Asterius of Petra were commissioned to proceed to Antioch, taking with them the synodal letter (*Tomus ad Antiochenos*), which was probably the work of Athanasius.

The prospects of peace had, however, been fatally imperilled before the commissioners reached the city. Lucifer bishop of Calaris had chosen to go direct to Antioch instead of attending the council of Alexandria. He appears to have repeatedly exhorted both Meletians and Eustathians to unity; but his sympathies were strongly with the latter; and, when the former opposed him, he took the injudicious step of consecrating Paulinus to be bishop. "This was not right," Theodoret justly protests, and the consequences were what might have been expected; the act increased the dissension, and was the means of prolonging the schism for eighty-five years (Theodoret, iii. 5). When Eusebius reached Antioch, he found that "the evil had, by such unwise measures, been made incurable;" remonstrance was useless, and, in fact, accentuated the antagonism to such a degree that Lucifer severed himself from communion with the Alexandrian church (see LUCIFER). The long connexion of Athanasius with the Eustathians made him unwilling to disown Paulinus, who accepted the synodal letter; and further attempts at union were for the time given up.

The short reign of Julian was one of great distress to the Christians at Antioch. Meletius remained at his post, and is said to have accompanied to the place of martyrdom two officers, who in A.D. 363 were put to death for refusing to lay aside the Christian standard of the labarum (Ruinart, quoted in Bright's *Hist. of the Church*, p. 123, note k). The same year Jovian succeeded the Apostate, and a truer toleration was instituted by an emperor who did not hesitate to announce his preference for the Homousian faith (Socrates, iii. 24). Meletius is said by Socrates to have been held in high estimation by Jovian; and his influence at court was soon craftily utilised by the Acacians. They were known for a "readiness to accommodate their opinions to those invested with supreme authority;" they now persuaded Meletius that they assented to the Nicene creed; and the orthodox world witnessed the presentation to Jovian of a declaration in which Catholic and Acacian attested side by side a common faith in God and a common hatred of the Anomoians. Jovian's reply, according to Anomoian the same liberty of opinion as to Acacian, was a proof that he understood the new supporters of Meletius better

than the bishop [ACACIUS]. Jovian's death (A.D. 364), and the edict of Valens, expelling a second time the bishops expelled by Constantius and recalled by Julian, once more drove Meletius into exile. Two devoted Antiochians, Flavian and Diodorus, rallied the persecuted who refused to communicate with the Arian Euzoios, and assembled them in caverns by the river side and in the open country. Paulinus, "on account of his eminent piety" (Socrates, iv. 2), was left unmolested.

During the fourteen years which followed, the few facts which throw light upon the state of religious parties at Antioch seem to exhibit suspicion and imputation, bitterness and alienation as rife amongst the followers of Meletius and Paulinus. Basil (*Ep.* 89) recommended Meletius to write to Athanasius, who was grieved with the failure of his previous efforts. If Meletius did so, he probably could not avoid expressing his regret that the advice of the council of Alexandria had not been more firmly pressed upon Paulinus by Athanasius. But as Athanasius would not sever the old ties between himself and the Eustathians, Meletius must have felt that nothing could be done towards union so long as that party was backed in their disunion by the great archbishop. The death of Athanasius (A.D. 373) did not advance matters towards a solution. His successor Peter and Damasus of Rome spoke in A.D. 377 of Eusebius and Meletius as Arians (Basil, *Ep.* 266). The Western bishops and Paulinus in fact suspected Meletius and the Easterns of Arianism on account of their assertion of "three Hypostases;" the Easterns in their turn imputed Sabellianism to the Westerns. "All the charitable pains taken by the council of Alexandria appear to have been thrown away" (Bright, p. 159).

Gratian became sovereign of the whole empire in A.D. 378, and he at once proclaimed toleration to all sects, with a few exceptions (Socrates, v. 2). The Arians of Antioch must have been among these exceptions (Theodoret, v. 2). Sapor, a military chief, went there to dispossess the partisans of Euzoios, and to assign the Arian churches to the orthodox party. On his communicating the imperial mandate to Paulinus, that aged and venerable man promised to communicate with Damasus. His intention was somewhat scornfully treated by Flavian. Meletius is said to have taken a kinder line (Theodoret, v. 3). He addressed Paulinus thus: "As God has committed to me the care of this flock, and to you the charge of another; and as our respective sheep hold the same doctrines of religion, let us, my friend, unite our flocks; let us throw aside all contests for superiority, and tend with equal diligence the sheep entrusted to us. If the episcopal chair of this city be to us a matter of contention, let us place the holy Gospel upon it, and let us seat ourselves on each side of it.\* If I die first, you shall become the only ruler of the flock; if you die first I will—as far as I am able—tend the flock alone." This offer, whether made by Meletius himself or by his partisans (Socrates, Sozomen), was declined; Paulinus and his followers declared it to be contrary to the canons to admit as coadjutor one who had

been ordained by Arians. Sapor pacified the Meletians by handing the churches over to them; and the mutual animosity of the two parties was for the time allayed by the action of the six principal presbyters of the church. They bound themselves by oath not only to use no effort to secure consecration for themselves when either Paulinus or Meletius should die, but also to permit the survivor of these two to retain undisturbed and sole possession of the see.

In A.D. 379 a council at Antioch, under Meletius, accepted the synodal letter of Damasus (A.D. 378), which, known as "the Tome of the Westerns," was sent in the first instance to Paulinus; and two years later (A.D. 381) Meletius—though disowned by Rome and Alexandria—was appointed to preside at the council of Constantinople (the second great council). The bishop was greeted by the emperor Theodosius with tokens of the warmest affection; and, in explanation of "demonstrations of affection such as would be shewn by a dutiful son on beholding a beloved father after a long separation," the emperor recounted his vision in which he had seen the bishop of Antioch investing him with imperial robes and placing a crown upon his head (Theodoret, v. 6, 7).

During the session of the council, Meletius died. His remains were conveyed to Antioch with care and reverence; the cities through which the escort passed received them with honour and singing of psalms; they finally rested by the side of Babylas the Martyr.

The schism, in pursuance of the agreement already mentioned, ought now to have ended. Paulinus was still alive, and should have been recognised as sole bishop. The Meletian party, however, irritated by his treatment of their leader, secured the appointment of Flavian; and thus a fresh division arose, "rending the church of Antioch into rival factions not grounded on any difference of faith, but simply on a preference of bishops" (Socrates, v. 269).

The history of the Meletians, as a separate party, becomes now merged into that of the Flavianists [FLAVIAN]. It need only be recorded here that the schism was practically ended in Flavian's lifetime.

In addition to the authorities quoted or referred to, consult Herzog's *R. E.* and Ceillier, *s. n.*, as well as the usual church histories.

[J. M. F.]

**MELETIUS (4)** (designated in the super-scription of the letter ἀρχιεπιστοῦς, a friend of St. Basil, residing in a remote and solitary place, who had invited Basil to visit him A.D. 375. Basil regrets his inability. (Basil, *Epist.* 193 [369].) [E. V.]

**MELETIUS (5)**, a young recruiting officer, styled by Basil his "much-desired son," ποθεινότατος υἱός, by whom Basil sent letters to Amphiloehus of Iconium in the spring of 375 A.D. (Basil, *Epist.* 200 [397].) [E. V.]

**MELETIUS (6)**, a presbyter much trusted by Basil, who speaks of him as his fellow-labourer in the gospel, who had subdued his fleshly appetites at the expense of his bodily health. In 375 Basil sent letters by him to the monks of Pontus, of whom he had been the superior, begging them not to listen to the

\* In the ancient church, the Book of the Gospels was considered the symbol of Christ Himself.

calumnies by which he was attacked (Basil, *Epist.* 226 [73]), and also to Elpidius, one of the bishops of the seaboard, asking him to appoint a time and place for a congress of the neighbouring bishops (*Epist.* 205 [322]). [E. V.]

MELETIUS (7), a relative of Gregory Nazianzen by marriage; it is not quite certain whether the husband of his sister or of one of his nieces, whom he regarded as his own daughters, the word *γαμβρός* denoting equally brother-in-law and son-in-law. He is stigmatised in Gregory's will for retaining possession of a farm at Apenzinus which was really the property of Euphemius. [EUPHEMIUS (2).] (Greg. Naz. *Test.*) [E. V.]

MELITO, bishop of Sardis, the capital of Lydia, held, in the third quarter of the 2nd century, a foremost place among the bishops of Asia, both in respect of personal influence and of literary activity. Shortly before the end of that century his name is mentioned by Polycrates of Ephesus, in his letter to Victor of Rome (*Eus. H. E.* v. 24), as one of the luminaries of the Asiatic church by whose authority its Quartodeciman practice had been commended: "Melito the eunuch, whose whole walk was in the Holy Spirit, who lies in Sardis, waiting for the episcopate from heaven, in which he shall rise from the dead." This notice falls in well enough with the supposition that Melito had died some twenty years previous to its date. Melito, being last on the list, may be supposed to have been the latest of those included in it; and we may infer that he died a natural death, since it is not said of him, as it is of some of the others, that he suffered martyrdom. It may be doubted whether the description "eunuch" is to be understood literally, or whether it only means that Melito passed his entire life in virgin continence; and in behalf of the former view it might be argued that such continence could hardly have been so unusual in a bishop of the time as to gain for Melito a special epithet. On the other hand, it may be mentioned that, in speaking of the virginity of the apostle John, Tertullian (*de Monog.* 17) applies to him the epithet "spado," and Jerome (on Isaiah, c. 56, vol. iv. p. 658) calls him "eunuchus." Zahn (p. ciii.) supposes these epithets to have been derived from Leucius (see LEUCIUS), and that the work of Leucius was older than Polycrates. If so, the use of the word by Polycrates in a similar sense could be accounted for. At all events this use of the word is illustrated by the fact that the Encratite work of CASSIANUS (*q. v.*) on continence had for its second title *περὶ εὐνουχίας*.

The next extant mention of Melito is in the "Little Labyrinth" (see HIPPOLYTUS, Vol. III. p. 98), a work some twenty years later than the letter of Polycrates (*Eus.* v. 28). Melito is there appealed to as one of the writers, older than Victor of Rome, who had spoken of our Lord as being God as well as man. The extant fragments well bear out this assertion, the marvel that the attributes of two natures should be united in one person being to all appearance the topic on which Melito had most delight in enlarging.

A reference to Melito contemporary with that last cited, or a little earlier, was made in a lost work of Tertullian, and is known to us through

a citation by Jerome in the article in his catalogue (c. 24) on Melito. He says, "Hujus elegans et declamatorium ingenium cavillatus Tertullianus in septem libris quos scripsit adversus ecclesiam pro Montano dicit eum a plerisque nostrorum prophetam putari." The notice sufficiently shows the high reputation which Melito bore in the time of Tertullian. Of Melito's relations to Montanism we shall speak presently.

Our fullest information is derived from the notices in Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 13, 26), who gives a list of the works of Melito with which he was himself acquainted, together with three extracts. We thus learn that Melito was a very voluminous writer. We speak first of his apology presented to the emperor Marcus Aurelius, though chronologically this may have been the latest of his works. At least Eusebius mentions it at the end of his list with the words, *ἐπὶ πᾶσι καὶ τὸ πρὸς Ἀντωνίνου βιβλίδιον*. The name *βιβλίδιον* (*libellus*) is the proper technical name for a petition addressed to the emperor. The Apology of Melito is placed under the year 170 in Jerome's translation of the chronicle of Eusebius, and though this notice is absent from the Armenian, this is probably one of the many inaccuracies of that version. The date may be more securely inferred from one of the passages preserved by Eusebius. Melito, addressing Marcus Aurelius, and speaking of Augustus, says, "Of whom you have become the much wished-for successor, and shall be so with your son if you keep that philosophy which took its beginning with Augustus," &c. That he here says "with your son," not "with your brother," is evidence that the date is later than the death of Lucius Verus, in 169. Commodus was associated in the empire with his father in 176. The passage which we have quoted does not determine whether this association had already taken place or was only anticipated. In the year 177 persecutions of Christians were raging violently all over the empire. Melito's memorial seems to have been written at the very first beginning of that persecution. The Christians seem to be suffering more in their property than in their persons, and Melito is able to express a doubt whether the emperor had sanctioned the cruelties inflicted on them, and a belief that, when he had examined into the case, he would interfere in their favour. Melito declares that Nero and Domitian were the only emperors who had sanctioned persecutions of Christians, and it is probably from this passage that Tertullian derives his argument that only bad emperors had persecuted the Christians. On the other side, as forbidding interference, Melito quotes the letter of Hadrian to Fundanus, and letters of Antoninus, at a time when Aurelius himself was associated in the government, to the people of Larissa, of Thessalonica, and of Athens. One extract from the Apology preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle* (p. 483, Dindorf) gave rise to some discussion in the early Socinian controversy. "We are not worshippers of senseless stones, but adore one only God, who is before all and over all, and [over] His Christ truly God the Word before all ages." The second "over" given in Rader's edition of the Chronicle does not appear in the latest edition (Dindorf's).

An Apology under the name of Melito is extant in a Syriac translation in one of the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum. It bears the heading, "The oration of Melito the Philosopher held before Antoninus Caesar, and he spoke to Caesar that he might know God, and he shewed him the way of truth, and began to speak as follows." It is likely that the Syriac translator, finding in his Greek original that the Apology was "addressed" to the emperor, made a blunder in supposing that it was delivered before the emperor *vice versa*. This Apology was printed in Syriac, with English translation, by Cureton (*Spicileg. Syr.*) and by Pitra, with a Latin translation by Renan (*Spicil. Solesm.* vol. ii.). This Latin translation has been revised in Otto's *Apologists*, vol. ix. Although this Syriac Apology has the appearance of being complete, it contains none of the passages cited by Eusebius, and its character seems to be entirely different from that of the work known to Eusebius. The latter work, as far as we know it, had mainly the practical object to induce the emperor to stop the persecution of Christians by shewing that they did not deserve the treatment inflicted on them. The Syriac Apology is a calm argument against the absurdities of polytheism and idolatry, such as might have been written with the hope of making a convert of the emperor, but does not exhibit any of the mental tension of one suffering under unjust persecution. On the whole we conclude that the Syriac Apology is not the same as that from which Eusebius has given extracts. The question then arises, did Melito write two apologies? In proof that he did, appeal has been made to the *Paschal Chronicle*, which records an Apology of Melito both under the years 164 and 169. But an examination of the passages shews that it is clear that they only exhibit a double mention of one Apology; so that the hypothesis that there were two remains without historical confirmation. The double mention in the Chronicle was probably caused by the double mention in Eusebius, iv. 13, 26. Though the ascription of the Syriac Apology to Melito is probably an error, yet the document is likely to be not much later than the age of Melito. There are slight, but we think decisive, traces of the use of Justin Martyr's Apology: this work must therefore be placed later. It is addressed to an emperor Antoninus, under which name might have been addressed Pius, Aurelius, Caracalla, or Elagabalus. It is probable that one of the two last is intended. The writer's point of view seems to be Syrian. In his enumeration of heathen idolatries he does not mention, as we might expect from Melito writing in Asia Minor, Cybele, or the Ephesian Diana; while he speaks in much detail of Syrian objects of worship, and seems to shew a personal acquaintance with the city of Mabug, the Syrian Hierapolis. The admonition, "If they wish to dress you in a female garment remember that you are a man," is more suitably addressed to Elagabalus than to any of the other emperors we have mentioned. From other arguments used we cannot draw any certain inferences. Thus the emperor is not allowed to excuse himself for the retention of idolatry by the necessity of consulting the wishes of his subjects, or of following the usages of his fathers. One pas-

sage more may be reckoned as yielding a presumption of Syrian authorship. The writer speaks of the world as destined to suffer from three deluges—one of wind, one of water, one of fire; the first two already past, the third still to come. The deluge of wind is that by which the tower of Babel was supposed to have been destroyed (see the Sibylline verses quoted by Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* ii. 31, and also Abydenus, quoted by Eusebius, *Praep. Evan.* ix. 14). Cureton (*Spic. Syr.* p. 94) quotes the phrase "flood of wind" as occurring in the work called *The Cave of Treasures* (see ADAM, BOOKS OF, Vol. I. p. 36). The same phrase is found in the Ethiopic book of Adam (Ewald's *Jahrbücher der Bibl. Wiss.* 1853). It has been contended that the language in which the apologist here speaks of the deluge of fire shews acquaintance with the Second Epistle of Peter; but it seems to us that this can by no means be positively asserted. On the New Testament allusions in this Apology see Westcott, *N. T. Canon*, p. 219.

Against placing the Apology so late as Elagabalus, may be urged that its conclusion, if interpreted most naturally, speaks of the emperor as having children; and though the force of the argument may be evaded by supposing the apologist to be merely expressing a wish on behalf of the emperor's unborn successors, yet it is simpler to refer the work to the time of Caracalla, who spent some time in Syria. There seem also to be traces that Tertullian, who was acquainted with the Eusebian Apology of Melito, also used this one. Such perhaps may be the identification of Serapis with Joseph, and the remark that the old heathen gods were practically held in less honour than the emperors, as was proved, for instance, by the fact that their temples had to pay taxes.

We turn now to other works of Melito. First in the list of Eusebius is mentioned a work in two books, *περὶ τοῦ πάσχα*. The date is limited by the opening sentence which Eusebius quotes: "In the proconsulate over Asia of Servilius Paulus, at the time that Sagaris suffered martyrdom, there took place much dispute at Laodicea about the Paschal celebration *ἐπιπέοντος κατὰ καιρὸν* in those days, and these things were written." Rufinus here reads "Sergius Paulus," and this appears from other authorities to have been the real name of the proconsul in question. He was afterwards city prefect, and had his second consulship in 168, from which it may be inferred (see FUSCIANUS) that he was made city prefect in 167. The appointment being usually for life, Waddington and Le Bas infer (*Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques*, ch. ii. § 148 in *Voyage Archéol.* t. iii. p. 731) that his proconsulate was earlier, probably within the limits 164–166.

There is some difficulty in the words which we have left untranslated. If we explain them as saying that the martyrdom of Sagaris took place at Easter, the following words, "in those days," are superfluous and unmeaning, unless we transpose the *καί*, and read the last clause, "And in those days these things were written." On the other hand, if we understand it that there was a coincidence that year between the Easter celebrated by both parties, why should there have been a dispute? And was the

moment when persecution had cut off a leading bishop just the time when Christians from other cities would court danger by crowding to the spot, and would engage in disputes as to their respective customs? The best solution we can offer is that the Paschal disputes took place, not the year of the martyrdom of Sagaris, but the year following. In the years 164 and 167 the astronomical full moons fell on Sundays, March 26 and 23 respectively. According to our present rules, both these days would be Easter Sundays; and it is quite possible that all parties in Asia Minor might have united in Paschal celebrations on both days. Supposing that Sagaris was martyred on either day, next year there would be a new proconsul, and the Asiatic churches might have peace. Christians might come together at the Easter season from all the Asiatic cities to celebrate the anniversary of the martyrdom of Sagaris, and the diversities in the Paschal celebrations of different cities would be forced into notice.

The appeal of Polycrates to the authority of Melito leaves no room for doubt that the latter, in his work on Easter celebration, took the Quartodeciman side. Eusebius tells us that the work of Melito drew forth another, no doubt on the opposite side, from Clement of Alexandria. It has been conjectured that Melito was the Ionian whom Clement (*Eus. H. E.* v. 11) enumerates as among his teachers. It would be foreign to this article to discuss the points at issue in the Quartodeciman disputes. Suffice it here to say that the extant fragments of Melito refute the notion that Quartodecimanism was inconsistent with the reception of the fourth Gospel. In one passage Melito speaks of our Lord's three years' ministry after His baptism, which he could not have learned from the synoptic Gospels. In another he accounts for the fact that it was a ram, not a lamb, that was substituted as a sacrifice for Isaac, by the remark that our Lord, when He suffered, was not young like Isaac, but of mature years. Possibly here there may be an indication that Melito held the same theory concerning our Lord's age as Irenaeus and other Asiatics, derived no doubt from John viii. 57. At all events the whole passage shews that Melito believed strongly in the atoning efficacy of Christ's death, and looked on Him as the sacrificial lamb. The word he uses is *ἀμνός*, as in the Gospel, not *ἀρνίον*, as in the Apocalypse.

The next work of Melito from which Eusebius has given an extract is a work in six books, called "Selections," addressed to a friend named Onesimus, who had asked Melito to make selections from the law and the prophets of passages treating concerning our Saviour, and concerning all our faith, and also to give him accurate information as to the number and order of the Old Testament books. Melito relates that he had gone up to the East to the place where the things were preached and done, and had accurately learned the books of the Old Testament. His list is as follows: The five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four of Kings, two of Chronicles, Psalms of David, Proverbs of Solomon, also called Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; of the Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve Minor Prophets in one book, Daniel,

Ezekiel, Esdras. The last, no doubt, includes Nehemiah and possibly Esther, which otherwise finds no place in the list. This list gives the Hebrew canon adopted by our own church; but if it be compared with the list of Josephus, it will be seen that there are some differences in the order of the books, and that the number of twenty-two books is not attempted to be made out. The expressions which occur in the extract, "the Old Books," "the Books of the Old Testament," shew clearly that the church of Melito's time had a *New Testament* canon.

Besides the three works from which he has given extracts, Eusebius enumerates the following works of Melito as having come to his own knowledge. The titles only enable us imperfectly to guess at the contents of the books, and in some cases there is uncertainty about the titles themselves. (4) *τὰ περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν*. Jerome, who translates "*De vita prophetarum liberum unum*," appears to have read *περὶ πολιτείας τῶν προφητῶν*, and this reading is adopted by Otto. Jerome's "*librum unum*" is certainly wrong. If only a single work is spoken of, the *τά* shews that it must have been in more books than one. But it is more likely that two separate works "on Christian Conversation" and "on the Prophets" are coupled together by Eusebius, because in the Caesarean Library they were contained in the same volume. It is to be noted that one of the letters of Dionysius of Corinth is described by Eusebius as *διεργητικὴ τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελιον πολιτείας*. If we join the words together we might be inclined to imagine the book to be anti-Montanist, dealing with the unsaintly lives of the Montanist prophets in the same way as Apollonius (*Eus. H. E.* v. 18). But the things which Apollonius reprehends are not likely to have exhibited themselves so early as the time of Melito. (5) *περὶ ἐκκλησίας*. It has been conjectured that the breaking out of Montanism may have made it necessary to insist on the authority of the church. (6) *περὶ κυριακῆς*. Possibly the Quartodeciman controversy led to discussion about the Lord's Day. This word *κυριακῆς*, used in Rev. i. 10, is found also in Ignatius's epistle to the Magnesians, c. 9, and in the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to Soter (*Eusebius*, iv. 33). (7) *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*. Some MSS. of Eusebius read *πίστεως* instead of *φύσεως*, and so Rufinus and the Syriac list given by Cureton; Jerome omits this altogether. (8) *περὶ πάσσεως*. This book on the formation of man, and the preceding one on the nature of man, if that be the reading, are conjectured to have been directed against Gnostic theories. (9) *περὶ ὑπακοῆς πίστεως αἰσθητηρίων*. The "obedience of faith" is a Pauline phrase, but what was the subject of a treatise on the obedience of faith of the senses, has perplexed ancient as well as modern readers of this list. An obvious solution is that a *περὶ* may have dropped out of the text, and that there were two treatises, one on the Obedience of Faith, one on the Senses: this is Jerome's solution. The Syriac translator, or the text which he followed, substitutes *ἀκοῆς* for *ὑπακοῆς*, and he renders "on the hearing of the law of faith." The rule of preferring the more difficult reading is in favour of the present text of Eusebius, but we

do not care to repeat any of the conjectural explanations that have been given of the special object of this treatise. (10) *περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος καὶ νοῦς*.<sup>a</sup> This work was probably akin to No. 7 on Human Nature. On the trichotomy compare Irenaeus, V. 9. Some Syriac fragments from this treatise were published by Cureton (xiii. Otto). (11) *περὶ λουτροῦ*. We have no means of verifying or refuting Piper's conjecture that in this work on Baptism the question of the validity of heretical baptism already came under discussion. In an extant fragment (No. xii. Otto) Melito treats the *ἕδωρ ἀφέσεως* (Ezek. xlvi. 3, LXX.) as a prediction of baptism, and in the same passage says that two things confer forgiveness of sins, suffering for Christ and baptism. This passage has very unreasonably been imagined to bear the stamp of a later age, when the merits of martyrdom were unduly exalted. The very first time a catechumen suffered martyrdom it could not but be felt that however strongly baptism might be regarded as ordinarily necessary to the forgiveness of sins, it must not be held to be so exclusively necessary as to oblige us to despair of the salvation of those to whom, though unbaptized, Christ had given grace to confess Him and to die for Him. (12) *περὶ ἀληθείας*. This may have been an apologetic work in commendation of Christianity. A work of Apollonius with the same title is mentioned by Eusebius, No. 27, in juxtaposition with a work *πρὸς Ἕλληνας*. It has been conjectured that the Syriac Apology already mentioned may be identical with this work. (13) *περὶ κτίσεως καὶ γενέσεως Χριστοῦ*. It would seem that some transcribers stumbled at the use of the word *κτίσεως* in reference to our Lord. Several MSS. read *πίστεως*, and this reading was adopted by Rufinus, who breaks up the work into two, *De Fide* and *De Generatione Christi*. Jerome omits the former word altogether. But there is nothing to take offence at. Ancient writers with one consent apply to our Lord the *Κόριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ* of Prov. viii. 22. For a full discussion of this verse see Athan. *Or. Cont. Ar.* ii. 44. (14) *περὶ προφητείας*. A work with the same title written, or intended to be written, by Clement of Alexandria, was directed against the Montanists (*Strom.* iv. 13, p. 605), and this may also have been the design of this work of Melito. It must be borne in mind, however, that we do not know for certain that the Montanist controversy had broken out before the death of Melito. Whether through carelessness or through variety of reading, Jerome translates the words of Eusebius, *λόγος αὐτοῦ περὶ προφητείας*, *De prophetia sua librum unum*, as if he had read *περὶ πρ. αὐτοῦ*. And so Rufinus seems to have read, who connects the clause with the preceding "De generatione Christi et de prophetia ejus." (15) *περὶ φιλοξενίας*. (16) *ἡ κλείς*. What was the nature of this work we have no information, and are left to conjecture. For a long time it was supposed that we had excellent means of knowledge. A Latin work, bearing the title *Melitonis Clavis Sanctae Scripturae*, was mentioned by Labbe in 1653 as preserved in the library of the Clermont

College, and as akin to the *Formulae Spirituales Intelligentiae* of EUSEBIUS (see Vol. II. p. 256). This work several times missed a chance of publication. It had been consulted by Sirmond; it had been copied by Le Quien for Grabe, in whose *Spicilegium* it would have been inserted if death had not prevented; copied again by Magnus Crusius and by Woog, the former of whom failed to carry out an expressed intention of publishing it, the latter published only some specimens, which produced no favourable impression of the work. Galland sought information about it, but did not include it in his collection. Neither did Routh, who was able to use the copy made for Grabe. At length Pitra, whose attention had been caught by Labbe's note, made it his ambition to recover such a treasure as a 2nd century work on the interpretation of Scripture; and he gives a most interesting account of his nearly twenty-five years' search, his successive disappointments, and his ultimate success. The Clermont Library had been dispersed, the MSS. had been purchased by a Dutch collector, Gerard Meermann, on whose death they were sold by auction, and the copy of the *Clavis* suffered the ignominy of only fetching two florins. Pitra could not learn who had been the purchaser. It was long afterwards that in idly turning over in the Strasburg Library a MS. of little promise containing various notes on books of Scripture, he had the delight of finding a transcript of the long-sought work of Melito. It was not long before this first success was followed by others; and when at length Pitra was able to publish the fruits of his researches (*Spicileg. Solesm.* vol. ii.), his work rested on the authority of no fewer than eight MSS.

Alas! it is painful to have to relate that the object of so much research has proved to be quite unworthy of the toil bestowed on it, and instead of being the translation of a Greek work of the 2nd century, is an original Latin medieval composition. It is a dictionary of the allegorical interpretations of Scripture, arranged not alphabetically, but according to subjects, giving under each word the different allegorical uses that it serves in Scripture, with quotations of the passages. An example taken at random will sufficiently illustrate: MENSES. (1) Apostoli, "per singulos menses reddent fructus suos" (*Rev.* xii. 2). (2) Perfectio, "et erit mensis ex mense" (*Isa.* lxi. 28). (3) Actiones, "sicut servus desiderat umbram, sic et ego habui menses vacuos" (*Job.* vii. 3). (4) Ecclesiae multiplicatae, vel ordines vel dignitates angelorum, "non computetur in diebus anni" (*Job.* iii. 6). (5) Collectiones animarum, "Quis mihi tribuet ut sim juxta menses pristinos" (*Job.* xxix. 2). Ronth had observed that if the work came from Melito, which he would not venture to deny, it must at least have been extensively interpolated, and that by a Latin writer. (And in fact there are explanations connecting the word *hostia* with *hostis*, *virga* with *virgo*.) There are passages written after the rise of Monasticism. Thus on the number three is the explanation, "Tres ad trinodam fidelium professionem, id est clericorum, monachorum et conjugum." Steitz made a careful examination of the *Clavis* as published by Pitra (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1857, p. 584), the result of which was to shew that the hypothesis of

<sup>a</sup> See in Otto, p. 376, for a curious example of the confusion here caused by the insertion of a marginal note into the text.

interpolation is untenable, and that the work is, as has been said, entirely medieval and Latin. The obligations to the works of Gregory the Great are most extensive; nor is Pitra's hypothesis tenable that it was Gregory who helped himself largely from the writings of Melito. There are many of the things common to Gregory and the *Clavis* which are clearly later than Melito; as, for instance, the number nine is illustrated by a reference to the nine orders of angels, first heard of in the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius. The *Clavis* too uses as Scripture the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, which the genuine Melito rejects. It is still more important to remark that of Pitra's MSS. the majority do not name Melito at all as the author. There is reason to think then that it was by no fraudulent design of the author that the *Clavis* came to be ascribed to Melito, but through the bold conjecture of some transcriber who dignified this anonymous work with the name of Melito, well known in the middle ages, as will appear when we come to speak of other spurious works ascribed to him. The *Clavis* then having been shewn to have no connexion with Melito, we have no right to assume that the real "Key" was a work of the same kind, and though it may very probably have dealt with the interpretation of Scripture, any assertion on the subject must rest on mere conjecture. (17) (18) τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου. Jerome understands this of two distinct treatises. The form of expression would rather indicate that both subjects were discussed in a single treatise in more books than one. It is easy but precarious to speculate on the controversies which Melito here dealt with. Origen, in Psalm. 3 (xi. 411, Lomm.), tells that Melito had spoken of Absalom as a type of the devil making insurrection against the kingdom of Christ. The reference may be to the present work. (19) περὶ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ. It would be natural to translate this, On God Incarnate, and it will presently appear that we have other evidence that Melito wrote on the Incarnation. And so the words were understood by the Syriac translator. When Melito speaks of the two natures which our Lord combined, there is no trace of anthropomorphism in the attributes which he ascribes to the Divine nature. Thus in a Syriac fragment he is described as in his divine nature, "invisibilis, incomprehensibilis, incommensurabilis, impassibilis." On the other hand Origen, commenting on Gen. i. 26 (vol. viii. 49, Lomm.), and arguing against the Anthropomorphites, says "of whom is Melito, who has left a certain treatise, περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου εἶναι τὸν θεόν." Here occurs the doubt: Had Origen himself read the treatise of Melito, or did he know nothing but the title, and rashly jump to the conclusion that Melito held views akin to those which he was at the moment combating? If Melito be the author of the Syriac apology no fault can be found with the spirituality of his conceptions of God. It does not seem possible now absolutely to determine the question. We are ourselves inclined to believe that Origen made a mistake, and that the subject of Melito's treatise was the Incarnation. But it is not at all impossible that a writer as orthodox as Melito may have held the opinions which Origen imputes to him. The

views of Tertullian, for example, about the soul are materialistic, and he expressly ascribes "body" to God, though using the word in the sense of substance. "Quis negabit Deum corpus esse etsi Deus spiritus est?" (*Adv. Prax.* 7). Gennadius, if he may be accounted an authority, classes Melito and Tertullian together as holding that there was something corporeal in the Trinity (*De Eccles. Dog.* 4).

Eusebius does not put forward the list we have copied as a complete list of Melito's works, but it is long enough to shew Melito's great activity as a writer, and the wide range of subjects which his writings embrace. We now supplement the list of Eusebius by a few notices from later writers. (20) ANASTASIOS (see Vol. I. p. 110), writing in his Hodegus against the Monophysites, quotes a passage from the third book of the treatise of Melito on the Incarnation, περὶ Σαρκώσεως Χριστοῦ. Against the supposition that this is the same work as No. 19, may be urged that Eusebius would probably not have used the singular number in speaking of a treatise in more books than one. The work quoted by Anastasius was directed against the Marcionites, who defended their docetic views concerning our Lord's body by the same arguments as those urged by the Monophysites. Melito, who receives from Anastasius the epithets θεῖος καὶ πάσσοφος ἐν διδασκάλοις and θεόσοφος, defends the position (in conformity with what is told of him in the "Little Labyrinth") that our Lord was perfect God and perfect Man; His manhood being exhibited in the thirty years previous to His baptism, His deity in the miracles of the three subsequent years. (21) From a work, *eis τὸ πάθος*, which is probably different from any in the list of Eusebius, Anastasius has cited a sentence, Ὁ Θεὸς πέπονθεν ὑπὸ δεξιᾶς Ἰσραηλιτίδος. The first words were of importance in the controversy as to the admissibility of such phrases as "God suffering." Routh connects the last words with the saying of an anonymous elder quoted by Irenaeus, v. 17; but in this we cannot follow him. A Syriac fragment (xvi. Otto) we accept as preserving largely the context of these words. (22) (23) Two other Syriac fragments are from works bearing the titles *De Cruce* and *De Fide*, which may or may not be the same as works mentioned already. And lastly, there are some Greek fragments edited by Routh from a *Catena* commenting on the sacrifice of Isaac as a type of the sacrifice of Christ, which we do not know how to assign to any particular work. In the last fragment Melito compares the reading of the LXX with another, which he introduces with the words, "the Syriac and the Hebrew says." The singular number would lead to the supposition that he knew the Hebrew through the Syriac, if not through a Greek translation of the Syriac. Piper, who on this passage deserves to be consulted, refers, p. 68, to Eusebius of Emesa as giving the same reading in the same words, only substituting "say" for "says."

It only remains to speak of spurious writings ascribed to Melito. We content ourselves with a bare mention of a commentary on the Apocalypse, the ascription to Melito apparently having been made only by the fraud or ignorance of some transcriber, and not to have been intended in the work itself, which is a compilation from



various writers, some as late as the 13th century. But through two works with which Melito's name was connected, it became widely known in the West, though with various disguises of form, such as Mileto, Miletus, and Mellitus, the last being the most common form. The two works are *de passione S. Joannis* and *de Transitu b. Mariæ*. The similarity of the prefaces to each bespeaks common authorship, and these prefaces sufficiently explain the nature and object of the works. He warns the brotherhood against a certain Leucius, who wrote acts of the apostles John, Andrew, and Thomas, in which he related many true things concerning their miracles, but much falsehood as to their doctrine: in particular falsely asserting that they had held the doctrine of two principles—the one, the good principle, being the maker of man's soul; the other, the evil one, being the maker of the body, which therefore through necessity involves the soul in sin. This Leucius he describes as having been a fellow disciple of his own with the apostles, but as having departed from the way of righteousness. It is plain then that when the Pseudo-Melito wrote, the acts of LEUCIUS (*q. v.*) were in circulation, and that this writer wished to neutralise their mischief by publishing an expurgated edition, the facts being retained and the heretical doctrine cleared away. He attempted to authenticate his work by affixing to it the name of Melito, whom he evidently supposes to have been a personal disciple of the apostle John. Leucius is accepted as also, as his Acts represent him, a disciple of the apostles, but is discredited as having fallen into heresy. In one MS. Pseudo-Melito is made to display considerable knowledge of the genuine writings. He tells the Laodiceans that having already addressed to them two short works, *De Vita Prophetarum* and *De Incarnatione Domini*, also a book *de Ecclesia*, he now writes to them *De Obitu Genetricis Domini*, chiefly because, as she remained a virgin, notwithstanding the birth of Christ, so the Church, though bringing forth spiritual children to Christ, yet retains the merit of virginity. But it is likely that this passage belongs to a transcriber and not to the original author; for Melito would hardly have been reckoned as a personal disciple of St. John by one with so much knowledge of his writings as is here displayed. The treatise on the Incarnation, it will be remembered, is not named by Eusebius or by Jerome, and is only known to us through Anastasius.

A comparison of the two prefaces shews that the work *De Transitu Mariæ* is the later of the two; for in it he refers to his having previously written about Leucius. In this latter work Melito is correctly described as bishop of Sardis, and the work is addressed to the brethren at Laodicea. In the former work, as we have it now, Melito is described as bishop of Laodicea, and the work is addressed to the bishops and churches throughout the world. We can scarcely doubt that the inscription of both writings had been originally the same, and that one of them was unskilfully altered by a transcriber who wished to represent the book as intended not for the use of a single church but of the whole world.

Pseudo-Melito is not the only person who attempted to adapt the Leucian Acts to Catholic

use. Under ABDIAS an account has been given of another work of like nature which in part agrees even verbally with that of Mellitus. Yet we have every reason to believe them to be independent reproductions of the same original. Abdias did not copy from Mellitus, for he gives several stories in full which the latter abridges so much as to leave them scarcely intelligible; neither does Mellitus copy from Abdias, from whom he would not even have learned the name of Leucius, to say nothing of his full knowledge of the nature of the heretical doctrine of that writer, which heretical doctrine Abdias expurgates less perfectly than Mellitus. Mellitus and Abdias then must have had a common original; and their verbal agreement shews that that original must have been in Latin. The use made of Leucius (see that article) by Augustine and his contemporaries shews that a Latin translation of Leucius must have been current at least in the 4th century. It would seem then that we might restore to a certain extent this Latin Leucius by taking the things common to Abdias and Leucius. This Latin Leucius may no doubt have enlarged on its Greek original; for instance, it would be fatal to Zahn's claim of a second-century date for the Greek Leucius if we suppose it to have contained a statement common to Abdias and Mellitus that after the fall, at St. John's prayer, of the temple of Diana at Ephesus, a basilica was built in the apostle's name, in which also his death took place. It is also possible that the Latin Leucian Acts had received interpolations before Abdias and Mellitus worked on them. The composition of Abdias is placed by Von Gutschmid between 550 and 600; that of Mellitus is probably not earlier; and by that time the Latin Acts may have been a couple of centuries in circulation.

The work on the Passion of St. John was first published by Florentini in his *Martyrology*, 1688. It was reprinted by Fabricius (*Cod. Apoc. N. T.* iii. 604-623). What are substantially the same Acts had however been published in the *Sanctuarium* of Mombritius, only without the introduction or any mention of Melito's name.

The contents of the work *de Transitu B. V. M.*, are given in the *Bible Dictionary*, ii. 264, in the article MARY THE VIRGIN, together with some references, which need not here be repeated, to works where the story is to be found. Suffice it here to say that in the later forms of the story, not Melito but John the Apostle is the relator. See the *Dormitio Mariæ* in Tischendorf's *Apocalypses Apocryphæ*, p. 95, and Wright's *Syriac Apocrypha*, p. 24. It deserves to be mentioned that the Gelasian decree has the two entries "Libri omnes quos fecit Leucius discipulus diaboli, apocryphi," "Liber qui appellatur Transitus, id est assumptio sanctæ Mariæ, apocryphus." It will be observed that in neither place is Melito's name mentioned. It is probably the same work that is referred to, but still without mention of Melito's name, in the spurious homily ascribed to Jerome and addressed to Paula and Eustochium (vol. xi. p. 93), which contains the words "ne forte, si venerit in manus vestras illud apocryphum de transitu ejusdem virginis, dubia pro certis recipiatis."

The remains of Melito are given by Routh (*Rel. Sac.* i. 113-153), and more fully by Otto (*Corp. Apol. Chr.* ix. 375-478). The reader may

also consult with advantage Piper (*Stud. und Krit.* 1838, p. 54), Westcott (*N. T. Canon*, p. 218), Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.* Feb. 1876). [G. S.]

MELLITUS, the first bishop of London, and third archbishop of Canterbury. Mellitus was not one of the original missionaries who accompanied Augustine to Britain, but was sent by St. Gregory, in the year 601, to strengthen the hands of the newly consecrated archbishop, and to convey to him the pall. Mellitus, as soon as he appears in history, is called an abbat, and it has been supposed that he was, as Augustine himself had been, abbat of the monastery of St. Andrew. There is, however, as Mabillon remarks, nothing to shew whether he was abbat of St. Andrew's or of the patriarchal church in the Lateran assigned to Benedictines, or merely bore the title as the head of the monastic mission to Britain. Under this title, however, he was commissioned by St. Gregory, as soon as the success of the Kentish mission was assured, to lead a second expedition. Mellitus, accompanied by Laurentius, whom Augustine had sent to Rome, as well as by Justus, Paulinus, and Rufinianus, left the city on or about the 22nd of July, 601. They carried letters of commendation to the bishops of Vienne, Arles, Lyons, Gap, Toulon, Marseilles, Chalons on the Saone, Metz, Paris, Rouen, and Angers; to Theoderic, Theodebert, and Clothair, kings of the Franks, and also to queen Brunichild. The addresses of these letters probably indicate the route that the missionaries intended to take, and there is no reason to doubt that they followed it, for there is no evidence to support Ussher's conjecture that they visited Columbanus at Luxeuil on the way. To Augustine Mellitus brought not only the pall, but the answers which St. Gregory sent to the questions laid before him by Laurentius, and a supply of church furniture, "all things which were needed for worship and the ministry of the church, sacred vessels, altar-cloths, church ornaments, priestly and clerical robes, relics of saints and martyrs, and several books (universa quae ad cultum erant ac ministerium ecclesiae necessaria, vasa videlicet sacra, et vestimenta altarium, ornamenta quoque ecclesiarum, et sacerdotalia vel clericalia indumenta, sanctorum etiam apostolicorum ac martyrum reliquia et codices multos) (Bede, *H. E.* i. 29). Some account of the portions of St. Gregory's benefaction, which were preserved at Canterbury in the 15th century, is given by Elmham (ed. Hardwick, pp. 96 sq.). Augustine, having received from the pope authority to consecrate bishops for the newly converted nation, chose Mellitus for the see of London. That city, which was properly the capital of the East Saxons, was at this time under the dominion of Ethelbert king of Kent, who had prevailed on the dependent kings of the East Saxons to receive Christianity, and who now founded the church of St. Paul as the cathedral of the new bishopric. No distinct date is given by Bede for the consecration of Mellitus; the event, however, must have occurred some time between the winter of 601, when he arrived from Rome, and the early summer of 604, to which the death of Augustine is with the greatest probability to be referred. Of this period of Mellitus's episcopate nothing is known; but his name occurs in some of the

more than questionable charters of the Canterbury monasteries, which are attributed to this date. He is mentioned as confirming the charter of Ethelbert to St. Augustine's (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 4; Elmham, p. 114; *Mon. Angl.* i. 127), and in the great privilege of Augustine himself (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 5; Elmham, p. 119; *Mon. Angl.* i. 127), in both which documents he is described as bishop, Laurentius continuing to be a simple presbyter. There is in the archives of St. Paul's a charter of Ethelbert, purporting to be a grant of Tillingham in Essex to Mellitus (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 972); but this document bears marks of later and factitious garbling. The estate of Tillingham, however, unquestionably was a very early possession of St. Paul's, and continues to the present day appropriated to the maintenance of the fabric. If the donation recorded in the grant be historical, it will prove that Ethelbert's authority extended not only over the city of London, but over the whole kingdom of Essex.

Mellitus continued undisturbed in his see during the reign of Ethelbert. He joined in the letter addressed by Laurentius to the Irish bishops (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 4), and in the year 609 undertook a journey to Rome to treat with pope Boniface IV. on matters necessary for the welfare of the English church. The precise object of this journey is not mentioned by the historian, who, however, tells us that Mellitus was present at a council held on the 27th of February, 610, and that he confirmed the decrees with his subscription, and subsequently carried them with him for the English church to observe. The purpose of this council was to secure the peace of the monastic order (*de vita monachorum et quiete ordinationis*), and two versions of a decree, both of them probably spurious, are extant, in which attempts to restrain the monks from undertaking the priestly office are forbidden (Labbe, *Conc.* v. 619; Mansi, *Conc.* x. 504; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 64, 65). Bede adds that, besides the decrees of the council, Mellitus brought with him letters from the pope to Ethelbert, Laurentius, and the whole clergy and people of the English. Of these letters, that to Laurentius is certainly lost, and the epistle preserved by William of Malmesbury and Eadmer, addressed to Ethelbert, and ordering the association of monks with the clergy of the cathedral monastery of Canterbury, is almost as certainly fictitious (W. Malmesb. *G. P.* lib. i.; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 65). The monks of St. Augustine's also shewed a bull of Boniface IV., dated Feb. 27, 611, addressed to Ethelbert, confirming the request presented by Mellitus, and mentioning the privileges of St. Augustine's (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 129-131; Thorn, ap. Twysden, c. 1766; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 67-69).

The connexion of Mellitus with the foundation of Westminster is of course apocryphal, and the whole legend is, at the earliest, not much earlier than the Conquest. According to this story, the abbey founded on Thorney Island under the influence of Ethelbert and Sebert was built during the pontificate of Mellitus; and, when he was ready to consecrate it, it was found to have been already miraculously consecrated by St. Peter himself (Will. Malmesb. *G. P.* lib. ii. § 73; *Mon. Angl.* i. 288 sq.). Unfortunately nothing whatever is known of the early history of Westminster,

which emerges, and that with some uncertainty, in the days of Dunstan. When, however, the foundation had been amplified by the Confessor, and it was necessary to find for it an ancient founder, it was not unnatural to refer the original foundation to the first bishop of London. In the same way, when the life of St. Erkenwald was written, his early education was ascribed to Mellitus as the apostle of the City of London. Baronius goes so far as to suppose that one part of Mellitus's business at Rome was connected with the consecration of Westminster. Elmham, whose authority on such a point is worthless, assigns to the year 615 a second visit of Mellitus to Rome for the purpose of securing the introduction of monks at Christchurch (ed. Hardwick, p. 134).

On the death of Ethelbert, the whole fabric of the newly-founded church was in danger of dissolution. Mellitus and Justus fled to Gaul, and Laurentius was only saved by a miracle from the disgrace of following them. Bede tells very circumstantially the story of Mellitus's flight. The sons of the Christian king Sebert had continued to be pagans. Seeing the bishop celebrate the holy communion and give the eucharist to the people, they presumptuously asked, "Why do you not give us the white bread which you used to give to Saba our father and still give to the people?" The bishop replied that if they would be baptized they should have the bread. They refused the sacrament of initiation, but still demanded the bread. On Mellitus's persistence in refusing it, they banished him. He fled to Kent, and afterwards to Gaul, from whence he was recalled by Laurentius after the conversion of Eadbald. The Londoners, however, declined to receive him as their bishop, and Eadbald was not strong enough to force him upon them. He probably remained at Canterbury until the death of Laurentius in 619, when he succeeded to the vacant see. According to Bede, Mellitus and Justus, after the death of Laurentius, received hortatory letters from pope Boniface V., and some such letters are referred to by the English bishops, who, in or about the year 805, wrote to pope Leo III. on the question of the pall (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 559); but no remains of the letters are preserved. Mellitus is said, in the ancient list of palls, preserved among the Canterbury archives and by Gervase and Ralph de Diceto, to have received the pall from St. Gregory, a fictitious story, which Gervase accounts for by supposing that that pope sent to St. Augustine three palls for three archbishoprics, Canterbury, London, and York, and that they were used by the first three archbishops. But the explanation is itself based on a mistake, and there can be no doubt that Laurentius and Mellitus received no pall at all, which may account for their not having consecrated any bishops.

Mellitus held the archiepiscopal see from 619 to 624; his activity was no doubt impaired by gout, and this fact is nearly all that is preserved about him. Bede mentions that he consecrated a church to the Blessed Virgin within the precincts of St. Augustine's monastery (*H. E.* ii. 6), and that, on the occasion of a great fire at Canterbury, in a place termed the "martyrdom of the four crowned martyrs," he was carried to the spot and obtained by his prayers a wind

which drove the flames southwards and saved the city (*H. E.* ii. 7). Elmham adds a few questionable details, especially his friendship with Rufinianus abbot of St. Augustine's. Bede gives the exact day and year of his death, April 24, 624 (*H. E.* ii. 7). He was buried at St. Augustine's. Some relics of Mellitus were preserved in St. Paul's in the year 1298 (Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* sec. ii. pp. 84-87; Bede, *H. E.* i. 29, 30; ii. 37). A life of Mellitus by Goscelin is still in MS. (Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 219, 220), and an abridgment of it is printed in Capgrave's *Legenda*, ed. 1516, p. 228). Some small and late pieces, written in honour of the archbishop, are also extant (Hardy, *ut supra*, p. 220). [S.]

MELLO. -ONUS, MELLANIUS, MELO, MELONINUS, MALLO, bishop of Rouen, a Briton, but with obscure legend. It is contained in *Vita S. Mellonis* (Capgrave, *Nor. Leg. Angl.* f. 229 sq.; see also *Gall. Christ.* xi. 6; Usuard., *Mart. Auct.* Oct. 22; *Boll. Acta SS.* 22 Oct. t. ix. 570; Tillem. iv. 32, 486, 487; Ussher, *Wks.* v. 174; Cressy, *Ch. H. Brit.* v. cc. 14, 15; Ord. Vital. *Hist. Eccl.* v. c. 8). According to the legend, St. Mello passed over into Brittany and thence to Rome, where he was converted, baptized, and sent as bishop to Rouen (presumably to be its first bishop) by pope Stephen I., in A.D. 256. There in old age he died and was buried, about A.D. 280. His feast is Oct. 22. Gams (*Ser. Ep.* 613) gives his dates as from about A.D. 260 to about 311 or 312. [J. G.]

MELTIUS, subdeacon of Carthage sent by Cyprian to Cornelius with an acolyte named Niceforus to confirm the steadfastness of Cyprian's adhesion and to convey his letter of excommunication to the Novatianising Roman confessors, after first obtaining Cornelius's sanction (*Cyp. Ep.* 46, 47). He conveyed also second copies of *Epp.* 41 and 43 in order to circulate them. [E. W. B.]

MEMMIUS (ST. MENGE), first bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône. Gregory of Tours, the first author who mentions him, says: "The city of Catalaunum boasts for its patron St. Memmius, who is said to have raised one from the dead." He goes on to relate miracles he had himself witnessed at the tomb, and particularly the cure of one of his own servants of fever (*De Glor. Conf.* lxxvi.). Rabanus Maurus, in his Martyrology, says it was read of him that he was sent into Gaul by St. Peter with other saints (*Aug. 5. Pat. Lat.* cx. 1161). Ado's account is much the same, though, for a reason we do not know, the notice appears on Dec. 21 instead of Aug. 5, his usual day of commemoration (*Martyrologium, Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 416). Usuard has the same story (*Martyrologium, Aug. 5. Pat. Lat.* cxxiv. 333), and it is incorporated with additions into a valueless life published by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 11-12). Flodoard, however, makes him a contemporary of St. Sixtus of Rheims, whose date is fixed at about 290 (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. 3). (*Boll. ibid.* 7-9; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 860-1; Tillem. iv. 498; Ceill. xii. 697.) [S. A. B.]

MEMNON, bishop of Ephesus at the period of the council of Ephesus, 431 (Le Quien, i.

677). He was ordained at Ephesus (Mansi, vii. 294). The bishops in his jurisdiction, whom he assembled for the council, were above thirty, and the Nestorian party accuse him of intimidating them to support him and Cyril by besetting their lodgings with rude country peasants (iv. 1278). They charge him also with being the originator of all the dissensions by refusing them, at the beginning, the use of the churches, the martyries, and the *ἀποστόλιον* (1234 D). He approved the letter of Cyril to Nestorius (1139). The Nestorian party pronounced him deposed (1267), and petitioned the emperor for his expulsion (1383 B). Count John committed him to custody (1398). But he was afterwards liberated by the emperor's order (Coteler. *Ecol. Gr. Mon.* i. 41 c). His letter to the clergy of Constantinople is preserved (Mansi, iv. 1438). He is constantly found acting with Cyril at the council, and is usually mentioned with him (iv. 1123, 1214, 1306, 1310, 1311, 1315, 1318, 1319, 1322, 1363, v. 611, 711, vi. 871, 902, vii. 701; Soc. vii. 34; Evag. *H. E.* i. 5; Tillem. xiv. 295, 296, 378, 384, 393, 397, 411, 419, 420, 423, 430-434, 456, 465, 483). More of him will be found under the article **BASSIANUS** (cf. Tillem. xv. 460).

[C. H.]

**MEMORIUS** (MEMOR), an Italian bishop, but of what see is not known, father of Julian the Pelagian, a pious and good man, who endeavoured, though in vain, to restrain his son's erroneous notions. He was an intimate friend of St. Augustine, and wrote to him, asking some questions about music, and requesting him to send him his treatise on that subject. (August. *Ep.* 101 al. 131, A.D. 408 or 409; *c. Jul.* lib. i. cap. 4 § 12; Mercator, in August. *Opp.* vol. x. App. ii. p. 1738, ed. Migne.) Ughelli (vi. 301) and Cappelletti (xx. 19, 123) make him bishop of Capua.

[H. W. P.]

**MENANDER**, a Samaritan false teacher who lived in the early part of the second century. Our knowledge of him is probably all derived, either directly or indirectly, from Justin Martyr. What he tells directly (*Apol.* i. 26, 56) is, that Menander was a native of the Samaritan town Capparatea; that he was a disciple of Simon, and, like him, had been instigated by the demons to deceive many by his magic arts; that he had had success of this kind at Antioch, where he had taught, and had persuaded his followers that they should not die; and that when Justin wrote some of them survived holding this persuasion. Justin wrote a special treatise against heresies, and from this, in all probability, was derived the somewhat fuller account given by Irenaeus (i. 23, p. 100). According to this, Menander did not, like Simon, declare himself to be the chief power, but taught that that power was unknown to all. He gave the same account as Simon of the creation of the world—viz., that "it had been made by angels" who had taken their origin from the *ΕΝΘΟΕΑ* of the supreme power. But he put forward himself as having been sent by the invisible powers to mankind as a Saviour, enabling men, by the magical power which he taught them, to get the better of these creative angels. He taught that through baptism in his own name his disciples received a resurrection, and should thenceforward neither die nor grow old,

but should abide in immortal youth. Irenaeus evidently understood this language in its literal sense, and the history of heretical sects shews that it is not incredible such promises may have been made by Menander to his disciples; but what Justin tells of the continuance of a belief which the experience of the past must have been disproved, assures us that a spiritual interpretation must have been found for this language. Cyril of Jerusalem (C. I. 18) treats the denial of a literal resurrection of the body as a specially Samaritan heresy.

Irenaeus (iii. 4, p. 179), having spoken of Valentinus and Marcion, says that the other Gnostics, as had been shewn, took their beginnings from Menander, the disciple of Simon; and there is every probability that it was from the Samaritan Justin that Irenaeus learned his pedigree of Gnosticism, viz., that it originated with the Samaritan Simon, that it was continued by his disciple Menander, who taught at Antioch, and that there Saturninus (and, apparently, Basilides) learned from him.

The name Menandrianists occurs in the list of Hegesippus (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 22). Tertullian evidently knows no more than he has learned from Irenaeus (*De Anim.* 23, 50; *De Res. Carn.* 5). The same may be said of all later writers, and it is scarcely worth while to mention the imaginary condemnation of these heretics by Lucius of Rome, invented by "Prædestinatus." [C. S.]

#### MENDEAEANS. [SABIANS.]

**MENEFRIDA**, ST., a daughter of Brychan, the saint of the parish of Minver, near the Padstow estuary, in Cornwall. William of Worcester (108) quotes from a calendar at Bodmin, "Sancta Menefrida virgo non martir, die 24 Novembris F. littera." In 1434 the parish wake was altered from July 24 to 13 (Oliver, *Monasticon Exon.* 441). A manor of Ros-minvet occurs in Domesday. [C. W. B.]

**MENNAS**, patriarch of Constantinople between Anthimus and Eutyehius, A.D. 536 to 552. On the deposition of Anthimus, Mennas, superior of the great convent of St. Samson at Constantinople, was elected to the see. Constantinople at the time was witnessing the unwonted presence of the pope himself, and it was by the hands of Agapetus that Mennas received consecration. The pope had presided at the council at Constantinople for the decision of the case of Anthimus. Mennas accepted the council of Chalcedon; he was a Catholic, and well known for his knowledge and integrity. [ANTHIMUS.] On May 2, 536, he presided at a council assembled by Justinian at Constantinople at the request of eleven bishops of the East and of Palestine, and of thirty-three other ecclesiastics, to finish the case of Anthimus, and to decide the cases of Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, and the Eutyehian monk Zoara. The request had been made to pope Agapetus, but he died at Constantinople on the 22nd of April in that year, before the council could be held. It is unnecessary to go into the details of the council. The result was that search was made for Anthimus and he could not be found; he was forbidden to resume his episcopate of Trapezus, and was deposed from his rank; the others were also anathematized. Mennas obtained from Justinian

the passing of a law, dated August 6, 536, confirming the acts of this council. He also sent the acts to Peter of Jerusalem, who held a council to receive them. On Sept. 13, 540, pope Vigilius wrote to Mennas, as well as to the emperor Justinian, by the hands of Dominicus the patrician. He endeavours to carry on the influence which Agapetus had held over the affairs of the church of Constantinople. He confirms the anathemas pronounced by Mennas against Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, Anthimus, and other schismatics, while at the same time he will offer communion again to all who should come to a better mind. Mennas died on the 5th of August, 552, just before the second great council of Constantinople, called the 5th General. It was in the midst of the angry discussions about the "Three Chapters." Mennas had signed the declaration of faith addressed to pope Vigilius by Theodore of Corsaria and others to satisfy his protests and to preserve the peace of the church. [VIGILIUS.]

In the controversies which gave rise to the Lateran council, held in 649 A.D., a Monothelite writing was brought forward by Sergius patriarch of Constantinople, who sent it to Theodore bishop of Pharan in Arabia as a genuine work of Mennas, supposed to be addressed to pope Vigilius. But in the second session of the third great council of Constantinople, Nov. 10, 680 A.D., as soon as this document was read, the Roman legates exclaimed against it, and proved a discrepancy of date. After examination the piece was rejected. Information came that the author of the treatise was alive, and that it was the monk George. He was brought into the midst of the 14th session of the council, April 14, and made to confess that he had composed it at the instance of Stephen, disciple of Macarius patriarch of Antioch. Paul of Constantinople had caused the same addition to be made to a Latin copy, by Constantine, a presbyter of his church. Constantine was also summoned and made a confession similar to that of George, adding that his accomplice was the deacon Sergius. The deacon was finally called, and admitted the fact. Anathema was then pronounced on the false treatise of Mennas to Vigilius, and on those of Vigilius to Justinian and Theodora, which were involved in the same fate, as well as on all who had composed and copied them, or had tampered with the Acts of the 5th general council.

Mansi, viii. 869, 870, 960, ix. 157, &c., x. 863, 971, 1003, xi. 226, &c.; Liberatus, *Brev.* xxi. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 1039 (see also the dissertations at the end of that volume). Vigil. Pap. *Epist.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxxix. 21, 25; Agapet. Pap. *Epist.* in *Patr. Lat.* xlvi. 36; Evagrius, iv. 36 in *Patr. Graec.* lxxxvi, Part 2, 416, &c.; Ceillier, xi. 121, 194, 968; xii. 922, 947, 953.

[W. M. S.]

MENOPHANTUS, Arian bishop of Ephesus, named by Philostorgius (*H. E.* ii. 14) among the disciples of Lucian the martyr. He subscribed the decrees of the council of Nicaea in 325 (Mansi, ii. 694, 699), though he was one of the Arian party (ii. 818). In 343 he was one of the seceders from Sardica to Philippopolis (Mansi, iii. 138) and was excommunicated by the Sardican fathers (*Athan. Ap. c. Ar.* §§ 36,

48, 49, *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 17; Mansi, iii. 63, 66). In 356 he was one of the synod of Antioch which intruded George into the see of Alexandria (*Soz.* iv. 8; Mansi, iii. 232). He is mentioned by Hilary of Poitiers (*Ad Const.* i. 5, *Frag.* ii. 7, 8, 14, in *Pat. Lat.* x. 560, 637, 638, 642). See also Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 674; Tillem. v. 770, vi. 251, 253, 333, 394, 646, vii. 270, viii. 95, 106, ix. 493. [C. H.]

MENSURIUS, bishop of Carthage at the beginning of the fourth century, during the persecution under Diocletian A.D. 303, and also during the disastrous sway of Maxentius in Africa A.D. 311. His behaviour during these times, during the former of which he was accused of "tradition," and even of direct persecution, is described above (Vol. I. pp. 881, 882). (*Opt.* i. 17, 18; *Zos.* ii. 14; *Aug. Brevic. Coll.* iii. 13, 75; 14, 26.) [DONATISM, FELIX (187). LUCILLA.] [H. W. P.]

MERCELINUS, or MERCELMUS, son of Penda king of Mercia by his wife Kineswitha, who is called "sanctus" by Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* p. 637), and made to succeed his brother Merewald as king of the West-Hecani, or inhabitants of Herefordshire. [S.]

MERDDIN. [MERLINUS.]

MEREWALD, a son of Penda king of Mercia, who either succeeded or acted under his father as king of the Western Hecani in Herefordshire. He was married to Eormenburga or Dompneva, daughter of Eormenred of Kent, and by her was father of Mildred, Milgitha, Milburga, and Merefin (*Flor. Wig.* in *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 534, 630, 635, 638). Merewald is not mentioned by Bede; and in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle he only occurs as advising his brother Ethelred on the foundation of the abbey of Medeshamstede, in a passage which is one of the interpolations of the Peterborough annalists (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 313). Hence the uncertainty as to his exact date. It would seem, however, most probable from his traditional relation to early Mercian Christianity that his period of royal sway should be placed after his father's death. The author of the life of St. Milburga furnishes several particulars about him which require historical confirmation. According to this authority Merewald was the third son of Penda, and reigned conjointly with his brother Wulfher. He was brought to the faith by a Northumbrian priest named Edfrid, who was sent by divine direction to a place named Redeswode to convert both king and people. Edfrid arrived at Redeswode at sunset, and spent the night in the open air. During the night a lion approached him, but when Edfrid presented him with some of the bread which he carried, the lion became more gentle than a lamb. On the morrow he arrived at the place where Merewald was staying, and was entertained by a knight. The next night the king had a dream, which none of his attendants could interpret. The knight who entertained Edfrid suggested that he might explain it; he was sent for, and the king told his dream: he thought that he had been attacked by two savage dogs, but had been delivered by a venerable person with shaven head, who carried a golden key. Edfrid explained that the dogs were satellites of Satan, into whose

hands he would fall if he did not renounce paganism. The venerable keybearer was St. Peter, in whose honour a church ought to be erected forthwith. Merewald directly became a Christian, and was baptized in the year 660; he founded the church, and placed Edfrid at the head of it. Merewald and Eormenburga subsequently spent their lives in chastity. (Capgrave, *Legenda*, s. v. St. Milburgae; ed. 1516, ff. 231, 232.)

[S.]

**MEREWENNA, ST.**, a daughter of Brychan, whom Leland calls an abbess (*Coll.* iii. 409, iv. 82), the saint of Marhamchurch in Cornwall, a name altered from the mediaeval name Merwynchurch. The name of the manor in the Exeter Domesday is Maronacirca. The parish feast is on the Sunday after old Lammas Day, 12th August. A Merewinna was buried at Romsey (William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, ii. 78, p. 175), and Sir H. Nicolas gives "Merwine, virgin and abbess, 13 May." [C. W. B.]

**MERIADOCUS, ST.**, bishop of Vannes in Brittany in the seventh century; he is said to have been consecrated priest in 659 (*Acta Sanctorum*, 7th June, ii. 36). The church at Camborne in Cornwall was dedicated to him, though a later dedication to St. Martin has driven Meriadocus out of memory, but the saint's well is still known; see Leland's *Collectanea*, iv. 28. There exists a Cornish miracle play called "Beunans Meriasek," the life of St. Meriasek (the Cornish language softening *d* into *s*), bishop and confessor, which was edited by Whitley Stokes in 1872, whose preface gives a full account of Meriadoc; and see *Revue Celtique*, i. 486. Several saints were connected with Camborne, and in the will of Reginald Mertherderwa, 1447 (Anstey's *Munimenta Academica*, ii. 559), St. Derwa and the bridge of St. Derwa are mentioned (see v. DERWA; a Derwela is mentioned in R. Rees, 256).

[C. W. B.]

**MERINTHUS.** A heretic of this name is mentioned only by Epiphanius and by those who have copied him. Epiphanius two or three times (*Haer.* 28 and 51, p. 427) joins together the names Cerinthus and Merinthus; but frankly owns his ignorance about the latter name, which for all he knows may designate the same person as the former. And it is likely that this was in truth the case; for we may adopt the conjecture of Fabricius (*Cod. Apoc. N. T.* 344) that *μηριυθος* (Iaqueus) was a controversial nickname used by the opponents of Cerinthus, instances being of perpetual occurrence in ancient controversy, where the name of an opponent was slightly altered in order to make it more susceptible of sarcastic comment. [G. S.]

**MERINUS, MERENUS (MIRENUS, MIRINUS, MIRREN)**, abbat, bishop, and confessor, best known as patron of Paisley, Renfrewshire. His legend is given in *Brev. Aberd.* Sept. 15 (Prop. SS. p. est. f. cvi.), representing him as a disciple of Comgall at Bangor, and as dying at Paisley, where the church was dedicated to him. This would bring his date to about the end of the 6th century. His feast is usually Sept. 15. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 397 et al.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. v. 2, 463; *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 67 sq.)

[J. G.]

**MERISTAE** [see GENISTAE], one of seven Jewish sects mentioned by Justin Martyr (*Trypho.* 80). We can only guess as to what these people were, for no other very early writer mentions them; and the earliest who do evidently know no more about them than ourselves. But the most plausible guess is that of Jost (*Judenthum*, i. 414), repeated by Renan (*Évangiles*, p. 450), that this was the form in which was translated to Justin the Hebrew name for heretics (Minim,  $\text{מִינִים}$  = pars). See MINEI. [G. S.]

**MERLINUS.** The prophecies of Merlin had great influence in the middle ages. Henry I. was not displeased to be regarded as the "Lion of Justice" mentioned in them. Llewelyn was encouraged by them in his struggle against Edward I. Some of them were applied by the poet Lawrence Minot to the victories of Edward III., and Owen Glendower agreed to partition England with Hotspur and Douglas in reliance on a prophecy of Merlin (Hall, p. 28) that the Dragon, Lion, and Wolf should overthrow the Moldewarp, i.e. mole. At last the prediction of the coming of a Welsh prince from across the sea to restore the rule of the Britons over the Saxons was fulfilled by Henry Tudor landing at Milford Haven before the battle of Bosworth, and the prediction probably drew the Welsh to Henry's side. The Tudor dynasty laid some stress on this, as we can see in Spenser, and this was the reason why Henry called his eldest son Arthur. In the time of Henry I., nearly contemporary with the Turpin romance of Charlemagne in France, Geoffrey of Monmouth undertook a Latin translation of Merlin's prophecies from the British tongue at the request of Alexander bishop of Lincoln, and afterwards inserted it in his *History of the Britons*, of which it forms the seventh book. The two romances had a marked effect on the two great nations that were then forming.

These prophecies were naturally increased or corrected as history went on, and we find curious interpretations applied to them, as, for instance, by Joannes Cornubiensis in the version printed by Greith in his *Spicilegium Vaticanum*, 1838, pp. 92-106, which shows that there was a Celtic original. These prophecies represent the enduring hate of the Welsh to the English conquerors, and were naturally put into the mouth of one of their ancient bards, who was for that purpose made the subject of many legends. The real bard was probably the Merddin, son of Morvryn, whose patron, Gwenddolew, a prince in Strathclyde, and an upholder of the ancient faith, perished A.D. 577 at the battle of Arderydd, fighting against Rhydderch Hael, who had been converted by St. Columba to Christianity. Merddin is here said to have undesignedly killed the son of his sister Gwenddydd, to have become deranged in consequence, and to have fled into the wood of Caledon, where he is said to have met with St. Kentigern. The life of St. Kentigern says that there was at the court of Rhydderch Hael a madman named Laloicen, who uttered predictions. Laloicen means the "twin" (llallogan), perhaps referring to Merddin's sister Gwenddydd. When the northern Kymry were pressed backwards and southwards into Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany, they took the story of Merlin with them and relocalized it

in their new abodes. Merddin is now represented as a Christian, and said to be buried in Bardsey, the island of the Welsh saints; but much of his career is passed in Cornwall, which was long under the same dynasty as South Wales, even after the English got possession of the coast at Bristol, and broke the connexion by land between the two districts. As the mass of tradition grew into the shape in which we find it in Nennius, and later on in Geoffrey, Merlin becomes a wholly mythical character, the prophet of his race. The earliest shape of Nennius's work may date from 796, but the Vatican MS. attributes the book to Mark the Hermit (Appendix ad Opera edita ab Angelo Maio, 1871, p. 96), and gives the date as 946, the fifth year of king Edmund. It is evident that the narrative grew, and that we have several editions of it, and that several stories are blended together. Thus the history of Vortigern is interrupted to introduce a long account of the miracles of Germanus, and the legend of Patrick is shown by the Vatican MS. to be a similar insertion. In Nennius mention is made of a boy born without any human father, who prophesies to Vortigern about the struggle between the Britons and Saxons, and who is called Embres Guletic, i.e. Ambrosius the Ruler—probably a reference to the Ambrosius Aurelianus mentioned in Gildas. It is not till Geoffrey of Monmouth that we find the boy called Merlin, and made the confidant of Utherpendragon and of Arthur, and able to bring the stones of Stonehenge from Ireland. Nennius does not mention Merlin among the early bards, and the poems attributed to him were really composed in the 12th century, when there was a great outburst of Welsh poetry (Stephens, *Literature of the Kymry*, § 4). Among these poems there is a dialogue between Merddin and his sister Gwenddydd ("The Dawn"), which contains prophecies as to a series of Welsh rulers. The story of Merlin made an impression abroad as well as in England. Layamon alludes to several of his prophecies, and they soon became matter of popular fame. There is a *Vita Merlini* in Latin hexameters, also attributed, though wrongly, to Geoffrey of Monmouth, which was printed by the Roxburge Club, 1830. The later English forms of the story have been printed by the Early English Text Society. The one fact embodied in the legend is the long-continued enmity of the Kymry to the English invaders; but even this almost disappears when the story became part of the great romance of Arthur. [C. W. B.]

**MERNOC**, son of Barurachus, is mentioned in the legend of St. Brendan (*Lives of Cambro-British Saints*, 576, 578). The Calendars mention a bishop and confessor Marnoc at 25th October. [C. W. B.]

**MEROBAUDES, FLAVIUS.** The facts of the life of Flavius Merobaudes are to be gathered from the scanty but strikingly concurrent testimony of a contemporary chronicler, Idatius, a contemporary poet, Sidonius Apollinaris, a contemporary inscription on the pedestal of a statue raised in his honour, and lastly his own writings. (See authorities at the end.)

He was probably born about the end of the 4th century A.D., and was by birth a Spaniard of the province of Baetica. His family was

ancient and noble. The name Merobaudes is connected by Sismondi with the ancient title of the Frankish chiefs, who first passed into Northern Gaul from the mouth of the Elbe, and even with that of the Merovingian dynasty. It was borne (but possibly in the form Mellobaudes) by a distinguished Frankish general in the time of Gratian. The pronomem Flavius may have been assumed, according to custom, by the family or individual members, when they became connected with the Roman imperial system, for the sake of its old and proud associations. The two names together may then well represent one of the many families of mixed provincial origin, whose fresh vitality and power helped to invigorate the frame of the decaying empire.

The commotions with which Spain, like other outlying provinces of the empire, was at this time becoming more and more convulsed, and which in later life he was employed to quell by arms, may have determined Merobaudes to "flee from his native Baetis and seek the thirsty salt-fens of Ravenna" (Sidon.), but perhaps not before he had gained the excellent education, which he undoubtedly received, in the land which had already produced the two Senecas and Lucan, and could boast such cities as "facunda" Corduba and Hispalis. Then, as in Rome's greater days, the legal training required to make a successful public speaker, advocate, and officer, was an indispensable qualification for entry into the vast civil service of the empire, and even if the five years' curriculum of the famous school of law at Berytus was not a type of the course passed through by such students generally, the thoroughness of Merobaudes's education is attested alike by the character of his own writings, and by the terms "rhetor, scholasticus, professio dicendi" applied to him, the latter by himself, and expanded in the inscription above referred to ("a crepundiis par virtutis et eloquentiae cura, ingenium ita fortitudini ut doctrinae natura") and bore fruit not only in obvious and successful imitation of his predecessor, Claudian, but possibly also in the notes to Cic. Topica, of which Boethius quotes at least two instances by "Merobaudes rhetor." How long, after this moral and intellectual training, he continued to practise the profession with which his name is most commonly connected, is uncertain. If the Flavius Merobaudes, whose faithful service to the state won him the highest personal and official position under the emperor Gratian, was an elder relative of his, this might alone determine him to fly to Ravenna, as the residence of the court and administrative centre of the Western Empire. The same connexion may also partly account for the fact of his rise to a high place in the imperial favour, and his employment in military service, in which, according to the inscription, he managed to distinguish himself most highly, not only with his sword, but with his pen ("inter arma literis militabat, et in alpibus acuebat eloquium"), and was elevated to the very high rank of a "vir spectabilis" and "comes sacri consistorii," that is, member of the imperial cabinet, with social precedence of all except the "illustres," the highest officers of the empire, and equality with the three great proconsuls of Africa, Asia, and Achaia.

But the most important step in Merobaudes's



career is connected with a remarkable incident in the history of the time. The great general Aetius, after the death of his rival Bonifacius, had been compelled by the empress Placidia to retire into Pannonia. Two years later, in A.D. 433, he suddenly reappeared at the head of an enormous and irresistible army of Huns, and demanded his pardon. Placidia and her son, the young emperor Valentinian III., had no alternative but complete submission, and Aetius was at once made a patrician, and invested with the whole military power of the empire, which he wielded faithfully and successfully in its defence for nearly twenty years. Just at this juncture Merobaudes produced his Panegyric on Aetius. The considerable fragments which remain, and which are further described below, shew a vigour, style, and rhythm which abundantly establish its literary merit, but its extraordinary success was undoubtedly due to the fact that it furnished an adequate and appropriate expression of the feelings of the Roman world, at the moment when all, emperor and subjects, found themselves suddenly obliged to do homage to a single unprincipled and irresistible master. The author himself bears witness (in the preface) to the truth of the inscription, which states that "Rome joined with its emperors, Theodosius and Placidius Valentinianus, Lords of the World, in conferring upon Flavius Merobaudes the high and time-honoured distinction of a statue of brass in the Forum Trajanum in reward for his military services in the field and for his Poem." The statue was dedicated on July 29, 435 A.D., in the Poets' Corner of Rome, already adorned with a statue to Claudian, and soon to be enriched with another to Sidonius. Merobaudes's fortunes were for the time established. From the emperor of the East he received the honour of a consulship; his minor poems imply acquaintance and even intimacy with the imperial family of the West, while he maintained his popularity and ingratiated himself with Aetius by perhaps more than one revision and extension of the Panegyric. He also married (it is not known at what time) a daughter of the patrician Asturius, and when that general was superseded in his command in Spain about the year A.D. 442 Merobaudes was appointed to succeed him, and within a very short time was enabled to inflict a heavy blow on the Bagaudae, or peasant-insurgents, of Ara Coeli in Hispania Tarraconensis. That nevertheless "the determined ill-will of his enemies compelled his speedy recall by a special imperial order" (so to interpret "*saera praeceptio*") shews that he did not escape the fate which often attends popular and successful public servants. Of the subsequent life and end of Merobaudes nothing is known. If the "ill-will of his enemies" succeeded in involving him in the downfall of his hero Aetius in A.D. 454, he may still have used his leisure in the congenial task of editing (as Jeep suggests) his predecessor and model, Claudian, and even after the adverse remarks of Milman and Niebuhr, it may fairly be concluded from his extant works that he lived and died, not only an accomplished scholar and soldier, but a well-instructed member of the church of Christ.

2. The extant works of Merobaudes consist almost entirely of five poetical fragments, first identified and edited by B. G. Niebuhr in 1823

from eight much mutilated leaves of a palimpsest in the library of the monastery of St. Gall, defects being supplied conjecturally (see his preface, and authorities below).

The first fragment is an elegiac poem of twenty-three lines, describing in terms of courtly and affected flattery the imperial family of the West at a banquet. Niebuhr recognizes allusions to the young emperor, Valentinian III., his famous mother, Galla Placidia, his elder sister Honoria, wife Eudoxia, and apparently his eldest daughter, a new-born infant, whose baptism is thus described:

En nova jam suboles, quae vix modo missa sub auras  
Mystica jam tenero pectore sacra gerit,  
Vagitu confessa. Deum sentire putares;  
Mollia sic tremulo moverat ora sono.

It seems, however, to be historically improbable that these particular persons can ever have met in the way implied. Honoria was closely confined at Constantinople at the time when this birth must have taken place.

The second and third fragments, consisting of fourteen and seven elegiac lines respectively, describe the gardens of the emperor, then married and still in early manhood (and so probably about the year A.D. 438), and of a "*vir illustris*," whom Niebuhr identifies with Anicius Aclius Glabrio Faustus, Praefectus Urbis in A.D. 424, consul A.D. 438.

