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PREFACE TO VOL. II.

In publishing another volume the Editors have to explain that it has been found desirable to extend the work to four volumes. They felt that the value of a Dictionary of early Christian Biography would depend both upon the completeness of its onomasticon, and upon its thorough discussion of the greater names. It became apparent, as they proceeded, that to attain these objects a larger space would be required than was at first contemplated, and the liberality of the publisher has allowed them the space necessary to carry out their design. Although the present volume terminates with Hermocrates, it will be found that, for the special purposes of the Christian Biography of the first eight centuries, one half of the Alphabet has practically been treated. A remarkable number of the important names in Church History occur in the early letters. This volume, for instance, contains articles which are necessarily of exceptional length on such names as Eusebius of Caesarea, Gnosticism, the Gregories of the East and the West, Ephraim the Syrian, Epiphanius, the Apocryphal Gospels, the Hebrew Learning of the Fathers, and Hermas; while Anglo-Saxon names commencing with the letter E are peculiarly numerous. There will consequently be no difficulty in completing the work within the limits now prescribed to it.

In reference to this extension of the book, the Editors feel that it is but justice to the generous labours of the contributors to call attention to the original research which has been bestowed upon it and to the scientific purpose which has been kept in view. The first volume was very kindly received; but some further explanation of the design and character of the undertaking seems still due to the distinguished English and Foreign scholars who have cooperated in it. In combination with the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, the book will be found to be unique in the comprehensiveness with which the whole sphere of Christian life during the first eight centuries has been treated. It has been compared with the valuable German cyclopaedias of Herzog and of Wetzer and Welte. But in the first place it is an attempt, to which those works make no pretension, to notice every name connected with the history of the early Church; and though many such names may be insignificant in themselves, they are frequently of considerable importance in determining critical difficulties which arise in respect to the greater personages. It sometimes happens, for example, that
exact knowledge respecting some obscure name which is mentioned by two writers may throw important light on their relations to each other. The information, moreover, furnished by these minor articles is often precisely that which a student finds it most difficult to obtain, and the minute points they illustrate in Church History are sometimes very characteristic. But a not less important difference between this work and the foreign cyclopaedias which have preceded it will at once be seen if reference be made to a few of the more important articles. The subjects of such articles will be found to be treated not merely with independence and originality, but with a fulness which no modern work has attempted. Since, indeed, the Cyclopaedias just mentioned survey the whole range of religious history, from its commencement to the present time, it would have been impracticable for them to enter with any fulness of detail into the history of the first eight centuries. From this point of view it is hoped that this Dictionary may serve to remove a reproach which has not unfrequently been cast upon Protestant learning, and for which it must be admitted that there has hitherto been some ground. Since the admirable work of Cave, the subjects of Patrology, and of early Christian life and literature, have been less comprehensively treated among us than is their due. The present work, however, will supply a greater mass of materials for the history of the early centuries of the Church, together with a more complete application to them of the resources of modern learning and criticism, than is anywhere else accessible; and the credit may, therefore, without presumption, be claimed for it of being, at least in design and effort, the most important contribution to Church History which, either in this country or abroad, has been made for many years.

In dismissing a second volume, the Editors have again to express their gratitude for the ready and cordial co-operation they have received; but their acknowledgments are pre-eminently due to two distinguished scholars, to whose generous assistance the work is peculiarly indebted. Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, and Canon Stubbs, the Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, have not only written numerous and important articles, but have had the goodness to read the proofs of this volume. They are of course in no way responsible for the final result of the Editors' labours; but their suggestions have been of the greatest service. The Editors must also express their continued obligations to the Rev. Charles Hole, Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London, for the constant devotion with which he has assisted them, and for the invaluable learning and labour he has bestowed upon the work.
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EABA

EABA, a daughter of Eanfrith, brother of Eanhere, under-kings or eldersmen of the Hwicce, and wife of Eadwald, king of the South Saxons (d. 685). She was baptized in her brother’s dominions, and, with her husband, who received Christianity about 661 under the influence of Wulfhere, king of the Mercians, encouraged Wilfrid in 681 to attempt the conversion of the South Saxons. Nothing more is known of her, but from her father Eanfrith, her friendship with Wilfrid, and the connexion between the Hwiccian princes and the royal house of Northumbria, she was probably nearly related to St. Ebba, abbess of Coldingham. (Bede, H. E. iv. 13; Edd. V. Wulf. c. 40.) [S.]

EABA (2), an abbot of Malmesbury in the 8th century. His name occurs among the memorials of St. Boniface, in a letter addressed by a monk unnamed [Hildeg] to Lullus of Mainz. In this the writer reminds Lullus of their ancient friendship “in Maldubia civitate, quando Eaba ubus in amabilis caritate nutritvit,” and calls to his recollection that Eaba had given him the name of “Lytel.” (Mon. Magunt. ed. Jaffé, p. 300; Bonif. Append. ed. Würdtevin, ep. 123.) No such name occurs in the received, but very imperfect lists of the abbots of Malmesbury. (W. Malmesey, G. P. lib. v.; Monast. Angl. i. 255.) There is, however, in the list recently discovered by Mr. W. de G. Birch in the Cotton MS. Vitellius A. 10 (Birch, Abbats of Malmesbury, pp. 6, 30), an abbot Aembrht, who may be identical with Eaba, and with an abbot Embrht, who, between 755 and 757 had a charter from Ethelred of Mercia, and Cynwulf of Wessex. [Embrbht.] However this may have been, as Lullus must have been over thirty when in 754 he was made bishop, and as according to his biographers he was seven years old when he was admitted into the monastery (Vit. S. Luli, ap. Surium, Oct. 16), Eaba’s date at Malmesbury must fall about 730. [S.]

EABA (3), presbyter of Boniface and bishop of Maastricht. [Eodanucus.]

EABB (Kemble, C. D. 37; Thorin, in Twaed. col. 1770; Elmhamp, pp. 223, 234, ed. Hardwicke), abbess. [Eodmensbury.] [C. H.]
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EADBald

EADA, presbyter, a valued friend of Alcuin, who thanks him for presents, and praises his munificence towards him. Alcuin says his bark has been hurried along by gales into the vortex of wealth, and he envies Eada his chosen life of poverty, where he would gladly follow him according to his own earliest bent. Mabillon concludes that Eada was a monk. The editors of the Monumenta Alcuiniana have no doubt that the epistle addressed to him was written before Alcuin went to reside over his abbey at Tours and they suggest the date A.D. 796. (Mon. Alcuin. ep. 47, ed. Jaffé, p. 269; Alcuin, Opp. ed. Froben. i. 201, ep. 140; Mabill. Annal. Ord. S. Ben. lib. xxvii. c. 31.) [C. H.]
and converted. This is the tale; it has been suggested that originally it was only a story of a dream, and that the corporal inflictions were a later addition to it; in that case Eadbal must have been impressed by Laurentius's account of the dream, and by that only. The other alternative is to suppose that Laurentius stooped to a fraud for the purpose of making a salutary impression on the self-willed pagan prince. Whatever was the cause of Eadbal's change, it was most thorough and practical. He broke off his unlawful "cunnabulum" (Bede, i. 6), denounced all manner of idolatry, accepted the faith, was baptized, and took pains in all things to consult for and promote the interests of the church, to the utmost of his power. He sent to Gaul, and recalled Mellitus and Justus; the latter returned in peace to Rochester, but the Londoners would not receive the former, and Eadbal, not having inherited his father's lordship, was unable to constrain them. What he could do he did; "in union with his own people," he studied to devote himself to the divine precepts. He built a chapel of the Virgin within the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul. He is said to have bestowed a munificence to Folkestone for his daughter Eanswitha, who became the local saint of the place. The venerable church within the precincts of Dover Castle is thought to be substantially a work of his reign (see Freeman, Norw. Conq. iii. 939). But he did not enforce the abandonment or destruction of idols (cf. Bede, ii. 8). When Edwin, who had recently gained possession of the throne of Northumbria, sent envoys to ask the hand of Eadbal's sister Ethelburga—called Tata in her own family as a name of endearment—her brother answered firmly, that he could not allow a Christian maiden to be wedded to a heathen husband. The envoys reported this refusal to Edwin, who sent them back with the assurance that he would in no wise hinder Ethelburga from the practice of her own religion; on the contrary, he would freely permit both herself and her attendants, male and female, to worship as Christians, and would even himself adopt their faith, if, on inquiry, it should seem better to wise men "holier and worthier of God." On these terms Eadbal consented to the marriage in 625, and sent with her on her journey northwards Paulinus, consecrated by archbishop Justus, in the episcopate, in the hope that he might act not only as her spiritual guide, but as a missionary bishop in Northumbria. When Edwin fell in the battle of Hatfield, and Ethelburga and Paulinus returned to Kent, Eadbal established the latter in the vacant see of Rochester (Bede, ii. 20). This was in the close of 633; Eadbal lived seven years longer, and died in 640, "leaving his kingdom to his son Earcombert" (Bede, iii. 8). For a Cottonian MS. referring to Eadbal, see Hardy, Descr. Cant. i. 359. [W. B.]

EADBALD (3), an ealdorman, whose name (printed Facundius by the Magdeburg Centurio-dators) appears among the witan, who approved the acts of the legatine council held in southern England in 787. He is identified by Jaffé with the ealdorman Eadbal, who attested Mercian charters from 777 onwards. (Kemble, C. D. i. 158, 167, 170; Mon. Alcuin. p. 162; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 402.)

EADBERHT (5), aedbolus, F. Wig. M. H. B. 546), the twelfth bishop of London in the ancient lists. (M. H. B. 617.) As his name occurs between those of Kenwalch, who was bishop in 753, and Heathoberht, who attested grants in 798 and 799, he is no doubt to be identified with the bishop Eadbal, who, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, went away from the land in the year of Offa's death, 796. (M. H. B. 338.)


EADBALT (Gaimar, Estoria, v. 1273, M. H. B. 780), king of Kent. [EADBERHT (1).]

[CH.]

EADBERHT. [EADBERHT, EADBERHT.]

EADBERHT (1) (Kemble, C. D. 72, a.d. 724, brother of Ethelberht king of Kent; C. D. 85, a.d. 738; 1003, a.d. 741; 1004, a.d. 747), king of Kent. [EADBERHT (2).]

EADBERHT (3) (Kemble, C. D. 106, a.d. 761; 107, a.d. 761; 110, a.d. 762, all doubtful), king of Kent. [EADBERHT (3).]


EADBERHT (4) (A. S. C. ann. 757, 788 in M. H. B. 333, 334; Simeon Dunelm. G. R. A. in M. H. B. 639 a, 662 a, c, e, 663 e), king of Northumbria. [EADBERHT (5).]

[CH.]

EADBERHT (5) (EADBERT), a monk of Lindisfarne, succeeded Cuthbert in a.d. 688 as bishop of that see, being especially noted for his knowledge of the Scriptures, and for the strict way in which he gave a tenth of everything to the poor (Bed. H. E. iv. 29). He was the first prelate who removed from his monastery the old roof of reeds or wattles, with which Finan had covered it, replacing them with sheets or webs of lead (id. iii. 25).

In the spring of a.d. 698, the first translation of the remains of St. Cuthbert took place. Eadberht gave his assent, but was from home when the examination of the grave was made, spending Lent, according to his wont, in solitude and prayer on some neighbouring island. The monks open the grave, and find what they consider to be an un decayed body. Delighted at their discovery they hasten with the news to Eadberht, taking with them some of the robes which they had found in the tomb. The bishop kissed them, and bade his brethren clothe the saint anew, and inter him in the coffin above ground, which had been prepared. Then the tears rushed down his cheeks, and he told them that the place where the body had been taken would soon be filled again. The words were prophetic. On the 6th of May following the speaker himself died, after a long and a painful illness, and in accordance with his earnest desire, as he deprecated a sudden death. The monks laid his body under Cuthbert's coffin (Bed. H. E. iv. 30; Via S. Cath. cap. xlii. xiiii.; Symeon, Hist. Eccl. Dun. i. 11).
The memory of Eadberht was dear to the “family” of Lindisfarne, and in their enforced wanderings they carried about with them his remains, together with those of their great patron. At Durham, where they finally rested, the bones of Eadberht occupied one of the little vats of relics with which Cuthbert’s body was surrounded (Sivon Poem de Svit: Danemâc; Hist. Transil. S. Cuthberti, ed. Surtees Soc. 191; Symeon, Hist. Eccl. Dumn., ii. 18). When Cuthbert’s tomb was opened in 1827 some of these relics were discovered in it. Eadberht has a place in the calendar on May 6. (Cf. Acta SS. Boll. 6 Maii, ii. 107–8.) There is a short account of Eadberht derived from Bede in MS. Cotton, Julius, A. x. 93–4. [J. R.]

EADBERHT (6), bishop of Dunwich. [ALDBERT (1).]

EADBERHT (7) (EADBERT, FIDIBERT, Wharton, Epp. Lond. p. 20; ALDBERT), the ninth bishop of London (M. H. B. 617). He is probably the “Eudberchus,” whose name occurs among the attestations of the legatine council of 787 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461), and, as two bishops of this name are attested at the date of Offa at the council of Brentford in 781 (Kemble, C. D. 145; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 439), it is probable that he became bishop between 772, when his predecessor Wighest was living (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 402), and the year 780. Endgar, his successor, was bishop in 788. Eadberht would, if these limits are correct, be bishop of London at the time of the foundation of the archiepiscopate of Lichfield.

EADBERHT (8) (Kemble, Coll. Diplom. 992, A.D. 683; 995, A.D. 892), bishop. [EADBERHT (7).] [C. H.]

EADBERHT (9), abbot of Reculver. To him about the year 747 a grant of land at Berhamstede (Berstow) was made by Eardulf king of Kent. (Kemble, C. D. 1005.) The name appears as Henberht in Monast. Angl. 1. 454, 455.

EADBERHT (10), a Mercian abbat, who attested a charter of Offa, dated in 774 (Kemble, C. D. 121), in which land is granted at Heaham (Higham) to archbishop Jacobert.

EADBERHT (11), an abbot of the diocese of Sherborn, who attested the acts of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.)

EADBERHT (12), a priest of the diocese of Leicester, who attested the acts of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.) The name is common to three other priests who attended the same council from the dioceses of Elam, Dunwich, and Selby. (Ib.)

EADBERT (1) (Alcuin, Carm. 289, Opp. ii. 240, ed. Froben.), bishop of Lindisfarne. [EADBERHT (5).] [C. H.]

EADBERT (2), king of Kent, son of Wihtred, and brother of Ethelbert and Alric, whom Bede (B. E. c. 28) mentions as Wihtred’s heirs. At the witagemot of Bescanced (696–716) there appears among the attestations “signum Aethelberthi pro se et fratrem suo Eadbarto,” from which it would seem probable that Eadbert was the second son. According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (M. H. B., p. 380) Eadbert succeeded Wihtred in 725 and died in 748. Withred’s death is fixed by Bede to April 23, 725, and it would seem probable from charters that the brothers, or at least Eadbert and Ethelbert, then began to reign conjointly. Thus, besides the evidence afforded by charters of Ethelbert as king dated in 732 and 740 (Kemble, C. D. 77, 80), in a charter dated April 738 Ethelbert grants ten ploughlands at Hohgild to Andscobesham to the church of Rochester (K. C. D. 85), and the grant is confirmed by Ethelbert; another charter of Eadbert, dated 747, is a grant from the port dues at Fordwich to the church of Reculver (S. 1004), which appears in a genuine charter of Ethelbert dated 741 (S. 80) as a grant of that king. In a third grant, however, Eadbert seems by himself to give fisheries at Limenes to Christ Church, Canterbury. (Kemble, C. D. 1003.) The last document, in its present form, is spurious, as it identifies Eadberht with his namesake and contemporary, the king of Northumbria, Eadbertain Exitage; and the other two are of questionable authority. If this last charter is genuine, the death of Eadberht in the Chronicle and by Florence of Worcester be accepted, all the later charters in which the name appears must be assigned to another Eadbert; on this point the evidence of historians is both weak and conflicting. Florence of Worcester in his Chronicle (M. H. B. 643) makes Ethelbert succeed Eadbertain in 748 and die in 760 (C. 544), whilst in the Gesta regum (S. 635) he makes Ethelbert succeed Wihtred, and Eadbert, whom he confounds with Eadbert Praen, succeed Ethelbert. William of Malmesbury assigns to the three brothers successive reigns, Eadbert twenty-three, Ethelbert eleven, and Alric thirty-four years; a computation which agrees with that of the Chronicle of Florence so far as concerns the two elder brothers, but would give an inordinately long life to Alric, whom also he represents as conquered by Offa in 774. (G. R. lib. i. 15; ed. Hardy, p. 24.) The Canterbury writers and the charters of St. Augustine’s add a new element of confusion. According to Elmhelm, Eadbertain, in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, which he makes coincide with the year 760 and the archiepiscopate of Bregwin, bestowed land at Mengham on St. Augustine’s (Elmhelm, ed. Hardwicke, p. 319), and the same year confirmed to the abbess Sigeburga a grant which had been made by Ethelbald king of Mercia. (Ib. 322.) The king’s death is also dated in 761 and it is added that he was buried at Reculver (S. 324), Ethelbert being his successor and reigning only one year. It is obvious that the chronology is here constructed to agree with the charters; the writer was conscious of the difficulty, and tried to correct the supposed misstatement of the Chronicle; but he follows William of Malmesbury in ascribing to Alric the third brother a reign that ends in 795. (Ib. 337.) In this confusion it would seem most reasonable to set the reign of Alric aside altogether, and to take the evidence of Eadbertain’s charters rather than that of William of Malmesbury; to accept the year 762 for the death of Ethelbert [ETHELBERT (2)], and to suppose that any genuine grants, if such there be, which bear the name of
EADBERT

Eadbert later than 762 were issued by some other Eadbert, who, in the anarchic condition of Kent, may have risen to power. Such would be the grant of king Sigwine to bishop Eadulf, dated 762, and confirmed by Eadbert (Kemble, C. D. 110; Mon. Angl. i. 162); that of Offa to Rochester dated 764, and attested by king Hebert (K. C. D. 111), and two undated grants by Ecgbert to Rochester, also attested by Hebert. (7b. 113, 160.) The great uncertainty as to the true date of Eadbert’s death makes it impossible to refer any important events of English history to his reign; Elmham, however, accuses him of burning the town by the command of Archbishop Cahtbert attempted to deprive St. Augustine’s of the privilege of the archiepiscopal burials. (P. 317.)

EADBERT (3) king of Kent, referred to in the preceding article, seems to reign conjointly with Egbert in 765. (Kemble, C. D. 113.) In another charter in which Doria is mentioned as bishop of Rochester (K. C. D. 160), and which therefore must be dated between 765 and 785, Eadbert (under the form Henberht) subscribes an act of Egbert. Nothing more is known about him, unless, which is difficult to suppose, he was identical with Eadbert Pena.

EADBERT (4) PRAEN, king of Kent, a member of the royal house of Kent and a kinsman of Egbert of Wessex. (H. Hunt. M. H. B. 733; cf. Chr. L. A.D. 923; M. H. B. 343.) Although he was in holy orders, he had been perhaps ordained in order to disqualify him for the Kentish crown, he obtained, after the death of Offa, the support of a great part of Kent, and made himself king. Notwithstanding the hostility of Kuenulf king of Mercia, and of archbishop Ethelhard, who enlisted pope Leo III. against him as an apostate priest, he maintained his position for three years. As these years must be computed from the death of Offa they fall in 795, 796, and 797; in the last of which Eadbert Pena was taken prisoner by Kuenulf, who ordered his eyes to be put out and his hands to be cut off. Kuenulf then annexed Kent as a subject kingdom to Mercia, and placed it under the government of king Cuthred. (Sim. Dun. M. H. B. 670; H. Hunt. ib. 732, 733, 734.) If the tradition of the abbey of Winchelcumb rests on any authority Eadbert Pena survived his overthrow for many years, and on the occasion of the dedication of that monastery in 811, recorded by William of Malmsbury (G. P. ed. Hamilton, p. 294; G. R. ed. Hardy, lib. i. § 85), was unannounced by Kuenulf. During his short reign he struck coins bearing his name, “Eadbirt rex,” and those of four different moneys, Babba, Ethelmod, Juenerht and Thidren. (Hawks., Silver Coins of England, pp. 32, 33.)

Several interesting points might be raised respecting Eadbert Pena. The origin of his surname is unknown. His relation to the Aescings is obscure, and his political career may be read in two ways. It is even possible that he was identical with the Eadbert whose name appears in the charters of 762 and later years [EADBERT (5)], and that having been deposed in one of the struggles of the time, he may have been condemned to the touscure. As he was a kinsman of Ethlmand, father of Egbert king of Wessex, who reigned in Kent in 786, he probably belonged to a branch which represented the West Saxons as opposed to the Mercian interest in Kent; and as archbishop Ethelhard was altogether under the influence of Kuenulf, he had ably been a nominee of Offa, his opposition to Eadbert Pena was no doubt as much political as ecclesiastical. We may then infer that Eadbert, instead of being a mere adventurer, was the champion of Kentish independence; such a conclusion is warranted by the words of Henry of Huntingdon, who, following some lost authority (or perhaps the Chronicle, M. H. B. 343), describes the deposition of Eadbert as an unjust act. (M. H. B. 733.) A great deal of light is thrown on this side of the subject by the letters of Alcuin. In one he entreats Ethelhard not to desert his church (Mon. Alcuin. ep. 44, p. 265; H. and S. iii. 495), and mentions that he has written to Offa to defend him. Although Eadbert is not mentioned by name the letter suggests that his schemes had been in preparation before Offa’s death. In another letter Alcuin writes to the nobles and clergy of Kent, urging them to recall Eadbert, and warns them of the evils of discord, alleging that the ancient lines of the kings had nearly become extinct. (Mon. Alcuin, ed. Jaffé, p. 369; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 509–511.) Although we cannot accept 795 as the date of the death of King Alric, to which Alcuin might seem to refer, it is probable that the direct line of succession was quite extinct before the West Saxon Ethel- mund became king in 786. In 795 Leo III. writing to Kuenulf says that he has superintended the deposition of Eadbert, “qua nos de clerico illo apostata qui ascenderat in regnum, similem illum deputasset Juliano Parbatasae, anathematizantes abijcimus, salutem animae ejus procurantes,” and promises that if the pretender still holds out he will issue letters to the whole nation of Britain to rise and expel him. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 524.) It is clear, therefore, that Eadbert was no ordinary rebel; but the obscurity that hangs over the Kentish succession cannot now be penetrated. The mistake of Florence, by which Eadbert Pena is confused with the earlier king, son of Wihtred, has been noticed [EADBERT (1)].

EADBERT (5) (EADBURGH), king of Northumbria, son of Æsta, and cousin of “the most glorious Ceolwulf,” whom he succeeded a.d. 737 (Cont. Bed. in M. H. B. 288 n.). His brother Egbert became archbishop of York two years earlier. Eadberht was a very able ruler, and added largely to the dignity and extent of his dominions. Symeon tells us that he won the admiration and the friendship of the Angles, Picts, Britons, and Scots, and that Pepin, king of France, regarded him with respect, and sent him various king-like gifts (Hist. Eccl. Dom. ii. 2). In a.d. 740, whilst Eadberht was attacking the Picts, a part of his kingdom was ravaged by Ethelbald king of Mercia (Chronol. apud Bedan). In a.d. 750 he took from the Britons of Strathclyde the district of Kyle in Ayrshire, which had formerly belonged to Northumbria (id.). In the same year Eadberht came into violent collision with the officers of the church of Lindisfarne. Symeon gives a somewhat different account of the occurrence in his History of the Church of Durham (ii, cap. 2) from that which is recorded in the chronicle ascribed to him.
EADBERT
(p. 19, ed. Surtees Soc.). It appears that Offa, son of Aldfrid, a man of royal descent, took sanctuary in Lindisfarne at St. Cuthbert's shrine, from whence he was forcibly taken by his foes and killed. In connexion with this outrage, Cynewulf, bishop of Lindisfarne, was imprisoned by Eadbert at Bambridg, and the charge of his diocese was intrusted for a time to Fritho bert bishop of Hexham. It seems probable that the king was offended with Cynewulf for giving protection to the fugitive, who, if he was a son of king Aldfrith, may possibly have been looked upon by Eadbert as a rival.

In A.D. 756 Eadbert met with a great reverse. He made an alliance with his former enemies, the Picts, and joined Uungs their king in an expedition to Alcestrœ, where the Britons surrendered to him. But a few days subsequently, on the 10th of August, his army was routed and destroyed between Ouana and Nivanbürig (Symeon, Hist. Regnum, 20). Mr. Hodgson Hinde was of opinion that these places were Loch Duan and Newburgh in Perthshire. Mr. Skene, however, prefers Newburgh in Northumberland.

In A.D. 757 pope Paul I. wrote to Eadbert, stating that abbot Forcdred had complained to him of his taking away three monasteries which had been granted to him by a certain abbess, Staninggarve (Stonegrave), Cohawalla (Cowxold) and Donasmethe (Jarrow), and giving them to the patrician Moll (possibly Ethelwald Moll), who is spoken of as "frater ejus," a layman. The pope asks him to make restitution (Wilkins, i. 145; cf. ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 394).

Two years after this disaster, and perhaps in consequence of it, Eadbert voluntarily resigned his throne in behalf of his son Osulf, and adopted the religious life. Symeon tells us that the other English kings tried to prevent him by promising to surrender a portion of each of their kingdoms for the augmentation of Northumbria, if he would continue to preside over it (Hist. Eccl. Dan. ii. 3). They pleaded in vain. Eadbert retired to the munster of York, of which his brother Egbert was the head, and there spent ten years. He died on Aug. 19, 768, and was buried in the cathedral in the same porch (or chapel) in which Egbert had been laid two years earlier (Saxon Chron. sub anno).

The two brothers possessed a mint at York, at which they coined stycas, the little copper coins which were peculiar to Northumbria. They show the legend of the king on one side, and the archbishop on the other. Several types have been discovered, which used to be erroneously ascribed to Eadbert of Kent.[r.]

EADBERT (5) (Eadbirt), the first bishop of the South Saxons. He was abbot of the monastery founded by Wilfrid at Selæ; and when, under the administration of Daniel bishop of Winchester and Forthere bishop of Sherborne, the South Saxons were detached from the West Saxon dioceses, Eadbert was consecrated bishop of the new see. This event took place after the death of Aldhelm (A.D. 709), and is commonly dated in 711. (Matt. Paris, ed. Luard, i. 323.) The attestation of Eadbert is found attached to the act of the council of Clovesho, A.D. 716, by which the privilege of Withred was confirmed (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300); his name is likewise found in the attestations of charters of Nuna king of Sussex, which in their present condition are of uncertain date and questionable authenticity. (Kemble, C. D. 955, 1000, 1001.) The name "Eadburtus abbis" attached to a spurious charter of Caedwalla, dated 888, was probably intended to denote this person (ib. No. 994). William of Malmesbury, by a curious mistake, represents Eadbert as consecrated by archbishop Nothhelm. (G. P. lib. ii. § 96.) He and his successor Eola were both dead before Bede closed his history. (H. E. v. 18.)[s]

EADBERT (8), one of the East Anglian bishops at the time of Bede's death, according to Florence and Simeon, whose general narrative at that point is based upon the account in Bede (H. E. v. 23), Aldbert however, not Eadbert, being the name in Bede. All three mention the two East Anglian bishops (Heathelac being the second, in which they agree) without assigning their respective sees, whereas Wenvower gives Eadbert to Elmham and Heathelac to Dunwich. The ancient lists however (M. H. B. 618), which are of supreme authority to Wenvower, assign "Albertus" (if he be the same) to Dunwich. There is evidently much obscurity as to the succession in Elmham and Dunwich at that period, as to which, vid. ALDBERT (1), and Stubbs, Regist. Sacr. 168. (Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 731 in M. H. B. 542 b; Sim. Dun. G. R. U. in M. H. B. 657 c; Wond. F. H. ann. 731, ed. Coxe.)

EADBERT (9), the fifth bishop of the Middle Angles at Leicester. (M. H. B. 624.) He was consecrated according to the northern chronological preserved by Simeon of Durham, in 704. (M. H. B. 663.) His name is found attached to the charters of the Mercian kings from 707 to 781, and, as his successor Unwona appears among the prelates at the legatine council of 787, his death probably took place between 781 and 787. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 436; W. Malmsb. p. 7; Kemble, C. D. 116, 120, 121, 126, 129, 131, 134, 137, 143, &c, &c.)

EADBERT (10) (Kemble, Cod. Dip. 139), bishop, see unnamed, witnesses a charter of Offa king of Mercia, reckoned spurious or doubtful by Kemble, Sept. 22, 780. His name occurs next to that of the archbishop. [EADBIRHT (7).]

EADBERT (11) (Ricard. Hagulst. cap. 18, ed. cap. 19 EADBIRHT; Tswysden, col. 299, 300; ed. Raina, pp. 41, 42; Wond. F. H. ann. 800, ed. Coxe), bishop of Hexham. [EADBIRHT.]

EADBERT (12), according to Wenvower a bishop of London, who died A.D. 802, and was succeeded by EADGAR (Wond. F. H. ann. 802, ed. Coxe). He is possibly intended for Heathelbert, the thirteenth bishop. [EADBIRHT]

EADBIRHT, a bishop whose name is attached to a charter of Nuna king of the South Saxons, granting him lands, A.D. 725 (Kemble, C. D. 1000). [EADBIRHT (7).]

EADBIRTH (Nenn. Hist. in Mon. Hist. Brit. 75 b), EADBIRHT (Flor. Wig. Chron. ann.
EADBOLD (A. S. C. ann. 633 in M. H. B. 309), king of Kent. [EADBALD (1).] [C. H.]


EADBRYHT (3), bishop, see unnamed, attesting a charter of archbishop Ethelward, considered spurious or doubtful by Kemble, A.D. 798. (Kemble, C. D. 1018.) Probably bishop of London. [EADBERT (10).] [C. H.]

EADBRITH (Wend.F.H. ann. 675, ed. Cox), bishop of London, succeeding Wiger, i.e. Wided. He is the Aiderbirht, ninth bishop, of Stubbs’s Registr. Sacr. 159.

EADBURG (Gaimar, Estoire, v. 2066; M. H. B. 789), queen of Wessex, daughter of Olf king of Mercia. [EADBOLI (1).]

EADBURG (1), daughter of Olf, and queen of the West Saxons. She is mentioned by Olf in a grant to Chertsey abbey, dated 787, together with his wife Cynethritha, his son Egfrith, and his daughters Ethelberga, Ethelfleda, and Ethelswitha. (Kemble, C. D. 151.) In 789 (Chr. S. 787) Eadburga was married to Britric, king of Wessex, who thus obtained the protection of Olf. According to Asser (M. H. B. 471), that says that he heard the story from king Alfred, and no doubt preserved the tradition of the West Saxon royal family, Eadburga was extremely jealous of any one who had influence with her husband, and altogether unscrupulous in the use she made of the sword or poison to get rid of her rivals. On one occasion she prepared poison for one of the favours, whose dismissal she had failed to secure; Britric drank the poison and left Eadburga a widow in the year 802. (Chr. S. 800.) As the West Saxons would not tolerate her continuance in the kingdom, she fled to the continent, and took refuge with the emperor. Charles on the occasion of her reception, jestingly gave her the choice between himself and his son. Eadburga replied: “If the choice is given me, I choose your son, inasmuch as he is the younger.” Charles answered: “If you had chosen me you should have had my son; as you have chosen my son you shall have neither.” He gave her, however, a monastery, over which she presided as abbess, but having been unchaste she was expelled, and died after having beggad alms daily, attended by a single servant, in the streets of Pavia. (Asser, M. H. B. 471, 472; Flor. Wig. 546, 552; Sim. Dun. 673.) In consequence of Eadburga’s misconduct the West Saxons refused to give the title of queen to the wives of their kings, a rule which was first broken when Judith, the wife of Ethelwulf, was crowned by Hincmar at Verberie. (Asser, p. 741; Ann. Bertin. ap. Pertz, i. 450; cf. Will. Malmesb. G. R. lib. ii. § 113.) [S.]

EADBURGA (2) (Bonif. Epp. in Monument. pp. 53, 84, 98, 211, 212, 214; Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 475), abbess of Minster in Thanet. [BUGA (3).]

EADBURGA (3), abbess of Repton; daughter of Eadulf [ALDWULF], king of the East Angles; called also Ethelburga (Wallisford, ap. Gale, p. 528), Aedberga, Aetberga, and Redburga (Ld. Elensa. p. 25), Aegburga (V. S. Guthlac; A.A. 86. G. S. sacc. iii. pt. 1, p. 270). After having lived as a nun for a number of years she became abbess of Hrepsundun or Repton towards the close of the 7th century. She is recorded to have sent to St. Guthlac a leaden coffin with a shroud for his burial, and to have asked him to foretell his successor. Guthlac described her as a person who was still a pagan, but would shortly be baptized, a prophecy which was fulfilled in Cista, who succeeded him. (Vit. S. Guthlac; Hist. Elensa. lib. i. c. 7; ed. Stewart, p. 26.) (Bromton, ap. Twyden, v. 797.) Another Eadburga, who is said to have been a nun at Aylesbury, and to have given her name to the village of Edbury, is called a daughter of Redwald of East Anglia; but she seems altogether mythical. (See Hardy, Cat. Mat. Brit. Hist. i. 476.) [S.]

EADBURGA (4), the second in the list of the abbesses of St. Peter’s, Gloucester. According to the “Historia” of that monastery she was the widow of Wulfhere king of Mercia, and received benefaction from St. Egwin in 710; is the 15th (or 25th) year of her abbacy she died, and was succeeded by bishop Wilfrid. (Another, A.D. 735. (Hist. Glosn. ed. Hart, i. 6, 7; Mon. Anglii, i. 532, 542.) This story is scarcely reconcilable with the history of St. Eorlend, who is likewise described as wife of Wulfhere [EORLMIELD]; and the authority on which it rests is scarcely worth consideration. It is, however, possible that Eorlend may have left her husband to become a nun, and that Eadburga was a later wife. [S.]


EADBYRHT (1) (MSS. in Hardy, Deor. Cat. i. 365), bishop of Lindisfarne. [KADBEIRT (5).] [C. II.]

EADBYRHT (2) (Ithelwerth, Chron. ii. 15 in M. H. B. 507 e, d), king of Northumbria [EADBEIRT (5).] [C. II.]
EADDA, bishop, see unnamed, who attests a charter of Ethelward subregulus of the Hwiccii, a.d. 706. (Kemble, C. D. 56.) [Hedd.; Heada.] [C. H.]

EADFERD FLESARUS (Nenni, Hist. in m. H. B. 76 A), king of Northumbria. [Ethelefrid (1).] [J. R.]

EADFIRD (Hist. Nennii in m. H. B. 75 b), son of Edwin king of Northumbria. [Eaefrid (1).] [C. H.]

EADBRD (Eadfrith), a son of Edwin king of Northumbria and his first wife Coenburga, daughter of Ceall of Mercia. He was born whilst his father was in exile, prior to his accession to the throne. With the rest of the royal family he became a Christian, and was baptized by Paulinus (Bed. H. E. ii. 14). In A.D. 633, after the death of his father at Haethfelth, Eadfrid was obliged to take refuge with Penda king of Mercia by whom he was treacherously put to death (id. ii. 20). [J. R.]

EADFRID (2) (Eadfrith), bishop of Lindisfarne from A.D. 698 to 721 (Flor. Wigorn. i. 45, 50). There is little known of him except in connection with his monastery. There is a single letter addressed to him by Alhelin abbate of Malmsbury on his return from Ireland. It is written in the uncouth Latinity of the period, and is of trifling importance (Epp. Hib. Syll. iv. 13; Aldhelm, cd. Giles, 90–95).