These elegiacs are throughout classical and pure in style and prosody, "*ovans*" being once admitted at the end of a pentameter.

The fourth fragment consists of forty-six correct and flowing hendecasyllabics, commemorating the first anniversary of the birthday of a son of Aetius, perhaps the Gaudentius afterwards betrothed to the daughter of Valentinian III. (see *Fragm. 1*) and carried away into Africa by Genseric after the sack of Rome by the Vandals. His baptism as an infant is fully and accurately dwelt upon.

The fifth poem is the famous Panegyric on Aetius, and with its preface is in length and historical importance the most considerable. The preface is a flattering address to Aetius in fluent and forcible prose, shewing, however, naturally a somewhat greater deviation than the poems from classical standards. It congratulates him on being proof against the criticism of the world, recites his high civil and military capacities, acknowledges the rich rewards which the following poem has already won for its composer, and ends abruptly in a graphic description of one of Aetius's latest victories. It is obvious from its reference to the statue and consulship that this preface was added some time after the Panegyric was first written; and indeed if Niebuhr is right in assigning portions of the poem (he apparently assigns the whole) to a date later than Aetius's third consulship, A.D. 446, the whole Panegyric must have been enlarged, if not entirely rewritten, a proceeding not unlikely in itself, in order to give as complete a view as possible of Aetius's career.

This poem consists of eight more or less disconnected fragments, comprising about 197 hexameter lines, almost entirely correct and classical in prosody and rhythm, and written with a spirit and style, which inclines Niebuhr

and Thierry to rank it at least as high as the poetry of Claudian. It may be briefly summarized as follows:—Fragm. 1. Account of Aetius's triumphs in the region of the Danube, Tanais, Caucasus, Rhine, Armenia, Southern Gaul, and Spain. Fragg. 2. Genseric, having conquered Libya, wishes to make a lasting peace, on which the poet congratulates Rome and Aetius. Fragg. 3. After an "annosa pax," a goddess hostile to Rome resolves to stir up war anew, and Fragg. 4 charges a war-fiend to do her bidding. Fragg. 5. All eyes at this crisis turn to Aetius, to save his country and conduct the war. Fragg. 6. Details of Aetius's early training and proficiency in war in the camp of Alaric. Fragg. 7. His exploits in Gaul compared favourably with those of Julius Caesar. The storming of a stronghold. Fragg. 8. Triumphant victory. The treaties concluded by Aetius. The whole ends abruptly. For its historical value, see Hansen's *Life of Aetius*. It contains nothing to prove its writer pagan or Christian.

It remains to consider the somewhat complicated critical question of the authorship of the short poem of thirty hexameter lines, beginning "Proles vera Dei," entitled "De Christo" or "Laus Christi," and for 250 years supposed to be the only relic of the writings of Merobaudes. This poem appears first in John Camers's edition of Claudian, Vienna, 1510, as "Claudiani Laus Christi," and as added by him for the first time (with three other short poems) to Claudian's printed works. It appears also that Camers in editing Claudian had before him the Codex Veronensis. On the other hand there is no trace of the poem in question in the Veronensis or any other of the best MSS. of Claudian (see Jeep), and G. Fabricius, while acquainted with Camers's edition and occasionally criticising its correctness, distinctly states that he (Fabricius) copied the "Laus Christi" with the heading "Carmen Merobaudis Hispani scholastici" from an ancient MS. sent to him by Oporinus. The accuracy of this statement has never been questioned (though the poem is printed in most editions of Claudian among his *Opera Minora*, *Epigrammata*, &c.). The description of Merobaudes harmonizes well with his history, and perhaps the most serious objection to regarding the authorship as settled is a certain crudeness, want of arrangement, and obscurity of expression, which does not harmonize well with Merobaudes's known powers as a writer. Jeep suggests that Merobaudes, in editing Claudian, may have himself added this poem as a production of his own. The poem speaks of the eternal pre-existence of the Son of God, His work in Creation, His Incarnation,

(Christus) dignatus iniquas  
Aetatis sentire vices et corporis hujus  
Dissimiles perferre modos, hominemque subire  
Ut posses monstrare Deum,

the visit of the Magi, Christ remitting sins and raising the dead, the descent to the "Manes," Ascension, and abiding work on earth, ending with the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity and universal significance of Christ's Atoning Death.

The phrase "hominem subire" may have a special significance in reference to the Nestorian controversies of the time.

3. Authorities: (a) for the Life of Merobaudes, *Corp. Inscript. Latin.* vol. vi. part 1, No. 1724 (Berlin, 1876); *Idatii Chronicon* in *Bibliothec. Patrum*; Sidon. Apollinaris, *Carm. ix. ad Felic.* 293–298 (note by Sirmond.); *Bibliothec. Hispan. vetus* by Nic. Antonio, Matr. 1788, Bk. ii. ch. 3, pp. 252–4; (b) for the works of Merobaudes, *Corp. Script. Hist. Byzantina*, by Imm. Bekker, vol. xxix. Bonn, 1836, which incorporates B. G. Niebuhr's edition, with preface, published at Bonn, 1824; Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxi. Paris, 1847; G. Fabricius, *Poet. vet. Eccl. Opera Christiana*, Basle, 1564; and lastly, L. Jeep's exhaustive critical edition of Claudian, 2 vols. Lips. 1876–9, and his article in *Rhein. Mus.* 1873, vol. xxviii. pp. 298–303. [A. C. M.]

MEROCLES (MIROCLES, MYROCLES, MERO-CLETES), according to Gams (p. 795), the first well-authenticated bishop of Milan, from 304 to 315 A.D. He was one of the nineteen bishops who formed the assembly at Rome, A.D. 313, under the direction of Constantine, to try the case of Caecilianus (CAECILIANUS, Vol. I. p. 367; DONATISM, p. 882). He was also a member of the council held at Arles in the following year on the same subject. The title of confessor is given to him by Ennodius, and St. Ambrose mentions him as one of his faithful predecessors in the see of Milan. An epigram cited by Baronius records that he built a church there in honour of St. Anatolius, but of his personal history nothing is known. The letter of Constantine to Melchades bishop of Rome concerning the council is addressed, according to the received copies of the passage in Eusebius, to a person named Mark, a name for which it has been conjectured, but without sufficient reason, that Meroeles should be substituted. He is commemorated in the Roman Calendar on Dec. 3. (Opt. i. 23; Euseb. II. E. x. 5; Tillemont, vol. v. 693, vi. 13; Ennodius, *Vit. S. Epiphani. Ticin.* ed. Migne, vol. lxxiii. p. 208; S. Ambrose, *Ep.* 21, ed. Caillau, viii. p. 349; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 94.) [H. W. P.]

MEROVEUS (MEROVECHUS), second son of Chilperic I. by Audovera, displayed during a short life the characteristic turbulence and faithlessness of the Merovingian race. In the year 576 his father entrusted him with the conduct of an army directed against Poitiers. On the pretence of celebrating Easter he lingered at Tours while his forces pillaged the neighbourhood. Then feigning a desire to visit his mother, who was immured in a neighbouring monastery, he betook himself to Rouen, where he induced his godfather, the bishop Praetextatus, to marry him to the notorious Brunehilde, his uncle Sigebert's widow. The pair took refuge from Chilperic's indignation in the church of St. Martin in that city, nor could his father entice them out till he had sworn not to attempt to separate them. The bishop was deposed at the council of Paris (577) for his part in the proceeding. The rest of Meroveus's life was spent in plots, begun with the bishop at Rouen, to seat himself on his father's throne, and in flight from his father's vengeance on their discovery. Suspected on account of troubles at Soissons, he was arrested by Chilperic and soon afterwards tonsured and ordained priest. He finally lost

his life near Rheims in 577 and was buried at Paris in the church of St. Vincent (afterwards Saint-Germain-des-Près). (See Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 28; v. 2, 3, 14, 19, 49.) [S. A. B.]

**MESOTES**, in the Valentinian system, the middle region, higher than the highest heaven, but below the Pleroma. This region is the special home of that which is psychical, as the Pleroma is of the spiritual, and the lower region of the choical. In the middle region now dwells Achamoth, but hereafter, when she shall be permitted to enter the Pleroma, the Demiurge, who, as not being spiritual, cannot attain so high, will be exalted to the middle region from his present position in the Hebdomad (Iren. i. 5, 6). This doctrine of a middle region is found in Basilidian as well as in Valentinian speculation. [See HEBDOMAD and PISTIS SOPHIA.]

[G. S.]

**MESROBES**, one of the most celebrated patriarchs and historians of Armenia. He was born in A.D. 354 at the town of Hasecasus, now Mush (Tozer's *Turkish Armenia*, p. 286), and was educated under Nerses Magnus, the fourth patriarch of Armenia from St. Gregory the Illuminator, to whom also Mesrobes acted as secretary, an office which he likewise filled in the court of king Varaztad till dethroned by the Romans A.D. 386 (Langlois, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* t. v. part ii. pp. 297-300). He then took holy orders and sought a solitary life. He became coadjutor to the patriarch Sahag in 390, when he devoted himself to the extirpation of the remains of idolatry which still existed in Armenia. Under Mesrobes a great revival of Armenian literature took place. From the introduction of Christianity Syriac had become the dominant language, a knowledge of it being deemed a necessary qualification for holy orders (cf. Agathang. *Hist. Tiritat.*; Zenob. *Hist. Daron.* in Langlois, *l. c.* pp. 179, 335, *Disc. Prelim.* p. xiv.; Goriun, *Hist. de S. Mesrop*; Vartan, *Hist. d'Arménie*, p. 51, Venice, 1862). Mesrobes devoted himself to the revival of the ancient Armenian culture, some fragments of which can yet be traced in Moses Chorenensis. He was an accomplished Greek, Persian, and Syriac scholar, but wished to revive a national literature. His first step was to restore, if not to invent, an alphabet for the Armenian tongue instead of depending on the Syriac character. For this purpose he induced the patriarch Sahag, alias Isaac, to convoke a national council at the city of Vagharschabad to consider the question, at which the king Vram-Schapouh assisted. Thereat he learned that a Syriac bishop, one Daniel, possessed an ancient Armenian alphabet, to whom he sent a priest named Abel, who brought it back. It is supposed to have consisted of twenty-two or twenty-seven letters. With this as a basis and with the help of various other persons who possessed some traditionary knowledge of ancient Armenian, as Plato chief librarian at Edessa, and two learned rhetoricians, Epiphanius and Rufinus, he composed the alphabet which the Armenians adopted in A.D. 406, the seven vowels having been made known, as it was said, by direct revelation from heaven (cf. Langlois, *l. c.* *Disc. prélim.* p. xv.; Moses Choren. *Hist. Armén.* lib. iii. cap 52, 53, and

for minute details of the whole question, Karékin, *Hist. de la Litt. Armén.* p. 8 sqq. Venice, 1865; *Jour. Asiat.* 1867, t. 1, p. 200). Mesrobes attracted great numbers to his schools and picking out the ablest pupils sent them to study at Edessa, Athens, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and even Rome, whence they brought back the most authentic copies of the Scriptures, the Fathers, Acts of the councils, and of the profane writers. In fact these young scholars imbibed such a rage for Greek studies that they endeavoured to adapt the Armenian tongue to the rules of Greek grammar and for this purpose translated into Armenian the grammar of Dionysius the Thracian, an edition of which with a French translation was published at Paris in 1830. This Hellenising movement among the Armenians of century 5 was analogous to similar ones in centuries 6, 7, 8, among the Persians and Monophysites, and in century 9 among the Arabs, movements to which we thus owe the preservation of some of the most precious monuments of antiquity, as Tatian's long-lost *Diatessaron*, published at Venice out of the Armenian in 1875, cf. *Quarterly Review* of April 1881, art. on the "Speaker's Commentary on the New Test." (cf. Renan, *Hist. des Lang. Sémit.* p. 297). Among the disciples of Mesrobes were all the leading writers of Armenia, among them, Leontius presb. and mart., Moses Taronensis, Kioud of Arabeza, afterwards patriarch, Mamprus lector, Jonathan, Khatchig, Joseph of Baghin, Eznig, Knith bishop of Tertchan, Jeremiah, Johannes of Egeghats, Moses Chorenensis, Lazarus of Barb, Goriun biographer of Mesrobes, Elisaeus (Langlois, *l. c.*; Neumann's pref. to *Hist. of Vartan* in Public. of Orient. Trans. Fund, London, 1830). The Armenian church through their labours possessed a vernacular edition of the Bible in 410. Mesrobes also invented an alphabet for Georgia similar to the Armenian but containing twenty-eight letters. Both alphabets had the letters arranged after the Greek order. The Armenians attribute to him also the settlement of their liturgy. Sahag died Sep. 9, 440, and was succeeded by Mesrobes, who only held the episcopal see till Feb. 19, 441, when he died. The Life of Mesrobes by Goriun was published by the Mekhitarite Fathers at Venice in 1833, and was translated into German and published by Dr. B. Welte, Tübingen, 1841. In Moses Choren. *Hist. Armén.* lib. iii. capp. xvii. lii.-liv. lvii. lviii. lx. lxi. lxvi. lxvii. copious details of his life will be found. See also an article by Petermann s. v. Mesrob, in Herzog's *Real Encyklop.* [G. T. S.]

#### MESSALIANI. [EUCHITES.]

**METANGISMONTAE**. In the course of the Arian controversy cavil was raised on the text, "I am in the Father, and the Father in Me," and the question was asked, How can the greater be contained in the less? To this Athanasius replied (*Or. 3. cont. Ar.* p. 436) that such a question betrayed a material conception of the Deity, as if they who asked it thought of the Persons of the Godhead as empty vessels, filled the one from the other (*ὡσπερ ἐν ἀγγείαις κενοῖς εἰς ἀλλήλων πληρούμενοι*). There is no sufficient evidence that any of the Arians them-

selves used this illustration, much less that they who used it constituted a distinct sect; but Philaster, who loved to lengthen his list of heretical sects, counts as 51st in his list those who taught a *μεταγγισμός*, that is to say that the Son was in the Father as one vessel (*ἀγγεῖον*) in another. Augustine (*Hæc.* 58), who copies Philaster, gives to these heretics the name *Metangismonitæ*, and "*Praedestinatus*" as usual invents an imaginary bishop, Diodorus of Nicomedia, who confuted them. Concerning Philaster it may be noted that in rejecting a theory which put limitations on any Person of the Deity, he uses language nearly coincident with that of the Athanasian creed, "*qualis immensus est Pater, talis est et Filius, talis est et Spiritus Sanctus*;" and also that a statement in his present text, that these heretics were led by their false prophets to separate from the Catholic church, owes its origin to the error of a copyist, who has inserted in c. 51 a line really belonging to c. 49 on the *Cataphryges*. [G. S.]

**METHODIUS** (called also *Eubulius*), commemorated June 20 (*Basil. Menol.*) and Sept. 18 (*Mart. Rom.*), a Lycian bishop highly distinguished as a writer, bishop first of Olympus, afterwards of Patara, at the beginning of the 4th century. Jerome states (*Catal.* 83) that he was bishop of Olympus and was translated elsewhere; and that he was bishop of Olympus is also testified by Socrates (*vi.* 13) and Maximus (*in Schol. Dionys. Areop.* 7). On the other hand, Leontius of Byzantium calls him bishop of Patara, and it is as bishop of Patara that he is known to all the later Greek authorities. We therefore reject Jerome's unsupported statement that it was to Tyre Methodius was translated, as probably due to a transcriber's error, Tyre for Patara, in the authority which Jerome followed. The only other mode that has been suggested for reconciling the authorities is quite inadmissible, namely, that before going to Tyre, Methodius ruled at the same time over both Olympus and Patara. These cities were not only remote from each other, the one on the east, the other on the west coast of Lycia, but were separated by Myra, itself a celebrated see. It is most improbable that Tyre should have borrowed a bishop from a place so distant as Lycia; but if Methodius ever became bishop of Tyre it would be as such, and not as bishop of Patara, that he would be known to later times. There is some difficulty in making room for Methodius among the known Tyrian bishops. The only place for him is after the death of Tyrannio, who suffered in the early part of the Diocletian persecution; and as Methodius is himself said to have been a martyr, we might suppose that after a short episcopate he suffered at the end of the same persecution. But then it is scarcely possible that Eusebius, when mentioning the martyrdom of Tyrannio, should have failed to say anything as to that of his successor. Methodius was an assailant of Origen, of whom Eusebius was a great admirer, and Valesius has imagined that this may have generated a dislike which caused Eusebius to say nothing about Methodius in his *Ecclesiastical History*. This might sufficiently explain silence as to the literary performances of Methodius; scarcely however silence as to his martyrdom if it took

place, but certainly not if Methodius when he suffered was bishop of Tyre.

As to the death of Methodius, Jerome states that "he was crowned with martyrdom at the end of the last (*i.e.* the Diocletian) persecution; or as some affirm under Decius and Valerian, at Chalcis in Greece." The earlier date may at once be set aside as inconsistent with the facts that Methodius wrote against Porphyry, and that Eusebius speaks of him as a contemporary (*ap. Hieron. Apol. adv. Rufin.* l. vol. ii.).

The martyrdom of a Lycian or Phoenician bishop at a place so remote as Euboea must also be pronounced incredible. The places were not even at the time under the same ruler, Greece being under the government of Licinius and the Eastern provinces under Maximin. Accordingly Sophronius, the Greek translator of St. Jerome, substitutes for Chalcis "in Greece," "in the East," whence some modern critics have concluded that Methodius suffered at Chalcis in Syria. But no weight can fairly be attached to this correction of Sophronius; and it is more probable that a Methodius whose name tradition had preserved as a martyr at Chalcis under Decius was wrongly identified with the better known Lycian bishop. The evidence remaining that the latter was a martyr at all is weak, and the silence of Eusebius is a difficulty; but Theodoret calls him bishop and martyr, as do the late Greek writers, while the *Menæa* make the mode of death decapitation.

Methodius wrote much, and his works were widely read and highly valued. Jerome several times refers to him: *Épiphanius* calls him *ἀνὴρ λόγιος καὶ σφόδρα περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγωνισάμενος*; Gregory Nyssen, or Anastasius Sinaita (for the authorship is disputed) *ὁ πολλὸς ἐν σοφίᾳ*; Andrew of Caesarea, *ὁ μέγας*; Eustathius of Antioch, *ὁ τῆς ἀγίας ἄξιος μνήμης*, and he is quoted besides by Theodoret, besides many later writers. Photius has preserved copious extracts (*Codd.* 234-237); other shorter extracts are to be found in *Catænae*, and others are given in the *Nitrian MSS.* (see Wright, *Cat. MSS. Syr. in Brit. Mus.*). The works of which we have knowledge are as follows:

(1.) The only one that has come down entire is the *Symposium*, or Banquet of the Ten Virgins. This work reveals Methodius as an ardent admirer of Plato, from whom he probably derived his preference for the dialogue form of composition, and whom in the present case he has not only imitated in several particular passages, but has taken from him the whole idea of his work, thus entering into direct and somewhat audacious rivalry with him. As in Plato's *Symposium* the praises of Love are celebrated, so here are proclaimed the glories of *Virginity*. The imitation of the form of Plato's work is even kept up in not presenting the dialogue directly, but as reported by one who had been present at it. Eubulius, or Eubulium, receives from a virgin Gregorian an account of a banquet in the gardens of Areté, not under Plato's plane-tree, but under an *agnus-castus*, in which ten virgin guests, at their hostess's command, pronounce ten successive discourses in praise of chastity. At the end of the banquet the victor Thecla leads off a hymn, to which the rest standing round as a chorus respond. The dialogue concludes with a discussion between Eubulius and Gregorian as

to whether is to be preferred, the chastity which knows no concupiscence, or that which feels the stings of lust and triumphs over them. The name Eubulius is found also in Methodius's dialogue on the Resurrection, and from one passage it appears that Epiphanius was right in thinking that this interlocutor was intended to represent Methodius himself. With all Methodius's admiration for Plato and imitation of his form, he has caught very little of his style or spirit. He has little dramatic power, and except that the dialogue form occasionally enables him conveniently to state the case for opposing views, there is little to distinguish one speaker from another. In one case, that of Theophila, his ill-success in sustaining the character of a virgin is even offensive. Photius, who quotes the work as *περὶ ἀγγελίας*, says that it has been much falsified by Arian and other heterodox interpolations; and Bishop Bull accepts this account as relieving him from the necessity of discussing particular passages in the treatise. Of the general soundness of Methodius on the question of our Lord's Divinity there can be no doubt; and we have not found anything in the writings ascribed to him which an orthodox man might not have written, especially before the Arian disputes had made caution of language necessary. Elsewhere (*Cod.* 162) Photius mentions Methodius with Athanasius and other great names as one from whose writings Andrew had produced extracts garbled and falsified so as to teach heresy. (See EUSEBIUS OF THESSALONICA, vol. ii. p. 373.)

(2.) In the Catalogue of Jerome he gives the first place to the writings of Methodius against Porphyry. He elsewhere refers to them (in *Comm. in Dan. Pref.* c. 13, vol. v. pp. 618, 730; *Apol. ad Pammach.* vol. i.; *Ep.* 70 ad Magnum, i. 425), stating in the last-mentioned place that the work of Methodius ran to 10,000 lines. Philostorgius (viii. 14) rates the reply of Apollinarius to Porphyry as far superior to that either by Eusebius or by Methodius. All three replies have perished.

(3.) *On the Resurrection.*—This work has been lost, but large extracts have been preserved by Epiphanius, *Haer.* 64, and by Photius, *Cod.* 234, see also Johan. Damasc. *De imag. Orat.* 2. The text as given by Combefis and reprinted by Migne suppresses the heretical portions of the Epiphanius extracts. This work, as well as that first mentioned, is in the form of a Platonic dialogue, and is in refutation of Origen. In this case, too, the dialogue seems not to have been presented directly, but as related by Eubulius to a "most excellent Theophilus," who acts as judge. The speakers on the orthodox side are Eubulius and Auxentius, while the views of Origen are set forth by Proclus and a physician Aglaophon, whose name is affixed to the dialogue in the Syriac citations. The Origenist speakers deny the materiality of the resurrection body. One of them urges that to insist literally on the resurrection of the same matter would lead to countless difficulties. Was a man only to rise with the emaciated body he might have at the moment of his death, or was he to get back all the flesh he had lost before, the blood that had been drawn from him in blood-letting, the hair and nails that had been cut off in his lifetime? Suppose the body of a man to be eaten by an

animal, and the flesh of that animal by another man so as to become food for his body, to whom would the common flesh belong in the resurrection? [For ingenious solutions of these difficulties, see Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xxii.] The fact is, the matter of a man's body is in a state of constant flux; the only sameness is in the form, and it is therefore enough if we believe that the same form shall rise again, and that, no doubt, beautified and glorified. Bodies must be adapted to the element in which they are to live; if we had to live in water our bodies might be like those of fishes; as it is in heaven we shall have to live, our bodies will be spiritual; and so St. Paul teaches: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body;" "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God." The Origenist speaker teaches that man had been originally in Paradise, that is to say, in the third heaven (2 Cor. xii.), having there none but a spiritual body; that having sinned he was cast down to earth, where God made him "coats of skins," that is to say, by way of punishment clad him in our present gross material bodies, which act as a clog and fetter on the soul and out of which spring our temptations to sin; for without the body the soul cannot sin. When we rise therefore to dwell where sin cannot be, we shall be like the angels, liberated from the flesh which has burdened us here. In reply, Methodius acutely points out the inconsistency of teaching that the soul cannot sin without the body, and also that the body had been imposed on the soul as a punishment for sins previously committed. Further, it is absurd to call the body a fetter. Criminals are fettered to prevent their committing more crimes, but here we are asked to believe that God put a fetter not on the evil but on the good. For the body is no fetter on sin; soon after the fall Cain is found committing murder. And in truth the body is an instrument for good as well as for evil. Paradise and the third heaven are not identified (2 Cor. xii.); two distinct revelations are spoken of. It is said that we shall hereafter be as the angels, that is, like them, not subject to change or decay; but not that we shall be angels, or as they are, without earthly bodies. God does not make mistakes; if He had meant us to be angels He would have made us so at first. His creatures are diverse: besides angels, there are thrones, principalities, and powers. By death He does not design to turn us into something different in kind from what He at first meant us to be; but only as an artificer, when a work of his has become polluted with stains which cannot otherwise be removed, melts it down, and makes it anew; so by death we shall be remade free from the pollution of sin. And so in like manner we are not to think that the world will be destroyed, but made into a new and purer earth, fit to be the abode of the risen saints.

(4.) *De Pythonissa.*—Jerome tells us that this work, now lost, was directed against Origen. We may presume, therefore, that its scope was the same as that bearing the same title by Eustathius of Antioch, namely, to refute the opinion held by Origen after Justin Martyr that the soul of Samuel was under the power of Satan, and was evoked by the magical art of the witch of Endor. Methodius's view, however, could

not have been the same as that of Eustathius, for a passage at the close of Photius's extracts from the treatise on the Resurrection implies a belief that the appearance of Samuel was real.

(5.) *Xeno*.—Socrates (vi. 13), expressing his indignation against the reviling of Origen by worthless writers who sought to get into notice by defaming their betters, names Methodius as in time the first of Origen's assailants; adding, however, that he had afterwards by way of retraction expressed admiration of him in a dialogue entitled *Xeno*. No dialogue bearing that title has been preserved, but we believe the dialogue referred to by Socrates to be identical with that next to be mentioned. One would like to know whether the praise of Origen was expressed by Methodius in his own person, or only in that of one of the speakers in his dialogue. There is nothing, however, in Methodius's confutations of Origen inconsistent with his having felt warm admiration of the man; and he has certainly followed him in his allegorical method of interpretation.

(6.) *Περὶ τῶν γενητῶν*.—This work "on things created" is only known by extracts preserved by Photius (*Cod.* 235). It is a refutation of Origenist doctrine as to the eternity of the world, the principal arguments with which Methodius deals being that we cannot piously believe that there ever was a time when there was no Creator, no Almighty Ruler, and that there cannot be a Creator without things created by Him, a Ruler without things ruled over, a *παντοκράτωρ* without *κρατούμενα*. Further, that it is inconsistent with the unchangeableness of God to suppose that, after having passed ages without making anything, He suddenly took to creating. It is evident from the extracts that the work is written in the form of a dialogue, and that the orthodox speaker deals with his opponent by the Socratic method of question and answer. Photius's extracts begin with a discussion of the text, "Cast not your pearls before swine;" and we have near the commencement the phrase, *μαργαρίτας τοῦ ξενῶνος*. It is hard to get good sense by translating "pearls of the guest-chamber;" and with the knowledge we have that one of Methodius's dialogues was called *Xeno*, we are disposed to think that *Xeno* was one of the speakers in this dialogue, and that we are either to translate "*Xeno's pearls*," i.e. the pearls of which *Xeno* presumably had made mention before, or else to believe that the words *τοῦ ξενῶνος* have got transposed and ought to be prefixed to the extract, the whole being taken from a speech by this interlocutor. Photius says that Methodius calls Origen a centaur, and interpreters have been puzzled what he could have meant. It has been guessed that it was because Origen mixed up sacred and profane literature. We certainly find in the extracts preserved that the orthodox speaker addresses his Origenist interlocutor as *ὁ Κένταυρε*, but without the slightest air of uttering a sarcasm, so that if it were not that we have been able to find no example of such a proper name, we should be disposed to think that the explanation of the matter is that the name of the Origenist speaker in this dialogue was Centaurus.

(7.) *On Free Will*.—Of this dialogue we have spoken already. [See MAXIMUS (24).] Jerome

states that several other works of Methodius were then in circulation, among which he names commentaries on Genesis and on the Song of Songs; the catenae besides contain extracts purporting to be from commentaries on the Psalms, on Habbakuk, on the Apocalypse, and other books. Theodoret (*Dial.* vol. iv. 87, Migne) quotes from a discourse of Methodius "concerning martyrs." Of doubtful or spurious works ascribed to Methodius may be mentioned, a homily on the meeting with Simeon and Anna at the Temple. This is generally rejected both for reasons of style and because we have reason to think that the system of church festivals which it assumes was not in existence in the time of Methodius. On the date of the introduction of the festival Hypapante in connection with this homily, see *Dict. Chr. Ant.* p. 1140. But we cannot endorse the suggestion that the homily is the work of a later Methodius. The preacher expressly claims to be the author of the Symposium on Chastity; so that if the homily be not genuine it is not a case of mistaken ascription but of forgery, and a forger need not be of the same name as the author whom he personates. A homily for Palm Sunday, *εἰς τὰ βῆθια*, in one MS. ascribed to Chrysostom, is in another attributed to Methodius. To us the language on the subject of the Trinity seems clearly post-Nicene. We think favourably of fragments published by Gretser from a Homily on the Cross. On a passage which speaks of the Cross as to be found in the military "Vexilla," an argument has been founded that the homily could not have been written before the imperial adoption of the Christian symbol; but this passage is really derived from Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 55). Now Methodius used the writings of Justin Martyr, whom in one place he quotes by name and in another silently copies (*Apol.* 19). A book of "Revelations" ascribed to him is certainly not his, and was probably the work of Methodius of Constantinople, who lived at the early part of the 9th century. Concerning him and other Methodii see Leo Allatius, *Diatribes de Method. Script.* published in the second part of Fabricius's edition of Hippolytus; Fabricius, *Bib. Graec.* vii. 260; Ceillier, iii. 62, xii. 424. Carel's thesis on Methodius, Paris, 1880, may also be consulted.

The works of Methodius were first published by Combefis in 1644, the Symposium by Leo Allatius in 1656, and independently the year after by Porsinus. Combefis gave then in 1672 a more complete collection of the works in his *Nocum Auctarium*. This was reprinted by Galland, vol. iii., and by Migne, vol. xviii. The latest edition is by Jahn: *S. Methodii opera*, and *S. Method. Platonizans*, Halis. Sax. 1865.

[G. S.]

**METRIKOS.** Valentinian aeon (*Iren.* i. 1). In order to find names for these aeons the technical adjectives of the system were pressed into the service. The adjectives *patrikos* and *metrikos* were probably derived from earlier systems, since we find in the system of JUSTINUS the angels distinguished into paternal and maternal.

[G. S.]

**METRODORUS.** The library of Photius contained (*Cod.* 115) an anonymous tract against

the Quartodecimus, in which, among other things, was discussed, whether our Lord, immediately previous to the Last Supper, ate the Jewish passover. The author decided in the negative, holding that the passover day was only the next day, the day of the crucifixion; Photius himself, following the authority of Chrysostom and others, was of the opposite opinion. In the same volume was included a work of which the title ascribed the authorship to one Metrodorus, concerning whom Photius had been able to learn nothing else. This work contained a calendar of Paschal full moons and Easter days for 533 years, beginning with the first of Diocletian; that is to say, for a cycle of 532 years, and one year more, indicating the beginning of a new cycle, when the same days would be repeated in the same order. Although the calendar professed to be the result of accurate calculation, Photius declares that it does not appear to have been used by the church nor by ancient tradition. The next book on the list of Photius is a treatise on technical chronology, without author's name, but addressed to a certain Theodorus. A section of this work contained refutations of Metrodorus, but of what opinions of his we are not informed. The author took the view already mentioned that our Lord, on the night He was betrayed, did not eat the Jewish passover.

The Metonic cycle of 19 years is based on the assumption that 19 solar years contain an exact number (235) of average lunations; so that after 19 years the moon's changes will take place on the same days of the solar month; and the Paschal full moon will fall on the same day in the first year and in the twentieth. Now as these will not be the same day of the week, the Easter Sundays of the two years will be different. But since in 28 years any day of the solar year returns to the same day of the week, it was seen that if we put together 28 Metonic cycles of 19 years we get a cycle of  $(28 \times 19 =) 532$  years, after which the Paschal full moon returns, not only to the same day of the solar month, but also to the same day of the week, so that not only the full moon, but the Easter Sunday will be the same for the 1st year and the 532rd. This cycle was introduced into the West by Victorius A.D. 462. Syncellus ascribes its invention to Anianus, an Alexandrian monk and chronologer, who lived at the end of the 4th century. Against this statement the fact has been objected that in the next century Cyril of Alexandria introduced the use of a cycle of 95 years, which aims at the same object as the cycle of 532, but accomplishes it not quite perfectly. After 95 years the Easter Sundays of common years return to the same days, but those of bis-sextile years move one day. It has been thought that Cyril would not have adopted the less perfect cycle if he had known of the other, but as the shorter cycle may have been practically more convenient, we think that there is scarcely sufficient ground for rejecting the statement of Syncellus. According to his account Anianus had such faith in the absolute accuracy of his cycle that he carried his calculations backwards by its means up to the creation of the world. In point of fact, 235 lunations differ from 19 Julian years by nearly an hour and a half, so that after 28 repetitions of the Metonic cycle the difference would amount to

over forty hours, and the full moons given by the cycle would be some two days wrong.

Concerning Metrodorus we cannot be expected to know more than Photius. It has been inferred that he was an Alexandrian from his use of the era of Diocletian, which for a considerable time was in current use in Egypt. This era was particularly suitable to the purpose of Metrodorus, since the first year of Diocletian was also the first of a Metonic cycle. As to the date of Metrodorus, we are disposed to take the view of Van der Hagen (*De Cyclis Paschal.* p. 43), that he lived at a time when the error of the 19 years cycle had accumulated so as to become sensible, and that he was one of the private calculators who then began to publish corrections of the current church calendar, professing to be founded on more accurate computation. In this way we can account for the disparaging estimate which Photius seems to have formed of the work of Metrodorus, and for the fact that it encountered controversy. On this supposition Metrodorus would be a chronologer of the 6th or 7th century. [G. S.]

METRONIA, a Roman lady in the 4th century, who was left a widow when young and remained a widow for forty years. Her example is urged upon her granddaughter Ageruchia by Jerome in his letter *De Monogamia* (123, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

MEUBREDUS, ST., of whom William of Worcester (141) says, "Sanctus Mybbard heremita, filius regis Hiberniae, aliter dictus Colrogus, ejus corpus jacet in scrinio ecclesiae de Kardynan . . . et ejus dies agitur die jovis proxima ante festum Pentacostes." The parish of Cardinham is near Bodmin in Cornwall. [C. W. B.]

MEUGAN, MEUGANT (MEIGANT), Sept. 25, Welsh bard, son of Gwyndaf Hen and Gwenonwy, daughter of Meurig prince of Glamorgan. He is thus related to many other Welsh saints (Rees, *Essay on Welsh Saints* 123, 164-5; *Boll. Acta SS.* 25 Oct. xi. 617). He belonged to the colleges of St. Illtyd at Llantwit Major and of St. Dubricius at Caerleon, and died in the island of Bardsey. He founded Llanfeugan or Llanvigan, co. Brecon, and is patron of St. Maughan's in Llangattock-vibon-avel, co. Monmouth, and Capel Meugan in Llan-degfan, co. Anglesey (Rees, *W. SS.* 269; Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 320). To Meugant there are attributed two extant poems (both in *Myv. Arch.* i. 159, 160, and one in Skene, *Four Anc. B. of Wales*, i. 497, ii. 5, from *Black Book of Carmarthen*, ii. fol. 4a) dated in *Myv. Arch.* A.D. 600-650. Of these Stephen (*Lit. Kymr.* 207 sq. 294) thinks the *Elegy on Cynddylan* genuine, but the *Ode* as late as the 12th century, on account of its language being more modern, and also its mentioning Owain Gwynedd, who died A.D. 1169 (see also *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Ass. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 52; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, i. 106 sq.). [J. G.]

MEURIG, son of Tewdrig king of Morganwg and Gwent. On the abdication of Tewdrig, Meurig succeeded, and was much engaged in war with the Saxons, but his beneficence to Llandaff and Llanearvan is best known from the *Book of Llandaff* and Welsh annalists. The



first synod of Llandaff is said to have been convened by St. Oudoceus for the trial and excommunication of king Meurig on account of murdering Cynfeddw, Cynnetu, or Cynetu, contrary to his oath of peace. After lying under the ban for two years, he made amends in fasting, prayer, and alms-giving, presenting four villages to the church of Llandaff (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 125; *Boll. Acta SS.* 2 Jul. i. 284). He died A.D. 575, aged 90 years. He founded Merthyr Tewdrig, now Mathern, co. Monmouth, in honour of his father, while Ystrad Meurig in Llanafan, co. Cardigan, may mark his own place of burial. (*Lib. Land.* pass.; *Cressy, Ch. H. Brit.* xii. 8; *Rees, Camb. Br. SS.* 354 et al.; *Rees, W. SS.* 164-5, 184; *Williams, Em. Welsh.* 322.) [J. G.]

**MEVENUS, MEVEN, MEVENNIUS, MEVANIUS (MAEN, MEEN, MEIN, MAIANUS, MAINUS, MAJANUS, MAVENNUS),** Welsh saint in Armorica. Fullest notice is by Baertius (*Boll. Acta SS.* 21 Jun. 87-91), giving, with Praevius Commentarius and notes, the Life compiled by Albert le Grand from breviaries and other sources; the historical touches are meagre. He is said to have been nephew of St. Samson of Dol, and accompanied him to France, where he founded the monastery of St. Méen, which Judicael king of Brittany destroyed in A.D. 638; it was restored in the time of Charlemagne, and again in that of Louis I. He died near the close of the 6th century, or, as some say, later. His feast is June 21, but sometimes June 15. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 78, 88; *Cressy, Ch. H. Brit.* 224, 253-4. He is probably identical with the following. [J. G.]

**MEWANUS, ST.,** the saint of St. Mewan near St. Austell Bay on the south coast of Cornwall, called Santmawant in the Exeter Domesday. A St. Meven was patron of a monastery in Armorica (*R. Rees, Welsh Saints*, 319-20; for the name Mawan, see 77, 81; 207, 251). The monastery of St. Méen (Mevanius, a cousin of St. Samson) was connected with Bodmin as late as 1177 (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 78, 88). [C. W. B.]

**MICHAEL (1),** in the system of JUSTINUS, the first of the paternal angels (*Hippol. Ref.* v. 26, p. 151). In the Ophite system (*Iren.* i. 30, p. 111) Michael is given as one of the names of the serpent. [G. S.]

**MICHAEL (2)** (called SYNCELLUS and SYNCELUS), presbyter of Jerusalem and syncellus of the patriarch Thomas, cir. 802. He was addressed by Theodore Studita (*lib. ii. Ep.* 213 in *Patr. Gr.* xcix. 1640), and was the author of two extant Greek works, *Encomium Dionysii Areopagitae* and *Encomium in SS. Archangelos et Angelos*, as to the editions of which, and other sources of information concerning Michael and his inedited works, *vid. Fabric. Bibl. Gr.* xi. 186, ed. Harles. [C. H.]

**MIGETIUS, ST.,** Aug. 7, twenty-sixth bishop of Besançon, between St. Donatus and Ternatius in the latter half of the 7th century, was, according to Adso, the biographer of St. Waldebertus, abbat of Luxeuil, vir magnarum virtutum, and a friend of St. Waldebert. The two agreed that

the one who first died should be buried by the survivor. Accordingly, on the death of his friend about 665, Migetius repaired to Luxeuil and celebrated his obsequies. In Adso's Life the bishop's name is Nicetius, but the dates seem to render it probable that Migetius was the bishop referred to (Adso, *Vita S. Waldeberti*, § 8, in *Pat. Lat.* cxxxvii. 692-3; *Boll. Acta SS.* Mai. i. 279). St. Migetius probably died about 670. (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 16; Richard, *Hist. des Diocèses de Besançon et de Saint-Claude*, i. 121-2.) [S. A. B.]

**MILBURGA,** daughter of Merowald king of the Western Hecani [MEROWALD] by Eormen-burga or Dompneva; and sister of St. Mildred and St. Milgitha. According to her biographer, whose work, still in MS., is abridged by Capgrave (*Legenda*, ed. 1516, f. 232), Milburga was the eldest of the family and the founder of the monastic institute within her father's dominions. She built a nunnery at Wenlock, then called Winwick, and undertook the office of abbess, to which she was consecrated by archbishop Theodore (*Harfsf. Hist.* p. 82). She refused to marry, and on one occasion, whilst residing outside of her monastery, in a place called Stoches, she was delivered, by a miraculous rising of the river Corf, from the violent attack of a rejected suitor. The same place witnessed a miracle by which Milburga banished the geese which were doing injury to her fields, and the fields thus defended were freed for ever from the mischievous intrusion. Another story told of her is the not uncommon miracle of hanging her veil on a sun-beam; another records the prolonging of the life of a widow's son in answer to her prayer, during which she appeared enveloped in flames. At the age of sixty she died, commending her nuns to God, and the blessed virgin, on the 25th of June; Harpsfield, however, from the history of her miracles, gives February 23 as the day; and on February 23 her day was observed according to the Kalender of the Hereford Missal. Sir Harris Nicolas mentions May 26 as likewise dedicated to her, but this may be a misreading of Capgrave. The Bollandists calculate that the year of her death, counted from that of her father's marriage, would fall about 722. She was buried at Wenlock, where many miracles wrought by her relics were recorded in a work written by a certain Odo, who has been identified with the cardinal bishop of Ostia (1088-1101), but whom Fabricius recognises as Odo prior of Canterbury, who became abbat of Battle in 1175.

The relics of St. Milburga were translated in 1101. Earl Roger of Montgomery had given the site of her monastery at that time to the Cluniacs (*Hardy, Cat. Mat.* i. 274). William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* iv. § 171) gives an account of the discovery of her remains by a boy running over the pavement; and the History of her miracles says that a man named Raimund, working in the church of the Holy Trinity, found a document in which the place was described by a priest named Alstan, and that her coffin was found bound with iron after the manner of the English. See *Hardy, Cat. Mat.* i. 274, 275; *Mon. Angl.* v. 74, 75; Harpsfield, *Hist. Ecol.* ed. 1622, p. 83; Mabillon, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* § iii. pt. 1, pp. 420, 421; *Acta SS. Bolland.* Febr. tom. iii. pp. 388-391.

The churches of Stoke St. Milburgh, and Beckbury in Shropshire, of Wexford, Warwickshire, and Offenham, Worcestershire, are dedicated to St. Milburgh; Parker, *Anglican Church Calendar*, p. 262. [S.]

MILCHO, MILCHON, MILCHU, MILCHUO, MILCO, MILCON, MILCUO (MILEC, MILIAC, MILICO, MILIOC, MILIUC, MILUC, MAELCHU, MELICON, MICHUL), son of Buan or of the family of the Dal-Buain in Antrim. He is called magus, but more properly was a regulus of Dalaradia in the north-east of Ulster, and father of St. Bronach of Kilbroney, bishop Guasacht in Granard, and the two Emerias. He was St. Patrick's master in slavery for six years, and remained a heathen, afterwards preferring death to becoming a convert to his former servant. With slight variation he appears in all the Lives of St. Patrick (Colgan, *Tr. Th. pass.*). He lived about A.D. 390, and must have died about A.D. 432 or 433. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 489 sq.; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 373, 407-8; Lanigan, *E. II. Ir.* i. 216 sq.) [J. G.]

MILDRED (MILTHRITHA, MILDTHRITHA), ST., daughter of Merowald the son of Penda by Eormenburga or Dompneva, and sister of Milburga and Milgitha (Flor. Wig. in *M. H. B.* 534, 630, 638). According to her biographer Gotselinus, she was sent by her mother to Chelles to be educated under the abbess Wilcoma; and having refused to marry a kinsman of the abbess was shut up by her in a furnace in which her life was miraculously preserved. After further persecution she determined to leave the convent; wrote a psalter, which she sent with some of her hair to her mother by a messenger, to whom, by word of mouth, she entrusted her complaints. Eormenburga sent ships to fetch her daughter, but the abbess refused to let her go. Mildred then escaped secretly, and having returned to fetch some vestments and precious relics, notably "clavis crucifixionis Dominicæ," which she had left behind, effected her retreat to the ships, sailed and landed at "Ipplesfee" or Ebbsfleet, where she impressed her foot miraculously on the squared stone on which she landed, and which afterwards effected miracles of healing; an oratory was afterwards built on the spot. She was made abbess of Minster in Thanet, where she had a band of seventy nuns, and was consecrated to the office by archbishop Theodore. According to another tradition preserved by Simeon of Durham, she succeeded her mother in the office of abbess, and was blessed by Deusdedit [EORMENBURGA]. The biographer tells some stories of her resistance to diabolical machinations, and of a vision of the Holy Ghost in the likeness of a dove. On her death she was succeeded by Eadburga or Bugga [BUGGA].

St. Mildred is best known as abbess of Minster, and in fact gave her name to the monastery which her mother had founded in the honour of the Blessed Virgin. It was by Eadburga that the church was rebuilt and the bones of St. Mildred translated, and although the new church was dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul, it was better known as St. Mildred's. Until the Kentish hagiology has been subjected to a much more searching criticism than is possible whilst the writings of Gotselinus are still in MS., it is im-

possible to say what credit can be given to the scanty data of the legends of St. Mildred and her sisters. It would be, however, hypercritical to question their existence or their connexion with the localities to which they are referred. The numerous dedications of churches to St. Mildred, and the frequent use of her name as a baptismal name, prove that her cultus was far too widely extended and too deeply rooted to be the mere result of a monastic legend. Mr. Parker, in the *Anglican Church Calendar*, mentions as dedicated to her churches in Bread Street and in the Poultry in London, and others at Preston, Canterbury, and Whippingham, to which may be added one at Oxford, now demolished.

The earliest evidence of St. Mildred's historical character is, if the act be genuine, afforded by the famous privilege of king Wihtried of Kent, issued in the council of Bapchild at an uncertain date between 696 and 716; among the witnesses who attest the document are the names of five abbesses, the first of which is "Signum Mildrithæ Abbatissæ," Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 240. The next certain authority is that of Florence of Worcester, who mentions her both in his Chronicle and in the genealogies. Between these two distant dates lies the region of disputed charters; and, after the date of Florence, or contemporary with it, the legends preserved by Gotselinus.

The charters in which St. Mildred is mentioned are preserved among the Canterbury charters by Thorn and Elmham; in the first, Wihtried, in the fifth year of his reign, 696, grants protection to her monastery in Thanet (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 39; Elmham, p. 289); in the second, Ethelbert, son of Wihtried, during his father's life, grants to Mildred and her venerable sisterhood, land for one plough about the river Limene, and three acres at Hammespot (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 72; Elmham, p. 298), dated July 11, 724. Both these are rejected by Kemble as spurious. Other grants not less suspicious follow; in one, Ethelbald king of Mercia grants freedom from toll in the port of London (Elmham, p. 305; Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 84 and 97); and in another, dated in 748, the same king grants to Eadburga large immunities, mentioning especially the newly dedicated church into which St. Mildred had been translated (Kemble, *C. D.* 98; Elmham, p. 314). These immunities were confirmed by Offa and Eadbert (Kemble, No. 106; Elmham, pp. 321, 322).

To these scanty and suspicious materials the legend, as given by Gotselinus, is now added, and on this basis rises the posthumous history of the saint, some portion of which may be trustworthy. Thorn, writing in the 14th century (ap. Twysden, 1907, 1908), states that the abbess Eadburga translated the remains of St. Mildred to the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, which was dedicated by archbishop Cuthbert, and was close to the chapel of the Virgin built by Dompneva. On the death of Eadburga, Sigeburga succeeded as abbess of Minster; and after her Selethritha, after whom, owing to the devastation by the Danes, the history of Minster is a blank, until, in the year 1011, the name of an abbess, Leofwina, appears among the Danish captives. This seems to shew that the monastery had subsisted throughout the evil days, and possibly it may have enjoyed the immunities supposed to be guaranteed by the questionable

charters referred to above. These immunities subsequently led to a great dispute as to the possession of St. Mildred's relics. Two stories were told about this; the canons of St. Gregory's, Canterbury, a house founded by Lanfranc, asserted that these remains were translated to Lyminge, by an abess Eadburga, daughter of Ethelbert king of Kent, and thence translated by Lanfranc to St. Gregory's (Elmham, p. 224; Lewis, *History of Thanet*, p. 91). On the other hand, the monks of St. Augustine's averred that they had been translated to St. Augustine's by abbat Elfstan, with the leave of Canute, obtained when he was on his journey to Rome, about 1026 or 1027; a permission which had been secured by prayer and intrigue, and which carried with it the bestowal of the lands and immunities of Minster. On the controversy Gotselinus wrote a "Libellus contra inanes usurpatores sanctae Mildrithae." On this subject, which brings out some curious material of legend, and on the miracles of St. Mildred, see Thorn, cc. 1901-1911; *Acta SS. Boll. July*, tom. iii. pp. 512-524; Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 376-384. On the translation of some of her relics to Deventer in Holland, *Acta SS. ut s.* p. 514.

The day assigned to the commemoration of St. Mildred was July 13 (Capgrave, fo. 223); the 20th of February was the day of her depositio at St. Augustine's in 1262 (Thorn, c. 1905). By a bull issued in 1368 the feast of St. Mildred was ordered to be kept in Thanet as a double feast (Elmham, p. 68). [S.]

**MILGITHA** (MILDGITHA, MILDWIDA), daughter of Merowald king of the Western Hecani, by Eormenburga or Dompneva; and sister of SS. Mildred and Milburga. She is recorded in the English martyrology as having been a nun at Eastry in Kent, and as dying in 676. The 17th of January was the day of her commemoration, and nothing more seems to be known about her. See Flor. Wig. in *M. H. B.* pp. 534, 630, 638, and *Acta SS. Bolland.* Jan. 17, tom. ii. p. 176; Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 277. [S.]

**MILLO**, thirty-fifth archbishop of Trèves, between St. Leotwinus, or Lutwine, and St. Veomadus (circ. A.D. 713-53), a degenerate son of his predecessor, rose to the episcopate by the favouritism of Charles Martel, whose companion in arms he was. With Trèves he also held Rheims, whose bishop, Rigobertus, the Mayor of the Palace had driven into exile in Gascony. Through his long usurpation the latter diocese was reduced to a terrible state of desolation and poverty, and presumably that of Trèves was not more fortunate. Hincmar speaks of him as "tonsura clericus, moribus habitu et actu irreligiosus laicus" (*Vita S. Remigii* in *Pat. Lat.* cxxv. 1129-30). Much the same is Flodoard's account of him (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 12 in *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 116-8) and that of the *Gesta Treverorum*, which, however, gives him the credit of following at first in his father's footsteps before he became a tyrant (*Pat. Lat.* cliv. 1150-4). Boniface of Mainz was affected by the scandal, and consulted the pope, apparently suggesting strong measures. Zacharias, whose reply is extant, seems to have declined a contest. "Concerning Milo and his likes, who much trouble the churches of God, pray, according to the Apostle's

word, in season and out of season. If they follow your admonitions they shall save their souls. But you who pray duly shall not lose your reward (*Epist. S. Bonifacii*, lxxxvii., Würdtwein, p. 251). In 753, he was killed by a wild boar while hunting at Arno, close to Trèves. In addition to the authorities above mentioned, see *Goll. Christ.* ix. 26-7, xiii. 388; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 307, 470; and for documents relating to the diocese during his time, Hontheim, *Hist. Trev. Dipl. et Pragm.* i. 109-119. [S. A. B.]

**MILRED**, the fifth bishop of Worcester (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 622). He succeeded bishop Wilfrith in 743, 744, or 745; for the death of that prelate is referred by the different authorities to these several years; and sat until 774 or 775. He was thus contemporary with Ethelbald king of Mercia, during his latter and more unhappy years, and with Olla during the first half of his reign. The first charter to which his name is attached is an Anglo-Saxon grant made to Worcester by Ethelbald, undated, but bearing the attestation not only of Milred but of his predecessor Wilfrith. If this be genuine, and it seems to be accepted by Kemble as such (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 95), Milred must have been consecrated during Wilfrith's life, according to a practice not unusual at the time; and if this were so, we might thus account for the varying dates assigned to his promotion. In the year 747 Milred was present at the great synod held at Clovesho by archbishop Cuthbert (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360; Wilkins, *Conc.* i. 90), but his name is not attached to the important charter by which Ethelbald freed the monasteries of his kingdom from secular services, at Godmundslæch in 749 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 387).

Towards the close of the year 755, in which St. Boniface suffered martyrdom, Milred is found writing to his successor Lullus a letter which is preserved among the remains of St. Boniface's correspondence (*Mon. Mogunt.* ed. Jaffé, pp. 267, 268). From this we learn that Milred had during the preceding year visited Boniface in Germany, and there made acquaintance with Lullus. The writer desires to have a particular account of the death of Boniface, and also asks for the counsel and continued friendship of Lullus; he sends a few presents, and excuses himself for not sending "librum pyropyri metri," because archbishop Cuthbert has not returned it. The letter is important, as shewing that Boniface's intercourse with his native country had not been restricted to epistolary correspondence.

The name of Milred is appended to a few of the charters of Ethelbald: besides the grant already referred to, in which Ethelbald grants two shops in London to the church of Worcester, he attests a joint grant of Ethelbald and Cynewulf of Wessex to abbat Emberht [EARNBERTH] (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 100), and the name is attached to a spurious grant to the monastery of St. Mildred (Elmham, p. 314; Kemble, *C. D.* 98).

After the accession of Olla in 757, Milred's name occurs more frequently, and it is no doubt to his influence with that king and with the subreguli of the Hwiccas that the large endowments of the see of Worcester and its subject monasteries are to be ascribed. Some of the

existing charters are regarded as spurious, but although in some points they fail to stand diplomatic tests, it is more likely that the failure is owing to mistakes of transcription or to interpolation than to wholesale fabrication. In 757 Milred received from Eanbert, Aldred, and Uhtred, of the Hwiccas, land at Tredington for the church of St. Peter, which was then the cathedral monastery of Worcester (Kemble, *C. D.* 102); this grant is attested by Milred and confirmed by Offa. Milred attests a confirmation by Offa of Ethelbald's grant to Minster (Kemble, *C. D.* 112; Elmham, p. 321); a grant of Uhtred to Ethelmund in 767 (Kemble, *C. D.* 117); another to the church of St. Mary at Worcester in 770 (*ib.* 118) of land at Salwarp; and undated grants of Aldred to Beornheard (*K. C. D.* 125) of land at Huntenatun; of Offa to Milred himself, of land at Wick on the west of the Severn (*K. C. D.* 126); of abbat Ceolfrith to the church of St. Peter, conceding the old monastery of Heanburh and Sture in Usmere; of Uhtred to the church of St. Mary (*ib.* 128); of Offa to Milred himself, of land at Pirigtun (*ib.* 129). The last charter to be noticed is one granted by Milred himself, in which he secures the monastery of Withington to the abbess Ethelburga for life, with reversion to the church of St. Peter at Worcester (Kemble, *C. D.* 125). A good deal of interest attaches to these documents, as they shew how the mother church of the diocese was gathering in the endowments of the small hereditary monasteries of the kingdom, whilst they prove that side by side with the ancient church of St. Peter, a great monastery, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and more distinctly monastic in its rule, was growing up, ultimately to supplant the older church in its character of a cathedral. The last-mentioned charter is dated in 774, the last year of Milred's pontificate. His death is referred by Florence of Worcester (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* 544) to the year 775; the Chronicle places it in 772, but Florence probably wrote from local authority, and in this place may be regarded as correcting the faulty chronology of the Chronicle. His successor was Weremund, whose name is attached to a charter dated in the 13th indiction, *i.e.* A.D. 775 (*K. C. D.* no. 120). [S.]

**MILTIADES (1)**, an active Christian writer of the second century. Eusebius tells us (*H. E.* v. 17) that, besides leaving other records of his diligent study of the divine oracles, he composed a treatise "against the Greeks," another "against the Jews," and an "Apology" addressed to the rulers of this world on behalf of the school of philosophy to which he belonged. It is a natural inference from the plural "rulers" in the above that there were, when Miltiades wrote, two emperors on the throne, probably Aurelius and Verus. Valesius, however, understands by "rulers" provincial governors, laying, as it seems to us, undue stress on the statement of Jerome that Miltiades wrote in the reign of Commodus. The Apology may be supposed to have been a learned plea for toleration of Christianity, the purity of whose doctrines may have been favourably contrasted with the teaching of heathen philosophy. Though it has not come down to us, it seems to have had at the time a high repute. The writer of the "Little Labyrinth" (*Eus.* v. 28) names

Miltiades in company with Justin, Tatian, and Clement as among the writers in defence of the truth or against contemporary heretics who, before Victor's episcopate, had distinctly asserted the divinity of Christ. Tertullian (*Adv. Valentin.* 5) names Miltiades in company with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus as a writer against heresy, giving him the appellation, evidently intended in an honourable sense, "Sophista Ecclesiarum." St. Jerome, who twice mentions Miltiades (*Catal.* 39, *Ep. ad Magnum*, vol. i. p. 427) gives no clear indication that he knew more of Miltiades than he had learned from Eusebius.

Great obscurity hangs over the relation of Miltiades to Montanism, owing to a strange confusion, either on the part of Eusebius himself or of his copyists, between the names Miltiades and Alcibiades. In *H. E.* v. 2 Eusebius tells a story about one of the Lyons confessors named Alcibiades, and, going on to speak about Montanism, mentions an Alcibiades as among its leaders. After the death of Montanus, his sect seems to have been known in Phrygia by the name of its leader for the time being; and in an anti-Montanist document preserved by Eusebius, v. 16, the sect is called the party of Miltiades. This is the reading of all the MSS.; yet having regard to the earlier passage just mentioned, editors are disposed here to substitute Alcibiades for Miltiades. If we are not permitted to think that there might have been Montanists of both names, it would seem to us more natural to make the opposite correction. In ch. 16 there was nothing to lead copyists astray; in ch. 2 Eusebius, having named an Alcibiades just before, might easily by a slip of the pen have repeated the same name. This view is strengthened by the fact that at the close of the Muratorian fragment, a name transcribed as "Mitiades" occurs as that of one the ecclesiastical use of whose writings was totally rejected by the church. This would be explained by the supposition that Miltiades was the name of a Montanist who had written records of Montanist prophesyings or some other document, to which that sect had ascribed inspiration and had admitted it into their church use.

But the case is complicated by worse confusion in the 17th chapter of Eusebius. He begins by saying that the anti-Montanist document already quoted mentioned Miltiades as having written against Montanus; and then, having given extracts from the document, goes on to give the account we have already used of the other works of Miltiades. But the extract, according to the reading of all the MSS., names not Miltiades but Alcibiades as the author of an anti-Montanist treatise, "that a prophet ought not to speak in ecstasy." Here editors find it absolutely necessary to correct the Alcibiades of the extract into Miltiades in order to make Eusebius consistent with himself. Yet this leaves it unexplained why transcribers should go so strangely wrong. To us much seems to turn on the question, Did Eusebius transcribe his extracts from earlier writers with his own hand, or did he employ a scribe? On the latter supposition it is possible that the extract as actually copied by the scribe might reveal that Eusebius had made a slip in the account of it, which he had dictated from memory. In the present case Eusebius might remember

that the document contained mention of a Miltiades, and, being familiar with the church writer of the name, might have connected him in his mind with the authorship of an anti-Montanist treatise. But the extract as copied by the scribe seems to shew that the document had mentioned Miltiades but as the name of a soon-forgotten Montanist leader, and that the work against that sect had been written not by Miltiades, but by an equally forgotten Alciabiades. If this be the true account of the matter, the memory of Eusebius played him no worse trick than such as we have constant experience of. [G. S.]

**MILTIADES (2)** (MELTIADES, MELCIADES, MELCIADES, MELCHIADES), bishop of Rome after Eusebius, from 2nd July, A.D. 310, to 10th or 11th January, A.D. 314, during a little more than three years and six months, the see having been vacant before his ordination for ten months and fourteen days. The year 311, commonly given as that of his accession, rests on an apparent error in the Liberian Catalogue, being inconsistent with the duration in the same catalogue assigned to his reign. (See Lipsius, *Chronol. der röm. Bischof.* p. 257.) The long vacancy before his appointment is accounted for by the circumstances of his predecessor's death in exile, and the divided state of the Roman church at the time. [See EUSEBIUS.]

The pontificate of Miltiades was marked by the accession, and so-called conversion, of Constantine the Great, and the definite termination of the Diocletian persecution. It was to him, after his accession, that the possessions of the Christians at Rome, including the cemeteries, were at length restored by Maxentius: "Melchianes was recorded to have sent deacons with letters from the emperor Maxentius and from the prefect of the Praetorium to the prefect of the city, that they might recover possession of what had been taken away in the time of persecution, and which the aforesaid emperor had ordered to be restored" (Augustin. *Brevic. Collat. cum Donat.*; die iii. c. 34): It was between the July and November of the year 310, according to Lipsius (*Chron. der röm. bisch.*), but usually said to have been in the following year—that Galerius issued his edict of toleration, the first of the series, to which the names also of Constantine and Licinius were affixed. It was probably in the spring or summer of 312 that the two latter emperors issued a second tolerating edict, which is referred to in the more celebrated one of the following year. Constantine, after the defeat and death of Maxentius (28th Oct. 312), having entered Rome in triumph, and having thence gone to Milan, promulgated in 313 with Licinius, who met him there, the full edict of toleration known as "the Edict of Milan," which Licinius, after his defeat of Maximian, proclaimed in the June of the same year at Nicomedia in the East. All these important events were during the episcopate of Miltiades, who would be a personal witness of Constantine's entry into Rome after the battle of the Milvian bridge, with the labarum borne aloft, and the monogram of Christ, which he believed to have been revealed to him in vision, marked upon the shields of his soldiers. But the pope's name does not become prominent

until the complications which soon arose in connexion with the African Donatists. They arose as follows: Constantine sent from Gaul two successive letters to Anulinus proconsul of Africa, in the first of which he ordered the restoration to Catholic Christians of all their possessions that had been taken from them during persecution, and in the second exempted all the clergy from civil functions (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5, 7; *Cod. Theodos.* 16, t. 2, l. 1). Both the letters expressly confined these benefits to the Catholic church, over which Caecilianus presided. This the party of Majorinus, the rival bishop (called afterwards the *Donatists* from Donatus, who succeeded Majorinus, see DONATISM; CAECILIANUS), took much amiss, and went with a great multitude of followers to Anulinus, handing him an open document (*libellus*), together with a bundle of papers in a sealed bag, which they desired him to transmit to the emperor (*Ep. Anul. ad Constant. Labbé*, tom. i. p. 1428; Augustin. *Ep.* 88, Benedict. ed.). The papers contained charges against Caecilianus, their object being to procure his condemnation, and obtain for themselves the imperial support. With this view they begged Constantine to appoint some bishops of Gaul to judge the case. Gallic bishops are asked for because, their country having been exempt from persecution through the favour of Constantius, they were not implicated in the questions at that time in dispute.

Constantine, according to Optatus, was greatly annoyed at being called upon to settle disputes among the clergy, and replied in an angry strain (*pleno livore respondit*), saying, "You demand a judgment from me in this world, when I myself expect the judgment of Christ." But he complied with the request, nominating three Gallic bishops as judges, Maternus of Cologne (*Agripina Civitas*), Rheticius of Autun (*Augustodunum*), and Marinus of Arles, to whom he sent the documents received from Africa, commanding them to repair with all speed to Rome, there to adjudge the matter in conjunction with Miltiades. To him also he wrote a letter which is still extant, having been preserved by Eusebius, in which he again expresses the great annoyance caused him by the dissensions of bishops, and, after naming the commission he had issued to the Gallic bishops, desires earnestly a full consideration and settlement of the case. This letter is addressed, not to Miltiades alone, but to him and Marcus. Who this Marcus was is not known. He is supposed by Valesius (*in not. ad lib. x. Euseb.*) to have been a leading Roman presbyter, and probably the same who afterwards became pope. The emperor may have become acquainted with him when in Rome, and selected him on his merits as the pope's colleague: or he may have been an assessor on the ground of some position which he held.\* Baronius, anxious to make out that the pope alone was called upon to adjudicate the case, makes the untenable suggestion (scouted by Valesius) that "and Marcus" (*καὶ Μάρκος*) is an error of transcription for "hierarch" (*ιεράρχη*). This emendation is not only unsupported and impro-

\* Reasons for supposing Merocles of Milan to be intended are given under **ROME, COUNCILS OF**, A.D. 313 in *D.C.A.* and **MARINUS**.

bable in itself, but also inconsistent with the contents of the letter, which is addressed throughout to persons in the plural. There is no evidence, in this or other acts of Constantine, that he regarded the bishop of Rome as the sole or necessary judge of ecclesiastical causes on appeal. He did not indeed presume to judge them himself—he was careful to refer spiritual cases to the spirituality—and in this case he naturally and properly referred the chief cognisance of a case arising in Western Africa to the Roman see, though not to the pope singly, but to him assisted by assessors whom he named himself. Though only the three bishops of Gaul are named in the letter as colleagues of Miltiades and Marcus, it appears from Optatus that fifteen Italian bishops were added to the conclave, summoned, we may suppose, by Miltiades himself, so that he might hear the case canonically in synod with the assistance of the Gallic assessors. Constantine had, in his letter, desired him to cause the case to be heard “as the most holy law of God, as you know, requires,” and was afterwards fully satisfied with the mode of procedure. The synod thus constituted met on Friday the 2nd October, A.D. 313, in “the house of Fausta,” the wife of Constantine, in the Lateran, and had three sittings. Caecilianus, as the accused, and Donatus of Casae Nigrae, as the principal accuser, appeared before it. The emperor, in his letter to Miltiades and Marcus, mentions his having ordered Caecilianus to repair to Rome with ten supporters and ten accusing bishops. The result was that Caecilianus was unanimously acquitted, and Donatus condemned. Against the latter the sentence was pronounced, “That he confessed having rebaptized and laid hands on lapsed bishops, *quod ab ecclesia alienum est.*” The acquittal of Caecilianus was declared, according to Optatus, by Miltiades in the following words: “Since it appears that Caecilianus is not accused by those who have come with Donatus according to his profession, and that he has not been convicted by Donatus in any part of his own accusation, I judge that he is deservedly to be retained in full ecclesiastical communion.” The proceedings of the conclave seem to have been marked by great forbearance, and desire of union. None of the Donatist party were condemned, except Donatus of Casae Nigrae himself, as being the main author of the schism. All the rest had even letters of communion sent them on condition of their acknowledging Caecilianus: and it was provided that, when there were two rival bishops in any African see, he that had been first ordained, of whichever party, might be allowed to retain it, the adherent of the other finding him a see elsewhere (Augustin. *Ep.* 43, Benedict. ed.). Augustine, in the letter referred to, which is our authority in this instance, expatiates on the equity and gentleness of Miltiades and his colleagues, which he contrasts with the temper of the African synod, which had previously condemned Caecilian, saying of Miltiades himself, “O excellent man! O son of Christian peace! O father of the Christian people!” The decisions of the conclave were duly transmitted to Constantine, who was himself fully satisfied with them, and hoped that the dispute was ended (*Ep. Constant. ad vicar. Africae; ejusd. ad Episc. Syrac.*—Labb. i. p. 1445; Euseb. *II. E.* x. 5)

Moved, however, by the continued complaints of Donatus and his party, who alleged that the proceedings at Rome had been unfair and secret, and pleaded also the small number of bishops who had pronounced sentence (*ib.*), he ordered angrily fresh investigations to be made in Africa, and summoned the general synod of Arles (A.D. 314) with a view to a final settlement. In all these further proceedings the bishop of Rome does not appear to have been consulted by the emperor, or regarded as possessing any position of supremacy. Constantine, as has been already observed, professed great reverence for the episcopate in general, and recognized the right of the clergy to settle cases purely ecclesiastical; but he took upon himself to set in motion and regulate ecclesiastical proceedings, to delegate their administration to such ecclesiastics as he chose, and certainly shewed no peculiar deference to the Roman see. Nor do we find any protest on the part of the church of his day against his mode of procedure. Further, Augustine, writing afterwards (c. A.D. 398), refers to the objection of the Donatists of his day that the bishop of Rome, with his transmarine colleagues, had no right to usurp to himself the judgment of a case that had been settled in a synod of seventy African bishops under their primate; and he meets the objection, not by asserting any such inherent right in the Roman see, but by saying, “But what if he did not himself usurp it? It was the emperor who, being requested, sent judges to sit with him, and decide what was just on the whole case” (August. *Ep.* xliii. c. v. 14).

The fact that the conclave under Miltiades met in the Lateran palace (in the house of the empress Fausta) is adduced by Baronius (A.D. 312) as a conclusive proof of the truth of the tradition that Constantine had made over that palace to the pope as a kind of princely residence. But the fact itself proves nothing of the kind. It is quite possible indeed that, when the new emperor visited Rome after his victory over Maxentius, he may have endowed the see, as he is said to have done, with new possessions; but the subsequent traditions to this effect are no sufficient evidence; nor is it known with any certainty when the popes came into permanent possession of the Lateran.

Miltiades was, in the time of St. Augustine, accused by the African Donatists of having, as one of the presbyters of pope Marcellinus, with him given up the sacred books and offered incense under the persecution of Diocletian. Augustine treats the whole charge as unsupported by documentary evidence, and probably a calumny [MARCELLINUS]; and we find no mention of any such charge against Miltiades during his life, when the party of Donatus was likely to have made a strong point of it, had it been known of them.

Further, in the conference with the Donatists held A.D. 411, by order of the emperor Honorius, of which the *Breviculus* of St. Augustine is a summary, the charge was alleged, but all proof of it broke down. Being challenged to bring evidence, the Donatists could only succeed in shewing that among the deacons sent by Miltiades to recover the church property restored by Maxentius, there were two called Strato and Cassianus, and that two persons bearing those

names had been traitors. To this it was replied, that there was no proof of the identity of the parties, and that, even if there had been, Miltiades himself would not have been implicated (Augustin. *Brev. Collat. con. Donat.* c. 34).

Miltiades, having, as has been said above, received back from Maxentius the alienated church property, was buried, like his predecessors since Pontianus till the commencement of persecution, in the cemetery of St. Callistus on the Appian Way. There also he had deposited the remains of his immediate predecessor Eusebius (*Depos. Episc. Liber.*). But neither of these two popes (according to early recensions of the Pontifical) lay in the old papal crypt of that cemetery, but each in a separate *cubiculum* apart from it. De Rossi accounts for this by supposing the approaches to the old crypt to have been blocked up by the Christians so as to save it from profanation; and the state in which the passages leading to it have been found confirms this supposition. He has identified positively the *cubiculum* of Eusebius [EUSEBIUS], but that of Miltiades only conjecturally (see Northcote and Brownlow, *Rom. Sotter.* p. 146). Miltiades was the last pope buried in this cemetery.

The Felician Catalogue states that he was an African; that he forbade the faithful to fast on Thursday or Sunday, because the pagans kept these days as fasts; and that he directed the consecrated oblations called *Fermentum* to be carried to the various churches. For the meaning of the word *Fermentum*, and the custom referred to, see Art. on INNOCENTIUS I.

One spurious epistle, addressed to the bishops of Spain, is assigned to this pope. No genuine writings of his remain. He is commemorated as a saint on the 10th of December in the Roman Calendar. [J. B.—y.]

MINAS (MENNAS), patriarch of the Jacobites or Monophysites of Alexandria, succeeded Chail or Michael, A.D. 766. His episcopate was chiefly marked by the intrigues of one of his own clergy, whose story reads like an Eastern romance. Minas, as we are told, refused to promote a deacon named Peter to the episcopate. Bent on revenge, Peter betook himself to the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, got money through his help on false pretences, and informed the khalif Almanson that Minas was learned in "chymistry," and had filled his churches with gold and silver vessels "by means of the art of making gold." Almanson sent him home with a letter, ordering him to be made patriarch. The prefect or emir of Egypt, being friendly to Minas, allowed him to consult his brethren as to whether they should submit. But when the synod met in church, Peter appeared, wearing a patriarchal "cidaris" or crown, the gift of the khalif, whose name was inscribed on it. Supported by a guard, he entered the sanctuary, and began to recite "the opening prayer of the liturgy, a prayer of thanksgiving and for peace." Two bishops sprang upon him, tore off his "cidaris," and thrust him out of the sanctuary. But this act of violence provoked the emir, who ordered Minas to surrender the gold and silver vessels of his churches. The patriarch answered, "Our churches have been so often despoiled that we have only chalices of glass and wood." "Have you not, then, a book of alchymy?" "I have not." He and his

fellow-bishops were set to work at the docks, and endured this penal labour for a year. Afterwards they were cast into prison: but a new turn in their fortunes now arrived. Peter, flushed with success, had threatened to bring a charge against the emir. He was thereupon imprisoned, and the prelates were released. A new emir, finding Peter in chains, sent him to Bagdad; there he professed Islam, took the name of Abulhari, and was sent back to Egypt with large powers. But before he arrived, Almanson had died, and Peter's commission was valueless. He was treated by his own people as a renegade and a Judas. In vain, although with apparent sincerity, he besought the prayers of "certain bishops;" they deemed his case too flagrant for their intercession. Maximus died in the same year, 775, on the last day of Tybi, i.e. January 25. See Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 237 ff.; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 462; Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* ii. 122. [W. B.]

MINEI, mentioned by Jerome (*Ep. ad August.* i. 740) as the name by which the Jewish Christian sect of Nazarenes was known among the Jews themselves. This is evidently the Hebrew word מִיָּנִי (see Vol. II. p. 605b, and for further information, Buxtorf's *Lexicon*). The most probable account of it is that it is a general name for heretics, derived from מִן, *pars*, and this explanation is confirmed if we adopt the suggestion that Justin Martyr's MERISTAE is a translation of this word. But some have suggested that the word might have been at first a name for the followers of Manes; while again, seeing that it came to be specially applied to the heretical adherents of Jesus of Nazareth, others have guessed it to be a Rabbinical acoustic (כַּמְאִינִי "שֵׁן נוֹצָרִי"). (Jost, *Judenthum*, i. 414.) [G. S.]

MINERVINA. [CONSTANTINUS, Vol. I. p. 625.]

MINERVIUS (MINERIUS), a monk of the diocese of Toulouse in the beginning of the 5th century. He and his brother Alexander, having been educated for the bar, had taken the monastic vow, and had specially addicted themselves to the study of Scripture. The brothers in the year 406, hearing that their bishop Exuperius and two presbyters of the diocese, Riparius and Desiderius, were sending their friend Sisinnius to Jerome at Bethlehem, wrote him a letter with many questions on passages of Scripture. Jerome put off writing to them till close upon the time for the return of Sisinnius. He then answered their two principal questions, on the meaning of "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," and "We shall be caught up into the clouds." He quotes many commentators and decides in favour of the reading "We shall all sleep but we shall not all be changed," that is, as he interprets it, into the glory of Christ. To the second passage he gives a spiritual meaning—"We shall be caught up to be among the apostles and prophets, who are the clouds beyond which Christ has passed." He promises to answer the other questions on a future occasion, which apparently never came. But in the same year, 406, he dedicated to these two monks his *Commentary on Malachi*. That they were brothers is inferred from the words



in the preface to the *Commentary on Malachi*, "Non tam sanguine quam religione concordēs." (Jerome, ep. 119, and *Com. in Mal.*, *Opp.* vol. vi. 941, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

MINUCIUS FELIX, MARCUS, one of the earliest and most pleasing of the Latin Christian apologists. It may be said that nothing is known of his personal history except what may be gathered from his own book. The earliest writer to mention him by name is Lactantius (*Institut.* v. 1), who describes him as a lawyer, "non ignobilis inter caudicibus loci," but it may be doubted whether Lactantius is here speaking from independent knowledge, or merely drawing a natural inference from the introduction to the book itself, where Minucius tells how he had taken advantage of the court holidays to leave Rome for Ostia, "ad vindemiam feriae judiciariam curam relaxaverant." St. Jerome three times mentions Minucius (*Ep.* 48 *ad Pammach.* vol. i. p. 221; *Ep.* 70 *ad Magnum*, vol. i. p. 427; *de Vir. Illust.* cap. 58, vol. ii. p. 883), and describes him as "insignis caudicibus Romani fori;" but it seems clear that Jerome drew this description from Lactantius, whom he quotes. It has been attempted to deduce the date of Minucius from the place which Jerome assigns him in his list of illustrious men; but besides that Jerome in that list does not always observe chronological order, and that the relative position of Minucius and others is different on the different occasions where he is mentioned, there is no evidence that Jerome really knew more of the matter than we know ourselves. Still more may the same be said of Eucherius, who speaks of Minucius (*Ep. ad Valer.* in *Patr. Lat.* l. 719). Suffice it therefore here to say that the *gens Minucia* was widely spread at Rome, and that an inscription (Gruter, p. 918) makes known that among its families there was one with the cognomen Felix.

Turning then to the only work of Minucius which has come down to us, and which both Lactantius and Jerome speak of as known by the title "Octavius," we find it to be a dialogue modelled on the type of the philosophical works of Cicero, whose writings, and in particular the *De Natura Deorum* and the *De Divinatione*, Minucius has evidently carefully studied. It opens, as do Cicero's similar works, with a short introduction relating the occasion of the following discussion. Minucius, mourning for his lately deceased friend Octavius, recalls to mind in particular a conversation of his which had resulted in the conversion to Christianity of their common friend Caecilius. He tells how Octavius, long united to him in intimate friendship, had come to Rome, partly on business, partly in order to visit him, and leaving at home his wife and his children, then at that most engaging age when they were making their first essays at speech. He gives a charming description of the morning walk on the beach taken by the three friends after they had gone from Rome to Ostia; he tells of their enjoyment of the gentle sea-breeze and the pleasant sand beneath their feet; he tells how they watched the alternate play of the waves, and how they stopped to observe the boys' game of duck and drake, until at last they sat down for rest and for serious discussion on large stones which had

been placed for protection of the baths. The occasion of this discussion was, that at the beginning of the walk the heathen Caecilius, as they were passing an image of Serapis, had saluted it, as was customary, by kissing hands, whereupon Octavius charged Minucius with culpable negligence in having allowed his friend to continue in such degrading superstition. Caecilius, justly regarding this rebuke to Minucius as impliedly containing a more severe reproach to himself, challenges Octavius to a formal dispute. The little treatise then divides itself into two parts, containing first a lively attack by Caecilius on the Christian doctrines and practices, then a reply, about twice as long, by Octavius, refuting and retorting the heathen arguments. On comparing the two speeches, their complete correspondence exhibits the careful workmanship of the treatise, each of the points of the attack being dealt with in the defence, and each in its proper order. The end is that Caecilius confesses himself vanquished, or rather victorious, since he gladly ranges himself on the conquering side, and rejoices to be a sharer in his friend's victory, which has brought himself to triumph over error.

The following is an abstract of the arguments used by Caecilius on the heathen side. He censures the presumption of the Christians, who, though unlettered men, venture to pronounce positively on questions about which the greatest philosophers have doubted; he denies that there is any good ground for believing in the existence of a God, since the chance concurrence of atoms will sufficiently account for the origin of the world, while the prosperity of the wicked and the misfortunes of the good shew that the world is governed by no Providence. Then shifting his ground, he urges the duty of worshipping the gods whom their ancestors had worshipped, and the folly of rejecting what universal experience and the consent of all nations had found to be salutary. Each nation had its peculiar god: the Romans, the most religious of all, worshipped gods of all nations, and so had attained the highest prosperity. The power of their deities had been exhibited in many oracles and prodigies; only one or two philosophers had ventured to deny their agency, and one of these, Protagoras, had in consequence been banished by the Athenians. Was it not then deplorable that the gods should be assailed by men of the dregs of the people, who, collecting credulous women and silly men, banded them in a fearful conspiracy, cemented by secret and detestable rites? Tales are repeated, for some of which the authority of Fronto is cited, of the initiation of Christian neophytes by partaking of the blood of a slaughtered infant, of scenes of promiscuous incest at their meetings, of the Christian adoration of an ass's head, or even of the priest's genitals. If these things were not true, at least the obscurity in which they shrouded their rites shewed that they were such as they had cause to be ashamed of. These members of an illegal society dreaded to bring their doctrines into the light of day; they had no altars, no temples, no images, and they were not even in their manner of worship like the Jews, the only nation besides themselves who worshipped that wretched lonely God who had not been able to save His own people from captivity; yet wished to meddle with everything and pry into

every thought and every action. Nor was this the only absurdity of Christian doctrine. They threatened destruction to the world, which always had lasted and was bound together by fixed laws, and they said that one day it would be burnt up. Yet for themselves, who were not eternal like the world, but were seen to be born and die, they dared to hope for immortality, and expect that their dust and ashes would live again. In the prospect of this imaginary life they gave up all enjoyment of their real present life, trusting in a God whose impotence was exhibited in their daily sufferings, from which He was unable to save His worshippers. In fine, if the Christians had any modesty, let them give up philosophy, of which their want of education had made them incapable; or if they must philosophize, let them follow that greatest of philosophers, Socrates, whose maxim was "What is above us we have nothing to do with," otherwise the result will be either the destruction of all religion or the adoption of anile superstition.

In reply Octavius demands that a hearing shall not be refused to the arguments of the Christians because of their low worldly condition. Reason is the common property of all men. It is the rich who, intent on their wealth, are too often unable to lift their eyes to things divine. Some of those afterwards recognised as the greatest philosophers, were at first despised as poor and plebeian. He then establishes, by the ordinary arguments from the order of the universe, the existence and providence and unity of God, confirming his conclusions by the authority of various philosophers, whose opinions respecting the Deity he extracts from Cicero's treatise. In proof how natural is the belief in God's unity, he appeals to the common use of the singular Deus, both in the mouths of the vulgar and in the writings of the poets. He shews that the gods whom the heathen worshipped were but deified men, and he exposes the absurdity of the fables commonly told of them, the folly of image-worship, and the cruelty and licentiousness of the rites by which the gods were honoured. He shews the falsity of the assertion that the Romans owed their prosperity to their religion, since it was by a multitude of irreligious acts that their empire grew, and because their original native gods, to whom, if to any, must be ascribed the origin of their greatness, had been deposed from their position by the adoption of gods of the conquered peoples. He traces the source of all idolatry to the operation of the demons who, having lost their first estate, desired to draw others into the same ruin as themselves, who inspired oracles, wrought fictitious cures and other pretended miracles with a view to deceive men, and who were also the inventors and instigators of the calumnies against the Christian religion. All this was attested by their own confession when exorcised by Christians. Turning then to the different charges made against the Christians, Octavius not only denies and refutes them, but retorts them on the heathen, who had been the more ready to believe that others had been guilty of them because they had done the like themselves. If the Christians had not temples, or images, or altars, it was because they would not degrade the majesty of the

infinite God by limiting Him to a narrow place. Man himself was God's best image, a holy life the best sacrifice that could be offered Him. God is invisible, but so is the wind whose effects we witness; so is our own soul; the sun itself, the source of all light, we cannot look at. As for the Christian doctrines which Caecilius had represented as absurd and incredible, different heathen philosophers had taught a future destruction of the world by fire or otherwise; some of them had taught a transmigration of souls, a doctrine quite as difficult as that of the resurrection of the body, and less natural. The doctrine of a future life is recommended by countless analogies of nature; and though men whose lives are bad dislike to believe in future retribution, and prefer to think that death ends all, yet the current popular belief in Pyriphlegethon and Styx, a belief derived from information given by demons and from the Jewish prophets, shews how deep-seated is the conviction in men's minds that the time will come when it shall not be well with the wicked. Nor is it to be thought that God deals ill with His worshippers because He does not give them a larger share of prosperity in this life: the Christians do not covet earthly riches; they look on trials as their discipline, persecutions as their warfare, in which they are not deserted by their God, but combat under His eye. The Romans honour with their praises such sufferers as Mucius Scaevola and Regulus, yet the heroism of these men has been repeatedly surpassed by that of Christian women and children. In fine we need not be disturbed by the failure of sceptical philosophers to arrive at any certain knowledge of truth. These men's lives gave the lie to their professions of wisdom; we, whose excellence is in life and not merely in word, may boast that we have succeeded in finding what they sought in vain, and have only cause for gratitude that a revelation was reserved for our hands which was denied to them.

From this analysis of topics it will be seen how meagre Minucius is in his exposition of Christian doctrine, differing in this respect from all the other apologists. The doctrine of the unity of God, of the resurrection of the body, and of future retribution, go near to make up the whole of the system of Christian doctrine which here comes before us. The doctrine of the Logos which is so prominent in the apologies of Justin, Athenagoras, and Tertullian is passed over in silence; our Lord's name is not mentioned, and though from the manner in which Octavius repels the charge that the Christians worshipped a man who had been punished for his crimes, it may reasonably be inferred that he believed our Lord to be more than man, yet this is not plainly stated. Minucius clearly shews that the topics which he omits are excluded, not from disbelief in them or ignorance of them, but from a designed limitation of the objects of his work, because at the end, when Caecilius has declared himself satisfied on the main questions of the existence of God and of Providence, and of the general truth of the Christian religion, he asks for another conversation, not because he has still remaining doubts which need to be removed, but because he desires to be taught some things which are necessary to perfect instruction. This con-

clusion is confirmed when we find reason to think that Minucius was acquainted with Justin's *Apology*. It cannot be accident that Minucius does not imitate the entire unreserve with which Justin speaks of Christian doctrines and Christian rites. The work of Minucius, though in form that of a Christian addressed to Christians, was doubtless intended mainly to influence intelligent heathen; and we must infer that in the West at least the feeling prevailed when Minucius wrote which made Christians fear to cast their pearls before swine. It may be added that one striking difference between Minucius and Justin is the complete absence from the former of the argument from prophecy, yet the inspiration of the Jewish prophets is incidentally recognised (c. 35). Minucius never mentions the writings of either Old or New Testament, and has scarcely any coincidence of language with them. There is (c. 29) an echo of Jer. xvii. 5, and perhaps (c. 34) one of 1 Cor. xv. 36, 42.

Concerning the date of Minucius Felix it has been generally agreed that it must have been before A.D. 250, somewhere about which time Cyprian published his *De Idolorum Vanitate*, in which large use is made of Minucius. Schultze, indeed, who places Minucius in the reign of Diocletian (*Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.* 1881, p. 485), denies the genuineness of this work of Cyprian on the ground of difference of style. But we cannot so easily reject a work attested by Jerome and by Augustine; and we cannot think that the use by Minucius of such a general phrase as "reges et principes" gives sufficient warrant either to Keim to infer that there must have been then more occupants than one of the imperial throne, or to Schultze that there must have been not only Augusti, but Cæsares. A nearer determination of the date of Minucius depends on settling his relation to Tertullian. The dialogue of Minucius and the apology of Tertullian have in common so many arguments, sometimes urged in nearly the same words, that there is no room for doubt that one of the two used the work of the other, but which was the follower is a point on which critics have held opposite opinions, though some of the reasons that were given on both sides were far from conclusive. In fact the difficulty of the problem is mainly caused by the excellent use which both writers have made of their materials, whencesoever obtained, and the thoroughness with which they have incorporated them. We have already remarked on the perfect workmanship of the dialogue of Minucius. Tertullian's *Apology* is equally excellent in its way, though its plan is entirely different. It is in short an advocate's speech, written for presentation to heathen magistrates, whom it was desired to convince that Christians did not deserve to be persecuted. It is more loosely constructed, and evidently more hastily written, than the work of Minucius, but it bears a strong stamp of originality. Many points briefly touched on in Minucius are expanded in Tertullian, so that we must either hold that Minucius has abridged Tertullian, or else that Tertullian has used the suggestions of Minucius as the groundwork of developments of his own. This has furnished the best argument for the priority of Tertullian. Tertullian, it has been said, is one of the most original of writers, Minucius quite the reverse. We have already

mentioned his obligations to Cicero; his work is also largely indebted to Seneca, besides containing traces of his reading of Juvenal and other writers. Is it not then most natural to believe that in the same way as he has drawn his arguments for Theism from Cicero, he has taken his defence of Christianity from Tertullian? It may be further said that in the matter common to the two writers there are considerable differences both as to the arrangement and as to the form of expression. If Tertullian were the original, Minucius would have a change of arrangement forced on him by the plan of his work, while the changes in form of expression either improve the Latinity or make the sentence more pointed; whereas if Minucius were the original, Tertullian's changes can hardly be assigned any other object than to disguise his obligation. Notwithstanding, a very careful comparison of the common matter by Ebert (*K. Sächs. Ges. der Wissenschaften; philol.-histor. Classe*, Bd. v.) led him to the result that Minucius is the original, and the ability with which he argued the case obtained for a time general acceptance of his opinion. Ebert remarks with truth that many authors of great originality (Shakespeare and Handel for instance) have not scrupled to borrow extensively, and that Tertullian's own treatise against the Valentinians is an example how he could combine considerable originality of treatment with wholesale unacknowledged borrowing from Irenæus. In the majority of passages common to Minucius and Tertullian it is easy for an ingenious man to argue for the originality of either, but Ebert has the merit of finding a crucial test of relative priority. Minucius may be said to have almost worked with Cicero open before him, but there is no evidence that Tertullian, when he wrote his *Apology*, had recently read Cicero. Examine then whether the common passages contain traces of Cicero. If they do, it may be safely asserted that Minucius derived them directly from Cicero, Tertullian from Minucius. If they do not, it may be pronounced incredible that Tertullian could borrow extensively from Minucius, and yet through mere accident fail to appropriate any of that large portion of Minucius which is derived from Cicero. On applying this test, our report of the result is the opposite of Ebert's, the traces of Cicero in the common passages being not very numerous, and the inferences from them being disputable. We can find only one case where Ebert appears to be successful in establishing a derivation of Cicero through Minucius into Tertullian. Caecilius (c. 7) gives as an example of the power of the heathen gods, "testes equestrum fratrum in lacu statue consecrate, qui anhelis, spumantibus equis atque fumantibus de Perse victoriam eodem die qua fecerant, nuntiaverant." This reference is clearly taken from Cicero (*De Nat. Deor.* ii. 2), where the same story is told. Octavius in his reply (c. 27) ascribes to the operation of demons this and the other heathen miracles quoted by Caecilius in the same context, "De ipsis illa quae paulo ante tibi dicta sunt, ut Jupiter ludos repeteret ex somnio, ut cum equis Castores viderentur, ut cingulum matronae navicula sequeretur." Tertullian (c. 22) ascribes to the operation of demons, "Phantasmata Castorum, et aquam cribro gestatam, et navem

cingulo promotani." It is clear here that Minucius copied from Cicero, not Tertullian, but by no means clear that Tertullian is copying any one directly, and not drawing from the common stock of popular tradition. He did not find in Minucius the "Aquam cribro gestatam." And in another case of coincidence, it is almost certain that Tertullian did not use Minucius. Minucius has clearly copied from Cicero the story how Simonides, on being questioned by Hiero as to the nature of God, asked for time to deliberate, and always when the time came for giving his answer, asked for still longer and longer time for deliberation. Tertullian has the same story, but tells it of Thales and Croesus. If Tertullian were copying Minucius, why should he change the names? On the other hand Tertullian might easily, without any borrowing, use a popular story so apposite to his subject, and it is notorious how constantly popular versions of good sayings alter the names of the persons to whom they are ascribed. Ebert confirms his conclusion by producing passages where Tertullian appears to have blundered in copying Minucius. In some instances he makes out a strong case, but in all there is room for controversy; and on the other hand there are cases where Minucius seems plainly to have misunderstood Tertullian. Thus his ascription of atheism to Epicurus, "deos fingit otiosos aut nullos," is at once explained by comparison with Tertullian's language, "deum otiosum et, ut ita dixerim, neminem." Again Minucius says of Socrates "ad nutum et arbitrium adsidentis sibi daemonis vel declinabat negotia vel petebat," while Tertullian more accurately describes the daemon of Socrates as "daemonium dehortatorium." Again other instances are adduced by Schultze, who calls attention also to two important facts: (a) that Minucius has coincidences not only, as already observed, with Tertullian's *Apology*, but with other works of the same writer; (b) that Minucius in copying from Cicero, as if to disguise his obligation, makes exactly the same kind of verbal changes that he is accused of doing in copying from Tertullian. If we place Minucius before Tertullian, we can hardly place him back less than twenty years, for audacious plagiarism from a recently published work is not credible. Now all other evidence leads us to regard the Greek as the prominent element in the Roman church of the 2nd century. That so early as 180, it should include a man so highly educated in Latin literature as Minucius is what nothing else that we know would lead us to expect. Keim (*Celsus*, p. 156) places the composition of the *Octavius* a little before 180, his reasons being (a) that it appears from cc. 29, 33, 37, that two emperors were on the throne, who may be assumed to have been M. Aurelius and Commodus; (b) that the book bears signs of having been written in the embitterment of a great persecution, and so may be believed to have sprung out of that storm of the year 177, from which other apologies date their occasion; (c) that it was intended as an answer to the work of Celsus, which Keim places in the year 178. All these reasons seem to us inconclusive. (a) On the use of the word "reges," we have already commented. (b) We must subscribe to Teuffel's opinion, incomprehensible though Keim pronounces it to be,

that the tone of the *Octavius* indicates a time when Christians were not suffering external persecution. That they had had such to undergo is plainly related; possibly the dialogue is supposed to have taken place at a season of such persecution, but probably a considerable interval separated the supposed time of the dialogue, when the children of Octavius were but learning to speak, from the time of composition, which we take to have been after the death of Octavius. The *Apology* of Justin is pervaded by a sense of the writer's personal danger. He was deeply indignant that Christians should be sent to execution with no crime laid to their charge but that they bore the name of Christian. When a Christian expostulated before the tribunal on the injustice of such a proceeding, he got no other reply than, "I think you must be a Christian too," and on his answering in the affirmative was himself ordered to execution. At such a time, Justin puts his life in his hand; commits to writing the expostulation he is not allowed to utter *viva voce*; he puts his name to it, Justin, the son of Priscus, of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, and states at the same time that he was himself one of the people who had been unjustly persecuted and calumniated. And to this noble beginning corresponds the tension of mind through the whole treatise. We find nothing like this in the *Octavius*. The author makes known his name, profession, and religion, without any apparent sense of personal risk, and his tone is as calm as if he had been a Christian rhetorician living after the victory of Constantine. (c) On comparing carefully all the coincidences with Celsus, which Keim has noted, we can find none decisive; the agreement is only in topics which might well have been independently used by different heathens of the time, while on the contrary Minucius so fails to notice anything distinctive in Celsus, that if the argument *ex silentio* can ever be relied on, we may pronounce it impossible that Minucius could have known the work of Celsus. The very first point in Celsus, that the Christian religion was condemned by the law, is met by Tertullian (c. 4) and not by Minucius. For similar reasons we must set down Minucius as unacquainted with Athenagoras. It is to be noted that Minucius is silent on the topic on which Tertullian dwells, viz., that Christians are responsible for the public calamities.

The analogy of Cicero's philosophical treatises gives us a right to believe that though the dialogue is imaginary, the interlocutors are real persons. Nothing is known of Octavius (whose name is given more fully as Octavius Januarius) except what we gather from the work itself. He is represented as having come to Rome by sea, and it is probable that he lived in Africa. He acknowledges the prejudices of his pagan days, and recalls how he had then undertaken the defence of parricides and other atrocious criminals, yet had not thought the Christians worthy of a hearing. He further tells how, with a mercy which was really cruelty, he had tortured Christians who confessed their faith, in the hope of making them save themselves by apostasy. It appears then that he had been an advocate, and it would seem that he had held some magisterial office. Caecilius, of whom we are told that he also bore the name

Natalis, has been identified with the Caecilinus who converted St. Cyprian, and also with the confessor Natalius, who became a bishop of the Theodotians (Eus. *H. E.* v. 28), but neither conjecture has much to recommend it. But recently new evidence has been obtained. The dialogue would seem to describe him as a native of Cirta and fellow townsman of Fronto, of whom he speaks as "Cirtensis noster," while Octavius refers to him as "Fronto tuus." Now at Cirta (now Constantine in Algeria) the French have found no fewer than six inscriptions containing the name of Caecilius Natalis (Mommson, *Lat. Insc.* viii. 6996 and 7094-7098). This Caecilius was the chief magistrate of Cirta in 210, and afterwards, on the completion of five years of office, he raised at his own expense a triumphal arch in honour of Caracalla, brazen statues in honour of "Indulgentia domini nostri" exhibited "ludos scenicos" for seven days, and in other ways exhibited munificence. See an article by Dessau (*Hermes*, 1880, p. 471). We see no good reason for refusing to identify this Caecilius Natalis with the Caecilius of the dialogue. He is not likely to have been a Christian when discharging the functions just described; the conversation related by Minucius would therefore have occurred somewhat later than 215; and the composition itself might be a score of years later. We thus fall back on the opinion which was held by the best critics before the publication of Ebert's memoir, that the work of Minucius was written in the peaceful days of Alexander Severus, say A.D. 234.

The Octavius has been preserved only in a single MS., which had originally belonged to the Vatican Library, but passed to the Royal Library at Paris, on being presented by pope Leo X. to Francis I. While still at Rome it was published in 1542 by Sabaeus, then curator of the Vatican Library, but as the 8th book of Arnobius *adv. Gentes*, owing apparently to a confusion between octavius and Octavius. The mistake was repeated in two other editions, and was only set right in 1560 by Baudouin (Balduinus), who published an edition at Heidelberg, under the real author's name, and with a dissertation prefixed, establishing his authorship. We do not attempt to enumerate all the editions which have been published since, merely mentioning as useful for the student's purposes an edition in Gersdorf's *Bibl. Pat. Ecc.*, Leipzig, 1847, one with variorum notes in the third volume of Migne's *Pat. Lat.*, an excellent edition by Holden, Cambridge, 1853, and lastly that by Halm, Vienna, 1867, founded on a new collation of the MS., and which may therefore be regarded as the best authority for the text, but containing none but critical notes.

Jerome (*u. s.*) states that there was current in his time under the name of Minucius a book *De Fato*, which, however, difference of style proved not to be his. The subject was one on which Minucius (*c. 36*) had intimated an intention of writing. [G. S.]

MIRO (MIRIO, MIRUS), king of the Suevi in Spain from A.D. 570 to A.D. 583.

*Authorities*.—Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 42, vi. 43; *Joannes Bicl.* apud *Esp. Sagr.* v. 377, 380, 383; *Isid. Hist. Suev.* ib. 506; Acts of the Second Council of Braga; *Tejada y Ramiro, Colecc. de Lan. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 620; *Formula Honestae*

*Vitae*, by Martin of Braga; *Prof. Esp. Sagr.* xv. 383.

Miro represents a period in the history of the Suevian kingdom of Galicia, when, having renounced the Arianism imposed upon them in the 5th century by the necessities of their then existing relations to the Visigoths (see art. REMISMUND), the Suevi entered into alliance with the Franks on the one hand and probably the Eastern empire on the other, with the view of checking the power of the Arian Westgothic King LEOVIGILD, which at the beginning of Miro's reign threatened the absorption of the Suevian state in the kingdom of Toledo, a result actually achieved two years after Miro's death. The known facts of his reign, which, although few in number, are often contradictorily given by the authorities, are as follows. In 572 the second council of Braga, a kind of supplementary council to the more important gathering of 561 [MARTINUS (2)] was held, and the king is specially mentioned as contributing to its assembly. Some time in the same year Miro conducted an expedition against the Ruceones in Cantabria, one of the restless Basque tribes, with whom Suevi and Goths alike were perpetually at war. (On the identification of this tribe and the various forms in which their name appears, compare Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* v. 405.) Four years later Miro's great West-Gothic contemporary Leovigild, in the course of those early campaigns which established his power over the peninsula, appeared on the borders of Galicia. Miro sued for peace, and obtained it for a short time, on what conditions we are not told. In 580 the Catholic rebellion of HERMENIGILD against his father Leovigild broke out, and the rebellious son became the centre of Frankish, Suevian, and Byzantine policy in the peninsula. In 580 we hear of envoys sent by Miro to Guntchramn of Burgundy, Leovigild's worst enemy, and intercepted and detained on the way by Leovigild's ally, Chilperic of Soissons. According to Gregory of Tours, Hermenigild awaited his father's attack upon him in Seville, "relying upon the help of the emperor and of Miro king of Galicia." And in 583 Miro did actually set out from Galicia at the head of an army destined to raise the siege of Seville, then closely invested by Leovigild. He was, however, met on the way by Leovigild, and either forced to retreat, or to lend help against Hermenigild. According to Gregory of Tours, who is evidently best informed on the matter, he withdrew homewards, and died shortly after his return from the effects of the bad air and water of southern Spain. The two Spanish sources, Joannes Biclarensis and Isidore, say that he died before Seville, and describe him as assisting Leovigild in the siege of the town. On the reconciliation of these conflicting accounts, compare Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, vi. 571; and Görres, *Kritische Untersuch. über den Aufstand und das Martyrium der Westgoth. Königshohes Hermenigild*, in *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol.* 1873, I. Miro's relations to Martin of Braga, the Catholic leader and organizer of Galicia during his reign and that of his father, seem to have been intimate and friendly. Martin's principal work, *Formula Vitae Honestae*, is dedicated to him, and the *Exhortatio Humilitatis*, printed among Martin's works, is also probably addressed to him (*Esp. Sagr.* xv. Appendix). [M. A. W.]

MITHRAS (MITRAS, MITRIAS, MITRAS, MYTHRAS, MYTRAS, MYTRA, MYTTRAS, NABAZES—MITRA, Cautus Pates, *Corp. Inscr. Lat. t. ii.* num. 464, ed. Momms.; *Mitra*, Herod.; *Mithras*, Xenoph.; *Mithra*, Strab.; *Mithras*, Lucian; *Mithras*, Hieron.; MITHRA, Tertull.; MITRA, Sanscrit.; MEHER, or MITRA, Persian, cf. Wilson, *Parsi Religion*, cap. v.; *Ἡαῖος Ἀβελκῆτος*, Mommsen, *l. c.*, where will be found numerous inscriptions identifying him with Jupiter, Serapis, &c.).

The worship of Mithras, or the sun-god, was the most popular of all heathen cults, and the principal antagonist of the truth during the first four centuries of our period. Though its introduction into Rome well-nigh coincided with the rise of Christianity, yet its origin must be sought in the remotest antiquity. The researches of modern scholars have taught us whence it came, and their industry has enabled the most unlearned to trace in the pages of the *Rig-Veda* and the *Zend-Avesta* its onward march from India, through Persia, to Greece, Rome, and Britain. Nay, more, Rawlinson, in his *Ancient Monarchies* (ii. 322, 328), pushes the worship still further back, and makes it one of those primitive beliefs belonging to the southern branch of the Aryan race before it had separated into two divisions and adopted the conflicting creeds of Zoroastrism and Brahmanism (cf. Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i. 238). In any case a glance at the *Vedas*, as edited and translated by Müller, and at the *Zend-Avesta* as translated by Bleek (pp. 139, 256), will prove the worship of Mithras the sun, and also of Homa or Soma the moon, to be common to both. The curious inquirer may consult for its history at this early period, besides the authorities already named, Rawlinson's Herodot. t. i. p. 271, 426, *Essay on Religion of Ancient Persians*; Haug, *Essays on Parsee Relig.* p. 230; and his *Aitareya-Brahmanam*; Burnouf, *Comment. sur le Yasna*, 210-222, 349-352; Colonel Rawlinson, "Notes on Early History of Babylonia," in *Jour. Asiat. Soc.* xv. 254; J. D. Guigniant's *Rel. de l'Antiq.* vol. i. 2nd part, p. 728; Guizot and Milman, notes to Gibbon, cap. viii.

In historic times we first meet with a notice of Mithras in Herodot. i. 131, where he is identified, though wrongly, with the Assyrian Mylitta, the Arabian Alitta, and the Greek Aphrodite, the real representative of Venus in the later Pantheon of Persia being Tanata or Anaitis (Rawlinson, Herod. *l. c.*; cf. Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Pers.* p. 98; Rawlinson, *Seventh Monarchy*, p. 631; Windischmann, *Ueber die Pers. Anahita oder Anaitis*; Loftus, *Chald and Susiana*, p. 372; De Vogüé, *Mélang. d'Archéol. Orient.* pp. 41-68. Cf. for other references to the Persian cult in classical writers, Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 5; Strab. *Geog.* xi. 14, xv. 3; Plut. *Vit. Alex.* c. 30, *De Isid.* c. 46; Lucian. *θεῶν ἐκκλήσια*, *Opp.* Paris, 1840, p. 762; Statii, *Theb.* i. 719, 720). In Persian records his name occurs somewhat later; we find it first in the Achaemenian inscriptions of Artaxerxes Mnemon, A.D. 405 (Norris, "Mem. on Behistun Inscr.," in *Jour. Asiat. Soc.* xv. 159-162; cf. Rawlinson's *Anc. Mon.* t. iii. 361), where his symbol was a disk or circle, for which the Sassanian princes usually substituted a six-rayed star (Rawlinson's *Anc.*

*Mon.* iii. 320, 352, *Seventh Mon.* p. 628, note). We may just note here that some of the modern authorities quoted deny that in the *Veda* and *Zend-Avesta* Mithras is identical with the sun; while others, as Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarch. l. c.*, support this view. Upon this question, however, we cannot enter, as being entirely beyond the scope of this Dictionary. The cult of Mithras rapidly spread from Persia over the West of Asia, amalgamating, as it did, so easily with the sun-worship of that region. According to Plutarch (*Vit. Pomp.* c. 24) it was introduced to the knowledge of Western Europe by the Cilician pirates, who celebrated his rites upon Mount Olympus, A.D. 70, but this date is probably too late. There was another and more likely channel through which the knowledge of Mithraism may have reached Rome. The *Zend-Avesta* was translated into Greek at Alexandria during the 3rd century B.C., about the same time as the Septuagint version was made (Müller, *Chips*, i. 151). Now we find during the 2nd century B.C. decrees of the senate prohibiting the practice of Egyptian rites at Rome; we may therefore infer that Mithraism found a place among them one hundred years earlier than the ravages of the Cilician pirates (cf. Mommsen's *Hist. of Rome*, ed. Dickson, t. iii. 437; t. iv. part ii. p. 561). It was not, however, till the reign of Augustus that it became a fashionable cult at Rome, and began to extend itself even as far as Britain. From this time forward it became the most popular of all cults in Rome, though its progress in Greece and other parts of the empire was but slow till the 2nd century (Ste. Croix, *Myst. du Pag.* ii. 123; *Acad. des Inscript.* xvi. 272, 273). The emperors from Augustus to Diocletian and Constantine specially favoured it, as appears from the frequency with which its symbols appear on the coins of the Lower Empire. The golden age of Mithraism at Rome seems to have been from A.D. 180-240. Commodus supported it, and is even accused of mingling human sacrifices therewith. Septimus Severus, A.D. 193, married Julia, daughter of Bassianus priest of Mithras at Emesa; she was the mother of Caracalla A.D. 211. Her sister again married Julius Avitus, by whom she had daughters, who were the mothers of Elagabalus and Alex. Severus, both of whom were educated in Phoenicia, and the former of whom was consecrated as a Mithraic priest, a consecration to which Gibbon (cap. vi.) ascribes his accession to the imperial crown. (Upon the prevalence of Mithraism in Phoenicia, see Renan's *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 103, 104, 144, 145, 852; *Rev. Archéol.* 1869, t. ii. pp. 222, 223.) The prevalence of this worship all over the Roman empire is abundantly proved by the vast number of Mithraic remains, monuments, caves, &c., which have been found, for an account of which cf. Mommsen's *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* Indices to vol. iii. v. vii. s. r. Mithras, and J. de Hammer, *Mithriaca*, or *Mém. sur le Culte de Mithra*, Caen, 1833, who in cap. vii. analyses more than eighty which have been found specially in the Tyrol and Transylvania. (Cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1860, t. i. p. 313, upon Mithreum, discovered at Ostia; De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1870, pp. 125, 153, for that found under S. Clemente at Rome.) Several of them have been discovered in England. A very perfect specimen of a Mithraic cave was

discovered some sixty years ago at the great Roman station of Housesteads in Northumberland, and is described in a learned paper by the Rev. John Hodgson, M.A., in *Aeliana Archaeologia*, i. 274-320. In this memoir the subject is exhaustively treated, so far as the knowledge of the time enabled the writer to go. The date of this cave was A.D. 253. Among the symbols used in Mithraic worship were the signs of the zodiac. A relic of Mithraism in England still remains in the porch of St. Margaret's church at York, where these celestial symbols are found, evidently copied in mediæval times from some Mithraic monuments (cf. Macgregor's *Inquiry into the Age of St. Margaret's Church at York*, in *Aeliana Archaeol.* t. iii., where much information is given on this whole subject; Wellbeloved's *Eburacum*, pp. 79-86).

During the 4th century the worship of Mithras of course shared in the general downfall of heathenism, though its symbols and legend appear on the coins of Constantine to the end of his reign. Julian seems to have supported it, and perhaps even submitted to all the preliminary austerities demanded from its votaries (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* iv. *Opp. Migne*, P. G. t. xxxv. col. 591, 619, and *Orat.* xxxix. t. xxxvi. col. 339; Rendall's *Julian*, pp. 51, 78, et pass.). In Soc. *H. E.* iii. 2 will be found an account of a riot which arose at Alexandria in A.D. 361 upon the discovery of human skulls in a Mithraic cave, which ended in the death of George, the celebrated Arian bishop of that town [GEORGIUS (4)]. This narrative lends countenance to the report that human sacrifices formed part of Mithraic worship. The testimony of the ecclesiastical historian alone might be distrusted, but on this point is distinctly confirmed by profane authorities, as Lanprid. *Vit. Commodi in Hist. August.*; Porphyry, *de Abst.* ii. 56; cf. *Aelian's Archaeol.* i. 306; Ste. Croix, *Myst. du Pagan.* ii. 135. Indeed, as Porphyry (*de Abst.* l. c.) expressly states, even at Rome in his own time human sacrifices still prevailed in the worship of Jupiter Latiaris. In the *H. E.* of John of Ephesus in the 6th cent., ed. by Cureton and translated by Payne Smith (p. 209), will be found an instance of human sacrifices in heathen mysteries at Antioch so late as the last half of the 6th century (cf. Windischmann's *Mithra*, p. 68). The worship of Mithras prevailed in Rome till Jerome's time, as we find mention in a letter to Laeta about the education of her daughter, of the destruction of a Mithraic cave and its "portentuous simulacra" by the hands of her relative Gracchus, A.D. 376 [GRACCHUS], *Corp. Ins. Lat.* t. vi. pars. i. num. 1675, ed. De Rossi. It flourished again at Rome during the temporary revival of paganism under the usurper Eugenius, A.D. 392-394, De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1868, p. 49; cf. *Rev. Archcol.* 1868, t. xvii. p. 451, t. xviii. pp. 44, 47; De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1867, p. 76, and for 1877, p. 114; Henzen in *Bull. de l'Inst. Corr. Arch. de Rome*, April 1868. The early fathers, Justin, Tertullian, Origen, frequently mention Mithraism, which they regard as a demoniacal imitation of Christianity (Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 70; Origen, *adv. Cels.* vi. 22; Tertull. *de Praescrip. Haeret.* 40; *adv. Marcion.* i. 13). The ablutions performed in the secret rites of Mithras, and the feast celebrated by the

Persians on the 16th March in his honour, doubtless easily lent themselves to a competition with baptism and the holy communion. Justin Martyr (*l. c.*) seems, however, to go too far when he asserts that the rites of Mithraism were imitated from Christianity. The Iranian branch of the Aryan family brought with them from India the feast of Soma or Homa, or the moon-god, which to this day is celebrated with an intoxicating drink in India (Haug's *Aitareya-Brâhmanam*; Em. Burnouf, *Essai sur le Vêda*, cap. xi.; H. H. Wilson's *Relig. Festivals of Hindus*, *Opp. t. ii.* p. 199; Muir's *Sanscrit Texts*, ii. pp. 297, 469; Eug. Burnouf, *Sur Zend-Avesta* in *Jour. Asiat.* Dec. 1844; Müller, *Chips*, i. 106, 156, 178, Maury, *Rel. de la Grèce*, iii. 126). On March 16 the Persians celebrated the feast of Mithras, on which day alone they were allowed to get drunk (Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Pers.* 244-247; Ctesiae, *de Reb. Ind.* ed. Müller, p. 79; Rawlinson, *Anc. Monarch.* ii. 339). This practice would easily form a basis for a reformed Mithraic communion feast. A full discussion, however, of the Mithraic mysteries, their nature, their various degrees, and their relation to Christianity, would fill a volume. The curious reader may consult the second volume of a work quoted above (Sainte-Croix, *Myst. du Paganisme*, ed. Silv. de Sacy, Paris, 1817) for an elaborate treatment of the whole subject, specially a note by J. de Hammer, on p. 125, where he maintains that identically the same secret rites are still practised by the Fakirs of India, as formerly were used in the Mithraic ceremonial. On the ceremonial and degrees of Mithraism an interesting statement will be found in the *Trans. Roy. Soc. Litt.* v. 207-210. For references to Mithraic baptism and communion, cf. Tertull. *de Praescrip. Haeret.* xl., and *de Baptismo*, v. In Porphyry's treatises *de Antro Nymph.* and *de Abst.* lib. iv., are many details concerning this cult. He mentions treatises by Pallas and Eubulus on the same subject. Cf. also the apology of Jul. Firm. Maternus for many of the formulæ used therein [MATERNUS].

Hitherto we have treated of this worship as openly hostile to Christianity, but it also entered into combinations with heretical forms thereof. Thus it combined with Gnosticism. We have gems with Mithras, or Mithraic symbols—the lion, bee, stars, lunette—inscribed on one side, and the Gnostic symbol Abraxas on the other (Montf. *Antiq. Exp.* ii. 228, pl. 48, fig. 15, pl. 49, fig. 2). Basilides, too, adopted it into his system, as Jerome tells us in his Comment. on Amos iii. 9, that he identified Abraxas and Meithras (a common reading of the name as Montfaucon remarks) with the Almighty, and both of them with the days of the sun's course, which exactly equal the numerical value in the Greek alphabet of the two names, as in the following table:

Ἀβραξάς.

A = 1  
B = 2  
E = 5  
P = 100  
A = 1  
Ξ = 60  
A = 1  
Σ = 200

365

Μείθρας.

M = 40  
E = 5  
I = 10  
P = 100  
A = 1  
Σ = 205

365



(Cf. art. on ABRASAX and on BASILIDES, Vol. I. p. 279 of this Dictionary, which puts forward another view. King's *Antique Gems*, pp. 354-362; Salmassii, *Ann. Climaet.* pp. 569-576, ed. 1647.) Mithraism apparently, too, combined with Manichaeism (*Acta Archelai*, ed. Zacagn. p. 63; Ste. Croix, *Myst. du Pag.* ii. 136-140), where a dramatic representation is referred to as forming part of the Mithraic ceremonial (cf. also August. *contra Faust.* lib. v. 11, viii, ix., viii. 5, and *Aelian. Archaeol.* ix. 319). Besides the authorities already quoted, see a learned monograph by Windischmann in *Abhand. für die Kunde des Morgenland.* t. i. 1859. In this will be found all the classical and patristic references to the subject down to the time of Martianus, Capella, and the Pseudo-Dionysius, and also a discussion of its Indian and Persian origin (cf. also Lajard, *Mém. sur le Culte de Mith.* Paris, 1847; Hammen-Purgstall, *Mithriaca*, Paris, 1833; De Brog. *L'Église et l'Empire*, t. iii. 156, ed. 1868; Beugnot, *Destruct. du Paganism.* t. i. p. 160; Creuzer, *Symbolik u. Mytholog.* ii. 193; Boissier, *Rel. Rom. d'Aug. aux Anton.* i. 395; Spiegel's *Erin das Land. zwisch. Ind. u. Tyr.* pp. 235-238; Beausobre, *Manich.* i. 107; King's *Gnostics*, pass. and the latest treatise on the subject, Prof. Stark's (Heidelberg) *Zwei Mithraea der Grossherzog. Alterthümersammlung in Karlsruhe* 1864). At the conclusion of Hodgson's Essay quoted above, from *Aeliana Archaeol.*, is a full list of the older authors who have treated of this topic. Montfauc. *Antiq. Expliq.* t. i. par. ii. cap. iii.-vi. ed. 1722, has numerous illustrations of the subject.

The figure of Mithras is sometimes found combined with the head of Oceanus with Neptune's trident or with a human eye. These are only remnants of ancient Indian tradition. In the Vedas Mithras is almost invariably associated with Varuna, who presides over the firmament, and is at the same time Regent of the Waters and Ocean (cf. J. Mullinger in *Archaeologia*, t. xix. p. 70; J. A. Davies in *Trans. Roy. Soc. Lit.* v. 209, 2nd ser.; Northcote's *Rom. Sott.* ii. 356; Müller's *Chips*, i. 42; Colebrooke's *Philos. of Hindus*, *Opp.* t. ii. pp. 28, 391; Muir's *Sanscrit Texts*, t. ii. pp. 297, 469, t. v. p. 72). Mithras is generally represented as a young man clothed in Persian dress and stabbing the shoulder of a bull, which is at the same time attacked by an attendant dog, scorpion, serpent, &c. (cf. Montfaucou's plates). Several explanations of this symbol are put forward in Hodgson's Essay in *Aelian. Archaeol.* quoted above. It probably represented the recreative power of the sun upon the earth. Stark, l. c. p. 43, offers a somewhat different explanation: cf. Hyde's *Rel. Vet. Pers.* c. iv. p. 114. The name of Sunday was derived from Mithraism, as Augustine notes (*cont. Faust.* xviii. 5). The Hindus also attach a certain sanctity to that day for the same reason (H. H. Wilson's *Festivals of Hindus*, *Opp.* t. ii. p. 199).

[G. T. S.]

MIXIS, Valentinian aeon. (Iren. i. 1.) [See HEDONE.] [G. S.]

MOCHAEI, MOCHAI, MOCHAIUS, MOCAIUS, MOCHAOL, MOCHAU, MOCHAY, MOCHOE (MACHUI, MOCHOBUS, MOCHEUS, MOCHUA; also CAELAN, CAOLAN, COELANUS, KELANUS), abbat of Nendrum or Mahee Island,

in Loch Cuan, now Strangford Lough, co. Down. See Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 187 sq. His life is connected with that of St. Patrick, and there is no separate legend; but the variety in the name-forms has occasioned much obscurity. When St. Patrick was in the north-east of Ireland seeking in vain the conversion of his former master Milcho, he baptized, specially instructed, and tonsured him. When St. Patrick left, he gave his disciple the "baculus volans" which was long preserved at Nendrum; and also a copy of the gospels, "cum aliis sacri ministerii utensilibus" (Colgan, *Trip. Vit.* i. c. 53). In the Lives of St. Patrick, he is also said to have been promoted to the episcopate by St. Patrick, and made first bishop of Nendrum (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 73 c. 37, 125 c. 53). Accepting this and the authority of his Acts, now lost, Ware (*Ir. Bps.* 194, ed. Harris) and Ussher (*Works*, vi. 529) make St. Cailan or Mochaei first bishop of Down about the close of the 5th century; so also Cotton (*Fest.* ii. 197, 218); but Lanigan (*E. H. Ir.* i. 422-3), calling Cailan abbat of Antrim and first bishop of Down, distinguishes him from St. Mochay. But Mochaei's episcopate is very doubtful. After his conversion by St. Patrick he retired to the island in Strangford Lough, which still bears his name, "Mahee Island," and founded a monastery and school, where St. Finian of Moville and St. Colman Mullinn of Derrykeighan, his brother, were among his pupils. Reeves (*Ecol. Ant.* 188-9) and Todd (*B. of Hymns*, i. 100-3) thus fix his dates: birth about A.D. 420, conversion A.D. 433, and death A.D. 497 (*Ann. Tig.*). His feast is June 23.

[J. G.]

MOCHAEMHOG, MOCHAEMOG, MOCAEMOGUS, MOCHAEUOCUS (MOCHOEMHOG, MOCHOEMOC, -US, MOCHOEMOG, MOCHOEVOG, MOCHOMOGUS, MOCOEMOG, MOTHEMOGUS, COEMHGHIN, PULCHERIUS), abbat of Leamokevoe, in the parish of Two-Mile-Burris, bar. Elyogarty, co. Tipperary. (On the place past and present, see O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 485-6; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 266 n.) There are published two Lives of the saint, probably neither written by a contemporary—the first given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 589-96) ex codice Kilkenniensi, printed also in Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra* (380-91, ex cod. Armach.); the second by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 13 Mar. ii. 276-86) ex MS. Kilkenn., collated with Colgan's. (For MS. Lives and general authorities, see Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 253, pt. ii. 849; O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 647; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 339.)

Mochemhogg was one of the chief saints of Leinster, and received from St. Ita the name of Coemhghin or Mochoemog, "meus pulcher juvenis" (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 590 c. 6, 596, n. <sup>9</sup>), latinised Pulcherius. From the care of St. Ita he was put under St. Comgall at Bangor, and studied in the company of St. Lachtan of Achadh-ur, St. Molua of Clonfert-mulloe, St. Finnbarr of Inisdoimle, and St. Luchernus. Thence, after advancement to the priesthood, he went first to Antrim and then to Liath-mor, where in a dense forest he founded his monastery and lived for many years, numbering among his friends St. Colman of Doiremor, St. Cainnech of Achadh-bo, St. Dagan of Inbher Daoile, &c. The account of his life is of peculiar interest, shewing the rela-

tions of the monastic saints with the secular governors of Ireland, and also indicating some noteworthy phases of the religious faith of the day. The stories of divine interference on behalf of the saint are comparatively few, and only such as are common in narratives of the kind. He died A.D. 656. His feast is March 13. His principal dedication is Leamokevoige, co. Tipperary. (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 23 sq.; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 374, representing him as transmuted into KEVOCA, a female saint in Scotland; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 338 sq.; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 2 ser. 278; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 266-7 n.) [J. G.]

**MOCHALLAEUS, MOCHALLIUS**, bishop, nephew of St. Patrick by Darcera his sister. (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 227 n. 8.) [J. G.]

**MOCHIMUS** (*al. lec. MOZYMUS, MOSCHIMUS, MOCHOMEUS*), a Mesopotamian presbyter, who wrote at Antioch an excellent treatise against Eutyches, besides other works which Gennadius had not seen (Gennad. *Scr. Eocl.* cap. 71; Ceill. x. 582). Cave (i. 445) gives his period cir. 457; Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* i. 259) places him cir. 494, when Gennadius finished his catalogue. Dupin (i. 499 ed. 1722) identifies him with the oeconomus of Hierapolis. [C. H.]

**MOCHONNA, MOCHONN, MOCONNA** (DACHONNA, DUNCHANNA), of Derry; commemorated Mar. 8, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 565-6) has a memoir: "De St. Mochonn qui et Dachonna antistite Dorensi," but the results are doubtful. He flourished at the end of the 7th century, being present at Flann Finn's synod of Tara A.D. 697 [FLANN (1)], whose acts he subscribed as "antistes Dorensis," and died A.D. 706. Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 503) places him among the prelates of Derry, but in *Ord. Surv. of Londond.* p. 27, this is considered "manifestly an error," and his place is "one called **До́нне Мо́чонна** or Derry of Mochonna, and **До́нне О́рннот Да́чонна** or Derry-district of Dachonna, evidently from this saint." (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 141; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 267; Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Mar. i. 748 praet. and 3 Mai. i. 364 praet.) [J. G.]

**MOCHONNA**, bishop. [CONAN (3).]

**MOCHTA**, of Louth, one of the best known saints in the East of Ireland. His anonymous Life is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 729-737, Mar. 24), and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 19 Aug. 736-747; Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. 117, ii. 849; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 156), but it is largely fabulous. His history is much obscured by some authors identifying him with the monk Bachiaricus [BACHIARIUS].

Mochta was a Briton, called by St. Adamnan (*Vita S. Col. Praef.* ii.) "proselytus Brito, homo sanctus, S. Patricii episcopi discipulus" (Reeves, *St. Adamn.* 6), and accounted the last survivor of St. Patrick's disciples. According to the Life, he was brought to Ireland in infancy, educated by a Druid, raised to the episcopate by the pope, and received most friendly by St. Patrick on his return with twelve disciples. His first monastery was at Kilmor, "in Methcorum

memoribus," where he wrote a rule; but his chief foundation was at Louth, which St. Patrick is said to have vacated in his favour. There he had a famous school, and monastery. On this feature of the ancient Irish monasteries, see Todd, *St. Patr.* Introd.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. c. 2; Smith and Cheetham, *D. C. B.* voce "Monastic Bishop.") Of the historical points in his life we have few notices. He died probably A.D. 535. His official position at Louth is also uncertain; though classed among the bishops of Louth he was probably only presbyter-abbat. His only genuine remains are a fragment quoted in *Ann. Ult.* and *Ann. Tig.* A.D. 534. "Sic ipse scriptis in Epistola sua, 'Mocta (Macutenus, *Ann. Ult.*) peccator presbyter, sancti Patricii discipulus, in Domino salutem';" O'Curry (*Lect. Ir. MS.* 19, 20, 88) says it is "uncertain whether it was a book of general Annals or a Sacred Biography." His chief feast is Aug. 19. His shrine was violently seized and plundered by Flann, son of Foircheallach abbat of Lismore, in the year 803 (*Ann. Inisf.*), but recovered in 805 (*ib.*); in 817 (*Ann. Ult.*) Cuana abbat of Louth sailed with it into Munster. (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 94, 162, 167 et al.; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. ii.; Todd, *St. Patr.* 29 sq.; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 415-6; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 78; O'Conor, *Proleg.* 113, and *Ep. Nunc.* 108; Reeves, *St. Adamn.* 6, 82, 461.) [J. G.]

**MOCHUA** (1). [CRONAN (1).]

**MOCHUA** (2), **MOCCUA** (CRONAN, MOCHURO), abbat of Balla (Ballagh, in the barony of Clanmorris co. Mayo). An Irish Life, translated into Latin by O'Sullivan, is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 1 Jan. i. 47-9) and reprinted by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 789-90), but is largely fabulous; there is a Life on vellum in the *Book of Lismore* (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 197, 340), and one in the Burgundian Library in Brussels (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 480. See also Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. ii. 848 app.).

Mochua abbat of Balla was the son of Becanus or Began, in Ulster, and educated by St. Comgall at Bangor. Prior to St. Comgall's death in A.D. 602, he went to Connaught and founded Balla, which derived its name from the enclosed well which is said in the legend to have appeared as his signal to rest. At the age of 56 or 76 he died, March 30, A.D. 638 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is said to have been an eminent architect and builder; the importance of his monastery is attested by the remains of a round tower about 50 feet high. (*Gen. Ily-Fiachr.* 197, 215; Petrie, *Ir. Arch.* 453; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 255; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 70, 3rd edition.) [J. G.]

**MOCHUA** (3) (CRONAN), of Clondalkin, co. Dublin, was brother of Garbhan of Kinsaley [GARBIAN (2)] and other saints, and commemorated Aug. 6. He is usually called the first abbat of Clondalkin, but in *Kal. Drum.* (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 20) he is "holy bishop and confessor." Clondalkin was evidently a place of much ecclesiastical importance; the round tower of 84 feet high still remains, and the Antiphony of Clondalkin is carefully preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. (Archdall, *Mon.* 132; Camden, *Brit.* iii. 480, ed. Gough; Reeves, *Culdees*, pt. ii. §. 5.) [J. G.]

MOCHUA (4), of Ferns. [CRONAN (10).]

MOCHUA (5) (CUAN), abbat and patron of Timahoe, Queen's Co. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 1 Jan. i. 45-7) treat *De St. Mochua sive Cuano abb. in Hibernia*. He was son of Lonan "ex Lugne trahens originem;" till 30 years of age was a soldier, then became a monk, retired from the world, founded Teach Mochua and died at Molana, on the Blackwater, co. Waterford. He flourished about the 6th century (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 23; Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. 366). The round tower at Timahoe, though now a ruin 30 feet high, is of singular interest and beauty, as the ornamentation is unusually abundant, but belongs to a period much later than St. Mochua. (See Petrie, *Ir. Arch.* 239 sq.)

[J. G.]

MOCHUMMA (DOCHUMMA, CUMMINE, CUMINEUS), bishop of Nendrum (ΝΕΝΔΡΟΜΑ, now Mahee Island, in Strangford Lough), died A.D. 659 (*Ann. Tig.*), and commemorated Jan. 31. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 580; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 149, 376.)

[J. G.]

MODANUS (MODANE), abbat or bishop in Scotland. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 4 Feb. i. 502-4), Colgan (*Acta SS.* 252-3), Bp. Forbes (*Kals.* 401-2), and O'Hanlon (*Ir. SS.* ii. 288-93) attempt to give a critical account of the Modan or Modans, but can come to no general conclusion beyond the statements of the Scotch authorities. The primary authority is the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hym. ff. li. lii.) at Feb. 4, calling him abbat. According to the legend, he evangelised around Falkirk, and after going westward to the Gareloch in Dumbartonshire, and perhaps northward through Argyleshire, as far as Loch Etive, died at Roseneath in Dumbartonshire. Before coming to Falkirk he may have been at Dryburgh, or at least its proximity. His date is unfixed, in the seventh or ninth century; his feasts are Feb. 4 or 5 and Nov. 14. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 459) attributes to him *De Episcopi Officio*, ll. iii. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 400 sq. et al.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 282; Boll. *Acta SS.* 25 Ap. iii. 411, 14 Mai. iii. 263, 30 Aug. vi. 565.)

[J. G.]

MODESTUS (1), after Jerusalem had been sacked by Chosroes II., A.D. 614, and Zacharias the patriarch had been carried as prisoner into Persia, to prevent the patriarchal see remaining destitute of episcopal government, Modestus, the abbat of the monastery of St. Theodosius, was consecrated vicar (ποποληστής) of the captive bishop, "revera si non Episcopus loco tamen Episcopi" (Baron. ad ann.). Euty chius attributes the appointment to Heraclius (Euty ch. *Annal.*; Migne, *Patrol. Græc.* cxi. 1091). Modestus had previously shewn great heroism and religious zeal, when, after the pillaging of the monastery of St. Sabas by the invaders and the murder of the greater part of the inmates, forty-four in number, he repaired to the place, and collecting the relics of the slaughtered monks from the smoking ruins of the cells, he interred them with religious care in the burial-place of the convent; exhorting by his words, and encouraging by his example, those brethren who had escaped the massacre to return to the monastery and remain at their posts. We learn

these particulars from the dedicatory letter of Antiochus, the monk of St. Sabas, to Eustathius, prefixed to his Homilies, or *Pandectæ Scripturæ*, printed by Migne (*Patrol. Græc.* lxxxix. pp. 1421 sq.), and by Baronius, in a Latin translation (sub ann. 614, no. 24). The same letter speaks of his appointment as Zacharias's vicar, and describes the zeal he manifested in reinstating the sacred buildings which had been sacked and burnt by the Persian troops aided by the hatred of the Jews. Like "a second Bezaleel, or a new Zerubbabel," he restored from their ruins the churches of the Holy Sepulchre, the Holy Cross, and the Anastasis, and rebuilt from its foundations that of the Assumption. He also made the monasteries habitable, and recalled the scattered monks. According to Euty chius (*l.c.*) the funds for the restoration of the churches were furnished by Heraclius out of the taxes of Damascus. He also acted as the almoner of John "the Almsgiver," patriarch of Alexandria, in the distribution of the large sums raised by him for the relief of the destitute Christians at Jerusalem. Zacharias was restored, bringing back with him the wood of the True Cross, which had shared his captivity, A.D. 628. It is uncertain whether, on his return, Modestus retired from his vicarship or acted as his coadjutor. On Zacharias's death, March A.D. 633, he succeeded him, but died in the December of the following year, having only occupied the see independently for nine months (Euty ch. *Annal.* p. 1091). The Greek Menæa commemorate his name Dec. 16th. Photius (*Cod.* 275) gives fragments of two homilies of Modestus: (i.) εἰς τὰς μυροφόρους, and (ii.) εἰς τὴν ἑπαπαντῆν; and mentions that he had read a third (iii.) εἰς τὴν κοίμησιν τῆς Θεοτόκου, which he does not consider deserving of special notice, from its dissimilarity to the author's other writings. All three are printed (the last-named for the first time in full) by Migne (*Patrol. Græc.* vol. lxxxvi. part ii. pp. 3267-3312). A letter is mentioned as extant by Pagi (anno 616, no. 5). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 258; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 576.)

[E. V.]

MODESTUS (2), a 2nd century writer against Marcion, whose work, now lost, was highly commended by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 25). It was still extant in the time of St. Jerome, who states that there were in circulation other writings under the same name, which he said were rejected as spurious (*Catal.* 32). [G. S.]

MODESTUS (3), the prefect of the Praetorium, persecutor of the Catholics under the emperor Valens (Soc. iv. 16; Soz. vi. 18; Theod. *H. E.* iv. 18; Tillem. vi. 510, 555, 562, 574). He was commissioned by Valens to offer Basil the choice between deposition and communion with the Arians. [BASILIUS OF CAESARIEA, Vol. 1. p. 289 a.] A severe sickness having supervened, which he regarded as a judgment for his insolent behaviour to the holy man, he entreated him to visit his sick bed, humbly asked pardon for his behaviour, and commended himself to his prayers. He attributed his recovery to St. Basil's intercessions, and regarded him in consequence with the greatest reverence (Greg. Naz. pp. 352, 353). From this time forward Basil's influence with Modestus

was so great that persons came from a great distance to request letters from him to the prefect. Six of these letters remain to us (Basil. *Epp.* 104 [279], 110 [277], 111 [276], 279 [274], 280 [275], 281 [278]), in which Basil claims immunity from taxes for all the ministers of the church, begs for a lessening of the taxes for the impoverished inhabitants of the Taurus range, commends to him a friend who had been summoned to the capital by legal charges, and other friends. In all these letters Basil addresses Modestus with the respect due to his high official position, and expresses much gratitude for his readiness to listen to his requests.

[E. V.]

MODIANUS, Numidian bishop addressed by Cyprian in *Ep.* 62 (A.D. 253) [JANUARIUS (1)]; and in *Ep.* 70. (Syn. Carth. *de Bap. Haer.* 1.)

[E. W. B.]

MODUARIUS, a deacon of Unilas, the bishop appointed by Chrysostom over the converts among the Gothic tribes of the Danube. Shortly after Chrysostom's deposition he brought the intelligence of the bishop's death, and the urgent request of the king of the Goths, τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Γόθων, that a successor might be speedily sent. Chrysostom on receiving the intelligence wrote to Olympias from Cucusus in 404, urging her to take measures to delay the appointment, as he had no confidence in the selection of those then in power. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 14 ad fin.)

[E. V.]

MODWENA (MONENNA, MONYMA), July 6, Irish virgin, of Killeevy, at the foot of Slievegullion, co. Armagh, presents a history which is evidently in the utmost confusion, and probably beyond disentanglement, extending, as in some form it does, from the days of St. Patrick to those of King Alfred of Wessex, that is, from the fifth to the ninth century. It is most probable that several legends are combined, and the difficulty is to distinguish between them. Hardy (*Descrip. Cat.* i. 94-99, ii. 849) mentions ten lives, and gives a more detailed account of three. (1) *Vita S. Modwenae, virginis Hibernicae*, per Galfridum Edys, Burtonensem monachum. MS. Cotton., Cleopat. A. ii. vell. small 4to, 11th cent. This is Conchubran's *Vita S. Monennae*, quoted from and summarised by Ussher (*Wks.* v. 248-9). It is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 6 Jul. ii. 296-308, with Prologus Auctoris), and called *Vita S. Moduennae phiribus nominibus nuncupatae*, auctore Conchubrano. (2) *Vita S. Moduennae Vita, et Tractatus de Miraculis ejus*. MS. Bibl. Reg. 15 b. iv. ff. 76-8, by Geoffrey, abbat of Burton-on-Trent, A.D. 1114-1151. It is based on Conchobran's Life, and is the first to mention Aelfred, son of Aethelwulf's, visit to Ireland. (3) *Vita S. Moduennae*, MS. Cott. Tiber. v. i. ff. 199 b-204 b. It is given by Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Ang.* f. 234), and appears to be an abridgment of the preceding, as the first (1) appears to be abridged in the first Life printed by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 6 Jul. ii. 290-6; *Vita S. Moduennae (seu Darercae) virginis*, auctore anonymo. ex MS. Salm.).

After allowing for Moninna, better known as Darerca, the reputed sister of St. Patrick [DARECA], and also for the story of King Alfred of Wessex's visiting Ireland in his youth (b. A.D.

849) and being cured of some inveterate ailment by Moninna (Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 250; Turner, *Ang. Sax.* i. c. 8), we find two series of dates which probably point to two individuals in the 6th and 7th centuries, but no conclusions can be arrived at with certainty.

I. The elder, whose death is noted in *Four Mast.* A.D. 517 ("St. Darerca, of Cill-Sleibhtie-Cuilinn, whose first name was Moninne, died on the 6th of July; nine-score years was the length of her life"), may be the subject of the first part of the legend. She received the veil from St. Patrick, associated with herself eight virgins and a widow with her son, had a house at Rooskey (co. Louth), visited St. Ibar in the Aran Isles, and also at Begery, was the friend of St. Brigida of Kildare, and had her chief residence at Killeevy, co. Armagh. It is perhaps to meet any chronological difficulty that her age is extended to one hundred and eighty years.

II. The younger fills the chief part of the legend. She was daughter of Maugtheus, abess for some time at Foghart, near Dundalk, then removed to Killeevy, co. Armagh. She is next brought into contact with Aldfrid king of Northumbria, who spent some years in exile in Ireland, and afterwards placed St. Modwenna at Whitby, under St. Hilda. After her return to Ireland she visited Rome, founded a monastery at Burton-on-Trent, and then went to Scotland, where her brother, St. Ronan, was preaching the faith. There she founded seven churches, died at Longforgan, Perthshire, about A.D. 660 (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 404-7; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* c. xviii. § 9; Nicolson, *Ir. Hist. Libr.* 48, ed. 1736; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 37-8; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* xi. c. 10; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 177-8, and *Eccl. An.* 304 n.; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 249, 382; Earl of Dunraven, *Notes on Irish Arch.* by Miss Stokes, i. 109-11, describing and illustrating the remains at Killeevy.)

[J. G.]

MOERAGENES, the author of a life, in four books, of Apollonius of Tyana, quoted by Origen (*Adv. Cels.* v. 41), and spoken slightly of by Philostratus (*Apoll.* i. 3). [G. S.]

MOLAGA (MOLLOG), Jan. 20, abbat of Tegh-Molaga. The only printed life is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 145 sq.), translated from Irish into Latin, and adapted (Hardy, *Descrip. Cat.* i. pt. ii. 850), but evidently unhistorical. In the Irish martyrologies, at Jan. 20, he is Loichein, or Lochen. He was born at Liathmuine, near Fermoy, co. Cork, of poor and aged parents named Dubhgh, baptized by St. Cumin Foda. His first foundation was at Tulachmin, probably near his birthplace, but he left it in consequence of a contest with the Druids, and visited the north of Ireland, passed over into Scotland, then into Wales to St. David at Menevia (though the chronology disallows it), and presented him with a bell. He returned to Ireland by Dublin, and appears to have had a house at Llannbeachaire [see DOMHNOG for the legend and identification], but died at Tulachmin after the middle of the 7th century, and was buried at Labba Molaga (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 82 sq.; *Roy. Hist. and Arch. Ass. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 303; O'Flaherty, *Ogyg.* ii. pt. iii. c. 69, pp. 238-9, tracing his pedigree). In county Cork his name is found at Templemolaga, near

Mitchelstown, where his church is a venerable little ivy-clad ruin, on the banks of the Funcheon, and has beside it the saint's well, Tobermolaga. About four miles north-east is the townland of Labba Molaga, i.e. Molaga's bed (for an account of whose ruins, with plates, see the Earl of Dunraven, *Notes on Ir. Arch.*, by Miss Stokes, i. 62-4; also *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 434). At Teach-molaga, now Timoleague, in the same county, the roofless walls of the old abbey and church are still standing. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 355; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 145-7, 3rd ed.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 304.)

[J. G.]

MOLAISRE, MOLAISI, MOLAISSE, MOLAISIUS, MOLAISSUS, MOLASH, son of Cairrel, abbat and bishop of Leithghlinn, or old Leighlin, co. Carlow, commemorated April 18. [LASERIAN (2).] [J. G.]

MOLAISSE (MACLAISRE), Aug. 12, known from his association with the life of St. Columba (Reeves, *St. Adamn.* 252, 287). He was abbat of the monastery on Inishmurray, and built his church, which is one of the few remains of Cyclopean masonry still preserved in the west of Ireland. (For full account, with plates, see Earl of Dunraven, *Notes on Ir. Arch.* by Miss Stokes, i. 46-54.) He is called Mac Laisre the learned, and died A.D. 803. [J. G.]

MOLIBBA, MOLIBHA, MOLIIBA, MOLIBAEUS (LIVINUS), nephew of St. Coemgen and his successor at Glendalough; commemorated as bishop on Jan. 8. He flourished in the 7th century. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 368, 584; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 131; Cotton, *Fast.* ii. 214; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 218.) [J. G.]

MOLING, June 17, surnamed LUACHRA, LUACHRAENSIS, LUAIM, ILLUACHAIR, and also called DAIRCELL, TAIRCHEALL, bishop and confessor, famed both as an ecclesiastic and a politician of the 7th century. The only ancient life published is in the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 17 Jun. iv. 333), who give an article *De S. Molingo*, in which Baertius discusses many of the questions involved in the tradition. This life was known to Ware (*Ir. Writ.* i. c. 13), and others are mentioned as existing in the Burgundian library, Brussels, some in Irish and some in Latin (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 477 sq. viii. 372 sq.; Hardy, *Descrip. Cat.* i. pt. i. 365, pt. ii. 850). Legends regarding St. Moling are preserved in the Irish *Book of Leinster* (early in 12th century), and *Book of Lismore* (15th century), and Ware probably had access to old material now lost (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 340, 647, and *Lect. Anc. Ir.* iii. 34-36, 45).

St. Moling belonged to the Uí Deagha of the Hy-Cennsealach. co. Wexford, where he probably was born, but an Ossorian tradition places his birth at Mullinakill, par. Jerpoint, co. Kilkenny. He was first received as a monk at Glendalough. co. Wicklow, then founded a monastery at Tigh-Moling, now St. Mullins, co. Carlow, probably early or in the middle of the 7th century. He became bishop of Ferns, co. Wexford. Ware and others place him second in the list and immediate successor of St. Maedhog, who died A.D. 632, but to allow for the succession of the other bishops, they must suppose that St. Moling

soon resigned his seat at Ferns, and retired to Tigh-Moling. It is more likely that he was sixth in the succession (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 223 c. 5; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 220; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 132, 134), having followed Diratius, A.D. 691, and occupied till his death, A.D. 697. (On the succession at Ferns, see Ware, *Ir. Bps.*, Ferns, p. 437; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 223; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 425, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 670; Cotton, *Fast.* ii. 328 sq.) In *Ann. Tig.* A.D. 697, he is said to have died *ἰν Βρυτονηϊ*, "inter Britones," interpreted by Haddan and Stubbs (*Counc.* ii. pt. i. 6) as "either in Iona or Strathclyde." He is best known for the freeing the men of Leinster from the Borumha or Boarian tribute. According to the Irish account which is given in the ancient historical tale called *Borumha-Laighean*, or Origin of the Boromean Tribute, in the *Book of Lecan*, and in *Libr. Trin. Coll.*, Dublin, MS. classed H. 2, 18, this oppressive tax had been imposed upon the Leinstermen in the end of the 1st century of the Christian era by Tuathal Teachtmhar (d. A.D. 106) on account of a wrong done to him by Eochaidh Aincheann, king of Leinster. (See O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 230 sq.; O'Flaherty, *Ogg.* ii. pt. iii. c. 56; *Gen. Hy-Fiach*, by O'Don. 32; Keating, *H. Ir.* i. pt. i. c. 7.) During the reign of forty Irish monarchs, and as the fruitful cause of unspeakable bloodshed, this tax had been paid, until, about A.D. 690, Finachta Fleadhach, monarch of Ireland (d. A.D. 695), was induced by St. Moling to remit it entirely for himself and successors for ever. But in this transaction it is curious to find the name and influence of St. Adamnan, abbat of Hy, employed to prevent the remission, and St. Moling, on the other hand, obtaining his end by means of an equivocation (Reeves, *S. Adamn.* xlix.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 298-9 n.\*). St. Moling is usually regarded as one of the four prophets of Ireland. The *Evangelistarium of S. Moling*, a copy of the Gospels in its case or shrine, is preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin (O'Curry, *ib.* 23, 335-6; *Journ. Kith. Arch. Soc.* iv. 272-4; Westwood, *Pal. Sacr. Pict.*, Ir. Bibl. MSS. p. 4). [J. G.]

MOLIO, MOLIOS, MOLOE, MOLUE (MAOLIOSA, MAELJOS, MULUY), patron of Holy Isle in Lamash Bay, Isle of Arran, is said to have preached both at Lamash and Shisken, in Kilmory, dying at last at the latter, where his grave is still shewn (*Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. i. 245, 254; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 407 sq.). For his cave at Lamash, with its Runic inscriptions and other antiquities, see Wilson, *Prehist. Scot.* i. 127, ii. 277 sq.; Munch, *Chron. Mun.* 117, 118, calling him MACLIOSA and MACLIOS. [J. G.]

MOLOCUS, -OC, -OCH, -OCHUS, -ONACHUS, -ONATHUS, -UOCUS, Scotch abbat, and probably bishop of Lismore in Argyleshire. (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 449\*; *Boll. Acta SS.* 25 Jun. vii. 677-80.) [LUA (2).] [J. G.]

MOLONACHUS, -ACH, -ACHE, -AH, -ATIUS, bishop of Lismore, Argyleshire, called by the Scotch annalists the pupil of St. Brendan, and commemorated June 25; dated A.D. 629 by Dempster, A.D. 688, who ascribes to his pen *Acta Brandani magistri*. (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.*

ii. 455; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 155, 203, 238, 409; Boll. *Acta SS.* 25 Jun. vii. 677-80.) [J. G.]

**MOLUOC, -US, MOLUAG, MOLUOG, MOLOCH, MOLONCH,** abbat, probably bishop of Lismore, Argyleshire, in the sixth century, commemorated June 25. (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 481, 492; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 121, n. 6, ii. pt. i. 141; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 371.) [J. G.]

**MOMAEDOG, MOMHAEDOG, MOME-DOC (MAEDOCUS, MAIDDOCUS, MAIDOCUS, MEDOC, MIDA),** bishop or abbat of Fiddown, bar. Iverk, co. Kilkenny, was son of Midna, son of Metus, descended from Labhraidh Lorc, and thus related to St. Colum of Tirdaglas; his feasts are Mar. 23, and specially May 18. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 727, giving a short memoir, *De S. Maidoco sive Mo-Modoco abbate Fedh-Dunensi*; Boll. *Acta SS.* 23 Mart. iii. 438, 18 Mai. iv. 133 praet.) [J. G.]

**MOMILLUS,** Cyp. *Ep.* 57 (ap. Morcelli). See MONNULUS. [E. W. B.]

**MONAN, -E, -US (MINNANUS, MOYNENN, MYNNANE),** Scotch saint, called archdeacon, and bishop of St. Andrew's, also martyr as companion of St. Adrian on the Isle of May. He has his legend given in *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. hyem. ff. lix.-lx.), but it is very probable that he is really identical with the Irish St. Maeineann, bishop of Clonfert, who died March 1, A.D. 571. According to the Scotch legend he was born in Pannonia in Hungary, accompanied St. Adrian in the ninth century to Scotland, preached on the mainland at Invery in Fifeshire, and was martyred with his companions on the May. His relics were conveyed to Invery (Camerarius, *De Scot. Fort.* 109). He was a favourite saint in Scotland, as his name appears on March 1 in all the calendars; his chief dedication is St. Monance, Fifeshire. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 412-13, et al.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* ii. 682-4, iii. 63; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 23, 311-14; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Mart. i. 87-9, 324-6.) [J. G.]

**MONENN (MON-NENNIUS, MONINDE, MONINNINE)** presents in the immense variety of name-forms, about thirty in number, much confusion, so that it is questioned in how far the bishops of Cluain-coinne and Clonfert, and the abbat of Rosnat in Alba, are to be regarded as different persons or the same. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 437 sq. et al.) treats them as all different, but Lanigan (*E. H. Ir.* i. 434) and Todd (*B. of Hymns*, i. 102 sq.) prefer reducing them to two, Monennius, bishop of Clonfert, and Monennus, Nennius, or Nennio, abbat of the Monasterium Rosnatense or Candida Casa in Scotland. (Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 20; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 706 sq., iii. 10 sq., 63; Innes, *Hist. Scot.* 114, 124, 155, Sp. cl. ed.) [J. G.]

**MONNICA, ST.** The name of this most celebrated of Christian mothers was certainly spelt as above, Monnica not Monica, on the evidence of the oldest MSS. of the writings of St. Augustine. We are not aware that the etymology of the name has been ascertained. The less accurate spelling suggests a connexion with *μόνος*; may the other possibly have to do with *μόνος* = *μόνος*, monile?

The birthplace of Monnica, nowhere explicitly

named, may be assumed to be Tagaste, the home of her husband, Patricius. Her family was, probably, like his, in point of social grade, "curialis" (*Possidii Vita Aug.* c. 2), that is, it contributed a member or members to the senate of the colonia. Her parents' names are not known. They were Christians, and of consistent life; their home was (*Conf.* ix. 8) "domus fidelis, bonum membrum Ecclesiae." Monnica was born 331 or 332.

Her early domestic training was pure and severe, under the strong hand of an aged and trusted Christian nurse, who had once carried the child's father in her arms. By her Monnica and her sisters (no brothers are mentioned) were taught to abstain entirely from drinking, even water, between meal-times, with the aim of guarding them beforehand against habits of intemperance when, after marriage, they should become "dominae apothecarum et cellariorum" (*Conf.* l. c.). Yet Monnica, when scarcely past her early childhood, was on the verge of a confirmed love of wine, as she confessed long after to her son. Trusted to draw wine from the cask (cuppa) in a jug (laguncula), she sipped first little and then more, and was checked at last only when a maid, who had attended her to the cellar, in an angry moment called her "meribibula" to her face, and thus awoke her to her disgrace and danger (*Conf.* l. c.).

She was married, at what precise age we do not know, to Patricius of Tagaste, a "vir curialis;" a man passionate (ferox), immoral, and not formally a member of the church; though not therefore to be classed as a pagan, but perhaps rather as what in the language of modern missions would be called an "adherent."\* With him Monnica lived, a wife most patient and faithful, till at the age of forty she was left a widow, tenderly attached to his memory, and longing to be laid at death in his grave (*Conf.* ix. 11). He was rough and eager, but not ungenerous; and she was permitted to win him to the Saviour before his end. A curious picture of the manners of that time and region appears (*Conf.* ix. 9) when Monnica is described as surrounded by her married female friends, and seeing on some of them, "quarum viri mansuetiores erant [Patricio]," the marks of blows inflicted even on their faces, and counselling them to adopt, for protection, her own method of calm and unwavering submission. The mother of Patricius was an inmate of the home, and her also Monnica completely won to respect and affection, in spite of the slanders of the female slaves, by a union of filial obedience with vigour as a mistress.

She bore children more than once, perhaps often; for Augustine not only mentions a brother expressly (*Conf.* ix. 11, &c.), but was the uncle of many nephews and nieces (*Vita Benedictina Aug.* c. i.). Augustine was born when Monnica was twenty-three years old, and when, as we gather from his language about her whole influence, she was already a Christian in the noblest sense, strong in the power of spiritual holiness, and ardently prayerful for the salvation of her child, and therefore for his personal

\* See *Conf.* vi. 16 for a statement that Augustine's parentes, not only his mother, procured his initiation as an infant catechumen.

acceptance of the faith. It is noticeable, as a sign of popular Christian opinion and usage at the time, that she did not bring him as an infant to baptism, but merely to the initiation of a catechumen (*Conf.* i. 11; vi. 16), the sign of the cross and the salting with salt. Monnica evidently thought her son an unfit subject for baptism until he gave evidence of a true change of will.<sup>b</sup> In early boyhood, in extreme illness, he implored to be baptized, and she hastened to procure it; but he suddenly recovered, and she again resolved upon delay (*Conf.* i. 11).

Monnica joined cordially with Patricius in securing the highest education for Augustine, and in stimulating his studies; and even during her widowhood made every effort to maintain him in them, believing, with clear-sighted wisdom, that their effect ought to be only favourable to his enlightenment. But the developments of both his impurity and his unbelief meanwhile caused her agonising distress, which was aggravated by his cynical conduct, at least on some occasions. There was a time when she declined his presence beneath her roof and at her table, "aversans et detestans blasphemias [filii]" (*Conf.* iii. 11); but a memorable dream altered her decision. She saw a radiant being (*juvenem splendidum, hilarem, atque ardentem sibi*) approach her as she stood on a wooden beam (*regula*), bewailing her son's spiritual ruin; and he bade her be consoled, for where she was, there too her son should be. Augustine tried to parry the omen by the suggestion that it might portend his mother's unbelief; but she instantly rejoined that the words were not "Where he is, there thou shalt be," but "Where thou art, there he shall be." This was nine years before his conversion. About the same time she received also the famous consolation from a bishop, wearied (*substomachans taedio*) with her entreaties that he would reason with her son: "Go, prythee; the son of those tears cannot perish" (*Conf.* iii. 12).

When Augustine resolved to migrate to Italy she sorely bewailed it (*atrociter planxit*), and resolved not to leave his side; and when by a singularly heartless stratagem he escaped her, affecting to bid a friend good-bye on board ship, and persuading her to spend the night in a chapel dedicated to Cyprian, she would not give him up. Beside herself at first with grief (*insaniebat dolore*, *Conf.* v. 8), she took ship before long and followed him, and on a stormy voyage was the consoler of the terrified sailors, assuring them that she had seen a vision which promised safety (*Conf.* vi. 1). By the time of her arrival Augustine was already at Milan, and under the influence of Ambrose, but not yet won to the orthodox faith (*non manichaeus, sed neque catholicus christianus*); but she calmly assured him of her certainty that she should see him a believer before she died (*Conf.* l. c.).

The ministrations of Ambrose she attended with great and reverent delight (*iligebat illum virum sicut angelum Dei*), and gave a striking proof of her feeling in submitting at once to his judgment on a point that must have touched her

nearly. She had been used to bring oblations of vegetables, bread, and wine, to the shrines of the African martyrs, and began the like practice at Milan. But Ambrose had forbidden the usage, partly because it was much abused to intemperance, partly (a significant fact) because it so closely resembled the pagan parentalia. Augustine owns that probably his mother would have yielded to none but Ambrose in such a case; but to him she yielded without a murmur. Ambrose on his side fully understood Monnica's strength of Christian character, and delighted to praise her to her son (*Conf.* vi. 2).

At Milan she was a most devout and diligent worshipper; liberal in alms; daily attending the Holy Supper (*nullum diem praetermittibat oblationem ad altare [Domini]*), and twice daily present in the church, not to gossip there (*non ad vanas fabulas et aniles loquacitates*), but to hear the word and to pray (*Conf.* v. 9). During the struggle of Ambrose with the Arian empress-mother Justina (385) Monnica was the most devout among the host of worshippers who gathered for vigils and prayers in the church (*Conf.* ix. 7). The hymns of Ambrose were greatly loved by her, and treasured in her memory; the dialogue *De Beatâ Vitâ* closes with some noble words from Monnica, introduced by a quotation from the hymn "Fove precantes, Trinitas."

The final crisis of her son's conversion was instantly reported to her by Augustine and Alypius, to her extreme delight (*exultat et triumphat*, *Conf.* viii. 12). It must not be forgotten that this final crisis was the resolution of Augustine not only to be baptized but to accept the life of celibacy; and Monnica's joy shews that in this as in other respects she shared some distorted religious theories of her age, as certainly did her great and heavenly-minded son.