Eadfrid’s chief mission in life was to spread the fame and glory of his great predecessor, Cuthbert. “Multum servas amore,” says Synoe, “rebuild the oratory on Farne island, where Cuthbert had lived, and Fuldige then being its occupant (Synoe, H. E. D. i. 11).

But he did more than this. He was an artist of no common skill, and wrote and illustrated the famous Evangelarium, known as the Durham book, or Lindisfarne Gospels, which is one of the most beautiful MSS. in Europe. Eadfrid probably commenced it during Cuthbert’s lifetime, whilst he was a monk at Lindisfarne, and it was afterwards laid by the scribe as an offering upon the shrine of the saint. Ethelwald, Eadfrid’s successor in the see, gave the cover, which Bilfrid decorated with silver and gold set with precious stones, and Aldred added an interlinear gloss. This volume was henceforward one of the most precious treasures of Lindisfarne.

When the monks were obliged to flee before the Danes they took it with them. On one occasion, in the 9th century, it had a wonderful escape. The monks were trying in vain to cross over the channel to Ireland, when the Gospels fell into the sea (Synoe, Hist. Eccl. Danelm. ii. 12). After three days they discovered the book to their great delight on the coast of Whithern, uninjured, save by a few stains of seas-water, which it still shews. When the monks rested at length at Durham, and Lindisfarne was restored, the volume went back to its old home, and there it stayed until the Dissolution. It was called in the Inventories of the House ‘Liber S. Cuthberti qui demersus est in mare.’ After a while it passed into the hands of Robert Bowyer, clerk of the House of Commons, from whom it was acquired by Sir Robert Cotton. It is now among the Cottonian MSS. in the British Museum, Nero D. 4. The text of these Gospels, with their invaluable Anglo-Northumbrian gloss, has been edited for the Surtensis Society by Messrs. Stevenson and Waring. A more exact rendering has been made for the Syndics of the University of Cambridge by Messrs. Kemble and Hardwick, and since their deaths by Mr. Skene. The gloss has been printed by Karl Guterweck (Die vier Evangelien in altuordnungssprachischer Sprache, 800, 1857). The beauty of the writing and the exquisite illuminations are noticed by every writer on paleography, especially by Professor Westwood.

The writing of these Gospels was not Eadfrid’s only offering to Cuthbert’s memory. He took care that his good deeds were handed down to posterity. The nameless author of the first biography of Cuthbert dedicates his work to Eadfrid and the family at Lindisfarne, stating that he had written it at their desire (Appendix, Bede opp. cit. “De Cuthberto”), and that they had also the honour of evoking a greater boon to history, in inducing Bede to draw up his famous Life of the saint, in return for which Eadfrid promised that the writer should be duly remembered in the prayers of the house of Lindisfarne (Vita S. Cuthb. Prologus).

It can be no matter of surprise that the wandering Cuthbertines carried about with them the bones of Eadfrid, to whom their beloved saint had been so dear. The relics rested at last in Durham, in the shrine, where they were deposited in a little bag, and even now they have not wholly disappeared (Carmen de Situ Danelm. Hist. Translat. S. Cuthbl. 191; Synoe, Hist. Eccl. Danelm. ii. 6.)


EADGAR (1), the third bishop of the Lindisfar, or people of Lindsey (M. H. B. 924; Bed. H. E. iv. 19). His name is attached to an Evangel of the year 706 (Kemble, C. D. 157), and to the act of the council of Cloesfana in 716, by which the privilege of Whithred was confirmed (Haddan andStubbs, iii. 300). Before the year 731, where Bde closes his history, Edgar had been succeeded by Cynberct or Kinbert. (H. E. v. 23.) [S.]

EADGAR (2), the tenth bishop of London. (M. H. B. 617.) He is known only by the fact that his name appears in the ancient lists between those of Eadberht or Alderberht, and Coenwulf or Kenwulf, and in the attestation of a grant made by Offa to Rochester at a council at Cealhyth in 789 (Kemble, C. D. 157; see also 155; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 463). As Eadberht was alive in 727, and the episcopate of Coenwulf ended before 796, Edgar’s date must fall between those limits. [S.]

EADGAR (3), presbyter, who signs a charter of Coenwulf king of Mercia, a.d. 814. (Kemble, Cod. Dip. no. 206.) [C. H.]

EADGUIN (Nenni, in m. H. B. 74 c, 76 b), king of Northumbria. [Edguin.] [C. H.]
EADGYD, a nun of Barking, mentioned by Bede. (H. E. iv. 8.) She died on the plague of 664, after being thrice called by the boy Ascelin whilst he was dying. [S.]

EADHAETH (Bed. H. E. v. 24, Recapit. Chron. ann. 678 in M. H. B. 288 d), bishop of Lindsey. [EADHER.] [C. H.]

EADHAMAIR, Irish saint. [EDHAMAIR.]

EADHED, a priest of Oswy king of Northumbria, sent by him with Ceadda into Kent to seek episcopal ordination for the latter at the hands of Deusdred. This was in A.D. 664. Finding that Deusdred was dead, they went to bishop Wini, by whom Ceadda was consecrated. (Bed. H. E. iii. 28.) In A.D. 678, archbishop Theodore, at York, consecrated Eadhed bishop of Lindsey, that province having come under the rule of Egfrid of Northumbria (Bed. H. E. iv. 12; A. S. C. ann. 678). Soon afterwards Ethelred king of Mercia recovered the province of Lindsey, and Eadhed retired from it. He was then placed at Ripon. (Bed. ut sup.) [J. R.]

EADHERE, a priest of the diocese of Lichfield, who attended the council at Clovesho in 883. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 546.) [S.]

EADHOLAC (Chron. Marv. ann. 731), bishop of East Anglia. [HEATHOLAC.] [C. H.]

EADILBALE (Hist. Nennii, M. H. B. 75 a), king of Mercia, son of Alguin. [ETHERBALE (1).] [C. H.]

EADILFRID (Hist. Nennii, M. H. B. 76 b), king of Northumbria. [ETHERFRID.] [C. H.]

EADILIT (Hist. Nennii, M. H. B. 75 a), king of Mercia, son of Penda. [ETHERRED.] [C. H.]

EADRED (1) (Angl. Soc. i. 404), bishop of Dunwich. [EARDULF (3).] [C. H.]

EADRED (2) (HEARDRED, HEARDRED), was consecrated bishop of Hexham on Oct. 29, A.D. 797, at a place called Wudufordia. The consecrators were archbishop Egfrid and bishop Higbald (Saxon Chron.; Symeon, Chron. ed. Surtees Soc. 35). He died in A.D. 800, in the third year of his episcopate, of which there is nothing known (Symeon, ut supra, 38). [J. R.]

EADRED (3), a name common to two priests, one of the diocese of Leicester, the other of that of Sincaster, who attended the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.) [S.]

EADRIC (1), king of Kent, son of Egbert. On the death of his father, which took place in July, 673, Eadric was probably under age; anyhow his claim to the succession was set aside in favour of that of his uncle Hlothere, who occupied the throne from 673 to 685. During some part of this time Eadric was apparently admitted to a share of the royal dignity, but towards the close of his reign he ran into exile among the South Saxons, with whose aid he engaged in war with Hlothere. In the campaign Hlothere was wounded, and died under the hands of his surgeons, Feb. 6, 685. (Bede, H. E. iv. 26.) After his uncle's death, Eadric reigned for a year and a half, dying, according to Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 537), in 686; but the depositions given in the very ancient Annales Cantuarienses (Pertz, Scr. iv. 2) as Aug. 31, 687. He is probably identical with that Eadric whom William of Malmesbury (G. R. lib. i. § 34) calls king of the South Saxons and successor of Ethelwalh, who was killed by Caedwalla of Wessex in his attack of Sussex in 686. Eadric is mentioned by Hilton in a charter dated May, 679, in which he bestows lands in Thanet on abbot Berecwald with the consent of archbishop Theodore and of Ethric, his brother's son (Kemble, C. D. No. 16). It is possible, then, that his claim to share the throne was recognised thus early. The Textus Roffensis has preserved a short code of laws of sixteen articles, entitled, "These are the dooms which Hlothere and Eadric kings of the Kentishmen established," but containing no clauses of ecclesiastical interest (Thorpe, Ancient Laws, pp. 11-15). This would seem to prove that the relations of Eadric with his uncle had been for some time at least pacific. Kent was, during the whole period assigned to Hlothere and Eadric, in a very uneasy state; Ethelred of Mercia, Osywy of Northumbria, and Swibeheard, son of Sebbi of Essex, claimed, if the charters of the Kentish monasteries are at all to be trusted, the right of overlordship. A new share in the Kentish territory, and the enterprise of Mul and Caedwalla added a new element of trouble. Sussex was the place of refuge for discontented princes from both Kent and Wessex. It is just possible that Eadric in 686 had succeeded in uniting Kent and Sussex under his own sway; both kingdoms broke up after his death. Sussex was governed by two ealdormen, Aedelnoth and Berthun, who, after the death of Ethelwalh, had resisted Caedwalla, but now fell before him; and Kent was devastated, as Bede says, by foreign and doubtful kings, until Wibert, the brother of Eadric, succeeded in recovering the royal authority about the year 694 (Chr. S. M. H. B. 323). One charter granted by Eadric as sole king was preserved at St. Augustine's; in this he granted to that monastery lands near to Canterbury, adjacent to an estate which had been given by Hlothere; it is dated June, in the fourteenth indiction, which fixes it to 686 (Kemble, C. D. 27; Elpham, ed. Hardwick, p. 251; Thorn, ap. Twysden, c. 1770). According to Elpham, who asserts that he was killed by Mul and Caedwalla, he was buried at St. Augustine's (p. 252). William of Malmesbury, who likewise mentions his violent death, regarded the shortness of his reign as a punishment for the sin committed by his father Egbert against the rights of the children of Eormenred (G. R. lib. i. § 14). [S.]

EADRIC (2), the second abbott of St. Alban's (Gesta Abbatum, i. 8, 9; Monast. Angl. i. 179). He is not mentioned in any ancient authority and may be entirely mythical. According to the St. Alban's story, he was a kinsman of Offa, and was, in compliance with Offa's request that the abbots should withdraw out of the world, the first monk chosen to the abbacy after Offa's death in 796. He ruled his house discreetly, and maintained its rights when they were threatened by Egfrid. [S.]
EADULF (1) (Stubbs, Reg. Sac. pp. 5, 173), bishop of Rochester. [ALDULF (2)]

EADULF (2) (Stubbs, Reg. Sac. 168), bishop of Dunwich. [EADULF (3)]

EADULF (3) I. (ALDULF, EALDWULF), the sixth bishop of Lindsey (M. H. B. 625). He had served his predecessor Alwig as deacon, and was consecrated as his successor in 750 (Sim. Dun. in M. H. B. 662). The only charter to which his name is appended is a grant made by Cynwulf of Wessex to Bath in 758 (see Kemble, C. D. 193, where the date is wrongly given 808 instead of 758; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 396). He died in 765 (Sim. Dun. M. H. B. 663). The proper form of his name is unquestionably Eadulf.

EADULF (4) II. (EALDWULF), the eighth bishop of Lindsey (M. H. B. 625). He succeeded Cynwulf in 796, and ruled his diocese for forty years. He is probably the "Eadulfus" who is described as "Eboracensis humilis episcopus" in the profession of obedience made to archbishop Ethelhard of Canterbury (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 508), a document which was no doubt garbled to support the later claims of Canterbury over York. It is hard to see what such a bishop of York at the time, nor, although the profession is in other respects sound, was any claim of the sort as yet asserted for Canterbury. As Eadulf attests two charters of Egfrid of Mercia (Kemble, C. D. 170, 171, A.D. 769) as "electus," it is probable that he was consecrated by Ethelhard, but the rite may have been delayed by the fact that jurisdiction over Lindsey was just at this time claimed by the archbishop of Lichfield. Eadulf's signature is appended to acts of the council of Clovesho in 796 (Kemble, C. D. 175; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 515). He attended the synod of Clovesho in 803 with two abbots and four priests of his diocese (K. C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 540); and his name is attached to meretricious Mercian charters of the age and to the records of councils and synods. Of these the most important is that of Celicyth in 816 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579). He appears for the last time in 836. The proper form of his name seems to be Eadulf. Although he was bishop during the most trying period of Mercian history, nothing more of his personal action is to be discovered.

EADULF (5) (ALDULF), the fifteenth bishop of Lichfield (M. H. B. 626). He succeeded Higbert, probably at the time when Lichfield was reduced to the rank of a suffragan see; attended the council of Clovesho in 803 (Kemble, C. D. 1024), and subscribed Mercian charters from that year until 814. In 816 his successor Herewin attended the council of Celicyth, so that Eadulf died or resigned before that year. He is mentioned as the predecessor of Herew in the profession made by the bishop of Lichfield to archbishop Ceolnoth (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 614). If it were not that his name is authoritatively written Aldulf, it might be suggested that the profession of Eadulf referred to in the preceding article [EADULF (4)], was his. Much of the historic importance of this prelate is owing to the fact that William of Malmesbury, and most of the writers who followed him supposed Eadulf to be the archbishop of Lichfield who was appointed by Offa in 787 or 788, thus confounding him with Higbert his predecessor. Malmesbury may have been misled by further confusion between Aldulf of Lichfield and Aldulf bishop of Mayo, whose consecration is mentioned by Simeon of Durham under the year 784. This mistake, which perpetuated itself throughout the Fasti of the bishops, and even misled the learned Henry Wharton, was not cleared up until the publication of the Anglo-Saxon charters satisfactorily proved Higbert to have been the only archbishop of Lichfield. (See Will. Malmseb. G. F. ed. Hamilton, pp. 10, 208; Wharton, Ang. Sacra, i. 400.) [HIGBERT.]

EADULF (6) (EALDWULF, ALDULF), a South-Saxon dux or ealdorman, contemporary with Offa king of Mercia, and bishop Wlothun of Selsey, whose name appears in grants of lands in Sussex about the year 830 (Kemble, C. D. 1015, 1016). One of these is a gift to bishop Wlothun for a church of St. Andrew at Ferring, the other a gift to Selsey in the time of bishop Gislehere, who attests it. The latter is probably the earlier in date, as Gislehere was bishop in 780 and 781, and Wlothun from 789 to 805; but both share the general doubtful character of the Selsey charters.

EADULF (7) (EALDWULF), a priest of the diocese of Sidnaecaster, who signs the acts of the synod of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.)

EADUUNE (Ethelward, Chron. iii. 2 in M. H. B. 510 d), king of Northumbria. [EDWIN.]

EADUUNE (Kemble, Cord. Dip. 170, 171, 175, 183, 185, 190, 191, 217), bishop of Lindsey. [EADULF II.]

EADWAD (1) (Wend. Flor. Hist. ann. 665, 680), king of East Anglia. [ELDWULF.]

EADWAD (2), Wilfred's adopted son. [EADWALD.]

EADWARA, a British saint, sister of St. Ithwara, mentioned by Cressy (Ch. Hist. Brit. xxii. 8) from Capgrave's Vita S. Ithwar. In the 8th century (Rees, Welsh Saints, 321).


EADWULF (Kemble, Cord. Dip. 1023, of Kenulf, king of Mercia, a.d. 801), EADWULF (9. 1023, of Kenulf, a.d. 801; 1024, of archbishop Ethelhard, Oct. 12, 803; 188, of Ethelric king of Mercia, a.d. 804; 207, of Kenulf, a.d. 814), bishop of Lindsey. [EADULF III.]

EADWOLF (Wend. F. H. ann. 655, 680, ed. Cox), king of East Anglia. [ALDULF (1).]
EAFA, son of Eoapa and father of Ealhmund, king of Kent, the father of Egbert of Wessex. (Ch. S. M. H. B. 348.)

EEHPFRID, an Anglo-Saxon scholar who studied in Ireland, and to whom on his return Aldhelm wrote a curious letter, in which he tries to exhibit the scholarship of Theodore and the Canterbury school as greatly superior to the Irish. (Aldhelm, Opp. ed. Giles, pp. 91-95.) He is possibly identical with Echfrith abbot of Glastonbury [ECHFRITH], or with Eadfrid bishop of Lindisfarne [EADFRID (2)].

EALCHEARDUS, bishop, see unnamed, who attests a charter of Offa king of Mercia, believed spurious or doubtful by Kemble, a.d. 793. (Kemble, C. D. 162.) [ALHEARD] [C. H.]

EALDBALD (Nenn. Hist. Brit. cap. 66, in M. H. B. 74 c), king of Kent. [EALDBALD (1).] [C. H.]

EALDBEOORCH, one who at the conclusion of a letter from Egberga to archbishop Boniface who doubt the penman of it, describes himself as panopelus Christi. He salutes Boniface affectionately in his own name, and claims his prayers on the ground of old friendship. (Munum. Magunt. ed. Jaffe, p. 66.) [C. H.]


EALDEL (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1574, in M. H. B. 780), EALDEL (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1574, in M. H. B. 780), abbot of Malmesbury and bishop of Sherborn. [EALDELH.] [C. H.]

EALDÆPERTH (Ethelweard, Chron. ii. 11, in M. H. B. 507 a), king of Northumbria, ob. a.d. 705. [EALDÆPERTH.] [C. H.]

EALDFRITH (1), king, who witnesses a charter of Ealdwulf of Sussex, a.d. 791, signing last and after Offa king of Mercia. (Kemble, C. D. 1016.) [C. H.]

EALDFRITH (2) (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1500 in M. H. B. 782), king of Northumbria, brother of Egfrid. [EALDFRITH.] [C. H.]

EALDFRIH (Bed. v. 18, Saxon version, Smith's Beda, p. 635, 18), son of Oswy. [EALDFRIH.] [C. H.]

EALDULF (1) (Wend. F. H, ann. 732), bishop of Rochester. [EALDULF (2).] [C. H.]

EALDULF (2) (Kemble, C. D. 203, charter of Kenulf), EALDULPH (Flor. Wig. Nom. Præsid. Lindisf. in M. H. B. 629), bishop of Lindsey. [EALDULF (4).] [C. H.]

EALDMUND, EALDULF (3), South Saxon alderman [EALDULF (4).]


EALDWULF (1) (Flor. Wig. Nom. Præsid. Lindisf. in M. H. B. 625 a), bishop of Lindsey. [EALDWULF I. bishop of Lindsey.] [C. H.]

EALDWULF (2) (Kemble, Cod. Dip. 1023, charter of Kenulf, a.d. 801), bishop of Lindsey. [EALDWULF II.] [C. H.]


EALDWULF (2) (Kemble, C. D. 1015, a.d. 791 in 1016, cir. A.D. 791), king of Sussex. [C. H.]

EALDWULF (3), bishop of Rochester. [Aldulf (5).]

EALFRID (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1588 in M. H. B. 783), king of Northumbria, died at Drifeld. [AELFRITH.] [C. H.]

EALHEARD, EALHEARD, bishop, see unnamed, who attests charters of Offa king of Mercia, a.d. 789, 790. (Kemble, C. D. 157, 159.) [EALHEARD.] [C. H.]

EALHEARD, a deacon whose attestation is appended to a spurious charter of Kenulf of Mercia in 799. (Kemble, C. D. 177.) [B]

EALHLPÆDE (Bed. H. E. iii. 21, sat. transl. in Smith's Beda, p. 550, 42), daughter of Oswy, wife of Peada of Mercia. [AELHPÆDE.] [C. H.]

EALHFRITH (Bed. H. E. iii. 14, 21, sat. transl. in Smith's Beda, p. 539. 19, 551-5), son of Oswy. [AELFRITH.] [C. H.]

EALHMUND (1), king of Kent, son of Eaf and father of Egbert afterwards king of Wessex. His reign in Kent is fixed by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in 784 (rightly 786). The same year, 784, is given as the date of a charter (Kemble, C. D. 1015), in which he grants to abbot Wetred, and the monastery of Reculver, twelve hides of land in Scildwine, and that is all that is distinctly known about him; but it is possible that the Ænamundus rex who is company with archbishop Bregwin confirms a grant of Sigiræd to Rochester (Kemble, C. D. 114), before 706, may be identical with Ealhmund. It may further he conjectured that he was one of the many kings of divisions of Kent who sprung up after the main line of the Aescings was extinct; and that, as his son Egberht is spoken of as a kineman of Eadberht Pæn (H. Hunt. M. H. B. 733), he was an earlier champion of the national party in Kent opposed to the supremacy of Mercia. [See EORBERT (4) and EADBERHT PÆN.] [S]
EALHMUND

EALHMUND (2) (Kemble, C. D. 1018, a.d. 798, marked by Kemble doubtful or spurious), intended for Alhmund bishop of Winchester, who was not consecrated until 802. (Stubb's, Reg. Soc. 9, 16.)

[C. II.]

EALHMUND (3), abbat, attests a charter of Offa king of Mercis, A.D. 789. (Kemble, Cod. Dip. No. 155; Birch, Fasti Monast. p. 68.)

[C. II.]

EALHUN, a priest of Canterbury, who attested a charter of archbishop Wulfred, dated 811. (Kemble, C. D. 195.)

[5]

EALHWINE (Lapp. Hist. Eng. i. 181), [ALHWINE.][AULCHIN.]

EALRED (Wend. F. H. ann. 773, ed. Cox), king of Northumbria. [AULCHRED.] [C. II.]

EAMBERCH, archbishop of York. [EGBERT.]

EANBALD I. (EANBALD), the pupil and the successor of Albert in the see of York. It is probable that he was brought up in the minster under the charge of Egbert and Albert, and, winning their regard, in due time became a teacher himself. Albert showed his regard for Eanbal and Alcuin by making them the keepers or masters of the fabric of the new minster which he built. In the last years of his life Albert, according to the old Celtic custom, practically nominated Eanbal his successor by making him his coadjutor in the see about the year a.d. 780. In this capacity he was associated with Albert in his last public act, the dedication of his new cathedral. (Acuin, de SS. Fict. Ebor.)

Eanbal succeeded Albert in a.d. 782, and Alfwold, king of Northumbria, took immediate steps to procure for him the pall. (Sixon Chron.; Symeon, Chron. ed. Surtees Soc. 26.). Alcuin, at his old friend's request, went to Rome to bring it. (Vita Alcuini, ed. Jaffé.) As he was returning with it he met Charlemagne at Parma, who exerted from him a promise that he would come and stay with him in France if he could gain the consent of his own king and archbishop. In a little while the desire of Charles was realised. Alcuin, on his return to York, obtained the permission that was required, and went to France accompanied by some of his most distinguished scholars—Wizo, Frigidusius, and Sigulf. The result of this visit was the establishment of a system of universities, or higher schools, in France, Germany, and Italy.

In a.d. 786 was held a great council of the Northumbrian church, before the legates George and Theophylact, at which Eanbal and his suffragans and king Alfwold were present. (Stubb's and Haddan, ill. 444, etc.; Alcuin, Letters, ed. Jaffé, 155, etc.)

The state of Northumbria during Eanbal's archiepiscopate was very long unsatisfactory. King after king was murdered or dethroned, and all the foundations of society were so violently shaken that it would be impossible for the church and school of York to make their influence properly felt. Alcuin did his best to restore peace and order. He had gone to France soon after Albert's death to assist Charlemagne in his educational work, but he came home to Northumbria in a.d. 790 to lend the king and Eanbal a helping hand. (Ep. ed. Jaffé, 170-1, 174-5.) It was all in vain. The disorder was so great that a short while after the great scholar left Eanbal and York and went back to France, where the rest of his life was passed.

In a.d. 795 Eanbal's name was inscribed on the Domesday Book into Northumbria added largely to the misery of the kingdom. The famous house of Lindisfarne was devastated by the marauders, who made an attempt upon Jarrow in the following year. These were only the beginnings of such troubles, but they cast dismay upon the northern church. Alcuin, from his home in France, wrote more than one warning letter to king Ethelred (Ep. 180-90); he consolled Higbald of Lindisfarne for his loss, and promised to use his good offices with Charlemagne for the restoration of the captives (id. 190-4); he spoke many kind words of comfort and hope to the brethren of Wearmouth and Jarrow (Ep. 196-201); he impressed upon all the absolute necessity of union in the face of so savage a foe.

In a.d. 795 great efforts were made by Eanbal and the church of York to bring Alcuin back to England. It seems to have been Eanbal's intention, like his predecessor, to retire from his charge, and it was no doubt the general wish that Alcuin should succeed him. Alcuin gives his Northumbrian friends good advice, and speaks of them with the utmost affection (Ep. 249-56), but manifests no eagerness to return. In a letter to Eanbal he begs that if he is determined to resign there may be a free choice of a successor in the hands of the chapter; and upon the chapter itself he impresses unanimity and the avoidance of simony in a fresh election (id. 257-8, 290-1). Eanbal's idea, if seriously entertained at all, was never carried out. His last official act was the coronation of Eadulf, king of Northumbria, on 25th of June, a.d. 796. On the 10th of August the archbishop died at a monastery called Etlete or Etlete (Symeon, Chron. p. 34). T. Stubb's (col. 1697) calls it Aetece. It may possibly be Etmer (Leeds), where there was a monastery in Bede's time. Eanbal's remains were interred with those of his predecessor in York. Alcuin, writing after his death to Ano, archbishop of Salzburg, solicits his prayers for Eanbal, who was, he says, "mihi pater et frater et amicus fidelissimus, etiam et condiscipulos sub magistro meo." (Ep. p. 324.)

There are silver and copper coins of Eanbal in existence struck by him during his archiepiscopate.

[J. B.]

EANBALD II. (EANBALD, HEANBALD, EANTBALD), archbishop of York, following Eanbal I. Our information of him, which extends only through a period of about twelve years, is derived chiefly from the epistles of Alcuin; and among the historians we are the most indebted to Simeon of Durham. Eanbal was trained in the school of York, where he was a favourite pupil of Alcuin. His name first occurs in the correspondence of Alcuin in the latter days of Eanbal I. Alcuin in an epistle to the brethren of the church of York (ep. 6. ed. Froben) speaks of having received their letter through the presbyter Eanbal, and Froben, dating the epistle a.d. 793, rightly concludes that the
presbyter was he who afterwards became Eanbal II., referring to Hoveden's statement that Eanbal presbyter of York was the successor of Eanbal I. (See Hoved. ann. 796; ed. Stubbs. i. 16). Since Froben's time there has been found among the Cotton manuscripts a passage (Mon. Aec. ep. 35, p. 254; Hadden and Stubbs, Concil. iii. 500), purporting to be a continuation of ep. 6, stating that Eanbal was unable to return home, being detained by a severe illness with Alcuin, who was in attendance on Charles the Great in Saxony. Charles is known to have been in Saxony at the beginning of the year 793, when the death of Eanbal is recorded (as Hadden and Stubbs) or 795 (as Mon. Aecuini. ed. Jaffé, p. 252). There does not seem any sufficient reason to doubt that the presbyter Eanbal of the new passage is identical with the presbyter Eanbal of ep. 6, and the second archbishop of the name. No translation to the northern metropolitan see from another see had yet occurred; every archbishop had been elevated directly from the diaconate (e.g. Hadden and Stubbs, Concil. iii. 506, in locis). Alcuin in the next epistle (ep. 49, Froeb. Aug. 796; ep. 37, Mon. Aec. a. d. 795; H. and S. iii. 499, A. D. 499) addresses one whom he calls "dominus omnium dilectissimus," and Alcuin "his son" is prevented coming to him by a sharp fever and King Charles' detention in Saxony; Alcuin longs to see him again, and trusts he may find him enjoying the same honour in which he left him; he rejoices in the intelligence of his prosperity, and dispatches to him by Eanbal (who is not here designated "presbyter," only "famulus vester," but Froben thinks he is perhaps the presbyter of ep. 6); a new archbishop is about to be appointed, and Alcuin beseeches this "dominus" to permit no violence against the church of God, and to take care that the brethren have a free election. Froben does not attempt to identify the person here addressed; in Hadden and Stubbs he is a "powerful man"; but in the Mon. Aecuini he is assumed, and we think with much probability, to be none else than archbishop Eanbal I., who in that case would be meditating resignation. It is at all events clear that a formidable danger was menacing the succession at York, and Alcuin was employing his great influence in securing the free action of the clergy in the appointment. Alcuin's next letter reveals another danger. It is addressed to his "beloved friends at York." (Ep. 48, Froeb. A.D. 797; ep. 38, Mon. Aec. a. d. 795; H. and S. iii. 500, A. D. 796.) Alcuin urges that it should be necessary for them to elect an archbishop before he could reach them (implying, as Froben notices, that he was a member of their body and had a voice in the election) they would proceed with scrupulous integrity and tolerate no manner of simoniacal doings. In the most solemn terms he bids them maintain their old unsullied reputation in the choice of their archbishop. One more letter belongs to this crisis (ep. 39, Mon. Aec. a. d. 795). It is from the presbyter Eanbal to archbishop Eanbal, reporting his return from abroad, and delivering a letter he has brought him from Alcuin, so that there is a strong presumption that the "dominus" was the archbishop, whose "famulus" the presbyter might well have been termed. Eanbal I. died Aug. 10, 786, and Eanbal II. was consecrated on Sunday, Aug. 14. (A. S. C. ann. 796; Simeon of Durham's Sunday, Aug. 13, being an error, as Aug. 13 was Saturday.) As the vacancy lasted but four days, it is obvious that Alcuin's letters of the 10th and 13th were written before it occurred and while it was in expectation. Matters seem to have stood thus: Eanbal I. feeling the approach of death meditated retirement; the court was watching the event and preparing to force its nominee; the presbyter Eanbal, as the candidate favoured by the archbishop and the best of the cathedral body, was sent to Alcuin to obtain his adhesion and procure his return; his reply could only be to accept the intended appointment; the archbishop died, and the election was made at the earliest possible moment. The subsequent views obtained of Eanbal II. are consistent with this account of the crisis; the new archbishop has to deal with a worldly-minded clergy and a hostile court, but he is constantly supported and encouraged by letters from Alcuin. It may be remarked that an unsettled state of affairs is similarly described by the Surt. Hist. Durk. iii. 243, 265.)
which is septiform in the gifts of the Spirit, may shine in a septiform distinction of ecclesiastical degrees, all occupying their proper positions and vested according to their rank. The clerics in costly apparel, in domenour staid, should in their singing avoid all swagger of tone, and seek to please God rather than man. Nor let them disdain to make themselves acquainted with the rules of the _Ordo Romanus_ (the earliest historical mention of which work is believed to occur in this passage, _Aec. Opp. Frob. i. 66, note f_; _H. and S. iii. 504 note_; for in thus imitating the chief of the church of Christ they may win St. Peter’s blessing. In another letter of advice _op. 57, Frob.;_ H. and S. iii. 505, a. d. 529; Alcuin strongly recommends him the use of Gregory’s _Pastoral_, which he should read and re-read, taking it with him wherever he went.

It was on Sept. 8, 797 (A. S. C. ad ann.), when the Nativity of St. Mary was celebrated (Sim. Dun. G. R. A., true reading of the date in _Surtees Soc. ed. p. 34_), that Eanbald, having received the pallium from Rome, was “solemnly confirmed in the episcopate of the Northumbrians,” but in what the confirmation consisted Simeon, who alone mentions it, does not state, and, as usual, using the language of his own day. He was the fourth archbishop of York (not the third, as Malmes. G. R. i. 65, ed. Hardy) reckoning from Egbert, and the tenth bishop counting from Paulinus. The contemporary king of Northumbria was Eardulf, whose accession was about three months before Eanbald’s, and the archbishop of Canterbury was Ethelhah. His first recorded metropolitical act was the consecration, on Oct. 29, 797, of Heardred bishop of Hexham at Wadsaforda, assisted by his suffragan Higbald of Lindisfarne. (Rich. of Hexham, cap. 8, Twyd. col. 299; Sim. Dun. G. R. A. in M. II. B. 669 e, “_Wudoforda_”; A. S. C. ann. 797 does not mention Higbald nor the place._) The localities of all the consecrations held by Eanbald are mentioned, but not one of them, nor even the place of his own consecration, was York, an indication possibly of a hostile court influence in that city. Another letter of Alcuin to Eanbald, whom he now begins, after his whim [Alcuin], to call “Simeon” (Ep. 171, Frob. “de anno et loco minimè constat”; _H. and S. iii. 507, a. d. 796, or later_), discloses growing difficulties. Alcuin sympathises with him in certain trials (not further indicated) which have accompanied his elevation; he replies to inquiries respecting the _Liber Missalis_ again, and with much point, he returns to the _Ordo Romanus_, his language plainly shewing that the book was meeting with anything but a welcome at York. He hopes that in the faith and piety of his son Eanbald he will himself survive after death, while he trusts that sacred studies will never be neglected at York to render all the pains he once took in the collection of books a labour lost. With this letter Alcuin sends a present of four cups (caucelli); and a hundred pounds of ‘stagnum’ (stannum, tin) for covering the ‘domusula cloacaecorum’ (the bell-tower, as Raine understands it) “propter ornamentum et loci celebratitatem. It is to be observed, in reference to Eanbald’s troubles that in these last days of the heptarchal church the archbishops of both provinces were at feud with their sovereign, Ethelhald of Canterbury with the Mercian king _Seo_ ruled the south, and Eanbald with Eardulf. The temporary establishment of a Mercian archiepiscopate [Hesmer] proves how intense was the quarrel in the southern and strongest division of England. This community of trouble drew the two archbishops together to a degree that was quite unusual in those days as compared with the intercourse they each had with foreign churches (H. and S. iii. 520). In 798 we find Alcuin counselling Ethelhald to confer with Eanbald in reference to the great schism that then existed between Mercia (Ep. 60, Frob.; H. and S. iii. 520). To this year also belongs the most interesting of all the actual facts recorded of Eanbald’s archiepiscopate—his assembling a synod at Pincanhalth (on the supposed identity of which with Finchale, near Durham, see note in H. and S. iii. 444. Neither Surtees nor Raine could venture to affirm the identity. Raine, _Priory of Finchale_, pref. pp. xii. xiii.). The synod of Pincanhalth (again it is some other place rather than York) is worthy of notice on several accounts. It is the first Northumbrian synod of which any particular account survives since that of Whithby, in 684, so fully reported by Bede, and the synod of Whitby was not the synod of the south with which it may be compared—Haethfylth under Theodore in 680 (Bede. _H. E. iv. 17_; H. and S. iii. 141), and Celychth under Jaenbert in 787 (H. and S. iii. 444). It may be noted also that the Paschal controversy, which was a grand topic at Whithby, is prominent here again at Pincanhalth, shewing that the old Celtic and anti-Roman party of the north had not died out, another token of which is the cold reception of the _Ordo Romanus_ already noticed. Finally, the synod of Pincanhalth was the last in the north previous to the downfall of the Northumbrian church under the Dunes, and its latest testimony was according to the orthodoxy of the day. This synod therefore ought certainly to have received more attention than it has had from the modern historians of the heptarchal church (see a brief and quite exceptional notice in Collier, _Eccles. Hist. i. 339_). It was attended, writes Simeon of Durham, by many great laymen (principales) and ecclesiastics, who “consulted on many things affecting the interest of God’s holy church and the nation of the Northumbrians and of all the provinces, and concerning the observance of the Paschal feast, and of decisions divine and secular which were made in the days of righteous kings and good dukes and holy bishops and other wise men, monks and clerics, of whose wisdom and justice, and divine virtues the state of the kingdom of the Northumbrians was at that time sweetly and unspadamente redolent. They took care by wise counsel to make arrangements for the honour of God and the services of the faithful that and to augment the service of God, that for these things they might receive the good recom-
pine of eternal reward. The lord bishop Eanbald commanded the faith of the five councils to be recited." Here Simeon indicates the dogmatic articles from The History of the Angles, in a rough quotation from Bede's account of the synod of Haethfelth, and concludes: "Having asserted and confirmed these things they returned home, praising God for all his benefits" (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 798, Stevenson's trans. p. 460). The synod of Haethfelth in 680 was of course unable to affirm the sixth council (on the Monothelitism heresy), that council commencing its sessions only in the same year; but why the sixth council of Tyro was Pincanalth also does not appear; perhaps this northern synod held it sufficient to adopt the precedent preserved by the great northern historian. The synod of Celsyth in 787 accepted the sixth council as well as the first five; but it was too early for it to express an opinion on the seventh council (on image worship), which was sitting only in that year. To this extent, then, the proceedings of Eadberht with his territorial bishop, Alfred, and Eanbald, being then in conference with Alcuin, must have witnessed his uncompromising attitude in regard to it. The ignoring of the seventh council at the synod of Pincanalth so soon afterwards was a victory on Alcuin's side in his own country, and may well be regarded as a sign of his influence.