Between his conversion and baptism she retired with him to Cassiciacum, the campaign of his friend Verecundus. The dialogues *De Ordine* and *De Beatâ Vitâ* give us a charming picture of this interval of retirement, spent in holy intercourse and in lofty thought lighted up with eternal truth. Monnica appears as an interlocutor in both dialogues, conspicuous for strength of native sense, and occasionally speaking with a vigour and esprit which are evidently reported from the life, and shew her as a woman who might have shone at any period for intellectual gifts. "We fairly forgot her sex, and thought that some great man was in our circle" (*de B. V.* § 10).

At the close of the dialogue she speaks of the bliss of the Eternal Vision: "This, beyond dispute, is the blessed life, the perfect; at which we must look to be enabled to arrive, hastening on in solid faith, joyful hope, and burning love" (*de B. V. ad fin.*). In the dialogue *De Ordine* Augustine speaks of his mother's "ingenium, atque in res divinas inflammatus animus" (*de Ord.* ii. § 1).

She was now near the end. Her son, an orthodox believer, was about to return with her to Africa. They were lodging at Ostia, and making the last preparations for the voyage (*Conf.* ix. 10). Augustine, in a memorable passage, records a conversation with his mother, spoken as they sat at a window looking out on the *viridarium* of the house; a delightful col-

<sup>b</sup> We are aware of the discussions raised upon this incident. See e. g. Wall on Infant Baptism, Part ii. ch. iii. § 11. But we think the narrative in the Confessions does not imply that *Patricius* interfered to defer Augustine's baptism.



loquy (colloquebamur soli valde dulciter), rising from theme to theme of subtle but holy thought to reach the height of the beatific vision. And the "colloquy" was surely no mere monologue on Augustine's part, if he has drawn his mother truly in the two dialogues to which we have just referred. It closed with a solemn utterance from her: "she had done with the wish to live; her son was a believer, and fully consecrated; what did she there?" (*Conf.* ix. 10). Five days later she was taken ill (decubuit febribus), and at once recognised the end. Her long-cherished wish to lie in the grave of Patricius was gone. "Nothing," she said, "is far from God. There is no fear lest He, at the last day, should not know whence to raise me up." "So on the ninth day of her illness, in the 56th year of her age, and in the 33rd of my own, that devout and saintly soul was released from the body." She died in the presence of Augustine, of another son, of her grandson Adeodatus, so soon to follow her, and of many others (omnes nos) (*Conf.* ix. 11, 12).

Most affecting is Augustine's confession of his struggles with grief, and with what was surely a mistaken dread of its unreserved indulgence before God. The burial was tearless (cum ecce corpus elatum est, inus redimus sine lacrymis). Then followed another time of conflict, and a vain effort for relief at the bath. Then sleep came and a calmer waking, and now Augustine, like his blessed mother, found help in an Ambrosian hymn, "Deus creator omnium;" and at length he was able to weep without misgiving. He records his prayers for the departed soul, and begs those of the reader; as certainly Monnica herself would have done. Neither the mother nor the son had fully grasped the simplicity of the profound assurance that "to depart" is "to be with Christ, which is πολλὰ μᾶλλον κρείσσον." But they possessed the passport to that unseen bliss.

We may dispense with any long summary of Monnica's character; equally strong, lively, and tender by nature, and refined by grace to extraordinary elevation. Augustine lavishes his unique eloquence upon her heavenly tone of life and influence, and the intensity of her longings for the salvation of the souls she loved. He calls her his mother both in the flesh and in the Lord. His whole being was due, under God, to Monnica. Christians who knew her "dearly loved her Lord in her, for they felt His presence in her heart" (*Conf.* ix. 10). She was an eager student of the Scriptures (*de Ordine*, i. § 32).

In Brieger's *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. p. 228, is printed (from Riese's *Anthologia Latina*, fasc. ii. p. 127) an epitaph of Monnica, bearing the name of *Bassus, exconsul*; probably Anicius Bassus, consul A.D. 408, and therefore a contemporary of Augustine's. The lines are:

*In tumulo Monicæ. (sic.)*

Hic posuit cineres genitrix castissima Iulias  
Augustine tui altera lux meriti,  
Qui servans pacis cælestia iura sacerdos  
Commissos populos moribus instituit.  
Gloria vos maior gestorum laude coronat  
Virtutum mater felicior suboluit.

In the last couplet Monnica and her son are, apparently, addressed together. The pentameter, with its startling metrical licence (a feature however not uncommon in the verse of in-

scriptions), apostrophises Monnica as "Mother of Virtues," and Augustine as her yet "happier offspring;" happier, it may be, as a *celibate* saint. This epitaph is an interesting proof of the religious reverence accorded from the first to Monnica.

In the same pages of Brieger's *Zeitschrift* is mentioned also the translation of the bones of Monnica from Ostia to Rome, in 1430, in the reign of Martin V., and at the expense of Mapheus Veghius. The relics were deposited in a chapel dedicated on the occasion to Augustine, and on the sarcophagus were inscribed the following lines, a curious and instructive advance upon the older epitaph in their ascription of mediatorial powers to Monnica:

Hic Augustini sanctam venerare parentem,  
Votaque fer tumulo, quo jacet illa, sacro.  
Quæ quondam gnato, toti nunc Monica mundo  
Succurrit precibus, præstat opemque suis.<sup>c</sup>

This translation is dated, in the Roman Martyrology, April 9. Monnica appears as a saint in the Roman calendar, Sancta Monnica vidua, April 4.

She appears not infrequently as a figure in mediæval art. Ary Scheffer's picture, painted 1845, "St. Augustin et sa mère Ste. Monique," gives a noble modern realisation of Monnica, as she sits holding the hand of her son and, with him, gazing upwards.

"Together 'neath the Italian heaven  
They sit, the mother and her son,  
He late from her by errors riven,  
Now both in Jesus one:  
The dear consenting hands are knit  
And either face, as there they sit,  
Is lifted as to something seen  
Beyond the blue serene."

Such, we believe, is the ordinary interpretation of the picture; as if it represented the colloquy at Ostia. But an interesting passage in Mrs. Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art*, p. 314, seems to shew that Ary Scheffer had in view some moment before Augustine's conversion; perhaps that recorded *Conf.* vi. 1, when Monnica assures Augustine, while he still hesitates to accept the faith, that she should see him a believer before her death. [H. C. G. M.]

MONNULUS (v. l. MUNNULUS, MONULUS, MONTULUS, MANNULUS, MOMILLUS, &c.), African bishop Conc. 2 Carth. sub Cyp. A.D. 252. *Cyp. Ep.* 57, *Sentt. Epp.* 10, bishop of Girba, the imperial factory of purple on the traditional island of the Lotophagi, Menine. [E. W. B.]

MONOGENES, in the Valentinian system, both the name of one of the decad of æons, and also an alternative appellation of the primary æon Nous. The double use of the name probably indicates successive steps in the development of the system. (Iren. i. 1.) [G. S.]

MONOIMUS (a form, possibly representing the Jewish name Menahem), an Arabian Gnostic of the second century. Until recent times, his name had been only preserved by a brief notice in Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 18); but the recovery

<sup>c</sup> v. l. *sibi*, as the epitaph appears in Papebroch, *Acta Sanctorum Martii*, t. i. p. 491; to which authority reference is made in Brieger's *Zeitschrift*.

of the lost work of Hippolytus against heresies has shewed that it was from this work Theodoret had derived his knowledge. Hippolytus there gives a short abstract of the doctrine of Monoimus, together with an extract from a letter of his to Theophrastus, whether an actual letter to an unknown Theophrastus, or a rhetorical address to the Aristotelic philosopher of the name, we cannot determine. On a hasty glance at the system described, it might seem one of mere pantheism, but a closer examination shews Christian elements in the scheme, so that it is rightly classed as a heresy, and not as a form of heathenism. There is, for instance, an express quotation of the Epistle to the Colossians, and a probable reference to the prologue of St. John's Gospel. The starting point of the speculation is the ascription in the New Testament of the work of creation to the Son of Man, whence it was inferred that the first principle was properly called Man. It follows that it is a mistake to look for God in creation; we must seek Him in ourselves, and can best find Him by the study of the involuntary operations of our own soul. The relation between the "Man" and "Son of Man" exists from beyond time. The latter is derived from the former, but, it would seem, by an immediate and eternal necessity of His nature, just as from fire is necessarily derived the light which renders it visible. Thus, concerning the first principle, the Scriptures speak both of a "being" and a "becoming" (*ἦν καὶ ἐγένετο*), the first word properly applying to the "Man," the second to the "Son of Man." in order to illustrate how in this first principle are combined unity and multiplicity, perfect simplicity with the most contradictory attributes, we are referred to the Greek letter  $\iota$ , the single stroke of which represents units; and which also represents the number ten. Then again from the units all other numbers flow. The process of creation is further illustrated by a mathematical theory of the generation from numbers of the regular solids, and from those the elementary bodies are supposed to be formed. A type of the activity of the Son of Man, who works all the transformations of nature, is found in Moses' rod; which was also an iota, a single branch, but having a tenfold operation. The speculations of Monoimus, as reported to us, only relate to the work of creation; we are not told whether he had any theory as to the problem of redemption.

The use made by Monoimus of the phrases "Man" and "Son of Man" reminds us of the system of the NAASSENES (Hippol. *Ref.* § 7, p. 95, see also the article Gnosticism, Vol. II. p. 292), and a closer examination shews that this is no chance coincidence, and that Monoimus is really to be referred to that sect, although Hippolytus himself has classed them separately; for Monoimus describes his first principle as bisexual, and (p. 269) applies to it the titles "Father, Mother, the two immortal names," words, as we know from p. 95, taken out of a NAASSENE hymn. But there is a common source of this language in the *Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη* of Simon (see p. 171, line 20), this passage also being clearly the original of the description given by Monoimus of the contradictory attributes of his first principle. Further traces of the obligations of Monoimus to Simon are found in the reference

(p. 271, line 1) to the six powers instrumental in creation, which answer to Simon's six "roots," while a similar indebtedness to Simon on the part of the Naassene writer in Hippolytus is found on comparing the anatomical speculations connected with the name Eden (v. 9, p. 120, vi. 14, p. 168). A more doubtful question is whether there be any relation of obligation between Monoimus and the Clementine Homilies, there being in both a contrast drawn between the "Son of Man" and those who are "born of women" (*Hom.* ii. 17). It only remains to be mentioned that Monoimus has mysteries in connexion with the number 14, shewing that he attached importance to Paschal celebration.

[G. S.]

MONOPHYSITES and MONOTHELITES  
[PERSON OF CHRIST, CONTROVERSIES RESPECTING THE].

MONTANUS (1), a native of Ardabau, a village in Phrygia, who, in the latter half of the 2nd century, originated a schism which spread very widely, and of which traces remained for hundreds of years.

I. *Rise of Montanism.*—The name Montanus seems to have been not uncommon in the district. It is found in a Phrygian inscription (Le Bas, 755) and in three others from neighbouring provinces (Boeckh—3662 Cyzicus, 4071 Ancyra, 4187 Amasia). Montanus had been originally a heathen, and according to Didymus (*De Trin.* iii. 41) an idol priest. The epithets "abscissus" and "semivir" applied to him by Jerome (*Ep. ad Marcellam*, vol. i. 186) suggest that Jerome may have believed him to have been a priest of Cybele. Some suppose that after his conversion he was advanced to the rank of priest, or even of bishop, but of this there is no evidence. He taught that there was no reason to think that God's supernatural revelations came to an end with the apostles, but that on the contrary even more wonderful manifestations of the divine energy might be expected under the dispensation of the Paraclete, whom Christ had promised to send to His church. It is asserted that he claimed to be the Paraclete himself; but we believe this to have been a mistake arising out of the fact that Montanus claimed to be an inspired organ by whom the Paraclete spoke, and that consequently words of his were uttered and accepted as those of that Divine Being. We are told that Montanus claimed to be a prophet, and that in a kind of possession or ecstasy he delivered certain strange utterances. Montanus held that the relation between a prophet and the Divine Being who inspired him was the same as between a musical instrument and that which played upon it; and that consequently the inspired words of a prophet were not to be regarded as those of the human speaker. In a fragment of his prophecy preserved by Epiphanius he says: "I have come, not an angel or ambassador, but God the Father." See also Didymus (*u. s.*). It is clear that Montanus here did not speak in his own name, but uttered words which he supposed God to have put into his mouth; and if he spoke similarly in the name of the Paraclete we need not imagine that he identified himself with the Paraclete.

The prophesings of Montanus were soon outdone by those of two female disciples of his.

Prisca or Priscilla and Maximilla. They fell into strange ecstasies, delivering in an unconscious state what were regarded by Montanus and his followers as divine prophecies. Scenes would seem to have taken place analogous to those that were exhibited on the first manifestation of the Irvingite gift of tongues. Prisca and Maximilla, who had been married, left their husbands, were given by Montanus the rank of virgins in the church, and were widely revered as prophetesses. But when these things came to be noised abroad, a very different opinion was formed of them by the sober judgment of some of the neighbouring bishops. Phrygia was a country in which heathen devotion exhibited itself in the most fanatical form, and it seemed to calm observers that the frenzied utterances of the Montanistic prophetesses were far less like any previously known manifestation of the prophetic gift among Christians, than they were to those heathen orgiisms which the church had been wont to ascribe to the operation of demons. They desired then to test the matter by exorcising the supposed prophetesses and driving the evil spirits away; but their adherents naturally would not permit such an insult to be offered. The result was a schism between those who ascribed the new prophesying to God and to the devil. Modern critics have blamed the intolerance of the church authorities who allowed matters to come to a schism; and have believed that wiser counsels of peace and comprehension were given by some eminent church teachers; by Melito or Irenaeus. We believe that such critics have entirely failed to enter into the feelings of Christians of those days and have in consequence wholly misread the history. A critic of the 19th century may give a naturalistic explanation of the Montanist phenomena and may ascribe them to nervous excitement, hysteria, and so forth; but it is certain that any one in the 2nd century who should deny the supernatural character of such manifestations, instead of being accepted by both parties as a peacemaker, would be scouted by both as an infidel. The phenomena then, if supernatural, came either from God or from Satan; and how was a conciliation possible of these opposite views? The church party looked on the Montanists as wilfully despising our Lord's warning to beware of false prophets, and as being in consequence deluded by Satan, in whose power they placed themselves by accepting as divine teachers women possessed by evil spirits. The Montanists looked on the church leaders as men who did despite to the Spirit of God by offering the indignity of exorcism to those whom He had chosen as His organs for communicating with the church.

It does not appear that any offence was taken at the substance of the Montanistic prophesyings. On the contrary, it was owned that they had a certain plausibility, as for instance because, with their congratulations and promises to those who accepted them, they mixed a due proportion of rebukes and warnings; but this was ascribed to the deeper art of Satan. What condemned the prophesyings in the minds of the church authorities was the frenzied ecstasy in which they were delivered. It has been said with truth that there was nothing new in the Montanist illustration of the musical instrument

already cited, or in the doctrine that a prophet's words are not his own but those of the Divine Being whose messenger he is. But it is unjust to the church teachers to suppose that in controversy with Montanists they altered the ancient doctrine. They appear to have been quite right in maintaining that previous prophets while obeying the divine impulses remained in perfect possession of their faculties, and that there had been no precedent in the church for the loss of self-control displayed in the Montanist ravings.

The question we have indicated as to the different characteristics of real and pretended prophecy, was the main subject of discussion in the first stage of the Montanist controversy. It is possible that it was treated of by Melito in his work on prophecy: it was certainly the subject of the work of Miltiades *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν*; it was touched on in an anonymous\* early writing against Montanism [see ABERCIUS], of which large fragments are preserved by Eusebius (v. 16, 17). We cannot doubt that some more of this polemic is preserved by Epiphanius, who often incorporates the labours of previous writers and whose section on Montanism contains a discussion which is clearly not Epiphanius's own, but a survival from the first age of the controversy. We learn that the Montanists brought as Scripture examples of ecstasy, the text "the Lord sent a deep sleep (*ἐκστασι*) upon Adam,"<sup>b</sup> that David said in his haste (*ἐν ἐκστάσει*) "all men are liars," and that the same word is used of the vision in which Peter was warned not to refuse the invitation of Cornelius. The orthodox opponent points out that Peter's "not so" shews that in his ecstasy he was not so carried away by the divine influence as to lose his individual judgment and will. Other similar instances are quoted from the Old Testament.

The same argument was probably pursued by Clement of Alexandria, who promised to write on the subject of prophecy against the Montanists (*Strom.* iv. 13, p. 605). In a former book (i. 17, p. 369) he notes it as a characteristic of false prophets *ἐν ἐκστάσει προεφήτευον ὡς ἂν Ἀποστάτου διάκονοι*. Tertullian no doubt defended the Montanist position in his lost work in six books on ecstasy, with a seventh specially directed against Apollonius, mentioned by Jerome in his catalogue in the article (40) on Apollonius. He recurs to the subject (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 22, *De Anima*, 21, 45). The church's rejection of the Montanist doctrine on this subject is sufficiently illustrated (*Athan. Or. adv. Ar.* iii. 47, p. 473).

Notwithstanding the condemnation of Montanism and the excommunication of its adherents by the neighbouring bishops, it continued to spread and to make converts. Visitors came from a distance to witness the wonderful phenomena; and the condemned prophets hoped to reverse the first unfavourable verdict by the sentence of a larger tribunal. Yet while the cause of the new prophesyings gained in numerical strength, it failed to obtain ecclesiastical approval; and all the leading bishops of Asia

\* It seems to have been only through inaccurate recollection of Eusebius that Jerome names at one time Rhodo, at another Apollonius as the author.

<sup>b</sup> So also Tertullian (*De Jejun.* 3, *De Anima*, 45).

Minor declared against it. At length an attempt was made to influence or overrule the judgment of Asiatic Christians by the opinion of their brethren beyond the sea.

A good deal of darkness has been supposed to hang over the chronology of the Montanist controversy, chiefly arising, partly from attempts to reconcile with the chronology of Eusebius that of Epiphanius, who is not even consistent with himself, partly from the acceptance of another authority utterly unworthy of credit.<sup>c</sup> But about the most important date in the history there is no uncertainty. It is of little consequence to know how long the flame had been smouldering, if we can fix the time when it burst into open conflagration. We cannot pretend to be sure how long Montanus had been teaching, or how long the excesses of his prophetesses had given scandal to their more sober neighbours; but we can name the year 177 as that when Western attention was first called to these disputes. In that year the interference was solicited of the martyrs of Lyons, who were at the time suffering imprisonment and were in prospect of suffering death, for the testimony of Christ; and who were informed of the disputes by their brethren in Asia Minor, the native country no doubt of many of the Gallic Christians. Eusebius in his chronicle assigns the year 172 for the beginning of the prophesying of Montanus. He may not have fixed this date at random. One of his authorities names the year of the pro-consulship of Gratus as that of the beginning of Montanism, and Eusebius may not have been so ignorant as we, what year that was. We should have been disposed to allow a few years more for the growth of the new sect in Asia before it forced itself on the attention of foreign Christians; and on this account the Epiphanian date 157 may appear more probable, with which also tolerably agrees the vague

<sup>c</sup> The statement, which probably expresses the real opinion of Epiphanius, is (*Haer.* 48) that Montanism began in the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius (i.e. A.D. 157). But in the next section, fixing the date of his own writing at A.D. 374, he says that Montanism had arisen 290 years before. It is natural to suspect corruption of reading, and the editors have altered the text accordingly; but it is equally possible that Epiphanius, borrowing an argument from an older writer and trying to alter the figures so as to suit his own chronology, may have gone wrong in his arithmetic. A similar explanation is probably to be given of a third puzzling statement as to the chronology of Montanism (*Haer.* 51 § 33). In defending the Apocalypse he answers the objection: "An epistle is addressed to the church of Thyatira, and there is no Christian church in Thyatira. The answer, if we understand it rightly, is, 'It is true the church of Thyatira completely disappeared, having been overrun by Montanism. John, writing ninety-three years after our Lord's ascension (birth?), had foretold this, what he says about the woman Jezebel being a prediction of the Montanist prophetess. But now after 112 years there is a church at Thyatira again, which by God's help will increase.'" If there has been no corruption of text we should suppose that Epiphanius had recklessly copied what some one had written at the beginning of the 3rd century. We might suspect Epiphanius to be using the book which Hippolytus is known to have written in defence of St. John's Gospel and Apocalypse; but the chronology is not that of Hippolytus, and Epiphanius's authority is more likely to have been some Egyptian chronologer.

date of Didymus, "more than 100 years after the Ascension." But in truth the prophesying of Montanus might have been going on some time before it made much noise even in Asia; and we could reconcile the authorities by supposing 157 to be the date of the conversion of Montanus, 172 that of his formal condemnation by the Asiatic church authorities.

Concerning the appeal to the Gallic churches it may be asked whether they were consulted by the orthodox, by the Montanists, or by both; and there is a further question, What answer did the Gallic Christians give? On this last point Eusebius only tells us that their judgment was pious and most orthodox, and that they subjoined letters which those who afterwards suffered martyrdom wrote while yet in prison to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia and also to Eleutherus bishop of Rome, pleading (or negotiating, *πρεσβεύοντες*) for the peace of the churches.

From the last expression Pearson, followed by many others, concluded that the Gallic martyrs entreated the removal of the excommunication and for the peaceful comprehension of the Montanists in the church. If such advice was given it certainly was not accepted, and as we have already said, it could not have been accepted. The Asiatic church could not recognise as coming from the Spirit of God what it had already condemned as Satanic. We do not think it possible that the Gallic church should advise that this should be done; but we need not press this point, for it is enough to ask, If such advice had been given would Eusebius praise it as pious and orthodox? He begins his account of Montanism by describing it as a device of Satan, the enemy of all good, who having vainly attempted to overthrow the church by persecution, left no method of assault untried, and brought about the springing up of strange heresies. It is monstrous to imagine that Eusebius, thinking thus of Montanism, could praise as pious or orthodox the opinion of men who, ignorant of Satan's devices, should take the devil's work for God's.

The way in which we ourselves read the history is that *the Montanists had appealed to Rome*; that the church party solicited the good offices of their countrymen settled in Gaul, who wrote to Eleutherus representing the disturbance to the peace of the churches (a phrase probably preserved by Eusebius from the letter itself) which would ensue if the Roman church should approve what the church on the spot had condemned. Considering the activity of intercourse between the capital and every part of the empire, we need not think it impossible that Roman interference should have been sought. The resources and liberality of the Roman church made its friendship a matter of importance to every provincial church. We know of the mediation of Rome in the Corinthian dissensions at the end of the 1st century, and of the gift of money sent by Soter to the same Corinthian church shortly before the beginning of the Montanist troubles. On the other hand we have no reason to think of Rome as then enjoying such supremacy that its reversal of an Asiatic excommunication would be quietly acquiesced in. Such a step would have been a violent disturbance to the peace of the churches. Yet the Asiatic bishops might well be anxious how their decision would commend itself to the

judgment of a stranger at a distance. To such a one there would be nothing incredible in the news that special manifestations of God's Spirit had displayed themselves in Phrygia, while the suggestion that the new prophesying was inspired by Satan would be repelled by the facts that it was admittedly perfectly orthodox, and that all that it professed to reveal tended to the glory of Christ and to the increase of Christian devotion. To avert then the possibility of the calamity of a breach between the Eastern and Western churches, the Gallic churches, it would appear, not only wrote, but sent Irenaeus to Rome at the end of 177 or the beginning of 178. The hypothesis here made relieves us from the necessity of supposing this *πρεσβεία* to have been unsuccessful, while it fully accounts for the necessity of sending it.

The Asiatic churches took good care to lay before the Christian world justification for the course which they had adopted. Their case was stated by one of their most eminent bishops, Claudius Apollinarius of Hierapolis. It has been asked why we do not hear of Melito at this stage of the controversy, and the most probable answer is, that he was dead at the time. Apollinarius joined to his work the signatures of different bishops who had investigated and condemned the Montanist prophesyings. One of these, who came from a distance, Sotas of Anchialus, on the western shore of the Black Sea, was dead when Apollinarius wrote; but Aelius Publius Julius, bishop of the neighbouring colony of Debeltus, gives his sworn testimony that Sotas had tried to cast the demon out of Priscilla but had been hindered by the hypocrites. We learn from a later writer that Zoticus of Comana, and Julianus of Apamea, similarly attempted to exorcise Maximilla, and were not permitted to do so. Another of Apollinarius's authorities adds weight to his signature by appending the title martyr, then commonly given to those who braved imprisonment or tortures for the cause of Christ, until the modesty of the Gallic sufferers confined it to those whose witness was crowned by death. The result of the case laid before the Roman church was that the sentence of the Asiatic bishops was approved. This we know independently from the testimony of Tertullian to be presently mentioned. With this definite excommunication of the Montanists the first stage in this history comes to a close.

It may be pronounced certain from the whole history, that Eleutherus was the first bishop of Rome who had to give an opinion on the Montanist question; and we almost doubt whether it is worth while to mention the statement of the writer known as Predestinatus, that a previous bishop of Rome, Soter, wrote against them. Predestinatus is not a blunderer but a wilful liar; his false assertions do not originate from haste or carelessness, but from pure invention. He thinks it necessary to state under each heresy the name of the orthodox champion by whom it was first confuted; but it is easy to see that he freely supplies the defects of his knowledge by invention. We have not the least reason to think the work of Soter against the Montanists to have had more real existence than, for example, the work of pope Alexander against Heraclion. In a later section Predestinatus outrages all chronology by making Soter condemn Tertullian. It is

clear that he knew Tertullian to be a Montanist, that he imagined Soter to be the contemporary bishop of Rome, and therefore the fit person to whom to ascribe the condemnation of that heresy.

Not more authentic than the inventions of Predestinatus, though less glaringly false, are the Antimontanist councils entered in the "Libellus Synodicus," viz. one at Hierapolis under Apollinarius, one under Sotas at Achillae (Anchialus is plainly meant), and one by the Gallic confessors. It is plain on examination that the compiler, wishing to enrich his collection with records of ancient councils, invented these imaginary councils, taking his main facts directly or indirectly from Eusebius and adding some blunders of his own. That meetings of bishops, however, to discuss this subject, took place we have every reason to believe.

II. *Montanism in the East—second stage.*—For the history of Montanism in the East after its definite separation from the church, our chief authorities are fragments preserved by Eusebius of two writers, the anonymous writer already mentioned and Apollonius of Ephesus.<sup>4</sup> The date of both these writings is considerably later than the rise of Montanism. Apollonius places himself 40 years after its first beginning. In the time of the Anonymous the first leaders of the schism had vanished from the scene. Montanus was dead, and Theodotus, who had at an early point taken a leading part in the movement. He had probably had the financial management of the affairs of the sect, for he is said to have been towards it a kind of *ἐπιτροπος*. The Anonymous knows with great precision the date of the death of Maximilla, since when, at the time he wrote, 13 full years had elapsed and a 14th had begun. Priscilla must have died previously, for Maximilla believed that she was herself to be the last prophetess in the church and that after her the end would come. Though the Anonymous knows the date, he does not profess to know the circumstances of these deaths. He had heard a story that Montanus and Maximilla had, at different times, both hanged themselves; that Theodotus had met a death like that in some legends attributed to Simon Magus, being deceived and deserted by the demon who, he had hoped, would have carried him up to heaven. What truth there might be in these stories the Anonymous will not undertake to say. In his work and in that of Apollonius, as far as we know them, only one is touched on of the points of doctrine and discipline which the writings of Tertullian have taught us to connect with the name of Montanism, namely the question of the new fasts instituted by Montanus. The parts are now reversed; it is the Montanists who appear to incline to the side of worldly laxity, the church party to that of puritanical overstrictness. The Montanists are censured because their prophetess receives presents of money and costly garments; because their prophet also takes presents, because he dyes his hair, paints his eyebrows, uses cosmetics, plays at dice and tables, and lends money on usury. The Montanists had organised a complete financial system,

<sup>4</sup> Bonwetsch has the merit of pointing out that the section in Didymus, already referred to, is important as founded on an independent use of Montanist writings.

appointing collectors, levying contributions even from the poorest of their members, and paying regular salaries to their preachers. At all this Apollonius is much scandalised. We cannot doubt that the church clergy at the time must have been supported by the gifts and offerings of their people, so that apparently the novelty at which Apollonius took offence was that prophets or preachers should take money for their services. Again he complains because Themiso, a leading Montanist, having been cast into prison for the faith, managed to obtain his release by presents of money, and instead of shewing signs of shame for his faint-heartedness, assumed the airs of a martyr, and had the impudence to write, as if he were an apostle, what he called a catholic epistle. We may contrast the strenuous arguments with which Tertullian condemns such escape by money payment from the risk of martyrdom in his tract *De Fuga in Persecutione*.

The Themiso here mentioned seems to have been, after Montanus, the head of the Montanists. He was at any rate their leading man<sup>e</sup> at Pepuza; and this was the headquarters of the sect. It was there probably that Montanus had taught; it was there that the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla resided; there Priscilla had seen in a vision Christ come to her in the form of a woman in a bright garment, who inspired her with wisdom and informed her that Pepuza was the holy place and that there was the New Jerusalem to descend from heaven.<sup>f</sup> From that time Pepuza and the neighbouring village Tymium became the Montanist holy place, and were habitually spoken of as Jerusalem. It was there that Zoticus and Julianus, as already mentioned, visited Maximilla, and Themiso was then at the head of those who prevented the intended exorcism.

It seems likely that Montanus himself did not live for many years to preside over his sect, and this perhaps is the reason why it is seldom called like other heresies by the name of its founder. The sectaries themselves called themselves *πνευματικοί*, spiritual, calling the adherents of the church *ψυχικοί*, carnal, in this language following the usage of some Gnostic sects. In Phrygia itself the Catholics seem to have called the new prophesying after the name of its leader for the time being. But elsewhere over the Christian world, it was, like the Plymouth sect, called after its place of origin, the Phrygian heresy, *ἡ κατὰ Φρύγας αἵρεσις*. In the West the name was by a solecism translated the Cataphrygian heresy, and the heretics were called Cataphrygians.

It seems to us that, after Themiso, Miltiades presided over the sect; at least the Anonymous begins his work by calling it the heresy *τῶν κατὰ Μιλτιάδην*. On this however see MILTIADDES. One other Montanist of this period we can name, Alexander, who was honoured by his party as a martyr, but who, according to Apollonius, had been only punished by the proconsul,

Aemilius Frontinus, for his crimes, as the public records would testify. We have unfortunately not the means of throwing light on the chronology by fixing the date of that proconsulship.

Taking the Eusebian date for the rise of Montanism, Apollonius, who wrote 40 years later, must have written about 210. The Epiphonian date would make him 15 years earlier. The Anonymous gives us a clue to his date in the statement that whereas Maximilla had foretold wars and tumults, there had been more than 13 years since her death during which there had been neither general nor partial war, but the Christians had by God's mercy enjoyed continual peace. This then must have been written either before the wars of the reign of Severus had begun or after they had finished. Take the latest admissible date on the former hypothesis, and we get 192, and for the death of Maximilla 179. It is hardly likely that in so short a time all the original leaders of the movement would have died. Besides in the time of the Anonymous, Maximilla had had no successor; but in the time of Apollonius, a prominent figure was the prophetess, by whom it is natural to understand Maximilla. If so, she must have been a young woman when she first left her husband. It must be mentioned, however, that Epiphanius has got the name of one Quintilla, whom he does not know whether or not to identify with Priscilla, and who may possibly have come forward as a prophetess between 192 and 210.<sup>g</sup> If we place the Anonymous after the wars of Severus we can scarcely find an earlier date for him than 232, which certainly is later than the character of the extracts would have led us to suppose. Without pressing too much the precarious argument *ex silentio* we may at least observe that the phrase, "the new prophesying," is more appropriate 20 than 60 years after their beginning. We have to add that the Anonymous states that the occasion of his work was a request by the clergy of Ancyra in Galatia that he would leave them a written record of a *viva voce* confutation of Montanism he had made in that city.

Before the end of the 2nd century it would seem that Montanist teachers had made their way as far as Antioch; for Serapion, bishop of that city, wrote against them, copying the letter of Apollinarius already mentioned. It is through Serapion that Eusebius seems to have known this letter.

Early in the 3rd century the church had made converts enough from Montanists born in the

<sup>g</sup> Certainly the Montanists did not remain permanently without a prophetess, for Epiphanius tells us that in their church seven virgins used to come in, in white raiment, bearing torches, who used to prophesy to the people and move them to tears of repentance by their pathetic discourse. He adds that in this sect they had female priests and bishops, sex making no difference as to eligibility for sacred functions. This agrees with a story told by Firmilian in the letter cited above, of a prophetess, apparently a Montanist, who appeared in his own diocese and had led away many, and who presumed not merely to baptize but to consecrate the eucharist. Tertullian however always condemned any committal of sacerdotal functions to females, and his prophetess (*De Anima* 9) does not appear to have been allowed to tell her visions until the congregation had departed.

<sup>e</sup> If the late witness of Jerome may be trusted (*Ep. ad Marcellam* already quoted) the sect was governed by a patriarch at Pepuza; under him were officers called canones; only three came into the third place.

<sup>f</sup> The same vision, apparently, is referred to by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 24).

sect, for the question to arise, on what terms were converts to be received who had had no other than Montanist baptism? Matter and form were perfectly regular; for in all essential points of doctrine these sectaries agreed with the church. But it was decided, at a council held at Iconium, to recognise no baptism given outside the church. This we learn from the letter to Cyprian by Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, when the later controversy arose about heretical baptism. This council of Iconium, and one at which a similar decision was made at another Phrygian town, Synnada, are mentioned also by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. vii. 7). Firmilian speaks as if he had been present at the Iconium council, the date of which may be roughly set down as 230.

A more painful proof how entirely the Catholics ceased to regard the Montanists as Christian brethren is the fact stated by the Anonymous, that when persecution by the common enemy threw confessors from both bodies together, the orthodox persevered till their final martyrdom in refusing to hold intercourse with their Montanist fellow-sufferers; dreading to hold any friendship with the lying spirit who animated them. The Montanists acutely felt this treatment. In an extant fragment of her prophesying, Maximilla complains of being hunted like a wolf from the sheep: "slayers of prophets" was the reproach which they cast upon the ecclesiastical party. To this reproach the Anonymous answers that none of the so-called prophets had died a violent death, unless indeed they had killed themselves.<sup>h</sup> As for the martyrs whom they boasted among the obscurer members of their sect, that was no proof of the soundness of their faith. Marcionites and other heretics had their martyrs, and, as has been already said, the real martyrs refused to recognise the Montanist martyrs.

Epiphanius states that in his time the sect had many adherents in Phrygia, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Cilicia, and that there was a considerable number in Constantinople. That the spread of the sect was confined within comparatively narrow limits is proved by the story told by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 16), and repeated after him by several writers, that the sacrifice of an infant, and the partaking of his flesh, formed part of the Montanist mysteries.<sup>i</sup> The tale is only worth notice as shewing that in the places where it was circulated and believed the sect must have been practically non-existent.

III. *Montanism in the West.*—It has been already mentioned that, if we set aside the worthless Predestinatus, there is not a particle of evidence that any Roman bishop before Eleutherus had heard of Montanism, and the history of the interference of the Gallic confessors shews that it was then a new thing in the West. The case submitted to Eleutherus no

doubt informed him by letter of what had taken place in Phrygia; but there is no appearance that any Montanist teachers in person visited the West at this time, and after the judgment of Eleutherus had been given the whole transaction would seem to have been forgotten at Rome. It was in a subsequent episcopate that the first Montanist teacher, probably Proclus, appeared at Rome. There was no reason why he should be regarded with suspicion. He could easily satisfy the bishop of his perfect orthodoxy in doctrine: and there was no reason for disbelieving what he might tell of supernatural manifestations which had taken place in his own country. He was therefore either received into communion, or was on the point of being so, and of obtaining authority to report to his churches in Asia that their commendatory letters were recognised at Rome, when the arrival of another Asiatic, Praxeas, changed the scene. Praxeas was able to shew the Roman bishop that the Montanist pretensions to prophecy had been condemned by his predecessors, and probably the letter of Eleutherus on the subject could still be referred to in the Roman archives. The justice of this previous condemnation Praxeas was able to confirm by stories which he himself told of the Montanist churches and their prophesying; and his testimony had the more weight because, having suffered imprisonment for the faith, he enjoyed the dignity of a martyr. The Montanist teacher was accordingly put out of communion at Rome. This story, which has all the marks of probability, is told by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.*) who is likely to have had personal knowledge of the facts. The bishop could be no other than Zephyrinus; for we cannot go later: and as predecessors in the plural number are spoken of, these must have been Eleutherus and Victor. The conclusion at which we have arrived, that Montanism made no appearance in the West before the episcopate of Zephyrinus,<sup>k</sup> is one of great importance in the chronology of this controversy, and though, as far as we know, Dodwell is the only authority who has adopted it, the evidence for it seems to us decisive. Dodwell's reason is worth quoting, for it is quite independent of those which had led us to the same conclusion. He points out (*De Rom. Pont.* c. 16) that Pseudo-Tertullian names Praxeas last in his list of heretics, "Post hos omnes, etiam Praxeas." Now the heretics mentioned previously are Blastus and Theodotus the leather-cutter, both of whom had been condemned by Victor, and after these Theodotus the banker, a pupil of the former Theodotus, who must have been later. It is still later that Praxeas comes. Dodwell's inference from the use of the present tense that Praxeas was still teaching when Pseudo-Tertullian wrote, cannot be relied on, when notice is taken of the author's use of the same tense in speaking of former heresies. Since Dodwell's time what has been learned

<sup>h</sup> Bonwetsch has proved that it had been wrongly inferred from the context of this passage that the Phrygian Christians were then suffering from Jewish persecution. The Anonymous is only answering the Montanist argument that the continuance of prophecy in the Christian church had been predicted (*Matt.* xxiii. 34).

<sup>i</sup> This story is told both by Epiphanius and Philaster, but it is not credible that in this case Hippolytus was their common authority (see Lipsius, *Q. K. des Epiph.* 224).

<sup>k</sup> We have not been able to find in the writings of Irenaeus any decisive proof that he had come into practical contact with Montanism. The false prophets spoken of (*Iv.* xxxiii. 6) are much more like those of Hermas than of Montanus. That there was much false prophecy current besides Montanism may be gathered from what Celsus says (*Origen, Adv. Cels.* vii. 9), where there is nothing to connect what is told with Montanism.



from the newly recovered work of Hippolytus as to the state of feeling at Rome has led to the suspicion that in the assertion of Pseudo-Tertullian that Praxeas was confirmed in his heresy by Victorinus, the mistake, or the reverence, of some transcriber has substituted Victorinus for Zephyrinus.

The language in which Tertullian speaks of the interference of Praxeas is such as he would have scarcely used if writing under the episcopate of the same bishop, or even of his successor. The conclusion then we adopt leads to the corollary that the work against Praxeas was written after the death of Callistus in 222. But the present writer had already been led by other considerations to believe that the literary activity of Tertullian continued later than those who have made a chronology of his writings usually arrange.

The formal rejection of Montanism by the Roman church was followed by a public disputation between the Montanist teacher Proclus, and Caius, a leading Roman presbyter. Eusebius, who read the record of this disputation, tells us that it took place under Zephyrinus, and that Caius, in curbing the rashness and audacity of his opponents in framing new Scriptures, does not count the epistle to the Hebrews with the other thirteen as one of the Pauline epistles. We think it a mistake to infer from this that there was any controversy between the Catholics and the Montanists about the epistle to the Hebrews, but only that Eusebius, in reading the list of canonical books which Caius opposed to the Montanist innovations, was struck by the omission of that epistle. The Montanist preachers, whatever their failures, had one distinguished success in the acquisition of Tertullian. He may have been attracted by the foreign teachers before the Roman church had on this occasion pronounced against them. He would be at liberty to hold fast all the articles of the creed in which he had been brought up. The substance of the alleged new revelations was in perfect harmony with his feelings. The extravagances attending the first delivery of the new prophesying, which had caused the local church to reject it, were separated from Tertullian by too great a distance of time and place to have much influence in repelling him. Apparently the condemnation of the Roman bishop was not in his mind decisive against the Montanist claims; and so he engaged in an advocacy of them which resulted in his separation from the church. His writings are the great storehouse of information as to the peculiarities of Montanist teaching. Of these we proceed to give an account, only first mentioning that the Italian Montanists were soon divided by schism, arising out of the Patripassian controversy which raged violently at Rome at the beginning of the 3rd century. Among the Montanists, Aeschines was the head of those who took the Patripassian side, and in this it would appear from an extract in Didymus that he followed Montanus himself; Proclus and his followers adhered to the orthodox doctrine on this subject. That pseudo-Tertullian, who tells us this, derived his information from the earlier work of Hippolytus against heresies, is confirmed by the fact that Hippolytus in his later work refers to the same schism among the Montanists.

IV. *Montanism and the Canon.*—Before going into the details of Montanist teaching it is important to speak of the most fundamental point of difference, namely, that then first was put forward the theory of an authorised development of Christian doctrine, as opposed to the older theory that Christian doctrine was preached in its completeness by the apostles and that the church's only duty in the matter was faithfully to preserve the tradition of their teaching. The Montanists did not dream of rejecting the apostolic revelations, or of abandoning any of the doctrines which the church had learned from their older teachers. The revelations of the new prophecy were not to displace Scripture, but only to supplement it. The Montanists believed that while the fundamental truths of faith remained firm and unshaken, other points both of discipline and of doctrine might receive correction, as the grace of God continued to work and make progress even to the end. "Shall the devil daily devise new contrivances for evil, and can it be believed that the work of God should stand still and make no countervailing advance? The limitations of the human faculties did not permit that everything should be communicated at once. Christ had said, I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: when the Spirit of Truth is come He shall guide you into all truth and shall shew you things to come. There is, as Ecclesiastes said, a time for everything. First comes the seed, then the tender shoot, then the boughs and leaves, then the full-grown tree. Then comes the blossom, the bud, the flower, the fruit, the fruit itself requiring time to ripen it into sweetness. A like process of development was exhibited in the system of God's revelations. It had its rudimentary principle in the religion of nature, its infancy in the law and the prophets, its youth in the gospel, its full maturity only in the dispensation of the Paraclete. Through His enlightenment the dark places of Scripture are made clear, what had been spoken in parable is made plain, those passages of which heretics had taken advantage are cleared of all ambiguity" (*Tert. de Virg. Vel. i.; de Res. Carn.* 63). Accordingly Tertullian appeals to the new revelations not only on questions of discipline, such as that of second marriages, but also on questions of doctrine, as in his work against Praxeas, and in his treatise on the Resurrection of the Flesh. Some have thought it a thing to be regretted, that the church by her condemnation of Montanism should have pressed down under the weight of authority the freedom of individual prophesying. It must be remembered that each new prophetic revelation, if acknowledged as divine, would put as great a restraint on future individual speculation, as words of Scripture or decree of pope or council. If Montanism had triumphed, Christian doctrine would have been developed, not under the superintendence of the church teachers most esteemed for wisdom, but usually of wild and excitable women. Thus Tertullian himself derives his doctrine as to the materiality and the form of the soul from a revelation made to an ecstasica of his congregation (*De Anima* 9). In times subsequent to Montanism the reality of divine revelations made to individuals has been admitted, but it has been held that the truths

communicated were only made known for the private information of the recipients, and formed no part of the deposit of faith which the church was to guard. To the Montanists it seemed that if God's Spirit made known anything as true, that truth could not be too extensively published. It is evident from quotations in Epiphanius and Tertullian that the prophecies of Maximilla and Montanus were committed to writing.<sup>1</sup> To those who believed in their divine inspiration, these would practically form a real addition to the books of Scripture. Hippolytus tells that the Montanists "have an infinity of books of these prophets whose words they neither examine by reason, nor give heed to those who can, but are carried away by their indiscriminating faith in them, thinking that they learn through their means something more than from the law, the prophets, and the gospels." Didymus is shocked at a prophetic book emanating from a female, whom the Apostle permitted not to teach. There is evidently an oblique censure of the Montanistic additions to Scripture in the scruples expressed by the Eusebian Anonymous about committing his arguments to writing, lest he should seem to be making an addition to the New Testament of the gospel to which no one who is resolved to walk after that gospel can either add or take away. A similar jealousy of rivalry with the New Testament is shewn in Apollonius's censure of the presumption of Themisio who called his letter a catholic epistle. On weighing these passages it will be seen to be a mistake to suppose that the Montanistic disputes led to the formation of a New Testament canon. On the contrary, it is plain that when these disputes arose Christians had closed their New Testament canon in this sense that they were shocked at the idea that any modern writing should be put into rivalry or competition with the inspired books of the apostolic age. It was of course allowable, if any church's list of such books was defective or erroneous, to correct it by comparison with other churches. The Montanist disputes led to the publication of such lists, and we consider that it was in opposition to the multitude of Montanist prophetic books that Caius in his disputation gave a list of books recognised by his church. This controversy also made Christians more scrupulous about paying to other books honours like those given to the books of Scripture, and we believe that it was in consequence that the Shepherd of Hermas was deprived of the place in church reading which it had enjoyed. But still we think it plain from the history that the conception of a closed New Testament canon was a thing which Montanism found and did not create.

*V. Montanist Doctrines and Practices.*—Having sufficiently pointed out that the church had a quarrel with Montanism founded on its objection that any addition should be made to

<sup>1</sup> The Eusebian Anonymous quotes one prophecy of Maximilla as from τὸ κατὰ Ἰσπέριον Οὐρβανόν, an expression which has been found puzzling. I am inclined to conjecture that notes of this woman's prophesying had been published having the reporter's name inscribed after the fashion of the κατὰ Μάρκον of our gospels. [Since this was printed I find the same view taken by Bonwetsch.]

the teaching of Scripture, we have now to state, as far as it is known, what was the nature of the additions actually made by the Montanists.

(1.) *New Fasts.*—We have mentioned this as one of the things to which exception was taken by Apollonius. It is also given a prominent place by Hippolytus. It appears that the prophetesses had ordained that in addition to the ordinary annual paschal fast of the church two weeks of what was called Xerophagy should be observed.<sup>m</sup> In these the Montanists abstained, not only from flesh and wine and the use of the bath, but from all succulent food, as, for instance, from juicy fruit. On Saturday and Sunday, however, there was no abstinence. The weekly stations also, or half fasts, which in the church came to an end at three o'clock, were by the Montanists usually continued on till the evening. It is obvious that what the church party resisted was the imposition of these two new weeks of abstinence as divinely obligatory. In the church individuals were at liberty to add to the regular fasts according to their own devotion. Bishops, at their discretion, appointed additional days of fasting. It seems to have been a common way of making a charitable collection, for the bishop to appoint a fast, the money saved by abstinence being devoted to the pious object; and Tertullian gives us the interesting information that in Greece councils of bishops were preceded by fasting as well as prayer. Thus, then, though Tertullian successfully refutes some ill-judged objections which had been brought against the Montanist fasts, it is mere rhetoric of him to assume that those who repudiated them were actuated by gluttonous propensities; and to prove against them the advantages of fasting, which they did not deny. The real question was, had the prophetess who instituted them God's command for doing so? This particular revelation of theirs only came into prominence because at recurring intervals it put a marked difference between Montanists and Catholics, of the same kind as that which the paschal fast put between Christians and heathen.

(2.) *Second Marriages.*—On this subject again the point of difference between the Montanists and the church really reduces itself to the question whether or not the Paraclete spoke by Montanus. Second marriages had before Montanus been regarded with disfavour in the church.<sup>n</sup> Tertullian, for example, deprecates them with almost as much energy in his pre-Montanist work *Ad Uxorem* as he afterwards does in his Montanist *De Monogamia*. But in the church, however unfavourably such marriages were thought of, their validity and lawfulness was not denied. In fact, St. Paul had seemed

<sup>m</sup> Jerome states that one of these was after Whitsuntide (in Matt. ix.). Elsewhere (*Ep. ad Marcell.*) he says that there were three Lents in the year. Bingham (xxi. 15) supposes that these were of two weeks each; for Sozomen (vii. 9) tells that the Paschal fast of the later Montanists was only of two weeks, when elsewhere it was six or seven; and it seems likely that they preserved the ancient tradition of their sect.

<sup>n</sup> See Theoph. *ad Autol.* iii. 15; Irenaeus *lib.* 17, 2; Clem. *Strom.* iii. 12, p. 548; Hermas, *Man.* iv. 4. Athenagoras (*Legat.* 33) calls a second marriage a specious adultery; but this language taken in connection with his language on prophecy has made him suspected of Montanism [ATHENAGORAS].

expressly to declare that such marriages were not forbidden (Rom. vii. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 39), and, further, the direction in the pastoral epistles that a bishop should be husband of one wife seemed to leave the laity free from a restriction only imposed on the clergy. Tertullian tries to shew that Paul's permission of a second marriage only applied to the case when the first had been contracted before conversion and baptism. But, conscious of the weakness of that defence, he takes his stand on the principle that as Christ had abrogated that liberty of divorce which Moses had allowed for a time on account of the hardness of the hearts of his people, so an indulgence, which Paul had conceded because as yet Christians were not able to bear greater strictness, the Paraclete had withdrawn when Christian training had advanced and the end of the world approached more near. Clearly here controversy was at an end if the inspiration of the new prophets was acknowledged. With respect to the requirement of monogamy from clergy only, Tertullian answers that all Christians are priests; that in the absence of clergy they both baptized and offered the Eucharist, that they could not have priestly privileges without submitting to priestly restrictions, and that they ought not to disqualify themselves from, in case of necessity, performing priestly acts which were permissible to monogamists only. The argument that laity ought to be put under the same conditions with regard to marriage as the clergy, could not well have been used unless in the church at the time clergy, as well as laity, were allowed to marry once. But the Montanist prophetess Priscilla had a revelation (*De Exhor. Cust.* 10) which seems intended to teach that the ministrations of an unmarried clergy have higher efficacy.

(3.) *Church Discipline.*—The treatise of Tertullian (*De Pudicitia*) makes us acquainted with a controversy of Montanists with the church concerning the power of church officers to give absolution. The occasion was the publication, by one whom Tertullian sarcastically calls "Pontifex Maximus" and "Episcopus Episcoporum," of an edict of pardon to persons guilty of adultery and fornication on condition of their due performance of penance. We cannot doubt that a bishop of Rome is intended, and when we combine what Hippolytus tells (ix. 12) of Callistus being the first to introduce such laxity in granting absolution, it seems plain that he was the bishop referred to. Tertullian holds that for such sin absolution ought never to be given. Not that the sinner was taught to despair of obtaining God's pardon by repentance; but it was for God alone to pardon; man might not. Tertullian's argument assumes that in the Roman church of the time idolatry and murder were thus treated as irremissible offences, and he contends that a sin into which a man ran from the mere allurements of pleasure deserved to be treated with less indulgence than the sin of apostasy into which he might have been forced by torture. But we own that we find it hard to reconcile this sternness of discipline with what other authorities have told us of the practice of the church at the time. It is possible that the edict of Callistus may have contained a reference to the power of the keys given to Peter. At all events Tertullian discusses the texts which speak

of that power, and contends that they only conferred a personal prerogative on Peter, and gave no powers to the church. If an apostle forgave sin it was in the exercise of no ordinary functions, but of miraculous power: let the bishop exhibit like miracles, and then he might claim the same rights. Tertullian will not deny that the church has the power to forgive sins. The Paraclete had said by the new prophets, "The church has the power of forgiving sins, but I will not do it lest they should sin more." The church then might forgive; but it must be the church of the Spirit, speaking by a spiritual man; not a number of bishops. In other words, it was not in the official power of any to confer forgiveness; though God might supernaturally make known by an apostle or prophet that forgiveness which He alone could grant. This doctrine might easily have transferred to the new prophets the power which it denied to the church officers; but this result did not follow, and Jerome describes the characteristic of the sect "ad omne pene delictum obserant fores ecclesiae."

We refer to the article TERTULLIAN for other doctrines which, though advocated by Tertullian in the days of his Montanism, we do not feel ourselves entitled to set down as Montanistic, in the absence of evidence that Tertullian had learned them from Montanus, or that they were held by Eastern Montanists. The bulk of what Tertullian taught as a Montanist he probably would equally have taught if Montanus had never lived; but owing to the place which Montanism ascribed to visions and revelations as means of obtaining a knowledge of the truth, his belief in his opinions was converted into assurance when they were echoed back to him by prophetesses who in their visions gave utterance to opinions which they had imbibed from their master in their waking hours. Thus he supports his doctrine concerning the veiling of virgins by a revelation determining the space over which the veil was to extend; but we have no evidence that this doctrine came from Montanus. He quotes apparently from Montanus a saying in praise of martyrdom to the effect that it is far better to depart from this world as a martyr than in childbirth or by fever; but what is told of Themiso may lead us to suspect that Tertullian held stronger opinions than Eastern Montanists as to the duty of not shrinking from, or even of courting, martyrdom.

Again, there are other doctrines and practices on which we do not enlarge because we do not think they can be described as distinctively Montanistic. For example, an influential factor in Montanism was the expectation that our Lord's second coming would speedily take place. We have already told how Maximilla declared that she was the last prophetess, and that after her the end would come. In this belief it seemed to Montanists natural that greater restrictions should be imposed on marriage, as the approaching end of the world deprived the command "increase and I multiply" of its significance, and made offspring even undesirable. Other Montanist opinions may be traced to the same root. But belief that the end is near is no peculiarity of Montanism. It was held by Tertullian's contemporary Judas (*Euseb. vi. 7*), whom we have no reason to regard as a Montanist, and it has been held in successive generations down to our own time.

VI. *Later History of Montanism.*—The refusal to admit an Asiatic Montanist to communion at Rome would not, as a necessary consequence, impose immediate silence on those who thought more favourably of the new prophesying; and we gather from Tertullian's language (*Adv. Prax.*) that it was only after an interval that his persistent advocacy of Montanism drew excommunication on himself.<sup>o</sup> It is to this interval we refer the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas, in the editor of which we are not indisposed to recognise Tertullian himself. Both martyrs and martyrologist have clearly been under Montanist influences: great importance is attached to visions and revelations, and in the introduction the editor justifies the composition of new Acts, intended for church reading, on the grounds that the "last days" in which he lived, had witnessed, as had been prophesied, new visions, new prophecies, new exhibitions of the mighty working of God's Spirit, as great or greater than had been witnessed in any preceding age. Yet the martyrs are evidently in full communion with the church; they receive the good offices of its deacons, and the bishop Optatus has an honourable place in their visions. Even at the time of Tertullian's Montanist tract *De Virginitus Velandis* there seems to have been no breach of communion, for what is there told of the violent removal of the veils of certain virgins suggests that, though Tertullian's disciples, they attended the worship of the church and received this treatment at the hands of its officers. That no formal breach had as yet taken place is also proved by a sentence in the same treatise ending "una ecclesia sumus." It is true that this passage does not, as some have quoted it, formally assert Montanists and Catholics to be one church: the writer is speaking of African and Eastern Christians; but it clearly assumes that he and his Catholic readers all belong to the same church; and the argument is all the stronger because the thing is not asserted but taken for granted. The schism which soon afterwards took place, appears to have been of little importance either in numbers or duration. We hear nothing of Montanists in the writings of Cyprian, whose veneration for Tertullian would scarcely have been so great as is reported, if his church were still suffering from a schism which Tertullian had originated. In the next century Optatus (i. 9) speaks of Montanism as an extinct heresy, which it were slaying the slain to refute. Yet some, who called themselves after Tertullian, lingered on into the 4th century. Augustine tells (*Ilaer.* 86) that when he had been at Carthage he heard that a well-known church had formerly belonged to the Tertullianists and had been surrendered by them to the Catholics at the time when at length the last of them returned to the church. Augustine has evidently heard no tradition as to their tenets, and sets himself to search in Tertullian's writings for heresies which they presumably may have held.

<sup>o</sup> The case is the same as that of an Anglican clergyman believing in the inspiration of Swedenborg, a belief not in itself necessitating separation from his Church, but likely to lead to it. We consider that the ordinary division of Tertullian's writings into pre-Montanist and Montanist is insufficient unless the latter be subdivided into Catholic and schismatic.

Predestinatus also has a story about Tertullianists which perhaps may be true. Elsewhere in the West Montanism entirely disappears. Pacian supposes himself to have found an adherent of the sect, and without much knowledge of the controversy tries to convert him, but he turns out to be a Novatianist.

Turning to the East, we have already mentioned the councils of Iconium and of Synnada. There is a mention of Montanism in the Acts of Achatius [see ACACIUS (1)] (Ruinart, p. 152). Though these Acts are wanting in external attestation, internal evidence is strongly in favour of their authenticity. The place where the scene is laid is uncertain; the time is the Decian persecution of A.D. 250. And the magistrate, urging Achatius to sacrifice, presses him with the example of the Cataphrygians, "homines antiquæ religionis," who had already conformed. Sozomen (ii. 32) ascribes the extinction of the Montanists, as well as of other heretical sects, to the edict of Constantine depriving them of their places of worship and forbidding their religious meetings. Up to that time, being confounded by the heathen rulers with other Christians, they were able to meet for worship, and, even when few in number, still to keep together; but the effect of Constantine's edict was to kill all the weaker sects, and among them the Montanists, everywhere except in Phrygia and the neighbouring districts, where they continued to be numerous in Sozomen's own time. He tells (vii. 18) that, unlike Scythia, where one bishop ruled over the whole province, among these Phrygian heretics every village had its bishop. He tells that they were singular in the time of their celebration of Easter, determining it by the solar, not the lunar year; and also, as has been already mentioned, that they were singular as to the length of the preliminary fast. The question as to the validity of Montanist baptism came under consideration again at the council of Laodicea, where the decision of Iconium was confirmed that these heretics must be rebaptized.<sup>p</sup> St. Basil also, in his canonical epistle (188), rejects the Montanist baptism, but expresses his surprise that it had formerly been accepted by Dionysius of Alexandria. The rejection of their baptism was endorsed by the council of Constantinople in 381. The laws against heretics in Tit. xvi. of the Theodosian Code contain several mentions of Montanists, who are generally classed with Manicheans, Priscillianists, and other heretics of the worst kind. Penal laws were passed of continually increasing stringency. Their churches were confiscated; a rigorous search ordered for the destruction of their books; the ordination of their clergy forbidden; the power of making wills taken from them; their slaves given the right to leave them; their nearest Catholic relative given a right to claim their property. At last the orthodox zeal of Justinian took such measures for the crushing out the remains of the sect in Phrygia, that these heretics in despair gathered themselves with wives and children into their places of worship, set them on fire, and there perished (Procop. *Hist. Arc.* 11).

<sup>p</sup> The condemnation of these heretics at Laodicea was proclaimed in a late inscription, still extant, on the great church at Bethlehem (Boeckh, p. 8953).

In connection with this may be taken what is told of John of Ephesus in the same reign of Justinian (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii. 88), that in the year 550 he had the bones dug up and buried of Montanus and of his prophetesses Carata, Prisca, and Maximilla. What may be disguised under the first of these three names we cannot tell.

It is hardly likely that Montanism survived the persecution of Justinian. Gibbon indeed (c. 47) speaks of it as in existence three centuries later, but I do not know to what he refers. Two centuries later indeed, in the reign of Leo the Isaurian, Theophanes (p. 617 ed. Bonn), copied by Cedrenus, represents them as burning themselves in their churches with wives and children in order to avoid being baptized. Baronius (*Ann.* 722, n. 1) suggests that as the Montanists did not object to baptism some other sect must be intended. But the identity of the story in other respects with that told by Procopius is so complete, that we are more inclined to think that Theophanes by a blunder misdated the occurrence.

Besides the name Cataphrygians they were often called from their headquarters, Pepuzans, which indeed Epiphanius counts as a distinct heresy. Other names, Artotyrites, Tascodrugites, Passalorynchites, are given by Epiphanius to branches of the Montanists, but are supposed by Philaster to belong to distinct heretical sects in Galatia. We do not think there is any sufficient reason for connecting them with Montanism. With respect to the first in particular, we do not think that the passage commonly quoted from the Acts of Perpetua affords any good reason for thinking that the Montanists made a Eucharistic use of cheese. The martyrs in question were not schismatics, and could have had no other Eucharist than that of the church.

In the course of this article the primary authorities for the history of Montanism have been referred to. Space does not permit a discussion of the modern literature of the subject. An account of it will be found in the latest and best monograph on Montanism, by Bonwetsch, Erlangen, 1881. This work did not come to England until this article had been for some time in type; but fortunately was in time to permit some use to be made of it in the final revision for press. [G. S.]

**MONTANUS (2).** Fell for Manthaneus, *q. v.* (*Cyp. Ep.* 57.) [E. W. B.]

**MONTANUS (3),** bishop of Toledo from about 523 to about 531.

*Authorities.*—(1) The life of him by Ildefonsus (*De Vir.* iii. cap. 3). (2) Two letters first printed by Loaysa (*Conc. Hisp.* p. 88.), afterwards by Aguirre (*Coll. Max. Conc. Hisp.* ii. 159), and Florez (*Esp. Sajr.* v. 409, 415). (3) The Acts of the Second Council of Toledo (Tejada y Ramiro, *Coll. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 701).

*His Life.*—The facts related by Ildefonsus are extremely meagre. We are told that Montanus was the successor of Celsus in the "prima sedes" of the province of Carthaginensis; that he defected and maintained his office; that he wrote two letters on points of church discipline, one addressed to the inhabitants of Palencia, the other to a certain Turibius, a "religious;" and that he was at one time enabled to rebut a scandalous

accusation made against him by the help of a miracle wrought in his favour. The second council of Toledo is not mentioned by Ildefonsus, who however never mentions one of the Toledan councils throughout his lives, so that no argument can be drawn from the omission against the genuineness of the Acts. These Acts are curious and important, and have been at times suspected of at least containing interpolations, if not of being altogether spurious. They appear, however, in all the MSS. of the *Hispana*, both of the earlier and later type (*Maanen, Literatur des Canonischen Rechts*), and though no doubt they contain expressions very convenient to the ambition of the church by whose officials the compilation of the Spanish *Codex Canonum* was superintended, this is no sufficient reason in itself for doubting their genuineness. The council, which really consisted of no more than five bishops whose sees are not given, although three other bishops not belonging to Carthaginensis were subsequently induced to sign and approve the acts, was opened on May 17 in the fifth year of Amalaric (A. D. 527) according to the reckoning generally adopted since Florez' day, 531 according to the older reckoning. The bishops began by expressing their intention of adding to the *Codex Canonum* certain provisions not already contained in the ancient canons on the one hand, and of reviving such prescriptions as had fallen into disuse on the other. They then drew up five canons: (1) laying down the general outlines of clerical education from the first session of a child to the church by its parents, and adopting substantially the same rule with regard to the youths dedicated to the church who should at the age of eighteen publicly declare their wish to marry, as was adopted about thirty-five years later by Martin bishop of Braga in his *Capitula* (MARTINUS (2)); (2) forbidding those educated by one church to migrate to another; (3) forbidding clerks to live with any woman unless it be a mother or sister or some other near relation; (4) regulating the disposition by testament of any agricultural works or improvements made by a clerk upon church lands; (5) forbidding unlawful and incestuous marriages. The material of these canons is material common to most of the various Spanish councils held in the first half of the 6th century. It is the concluding passage of the Acts which makes the council of special interest in Spanish ecclesiastical history. "According to the decrees of ancient canons, we declare that, God willing, the council shall be held in future 'apud' our brother, the bishop Montanus, so that it will be the duty of our brother and co-bishop Montanus, who is in the metropolis, to forward to our co-principals, bishops of the Lord, letters convening the synod when the proper time shall arrive." An expression of thanks "to the glorious king Amalaric," with regard to whom the bishops pray that "throughout the unnumbered years of his reign he may continue to afford us the licence of carrying through all that pertains to the cultus fidei," concludes the Acts.

In the words which we have underlined above is contained the first mention of Toledo as the ecclesiastical metropolis of Carthaginensis, the first indication of that commanding position to which the see was to attain under its seventh-

century bishops. The question of the rise of the see of Toledo is one which no student of the Visigothic church can afford to neglect, and a knowledge of the history of the see in the 5th and 6th centuries is necessary to the understanding of the full and interesting materials remaining to us for its history in the 7th (see arts. JULIANUS (63) and ILDEFONSUS). We propose therefore in this place to sketch the very meagre and often contradictory evidence which remains to us on this point.

It is tolerably evident from the circumstances of the council of 527, from the small number of bishops present, and from the emphasis with which the claim of Montanus is asserted, both in the passage quoted, and in two extant letters of his, that at the time it was held there was no general recognition of Toledo as the metropolis of the province on the part of the other sees of Carthaginensis. Other contemporary facts to be noticed presently point in the same direction. Looking back over the 5th century, we find Merida, Tarraco, and probably Braga (though with regard to Braga there are complications) enjoying undisputed metropolitan precedence, and the metropolitan dignity of Seville may be inferred from the fact of the superadded dignity of the papal vicariate conferred by pope Hormisdas upon bishop Zeno (A.D. 480). But there is no mention throughout this century of any metropolis of Carthaginensis, nor are there any facts from which we can infer the existence of a metropolitan see generally recognised throughout the province. Cartagena, the civil metropolis of Roman times, where we should naturally look for a metropolitan bishop, was destroyed by the Vandals in 425, and we have no mention of the see at all until in 516, eleven years before the second council of Toledo. We find a bishop Hector signing the Acts of a council held at Tarraco in that year as Hector in Christi nomine episcopus Carthaginensis metropolitans or Carthaginis metropolis. On the other hand, at the important first council of Toledo in 400, at which the bishop of Toledo, Asturius, was present, Patruinus of Merida presided, and Asturius appears twelfth in the list of bishops. The bishop Hilarius, of unknown see, who reported proceedings of this council to Innocent I., may have been metropolitan of Carthaginensis as Gams supposes, or metropolitan of Tarraconensis as Florez supposes. There is no proof possible of either theory, although that of Gams offers on the whole a better explanation of the facts than that of Florez. But if he was metropolitan of Carthaginensis, in what see lay the metropolis?

We are thus brought up against, first, the signature of Hector at Tarraco, which has been disputed, but which is supported by strong MS. authority (Tejada y Ramiro, *l. c.* p. 115); and secondly, the attempt of Montanus and his five bishops in 527 to assert the metropolitan supremacy of Toledo. The two letters which remain to us from Montanus's hand also assert this claim in strong language, as will be seen presently. Meanwhile, for the understanding of the general question, it will be well to look beyond Montanus. In the year 546 a council was held at Valencia, at which a certain Celsinus presided, Justinian, bishop of Valencia at the time, signing the Acts in the second place. The natural conclusion is that Celsinus presided as

metropolitan. There is no indication of see, but neither is there any valid reason for connecting Celsinus with Toledo. In the ancient episcopal catalogue of Toledo followed by Florez, three names intervene between Montanus and Euphemius, who was bishop at the Toledan Council of 589, and that of Celsinus is not among them. It is on the whole most probable that he was the successor of Hector in the see of Cartagena, and that in presiding over the council of Valencia he was claiming those metropolitan rights over the eastern half of the province which Montanus had been able to assert over the western half in 527. Twenty-three years later, at the great conversion council of 589, Masona of Merida presided as the senior metropolitan, and Euphemius of Toledo signed the Acts among the metropolitans certainly, but as metropolitan, not of Carthaginensis, but of *Carpetania*, the regio which constituted the south-western half of that province. In 610, the *Decretum Gundemari*, drawn up at a time when Cartagena was in the hands of the Eastern Empire and could therefore no longer effectively dispute with Toledo the ecclesiastical supremacy of Carthaginensis, described the signature of Euphemius as a *sententia ignorantiae*, denounced the "double government of two metropolitans in the same province," and by its lofty assertion of the claims of Toledo paved the way to the primacy canon of seventy years later.

The meaning of these facts appears to be that the question of metropolitan supremacy within Carthaginensis, was throughout the 5th and 6th centuries an unsettled and disputed point. Cartagena had civil importance, and analogy with other cases on its side. On the other hand, the central position and magnificent site of Toledo were natural advantages, sure in the long run to prevail in the new order of things which followed upon the break-up of the empire. The withdrawal of the West-Gothic power at the end of the 5th century within the limits of Narbonensis and the Spanish peninsula helped to exalt Toledo, which as a military position was sure to attract the West-Gothic kings, and did in fact under Leovigild become the West-Gothic capital. Montanus lived under Amalaric, the first sovereign of what Dahn calls the kingdom of Toledo in opposition to the kingdom of Toulouse. All the facts concerning this bishop of which we have any knowledge fall within the early years of this king, and are connected with the policy of those years, a policy of conciliation towards Catholicism, symbolised by the king's marriage with the Frankish princess Chrotildis. It follows from some expressions in one of Montanus's letters that he had personal knowledge of the king, and that in matters of church discipline he could calculate upon his support at the time when the letter was written. Relying upon this support, upon the physical advantages of Toledo, and upon an ecclesiastical tradition capable of various interpretations, Montanus made his attempt permanently to exalt the power and position of his see. The time, however, was not yet come, and in the stormy and disastrous reign which followed such an ambition could not easily fulfil itself. The question remained an open one, and was still open in 589. But the great reign of Leovigild, which had consolidated the Gothic power and fixed the seat of that power in

Toledo, practically settled a long-vexed question. Cartagena was in the hands of Byzantium, whereas the bishop of Toledo was the bishop of the urbs regia. It took some time to accomplish, but the *Decretum Gundemari* as a first step, and the Primacy Canon of the twelfth council of Toledo as a second, were the inevitable ecclesiastical complements of physical and political facts.

*The Letters of Montanus.*—Letter I. is addressed to the people, especially to the presbyters, of Palencia, with whom it remonstrates on two points: (1) the consecration of the chrism by the presbyter instead of by the bishop, an uncanonical abuse which he strongly rebukes, and with regard to which he lays down that during the vacancy of the see and until a new bishop is appointed, “dum vobis praeperatur Antistes,” the presbyters are to apply to himself for the holy oil; (2) the illegality of inviting bishops of other dioceses and belonging to another kingdom (*alienae sortis*, i.e. the Suevian kingdom of Galicia) to consecrate bishops instead of applying to him, Montanus, as their metropolitan. Letter II. is addressed to a certain Turibius, a pious man (*religiosus*) according to Ildefonsus, probably the holder of high civil office, but at any rate not a bishop as Dahn concludes (*Könige der Germanen*, vi.). It protests against the same evils, and requests Turibius to use the “authority of the severest bishop,” if necessary, in repressing them, threatening him with the anger of the king, “dominus rerum,” whose *pietas* Montanus praises, and with the interference of the judge Erga if he refuse to do so. This second letter is possibly imperfect, and contains a curious passage which has been variously interpreted (Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 450). As far as the history of the Toledan see is concerned, we find in Letter I.: “Cum Toletanae urbi Metropolitaniani privilegium vetus consuetudo tradiderit, et eo magis non solum parochiarum, sed et urbium cura sollicitet sacerdotem;” while in Letter II., as the text stands at present, Montanus appears to protest against the invitation of alien bishops (i.e. bishops from the Suevian side of the boundary, between Galicia and Carthaginensis), for the purpose of consecrating churches, on the ground of a “privilegium” granted by “vester episcopus” to his predecessor in the Toledan see, and to the bishops of Carpetania and Celtiberia. Does this mean that Palencia, during the confusion of the 5th century, had attached itself to her neighbour Astorga in ecclesiastical matters, and that at the beginning of the 6th century the bishop of Palencia was induced, in consideration of certain territorial additions to his see (conf. the last obscure paragraph of Montanus’s letter as given in Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* v. 416), to give in his adhesion formally to Carthaginensis, and to Toledo as his metropolis? This is on the whole the most obvious explanation of an obscure and difficult document. (Ferrerias, ed. d’Hermilly, ii. 133-140; Aguirre, *Coll. Mar. Conc. Hisp.* ii. 152, 159; on the growth of the Toledan see, p. 160; Tejada y Ramiro, *l. c.* p. 465; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Eccl.* xvi. 693; Hefele, *Conc. Gesch.* ii. 700; *Esp. Sagr.* v. 131, cap. iii. *Qual fue la Metropoli Ecclesiastica de la Provincia Carthaginense*; Gams, *l. c.* ii. (2) 210, cap. 12.)

[M. A. W.]

**MONTENSES**, a name given to the Donatist community formed at Rome A.D. 358, from the place, perhaps on the Esquiline hill, at which they met for worship. They are also called Campenses or Campitae, for which some MSS. read Cuzupitae. Seven bishops are known to have presided over this little community, who sought to arrogate to themselves the name of the church in Rome, viz. Victor of Garba, Bonifacius of Ballita, Encolpius, Macrobius, Lucianus, Claudianus, Felix. Of these the first two evidently had come from Africa. (*Opt.* ii. 4; *Aug. Ep.* 53. 2; *Haeres.* 69; *Hieron. Chron.* vol. viii. p. 687; *adv. Lucif.* 28, vol. ii. p. 182, ed. Migne; *Mon. Vet. Don. Carth. Coll.* i. 157; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. p. 222.) [H. W. P.]

**MONTIUS**, a layman whose affection, hospitality, and kindly consideration towards him are mentioned very gratefully by Chrysostom. (*Chrysost. Ep.* 171.) [E. V.]

**MORAIND**, bishop of Nendrum, now Mahee Island, in Strangford Lough, co. Down, died A.D. 680 (*Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 673, Cod. Bodl.; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 149; Cotton, *Fast.* iii. 218). A Moraïnd was bishop of Clogher, but probably towards the end of the 9th century (Cotton, *ib.* iii. 72.) [J. G.]

**MORAN (MARUAN), ST.**, an Irish devotee, who came over with St. Breaca. Lamorran in Cornwall is dedicated to him (Whitaker’s *Cornwall*, i. 338). The place is called Lanmoren in 1190. [C. W. B.]

**MORE (MORA)**, an abbat who is recorded, in the Northumbrian annals preserved by Simeon of Durham, to have been killed by his prefect or reeve, by a mournful death, in the year 799 (*Sim. Dun. M. H. B.* 671; *Ann. Mailros*, ad ann.; *Hoveden.* i. 17). The name of the slayer seems to have been Tilthegn, but is written Athilhegno, Altilhegno, and Athiltegno in various MSS. Much research has been spent in vain in attempts to identify More with an Irish Mor, or a foreign Maurus; but no solution of the question seems attainable. [S.]

**MORGAN (I) (MORCANT)**, surnamed Mwynfawr, son of Athrwy, Arthruis, or Adras ap Meurig ap Tewdrig, succeeded Gwynlliw as regulus of Glewysig, and his father Athrwy as supreme ruler of Glamorgan; the latter must have taken place soon after his grandfather’s death, A.D. 575 (Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 354, 539, 655). He was much beloved as a ruler, just, humane, and pious, yet a story is told in *Lb. Land.* (143 sq. 395 sq.) of his having slain his uncle Ffrioc in despite of his oath of peace: he was excommunicated according to the terms of the oath, but restored by bishop Oudoceus and the second synod of Llandaff on his doing penance and specially granting regal exemption to the three congregations of Cadoc, Illtyd, and Docunni. He was otherwise liberal to the see of Llandaff (*ib.* pass.). He is said to have lived at Margam, where he erected a bishopric, which was afterwards united to Llandaff. In a list of bishops of Margam left by Iolo Morganawg (*Iolo MSS.* 361 n.) the first is “Morgan, the son of Adras, bishop and king” (Rees, *Camb. Brit. SS.* 625 n.). His death could not have been much



before the end of the 6th century. (Cressy, *Ch. H. Brit.* xii. c. 9; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc. i.* 125; Wilkins, *Conc. i.* 17.) [J. G.]

MORGAN (2), said in British tradition to be PELAGIUS the heretic, the latter name being a Greek form of the British Morgan and Latin Marigena, sea-born. (Ussher, *Wks.* v. 354.) [J. G.]

MORNANUS, bishop among the Scots, at Iona about the sixth century (Spotswood, *H. C. Scot.* 11, 3rd ed.), but doubtful. [J. G.]

MOROC, -OCUS, -OKE, bishop and confessor in Scotland, patron of Lecropt, Stirlingshire, his place of burial, as MAWORROCK, and said by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 185) to have been abbat at Dunkeld; he is perhaps also found at Kilmorick near Dunkeld, and Kilmorack in Inverness-shire (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 414 et al.: *Brev. Aberd.* Prop. SS. p. estiv. f. 147, merely saying in the rubric that he was "Ep. et conf. in düblänesi dyocesi"). His feast is Nov. 8 or 9, and King (*Käl.*) gives A.D. 817 as his date (Bp. Forbes, *Ib.* 167). [J. G.]

MORWAL, bishop of Menevia, but not authenticated. (Godwin, *De Pres. Angl.* 601; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 154.) [J. G.]

MORWENNA, ST., a daughter of Brychan, the saint of Morwenstow on the north-east angle of Cornwall, a district that became English at a comparatively early time (Whitaker, *Cornwall*, ii. 96, 97). William of Worcester (104) says, "Sancta Norwinna virgo jacet in ecclesia quae stat per 11 miliaria de Seynt Nichtons." [C. W. B.]

MORWETHA, ST., the saint of Morvah on the Cornish coast north of Penzance. It was a daughter church to Madron. [C. W. B.]

MOSES, MYSTERIES or ASCENSION OF; an apocryphal book quoted in Evodius, writing to Augustine, but as of no authority (*Epp.* clviii.; Ceill. i. 38-40). [G. T. S.]

MOSES (1), first bishop of the Saracens, cir. 375 (Tillem. x. 454). He was of Saracen birth and an eminent solitary when chosen for the episcopate. Theodoret describes the locality of his abode as the desert between Egypt and Palestine. Mavia the queen of the Saracens offered the Roman generals peace on condition of their bringing Moses to be a bishop over her people. He was accordingly carried by the troops to Alexandria for consecration, but on his refusal to receive the rite from the persecuting archbishop Lucius, he was taken by his friends to the mountains, and there ordained by the exiled bishops. This event terminated the Saracen war. (Soc. iv. 36; Soz. vi. 38; Theod. iv. 22 al. 23; Le Quien, ii. 85; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* xi. 46; Tillem. vi. 591, vii. 593; Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Feb. ii. 43.) [C. H.]

MOSES (2), a bishop to whom Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus, A.D. 404, exhorting him to keep aloof from the party of Arsacius. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 90.) [E. V.]

MOSES (3) (MOYSES), Roman presbyter and confessor (? of Jewish origin). He was a leading

member of an influential group of confessors in the time of Cyprian, about the commencement of the Novatianist schism. The others were MAXIMUS, a presbyter, NICOSTRATUS (Cyp. *Ep.* 31 tit.), and RUFINUS, deacons, URBANUS (Ep. 49, 51), SIDONIUS, MACARIUS, and CELERINUS (q. v.). As Cyprian says (*Ep.* 28) that they were the first confessors in the Decian persecution, they must have been imprisoned at the time when FABIAN was martyred (Jan. 20, A.D. 250). (But Liberian Cat. has "post passionem ejus.") They wrote early in the persecution, urging the claims of discipline on the Carthaginian confessors (*Ep.* 27) (cf. Tillemont, t. iii. Notes s. Moyses, t. iv., S. Cyp. a. xv., Lipsius *Chr. d. röm. Bisch.* p. 200), and Moyses signed the second letter of the Roman clerus (viz. *Ep.* 30), which was drawn up by Novatian, according to Cyprian (*Ep.* 55, iv.), and he wrote with the other confessors *Ep.* 31 to Cyprian (*Ep.* 32). When they had continued a year in prison (*Ep.* 37), or more accurately eleven months and as many days (Liberian catalogue, Mommsen, *Chronogr.* v. Jahre 354, p. 635), i.e. on about Jan. 1, 251 A.D., Moyses died and was accounted a confessor and martyr (*Ep.* 55).

Shortly before his death he refused to communicate with Novatian and the five presbyters who sided with him (*ἀποσχίσαντες*) because he saw the tendency of his stern dogma (Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch. Eus. vi. 43, *καριδών*). Lipsius (*Chr. d. röm. Bisch.* p. 202 n.) contends that this separation was from Novatus, not from Novatian, on account of the mention of "the five presbyters" so notorious in Carthage: that Eusebius does not distinguish the two: and that in the extracts from Cornelius no name is given, so that we must judge from the context. But the number "five" would at best be a shadowy reason, and is the only one; whilst in fact of the five Carthaginian presbyters Novatus was himself one. So that *τοῖς ἅμα αὐτῷ ἔννε* does not describe Novatus at all: he had four presbyters on his side, and Novatian had five.

Moyses' severance from him was not because Novatian had already left the Catholics, for he did not take that step till June 4, after the election of Cornelius; and Novatus, who induced it, did not leave Carthage for Rome until April or May (Rettberg, p. 109), whereas, from understanding Cornelius to mean that Moses disowned Novatian on account of his secession, even Pearson has been led to place the separation and Novatus' journey earlier than January, to the confusion of chronology and contradiction of the Liberian catalogue on which he relies; yet which states distinctly that all this happened after Moses' death (Pearson an. Cyp. A.D. 251 i. and Vales. ad Eus. l.c.). Moyses' great authority remained a strong point in Cornelius's favour, when the rest of the confessors (*Ep.* 51) after their release threw their great influence on the side of Novatian as the representative of the stricter discipline against Cornelius. Hence even in a record so brief as the Liberian catalogue it is said that Novatus separated Novatian and certain confessors from the church *postquam Moyses in carcere defunctus est*. Cyprian, after a correspondence noble in courtesy and Christian love on both sides, reconciles the whole body to Cornelius (list of *Epp.* v. MAXIMUS) except Nicostratus, whose name disappears from the letters,

and whom we find (*Ep.* 50) labouring for the Novatianist cause in Carthage. The party was numerous (*Ep.* 49). Letters, of which they afterwards repudiated the authorship, were circulated in their name in favour of Novatian among foreign churches. They received from Dionysius of Alexandria the remonstrance which is preserved (*Euseb.* vi. 45). The headship of the party belonged after Moyses' death to MAXIMUS (3), and as delegates from him Urbanus and Sidonius approached Cornelius. [E. W. B.]

MOSES (4), a presbyter of influence who wrote to Chrysostom extolling him in unmeasured terms. Chrysostom replied to him that prayers, not praises, were the most needed at that juncture. (*Chrysost.* *Ep.* 92.) [E. V.]

MOSES (5), of Khoren (MOSES KHORENENSIS)—called by his countrymen the Father of History—the Poet, and the Grammarian, was the most celebrated writer of Armenia. He was the nephew and disciple of St. Mesrob, the founder of Armenian literature (MESROBES). He was born at Khoren or Khorni, a town of the province of Daron. He was one of a band of scholars sent by Mesrob to study at Edessa, Constantinople, Alexandria, Athens, and Rome. There he accumulated very wide historical knowledge (cf. *Hist. Armen.* iii. 61, 62). Upon his return to Armenia he assisted St. Mesrob in the translation of the Bible into his native language, a work which was accomplished between A.D. 407 and 433. This fixes the date of his birth in the early part of cent. v.; though some place it in the latter part of cent. iv. Beyond his literary activity we do not know much about his life. He succeeded Ezniq [EZNIQ] as bishop of Pakrevant, where he displayed great spiritual activity. According to the mediaeval Armenian chronicler, Samuel of Ani, he died in the year 483, aged one hundred and twenty. This extended age may only have been attributed to him because the Jewish patriarch of the same name attained to those years. The following works of his are still extant: (1) *History of Armenia*, (2) *Treatise on Rhetoric*, (3) *Treatise on Geography*, (4) *Letter on Assumption of B. V. M.*, (5) *Homily on Christ's Transfiguration*, (6) *Oration on Hripsinia, an Armenian Virgin and Martyr*, (7) *Hymns used in Armenian Church Worship*. He wrote also two works now lost, viz., *Commentaries on the Armenian Grammarians*, of which fragments are found in John Erzengatz, an Armenian writer of cent. xiii., and *Explanations of Armenian Church Offices*, of which some fragments alone have survived in Thomas Ardzrouni, a writer of cent. vii. The *History of Armenia* is his most important work; in some respects indeed it is one of the most important historical works of antiquity. Thus it embodies almost the only remains of pre-Christian Armenian literature we now possess, and preserves for us many of the songs and traditions retained at that time in popular memory. As such it has been made of late years the subject of special studies by Dulaurier in the *Journ. Asiatique* for Jan. 1852, in an article with the title "Études sur les Chants Historiques et les Traditions populaires de l'ancienne Arménie," with which may be compared another article on the same topic by Dulaurier, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1852,

t. xiv. p. 224; and also by J. B. Emin, in an Armenian treatise published at Moscow in 1850. It is also very valuable because of the extensive remains of Assyrian, Chaldean, Syrian, and Greek writers it embodies, which throw interesting light on the numerous discoveries of modern times. Moses had studied long at Edessa, where the library was very rich in ancient Assyrian chroniclers. Thus he quotes largely from writers like Mar-Abbas-Catina [MAR-ABBAS-CATINA] and Abydenus, a disciple of Aristotle, author of a history of the Chaldeans used by Eusebius in his *Chronicle* and *Preparatio Evangelica*. An exhaustive list of the Greek historians quoted by him will be found in V. Langlois, *Fragmenta Histor. Græcor.* t. v. pars ii. p. 386. This work again throws much light on the history of the Roman empire in cent. iv. and v., and the struggles it maintained against the renewed Persian empire and the efforts of Zoroastrism. Moses probably wrote his history some time between A.D. 450 and 480. This we conclude because it brings the history of Armenia down to the year 441, while the work is dedicated to Isaac, an Armenian prince, elected Mazban of Armenia in A.D. 481, and who after heading a revolt against the Persians died in 483. He divides his history into three books, beginning from Adam. He traces back the Armenian kingdom to Haïg, fifth in descent from Japhet. He then gives the history of the dynasties which reigned over Armenia: first the descendants of Haïg, and second, the Arsacides, from B.C. 152 to A.D. 433, concluding with an account of the Persian satraps who ruled from this latter year to 441, and of the exertions of St. Mesrob on behalf of the nation. This history has long attracted the attention of scholars. The first edition was published at Amsterdam in 1695; the second at London, with a Latin translation by the brothers Whiston in 1736, the third at Venice, by Sargis archbishop of Constantinople in 1752. During this century it has been translated into French by De Florival, Venice, 1841; into Italian by the Mechitarite Fathers, Venice, 1841; into Russian by J. Johannes, 2 vols. 8vo, St. Petersburg, 1809; and latest of all, into French by V. Langlois in *Historiens Anciens de l'Arménie*, Paris, 1867, t. ii. p. 47-175, cf. Langlois, *Fragmenta Hist. Græc.*, as already quoted. The Mechitarites of Venice have twice published the Armenian text of the History, first in 1827, with engravings, and again in an edition of his complete works, 1843-1864. Dwight, an American missionary, notes that a very ancient manuscript copy of this work on parchment exists in the library of the Armenian College at Tiflis, *Journ. Armenian Orient. Society*, t. iii. p. 248. His treatise on Rhetoric is divided into ten books. It was published at Venice in 1796, with notes by P. J. Zohrab. It contains a fragment of the Peliades, one of the lost tragedies of Euripides. This fragment was pointed out by Cardinal Mai in his edition of the *Chronicle of Eusebius*, Milan, 1818, p. 43, note 3; cf. opp. *Euripid.* ed. Didot, p. 765. The passage of Moses where this fragment is quoted is a refutation of the fable about Medea, cf. Langlois, *Fragmenta Hist. Græc.* l. c. p. 397. The most important of the other works ascribed to him is the treatise on Geography (*Epitome Geographiæ*), largely derived from Ptolemy and the Alexandrian mathematician

Pappus, who lived under Theodosius the Great at the end of cent. iv., cf. Suidas, s. v. Πάππος. It was first printed at Marseilles A.D. 1678, and again in 1683, and afterwards in London, with a Latin translation by the Whistons, in 1736. It will be found appended to their translation of his history, and followed by two epistles, one from the Corinthians to St. Paul, the other from St. Paul to the Corinthians. Saint-Martin in his *Mém. sur l'Arménie*, t. ii. p. 406, gives a French version of it. He will not, however, ascribe it to Moses, and offers strong reasons for assigning it to the ninth or tenth century; cf. *l. c.* p. 305-314; Langlois, however, in an essay, whose full title is given below, upholds its genuineness, explaining the objections of Saint-Martin as mere interpolations of copyists. The other extant works of Moses do not call for any special remark. It is believed that he composed other historical and philosophical treatises, and translated the *Chronicle of Eusebius* and some other works into Armenian; of this we have, however, no certain knowledge. Most of the principal modern authorities on the subject have been already mentioned. Saint-Martin contributed a valuable notice on Moses and his works to the *Jour. Asiatique*, t. ii. pp. 322-344. A very exhaustive article by Langlois will be found in *Bullet. de l'Acad. des Sc. de St. Pétersb.* t. iii. p. 537, *Étude sur les sources de Moïse de Khorène*. This is the best monograph on Moses and his writings; cf. *Jour. Asiat.* 1829, p. 56, *Mém.* by Neumann, Quatremère in *Jour. des Sav.* Juin 1850, p. 364; Petermann in Herzog, s. v., and in *Zeitsch. der Deutsch. Morgenland. Gesellschaft*, v. 366; Pichard's *Essai sur Moïse de Khorène*, Paris, 1866, which is not however of critical value; Skias de Somal, *Storia di Mose Corenese*, Venice, 1850. See also Gutschmid in the *Berichte der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft*, 1876. [G. T. S.]

MOSHACRA, MOSHACCRA (MOSACER, MOSACRA, MOACRA, MOACRUS), abbat of Clonagh, Queen's County, of Saggard, co. Dublin, and of Fionn-mhagh in Fotharta (perhaps near Wexford), commemorated March 3 (*M. Doneg.* 63). Colgan (*Acta SS.* 454) has a memoir *De S. Sacro sive Mo-sacro abbate*, ex variis, and the Boll. (*Acta SS.* 3 Mar. i. 221 praet.) a shorter notice. He was of Leinster, and son of Senan descended from Maelcroc, son of Roderic king of Ireland. He is connected with several monasteries, but the traditions of two or more Moshacras may be mixed up. He attended the council held at Tara about A.D. 697 under the bishop of Armagh [FLANN FEBLA]. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 130, iii. 99; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 150, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

MOVEANUS (MOVEUS, MOUYUS), Scotch saint, contemporary with SS. Viganus and Medanus, and patron of Kippen; Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 458) also says that he wrote *De regulari vita ad Monachos; Decreta Ecclesiastica; Ad Ecclesias Scoticas; Epistolae ad diversos*, and flourished A.D. 444 or 450. There can be no reasonable doubt but that he is Mobiu, Dabius, or Biteus, abbat of Inch, co. Donegal. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Sept. ii. 206 praet., 12 Oct. vi. 6 praet.; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 414.) [DABIVS.]

MOYLE-IMORCHOR, "Bishop of Ach-

roy m O Mayne" (Aughrim, co. Galway), died A.D. 751. (*Ann. Clonm.* A.D. 747 ap. *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 349 n. f.) [J. G.]

MUCA, abbat of Glastonbury (*Mon. Angl.* i. 3; *Memorials of Dunstan*, pf. p. lxxxii). The name of Muca is the sixth in the ancient list of abbats of Glastonbury given in the Cotton MS. Tiberius B. 5; he there succeeds Cealdhun, and is followed by Wiceca. In the list given by William of Malmesbury (*Antt. Glaston.* ap. Gale, pp. 316, 328), Muca is the 13th abbat, coming between Beadulf and Gutlac, with dates 802-824 assigned him.

Muca attended the council of Clovesho in 805, in company with the bishop of Sherborne, to whose diocese his monastery must have then belonged (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546, 547). His name is attached likewise to a spurious or questionable grant to the minister Eadgils by a king named Edbirtus, attested also by bishops Kinebert and Wihberd, and dated in 801 (Kemble, *C. D.* 178); the Edbirtus of the charter can of course only be Egbert of Wessex; Kemble, however, conjectures that the name is a misreading for "Eadburh regina;" Brihtric's wife, who is said, in a note appended to the charter, to have restored it to Glastonbury. The land granted to Eadgils is at Bodecanleage or Butleigh, in Somersetshire, and the transfer of the estate to Glastonbury by Eadgils is mentioned by William of Malmesbury (ap. Gale, p. 316). This writer also mentions a grant made by Egbert, at the request of abbat Muca, of land of five manentes, on the river Toric (*ibid.* 316, 327).

William of Malmesbury (p. 316) seems to confuse Muca with his fifth predecessor, Cuma; and the great obscurity of his list may seem to indicate that some of the intervening names, not being otherwise known, are merely fictitious. On the other hand, if the earlier list be accepted, the abbacy of Cealdhun seems insufficient to cover the long interval between abbats Beorwald and Muca; it may therefore be readily conceded that that list is imperfect. Nothing of more importance is known of Muca. [S.]

MUCNA (MUCIN, MUKNA, MUKINUS, MUCCINUS, MUCINUS), bishop of Domnachmor in Tirawley, co. Mayo, contemporary with St. Patrick, and perhaps commemorated March 4, when in the Irish kalendars he is called "of Maighin," i.e. of Moyne near Killala. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 457) has a short memoir, *De S. Mukna sive Mukino Episcopo*, but the Boll. (*Acta SS.* 4 Mart. i. 297 praet.) doubt Colgan's identifying St. Patrick's friend with the saint of Maighin. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 110, 595, 612; Lanigan, *E. II. Ir.* i. 253 sq., also criticising Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 141 c. 83 et al.) [J. G.]

MUGENTIUS (MAUGANTIUS, MEIGANT, MEUGAN, MUGINT), master of St. Fridian or Finnian, and over a large school or monastery at Candida Casa. In the two Lives of St. Fridian given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 634 c. 1, 638 c. 6) Mugentius plotted against his pupil, and, moved by jealousy in teaching, sought his life, but himself fell in the plot. But in the Scholiast's Preface to the *Hymn of Mugint* (Todd, *Book of Hymns*, i. 94 sq.; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc.* 4 ser. iii. 199 sq.) the plot has even a less

credible basis. The hymn, a mixture of Latin and Irish, or more accurately Latin in an Irish character, is evidently upon the model of the penitential psalms, and seems suited for a time of national affliction. Both Colgan and Todd seek an Irish or Welsh identification, but beyond his being at Candida Casa, now Whithern, Wigornshire, in the 6th century, all is uncertain. (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 48-9.) [J. G.]

MUHÁMMAD AND MUHÁMMADAN-

ISM. An adequate knowledge of the geography of Arabia, especially that part of it which was the principal scene of Muhámmad's career, of the religious and social condition of the Arabs at that period, as also of contemporaneous history, is absolutely necessary in order to an intelligent and comprehensive appreciation of the subjects of this article.

The Greeks and Romans divided Arabia into three great regions, viz., Arabia Felix, Arabia Petraea, and Arabia Deserta; but this nomenclature is unknown to the Arabs themselves. *Bárru'l-Arab*,\* or the Land of the Arabs, is the name given by them to the peninsula generally. The other divisions are the *al-Hijáz*,\* which comprised Arabia Petraea and several of its adjacent territories; *al-Yáman*,\* including Arabia Felix and the country forming the south-east extremity of the peninsula; and *Najd*, (literally, High Land,) which may be termed Central Arabia. The cities of Mikkah<sup>b</sup> (Mecca) and al-Madinah,\* reckoned within the confines of the al-Hijáz, as being respectively the birth-place and burial-place of Muhámmad, call for special notice. The valley of MECCA—such is the concurrent belief of the Arabs—was the cradle of the race which sprang from Ishmael. Thither, according to the received traditions, Abraham conducted Ishmael and his mother, in order to propitiate the jealousy of Sarah. Instructed by a revelation from heaven, he led them to the spot whereon Mecca was afterwards built, and there left them. Having consumed her scanty supply of provisions Hagar went in search of water. During her absence the young Ishmael began to cry and to beat the ground with his feet, whereupon a spring suddenly gushed forth. Full of joy, and fearing lest the water should be lost, Hagar tumped the spring so as to form a basin, and it is this same source which, according to Muslims, still feeds the so-

called "Well of Zámzam." A tribe of the Amálikah, (Amalekites,) who were encamped in the vicinity, led thereto by a flight of birds hovering over the place, came upon the spring and eventually removed to the spot. Among these Ishmael was brought up until he was seven years old, when, agreeably with the command of God, Abraham came to sacrifice him. Satan, in human form, vainly endeavoured three times to turn him from his purpose, but when his hand was uplifted to slay his son the angel Gabriel arrested him, and allowed him to substitute a ram in its stead. Subsequently, other tribes, the descendants of Júrhum and Káturah, (Katurah,) joined the Amálikah, who were eventually expelled by a plague of ants, sent by God to punish them for their wickedness. Ishmael remained with the immigrants, and allied himself to them by marrying the daughter of the Júrhumite king Mudhádh. It was about this time, according to Arab legend, that Abraham, during a later visit to Ishmael, and assisted by him, built the *al-KAÁBAH*, *La Maison Carrée*, at Mecca, so called because it was nearly a *kaábah*, or square. The model of this temple most Muslims believe to have been constructed in heaven, where it was an object of adoration to the angels, who performed around it the sacred circuit, or circumambulation, called the *Tawáf*. Whilst Ishmael was in search for a stone to mark the angle from which the *Tawáf* should begin, the angel Gabriel met him, and gave him that which has since become famous under the name of *al-Hájaru'l-Áscad*, or the Black Stone, although it was then of a dazzling whiteness. The temple completed, Abraham and Ishmael dedicated it to the Lord, and the angel Gabriel came down to instruct them respecting the prayers and the rites with which the pilgrimage to this shrine was to be celebrated.

But to what date are we to refer the foundations of this temple, and, was it originally dedicated to God or to pagan deities? The judicious M. Caussin de Perceval, to whose admirable *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme*, &c., the writer of this article is deeply indebted, replies: "On these two points it would be rash to hazard any conjecture." Ash-Shahrástány, the learned Muslim author of the *Kitáb-u'l-Mílal-wa'n-Nihal*, (Religions and Philosophical Sects,) maintains that it was originally a temple dedicated to *Zúhal*, or Saturn, but he adduces no authority in support of the assertion. Herodotus, who wrote three centuries prior to our era, does not mention it, although he briefly alludes to the religion of the Arabs at his day; but Diodorus Siculus (*lib.* iii.) two and a half centuries later, speaking of that part of Arabia that is washed by the Red Sea, says: "There exists in this country a temple which is held in great estimation by all the Arabs." The *al-Kaábah* is the only religious edifice in Arabia which comes up to that description. That it was built long prior to the age of Diodorus cannot be doubted, "and with equal certainty," so writes Caussin de Perceval, "its origin is to be assigned to a time much posterior to the date which Muslim authors claim for it." Sir William Muir, in his well-nigh exhaustive *Life of Mahomet*, whilst admitting that "a very high antiquity must be assigned to the main features of the religion of Mecca," regards as fabulous

\* The writer uses the acute sign (´) over a vowel to denote where the syllable should be accented in pronunciation; the circumflex (ˆ) to denote a long vowel; and the apostrophe (´) the elision of a letter. The letter *y* at the end of transliterated Arabic names should be enunciated with a ringing sound. The symbol (´) is placed over the vowels *a, i, u*, respectively to represent the Arabic *عَ عِ عُ*. The prefixed article

*al-* is retained in those names which absolutely require it, together with the English article. To say *Madinah*, meaning thereby the city so called, would be as ambiguous as for us, in London, to say "City" when we meant The City. For the sake of brevity he writes "Kurán" for the *al-Kur-án*, (the old "Alcoran,") which should be pronounced with a hiatus after the *r*; and "Islám" for *al-Islám*.

<sup>b</sup> Such is the correct transliteration of the original; but, in conformity to familiar English usage, "Mecca" is adopted.

the traditional association therewith of the Father of the Faithful:—"There is no trace of anything Abrahamic in the essential elements of the superstition. To kiss the Black Stone, to make the circuit of the Káaba, and perform the other observances at Mecca, Arafát, and the vale of Miná, to keep the sacred months, and to hallow the sacred territory, have no conceivable connection with Abraham, or with the ideas and principles which his descendants would be likely to inherit from him." There is something too sweeping in these remarks, considering that the same accomplished writer, speaking of the temple and its rites having been indebted for their origin to Abraham and Ishmael, says: "This was no Muslim fiction, but the popular opinion long before the time of Mahomet. Otherwise it could not be referred to in the Corán as an acknowledged fact; nor would certain spots around the Káaba have been connected, as we know them to have been, with the names of Abraham and Ishmael." He has accordingly been challenged by the Syed Ahmed Khán Bahádoor, C. S. I., the author of a *Series of Essays on the Life of Mohammed*, who, whilst claiming for the al-Kaábah an Abrahamic origin, does not hesitate, on good Muslim authority, to reject many of the popular legends of miraculous intervention in its construction. The Sáyyid adduces Gen. xii. 7 and xiii. 18 to shew that it was the practice of Abraham, as it was of succeeding patriarchs, to raise altars to God's worship. These altars, he assumes, without sufficient warranty, to have been made of "unhewn stones placed vertically like pillars;" whereas, in another passage which he quotes, Ex. xxiv. 4, a distinction is drawn between the "altar" and the "twelve stones" which Moses is there recorded to have erected. His reference to Jacob is more to the point:—"And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone which he had put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he called the name of the place Bethel, but the name of that city was called Luz at the first. . . . And this stone which I set up for a pillar shall be God's house." (Gen. xxviii. 18-22.) He accordingly holds the Black Stone to have been "no other than one of the numerous altars erected for the suitable performance of God's worship;" and, dismissing all the silly legends with which it has been associated, he adduces a tradition, handed down by "Abdollah Ibn Ameer," that the Black Stone is "a piece of rock from the Abba Kobais mountain, in the vicinity of Mecca," and that the change in its colour is due, not to the sins of the people, as some superstitiously believe, but to two fires which broke out in the Temple on two separate occasions, one prior to Islám, and the other in the time of Ibn-Zubáir, on which latter occasion the stone was split into three pieces, and was reunited by means of hooks and rings. As regards the *Tawáf*, or making the circuit of the al-Kaábah, the Sáyyid, after a critical examination of al-Bukhárý and other writers on Muslim traditions, conceives that the usage sprang up thus:—"In the then imperfect state of civilization, the inhabitants of the peninsula of Arabia had a rude but very earnest, enthusiastic, and devout mode of performing prayer. They would

assemble in great numbers, and nearly half naked, round the temple of the Káaba, and there, warmed and excited by zeal and enthusiasm till they were almost frantic, they would make, in procession, the tour of the temple, dancing, jumping, and vociferating aloud, but in tones of mingled love and devotion, the name of God; then, again kneeling down, they would with the utmost reverence imprint on the corners of the temple a kiss, in which was mingled the warmest devotion with respect the most profound." Without taking this optimist view of the religious service under consideration, there can be no doubt that the custom of circumambulating sacred places is of very ancient date. Samuel "went from year to year in circuit to [or, more correctly, he circuted] Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpeh." (1 Sam. vii. 16.) Now, it is worthy of remark that these several localities were hallowed by a memorial pillar or monument. That at Bethel has already been noticed. At Gilgal the twelve stones taken from the bed of the Jordan, where the Israelites crossed over into Canaan, were set up, (Josh. iv. 19, 20,) and the spot became subsequently one of the holy places to which Samuel resorted to offer sacrifices unto Jehovah. (1 Sam. x. 8.) At Mizpeh, also, was the heap of stones piled up by Jacob and Laban as a testimony between them. (Gen. xxxi. 48.) When Jephthah prevailed upon to become the leader of the people, he went and "uttered all his words before the Lord in Mizpeh," (Judg. xi. 11,) where he appears subsequently to have resided, and in all probability it was upon the altar of that sanctuary that his terrible vow was consummated. (*Id.* 35.) "Unto the Lord in Mizpeh" is a phrase of frequent occurrence in the Book of Judges, and the weight of testimony is in favour of Mizpeh having been the place where the great assembly was held to decide upon the measures to be taken against Gibeah, after the outrage upon the Levite and his concubine, (Judg. xx. xxi,) in which narrative it is twice called "Bethel," the House of God. The words of David, also, singularly illustrate the ceremony of the *Tawáf*:—"I will wash mine hands in innocency, and so will I compass [circumambulate] Thine altar." (Ps. xxvi. 6.) The latest and by far the best Arabic version of the Bible extant uses the verb *Táfa*—the root of the noun *Tawáf*—to express this compassing of the altar. Then, as regards the "dancings," which may fairly be presumed to imply mental as well as bodily excitation, such as accompany the Muslim *Tawáf*, it is clear from Ex. xxxii. 19, that the custom obtained at that early period when Moses, on descending from the mount, saw the calf which the Israelites had made, and the "dancing" around it. Moreover, at Shiloh, one of the most famous sanctuaries of the Jews, and where there was a yearly feast "to Jehovah," the daughters of the place came forth regularly "to dance in the dances." (Judg. xxi. 21.) And that such religious exercises were common in those times is clear from the frequent appeals made in the Psalms calling upon the people to praise the Lord "in the dance;" and in 2 Sam. vi. 14, we read that David himself "danced before the Lord with all his might." It is but fair to add that the Kurán is silent about the Black Stone, and only mentions the

al-Kaábah twice, by name, in *Sûr.* v. 96, 98. In one of these passages pilgrims are enjoined not to kill game during the season of the Pilgrimage, and, if they do, domestic animals of equal value are to be given as an offering to the al-Kaábah; and in the other that sanctuary is declared to be "a sacred house appointed as an institution for all mankind." References to it under the latter designation are more numerous. In *Sûr.* iii. 90, 91, it is declared to be "the first House that was built for mankind in Bakkah," (a synonym for Makkah or Mecca,) and in *Sûr.* ii. 121 Abraham and Ishmael are distinctly stated to have laid its foundations under special directions from the Almighty, one of which was that "they were not to unite aught with Me in worship," but to "cleanse My house for those who go in procession around it, and who stand and bow in worship;" and in *Sûr.* xxii. 25 the "holy Oratory is appointed for the use of all men, alike for those who reside there and for strangers."

The original al-Kaábah worship may or may not have partaken of the comparative simplicity of the Jewish rites above referred to. It is indisputable, however, that in the course of time it degenerated into the most flagrant idolatry. With the worship of *Alláh*, the supreme God, was associated a legion of inferior deities whose images, including that of Abraham, were set up in and around it. It was, in fact, the grand Pantheon of the nation, the only temple for which the *al-Hijj*, or Pilgrimage, was instituted. As these pilgrimages were the occasion of several large annual fairs being held in the vicinity of Mecca, the commercial advantages arising therefrom to that place were doubtless very considerable. The twofold pre-eminence which it thus enjoyed in religion and trade appears to have excited the cupidity and rivalry of the adjoining kingdom of al-Yáman. Tibbán-Asáad-abu-Káribah, a Himyarite sovereign of that country, is recorded to have invaded the al-Hijáz at the beginning of the third century of our era, on which occasion he was urged by the Bānu-Hudháil to destroy the al-Kaábah. Two Jewish doctors, however, who had associated themselves with him, and through whom he is said to have embraced Judaism, strongly advised him against the attempt. "They wish your ruin," said they, "for there is no place more sacred in the world than the temple of Mecca. Instead of violating it, visit it with profound respect, perform the circuits, and all the other pious rites connected with that sanctuary." On being asked by the king why, in that case, they did not do the like themselves, they replied: "It is quite true that this is the temple of our father Abraham, but it is now profaned by idolatry and by the impure blood which is shed therein." As persuaded by them he went through all the stated ceremonies, and furthermore covered the al-Kaábah for the first time with a rich stuff, which action on his part is said to have originated the annual present of a brocade *Káṣnah*, or Covering, sent with great pomp from Cairo, at the expense of the Ottoman sovereigns. Again, A.D. 270-272, four anonymous kings of al-Yáman marched against the al-Kaábah with the avowed object

of seizing the Black Stone and of setting it up at Sanáá, in a temple which they intended to build there, in order that that city might become the goal of the pilgrimage; but their attempt signally failed. On a third occasion Ábraha-'l-Áshram, who ruled over al-Yáman, A.D. 537-570, undertook a campaign against Mecca and the al-Kaábah, instigated thereto—so it is stated—by the fact of one of the Bānu-Kinánah having defiled the church which he had built at Sanáá. (The Abyssinians conquered al-Yáman, A.D. 523, and it was during the reign of Ábraha that the bishop Gregentius, sent by the patriarch of Alexandria, established his see at Zhafár, in that province.) The Arab's motive is recorded to have been to desecrate the church, and thereby to frustrate the supposed design of Ábraha to make it the object of the Pilgrimage. Ábraha, mounted on an elephant, led the van of his army, and after seizing several places in the al-Hijáz sent a messenger to the head man at Mecca to announce that he had come to destroy the al-Kaábah. At that period the aged Abdu-'l-Múttalib, of the al-Kuraish tribe, was chief of the local oligarchy. Being summoned by Ábraha he presented himself before him, and requested that two hundred camels, which had wrongfully been taken from him, should be restored. Ábraha, who was struck with the noble bearing of the Arab, expressed surprise that he should think more of the camels than of the temple which he had come to destroy. "The camels are my property," replied the chief; "the temple belongs to one who knows how to defend it." Abdu-'l-Múttalib, on his return to Mecca, directed the people to take refuge in the neighbouring hills; but before his own departure, so writes at-Tabary as quoted by Ibn-Khaldún, he laid hold of the ring of the door of the al-Kaábah, and uttered this prayer:—"O God, the humblest of Thy creatures defends his own property. Defend Thou the majesty of Thy temple, and suffer not the cross to be erected triumphantly upon the spot which Thou hast consecrated." On the day following, Ábraha, mounted on his elephant Mahmúd, proceeded towards Mecca, whereupon an Arab named Nufáil, seizing the ear of the elephant, whispered to him, saying: "Return from whence thou camest. Thou art here on ground consecrated to God." Thereafter, no amount of goading could induce the beast to advance. If turned towards al-Yáman he began to walk, but if towards Mecca he fell on his knees to the ground. It was at this juncture that God sent flights of birds, called *Abábil*, each having in its beak and claws a stone as large as a lentil. These they hurled at the Abyssinians, whose bodies were forthwith covered with pustules, of which they died. Their army was utterly routed, and Ábraha died of his wounds on his return to Sanáá. This miraculous intervention is thus referred to in the Kurán, *Sûr.* v., entitled the *Chapter of the Elephant*:—"Hast thou not seen how thy Lord dealt with the army of the elephant? Did He not cause their strategy to miscarry? And He sent them the *Abábil*. Claystones did they hurl down upon them, and He made them like corn the grain [or core] of which has been eaten." The author of the *Siratu-'r-Rasûl* gives a more credible account of the cause which led the Abyssinians to

retire from the al-Hijáz where he says: "It was in this year that the small-pox first broke out in Arabia." The patriotic conduct of 'Abdu-'l-Múttalib on this occasion tended to raise the tribe of the al-Kuráish to the highest pinnacle of glory. They forthwith instituted several new rites for the pilgrimage, assumed the title of *Hums*, or Defenders of the Faith, and ordered that all Arabs beyond the territory of Mecca should wear a particular garb whilst making the *Tawáif*. If too poor to provide it they were to perform the rites in a state of nudity, or if they retained their own garments they were not to be worn thereafter.

It was shortly after this catastrophe to the Abyssinian army that 'Abdúllah, the son of 'Abdu-'l-Múttalib, was directed by his father to go to Yáthrib (al-Madinah) to purchase dates for his family. He died on the journey at the age of twenty-five years. Aminah his wife was at that time in an advanced state of pregnancy, and on the 12th of Rabí'ul-Áwwal, of the Year of the Elephant, she gave birth to Muhámmad, destined to become the future Legislator of the Arabs. By careful computation M. Caussin de Perceval makes that date to correspond with the 29th of August, A.D. 570.

There is a striking parallel, worthy of notice, between the conduct of the Arab sovereigns of al-Yáman, their jealousy of Mecca and of the al-Kaábah, both as a temple and the goal of the national Pilgrimage, as set forth in their attempt to set up a rival temple at Sanáá, and the conduct of Jeroboam, king of Israel, who built a temple at Shechem, made two golden calves there, and instituted several other pagan rites in order to prevent the people from going to sacrifice at Jerusalem. (1 Kings xii. 25-33.)

The other town of the al-Hijáz calling for special mention is that of Yáthrib—afterwards named al-MADÍNAH—situated about 120 miles due north of Mecca. According to Muslim historians Yáthrib was the chief of the Amálikah, who settled in that territory, which afterwards bore his name, including Khaibar and several of the adjacent districts. M. Caussin de Perceval is mistaken in supposing that the term Amálikah (or Amalekites) is confined in sacred Scripture to the posterity of Esau by his son Amalek, for we read of the Amalekites a century before the birth of Esau, (Gen. xiv. 7.) and Balaam styled Amalek "the first of the nations." (Num. xxiv. 20.) The probability is that, as used by the writers referred to, the appellation included other nomads, of different stocks, whose predecessors occupied the country from the Jordan, through Edom, to the region east of Egypt. There is a concurrent testimony among Arabian historians that the Amálikah were superseded in their authority over the al-Hijáz by a colony of Jews, although their accounts differ respecting its origin. According to Ibn-Khaldún the immigrants formed part of an army sent by Joshua against the Amálikah, which after destroying the people took possession of the country, and occupied Yáthrib, Khaibar, and the surrounding places. Others, and among them the author of the *al-Aghány*, make the original Jewish colonists to have consisted of a large body of troops which Moses despatched against the Amálikah, but that having spared Árkam, the young son of the Amalekite king, the Israelites refused to

receive them on their return from the expedition. Caussin de Perceval, who has carefully analyzed the various notices found in the principal Arabian historians respecting the early settlement of the Jews in the al-Hijáz, considers the latter legend to bear a strong resemblance to the story of the Amalekite king Agag, whose life was spared by the soldiers of Saul against the positive command of the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. xv. 9.) He accordingly remarks, that if the Arab tradition is founded on any historical truth connecting the fact of the disobedience of the Israelitish troops with the establishment of a colony of Jews in the al-Hijáz it would serve to fix the date of that immigration to the time of Saul, or four centuries after Moses. Other Arabian historians assert that the immigration did not take place till after the fall of Zedekiah and the devastation of Judea by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar, nearly six centuries B.C. Personal experience enables the writer of this article to state that this latter is the prevailing tradition among the al-Yáman Jews of their original settlement in that part of Arabia.

The ascendancy of the Jews was overthrown, in turn, by the al-Áus and the al-Kházzaj, two Arab tribes that had separated themselves from the Bánú-Ghassán, in Syria, immigrated to the al-Hijáz, and eventually (cir. A.D. 492) seized upon Yáthrib. Successive feuds broke out between these two tribes, in which the al-Kházzaj were generally the victors. Their persecution of the Jews induced the latter to form an alliance with their rivals, the al-Áus, and a famous battle, was fought between them in which the al-Áus were successful. Eventually an effort was made to heal these intestine divisions by the joint election of a sovereign who was to rule over both tribes, and this subject was under discussion when Muhámmad appeared on the scene as the Prophet of the Arabs. A party from the combined tribes, who were still mostly pagans, while performing the pilgrimage at Mecca, heard his preaching, believed that he was the prophet whom the Jews among them expected, embraced his doctrines, and undertook to introduce them among their brethren on their return home. What followed thereon forms part of the Life of Muhámmad, and will be noticed in its proper place. As regards the Jews, they appear up to that time to have retained a considerable degree of importance. Writing of that period Caussin de Perceval remarks:—"The Jewish race was still powerful. They possessed, between three or four days' journey from Yáthrib, a fertile territory abounding in grain and date-trees, and protected by several forts . . . The district occupied by those strongholds was styled *Khaibar*, a word which Arabian authors take to signify a castle. [More probably a confederation, or colony, from the Hebrew *חבר* to be confederated.] Its population was composed of different families which had been established in the country from time immemorial." Scarcely any remains of these colonies exist at the present day. Captain R. Burton, in his *Pilgrimage to Meccah and el-Medinah*, says: "It is the popular boast at al-Hijáz that, with the exception of Jeddah (and perhaps Yembo), where the Prophet never set his foot, there is not a town in the country harbouring an infidel; but, if history may be



trusted, it has become so only lately." Ludovico di Varthema, the Bolognese traveller, who journeyed from Damascus to al-Madinah, A.D. 1503-5, mentions a mountain on the road which was inhabited by five thousand Jews. "They are circumcised," he writes, "and confess that they are Jews." As late as A.D. 1762 Niebuhr was informed that the district of Kháibar was still inhabited by several independent Jewish tribes, who had shaikhs of their own like other Arabs. Burckhardt, also, mentions the old colony of Jews at Kháibar, but says that it had disappeared, though there still existed an unfounded belief at Mecca and Jiddah that their descendants still existed there, strictly performing the rites of their religion.

Although the foregoing description of the al-Kaábah worship gives a *coup d'œil* of the national creed and manners of the Arabs, it is nevertheless desirable, in order fairly to appreciate the radical reforms effected therein by Muhámmad, to analyze more in detail THE RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL CONDITION OF ARABIA PRIOR TO THE INTRODUCTION OF ISLÁM. The whole race was plunged in the darkness of paganism. Circumcision was general among them, and it seems probable that every family had its *lares* and *penates*. Besides idols, some of the tribes had temples of their own. All, however, seem to have believed in a supreme God, called *Alláh*, with whom was associated a host of minor divinities who acted as mediators with him. Under the figure of these gods they worshipped angels, whom they conceived to be of the feminine gender, and styled them *Banátu-'Uláh*, Daughters of God. Others adored the stars, and especially the sun. The Bánu-Kinánah addressed their homage to the moon and to the star Aldabarán; the Bánu-Lakhm and Bánu-Juzhám to the planet Jupiter; the Bánu-Asáad to Mercury; the Bánu-Tay to Canopus; and the descendants of Kais-Ailán to Sirius. Some among them believed that death was the end of man; others believed in a resurrection and a life beyond the grave. These latter, on the death of a relative or friend, sacrificed a she-camel, or left it to perish of hunger, under the belief that it would be revived with the departed one, and serve to carry him when called upon to appear before the judgment-seat of God. According to them the soul, on quitting the body, hovered about in the form of a bird, which they called *Húma* and *Sála*, uttering plaintive cries, through which they conveyed to the departed news of those whom they had left behind. If the deceased had been the victim of a murder the bird cried *Ishúni*, Give me to drink, until his surviving relatives had avenged him. The belief in Genii, or Ogres, in magic, divination, and in the oracles of their idols, which were consulted by means of arrows, was almost universal among them. Further, any man was at liberty to marry as many wives as he was able to maintain, and of divorcing them at pleasure. A widow was regarded as part of the heritage of her deceased husband, and hence incestuous marriages between sons and daughters-in-law were common. But one of the most revolting customs among them was that of the inhumation of living girls by their parents, called *Wáadu-'l-Banáti*, (*lit.* the Burial of living daughters). On a female child being

born to them many of the Arabs in the time of the *al-Jáhiliyyah*, or Ignorance, which is the term applied by Muslims to the state of the Arabs before Islám, had it buried at once, lest it might prove a burden to them, or, as some say, under an exaggerated sense of honour, lest she might some day be seized and dishonoured by their enemies. Much more might be added to the foregoing list of pagan rites and usages. Those who are curious in such matters should consult the Syed Ahmed Khán Bahadoor's *Essays on the Life of Mohammed*, wherein he has collected together, from original sources, an interesting account of the religious and social condition of the pre-Islamitic Arabs.

Further, among the Arabs, prior to Muhámmad, there were many Sabians, who are thrice mentioned by name in the Kurán. (Súr. ii. 59; v. 73; xxii. 17.) The drift of these passages is almost identical, and places the Sabians, together with Jews and Christians, within the pale of salvation, subject to the final decision of God. Hence they are generally regarded as the "People of a Book," that is, possessing a Divine Revelation, on which point, however, there is much uncertainty. They are said to ascribe their Book to Adam, and to derive their religion and law from Shith and Idris, (Seth and Enoch). Some Muslim and Christian writers, confounding them with the old Sabaeans of Chaldea and the modern so-called "Christians of St. John," in Mesopotamia, allege that they possessed the Book of Psalms, and observed several Christian rites. Ash-Shahrástány, in his *Kitábu-'l-Máat wa-'n-Nihal*, already quoted, gives by far the fullest account of the Arab Sabians prior to Islám. In the form of a dialogue between them and the al-Hanifiyyah, (the name given to the followers of Muhámmad before that of "Muslim" was adopted,) he points out the cardinal differences which existed between the two creeds. According to him the Sabians were divided into several sects, among which he enumerates the Spiritualists, or believers in spiritual beings, and those who had temples and *Shákhs*. The latter word signifies literally a Person, but it is still applied by the Yazidis, relicts of Zoroastrianism, near Mosul, to the neat tapering monuments which they raise in their villages, and which in order to conceal their creed from outsiders they declare to be tombs or cenotaphs. (Badger's *Nestorians and their Rituals*, vol. i. p. 107.) The Rev. J. M. Rodwell, in the preface to his translation of the Kurán, quotes the *Fihrist*, a MS. in the Bibliothéque Royale, at Paris, in which he avers that the "Sabéites" are called "Hanýfs," and that they are spoken of in the same treatise as having received the Book of Abraham, mentioned in Súr. lxxxvii. 19. This statement it will be seen is in direct opposition to that of ash-Shahrástány, and the weight of authority is certainly on the side of the latter. The Sabians generally held that the Spiritual Beings were created from nothing, that they consist of pure light, so subtle as to be imperceptible either to the mind or sight, whereas man, they say, is a being of composite elements. This doctrine they profess to have learned from Azhimún and Hírmis, that is, Shith and Idris, (Seth and Enoch). These Spiritual Essences they held to be appropriately symbolized by light, such as the constellations and planets, and deny that they can

properly be symbolized by man; hence they denied the mission of apostles as their representatives. Those asterisms were accordingly regarded by them as the abode or embodiment of the Spiritual Beings who direct the course of events, inasmuch as they are causes, not caused. But inasmuch as the asterisms were not visible at all times, the Sabians recognized the necessity of having a medium, which should always be present with them, through which they could approach the Spiritual Beings, and through them the Almighty God, and they accordingly erected *Ashkhás*, (the plural of *Shákh*, temples or monuments,) to represent them, so arranging the order and service of the same that each temple should be a type of the conditions or influences of the planet or constellation which it symbolized. Ash-Shahrastány, taking these *Ashkhás* to signify idols, does not hesitate to call the Sabians idolaters. According to the same author, in an elaborate account of the religions and customs of the pre-Islamite Arab tribes, of which what follows is a brief summary, some of them inclined to Judaism, others to Christianity and Sabianism. They believed in the transmigration of souls, and in the astrologers who consulted the stars. Some believed in the unity of God and a day of final judgment. When at the point of death some among them would call upon one of their sons and direct him to bury a she-camel with him in order that he might be spared the fatigue of walking on foot to the Judgment. Among other customs they used to bind the fore-shank of a she-camel to her arm at the grave of her master, leaving it there till it died, believing that the master would be raised from the dead on her. They used to hold as prohibited many things which were subsequently prohibited in the Kurán. They neither married their mothers, nor daughters, nor maternal or paternal aunts. The worst which they did in this respect was to marry two sisters, or to take the wife of a father; but those who did this were considered a disgrace. If a man died leaving a wife she fell to the eldest son, and if he wished to have her he cast his garment around her; if not, others of his brethren married her, giving her a new dowry. It is said that they used to demand a woman in marriage from her father, or brothers, or uncles, and marriages among them were mostly contracted between persons of the same station in life. They used to offer oblations, to practise the rite of casting pebbles, and to observe the sacred months, during which they abstained from war. Some, forgetting the months, adopted a rude system of intercalation, but in performing the Pilgrimage they did not fail to make the day of the *Táwriyah*, (the providing one's self with water,) that of *Arifah*, (when the pilgrims halt at *Arifát*), and that of the *an-Náhr* (or sacrifice) to correspond with the rites of the month of Dzu'l-Hijj, and when they sacrificed to idols they smeared their garments with the blood of the victims, believing that thereby their wealth would be increased. Further, they used to observe the purifications of the *Fitráh* (religion) of Abraham, which he made obligatory upon himself, namely, the ten precepts, five of which had respect to the head, and five to the other parts of the body. The first were: the rinsing of the mouth, the drawing of water into the nostrils, the clipping of the defluent hair

around the mouth, and the cleansing of the teeth. The other five were: the ablation of the secret parts, the paring of the nails, the removal of the hair from under the armpits, the shaving of the pubes, and circumcision. "These Islám afterwards confirmed by a law." This last weighty statement, distinctly recognizing as it does the adoption by Islám of many of the rites of the pre-Islamite Arab tribes, deserves special notice.

It will be seen from the foregoing review that JUDAISM co-existed with idolatry at the advent of Muhámmad. Although fallen from the high estate which it had previously held in Arabia, it was still professed by some of the old Himyaritic stock in al-Yáman, and notably by the al-Kurázihah and the an-Nadhír at Yáthrib and Kháibar. CHRISTIANITY, also, appears to have been widely diffused among the Arabs at the same epoch. Caussin de Perceval adduces abundant evidence from the authors of the *Siratu'r-Rasúl*, the *al-Aghány*, and other Muslim histories to prove, that albeit the date of its introduction among them cannot be precisely determined, nevertheless the fact of its existence among the Bánu-Tághlib of Mesopotamia, the Bánu-Ábdi'l-Kais of al-Báhrain, the Bánu-'l-Háarith of Najrán, the al-Ibád of al-Írák, the Bánu-Ghassán of Syria, and the Bánu-Kalb of Dúmatu-'l-Jándal, between al-Madfnah and al-Kúfah, is incontrovertible. Of its first introduction into al-Yáman, and its subsequent fortunes there, the materials are more abundant. The tradition that St. Bartholomew preached the Gospel in India, of which at that period Arabia Felix and Abyssinia were supposed to form part,<sup>d</sup> is recorded by Eusebius, as also the mission of Pantaenus, who was sent thither by Dionysius, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 192-235 :- "He [Pantaenus] is said to have been a preacher of the Gospel to the Eastern Gentiles, and was sent as far as India . . . He found there the Gospel of St. Matthew, written in the Hebrew tongue, kept of such as knew Christ, which was preached there before his coming by Bartholomew, one of the Apostles." (*Eccles. Hist.* lib. v. c. 9.) The next event which subsequently proved pregnant with importance to the cause of Christianity in Arabia took place about A.D. 326, when Frumentius, a Christian native of Tyre, but brought up at the court of the king of Ethiopia, having already manifested his zeal for the spread of the Gospel by collecting together for worship the Roman traffickers in that country, was consecrated first bishop of Abyssinia by Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria. Socrates Scholasticus, in his *Eccles. Hist.* lib. i. c. 15, gives a full account of this Frumentius. Following upon the above was the mission of the monk Theophilus, an Indian bishop, who according to Philostorgos (*Hist. Eccles.* i. 3), and other Christian historians, was sent by the emperor Constance, A.D. 343, to the Himyarite king of al-Yáman. Theophilus brought with him rich presents, and succeeded in the object of

<sup>d</sup> "The Apostle Matthew chose Aethiopia, Bartholomew chose India, which adjoined thereto; but the middle India, inhabited of many barbarous nations, varying also among themselves in language, was not lightened with the word of God and the faith of Christ before the reign of Constantine." (*Soc. Schol.* lib. i. c. 15-)

his mission, which on the part of the Roman emperor was to strengthen himself against the Persians by an alliance with the Himyarites. It is doubtful how far he succeeded in converting the inhabitants, but he is said to have obtained permission to build three churches for those who professed Christianity in that province, one at Zhafār, the royal residence, another at Aden, and a third on the island of Hormúz, in the Persian Gulf. Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* tom. iii.) conceives that Theophilus merely converted the few who were already Christians there to the Arian heresy. The same author fixes the end of the 5th century of our era as the date of the introduction of Christianity into Najrán, a large and fertile district of al-Yáman, situated on the north-east of that province. The fact is attested by several Arabian historians, who attribute the work to one Faimayyûn, a devout man who travelled about the East accompanied by his disciple Sâlih. Being seized by a party of Badawîn, he was brought by them to Najrán and sold to a wealthy man there. The power of working miracles, which he is said to have possessed, led to the conversion of the prince of that country and a large number of the inhabitants. The Himyarite Dzhu-Nuwás, who ruled over al-Yáman at that time, and who is said to have embraced Judaism, hearing that two Jews had been murdered at Najrán, or, as others state, being determined to arrest the progress of Christianity there, marched against the place and massacred 20,000 of the inhabitants, Ábdúllah, or as he is called by ecclesiastical writers, "Aretas," who was subsequently canonized, being among the number. According to Greek and Syrian chronicles the news of this massacre was brought to Justin I. by one Abraham, who had been sent by that emperor on a mission to the Arab king of Hira; but Muslim historians record that it was carried by one Dhs-Dzhu-Thalihân, who having escaped the massacre made his way to Constantinople. On being presented to the Caesar he solicited his aid on behalf of the persecuted Christians. Justin is said to have replied that the country was too far distant for him to do so himself, but he gave him a letter to the Najâshî, or king of Abyssinia, in which he directed him to despatch a force against al-Yáman. This army is stated to have consisted of 70,000 men, and was transported across the Red Sea in a fleet of six hundred boats, supplied mainly by the Roman authorities in Egypt. Dzhu-Nuwás made every effort to repel the invaders, but his army was routed by Aryât, the Abyssinian general, who soon reduced the country to his sway. Being appointed viceroy he set about demolishing the strongholds of the country, and is recorded to have received an order from the Najâshî, which was partially executed, to destroy a third of the male inhabitants, and to send a third of the females to Abyssinia. Worn out by his tyranny many of the Abyssinians revolted and chose another countryman of theirs, named Ábraha, as their chief. When the two armies were drawn up to battle Ábraha challenged Aryât to single combat, which being accepted the latter was slain. Ábraha ruled as viceroy over al-Yáman from A.D. 537 to 570. Following the example of his predecessor he tyrannized over the Himyarites, and one of his sons whom he had associated with

himself in the administration became so odious to the people that he was murdered by a Himyarite. Nevertheless, Christianity appears to have progressed during the viceroyalty of Ábraha. A bishop, sent by the Patriarch of Alexandria, took up his residence in the city of Zhafār and compiled a code of laws for the country, written in Greek, the original of which is to be found in the Imperial Library at Vienna. Another curious monument of the piety of this prelate is the account of a conference held between him and a certain Jew, a copy of which in Greek and Latin, entitled *Teperensis Episcopi Disputatio cum Herbaso Judæo*, is preserved in the *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*. M. Caussin de Perceval quotes Muslim authorities for the following events which occurred at this period. Ábraha built a church at Sanâá, which was the wonder of the age, the Roman emperor and the king of Abyssinia furnishing marble and workmen for the edifice. Seeing that a great number of the Arab tribes of al-Yáman still adhered to paganism, and continued visiting the al-Kaábah, the viceroy issued a proclamation ordering all Arabs to perform their pilgrimage to the new church. Great indignation was excited throughout Arabia by this ill-judged measure. One of Ábraha's missionaries was killed in the al-Hijáz by a tribesman of the al-Kinânah, and another of the same tribe defiled the church at Sanâá with filth. Hearing that both culprits were attached to the al-Kaábah, Ábraha took an oath that he would destroy that temple. He accordingly marched at the head of a large army of Abyssinians, mounted on an elephant, and proceeded towards Mecca. The result of that ill-boded expedition, which brings the history of Christianity in Arabia down to the period immediately preceding the birth of Muhámmad, has already been noticed.

But the type of Christianity which prevailed in Arabia, even more than its extension, is a matter of the utmost importance in this disquisition. Trustworthy ecclesiastical writers draw a gloomy picture of the history of the Church as early as the 4th century, which gradually darkens during the three centuries following. Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat.* i. p. 33) says that "the kingdom of heaven was converted, by discord, into the image of chaos, of a nocturnal tempest, and of hell itself." Writing of the internal history of the church during the 5th century Mosheim remarks: "If before this time the lustre of religion was clouded with superstition, and its divine precepts were adulterated with a mixture of human learning, this evil, instead of diminishing, increased daily. The happy souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers. . . . The images of those who during their lives had acquired the reputation of uncommon sanctity were now honoured with a particular worship in several places, and many imagined that this worship drew down into the images the propitious presence of the saints or celestial beings they represented, deluded perhaps into this idle fancy by the crafty fictions of the heathen priests who had published the same thing respecting Jupiter and Mercury." In the 6th century "abuses were daily multiplied, and superstition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of

absurdities which were added to the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles." Of the 7th century—that in which Muhámmad flourished—the same writer says: "In this barbarous age religion lay expiring under a motley and enormous heap of superstitious inventions, and had neither the courage nor the force to raise her head or display her natural charms to a darkened and deluded world;" and he does not hesitate to attribute much of the early success of Islám to this state of abject degradation into which the Church had fallen, "to which we may add the bitter dissensions and cruel animosities that reigned among the Christian sects, particularly the Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monophysites,—dissensions that filled a great part of the East with carnage, assassinations, and such detestable enormities as rendered the very name of Christian odious to many." Further, it is notorious that Arianism was triumphant in many parts of Asia and Africa during the 6th century, and also that from the controversies which arose among the Monophysites was begotten the sect of the Tritheists, whose chief, John Ascuage, a Syrian philosopher, was warmly defended by John Philoponus, of Alexandria. The worship of the Virgin Mary, which was unquestionably an important factor in the genesis of Islám, should not be overlooked, more especially as a broad development of it took place in Arabia, into which country it is stated to have been introduced towards the end of the 4th century by certain women from Thrace. Two jarring factions took part in this controversy, namely, the Antiduo-Marianites and the Collyridians. The former maintained that the Virgin did not always preserve her immaculate state, but received the embraces of Joseph after the birth of Christ. The latter, running into the opposite extreme, worshipped the Virgin Mary as a goddess, and judged it necessary to appease her anger and to seek her protection by libations, sacrifices, and the oblation of cakes (collyridae). The cultus made rapid strides during the following century, owing probably to the Nestorian controversy, and among the images which began to be set up in the churches that of the Virgin Mary, holding the infant Jesus in her arms, always obtained the most conspicuous place.

If such was the deplorable state of Christianity in the more civilized parts of the world, what likelihood is there that it shone with a brighter lustre in Arabia, where it had to contend not only against deep-rooted paganism, but also against the ruling powers of that peninsula? The rational inference gainsays the conjecture, and albeit local materials for forming a decided judgment on this point are very scanty, nevertheless the fact that the church in Arabia seems always to have been more or less associated with or dependent upon the church in Abyssinia,—a church never eminent either for purity of doctrine or evangelical piety, but rather the reverse, and which prior to the birth of Muhámmad had embraced Monophysitism,—that fact alone tells strongly against the type of Christianity which existed in Arabia up to that period. Sir William Muir epigrammatically sums up the religious aspect generally at that period:—"The surface of Arabia had been now and then rippled by the feeble efforts of Christianity; the sterner

influences of Judaism had been occasionally visible in a deeper and more troubled current; but the tide of indigenous idolatry and Ishmaelite superstition, setting strongly from every quarter towards the Káaba, gave ample evidence that the faith and worship of Mecca held the Arab mind in a thralldom rigorous and undisputed."

THE POLITICAL STATE OF THE CIVILIZED WORLD WHEN ISLÁM FIRST APPEARED IN ARABIA CALLS FOR CURSORY NOTICE.—That country prior to the Christian era was almost unknown to the Western nations, and the attempt made by the Romans under Aelius Gallus, B.C. 24, to subjugate it signally failed. The various tribes of the al-Hijáz appear, from the outset, to have been ruled by their respective chiefs, while in al-Yáman, or Southern Arabia, a monarchical form of government obtained as far back as the time of the queen of Sheba. This was continued through subsequent centuries under the Hímyarite kings, and lasted until the overthrow of that dynasty by the Abyssinians, as above related. These latter, after holding the country for upwards of half a century, were in turn expelled by the Persians, whose aid the Arabs had invoked against them. The news of the overthrow of the Abyssinians caused great joy throughout Arabia, and Maádkárib, a scion of the Hímyarite family, whom the Persian general Wáhráz had created viceroy of al-Yáman, received the personal congratulations of many distinguished men from Mecca, among whom was Abdu'l-Múttalib, the grandfather of Muhámmad, who acted as spokesman for his companions. Owing, apparently, to a contest which arose between the Arabs and the Abyssinians who had remained in al-Yáman, a second expedition, also under Wáhráz, was despatched against that country which utterly extirpated the Abyssinians and their half-caste progeny. Wáhráz became viceroy of the province, and during his administration the three religions, Pagan, Jewish, and Christian, are said to have been equally tolerated. Christianity maintained its footing in Najrán under Kuss, an eminent bishop of that place, whose eloquence is highly extolled by Arab historians. In his youth Muhámmad is stated to have heard him deliver a discourse full of beauty at the great fair of Ukáz. In addition to al-Yáman, the Persians at the period referred to ruled over the settled Arab population which inhabited al-Báhrain and al-Írák; but the Badawín, or Nomads, were, as they are still, virtually independent. The Arabs of Syria were under the Romans, those of Mesopotamia alternately under the Romans and Persians. The tribes of Central Arabia and the al-Hijáz, over whom the Hímyarite sovereigns of al-Yáman had occasionally exercised a precarious authority, were now their own masters.

The foregoing analysis of the condition of Arabia having been made to converge, in its different phases, to a point of time immediately preceding the birth of Muhámmad, this latter subject, with its ulterior consequences, follows next in course for discussion. And albeit the word "Muhámmadanism," as the term more usually applied by Europeans to the religion of Muhámmad, forms part of the title of this article, the writer prefers for various reasons,

and specially because it is more correct, to use the word "Islám" to designate the creed, and "Muslim" to designate one of its professed followers.

MUHÁMMAD.—According to Oriental writers Muhámmad descended in a direct line from Ishmael, and consequently from the patriarch Abraham. His family for several generations had presided over the al-Kuráish, the most noble of the Arab tribes, who also held the guardianship of the al-Kaábah. His grandfather Abdu-1-Múttalib, the prince of the al-Kuráish, is recorded to have been a man of boundless generosity, extremely affable in his manners, and easy of access. He had twelve sons, of whom one of the younger, named Abdúllah, was considered the most handsome person of the tribe. When between twenty and twenty-four years of age his grandfather married him to Aminah, the daughter of Wáhb-ibn-Ábdmanáf, who was then head of the family of Zúhry. Muslim authors represent Aminah as the most beautiful, prudent, and virtuous woman of her tribe. Then followed the Abyssinian invasion of the al-Hijáz, and shortly after Abdúllah was sent to Yáthrib (al-Madínah) to purchase dates for his family. He died on that journey at the age of twenty-five, and was buried in the quarter of his maternal uncles there. At the time of Abdúllah's death his wife was far advanced in pregnancy, and on the 12th of Rabíá-1-Áwwal, of the Era of the Elephant, and about fifty days after the destruction of the Abyssinian army, or according to M. Caussin de Perceval on the 12th of August, A.D. 570, she gave birth to the future lawgiver of the Arabs. The entire property left by Abdúllah for his widow and infant child consisted of a house, five camels, an Abyssinian female slave, and a few sheep.

Great and numerous portents are said to have attended the childbirth of Aminah. Suffice it to say that these legends rest upon no trustworthy authority, and that whatever credence may be given them by the wonder-loving vulgar, the more intelligent Muslims either explain them away or repudiate them as idle fables. Premising here that the history of Muhámmad is extremely obscure prior to his assumption of the character of a prophet; that his earliest Arabian biographers lived at least two or three centuries after the events which they narrate; and that there exists a great diversity of opinion among Muslim jurists as to the authenticity of the *Hadith*, that is, the Sayings attributed either to Muhámmad himself, or to the *Sháhábah*, his Companions, or to the *Tabíy*, or Those who came after them; and that the same or even greater conflict of opinion prevails among them as regards the *Siyar*, or Ecclesiastical History of Islám, it is of importance that too great stress should not be laid on these more or less allowedly apocryphal authorities. In the following remarks on the childhood of Muhámmad only those legends will be noticed which seem to have had a bearing on his subsequent career.

On the seventh day after his grandchild's birth Abdu-1-Múttalib gave a feast to the al-Kuráish. The feast ended, the guests asked him what the child's name was to be. "Muhámmad," that is, the Praised One, he replied; and to the query why he adopted a name which was unusual in his family he answered: "In

the hope that my grandson will be praised by God in heaven, and by God's creatures on earth." In accordance with a custom which prevailed then, as now, among the citizens of the al-Hijáz, the child was committed to the care of a Badawin nurse, one Halimah, the wife of Hárith, who took him into the desert of the Bánu-Saád. Muhámmad grew rapidly, and at two years old was weaned, when Halimah brought him back to his mother; but her household having been greatly prospered while the infant Muhámmad was with her, she induced his mother to allow him to return with her until he was older and stronger, alleging that the air of Mecca was much less salubrious than the air of the desert. Shortly after, however, the child was seized with some sort of a fit, the particulars of which are thus narrated: "One day Muhámmad, while at some distance from the encampment of the Bánu-Saád, accompanied by a son of his foster-mother and father who was tending a flock of sheep, Halimah saw her son running towards her, and asked, 'What is the matter?' 'My little brother, the al-Kuráishy,' replied he, 'was seized by two men dressed in white, who stretched him on the ground and opened his belly.' Halimah and Hárith hastened to the spot and found Muhámmad standing erect, but his countenance was wan and pale. On being questioned as to what had befallen him he confirmed the story told by his companion. Thereupon Halimah brought him into the tent, when her husband said to her, 'I fear this child is possessed [with a demon]; we must restore him to his mother before the disease develops itself.'" Another tradition relates that in after years Muhámmad explained to his disciples that two angels had taken his heart out of his bosom to wash and purify it, and the poetic fancy of Arabian writers has embellished the story for the sake of exalting their Prophet. The only allusion to it in the Kurán is this: "Have We not opened thy breast?" (Súr. xciv. 1), which al-Baidháwy comments upon thus: "that is, by disposing and enlarging it to receive the truth, and wisdom, and prophecy; or, by freeing thee from uneasiness and ignorance." Aminah, surprised that her child had been brought back to her so soon, inquired the reason. To which Halimah replied that she feared some evil might befall him; but, upon being pressed by the mother, she expressed her fears that the child was possessed. "No, no," rejoined the mother, "nothing of the kind. The demon has no power over him. A high destiny awaits him."

Such are the traditional notices upon which Moracci, Prideaux, and others have based their conclusions—in which Sir William Muir seems to coincide—that Muhámmad was subject to epileptic fits. The correct text of the traditions quoted does not afford the least ground for this inference, and, whatever the temporary malady may have been, it was quite natural, in the then state of ignorance which prevailed among the Arabs, to ascribe it to the influence of evil spirits. The silence of Muslim writers respecting any such ailment in their Prophet is a strong argument against his having been affected by it. These generally represent Muhámmad as of a robust constitution, which enabled him in after life to undergo great

mental and bodily fatigue. Hence, there seems to be no foundation whatever for the following surmises of Sir William Muir: "If we are right in regarding the attacks which alarmed Halima as fits of a nervous or epileptic nature, they exhibit in the constitution of Mahomet the normal marks of those excited states and ecstatic swoons which perhaps suggested to his own mind the idea of his own inspiration, as by his disciples they were certainly taken to be evidences of it." Sir William is more happy and instructive in his subsequent remarks: "It is probable that, in other respects, the constitution of Mahomet was rendered robust, and his character free and independent, by his five years' residence among the Bani-Sâd. At any rate his speech was formed upon one of the purest models of the beautiful language of the Peninsula. . . . When eloquence began to form an important element towards his success, a pure language and standard dialect were advantages of essential moment."

When Muhámmad was six years old his mother Aminah took him to Yáthrib to present him to his maternal relations, and died on the return journey. Thereupon the child was received by his grandfather Abdu'l-Múttalib, who always manifested the greatest fondness for him. When on his death-bed, two years after, the aged patriarch committed the guardianship of the orphan to his son Abu-Tálib, the uterine brother of his father Abdúllah, whose attachment to the lad equalled that of Abdu'l-Múttalib. In after years Muhámmad affectingly recalls these incidents of his early life in the following beautiful passage from the al-Kurân, Sûr. xciii. 3-11:

"The Lord hath not forsaken thee, neither hath He been displeased.

And, surely, the future shall be to thee better than the past.

Hereafter shall thy Lord vouchsafe to thee that which shall satisfy thee.

Did He not find thee orphan, and gave thee a home?

Did He not find thee erring and guided thee?

And found thee needy and enriched thee?

[Therefore] wrong not the orphan,

Neither chide away the beggar;

But proclaim abroad the bounty of thy Lord."

When about twelve years old Muhámmad accompanied his uncle Abu-Tálib into Syria on a mercantile expedition. At that time there appears to have been regular commercial intercourse between the two countries, the traders of the al-Hijáz bringing back from Syria, in exchange for their dates and the spices of al-Yáman, corn, raisins, stuffs, and other produce of that part of the Roman empire. How far the caravan proceeded is not recorded, but it certainly reached Busra, (the Bozrah of the Bible,) a town situated about fifty miles to the south-east of the Lake of Tiberias, where there was a Christian monastery. According to a tradition mentioned by several Arabian authors, a monk came out and invited the people of the caravan to a repast. The name of this monk, who is said to have been an Arab of the tribe of the Abdu'l-Kais, located in Mesopotamia, was Bahíra, although among his co-religionists he bore the name of Sarjís, or Jirjís, the latter the Syriac and Arabic for "George." Bahíra, fixing his eyes on the young Muhámmad, is related to

have said to his uncle: "Convey your nephew home again, and guard him carefully, especially against the Jews, for if they discover certain signs upon him, which I have found out, they will make some attempt upon his life. Know, further, that a glorious future awaits the son of your brother." The signs here spoken of are supposed to refer to the "Seal of Prophecy," which some ignorant Muslims believe to have existed on the back of the Prophet, written in letters of light. The Syed Ahmed Khan, in his treatise on the *Birth and Childhood of Mohammed*, adduces several traditions to prove that this so-called Seal of Prophecy was nothing more than a cluster of black moles, covered with hair. Whereupon he adds: "The real fact appears to be that, as everything connected with the Prophet was regarded with reverence, his followers, thinking that it would be rather derogatory to the Prophet himself . . . to call the fleshy excrescence of his body by the common name of mole or wart, figuratively designated it by the more exalted appellation of 'the prophet's seal.'" The monk Bahíra is generally represented as being a Nestorian, but upon what authority does not appear, although the statement that he belonged to an Arab tribe settled in Mesopotamia favours the notion. Busra, or "Bostra," as it is called by Eusebius, was an episcopal see up to the early part of the 3rd century, when it was occupied by Beryllus, who denied Christ to be the second Person of the Trinity before His incarnation. I am unable to trace the bishopric up to the time under review, but there can be no doubt that the place was still inhabited by a considerable Christian Arab community.

Sir William Muir dilates in a pleasing strain on the probable influence which this journey through Petra and other remains of mercantile grandeur had upon the mind of the young Muhámmad. He must have passed through several Jewish settlements, and at Busra, and perhaps other places in Syria, come into contact with the national profession of Christianity. The social customs and religious rites of the Christians, their churches, crosses, images or pictures, and more especially the sight of whole tribes of Arabs practising the observances of the Christian faith, can hardly fail to have made a deep impression on him. "However fallen and materialized the Christianity of that day in Syria, it must have struck the thoughtful observer in favourable and wonderful contrast with the gross idolatry of Mecca."

A sanguinary feud, which lasted for ten years, broke out, A.D. 580, between the al-Kuráish and their associates the al-Kinánah on the one side, and the Kais-Áilán on the other. These wars, from having been entered upon during the sacred months, when such conflicts were forbidden, obtained the name of *Sacrilegious*. They originated at Úkáz, about three days' journey to the eastward of Mecca, where a great annual fair was held. In one of these wars Muhámmad is said to have been present, and to have been engaged in picking up the arrows which were discharged by the enemy and handing them to his uncle, who took part in the battle. It is very probable, as Sir William Muir suggests, that the gatherings at this fair, where the national bards contended for the prize of elo-

quence, the successful poems being transcribed in illuminated characters, called "Golden," and subsequently attached to the al-Kaábah and honoured with the name of *al-Muúllakát*, or the Suspended, had a powerful influence upon the mind of the youthful Muhámmad. "At these spectacles . . . he had rare opportunities of cultivating his own genius, and of learning from the greatest of masters and most perfect models the art of poetry and the power of rhetoric. But another and a nobler lesson might be learned in the concourse of Ocátz. The Christianity as well as the chivalry of Arabia had representatives there; and, if we may believe tradition, Mahomet while a boy heard Coss, the bishop of Nadjrán, preach a purer creed than that of Mecca in accents that agitated and aroused his soul. . . . There, too, were Jews, serious and earnest men, surpassing the Christians in number, and equally with them appealing to an inspired Book. . . . May there not have been here too the germ of his great catholic design; of that faith around which all the tribes were to rally?"

Little further is recorded of Muhámmad until he had attained his twenty-fifth year. During some portion of the interval he appears to have gained his livelihood by tending sheep in the neighbourhood of Mecca, an occupation which he is related to have referred to in after life, saying: "Verily, there hath no prophet been raised up who did not perform the work of a shepherd." The probable effect upon him of his shepherd life is thus beautifully described by Sir William Muir: "While he watched his flock, his attention would be riveted by the evidences of natural religion around him: the twinkling of the stars and bright constellations gliding through the dark blue sky silently along would be charged to him with a special message; the loneliness of the desert would arm with a deeper conviction that speech which day everywhere utters unto day; while the still small voice, never unheard by the attentive listener, would swell with grandeur and more imperious strains when the tempest swept, with its forked lightning and far-rolling thunder, along the vast solitudes of the mountains around Mecca. Thus, we may presume, was cherished a deep and earnest faith in the Deity, as an ever-present, all-directing agent,—a faith which in after days the Prophet was wont to enforce, from the stores of his well-furnished observation, by eloquent and heart-stirring appeals to the sublime operations of nature, and the beneficent adaptations of Providence." These reflections suggest a striking parallel between Moses and Muhámmad; the former divinely summoned away from pasturing Jethro's flock, at Midian, to recall to the mind of the Israelites in Egypt the probably forgotten knowledge among them of the only living and true God; the latter similarly called, as he himself doubtless believed, after having followed a like occupation in an adjoining district of the same wild region, to proclaim to his idolatrous countrymen the doctrine of the unity of God.

Some years after the *Sacrilegious* wars a spirit of religious inquiry appears to have sprung up among some of the more enlightened citizens of Mecca. This fact deserves notice as shewing that the ground was being gradually prepared

for the subsequent mission of Muhámmad. Four individuals are mentioned in the *Siratu'r-Rasúl* as having taken part in this movement, namely, Wárahah-ibn-Náufal, the cousin of Khadíjah, Muhámmad's first wife, Óthmán-ibn-Huwáirith, Óbaidúllah-ibn-Jáhsh, and Zaid-ibn-Amr. The first of these is said to have acquired considerable information from the Jews and Christians, and, learning that there was a general expectation among the former of the near appearance of a messenger from heaven, he assumed that he would rise up among the Arabs. He is recorded to have been able to read Hebrew, and to have had considerable knowledge of the Hebrew and Jewish scriptures. Wárahah is stated to have acknowledged the mission of Muhámmad on hearing from Khadíjah her account of Gabriel's visit to her husband, as subsequently recorded in Sur. xcvi. of the al-Kurán. Óthmán eventually embraced Christianity, and found his way to the Roman court. On his return to Mecca he made some attempts to have that territory annexed to the Roman empire, but being obliged to flee the country he took refuge with the Christian Arab tribe of the al-Ghassán, by whose chief he was delivered up to some of the al-Kuráish traders who happened to be there, and who poisoned him. Óbaidúllah, after vain attempts to discover what was then styled *al-Hanifíyyah*, or the Orthodox religion of Abraham, became one of the early converts to Islám, which he subsequently, while in Abyssinia, abjured for Christianity. Muhámmad married Záinab, the sister of this Óbaidúllah, A.H. 5. Zaid, on renouncing paganism, endeavoured to flee the country, but was prevented by his relatives. He is said to have frequented the al-Kaábah daily, praying to God to enlighten him. He set up a religion of his own, based on the Divine unity. His bold denunciations of idolatry stirred up the anger of his countrymen. He effected his escape into Mesopotamia, making inquiries of all the religions whom he met about the religion of Abraham. Hearing afterwards that a prophet had appeared in Arabia who preached that religion—Muhámmad had by that time begun his public mission—he set out for that region, but was killed by an Arab tribe on the northern confines of the al-Iljáz.

To return to Muhámmad. All authorities agree that his youth was irreproachable, and that he was held in general esteem as well for his solid virtues as for his engaging manners, so much so that he acquired the title of *al-Amín*, or the Trustworthy. When he had attained his twenty-fifth year these qualities attracted the attention of Khadíjah, a rich widow who had been twice married and was fifteen years his senior in age, who carried on an extensive trade with the surrounding countries. She proposed to employ him as her agent on a mercantile journey to Syria, which Muhámmad executed with such success that she offered him her hand in marriage, being further induced thereto—so the tradition runs—by the report of her servant, Máisarah, who accompanied the caravan, that he had seen two angels shading Muhámmad from the sun with their wings. Abu-Tálib, on being informed of this proposition, proceeded at once to Khuwáilid, the widow's father, to obtain his formal permission to the union. The nuptial



feast was celebrated with great pomp, and the marriage proved a very happy one. All accounts concur in stating that Muhámmad remained faithful to this his first wife until her death, which occurred twenty years later. Within the next ten or twelve years Khadíjah bore him two sons and four daughters. The sons died in infancy. All the daughters embraced Islám. Rukáyyah, the eldest, and Umm-Kulthúm, the third, were successively espoused by Óthmán-ibn-Affán, who afterwards became Khalífah, or Successor (to Muhámmad). Fátimah, the youngest, born about A.D. 606, married Aly-ibn-Abi-Talib, Muhámmad's cousin, who succeeded Óthmán in the Khalífate. To console himself for the loss of his male children Muhámmad subsequently adopted his cousin Aly and Zaid-ibn-Háarithah, the latter a slave who had belonged to Khadíjah, whom he manumitted, and who in after years obsequiously divorced his wife Záinab, in order that she might be married to the Prophet, who had taken a fancy to her. The Arab tribes to which Zaid belonged on the father and mother's side professed Christianity.

Sir William Muir deems it likely that during his second journey into Syria the mind of Muhámmad received deep and lasting impressions from what he saw and learnt of the tenets and practices of the Syrian Christians, and from his probable intercourse with their clergy. Of the latter he always speaks with respect; but for their peculiar doctrines he had no sympathy: "The picture of Christianity in the Corán must have been, in some considerable degree, painted from the conceptions now formed. Had he witnessed a purer exhibition of its rites and doctrines, and seen more of its reforming and regenerating influences, we cannot doubt but that, in the sincerity of his search after truth, he might readily have embraced and faithfully adhered to the faith of Jesus. Lamentable, indeed, is the reflection that so small a portion of the fair form of Christianity was disclosed by the monks and ecclesiastics of Syria to the earnest inquirer, and that little how altered and distorted! Instead of the simple majesty of the Gospel—as a revelation of God reconciling mankind to Himself through His Son—the sacred dogma of the Trinity was forced upon the traveller with the misguided and offensive zeal of Eutychnian and Jacobite partisanship, and the worship of Mary exhibited in so gross a form as to leave the impression upon the mind of Mahomet that she was held to be a goddess, if not the third Person and the consort of the Deity. [See Súr. v. 125.] It must surely have been by such blasphemous extravagances that Mahomet was repelled from the true doctrine of Jesus as 'the Son of God,' and led to regard him only as 'Jesus the Son of Mary,' the sole title by which he is spoken of in the Corán [in that relation]. We may well mourn that the misnamed Catholicism of the Empire thus grievously misled the master mind of the age, and through him eventually so great a part of Asia and Africa."