To proceed chronologically with Eanbald; in the year 800 another of the suffragans of York, Eadbert bishop of Hexham, is consecrated, and the archbishop may be assumed to have officiated, though he is not expressly mentioned (Rich. of Hexham, capp. 18, 19, in Twysd. X. Script. col. 299). The consecration was at Ethingaham. In 800 or 801, Alcuin once more and for the last recorded time, addressed "the son of his prayers Symeon saceros" (Ep. 174, Fab. a.D. 800; Mon. Acl. ep. 80, p. 629, post, Ap. 3, 801; H. and S. iii. 534, a.D. 801). Here the archbishop's troubles come more distinctly into view. Alcuin suspects that they may have arisen partly from Eanbald himself, in case he has harboured the king's enemies or protected their possessions. If he suffers justly, why is he disturbed? If unjustly, he should remember the tribulations of the saints. Let him not, however, think of forsaking his church, but rather await the martyr's crown. Thus was Eanbald warned against a desertion of his flock like that so severely blamed by Alcuin in his brother archbishop of the south. Eanbald must stand fast as the standard-bearer of Christ. Let him remember how the venerable Mattathias, in the peril of death, exhorted his sons to contend against the Lord's adversaries. Eanbald has seen how kings and princes who persecuted his predecessors and the church of Christ came to untimely ends; let him be patient and prayerful; God will perhaps convert his opponents from foes to friends. This being the state of affairs, it may well be suspected that the recent synod of Pincanalth was implicated in the dispute. Eminent laymen were present but not the king, though secular and ecclesiastical were discussed; it was a quasi-parliamentary gathering under the archbishop, and may have been a general rallying-point of the Northumbrians to the spiritual power in opposition to the royal authority, for Eardulf was at strife with his lay subjects as well as with the great ecclesiastic, and in 808 was a fugitive from his throne.

In the year 800 Alcuin writes (Ep. 175; Frob. a.D. 800). He has heard of the affliction of his beloved "Symeon." Calvines and Cuculina must exhort him to be of good courage; his predecessors in the see had to endure the like; may, all the saints have been sufferers, and the Baptist died a martyr to the truth. But let "Symeon" be jealous of any other cause of suffering than that of declaring the truth; for Alcuin fears he may be courting trial through his connection with the turbulent and enemies of the king. And why does he number so many soldiers in his train? Apparently it is out of compassion to others, but that is a shortsighted compassion which injures the many, even the good, while seeming to benefit the few, and those perhaps not innocent. For "Symeon" is injuring the monasteries, when he takes a crowd of such followers into them to be entertained with him on his visits; never had his predecessors so numerous. From these expressions, and from other indications noticed in the course of this article, we seem to view a prelate generally on the move, keeping the rural roads, travelling from monastery to monastery, never far from the lands of the see, and scarcely, if at all, abiding in the city of York. Medallic testimony points much the same way, disclosing a great lord who coin's his own money to circulate from the monasteries, and on the estates of the church. Mr. Edward Hawkins observes that the earliest known coins of the see of York, next to those of archbishop Egbert, belong to Eanbald, whose coins he was once disposed to regard as the earliest of all (1st ed. 1841, p. 53); and this Eanbald he concludes to be the second archbishop of the name from the fact that all the types and moneyers on his coins appear likewise on the coins of king Eanred, in whose reign Eanbald II. died. Nor is it without significance that in a hoard of 8000 coins found at Hexham in 1833 those of Eanbald were numerous enough to have made the specimens common, while out of 10,000 discovered at York in 1842 not more than one of Eanbald was found. (Hawkins, Silver Coins of England, 2nd ed. 1876, pp. 73, 105.)

In 801 Eanbald is mentioned in a letter of Alcuin addressed to Ethelward (Ep. 173, Frob. A.D. 800; Mon. Acl. ep. 171, a.D. 801, p. 619; H. and S. iii. 535, a.D. 801). Alcuin is pleased that the two archbishops have met and conferred, one result of which he trusts will be that the churches of Christ will be exalted in honour, and the lives of those who minister in them will be amended. Very corrupt have those lives been, hardly above the level of the vain show. Clergy and people seem to differ in nothing but the tombsure.

There occurs another consecration by him of
a suffragan, Egbert of Lindisfarne, probably on
Trinity Sunday, June 11, 803, Eanberht of Hes-
ham, Badulf of Withern, “and other bishops”
assisting, the place being Bignall (Sim. Dun. 
Hatt. Ch. Durham, Stevenson’s note; Stubbs,
Reg. Soc. p. 9). In 808 Eanbeald is mentioned
in the correspondence of pope Leo III. with
the emperor Charles, in connection with the ex-
pulsion of Eadulf from his kingdom, but it is
uncertain what were the archbishop’s relations
with the deposed king and his rival (H. and S.
iii. 564, note); one of the letters shews Eanbeald
opposed, as well as the archbishops of Canterbury
(now Wulfred), to Kenheim king of Mercia, who
ruled in the south (Ep. of Leo III. to Charles,
Mansi, Concil. xiii. 969; Mon. Carolina, ed.
Jaffe, 311; H. and S. iii. 563); in another letter
he is again mentioned, but with no light; he has
sent a dispatch to Charles, but his messenger
has misunderstood his business, and offended the
emperor by proceeding to Rome before delivering
it. (Mansi, xiii. 974; Patr. Lat. xcviii. 553; H.
and S. iii. 565.)

Here ends the clear contemporary light cast
upon this Northumbrian metropolitan. It is
but a few glimpses we get of him after this.
The “præsenal Eanbealdus,” who loves pope Leo
in Alcuin’s poem (Carm. 226, Opp. ii. 298, Prokh.
is probably Eanbeald II., or Eanberht.
Eanbeald was evidently on a visit to Alcuin
when this little poem was written. There is
independent proof that after his elevation to the
see Eanbeald was with Alcuin, but at what date
cannot be determined, except that it must have
been between 800 and 807, while George was
patriarch of Jerusalem. In a letter to that pre-
late (Ep. 123, Prokh.) Alcuin begs his intercessory
prayers for “Sycon, bishop,” for Onias and
Martinus “sacerdotes,” for Nathansel, arch-
deacon, and others, adding, “Who are with us,
and never cease to intercede for your solita-
tude.” As Alcuin died May 19, 804, the inter-
val for this visit is defined within narrow
limits.

He lived long Eanbeald II. lived after 808 is
uncertain. Simeon of Durham says that
his successor, Wulfys, was archbishop in the
reign of Eanred (Sim. Dun. Epist. de Archip.
Floro, Opp. Surt. Soc. p. 134), and 812 is the
year some have supposed (Raine, Archbishops of
York, p. 111). Pits attributes to Eanbeald II. a
work entitled Decretum Symodalia (Pits, Angl. S.
Theol. 181), and Tanner repeats the statement
(Tann. Bibl. Brit. 248), but as Raine observes,
without any foundation. [C. H.]

EANBERCH, denounced with Hunred and
two others by Boniface archbishop of Mainz, in
his Life of Wilfrid, as false brethren, who in
the name of religion seduced the people into

EANBERHT (1), one of five presbyters in
Thuringia, whom Lullus archbishop of Mainz
directs to arrange in their localities for public
prayers and a week of abstinence to avert a
plague of rain which was then afflicting the
country. Each was likewise requested to offer
thirty masses for the deceased bishop of Rome,
who is not named, as well as for the two
laics Megenfrith and Hraban. During the episco-
pate of Lullus three bishops of Rome died, so
that this letter may belong to any of the years
757, 767, or 772. (Monum. Magunt. ed. Jaffé,
281.) [C. H.]

EANBERHT (2), an abbot to whom Ethel-
bald king of Mercia, in a charter attested by
Cynewulf, of Wessex, and the West-Saxon
bishops and abbots, granted lands “in dominium
Christi ecclesiae.” (Kemble, C. D. 100, A.D.
755-757.) The list of abbots of Malmesbury
recently discovered by Mr. Birch contains the
name of Aescumbri, who may be identified with
this person and possibly with Eaba [EABA
(2)]. (Birch, Abbates of Malm. p. 6.) [S.]

EANBERHT (3), ealdorman of the Hwiccei,
and brother of Aldred and Uhtred. (Kemble,
C. D. 102, 105.) The three brothers were bene-
factor to Worcester from 755 to 770. [Hwiccl.
[3.]

EANBERHTTA (Cod. Dipl. 10) ; Birch,
Abbates of Malmesb. p. 6; H. Fasti Monast. 68),
abbat. [EANBERHT (2); EABA (2).] [C. H.]

EANBERHT (4), Eadberht; Eanberht; Os-
bert, bishop of Hexham, between Heorred and
Tidferth. Richard of Hexham states that he was
ordained at Ethingaham, A.D. 806, and sat four
years; but the Saxon Chronicle places his
death in 806. His episcopate fell in the reign
of Eadulf, king of Northumbria, and his metrop-
olitan was Eanbeald II. archbishop of York.
Nothing further is known of him. (Ricard.
Hagulast. cap. 18, 19 in Twysd. Scriptores, coll.
299, 308; Wendl. Flor. Hist. ann. 800, ed. Core;
A. & C. ann. 808; Stubbs, Regist. Soc. 9, 181.)

EANBRYTH (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 800 in
M. H. ii. 671), bishop of Hexham. [EANBERHT
[C. H.]

EANBURGA, an abbess mentioned in a
quattro-stanzo charter of Offa, belonging to Wor-
cester, and dated 761. In this the king con-
irms to Eanburga, for her life, lands in Huntingt
and Fuchalouge, which bishop Heathred had
given her, subject to the rights of the mother
church of Worcester. (Kemble, C. D. 141.)

EANFERTH, bishop of Elmham. [EANFERT
[3.]

EANFLED (1), a name inscribed on the fourth
tablet of the taller pyramid in the cemetery at
Glastonbury, which William of Malmesbury
describes as of great antiquity. (Malm. G. R. i. § 21, ed. Hardy.) [C. H.]

EANFLED (2) (EANFLEDE), daughter of Ed-
win king of Northumbria, by his second wife
Ethelburga of Kent. She was born on Eleventh
Sunday, A.D. 626. On her birth Paulinus, who
was the queen’s chaplain, ascribed the safety of
the mother and child to God’s answer to his
prayers, and Edwin, who was then wavering
between Christianity and paganism, allowed
Paulinus to baptize the infant. The ceremony
was performed on Whitsunday. (Bed. H. E.
ii. 9.) On the death of her father, in A.D. 635,
the princess was carried by her mother into
Kent. (Ed. ii. 20.) About A.D. 643 she be-
came the wife of Oswy king of Northumbria
EANFRID (ed. iii. 15), who at her request gave Ingel-llingum (Gilling?) to Trumheri, to be the site of a monastery in memory of the murdered Oswin (ed. iii. 24). Eanael was a great patroness of religion, observing the Roman method of counting Easter, and having a chaplain of her own, named Romanus (iii. 15). It was by her assistance that the youthful Wilfrid was enabled to pay his first visit to Rome. (Eddi, cap. p. 213; Bed. H. E. v. 19.) Eanael was buried with her husband at Whitby, in the monastery of which her daughter Elfleda was subsequently the abbess. (Bed. H. E. iii. 24.) [J. R.]

EANFRID (1) (ANFRID, EANFRITH), a son of Ethelfrith king of Northumbria, and himself king of Bernicia on the death of Edwin in A.D. 633. During his predecessor’s reign he had been in exile with his brothers in Scotland, where he had been converted to Christianity and baptized. On becoming king he apostatized. In the following year he was treacherously slain by Caedwalla, whom he had incautiously sought with twelve chosen knights to sue for peace (Bed. H. E. iii. 1). [J. R.]

EANFRID (2) (Kemble, C. D. 198, A.D. 808, an error for 758 [EADULF (3)],) bishop. [EANFRITH (3).] [C. H.]

EANFRIDUS, Alcuin’s agent on the continent. Alcuin in 790 writes from England to his disciple Josephus abroad beging him to send for Eanfridus, and confer with him as to the transmission of some silver, the proceeds apparently of his villa of Vurnec, and a goat’s-hair dress, “vestimentum caprimum.” (Mon. Alcuin. ed. Jaffé, p. 171, ep. 16, not in Froben’s collection.) [C. H.]

EANFRITH (1) (Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 593, 634; M. H. B. 526 b, 528 e; id. Gesta Reg. North. M. H. B. 632,) king of Bernicia. [EANFRID (1).] [C. H.]

EANFRITH (2), king of the Hwicci, brother of Eanhere and father of Eoba queen of the South Saxons (Bede, H. E. iv. 13), about the year 661. He was probably father or near kinsman of Osric and Oshere, who, in the next generation, were benefactors of the Mercian churches. [HWICCI.] [S.]

EANFRITH (3) (EANFERTH), the fifth bishop of Elmham, called Lanfranc in the printed lists. (M. H. B. 618.) His name occurs between that of Ethelfrith, who was consecrated in 736, and that of Ethelwulf, who attested a charter of 781. He may thus be identified with Eanfrith, who attests a grant of Cinewed to Wessex to Bath in 758 (Kemble, C. D. 128; for date cf. EADULF (3),) and possibly with the bishop Eanfrith, who, having been a monk of Glastonbury, died, according to William of Malmesbury, in 782. (Antt. Glaston. ap. Gale, p. 325.) [S.]

EANGHEARD, a priest of Canterbury, who subscribes a charter of archbishop Wulfred, dated April 21, 811. (Kemble, C. D. 195.) [S.]

EANGIST, a disciple of Alcuin, who is said to have been cured of his toothache by a touch of his master’s comb. (Vit. Alcuini Auscl. Anon. ap. Mon. Alcuin. p. 33, ed. Jaffé.) [C. H.]

EANGITHA, an English abbess, mother of Heburga otherwise called Bagga. [BOGA (2).] A letter is extant addressed by her to St. Boniface, to be dated between 719 and 722. In this she complains of her many cares, the poverty of her monastic estate, the hostility of the king, and the frowardness of her relations. She refers also to the abbess Wale as her spiritual mother, and recommends a brother named Denewald to the good offices of Boniface. (Bonif. Epist. 14; Mon. Moguntia, p. 66.) If the identification of Bagga, or Heburga, with Eadburga abbess of Minster, be allowable, then Eangitha may have been the widow of Centwine king of Wessex, and sister of Eormenberga queen of Northumbria. It is perhaps safer not to rely too much on the identification. [S.]

EANGYTH (Monum. Mogunt. ed. Jaffé, p. 66), abbess. [EANGITHA.] [C. H.]

EANHERE, brother of Eanfrith, king or viceroy of the Hwicci. [EANFRITH (2).] [S.]

EANMUND (1) (Kemble, C. D. 114, between A.D. 759 and 763), king in Kent. [EALMUND.] [C. H.]

EANMUND (2), founder and first abbot of a monastery of St. Peter, in Northumbria, the history of which, written by the monk Ethelwulf, is dedicated to bishop Egbert of Lindsey. [ETHELWULF (2).] [S.]

EANRED (1), presbyter of the diocese of Leicester, who attested the acts of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 903. (Kemble, C. D. 1024.) [C. H.]

EANRED (2), king of Northumbria, who succeeded Elfwold or Elfwh, A.D. 810, and reigned thirty-two to thirty-three years. Within the period embraced by this work, he was contemporary with Eanbald II. and Wulfsey archbishops of York, Egbert bishop of Lindsey, and Tidferd bishop of Hexham. (Symeon Dun. ed. Surtees Soc. pp. 134, 211, 219; Wend. P. H. ann. 810.) On Eanred’s coins, see E. Hawkins, Silver Coins of Eng. ed. Kenyon, pp. 71–73. [C. H.]

EANSWITHA (EANSWIDA), a daughter of Eadbad king of Kent, who lived a virgin and was buried at Folkstone. (Flor. Wig. in M. H. B. 627, 635; Elmham, Hist. Aug. pp. 175, 176.) Her life (printed by Capgrave, fo. 97, and in the AA. SS. Bolland. Aug. vol. vii. pp. 686, 687) says that Eadbad built her a church at Folkstone, which was dedicated to St. Peter, near which she founded a nunery, with a church of her own. She was asked in marriage by a king of Northumbria, but refused him. The day of her death was Aug. 31, the year is given as 640 or 673, alike without authority. Her relics, which had been at first buried in her own church, were subsequently translated to St. Peter’s. The present church of Folkstone is dedicated to her conjointly with St. Mary, and that of Brentwell, in Kent, is dedicated to her sole honour. On the seal of the corporation of Folkstone she appears carrying two fishes in a half-hour. (Park. Anglicam Calendar, p. 229, quoting Hussey’s Emblems of the Saints. See also Mon. Angl. i. 451; Harly, Cat. Mat. Br. Hist. i. 229, 229, 382.) [S.]
EANTBALD. This name with the title of præsulis occurs in a poem of Alcuin addressed to pope Leo III. Eantbal sends his presents to Leo, and Alcuin sends a poem by his messenger. It is thought that Eantbal is the archbishop of York, Eanulf II, so often mentioned in Alcuin's works. (Alc. Carm. 226; Opp. ii. 228, ed. Froben.) [C. H.]

EANULF (1), a Mercian noble, son of Osmund and kinsman of Ethelbald king of Mercia (716–757). He founded the monastery of Bredon, in Worcestershire, about the year 716, with the advice of Ethelbald, who began to reign in that year, and of Egwin bishop of Worcester, who died soon after. His monastery was dedicated to St. Peter, and archbishop Tatwin was educated there. Eanulf was grandfather to king Offa, who was a great benefactor of Bredon. (Kemble, C. D. 120, 138, 140, 248, 261.) Besides Bredon, Eanulf had a grant of land at Westbury, which subsequently was given to Worcester. (Rem. C. D. 166; Monast. Angl. l. 607; vi. 1625.) [S.]

EANULF (2), a prebendary addressed by Alcuin in or before the year 804. Alcuin was then abroad, but where Eanulf was not apparent. Eanulf, who had been a disciple of Alcuin, is counselled, among other things, not to wander about in his ministry, but remain where he was appointed to serve. The letter, which shows in what a way he was a man who had to regular discipline, gives a hint of what had been his previous life, and what were some of the temptations and difficulties of his office. (Alcuin, Ep. 226, ed. Froben.; Ep. 281, Mon. Alcuin.) [C. H.]

EANWALD, a priest of Worcester, who attests a charter of bishop Deneberht in or about 892. (Kemble, C. D. 181.) [S.]

EANWELF, an abbot of a monastery, unnamed, who addresses Lullus archbishop of Mainz, May 24, 773, expressing gratitude for a letter received from him and a deep sense of the honour. On the following day, May 25, he addresses Charles king of the Franks. It was about two years after Charles's accession, and when his expeditions against the pagan Saxons had commenced. The abbot counsels him to be zealous for their conversion, hunt down (inaequir) idolaters, overthrow their temples, reform their manners by severity, by gentleness, by good example; Christ will then reward him in the next life, besides giving him a glorious name on earth to future ages. (Monum. Mogunt. ed. Jaffé, pp. 282, 283.) The letter indicates how the church was watching the opening career of the great Frank. [C. H.]

EAPP, one of the priests of Wilfrid, who materially assisted him in A.D. 678 in the conversion of Sussex, baptizing many of the people (Bed. H. E. iv. 13). He afterwards became the head of the monastery of Selsey, and probably gave to bishop Acca an account of a miraculous vision at that place, with which his name is connected (Id. iv. 14). Eappa is not mentioned by Eddi. [J. E.]

EARCOMBERT, king of Kent, son of Eadbald and Emma, succeeded his father Eadbald in Christ. Biogr.—Vol. II. 640, and reigned until 664. According to the later writers he was younger than his brother Eormenred (Eormenrad), and secured the succession either by the will of his father (Sim. Dun. in M. H. B. 640), or by usurping the rights of his infant nephews (Elpham, pp. 176, 184), Ethelbert and Ethelred. Bede, however, says nothing about this, but describes Earcombart as a zealous Christian king, as the first English king who by his royal authority ordered the worship of idols to be abolished, and as having directed the observance of the Lent fast (H. E. iii. 8; Chr. S. in M. H. B. 310) under severe penalties. No laws, however, bearing the name of Earcombart have been preserved. He married Sexburga, the elder daughter of Anna king of the East Angles, who, after his death, became abbess of Sheppey, and subsequently succeeded her sister St. Ealhreda as abbess of Ely. By Sexburga Earcombart was the father of St. Earcongota (Bed. H. E. iii. 8), St. Eormenred (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 627), and Egbert and Hlothere, who successively reigned in Kent. Earcombart is mentioned by Eddius (c. 3) and Bede (H. E. v. 19) as welcoming Wilfrid in his first visit to Kent, and Eddius in particular enlarges on the assistance afforded by Earcombart. Notwithstanding his piety, Earcombart does not occur as a monastic benefactor. He died after a reign of twenty-four years, July 14, 684, the same day as archbishop Deusdedit (Bede, H. E. iv. 1), and was buried at St. Augustine's. (Thorn. c. 1768.) [S.]

EARCONGOTA, the daughter of Earcombart, king of Kent, by his wife Sexburga. She is described by Bede (H. E. iii. 8) as a virgin of great virtue, and as a nun of the monastery of Farmoutier in Brie, recently founded by St. Fara or Burgundofara. Bede says that many stories were told of Earcongota's miraculous powers, and gives an account of the circumstances of her death. As the time, of which she had warning, approached, she visited the cells of the sisters and asked their prayers. She had seen a band of white-clad men approach the monastery, and when she asked their errand was told that they were come to fetch the coin of gold that had come from Kent. Some of the faithful saw her soul carried off by angels; her body was buried in the church of St. Stephen. (See Bede, H. E. iii. 8; Elpham, p. 191; A.A. S. Boil. 25 Feb. iii. 387, 388, 759; Hardy, Cat. Materials for British History, i. 389, 370.) Her life, written by John of Tynemouth, is still in MS. William of Malmesbury (G. R. lib. i. § 11) places Earcongota at Chelles, not at Farmoutier. [S.]

EARCONUALD (Bed. H. E. iv. 6; M. H. B. 217), bishop of London. [EERKENWALD.] [C. H.]

EARDRED, the third bishop of Dunwich after the division of the East Anglian diocese. (M. H. B. 618.) There is great difficulty in assigning the dates and even the relative position of the bishops of Dunwich. Aldberht, the bishop mentioned by Bede at the close of his work (H. E. v. 26) appears as the fifth bishop in the ancient list; if both these authorities are right, Eardred's date must fall within the first thirty years of the 8th century. If again he is identified with Eardulf, 'the East Anglian
bishop who attended the council of Clvesho in 747 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360), Alderberht must be misplaced.

EARDULF (1), a king of Kent, who flourished about the middle of the 9th century, but of whom very little is known. The most important point of certainty in his history is his joining, after the year 755, with bishop Eardulf, of Rochester, in the letter to Lullus, of which an account is given in the notice of that bishop. In charters he appears as a benefactor to the Kentish monasteries; one of these, dated by Kemble in 747, is mentioned in the same notice (Kemble, C. D. 96, referred by Lappenberg to the year 758); another is a grant to Eadburt, or Henhbert, abbot of Reculver, of lands at Bernhamsted. (Kemble, C. D. 1065.) If both the dates are to be accepted, Eardulf must have begun to reign in Kent before the death of king Eadburt, and have retained his rule during a great part of the sole reign of Ethelbert II. It is, however, impossible to fix his place either in the pedigree or in the chronology of the Oescings. He is unknown to the annalists, and no coins are extant on which his name occurs. Lappenberg (vol. i. p. 247) supposes him to have been a son of Eadburt, and nephew of Ethelbert II., and to have died before his uncle. But this is mere conjecture.

EARDULF (2) (Ardwulfus, Eardulfus, Eardulf, Heardulf), king of Northumbria, son of Eardulf, a Northumbrian duke or ealdorman of the royal blood (Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc. 34, 211). During the reign of Ethelred, son of Moll, Eardulf incurred his master's displeasure. He was arrested, and carried to Ripon, and there seemingly executed before the entrance into the minster. The brethren of the place carried the body inwards with Gregorian music, and then laid it out on the outside, but in the morning the supposed victim was found alive in the minster (Symeon, 30). This made men look upon Eardulf with a reverence which was certainly unmerited.

After this Eardulf was in exile, from which he was recalled in A.D. 796, by the popular voice, to be king in the room of the murdered Ethelred. He was consecrated in York minster at the altar of St. Paul, on May 25, archbishop Eanbald officiating, assisted by three of his suffragans (Symeon, 34; Saxoz Chron.). Alcuin wrote a letter to him on his elevation, reminding him of the incident in his earlier life, and urging him to be a just and a God-fearing king (Epp. ed. Jaffé, 320). Besides the charter of king Eardulf, this bishop received other grants for Rochester; land at Woldham from king Ethelbert in 750, and land in the city of Rochester from Sigiræc, king of half Kent, in 762. In 764 Offa and Sigiræc gave him twenty ploughlands at Eslingham, Frensham, and Wicham. (Ann. Roif. Ang. Sac. i. 341.) The charters by which these grants were secured are some of them preserved in the Tectus Roffensis, but are not free from the suspicion of forgery, and add considerably to the difficulty of settling the chronology of the Kentish kings; see Kemble, C. D. 110, 111, 113, 114. The last two, which are less suspicious than the others, are of the time of archbishop Bregwin, and one is dated (Symeon, 37). In the next year another dangerous rival was arrested and slain at Eardulf's bidding, Alchmund son of Alred, who was really the legitimate heir to the Northumbrian throne (Symeon, 38). Three enemies having been thus removed, Eardulf, in A.D. 801, led an army against Kenulf king of Mercia, whom he accused of harbouring and encouraging the conspirators against his life. No bloodshed, however, occurred, the bishops and nobles making peace between the intending combatants (Symeon, 39). These, however, were troublesome times in Northumbria. Archbishop Eanbald II., like king Kenulf, found it necessary to keep soldiers in his retinue for protection, and is said to have protected the lands and persons of the foes of Eardulf. Alcuin blames him for this conduct (Epp. 621, 623), probably seeing that the only chance for Northumbria was having a stern king like Eardulf at its head. At last, in A.D. 808, a competitor of the name of Alfwold drove Eardulf from his kingdom. He was too active to be long in exile. He visited Charlemagne and pope Leo, who suspected archbishop Eanbald and king Kenulf of hatching the successful conspiracy, and in A.D. 809 the banished sovereign was restored through the interposition of Charlemagne (Einhard, apud Duchesne, ii. 233; Bouquet, r. 602; Mabillon, Ann. Bodl. ii. 283). In the following year Eardulf died, and transmitted his kingdom to his son Eanred, who was the last independent monarch of Northumbria. During the reign of Eardulf the province of Galloway came into the possession of the Picts. There are coins of Eardulf in existence, and those struck by his son are exceedingly numerous.

EARDULF (3) (Herulf), a bishop of East Anglia, who was present at the council held at Clvesho in 747. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360.) As Eanfrith was at this time bishop of Elmham, Eardulf must have been bishop of Dunwich; but nothing more is known about him, and his name does not appear in the ancient lists.

EARDULF (4), the twelfth bishop of Rochester. (M. H. B. 616.) He first appears in a grant made by Eardulf, king of Kent, to Rochester, the date of which charter (762) is confirmed by the titles of the names of the witnesses to 747. If this charter and its correction be trusted, Eardulf must have become bishop the very year in which his predecessor Dunno had attended the council of Clvesho (Kemble, C. D. 96), and have been involved in a contest about the rights of his church with a person called Walthun. His successor, Diora, appears first in 775. Eardulf's dates fall between these two limits. In the following year Alcuin, writing to Osbert, expresses his opinion that Eardulf will lose his kingdom speedily as a punishment for putting away his wife, and taking a concubine in her room (Epp. ed. Jaffé, 350). In A.D. 798 the anticipated storm broke upon him. A revolt was made, apparently by those who had placed Eardulf on the throne, among whom were Alric son of Ethelred and Wada the duke. The rebels were utterly defeated near Whalley, in Lancashire, Alric falling on the field, and Wada securing safety by flight (Saxon Chron.; Symeon, 35). In A.D. 799 Eardulf made his throne more secure by putting to death Moll, a duke, who was probably a son of his old master Ethelred
EARDUULF

785. Eardulf's name as witness also appears in a grant to Minster. (K. C. D. 112.) See Ang. Soc. i. 343. A more interesting relic of Eardulf is a letter addressed by him, in conjunction with Eardulf king of Kent, to Lullus of Canterbury, the successor of St. Boniface. In this he calls Lullus his most intimate friend, addresses Mercia as an intimate friend, and desires his prayers for both the Eardulfs. A little present, "reptia reptilia," is sent with the letter; the bearer is the priest Lazaerold, and the names of three kinsmen are appended, for whom the prayers of Lullus are requested; irmigi, Notthary and Ducha. The date of the letter must of course be 755, or later, as in that year Lullus became bishop. (Mon. Mogunt. pp. 285, 286.) [S.]

EARDUULF (Kemble, C. D. 98), king of Kent. [EARDULF (1).] [C. H.]

EARDWULFUS (Sim. Dun. G. R. A ann. 798 in M. H. B. 699 a, 670 a, 671 a, d), king of Northumbria. [EARDULF (2).] [C. H.]

EARNUULF (Chron. Mailr. ann. 794), king of Northumbria. [EARDULF (3).] [C. H.]

EARPWALD (Earpwald, Aerthwald, Lb. Kilims. p. 13), the son of Redwald, king of the East Angles. Redwald had received Christianity in Kent, but had relapsed on returning to his own kingdom. Earpwald was converted under the influence of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and introduced Christianity into his dominions soon after Edwin's own conversion, and some time before the year 632, in which year the event is referred to by Florence of Worcester. (M. H. B. 528.) We have no account of the date of his succession to the throne. Shortly after his conversion he was murdered by a pagan named Richert. Smith, the editor of Bede, arguing from the chronology of the East Anglian bishops, places this event in 627; and Hussey remarks that at least twenty-eight years elapsed between the conversion of Earpwald and the death of archbishop Honorius (Bede, H. E. ii. 15), which would throw back the date to 625. The years of his reign are given by Luppenberg as 617-828. Redwald is last mentioned in 617. (Chr. S. M. H. B. 308.) Henry of Huntingdon ascribes the death of Earpwald to Penda. (M. H. B. 716.) [S.]

EASCULPH (Angl. Soc. i. 404), bishop of Dunwich. [A스트WULF.] [C. H.]

EASCWINUS (Wend. F. H. ann. 673, 676, ed. Coxe), king of Wessex. [BONEW.] [C. H.]

East Angles, Kings of. The kingdom of the East Angles, which in its later extension was co-extensive with the diocese of Elmham, Thetford, or Norwich, comprised in its earlier stages, besides the modern counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, some of the frontier lands which were afterwards parts of Mercia. The fen country of the Gyvri, extending from South Lincolnshire to South Cambridgeshire, which, after the consolidation of the Mercian power, was regarded as part of Mercia, was earlier a debatable land between Mercia and East Anglia, and earlier still was a part of East Anglia itself. Ely, according to Bede, was in East Anglia (H. E. iv. 19); and Florence of Worcester and William of Malmsbury place Cambridgeshire also under the rule of the kings of the East Angles (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 644; W. Malmsb. G. R. ed. Hardy, lib. i. § 192). The East Angles were converted to Christianity, but the conversion addresses Mercia, and was probably the early foundation of the nun monasteries. The see of the first four bishops of the East Angles was at Dunwich, on the coast of Suffolk; the diocese was divided in 673 between two bishops, one of whom, at Elmham (Helhjem, North Elmham), ruled Norfolk; the other, at Dunwich, ruled Suffolk. In the Danish ravages of 870 both lines of bishops were for a time extinguished, and when the church revived under the sons of Edward the Elder, Elmham was regarded as the sole see for the whole province.

The kings of the East Angles, within the period known to history, traced their descent from Woden through Wuffa in the ninth generation from the mythical patriarch Wealhtheow (called by the hagiographers Offa) was father of Tytla or Tytil, who was father of Eini and Redwald. The East Angles must have been among the earliest of the German settlers; the details of their migrations are altogether unknown, but Henry of Huntingdon probably represents a true tradition when he asserts that, like Mercia, the East Anglian territory was long divided among a number of nameless "proceres." If Wuffa was the first who united the whole nation under one sceptre, this would account for the prominence given to him in the genealogy. As grandfather of Redwald he could hardly be dated earlier than 530 A.D. Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 714) gives him the title of king, and makes him a contemporary of Corelin, king of Wessex, cir. 571 A.D. The dates assigned in the later chronicles are of no authority whatever. Matthew Paris, however, following Henry of Huntingdon, dates Offa in 571, and Tytil in 578. (Chron. Maj. ed. Luard, pp. 248, 249.) The first Christian king was Redwald, the son of Tytil [KIRPWALD]. No date is assigned for his accession; he is counted by Bede as the fourth of the kings who from the time of the Conquest have exercised supreme power over the whole of Britain, and by the Saxons as the fourth Bretwald. Such a position he could have acquired only after the death of Ethelbert I. of Kent, in 616. (Bede, H. E. ii. 5; Chr. S. A.D. 827, M. H. B. 843.) The date of the conversion and relapse of Redwald cannot be fixed. Earpwald [KIRPWALD] succeeded him, probably about 824. Richert, who killed Earpwald, was a pagan, and a period of anarchy followed the murder. Sigbert, son of Redwald, restored unity to the kingdom about 861, reigning conjointly for a few years with his kinsman Egric, who succeeded him on his resignation. Sigbert and Egric both perished in battle against Penda, about A.D. 850 (Flor. Wig.). Anna, son of Eini the brother of Redwald, succeeded [ANNA], and reigned until 854 (Chr. S. cf. Smith's Notes on Bede, H. E. iii. 18, 19). Ethelhere, brother of Anna, the next king, perished at the battle of Winwaed, A.D. 655 [ETHELHERE]. Here at last a definite date is found. Ethelwald, brother and successor of Ethelhere, died according to Florence (M. H. B. 332) in 684. Aldulf, son of Ethelhere, was in the seventeenth year of his reign in 689 (Bede, H. E. iv. 17). [ALDULF (1)]. His accession
is therefore definitely fixed. If the letter of pope Sergius on the appointment of archbishop Britwald (Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 229) be genuine, Aldulf must have been alive in 692. Aldwulf or Elfwald, his brother and successor, is mentioned in the genealogies without definite dates. There is a letter of a king Elwald of the East Angles to St. Boniface, which must be dated about 747 (Mon. Magn. p. 210); and the death of Elfwald is given by Simeon of Durham under the year 749 (M. H. B. 663). A king named Selred, who is called king of the East Angles, and made (Chr. Malm. ) the predecessor of Elfwald, is really king of the East Saxons.