It is important to bear in mind the foregoing experiences in the life of Muhámmad as we approach the period of his alleged revelations. There can be no doubt that by this time he had acquired, as well through his own observation

and inquiry as through intimate converse with Bárahah, reputed the most learned Arab of the age, considerable acquaintance with the dogmas of Judaism and Christianity; that he had some knowledge of the Bible, the Talmud, and the Gospels; that he was thoroughly versed in Arab legendary lore; and that being gifted with a ready flow of speech, an ardent imagination, together with a bold enterprising spirit, he was well equipped for carrying out that great social and religious revolution among his countrymen which he contemplated. Muslim authors generally deny that he was able either to read or to write; hence he was styled *Ummiyy*, illiterate; in support of which theory the following passage of the Kurán is adduced:—"We have not taught him [Muhámmad] poetry, neither was it fit for him." (Súr. xxxvi. 69.) There is another passage, however, (Súr. xxix. 47,) which says, "Thou didst not read, before it, from a book, nor didst thou write it with thy right hand," which some commentators take to mean that he subsequently became acquainted with the art of reading and writing.

It appears that for some years prior to the events about to be narrated Muhámmad had been in the habit of retiring with his family to a cave in Mount Hirá, near Mecca. Dismissing as untrustworthy the traditions of his having been addressed frequently, during his solitude, by a mysterious voice saluting him as the Apostle of God, we come to the occasion when he himself first claims a divine, or angelic authority for his mission. He had now attained his forty-first year, and was, during the month of Ramadhán, at his usual retreat in the cave, when his wife, Khadíjah, missing him from her side and being alarmed at his absence, sent servants in every direction to search for him. On his return—so runs the tradition—Muhámmad communicated to her what follows:—"I was in a deep sleep when an angel appeared to me in a dream. He held in his hand a large piece of silken stuff covered with written characters. This he held up before me, saying, 'Read.' 'What shall I read?' said I. Thereupon he covered me with the stuff in such a way that I was almost smothered. Again he said, 'Read.' I repeated my answer, 'What shall I read?' He rejoined, 'Read: In the name of thy Lord who created; created man from clots of blood. Read: The bounty of thy Lord is infinite; it is He who has taught writing; He has made men acquainted with that which they knew not.' I repeated these words after the angel, whereupon he departed. I awoke. The words which he had made me repeat seemed to be engraven on my heart. I went out to quiet my emotion, and reached the edge of the mountain. There I heard a voice above my head saying, 'O Muhámmad, thou art the Apostle of God, and I am Gabriel.' I lifted up my eyes and saw the angel. I became rooted to the spot, with my sight fixed upon him till he disappeared. Then I returned towards you." Gabriel is only mentioned by name three times in the Kurán: once in Súr. lxxvi. 4, where he is stated to be a "protector of the faithful," and twice in Súr. ii., where that angel is represented as "he who by God's permission hath caused the Kurán to descend on thy [Muhámmad's] heart." Hence the same angel is generally believed to have been the usual

medium through which the Divine will was communicated to the Prophet. According to Muslim commentators it was the angel Gabriel who appeared to Zacharias, albeit in Súr. iii. 37 of the Kurán the word "angels" is used. In like manner they interpret the passage about God having strengthened Jesus, the son of Mary, with the Holy Spirit, (*Id.* ii. 81.) as meaning Gabriel who sanctified and constantly attended on him. Tradition records that when questioned on the subject of inspiration Muhámmad replied: "It descendeth upon me in one of two ways. Sometimes Gabriel cometh and communicateth the revelation to me as one man to another, and this is very easy. At other times it affecteth me like the ringing of a bell, penetrating my very heart, and sending me, as it were, in pieces, and this it is which grievously affecteth me." Exception has been taken to the violent physical and mental excitement which Muhámmad appears to have laboured under at such times, and some have gone so far as to attribute it to Satanic influence. Our own Scriptures frequently describe the prophets and others as being either greatly agitated or suddenly rendered insensible when about to receive some communication from above. (See Ex. xix. 16; Job iv. 13-16; Is. vi. 5; Ezek. i. 28; Dan. viii. 17; Rev. i. 17.)

On his return to Mecca, Muhámmad communicated to his wife Khadjjah a more particular account of his vision, which she received with great joy, and having preceded all others in her belief of his mission she is generally regarded as the first proselyte to *al-Islám*, or the Religion of Muhámmad, as inculcating the *Resignation of self* (to God, and conformity to the precepts of His Prophet). Restricting his efforts at the outset to private persuasion, Muhámmad's next proselytes were members of his own household. Aly, his pupil and cousin, Wárahah, and Zaid-ibn-Háarithah readily embraced the new faith. A much more important conquest, however, was *Abdu-'l-Kaábah-ibn-Kuháfah*, a man of considerable influence among the al-Kuráish, who was also regarded as the most learned man in Mecca. On embracing al-Islám he changed his name to *Abdúllah*, and on subsequently marrying his daughter *Aishah* to Muhámmad he took that of *Abu-Bakr*, by which he has since been generally recognized. This personage, who appears to have been a fervent and zealous convert, succeeded in inducing several of his friends among the principal families of the al-Kuráish to adopt his views. Among these was *Othmán-ibn-Affán*, of the house of the al-Umayyah, who became Khalifah after *Abu-Bakr*, whose claim to the dignity of being the first Successor to the Prophet was considered to outweigh that of his cousin Aly, a claim which the *ash-Shiáah* dissidents deny to this day.

The obligations imposed by Muhámmad upon his disciples at this period were: the duty of believing in one God, in a future reward reserved for the righteous in another life, and a future punishment for the wicked; of acknowledging him as the Apostle of God, and of obeying him as such; of practising ablution, and of offering up prayer according to certain specified rules. These, he contended, did not constitute a new religion: they merely restored the ancient religion of Abraham to its pristine

purity. His teachings—so he maintained—were not the outcome of his own mind, neither were they drawn from any human source. They were written revelations which had been conveyed to him by Gabriel, and he simply rehearsed to the faithful what the angel communicated to him. Here we have the origin of the word *Kur-án*, which signifies reading or recitation, and which when preceded by the definite article, *al-Kur-án*, indicates *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the Reading, or the Recital. (Súr. ii. 181; v. 101; x. 38; xxv. 34; xliii. 30, &c.)

For the space of three years, during which he professed to have received frequent revelations, Muhámmad instructed his disciples in private. The support now afforded him by a devoted band of about forty Muslims seems to have decided him to keep his mission no longer a secret, although he himself refers the decision to a higher authority. In Súr. xv. xxvi. and lxxiv., apparently written at this period, he is bade to "arise and warn," to "profess publicly what thou hast been bidden, and withdraw from such as associated gods with [the one] God," and especially to admonish his "near relations." In accordance with these injunctions tradition represents him as ascending the eminence of *as-Sáfa*, at Mecca, and openly preaching to the al-Kuráish. He then directed his cousin Aly to prepare an entertainment for the sons and descendants of *Abdu-'l-Múttalib*, intending on that occasion to open his mind to them, but *Abu-Láhab*, one of Muhámmad's uncles, frustrated the attempt. However, at another entertainment given the following day Muhámmad thus addressed the assembled guests:—"I know of no man in the whole peninsula of Arabia who can propose to his relations anything more excellent than what I now propose to you. I offer you the happiness both of this world and of that which is to come. God Almighty hath commanded me to call mankind unto Him. Who, therefore, among you will second me in that work, and thereby become my brother, my vicegerent, my Khalifah?" Thereupon Aly rose up, and replied: "I, O Apostle of God, will be thy minister. I will knock out the teeth, tear out the eyes, rip up the bellies, and cut off the legs of all who shall dare to oppose thee." Muhámmad forthwith embraced his cousin, and said to the assembled guests:—"This is my brother, my deputy, my Khalifah; hear, therefore, and obey him;" whereat the whole company broke out into laughter, telling *Abu-Tálib* that he must now be submissive to his own son.

Notwithstanding this repulse Muhámmad was so far from being discouraged that, instead of restricting his preaching to a declaration of the unity of God and his own apostolic mission, he now began to denounce idolatry, and to point out the absurdity of worshipping images of wood and stone. So highly did these attacks upon their ancient religion provoke the al-Kuráish that they would certainly have silenced him had he not been protected by *Abu-Tálib*, his uncle. The latter, however, was so warmly pressed by the tribe to restrain his nephew that he ultimately dissuaded him against pursuing his course any longer. But Muhámmad was not to be intimidated, and he plainly told his uncle that were they to set the sun against him on his

right hand, and the moon on his left, he would not abandon his enterprise. Abu-Tálib, finding him so firmly resolved, forbore to urge him any further, and promised to support him against his enemies.

The al-Kuráish, seeing that they could not silence the new converts either by fair words or threats, determined to resort to stronger measures. They used the Muslims so outrageously that it was not safe for them to remain any longer in Mecca, and Muhámmad himself was subjected to personal violence at their hands, one of them offering him the indignity of pulling his beard. Albeit these attacks discouraged some among the Muslims, others were induced thereby to sympathize with the persecuted Apostle and his followers, inasmuch that Hámmzah, one of Muhámmad's uncles, became a proselyte to Islám. Another famous convert at this time was Omar-ibnu-'l-Khattáb, a person highly esteemed among the al-Kuráish, who had previously been a violent opposer of the Prophet. Thirty-nine of Omar's adherents are said to have followed his example on the day that he professed himself a Muslim. Owing, possibly, to these conversions the al-Kuráish not only suspended their persecution of Muhámmad for a time, but even attempted to come to some understanding with him. According to a tradition contained in the *Siratu-'r-Rasûl* he was one day seated in the *al-Hijr*,—the space round the north-west side of the al-Kaábah,—at some distance from a group of the al-Kuráish chiefs, who were all opposed to his doctrines. One of them, named Útbah-ibn-Rabi'ah, whose younger brother, Abu-Hudháifah, had embraced Islám, came and sat near him, and said: "O son of my friend, you are a man distinguished alike for your qualities and your birth. Although you have thrown the country into commotion, have created dissensions among families, have outraged our gods, and taxed our ancestors and wise men with impiety and error, nevertheless we would deal kindly with you. Listen to the proposals which I have to make to you, and reflect whether it will not be well for you to accept some of them." "Speak; I hear you," replied Muhámmad. "O son of my friend," rejoined Útbah, "if your object is to attain riches, we will all join together to give you a fortune larger than that of an al-Kuráishy. If you aim at honours, we will make you our *Sáyyid*, and decide nothing without your concurrence. If you are under the spell of an evil spirit which seems to haunt and dominate you so that you are unable to throw off its influence, in that case we will call in skilful physicians, and give them much gold, that they may cure you." "Have you said all?" rejoined Muhámmad. On receiving an affirmative reply Muhámmad recited the 41st *sûrah* of the Kurán, which is supposed to have been written with a special view to Útbah's conversion. (The chapter contains many beautiful passages on the wisdom, power, and sovereignty of God, and the duty of worshipping Him only. It claims for the Kurán the character of being a "Revelation from the Pitiful, the Compassionate" (One), describes Muhámmad as being "only a man," like other men,—a phrase of frequent occurrence in the same book,—who is commissioned to tell men to "go straight" to God and implore His pardon,

and to "denounce woe to those who join other gods with [the only] God.") Útbah, on returning to his companions, readily admitted that he had never heard such discourse before. "It was not the language of poetry," said he, "nor the language of magic; but there was something in it which was penetrating." On advising his friends not to meddle with Muhámmad, and to let him pursue his mission freely among the Arabs, they cried out, "He has bewitched you." On two or three subsequent occasions the same party made him similar proposals, and finally called upon him to perform a miracle to prove the truth of his mission. Muhámmad reiterated his assertion that God had not sent him for any such purpose, but simply to communicate His will to mankind. (Reference seems to be made to these circumstances in *Sûr. vi. 50, 56, 164, and xxv. 8 et seq.*, of the Kurán.) "All that you announce," retorted they, "has been taught you by a certain ar-Rahmán; but we will not believe this ar-Rahmán. Be warned, and further rest assured, that we shall never cease to oppose your attacks upon our religion, and that one or other of us must perish in the conflict." (*Ar-Rahmán*, or the Merciful, one of the names most commonly applied to God in the Kurán, appears to have been also the name of an Arab of al-Yamámah. Hence the charge against Muhámmad that what he announced as revelations from God was merely the teaching of the said Arab.) About this time, also, a rumour got afloat that a Christian Greek, named John, who kept a goldsmith's shop at Mecca, and with whom Muhámmad held frequent intercourse, dictated his alleged divine communications. This insinuation was rebutted thus:—"We also know that they say: surely a certain person teacheth him; but the tongue of him at whom they hint is foreign, whereas this [Kurán] is in perspicuous Arabic." (*Sûr. xvi. 105.*)

The al-Kuráish, unable to resist Muhámmad's powerful and sublime eloquence, and finding that every attempt on their part to ensnare him in his talk turned to their own confusion, decided at length to prohibit all intercourse with him, and threatened to punish those who should contravene this injunction. Consequently, when the Prophet visited the al-Kaábah for prayer, where he was accustomed to recite aloud a chapter of the Kurán, all forthwith left the place and retired to a distance from him. One Muslim, named Abdúllah-ibn-Mas'úd, bolder than the rest of his persecuted co-religionists, determined to oblige the al-Kuráish to listen to the Kurán, and to brave their opposition. One day, at noon, he repaired to the precincts of the al-Kaábah, and taking his stand near the *Makám-ibrahím*, where the chiefs of the al-Kuráish were assembled, he uttered in a thrilling voice the following verses from *Sûr. lv.*: "In the name of God, the Pitiful, the Compassionate! The Pitiful hath taught the al-Kurán. He hath created man. He hath taught him discrimination. The sun and the moon in their revolutions, and the stars and the trees adore him;" &c. Whereupon the al-Kuráish fell upon Abdúllah, who, despite the blows dealt out to him, continued his recitation, and on rejoining his companions, bespattered as he was with blood and covered with bruises, gloried in having obliged the idolaters to listen to the Kurán. As might

have been expected, this instance of audacity increased the irritation of the al-Kuráish, who now organized a regular system of persecuting the Muslims. Every family, in order to avoid suspicion and escape the vengeance of this inquisition, harassed those of their household who were suspected of a leaning towards al-Islám. Muhámmad, owing to the protection of his uncle Abu-Tálib, of Abu-Bakr, and of a few powerful friends among the idolaters, escaped personal violence, but his followers were cast into prison and scourged. Some were exposed to the scorching rays of the sun, others made to suffer hunger and thirst, and, when utterly exhausted, were asked to worship the idols. A few recanted, but the greater part persisted in their faith. Among the latter was one Balál, a half-caste slave of the family of Jumah, whose master, Umáyyah, took him daily to the valley of al-Bathá when the heat was at its height, and there extending him on the ground, with his face upturned to the sun and a heavy stone placed on his chest, used to say to him: "You shall remain there until you die, unless you deny Muhámmad and worship the idols Lát and Uzza." "There is no god but the God! there is no god but the God!" replied Balál. One day Abu-Bakr, happening to witness this torture, said to Umáyyah: "Are you not afraid of the vengeance of heaven for your barbarity to this poor man?" "You it is who have seduced him," was the reply; "redeem him if you choose." Thereupon Abu-Bakr offered him in exchange for Balál a robust negro slave, who was an idolater. The offer was accepted, and Abu-Bakr forthwith manumitted Balál. The same philanthropic personage purchased six other slaves, one man and five women who professed Islám, all of whom he enfranchised.

Profoundly distressed at the sufferings which his disciples had to endure—sufferings which he was powerless to prevent—Muhámmad advised them to seek an asylum in Abyssinia until God should open a way for their return home. Twelve men and four women accordingly started for that country, making their way on foot to the shores of the Red Sea, where they hired a boat to convey them across. This first emigration is recorded to have taken place during the fifth year of Muhámmad's mission, or about A.D. 615. The emigrants were subsequently joined by another body of Muslims, so that their number was increased to eighty-three males and eighteen females. The al-Kuráish, in order to deprive them of his protection, sent an embassy to the Najáshi, or king of Abyssinia, to induce him to deport them. To this the king demurred until he had examined them respecting their creed, with which—if Muslim tradition is to be relied on—he was so well satisfied, especially after one of the emigrants had recited the passage in the Kurán (Súr. xix.) which narrates the appearance of an angel to Zacharias, the father of John, that he not only promised them his protection, but became, in secret, a disciple of al-Islám.

Hitherto Muhámmad alone had ventured to say his prayers within the precincts of the al-Kaábah, with his face turned towards the *Rúknush-Shámy*, the angle pointing in the direction of Syria. Now, however, he was joined therein by the redoubtable Ómar-ibnu-'l-Khattáb

and other Muslims, who felt themselves secure under his guardianship. The return of the disappointed envoys from Abyssinia determined the al-Kuráish to take more decisive measures to oblige Abu-Tálib and the other relatives of Muhámmad to withdraw their countenance from him. A league was accordingly entered into against the descendants of Háshim and Muttálib, whereby it was resolved to deprive them of all civil rights; intermarriage with them was forbidden, and no one was to have commercial dealings with them. In order to add solemnity to this engagement its terms were written on parchment and deposited in the al-Kaábah. The excommunicated families, Muslims and Pagans included, fearing that these proceedings were the prelude to an open attack upon them, quitted their houses and, accompanied by Abu-Tálib, took refuge in a mountain-glen near Mecca, where they remained three years on the defensive, and would undoubtedly have perished from hunger but for the supplies clandestinely sent them by outside friends. It was during this recess, or about A.D. 619, the tenth year of Muhámmad's mission, that the league above mentioned was dissolved in a singular manner. One Hishám-ibn-Amr, who felt a deep interest in the Háshimites, with whom he was related by blood, undertook to effect a reconciliation between them and the al-Kuráish, and succeeded in enlisting the co-operation of four from among the chiefs of the latter in his design. At this juncture Abu-Tálib is recorded to have presented himself before the assembled al-Kuráish, and to have addressed them as follows: "My nephew informs me of its having been revealed to him that, as regards the document which your hatred dictated against us, God has sent worms which have eaten out every word therein expressive of injustice and enmity, sparing only the august name written above it. Should this prove to be true, withdraw your anathema from us; if false, I will deliver my nephew into your hands." The al-Kuráish, having accepted the proposal, sent several persons into the al-Kaábah to inspect the writing. To their great astonishment they found that it had been wholly erased by worms, with the exception of the words "In Thy name, O God!" The revocation of the excommunication immediately ensued, under protest from a few, and the self-exiled families, together with Muhámmad, returned to Mecca. Sale, who is usually most impartial, considers it probable that Muhámmad "had some private notice of this accident." That it was a ruse can hardly be doubted; but whether Muhámmad was a party to the collusion is uncertain. The narrative is legendary, and is not referred to in the Kurán.

About this year, the tenth of his mission, Muhámmad suffered a great loss by the death of his uncle, Abu-Tálib, who had successfully supported him against all his enemies; and very shortly after, Khadíjah, his faithful wife, died at the age of fifty-five years. These two events proved most prejudicial to the Prophet's fortune. The al-Kuráish became more troublesome than ever, inasmuch that he was driven to seek an asylum with the ath-Thakíf, at at-Taíf, situated about sixty miles to the eastward of Mecca, but the chiefs received him coldly, and treated his mission with derision. After remaining there

a month he was ignominiously handled and driven away by the rabble. Thereupon he returned to Mecca, after having secured the protection of Muátim-ibn-Ády, who armed his retainers and escorted him to the precincts of the al-Kaábah, which he circuted seven times before going to his house. There he remained in comparative retirement, and inveighed less openly against idolatry, restricting his teaching to the doctrine of the unity of God, and his mission as God's Apostle. He appears, however, to have made some converts from among the groups of outside Arabs who frequented the al-Kaábah. Towards the end of this year Muhámmad espoused Sáudah-bint-Zámáah, the widow of one Sukrán, and also Aishah, the daughter of Abu-Bakr, then only eight years old. The latter marriage was not consummated till after the lapse of several years.

The *Lálatu-'l-Miuráj*, or Night of the Ladder, in which Muhámmad is related to have ascended from Jerusalem to heaven, after having been conveyed to the former place from Mecca upon the beast called *al-Burák*, is generally referred to the commencement of the eleventh year of the Prophet's mission. An account of this miraculous journey—how Muhámmad was conveyed to Jerusalem, the rites which he performed there, his ascent to heaven under the guidance of Gabriel, and what he saw and heard as he was conducted from the first to the seventh heaven—all this is given in detail by several of his biographers, and it is unquestionable that the majority of Muslims hold the journey to have been made corporally. The more judicious, however, believe on good grounds that the whole was a vision. Thus much is certain, that the *Súratu-'l-Isra* (Súr. xvii.) is utterly silent about the prodigies with which the story has been embellished. The opening verse runs thus: "Praise belongeth unto Him who transported his servant by night from the Temple at Mecca to the Farther Temple [at Jerusalem], the circuit of which We have blessed, that We might shew him some of Our signs;" and at v. 16 it is distinctly stated, "We have appointed the vision which We have shewed thee." Another reference to the same subject occurs in Súr. liii. 13-19, but it merely repeats that "at another time, by the lote-tree, beyond which there is no passing, and near which is the paradise of the souls of the martyrs," the Prophet saw "some of the greatest signs of his Lord." The revelations stated to have been made to him on this occasion are confined in the main to a repetition or confirmation of some of the sublimest ascriptions of praise to the Divine attributes, and of some of the noblest precepts contained in the Kurán, and conclude with the injunction: "Prostrate yourselves before God, and worship." Tradition relates, however, that the times of prayer for Muslims were now definitively fixed at five, in accordance with the command of God to the Prophet during this vision. The same authority records that many of Muhámmad's friends regarded the narrative of the *al-Miuráj* with suspicion, and vainly advised him to be silent about it. Venturing to repeat it boldly before the al-Kuráiish, they assailed him with a shower of ridicule, which he himself bore with imperturbable assurance, but some of his adherents wavered and forsook

him. It was on this occasion that Abu-Bakr is reported to have exclaimed: "Muhámmad cannot lie. I believe all that he has said, and am ready to die to testify thereto." For this saying he was thenceforward styled *as-Siddih*, the Veracious.

In the twelfth year of his mission Muhámmad held a conference at Ákabah, a hill on the north side of Mecca, with twelve men of the al-Áus and the al-Khárazj tribes resident at Yáthrib, (al-Madinah,) who took an oath to be faithful to him and to his religion. They swore to worship one God only, to abstain from theft, infanticide, adultery, fornication, and slander, and to obey all the just requirements of the Prophet. This was the usual formula required of male and female converts alike. Subsequently it was restricted to women, and another was shortly after drawn up for men, who engaged in addition to take up arms in defence of the Prophet's cause. Músáab, one of his Mecca disciples, was directed to accompany the party on their return to Yáthrib for the purpose of teaching them the Kurán and instructing them in the rites of the new religion. Músáab discharged the duty zealously and with considerable success, for he returned to Mecca the following year accompanied by seventy-three men and two women of Yáthrib, who had embraced Islám. On their arrival they sent to Muhámmad, offering him their assistance, an offer which was most acceptable, for his adversaries at Mecca had become so overbearing that he could not remain much longer there without imminent danger. A conference was accordingly held on the hill Ákabah, when, after an address from al-Abbás, the Prophet's uncle, Muhámmad, at the request of the Yáthribites, set before them his conditions, which were to the effect that, in addition to the worship of one God, they were to defend him and his as they would defend their own wives and children. "And what will be our reward," said they, "if we die in your cause?" "Paradise," was the brief reply. (This promise is supposed to be founded on the following passage:—"And those who die in defence of God's true religion, God will not suffer their works to perish. He will guide them, and will dispose their hearts aright, and will lead them into paradise." (Súr. xlvii. 5-7.) After this engagement had been ratified by each person taking the hand of the Prophet, the latter requested them to select twelve from their number to be his *Nakíbs*, or Delegates to the tribes, "after the manner of the Apostles, who were the delegates of Jesus." The conference then broke up, and the men of the al-Áus and al-Khárazj who had attended it, and who thereafter were styled *Ansárs*, Auxiliaries or Defenders, returned to Yáthrib.

Intelligence of this confederacy reaching the al-Kuráiish they determined to do all in their power to thwart it. After several milder measures had been proposed and rejected, it was decided that one man should be selected from each of the tribes who should severally strike Muhámmad a blow with his sword, in order that the guilt of his blood might be shared equally among them. Muhámmad, informed by the angel Gabriel of the threatened danger,—so the tradition runs,—advised his followers to flee to Yáthrib, whilst he, accompanied by Abu-Bakr,

repaired to a cave in Mount Thûr, about three miles to the south of Mecca. His movements, however, had been narrowly watched, and several attempts were made to prevent his escape, special allusion to which is supposed to be made in the following passage:—"And [call to mind] when the unbelievers plotted against thee, to detain thee prisoner, or to kill thee, or to expel thee. They plotted, but God [also] plotted, and God is the best of plotters." (Sûr. viii. 30.) The third night after the escape of the refugees from Mecca, the guide, Abdûllah-ibn-Urâikit, accompanied by Asmâ, Abu-Bakr's daughter, and his freed slave Amîr-ibn-Fuhâirah, brought them a supply of provisions and a couple of she-camels. Muhámmad mounted on one of these and Abu-Bakr on the other, the latter with Amîr behind him, the party set out for Yáthrib, by way of the coast. On arriving at Kûba, a village two miles to the south of that town, they were received with reverence by the inhabitants, and on the following day Muhámmad laid the foundation of a mosque, called *at-Tâkwa*, the Fear of God. This was the first temple raised by Islâm. Muhámmad was received with great demonstrations of joy on his entry into Yáthrib, and was conducted in triumph, accompanied by Abu-Bakr, to the house of Ayyûb-ibn-Zaid, one of the Ansârs, where he remained until he had built a house for himself, and also a mosque. From this time the name of the place was changed from Yáthrib into *Madînatu'n-Nâbi*, the City of the Prophet, or *al-Madînah*, The City, *par excellence*. Shortly after, Muhámmad drew up a charter in which he assured religious toleration to all, together with the peaceable possession of their property. It contained, besides, several other ordinances respecting the mutual relations to be observed between Muslims and Jews, and in the event of any dispute it was to be referred to "the decision of God and His Prophet." Muslim historians are not in accord as to the precise date of the *al-Hijrah* (the Hegira), or the Flight (from Mecca). M. Caussin de Perceval, who has gone deeply into the subject, makes the true *al-Hijrah* to correspond with the 12th or 13th of June, A.D. 622. This era, which superseded all others among the Arabs, and which is now used by all Muslims, was instituted seven years after by the Khalifah Ômar, who fixed it at the first of the month al-Muhárram of the year in which the event took place. According to the same authority, Muhámmad reached the village of Kûba on the 28th of June of the same year.

Up to the time of the Flight Muhámmad's life, both as a citizen and a teacher of religion, appears to have been blameless. He was uniformly grateful to those who reared him, true to his friends, faithful in his married life, upright in his moral character, frugal in his habits, tender-hearted, compassionate, and charitable. If exception is taken to his prophetic claims, it would be difficult to shew that, up to the period specified, he was not in some guise inspired with a spirit not unlike that which moved the prophets of old; for, from whatever source derived, his doctrine, especially that respecting the unity of God and the duty of worshipping and praying to Him only, is in accordance with the Old Testament Scriptures. More difficult still would it be to prove him an im-

postor; for that he believed himself to have been divinely called does not admit of a doubt. And to suppose that he braved the jeers, the taunts, and the cruel persecution of the al-Kurâish for the sake of ambition or gain, or in order to cover an imposture, is to suppose an absurdity. Further, during his residence at Mecca he openly declared that he had not received permission to compel any one to embrace his religion: his business was simply to preach and admonish, and whether men believed or not was no concern of his but belonged solely to God. So far, indeed, from allowing his followers to use force, even in self-defence, he enjoined them to bear patiently those outrages to which they were subjected on account of their religion, advising them to seek a refuge elsewhere, as he himself did, rather than resist their adversaries. But a great change seems to have come over Muhámmad as soon as he found himself free and triumphant at al-Madînah. It has already been noted how he forthwith assumed the reins of temporal power, and conducted himself as an absolute sovereign. Now he as openly declares that he and his followers were not only permitted to defend themselves, but also to attack and extirpate the unbelievers wherever they found them. These injunctions are frequently repeated in the chapters of the Kurân revealed at al-Madînah. Other serious deteriorations in the twofold character of Muhámmad will appear in the sequel.

On the completion of his house the Prophet sent for his two wives, Sâudah and Aïshah, for whom as well as for himself separate apartments had been constructed in the building. The adjoining mosque was finished about the same time, and its *Mihrâb*, or Niche, indicating the point to which the Faithful should turn in prayer, consisted of a block of stone set up in the direction of Jerusalem. His next step was to form a bond of union between the *Ansârs*, or Auxiliaries, who boasted that they were the first to do battle for the Prophet, and the *al-Muhâjirîn*, or Emigrants, from Mecca, who were the first to embrace Islâm. By the arrangement now made each *Ansâr* was joined in the bonds of brotherhood to a *Muhâjir*—a political step which tended to extinguish rivalry between the two parties. With this organization the transactions of the first year of the al-Hijrah terminated. In the course of that which followed several other institutions were founded which obtain among Muslims up to the present day. First, the *Izhân*, or Call to prayer. After several suggestions respecting the means to be used to that end Muhámmad decided in favour of the human voice, and Bilâl, Abu-Bakr's freedman, was appointed the first *Mûazzh-zhin* to announce the five times of prayer in this formula: "God is above all! I testify that there is but one God; I testify that Muhámmad is the Apostle of God. Come to prayer! Come to salvation! God is above all; He is the only God!" Secondly, the institution of the *al-K'ûlah*. Hitherto the custom had been to turn the face, in prayer, in the direction of Jerusalem; now the Prophet alleged a divine revelation directing that in future the Muslims should pray towards the sacred mosque, the al-Ka'bah, at Mecca. (Sûr. ii. 136-147.) Thirdly, the fast of Ramadhân, which was to last the whole of that month; and the institution of the *az-Zakât*, Tithe or Poor

rate, amounting to about one-fortieth of the property possessed, provided that it came up to a certain amount, and had been held for eleven months. The *az-Zakát* was an obligatory offering to God, which was to be made over to the Prophet or his representatives for the relief of the poor and the exigencies of the State.

In the meantime Muhámmad, bent upon avenging himself on the people of Mecca, sent out several detachments to intercept their caravans and otherwise to harass them, he himself accompanying them on two occasions. Subsequently he despatched Abdúllah-ibn-Jáhsh, with eight of the *al-Muhájirín*, to reconnoitre in the direction of an-Nákhlah, near Mecca, instructing him particularly, as the month of Rájab had set in during which war was still prohibited, to confine himself to spying out the movements of the al-Kuráish. But Abdúllah, lighting upon a caravan escorted by four men, fell suddenly upon them, killed two, took the other two prisoners, and carried off all the goods. This was the first booty made and the first blood shed by the Muslims. Muhámmad is said to have been greatly disconcerted at this proceeding, for he refused his share of the booty and sequestered the prisoners and the caravan. In order to quell the outcry made by the people of Mecca against this sacrilegious violation of the general truce, the Prophet, whilst disapproving what had been done, impiously excused the act in the name of God, according to the following alleged revelation made to him at this time: "They will ask thee concerning war in the sacred month; say, To war therein is bad, but to turn aside from the cause of God, and to have no faith in Him and in the sacred Temple, and to drive out its people is worse in the sight of God." (Sûr. ii. 214.) After the proclamation of this revelation Muhámmad allowed the partition of the booty and accepted a ransom for the two captives.

But what established Muhámmad's position at this juncture was the great victory gained at Badr (or Bedr), a village about thirty miles south-west from al-Madínah and ten from the coast. The particulars of this famous battle are given in detail by Muslim historians; a summary of them must suffice here. Having received information that a rich caravan of one thousand camels was on its way to Mecca, escorted by thirty or forty of the al-Kuráish, Muhámmad determined to attack it. But Abu-Sufyân, the leader of the escort, getting wind of his movements, despatched a courier to Mecca for reinforcements. Nine hundred men accordingly set out to his assistance. This counter-movement coming to Muhámmad's ears he drew his forces together, which consisted only of 313 men, and advanced towards Bedr. In the meantime Abu-Sufyân managed to effect his escape with the caravan by making a détour towards the coast. On the 17th of Ramadhân, (13th of January, A.D. 624,) having previously held a council of war and received the assurance of the Muslims that they would follow wherever he led them, Muhámmad ordered his men to march against the enemy; but before the battle commenced there was a single combat between three from each side of the contending parties, in which the Mecca champions were slain—a circumstance which greatly elated the Muslims, who regarded it as an omen of success. Mu-

hammad is said to have offered up fervent prayers to God in the meantime, and then falling into a trance declared that God had promised him certain victory, after which, throwing a handful of dust towards the enemy, he exclaimed: "May their faces be confounded! Onward!" Thereupon the Muslims charged with such bravery that they soon put their adversaries to flight, after having killed seventy of the chief men among them and taken as many prisoners, with a loss on their side of fourteen men only. Several references to this battle are contained in the Kurân. In Sûr. iii. 11 the infidels are represented as having been supernaturally led to estimate the Muslims at double their own number. In Sûr. viii. 9 God is made to reply to the Muslim prayer for succour: "I will aid you with a thousand angels," whilst at v. 45 of the same chapter God is described as causing the enemy to appear few to the Muslims, and the latter many as compared with their adversaries, —a discrepancy explained by commentators as meaning that the Muslims were made to seem few at the outset only, in order to draw on the enemy. Tradition has made the most of these alleged Divine interpositions, and associated them with the most extravagant and absurd prodigies. The bodies of the men slain at Bedr were, by Muhámmad's order, cast into pits. Among the principal prisoners taken were Abbás, his uncle, and two of his most inveterate personal foes, Nádr-ibn-Háarith and Úbah-ibn-Rabiáá. His uncle he directed to be loosed from his bonds, the two latter to be decapitated. Nádr is recorded to have brought some romances from Persia, and to have recited them to the al-Kuráish as compositions vastly superior to the foolish stories of the Kurân, and Úbah is said to have spat in the face of the Prophet at Mecca. Both are supposed to be referred to in Sûr. lxxxix. 25; xc. 31; lxxxii. 5. Úbah, when about to receive the fatal blow, exclaimed, "Who will receive my children after I am dead?" "Hell fire," was Muhámmad's inhuman reply. The other prisoners were well treated, and were subsequently ransomed by their friends at sums reckoned according to the property of each. Abbás, who was very rich, had to pay the heaviest fine; others, owing to their poverty, were liberated gratuitously, on condition of their promising not to take up arms against the Muslims. Such of them, however, as were able to write Arabic were bound to remain for a certain time at al-Madínah, and each to instruct a class of ten pupils. Zaid-ibn-Thâbit, a young *Ansâr*, took advantage of the opportunity thus offered, and being an intelligent youth Muhámmad had him taught Hebrew, in order that he might carry on his correspondence with the Jews.

A serious dispute arose the day after the battle about the division of the booty, which Muhámmad arrested at the time by declaring that it belonged to God. However, on the way back to al-Madínah he had the whole distributed equally, by lot, among all the Muslim combatants; but in order to prevent similar dissensions in future he subsequently published the law on the subject contained in Sûr. viii. entitled *The Spoils*, which begins thus: "They will ask thee about the spoils; say, the spoils are God's and the Apostle's;" but in v. 42 this division is further explained or modified thus:



"When ye have taken any booty a fifth part belongeth to God and His Apostle, and to the near of kin, and to the orphans, and to the poor, and to the wayfarer;" the remaining four-fifths to be divided among those who took part in the action. Muslim jurists are not agreed as to the distribution of the first fifth named, neither does Muhámmad himself appear to have always adhered strictly to the alleged revelation on the subject. Another revelation, indeed, gives him absolute power over all booty. (See Súr. lix. 6, 7.)

Muhámmad was received in triumph at al-Madinah, but the public joy was interrupted by the death of his daughter Kúkáyrah, the divorced wife of Útbah-ibn-Láhab, who was afterwards married to Óthmán-ibn-Affán. On the other hand the al-Kuráish, who were in the greatest consternation after their defeat, vainly sought the alliance of the Najáshí of Abyssinia. An event now occurred which led to the exile of the Bánu-Káinuká, a Jewish tribe settled at al-Madinah. One of their number having committed an indecent assault upon an Arab woman was killed on the spot by a Muslim. A great tumult followed, which was quelled for a time by the Prophet's intervention; nevertheless he withdrew from the Jews those privileges which had been secured to them by the late treaty, unless they embraced Islám. On their refusal he besieged them in their entrenchments until they surrendered at discretion. Thereupon he ordered them all, to the number of seven hundred, to be put to the sword. At the interposition of Abdúllah-ibn-Abi-Salúl he spared their lives, but ordered their summary exile into Syria, retaining as booty all their riches and valuable effects.

During the last month of A.H. 2, Fátimah, Muhámmad's daughter, was married to Ály-ibn-Abi-Tálib. The third year opened with the assassination of Kaáb-ibnu-'l-Ashraf, a famous Jewish poet of the Bánu-Nadhír, who after the battle of Bedr repaired to Mecca and roused the al-Kuráish to avenge themselves by writing satires upon the Prophet and proclaiming them aloud. "Who will rid me of him?" asked Muhámmad. Five of the *Ansárs* responded to the call, and having received Muhámmad's permission to use any stratagem to effect his object they drew him into an ambuscade and assassinated him. Another Jew, Rafí-Sallám, one of the principal chiefs of the same tribe and an inveterate enemy of the Prophet, shared the same fate, with Muhámmad's express approval. Five of the al-Kházraj forced their way into his house and murdered him. About this time Muhámmad married Háfsah, the daughter of Ómar, on the death of her husband Khunáís. Háfsah lived till A.H. 45. Shortly after, he took to wife Záinab-bint-Khuzáimah, the widow of Óbáidah, who was slain at Bedr. The Prophet had now four wives living.

During this year occurred the battle of Úhud, a hill situated about three miles to the northwest of al-Madinah, whither the al-Kuráish, led by Abu-Sufyán, had marched and drawn up an army of 3000 men, including 700 clad in coats of mail, and 200 horse. Muhámmad had decided to keep within the town, but the majority being of a different opinion he sallied forth at the head of 1000 men and took up a position to the north of the city, placing fifty archers in the rear, with strict orders not to quit their post.

The al-Kuráish were drawn up in the shape of a crescent. The Muslims began the assault, which was made with such fury that the enemy's centre gave way, whereby the whole army was thrown into confusion. The archers, thirsting for plunder, abandoned their post, whereupon Khálid-ibnu-'l-Walíd, who commanded the right wing of the al-Kuráish, attacked the enemy with his cavalry and turned the fortune of the day. His loud vociferation of "Muhámmad is slain!" added to the confusion of the Muslims, and defied the Prophet's efforts to rally them. He himself was struck down by a shower of stones, and wounded in the face by two arrows. The retreat, however, was so ably conducted by Abu-Bakr, Ómar, and Óthmán that the al-Kuráish did not attempt a pursuit. Seventy Muslims fell in this engagement, among whom was Himzah. Muhámmad's uncle, whose head Abu-Sufyán had cut off on the field of battle, and fixing it on a lance exclaimed: "O Hubál [an Arab idol], thou art exalted!" The defeat at Úhud threatened to endanger Muhámmad's position, some of his followers murmuring that had he been really a prophet sent by God, God would not have permitted the infidels to triumph over him. The Prophet, however, was equal to the occasion. Revelations were at hand to assure the Muslims that every man's death is predetermined by the Almighty, and that those who fell at Úhud would inevitably have died had they remained at home, whereas now they were reaping the reward of martyrdom. These were not dead, but "alive with their Lord," "filled with joy for those who follow after but have not yet overtaken them;" "for them are the gardens beneath which the rivers flow; there they shall abide for ever." (Súr. iii. 159-165; lxi. 11-13.) The campaign of the fourth year of the al-Híjrah (15th April, 625, to 3rd May, A.D. 625,) opened with the despatch of 500 Muslims against the tribe of al-Asáad, who were making preparations to invade the territory of al-Madinah. The enemy fled at the appearance of the Muslims, who sacked the place and carried off much cattle. Abu-Sálamah, the captain of the troop, dying soon after, Muhámmad married Umm-Sálamah, his widow, who thus became his fifth wife. Hearing that Khálid-ibn-Sufyán, of the al-Hudháil, meditated a similar hostile incursion, the Prophet sent one Abdúllah-ibn-Únáis to assassinate him, and as a reward for his success gave him the cane which he carried in his hand, saying: "Present this cane to me on the day of the resurrection to remind me of thy devotion." Shortly after these occurrences Muhámmad, at the request of certain deputies from the al-Ádhl and the al-Karáib tribes, sent six missionaries with them to instruct their people in the tenets of Islám. When about fourteen miles on the journey the deputies fell upon the missionaries, killed three of them, and took the other three prisoners. One of these effected his escape, the other two were sold to the al-Kuráish, who put them to a most cruel death. A similar fate befell another body of seventy missionaries sent to the province of Najd. Before undertaking his next expedition Muhámmad, bent upon avenging the murder of his missionaries by the al-Kuráish, despatched Amr-ibn-Umayyah to assassinate Abu-Sufyán, one of the foremost chiefs of the tribe; but

Ámr's object having become suspected he took to flight, atoning for his failure by killing two men of Mecca on his way back to al-Madinah, piercing another with an arrow, and taking a third captive to Muhámmad. Two further expeditions closed the campaigning of this year. The first was into the province of Najd, where Muhámmad narrowly escaped assassination, and the other to Bedr, in fulfilment of his promise to Abu-Sufyán to meet him there on the anniversary of the first battle known by that name. After waiting for the al-Kuráish eight days the Muslims returned triumphantly to al-Madinah. Early in the following year, A.H. 5, (3rd May, 626, to 23rd April, A.D. 627,) the Prophet marched an army of 1000 men to Dáumat-Jándal, a place situated thirteen days' journey to the north-east of al-Madinah, the Christian Arabs of which district had been in the habit of plundering the caravans plying between Syria and Arabia. Coming suddenly upon the marauders the Muslims easily dispersed them, and then returned home with the spoils. A few months later, however, the latter were threatened by the combined contingents of the al-Kuráish, the Bánu-Gháfafán, and the Jewish tribes of an-Nadhír and al-Kuráizhah, who invested al-Madinah with an army of 12,000 men. At the advice of the Persian Salmán, the Prophet had caused a trench to be dug round the city, and then issued forth to defend it at the head of 3000 Muslims. Both sides remained comparatively inactive for nearly a month, during which several prodigies are said to have happened which greatly disconcerted the invaders. What really led to the miserable failure of the expedition was the crafty policy of Muhámmad, who found means to corrupt the leading men of the enemy, to excite their mutual distrust, and to set them at variance one with another. The al-Kuráish first, and afterwards the Bánu-Gháfafán, broke up the siege and retired towards Mecca, the remainder following their example. This engagement is known as the "Battle of the Ditch." As might have been expected, the Prophet lost no time in avenging himself upon the Jews of the al-Kuráizhah. Marching at the head of a considerable force he invested their principal fortress, and at the end of twenty-five days the besieged, by the advice of Saád-ibn-Muáádh, chief of their old friends and confederates the al-Áus, surrendered at discretion, hoping through him to obtain the most favourable terms. In this, however, they were disappointed, for Saád, offended at their breach of faith in having gone over to the al-Kuráish at the Battle of the Ditch, on being appealed to by Muhámmad, adjudged that the men should be put to the sword, the women and children enslaved, and the goods divided among the Muslims. In accordance with this decision, which was highly approved by the Prophet, from six to seven hundred men were massacred, all the women and children carried into captivity, and the spoils divided among the Muslims. Muhámmad chose from among the captives a beautiful damsel, named Rihánah-bint-Ámrú, whom he subsequently induced to embrace Islám, and retained her as his concubine. Special reference is made to the Battle of the Ditch in the Kurán, (Súr. xxxiii. 9-29,) where the success of the Muslims is attributed to the direct inter-

vention of God, "who sent against" their enemies "a blast, and hosts that ye saw not." The submission of the Jews was due to the same cause:—"He caused those of the people of the Book [the Jews] who had aided [the Confederates] to come down out of their fortresses, and cast dismay into their hearts: some ye slew, others ye took prisoners, and He gave you their land for an heritage,—even a land on which you had never set foot." Reference is also made in Súr. lix. to the booty seized on this occasion, when Muhámmad appears to have appropriated to himself more than his lawful share. According to Abulfidá, it was during this siege likewise that Muhámmad forbade the use of wine, (Súr. ii. 214.) which is interpreted to include all intoxicating drinks. Nevertheless, "rivers of wine, delicious to those who quaff it," are promised to the faithful in paradise. (Súr. xlvii. 16.)

Before the close of A.H. 5 Muhámmad married his cousin Záinab, daughter of Jahsh and Amínah, the latter the daughter of Abdu'l-Múttalib. The Prophet had previously given her in marriage to Zaid-ibn-Háarithah, his freedman, whom he had adopted, and who therefore went by the name of Muhámmad's son. On going to the house of Zaid, and not finding him at home, the Prophet accidentally cast his eyes on Záinab, and was so smitten with her beauty that he exclaimed: "Praise belongeth unto God who turneth the hearts of man as He pleaseth!" Záinab did not lack penetration to see that she had made a conquest of the Prophet, and on recounting what had passed to her husband when he returned home, Zaid determined to part with her in favour of his benefactor. Muhámmad, foreseeing the scandal which such proceeding would create, vainly endeavoured to dissuade Zaid from his purpose. Zaid accordingly divorced her, and at the expiration of the *Iddah*, or the prescribed time after a divorce before re-marriage was lawful, Muhámmad married her, giving a sumptuous feast on the occasion to celebrate his new nuptials. This marriage gave great offence to many Muslims, for the relationship which existed between him and Zaid, albeit fictitious, created an impediment to wedlock among the old Arabs, who considered it within the prohibited degrees. The Prophet, however, was not at a loss to vindicate himself. He introduces God as sanctioning the abolition of the established custom, and clearing him of all guilt in the matter. (See Súr. xxiii. 37-40.) Nevertheless, an alleged divine injunction places a restriction on his passion in future:—"It is not permitted thee to take [other] wives hereafter, nor to change thy present wives for other women, though their beauty charm thee, except such as thy right hand hath acquired," (captive women;) and as if to prevent the example of Záinab being followed by his own wives he ordained that if any had a request to make of them they were to prefer it from behind a *Hijáb*, veil or screen, adding, "Purer this will be for your hearts and their hearts." (*Id.* 52, 53.) The same custom prevails still among Muslim females of the upper classes. Záinab was the Prophet's ninth wife, albeit he had limited the believers to four. (Súr. iv. 3.) He himself, however, assumed the privilege of having as many as he pleased.

Several militant expeditions were undertaken during the sixth year of the al-Hijrah, (23rd April, 627, to 12th April, 628.) In the month of al-Muhārram the Prophet despatched Muḥammad-bin-Māslamah against the Bānu-Kūr-zah, located seven days' journey to the south-east of al-Madīnah. In the month of Jumādū-'l-Āwwal, (19th August to 18th September,) he started himself with two hundred men to punish the Bānu-Lahyān, who dwelt on the road between Mecca and al-Madīnah, for the murder of his missionaries. During the march he stopped for a few moments near the grave of his mother, offered up a prayer, and wept. But a verse of the Kurān, alleged to have been revealed to him on this occasion, forbade his praying for forgiveness on behalf of one who had died an infidel:—"It is not for the Prophet or the Faithful to pray for the forgiveness of those, even though they be of their kin, who associate other beings with God, after it has been made clear to them that they are to be the inmates of hell." (Sūr. ix. 114.) Next he led 500 men against the Bānu-Fazārah, some of whose horsemen had killed his camel-herd and carried his wife away captive, although she subsequently escaped. Other raids were conducted by Zaid-ibn-Hārithah. Following on these was the murder of Elyonsair-ibn-Rijām, one of the chiefs of Khāibar, who it appears had prevailed upon the Bānu-Ghatafān to league against Muḥammad. A number of the latter tribe, who were encamped between Khāibar and Fāzḍak, were dispersed by Āly-ibn-Abi-Tālib. Elyonsair was subsequently induced, by false pretences, to accompany a party of Muslims to al-Madīnah, where the Prophet was to raise him to the highest dignity among his people. While on the journey the Muslims fell upon him and murdered him. In the mean time, Muḥammad despatched a force under Abdu-'r-Rahmān-ibn-Āns, in the direction of Dāumat-Jāndal, with instructions to bring over the Christians of the Bānu-Kalb to Islām; in the event of their refusal they were to be reduced by force. Some conformed, whilst those who preferred adhering to their old faith were allowed to do so on condition of paying tribute. About the same period Muḥammad marched in person against the Bānu-Mustālik, a sub-tribe of the al-Khuzā'ah, who were reported as contemplating an incursion into the territory of al-Madīnah. Coming up with them while they were encamped not far from the sea, about ten miles north of Ūsān, he completely routed them. One thousand camels, five thousand sheep, and a great many women and children became the spoil of the Muslims. One of the female captives, named Juwairiyah-bint-Hārith, fell to the lot of Thābit-ibn-Kais, who offered to set her at liberty for a certain sum. On applying to Muḥammad to help her to pay the ransom he readily agreed to do so, and then married her. Thereupon the Muslims, recognizing the al-Mustālik as allies of the Prophet, liberated all the captives. Juwairiyah survived Muḥammad forty-five years.

The last night-halt of the troops on their return to al-Madīnah was signalized by an adventure which caused Muḥammad no little chagrin. His beloved wife Āishah, the daughter of Abu-Bakr, was accused of having committed adultery with Safwān-ibn-Mu'āttal, a prominent

*Muhājir* of the Bānu-Sulāim. It had fallen to Āishah's lot on this occasion to accompany the Prophet, and, according to her account, having had occasion to alight from her camel, she missed a valuable necklace. Whilst absent in search of it her attendants, assuming that she had re-entered the litter, placed it on the camel and went their way. She walked on for some time, but finding that no one returned for her she fell asleep, and remained on the spot all night. She was discovered early the following morning by Safwān, who had stayed behind the troop to refresh himself. He forthwith placed her on his own camel and conducted her safely to the camp. This incident made a great noise, and several magnates of the al-Khāzraj, among whom was Abdūllah-ibn-Ūbay, openly accused Āishah of adultery. Muḥammad himself seemed disposed at the outset to suspect his wife's fidelity, but after she had taken up her abode at her mother's house for about a month he consulted Āly-ibn-Abi-Tālib and Ūsāimah-ibn-Zaid, who recommended him to consult Burāirah, Āishah's tirewoman. The upshot was a revelation vouchsafed to the Prophet fully acquitting his wife and clearing her reputation:—"Of a truth those who advanced that lie were a party among you; but regard it not as an evil to you. No, it is an advantage to you [whose characters are cleared]. To every man among them shall be done according to the offence which he hath committed; and as to that person among them [Abdūllah-ibn-Ūbay] who took upon himself to aggravate it, a sore punishment doth await him." (Sūr. xxiv. 11.) Three of the accusers were beaten with eighty stripes, as enacted in v. 4 of the same chapter, but Abdūllah, the principal offender, owing to his great influence among the people, was prudently spared. Muḥammad seems to have availed himself of this occasion to lay down laws for the punishment of whoredom and adultery. The whore and whoremonger were to be scourged with one hundred stripes, and adultery required the attestation of "four witnesses to the fact."

At the beginning of the month Zu-'l-Kādah of this the sixth year of the al-Hijrah (cir. 12th Feb. 628) Muḥammad set out with an army of 4400 Muslims, intending to perform the *Umrah*, or religious Visitation of the Holy Places, and the *Hijj*, or Pilgrimage to Mecca,—duties enjoined by the Kurān, but which had unavoidably been suspended since his establishment at al-Madīnah. The al-Kurāish, doubting Muḥammad's good faith, sent messenger after messenger as well to spy out his forces as to ascertain his designs. His repeated assurances that his object was a peaceable one failed to convince the al-Kurāish, who finally decided to bar his further progress. Whereupon Muḥammad assembled his troops around him, and whilst seated under an acacia-tree exacted a new pledge from them that they would fight for him to the last. (This ceremony is referred to in the Kurān, Sūr. xlvi. 18, as the Oath taken under the Tree, and which had secured the approbation of God.) That done, the Prophet resolved to attack the city, which coming to the knowledge of the al-Kurāish they began to sue for peace. To the disgust of many of the Muslims Muḥammad agreed to a compromise, and a treaty was drawn up and agreed to by

the two parties importing as follows: That there should be a truce between them for ten years; that any person might league himself with Muhámmad or with the al-Kuráish as he thought fit; and that the Prophet should be allowed to visit the al-Kaábah the coming year and remain there three days. After remaining twenty days at Hudhailiyah, the name of the place where these arrangements were made, and situated within twelve hours' march of the sacred territory of Mecca, the Muslims returned home.

Several minor expeditions were undertaken this year, one of them against Mádyan, the Midian of the Bible, of which place Captain R. Burton has recently published an exhaustive and most interesting account. Towards the end of the year, or at the beginning of A.H. 7, Muhámmad conceived the idea of addressing foreign sovereigns and Arab princes, inviting them to embrace Islám. These letters were sealed with a silver signet, bearing in three separate lines the words: MUHAMMAD—the APOSTLE—of GOD. The first was sent to Kasra-Parwiz, then king of Persia, who considered Arabia as a dependency of his empire. After reading the letter Kasra tore it into shreds, and exclaimed in a fury: "How dare this fellow, who is my slave, write to me in this style!" On hearing of the fate of his epistle, Muhámmad remarked: "Even so shall his kingdom be shattered to pieces." His next embassy was despatched to the king of Abyssinia, who received it with all honour, for according to Muslim writers he was already in heart a believer, and now made a public profession of Islám—a statement entirely devoid of corroborative evidence. The third embassy was sent to Jarh-ibn-Mátta, the Mukáukis,<sup>e</sup> or Governor,

of Egypt, who acted as intendant of customs under the emperor Heraclius. He was a Copt, and therefore secretly hated the Greeks. He received Hátib-ibn-Abi-Baltaá, Muhámmad's deputy, with every mark of respect, ordered his secretary to write a reply to the Prophet's letter, to whom he also sent a valuable present, including two Coptic damsels of surpassing beauty. One of these, named Sírín, he made over to the poet Hassán, the other, named Maria, he reserved for himself. In A.H. 19, when Egypt was conquered by the Khalífah Omar, this Mukáukis and the Copts generally perfidiously deserted the Greeks and concluded a treaty with Amru-ibn-al-'As, the Khalífah's lieutenant, in virtue of which, upon the payment of tribute, he and his co-religionists were permitted to profess Christianity. The different Arab princes to whom similar missives were sent do not call for special notice.

In the month of al-Muhárram, A.H. 7, Muhámmad assembled a body of 1400 foot and 200 horse and marched for Kháibar, the name of a fertile territory inhabited by Jews, and situated six stages from al-Madínah, on the north-east. The district was defended by several detached forts, the principal of which, named al-Kammús, was built on the summit of a mountain very difficult of access. Into these the Jews fled on the approach of the Muslim army, of which they had received no intelligence until it was close upon them. Muhámmad, having made the proper dispositions for laying siege to the fortresses, attacked successively those known as *an-Naiim* and *an-Natát*, which were readily captured. He then proceeded to the *al-Kammús*, which was defended by a Jewish garrison commanded by Kinánah-ibn-'r-Rabiaá, the richest and most powerful man of the nation, who was dignified by the title of "King of the Jews." A breach having been made in the walls by battering-rams, several assaults were made, which were vigorously repulsed by the besieged. A subsequent attempt made under the command of Abu-Bakr and another under Omar having failed, Aly-ibn-Abi-Tálib was expressly selected by the Prophet, to lead a picked detachment to the attack. (Aly had been suffering from ophthalmia, but a little spittle applied to his eyes by Muhámmad is said to have cured him!) A famous Jewish warrior, of gigantic proportions and heavily armed, named Márhah, now presented himself, and challenged the Muslims to single combat. Aly accepted the challenge, and cleft his head in twain with

<sup>e</sup> Hyde Clarke, Esq., recently submitted to the writer of this article a photographic copy, taken from what appears to be Muhámmad's original Epistle to this Mukáukis. It is written in the Kufic character, and sealed with the signet mentioned above. The original is much defaced, but enough remains of it to allow of the restoration of the missing letters. This has been done by Muhámmad-Múnis-Zádah, who gives the following account of the document: "This is the copy of a letter from the Prophet (may God bless and save him!) which he addressed to Mukáukis, the head of the Copts in Egypt, accurately transcribed from the original which the Prophet (may God bless and save him!) sent to him, sealed, by Hátib-ibn-Abi-Baltaá-Amru-ibn-Omair-ibn-Sálamah (upon whom be peace!) in the 7th year of the al-Hijrah. In A.H. 1275 (A.D. 1858) the original letter was discovered by a party of Frank travellers belonging to the French nation in one of their journeys in Coptland, who purchased it from some monks attached to a monastery in the town of Ikhmím, situated in Upper Egypt. They then took it to the Ottoman Khán, Abdu-'l-Majid, to whom they presented it, and he ordered it to be preserved among the relics of the Prophet at Constantinople." The letter as restored reads: "In the Name of God, the Pitiful, the Compassionate! From Muhámmad the servant of God and His Prophet, to Mukáukis, the head of the Copts. Peace be upon him who follows the right way [Islám]. Further, I write you to embrace Islám: become a Muslim and you will be saved, [and] God will vouchsafe you a double reward; but if you decline you will be answerable for the calamities which shall befall the Copts. *O people of the Book [having Sacred Scriptures], come ye to a just judgment between us and you.—That we worship not aught but God, and that we associate nothing with Him [as a*

plurality of Persons], and that the one of us take not the other for lords [Rabbis] beside God. Then if they decline say: Bear ye witness that we are Muslims."

MUHÁMMAD.  
THE APOSTLE  
OF GOD.

The sentence printed in italics is from the Kurán, Súr. iii. 57. It is not improbable that, *mutatis mutandis*, the above is a draft of the other letters addressed to foreign potentates as above mentioned.

his famous sword *Zhu-'l-Fakár*, which Muhámmad had given him for the purpose. The loss of their champion so disheartened the Jews that they offered no further resistance. The capture, a few days after, of the forts *al-Watáh* and *as-Sulálim* completed the subjugation of Kháibar. The booty taken was immense, exceeding in extent and richness any previously captured. Half of it was set aside to defray the expenses of the visit to the Holy Places at the close of the year, and the remainder was distributed among the troops. Muhámmad had ruled on a former occasion that a mounted trooper should have three shares, one for himself and two for his horse. He now adjudged an additional premium to those who rode blood-horses. Among the female captives taken was Safiyyah, wife of the prince Kinánah, who had held the *al-Kammús*. Dihyah-ibn-Huláifah had begged her of the Prophet, but the latter, struck with her beauty, threw his mantle over her, indicating that he reserved her for himself. He compensated Dihyah by granting him two of her cousins, who were also captured. On Safiyyah's conversion to Islám, Muhámmad married her, and exercising his assumed prerogative of a Prophet gave her no other dower than her liberty. At first, the conquered Jews asked for nothing but their lives. Subsequently they requested permission to remain and till their land, holding it as tenants, engaging to pay the Muslim landlords a moiety of the produce. Muhámmad consented, but reserved to himself the right of expelling them whenever he thought fit. Omar, the second Khalifah in succession to the Prophet, availed himself of this prerogative. Determined that none other than the Muslim religion should exist in Arabia he exiled the Jews of Kháibar to the district of the Jordan, where he assigned them land for cultivation.

The subjugation of the Jewish districts of Fádak, Wádi-'l-Kúra, and of Táimah, on the confines of Syria, followed that of Kháibar. On his return to al-Madinah Muhámmad sent a letter by the hand of Dihyah-ibn-Huláimah to the emperor Heraclius, who was then in Syria on his return from his successful campaign against the Persians. Dihyah was forwarded on by the governor of Bustra to the emperor, who is reported to have given the delegate a good reception, and to have sent him back with a favourable reply. After despatching similar missives to several Arab princes Muhámmad commenced making preparations for the *Umratu-'l-Kádhá*, the Solemn Visit of the Fulfilment, designed to complete the Visit to Mecca which had failed the preceding year. All those who had accompanied the Prophet on the former occasion attended him on this, and leaving 200 of them to guard the baggage at Batn-Yájaj, a few miles from Mecca, he proceeded on his journey, the al-Kuráish retiring to the summits of the neighbouring mountains to avoid the chagrin of witnessing the procession. On arriving at the city Muhámmad repaired to the al-Kaábah and entered upon the prescribed ceremonies. Coming to the angle where the Black Stone is fixed he devoutly kissed it. Next, he and his companions performed the *Tawáf*, or Circumambulation of that temple. This they did seven times, three at a quick and

the remainder at a slow pace, called respectively *al-Hárwah* and *ar-Rámál*,—a custom which still obtains, although the quick pace is not obligatory. As often as the Muslims passed the Black Stone they either kissed it or touched it with the hand and then kissed the latter, which accords with the present practice. Next, the Prophet mounted on his favourite camel ran seven times between the hills *as-Sáfa* and *al-Márwah*, partly at a slow and partly at an accelerated pace. This ceremony, now known as the *as-Saáyu*, was objected to by some of the Muslims because of two idols on the hills, which were worshipped by the al-Kuráish. Their scruples were set at rest by the Prophet, to whom the following alleged revelation was made on the occasion: "Moreover, *as-Sáfa* and *al-Márwah* are two of the monuments of God; whosoever, therefore, goeth on a pilgrimage to the House [the Temple at Mecca], or visiteth it, it shall be no crime if he circuit them both." (Súr. ii. 153.) Lastly, he sacrificed the camels brought with him for that purpose in the valley of Múna, after which the Muslims shaved their heads and resumed the state of *Ihlál*, that is, of being quit of their obligations. On the fourth day they left Mecca, but during his stay there, and while he was still in a state of *Ihrám*, that is, one in which what was at other times allowable was now forbidden, Muhámmad, again taking advantage of his assumed prerogative of dispensing with such recognized restrictions, contracted an alliance with Maimúnah-bint-Háarith, and consummated the marriage at ash-Sharif, on the return journey to al-Madinah. Maimúnah, who was the last of the Prophet's wives, survived them all, and died at Mecca.

The moral effect of Muhámmad's visit to his native place was immense. Persecuted and driven therefrom seven years previously, he had returned to it surrounded with the state and pomp of a sovereign, and had established the new creed side by side with the old in the most sacred temple of the Arabs. Numerous proselytes, who had hitherto been believers in secret, now openly declared themselves, and several important conversions were made to Islám. Among the latter were Óthmán-ibn-Tálhah, the *Hijábah*, or Guardian, of the al-Kaábah; Ámr-ibnu-'l-'Ás, a man renowned for sagacity, and who during the Khalifate of Omar conquered Egypt; and Khálid-bin-Walid, whose exploits on behalf of Islám obtained for him the title of *Sáifu-'láh*, the Sword of God. Proud of these accessions to his growing power Muhámmad determined to try issues with the Roman empire. The murder of Háarith-ibn-Umaír, whom he had sent on a message to the chief of the Bánú-Ghassán, at Bustra, offered a plausible excuse for the attempt, and he accordingly despatched an army of 3000 men, under the command of his freedman Zaid, to carry out his purpose. One of the al-Kuráish, who was travelling at the time, having apprised Theodorus, the deputy of Heraclius in Palestine, of the intended attack, the latter lost no time in preparing to meet it, and assembled a body of 10,000 men from among the Arab tribes subject to his jurisdiction. The two armies met at Múta, a village of the Lower Balká, situated a little to the south of the castle of Kárák, and half a day's journey from Muáb. Zaid, carrying the standard of Islám, was killed in

the beginning of the action, as were also Jaáfar-ibn-Abi-Tálib and Abdúllah-ibn-Isuálah, who successively took his post. The command then devolved upon Khálid-ibn-u-Walid, who rallied the fugitive Muslims, and returning to the attack retrieved in some measure the losses of the day. He is reported to have pursued the enemy, to have inflicted great losses upon them, to have taken possession of their camp, and carried off a large booty. This memorable battle was fought in the month of Jamádu-l-Áwwal, A.H. 8.

The ten years' truce which had been agreed to by the Muslims and the al-Kuráish was binding on their respective allies. It was now violated by the Bánu-Bakr, confederates of the latter, who made an incursion into the territory of the Bánu-Khuzaáh, the allies of the former, and killed twenty of them. Determined to punish this violation of a solemn treaty Muhámmad ordered preparations to be made for an expedition against Mecca, and sternly refused all the overtures which were made by the al-Kuráish, through their deputy Abu-Sufyán, for an accommodation. He accordingly left al-Madínah on the 10th of Ramadhán, (1st Jan. A.D. 630,) at the head of a large body of the *Ansárs*, the *Muhájírán*, and other Arabs who had recently embraced Islám. The Muslims observed the fast of Ramadhán until they reached Kadid, where Muhámmad permitted them to break it on account of the fatigue of the journey. At Mírru-zh-Zhubrán, four leagues from Mecca, he reviewed his army, and finding that it numbered 10,000 men he gave directions for as many bonfires to be lighted at night in order to impress the enemy with the greatness of his host. The day following, having previously appointed Aly, bearing the standard of Islám, to command the left wing, Khálid the right, and Abu-Úbáidah the centre, he moved forward with the force, mounted on his camel. Halting at Zhu-Tuwá to perform his devotions, and perceiving from thence no sign of the enemy, he gave orders for an immediate advance towards Mecca. Aly took possession of the post assigned to him, as did also Abu-Úbáidah, without the effusion of blood; but Khálid encountering a large body of the al-Kuráish and other tribes who attempted to bar his passage, he dispersed them, killing twenty-eight of them, much to the chagrin of Muhámmad, who had wished this to be a bloodless victory.

The Prophet made his public entry into Mecca mounted on his camel, having Abu-Bakr on his right hand, Usáid-ibn-Hudháir on his left, whilst Usáma-ibn-Zaid walked behind him. On the way he repeated Súr. xlviii. of the Kurán, entitled *al-Fat-h*, the Victory, which it is said he pretended to have had revealed to him two years prior to the expedition. All tumults being now appeased, the Prophet circuted the al-Kaábah seven times, touching the Black Stone with the *Mihjan*, or Wand, which he carried in his hand, as often as he passed it. He then entered the sacred Temple, and observing several pictures of angels, as also one of Abraham, on the walls, the latter represented with the *Azlan*, or Arrows of Divination, in his hand, he ordered them to be destroyed, destroying himself at the same time a wooden pigeon, suspended from the roof, which was esteemed as one of their deities

by the pagan al-Kuráish. On entering the interior the Prophet proclaimed with a loud voice the Muslim formula, "*Alláhu Ákbar!*" God is the Highest! turning towards every quarter of the temple. He then prayed between the two pillars, saying to those who attended him, "This is your *Kiblah*," or point to which you should turn in prayer. Next, he ordered the destruction of the 360 idols which were set up in the al-Kaábah, again compassed the temple seven times, visited the well Zámzam, performed the *Wudhú*, or Ablution, and the other prescribed ceremonies, all of which are scrupulously observed by his followers at the present day. On this occasion, moreover, Muhámmad is said to have addressed the al-Kuráish, who were silent spectators of his iconoclasm, in the following manner: "There is no God but the [one] God; He has no partner. He has fulfilled His promise, and given His servant the victory over all his enemies. Men of the al-Kuráish! let there be no more pagan haughtiness among you; no more pride of ancestry. All men are children of Adam, and Adam was created out of the dust," adding thereto the quotation from the Kurán, "O men! verily We have created you of a male and female; and We have divided you into peoples and tribes that ye might have knowledge one of another. Truly the most worthy in the sight of God is he who feareth Him most." (Súr. xlix. 13.) He wound up his address thus: "Descendants of the al-Kuráish, how do you desire that I should act towards you?" "With kindness," was the reply; "for you are a generous brother." "Depart," rejoined he, "you are amnestied." Subsequently, while seated before the al-Kaábah, he confirmed Óthmán-ibn-Tálhah in the *Hijábah*, or Guardianship of the temple, restricting the office to his descendants, and his uncle Abbás he confirmed in the *Sikáyah*, or office of Distributor of the beverage made of raisins steeped in water. With these two exceptions he abolished all the other dignities and prerogatives that had been connected with the pagan institutions of the al-Kaábah. On the 11th of Ramadhán, (11th Jan. A.D. 630,) he repaired to the hill as-Sáfa, where all the inhabitants of Mecca had been directed to attend in order to take the oath of allegiance to him. Ómar-ibn-Khattáb, acting as his representative, gave his hand to those who presented themselves, and vowed, in the name of the Prophet, to defend each and to rule justly. The oath taken by the men bound them to implicit obedience to Muhámmad; that by the women to worship God only, and to abstain from theft, adultery, infanticide, lying, and backbiting. It may be noted here that, with the exception of a few, who had previously been put to the sword, most of the outlaws were pardoned on this occasion; also, that during his fortnight's residence at Mecca Muhámmad sent different detachments into the surrounding districts to destroy the temples of al-Uzza, as-Siwa, and al-Muwát, three famous idols worshipped by the al-Kuráish and other tribes in the neighbourhood. He gave strict orders that this undertaking should be executed in a peaceable manner, and strictly forbade the soldiers to use their arms, unless absolutely obliged to do so. Khálid-ibn-Walid, however, who commanded one of these troops consisting of 350 men, marched towards

the locality of the al-Jadhímah, against whom he entertained a grudge of long standing. The al-Jadhímah prepared to defend themselves, but at Khálid's bidding they laid down their arms. Instead, however, of saying, as he had directed them to say, "We are Muslims," they said, "We are Sabians," the name by which the pagan Arabs up to that time had designated the Muslims. Taking advantage of this equivocal expression, Khálid caused them all to be bound and ordered them to be beheaded. "My God!" exclaimed Muhámmad, on hearing of this barbarity, "I am innocent of what Khálid has done;" and he forthwith despatched a large sum of money to the surviving members of the outraged tribe, and rebuked Khálid most severely on his return with the detachment.

The Prophet left Mecca at the head of 12,000 men to attack the Bánu-Thakif, who held the stronghold of at-Taíf, and their allies the Bánu-Huwázin, who had marched out against him with a much smaller force as far as Hunáin, a valley three miles from Mecca. Málík-ibn-Aús, the chief of the former tribe, charged the Muslims with such fury that they were thrown into confusion, and it was with the utmost difficulty that they were rallied; but the Prophet, who had been himself in great danger, having thrown a handful of dust in the direction of the enemy, as a signal of their discomfiture, so inspirited his followers that they returned to the charge and gained a complete victory, obliging Málík to retreat to at-Taíf, after leaving 700 of his men dead on the field. This success was immediately followed by another obtained over a detachment of the al-Hawázin, who had taken up a position in the valley of Antás. The former of these battles is thus spoken of in the Kurán: "Now hath God helped you in many battle-fields, and, on the day of Hunáin, when ye prided yourselves in your numbers . . . then turned ye your backs in flight. Then did God send down the spirit of repose upon His Apostle and upon the faithful, and He sent down the hosts which ye saw not, and He punished the infidels." (Súr. ix. 25, 26.)

The next expedition was directed against at-Taíf, a large city three stages to the east of Mecca. A large number of catapults, battering-rams, and other warlike engines had been prepared to reduce this redoubtable fortress; but the Bánu-Thakif defended themselves with such bravery that, after investing it for twenty days, Muhámmad was obliged to abandon the siege. On his way back he harassed several districts belonging to the tribe, and halting at al-Jaránah he caused an inventory to be made of all the spoils taken in the late engagements. They amounted to 6000 prisoners, 24,000 camels, 40,000 sheep, and 4000 ounces of silver, all of which were divided among the Muslims, but the favouritism shewn on this occasion to the Mecca contingent, as also to other recent converts, caused some murmuring among the *Ansárs*, which, however, the Prophet dexterously silenced by an address to the vanity of the malcontents, who in a flood of tears, which soaked their beards, exclaimed: "Prophet of God! we are content with the share allotted to us." The unsuccessful attack upon at-Taíf was, to Muhámmad's great joy, followed by the submission of Málík, the chief of the Bánu-Thakif, and the

greater part of the tribe, who eventually embraced Islám.

A few days after Muhámmad's return to al-Madínah, Maria, his Coptic slave and concubine, was delivered of a son, whom he named Ibrahim, and celebrated the event with a magnificent banquet. On this occasion, moreover, he declared that the birth of the child rendered the mother free. Muhámmad manifested great affection for the young Ibrahim, going frequently to the house of his nurse to see him, until the time of his death, which took place about a year later.

An episode in the domestic life of Muhámmad, which is referred to the next, or ninth year of the al-Híjrah, has left an indelible stain on his assumed character of the Apostle of God. Having, as above stated, enfranchised Maria, he deprived himself of the recognized rights of a master over his female slave; nevertheless, his attentions to the fair Copt were stealthily persevered in to the great vexation of his titular wives. Some relate, indeed, that Háfsah caught the Prophet in a situation which left no doubt of his criminal amours with her. To appease his wife he promised with an oath never to touch her again, and to gratify her vanity, as well as to induce her to keep the affair a secret, he foretold to her that Abu-Bakr and Omar should be his successors. Háfsah, however, could not resist revealing the matter to Aishah, who communicated it to her father Abu-Bakr, as did Háfsah to her own father Omar, and the Prophet perceiving from their manner that his secret had been discovered upbraided Háfsah with having betrayed him. For this indiscretion he not only divorced her but likewise separated himself from all his other wives for a whole month, spending that interval in amorous dalliance with Maria, in open violation of his oath to Háfsah. But dreading the resentment of her father he shortly after took her again, and in order to free himself from his oath to her he published Súr. lvi. of the Kurán, which besides justifying his own conduct allows Muslims to forswear themselves:—"Why, O Prophet, dost thou hold that to be forbidden, from a desire to please thy wives, which God hath made lawful to thee, since God is lenient, merciful? God hath allowed you release from your oaths; and God is your master; and He is the Knowing, the Wise. When the Prophet told a recent occurrence as a secret to one of his wives, and when she divulged it, and God informed him of this, he acquainted her with part and withheld part. And when he had told her of it, she said: Who told thee of this? He said: The Knowing, the Wise hath told it me . . . Haply, if he put you both away, his Lord will give him, in exchange, other wives better than you, Muslims, believers, devout, penitent, observant of fasting, both known of men, and virgins." (1-5.)

Several Muslim biographers relate that during this same year a Christian deputation, consisting of forty priests and twenty of the principal laymen of Najrán, with Abu-Háarithah the bishop at their head, waited upon Muhámmad, who received them in the mosque at al-Madínah. After prayers, which they offered up turning towards the East, they entered into a discussion with the Prophet respecting Jesus Christ, whom they styled the Son of God and



the second Person in the Trinity. To the texts adduced by them in support of this doctrine Muḥammad replied by quoting the following from the Kurān:—"In the sight of God, Jesus is the counterpart of Adam. He created him of dust, and said to him, Be, and he was. . . . Jesus, the son of Mary, is only an apostle of God, and His Word which he conveyed into Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Himself. Believe, therefore, in God and His Apostle, and say not three.—Forbear, it will be better for you. God is only one God. Far be it from His glory that He should have a son." (Sûr. iii. 52; iv. 169, 170.) "How," rejoined the bishop, "can you pretend that God has revealed to you matters quite different from those contained in the Gospel, which you yourself recognize as a divine book?" At this juncture, so Muslim writers avouch, God revealed to the Prophet the following verse:—"Whosoever shall dispute with you about him [or about this matter] after the knowledge which hath been vouchsafed to thee, say: Let us summon our sons and your sons, and our wives and your wives, and ourselves and yourselves, and let us invoke the curse of God upon those that lie." (Sûr. iii. 54.) The proposed ordeal, called *Mubâlahah*, would, it was believed, reveal the wrongdoer, and expose him to the curses imprecated. The Christians, shrinking from the test—so the tradition runs—preferred paying tribute as Christians, rather than accept the alternative of conversion to Islâm.

Hearing that the Romans were assembling a large force on their frontier at Tabûk, a town situated midway between al-Madīnah and Damascus, Muḥammad determined to attack them in spite of the reluctance of the Muslims to march during the heat and drought of summer. As the enemy had retired on the approach of the Arabs, Muḥammad availed himself of the halt at Tabûk to write another letter to the emperor Heraclius, inviting him to embrace Islâm, and also to receive the submission of several chiefs of the neighbouring tribes, among whom was Yuhâna-ibn-Kûbah, the lord of Ailah, on the shore of the Elanitic Gulf, now the Gulf of Akabah, who concluded a treaty with the Prophet which entitled the Christians there to his protection, in consideration of an annual payment of 330 gold dinârs. On his way back Muḥammad despatched Khâlid-ibn-Walid to reduce Dâumat-Jândal, and shortly after his return to al-Madīnah he received the submission of so many tribes of al-Yâman, Mâhrâh, Ômân, and al-Yamânah, that this the ninth of the al-Hijrah was called the Year of the Deputations. At the commencement of the year following the Muslim empire was definitively founded. With the exception of a few Christians and Jews who had been subjected to tribute, the population of the entire peninsula of Arabia had adopted Islâm, and the different portions of the Kurān which had been successively published during the preceding twenty years had been collected together by the Prophet's secretaries, and formed a complete civil and religious code. Muḥammad had accomplished his task, and he now proposed to crown it by a solemn Pilgrimage. Twice since the Flight he had performed the *Umrah*, or Smaller Pilgrimage to the Sacred Places, which might be done any month of the year.