On the death of Elfwald, the East-Angelean kingdom was held conjointly or contemporaneously by two kings, whom Simeon calls Alberht and Hunbeanna, who divided the kingdom. Hunbeanna is perhaps a misreading for the name of Beorna, who in the genealogy by Florence (M. H. B. 638) is made a contemporary of Ossa, and, in the Chronicle of Florence (M. H. B. 544), is represented as king in 752. Beorna was succeeded by Ethelred, who was the father of St. Ethelbert (ETHELBERT (3) ), who perished in 729. Edmund, the martyr king of 870, is the only other king of English race known to have borne the title. The obscurity and uncertainty of the whole series is partly owing to the destruction of all national monuments during the Danish occupation, and partly to the fact that from the age of Ethelbald king of Mercia onwards the East Angles were entirely under the rule of Mercia, a state of things which may possibly be dated earlier, as it is clear that from the death of Anna the kings were in a very secondary position.

Some coins ascribed to East Anglian kings are in existence; a silver coin resembling a sceatta assigned to Beorna (or Hunbeanna); and coins bearing the name of Eadwald, with that of monefer Wintred, who is known to have struck East Anglian coins under Ossa and Rurulf, are recorded to an East Anglian king of the name, but only conjecturally, as there is no other evidence that such a person ever existed (Havkins, English Silver Coins, pp. 55–57). [S.]

**EAST SAXONS**

The kingdom of the East Saxons was conterminous with the old diocese of London. That diocese embraced the counties of Essex, Middlesex, and southern Hertfordshire; the last-mentioned district, however, largely consisted of the territories of St. Alban's Abbey, and was exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. This exemption was of much later date than the period embraced in this work; but it had the effect of continuing an uncertainty of boundary which existed earlier in consequence of the uncertainty of the boundary between Mercia proper and the East Saxons kingdom, which was almost invariably subject to the Mercian kings. London itself, although the seat of the East Saxon bishopric, was not in the Saxon kingdom. It was often regarded as Mercian, and occasionally seems to have admitted the influence of the Kentish and West Saxons in a way that is extremely difficult of explanation. Northern Hertfordshire belonged to the diocese of Lincoln, and was never regarded as part of the East-Saxon kingdom. The deaneries of Braunging, Edwinstree, and Hertford, containing twenty-nine parishes, and coinciding with the hundreds of the same names, were East Saxon and subject to the see of London. The archdeaconry of St. Alban's, containing twenty-two parishes in Hertfordshire and four in Buckinghamshire, was added to the diocese in 1114 by Richard de Redenhall, who was of the family of the earls of Convers of Edward VI. The independence of the St. Alban's parishes dates a long way back into antiquity, and they may be regarded either as Mercian or as a border land between the two kingdoms.

The kings of the East Saxons traced their genealogy through Ecwine, in the ninth generation from Woden; and the peculiar feature of their pedigree is that with one exception, that of Offa, all the rulers of the East Saxons are related, according to the old legend, to S. To Ecwine, who is also called Erchenwic, no historian has ventured to assign a date; but he is regarded as the first king of the East Saxons. His son Sleda was married to Ricola, the sister of Ethelbert I. of Kent. Sebert, his son and successor, was the first Christian king, and must have been reigning under the supremacy of Ethelbert in the year 694, when the see of London was founded. Sebert, some time before the death of Archbishop Offa, was banished in 616, died, leaving his kingdom to his three sons (Bede, H. E. ii. 5). Saxred, Seward, and Sigeberht, who all fell in battle against the West Saxons (B. Flor. Wig. M. H. B. p. 527). The date of this event is fixed by Matthew Paris (l. 272) in 623, but without authority. The next king was Sigeberht the Little, the son of Seward (Bede, H. E. iii. 29; Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 629). Sigeberht the Good, who succeeded his uncle, Sigeberht the Little, restored Christianity among his people, who had fallen away after the death of king Sebert; he was the son of Sigezal (or Sexalbald), a descendant of Sleda through another line, was baptised about 653 under the influence of Oswy king of Northumbria, and soon after (civ. 660) was killed by his subjects. Swithhelm, his successor, seems to have been his brother (Bede, H. E. iii. 29; Flor. Wig. in M. H. B. 657); he was baptised by Verbius, and, like Sigeberht, was restored Christianity among his people, who had probably a competitor for the kingdom of Kent with Wihtric. Offa seems to have survived these two kings, and to have united the kingdom again (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 637). On Offa's departure the kingdom of the East Saxons passed to Sigebert the Good (ib.), succeeded. His death is recorded by Symeon of Durham in 747 (M. H. B. 662). Swithred his successor (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 637) was king in 758 (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 544); he appears in the genealogy as Swithred, and his position in the pedigree is not fixed. Seled had a son Sigeric (Flor. Wig. 639) or Sirico, who went to Rome in 798 (Ch. M. H. B. 330); and Sigereid was his son (Flor. Wig. 629).
This Sigemund is mentioned in the Winchcomb charter of 811 (Kemble, C. D. 197) as present at the dedication of the church, in company with Kenuil. His is the last name in the genealogy; but another king, named Swithred or Swithred, is mentioned by Matthew Paris as conquered by Egbert in 828 (ed. Luard, i. 374, 375). The name mentioned in this article may be suspected.

The dense obscurity that hangs over every portion of East-Saxon history is not broken by any light derived from coins or charters. [5]

EASTERWINE (EASTERWINT), coadjutor abbot of Wearmouth, was the nephew of Benedict Bishop, founder and first abbot of that monastery. He was born in 650 (Hist. i. 157), the eighth year of King Oswy, and, being of noble birth, held the rank of a "minister" or "king's thane," under Oswy's son and successor Egfrid, before he was 24. At that age he renounced all secular prospects in order to join the community of which his uncle was then the head at Wearmouth. As a monk, he was so far from presuming on his "earl-kin," that he took pleasure in sharing the homeliest work with his brethren; he was to be seen, conspicuous by his vigorous form and kindly demeanour, engaged in threshing, winnowing, milking, baking, gardening, cooking, always "lingua suavis, et animo hilaris" (Bede, Hist. Abb. 7). He was ordained priest in 678. After Egfrid had been sent with a new monastic colony to Jarrow, Benedict made Easterwine his own coadjutor at Wearmouth, "in the 9th year from its foundation," i.e. in 682-3. In this dignity he retained all his frank humility; whenever he came across monks at work, he would join them by handling plough or hammer or winnowing machine, as if simply one of themselves; he shared their meals, slept in their dormitory, and, while careful to maintain discipline, was accustomed, "from his innate and habitual affectionateness," to warn beforehand against the misconduct which, if it occurred, would bring a cloud of sorrow over his bright countenance ("limpidissimam nullus ejus lucem"). During Benedict's last summer, Benedict's journey to Rome, a new colony, Easterwine, with many others of the community, was attacked by the "yellow pestilence." Even after fatal symptoms appeared, he remained two days in the common dormitory, and then removed into a private room. On the day before his death he came out, sat in the open air, and summoning all the monks, gave them, "more nature than coordinates," the kiss of peace and farewell, while they were weeping over the imminent departure of "such a father and pastor." He died while matins were being sung in the church, on the 7th of March, 686, aged only 36 years. See Bede, Hist. Abb. 6, 7. [W. B.]

EATA (1), the first bishop of Hexham and the fifth of Lindisfarne. He was one of the twelve Northumbrian boys whom St. Aidan, in the first days of his episcopate at Lindisfarne, "received to be instructed in Christ" (Bede, iii. 28). One of his fellow pupils was Cedd or Chad (3, iii. 28). In the year of Aidan's death, 651, we find Eata presiding as abbot over a monastery at "Malloruc," Old Melrose, a spot which Bede describes as "almost surrounded by the windsing of the Tweed (65, v. 12). He happened to be absent when, in the winter of that year, Cuthbert applied for admission into the monastery, and was received by Boisil the prior (Bede, Vit. Cuthb. c. 6). When, "after a few years," the sub-king Alchfrid, son of king Oswy, gave Eata some land at Ripon for the construction of a monastery, the abbot sent Gauther with other monks to occupy the new home. Eata himself appears to have spent some time there, for we read that he with the other inmates was sent back home (Vit. Cuthb. c. 8), or as we may infer from another passage (Bede, E. H. v. 19), preferred to depart rather than adopt the Catholic Easter and other observances which differed from those of Lindisfarne. After the conference of Whitby, bishop Colman, on the eve of his departure from Lindisfarne, asked king Oswy to place Eata over that monastery; and the abbot of Melrose thus (contrary to the rule established in foreign churches, C. of Epson, A.D. 517, c. 9) held in combination the government of two monasteries, and the priorship over both communities by qualities which Bede commemorates in the brief description of him as "the gentlest and simplest of all men" (Bede, iii. 26, iv. 27). About the same time he lost his prior Boisil, who, as he himself, we are told, had forewarned Eata three years previously, died of the plague which then ravaged Britain, and was known in Ireland as "the yellow pestilence" (Vit. Cuthb. 8). After some years, Eata transferred Cuthbert, who had succeeded Boisil as prior of Melrose, to the priorieship of Lindisfarne and employed him in a task which, perhaps, was too rough for his own disposition, that of improving the discipline of the house (Bede, iv. 27 Vit. Cuthb. 10). By Eata's request Cuthbert framed a body of rules for the monks (Anon. Vit. Cuthb. i. 3). In 678, when the diocese of York was divided by archbishop Theodore and king Egfrid without the consent of bishop Wilfrid, Eata was selected for one of the new bishoprics. He was to preside over Bernicles, having his episcopal chair either in Hexham or in Lindisfarne. Three years later, in 681, a further subdivision took place; Eata retained his office in Lindisfarne, while Wilfrid was made bishop in Hexham (Bede, iv. 12). When in 685 Cuthbert was consecrated as successor of the deceased Trumbert, Eata yielded to his former prior's strong feeling in favour of Lindisfarne, and returned to Hexham, where he spent the remainder of his life. He died of dysentery (Bede, Vit. Cuthb. 8) on October 26, 686, after an episcopate of eight years, and probably about fifty years after he had come to Lindisfarne, as a boy, to be trained by Aidan. He was commemorated on the anniversary of his death, and a church, called after "St. Eata the Confessor," was standing at Attingham (Atcham) on the Severn, near Shrewsbury, in 1075. The village was the birthplace of Ordericus Vitalis, who was baptised in the church on the "Easter Sunday" of that year (Ord. Vit. v. 1, xii. 45). See also Hardy, Desc. Cat. i. 292. [W. B.]

EATA (2) (A. S. C. ann. 738 in M. H. B. 322; EATE, Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1732 in M. H. B. 783), son of Leodwald, was the father of Eadbeth king of Northumbria, and of Egbert archbishop of York [C. H.]
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EATA (ECHA, ETNA), an anchoret who lived at Clytha, in Yorkshire, and whose death in 787 is recorded by Simeon of Durham (M. H. B. 683). In a marginal note of the MS. of Simeon the event is placed in 752 (b. 662). Under the name Echa, this person is described by Alcuin, in the poem on the saints of York, as a chaste man who had given up worldly honours to hold communion with God, and as endowed with the gift of prophecy. He makes him a contemporary of archbishop Egbert of York, A.D. 734-746 (Mons. Alcuin. ed. Jaiffé, p. 125). His name appears in the list of anchorites in the Liber Vitae Duennemenis, p. 6, as "Echa presbyter."

EATBERT (Bed. H. E. Chronol. in M. H. B. 288 e), king of Northumbria. [EATBERT (4).] [C. H.]

EATHED (Flor. Wig. Nom. Præael. Lindis. in M. H. B. 624 d, e; Id. Chron. ann. 677, 681), bishop of Lindsey. [EATHE.] [C. H.]

EATTA (Wend. F. H. ann. 678, 686, ed. Coxe), bishop of Hexham. [EATA (1).] [C. H.]

EBAGNUS, a magistrianus, or official of the magister officiorum in the imperial court (Ducange, s. v.). He was sent with a letter from the emperor Theodosius II. to Augustine inviting him to the council of Ephesus. On arriving at Carthage, Ebagnus learned from the bishop Capreolus that Augustine was dead; he then returned to Constantinople with a letter from Capreolus to that effect. (Liberatus Dionysius, Brevarium, c. 5, Patrol. Lat. lxvii. p. 977; Cellarius, viii. 417; Baronius, a. D. 430, lxiv.) [W. M. S.]

EBALTERIUS, EBAULTIUS, EBARCIS. [EBARCUS.]

EBARCUS (1) Sixteenth bishop of Nevers, following St. Itherius, and succeeded by Opportunus. He flourished about A.D. 696, according to the Gallia Christiana. His date, however, is very doubtful. Coquelle, in his list of the bishops of Nevers (Hist. du Neversois, Paris, 1612, sub fin.), places Quercius or Evacius between St. Redatus (called by him Herdatus) and Galdo, while Le Coite (ann. 766; n. x. tom. v. p. 692) mentions an Evacius or Enardus as in occupation of the see in A.D. 766, as the successor of Waldo, or nearly a century later. It is possible, too, that the passages quoted under the head of Ebascius bishop of Tours, may refer to Ebacius of Nevers (Gallia Christiana, xii. 628.) [S. A. B.]

EBARCUS (2) (EBALTUS, EBASTUS, EBARCIS, EBALTHERIUS, EVARCUS), 33rd bishop of Tours, succeeding Bertus, and followed by Palladius. He appears under the name of Ebacis as a subscriber of a privilegium or charter of Agirardus, or Agardus, bishop of Chartres, given, A.D. 696, to the monastery of the Blessed Virgin, on the Loire (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxviii. 1226, and Mabillon, de die Dipl. lib. v. tab. 21, who, however, conjectures him to belong to Nevers) and again, in a placitum of Childebert III. concerning Noisy-sur-Oise (Nocito-Villa) (Bouquet, Hist. de la Fr. iv. 676). In a charter of Louis, king of the Aquitaniens (the Piouc), in favour of Noelles (Nobiliacum), mention is made of an Ebacius, who may have been identical with Ebarcius of Tours (see Gall. Christ. ii. instrumenta, p. 346, and see also Eparchius bishop of Poitiers). In none of the above quoted passages is the see mentioned, so that it is at least possible that Ebarcius bishop of Nevers is the person referred to, or Eparchius of Poitiers (Gall. Christ. xiv. 30). [S. A. B.]

EBARCUS (3) bishop of Poitiers. [EBARCUS (2).]

EBASISUS, bishop of Vicus Aeteri, a town in the province of Byzacia in Africa. He subscribed the synodal epistle of St. Stephen the primate of the province of Byzacia, purporting to be addressed to the emperor Constantine against the Monothelites. Hardouin (Concil. iii. 739) and Mansi (Concil. x. 927) both date this council and letter A.D. 648, when no Constantine was reigning, but Constans II., who succeeded Constantine III. in 641. Morelli (Afr. Christ. i. 353), though referring to Hardouin as his authority, gives A.D. 641 as the year. Baronius (Annal. ann. 646. i. vi.) gives 646 for the date, and reads Constans for the emperor. [C. H.]

EBASTUS. [EBARCUS.]

EBBA (1) (AERBA, AERBE, EBBE, Malmes. Gest. Pontif. 231, ed. Hamilton), abbess of Coldingham, a daughter of Ethelfrid king of Northumbria, by his second wife, Acha or Aeca, sister of king Edwin, to whom he was married about A.D. 603. She was ueterine sister of St. Oswald, and sister or aunt to several kings of Northumbria. After her father's death in A.D. 616, she sought refuge in Scotland with her brothers, where Donald Breck, the king, protected her (Aberdeen Brevery). Capgrave states that she was sought in marriage by Aedan king of Scots, and that to escape from him she fled to Coldingham, where she was protected by a miracle. This story may be possibly be dismissed when we remember that Aedan was vanquished in battle by Ethelfrid before Ebba was born. Capgrave says that Ebba received the veil from bishop Finch. Her brother king Oswy gave to her a small Roman camp, on the Derwent, in the western part of the county of Durham, which she turned into a monastery, and which was called Ebchester after her. The village church is also dedicated to her (Capgrave; Surtees, Durham, ii. 301).

Ebba was also abbess of Coldingham, in Berwickshire, and gave her name to St. Abb's Head, the bleak rock hard by, which juts out into the sea. Coldingham was a twin or double monastery, i.e. an establishment in which monks and nuns resided, apart indeed, but under one head. This system was at all times a dangerous one, and in this particular case, as history shews, had afterwards its peculiar disadvantages. Of Ebba's rule at Coldingham there is but little known. It was under her that Etheldreda her nephew Egfrid's wife placed herself when she took the veil in A.D. 671 (Bed. H. E. iv. 19). [ETHEL- DREA (2).] Here Cuthbert visited Ebba at her desire, and went to pray by night on the desert beach, where the souls' came nesting up to him out of the water (Hist. Vitae S. Cuth. cap. x.) On
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one occasion queen Ermenburga, Egfrid’s second wife, was mentally afflicted under her roof, and Ebba ascribed it to the imprisonment of Wilfrid by Egfrid, and blamed her nephew severely for his conduct. She also described a miracle which Wilfrid is said to have wrought while he was in ward (Eddi, cap. 37, 39).

In A.D. 679, the monastery of Coldingham was destroyed by fire, an event which made a great sensation far and near (Bed. H. E. iv. 25). The buildings were probably of a very humble description, the walls of wood and clay, and the thatch of straw. Ebba did not long survive the destruction of her house. She is said to have died on August 26, A.D. 688 (on which day her festival was observed). Capgrave says that she was buried in her monastery, where a long while after her death her body was found by some shepherds. This was probably after its subsequent destruction by the Danes. Ebba’s remains are said to have been removed, and placed on the south side of the altar. In a later day another Egfrid, a nobleman of the north, brought Ebba’s bones, or some of them at least, to Durham, where they were laid beside those of her friend St. Cuthbert, in his shrine (Symeon, Hist. Eccl. Dun. iii. 7).

Ebba was worshipped as a saint, and divers miracles are ascribed to her agency. A life of her by Reginald, a monk of Durham, is in the Bodleian library (Fairfax, 0). It is short, and of little merit, compared with the other works of the same author, and although unpublished itself has largely been used by Capgrave. Cf. Nova Legenda Angliae, ff. 99-101; Acta SS. Aug. 25. v. 196-9; Forbes, Scottish Saints, 530; Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 288-290. [J. R.]

EBBA (2), an abbess who was sent to bishop Wilfrid in A.D. 709 by Ceolred, king of Mercia, to invite him to a conference on the state of the monasteries in his kingdom. (Eddi, Vita Wif. cap. 61.) [J. R.]

EBBI, an abbess, probably in Northumbria, of whom we know nothing more save that he died in A.D. 775. (Symeon, Chron. ed. Surtees Soc. 24.) [J. R.]

EBBO (1), ST., the 29th occupant of the see of Sens, succeeding his uncle Gericus, was born towards the close of the 7th century at Tonnerre, of noble parents. In early life he was elected to the administration of the district, a post which had become almost hereditary in his family. Civil honours, however, were distasteful to him, and while still young he relinquished his post and entered the monastery of St. Pierre le Vif, near Sens, of which, on the death of Viriaiboldus, he was elected abbot. He could not have remained here long, for in the first year of Dagobert III. (A.D. 711) he subscribes himself episcopus to a charter or deed, by which his sister Ingoara made over certain lands to the monastery of St. Pierre (Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxviii. 1258). According to the Chronicon Fontanellense (see D’Achery, Spicilegium, tom. ii. p. 270) he was present at a convent of bishops at Tolpiac, which is assigned to A.D. 722 or 723. A few years later he is said to have saved the city of Sens. The Saracens, after a long siege of Gaul, arrived before Sens, and laid siege to it (A.D. 732). The garrison, reduced to the last extremity, besought the aid of Ebbo, who, after prayer, rallied forth, almost unaccompanied, and put the enemy to flight, their arms being miraculously directed against themselves. The latter portion of his life he spent in solitude and meditation at Arce (Arec), a place situated a few miles from Sens, returning, however, at intervals to teach and console his flock. He died about A.D. 750, and was succeeded by Merulfs, or, according to the Bollandists, Arthuretus. He was buried at his old monastery of St. Pierre, by the side of his sisters, Ingoara and Leoteria. (Chroniques de St. Denis, liv. v. c. xxvi.; Chron. Auct. Incert.; Vita Ebbo. Episc. Sen. Auct. Anon. Socci. x., all to be found in Bouquet, iii. pp. 311, 315, 350 respectively; Roll. Acta SS. Aug. vi. 94; Gall. Christ. xii. 12.) [S. A. B.]

EBBO (2) (EBUL, EUBLUS), 29th bishop of Limoges, succeeded St. Cessar, and was followed by Aedelicus. He is said to appear in the catalogue of the abbots of Paris as “Ebulo Episcopus.” Le Coince (Ann. Eccl. a. 752 n. clv. tom. v. 387) conjectures that he was abbott and bishop as late as the beginning of Pippin’s reign A.D. 752. (Gall. Christ. ii. 506.) [S. A. B.]

EBDJEDESUS (1) (ΔΑΣΡΟΣ), the name of a bishop, three prebendaries, a deacon, and a monk, in the Persian martyrdoms under Sapor, about A.D. 361.

(i) In a bare list of bishops mentioned by Sozomen (H. E. ii. 13) as suffering in that country at this period Abdas and Ebedjedesus occur together, while Dausus, who closes the list, is briefly stated to have been taken captive at Zabde and martyred. Copious Acta of these two bishops and numerous companions were first printed in the original Chaldæan, with a Latin translation by Assamani (Herm. gr. et Lat. 1748, p. 144). The Monumentum of Balli also relates (May 16) how bishop Ebedjedesus in Persis, denounced by his own nephew, a deacon, was martyred under Sapor with bishop Abdas and others.

(ii) Three prebendaries, Ebedjedesus, are named in the Assamani MS. just referred to as martyred with bishops Abdas and Ebedjedesus.

(iii) In the same Chaldæc Acta occurs a deacon Ebedjedesus, a mere name, in a company of deacons martyred with the two bishops. But in another of Assamani’s Chaldæic MSS. (ut sup. p. 133), wherein the martyrdom of bishop Dausus is related, Ebedjedesus appears as a distinct and prominent character. [DAUSAR.] Sozomen is silent as to this companion, whereas the Acta in Assamani are very full, and are supported by the Memoria (Ap. 9) which it cites. Assamani states that a mutilation in his MS. prevents any information being given concerning the death of deacon Ebedjedesus.

(iv) The monk Ebedjedesus is enumerated with other monks in the Assamani Acta (s. p. 144) as suffering with bishops Abdas and Ebedjedesus. [C. H.]

EBDJEDESUS (2) was a disciple of St. Abda Durkonensis, and flourished in the episcopal of Tamuz or Tomarra, who was bishop of Seleucia about the end of the 4th century (Assamani Ebd. Orient. iii. 614). He founded the monastery
EBERHARD, bishop. [C. H.]

EBERHARD (2), bishop. [C. H.]

EBERLULFS, chamberlain and alleged murderer of Chilpéric I. The crime was committed in A.D. 564, and the same year Guntram, Chilpéric's brother, and king of Burgundy, announced his intention of investigating the matter. Fredegund, the widow, denounced Eberlulf, who, she said, had afterwards stolen part of his treasure and fled to Tours. Guntram thereupon swore before his nobles to take vengeance upon Eberlulf and his posterity to the ninth generation, that the sight of their punishment might arrest for ever the impulse of custom of killing kings. Eberlulf took refuge in the sanctuary of St. Martin at Tours. Whether he was guilty of this particular crime remains doubtful. According to Gregory of Tours his denunciation was due to the fact that he had offended Fredegund by refusing to remain with her after Chilpéric's death. The author of the Gesta Regum Francorum imputes the crime to Fredegund herself, alarmed at the prospect of detection in her adultery with Landericus (c. 35, Migne, Patr. Lat. xcvii. 1453-4), and in this is followed by Almain (ii. 57; Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 730, 731). But whether implicated in the murder or not, Eberlulf was one of the most lawless and desperate men of his time. Though a refugee in the sanctuary, and scarcely daring to quit the actual tomb, he put no check upon his violent nature. He blasphemed the saint, and committed murders at his very feet, and the shrine was polluted with his orgies and extravagances. A priest who hesitated to give him more wine, when he was already drunk, barely escaped with his life; and Gregory of Tours himself, to whose championship of the rights of the sanctuary he might at any moment have to look for his life, he outraged and threatened continually declaring that he should die contented if he could first slay him and every other of St. Martin's servants. Guntram sent one Claudius with instructions to draw him, if possible, out of the precinct, and then kill or take him prisoner, but to be careful not to violate the sanctuary. Arrived at Tours, he succeeded in ingratiating himself with Eberlulf by protea9tions of friendship and assurance of his good offices with the king. In the absence of Gregory, the two made a feast in the church, in the course of which Eberlulf was induced to send away his servants for more wine. Claudius and his attendants then fell upon him, and killed him within the sanctuary. They themselves lost their lives either in the combat, or from the indignation of the people, who resented the insult done to the saint. Such of his goods as had not been already pillaged when he first fell into disgrace were distributed by Guntram among his friends. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. vii. 21, 22, 29.)

EBIONISM and EBIONITES. The name Ebionite first occurs in Irenaeus (circa A.D. 180-190; Adv. Haer. i. c. 29; [al. c. 26.] pp. 212-13, ed. Harvey). It was repeated, probably from him, by Hippolytus (c. A.D. 225-235; Refutat. Omn. Haeres. vii. c. 34 [al. c. 22]. ii. p. 406, ed. Duncker) and Origen († A.D. 254; Contr. Celsum, ii. c. 1) who set the example of introducing explanations of the name not always consistent with each other (cp. loc. cit. and De Principiis, iv. c. 1, § 22, Greek). In this, others imitated him, but offered different explanations (e.g. Eusebius [† c. A.D. 340]; Eccl. Hist. iii. c. 27), while other writers fabricated a leader, "Ebion," after whom the sect was called (cp. Oehler, Corpus Haeres. i. for the opinions of Philastrius (p. 42), Pseudo-Tertullian (p. 275), Pseudo-Jerome (p. 290), Isidore of Spain (p. 306), &c.).

These derivations and explanations owe their origin to the tendency to carry back the character of Ebionism, or the date of its founder, as far as possible. Thus the "Ebionite" was (according to his own statement) the "poor" man (Πων), who voluntarily strove to practise the Master's precept (Matt. x. 9) in Apostolic times (Acts iv. 34-7; cp. Epiphanius, Haer. xxx. c. 17); and the correctness of the etymology is not shaken by the Patristic scorn which derived the name from "poverty of intellect," or from "low and mean opinions of Christ" (see Eusebius, l. c.; Origen, de Princ. i. c.; Ignatius, Epist. ad Philadeph. c. 6, longer recension). "Ebion," as a name first personified by Tertullian, was said to have been a pupil of Cerinthus, and the Gospel of St. John to have been as much directed against the former as the latter. St. Paul and St. Luke were asserted to have spoken and written against Ebionites. The "Apostolical Constitutions" (vi. c. 6) traced them back to Apostolic times; Theodoret (Haer. fideb. ii. c. 2) assigned them to the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96). The existence of an "Ebion" is, however, now surrendered. Ebionism, however, had a nucleus, but the belief that its birth-place was the Holy Land, and its existence contemporary with the beginning of the Christian Church, is, with certain reservations, probably correct. A tendency to Ebionism existed from the first; gradually it assumed shape, and as gradually it developed itself in the two special forms presently to be noticed.

The records of the Church of Jerusalem contained in the Acts of the Apostles prove how
strong was the zeal for the Law of Moses among the Jewish converts to Christianity. Gradually the leading Apostles there, SS. Peter, James, and John, whose powers of restraint and conciliation cannot be over-estimated, piously, drew away, or were withdrawn. The fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) took place, and the Church was formed at Pella under Symeon. The Jewish Christians were from the time of this visitation of God brought face to face with two leading facts. The first was that the temple was being obliterated, and the observance of the Law and its ordinances being positively impossible in part, there was valid reason for doubting the necessity of retaining the rest. The second was that if they adopted this view they must henceforth expect to find in the Jews their most uncompromising enemies. As Christians they had expected a judgment predicted by Christ, and, following His advice, had fled from the city. Both prediction and act were resented by the Jews. What the Jews were prepared to do, and actually did, is shown not only by the contemptuous term (Minim) they applied to the Jewish Christians (Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, iv. p. 89, &c.), but by the share they took in the death of the aged bishop Symeon (A.D. 106). The breach was not full; there still remained a portion of the Jewish Christians to take part in the national struggles—notably that of Bar-Cochba (A.D. 132)—against the Romans, by the tortures they had to suffer for their refusal, and lastly, by the erection of Aelia Capitolina (A.D. 138) on the ruins of Jerusalem. The Jews were forbidden to enter it, while the Jewish and Gentile Christians who came there were reviled and allowed no rights of Roman citizenship. The abolition of the most distinctive Jewish rites, and they practically signified their assent to it by electing as their bishop a Gentile and uncircumcised man—Mark (Essuc. Eccl. Hist. iv. 6).

Changes hitherto working gradually were now rapidly developed. Jewish Christians, with predilections for Gentile Christianity and its comparative freedom from the observance of the Sabbath, and the absence of the more precise observance of a kindred law, were able to adapt themselves to the contempt of Rabbin as well as Christianty (Grätz, p. 433); others lastly receded farther from Christianity, and approximated more and more closely to pure Judaism. The Ebionites are to be ranked among the last. By the time of Trajan (A.D. 96–116) political events had given them a definiteness of organization to which they had been previously strangers, and their position as a sect opposed to Gentile Christianity became fixed by the acts which culminated in the erection of Aelius Capitolina. The Ebionites were known by other names, such as "Homunculi," Greek "Anthropomorphites," or "Anthropolatriots" from their Christological views, "Periscars" from their settlement at Persa, and "Symmacians" from the one able literary man among them whose name has come down to posterity "Simmachus." Acquaintance with Hebrew was then confined to a few, and his Greek version of the Old Testament was produced for the benefit of those who declined the LXX adopted by the Ebionite Christians, in the Greek version of Aquila and Theodotion accepted by the Jews. Many, if not most, of the improvements made by the Vulgate on the LXX are due to the Ebionite version. (Field, Origines Hexaparum, quae supersunt. Preface.)

Ebionism presents itself under two principal types, an earlier and a later, the former usually designated Ebionism proper or Pharisaic Ebionism [see Nazarenes], the latter, Essene or Gaotic Ebionism. The earlier type is to be traced in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, &c.; the later in those of Epiphanius especially.

(a) Ebionism proper.—The term expresses the opinions and practices of the descendants of the Judaiizers of the Apostolic age, and is very little removed from Judaism. Judaism was to them not so much a preparation for Christianity, as an institution eternally good in itself, and but slightly modified in Christianity. Whatever merit Christianity possessed was possessed as the continuation and supplementation of Judaism. The divinity of the Old Covenant was the only valid guarantee for the truth of the New. Hence the tendency of this class of Ebionites to exalt the Old at the expense of the New, to magnify Moses and the Prophets, and to allow Jesus Christ to be "nothing more than a Solomon or a John" (Tertull. de Carne Christi, lib. iv. 18). Legal righteousness was to them the highest type of perfection; the earthly Jerusalem, in spite of its destruction, was an object of adoration "as if it were the house of God" (Irenaeus, l.c.); its restoration would take place in the millennial kingdom of Messiah, and the Jews would return there as the manifestly chosen people of God. They distrusted the life of Jesus Christ into two parts; one preceding, the other following, His Baptism. In common with Cerinthus and Carpocrates, they represented Him to have been "the Son of Joseph and Mary according to the ordinary course of human generation" (Iren. l. c.). They denied His birth of a Virgin, translating the original word in Is. vii. 14 not ωθηθας, but ωθησαν. He was a "mere man, nothing more than a mere descendant of David, and not also the Son of God" (Tert. c. 14). But at His Baptism a great change took place. The event is described in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" current among them, and the description is an altered expansion of the record of St. Matthew (iii. 13, 14). The voice from heaven spake not only the words recorded by the Evangelist, but also the words: "This day have I begotten Thee." (Ps. ii. 7). A great light suddenly filled the place. John the Baptist asked, "Who art Thou, Lord?" and the Voice answered as before. John prostrated himself at the feet of Jesus, "I pray Thee, Lord, baptize me," but Jesus forbade him, saying, "Suffer it to be so," &c. &c. (Epiphanius, Haer. xxx. 13). The day of Baptism was thus the day of His "anointing by election and then becoming Christ" (cf. Justin Martyr. Dial. c. Tryph. c. xii.). It was the turning-point in the life of Jesus: from that moment He was endowed with power necessary to fill His mission as Messiah; but He was still man. The Ebionites knew nothing of either pre-existence or divinity in connexion with Him. They are said to have freed themselves from Jewish dogmas, and to have held that the Messiah was to be an earthly king; they were not shocked, as were so many of the Jews, at
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the humbleness of the birth, the sufferings, and crucifixion of Jesus; but they agreed with them in looking upon the advent of Messiah as future, and in denouncing the restitution of all things to the millennium.

In conformity with these opinions upon the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, and upon the person and dignity of Jesus Christ, the Ebionites proper insisted that the Law should be strictly observed not only by themselves but by all. They quoted the words of Jesus (Matt. v. 17), and pointed to His practice (cp. Matt. xxvi. 55; John vii. 14, &c.). In like manner, the author of the New Testament seems to diminish the value of faith in Christ and a corresponding life. Of far greater moment to them, and as necessary to salvation, was the due observance of circumcision, the sabbath, the distinction between clean and unclean food, the sacrificial offerings—probably with the later Pharisaic additions (cp. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. vi. c. 17)—and the refusal of fellowship or hospitality to those who refused. They even quoted the words of Jesus (Matt. x. 24, 25) as their warrant, and affirmed their motto to be: "We also would be imitators of Christ." (Origen, quoted by Schleierm.) Jesus, they asserted, "was justified by fulfilling the Law; He was the Christ of God, since not one of the rest of mankind had observed the Law completely. Had any one else fulfilled the commandments of the Law, he would have been the Christ." In consequence, they declared, "when Ebionites in like manner fulfill the Law, they are able to become Christ." (Hippolytus, l.c.) As might be expected, the Apostle Paul was especially hateful to them. They repudiated his official character, they reviled him personally, in language which recalls that of the Judasizers alluded to in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, they represented him as a teacher directly opposed to St. Peter, St. James, and St. John; they reproached St. John with having no apostolical authority because (as they affirmed) he had not been "called of Jesus Christ Himself," nor trained with the other Apostles in the Church of Jerusalem. They twisted into a defamatory application to himself his employment of the term "deceiver" (2 Cor. vi. 8); he was himself one of the "many which corrupted the word of God." (2 Cor. ii. 17); he proclaimed "deliverance from the Law" only "to please men" (Gal. i. 10) and "condemn himself" (2 Cor. iii. 1). His personal character was held up to reproach as that of one who "walked according to the flesh" (2 Cor. x. 2), puffed up with pride, marked by levity of purpose (2 Cor. iii. 1), and even by dishonesty (2 Cor. vii. 2). They rejected his Epistles—not on the ground of authenticity—but as the work of an "apostate from the Law." (Euseb. iii. c. 27; Iren. i. c.) They went so far as to assert that by birth he was not a Jew but a Gentile (wresting his words in Acts xxi. 39), who had become a proselyte in the hope of marrying the High-Priest's daughter, but that having failed in this he had severed himself from the Jews and had occupied himself in writing against circumcision and the observance of the sabbath. (Epiphanius, adv. Haer. i. xxx. 16, 23.)

In common with the Nazarenes and the Gnostic-Ebionites, the Pharisaic Ebionites used a recension of the Gospel of St. Matthew, which they termed the "gospel according to the Hebrews." It was a Chaldee version written in Hebrew letters, and was afterwards translated by Jerome into Greek and Latin, who declared that he was acquainted with the "gospel of the Twelve Apostles," and the "gospel of the Nazarenes" (see Herzog, Real-Encykl., "Aporkr. d. N. Test," p. 520, ed. 1877). In the Ebionite 'gospel' the section corresponding to the first two chapters of St. Matthew was omitted, the supernatural character of the narrative being contradictory to their views about the person of Jesus Christ. It is difficult to say with certainty what other elements of the New Testament were known to them; but there is reason to believe that they (as also the Gnostic-Ebionites) were familiar with the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke. The existence among them of the "Protevangelium Jacobi" and the Nēprōn τοῦ Ἡσαυροῦ indicates their respect for those Apostles. (b) Essence or Gnostic Ebionism.—This, as the name indicates, was a type of Ebionism affected by external Gnosticism. They even accepted features of the Ebionite reformation were reproduced in its practice, and the traces of influences more directly mystical and oriental were evident in its doctrines. The fact that Ebionism generally passed through different phases at different times renders it, however, difficult to define with precision the line which separates Gnostic and Pharisaic Ebionism. Epiphanius (Adv. Haer. xxx.) is the chief authority on this class of Ebionites. He met them in Cyprus, and by personal inquiry obtained information upon points in which the older Hæresiologists had failed him (cp. G. A. Lipsius, Zur Quellen- Kritik d. Epiphanius, pp. 138, 143, 150, &c.).

Their principal tenets were as follows:—Christianity they identified with primitive religion or genuine Mosaism, and as distinguished from what they termed accretions to Mosaism, or the post-Mosaic developments described in the later books of the Old Testament. To carry out this distinction they fabricated two classes of "prophets," προφήται ἄληθες, and προφήται σύνεσις ὑπὸ ἄληθες. In the former class they placed Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Aaron, Moses, and Jesus; in the latter David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c. In the same spirit they accepted the Pentateuch alone among the Old Testament writings, and emasculated it; rejecting whatever reflected questionably upon their favourites. They held that there were two antagonistic powers appointed by God, Christ and devil; to the former was allotted the world to come, to the latter the present world. The conception of Christ was variously entertained. Some affirmed that He was created (not born) of the Father, a Spirit, and higher than the angels; that He had the power of coming to this earth, where He would, and in various modes of manifestation, that He had been incarnate in Adam, and had appeared to the patriarchs in bodily shape; others identified Adam and Christ. In these last days He had come in the person of Jesus. Jesus was therefore to them a successor of Moses, and not of higher authority. They quoted from their gospel a saying which was attributed to Him, "I am He concerning Whom Moses prophesied, saying, A prophet shall the Lord God raise unto you like unto me," &c. (Clem. Hom. iii. c. 63), and this
was enough to identify His teaching with that of genuine Mosaicism. But inasmuch as they declined to fix the precise moment of the union of the Christ with the man Jesus—a union assigned by the Pharisaic Ebionites to the hour of Baptism—they admitted His miraculous origin.

In pursuance of their conception that the devil would seek to destroy the Church by the set of heretics and ascetics. They abjured flesh-meal, repudiating passages (e.g. Gen. xviii. 8) which contradicted their view; they refused to taste wine, and communicated with unleavened bread and water. Water was to them "in the place of a god;" ablations and lustrations were imperative and frequent. In one point they rejected asceticism for truer rules; they held the married life in honour, and recommended early marriages. To the observance of the Jewish sabbath they added also the observance of the Christian Lord's day. Circumcision was sacred to them from the practice of the patriarchs and of Jesus Christ; and they declined all fellowship with the uncircumcised. They observed the sacrifices of the altar and the reverence of the Jew for the Temple. In common with the Ebionite proper, they detested St. Paul, rejected his Epistles, and circulated stories creditable to him. The other Apostles were known to them by their writings, to which they assigned inferior rank in comparison with their own gospel.

It may perhaps be impossible to state precisely when Gnostic Ebionism replaced Ebionism proper, just as it is impossible to state definitely when Esseniastic Ebionism became affected by Gnosticism; but the conjecture appears not improbable that as the siege of Jerusalem under Titus gave an impetus to Ebionism proper, so the ruin under Hadrian developed Gnostic Ebionism. Not that Gnostic Ebionism began then to affect it for the first time, but that Gnostic ideas hitherto held in solution were precipitated and found a congenial home among men who through contact with oriental systems in Syria were already predisposed to accept them. The Essene Ebionite in accepting Gnostically Christiansitied Christianity brought it to the customs to which he was most attached. (Cp. Mansel, The Gnostic Sect, viii.)

This is further evident from the book of Elchassai and the Clementine Literature (see these names). These works are the production of the Essene Ebionites; and where they speak of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, His sayings and their lives, they do so, not in the words of the canonical Gospels and Epistles, but with additions or omissions, with that colouring which transforms (e.g.) St. Peter, St. Matthew, and St. James the Just into Essenes, and yet with that Gnostic tendency of thought which makes them lineal descendants of the Judeaizers who impelled the church at Colossae. (See Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 73, &c., and Essenism and Christianity, p. 397, &c.) The Essene or Gnostic-Ebionites differed from the Pharisaic Ebionites in another respect. By missionary zeal, as well as by literary activity, they sought to obtain converts to their views. In the earlier part of the 3rd century the Ebionite Alcibiades of Apamea (Syria) repaired to Rome. He brought with him the book of Elchassai, and "preached unto men a new remission of sins (proclaimed) in the third year of Trajan's reign." (A.D. 101.) Hippolytus, who gives an account of the matter (Hær. ix. c. viii. &c. ed. Clark), exposed the decided anti-Judaism which penetrated the teaching of the mythical teacher and of the pupil, but it is evident that many "became victims of the delusion." The immorality which the book—in imitation of the teaching of Callistus—indirectly encouraged probably attracted some; but could not fail to discredit the views of the mischievous sect.

Ebionite Christianity did no; however, last very long, neither did it exercise much influence west of Syria while it lasted. In Palestine the discomfiture accorded to "a certain one" (probably Alcibiades) who came to Caesarea about A.D. 247 maintaining the "ungodly and wicked error of the Elchsassai" (Baseb. vi. c. 38; cp. Redepenning, Origines, ii. p. 72) was in keeping with the reception accorded to less extreme Ebionite views from the time of the reconstitution of the mother Church at Aelia Capitolina. Judaism of every kind gradually passed out of favour. The attitude of the bishops of Palestine in the Paschal controversy of the 2nd century was the attitude of men who sympathized with the sympathies of the Jews; the language of Justin Martyr and of Hegesippus was the language of the representatives of the Samaritan and the Hebrew Christianity of the day, not of the Ebionite. And outside of Palestine Ebionism had even less chance of survival. From the very first the instructions and memories of St. Paul and St. John excluded it from Asia Minor; in Antioch the names of Ignatius, Theophilus, and Serapion were vouchers for Catholic doctrine and practice; and the daughter-Churches of Gaul and Alexandria naturally preferred doctrine supplied to them by teachers trained in the school of these Apostles. Even in the Church of Rome, whatever tendency existed in Apostolic times towards Ebionism, the separation also in Apostolic times—of the Judaising was the beginning of the end which no after-amalgamation under Clement could retard. The tone of the Shepherd of Hermas—a work which emanated from the Roman Church during the first half of the 2nd century (see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 59, n. 2)—however different from the tone of the Apocrypha and St. Paul, is yet, in the slightest comparison with another so-called Roman and certainly later Ebionite work—the Clementine writings—is sufficient to prove it. The end of Ebionism had actually come—so far as the Roman Church was concerned—when in the 2nd century Jewish practices—notably as regards the observance of Easter—were unsuspectingly rejected. The creed of the Christian in Rome was the creed which he held from Irenaeus in Gaul and Polycarp in Asia Minor, and not from the Ebionite. When the above-named Alcibiades appeared in Rome (A.D. 219), Hippolytus denounced his teaching (that of Elchassai) as that of "a wolf risen up against many wandering sheep, whom Callistus had scattered abroad;" it came upon him as November; he had "risen up," he says, "in our own day." (Hær. ix. c. 8, 12.) The bishop's language is a proof of the oblivion which had certainly befallen any previous propagation of Ebionism in Rome.

For a couple of hundred years more, Ebionism—especially of the Essene form—lingered on. A few Ebionites were left; the time of Theodoret, about the middle of the 5th century: the rest had either returned to strict Judaism and to the
EBODICHUS [EBODUS].

EBORAS, a Persian presbyter, martyred with Miles a bishop, and Sebosa a deacon, during the reign of Sapor II. (A.D. 346). He was commemorated Nov. 13. (Memol. Bas.) [T. S. B.]

EBORIC, king of the Suevi in Spain. [EBURIC.]

EBORINUS (EBORINTS), sixteenth bishop of Toul, succeeding Theodelfiridus and followed by St. Leudinus. He is one of the bishops addressed in the charter of Numeriani archbishop of Toul, to the abbot of Neronus, the founder and abbot of the monastery of Vallis-Gallasen in the Vosges (circ. A.D. 664).

(Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 1191; Gall. Christ. xii. 963, in str. 291.) [S. A. B.]

(EBORIJUS, (1). The name of "Eborius episcopus de civitate Bibracensi provincia Britannia" is attached, with those of Restitutus and Adelfius, to the acts of the council of Arles in 314. [ADELFUS.]

He is possibly the person called Hibernius in the synodal letter to pope Sylvester (Mansi, li. 469). The name may represent the British Ivor, Ebor, or Ibar. (See Haddan and Stubbs, i. 7; Mansi, Conc. ii. 466, 467; Labbe, Conc. i. 1430.) [EBURICUS.]

(EBORIUS, (2), king of the Suevi in Spain. [EBURIC.]

EBRAISILUS (Boll. Acta SS. Aug. vi. 694), bishop of Meaux. [EBREGISILUS.] [C. H.]

EBREGISILUS (EBREGISILUS, EBREGISILUS), ninth bishop of Cologne, succeeding Charentinus, and followed by Remedius, or, according to some, eighth, preceding Charentinus. In Gregory of Tours the name appears in a double connection, as borne by an ambassador of queen Brunehild, and a bishop of Cologne. Although there is no statement to that effect, it is by no means improbable that the two are identical. In the former capacity he was sent by the queen to Spain with a golden shield and two costly bowls as presents for the king, but Guntram, at Paris, being informed that gifts were on the way to the sons of Gundobald, his enemies, and suspecting that the ambassador was intended to excite hostilities against himself, intercepted the ambassador, and condemned him to death. He escaped, however, by affirming that the presents were for king Richardus, the betrothed of Chlodosuinda, sister of Childebert II.

As bishop, he was sent by king Childebert in A.D. 590 to assist in quelling the scandalous disturbances which had arisen in the monastery of the Holy Cross in Poitou, and he took part in the council of Poitiers, which was necessitated by them. [CHROTELIGUS.]

Two miracles are related by Gregory in connexion with him. Being seized with pains in the brain, he was healed by the application to his head of some of the dust of those fifty of the Theban Legion, who were said to have been buried at Cologne. He was also famous as the discoverer at oppidum Bertone of the body of St. Malouus. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. ii 29; x 15; De Glor. Mart. iii. ixi. vii.; Gall. Christ. iii. 625; Labbe, Sacros. Conc. vi. 1317.) [S. A. B.]

EBREGISILUS (Boll. Acta SS. Aug. vii 694), bishop of Meaux. [EBREGISILUS.] [C. H.]

EBREGISUS (EBREGISUS, EVERGISUS), ST. twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth bishop of Trogres (afterwards Liège), succeeding St. Perpetuus. In the Gesta of Herigerus bishop of Liège (ob. A.D. 1009), the following words occur after a notice of St. Perpetuus, "Beatus quoque Ebergissus succedens 24 in Trumonia ejusdem episcopatus villa futu tumulatus." (Gesta, xxviii. Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 1033.) In a short Chronicle of Liège (see Gall. Christ. iii. 820) it is stated that he was bishop in A.D. 618. According to the compilers of the Gallia Christiana, his day of commemoration is the 28th of March, as distinguished from that of Evergisus of Cologne, with whom he has been confused, and whose day is the 24th of October (cf. Usuard, Martyrologium; Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxii. 884, cxvii. 616, 617, 618). He is said to have died in A.D. 623, and to have been buried at Dortmund (Trumonia). His successor was Joannes. (Le Coite, Ana. Eccl. Franc. anno. 609, n. 15, anno. 623, p. 6, temp. iii. pp. 609, 723.) [S. A. B.]

EBRELINDUS, bishop of Lon. [ELINANDUS.]

EBREMUNDUS (EBREMUNDO), priest, and abbot. Migne and the Bollandists agree in the account of his life, but place it at quite different periods; the former saying he was born about the middle of the 7th century, and died about A.D. 720; the latter placing his death before A.D. 584. He was born at Bayeux, of a noble family, and passed his youth at court, Thierry III. being then king according to Migne, and Chliperic I. according to the Acta and Du Saussay. There he was rich and honoured, and married a wife of noble birth. Reading one day the words of our Lord "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me," he resolved to renounce the world, and with the consent of his wife, who took the veil, retired from court and founded the abbey of Fontenay, in the diocese of Seez. He was afterwards made by the bishop of that diocese abbot of Mont Maire. Many miracles are related of him. His body was buried at his monastery, but was translated to Creil in the 10th century, for fear of Norman sepulchres. It was burned by the Huguenots in 1567, with the exception of part of the head, which, being in a separate reliquary, was preserved by the monks.

The common source of the various accounts of the saint seems to be a life of doubtful authority, taken from a breviary of Sensis, and given at length in the Acta, which places him in the time of King Chliperic, who was assassinated in A.D. 584, and makes him a contemporary of St. Ethel- phus or Evroux, and of St. Aloubert or Anobert.
EBRETINGUS, bishop of Leoni, who attended a council at Rouen in A.D. 689, and died in A.D. 701. The same life says he was buried by Loithaire, bishop of Sées, who is said to have been either next or fourth in succession from Alarbert. Migne seems to have chosen one mode of cutting the knot of the self of the name of Bayeux which was founded in the reign of William the Conqueror. The former abbey was destroyed by the Normans and never restored. Its site was two leagues north of Sées. (Gallia Christiana, xi. 413, 712.) [F. D.]

EBRETINGUS, bishop of Leoni. (ELEN-ANDUS.)

EBRIGISILUS, ST. (EBREGISILUS, EBRAI- SILUS), twenty-third bishop of Mœurs, the successor of St. Patarius. He is said to have been a monk of Jourarre (Jotrum), near Mœurs, and the brother of Aguilberta, the abbess of the nunnery in the same place. His date is quite uncertain, but perhaps may be placed towards the end of the 7th century. He was succeeded by Edolus. He was buried in the burying-place of the monastery, but in 1627 his remains, together with those of his sister and St. Theolechild, were disinterred in the presence of the queen Maria de Medicis, and placed in the church of Jourarre (Gall. Christ. viii. 1601; Boll. Acta SS. Ang. vi. 694.) [S. A. B.]

EBRIOINUS (Bed. iv. 1), mayor. (EBRONIUS.)

EBRIOINUS (1) was set up by the Frankish chiefs as mayor of the palace in Neustria and Burgundy about the year 638 (Gesta Reg. Fr. 45). Balthildis, mother of Clotaire III., regent during the minority of her son, was in some degree a check upon Ebroin. With her retirement in 644 to the monastery of Chelles, Ebroin's unlawful and tyrannical rule became arbitrary, rapacious, and cruel; he sold justice for money; he trampered under foot both nobility and clergy [pro levi offensâ sangvinem nobilium multorum fundebat innoxium (Vita Leodegari, c. 2, ap. Bouquet, ii. 611)]. In 670, on the death of Clotaire, Ebroin determined to set up Theodoric (or Thierry), Clotaire's brother as king; without calling together the customary Frankish assembly. The chiefs who, unwilling, came to salute the new king were repulsed with insults (V. Leodec. c. 3). A conspiracy was formed. Childeric of Austrasia was set up as king of the whole realm, Theodoric deposed and banished to a monastery; Ebroin was also banished to Luxeuil. The leader in this revolution was Leodegar bishop of Autun. Three years later, Thierry himself shared the same fate and the hands of Wulfoald. Wulfoald's tyranny again brought about the murder of Childeric, and universal anarchy prevailed (magna turbatio patriae, V. Leod. c. 7). In Neustria Theodoric was set up as mayor by the Burgundian party under Leodegis, Erchinoald's son, and Leodegar, who had returned from banishment. In Austrasia Dagobert II. was king of one party (Wulf-

EBRULFUS (3) (EVROLT, EVROYLT), St.,
said to have been abbot of the monastery of St. Fuscien-aux-Bois, near Amiens, probably towards the close of the 6th century. A life of him written by an anonymous author not earlier than the 9th century, was first published by Mabillon from a very old MS. (Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict. i. 566, Paris, 1668-1701), and again from another MS. by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 25 Jul. vi. 194). Historically it is probably worthless. He was born at Beauvais, of French parents, in answer to the prayers of his mother, who had been long barren. From earliest childhood he was prompt in obedience and averse to evil. Soon, for the love of Christ, he withdrew himself from his parents, esteeming the carnal affections as enemies of his soul, and passed his youth in fasting and reading the scriptures. After a time he assumed the monastic habit, and built himself a cell at the place which was called, from its numerous houses of prayer, Oratorium (Oroir). The fame of his sanctity reached the bishop of Beauvais, who summoned him to his presence, and ordained him a deacon. In due course he became a priest, and his eminent piety was evidenced by the performance of many miracles. The monastery he established on the spot where St. Fuscienus and St. Victorious had suffered martyrdom, near Amiens, lost its abbat, and queen Fredegund, who, according to this most improbable narrative, venerated Ebrulfus, persuaded the nobles of her court to confer on him the office (cf. Gall. Christ. x. 1302). A vision directed him to accept it, though against his will. In the monastery he shewed himself humbler than the lowest of the brethren. It was vouchsafed to him to find the body of Maxianus or Maximinus (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. i. 461), directed in a vision by St. Lucian, the fellow-sufferer of that martyr. He died July 25, and was buried in the oratorium, in the territory of Beauvais, where he had formerly dwelt, and which was afterwards called by his name. Some years later his tomb was adorned and enriched by a pious and noble matron named Theclana or Teclana, and Theodebert, or Chrodeberht, bishop of Paris (Gall. Christ. vii. 25), built a church over it. A nursery too was established there, which in the time of the first abbess Angadrismna was saved from conflagration by the presence of the saint's body (cf. Gall. Christ. ix. 813). When the Northmen devastated France his body was translated to Beauvais and placed in the church of St. Peter (circa 850). The life is followed in the Acta SS. by an account of his miracles (p. 196) by another anonymous and still later author. Though his death is assigned to July 25, and is marked under that date in the martyrologies (e.g. Usuard auct. Reg. Suec. in Migne, cxxiv. 297), the church of Beauvais commemorates him on the 26th. There has been some discussion as to his date. Mabillon and the Bollandists (obs. praevar. ut supra, p. 192) follow the life, which plainly speaks of the reign of Chilperic I, at the close of the 6th century. Le Cointe would place him a century later, but this view is generally disseminated from.

(Hist. Lit. de la France, vi. 88.)

[EBRULFUS (3)]

EBRULFUS (2), eighth bishop of Noyon and Tournai, following Chrodegang and succeeded by Bertundus or St. Acharius. According to Le Cointe he died in A.D. 621, but he is placed earlier than 575 by the compilers of the Gallia Christiana. Nothing is known of his life. (Le
EBULUS (1) (Evolum, Elmius), third bishop of Limoges, placed by the Sammarthani next to St. Aurelianus, whose death they date A.D. 89. He fled through fear of persecution to Evraeum (Eueva) in Briis, where he remained in concealment (p. 379). Jordanus, a bishop of Limoges in the 11th century, mentions him by the name of Ebulus. (Gall. Christ. ii. 500; Jordanus, Epist. ad Bened. viii. pop. in Patr. Lat. ciii. 1159 a; Gams, Serm. Ep. 564.) [R. T. S.]

EBULUS (2) (Evulus), sixth bishop of Avignon, succeeding one unknown, A.D. 202, according to an ancient manuscript quoted in the Gallia Christiana (ii. 852), where it is stated that he was ordained and sent to Vienne from Rome by pope Victor at the close of his pontificate, and that having sat sixteen years and above eight months (the last three years being spent in the desert), he died in his church before the altar of St. Mary in the act of blessing his clergy and people, on 12th June (the year being by computation 219), having previously consecrated the presbyter Joannes as his successor. The Sammarthani in this place conjecture that he was the Ebulus who carried the letter of Victor to Augustinus the fifth year of his pontificate (cir. 194) to Desiderius bishop of Vienne, Victor calling him “de collegio nostro,” and begging for him a favourable reception as one ready to live and die with Desiderius. This letter of Victor occurs in Baronius (A. E. ann. 198, xvii.), and Baronius, on the strength of it recognizes Desiderius as bishop of Vienne. But the later compilers of the Gall. Carol. (xvi. 9 b) reject this Desiderius, and Jaffé prints Victor’s letter as spurious (Reg. Post. 922). The doubt cast upon Desiderius of course makes the existence of Ebulus questionable. [C. H.]

EBULUS (3), EBULO, 29th bishop of Limoges. [Evno (2).]

EBUR, or, according to another reading, Ywou, a bishop who is said in the Annales Cambirensis to have died A.D. 501, “nano clero aetatis susce.” (Annales. Camb. ann. lvi. i.e. A.D. 501, in M. H. B. 830 b.) In the Annales de Téjernach, where he is named Ibar (O’Conor, Script. ii. 157), he is said to have died 9 kal. Maii. A.D. 503, aged 303 years. [EBURUS (1).]

EBURIC (Eborich, Esborius, and in Gregory of Tours Eboricus), king of the Suevi in Spain. He succeeded his father Miro A.D. 583, and immediately after his accession acknowledged the supremacy of the Goths under Leovigild. “He asked for Leovigild’s friendship, rendered him the oath of allegiance as his father had done, and received from him the kingdom of Gallicia,” says Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. vi. 43), an act which may possibly have given umbrage to the national party among the Suevi, and caused the rising of Eburic’s brother-in-law, Audika, in 584. Eburic was deposed and forced into a monastery. (Isid. Hist. Suev. apud Exp. SAGR. vi. 506, and Baron. Annal. ann. 584, ix.) Audika then married Miro’s widow, Sigisvandhis, Eburic’s step-mother, his first wife being apparently dead. His success, however, was short-lived. In the following year, 585, Leovigild took him prisoner and condemned him to the same fate that he had previously forced upon Eburic, says Isidore (I. c.). Leovigild, however, took no steps to reestablish Eburic, of whom we hear nothing further, and the Suevi were incorporated in the Gothic state (Joannes Bichiresia, ann. 585, apud Exp. SAGR. vi. 346). Eburic therefore was lost as the last of the native Suevian kings. From 584 onwards the Gothic kings are often found bearing the title of Rex Suevorum. (Dahn, Könige der Germanen, Vte. Abth. 571.) [M. A. W.]


ECBERCOTUS (Bed. de Sex. Aetat. in M. H. B. 100 d), ECBERT (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1659, in M. H. B. 784), ECBHRHIT (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1725, in M. H. B. 780), presbyter. [EGEBERT (5).]

ECBERITH EATINGO (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1755, in M. H. B. 786), ECBRATH EATINO (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1751, in M. H. B. 785), king of Northumbria, son of Eathan. [EADBEERT (4).]

ECBERT (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 2215, in M. H. B. 791), ECBRITH (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 2235, 2249, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2278, 2295, 2345, 2353, 2356, 2361, 2363, 2375, 2386, 2329, in M. H. B. 791–794), king of Wessex. [EGEBERT (43).]

ECBRICTH (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1389, in M. H. B. 781), ECBRICH (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1407, in M. H. B. 781), king of Kent. [EGEBERT (1).]

ECBRITH (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 2181, in M. H. B. 790), king of Kent. [EADBEERT FRAX.]

ECCAC (1), Mac h-Uca, of Letheain, is in the Mort. Taltagh at Jan. 20, and attempts have been made to represent him as the same person with St. Fechin, of Fore, or with Aenna Na Laighisigh, both commemorated on this day, or again with Acca, bishop of Hexham, but his name, family, and place are alike unknown (O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 379–383). [J. G’]

ECCAC (2) (Flor. Wig. Nom. Proseul. Mugeset, in M. H. B. 621), bishop of Hereford. [HECCAC.]

[C. H.]


ECCELEIA, one of the eight primary aeons in the system of VALENTINUS (Iren. i. i. p. 7, v. p. 17; Hippl. Ref. vi. 50, p. 197; Epiph. Diogn. 31, pp. 165, 109). This higher Ecclesia was held to be the archetypus of the lower Ecclesia constituted by the spiritual seed on earth (Iren. i. v. 6, p. 28). In a Gnostic system described by Irenaeus (L. xxx. p. 109) we have also a heavenly church, not, however, as a separate aeon, but as constituted by the harmony of the first existing beings. According to Hippolytus (v. 6, p. 95), the NAAMBENNE counted three Ecclesiae.

It is especially in the case of the church that we find in Christian speculation prior to Valentinus traces of the conception, which lies at the root of the whole doctrine of aeons, that earthly things have their archetypes in pre-existent heavenly things. Hermas (Vis. ii. 4) speaks of the church as created before all things and of the world as formed for her sake; and in the newly discovered portion of the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (c. 14) the writer speaks of the spiritual church as created before the sun and moon, as pre-existent like Christ Himself, and as Him manifested in the last days for men's salvation; and he even uses language which, if it were not sufficiently accounted for by what is said in the Epistle to the Ephesians as to the union between Christ and His church, might be supposed to have affinity with the Valentinian doctrine of the relation between Anthropos and Ecclesia. In the notes to the passages just cited, in Lightfoot's and in Gebhardt and Harnack's editions will be found references to other early writers who have used similar language concerning the church. It need not be supposed that this language was directly suggested to those who used it by the Platonist philosophy, for there are passages in the New Testament which sufficiently account for it; and the so-called Clement claims to have derived his doctrine from "the books and the apostles." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes the direction to Moses to make the tabernacle after the pattern shewn him on the Mount (a passage cited in Acta viii. 44), and the argument dwells on the inference that the various parts of the Jewish service were but copies of better heavenly archetypes. This same heavenly tabernacle appears as part of the imagery of the book of the Revelation (xi. 19, xv. 5). In the same book the church appears as the Lamb's wife, the new Jerusalem descending from heaven; and St. Paul's teaching (Eph. i. 5) might be thrown into the form that the church existed God's election before the foundation of the world.

ECCELESIASTICAL HISTORIANS [HISTORIANS, ECCLESIASTICAL.]

ECCELESIASTICUS. It would seem from Irenaeus, iii. 15, that this title was first used by the Valentinians as a nickname for the members of the church who refused to join their sect. However this may be, it soon became a recognised appellation for members of the church, whether of the church as opposed to the world (Cyril. Hier. Catech. 15. 2, p. 296), or of the church as opposed to heretics. On the uses of the word, see DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY. Further illustrative references will be found in Du Cange, in the notes of Valesius and Heinichen on Eus. H. E. ii. 25, and of Massuet and Toutée respectively on the passages cited from Irenaeus and Cyril. But it is to be noted that several of the instances cited by these authors are of the early use of the word to denote members of the clergy are not at all decisive, and that when the word first came to be so used, it was limited to the inferior orders of the clergy.

ECCELESIASTICUS (1), bishop of Ravenna, from c. 523 to 532, between Aurelianus and Ursicians. July 27, according to tradition, was the day of his death. He accompanied pope John I, whom Theodosius compelled to go on a mission to the emperor Justin in 526. (Anastasius Valesianus, i.e. the Chronicle of Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna, so Waiz and Holder Egger, Monum. Rerum Italicarum, i. 273, p. 273, ed. Gardthausen, 1876, p. 303.) He had some disputes with his clergy, and the matter was carried to pope Felix IV, who summoned Ecclesius to Rome. The matter was arranged by a decree of the pope (Agnellus, Liber Pont. cap. 60), and the customs instituted under Ecclesius were appealed to by later archbishops. (Cl. Agnellus, Vita Theodori; Jaffé, Regest. Pontif. ann. 526–550, p. 71.)

Ecclesius built the church of Sancta Maria Maggiore in Ravenna. (Rubens, Hist. Ravenn. p. 154.) Under his direction also was begun the celebrated basilica of St. Vitalis in Ravenna, built by Julianus Argentarius, and consecrated in 547 by archbishop Maximianus. Agnellus, cap. 77, records an inscription in the narthex of the church commemorating the work. It is mentioned also on the gravestone of Ecclesius, who was buried in the church of St. Vitalis. (Richter, Die Mosaien von Ravenne, 1876, p. 72.) In the central mosaic of the apse of this church the angel on the left introduces Ecclesius bearing a model of the church. (Kugler's Hand book of Painting, Itali. School, Lady Eastlake's 4th ed., pt. i. p. 32; Richter, p. 92, and note.) In the church of St. Apollinaris in Classe, whose mosaics belonging to the end of the 7th century are intended to place the church of Ravenna on a level with that of Rome, Ecclesius appears among the four bishops of Ravenna below the apse. (Richter, p. 104; Kugler, p. 60.) For the life of Ecclesius, the chief authority is Agnellus, Liber Pontificiorum. Eccles. Rav. ed. Holder Egger, Monum. Rerum Italicarum, etc. 1878, pp. 318–322.

ECCELESIUS (2), bishop of Chiusi (Clusium), a.d. 600–602, the second known bishop of that see standing in the list between St. Florentius and Marcellinus (Ugel. Ital. Sacr. iii. 587, where he is called Eulogius; Games, Sac. Ep.
paganism at Antioch, and read a composition in praise of Apis on that occasion (Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 14). There are also edicts of Julian addressed to Ecdicius in the Codex Theodosianus, both of which were issued at Antioch, and are dated Dec. 2, A.D. 362 (XV. i. 8, 9, ed. Ritter, v. 317, 318; Prosopogr. iii. vii. pt. ii. 50 b).

[A. H. D. A.]

ECDICIA, a lady to whom St. Augustine wrote a letter of rebuke, on account of her conduct towards her husband. Having partly persuaded him to adopt the rule of matrimonial continence, she persevered in her resolution when he wished to put an end to the engagement; and sent only so far, but by assailing widow's weeds and withdrawing from his society she so irritated him as to induce him to give way to the temptation to adultery. Besides this, she had given away to some wayfaring monks nearly all the money of his that she had in her possession, and thus excited in him a general spirit of indignation against persons of this class. With the view of training their son for the monastic life, she had stinted him in necessary food. Augustine, therefore, rebukes her sharply, in a letter full of sound sense and clear spiritual discernment. (Aug. Ep. 262; see also Serm. 354.)

[H. W. P.]

ECDICIA (1) or ECDITIUS, martyr, Mar. 10. [Sectane, Forty Martyres op.]

ECDICIA (2), a civil officer of high rank under the emperor Julian. He was governor of the great diocese of Egypt in the prefecture of the East, in succession to Hermogenes, and as such enjoyed the dignity of "praefectus augustalis" and resided at Alexandria (Cod. Theod. XIV. xxvii. 1). As Georgius, the previous bishop of Alexandria, had been a great collector of books, and left a considerable library, Julian wrote to Ecdicius that he would do him a personal favour if he would search for those literary treasures and have them sent to him. However, Ecdicius may have fulfilled these instructions, he would appear to have been somewhat remiss in the discharge of his official duty with regard to paganism. The beauteous of Alexandria had long been accustomed to celebrate a great festival at the rising of the Nile, when, among other ceremonies, the praefect of Egypt cast "golden presents" into the river (Seneca, Nat. Quaesit. iv. 2). Constantine had forbidden this festival, but an edict of Julian had re-established it (Euseb. u. z.; Sozomen, v. 1). Julian evidently had his doubts about the heartiness of Ecdicius in the revival, and accordingly wrote to him a characteristic letter on the subject, telling him that he had heard of the "rise of the Nile from Theophilus the Stratopedarch, and that "perhaps he would like to know it" (Julian. Ep. 50, Heyler, p. 93). Ecdicius was the officer charged by Julian with the expulsion of Athisanians, and appears to have been lukewarm in that proceeding. There is extant another letter from Julian to Ecdicius. In this the emperor declares his great personal interest in "music," and charges the praefect to encourage it in Alexandria "by all means," making special mention of the praefect of Dioscorus, a "musician" of the city (Ep. 56, Heyler, 108; Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 16). Ecdicius would be the "Rector Aegypti," who took a prominent part in Julian's ostentatious display of his CHRISt. BHOOr.—VOL. II.

ECFERTH (2) (Gaimar, Estorie, 2175, M. H. B. 790), ECFRIRD (Kemble, C. D. 162, spurious or doubtful charter of Osca king of Mercia, a.d. 793, signature; Ecfrird in the body), king of Mercia, son of Osca. [Ecfeird (2).] [C. H.]

ECGBALD (1), abbat. [Ecgbald (1).]

ECGBALD (2) (Kemble, C. D. 133, 143), bishop. [Ecgbald (2).] [C. H.]


ECGBERT (2) (Bed. H. E. iii. 14, 17, 18, 19, 31, 29, 27, 28; v. 1, 19, 24, Recapit. Chron. ann. 675, 685; M. H. B. 198 a, 265 b, 215 c, 222 c, 227 c, 228 c, 229 c, d, 232 d, 241 a, 242 b, 244 a, 249 a, 271 c, 273 a, 285 d e; Flor. Wig. Chron. in M. H. B. 537 a; id. Ad Chron. App. in M. H. B. 624 d, 638 b, 639 d, e; Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 794, in M. H. B. 668 e), ECGBRTH (Flor. Wig. Gen. Reg. Northum. in M. H. B. 642), king of Northumbria, son of Osy. [Ecbert (2).] [C. H.]


ECGBRTH, king of Mercia. [Ecberth.]

ECGLAF (Egvalf), the sixth bishop of Dunwich. (M. H. B. 618.) He must have flourished during the latter half of the 8th century, as his successor Headred was at the council of Brintford in 781. Only his name is known. [S.]


ECGRIC (2), reader (lector), mentioned by Simeon of Durham as dying in 771. (Sim. Dun. M. H. B. 664.) He was one of the same class of teachers with Higlac and Colcu, the contemporaries of Alcuin. [S.]

ECGULUF (Kemble, C. D. 129 a, d, spurious or doubtful charter of Osca king of Mercia, a.d. 765-775), ECGULUF (Kemble, C. D. 119), spurious or doubtful charters of Osca king of Mercia, a.d. 750-764; Flor. Wig. Nom. Episc. Lund. in M. H. B. 617), bishop of London. [Egulf.]

ECGWALD, abbot of Tisbury, in Wilts, in 759. He is known only from a charter found in the Shaftesbury chartulary, preserving a notice of a grant made by Coenred, the father of Ina, to an abbot named Bectun, between the years 670 and 676. Catwulf, the successor of Bectun, sold the land to Wintra abbot of Tisbury. A dispute arose between Egwald the successor of Wintra and Tidball the successor of Catwulf, and the land was in 759 adjudged by king Cynwulf to Egwalid (Kemble, C. D. 104). The interest of the matter lies in the fact that Wintra abbot of Tisbury was an early friend of St. Boniface, and from this charter we get a glimpse at the early monastic life of Wessex. (See Willibald’s Life of Boniface, cap. 4; Mon. Magnus, p. 439.) It is just possible that the
Ecgwin may be identical with Ecgald bishop of Winchester. [Ecgald (3).]


Echa, anchoret at Crayke. [Eata.]

Echdach (Echaad, Ann. Tg.), son of Eudin (Cutin) king of the Saxons, clerked and put in confinement (Ann. Ult. A.D. 730; Ann. Tg. A.D. 731; O’Conor, Scriptt. ii. iv.). He has not been identified in the Anglo-Saxon royal families. The name is generally used by the Annals of Ulster for Echdaidh. [J. G.]

Echea, niece of St. Patrick. [Echt.]

Echen, Echeus. [Echen.]

Echpferd (Gimal, Estoria, v. 1932, in M. H. B. 787), king of the Mercians. [Eofrad (2).]