He now wished to consecrate, by his own example, the *al-Hijj*, or the Greater Pilgrimage, enjoined upon the faithful in the Kurān, the celebration of which, from time immemorial, had been fixed on the 10th of Dzu-'l-Hijjah, the second month of the year. He accordingly set out from al-Madīnah on the 25th of Dzu-'l-Kaâdah, (23rd Feb. A.D. 632.) accompanied by 80,000 (some say 100,000) Muslims, who flocked to him from all quarters, taking with him also his wives, in litters, and a large number of camels covered with garlands destined for sacrifice. Arriving at Mecca on the fourth day he immediately repaired to the al-Kaâbah, devoutly kissed the Black Stone, and performed the seven circuits of the *Tawâf* in the manner described on the occasion of his previous visit. After reciting a prayer by the *Makâm-Ibrahim*, the point of the al-Kaâbah so called, he again kissed the Black Stone, and then proceeded to the hill as-Sâfa, concluding the day's celebration by performing the *as-Sâdu*, which consists in passing seven times between the hills as-Sâfa and Mârwah. On the 8th of Dzu-'l-Hijjah (8th March) called the *Yâmunu't-Tâwviyah*, the day of providing one's self with water, the Prophet, accompanied by a large concourse of people, went to the valley of Mina, where a tent was pitched for him. There he offered up the five prescribed prayers, namely, that of *azh-Zuhûr*, or Midday; of *al-Asr*, or Afternoon; of *al-Maghrib*, or Sunset; of *al-Asha*, or Evening; and of *al-Fajr*, or Dawn, of the next day. Then, proceeding to Arafât, he addressed the assembled multitude while seated on his camel, his sentences being repeated in a stentorian voice by Rabiâ-ibn-Umâyyah. The following are extracts from this allocution:—"Men, listen to my words, for I know not whether I shall be permitted to meet you again in this place. Be humane and just one towards another. The life and property of each should be sacred to all the rest, even as this month and this year is sacred to you all. You will have to appear before your Lord, who will demand an account of your actions. Let every depositary restore faithfully the deposits confided to him. Henceforth let there be no more usury: the debtor shall return solely the amount which he has received. Interest on money lent is suppressed, beginning with the sums due to my uncle, Abbâs-ibnu-'l-Muttalib. Vengeance is forbidden to be taken for murders committed during paganism, beginning with the murder of my cousin Rabiâ-ibn-Hârith-ibn-Abdu-'l-Muttalib." "Verily, the *Nâsy* [the intercalation and transposition in the lunar year] is the source of error to the unbelievers. One year they authorize the *Nâsy*, and another they forbid it: so that whilst the number of the sacred months is thereby observed, that which God has declared to be inviolable is profaned, and that is sanctified to God which He has declared to be profane. Verily, time in its revolutions has returned to what it was on the day when the earth was created. In God's sight the number of the months is twelve. Of these four are sacred, namely, Rîjâb of Mûdhâr, which is isolated between Jumâdah and Shaâbân, and three other consecutive months." "Men! you have rights over your wives, and they have rights over you. Their duty is not to defile your bed by adultery. Should they fail there-

in, God allows you to separate from them, and to chastise them, but not so as to endanger their lives. If they conduct themselves well, you are bound to feed and clothe them suitably. Treat them with kindness and affection. Remember that they are like captives [slaves] in your house, possessing nothing of their own. They have surrendered their persons to you, trusting in God,—a deposit which God has confided to you." "Listen to my words, and let them sink into your hearts. I leave you a law, to the which if you cleave it will preserve you always from error: a clear and positive law, a book dictated from on high." "O men! listen to my words, and let them sink into your hearts. Know ye that all Muslims are brothers. No one shall appropriate that which belongs to his brother, unless it be freely given to him. Abstain from injustice, for it will lead to your eternal loss." Muhámmad wound up his address by exclaiming, "O my God! have I fulfilled my mission?" A thousand voices replied, "Yes, thou hast fulfilled it." The Prophet rejoined, "O my God, hear this testimony."

The passage in the foregoing referring to the *Násy*, or triennial embolism, and the prorogation of the observances of the month of al-Muhárram to that of as-Sifár, which had been in vogue among the Arabs for two centuries, corresponds with what Muhámmad published on the subject either during this, his last pilgrimage, or the preceding year. (Súr. ix. 36.) By thus interdicting the *Násy* he re-established the lunar calendar which the Arabs had observed for ages, but at the same time virtually sanctioned the intercalation of one month every third year in order to reduce the lunar to the solar year. As regards the sacred months, their sacredness was confirmed, but their inviolability was set aside by the precept contained in the verse just quoted, which bade the Muslims not to wrong themselves therein; nevertheless they were to "attack those who join gods with the [one] God in all, as they attack you in all;" and Muhámmad himself had infringed the inviolability by his expedition to Tábúk against the Romans during the previous year.

His address ended, the Prophet alighted, and after performing the prayer of Noon and Afternoon he remounted his favourite she-camel Kúswah, and proceeded to another part of Mount Arafát, called *as-Sákhárat*, where he announced, as from God:—"This day have I perfected your religion for you, and have filled up the measure of my favours towards you, and it is my pleasure that al-Islám be your religion." (Súr. v. 5.) Abu-Bakr, regarding this utterance as prophetic of Muhámmad's approaching end, wept sorely. Towards sunset the Prophet rode to Muzdálifah, where he performed the Night prayer, and on the following morning, after the prayer of Dawn, he went to the *al-Masháriu-l-Harán*, then traversing hastily the valley of Bátu-Muhássar he entered that of Mina. On passing certain spots there, called *al-Jamarát*, where Satan is said to have appeared to Abraham, he threw several pebbles at each, and then repaired to the tent which had been pitched for him. The camels destined for sacrifice were now brought to him. Of these he

slaughtered sixty-three with his own hand, one for each lunar year of his age, and manumitted as many slaves. Twenty-seven additional camels were slaughtered by Aly. After this ceremony the Prophet summoned a barber, who shaved his head, beginning on the right side. As the hair fell from the razor it was picked up and shared among his followers. Khálid-ibn-Walid is reported to have secured a small tuft, which he placed in his head-gear, and it was afterwards remarked that victory ever attended this redoubtable warrior whenever he wore the precious relic. On his return to Mecca the Prophet said the Prayer of Noon and circuted the al-Kaábah before he returned to his lodgings.

Such is the narrative given by Muslim historians of this pilgrimage. They style it the *Hájjatu-l-Balágh*, the Pilgrimage of the Announcement, because Muhámmad, by his precepts and example on that occasion, announced and established the rites with which it was to be celebrated. It is also called *Hájjatu-l-Islám*, the Pilgrimage of Islám, as forming the complement of that religion. And, lastly, it is more commonly designated *Hájjatu-l-Wudáá*, the Farewell Pilgrimage, the Prophet having therein bade adieu to the Muslims at Mecca and taken a final leave of his native place.

Muhámmad started a few days after on his return journey. He had barely entered al-Madinah when he felt so ill that the change was noticed by all. This fact was speedily noised abroad throughout Arabia, and served to loosen the allegiance to al-Islám of several of the tribes who, through fear, had recently embraced it. Three different revolts, each headed by a dangerous competitor, were now on the point of breaking out. The first of these was that of Tuláihah-ibn-Khuwáilid, a famous warrior of Najd, whose claim to inspiration was that while conducting an army through the desert he indicated a spot where water would be found on digging in the sand. The second was that of Abu-Thumámah-Hárún, commonly called Musáilamah, a man of some repute in al-Yamámah. He had conducted an embassy to the Prophet in the ninth year of the al-Hijrah, when he professed himself a Muslim. What tended most to raise him in the estimation of his followers was the statement of a townsman of his who declared that, whilst at al-Madinah, he distinctly heard Muhámmad designate Musáilamah as his successor. The third rival was one Áihalah-bin-Kaáb, of al-Yáman, generally known as al-Áswad. He was very wealthy and eloquent, and succeeded in passing himself off as a diviner. Being withal a clever juggler he induced the people to believe that he held intercourse with celestial beings.

In the mean time Muhámmad, whose health seems to have improved, and who was still ignorant of the movements of his rivals, projected another invasion of the Roman territory. Shortly after, however, he was seized with a fever, which never left him. It appears to have commenced on the arrival of some messengers who brought him word of the revolts above mentioned. One of them was charged with the following message from Musáilamah: "Musáilamah, the Prophet of God, to Muhámmad, the Prophet of God: Peace. I am your associate:

the exercise of authority should be divided between us. A half of the earth is mine, the other half belongs to the al-Kuráish. But the al-Kuráish are a greedy people, and I doubt whether they will be satisfied with a fair division." The Prophet charged the messenger with this reply: "Muhámmad, the Prophet of God, to Musáilamah, the Impostor. Peace be upon those who follow the right way. The earth is God's, and He giveth it to whom He will. Those only prosper who fear the Lord." It may be remarked here that the revolt under Musáilamah grew to formidable dimensions after the Prophet's death. He was eventually slain, and his followers routed by Khálid-bin-Walíd, during the Khalífate of Abu-Bakr. The revolt of al-Áswad was quelled by a force despatched by Muhámmad under Wabr-ibn-Yúhánnes, who secretly effected an entrance into Sanáá through the collusion of certain disaffected chiefs, one of whom cut al-Áswad's throat while he lay asleep and threw the corpse among the insurgents. Thereupon the latter speedily dispersed, and the city was restored to the jurisdiction of the Prophet.

Hitherto Muhámmad had passed the night, by turns, in the chamber of each of his wives, but finding his health grow worse he requested their consent to his remaining in the apartment of one of them, to which they all agreed, and he accordingly installed himself in that of Aishah. There on a certain day he called his relatives and friends together, and said to each of them: "The time of our separation is at hand. Be faithful to God, to whom I commend you." In a moment all eyes were filled with tears. Then, after giving instructions about his burial, he added: "Peace be upon all you who hear me, upon my absent companions, and upon all who shall follow my religion in the ages to come." On one of his last visits to the mosque he was supported by his cousins Aly and Fádhl-ibn-Abbás. Seating himself in the pulpit, after having offered up praise to God, he addressed the audience in these words: "Muslims, if I have smitten any of you, here is my back, and let him smite me in return. If I have wounded any man's reputation, let him return me insult for insult. If I have defrauded any one of his goods, let him take from me what is his due; everything that I possess is at his disposal. Let him not dread exciting my hatred, for hatred is not in my nature." He terminated his discourse by recommending the *Ansárs*, "the men who had given an asylum to the fugitive Prophet, and promoted the success of his cause," to the Muslims of Mecca. Shortly after, feeling unable to leave his room to preside at prayer in the mosque, which communicated with his house through a door, he directed that Abu-Bakr should take his place, and he accordingly discharged the functions of Imám, or Antistes, for three days. During that time Muhámmad grew sensibly weaker, was seized with fainting fits, and sometimes with lightheadedness. Nevertheless, between these attacks he continued to receive his intimate friends and to give them instructions. On the last of these occasions he recommended them to expel all from Arabia who did not profess al-Islám, to treat all new proselytes with honour, and to be exact in fulfilling the duty of prayer. On a prior occasion he suddenly ex-

claimed: "Bring me pen and ink, for I wish to write a book which will always preserve you from going astray." "The Prophet is delirious," remarked Omar; "have we not already the Kurán, the book of God?" On Monday the 12th of Rabíáu-l-Áwwal, (8th June, A.D. 632,) while Abu-Bakr was conducting the service in the mosque, Muhámmad issued from the door of his house, which communicated therewith, supported by his two cousins, and with a bandage round his head. His unexpected appearance caused no small commotion. Abu-Bakr ceased reciting the prayer, but a gesture from the Prophet directed him to proceed. At the conclusion Muhámmad rose up, and said: "Muslims, rude assaults await you, which will come upon you like stormy clouds. Let the Kurán be ever your guide. Do that which it prescribes or allows; eschew that which it prohibits." He spoke with a firm and sonorous voice, so much so that Abu-Bakr said: "Apostle of God, thanks to heaven you are better to-day. May I go and see Bint-Khārijah?" (the name of a woman of al-Madīnah whom Abu-Bakr had married, and who resided at Sunh, in the environs, with her relatives of the Bānu-Hārith.) "Go," said Muhámmad, who then returned to his apartments, where he remained alone with Aishah. The effort which he had made utterly prostrated him. He lay on his bed, and remained listless for several hours, after which he uttered, in broken sentences: "My God! . . . yes . . . with the companion from on high," (Gabriel.) At this moment Aishah, who had the head of the sick man on her lap, felt that he was growing heavy. She looked at his eyes, which were dim and fixed. The Prophet was dead.

Intelligence of this event was no sooner published than a crowd of people appeared before the door of Muhámmad's house, exclaiming: "How can our Apostle be dead, he who was to be our witness on the day of judgment?" "No," said Omar, "he is not dead; he has gone to visit his Lord, as Moses aforesaid did, when, after an absence of forty days, he reappeared to his people. Muhámmad will be restored to us. These are false Muslims, traitors, who say that he is dead. Let us cut them to pieces." Abu-Bakr, having been apprised of the Prophet's decease, hastened back from Sunh, and arrived on the scene at this juncture. Entering the apartment where the corpse lay, he raised the mantle which covered it, with tears in his eyes kissed its cold cheeks, and then laid his hand upon the heart which had ceased to beat, saying: "Oh, thou who wast dearer to me than the authors of my existence, thou art no more; thou hast tasted death, as God hath appointed unto thee!" Then presenting himself to the crowd, whom Omar was still vehemently addressing, he expostulated with them thus: "Muslims, if you adore Muhámmad, know that Muhámmad is dead. If you adore God, God is alive, and cannot die. Do you forget that passage in the Kurán—'Muhámmad is no more than an apostle; other apostles have already passed away before him; or that other verse—'Thou shalt truly die, O Muhámmad, and they also shall die.'" (Súr. iii. 138; xxxix. 31.) All doubts were set at rest by these quotations, and even Omar acknowledged his error. But a grave question now arose respecting a *Khalifah*, or Successor to Muhám-

mad. It was of the utmost importance that a selection should be made at once, in order to prevent the formation of cabals. Aly, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet, who had some legitimate claims to the office, fearing that his youth might be adduced as a bar thereto, retired into the apartment of his wife, Fátimah, together with a few of the Mecca emigrants. With this exception, all the *Muhájirín* of Mecca grouped themselves around Abu-Bakr, prepared to give him their suffrages. Meanwhile a large number of the principal *Ansárs* were holding a consultation at the place called *as-Sahífah*, at which it was decided to elect Sa'ád-ibn-Úbáidah, of the Bānu-Kházraj. Hearing of this, Abu-Bakr forthwith proceeded thither, accompanied by Ómar, Abu-Úbáidah, and a few of the *Muhájirín*, and, taking their seats in the assembly, listened to an orator who was expatiating on the claims of the *Ansárs* to have a successor to Muhámmad chosen from among them. Ómar made as though he would reply to this speech, but Abu-Bakr bade him to be silent, and himself spoke thus: "Ansárs, the services which you have rendered to Islám are unquestionable, and cannot be sufficiently extolled. But we belong to the family of the Prophet, and the superior rank and nobility of the al-Kuráish has always been recognized by the Arabs, and the nation can only be united together under the authority of one of that tribe." Then, taking the hand of Ómar and Abu-Úbáidah, he added: "I present to you two persons; select which you please. Both are deserving of the supreme power." "Not so," replied Ómar and Abn-Úbáidah; "the supreme power should belong to you—you, the particular friend of the Prophet, and his companion in the cave of Mount Thúr. He himself indicated you as his successor by appointing you to represent him at prayers, when he saw that his end was drawing near." This proposition met with some demur from the opposite party; nevertheless Ómar, taking advantage of the favourable impression made by Bashir, one of the principal *Ansárs*, who was the first to acknowledge the claims of the al-Kuráish, he exclaimed to Abu-Bakr: "Stretch out your hand." Whereupon, seizing it, he declared in a loud voice that he recognized him as the sovereign of the nation, and swore allegiance to him. His example was forthwith followed by all present, who pressed upon Abu-Bakr to do homage to him. This incident took place on Monday, the day of Muhámmad's death. Next day all the population of al-Madínah was convened in a general assembly to inaugurate the new chief. Abu-Bakr having seated himself in the pulpit, Ómar addressed them as follows: "Muslims, yesterday I made a foolish speech, and one opposed to the text of the sacred book. I believed that the Apostle of God was to survive us all; but it has pleased God to remove him from us for ever. Nevertheless, the Kurán remains with us. That book which God gave to His Prophet as a guide will keep us in the right way, if we obey its precepts. To-day God appoints as our head the best among us, the friend of Muhámmad, his companion in the cave. Come forward, then, take the hand of Abu-Bakr, and swear solemnly to be faithful to him." All present responded to this, appeal with the exception, so it is said, of Aly, who kept himself closeted in Aishah's house with some

other of the descendants of Hášhim. Thereupon, as some authors state, Ómar, accompanied by a body of the *Ansárs* and *Muhájirín*, went and pressed him to take part in the proceedings of the day, threatening, in the event of his refusal, to set his house on fire. The same authorities state that he yielded, and did homage to Abu-Bakr. Others, however, maintain that he did not recognize him until the death of his wife Fátimah, which took place six months after the death of her father. Abu-Bakr then addressed the assembly as follows: "I have now been entrusted with the charge of ruling over you. I am by no means the best among you, and I have need of your counsel and support. If I do well, help me; if ill, put me right. To declare the truth to the depository of the supreme power is an act of loyalty and devotion; to conceal it from him is treason. Before me the feeble and the strong shall be alike, and I will dispense impartial justice to all. Obey me while I continue to obey God and His Prophet. Should I ever cast aside the laws of God and of His Prophet I shall cease to have any claim on your obedience."

These proceedings terminated, preparations were made for the burial of Muhámmad, at which ceremony his uncle Abbás presided. The body having been placed under a curtained canopy, the different members of the Hášhim family seated themselves around it, while Abbás, with his two sons Fádhl and Kútham, together with Muhámmad's two liberated slaves Úsamah and Shukrán, entering it, proceeded to perform the funeral ablution of the corpse. Out of respect for the Prophet they did not uncover his body, but washed it with their hands under the tunic. They then anointed it with perfumes, covered it with spices, and enveloped it in three garments of rich stuffs of Suhár and al-Yáman. Some dispute having arisen between the al-Kuráish and the *Ansárs* about the place of sepulture, Abu-Bakr silenced it by affirming his having heard Muhámmad say that a prophet should be buried on the spot where he died. A grave was accordingly dug in the ground within the apartment of Aishah, and under the bed on which the Prophet had died. These last rites were performed by Aly and the two sons of Abbás, and the obsequies were terminated at midnight. The form of prayer used on the occasion was based on this sentence in the Kurán: "Verily, God and His angels bless the Prophet. O true believers, do ye also bless him and salute him with a reverential salutation." (Súr. xxxiii. 56.) Arab historians differ about the age of Muhámmad at the period of his death. M. Caussin de Perceval, who has collated the different authorities on the subject, judges that he was sixty-three lunar years and eight months, or a little above sixty-one solar years and nine months old.

The foregoing memoir, derived from acknowledged trustworthy sources, affords materials for gauging the private and public character of Muhámmad from the al-Híjrah to the time of his death. Nevertheless, the difficulty of forming a correct opinion on the subject is allowedly great. If, on the one hand, there is much in this phase of the Prophet's career which instinctively calls forth our reprobation, on the other there are passages therein which command our respect

and admiration; and unless both are candidly weighed, allowance being made for natural temperament and the circumstances of the time, our estimate will be imperfect and distorted. Much censure has been cast upon Muhámmad for the freebooting expeditions which he initiated on the establishment of his power at al-Madínah, the blood that was frequently shed on those forays, the questionable stratagems which were employed, and the occasional assassinations which were perpetrated with his sanction, and sometimes by his express orders. Judged by the standard of the Gospel these acts were undoubtedly immoral and wicked; but counterparts of them occur in the lives of some of the best among the Judges and Kings of Israel. (See 1 Sam. xvii. 2, 8-12; Judges iii. 15-26; iv. 18-21.) If it be argued that these victims were the enemies of Israel, and as such deserved their fate, it should be borne in mind, also, that Muhámmad undoubtedly regarded all those upon whom he made war as the enemies of God and His religion, whom the Lord had delivered into his hand. No such plea however can be adduced to palliate the murder, by his order, of the three Jews, Kaáb-ibun-'l-Ashraf, Sullám ibn-Abdu-'l-Hukáik, and Elyonsáir, as also of Khálid-ibn-Sufyán. These men, it is true, had either satirized or displayed hostility to him personally. Nevertheless, their assassination, in order to satiate private enmity and revenge, was an outrage upon humanity. The impartial narrative of our own Scriptures records an equally deplorable episode in the life of David. (See 2 Sam. xvi. 9-11; xix. 21-23; 1 Kings ii. 8, 9.)

Intolerance is another grave charge brought against Muhámmad. It is unquestionable that his conduct in this respect underwent a great change when he found himself firmly established at al-Madínah. At Mecca he had distinctly forbidden the use of force to compel men to believe: "If thy Lord had pleased, verily all who are in the earth would have believed together. What! wilt thou compel men to believe?" (Súr. x. 99.) And a similar prohibition, which was probably published before the Prophet found himself secure at al-Madínah, occurs in Súr. ii. 257: "Let there be no compulsion in religion. Now is the right way made distinct from error." These injunctions are in opposition to others of a later date which breathe a different spirit, albeit in well-nigh every instance toned down by considerations of policy or clemency: "And fight for the cause of God against those who fight against you; but act not aggressively; God loveth not the aggressor. And kill them wherever ye find them, and eject them from whatever place they have ejected you." (Súr. ii. 186-7.) "O Prophet, stir up the faithful to fight. Twenty of you who stand firm shall vanquish two hundred; and if there be a hundred of you, they shall vanquish a thousand infidels." (Súr. viii. 66.) "When ye encounter the infidels strike off their heads until ye have made a great slaughter among them, and [of the rest] make fast the fetters. And afterwards let there be either free dismissals or ransoms, until the war hath laid down its burdens." (Súr. xlvii. 4, 5.) On the supposition that Muhámmad was fully imbued with the idea of his having been divinely chosen to abolish paganism and to establish the worship of

the true God, these injunctions pale before those recorded to have been given to the Judges of Israel for a similar object, to exterminate the heathen Midianites, Amalekites, and Canaanites. (See Deut. xx. 16-18; xxv. 17-19; Numb. xxxiii. 55, 56; 1 Sam. xv. 3, 33.) Muhámmad, on the contrary, on hearing that Khálid-bin-Walid, in command of a cavalry detachment, had, without provocation, attacked the pagan al-Jadhímah, killing a number of them, exclaimed in horror, "My God! I am innocent of what Khálid has done," and forthwith despatched Ály with a large sum of money to the remainder of the tribe, as an indemnity for the outrage. He also granted protection, together with the privilege of professing their religion, to Jews and Christians who submitted to him, on condition of their paying tribute. And, lastly, the reader is referred back to the Prophet's triumphant entry into Mecca as a signal instance of his forbearance and toleration. As regards the future state of unbelievers in another world, Muhámmad dooms them to be "broiled in hell fire" for ever,—a fearful denunciation not peculiar to his creed. Further, that intolerance in a general sense, as restricting investigation within the hard-and-fast lines of dogma, is not absolutely held to be of the Essence of Islám is proved by the fact that orthodox Muslims in every age have, without forfeiting their orthodoxy, discussed all manner of questions relating to science in general as well as of theology.

With respect to the private as distinct from the public character of Muhámmad, from the time of his settlement at al-Madínah, it does not appear to have deteriorated, except in one particular, from what it had been prior to the flight from Mecca. He was still frugal in his habits, generous and liberal, faithful to his associates, treasured up the loving memory of absent and departed friends, and awaited his last summons with fortitude and submission. That he entertained an excessive passion for women, was lustful if you will, cannot be denied; but several of the old Testament sovereigns allowed themselves a similar licence in that respect. (See 2 Sam. v. 3; 1 Chron. iii. 1-9; xiv. 3; 1 Kings xi. 3; 2 Chron. xi. 21.) It is not so much his polygamy, considering all the circumstances of the case, which justly lays Muhámmad open to reproach, but his having deliberately infringed one of his own alleged divine revelations, which restricted the number of wives to "four and no more," (Súr. iv. 3;) also, for having in the first instance dallied with Zainab, the wife of his freedman and adopted son Zaid-ibn-Háritah, who complacently divorced her in order that she might espouse the Prophet. In this case, moreover, as has already been related, he adduced the authority of God as sanctioning on his behalf first, and thenceforth in the behoof of all Muslims, the marriage of a man with the divorced wife of his adopted son, which up to that time had been considered incestuous. Whatever apology may be adduced for Muhámmad in this matter of polygamy, there is no valid plea to justify his impropriety and impiety in the case of Zainab.

The *al-KURÂN*, as containing the alleged divine revelations made to Muhámmad, and as constituting the *lex scripta* of Islám, is the next point to be considered. The Kurân, in a general

way, may be regarded as the Bible of the Muslims, who claim for its dicta an authority equal to that claimed by Christians for the Old and New Testament Scriptures. It embodies the utterances of the Arabian Prophet on all subjects religious and moral, administrative and judicial, political and diplomatic, from the outset to the close of his career, together with a complete code of laws for regulating marriage, divorce, guardianship of orphans, bargains, wills, evidence, usury, and the intercourse of private and domestic life as they were dictated by him to his secretaries, and by them committed to writing on palm-leaves, the shoulder-blades of sheep, and other tablets. These, it appears, were thrown pell-mell into chests, where they remained till the reign of Abu-Bakr, the immediate successor of Muhámmad, who during the first year of his Khalífate entrusted Zaid-ibn-Háarithah, an *Ansár*, and one of the amanuenses of the Prophet, with the task of collecting them together, which he did, as well from "the breasts of men" as from the aforementioned materials, meaning thereby that he availed himself of the memories of those who had committed parts of the Prophet's utterances to memory. (Tradition states that one of the contemporary Muslims had learnt as many as seventy chapters by heart.) Zaid's copy continued to be the standard text during the Khalífate of Abu-Bakr, who committed it to the keeping of Háfsah, one of Muhámmad's widows. Certain disputes having arisen regarding this text, owing mainly to the variations of dialect and punctuation occurring therein, Ómar, the successor of Abu-Bakr, in the tenth year of his Khalífate, determined to establish a text which should be the sole standard, and delegated to Zaid, with whom he associated several eminent Arab scholars of the al-Kuráish, the task of its redaction. On its completion, copies were forwarded to the principal stations of the empire, and all previously existing copies were committed to the flames. This is the text now in general use among Muslims, and there is every reason to believe it to be a faithful rescript of the original fragmentary collection, amended only in its dialectical variations, and made conformable to the purer Arabic of the al-Kuráish, in which the contents of the Kurán were announced by Muhámmad. The absence of any adequate motive for tampering with the original text is a strong argument in favour of the genuineness of the copy. In addition to which it is reasonable to suppose that the denunciation against those "who invent a lie concerning God,"—a threat repeated eleven times in the Kurán,—taken together with the reverence of the early Muslims for what they considered the Word of God, acted as a powerful check upon any alteration of the sacred text.

As regards the actual order of the Kurán the Rev. J. M. Rodwell justly remarks that "Zaid and his coadjutors do not appear to have arranged the materials which came into their hands upon any system more definite than that of placing the longest and best known *Súras* [chapters] first, immediately after the *al-Fátihah*, or Opening chapter, although this rule, artless and unscientific as it is, has not been adhered to with strictness. Anything approaching to a chronological arrangement was entirely lost sight of. Late Medina *Súras* are often placed before early

Meccan *Súras*; the short *Súras* at the end of the Koran are its earliest portions; while verses of Meccan origin are to be found embedded in Medina *Súras*, and verses promulgated at Medina scattered up and down Meccan *Súras* . . . The text, therefore, as hitherto arranged, necessarily assumes the form of a most unreadable and incongruous patchwork, and conveys no idea whatever of the development and growth of any plan in the mind of the founder of Islám." In a lesser degree, the same absence of any reference to the occasions which call them forth prevents a full appreciation of many of the Psalms. Mr. Rodwell, in his edition of the Kurán, has done much towards throwing light upon the chronological order of the *Súras*, a task of no small difficulty, as the following extract, quoted by Weil in his *Mohammed der Prophet*, p. 263, from the Imám-abu-'l-Kásim-Hásan-ibnu-Muhámmad, abundantly shews:—"Whosoever will give his opinion respecting the Book of God must know how the *Súras* appeared in succession in Mecca as well as in al-Madinah, and be acquainted with those respecting which the learned disagree. He must know what has been revealed twice; what appeared in al-Madinah, and what was made known at Juhfáh, Jerusalem, at-Táif, and at Hudhaibíyyah. He must be able to discover which Mecca verses are mixed up with al-Madinah *Súras*, and which al-Madinah verses were confounded with Mecca *Súras*. He must be likewise acquainted with those which were carried from Mecca to al-Madinah, and from al-Madinah to Mecca and Abyssinia. Finally, he must know the *an-Násikh* and the *al-Mansúkh*." These technical terms, signifying the Abrogating and the Abrogated, have given rise to much discussion among Muslim canonists, some maintaining that they apply to passages of the Kurán which were cancelled by subsequent revelations, others that they refer to the laws of God, such as those previously possessed by the Jews, which were altered by later and better ordinances divinely made known to Muhámmad, in the same manner that many of the Old Testament ordinances are held to have been superseded by the new and better covenant of the Gospel. The principal texts in dispute are these:—"And when we change one verse for another,—and God knoweth best what He revealeth,—they say: Thou art only a fabricator, (*Súr. xvi. 103*;) and, "Whatever verse we cancel, or cause thee to forget, We bring a better or its like. Knowest thou not that God hath power over all things?" (*Súr. ii. 100.*) On which Sir William Muir remarks: "Though the convenient doctrine of abrogation is acknowledged by the Corán, yet the Mussulman doctors endeavour as far as possible to explain away such contradictions. Still they are obliged to allow that the Corán contains no fewer than 225 verses cancelled by later ones." The Syed Ahmed Khán, in his *Life of Mohammed*, strongly contests this view of the *an-Násikh* and *al-Mansúkh*, and gives the following as the correct drift of those terms:—"There are to be found in the Koran, and in the sayings of the Prophet, commandments relating to one and the same matter, but under different circumstances; and when one of those circumstances no longer remained, the commandment relating thereto does not remain in force, while the commandment which is intended to meet the altered

circumstance then comes into operation, the former commandment being called *Mansookh*, and the one subsequent to it *Násikh*. This, however, by no means implies that the former commandment was in any way defective, but that the circumstance to which it is applicable has ceased to exist, and consequently that the commandment itself ceases to be in force, but that, should the same circumstance again present itself, the same commandment will again come into operation, and that the one which was subsequent to it will then, in its turn, cease." As an instance in point the same author adduces the following:—"So long as the true believers remained subject to the idolaters at Mecca, they were commanded to bear patiently all the wrongs which their rulers inflicted upon them; but as soon as the Moslems had left the dominions of the idolaters they were allowed to fight against the unbelievers at Mecca." But, plausible as the Syed's defence is, it does not alter the fact, already pointed out, that Muhámmad for his own private and voluptuous purposes suspended prior by subsequent alleged divine revelations. "This," however, as Sir William Muir justly remarks, "does not in any measure affect the value of the Corán as an exponent of Mahomet's opinions, or at least of the opinion which he finally professed to hold; since what we now have, though possibly corrected and modified by himself, is still *his own*."

With regard to the contents of the 114 *Súrah's* and 6666 verses into which the Kurán is divided, apart from those portions which are undoubtedly borrowed either from Jewish or Christian sources, frequent outbursts of sublime poetic inspiration on the majesty of God, His creation and providence, with occasional references to Arab history, the remainder is made up of what Mr. Bosworth Smith calls "political bulletins, or of personal apologies, rather than of messages direct from God;" or, as Sir William Muir says, of "general orders, in which victories are announced, success promised, actions recounted, failure explained, bravery applauded, cowardice or disobedience chided, military or political movements directed, and all this as an immediate communication from the Deity." The assertion, therefore, that there is nothing original in the Kurán is not wide of the truth. It seems, indeed, with ideas and even phraseology borrowed from the oral law of the Jews, with whom Muhámmad was in constant intercourse, and whose religious views must have been well known throughout Arabia. The Rev. J. Muhleisen-Arnold, in his *Islam and Christianity*, making use of the prize essay of the Rabbi Abraham Geiger, in answer to the thesis, *Inquiratur in fontes Alcorani seu legis Muhammedicæ eos qui ex Judaismo derivandi sunt*, gives a long list of the plagiarisms from the Talmud contained in the Kurán. The seven heavens, seven earths, and seven hells of the former, its intermediate place between heaven and hell, many of its ceremonial and moral precepts, its demonology, its legendary and fabulous tales about Adam, Cain and Abel, Noah, Nimrod, Joseph, Jacob, Moses, Saul, David, and Jonathan are all reproduced in the Kurán as Divine revelations made to the Arabian Prophet, who whenever he steps beyond his copy falls into signal blunders,

as when he makes Jacob the son of Abraham, (*Súr. vi. 84; xxix. 26, et aliter*), and Haman and Korah officers of Pharaoh. (*Súr. xxviii. 38, 76; xl. 25*.) As regards the latter, Jewish tradition makes him the treasurer of Pharaoh. On this subject Mr. Rodwell remarks: "There can be no doubt from the constant identity between the Talmudic perversions of Scripture histories and Rabbinic moral precepts that the Rabbins of the Hejaz communicated these legends to Muhammad. And it should be remembered that the Talmud was completed a century previous to the era of Muhammad, and cannot fail to have extensively influenced the religious creed of all the Jews of the Arabian peninsula."

It is equally obvious that, in the compilation of the Kurán, Muhámmad drew from Christian sources. It is uncertain whether any Arabic translation of the New Testament existed at that period, although a few sentences are more or less distinctly quoted therefrom. But there were many Christians among the Arab tribes settled in the neighbourhood of the al-Hijáz; and, besides, Muhámmad's wife Khadíjah, and her cousin Wárahah, an intimate friend of the Prophet, are said to have been well versed in the books of the Jews and Christians. Moreover, Muhámmad himself had made one or two trips to Bustrá, where he doubtless had opportunities of gaining some acquaintance with the doctrines held by the Oriental Christians at that period, and with their rites and ceremonies. Mr. Rodwell holds it to be "quite clear that Muhammad borrowed in several points from the doctrines of the Ebionites, Essenes, and Sabeites. Epiphanius (*Hæc. x.*) describes the notions of the Ebionites of Nabathæa, Moabites, and Eascenites, with regard to Adam and Jesus almost in the very words of *Súr. iii. 52*. He tells us that they observed circumcision, were opposed to celibacy, forbade turning to the sunrise, but enjoined Jerusalem as their *Keblah* (as Muhammad did during twelve years), that they prescribe, as do the Sabeites, washings very similar to those enjoined in the Koran, and allowed oaths (by certain external objects, as clouds, signs of the Zodiac, oil, the winds, &c.) which we find adopted in the Koran. These points of contact with Islám, knowing as we do Muhammad's eclecticism, can hardly be accidental." It should also be borne in mind that at the outset of his career the Prophet was taunted with being prompted by others, "who dictated to him morning and evening." (*Súr. xxv. 6*.) Further, there is abundant evidence in the Kurán that, even if such apocryphal works as the *Protevang. Jacobi*, the *Evang. de Nativitate Mariæ*, and the *Hist. de Nativ. Mariæ et de Infantia Salvatoris*, were not then in existence, the fables contained therein respecting the blessed Virgin, the birth of Christ, His infancy and childhood, were nevertheless afloat at the time, and were adopted by the compiler, as were also the notions of the Cerinthians and Carpocratians respecting another victim having been sacrificed in Christ's stead. That Muhámmad recast all the information which he derived through these extraneous channels, and reduced them all to a uniform and chaste diction, is undeniable, and the masterly manner in which this has been done is a signal proof that he was not the illiterate man he is represented to have been by



his followers, who in general, as has already been stated, deny that the Kurān was composed by the Prophet, affirming that the first transcript thereof, on a preserved tablet, has existed from eternity by the throne of God, from whence a copy was sent down, by the ministry of Gabriel, to the lowest heaven during the *Lailatu'l-Kadr*, the Night of Power, (Sūr. xvii.) and from thence revealed by the same angel to Muḥammad in parcels, as the exigency of the case required. Admitted that the diction of the Kurān is faultless, that it contains passages of exquisite sublimity, albeit often marred by unsonant refrains apparently introduced for the sake of rhythm, nevertheless no one cognizant of the obvious sources from whence its constituent parts were mainly derived can for a moment believe it to have been penned under the immediate inspiration of God. Yet the al-Kurān is regarded by Muslims as the standing miracle of Islām, and is appealed to as such by Muḥammad himself, who defies men and genii to produce a book like it. (Sūr. ii. 21.)

The foregoing considerations dispose of two claims set up by the Kurān, first, that it is the latest revelation of God's will, and that its author was the Seal of the Prophets; secondly, the alleged inspiration of Muḥammad. That the religion inculcated by the New Testament is, in every respect, immeasurably superior to that of the Kurān must be patent to every intelligent and impartial mind, and hence, to suppose that the Almighty, in His providence towards mankind, revealed for their guidance what was less perfect for that which was perfect is to charge Him with more than human weakness, as, on the other hand, it would be impious to ascribe to the Omniscent the authorship of the fables and anachronisms contained in the Kurān. This, in fact, is the damning sin of Muḥammad, that he made himself superior not only to the Prophets of old but to Christ. If he verily believed himself to be such, he was self-deceived; if otherwise, he was an arrant impostor.

Before proceeding to discuss the peculiar dogmas and precepts of Islām, it will not be out of place to point out what were Muḥammad's opinions respecting the *Tawrāt* and *Injil* (in which two terms he evidently included all the sacred books of the Christians), as also what his notions were of Christianity. Bearing in mind how superficial his knowledge must have been on the subject, it is surprising that he should have formed so high a conception of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. At the outset of his prophetic career, and until the development of his own teaching necessitated their tacit supersession by the Kurān, he always described the latter as a book which simply attested the truth of preceding Divine revelations. (Sūr. v. 52.) Even after that period he never spoke of the Jewish or Christian Scriptures except in terms of pious reverence, and in the same Sūrah, 48-51, he enjoins upon Jews and Christians the solemn duty of obedience to the Law and the Gospel. Further, the charge made by some modern Muslims that the text of the original Christian Scriptures has been tampered with is not supported by the authority of the Kurān. It is deeply to be regretted that Muḥammad's sources of information respecting Christi-

anity were so untrustworthy and corrupt. That they were mainly apocryphal and legendary is beyond doubt; and it is reasonable to suppose that his misconceptions of the Trinity and of the Divine character of Christ are primarily referrible to the erroneous and materialistic views on those cardinal doctrines which prevailed at that time among the Christians of Arabia. What those views were has already been pointed out, and the candid reader must confess that with such distortions of solemn truths before him, he himself the while being fully imbued with the doctrine of the unity of God, it is not surprising that he was led astray. The following are his principal utterances on the subject of the Trinity:—"O ye people of the Book! overstep not the boundaries of your religion; and of God speak only the truth. The Messiah Jesus, son of Mary, is only an apostle of God, and His Word which He conveyed into Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Himself. Believe therefore in God and His apostles, and say not Three [that there is a Trinity]. Forbear, it will be better for you. God is only one God. Far be it from His glory that He should have a son!" (Sūr. iv. 169.) "Infidels now are they who say: God is the Messiah, son of Mary; for the Messiah said: O children of Israel! worship God, my Lord and your Lord. Whoever shall join other gods with God, God shall forbid him paradise, and his abode shall be the fire." (Sūr. v. 76.) "Sole maker of the heaven and the earth! how, when He hath no consort should He have a son." (Sūr. vi. 101.) To which may be added Sūr. cxiii., the shortest chapter of the Kurān and by Muslims regarded as containing the essence of the whole book:—"Say, God is one; God the Eternal; He begetteth not, neither is He begotten; neither is there any one like Him." It is clear from these passages that Muḥammad misjudged the Christians as blasphemously attributing human procreation to God. In all these instances, and in others which might be cited, he charges them with believing Christ to be the *Wālad* of God, that is, the son of God by natural procreation. Now, neither in any of the existing Arabic translations of the New Testament, nor among Arabic-speaking Christians of the present day, is that term applied to our blessed Lord. Always and everywhere He is styled *Ibnu-'llāh*, (from the root *bānu* to build), that is, the Son of God's building. The same distinction between the two Arab roots exists in the Hebrew, albeit wanting in the Greek and in our own language. It is not surprising, considering his views on this subject, that Muḥammad never applies the epithet of "Father" to God; but it is difficult to divine, seeing that in Sūr. ix. 30 he represents the Christians as using the correct expression *Ibnu-'llāh*, why he himself should persistently adopt the detracting term *Wālad* to the Sonship of Christ, whose miraculous birth, however, of the Virgin Mary is distinctly asserted by him:—"Remember" "when the angel said, O Mary! Verily God announceth to thee the Word from Him; His name shall be Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, illustrious in this world and the next, and one of those who have access to God. . . . She said: How, O my Lord, shall I have a son when no man hath touched me? He said, Thus: God will create

what He will." (Sûr. iii. 40, 42.) And, again: "Mary, the daughter of Imrân [a genealogical misnomer], who kept her maidenhood, and into whose womb We breathed of Our Spirit." (Sûr. lxi. 12.) Nothing can exceed the respect and reverence expressed in the Kurân for the Mother of our Lord.

As to the Persons constituting the Christian Trinity Muhámmad's notions were very confused and indistinct. It is generally supposed that in the passage where God is made to say, "O Jesus, son of Mary, hast thou said unto mankind: Take me and my mother as two gods, beside God?" (Sûr. v. 116,) he reckoned the Virgin Mary as the second Person. It is more likely, however, that it refers to the almost divine honours which then, as now, were paid to the Virgin by the so-called Orthodox churches in the East, and to the title of *θεοτόκος*, Mother of God, by which the mother of our Lord is still designated among them. The third Person in the alleged Christian Trithemism, according to Muhámmad, who does not appear to have had any idea of the place held by the Spirit of God in our theology, is Christ Himself:—"The Christians say, the Messiah is the son [*ibn*] of God. Such is the saying in their mouths; a saying resembling that of the infidels of old. God do battle with them. How are they misguided. They take their teachers, and their monks, and the Messiah, the son of Mary, for Lords [Rabbis: the word *Rabbî*, in that sense, is only applied in Arabic to the Deity] besides God, though bidden to worship God only." (Sûr. ix. 30, 31.) Christ is also called "a spirit proceeding from Himself," God, (Sûr. iv. 169,) and is further stated to have been strengthened with the Holy Spirit, (Sûr. ii. 81, 254;) but by the Holy Spirit in these passages the angel Gabriel is intended, as has already been pointed out. Apart, however, from His being a Divine person, Muhámmad attributes the highest rank among men to Christ, and invests Him with superior holiness. Besides the titles above applied to Him, he is styled a *Nabî*, or prophet, (Sûr. xix. 31,) and a *Rasûl*, Apostle of God, (Sûr. iv. 169;) is commissioned to teach the Gospel, that they who have received it might judge according to what God hath revealed, "and whosoever judgeth not according to what God hath sent down—such are the perverse." (Sûr. v. 51.) He is empowered by God to give sight to the blind, to heal the leper, to raise the dead, and also to prophesy, (Sûr. iii. 43,) and sends two of His apostles to a certain city (Antioch) as messengers from God. (Sûr. xxxvi. 12, 15.) His crucifixion is denied:—"They [the Jews] said: Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, the Apostle of God. Yet, they slew him not, but what was made to appear as a similitude [of him]. . . They did not really slay Him, but God took him to Himself." (Sûr. iv. 156.) Although Muhámmad believed the Saviour to be mortal, making Him to say while yet in His cradle:—"The peace of God was on me the day I was born, and will be on the day that I shall die, and the day I shall be raised to life." (Sûr. xix. 34;) yet His having died is not distinctly asserted. Nevertheless, He is to reappear on earth to be "a sign of the [last] hour," (Sûr. xliii. 61,) when, according to Muslim theologians, he is to kill Antichrist, to

die, and to be raised again. In prospect of His future sepulture a place is reserved for His body near that of the Prophet, at al-Madînah. The disciples of Christ are mentioned five times in the Kurân as the *al-Hawâriyyûn*, or Pure Ones. The only reference to Baptism is contained in Sûr. ii. 132:—"We have been baptized] "with the baptism of God, and who is better to baptize than God?" but no allusion whatever is made to the Lord's Supper. The passage (Sûr. v. 112-115) about Christ being "able to send down a furnished table to us out of heaven" is held by Muslim commentators to refer to one of our Lord's miracles.

It will be seen from the foregoing analysis of Muhámmad's views how many points of contact there are between Christianity and Islâm. We find set forth in the Kurân a distinct admission of the inspiration of the Christian Scriptures, the perfections of God, the pre-eminence of Jesus, the purity and exalted rank of the Virgin Mother, the reverence due to the prophets and apostles, the resurrection of the quick and dead, and the judgment of the last day, together with a striking accord between the two creeds respecting the obligation and practice of some of the moral virtues.

We proceed, in the next place, to notice the dogmas and precepts of Islâm as they are set forth in the Kurân, which, theoretically, constitutes the Muslim Rule of Faith and Practice, from which there is no appeal. The term *al-Imân* is generally applied to the fundamental articles of religion, and *ad-Dîn* to its ordinances, albeit the two words are often interchangeable. *Al-Imân* consists of the following six points:—

1. *Belief* in ALLÁH, God, or more correctly The God, that is, the only God, (for the title is compounded of the definite article *al*, and *iláh*, a god,) is as much the cardinal dogma in Islâm as it is in Christianity, always excepting the idea of a Trinity in Unity. Muhámmad's conceptions of the attributes and perfections of the Deity, as they are contained in the Kurân, are clothed in language of transcendent power and beauty, and the duty of worshipping and serving Him is enforced by every consideration calculated to affect a rational being. The absence of the phrase "the love of God" in Muhámmad's theology has been regarded by some as a great defect in his system; but neither does it occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the genius of the Arabic language barely admits of it. Nevertheless love, as one of the attributes of the Deity, is of constant occurrence in the Kurân. God "loves the charitable," (Sûr. ii. 191,) "the pure," (*id.* 222;) "God loves you and will forgive your sins, for He is the Forgiving, the Merciful," (Sûr. iii. 29;) God "loves the patient," (*id.* 140,) "those who trust in Him," (*id.* 153,) "the just," (Sûr. v. 46,) "the devout," (Sûr. ix. 4,) &c., and in like manner He is said "not to love" the opposite of these virtues. So great is the reverence of many Muslims for the name of God that they will not tread upon a scrap of written or printed paper lest the sacred name of *Alláh* should be inscribed thereon. Others, however, equally devout, do not hesitate to use God's name, and that constantly, in a way which we should consider profane. As a development of the injunction, "Most excellent titles hath God; by these call ye on Him," (Sûr.

vii. 179.) Muslims apply ninety-nine epithets to God, which they call *al-Asmá'ü-l-Husnah*, the Beautiful Names, and use a rosary of as many beads to aid them in the pious recitation of the same. A list of these titles is given by the Rev. T. P. Hughes in his *Notes of Muhammadanism*. It is to be regretted that in the transliterated Arabic names he has omitted the important article *al-*. The reader is also referred to the same useful manual for a translation, from Ockley, of a grand passage on the Muslim belief in God, as given in Pocock's *Specimen Historiæ Arabum*.

II. BELIEF IN THE *Malâ'ikah*, the Messengers or Angels, because they convey messages from God. The belief in the existence of angels is absolutely required by the Kurân, and whoever denies this article of Islam is declared to be an enemy of God, and an infidel:—"Whoso is the enemy of Jibril [Gabriel],—for he it is who by God's permission hath caused it [the Kurân] to descend on thy heart confirming what was before him, and as a guide and glad tidings to the faithful,—whoso is an enemy of God, or of His angels, or apostles, or of Jibril, or Mikâl [Michael, shall have God for his enemy]; for verily God is an enemy of the unbelievers." (Sûr. ii. 91-2.) Gabriel and Michael are the only two angels mentioned by name in the Kurân. Of the office of the former, which is referred to in the above passage, frequent mention has already been made. *Mikâl* (Michael) is only named in the same verse, nor is there any indication of his special office. Muslim commentators, however, regard him as the guardian-angel of the Jews, as in, Dan. xii. 1, and to these archangels they add *Âzrâ'il*, the Angel of Death, who separates men's souls from their bodies, and *Isrâ'îl*, whose office it will be to sound the trumpet of the resurrection. (Sale remarks that these four angels are described almost in the same manner in the apocryphal *Gospel of Barnabas*.) Founding the theory on a solitary verse of the Kurân that each individual has a *Muâkkilât*, or Succession of relieving angels, "before him, and behind him, who watch over him by God's behest," (Sûr. xliii. 12,) the same authorities teach that two guardian-angels attend on every man to observe and write down his actions. To these they add two others, *Nakîr* and *Munkar*, apparently of their own fancy, albeit tradition asserts that they were believed in by Muhámmad. The office of these is to visit every man in his grave, to make them sit up, and to examine them respecting their faith in the Prophet. Should the answers be satisfactory, the individual is allowed to sleep on in peace; if not, he will be struck with an iron sledge-hammer and made to cry out with pain. These cries will be heard by the animals near the grave, but not by men nor by the *Jinn* (Genii).

The Angels, according to the Kurân, are "created of fire." (Sûr. vii. 11,) are of different forms, some "having two, others three, and others four pairs of wings," (Sûr. xxxv. 1;) their numbers are countless, and they "stand in ranks," worshipping God. (Sûr. xxxvi. 1.) As God's Messengers they take a prominent part in the Divine providence. God "chooseth messengers from among them, but He only is to be worshipped." (Sûr. xxii. 74, 76.) Angels appeared to Abraham and Lot, (Sûr. xi. 72; xv.

51,) watch in turns over believers, defend them, and receive their souls when they die. (Sûr. iii. 120; xiii. 12; vi. 61.) They also "implore forgiveness for" them, and "ask pardon for the dwellers on earth;" (Sûr. xl. 7; xlii. 3;) are charged with the summons of death, "causing men to die," (Sûr. xxxii. 11; xlvii. 29,) are the appointed "guardians of the [hell] fire," (Sûr. lxxiv. 30,) and will "bear up the throne" of God on the day of resurrection. (Sûr. lxxix. 17.) No sanction is given in the foregoing passages to direct addresses to angels for their intercession with God.

The Devil, or Satan, is styled in the Kurân *Iblis* and *ash-Shaitân*; the first, supposing it to be derived from an Arabic etymon, signifies the Despairer, and the latter the Insolent or Rebellious one. *Iblis* was originally an angel, but lost his high estate for refusing to join with the other angels in worshipping Adam on his creation, "being puffed up with pride." (Sûr. ii. 32.) Whereupon God said: "Get thee down hence; Paradise is no place for thy pride. Get thee gone, then; one of the despised shalt thou be. He [*Iblis*] said: Respite me till the day when [men] shall be raised from the dead. He [God] said: One of the respited shalt thou be. He [*Iblis*] said: Now for that Thou hast caused me to err, surely in Thy straight path will I lay wait for them. Then I will come upon them from before and behind, and from their right hand and their left, and Thou shalt not find the greater part of them to be thankful. He [God] said: Go forth from it, a scorned, a banished one. Whoever of them shall follow thee, I will surely fill hell with you, one and all." (Sûr. vii. 12-17.) This story of *Iblis* is repeated four times in the Kurân. It was the *ash-Shaitân* who beguiled Adam and Eve and caused them to lose Paradise; (Sûr. ii. 34; vii. 19-21;) he threatens the faithful with poverty, and instils into them base desires; (Sûr. ii. 271;) he "causeth them to wander wide of the truth," and "promises only to deceive;" (Sûr. iv. 63, 119;) "sows hatred and strife among believers by wine and games of hazard;" (Sûr. v. 93;) "suggests evil desires to prophets and apostles;" (Sûr. xxii. 51;) and is "man's betrayer." (Sûr. xxv. 31.) As in the New Testament, the word is also found in the plural in many passages of the Kurân, and the final destiny of all the devils is to be "gathered together on their knees round hell." (Sûr. xix. 69.)

Besides Angels, the Kurân teaches the existence of a class of beings called *Jinn* (Genii), who are also created of "subtile" fire, (Sûr. xv. 27; lv. 14;) but are strangely classified with men, as having, like them, had apostles sent to them. (Sûr. vi. 130.) A company of them listened to a recitation of the Kurân at Mecca, (Sûr. lxxii. 1;) some among them are "good," others "of another kind." (*Id.* 10.) Of the latter one is named under the title of *Âfrît* (Malignant). "Many of the *Jinn* and men were created for hell," (Sûr. vii. 178,) and the Lord is made to say: "I will wholly fill hell with *Jinn* and men." (Sûr. xi. 120.) These fantastic notions are undoubtedly derived from Talmudic sources, although the Kurân, with equal certainty, claims for them the authority of divine revelation.

III. and IV. BELIEF IN THE BOOKS, or Scrip-

tures, AND IN THE PROPHETS. The Kurán teaches that God, in divers ages of the world, has given revelations of His will to a succession of Prophets. These revelations, according to Muslim divines, number 104, of which ten were given to Adam, fifty to Seth, thirty to Idris (Enoch), ten to Abraham, and the remaining four, namely, the *Tauráh*, (the Old Testament Scriptures,) the *Zabúr*, (Psalms,) the *Injíl*, (Gospel,) and the *al-Kurán*, were delivered successively to Moses, David, Christ, and Muhámmad, who is "the Seal of the Prophets." (Súr. xxxiii. 40.) Apparently through ignorance Muhámmad applies the words *at-Tauráh* and *al-Injíl* to the entire Old and New Testaments respectively, and undoubtedly seems to have thought that the whole of the former was given through Moses, and the latter through Christ. All but the last-named four books are supposed to have perished, but those four are acknowledged to be of Divine authority, and are frequently referred to as such. There are occasional charges of falsification of their scriptures made against Jews and Christians, more especially against the former, but these are very vaguely worded:—"O children of Israel! . . . clothe not the truth with falsehood, and hide not the truth when ye know it." (Súr. ii. 48, 49.) Again, "There are illiterates among them who are unacquainted with the book, [the *Tauráh*,] but with lies only, and have but vain fancies. Woe to those who transcribe the book corruptly, and then say: This is from God." (*Id.* 73.) Muslim writers, however, are far less reserved, and hesitate not to charge Jews and Christians with falsifying their sacred books in order to suppress the testimony which they assert was to be found therein to the claims of their Prophet. Christians are specially accused of changing *περικλυτός* into *παράκλητος*, (John xvi. 7,) in order to set aside the prophecy alleged in the Kurán to have been uttered by Christ:—"And [remember] when Jesus, the son of Mary, said: O children of Israel! of a truth I am God's Apostle to you to confirm the law which was given before me, and to announce an apostle that should come after me, whose name shall be ÁHMAD. But when he [Áhmad] presented himself with clear proofs of his mission, they said: This is manifest sorcery." (Súr. lxi. 6.) The argument here is, that *περικλυτός*, Very Famous, has the same signification as *Ahmad*, which is quite true, and that, consequently, the advent of the Arabian Prophet was predicted by Christ Himself. Now, seeing that the most ancient codices of the New Testament, the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Alexandrian, dating from the middle of the 4th to that of the 5th century, read *παράκλητος*, it savours not a little of arrogance for Muslim writers, whose acquaintance with the Bible has always been very meagre and misty, to bring this charge of wilful corruption against Christians, for which, moreover, they are unable to adduce any proofs whatever. Besides, *Muhámmad* and *Áhmad* are not, as seems to be taken for granted, synonymous terms, since the former signifies the Praised, and the latter the More or the Most Praised, and the two names are as distinct at the present day among Muslims as any two names are among Christians. If Muhámmad, as is supposable, had heard of a

*παράκλητος* having been promised by Christ, he may possibly have been told that it indicated some illustrious personage; but even then he studiously forbears applying the prophecy to his own person by using the name Áhmad instead of Muhámmad, which latter is that which he always applies to himself. (Súr. iii. 138; xxxiii. 40; xlvii. 2; xlviii. 29.) Further, it is nothing short of an insult to common sense to propound the retrograde morality and religious doctrines taught by Muhámmad as, in any way, a fulfilment of the offices attributed to the *παράκλητος* in the New Testament. The reader is referred to the Seyd Ahmed Khan's *Essays on the Life of Mohammed* for an elaborate and ingenious dissertation on this subject, which the foregoing remarks are intended briefly to confute.

The terms *Nábi* (prophet), and *Rasúl* (apostle), are often applied indiscriminately in the Kurán to the patriarchs and prophets of old, but both are used of Moses, Jesus, and Muhámmad. Several of the Bible prophets are mentioned therein by name, and the title of *Nábi* is also given to Idris (Enoch), Hád (Heber), Shuaíb (Jethro), and also to others whose names are not found in the Old Testament. According to Muslim tradition there have been some tens of thousands of prophets sent by God into the world. The Kurán recognizes different grades in the prophetic and apostolical office:—"Some of the apostles We have endowed more highly than others." (Súr. ii. 254.) "Higher gifts have We given to some of the prophets than others." (Súr. xvii. 57.) That Muhámmad had no clear conception of the chronological order of the Scripture patriarchs and prophets is evident from his strange enumeration of them:—"Verily We have revealed to thee as We revealed to Noah and the Prophets after him, and as We revealed to Abraham, and Ishmael, and Jacob, and the tribes, and Jesus, and Job, and Jonah, and Aaron, and Solomon; and to David We gave the Psalms." (Súr. iv. 161.) More bizarre still:—"And We gave him [Abraham] Isaac, and Jacob, and guided both aright; and We had before guided Noah; and among the descendants [of Abraham] David and Solomon, and Job, and Joseph, and Moses, and Aaron . . . and Zachariah, John, Jesus, and Elias: all were just persons. And Ishmael, and Elisha, and Jonah, and Lot." (Súr. vi. 84-86.)

V. THE BELIEF IN A GENERAL RESURRECTION AND FINAL JUDGMENT.—Reference has been made above to the two angels, *Nakír* and *Munkar*, whose office it is to test the departed in their graves. On that examination would appear to depend their intermediate state between death and the Resurrection. Such is the meaning given by Muslim doctors to the word *Bárzakh*—literally, something which makes a separation between two things—in the following passage:—"When death overtaketh one [of the wicked] he saith: Lord, send me back again that I may do the good which I have left undone. By no means. These are the very words which he shall speak; but behind them shall be a *bárzakh*, until the day that they shall be raised again. And when the trumpet shall be sounded, the ties of kindred between them shall cease on that day, neither shall they ask

each other's help. — They whose balances are heavy shall be blessed; but they whose balances shall be light—these are they who shall lose their souls, abiding in hell for ever." (Sūr. xxiii. 101-105.) This intermediate state is thus described under the name of *al-Ārāf*:—"And between them shall be a partition, and on [the wall of] the *al-Ārāf* shall be men who shall know all by their tokens, and they shall cry to the inmates of paradise: Peace be upon you! but they shall not [yet?] enter it, although they long to do so. And when their eyes are turned to the inmates of the fire they shall say: O our Lord! place us not with the offending people. And they who are upon the *al-Ārāf* shall cry to those whom they know by their tokens: Your amassings and your pride have availed you nothing. Are these they on whom ye swear God would not bestow mercy? Enter ye [the believers are addressed from the *al-Ārāf*] into paradise, where no fear shall be upon you, neither shall ye be put to grief. And the inmates of the fire shall cry to the inmates of paradise: Pour upon us some water, or of the refreshments God hath given you. They shall say: Truly God hath forbidden both to unbelievers." (Sūr. vii. 44-48.) This comparatively simple exposition of Muḥammad's Hades has been embellished by his followers with fancies too wild and absurd to merit notice.

The *Yāumu-l-Ba'ath*, the Day of the Resurrection, is described in the Kurān as one of awful grandeur: "The day when men shall be scattered like moths, and the mountains shall be like flocks of carded wool. Then as to him whose balances are heavy—his shall be a life that shall please him well. And as to him whose balances are light—his abode shall be the fire." (Sūr. ci. 3-6.) "When the sun shall be folded up; and when the stars shall fall; and when the mountains shall be moved; and when the she-camels shall be abandoned; and when the wild beasts shall be gathered together; and when the seas shall boil; and when the souls shall be paired [with their bodies?]; and when the female child that has been buried alive shall be asked for what crime she was put to death; and when the leaves of the book shall be unrolled; and when the heavens shall be stripped away; and when hell shall be made to blaze; and when paradise shall be brought near, every soul shall know what it hath produced." (Sūr. lxxxi. 1-14.) The Resurrection will be the rehabilitation of the dead wrought by the power of God:—"He it is who sendeth forth the winds as the heralds of His compassion, until they bring up the laden clouds which We drive along to some dead land and send down water thereon, by which We cause an outgrowth of fruit. Thus will He bring forth the dead." (Sūr. vii. 55.) And again: "We send down the rain with its blessings, by which We cause gardens to spring forth, and the grain of harvest. . . . So shall be the resurrection." (Sūr. i. 9, 11.) Then every man's fate shall be determined according to his actions in this life: "On the day of the resurrection We will bring forth to him a book which shall be proffered to him wide open. Read thy book; there needeth none but thyself to make an account against thee this day." (Sūr. xvii. 14, 15.) Beasts as well as mankind and all other created intelligences shall stand before

God on the great day of account: "No kind of beast is there on earth, nor fowl that flieth with its wings, but is a folk like you. Nothing have we passed over in the Book [of the divine decrees]. Then unto their Lord shall they be gathered." (Sūr. vi. 38.) As to the duration of the Day of Judgment, the Kurān in one passage states that its "length shall be a thousand years of such as ye reckon," (Sūr. xxxii. 4;) and in another "fifty thousand years." (Sūr. lxx. 4.) Respecting the locality of the Resurrection Muslim commentators differ widely. Muḥammad seems to teach that it will take place on this earth, which together with the heavens is to be changed on the occasion:—"On the day when the earth shall be changed into another earth, and the heavens also, men shall come forth unto God." (Sūr. xiv. 49.)

In addition to the signs of the coming of the Day of Judgment given in the preceding paragraph, Muslim writers enumerate twenty-five, whereby its approach may be known. The reader is referred for them to Mr. Hughes's *Notes on Muhammadanism*, pp. 87-89, as quoted from the *Mishkātul-Masābih*.

Hell, the abode which shall be assigned to unbelievers, hypocrites, lovers of money, &c.. on the Day of Judgment, is designated the Fire, *Jahannam*, and *al-Hāwīyah*, the latter meaning the Abyss or Bottomless Pit. "It hath seven portals." (Sūr. xv. 44.) The torments to be endured there are described in appalling terms:—"For those who have disbelieved garments of fire shall be cut out; boiling water shall be poured upon their heads; all that is in their bowels and their skin shall be dissolved; and there are maces of iron for them." (Sūr. xxii. 20, 21.) "But the people on the left hand, oh! how wretched shall the people on the left hand be, amid pestilential winds, and in scalding water, and in the shadow of a black smoke, not cool, and horrid to behold." (Sūr. lvi. 40-43.) "Woe on that day to those who are charged with imposture! Begone to that hell which ye called a lie; begone to the shadows which lie in triple masses; but not against the flame shall they shade or help you. The sparks which it casteth out are like towers, like tawny camels." (Sūr. lxxvii. 28-33.) This abode, as regards unbelievers, shall be eternal:—"The lot of those who must dwell for ever in the fire, and shall have draughts of boiling water forced on them which will rend their bowels asunder." (Sūr. xlvi. 17.) On the other hand, it would seem that all men are to make trial of hell for a time, or are to learn what it is possibly on their way to paradise:—"No one is there of you who shall not go down to it; this is a settled decree with the Lord. Then will We deliver those who had the fear of God, and the wicked We will leave in it on their knees." (Sūr. xix. 72, 73.)

The final abode of believers is described in the Kurān under several names, such as the *Jānnatu'n-Nā'īm*, the Garden of Delight, (Sūr. xxvi. 85;) the *Dāru's-Sulām*, the Dwelling of Peace, (vi. 127;) the *Jānnatu-Ādam*, the Garden of Eden, (Sūr. ix. 73;) the *Jānnatu-l-Firdaus*, the Garden of Paradise, (Sūr. xviii. 107;) the *Jānnatu-l-Khuld*, the Garden of Immortality, (Sūr. xxv. 16;) the *Jānnatu-l-Mā'wah*, the Garden of Refuge, (Sūr. xl. 19;) the *Dāru-l-Karār*, the Enduring Abode, (Sūr. xxxii. 42;) and the

*Jánnatu-'l-'Illyin*, the Garden of the highest Heavens. (Súr. lxxxiii. 18.) The following, from among several other passages of similar import, gives a fair picture of the Paradise of Muhámmad:—"The people of the right hand, how happy shall they be! . . . These are they who shall be brought nigh to God in gardens of delight . . . reclining on inlaid couches face to face. Ever-blooming youths go round about them with goblets, and ewers, and a cup of flowing wine; their brows ache not from it, nor fails the sense; and with such fruits as shall please them best, and with flesh of such birds as they shall long for; and theirs shall be the Húru-'l-'Áin, [Houris, women with eyes like those of the gazelle,] like pearls hidden in their shells, in recompense of their past labours. No vain discourse shall they hear, nor sin, but only the cry Peace! Peace! . . . How happy shall the people of the right hand be! amidst thornless *sútras* and *talh* trees clad with fruit, and in extended shade, and by flowing waters, and with abundant fruits, unailing, unforbidden, and on lofty couches. A [rare] creation [these Houris] have We created, and We have made them ever-virgins, shewing love to their spouses like them." (Súr. lvi. 9-27; see also Súr. lv. 46-78; xlvii. 16, 17.) There is no denying that the paradise thus portrayed is one of exclusively voluptuous gratification. The statement in the above quotation that neither vain discourse shall be heard there, nor sin, but only peace, is the one solitary passage which relieves all Muhámmad's descriptions of heaven from the charge of utter sensuality. A few modern Muslims are said to regard them as figurative, just as we regard those contained in the Song of Solomon and the Book of Revelation, but any such apology is at best an evasion. Sale's opinion is conveyed in the following remarks prefixed to his edition of the Kurán:—"It is not improbable that Mohammed might have been obliged, in some respects, to the Christian accounts of the felicity of the good in the next life. As it is scarce possible to convey, especially to the apprehensions of the generality of mankind, an idea of spiritual pleasures without introducing sensible objects, the scriptures have been obliged to represent the celestial enjoyments by corporeal images, and to describe the mansions of the blessed as a glorious and magnificent city, built of gold and precious stones, with twelve gates, through the streets of which there runs a river of water of life, and having on either side the tree of life, which bears twelve sorts of fruits, and leaves of a healing virtue. (Rev. xxi. 10-21; xxii. 1, 2.) Our Saviour likewise speaks of a future state of the blessed as of a kingdom where they shall eat and drink at His table. (Luke xxii. 29, 30.) But then these descriptions have nothing of those puerile imaginations which reign throughout that of Mohammed, much less any the most distant intimation of sensual delights which he was so fond of; on the contrary, we are expressly assured, that in the Resurrection they will neither marry nor be given in marriage, but will be like the angels of God." (Matt. xxii. 30.)

VI. BELIEF IN THE DECREES OF GOD, or of His having absolutely predestined both good and evil, is a cardinal article of the Muslim

creed. These decrees are affirmed to have been revealed by God "in an *Imám Mubín*," a Perspicuous Book, (Súr. xxxvi. 16,) and the doctrine is affirmed in the following from among many other passages of like import:—"God's behest is a fixed decree." (Súr. xxxiii. 38.) "Verily God misleadeth whom He will, and guideth whom He will." (Súr. xxxv. 9.) "Some of them there were whom God guided, and there were others decreed to err." (Súr. xvi. 38.) "Had We pleased we had certainly given to every soul its guidance." (Súr. xxxii. 13.) The doctrine, thus textually stated, goes far to make God the author of sin,—a position which many Muslim divines have strongly contested. On the other hand, it must be conceded that there are many passages in the Bible which, if taken literally, convey a similar view of God's prescience and absolute sovereignty. The subject is allowed a most difficult one. Few, perchance, will dissent from the subjoined exposition of the dogma as set forth in an orthodox Arabic treatise translated by Mr. Hughes:—"Faith in the decrees of God is that we believe with our hearts, and confess with our tongues, that the Most High hath decreed all things, so that nothing can happen in the world, whether it respects the conditions and operations of things, or good and evil, or obedience and disobedience, or faith and infidelity, or sickness and health, or riches or poverty, or life or death, that is not contained in the written tablet of the decrees of God. But God hath so decreed good works, obedience, and faith, that He ordains and wills them, and that they may be under His decree, His salutary direction, His good pleasure and command. On the contrary, God has decreed, and does ordain and determine evil, disobedience, and infidelity; yet without His salutary direction, good pleasure, and command, but being only by way of seduction, indignation, and prohibition. But whosoever shall say that God is not delighted with good faith, or that God hath not an indignation against evil and unbelief, he is certainly an infidel." (*Notes on Muhammadanism*, pp. 99, 100.)

The reader will probably have noticed that the foregoing Muslim Articles of Faith comprehend several of those contained in the so-called Apostles' Creed, such as Belief in God, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Forgiveness of sins by Him, the Resurrection of the body, and the Life everlasting.

The five Cardinal Ordinances of Islám are:—

I. THE PIOUS RECITATION OF THE KÁLIMAH, or Creed, *La iláha ila-'lláh, wa-Muhámmadu Rasúlu-'lláh*: There is no deity but the one God, and Muhámmad is His Apostle. Mr. Hughes correctly states that "when any one is converted to Islám he is required to repeat this formula, and the following are the conditions of every Muslim with reference to it:—1. That it shall be repeated aloud, at least once in a lifetime. 2. That the meaning of it shall be fully understood. 3. That it shall be believed in 'by the heart.' 4. That it shall be professed until death. 5. That it shall be recited correctly. 6. That it shall be professed and declared without hesitation." (*Notes on Muhammadanism*, pp. 102-103.)

II. PRAYER, *Salát*.—This duty is frequently enjoined in the Kurán as seasonable and proper

at all times:—"Observe prayer, and pay the *Zakát*," or legal alms. (Súr. ii. 104.) Prayer is a preservative against sin:—"Recite the portions of the Book which have been revealed to thee, and discharge the duty of prayer; for prayer restraineth from the filthy and the blameworthy, and the most solemn duty is the remembrance of God." (Súr. xxix. 44.) It should be resorted to before reading the Kurán:—"When thou readest the al-Kurán have recourse to God to aid thee against Satan," (Súr. xvi. 100;) it should be uttered in a subdued tone:—"Be not loud in thy prayer, neither pronounce it too low, but between these follow a middle way," (Sur. xvii. 110;) may be offered up in any posture—such is the construction put by Muslim commentators on the following:—"In the creation of the heavens and the earth, and in the succession of day and night, are signs for men of [understanding] heart, who standing, and sitting, and reclining, bear God in mind." (Súr. iii. 187-8.) Family prayer is especially recommended:—"Enjoin prayer on thy family, and persevere therein. We ask not of thee to find thine own provisions,—We will provide for thee, and a [happy] issue shall there be to piety." (Súr. xx. 132; compare with Phil. iv. 6.) Besides the above general directions, there are four set seasons for daily prayer:—"Glorify God when ye reach the evening, and when ye rise at noon . . . and at twilight, and when ye rest at noon." (Súr. xxx. 16, 17; see also Súr. xi. 116; xvii. 80.) From the verbs used in the text these stated times of prayer are called severally *Salátu-'l-Masá*, *Salátu-'s-Súbh*, *Salátu-'l-Ishá*, and *Salátu-zh-Zhúhr*, but in common usage another is added, namely, the *Salátu-'l-Mághrib*, or the sunset prayer, Muslim commentators being agreed that sunset is a part of the *Ishá*. These prayers are directed to be performed toward a given point, or *Kíblah*, which with Muslims is that of the Temple and al-Kaábah at Mecca:—"We have seen thee turning thy face towards every part of heaven; but We will have thee turn to a *Kíblah* which shall please thee. Turn then thy face towards the sacred Mosque, and wherever ye be turn your faces towards that part." (Súr. ii. 139.) There is another passage, however, which puts the real value on this injunction:—"There is no piety in turning your faces towards the east or west, but he is pious who believeth in God and the last day, and the angels, and the scriptures, and the prophets; who for the love of God distributeth his wealth to his kindred, and to the orphans, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and those who ask, and for ransomings, who observeth prayer, and payeth the *Zakát* [legal alms], and who is of those who are faithful to their engagements when they have engaged in them, and patient under ills and hardships, and in time of trouble. These are they who are just, and who fear the Lord." (Id. 172.) The stated prayers should always be preceded by ablutions:—"O ye true believers! come not to prayer when ye are drunken, but wait till ye can understand what ye utter; nor when ye are polluted, unless ye be wayfarers, until ye have washed you. If ye be sick or on a journey, or have come from the privy, or have touched a woman, and ye find not water, then bathe with pure sand, and rub your hands and face with it." (Súr. iv. 46.)

"When ye address yourselves to prayer, wash your faces and your hands up to the elbow, and your heads, and your feet up to the ankles." (Súr. v. 8.) The Muslim ritual applies three terms to these enjoined ablutions: first, *al-Wudhú*, or the washing of the face, hands, feet, &c.; secondly, *al-Ghúsl*, or the washing of the whole body after certain specific defilements; and, thirdly, *at-Tayámmum*, or the lustration with sand where water is not obtainable. The ritual of ablution is very minute, and the divergence existing between the different sects of Islám is evidenced by their different modes of procedure. Equally elaborate and distinctive is the ritual of prayer, a full description of which is given in Hughes's *Notes on Muhammadanism*, pp. 104-118. For an accurate description of the service in the mosque, the reader is referred to Lane's *Modern Egyptians*, on which subject he remarks:—"The utmost solemnity and decorum are observed in the public worship of the Muslims. Their looks and behaviour in the mosque are not those of enthusiastic devotion, but of calm and modest piety. Never are they guilty of a designedly irregular word or action during their prayers. The pride and fanaticism which they exhibit in common life, in intercourse with persons of their own or of a different faith, seem to be dropped on their entering the mosque, and they appear wholly absorbed in the adoration of their Creator; humble and downcast, yet without affected humility or a forced expression of countenance."

III. FASTING, *as-Sáum*.—Fasting is enjoined in the Kurán as a pious and meritorious exercise:—"Verily the Muslims and the *Muslimát* [female Muslims], and the believing men and the believing women, and the devout men and devout women, and the men of truth and the women of truth, and the men who give alms and the women who give alms, and the men who fast and the women who fast . . . for them God hath prepared forgiveness and a rich recompense." (Súr. xxxiii. 35.) It is also prescribed as a penance in certain cases. A believer who kills one of a people in alliance with the Muslims is to pay blood-money to the family of the murdered man, and to manumit a slave who is a believer; "but one who hath not the means shall fast two consecutive months. This is the penance enjoined by God." (Súr. iv. 94.) One who kills game during the Pilgrimage shall compensate for it in domestic animals of equal value to be brought as an offering to the al-Kaábah, or, as an expiation, shall feed the poor, "or as an equivalent shall fast, that he may taste the ill-consequence of his deed." (Súr. v. 96.) Again, such as put away their wives, and afterwards would recall their words, must free a captive before they can come together again, but "he who findeth not a captive [to set free] shall fast two months in succession before they come together again. And he who shall not be able [thus to fast] shall feed sixty poor men . . . These are the statutes of God." (Súr. lviii. 4, 5.) The great obligatory fast is that of the month of *Ramadhán*, so called, according to some, because of its occurrence during the vehement heat of summer; others, because the effect of the fast is to burn away sin. The institution is appointed in these words:—"O believers, a fast is prescribed to you for certain



days, as it was prescribed to those before you, that you may fear God. But he among you who shall be sick, or on a journey [shall fast] that same number of other days; and as for those who are able [to keep it and yet break it] the expiation of this shall be the maintenance of a poor man. And he who of his own accord performeth a good work shall derive good from it; and good shall it be for you to fast, if ye knew it. As to the month of Ramadhán, in which the al-Kurán was sent down to be man's guidance, and an explanation of that guidance, and of that *al-Furkán* [a word synonymous in import with *al-Kurán*], as soon as any one of you observeth the moon, let him set about the fast; or he who is sick or on a journey shall fast a like number of other days. God wisheth your ease, but wisheth not your discomfort, and that ye fulfil the number [of days], and that you glorify God for His guidance, and that you be thankful. . . . Ye are allowed on the night of the fast to approach your wives; they are your garment and you are their garment, [i.e. a mutual comfort to each other.] God knows that you used to act unfaithfully one to another [therein], so He turneth unto you and forgiveth you. Now, therefore, go in unto them with full desire for that which God hath ordained for you; and eat and drink until you can distinguish a white thread from a black thread by the daybreak; then fast strictly till night, and go not in unto them, but rather pass the time in the *Masájid*, [oratories or mosques.] These are the bounds set up by God; therefore come not near them." (Súr. ii. 179-183.) Every traveller in the East knows how scrupulously this fast is observed. That the indulgence allowed therein during the night-time is frequently turned into revelry is not surprising. On the other hand, there are many Muslims who observe it with exemplary piety and decorum. Mr. Hughes considers that the fast of Ramadhán must be "an easier observance than the strict fast observed during Lent by the Eastern Christians of Muhammad's day." I cannot agree with him, if those Christians were not far more rigid in keeping Lent than the generality of their co-religionists at the present day.