Echpfrith (Atfrith), the fifth abbot of Glastonbury in William of Malmesbury’s list. He presided, according to the same authority, from 719 to 729, during which time Ina’s greatest privileges were granted to the monastery (Will. Malmes. Antq. Glast. ap. Gale, pp. 316, 313, 328). The name does not appear in the more ancient list given in MS. Tiberius B. 5; Memorials of St. Dunstan. p. lxxii. See Kehfrith. [S.]

Echi (Echea, Achaa), niece of St. Patrick, commemorated Aug. 5. In Eruin’s Life of St. Patrick (Colgan, Tr. Thaum. 132, c. 21, 175 n. 4) mention is made of the three sons of Conis and Darerca, sister of St. Patrick, and also of their two daughters, St. Echea of Killglass in the region of Telfa (now Annaly, co. Longford), near the church of Ardagh to the south, and St. Lalanna or Senilia in Connaught. St. Angusus the Cudlee (in Matr. Sanc. iv. c. 6), O’Clery, and other Irish authorities, refer to the two sisters with more or less distinctness, yet of their history nothing is really known, and attempts at identification are fruitless (O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 363). Of St. Ech’s nunnery in the parish of Killglass, co. Longford, there are now no remains; Senilia, Senilia, or Senalia, where her sister Monus’s daughter is said to have been, is unidentified, but was probably in the county of Roscommon, on the west side of Slieve Baun. (Todd, Book of Hymns, Fasc. i. 111; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 211, calling Darerca his (sic) mother; Colgan, Tr. Thaum. 231, col. i. 227, nn. 5, 6.) [J. G.]

Echlech, son of Daighe and brother of Cusmine and Caemhann, is commemorated on Aug. 14 (Mart. Doneg.). [J. G.]

Echtach (Ectagiu), commemorated Feb. 5. In the Life of St. Corbmac (Mar. 27) it is related (Colgan, Acta SS. 753, c. 13) that St. Corbmac fixed his monastic seat among the sons and posterity of Almakeithid son of Fiachra, that is, in the present barony of Tirawley in the county of Mayo, and that there they, with their relations who were descended from Dathli, another son of Fiachra, venerated the most pious stranger and his successors with great readiness, till in course of time their devotion gradually turned away to a number of saints, and among others to St. Ectica, virgin. Colgan (fn. 755 n. 23) says this is the Echtach virgin whose dedication is given (Mart. Doneg. and Tall) on Feb. 5. [J. G.]


Echu. [Echadhur.]


Ecianus, bishop of Cluainfnda. [Echen.]

Ecclesiastics. Ecclesiastics have existed in many ages of the world; and the early history of Christianity furnishes a remarkable instance of such a system. It was impossible that the early Christians, when once they had received into their body men of culture and learning, should not be struck with that noblest product of ancient morality, the philosophy which took its birth from Socrates, and was thenceforward known by the names of its divergent branches, as Platonism, Aristotelianism, Stoicism, etc. Hence arose attempts to reconcile the various forms of philosophy with Christianity, and to present the whole under one view. The author of the Epistle to Diognetus; Justin Martyr; Athenagoras;Justin Alexander; and Origen, are the chief names connected with this tendency. It is to be observed that this eclecticism differed in its animating principle from every ordinary eclectic philosophy, in that it aimed in the first instance to reconcile philosophy with religion, and only as a secondary aim and by a sort of consequence to reconcile the different philosophies with each other. The following very remarkable passage from Justin Martyr displays the first and principal aim in its purest form: “We have been taught that Christ is the firstborn of God, and we have before shewn Him as being the word (or reason), in which every race of men has obtained participation; and they who lived by the aid of this word (or reason) are Christians, even though they were esteemed atheists, as among the Greeks, Socraletes and Heraclitus and those like to them, and among the barbarians Abraham and Ananias.” (τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτόκοτον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἀδίκημον, καὶ προφητεύουσαν λόγον ἐμπαίμαμεν, εἶναί τὸς ἄνθρωπος μετέχει καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιωτισμένοι Χριστιανοὶ εἰσὶ, καὶ οἱ θεοὶ εὐθερμοθεῖται οὐν ἐν Ἐλληνὶ μέλι Ακαδμίας καὶ Ἕρακλείτους, καὶ οἱ ἰδωμενικοὶ ἐν βαρβαρίας τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ Ἀνανίᾳ. Apol. pr. p. 71.) It will be seen from this passage that Justin laid stress (and
with perfect truth) on the spiritual element of the ancient philosophers as the uniting point between them and Christianity; with their system-making he had less concern, though he had been converted from Platonism to Christianity, and when a Christian always esteemed Platonism as far above the other ancient philosophies. Of the secondary aim above-mentioned, the reconciliation of the different ancient philosophies with each other, though always in subordination to Christianity, Clemens Alexandrinus is the typical example. He ridicules the fear which many have of the Greek philosophy, calling it a bugbear (Strom. lib. vi. cap. 16, p. 278). "By philosophy," he says, "I mean not the Stoic, nor the Platonist, or the Epicurean, or the Aristotelian; but whatever things have been spoken well by each of these sects, and which teach righteousness along with a pious knowledge, all this eclectic (or selected) matter I call philosophy." (φιλοσοφίας θε ού της Στουηίδι λέγω, ούτε την Πλατανικήν ή την Τάκτικον κι ο Αριστοτελίκην αλλα είναι παρ' έκδητι των άλλων τοιν καλά, δηδοισθείς μελ' ούτοι δια πάντα κατ' άλλας σειράς διαλεγομενής φιλοσοφίας σμί—Strom. lib. i. cap. 7, p. 124). Clement looked upon the ancient philosophies as definitely leading men on the way to absolute truth. It may be doubted if he went to the heart of the matter as much as Justin had done; and his idea that the ancient philosophers borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures was baseless and untrue. But of all the ancient Fathers, none presented so much of the type of an eclectic philosopher as Clement.

In Origen, philosophy, in so far as it is apparent, returns again to the Platonic form; and after Origen, attempts to reconcile Christianity with philosophy, though not quite unknown, are very rare among the early Fathers; for the use which Christian theologians afterwards made of the terms of Greek philosophy is quite different from an actual reconciliation of religion and philosophy. With the school of Origen, the bishop of Alexandria, continued the philosophical tradition is uncertain, though at an early age he had been a pupil of Ammonius Saccas. Synesius of Cyrene at a much later date was well known in philosophy; and Proclus, the Neoplatonist, is said to have been a Christian. Doubtless the rise of the Neoplatonic school, with its tendency to present itself at once the rival and the antagonist of Christianity, kept Christian writers in the main far removed from the domain of philosophy. But the approximation had been very close at the end of the second century A.D.; the founder of the Neoplatonic school, Ammonius Saccas, was himself born a Christian, and it is even not quite certain whether he did not continue such throughout.

None of the writers above mentioned called themselves Eclectics, or would appear to have been called by this name in ancient times. With reference to this whole subject see especially Vacherot's Histoire Critique de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, vol. i. ch. v. pp. 223-302, from which chapter the quotations in the present article have been derived. See also the names of the writers here mentioned in the present Dictionary.

[J. R. M.]

ECLECTUS (ELECTUS), chamberlain of the

emperor Commodus. On the last day of A.D. 194, that prince, after shedding during a long period the noblest blood of Rome, had determined on the following morning to execute amongst others Marcia his favourite concubine, Eclectus his chamberlain, and Laetus his Praetorius prefect. Learning their intended fate, they determined to prevent it by the death of the tyrant, and the same night they introduced to his chamber a wrestler, who strangled him without a struggle.

[W. M. S.]

His name has suggested a suspicion that he was a Christian (see vol. i. p. 611), and though this ground is but slight, the name Eclectus being found in non-Christian inscriptions (Gruter, 403-5, 691-4, 980-5, 1142-4; Boeckh, 4105, 6224, 6379), yet the conjecture receives some confirmation from the fact that he became the husband of Marcia, who was a Christian, certainly in sympathies, and possibly by profession. His Christianity is not disproved even if it be true that though he personally took no part in the assassination of his master, he was an accessory to it before the fact. He had ascertained that by his remonstrance against a mad and murderous project he had so incensed the tyrant's deadly resentment that it was only by the emperor's death the lives of himself and of those who had joined in his advice could be saved. The question is not how in such circumstances a Christian ought to have acted, but whether it can be pronounced improbable that a professing Christian might have acted as Eclectus is said to have done. His conduct on this occasion may claim the more lenient judgment on account of his fidelity to his new master. When a mob of soldiers came in to take the life of Pertinax, Eclectus was the only one of his attendants who did not desert him, and he died fighting in his defence against overwhelming odds; on which his contemporary, Dion Cassius remarks that he had before that considered Eclectus a good man, but then gave him real admiration. On the other hand, Tertullian has said (Apol. 15) that any of the murderers of Commodus was a Christian. Eclectus was by birth an Egyptian; he had been a freedman of L. Verus, on whose death he was retained by M. Aurelius, passed then into the service of Quadratus, where Marcia was his fellow servant, and on the destruction of Quadratus was taken with her into the service of Commodus. (Dion Cass. lxxii. 4, 19, 22, lxxiii. 1; Capitol. Ver. 9, Part. 4, 11; Herodian. i. 51.)

[G. S.]

EC PHY SIUS, martyr. [EPHYRIUS.]

EC TGA ILE, son of Bait, abbat of Muicirt, died A.D. 787 (Ann. Ult. in O'Conor, Script. iv. 113). [J. G.]

E C - T H E S I S, a declaration on the nature of the Person of the Son issued by the emperor Heraclius, in A.D. 639. During the greater part of the 7th century the Greek church was disturbed by the Monothelite controversy. The name arose from the party who maintained that the Son had one will and not two. For the details of the controversy reference should be made to Monothelism, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, Theodore, Bishop of Pharan,
ECThesis

Sophonius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Maximus, a Monk. It is only necessary to say here that about 616 Sergius had met with words ascribed to his predecessor, Menas, "one will and one life-giving operation," that after consulting bishop Theodore about them, he adopted them in 618. It was then that the controversy began, and that the opposite contention was that there were two wills acting in the same direction. At the same time the emperor Heraclius was, from political motives, anxious to reconcile the great Monophysite party to the ruling church of the Greek empire. In his campaign against the Persians in 622 he met many Monophysite bishops, and it occurred to him that the formula "one divinely human mode of working and willing in Christ" might serve as a ground on which Chalcedonians and Monophysites might both stand. Or, at any rate, these words became the subject of his inquiries and correspondence. Both parties recognized the Greek father Diodore; Sergius attributed to Christ an θεοτειχώμενος, Sergius the patriarch, when consulted by the emperor about the phrase (Harduin. Concil. iii. 1338), could not object to it.

But Cyrus of Phasis doubted its propriety. He consulted Sergius. Sergius, in a letter which displays a most servile adherence to patristic language, replied that many fathers had used the expression one mode of working, none had spoken of two. If one had done so, it would be necessary to follow him. The scruples of Cyrus were removed. In 630 he found himself patriarch of Alexandria. He brought back thousands of Monophysites by a compromise in nine points, placing the Monophysite tenets beside the language of Chalcedon.

But there was in Alexandria a zealous monk of Palestine named Sophronius. The doctrine of the phrase seemed to him to lead to Monophysitism. He opposed it. The matter was referred to mutual consent, to Sergius. Sergius, approving rather the "one mode of working and willing," did not wish to make it binding on the church; against two modes of working and willing, he was decided. He persuaded Cyrus to abide by the forms in use; and Sophronius promised he would speak neither of one mode nor two, and avoid all dispute. In 634 Sophronius was elevated to the patriarchate of Jerusalem (Hard. iii. 1315).

This gave a new turn to affairs. Sophronius would now have to issue his profession of faith, and might be considered a more independent authority. Sergius invoked the aid of pope Honorius. Honorius wrote twice to Sergius, in concurrence with his views; he wrote also to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem. Although his language may be in some points questionable, he was, with much good sense, opposed to the logical determinations on such a subject. Christ must have one will. He approved the ἀλεξανδρία or accommodation which had united the Monophysites of Alexandria and elsewhere with the Catholic church. But on the one hand, "one mode of working" might lead to Nestorianism; "two modes" might end in Eutychianism. Both expressions should be avoided.

Monteith's customary encyclical of Sophronius had appeared on his assumption of the patriarchate of Jerusalem. Without rejecting the phrase θεοτειχώμενος, he insisted on two modes of operation, each belonging to the different natures, acting in the harmony of the one Christ. The Saracens soon afterwards separated Palestine from Christendom. But this revival of the controversy was the origin of the Ecthesis.

The emperor Heraclius, anxious to nip in the bud a danger so menacing to the peace of the empire, issued in A.D. 638 this document, ἔκθεσις τῆς γονευμοσύνης. It expressed the opinions of Sergius, and was probably his work. According to the teaching of the Catholic councils it upheld the doctrine of one Christ in two natures, one and the same person working that which is divine and that which is human. But the phrase one θεοτειχώμενος was to be avoided, because, though it occurred occasionally in the writings of the fathers, yet it caused uneasiness to some persons, as it seemed to deny the duality of the natures. So, likewise, it was forbidden to speak of θεοτειχώμενος, because the expression had been used by no authority, and gave offence to many. It might involve two contradictory wills in Christ, and that was beyond even Nestorius. "The humanity with its own rational soul had never determined itself of its own will in opposition to the Αὐξερικια υπὸ τίνα, but always so as the divine Αὐξερικια willed."

The tendency of this document was evidently in favour of the Monothelites. And as far as it could help the peace of the church, it could only be by concealing real differences instead of removing them. It remained in force about ten years.

The Ecthesis received the sanction of councils at Constantinople under Sergius and his successor Pyrrhus, and at Alexandria under Cyril, no opposition could arise from Antioch and Jerusalem, which were in the hands of the Arabs. Honorius was dead; his successor in the papacy, Severinus, appears to have rejected it, and the following pope, John IV., condemned it with a council. The emperor thereupon dissolved it, telling John that Sergius was its author, and that it had been only issued at his urgent request.

Heraclius died in 641. Constantine, Heraclonas, and Constans II. followed in quick succession. John IV. and his successor, Theodore, begged these emperors to suppress the Ecthesis, and at length, in 648, it was superseded by the Typus of Constans. The Monothelite tendency of the Ecthesis had been vigorously opposed by Maximus.

(Euthynian.]

Ecuuin (Kemble, C. D. 53), bishop. [Egvin.] [C. H.]

Eda (Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 198, note), one of the names of Aidan or mabdec bishop of Ferns. [Edan.] [C. H.]
EDA (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. anno 801, in M. H. B. 672 b), dux and afterwards abbat. [EDWINE.] [C. H.]

EALDULUS (1), bishop of Vienne, the supposed recipient of an undated letter from pope John III. (560–573). This letter, which purports to be in answer to inquiries of the archbishop on some point of ritual in the service of mass, and to be accompanied by a gift of the pallium and relics, was first published by Joannes à Bosco, and is supposed, from internal evidence, to be a forgery. It is given by Migne (Patr. Lat. lxix. 18). Ealdulus does not appear in the list of Vienne bishops given in the Gallia Christiana (xvi. 26), where Naumatus and Philippus occur as the contemporaries of John III. There was a later Ealdulus in this see. [EOALDULUS.] (Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacrés, xi. 334.)

[S. A. B.]

EALDULUS (2), bishop of Meaux. [EODULUS.]

EALDULUS (3), forty-first bishop of Vienne. [EOALDUS.]

EDAN, a common form of AEDHAN, is most frequently attached to St. Maehog, of Cluniamor-Maehog (Apr. 11), brother of bishop Etchen (Feb. 11), of Clonfad. Edan was alive a.D. 598 [MAEHOG]. See also Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 188. [J. G.]

EDANA. [ETAOIN.]

EDANCUS, magister militum, and duke of Sardinia, allied to in a letter of Gregory the Great to the deacon Honoratus, concerning the better treatment of the inhabitants of the island. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. i. indict. ix. Ep. 49 in Migne, lxvii. 512.) [A. H. D. A.]

EDAPHUS, one of the three descents of Constantine whom Chrysostom was accused of having maltreated. (Phot. Biblioth. cod. 59, p. 18 a; Patr. Gr. cii. 107.) [E. V.]

EDATIUS, presbyter of Arthona, now Artonne, a village of Auvergne, dep. Puy-de-Dôme. (Greg. Tur. de Glor. Conf. cap. b.) [C. H.]

EDBALD (A. S. C. text, anno 640, in M. H. B. 310; Malmbst. G. R. A. i. §§ 10, 48, ed. Hardy), king of Kent. [EADBALD (1).]

[C. H.]

EDEBALT Brut y Tywysegion, Engl. tr. in M. H. B. 842), king of the Saxons. [ETHEDBALD.]

[C. H.]

EDBERGE (EDBURG), Mercian princess, venerated in Flanders (Butler, Lives of the Saints, June 29; Chambers, Book of Days, i. 798). [IDEBERGA.]

C. G.]


[C. H.]

EDBERT (2) (Wend. F. H. ann. 675, ed. Coxe), bishop of London. [HEATHBERT.]

[C. H.]

EDBERT (3) (Kemble, C. D. 129), bishop, signs charter of Offa king of Merina. A.D. 774, with Berthan bishop of Lichfield, and Ceolwulf bishop of Lindsey. [EADBERT (9).]

[C. H.]

EDBERT (4) (Gimair, Estoria, v. 1397, in M. H. B. 787), king of Northumbria. [EADBERT (5).]

[C. H.]


[C. H.]


[C. H.]


[C. H.]

EDBIRT, king of the West Saxons, mentioned in a spurious charter of A.D. 801 (Kemble, C. D. 178) as conferring land in Bodecanlage to his minister Eadgils. Kemble thinks that "Edbirht rex," in the body of the charter was a mistake of the writer for "Eadburh regina," "Eadbubh" being said at the conclusion to be the grantor of the charter to Glastonbury. But may not "Edbirt" have been an error for Bribrik king of Wessex, who was the husband of Eadbubh or Eadburga?

[C. H.]


[C. H.]

EDBRIHT (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. iv. in M. H. B. 728 b), king of Kent, who reigned twenty-two years and died in the ninth year of Cuthred. [EADBERT (3).]

[C. H.]

EDBRITH PREN (Malm. G. R. i. § 85, ed. Hardy), king of Kent. [EADBERT (4) PRAEK.]

[C. H.]

EDBURGA (1) (Dudg. Monast. i. 581, 582; Birch, Fast. Mon. 64), queen of Mercia, and afterwards abbess of Gloucester. [EADBURGA (4).]

[C. H.]

EDBURGA (2) (Emh. p. 219, ed. Hardwick; Dudg. i. 448), EADBURH, abbess of Minster in Thanet. [BUGGA (2).]

[C. H.]

EDDANUS (Gall. Christ. v. 784), bishop of Strassburg. [ETHDO.]

[C. H.]

EDDI (Kemble, C. D. 19, A.D. 680), bishop, who grants lands in Lantocul and Ferramore to abbat Hemjigls. [HEDDA, bishop of Winchester.]

[C. H.]

EDDIUS (or "ÆDID," named STEPHEN, as Bede calls him (iv. 2), "ÆDEDE" as he calls himself (Vit. Wulfr. 14), was distinguished as a chanter in Kent, when Wilfrid, unable to obtain possession of the see of York for which he had been elected and consecrated, visited Egbert king of Kent, during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, and performed episcopal work in that diocese. He says of himself simply that Wilfrid returned from Kent into Northumbria with the chanters "Æedde and Aednus: Bede says that Wilfrid "invited him from Kent, and that he was the first teacher of chanting in
many Northumbrian churches, excepting James," the deacon (iv. 2). He lived on confidential terms with Wilfrid, and accompanied him to Rome, on his second journey as an appellant, in 704 (see Vit. Wulf. 50, 51). After Wilfrid's death he was requested by Awwa, bishop of Hexham and Tabetbert abbot of Ripon to write the life of their common master and patron. He undertook the task (so he says in an elaborately modest preface), as a matter of obedience, but also as conscious of the "great gain" to himself personally involved in his remembrance of "bishop Wilfrid." He tells the tale like one who had heard from Wilfrid himself the most minute particulars of his personal history. But he is not only, as was natural, credulous as to whatever might enhance the glory of his hero, but inaccurate in regard to other persons; and the accusation which he makes (and in which Bede follows him) against queen Bathildis, or "Baelchild," as having been the cause of the execution of Wilfrid's early patron, the archbishop of Lyons, has been usually reckoned among these errors,—Bathildis being a devout woman whom the Frankish church learned to honour as a saint. Eddius also confounds the name of the archbishop (who was really called Anemund) with that of his brother or canon, Delphinus (Mabillon, Ana. Bened. i. 425, 438). He calls Colman metropolitan bishop of York—a double mistake (c. 10), and stranger yet, his text exhibits "papa" after the name of that presbyter Agatho who took part in the Whitby conference (6; cf. Bed. iii. 29). While he does full justice to Chad's excellence ("religiosissimum, admirabilissimum, servus Dei, verus et mississimus"), he makes him admit—what in all probability he never would have admitted—that he had "sinned" by receiving consecration from Wini and the two British bishops. He apparently exaggerates the rites performed by Theodore in regard to Chad (c. 15). He sometimes substitutes vague generalities for precise narrative, as in the account of the canonical division of Wilfrid's diocese in 678 (c. 24). He calls the Lombard king Pertharit "king of Campania" (c. 28). He seems to have had somewhat imperfect information as to Wilfrid's mission work in Sussex. He represents Theodore as humbling himself to Wilfrid in a strain which outruns probability (c. 42). He does not bring out the fact that both the first and the second restorations of Wilfrid were arrangements in the nature of a compromise, and that the second was still less favourable than the first to his original claim as bishop of York. On the whole he writes like a hearty partisan, but he cannot be called unfair or disingenuous. He does not conceal the harshness of Wilfrid's speech at Easiterfeld ("durus sermonibus," c. 45; he uses "durus" in a like sense in c. 37), and when he speaks of him as coming on one occasion from Ripon, "cum filio suo proprio" (c. 57), he uses words which have raised some question as to Wilfrid's character, but which have been naturally explained by his own anecdote about Eadwald, his brother's adopted son (c. 18). He was a well-educated man after the ecclesiastical standard of his age, his Latin is occasionally rather amalous, but he makes his readers see what he dejects, and his book has some passages at once terse and impressive. His "praefatio" contains a quotation from Horace, Carm. ii. 10, 11. The date at which he flourished, according to Gale (Ser. xv. vol. I.), is 720. [W. B.]

EDDO (1), bishop of Curia Rhaetorum, now Chur or Coire, a town of the Grisons. He stands sixth in the list, between Sidonius and St. Valentineus, and is believed to have sat from about the year A.D. 500 to about 530, during which period Rhaetia was for the most part at peace under the rule of Amalasuntha and Theodatus in the reign of Theodoric (Ambro. Eichhorn, Episcopatus, Curiensis, 1797, p. 9). [C. H.]


EDDRAN, Irish bishop. [Etherean.] [C. H.]

EDELAND (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 38, ed. Hardy), king of Wessex. [Ethelhard.] [C. H.]

EDEBALD (1) (Gaimar, Estorie, 1105, in M. H. B. 718), king of Kent. [Eadbald (1).] [C. H.]


EDELBRITH (Gaimar, Estorie, vv. 2210, 2306, in M. H. B. 791, 792), king of Kent. [Eadbred (4).] [C. H.]


EDELBURGH (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1247, in M. H. B. 779), daughter of Ethelbert king of Kent, wife of Edwin king of Northumbria. [Ethelburgh (1).] [C. H.]

EDELBURGA (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 90, ed. Hardy), daughter of Offa king of Mercia, wife of Britric king of Wessex. [Eadbred (1).] [C. H.]

EDELRUD (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1469, in M. H. B. 782), daughter of Anna king of East
EDELFRED, EDLEFRED, is given as a
chropeiscopus of Caerleon or Llandaff; he is also
claimed by London, Colchester, and Lincoln, being
probably the same as Adelphius, who sat in the
council at Arles, A.D. 314. [ADELPHIUS (1).]
(Lib. Land. by Rees, 623; Stubbs, Reg. Sac.
Angl. 154.) [J. G.]

EDELFERT (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. ii. in
M. H. B. 714 d, 715 b, 719 d), EDELFRED
(Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. ii. in M. H. B. 715 a, c,
d; Gaimar, Estoric, vv. 1009, 1141, 1147, 1160,
1258, in M. H. B. 777, 778, 780), EDLEFRED
(Gaimar, Estoric, v. 1081, in M. H. B. 778),
EDELFRIZ (Gaimar, Estoric, v. 1007, 1017,
in M. H. B. 777), king of Northumbria. [ETHE-
FRID (1).]
[C. H.]

EDELHARD (Gaimar, Estoric, v. 1761, in
M. H. B. 785), king of West Saxons. [ETHEL-
HARD (1).]
[C. H.]

EDELHERE (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. ii. in
M. H. B. 717 a), king of East Anglia, brother of
ANEL. [ETHELHERE.]
[C. H.]

in M. H. B. 718 c, 723 c, 724 c, 725 b, 727 d,
755 b; Gaimar, Estoric, vv. 1487, 1633, "EDIL-
RED PENDING," in M. H. B. 782, 784), EDIL-
RED (Gaimar, Estoric, vv. 1485, 1585, in
M. H. B. 782, 83), king of Mercia. [ETHEL-
RED (2).]
[C. H.]

EDELRED (2) (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. iv. in
M. H. B. 730 d, 732 a, b), EDILRED (Gaimar,
Estoric, vv. 1977, 2140, 2174, in M. H. B. 788,
790), EDILRED (Gaimar, Estoric, vv. 2018,
2193, in M. H. B. 788, 790), king of Northum-
bria, son of Moll. [ETHELRED (4).]
[C. H.]

EDELRED (3) (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. iv. in
M. H. B. 732 b, 733 a, marg.), archbishop of
Canterbury. [ETHELWALCH (5).]
[C. H.]

EDELWALCH (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 34,
ed. Hardy), king of the South Saxons.
[ETHELWALCH.]
[C. H.]

150-159. [JUSTINUS.]
In the system of Simon (Hippol. vi. 14, p. 168)
the account of Eden and its four rivers is ex-
plained as allegorically representing the womb in
which man is formed, and the veins and arteries
which proceed from it, and in the system of the
Naassenes (v. 9, p. 120) there is a speculation
apparently derived from this, in which Eden is
made to denote the brain.
[G. S.]

EDENUS, sixteenth bishop of Meaux, conse-
crated about A.D. 552. His predecessor and suc-
cessor were Medeves and Baudouwald respectively.
(Gul. Crist. viii. 1558; Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl.
Franc. ii. 587.) [S. A. B.]

EDESIUS (1), martyr. [AEDESIIUS.]

EDESIUS (2), one of the shorthand writers
at the inquiry concerning Donatism held before the
iii. 29.) [DONATISM, vol. i. p. 882.] [H. W. P.]

EDESIUS (3) (AEDESIIUS) shared the ro-
mantic fortunes of his brother Frumentius, the
first bishop of Auxumia (Axum), in the 4th
century. [FRUMENTIUS.] The biographical details
at our disposal consist of a lengthy narrative,
introduced on the authority of Edesius, by Rufius
into his Historia Ecclesiastica Libri III. The
narrative has been copied, with slight deviations
by Socrates (H. E. i. 19), Sozomen (ii. 24), and
Theodoret (i. 23, 24). Compare also Baronius
(Ann. 327, viii. ix. x.). Frumentius, and Edesius,
the young relatives of Meropius, a Syrian philo-
sopher (merchant), accompanied him on a voyage
of adventure to India. On their return to Phoenicia
by way of the Red Sea, they landed at a certain
port, "where there was a safe haven," and
there suffered from the barbarous assault of the
"Indians," who murdered every individual of the
ship's company, with the exception of the two
youths, upon whom the savages looked with com-
passion, and whom they conveyed as prizes to the
king. This personage appointed Frumentius and
Edesius to positions of trust, the former becoming
the treasurer and the latter the cupbearer of the
king. By their charity Xvangs Christianity was intro-
duced among the "Indians." The names they bear
in Ethiopian documents given by Ludolf (Hist.
Eth. iii. 2) were Frémonatos and Syracou.
(Cf. Gesenius, Athyon. Kirche in Ezech and
Gruber, and Hoffmann in Herzog’s Ency.) The
word "India" is used with the same indefiniteas
as we elsewhere find Ethiopia and Libya used.
From the time of Aristotle to those of Eratosthenes
and of Hipparchus, India and Africa were believed
to unite with each other at some unknown point
south of the Indian Ocean. (Dict. Anc.
Geography, vol. ii. p. 45, art. India; Pline. vi.
22-24.) These "Indians" were, from the subsequent
career of Frumentius, no other than Abyssinians.
The king, according to Ludolf’s Ethiopian
Codex, was called Abreha, and on drawing
near his end, offered his liberty to the two young
men; queen mother and queen besought them to
remain, to undertake the education of the young
prince Erazanes, and to assist her in the regimen
during the minority of the heir to the throne.
They consented, and moreover lost no opportunity of diffusing a
knowledge of Christ. They sought and
discovered Christian merchants trading in the
country, gathered Christian disciples, and built
houses of prayer, “that worship might be
offered, and the Roman ecclesiastical routine
observed.” (Sozomen, Ic.) They were, how-
ever, destitute of orders, and the infant church
was not incorporated into the general organiza-
tion of the church until their condition had been
made known. The two brothers sought permis-
sion at length to return to their friends. Edesius
remained at Tyre and became a presbyter in the
church in that city, where Rufius came into
contact with him. Frumentius, the more ener-
getic of the two, went to Alexandria, and laid
the whole case before Athanasius. It is uncer-
tain when this occurred. Theodoret places this
visit to Alexandria "about the time" of the
persecution of Eustathius, other hints seem to
bring the event to the period when Athanasius
had returned from his second exile. The conse-
quently the visit can hardly be doubted.
Frumentius himself was appointed bishop of
"the Indians" at Axumia, and received the
title of Abba Salama, and was regarded as the founder of the church in that country, the Ἀἰγύπτιοι deriving his ecclesiastical rank from the patriarch of Alexandria. [ETHIOPIAN CHURCH.]

[H. R. R.]

EDESIUS (4) (Aedesius), a philosopher in the 4th century, by birth a Cappadocian, of a noble but impoverished family. He was sent by his father to Greece to learn some trade, but applied himself instead to the study of philosophy, relishing rather reading than disputing. He travelled to enlarge his knowledge, and went into Syria to hear Jamblichus, and became almost his equal, and succeeded to his school on his death. He was obliged, however, to conceal his talents during the reign of Constantine. In reply to his prayers a god appeared to him in his dreams and uttered an oracle, to the effect that he had two lots open to him, either to dwell in cities and direct the minds of young men, by which he would win immortal fame, or to take a farm and turn shepherd, by which he would be reckoned among the blessed. He chose the latter lot, but was compelled by the entreaties of the students who besieged his dwelling to return to the city, and teach them. He accordingly left Cappadocia, and fixed his residence at Pergamus in Asia, where crowds, both of Greeks and natives, came to hear him. He shewed much kindness to Sesipatra, the widow of Eustathius, his successor in Cappadocia, when after her husband's death she came to live at Pergamus. Julian (afterwards emperor), at the age of twenty-three, A.D. 354, was attracted to Pergamus by the fame of Eudesius, now advanced in years and in weak health, and wished to remain with him; but Eudesius, feeling his health unequal to the task of instructing him, advised him instead to give the greater part of his time to his disciples Eusebius and Chrysanthisus, which Julian accordingly did, without however leaving Eudesius. He was a man of gentle disposition, and used converse with carpenters, smiths, and others whom he met, about their trades, for which he was rebuked by Priscus, one of his disciples, as betraying the dignity of philosophy. (Eunapius, ed. Stephani, 1616, Lives of Eudesius, Maximus, and Priscus, 32-66, 69-70, 82.)

[F. D.]

EDESIUS (5), deacon of Cyril of Alexandria, who, with his fellow-deacon Peter, was at Constantiople when Alexander bishop of Antioch came there to urge the restoration of St. Chrysostom's name to the diptychs. Eudesius and Peter brought back to Cyril an account of the state of things at Constantiople. When the patriarch Atticus wrote to Cyril to ask him for the sake of peace to restore Chrysostom's name to the sacred diptychs, he wrote also to Peter and Eudesius, urging them to use their influence with Cyril on the side of peace, so that the Egyptian bishops might not be the only ones to resist the imperial desires, and to disturb the universal tranquillity. At the end of the letter Atticus hopes they will soon return to Constantiople, as he misses the pleasure of their society, and finds his present companions less appetising. (Siccephorus Collisti, episc. c. 26, 491, 494, in Migne, Patr. Gr. col. 1138-1144; Ceillier, Aut. sacr. viii. 15.)

[F. D.]

EDGES (5) (Aedesius), a Christian orator and poet. The only knowledge we possess of this author is derived from the Life of St. Hilarus bishop of Aries (who died A.D. 449), of which Honoratus bishop of Marseilles is supposed by some to be the author. In this Life two miracles occur from Eudesius, whom the author honours with the title of saint, and calls "rhetoricae facundiae et metrice artis peritissimum vir."

The first quotation describes the writer's astonishment at seeing Hilarus at the same time reading and dictating to his secretary, and also making a note with his hands; the second describes the bishop's sympathy with charity towards the suffering. (Life of St. Hilarus, c. 12, in Migne, Patr. Lat. i. 1233, 1239; Hist. Lit. de la France, 1865, ii. 352.)

[F. D.]

EDESSA, MARTYRS OF. In the reign of Trajan a fierce persecution was carried on at Edessa. Barsimaesus was bishop there at the time; he was arrested, subjected to cruel tortures, and according to Barinus was martyred (A.D. 114). In the Menology of Basil, however, the account is that he was flogged and kept in prison, that as soon as the persecution was over he was released, and that the bishop being at the church of Edessa, Sarbelius, together with his sister Barbes, who had both been baptized by Barsimaesus, were martyred during this persecution. Special cruelties were practised towards Sarbelius in consequence of his having been an idol priest before he became a Christian. They are commemorated Jan. 30. (Men. Bas.; Baron. Anot. 107, i, 2.)

[T. S. B.]

EDESTUS, MARTYR. [HEDERTUS.]

EDEBNYN (1) (Edern, Ebyrn, Edryn) son of Gwrtheyrn (Vortigern) king of the Britons 449-466. He belonged to the company under St. Catwg (Cdoci), and gave his name to Llanderyn in Glamorganshire, where he had a community with three hundred members. It has been conjectured that he is the Faustus mentioned by Nennius as a son of Vortigern, and as having his residence on the banks of the river Rhis. Faustus was the child of incest, and according to the legend was attributed to Vortigern by St. Germanus (Rees, Welsh Saints, 108, 186, 337; Ussher, EccI. Ant. c. 12, v. 439-490).

[J. G.]

EDEYNYN (2), commemorated January 6; a bard who embraced a life of sanctity, and whose memory is preserved in the chapel of Bodedyrn, under Holyhead, in Anglesey, and in Edeyrn, county Caernarvon. He was the son, or grandson (by Nudd), of Beli ab Rnun, descended from Cunedda Wledig (Myny. Arch. ii. 23, 40; Rees, Welsh Saints, iii. 298, 323; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 593, 601). In the mediæval legends he assumes a wholly military garb, and as one of the chivalrous knights of his court, under the name of Hider, accompanies Arthur in his celebrated expedition to the continent against the Roman emperor (Myny. Arch. ii. 339; Geoff. of Monm. x. 4; cf. Lady Charlotte Guest, Mabinogion, ii. 153-4, et al.).

[J. G.]

EDGILS (Aedisil), a priest in the monastery of Coldingham, who, after its destruction by fire in A.D. 679, took up his residence at Jarrow, where he died. He was a friend of Bede,
and gave him some information about Coldingham and its inmates. (Bed. H. E. iv. 25.)

EDGUIN (Nenn. Hist. Brit. in M. H. B. 75 b), king of Northumbria. [EDWIN.]

[Ch. H.]

EDGYN, called brother of Cyngar and son of Geraint ab Erbin in the Pedigree of Welsh Saints, but he does not appear as either of these in Professor Ree's list (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 508; Rees, Welsh Saints, 113). [J. G.]

EDHAMAIR (AEDHAMAIR, AUDEMARA, EADHAMAIR, EUDUMAIR), virgin, daughter of Aedh, commemorated Jan. 18. Eadhamair, or Edhamair, is commemorated on this day in Mart. Dom. (by Todd and Reeves, 21), and as Aedhamair, in Mart. Tall. (Kelly, Col. Ir. SS. xii.), and in both is called daughter of Aedh. But Colgan (Acta SS. 598, c. 3), in classing her among the saints of the house of St. Mochoemuc or Pulcherius (Mar. 13), and race of Conmaic, gives both a different form of the name and a different genealogy: "S. Auromara seu Eudomara, filia Engenni, f. Talvy, f. Ailenii, f. Brugacii, f. Careldi, &c., collat. 18 Januarii." Colgan (Tr. Tunn. 112 a. 6) seeks to identify her with the Cathubris, who appears to be known under so many names in the Lives of St. Patrick (Cethrubris) (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 323-26). [J. L.]

EDHNIUCH (EGNACIUS), son of Erc, abbot of Lich, died A.D. 787 (Four Mast.). His place is supposed by Colgan (Acta SS. 598, c. 4, who calls him Egnacius) to have been Lich-mor-Mochoemhog, now Leamkeveroge, in the parish of Two-Mile-Burris, in the barony of Elygorty, co. Tipperary (Four Mast. by O'Donovans, i. 266 a. b, 371). [J. G.]


EDIBIUS (2), sixth bishop of Amiens, one of the subscribers of the first council of Orleans, held in the year A.D. 511. He followed Andoenaus, and was succeeded by Beatus. (Le Coiteau, Ann. Eccl. Franc. vol. i. p. 288; Gall. Christ. x. 1152; Labbe, Conc. v. p. 549.) [S. A. B.]

EDICTIUS (EDICUS, ECIICIUS, HECIDIIUS), ST., said to have been the thirty-fourth occupant of the see of Vienne, between St. Syndulpus and Chalcedolus. ADO, who wrote in the 9th century, says in his Chronicon, "Sindulpho episcopo defuncto, Hecidius Viennensis Ecclesiae praeulssatum susceptor, magnae religiosi vir." He goes on to say that Hecidius died at the close of the reign of Justinian (Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiii. 115). But this chronology is generally rejected as extending his life too long. A Recollectum of Vienne (quoted in the Gallia Christiana, xvi. 31) speaks of him as living in the time of Constantine, the successor of Maximus, while Dagobert II. was still on the throne, and at the time of the condemnation of Macarius of Antioch. Dagobert II. died in A.D. 678. A spurious letter purporting to be addressed to him by pope Aga tho is extant. He is commemorated on Oct. 23 (Boll. Acta SS. Oct. x. 71). [S. A. B.]

EDILALD, "illustrious virgin," commemorated by Mar. O'Gorman at April 21 (Mart. Domeg. by Todd and Reeves, 107 n.). [J. G.]

EDILBARD (Bed. H. E. e. 24, Addenda ann. 740, 750, in M. H. B. 288 b, c), king of Mercia. [ETHELBALD (1).] [Ch. H.]


EDILBERT (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. iv. in M. H. B. 724 e), king of Kent, son of Wlhtred. [ETHELBERT II.] [Ch. H.]

EDILBIGIN, eleventh bishop of Llandaff (Stubb, Reg. Sacr. Angl. 156), and probably the same as Ufelywy, a bishop in Ergyngh. [UPELYW.] (Lh. Land. by Rees, 524; Godwin, De Paenae Angl. 623). [J. G.]

EDILFYW appears to have been bishop of Llandaff, and to have died in the middle or latter part of the 7th century. Beyond his receiving from Gwyrron and Bonns two pieces of land, devoted to God and to St. Dubricius, for the good of their souls, we know nothing of him. He is probably to be distinguished from both Elyvutus and Edilbin (Liber Landav. by Rees, 415, 626). [J. G.]

EDILHARDUS (Bed. H. E. e. 24, Addenda ann. 739, in M. H. B. 288 b), king of Wessex. [ETHELHARD (1).] [Ch. H.]

EDILHUN (Bed. H. E. iii. 27, ed. Moberly), brother of Edilhun. [ETHELHUN.] [Ch. H.]

EDILTRUDIS. [ETHELREDATA.]

EDILUALD (Bed. H. E. e. 23, in M. H. B. 283 c), EDILWALD (Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. iv. in M. H. B. 726 d, 727 a), bishop of Lindisfarne. [ETHELOLD.] [Ch. H.]

EDILUVANUS (Bed. H. E. iv. 25, add. ann. 758, in M. H. B. 289 a), king of Northumbria, succeeded Oswulf. [ETHWALD MOLL.] [Ch. H.]

EDIRSEKEL. [ETRSESEL.]

EDILFRED FLESAUR (Nenn. Hist. Brit. in M. H. B. 74 b), king of Northumbria. [ETHELWHRD.] [Ch. H.]

EDNYFED is said to have been the son of Maesaw Wledig (the Roman emperor Maximus), by Elen, daughter of Euddaf, a wealthy lord of Carnarvon; but though he is counted among the Welsh saints, like his brothers Owain and Fledig, he is not remembered in any church dedication or name (Rees, Welsh Saints, 108, 115; Gibbon, Decl. and Fall, ii. c. 27). [J. G.]

EDOBIUS (EDOVICUS, EDOCHIUS, EDOCHIUS, EDOBECUS, ODOSBECUS), a general of the
EDOCHIMUS. [EDOCHUS.]

EDOLDUS (HELDOALDUS) is placed twenty-fourth in the list of the bishops of Meaux, after St. Eribigilus, and preceding Adulfus. His date may be about the close of the 7th century. [Gall. Christ. viii. 1602.]

EDOVICUS. [EDOBIUS.]

EDRABORDUS, an unknown or corrupt name of an abbot who attests the reception of the acts of the Legate Synod of 787 in the southern province. It may represent Ethelhard (afterwards archbishop of Canterbury) or Forthred, a prominent Mercian abbot of the time. [Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 462.] 

EDRIC (1) (Bed. H. E. iv. 26, in M. H. B. 242 a; Flor. Wig. Chron. anno 688, in M. H. E. 537 d; Malm. G. R. A. i. §§ 13, 14, ed. Hardy), king of Kent, son of Egbert. [EDRIC (1).] 

EDRIC (2) (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 34, ed. Hardy), successor of Ethelwald king of S. Saxons. [EDRIC (1).]

EDRIC (3), son of Eeni and the father of Aldulf (or Eadulf) king of the East Angles, according to Nennius, who is the only authority for his existence. He would thus be a brother of Anna king of East Anglia. Lappenberg's pedigree of the East Anglian kings makes him Eribric's uncle, not father, of Eadulf. (Nenn. Hist. Brit. in M. H. B. 74 c; Lappenberg Hist. Engl. i. 287.)

EDULF (Malm. G. P. i. § 7, ed. Hamilton, p. 16; Id. G. R. A. i. § 87, ed. Hardy), bishop of Sidnaestzer, suffragan of the archbishop of Lichfield. [EDULF (4).]

EDUS, ST. (MS. Vita, referred to in Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 189), one of the names of Aidan, Aedhan, or Maidoc, bishop of Ferna. [EDAN.]

EDWALD (Annal. Camb. ann. ccxiii. i.e. A.D. 757, in M. H. B. 833 c, and note), king of the Saxons; perhaps Ethelwald king of Mercia. [EDWIN, AEDGUN, KEDWIN, AEDWINE, AEDWIN, KEDWIN, EDWIN, EADWIN) was the son of Ella or All, who for at least thirty years was king of Deira. On the death of Ella in A.D. 593, Edwin was a child, and was deprived of his inheritance by Ethelric, whose son Ethelfrid had married Acht, the boy's sister. Ethelric reigned three years, and then his son Ethelfrid continued his father's usurpation. Between the brothers-in-law there was naturally much suspicion and jealousy. Edwin was obliged to flee, and for many years was in banishment or retirement. At last he found shelter with Redwald king of East Anglia, who was tempted by Ethelfrid with bribes and threats to surrender him. His faithless host resolved either to kill his guest or give him up. A trusty friend conveyed to Edwin the tidings, and promised to shew him a place of security. Edwin was incredulous, and said that, should his news be true, he had rather perish there than continue his wanderings. The friend retired, and Edwin, sick at heart, was sitting in front of Redwald's palace, when during the night a man came up to him, strange in features and dress. The visitor cheered the sad-hearted prince with his words, suggesting to him the possibility of safety and future power, and seeking and obtaining a promise of the maintenance of the listener's gratitude if his suggestion should be verified. Finally, he asked him what he would do if, in addition, the speaker should
be able to put before him a method of life and security better far than any of his kindred had attained to. Edwin at once promised to adopt it. The stranger then laid his hand upon his head, and bade him, when that sign was repeated, remember and keep his pledge. He was gone as suddenly as he had come. The young prince sat still, anxious although less sad than before, and he was sitting there when his friend returned with the happy news that Redwald, at the request of his queen, had now made up his mind to protect him. War thereupon broke out between Redwald and Ethelfrid, which ended in the rout and death of the latter in a battle near the river Idle in Nottinghamshire. This was in A.D. 616. By the death of Ethelfrid, Edwin obtained the kingdom of Deira, and that of Bernicia as well. (Bed. H. E. ii. 12.)

During his exile, Edwin married Cœurnburga, daughter of Cœfæl king of the Mercians, by whom he had two sons, Osfrid and Eadfrid. In A.D. 625 he took for his second wife Ethelburga or Tatha, daughter of Ethelbert king of Kent. The princess was a Christian; and for a time her brother Eadbald refused to give his sister to a pagan. The difficulty was settled by Edwin undertaking to allow the princess and her suite the most ample use of their own creed. The missionary bishop, Paulinus, accompanied the lady into the North as her chaplain. (Bed. H. E. ii. 9.)

In A.D. 626 a desperate assault was made upon Edwin with a poisoned weapon, by an assassin named Eumer, who was sent on his base errand by his father. Edwin was at his royal villa on the bank of the Derwent when the attempt was made, which was only frustrated by a faithful servant named Lilla interposing his body and dying in his master's stead. This was on Easter Day. In the evening of the same day the queen bore Edwin a daughter, who was called Elfrith. The king in the presence of Paulinus thanked his god for the boon, but Paulinus ascribed the mercy to Christ, and said that it was through his intercession that the life of the queen had been preserved. This pleased Edwin, who promised to become a Christian if he could punish Cuichel for his treachery, and as a pledge of his sincerity he permitted Paulinus to baptize, on Whit Sunday, his new-born child. The victory over Cuichel was gained; but Edwin, although worshipping idols no longer, shrank from adopting Christianity. Many conferences on the subject took place between the king and his nobles and Paulinus (Bed. H. E. ii. 9). Every spiritual agency was brought to bear upon the wavering monarch. Beæ preserves two letters which pope Boniface addressed to Edwin and his queen, urging on the great religious change (id. ii. 10, 11). It was at this critical period that Beda tells us, that the mysterious stranger at Redwald's palace re-appeared in Paulinus, who laid his hand upon Edwin's head, and bade him remember and be faithful. Edwin gave way, but wished to consult his council, that, if possible, the change should be a national one. The opinion of Côlô, the pagan chief priest, swayed the rest, and their idolatry was abandoned. This was evidenced by the destruction of the great heathen temple at Goodmanham, near York, on which Cœfæl himself (Côrfr) made the first assault (id. ii. 13).

The barriers were now broken down, and Edwin with his nobles and a vast multitude of his people became Christians. The king was baptized on Easter Day, A.D. 627, in the church of St. Peter, in York, which he had hastily constructed of wood for that purpose, and for catechetical instruction. At the same time he made York the seat of a bishopric for Paulinus, who prevailed upon the king to begin the erection of a larger and grander edifice of stone, enclosing in a square the wooden shrine in which the baptism had recently taken place. Edwin, however, never saw its completion. Meanwhile, the progress of Christianity was most rapid. All the king's children were baptized, and the people flocked in crowds to that holy rite. Every help was given to Paulinus, who was often in attendance upon the court. We hear of him spending thirty-six whole days at Adgefrîn (Yevering), in Bernicia, with the king and queen, instructing and baptizing the hosts which came to him. When the missionary baptized in the Trent Edwin was with him. But the details of the conversion of Northumbria are reserved for the life of Paulinus (Bed. ii. capp. 14, 16). Edwin did not confine his religious fervour to his own people. He induced Eadbald king of East Anglia, the son of his old friend Redwald, to embrace Christianity with his subjects (id. ii. 15). In A.D. 634, when Honorius became pope, he wrote a letter to Edwin, praising him for his good works and fervour, and urging him to still greater efforts (id. ii. 18). They travelled slowly in those days, evil or good. When the letter was written, Edwin was dead.

In A.D. 633, Caedwalla, a British king, rose against Edwin in rebellion, aided by Penda king of Mercia, who was eager to release his province from Northumbrian thraldom. The battle was fought at Haetherfelth (probably Hatfield Chase), which is called Melcan by Nennius, and ended in the victory of Edwin's forces over the British and his own death. Nennius says that not one of his men escaped (p. 52). Everything was then disorganized. Edwin's head was brought to York, and buried in the minster, in St. Gregory's porch. His body was interred at Whitby (Bed. H. E. iii. 24). Paulinus and his royal mistress Ethelburga returned to Kent by sea, conducted by Basus, a trusty soldier, and brought with them Eanfrid and Vescræa, the royal child-queen, with the son of Osfrid, Edwin's grandson (Bed. ii. 20).

By his first wife Cœurnburga Edwin had two sons, Osfrid, who fell at Haetherfelth (id. ii. 20), and Eadfrid, who was afterwards put to death by Penda, with whom he had taken refuge (id. ii. 19). By his second wife, Ethelburga of Kent, Edwin had several children. Ethelhun and Ethelberht died young and were buried at York (id. ii. 14). Vescræa, another son, was sent with his sister Eanfrid for protection and education to the court of Dagobert king of France, and died there (id. ii. 20). Eanfrid, the only surviving child, married Osfrid king of Northumbria, and is interred at Whitby. In an after day the monks of St. Alban's imagined the existence of another daughter, Rosella, who is said to have
been baptized at Tynemouth, in a wooden chapel or church which her father had built. There is no early evidence of anything of the kind.

The kingdom of Edwin was small at the first, but grew to a very considerable size. His father Elia was king of Deira, which extended from the London to the Humber; the West Riding, or Elmete, being an independent British state. On the death of the intruder Ethelfrid in A.D. 616, Edwin recovered not only his own kingdom of Deira, but acquired that of Bernicia as well. Bernicia extended from the Trees to the Frith-of-Forth, and included Reged. Edwin added to Deira the British kingdom of Elmete, and we hear of him subjugating the Mevanian islands, by which we must understand Anglesey and Man (Bed. H. E. ii. 9; Malm. de Gestis Regum, i. 69). On the death of Redwald he attained the dignity or office of Bretwalda, which he exercised over the whole of England save Kent, that kingdom being exempted, according to Malmesbury, because Edwin would not exert jurisdiction over the brother of his wife (William of Malmesbury. 68). Over Mercia he was more directly the sovereign, and the native British states generally recognized his over-lordship. He had thus a very large dominion. Still his subjects were composed of various races, especially in Northumbria. More than half the people in this province must have been Britons at this time, particularly in the west, and over these Edwin's hold must at all times have been precarious. That it was so is abundantly shewn by the success of the rebellion which, in spite of a long reign of peace and toleration, not only destroyed Edwin, but brought to an end the rule of his children.

Edferic, or York, was the chief city in Edwin's dominion, but the principal temple of pagan worship was at Goodmanham, near Market-Weighton; there was a royal town on the Derwent, and another at Campodunum, which is probably the modern Doncaster. Catterick on the Swale was the centre of a large population. In Nottinghamshire there was the city of Tiuswulflingcestor on the Trent. Edwinstow, in the same county, probably derives its name from Edwin, but Edwin's path, the scene of a council in Wilfrid's days, is changed by the light of modern criticism into Aestawinapath, the swine's path. In the north, the modern Bam- brough, king Æda's towers, was a royal residence of renown; there was another at Adegerfin, or Yevering, and the whole neighbourhood of the Cheviots in Edwin's time was densely populated. Still farther northwards, it is probable that Edinburgh is Edwin's-burgh, the town or burgh of Edwin.

The reign of Edwin was eminently prosperous and happy. Bede tells us that so profound was the peace in those days that in the writer's time it was still a proverbial saying that, when Edwin was king, a woman with her new-born child could walk from sea to sea without being molested. It was told of him that at the springs by the highway-sides he fixed posts with bronze basins fastened to them for the use of travellers, which none would carry away. Not only in war were banners borne before him, but in the times of peace, whenever he walked abroad, a standard and banner in advance, bearing an ensign called a Tuy, i.e., a tuf; of feathers fastened to a spear's point (Bed. H. E. ii. 17).

In the days of turmoil which followed, many would look back with longing to the peaceful reign of Edwin.


EDWINE (EDWINUS, EDA), described by Simeon of Durham as once a dux of the Northumbrians, afterwards abbot of Et-Gegenforde, mighty in the service of God, who died a "miles eremitus," Jan. 15, 801, at his monastery in the presence of the brethren, and was interred with much honour in the church of the monastery (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 801, in M. H. B. 672 b). He may have been the "dux Wada" who was put to flight in the rebellion of 798, as suggested by Mr. Hinde (Sey. Dun. p. 39, ed. Surtees Soc.). A similar instance of a military leader in Northumbria turning ecclesiastic about the same time occurs in the case of "Alric quondam dux," who died a cleric at York in 796 (Sim. Dun. s. a.).

Gegenforde must be the modern Gainford on the Durham side of the Tees, between Darlington and Barnard Castle, described by Camden (ed. Guage, 1768, iii. 112) and Surtees (Hist. Durham. 1846, iv. 9). Shortly after abbat Edwin's time (A.D. 821-845) "built a church at the vill which is called Gengford, and gave it to St. Cuthbert, and all belonging to it from the river Tees as far as the Weor." (Hist. S. Cuthbert, in Sim. Dun. ed. Surtees Soc. p. 142; see also Sim. Dun. Hist. Eccles. Dun. ii. 3.) From this passage Surtees infers that Gainford was thus early considered, what it certainly is found to be afterwards, the head of a district, but he does not notice Simeon's record of Edwin's monastery given above. That passage seems the only one that mentions the existence of a monastery at Gainford. The Chronicle of Melrose (ed. Stevenson, 1835, p. 13), calling him Edwinus and Eda, "quondam dux," and dating his death Jan. 15, 801, states that he was buried in his monastery. At Gainford it says nothing as to a monastery. Tanner and Dugdale are equally silent with Camden and Surtees as to any tradition of one. Birch (Festi Monastici, p. 71) includes abbat Eda in his list (calling him also "rex," not "dux") without naming his abbey, and referring only to Chron. Malm. dating his death Jan. 15, 800. Mr. Hinde, in a note on Simeon, remarks (p. 39) that "some interesting remains of an early ecclesiastical settlement have been recently (1867) discovered" at Gainford.

[CH.]

EGBALD (1) (EGBALIV, EGBOLD, EGBALD), mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as third abbot of Peterborough or Medeshamstedte (M. H. B. 329). The insertion of the name in the list of abbots is due to the fact that a charter is found in the Peterborough Chartularies in which land at Hogh, in Hurburheage in Kent, is granted to an abbat Ecgbald, and the grant is confirmed at Medeshamstedte by Etheldred king of Mercia, and Saxulf his bishop. The charter, which is full of difficulties, would claim a date about A.D. 690; but, even if it is not spurious, it proves no connection between Ecgbald and Medeshamstedte (Kemble, C. D. 40; Monast.
EGBALT, EGBALT, EGBALT, EGBALT, a West Saxon abbot, whose monastery was at Waltheim (probably Bishop's Waltham in Hampshire), and which flourished early in the 8th century. It was to his care that Willibald, afterwards bishop of Eichstaett, was committed when five years old. As Willibald was consecrated bishop in 741, in the forty-first year of his age, Egbert's date will fall in the very first years of the century, and he may be the true Egibald (No. 1) to whom the abbacy of Medeshamsted is ascribed. [Visa Wilhildi, Mabillon, AA. SS. O. S. B. sac. iii. pt. 2, p. 334.]

EGBALT (8), the tenth bishop of Winchester (M. H. B. 610). His name is attached to a charter of Cynegul, king of Wessex, dated 778, and to an act of the synod of Brentford in 781. He was succeeded by Dudda, and Dudda by Kyneburt before the year 787. [Kemble, C. D. 133, 143; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 438, 439.]

EGBERT (1) (Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 672, in M. H. B. 534 a), presbyter. [Egburt (5).]

EGBERT (2) (Flor. Wig. Nom. Archep. Ebor. in M. H. B. 625 b), archbishop of York. [Egburt (9).]

EGBERT (3) (A. S. C. ann. 784, in M. H. B. 336), king of Wessex. [Egburt (4).]

EGBERT (4) I, king of Kent, son of Eorlures and Sæxburga, succeeded his father in 654, and reigned until 673. (See Ann. Cant. in Hardy, i. 584; Pertz, S. c. iv. 2.) Like all the Anglo-Saxon kings of the age, he has a history with two sides, one legendary and the other historical. The veritable details of his reign we learn from Bede. His father Eorlure having died on the same day as archbishop Deusdedit, July 14, 664, Egbert's first important task was to obtain a new archbishop. The slow development of the episcopate in the south and the scarcely healed division between the Scottish and Roman partisans in the north, made it extremely desirable to obtain for the church a ruler about whom the title there be could be a question. Accordingly Egbert joined with Oswy king of Northumbria in selecting for the vacant post an English priest, Wigfrid, whom they sent to Rome for consecration. Wigfrid died at Rome, and pope Vitalian, thinking it incumbent on him to find a substitute, sent Theodore in his place. Theodore was consecrated in 668, and arrived at Canterbury in 669, His companions by Basfrid, whom Egbert had sent to conduct him to Britain (Bede, H. E. iii. 29, iv. 1). During the interval Egbert had invited Wilfrid to Canterbury, where he ordained priests and deacons and discharged other episcopal offices (Edd. V. Wilfr. c. 14, ed. Gale, p. 58). In the year 669, after Theodore's arrival in Kent, Egbert bestowed on his priest Basfrid land at Reculver for the foundation of a monastery (Chr. S. in M. H. B. 318), which became the burial-place of some of the later Kentish kings. He died in 673, on the 4th of July (Annal. Cantuar. in Pertz, Scriptores, iv. 2; Belo, H. E. iv. 5), leaving by a wife, whose name is not recorded, at least two sons, Eadric and Wihtred, who ultimately succeeded him. His immediate successor was his brother Hlothhere. He is regarded by Edius as a religious prince, and was certainly a powerful one, for his authority must have extended over Surrey, when Erkenwald bishop of London, partly under his auspices, was founding the monastery of Chertsey. Legend, however, has thrown a dark shadow over the history of Egbert. According to the Canterbury traditions, Eorlurul had succeeded to the throne of Kent in spite of the claims of Ethelbert and Ethelberht, the infant sons of his brother Eormenred, and had left to Ethelred a thronless embarrassed by a doubtful title. In order to gain favour with Egbert, Thunor, one of his friends, murdered the two princes, who were accounted martyrs; and Egbert, who had conspired at the murder, or rather had shown himself negligent in preventing it, gave to his sister Eormenburh or Domneda a mansion as a hide could run round in a day. On this she founded the monastery of Minster in Thanet. [Eormenburh (1); Ethelbert (5); Ethelred (1).]

EGBERT (2) II, king of Kent. A second Egbert reigned in Kent, or a part of it, in the latter half of the 8th century. His existence is proved by several charters which are found in the Texutus Roefensis, and by coins which apparently can be referred to no other period or country. If these are to be depended upon, Egbert began to reign at least as early as 775, in which he granted land at Rochester to bishop Eardulf in a charter which was confirmed by the kings Heberht (Eadburt (3)) and Offa (Kemble, C. D. 113; Monast. Angl. i. 163), another king named Sigref, claiming half Kent about the same time as Ethelbert, who had his see at Canterbury in 778; in this he bestows land at Bromgéhe (Bromley) on Rochester (Kem. C. D. 132; Monast. Angl. i. 166); and this is confirmed by another grant of the next year (K. C. D. 135; Monast. Angl. i. 167). Another undated grant, confirmed by Heberht, bestows land at Halling on the same church (Kem. C. D. 160; Monast. Angl. i. 166). Unfortunately all these documents proceed from the same scribe, and must either stand or fall together. If they stand, Egbert must have retained power longer than any of the other Kentish pretenders of the age, and have even survived the subjugation of the kingdom by Offa in 774. He is noticed by none of our historians, unless he be the Egbert who, according to Henry of Huntington (M. H. B. 734), ruled Kent for thirty-four years, after the death of his father Ethelberht, who died in 733, accompanied by Hawkins (English Silver Coins, ed. Keynes, pp. 31, 32), as struck by two monasteries, Úd and Babba, who also struck coins of Offa; so that all through his reign he may possibly have been under Offa's supremacy. But this must remain conjectural.

in M. H. R. 721; Malm. G. R. A. i. §§ 65, 69, 70, 72), king of Northumbria, son of Eata, also called Æthelbert. [Æthelbert (5).] [C. H.]

EGBERT (4) (Egbert, Ecgbert), king of the West Saxons 802–839. Although the longer and more important part of the reign of Egbert falls outside of the period comprised in this work, his position and power render the reign itself a mark of an epoch which in English history answers to that furnished by the reign of Charles the Great in the general history of Europe. It is impossible to point out in brief the main features of the reign and its special bearing on the unity and continuity of our ecclesiastical and civil history.

Egbert was the son of Ealhmund, who was the great-grandson of Ina's brother Ingild. Since the reign of Æthelbald in 725 the West-Saxon crown had been worn by a succession of kings who, whatever were their relation to the main line of Cerdic, were not in the direct line of succession. Ethelbert, Cuthred, Sigebert, Cynewulf, and Beorhtric are all described as kinsmen to one another, but in no case is the pedigree preserved. It is probable then that the direct line of Ingild having been set aside in favour of Ethelbert who founded the line in more distant times, the former was a competitor, Oswald, the restoration of the fortunes of the house was first attempted by Ealh

mound, who is said in the Chronicle to have been king in Kent in 784, or perhaps, allowing for two years' variation, in 786. Nothing can be affirmed positively as to his relations to Beorhtric [Berothric], but it is obvious that if both began to reign in 786, and both claimed to be kings representing the house of Cerdic, their relations could not be friendly. As no more is heard of Ealhmund, it must be inferred that his pretensions to Wessex, if he made any, were defeated; his position in Kent seems to have been taken up ten years later by Æthelbald Præn; and his son Egbert, who would probably be a child in 786, appears first in 802, on the death of Beorhtric. Beorhtric was a mere dependent of Offa; and to the agency of the two kings the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the authorities that followed it ascribe the banishment of Egbert and his exile at the court of Charles. Of the fact there need be no doubt, but the length of the exile is doubtful; the more ancient authorities (Chr. S., Flor. Wig., H. Hunt.) making it three years, William of Malmesbury, who probably had other authorities for the West-Saxon history, making it thirteen.

If Egbert returned from exile in 802, three years would be too short, as Offa had then been six years dead; but he may have returned on the death of Offa, and taken his chances with Æthelbald Præn; two dates may therefore be suggested, 793–796 and 789–802; the other two, 785–790 and 799–802, being excluded by the mention of Offa and Beorhtric as acting together.

As, however, Offa's hold on Wessex was finally established by the marriage of Beorhtric and Eadburga in 789 (Chr. S. 877) and thirteen years from that date bring us to the accession of Egbert in 802, probability, as contrasted with evidence, is in favour of this computation. If this be accepted Egbert must have witnessed some part of the career of Offa. Of his relations to Charles, especially his assumption of the imperial crown, and must have returned to England qualified by education and experience for the great part which he afterwards played. On the death of Beorhtric, which occurred in 802 (Chro.

A. 808), Egbert seems to have succeeded to the throne with little trouble.

England under Kenulf [Kunulf] was in a very different condition from that in which it had been under Offa, who had either subjugated all the other kingdoms, or reduced them, by bestowing his daughters on the kings, to the condition of humble allies. Before his death Northumbria had broken away from him, and his son-in-law Ethelred had broken away from him. Kenulf seems to have been under Æthelbald Præn, and Wessex itself was disquieted by the intrigues of Eadburga. Egfrid the son of Offa had reigned only a few months, and Kenulf, who was only a distant kinsman, possessed neither the policy nor the alliances of Offa. Still Kenulf during part of his reign retained supremacy in Kent and East Anglia, and was the most powerful king in England. What slight opposition was offered to Egbert's succession must have been owing to Kenulf's suggestion. According to the Chronicle, on the day of Egbert's succession, possibly in consequence of something which occurred at his election. Ealhewed, the ealdorman of the Hwicci, which made an immediate impression on the ealdorman, with the men of Wiltshire, withstood him, and although both leaders fell in the battle the invaders were routed.

From this year to 815 (813 Chr. S.) the annals of the reign of Egbert are blank. There is indeed a legend, or rather fabricated story, that in the first year of his reign Egbert called together his tenants at Winchester, and decreed that for the future his kingdom should be called Anglia (Monast. Ang. vi. 608), but the story need only to be mentioned to be rejected; it is clearly a forgery of a late date, at which Egbert had come to be popularly regarded as king of all England. Neither letter, charter, nor legend breaks the silence for fourteen years. Matthew Paris alone seems to assume the later conquests of Egbert, by placing the conquest of Cornwall in 808, and that of the northern Welsh in 810 and 811. These years were given, if we may argue from the results, to the consolidation of the West-Saxon power at home, and on the western border. Not a word is said of any participation of Egbert in the struggle between Canterbury and Mercia, nor does his name appear in the correspondence of the emperor: there are no West-Saxon synods, nor even a monastic charter.

Egbert, in some of his later charters, which are regarded as genuine, adopts with the computation of his regnal years, a method of dating by the years of his "ducatus," dating from 812: in charters of 826 the twenty-fourth year of the reign answers to the fourteenth of the "ducatus" (Kemble, C. D. 1035, 1036, 1038.) It may be inferred from this that the year 812 or 813 was marked by the initiation of hostile measures, probably against the Welsh. Whether the "ducatus" implies the assumption of the character of Bretwalda, or the national hegemony, or whether the charters in which the term occurs are genuine, may be most questions, but Egbert certainly had not in 812 or 813 performed such great career of enterprise as entitled him to such a claim; and the form was adopted only in later years when his sue-
cesses had justified the assumption. Anyhow his military activity begins about this time, and in 814 we have the first gleam of light on the ecclesiastical history of the West-Saxon realm. In 814 (Chr. S. 812), bishop Wigthen of Winchester went to Rome in company with archbishop Wulfred. From that period seems to date the gradual coldness between Wulfred and Kenulf, which broke out later into an open quarrel, and possibly also that closer intercourse with Wessex which still later grew into a strong alliance.

In 815 (813, Chr. S.) Egbert laid waste West Wales or Cornwall from east to west. If his victories in this struggle suggested to him the assumption of a new title, as he had seen Charies assume the imperium, he may now have assumed the "ducatus," dating it by the commencement of his expedition. After this another blank of ten years occurs, during which the great synod of Cealchyn in 816 was held, no mention of Egbert being made in it. King Kenulf died in 821 (Chr. S. 819), Ceolwulf his successor was deposed, and Beornwulf was placed on the throne 823. In 823 we have the first notice of the restitutions of the West-Saxon lands under Egbert; it was held at Aedleah, Oakley (probably the Hampshire Oakley, near Basing-stoke), and approved of a grant made by the king to his "praefectus" or reeve Wulfheard (Kemble, C. D. 1061, from the Codex Wintoniensis). The next year he was again at war, and his career of aggression began as before. His first expedition was against the Britons of Cornwal; the men of Devon fought with them at Camelot; there was great slaughter, but the result is not stated. (Chr. S.; H. Hunt. in M. H. B. 733.)

Egbert himself was probably employed in this campaign; for there are two charters drawn up with the date Aug. 19, 825, at Croedantrewe, "in hoste quando Egbertus rex Gewisorum movit contra Britones." (K. C. D. 1033, 1035.)

The same year was fought the battle of Ellandune, in which Egbert won his place as the first of the decisive encounters between Mercia and Wessex. The place is uncertain, but it was probably not far from Winchester, as Hun the ealdorman of Somerset who fell at Ellandune was buried at Winchester. (Ethelward, M. H. B. 510.) If Beornwulf had penetrated so far into Wessex as this, he must have taken advantage of Egbert's absence on the British frontier. The battle was a cruel one, and the streams ran with blood. Egbert was completely victorious, and the tottering fabric of Mercian supremacy fell at once. Into Kent Egbert sent his son Ethelwulf with the ealdorman Wulfheard and bishop Ealdhstan of Sherborn to recover the kingdom of his father Ealhmund, which, as the Chronicler says, had been unjustly lost. (M. H. B. 548.) Surrey, Sussex, and Essex submitted at once; East Anglia, whither Beornwulf had betaken himself, made overtures to Egbert, and there Beornwulf himself was killed by the people. The Mercians, divided among themselves, continued the unequal struggle for some few years. In 825 or 826 Ludecn succeeded Beornwulf; he fell in an attempt to recover East Anglia, after a reign of two years. (Fior. Wig. in M. H. B. 640.) Wiglaf his successor, who seems to have recovered the folkland of Essex, 828, was immediately attacked and deposed by Egbert (829, Chr. S. 827).

It is at this period that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle applies to the victorious king the title of Bretwald. After two or three years of exile Wiglaf was restored in 831 to the throne of Mercia by Egbert as a tributary king. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 557.) It was probably about this time or a little earlier that Egbert gave the kingdom of Kent to his son Ethelwulf. The Chronicle, under the year 827 (corr. 829), mentions an expedition of Egbert against Northumbria; he advanced to Der (Derbyshire) and there received the submission of the nation. Another expedition against the North Welsh completes this portion of the reign. During these years there is a very little light from charters; in 828 Egbert, together with Ethelwulf, whom he calls in the charter king of Kent, granted to the church at Rochester immunity for its estates from public imposts except the three regular exactions (Kem. C. D. 229)

In 830, as king of the West Saxons and the Kentishmen, Egbert gave lands in Kent to the thegn Etheric (Kem. C. D. 224). In 833 he gave a small estate in Kent to an abbat named Dun and his church at Sandon (Kem. C. D. 234), and that year held his court on St. Stephen's day at Dorchester, where he granted witan-geld, that is, land in a charter preserved in the Shaftesbury Cartulary (Kem. C. D. 232).

Shortly after this occurred the first alarms on the south coast from the northern sea kings. In 832 (corr. 834) Sheppey was ravaged by the heathen; in 833 (corr. 835) Egbert, in a battle at Charnouth (Carrum), had to contend with thirty-five ships of the Danes; he was defeated, and lost in the fray the two great Kentishmen. In 835 (837) the Danes and Cornishmen united and were defeated by the king at Hengistdewa. (M. H. B. 344, 345.) This was Egbert's last victory, although after the intermission of a year the Danes renewed their attack.