IV. LEGAL AND OBLIGATORY ALMSGIVING, called the *az-Zakát*, or Poor-rate, or portion of the property that is given by its possessor, as the due of God, to the poor. This duty is insisted on in many passages of the Kurán, and is generally associated with the observance of prayer and a belief in the life to come. It is one of the essentials of true piety:—"Yet was not aught enjoined on them but to worship God with sincere religion, sound in faith, and to observe prayer, and to pay the *Zakát*." (Súr. xviii. 4; compare with Luke xi. 41.) As in the Bible, it is called "lending to the Lord," and will be bountifully rewarded:—"Observe the prayers and pay the *Zakát*, and lend God a liberal loan; for whatever good works ye send on before for your own behoof ye shall find with God. This will be the best and the richest in the recompense." (Súr. lxxiii. 20.) No specific rate is fixed, but according to the best commentators it should amount to one-fortieth of the property possessed, or two and a half per cent. Beside the *Zakát* believers are enjoined to give supererogatory alms, which are described

as "spending in good works," or as *Sádhát*, that is, alms or gifts to the poor. The proper objects of such charity are named in the following passage:—"They shall ask thee what thou shalt spend in good works. Say: Let the good which ye bestow be for parents, and kindred, and orphans, and the poor, and the wayfarer." (Súr. ii. 211.) The promise to such benevolence is:—"If ye lend God a generous loan, He will double it to you, and will forgive you." (Súr. lxiv. 17.) Again: "Alms are to be given to the poor and needy, to those who collect them, to those whose hearts are inclined [to Islám], and for ransoms, and for debtors, and for the cause of God, and the wayfarer. This is an ordinance from God." (Súr. ix. 60.) These supererogatory gifts are held to compensate for the inability to discharge some prescribed duty. For example, those who are unable personally to make the Pilgrimage "must satisfy by fasting, or alms, or an offering." (Súr. ii. 192.) To bestow charity openly is well, but to do so in secret is preferable:—"If ye make your alms to appear, it is well; but if ye conceal them and give them unto the poor, this will be better for you, and will atone for your sins." (Súr. ii. 273.) The virtue of almsgiving is forfeited by inconsistent conduct in other respects:—"Make not your alms void by reproaches and injury, like him who spendeth his substance to be seen of men, and believeth not in God and the last day." (Súr. ii. 266.)

V. THE HAJJ, or HIJJ, that is, the Pilgrimage to Mecca, is instituted and enjoined in the following passages:—"Accomplish the *Hajj* and the *Umrah* [the Visitation of the Holy Places] in honour of God. . . . But whoever is sick among you, or hath an ailment in the head, must atone [or compensate] by fasting, or alms, or an offering. . . . But he who possesseth nothing to offer [being on the Pilgrimage] shall fast three days in the Hajj itself, and seven days when ye return, ten days in all. This is binding on him whose family shall not be present at the Sacred Temple. . . . Let the *Hajj* be made in the months already known, [Shawál, Dzu-'l-Kaádhah, and Dzu-'l-Hijjah;] whoever therefore undertaketh the Pilgrimage therein, let him not know a woman, nor transgress, nor wrangle. . . . And provide for your journey; but the best provision is the fear of God." (Súr. ii. 192-3.) The *Hajj*, or, as it is sometimes called, the Greater Pilgrimage, can only be performed during the appointed months; but the *al-Umrah*, or Lesser Pilgrimage, at any other season, and the rites of the two differ in several respects. Muhámmad claimed a Divine authority for this institution:—"Call to mind "when We assigned the site of the House [the al-Kaábah] to Abraham, [and said]: Unite not aught with Me in worship, and cleanse My House for those who circumambulate it, and who stand, and bow, and worship:—and proclaim to the people the *Hajj*: let them come to thee on foot, and on fleet camels, arriving by every deep defile, that they may bear witness of its benefits to them. . . . This do, and he that respecteth the sacred ordinances of God, this will be best for him with his Lord." (Súr. xxii. 27-31.) That a pilgrimage to the al-Kaábah existed from very ancient times, and was in vogue among the pagan Arabs up to the era of Muhámmad, is indisputable. Neither can there

be any doubt that this was one of those institutions which the Prophet embodied into his system for political as well as for pious purposes, and hence his assertion of its Divine origin is an evident piece of brazen imposture. Much more to his credit are the injunctions for the observance of the pilgrimage, and his estimate of its virtue as compared with other more practical duties, as contained in the following passage:—"He only should visit the temples of God who believeth in God and the last day, and observeth prayer, and payeth the *Zakát*, and dreadeth none but God. Do ye place the giving drink to the pilgrims, and the Visitation of the Sacred Temple, on the same level with him who believeth in God and the last day, and fighteth in the cause of God? They shall not be held equal by God." (Súr. ix. 19.) The ceremonies connected with the Pilgrimage have been so fully described in the account of Muhámmad's visit to Mecca from al-Madinah that it is needless to repeat them here.

There are several other points connected with the institutions of Islám which deserve notice.

1. *Circumcision*.—Although circumcision is not once mentioned in the Kurán, a few remarks on that rite, as practised by Muslims, will not be out of place here. The rite itself undoubtedly prevailed among the Arabs long prior to Muhámmad. Josephus (*Antiq.* lib. i. c. 23) records that the Ishmaelites used to circumcise their children, not on the eighth day as did the Jews, but when thirteen years old, at which age their progenitor underwent the operation. (Gen. xvii. 25.) Muslims accordingly regard the rite as of Divine institution, and yet not so absolutely necessary that it may not be dispensed with in certain cases, as in that of their Prophet, who is alleged to have been born *sine praeputio*. Children are now generally circumcised at the age of six years, when they are capable of pronouncing the name of God distinctly, but sometimes the rite is deferred. Mr. Lane, in his *Modern Egyptians*, gives a graphic account of the ceremony, and of the parade with which it is celebrated in Egypt.

2. *Marriage and Polygamy*.—A Muslim may marry four wives who are free women, and any number of the captive female slaves whom he may have acquired:—"If ye fear that ye shall not deal fairly with orphans, then of what women you please two, three, or four; but if ye [still] fear that ye shall not act equitably [to so many], then one [only], or what your right hand has acquired [of captive slaves], that is better in order that ye may not deviate from the right course." (Súr. iv. 3.) Muslim commentators differ widely about the meaning of this passage, but it is generally held to convey an injunction to believers, that if they found they should wrong the female orphans under their care, either by marrying them against their inclinations, or for the sake of their riches or beauty, or by not using or maintaining them as they ought, owing to their having other wives already, they should rather choose to marry other women, in order to avoid all occasion of sin. Inter-marriage with pagan or unbelieving women is strictly forbidden:—"Marry not female polytheists, until they believe; a female slave is better than a female polytheist, though she may

please you." (Súr. ii. 220.) The degrees of kindred within which marriage is lawful are clearly defined:—"Marry not women whom your fathers have married; for this is a shame, and hateful, and an evil way, though what is past [in the days of Ignorance] may be allowed. Forbidden to you are your mothers, and your daughters, and your sisters, and your aunts, both on the father and the mother's side, and your nieces on the brother and sister's side, and your foster-mothers, and your foster-sisters, and the mothers of your wives, and your step-daughters who are your wards, born of your wives to whom ye have gone in,—but if ye have not gone in unto them it shall be no sin in you to marry them,—and the wives of your sons who proceed out of your loins; and ye may not have two sisters, [see Lev. xviii. 18.] except where it is already done . . . [forbidden to you] also are [free] married women, except those whom your right hand has acquired, [i.e. female captives taken in war, even if they have husbands living.] This is the law of God for you. And it is allowed to you, besides this, to seek out wives by means of your wealth, with modest conduct, and without fornication . . . And whoever of you is not rich enough to marry free believing women, then let him marry such of your believing maidens as have fallen into your hands, [captive slaves.] Ye are sprung the one from the other. Marry them, then, with the leave of their masters, and give them a fair dower." (Súr. iv. 26–29.) Again: "Marry those among you who are single, [i.e. such as have no husband, spinsters,] and the good of your servants and handmaids. If they are poor, God of His bounty will enrich them . . . and let those who cannot find a match [on account of poverty] live in continence till God in His bounty shall enrich them." (Súr. xxiv. 32, 33.) Monkery, including, of course, celibacy and asceticism, is declared to be an "innovation," made by Christians who have departed from the simplicity of the Gospel. (lvii. 27.) On the other hand, Muslims are reminded, as are the Christians in 1 Cor. vii. 28, 32, that the married state may prove a snare to them:—"O ye who believe! Verily, in your wives and children ye have an enemy; wherefore beware of them. But if ye pass it over, [i.e. their occasionally beguiling you from your duty,] and pardon, and are lenient, God, too, is lenient and merciful." (Súr. lxiv. 14.)

The laws of inheritance are plainly laid down. Men and women are entitled to a share of the property left by their parents and kindred, and the rights of orphans and poorer relations are insisted upon:—"Verily, they who swallow the substance of the orphan wrongfully shall swallow down only fire into their bellies, and shall burn in the flames. (Súr. iv. 11.) Married women are allowed to have separate property, and the portions to be allotted to the different members of a family are carefully prescribed:—"With regard to your children, God commandeth you to give the male the portion of two females; and if they be females, more than two, then they shall have two-thirds of that which [their father] hath left;

† This injunction has been so far relaxed that it is now held lawful for a Muslim to marry a Christian or a Jewish woman; but in either case the offspring must follow the father's faith.

but if she be an only daughter, she shall have the half; and the father and mother of the deceased shall each of them have a sixth part of what he hath left, if he have a child, but if he have no child, and his parents be his heirs, then his mother shall have the third. And if he have brethren, his mother shall have the sixth, after payment of the bequests which he shall have bequeathed, and his debts. As to your fathers or your children, ye know not which is the most advantageous to you. This is the law of God . . . Half of what your wives leave shall be yours, if they have no issue; but if they have issue, then a fourth of what they leave shall be yours, after paying the bequests which they shall bequeath, and debts. And your wives shall have a fourth part of what ye leave; but if ye have issue, then they shall have an eighth part of what ye leave, after paying the bequests which ye shall bequeath, and debts. If a man or a woman make a distant relation their heir, and he or she have a brother or sister, each of these two shall have a sixth; but if there are more than this, then they shall be sharers in a third, after payment of the bequests which they shall have bequeathed, and debts." (Sûr. iv. 12.) Incontinency on the part of the married is strongly condemned:—"Have nothing to do with adultery, for it is a foul thing and an evil way." (Sûr. xvii. 34.) The prescribed punishment for an adulteress is: "If any of your women be guilty of whoredom [or adultery] then bring four witnesses against them from among yourselves; and if they bear witness [to the fact] shut them up in their houses till death release them, or God make some way for them." (Sûr. iv. 19, compare with John viii. 5.) In the case of a "proven lewdness" on the part of a wife of the Prophet her "chastisement was to be doubled," (Sûr. xxxiii. 30;) but in the case of a married slave it was to be "half the penalty enacted for free married women." (Sûr. iv. 30.) Compare the latter ordinance with Lev. xix. 20, where it is laid down that an incontinent bondmaid is not to be put to death, she is only to be scourged.

With regard to divorce, there is no law to restrict a man from repudiating a wife whenever and for whatever cause he pleases; all that is enjoined is that the divorced woman shall be treated kindly, and be allowed to retain her dower:—"If ye be desirous to exchange one wife for another, and have given one of them a talent, make no deduction from it. Would ye take it by slandering her, and with manifest wrong?" that is, by charging her with adultery, in which case she would not be entitled to her dower. (Sûr. iv. 24.) "When ye divorce women, and the time for sending them away is come, either retain them with generosity, or put them away with generosity; but retain them not by constraint, so as to be unjust towards them." (Sûr. ii. 231.) A believer may divorce his wife three times and receive her back again, "but if the husband divorce her [a third time] it is not lawful for him to take her again until she has married another husband; and if he also divorce her, then shall no blame attach to them if they return to each other." (*Id.* 230.)

*Polygamy* was permitted by the Hebrew law, as also divorce "for every cause." The latter, however, was distinctly disallowed by Christ, except upon the single ground of the wife's adultery.

The late lamented Edward William Lane, a most impartial witness, in his incomparable *Modern Egyptians*, writing on the subject of divorce and polygamy, says:—"That the facility of divorce has depraving effects upon both sexes may be easily imagined. There are many men in this country who, in the course of ten years, have married as many as twenty, thirty, or more wives; and women not far advanced in age who have been wives to a dozen or more husbands successively. I have heard of men who have been in the habit of marrying a new wife almost every month. . . . It is but just, however, to add that such conduct is generally regarded as very disgraceful, and that few persons among the middle or higher classes will give a daughter in marriage to a man who has divorced many wives. Polygamy, which is also attended with many injurious effects upon the morals of the husband and wives, and only to be defended because it serves to prevent a greater immorality than it occasions, is more rare among the higher and middle classes than it is among the lower orders; and it is not very common among the latter. A poor man may indulge himself with two or more wives, each of whom may be able, by some art or occupation, nearly to provide for her own subsistence; but most persons of the higher or middle classes are deterred from doing so by the consideration of the expense and discomfort which they would incur. A man having a wife who has the misfortune to be barren, and being too much attached to her to divorce her, is sometimes induced to take a second wife, mainly in the hope of obtaining offspring; and from the same motive he may take a third, and a fourth; but fickle passion is the most evident and common motive both to polygamy and repeated divorces. There are comparatively very few who gratify this passion by the former practice. I believe that not more than one husband in twenty has two wives."

3. *Slavery* is another institution associated with Islâm, but not peculiar to it. As regards Islâm, there can be no doubt that slavery was adopted from the usage which had previously existed in Arabia—a usage akin in most respects to that sanctioned by the Jewish law. As modified by Muhámmad it presents some noteworthy features. In the first place, there is no corresponding word for slavery in the Kurân, nor for slave in the sense of a bondman. Slaves are uniformly described as those who have been acquired by the right hand of believers, and refers primarily to captives taken in war. These, when the war was over, might be gratuitously set at liberty, or ransomed:—"And afterwards let there be free dismissals or ransoms till the war hath laid down its burdens." (Sûr. lxvii. 5.) The wars of the Jews, on the other hand, were wars of extermination, which virtually forbade the taking of captives. On the occasion of the war with the Midianites the Israelites saved all the women and their little ones, but Moses directed all the males of the latter to be slain, as also all the women who had known man, the residue being reserved for the conquerors. (Numb. xxxi. 9, 17, 18.) According to the Kurân, slaves have the privilege of redeeming themselves:—"And to those of your slaves who desire a deed of manumission execute it for them, if ye know good in them, and give

them a portion of the wealth of God which He hath given you." (Sûr. xxiv. 33.) In the case of the Jews, this privilege was confined to Hebrews who had become bondmen. (Deut. xv. 12-15.) Muslim masters are strictly enjoined to deal kindly with "those [slaves] whom your right hand has acquired. Verily, God loveth not the proud," (Sur. iv. 40;) and those among them are blamed who do not make their slaves sharers in their abundance:—"God hath abounded to some of you more than to others in the supplies of life; yet they to whom He hath abounded impart not thereof to those whom their right hand has acquired, so that they may share alike. What, will they deny, then, that these boons are from God?" (Sûr. xvi. 73.) Although Muslims have greatly transgressed the above limits prescribed for slavery—just as Christian nations generally have until recently shamefully ignored the principles of the Gospel in that respect—it is not to be inferred that their law sanctions the slave-trade, as it is carried on in Africa. The writer of this article, when on the Commission with Sir Bartle Frere to Zanzibar, was expostulated with by the Sultan, in conclave with his chiefs and Mullahs, for assisting in obtaining from his Highness a treaty for the abolition of the trade, as being a demand which he knew to be levelled against their religion. They were asked, in reply, to point out a single passage in the Kurân in support of the assertion. Their silence proved that they could not.

4. The *Jihâd*, or Holy War.—The word *Jihâd* is a verbal noun signifying the striving, contending, or fighting *against* something or some one. In that simple form it only occurs once in the Kurân:—"Obey not thou the unbelievers, but contend against them with it [the Kurân?] with a mighty contention," (*jihâd*.) (Sûr. xxv. 54.) In three other passages it occurs in conjunction with *Allâh* (God) and *Sabîlu-llâh*, the way, cause, or religion of God:—"Contend in behalf of God with a brave contention," (*jihâd*.) (Sûr. xxii. 77.) "If your fathers and your sons, and your brethren, and your wives, and your kindred, and the wealth which ye have gained, and the merchandise which ye fear may be unsold, and dwellings wherein ye delight, be dearer to you than God and His Apostle and efforts (*jihâd*) in His cause; then wait until God shall enter upon His work." (Sûr. ix. 24.) "O ye who believe, take not My foe and your foe for friends, shewing them kindness, since they believe not that truth which hath come unto you. They drive forth the Apostle and yourselves because ye believe in God your Lord. If you go forth to a *jihâd* in My cause, [i.e. for My religion,] and out of a desire to win My approbation, and privately [or openly] shew friendship unto them, verily I will know what ye conceal and what ye manifest, and whoever doeth this hath already erred from the straight path." (Sûr. lx. 1.) The verbal forms, *jâhada* and *kâtala*, occur still more explicitly in the same sense, namely, to fight for God's religion against the unbelievers, and those who engage in this war are styled *Mujâhidîn*. The duty of Muslims to join in the *jihâd*, and the promises attached thereto, are set forth in the following passages:—"When ye encounter the infidels, strike off their heads till ye have made a great slaughter of them. . . . Were such the pleasure of God, He could Himself take vengeance

upon them; but He would rather prove the one of you by the other. And whoso fight for the cause of God, He will not suffer their works to miscarry. . . . and He will bring them into paradise, of which He hath told them." (Sûr. xvii. 4-7.) "Let those, then, fight in the cause of God who barter this present life for that which is to come; for whoever fighteth in God's cause, whether he be slain or conquer, He will in the end give him a great reward." (Sûr. iv. 76.) "Goodly promises hath He made to all; but God hath assigned to the *Mujâhidîn* [those who fight for His religion] a rich recompense above those who sit still at home." (*Id.* 97.) There is another passage, however, which forbids Muslims to initiate a *jihâd*, and restricts its object to regaining possession of any territory which has been taken from them:—"Fight for the cause of God against those who fight against you, but act not aggressively; God loveth not the aggressors." (Sûr. ii. 186.) It can scarcely be doubted that this significant modification was an important factor in the origination of the canonical terms *Dâru'l-Harb* and *Dâru'l-Islâm*. The former is explained to mean "a country wherein the supreme rule is in the hands of the infidels, or in which the Muslims are in dread of them;" and the latter "a country the government of which is in the hands of the Imâm of the Muslims, or where they are in a majority, and are at peace." These definitions are by no means so explicit as to remove all doubt whether a country like India, for example, is a *Dâru'l-Harb* or a *Dâru'l-Islâm*, and they leave untouched the absolute duty of all Muslims to defend their country from aggression—a duty equally incumbent on Christians. And this is the *jihâd*, for the "preaching" of which the Mullahs of Afghanistan were so frequently and ignorantly censured during the late British invasion of that country.

The writers of some letters published in the *Times* at that period differed widely on the subject, although the *Fatwas*, or judicial opinions, quoted therein from the heads of three of the four orthodox sects and some Muslim bodies in India preponderate in favour of that country being a *Dâru'l-Islâm*. On the other hand, the Rev. Mr. Hughes, in his *Notes on Muhammadanism*, gives the following as the reply of a learned *Kâdhi* (judge) to the question whether India is *Dâru'l-Islâm* or *Dâru'l-Harb*:—"It is *Dâru'l-Harb*. One of his reasons for arriving at this conclusion was the well-known doctrine of Islâm that a Muslim cannot be a *Zimmî*, or one who pays tribute to an infidel power. We believe that the fact that Muhammadans, under Christian rule, are in an anomalous position, is a source of trouble to many a conscientious Muslim. Many Muslims believe that *Hijrat*, or flight, is incumbent upon every child of the Faith who is under *Kâfir* (infidel) rule: but as our friend the *Kâdhi* put it, 'Where are they to go?' This question, as might have been expected, has been discussed in Algeria, and M. B. Vincent in his *Études sur la Loi Musulmane*, (*Rite de Mâlek*,) gives the subjoined as the answer of the most learned juriconsults in that province:—"When the Christian becomes master of a Muslim country, those who are able, and have the health and means thereto, are bound to quit that country, in order to preserve their religion. As to such as are not so able, if their religion is

guaranteed to them, they may remain there and live as best they may: this is the most general opinion. There is another, however, according to which, when the laws of Islām continue to subsist in a country which has fallen under the power of the infidels, it is allowable to reside there; but this opinion is weak, owing to the humiliation which it nevertheless sanctions. But both opinions agree that if, owing to bad faith or perfidy, the Muslim is not safeguarded as regards his religion, he is bound to emigrate, to flee the country, . . . and to carry his religion into the desert, into villages and hamlets, there to live on roots, in order to put himself at a distance from those wretches who break the covenant of God, and spread disorder in the earth, for whom a wretched abode hereafter is reserved."

It must be admitted that these opinions are at best vague and unsatisfactory; and it may be questioned whether they have much, if any, influence in determining the conduct of subject Muslims towards a Government alien to them in race and creed. But Muslims are men very much like other men, and are swayed by motives which actuate the conduct of mankind in general.

A few remarks are subjoined on certain negative precepts of the Kurān.

*Lawful and Unlawful Food.*—"O ye who believe! Eat of the good things with which We have supplied you, and give God thanks, if ye are His worshippers. But that which dieth of itself, and blood, and swine's flesh, and that over which any other name than that of God has been invoked is forbidden you. But he who shall partake of them by constraint, without lust or wilfulness, no sin shall be upon him. Verily, God is indulgent, merciful." (Sūr. ii. 168-9.) In another place, the following additional restrictions are introduced, namely, "the strangled, and the killed by a blow, or by a fall, or by goring, and that which hath been torn by beasts of prey unless ye make it clean [by giving it the death-stroke yourselves], and that which hath been sacrificed on the blocks of stones [idol altars], is forbidden you." (Sūr. v. 4.)

*Wine and Gambling.*—"They will ask you concerning wine and lots, [*al-Māisir*, a game performed with arrows, but by "lots" here all games of chance are understood.] Say: In both there is great sin and advantage also to men; but the sin is greater than their advantage." (Sūr. ii. 216.) "O believers! Surely wine, and games of chance, and statues [or images], and the [divining] arrows are an abomination of Satan's work. Avoid them, that ye may prosper." (Sūr. v. 92.) The "statues" in this passage are supposed to refer to carved chessmen, which Muḥammad disapproved of on account of the figures represented by them. By "wine," in the above verses, Muslim commentators understand all intoxicating drinks. Although forbidden in this world, believers are taught to expect "rivers of wine delicious to those who quaff it," in paradise (Sūr. xlvii. 16.)

The reader will bear in mind that the foregoing analysis of the dogmas, ordinances, and rites of Islām is founded on the text of the Kurān, which, as has already been observed, is theoretically the ultimate authority with Muslims for deciding all points of faith and practice, as

is the Bible with Christians. Practically, however, the Islām of the Kurān has been modified and developed by the *as-Sūnah*, or Tradition, and, to a certain extent, the same may be said of the Christianity revealed in the New Testament. In its restricted legal sense, the *as-Sūnah* imports what Muḥammad commanded, what has been handed down from him by tradition, and what he has enjoined, by word or deed, with respect to such things as are not mentioned in the Kurān. Hence the technical phrase, *al-Kitābu-wa'-s-Sūnah*, implies the Kurān and the Institutes of the Prophet. These Institutes are by Muslim jurists and theologians divided into *Sūnanu-'l-Hida*, that is, those of which the observance is a completion of religion, and the omission or neglect of which is a misdemeanour, and the *Sūnanu-'z-Zawāid*, or Acts of Supererogation, the observance of which is good, but to the omission of which no blame is attached. As to the multitudinous traditions forming this codex, they are admitted to be of varied authority, and Muslim divines frequently disagree respecting some of those which are generally regarded as authentic. The difficulty of deciding which are genuine and which spurious Muslim traditions is so great that certain canons have been drawn up as aids to distinguish between them. These the reader will find, translated from the Arabic, in Mr. Hughes's excellent *Notes on Muhammadanism*.

As might have been expected, Islām, like Christianity and all other known creeds, has been and still is divided into many sects. The impartial author, Muḥammad-'sh-Shahrastāny, in his *Kitābu-'l-Milal wa-'n-Nihal*, reckons seventy sects among the Magians, seventy-one among the Jews, seventy-two among Christians, and seventy-three among Muslims. As regards Islām, the first heresy sprang up as early as A.H. 37, when 12,000 men revolted from the Khalifah Āly, because he had submitted his right to the Imāmate, that is, to being the supreme Antistes of Islām, to arbitration, whereas they held that judgment in such a matter belonged to God only. On that account they were styled *Khawārīj*, literally Outsiders, like St. Paul's *τοὺς ἕξω*. (1 Cor. v. 13.) These rebels are supposed to have been killed to a man, but there is good reason to believe that some escaped who subsequently propagated their peculiar tenets in Omān, where they are still professed by the al-*Ibādhīyyah*, as they are also by the Arabs of Zanzibar and the east coast of Africa, who go by the same name. (For a dissertation on the Imāmate see Appendix to the *Imāms and Sayyids of Omān*, by the writer of this article, in the publications of the Hakluyt Society.) The other heresies or sects are by Muslim scholastic divines arranged under four general heads. The first relates to the attributes of God; the second to predestination and the justice thereof; the third to questions concerning faith, to infidelity and error, and to God's promises and threats; and the fourth to the authority which ought to be allowed to history and reason in religious matters, as also to the conditions requisite to the office of the supreme Imāmate, some asserting that it depends on hereditary succession, others on election and the suffrages of the faithful. For a detailed account of these heresies and their ramifications see Pocock's *Specimen Hist. Arabum*, which gives some valuable extracts

from ash-Shahrástány on the subject; also Sale's *Preliminary Discourse* to the Kurán, pp. 201-232.

The orthodox sects of Islám are generally known as the *Ahlu's-Sunnah*, Traditionists, or those who follow the Kurán and the Institutes. These Sunnys are subdivided into four schools, which, notwithstanding some differences in their interpretation of the Kurán, are regarded as being within the pale of Islám, and capable of salvation. The founders are said to have been famous jurisconsults as well as men of great self-denial, who devoted themselves to the service of God. The first of these schools is that of the *al-Hanafíyyah*, whose founder, Abu-Hanifah-an-Númán-ibn-Thábit, was born at al-Kúfah, A.H. 18, and died at Baghdád. The Turks generally belong to this school, which is the most reasonable of all. Secondly, *al-Malikiyyah*, so designated from Málik-ibn-Ans, who was born at al-Madinah, between A.H. 90 and 95, and died there about seventy-four years afterwards. Thirdly, *ash-Shafíyyah*, from Ibn-Idrís, ash-Shafíyy, who was born either at Gaza or Ascalon, in Palestine, and died in Egypt. Most of the inhabitants of Arabia belong to this latter sect; the Egyptians partly to it and partly to the second. The Nubians and western Arabs are almost all Malíkys. Fourthly, the *al-Hambaliyyah*, from Ahmad-ibn-Hámbal-ibn-Hilál-ibn-Asáad, ash-Shihábí, who was born, some say at Marú (Merv) in Khorasan, others at Baghdád, A.H. 164. Very few Muslims belong to this sect at the present day.

Among the so-called Heterodox sects the principal is that of the *ash-Shi'áah*, Pharisees or Separatists. These are the adherents of Ály-ibn-abi-Tálib, the cousin and son-in-law of Muhammad, who was the fourth Khalífah, in succession to Óthmán. Arabian orthodox lexicographers describe them as "those who followed Ály, saying that he was the rightful Imám after the Apostle of God, and who held that the office of Imám should not depart from him or his descendants." Again: "They are an innumerable people who are innovators; the extravagant zealots among them are the *al-Imániyyah*, who revile the Two Shaikhs, [Abu-Bakr and Ómar,] and the most extravagant of them call the Two Shaikhs disbelievers. Some of them rise to the pitch of [that misbelief which is called] *az-Zandakah*," [infidelity.] Many of this sect carried their veneration for Ály and his lineal descendants to such a pitch that they transgressed all bounds of reason and decency. However much they differed among themselves in other things they all held a metempsychosis, and what they call *al-Nuhul*, or the descent of God on His creatures, meaning thereby that He fills every place, and appears in some individual person; hence many of them asserted their Imáms to be prophets, and at length gods. Some of them recognize seven, and others twelve, as alone being entitled to the dignity of supreme Imám. The last, who is surnamed *al-Nuhulí*, they believe to be still alive, and that he will appear with the prophet Elijah at the second advent of Christ. The chief points of difference between the Shi'ys and the Sunnys are the following:—"1. The former reject the first three Khalífahs, namely, Abu-Bakr, Ómar, and Óthmán, as usurpers; whereas the latter regard them as legitimate Imáms. 2. The Shi'ys prefer Ály to Muhammad,

or at best regard them as equal; but the Sunnys admit neither Ály nor any of the prophets to be on a par with Muhammad. 3. The Sunnys charge the Shi'ys with corrupting the Kurán, and the latter retort the charge. 4. The Sunnys receive the *as-Sunnah*, that is, the Traditions or Institutes of Islám, as of canonical authority; the Shi'ys reject them as apocryphal. The Persians are almost all Shi'ys, and the antipathy existing betwixt them and the Sunnys is as bitter now, if not more so, than it was when the schism first took place. It may fairly be questioned whether the animosity between Jews and Samaritans, or between Protestants and Romanists, ever reached that inexorable rancour which still obtains between the Sunnys and the Shi'ys.

The latest sect of Islám is the *al-Wahhábiyyah*, the Wahhábiys, so called after Muhámmad-ibn-Ábdu'l-Wahhábi, its founder, who was born at Ainah, in the province of al-Ázirih, of Najd, A.D. 1691. In his youth he visited various seats of learning in the East, and being convinced that Islám had become greatly corrupted in practice he determined to assume the character of a reformer, and began by peacefully disseminating his opinions in his native village. Expelled from thence by the governor of al-Hasá he found an asylum at ad-Diríyyah with Muhámmad-ibn-Súud, the Shaikh of a sub-tribe of the *al-Anizah*, with whose zealot co-operation he despatched missionaries, called *Mutáwá'ah*, to disseminate his doctrines, and to inculcate the merit of propagating them, if need be, by force of arms. In the meantime Súud, who had married a daughter of Ábdu'l-Wahhábi, in conjunction with his son Ábdu'l-Ázíz, commenced his military championship of the sect, and in a short time reduced the whole of Najd to his sway. He died in 1763, and was succeeded by his son Ábdu'l-Ázíz-ibn-Súud. Ábdu'l-Wahhábi himself lived till 1787. He had all the uxorious propensities of Muhámmad, and his twenty wives produced him eighteen children. In 1797 a Turkish army from Baghdád attacked the Wahhábiys, but were repulsed with great loss, and two years later Súud-ibn-Ábdu'l-Ázíz (Súud II.) led 20,000 men against Kárbala, the sacred shrine of the ash-Shi'ys, which they sacked, and carried off an immense amount of treasure from the magnificent mosque of al-Husáin. In 1802 Súud II. besieged Táif and captured it, destroyed all the tombs there, plundered the houses, and put the inhabitants to the sword. In the following year he took Mecca. Not the slightest excess was committed by the Badawín soldiery beyond the destruction of the splendid tombs which covered the remains of the descendants of the Prophet, including that of his wife Khadíjah. As smoking and all intoxicating drinks, including coffee, which is regarded by them as a stimulant, are an abomination to the Wahhábiys, all the coffee-houses were closed and hecatombs made of the smoking-pipes found in the town. The conqueror communicated this capture to Salim III., the then reigning Ottoman Sultan, in the following epistles:—"Súud to Salim: I entered Mecca on the 4th of Muhárram, A.H. 1218. I kept peace towards the inhabitants. I destroyed all the tombs that were idolatrously worshipped. I abolished the levying of all customs above two and a half per cent. I confirmed the Kádhi whom you had

appointed to govern in the place, agreeably to the command of Muhámmad. I desire that in the ensuing years you will give orders to the Páshas of Damascus and Cairo not to come accompanied with the *Máhmál*, [the ornamented litter borne on a camel and regarded as the royal banner of the pilgrim caravan,] trumpets and drums into Mecca and al-Madínah. Why? Because religion is not profited by these things. Peace be between us, and may the blessing of God be upon you. Dated 10th Muhárram." [3rd May, 1803.] In 1804 al-Madínah was added to the Wahháby conquests, and Abdu-'l-Azíz dying about this time his son Súúd II. succeeded him. His first care was to demolish the tombs, and that of the Prophet himself was despoiled of its costly trappings. The tomb itself was left uninjured, but Súúd forbade as idolatrous all adoration addressed to it. The orthodox Muslim world, distressed and scandalized that the holy places should be left in the hands of the Wahháby heretics, eventually induced the Sublime Porte to direct the famous Muhámmad-Ály, who had lately been appointed Pásha over Egypt, to attack them. The first expedition, which was commanded by his son Tussún, in its attempt to recover al-Madínah, barely escaped annihilation. The second, undertaken in 1812, succeeded in capturing the place, and the Wahhábs who had capitulated were for the most part ruthlessly massacred. Although the greater part of the al-Hijáz had now been reconquered, the position of the Turks was so far from being secure that Muhámmad-Ály deemed it desirable to repair to the province in person, taking up his quarters at at-Táif, with about 20,000 men at his disposal. At this crisis the Wahhábs suffered an irreparable loss by the death of Súúd II., who was succeeded by his eldest son Ábdúllah. Led by Muhámmad-Ály the Turkish army subdued all the southern tribes in alliance with the Wahhábs, while Tussún, his son, reduced those on the north. At length Ábdúllah sued for peace, and made his submission, whereupon Muhámmad-Ály and his son returned to Egypt. The former, however, refusing to ratify the treaty which had been made with the Wahhábs by Tussún, and insisting on the province of al-Hasá being given up to the Turks, Ábdúllah commenced making preparations to defend himself, and assembled a large army, which was reinforced from Bahrain and al-Hasá, Ómán and al-Yáman. Muhámmad-Ály, fully bent on his overthrow, despatched his son Ibrahím, in 1816, to attack them at ad-Diríyyah, by way of al-Madínah and al-Kasím. Five months were consumed in the siege of that important capital before it capitulated, when Ábdúllah gave himself up to Ibrahím Pásha, who sent him forthwith to Egypt, from whence he was transferred to Constantinople, and after being paraded over the city for three days was beheaded in the square of Aghia Sophia. Before leaving Najd Ibrahím rased ad-Dariyyah to the ground, and demolished all the fortresses in the province. Túrky and Fáisal, two other sons of Súúd II., appear to have ruled conjointly over the remains of the Wahháby confederation until the assassination of the former in 1834. What became of his brother does not appear. Túrky was succeeded by his son Fáisal, who was in his dotage when Palgrave visited Riyádh in 1862. He

died in 1866, and was succeeded by his son Ábdúllah-ibn-Fáisal, the present Amír, whose temporal jurisdiction does not extend beyond the province of Najd, and whose nominal subjects or dependants are constantly at feud one with another.

It was judged desirable to give the foregoing sketch of the rise of the Wahháby power in order to remove the regrets sometimes expressed at its downfall, as if it contained the promise of a purer religion. That it was even more sanguinary than that of the first followers of Muhámmad is beyond question, while the creed which it enforced aimed mainly at the reform of a few absurd or scandalous practices, leaving untouched the cardinal dogmas of Islám. The tenets of the Wahhábs, summarised by the writer of this article from a lucid statement by an Ómány shaikh, who visited them in the early part of the present century, are as follows:—"His account of Wahhábyism brings out into prominent relief the one great idea which pervades the system. Muhámmad-ibn-Ábdu-'l-Wahhábi, its founder, was not an innovator but a reformer, whose aim was the restoration of Islám to its primitive purity and simplicity by insisting that its fundamental dogma, 'There is no deity but (the one) God,' absolutely forbade all veneration to man, prophet or apostle, living or dead, however highly distinguished by the Divine favour. There can be no doubt that beyond this utter exclusion of human merit, the formula, as originally proclaimed by Muhámmad, implied the doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of God in a sense which reduced all created beings to a mass of unconditional passiveness. The great Wahháby appears to have grasped this theory, but it is highly probable that his efforts to explain it only added to its abstruseness, thereby giving some colour to the charge brought against his writings by the orthodox, that they consisted chiefly of 'sophisms and speculations.' It is equally reasonable to suppose that a very limited number of his disciples were capable of appreciating the recondite view which his power of abstraction enabled him individually to entertain of the nature and attributes of the Supreme Being. Less difficult of general comprehension, however, was that part of his system which denounced all honours paid to saints and tombs as heretical innovations, detracting from the worship due solely to the Creator, and therefore to be regarded and dealt with as idolatrous. To say nothing of Pagans and Christians, whom all Muslims hold to be Polytheists, the doctrine thus revived placed Súnnys and Shiíys, the al-Ibádhíyyah and Ráfidhys alike in the same category, and moreover sanctioned their being dealt with as such, despite their negation of any deity save one, by a strict adherence to the orthodox formula. Hence it was that 'they legalised the despoiling of the Muslims, taking their wives in marriage before they were legally divorced from their husbands, and without observing the *Iddah*, [the prescribed time after a divorce, or after the death of her husband, before a woman can legally marry again,] and the enslavement of their children.' All these outrages from the Wahháby standpoint were solemn duties imposed upon them by their obligations to God and Islám, which they could not forego



without risking their own salvation. It is quite conceivable that Muḥammad-ibn-ʿAbdu-ʿl-Wahhāb himself was personally uninfluenced in his fanaticism by any motives of temporal interest; but there can be little doubt that the majority of his followers were actuated as much by the licence which his doctrines warranted as by zeal for what they were taught to consider the true faith. Wahhābism, in fact, apart from certain speculative notions respecting the Supreme Being,—in the main perfectly in accordance with the theology of the Kurān,—may be defined as a politico-religious confederacy which legalises the indiscriminate plunder and thralldom of all peoples beyond its own pale." (See *The Imāms and Sūyids of Ōmān*, pp. lxiii.-lxv. 245-252.) The sect is said to have a following in India, and during the mutiny of 1857-8 some anxiety was felt, and it subsists still, as to its possible developments there. Mr. Hughes states that "within the last thirty years Wahhābism has widely influenced religious thought amongst the Muḥammadans of India." It may be so; but that it should ever assume the form among them that it did among the wild tribes of Najd, or lead them in any considerable number to abjure Muslim orthodoxy, may safely be regarded as a bugbear and a chimera.

*The Rise and Fall of the Arabian Khalifate.*—The following brief sketch of the Arabian Khalifate and empire is subjoined by way of connecting their rise and fall. During the reign of Abn-Bakr, the immediate successor of the Prophet, the Muslims brought the whole of Arabia into subjection, conquered al-ʿIrāk, and captured Damascus from the Romans. During the lifetime of his successor Ōmar, they defeated the Persians, made themselves masters of Şyria and Mesopotamia, Egypt and Khurāsan. Ōmar was assassinated at al-Madinah by a Persian slave. During the Khalifate of Ōthmān, the next in succession, they took Hamadān, Cyprus, and several places on the seaboard of Syria. Ōthmān was murdered by his rebellious subjects at al-Madinah. The reign of ʿAlī-ibn-ʿAbi-Tālib was signalled by severe intestine quarrels, which ended in his deposition and subsequent assassination. From ʿAlī the Khalifate passed into the hands of the Bānu-Umāyyah, having its seat at Damascus. During their rule, from A.D. 661-748, the Muslims ravaged northern Africa and settled at Carthage. They also invaded Cappadocia and conquered Spain, where a separate Khalifate was established by them during the rule of the Bānu-Abbās, or Abbasides, who succeeded to the supreme power, with their seat of government mainly at Baghdād, A.D. 749, and were dispossessed by the Tatars under Hūlākū-Khān, A.D. 1258. This put an end to the Arabian Khalifate, of which nothing more was heard till five years later, when a reputed scion of the Abbasides, Ōmar-bi-amri-ʿllāh, was appointed Khalifāh by azh-Zhāhir Bibars, the then Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt. (Here it should be carefully borne in mind, in correction of the notion that no two Khalifāhs have lived and been recognized at the same time, that besides the Khalifate named above as having been established in Spain by the Bānu-Umāyyah, another was set up at Kairawān, the ancient Cyrene, about A.D. 908, by the Fātimites, who

pretended descent from ʿAlī and his wife Fātimah, and lasted till the destruction of that dynasty two and a half centuries later.) The restored Abbaside Khalifate, in Egypt, continued to exist side by side with the temporal sovereignties of that country, but confined strictly to spiritual functions, till its conquest by the Ottomans under Salīm I., whose predecessors had reigned at Constantinople since the capture of that place by Othman, their founder, A.D. 1514. Salīm took the son of the last Khalifāh to Constantinople, and is reputed to have received from him, as the representative of the Abbasides, the investiture of the Muslim Khalifate. Now, whereas it is unquestionable that that dignity, whatever it may imply, was at the first intended to be the gift, by election, of the Faithful, it is equally certain that it very soon became, like the temporal power, hereditary in the two Arabian dynasties; nevertheless, up to the time of the last nominal representative of the Arabs, it had been restricted to the Arabs, and there is no instance on record, nor any authority, sanctioning its transfer by an individual of the family, or its bestowal on an alien race.

The foregoing is, in reality, all that can be urged in behalf of the successional claim of the Ottoman Sultans to the Khalifate; but inasmuch as that institution underwent several radical modifications prior to the time of Salīm I., it may with some show of reason be held to imply merely the principal sovereignty in Islām. That nothing beyond this is signified by the title now-a-days is patent from the fact that the indefinable spiritual authority held to be attached to it, namely, the supreme Imāmate, is far from being recognized by the generality of Muslims. The Ottoman Khalifate, or Imāmate, stands in the same position towards Islām as the Popedom does towards the Christian religion.

*The Propagation of Islām.*—Islām was propagated with the utmost vigour by the immediate successors of Muḥammad, and succeeded in an incredibly short space of time in reducing the limits of Christendom by one-third. Paley truly observes:—"The only event in the history of the human race which admits of comparison with the propagation of Christianity is the success of Mahometanism;" and what calls for special notice is the deplorable fact, that throughout the Arab or Saracen and the Turkish invasions alike, large Christian populations embraced the faith of the conquerors, whereas there is no record whatever of any such defection from Islām to the ranks of Christianity. The Nestorian congregations in Central Asia either conformed or soon dwindled entirely away, while the surviving representatives of the once flourishing African Church appear to have deliberately apostatised from the religion of Christ to that of their invaders. Another equally notable characteristic of Muslim success is the fact that, with the single exception of Spain, Islām has never been suppressed in any country where it has once taken root. Moreover, in the midst of the general decay of its political power and ascendancy, it is quietly making rapid progress still, in China, in India, in the Indian Archipelago, and more especially in West and Central Africa, inasmuch that its followers at the present day—and be it

remembered that it is six centuries younger than Christianity—are presumably not far behind the aggregate number of Christians. That the earlier conquests were mainly effected by the sword is unquestionable. On the other hand, the fact should not be ignored that Christians, as also Jews and Sabians, were generally offered the alternative of paying the *Jizyah*, or Tribute, which secured to them the toleration, under certain restrictions, of their respective religions, together with the protection of their life and property. It is more than probable that in many cases this security was little better than a delusion; nevertheless, when we call to mind the utterly defenceless condition of the Christians who braved the fierce persecutions to which they were exposed during the first three centuries of our era, we must needs come to the sorrowful conclusion that their successors during the Muslim invasions had, with their faith and love, lost the other many characteristics of Christian courage and patriotism.

Further, that Islâm wrought a wonderful religious and social reformation among the pagan Arabs is beyond a doubt. Equally certain it is that its numerous modern converts from among the heathen negroes are thereby raised immensely in the scale of civilization. In like manner there is no denying that the Muslim Arabs “for five hundred years held up the torch of learning to humanity,” and that they greatly developed several of the pre-existent sciences and originated others. But after a while all this scientific vigour came to a standstill. The irruptions of the Seljûk and Moghul Tatars into Asia Minor, and the subsequent overthrow of the Abbaside dynasty by Hâlâkû-Khân in the 14th century, were the main causes of this decay, and thenceforward Islâm retrograded. The written book, the Kurân, no longer subjected to the scrutiny and dissection of Arab schoolmen who had dared to bring Platonian philosophy and Aristotelian logic to bear upon its interpretation, became, to use Lord Houghton’s forcible metaphor, “the dead man’s hand, stiff and motionless.” There are not wanting signs, however, that this state of things is gradually passing away. More intimate connexion with the West, together with powerful political and social considerations, has undoubtedly tended to produce radical changes in a system which was once supposed, and is still supposed by many, to be petrified beyond pliancy or the possibility of expansion.

In conclusion. The contrast between Christianity and Islâm, every allowance being made for whatever may be fairly urged in favour of the latter, is admirably set forth in the following beautiful passage by Mr. R. Bosworth Smith:—“The religion of Christ contains whole fields of morality and whole realms of thought which are all but outside the religion of Mohammed. It opens humility, purity of heart, forgiveness of injuries, sacrifice of self to man’s moral nature; it gives scope to development, boundless progress to his mind; its motive power is stronger, even as a friend is better than a king, and love higher than obedience. . . . Nor are the methods of drawing near to God the same in the two religions. The Muslim gains a knowledge of God—he can hardly be said to approach Him—by listening to the lofty mes-

sage of God’s prophet. The Christian believes that he approaches God by a process which, however difficult it may be to define, yet has had a real meaning to Christ’s servants, and has embodied itself in countless types of Christian character—that mysterious something which St. Paul calls ‘a union with Christ.’ ‘Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.’”

Such being, allowedly, the vast superiority of Christianity over Islâm, what a glorious consummation it would be, what a vast addition to human happiness, if the Muslims could be made partakers of the blessings of the Gospel. Of them, indeed, it may be confidently said, as St. Paul said of Israel of old: “If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead;” for considering the eminent importance which Muslims attach to religion, their strict observance of its precepts and ceremonial, and their ardent zeal in the dissemination of their creed, it is not too much to expect that, under the power of the Gospel, every converted follower of Islâm would become an ardent propagator of the faith of Christ. “The Mohammedan quarry, so to speak,”—thus spake General Lake in one of his addresses before the Church Missionary Society,—“contains materials which only require the touch of the Master-Builder to form out of it pillars for that temple which is being raised to His glory in the earth.”

[Literature on this subject:—*Târikhu’l-Mulûk*, &c., by at-Tâbary, Gryphisvaldiae, 1831. The first three volumes of the *Modern Part of an Universal History*, treating of Muhâmmad and the Arabs, and published anonymously in London, date 1770, is specially recommended to English readers. It contains numerous quotations from original Arab authors, and its transliteration of Oriental names far exceeds in correctness the system or rather absence of system now in vogue. Pocock’s *Specimen Historiæ Arabum*, Oxonii, 1806. Dr. Joseph White’s *Bampton Sermons*, entitled *A Comparison of Mahometism and Christianity in their History, their Evidence, and their Effects*, London, 1811. Mons. Caussin de Perceval’s *Histoire des Arabes avant l’Islamisme*, etc., Paris, 1848. *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to al-Medînah and Meccah*, 1855–6, and *The Gold Mines of Midian*, 1878, both by F. Burton. Sir William Muir’s *Life of Mahomet*. The Syed Ahmed Khân’s *Essays on the Life of Mohammed*, Trübner, 1870. Lane’s *Modern Egyptians*. Palgrave’s *Central and Eastern Arabia*, 1865. *The Imâms and Sâyyids of Ôman*, published by the Hakluyt Society, 1871. R. Bosworth Smith’s *Lectures on Mohammedanism*, 2nd edit., 1876. Sale’s *Koran*, 1812. Rev. J. M. Rodwell’s *Koran*, 1861. The Rev. T. P. Hughes’s *Notes on Muhammadanism*, 1877. Rev. J. Muhleisen Arnold’s *Islam and Christianity*, 1874. This list might have been extended by the addition of numerous Arab writers on Muhâmmad and Islâm; but as the more prominent and trustworthy among these are largely indented upon by the author of the *Universal History* above mentioned, by Caussin de Perceval, and by the Syed Ahmed Khân, whose quotations from the original Arabic have in most instances been verified, the writer of this article has deemed it unnecessary to name them.] [G. P. B.]

**MUIRCHEARTACH, MUIRCERTACH, MUIRCERTAIG** (MORIERTAGII, MURCER-TACH, -US, MURCHERTACH, -TACIUS, MURTHERTACHUS), MacEarca, first or fourth Christian king of Ireland (O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 128 n.). He was son of Muredhach, son of Eogan, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, but received his surname from his mother Erca, daughter of Loarne king of the Dalriadic Scots, and aunt of St. CAIRNECH (2). He succeeded Lughaidh, son of Laeghaire, in the monarchy of Ireland, in A.D. 513. He was much under the influence of his cousin St. Cairnech, yet famous as a warrior, and the soldier poet Cennfaeladh has celebrated his deeds. He was married to Duiseach, daughter of Duach Teangumha king of Connaught, but at last fell a victim to the revenge of a repudiated concubine named Sin, the daughter of Sighe; he had slain her father at the battle of Assey, co. Meath, in the year 524 (*Four Mast.*), and put herself away at the command of St. Cairnech. As noted in the *Annals* and in the ancient Irish tale called *The Death of Muircheartach Mor Mac Earca* (preserved in the Library of Trin. Coll. Dublin, MS. H. 2, 16), he was drowned in a butt of wine in which he sought refuge when the house of Cletty was set on fire above his head by his late mistress Sin, in A.D. 534, on the eve of the feast of Samhain (*Ann. Tig.*). Lanigan (*E. H. Ir.* i. 434 sq.) says he is represented as a good and pious sovereign. (*Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 153 et al.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 782 and *Tr. Th.* 447.) [J. G.]

**MUIRCHU**, surnamed **MACC-U-MACHTENI, MACCUMAGHTHENI, or MACCUTENUS**, and cited by Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 375 et al.) as simply **MACCUTHENUS**, was son of that Cogitotus who wrote the *Vita S. Brigidae* [COGITOTUS], and is himself best known as the compiler of the imperfect *Vita S. Patricii*, which is found with Tirechan's in the *Book of Armagh*. In its original form the Life or Acts consisted of two books with contents and colophon, but in the *Book of Armagh* the first folio, which also contains the beginning of Muirchu's first book, is wanting; the second book is complete, and the summary of contents, which the copyist had carried with the Preface to the end, gives the headings of the missing chapters of the first. The colophon is most important for fixing Muirchu's date. "Haec pauca de sancti Patricii peritia et virtutibus Muirchu Maccumachtheni, dictante Aiduo Slebtiensis civitatis episcopo, conscripsit" (f. 20 ba). Aedh bishop of Sletty died A.D. 700 (*Ann. Tig.*), and in the preface the work is dedicated to him; the names of Aedh and Muirchu are found in the Acts of St. Adamnan's synod at Birr or Tara in the year 697, so that Muirchu lived in the close at least of the 7th century. He is commemorated on June 8, and his name may be found at Kill-Murchon, co. Wicklow. Muirchu's *Life of St. Patrick* is represented by Probus's (or Colgan's Fifth), and the patronymic Maccumachtheni is supposed by some to be an Irish equivalent for "filius Cogitosi." (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 15, 425 sq.; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* l. ii.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 465 n. 32, and *Tr. Th.* 218; *Trans. Roy. Ir. Acad.* xviii. 107 sq.; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 269 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 401, 423.)

[J. G.]

**MUIREADHACH** (MUREDACH, MORIEGH), son of Indreachtach, bishop of Mayo, and slain A.D. 732; but there is much doubt as to his episcopate, and a suspicion that a chieftain is made to borrow from St. Geraldus bishop of Mayo. (*Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 324 n. 3, 325; *Gen. Hy. Fiachr.* by O'Don. 452-3; Cotton, *Fast.* iv. 50.) [GERALDUS (1).] [J. G.]

**MUIREDHACH** (MUIREADHACH, MUIREDHAIGH, MURCADH, MURCHADH), bishop of Killala, co. Mayo; commemorated Aug. 12. He was son of Eochaidh and sixth in descent from Laeghaire (ob. A.D. 463) monarch of Ireland. (Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 173). It seems to be a clumsy device to suppose two bishops of the same name at Killala (Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iv. 61; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 223) to surmount the chronological difficulty. His dates are all doubtful, but he probably belongs to the first half of the 7th century; his acts are lost (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 253, ii. 183 sq.; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 2 ser. 132; *Gen. Hy-Fiach.* 227-8). He was founder of the monastery on Inismurray, a small island in Killala Bay (Earl of Dunraven, *Notes on Ir. Arch.* by Miss Stokes, i. 46 sq. for account and photographic views); his mass is found at July 11 among the *Missae propriae SS. Patronorum Franciae et Hiberniae*, published at Paris in 1734 under the authority of pope Clement XII. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Sept. i. 5 praet., 5 Oct. iii. 2 praet.) [J. G.]

**MUMMOLINUS** (MOMMOLENUS; for variations in spelling the name see Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vii. 953), Oct. 16, probably first abbat of St. Bertin and twenty-second bishop of Noyon and Tournay. The Bollandists publish an anonymous Life, which they believe from internal evidence to have been written in the 8th century. The biographies of contemporaries and formal documents furnish a few other facts. He was a native of Constance, and at an early age entered the monastery of Luxeuil. In the year 658 or 659, St. Eligius bishop of Noyon and Tournay died, and Mummolinus was chosen to succeed him, partly, according to his biographer, on account of his knowledge of both the Latin and Teuton tongues, Noyon speaking the former and Tournay the latter. Of his episcopate, which lasted twenty-six years, little is known. His name is found in a few contemporary documents.

The authorities for his life are the *Vita S. Mommolini*, Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. vii. 980-985; *Vita S. Audomari*, c. vii.-x., Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 562. Paris, 1669; *Vita S. Bertini*, c. ii. iv., Mabillon, *ibid.* saec. iii. 1, 108-109; Andoenu, *Vita S. Eligii*, ii. 45, 46, 47, *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 574-575; Jacques le Vasseur, *Annales de l'Eglise Cathédrale de Noyon*, 541-552; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 485; ix. 984-985; Laplane, *Les Abbés de St. Bertin*, i. 5-7; and the exhaustive *Commentarius Praevius* of the later Bollandists (*ibid.* pp. 953-980). [S. A. B.]

**MUNCHIN**, -US, bishop of Limerick (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jan. i. 1; Cotton *Fast.* i. 372, 375; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 227; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 27 sq.), son of Sedna, in the 5th or 6th century, but beyond his being a disciple of St. Patrick nothing is fixed. [J. G.]

MURA, MURAN, -US, MURO (MURUS), abbat of Fahan in Inishowen, co. Donegal. The chief authority is Colgan's collection (*Acta SS.* 587), *De S. Muro sive Murano*, on which others have built (*Boll. Acta SS.* 12 Mart. ii. 209; *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* i. 271 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 329 sq.). St. Mura was son of Feradach, and sixth in descent from Niall of the Nine Hostages; his mother was Derinilla, by whom he was brother uterine of DOMHANGORT of Slieve Donard and other saints. His acts are lost, but he has long been specially venerated as the patron of the O'Niells, who took their oath upon his pastoral staff. From the known dates of his pedigree Dr. Reeves calculates A.D. 645 as an approximation to the date of his death. He is said to have written an Irish metrical *Life of St. Columba*, from which extracts are quoted in the Irish Annals, &c. (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 392 cc. 21, 30; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* vii.; O'Reilly, *Ir. Writ.* xli.; O'Connor, *Proleg.* ii. 94, and *Ep. Nunc.* 179). Colgan also mentions "alium magnus et pervetustus Codex Chronicorum aliarumque totius patriae historiarum in magno pretio ab antiquariae rei studiosis semper habitus et saepe laudatus." Two extant relics of St. Mura are very highly esteemed. (1) His bell, which now belongs to Lord Otho Fitzgerald (see two accounts of St. Mura's bell, with illustrations, in *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* i. 271-3, 274-5; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* v. 206-7). (2) His pastoral staff, *bachull-Mura*, which Colgan mentions as enclosed in a gilded case, and covered with gems, is now in the Museum of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin. (*M. Doneg.* xxxii.; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 37-8.) [J. G.]

**MURATORIAN FRAGMENT.** The document thus designated is a very ancient list of sacred writings of the New Testament, first published in 1740 by Muratori (*Ant. Ital. Med. Aev.* iii. 851). He had found it in a 7th or 8th century MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, of which he had formerly been librarian. The MS. had come from the great Irish monastery of Bobbio, and would seem to have served as a kind of common-place book into which different things thought worth preserving had been transcribed. The fragment with which we are concerned would seem to have been a copy of a loose leaf or two, apparently all that was then remaining, of a lost volume. For it is defective at the beginning, and it breaks off in the middle of a sentence; but the defect does not arise from mutilation of the existing MS., which, immediately after the conclusion of this extract, goes on, on the same page, to give another from St. Ambrose. The mutilation, therefore, must have taken place in the archetype of our present copy. This copy, made by a scribe both illiterate and careless, is full of blunders which often sadly obscure the sense; and in fact it was first printed by Muratori professedly as a specimen of the barbarisms which disfigure MSS. of the period; though he sufficiently shews that he was aware of the value for its own sake of this relic of Christian antiquity.

That value arises from the fact that this is, as far as we know, the earliest attempt to make an enumeration of the New Testament writings recognised by the church. The document is approximately dated by means of a reference in it

to the episcopate of Pius at Rome, which it speaks of as "nuperrime temporibus nostris." The latest date assigned for the death of Pius is A.D. 157, and it is contended that no one would speak of an event as having occurred "very lately and in his own time," if it was then more than twenty years ago. So we get about A.D. 180 as the latest admissible date for this document. On these grounds has now been generally rejected Muratori's own conjecture as to the authorship, namely, that we have here an extract from a work written by Caius the Roman presbyter about A.D. 196. This date, though probably a little too early for Caius, has been held to be too late for our fragment; on this question we shall return further on. There is general agreement that the place of composition was Rome, which is spoken of simply as "urbs," while in the passage already referred to, the writer shews an acquaintance with the family relations of the Roman bishop Pius, not likely to be possessed by a stranger at a distance. It has not been found possible to name any member of the Roman church about 180 to whom the authorship can be plausibly ascribed. Bunsen's conjecture that Hegesippus was the author has nothing to recommend it, and without pressing too much the argument from the silence of Eusebius, we should certainly expect that his many notices of the work of Hegesippus would have included a mention of this list if he had found it there. Our fragment is in Latin, but a majority of the best critics have held that it has the marks of being a translation from the Greek. Hesse, however, the author of the latest monograph on the subject (*Das Muratorische Fragment*, Giessen, 1873), ably maintains the originality of the Latin, and in this view he has the support of some respectable names. His main argument may be summed up thus: If the fragment were a translation it might be expected to be a very literal one: we ought then to have no great difficulty in translating it back into Greek;\* and the process of retranslation ought to throw light on the obscure places of the text; but in point of fact there are many phrases of which it is not easy to say with any certainty what the Greek original could have been, and we can at least say that the translation could not have been very literal; while the attempts that have been made to explain difficulties by going back to a supposed Greek original, either all fail, or at least inspire us with little confidence in accepting them. We own there is a good deal of force in some of Hesse's arguments, yet they have not shaken our belief in the Greek original; a belief founded less on the Greek idioms to be found in particular passages than on the general impression produced by the whole style of the fragment. If textual criticism could clear away all transcriptional errors, we might have an intelligible document written in Latin as good as that of the translation of Irenaeus; but we cannot imagine any correction of text which would make of it such Latin as we might expect in the original composition of an educated man who habitually used that language as his own. From any one who wrote Latin of the kind

\* This retranslation has been attempted by Hilgenfeld (*Kanon*, p. 44) and by Bötticher (De Lagarde) in Bunsen's *Hippolytus* i., 2nd edition, *Christianity and Mankind*).

of the fragment, we should not expect the use of Greek idioms, except in a translation from Greek. Further if the fragment has the antiquity claimed for it, the presumption is that it is a translation from the Greek, since Greek is the language of all the literary remains that have come down to us from the Roman church of the 2nd century.

The first line of the fragment is evidently the conclusion of its notice of St. Mark's Gospel; for it goes on to speak of St. Luke's as in the third place, St. John's as in the fourth. It is clear that a notice of St. Matthew's Gospel and of St. Mark's must have come before; but we have no means of testing the conjecture that the document had previously given a list of Old Testament books. The document would appear to have undertaken to throw light on the choice of topics in the Gospels and on the point where each began (compare Irenaeus, iii. 11). It is stated that St. Luke (and apparently St. Mark also) had not seen our Lord in the flesh, and had based his narrative on such information as he could obtain, beginning from the birth of John. For the story told as to the composition of St. John's Gospel, see LUTCIUS. The document goes on to say that the variety in the Gospels makes no difference to the faith of believers, since by one and the same sovereign Spirit the same fundamental doctrines are fully taught in all concerning our Lord's birth, life, passion, resurrection, and future coming. At the date of this document, therefore, belief was fully established not only in the pre-eminence of four Gospels, but in their divine inspiration.

Next comes a notice of the Acts of the Apostles, in which St. Luke's choice of topics is accounted for by his having only designed to record what fell under his own notice, and having therefore left unmentioned the martyrdom of Peter and the journey of Paul to Spain. Thirteen epistles of St. Paul are then mentioned. (A) Epistles to churches, in the following order: 1 and 2 Cor.; Eph.; Phil.; Col.; Gal.; 1 and 2 Thess.; Rom. It is observed that though Paul, for their correction, wrote twice to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, he only addressed seven churches by name,<sup>b</sup> in this following the example of "his predecessor," St. John, who, in writing to seven churches, shewed that he was addressing the universal church.<sup>c</sup> (B) Epistles to individuals: Philemon, Titus, and two to Timothy, written from personal affection, but hallowed by the honour of the Catholic church for the ordering of ecclesiastical discipline. Next follow words which we quote in Westcott's translation: "Moreover there is in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, and another to the Alexandrians, forged under the name of Paul, bearing on ["ad;"]

<sup>b</sup> This "nominativ" would seem to leave room for the acknowledgment as Paul's of an epistle, such as that to the Hebrews, not addressed to a church by name. But if this had been intended, a mention of that epistle ought immediately to have followed.

<sup>c</sup> It is likely that our document was known to St. Cyprian, who mentions Paul's Epistles to Seven Churches (*de Exhort. Mart.* 11, see also *Tert. adv. Jud.* i. 20, and *Optatus, de Schism. Don.* ii. 3). Augustine uses language in still closer accord with our document (*de Civ. Dei.* xvii. iv. 4, see also Victorinus of Padua in *Apoc.* 1, and Pseudo-Chrys. *Opus imperfect.* in *Matth.* i. 6; pp. vi. xvii., Benedictine Edition).

we should have been more inclined to translate "favoring"] the heresy of Marcion, and several others, which cannot be received into the Catholic church, for gall<sup>d</sup> ought not to be mixed with honey. The epistle of Jude, however, and two epistles bearing the name of John, are received in the Catholic [church] (or are reckoned among the Catholic [epistles]). And the book of Wisdom, written by the friends of Solomon in his honour [is acknowledged]. We receive, moreover, the Apocalypses of John and Peter only, which latter some of our body will not have read in the church." It is known that Marcion entitled his version of the Ephesians as "to the Laodiceans," and there is also a well-known pseudo-Pauline epistle having the same title; but there is nothing to throw light on what can be meant by the above-mentioned epistle to the Alexandrians. The epistle to the Hebrews has been very generally conjectured; yet it is nowhere else described as to the Alexandrians, has no Marcionite tendency, and is not "under the name of Paul." No more satisfactory solution of the puzzle has been offered than that writings may have been current then which have not come down to us. We have sometimes thought it possible that the epistle of Barnabas may have been intended. Though only two epistles of John are here mentioned, the opening sentence of the first epistle had been quoted in the paragraph treating of the Gospel; and it is possible that our writer may have read that epistle as a kind of appendix to the Gospel, and is here speaking of the other two. That the Wisdom of Solomon should be mentioned in a list of New Testament books has been felt to be perplexing. We are ourselves inclined to adopt the conjecture that the first word of the sentence in question should be "Ut," not "Et," that not the apocryphal book of Wisdom, but the Proverbs of Solomon are intended, and that there is an inaccurate reference to Prov. xxv. 1 (LXX.). The fragment then, in a sentence already referred to, says that the Shepherd was written "very lately, in our own time," in the city of Rome, while his brother bishop, Pius, sat in the chair of the Roman church; that, therefore, it ought to be read, but not used in the public reading of the church. The text of the last sentence of the document is so corrupt as to be unintelligible, but we can make out that it names writings which are rejected altogether: amongst these, of Arsinous, Valentinus, and Miltiades, mention also being made of the Cataphrygians of Asia. Attempts have been made to find some better known heretics under the names of Arsinous and that which we have reported as Miltiades. In particular Harnack (*Zeitsch. f. Luth. Theol.* 1874, p. 276) maintains that the latter must be corrected into Tatian. But all he succeeds in proving (if he does succeed) is that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that copyists might have perverted "Tatiani" into "Metiadi;" and considering how many other names there are of which as much might be said, we have slender warrant for going back from "Metiadi" to "Tatiani." MILTIADES, as we believe, was the name

<sup>d</sup> The paronomasia here, "fel" and "mel," may have been accidentally introduced by a translator, and is no conclusive proof of Latin original. St. Jerome has the same proverb, but the word he uses is "venenum," not "fel."

of a leading Montanist, but we have not the smallest reason to think that the names should have come down to us of the authors of all the documents for which, about the end of the 2nd century, acceptance was claimed in the church of Rome. We know from Hippolytus that the Montanists revered many writings which the church rejected, but we are told nothing of the names of their authors. In the *Little Labyrinth* (see HIPPOLYTUS, p. 98), a document of not much later date than that under consideration, we are given the names of several other heretics who troubled the Roman church at the beginning of the 3rd century, of whom we hear nothing elsewhere. It will be observed that in this list of books received in the "Catholic Church"\* (a phrase recurring in this document of which it is important to take notice) no mention is made of the epistle of James, of either epistle of Peter, or of that to the Hebrews, unless we recognise it under the name of the epistle to the Alexandrians. Westcott, however, has shewn that it is impossible to build any argument on the omissions of our fragment. In order to obtain a measure of the accuracy of the scribe, he has examined the passage from St. Ambrose which immediately follows in the MS., and he finds that there is a long piece copied twice over, with serious variations between the two copies; that "in thirty lines there are thirty unquestionable clerical blunders, including one important omission, two other omissions which destroy the sense completely, one substitution equally destructive of the sense, and four changes which appear to be intentional and false alterations." It would be almost incredible that something of the same kind should not have occurred in transcribing our document, which is nearly three times as long. Besides, we do not know whether the archetype from which the scribe copied was a complete work, or only consisted of extracts. Certainly there are places in the fragment where there is such a break in the sense that it is very credible something has been left out. It would, of course, be hazardous in the extreme to attempt by conjecture to supply these omissions; but we think it safe to believe that the original list must have contained some mention of the first epistle of Peter, which certainly, at the earliest date claimed for the fragment, held such a position in the Roman church that entire silence in respect to it is incredible.

It would be tedious to enumerate the disquisitions of which our fragment has been the subject. It must suffice to mention Credner, *N. T. Kanon*, Volkmar's edition, 141 sq. 341 sq.; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* i. 394; Tregelles, *Canon Muratorianus*; Hesse, as already cited, and Westcott, *N. T. Canon*, 208 sq. 514 sq. We have already referred to Bunsen's and Hilgenfeld's retranslations. There have been besides countless articles in journals, of which it is enough to mention three of the latest, Harnack, *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1879, Overbeck, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1880, and Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift*, 1881, p. 129. Without making this article into a commentary, it would be impossible

to discuss all the points raised by so many critics; but it seems to us that over-subtlety is a fault of which they are often guilty, and that this is especially the characteristic of Harnack's article just referred to.

In what precedes the opinion of the best critics as to the date of this document has been given. Speaking now in my own name, I may venture to express an opinion in which I believe I am singular, or nearly so—that the document belongs to the episcopate of Zephyrinus. I expressed this opinion in 1874, with some hesitation (*Hermathena*, i.), and hold it now with more confidence, having since been led by two other roads to the same conclusion. In the first place, it is plain that the words "temporibus nostris" cannot be too severely pressed. Irenaeus (v. 30) speaks of the reign of Domitian as nearly his own time, that is to say, a time eighty or ninety years before. Eusebius (iii. 28) speaks of Dionysius of Alexandria and (v. 27) of Paul of Samosata as *καθ' ἡμᾶς*. We do not think that Lightfoot (vol. ii. p. 309) does much to save the strict accuracy of Eusebius by supposing that Eusebius must have at least been born before the death of these two bishops, the case being the same as if Queen Victoria were to speak of George III. as her contemporary, it being true that she was born before that monarch's death. The fact remains that a writer, who cannot be described as habitually loose in his use of language, speaks of a period fifty or sixty years before the time of writing as his own time. That the Muratorian writer was as careful and accurate as Eusebius is what we have not the least warrant for asserting; and we know nothing of the general argument of which the fragment is a part. If, for instance, as seems probable, the writer's object was to resist an attempt to claim for a modern writing that authority which he believed to be due only to the remains of the apostolic church, then we should not be justified in interpreting too strictly the controversial description of the writing as quite recent, and as belonging to his own time. Thus if the Muratorian writer were even fifty or sixty years after the death of Pius, he might speak of a period as recent and contemporaneous, of which he must have met with many able to speak from personal recollection.

Now there is reason to think that the interval between the bishop Pius and the Muratorian writer must have been longer than the twenty years critics generally allow. For he describes that bishop as "sitting in the chair of the Roman church," and evidently has no idea that the constitution of that church was different in the time of Pius and in his own. Yet those who take his word that the author of the Shepherd was the brother of Pius, infer from the language of the Shepherd that Hermas wrote during a struggle which ended in the confining to a single individual that honour of a principal chair, which before that time had been shared among many. If this be true, the Muratorian writer must have lived so long after Pius that all memory of that struggle had had time to be lost.

But in another way the reference to Hermas may be used to define the date of our fragment. For concerning the authority of Hermas a change certainly took place in the opinion of the Western church. Irenaeus quotes the Shepherd as Scripture. Tertullian in an early writing (*De Orat.* 16),

\* An argument for the Latin original has been drawn from the fact that we have simply "Catholica" without "ecclēsia," a usage which became common in Latin, but is unknown in Greek.

when its authority is alleged against him, tries to reconcile his views with it, without a word of dissent from those who treated it as Scripture. But in a later writing (*De Pudicitia*, 20) he not only himself rejects the Shepherd with contumely, but adds that in every council even of the anti-Montanist churches it had been reckoned among false and apocryphal writings. It is highly credible (see MONTANISM, p. 942) that in resistance to the modern revelations of Montanism, the Catholics felt the necessity of drawing more sharply the line of demarcation between apostolic and later writings. It is likely that the document which is the subject of this article had an influential part in determining among which the Shepherd was to be classed. We think there is reason to believe that our document was one which made some mark in its time. The parallels in Hesse lead me to think that not only Victorinus of Padua was acquainted with it, but Tertullian; but the parallels with Tertullian are to be found only in his later writings. Now if the Muratorian theory as to the date of Hermas had been authoritatively put forward by a leading man in the Roman church, we should at once have the explanation of the dethronement of the Shepherd from the place of honour it had previously occupied. In this way I was led to conjecture that the publication of the Muratorian document took place during the interval between the publication of Tertullian's two tracts, *De Oratione* and *De Pudicitia*. In this connection it is to be noted that the first historical note in the Liberian catalogue of the Popes, gives the same account of Hermas as the Muratorian document. It is generally believed that the earlier part of that catalogue is derived from the list of Hippolytus (see vol. i. p. 508), and if so, this notice also may have been copied from the same source. Hippolytus was fond of repeating himself; and if he were in any way concerned in the discovery of the supposed true date of Hermas, it would be intelligible why he should have gone a little out of his way to insert it in his papal list.

In the early part of the 3rd century true traditions of the times of Pius might easily have survived, and so I long struggled to reconcile the Muratorian statement that Hermas wrote in the episcopate of Pius, with the statement of Hermas himself that he was contemporary with Clement. But in writing the article HERMAS, I convinced myself of the entire falsity of the Muratorian statement, on the rejection of which all that had been strained and perplexing, sprang at once, as if by the release of a spring, into intelligible order. If the Muratorian fragment is not received as determining the date of Hermas, the notice of Hermas puts a limit on the date of the fragment. It must have been so much later than the times of Pius, that the writer was without trustworthy traditions to save him from misinterpreting the historical documents which he used. But it has further to be observed that in some papal catalogues, the brother of Pius is called not Hermas but Pastor, and that the name Pastor has a distinguished place in the traditions of the Roman church. In the article PASTOR must be examined whether the taking Pastor as a proper name is a blunder of the later catalogues, or whether the true account is that Hippolytus who we know was at the beginning of

the 3rd century at work on the episcopal lists, finding in the Roman archives Pius described as "frater Pastoris," rashly jumped to the conclusion that he was the brother of the author of the celebrated Shepherd. This would certainly be a huge blunder, but I cannot venture to pronounce it impossible that Hippolytus might have committed it, believing him to have been a man apt to form an opinion hastily and to hold it with a confidence quite unwarranted by the evidence.

Lastly, if the conclusion arrived at in the article MONTANISM be correct, viz. that it was only in the episcopate of Zephyrinus that the Montanist controversy became active in the Roman church, the question of the date of the Muratorian document is settled, for it is plainly anti-Montanist. If we admit the document to be not earlier than the episcopate of Zephyrinus, we are at once led to fall back on Muratori's hypothesis as to the authorship; for since we know from Eusebius that a work of that period, the disputation of Caius with Proclus, contained, in opposition to Montanist revelations, a list of the books revered by the Catholic church, it seems unnecessary to look further for the original of our document. We need not be embarrassed by any considerations which point to the researches of Hippolytus in the lists of Roman bishops as having had some share in shaping the conclusions of our author; for at the time in question, Caius and Hippolytus are likely to have been working together in harmony, and the learning of one would be at the service of the other. [G. S.]

MURDACHUS, Scotch saint in Argyleshire, called hermit and also Culdeus by Dempster, who relates that this last of the native bards lived at a place called Kilmurdah, was devoted in his attachment to the B. V. M., through whom he received many favours, flourished A.D. 800, and wrote *Hymni Deiparæ*. His feast is Sept. 15 and October 5 in the Scotch calendars; he is also called bishop and confessor, but his tradition is unfixed (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 104, 213, 416; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 474; Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Sept. v. 251 præt., 5 Oct. iii. 2 præt., stating and discussing the difficulties). He may be St. Murdoch of Inverkeillor, and the patron of "Chapel Dokie," in Monifieth, Forfarshire (Jervise, *Epit.* i. 518-19). [DOKIE.] [J. G.]

MURGEUS, Irish bishop, flourished A.D. 650, but erroneously identified by Ussher (*Wks.* vi. 479, 536, 606) with MURGHEIN the mermaid (*Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 299, 536; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 342). He belongs to the third class of Irish saints, and is unknown. (Lanigan, *ib.* ii. 331 et al.) [J. G.]

MUSAEUS, presbyter of Marseilles, famed for his knowledge of Scripture and the subtlety of his interpretations. At the requests of Venerius and Eustasius bishops of Marseilles he compiled a lectionary and a treatise on the sacraments, besides publishing some homilies. Gennadius (*Scr. Eccl.* 79) describes the two former works, and makes the author to have died cir. 460. (*Hist. Litt. de la Fr.* ii. 340; Cave, i. 447; Dupin, i. 502, ed. 1722; Ceill. x. 471.) [C. H.]

MUSANUS, writer against the ENCRATITES (see vol. 2 p. 119; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 21, 28;



*Chron. Ann. Abr.* 2220; Hieron. *Catal.* 31; Theod. *Haer. Fab.* i. 21). In the *Church History* Eusebius places Musanus in the reign of Antoninus Pius and episcopate of Anicetus. In the *Chronicle*, where the name appears to have been written Musianus, he had placed him some 40 years later, in the reign of Severus and episcopate of Zephyrinus. [G. S.]

MUSONIANUS, a lay friend of Chrysostom's to whom he wrote from Cucusus remonstrating with him for having allowed him to send him two letters without a reply. He is however confident of his affection, the proofs of which he can never forget. (Chrysost. *Ep.* 216.) [E. V.]

MUSONIUS (1), bishop of Neocaesarea, on whose death in 368 A.D. Basil wrote a long letter of consolation to his widowed church (*Epist.* 28 [62]) filled with the highest laudation of the deceased prelate, whom he designates as no unworthy successor of Gregory Thaumaturgus. He describes him as a rigid supporter of old customs and the ancient faith, endeavouring to conform his church in all things to the primitive model, and looking with abhorrence on everything savouring of novelty. His watchful care had preserved his church from the storms of heresy which were ravaging all neighbouring churches. So great was the reverence in which he was held, that though he was by no means the oldest of the bishops, when they met in council the presidency was always assigned to him. He must have been comparatively young when he attained the episcopate, for though he ruled the church of Neocaesarea for many years, he was not very aged at the time of his death. We learn from this letter that Musonius had been prejudiced against Basil, and regarded his election to the

episcopate with no friendly eyes, so that though they were united in faith, and in opposition to heresy, they were unable to co-operate for the peace of the church. Basil mentions him in a second letter to the Neocaesareans as the "blessed Musonius," the follower of the traditions of Gregory Thaumaturgus, "whose teaching was still sounding in their ears." (Basil, *Epist.* 210 [64].) [E. V.]

MUSONIUS (2), a professor of rhetoric mentioned by Eunapius (*Vit. Philos.*) in his account of Prohaeresius (*s. f.*). Baronius understands the passage to say that he was expelled under Julian for being a Christian (*A. E.* ann. 354 xxv., 362 cccxvii.); but Pagi (ann. 362 xli.) believes that Prohaeresius is the person meant. (Tillem. vii. 719.) [C. H.]

MUTIANUS (MUCIANUS), a scholasticus, cir. 550, employed by Cassiodorus (*Instit. Div. Lett.* cap. 5 in *Patr. Lat.* lxx. 1120) to translate into Latin Chrysostom's thirty-four homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews. This version is printed with St. Chrysostom's works (*Pat. Gr.* xii. 257; see also for the author the *Praefatio* § 4 at commencement of the volume; see also Cave 524; Tillem. xi. 405; Ceill. xi. 285). He believed to be the Mocianus Scholasticus again whom Facundus Hermianensis wrote his treatise (*Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 853 and note.) [C. H.]

MYENSIS (MYIENSIS) Episcopus attests the canons of the legatine council of Northumbria or Cealchythe (Sim. Dun. 786); he was Aldulf, bishop of the Saxon settlement at Mayo. (Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Angl.* 8; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* iii. 446; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 663-4.) [J. G.]

END OF VOL. III.





**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

---

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY**

---