During this period of war and danger, archbishop Ceolnoth had established himself in the see of Canterbury; he had thus been brought into closer intercourse with Egbert, with whom Ceolnoth was on friendly terms. Ethelwulf was, as his later history shows, peculiarly open to religious impressions, and Egbert seems in his last years to have shewn a strong inclination to strengthen himself by obtaining ecclesiastical support. Up to this time none of the West Saxon kings, except Ine, had shewn themselves liberal founders of churches; their charters are very few, and unless we suppose that the benefactions of later kings have been referred back to Ine, their gifts were neither many nor large. Egbert's own benefactions had been chiefly bestowed on Winchester, and for the first twenty years of his reign no extant charter is producible; nor is he found in attendance in any synod. The interdiocesan and other disputes of his bishops are settled in the synods of Ceolnoth and Cealchyn, under the direct influence of the Mercian king, and with no notice of his participation; and of his bishops, two or three, Herefrith, Wiften, and Ealhstan are known as warriors rather than as ecclesiastics, whilst the others can scarcely be said to be known at all. The apparent parsimony of the West-Saxon monarchs may be accounted for by the poverty of the kings, or by the smallness of the folkland in England, and the character of both kings and prelates by the constant needs of defensive warfare and internal
organisation. In this latter point it is even possible that more was done by Egbert than appears on the surface, and that we should refer to the appointment of bishops and ealdormen for each shire of his West-Saxon kingdom, an institution of which there are traces somewhat later, but not earlier. The year 838 seems to be marked by a step in advance. In a council held at Kingston-on-Thames, if the Canterbury story is to be trusted, Archbishop Ceolnoth concluded an alliance with Egbert and Ethelwulf, for themselves, their heirs and successors for ever. (Kem. C. D. 240; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 617, 518.) It appears from the document that an estate at Malling had been given to the church of Canterbury by king Baldred while flying before his enemies; the title of the convent was therefore regarded as imperfect, and the kings were moved by the prayers of Ceolnoth to complete it. This was done on the understanding that they and their heirs should receive from Ceolnoth and the convent, and their successors, firm and unshaken friendship, patronage and protection; all the Kentish monasteries, with the two kings and their defidents, were included in the alliance; the bishops agreed to it, and with the addition of certain immunities it was recorded and ordered to be kept among the "telligraphia" of the church of Canterbury.

A very similar document embodied a like alliance between the kings and the church of Winchester. (Kem. C. D. 1044; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 619.) Some doubts may be thrown on the genuineness of these charters, but those doubts arise rather from the nature of their contents than from their diplomatic unsoundness; the Winchester charter, which may have been drawn up in imitation of the Canterbury one, is the one to which these doubts mainly apply. It is, however, by no means impossible that we have in this record a monument of great importance, an alliance, so to speak, between church and state in Kent, which was on the verge of independence for later times. It was afterwards confirmed by Ethelwulf as sole king. This was nearly the last act of Egbert. His death, placed by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the authors who have followed its guidance, in 836, really took place in 839; an important point of chronology which is proved both by the charters of Egbert, and by the number of years assigned to him by all authorities. He reigned thirty-seven years and seven months, which, dating from 802, fix the period of his death about the middle of the year 839. Ethelwulf calls 839 the first year of his reign after his father's death (Kem. C. D. 240), and the year 802 may (notwithstanding the confusion of the Chronicle) be safely accepted as the first year of Egbert.

Egbert's coins are described by Hawkins (Silver Coins of England, ed. Kenyon, pp. 111–113). Some of them were struck at Rochester; about twenty different moneys seem to have been employed. The inscription is "Egbert (spelled variously Eggbeart, Aegbeartb, Hecbeartb) Rex"; in some of them the word "Saxo" occurs instead of the royal title, indicating the title of "Rex Saxorum," and in some the Mercian and the East Anglian A are possibly discernible. The title by which he appears in charters is "Rex Anglorum," A.D. 828 (K. C. D. 233); rex occidentalium Saxorum.
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which he thought he saw the soul of bishop Cedd descend with angels to take the soul of Chad into the "heavenly kingdom" (Bede, iv. 3).

Egbert renounced with king Egfrid of Northumbria, when in the spring of 884 he was planning an invasion of Ireland (S. iv. 26): "Why should he attack a country which had done him no harm?" But to Egbert, Egfrid "refused to hearken." Egbert, some two or three years later, was fired with that missionary ardour which at that time so powerfully animated the Irish church: he thought of "sailing round Britain" in order to evangelise some of the German tribes, as Frisians, Old-Saxons, Booruckarians, &c, or, if this could not be done, he meditated a pilgrimage to the "threshold of the apostles" at Rome (S. v. 9). He had selected his companions, and provided all necessaries for the voyage, when one morning a monk, who had lived at Melrose under Boisil, told him of a dream in which he had been warned by Boisil to say to Egbert, in Christ's name, that he was not to go, as the intended journey, and must rather go to teach the "monasteries of Columba." "Say nothing about this," said Egbert, "lest it should prove an illusion." He himself, "considering the matter in silence, feared that it might be true, yet did not like to give up his missionary enterprise. After a few days the monk told him that he had been rebuked in another dream, for having given the warning negligently and coldly: he must go again and say to Egbert, "that will he, nill he, he must come to the monasteries of Columba, because their ploughs do not go straight: that is his duty to recall them to the right path." Egbert no longer doubted, and yielded according to the picture he had made one more attempt to carry out his one purpose. His vessel was laden and was awaiting a fair wind, when a storm arose, destroyed some portion of the freight, though nothing of what belonged to Egbert and his friends, and left the ship "lying amid the waves near the shore." Then, at last, Egbert gave way. He remained, however, in Ireland until 728, and then went to Iona, where, by his piety and diligent exertions, he persuaded abbat Dunchad and the community to adopt the "Catholic Easter" and the crown-like tonsure, and then, in Bede's view, "consecrated" the island anew "to Christ" by bringing it into "the light of church fellowship" (S. v. 22). He spent there the remaining thirteen years of his life, dying happily on Easter-day, the 24th of April, A.D. 729.

Bede had a special veneration for this "most reverend and holy father," this "servant of Christ and friend, to be named with all honour" (lll. 4, v. 9, 29), who was sometimes commemorated as St. Egbert. [W. B.]

EGBERT (6) (CAMBRERIS, EGBERTUS, HEGBERTUS), archbishop of York, the son of Eata, and a scion of the royal family of Northumbria. He was sent by his father, in his infancy, to a monastery to be educated, and, when grown up, Egbert went to Rome with his brother Egred, where he was ordained deacon. Egred died there, and Egbert returned home. In A.D. 732, bishop Wilfrid II died, and Egbert was appointed his successor by king Coelwulf. (Symeon, H. E. D. ii. 3.) The Northumbrian chronicle places Egbert's accession in A.D. 732 (supd Bede), the Saxons Chron. two years later. Other dates are given, which are manifestly erroneous.

Soon after Egbert's accession, Bede addressed to him a most admirable letter, which gives a clearer insight into the history of the northern church than any other document of that age. In the first place Bede exhorts Egbert not only to personal piety, but also to an observance and dissemination of sound doctrine as well. Instead of abrupt changes from grave to gay, instead of seeking after worldly society and amusements, he bids him study God's word, and ordain more priests to preach and administer the sacraments in the country villages; to translate, also, the Greek and the Latin, and the Latins, as far as possible, into English, for the guidance of teachers and listeners. Bede then goes on to speak of the neglected state of the diocese. He says that there are towns and hamlets in the more inaccessible districts, which, although taxed for the support of a bishop, not only never see him from year to year, but are also without any clergy, and, through the want of such, he hitherto the great hindrance to the much-needed subdivision of dioceses has been the greed of bishops. Against this evil a wise and salutary remedy was provided by the prescience of pope Gregory, who directed that there should be twelve bishops in the northern province, and Bede exhorts his friend to obtain from the pall, which will give him metropolitan authority, and to obtain the permission of king Coelwulf to appoint suffragans. The creation of these can be effected by an arrangement with the monasteries, which may be made as episcopal centres; the power of election might rest in them, at all events they might facilitate it. Bede then goes on to speak of the condition of these monasteries. They were hot-beds of vice and iniquity, without discipline or superintendence. For the last thirty years and more it had been a habit among the laity to purchase lands for the establishment of monasteries, which, when they were established and freed from secular jurisdiction, became the property of the foundresses and their families, who paid no attention to celibacy or anything else. There was scarcely a prelate who had not founded a monastery in this way, and the officers and servants of the king had followed their example, and this prelate or officer called himself an abbot. The whole diocese, Bede said, was full of disorder, corruption, and luxury, and stood in need of the most vigorous and searching reform. (Bede, Opp. ed. Smith, pp. 305-12.)

The advice and the warnings of Bede were not lost upon Egbert. In A.D. 735 he got the pall at Rome from Gregory III., thus becoming the metropolitan of the north, and the first archbishop of York since the time of Paulinus (Saxon Chron.). In A.D. 738 his brother Eadbert became king, so that he could now rely upon the support of the secular arm. There is no record, however, of his making any attempt to increase the number of his suffragans—territorial reasons were probably against this—but there is strong evidence that Egbert was not only a learned man, but at the same time a wise and successful ruler. His literary works were of great repute. Alcuin commends him for the way in which he distributed his wealth, especially among the poor. Egbert was evidently a digni-
Sed ecclesiasticus, accustomed to patronize and to be looked up to, and yet with more suavity and geniality than might have been expected in a schoolmaster. He had also splendid tastes. He acquired many sacred vessels for his churches made of silver, and ornamented with jewels and gold, together with figured curtains of silk, apparently of foreign manufacture. He was also a reformer of church music, and seems to have introduced the observance of the hours. (Alcuin, de 33. Ebor. Eccl. 1262–1271.)

Egbert's chief claim to the gratitude of posterity is the establishment of the school or university of York, and his commencement of the library in connexion with it. The school was attached to the minster, on which it has conferred an enduring fame. Egbert himself was the moderator or head, and gave the religious instruction, whilst Ethelbert or Albert was the vice-principal or abbot, and had the charge of grammar and the arts and sciences. Scholars flocked to York from all parts of Europe, and among the pupils was the illustrious Alcuin, who speaks affectionately of the piety and goodness of Egbert, telling us what an excellent instructor he was, how just and yet gentle. We gain a glimpse of the scholastic life. It was his wont in the morning, as soon as he was at leisure, to send for some of the young clerks, whom he instructed in succession, sitting on his couch as he did so. At noon he went into his private chapel, and celebrated mass. When dinner was over, at which he was present with pleasure, his scholars discuss literary questions. In the evening he said compline with them, and then each received his blessing, kneeling at Egbert's feet. (Vita A. Alcuini, ed. Jaffé, 10–11.)

Towards the close of his life, Egbert resigned to Albert and Alcuin the management of his school, and devoted himself exclusively to his spiritual work. His brother king Eadburt laid aside his crown, and came to live with him in A.D. 737 in religious retirement at York. The archbishop died first, on Nov. 19, A.D. 766; his brother survived him until Aug. 19, A.D. 768. They were laid side by side in one of the porches or chapels of York Minster. (Gawro Chrom.; Symeon, B. II. 29–32.)

Egbert, in conjunction with his brother, struck coins, of which several types have been discovered. It was the fashion at one time to ascribe them to the kingdom of Kent.

Egbert was the most practically able man that had hitherto ruled the church of York. We do not mean he was a great reformer; he gave rather to the work that was generated on the side of order and godliness by his educational efforts, and his own gentle yet firm example. His books are classic or text books, pointing to what must then have seemed a very ideal state of discipline and purity, and setting up a possible standard of the most excelled kind. He had the advantage of being an educated man with a brother on the throne, so his plans had every reasonable chance of success, and he lived long enough to see them have a fair trial. It is not too much to say that the gentle influences of the school of York and its teachers kept Northumbria together until the close of the century in which Egbert lived. When we mark the political changes, and the violence and bloodshed of the times, we can only wonder that it endured so long. At the last, when Northumbria became hopelessly disorganized, the discipline and the learning of Egbert were enlightening other countries than that which they were intended to humanize. The children of the school of York taught the schools or universities of Italy, Germany, and France.

Among the letters of Boniface there are two addressed to Egbert, in one of which Boniface asks him to send him into Germany a part of Bede's Commentary; in the other he sends Egbert transcripts of the epistles of Gregory made for him at Bononia, as unknown, as the texts in England. The letters show the writer valued the archbishop's opinion, and are very genial and instructive (Epp. ed. Giles, i. 87, 113). York had a great deal to do in the 7th and 8th centuries with the evangelization of Germany. There is also a letter extant, written in A.D. 757, in which Hetruchi, called Hetrud, both Egbert and his brother Eadburt, for an injustice done to abbot Fordred (Wilkins, Conc. i. 144; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 394). The name of Egbert ought not to have been inserted in it, as the rebuke was intended for the king, not for the archbishop.

Egbert was an author of note and fame, his works having for their aim the elevation of the moral tone of his clergy and diocese generally. They consist of the following.

1. A Pontificale, or volume of episcopal offices, printed for the first time by the Surtees Soc. (vol. xxvii.), from a MS. in the national library at Paris, formerly that of the bishop of Chartres, and of Evreux. There are extracts from it in Martyr., de Ant. Eccl. Ritu. ii. 11; lii. ii. c. xii.; cf. Maspell. Monument. Ritual. var. loc.

2. Saccinctus Dialogus Ecclesiasticus Institutiones, a treatise on various points of church discipline, in the form of question and answer; printed for the first time by Sir James Ware, 8vo. Dublin, 1694, pp. 91–119, at first prefixed to a work of his own, Towards A.D. 1604–11; Johnson, ed. Baron. i. 161–179; Wilkins, i. 82–86; Mansi, xii. 482–88; Thorpe, Lives and Instit. ii. 87–96; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 403–13; cf. Leland, de Script. Brit. i. 114 Oudinuis, i. 1796.

3. Excerptum de Consenibus Catholicores populorum, seu Poenitentiatae acta remissione condemnati, printed in Martene and Durand, Ampl. Coll. viii. coll. 40–8; Wasserschleben, Busserudungen, etc., pp. 231–247; Haddan and Stubbs, Conc. iii. 413–81, where there is a learned and exhaustive note on the history of this work. The text printed by H. and S., and derived from Wasserschleben, seems to be the original work of Egbert, but it was subsequently overlaid with additional materials from other sources, which are sometimes called a Confessionale and Poenitentiata. These are printed in a variety of forms by Labbe, vii. coll. 1611–19; Spelman, 281–8; Wilkins, i. 113–44; Mansi, xiv. 458; Thorpe, ii. 228–239; cf. Wanley, ii. 109; Let. de Script. Brit. i. 114; Oudinuis, i. 1796; Wright, Let. i. 308; see also Fuller, Ch. Hist. b. ii. 111.

To Egbert there are also ascribed a series of Excerptiones, or extracts from the fathers and canons of the church, on matters of discipline. Wasserschleben, however, has shown that they cannot be Egbert's, as they contain extracts from the Capitularis of Charlemagne (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 415). They are printed as Egbert's
EGBERT (T), bishop of Lindisfarne. Florence of Worcester (ann. 802) says that Egbert being elected on the death of Higbald was consecrated on June 11 by archbishop Eanbald. Simeon of Durham (Twysd. Script. col. 119) writes: "Anno decimii. Higbaldus episcopus obit et Egbertus ei successit." The MS. however, has an hiatus after "Egbertus," and "ei successit" is supplied by Twysden from the continuation (see note in Sym. Dun. ed. Surtees Soc. p. 42, and M. H. B. 673.) but this fault in the manuscript affects Egbert’s succession less than that of Ceolnoth archbishop of Canterbury. June 11, 803, was probably the day of Egbert’s consecration, as that day was Trinity Sunday, and this is the date adopted by Wharton (Angl. Sac. i. 698) and Stubbs (Regist. Sacr. 9). Wendorow also gives 803. We are indebted to Simeon of Durham (Duceton. Eccl. ii. 18, Twysd. 13) for the information that Egbert was ordained bishop at Biggella, and that the assisting bishops were Eanbald of Hexham and Badulf of Whithern. Biggella is identified with Bywell on the north bank of the Tyne (Sym. Dun. ut sup. ed. Stevenson), an account of which spot is given in E. Mackenzie’s Northumberland, ii. 350, ed. 1825.

Egbert’s successor was Heathred, A.D. 821. His metropolitans were therefore Eanbald II. and Wulfald; the kings of Northumbria contemporaneous with him were Eardulf and Eanred. [Ethelwulf (2).] [C. H.]


EGBURGA, EGBURG, who writes to bishop Boniface A.D. 716-722; Ep. 32 in Patr. Lat. lxxxix. 732; Mon. Magunt. ed. Jaffé, p. 63. She is "ultima discipulorum vel discipulorum ejus"; she describes her regard for him in enthusiastic and almost fond terms, telling him how she has transferred to him, her abbat and her brother, all her sisterly affection since the death of his friend her brother Osberhe. A new befriending has been set on her, by her beloved Wutburga’s incarneration at Rome. But Wutburga is a happy confessor; Winfrid too is an honoured apostle; while she, the miserable Egburga, not deemed worthy of being a companion with such servants of God, is left to bewail her own sinfulness in the vale of tears. Deprived of the privilege of seeing Winfrid in the flesh, she implores him, on whom alone she leans, to place her upon the rock of his supplications, and moreover to send her some relics, a few written lines also, that by those tokens she may be able to think of him as present with her. Her amanuensis Ealhbeorceth may be responsible for the Latin and for some of the exuberance of style; but the sentiments are those of one who has wound herself up to believe she cannot serve God in the common round, the pairing of being anything because her heart is not an heroic one. One of the variants of Eadbubga abbess of Repton [Eadbubga (3)] is Aegberga; but whether Boniface’s correspondent was any of the known Eadbubgas may be questioned. [C. H.]

EGCBALD (Kemble, C. D. 35), presbyter and abbat. [Egbald (1).] [C. H.]

EGCLAF (Kemble, C. D. 87), bishop of Dunwich. [Ingelf.]

EGCUINF (Kemble, C. D. 193), bishop of London. [Ingulf.]

EGCUIN (Kemble, C. D. 124), bishop of Worcester. [Eugine.]

EGDUNUS, a presbyter, martyred at Nonemedia with seven others. They were amongst the first victims of the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303). Egdunus was hung up by his feet and suffocated with smoke. [Mart. Adon. Usuard.] He is commemorated March 12. [T. S. B.]

EGELERHT (A. S. C. ann. 552 in M. H. B. 302), king of Kent. [Ethelbert I.] [C. H.]

EGELRIHT, ST. (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 97, in § 86 Ethelbrht), king of East Anglia, slain by Offa. [Ethelbert (3).] [C. H.]

EGELRED (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 70, ed. Hardy), king of Northumbria. [Ethelred (4).] [C. H.]

EGEMONIUS (Agemontius, Ionoitus), bishop of Autun, mentioned by Gregory of Tours (De Gloria Conf. c. 75) as possessed of every episcopal virtue; died A.D. 374. [Gesta Chin. iv. 333; Gams, Spec. Ep. 499.] [R. T. S.]

EGEREDUS, bishop of Salamanca in A.D. 646. His signature appears among those of three councils, the seventh, eighth, and tenth of Toledo, in the years 646, 653, and under Lindastrith and Reckerrinth. [Exp. Sagr. iv. 276; Aguirre-Catalá, ii. 423, 444, iv. 158.] [Elfrithius (14).] [M. A. W.
EGFRID OF NORTHUMBRIA

EGFRID (1) (EGFRID, EGFRITH, EGIFRIG, EGFRID, EGFRITH, EGIFRUD), one of the younger sons of Oswy king of Northumbria and Eanfleda, daughter of King Edwin. In A.D. 655, when his father had been exiled to Strathclyde with Penda king of Mercia, Egfrid, then about five years of age, was kept as a hostage in Mercia by Cynwine the queen (Bed. H. E. iii. 24). After this we hear nothing of him until A.D. 670, when he succeeded his father on the Northumbrian throne as his eldest surviving son (ibid. iv. 5). He was in every way fitted to rule, and inherited a kingdom which his father at his death had left in profound peace.

Egfrid's first wife was Etheldreda, a daughter of Anna king of East Anglia, and widow of Tontbert, one of the rulers of that kingdom. The alliance with Egfrid was forced upon her, as she was under a vow of virginity, to which during her two years' alliance with his brother carefully adhered. Wilfrid was high in the favour of both husband and wife, and Egfrid is said to have solicited the bishop's aid to enable him to overcome the objections of his wife, but to no purpose. The ill-matched couple were divorced, and Etheldreda became a nun at Coldingham, whilst Egfrid took as his second wife Ermenburgha, sister-in-law of Ceolwulf king of Wessex. They had no children. (Bed. H. E. iv. 19.)

The part which Wilfrid had taken in the domestic affairs of the Northumbrian palace was partly, no doubt, the cause of the trouble in which he was afterwards involved. In queen Ermenburga he had a determined and energetic foe, and her influence soon brought over her husband to her. The love of splendour, the wide-spread popularity of Wilfrid, and, above all, his success made the queen and her husband look upon him with suspicion and dislike. An opportunity soon occurred for diminishing Wilfrid's power. Archbishop Theodore was invited into Northumbria by Egfrid, and without Wilfrid's consent his large diocese was subdivided. A bishop was placed at Hexham, and another at Whittingham. To this change Egfrid made a vehement but unsuccessful resistance, and finally appealed to Rome in defence of his rights. After a long journey thither and many delays, he came back to the Northumbrian court with a papal decree in his favour, to find it treated with derision and contempt. He was robbed, cast into prison, and finally banished.

The dread of Egfrid's revenge denied him also a shelter in Mercia and Wessex, and it was in heathen Sussex at last that he found a temporary home. In the meanwhile other changes were made in the Northumbrian diocese. Bosu became bishop of York, Eadheah came back from Lindsey to Ripon, whilst Trumbert, Eatas, and Trumwin were also prelates in the province. Wilfrid was thus excluded from his diocese, and as long as he lived Egfrid denied him access to his kingdom.

In the management of Northumbria Egfrid was a bold and vigorous ruler. He made but few additions to his kingdom towards the south, Mercia being in his way. He held indeed Lindsey for a short time, but soon lost it. With Ethelred of Mercia he waged, in A.D. 679, a bloody war, in the course of which Egfrid's own brother Ithelred was slain. Learning the news, Egfrid seemed to be imminent when peace fortunately was restored by the intervention of Theodore. Egfrid was thus enabled to turn his arm with greater success in a different direction. He consolidated his power far and wide by treaties or annexation, subjecting to his rule the independent states of Cumbria and Lothian, in which the Galloway. Strathclyde would also have been secured had Egfrid lived.

Egfrid was a true and generous friend to the Northumbrian church. In its management and welfare he took the greatest interest. He was present at the ecclesiastical synod at Haestfelth (Bed. H. E. iv. 17). In A.D. 684 he was at the synod at Tayford on the Alne, at which Cuthbert was elected bishop of Lindisfarne in his absence. Egfrid tried in vain to induce him to accept the office. At last he went himself, and with great persuasion and difficulty obtained his assent and brought Cuthbert back to the synod (H. E. iv. 29). Egfrid was afterwards present when Cuthbert was consecrated at York (Symeon, H. E. D. i. c. 9). Between Cuthbert and Egfrid there existed the most intimate and affectionate relations. The king and archbishop Theodore gave the saint divers lands in the city of York, where there is still a church which bears his name. They gave him also the village of Crayke near York, and the country around it three miles in circuit, that Cuthbert might be able to reside there as he went to and from York. The charter, however, which professes to record the gift is a fictitious one (Beda, ed. Smith, App. 782). As this benefaction was small, Egfrid added to it the city of Luel or Carlisle, with a circuit of fifteen miles. He also gave him Cartmel in North Lancashire and all its Britons, and the will of Sutwardibut, together with Cuthbert in Northumberland (Jist. de S. Cuth. ed. Sutroes Soc. 140–1). Benedict Bishop also experienced Egfrid's bounty. The king gave him the land at the mouth of the Wear on which Benedict erected his monastery of Wearmouth (Vitae Abb. auct. Beda). He was also, no doubt, connected with the building of Jarrow, the dedication stone of which still exists, stating that it was put there in the fifteenth year of king Egfrid's reign (Jarrow and Wearmouth, ed. Sutroes Soc. pref. 26). The place itself, which is situated at the confluence of the rivulet Don with the Tyne, was called Portus Egfridi (Symeon, H. E. D. ii. c. 5). Well might the memory of Egfrid be dear to the Cuthbertines and the houses of Wearmouth and Jarrow.

In A.D. 684 the lust of empire induced Egfrid to send an expedition under Beccus to Ireland, Christian country although it was. The outrage evoked the expostulations of Egbert (EGBERT 5)) for the unjust onslaught upon a peaceful and friendly people. The expedition seems to have failed, but it caused much misery and destruction of sacred places, and generated a bitter feeling, which was more injurious to Egfrid than a reverse in the field (Bed. H. E. iv. 26).

In the following year Egfrid attacked the Picts, whose king, as Nemius (p. 50) says, was his kinsman, contrary to the entreaties of Cuthbert and his own friends and advisers. The Picts lured him on until they got him entangled among the hills, and then they fell upon him and slew the invader and most of his army at a place called Cauthing, being the name of a fort, Necthan. The king's body was interred at Hii, or Iona (Bed. H. E. iv. 26; Symeon, H. E. D.
EGFRIHD OF MERCIA

i. 9). Bede tells us that the disaster was known beforehand to Cuthbert. In the preceding year he made Egfrid's sister, Ælfsca abbess of Whitby, acquainted with the approaching termination of her brother's life and dominion (Vita S. Cuth. c. 24). At the time of the defeat in Pictland Cuthbert was at Carlisle, his own town, where Ermensburgh the queen was anxiously awaiting some news from the north in a monastery, recently founded by Cuthbert, of which her sister was the abbess. The inhabitants escorted the saint over the city to shew him the walls and a fountain, built by the Romans, of wonderful construction. All at once Cuthbert bent over his staff, turning a saddened face to the ground. A vision seemed to pass before him. He raised his eyes and groaned as he spake aloud, "Perhaps now the crisis is over." "Whence knowest thou?" asked a priest near him; he would reveal no more; but went quickly to the anxious queen and bade her return with speed to the royal city in case the battle should have gone ill with her lord (Vita S. Cuth. c. 27). The spite of one of the biographers of Wilfrid represents that saint as beholding in Sussex, whilst he was celebrating mass, two demons carrying off the soul of the slaughtered monarch from the battle-field to the abode of the lost (Vita S. Wilf. asc. Ædmer. cap. 48). Bede, however, speaks of Egfrid as "pissimus rex!" 

Egfrid was in many respects a great king. He possessed the power of organization which was so rare among the princes of his time, and had he only been free from restlessness, he would perhaps have established on the firmest and most lasting foundations the lordship of Northumbria. Egfrid was most munificent to the church. In every territory which he acquired he seems to have planted bishops and set apart lands for ecclesiastical purposes. With men of Cuthbert's stamp Egfrid was always on the best of terms, although he did not always listen to their advice; but he was strictly in favour of the position and rights of national church, and on that account the Ultramontanism of Wilfrid was excessively, though unsuccessfully, set against him. He set his face against it once and for all. It was upon Egfrid's character and personal influence, often overstrained, that the cohesion of his dominions depended. As soon as he fell the process of dissolution began, "Spes caeptit et virtus regni Anglorum fuere, ac retro sublapse referri," says Bede. The Picts, flushed with victory, recovered what they had lost in the north, and bishop Trumwin retired from Whithern to Whitby to die. We hear no more of this noble man. Cuthbert, belonging to Cuthbert and Lindisfarne. Lindsey went irre- vocably to Mercia, and the supremacy of Northumbria, which had lasted for more than a century, came to an end for ever.

About the beginning of this century a small hoard of copper coins, which have been ascribed to Egfrid, was found in the churchyard of Jarrow. On one of them was the word "LXV." In the York Museum there are two other hoins of the same monarch, but of a different type. [J. R.]

EGFRIHD (2) (Eogfrith, Egfrith, Eoferth, Egfrith, Egfrith), king of Mercia. He was the only son of Offa and Cynewrith, and was from an early age destined to be the heir to his father's extensive power. In the year 787 (Chr. S. 785; M. H. B. 336) he received the royal consecration, the projected arrangement being probably one of the matters which were discussed at the legatine council held by the Roman legates George and Theophylact in that year. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 444, 445.) Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 731) supposed that Egfrid was made king of Kent on this occasion, but the assumption is not borne out by the charters, and it is far more probable that he was thus admitted to a share, or prospective share, of his father's full power. From the year 787 Egfrid frequently attests his father's charters as king; thus in 788 he, as "rex Merciorum," consents to a grant to Rochester (Kemble, C. D. 152); as "Egfrith rex," he sanctions other grants to Rochester in 788 (ib. 155 and 157) at the council of Caenlchyth. In two charters of Worcester (K. C. D. 164, 167) of the year 794, he signs as "Silius regis." His attestations as king are not, however, confined to Kentish charters, as would be the case if he were king of Kent, for he attests a Peterborough charter of abbat Beonna (787-796), K. C. D. 165, as "rex Merciorum." Nothing particular seems to be known about him during his father's lifetime. On Offa's death, July 28, 796, Egfrid succeeded him, but retained his royal power for a few months only, dying before the end of the year. (Chr. S. 794; M. H. B. 338.) William of Malmesbury (G. R. lib. i. § 94) says that during his short reign he shewed himself anxious to redress the evils that his father's cruelty had wrought, that he restored the monastic charters which his father had annulled, and in particular gave back an estate which had been alienated from Malmesbury. Several charters were issued by him during his short reign, one granted at Bath to Ethelmund, ealdorman of the Hwicci (Kemble, C. D. 170, 171), one to Malmesbury (Kem. C. D. 174); Malmesb. G. P. ed. Hamilton, p. 388), besides two questionable or spurious grants to St. Albans (Kem. C. D. 172, 173), dated in synod at Caenlchyth. There can be no doubt that the break-up of Offa's empire had begun even before his death, and that Egfrid's reign only comprised some part of the time under Eadbert Præn. But there are no other traces of personal action. Alcuin, in a letter to the Northumbrian ealdorman Oserberht, expressed his belief that Egfrid's early death was a sign of divine judgment on the bloody means by which Offa had procured his advancement. (Mon. Alcuin. ed. Jaffe, p. 350.) Florence of Worcester gives the exact length of his reign as 141 days, which would fix the day of his death at about Dec. 17. He was succeeded by his distant relation Coenulf. [KENULF.]

EGHLIONNA, virgin, commemorated Jan. 21. She is commemorated along with Fæniche a virgin, and they are both in Cluain-Deil or Cluain-Cean, in Eoghanacht, of Cashel (Mar. Doney.; Mart. Tall.). This is now Clooneen, a parish in the barony of Clannwilliam in Limerick, and the living is a messuage to the see of Cashel; it is probably the same as the Cluain-caen-Modimog (Four Mast. ii. 936, n. 8, 937), which O'Donovan says was in the territory of Eoghanacht Chaisil, which he considers to be the present barony of Middletresh, in the county of Tipperary. The irony of Middletresh a
EGIALÉUS contiguous to that of Clanwilliam on the east
(O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 395–96).

EGIALÉUS (EGIALÉUS), Grammaticus, one
of the judges between Manes and bishop Arche-
laus (Baron. Ann. 277. 13).

EGICA (1), bishop of Segovia (Sigüenza) in
A.D. 655. His signature appears last but one
among those of the eleventh council of Toledo.
He died before 680. (Exp. Sacr. viii. 129;
Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 247.)

EGICA (2), Gothic king of Spain, from A.D.
678 to 701. He was the son-in-law of his prede-
cessor Ervig (q.v.), having married his daughter
Cixilo. Lucas of Tuy makes him the nephew of
Wamba (iii. 69, apud Schott, Hist. Illus.), while
Sebastian of Salamanca (Exp. Sacr. xiii. 477)
speaks of him as Wamba's cousin (consobrinus).
It is tolerably certain, from the contemporary
evidence that remains, that he belonged either
to the family or party of Wamba, and that his
elevation to the throne may be regarded on the
one hand as an atonement or Ervig's part
218) for the treatment which Wamba and his
adherents had received (Ervios, Wamba), and on
the other as a demonstration of the triumph of
the strongly ecclesiastical forces of the Gothic
state.

Egics was anointed king by Julian, the metropo-
litan of Toledo, Nov. 24, 687. Six months later,
May 11, 688, the fifteenth council of Toledo met in the church of the Holy Apostles,
under the presidency of Julian. The ceremonial
observed was exactly the same as under Ervig. The
king appears, asks, kneeling (humo proractus), for
the prayers of the bishops, and then bade to them
the tomus, in which his wishes and his reasons for
summoning the council are contained. He asks
the advice of the bishops upon a point of con-
science—How is he to reconcile two contradic-
tory oaths? At the time of his marriage with
Ervig's daughter (her name does not appear until
the following council in 694) Ervig had
obliged him to swear that he would at all future
times, and on all possible occasions, protect the
lives and property, and further the interests of
Ervig's children and his wife's relations.
The text of this curious oath is given later on in
the acts, and is well worth attention. (Tejada y
Ramiro, Coleo. de Can. il. 545.) Afterwards,
when he became king he had taken the usual
constitutional oath of justice and fidelity to-
wards his people, also in the presence and with
the knowledge of Ervig, and he now complains that
it is impossible for him to keep both oaths.
On the one hand he fears to incur the guilt of
perjury by unjustly defending the family of
Ervig against the just claims of his people, or
on the other by dealing justly with his people at the
expense of those whose interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
which Ervig had extracted from the whole
nation on behalf of his interests he had sworn to
advocate and protect. Ervig is said (ut fertur)
to have treated many with injustice and cruelty,
degrading some from the condition of nobles
that of slaves, torturing and oppressing others,
but all plaintiffs are suspended because of the
royal oath, and because also of the general oath,
those, however, who are willing to forsake their errors various rewards and inducements are held out, and nothing is said of the specially atrocious provisions which disgrace the succeeding councils. (For a discussion of the Jev-laws of Ervign and Egica see the articles of the Archipeele des Westphalen-Redts, 192-207.) Canon 5, De Reparatione Ecclesiarum, &c. provides that the thirds (tertiis quas antiqui canones de parochiis suis habendae episcopis censuerant) shall be applied to the repairs of the church fabrics. Only if the church is in proper order is the bishop to appropriate them, and in no case is he to exact from the parochial churches more than the thirds either for the payment of the royal taxes (pro regis inquisitionibus), or for the salaries of officials (causa stipendiis). It is also forbidden that one presbyter shall under any pretext take charge of several churches. Every church which possesses ten slaves (the meaning of this condition is doubtful, Dahn, Vite Abh. 482; Tejada y Rumire, note to C. Tol. xvi. 5) must have a presbyter of its own.

There are certain errors in the Eucharistic ceremonial. The clergy are commanded to use bread specially prepared, and not to cut pieces from the ordinary bread made for their own use. In the seventh canon we get a glimpse into the procedure by which the acts of these national councils were made known and enforced throughout the country. The bishops are ordered on their return home, within six months at the latest, to gather together all the abbots, presbyters, deacons, and clerks of their dioceses, in order to read to them publicly the acts of the council, and make them fully known and understood by them. And whoever shall despise the acts, or shall endeavour to discredit them, or excite others to rebellion against them, is to be punished with two months' excommunica-
tion. In canon viii. we have a repetition of the oath of the Atalanta Prisca Regiae, referred to in the preceding canon as having been sworn to Ervign on behalf of his family, and now renewed in the case of Egica's children. The council enumerates the king's many virtues, his gifts to churches, his moderation in matters of taxation, his magnanimity towards his enemies, and his generosity in restoring those who had forfeited their liberty to a free condition, and out of gratitude, not only grants him the oath of protection, but decrees that in future in all churches wherever mass is celebrated prayer shall be made for the king and his children, his grandchildren, and all who belong to him. Canon ix. decrees the deposition and excommunication of Sisebert, the traitor metropolitan of Toledo, who had plotted the destruction of the whole royal family—king, queen, sons, and daughters. [SISEBERT:] Before the opening of the council Sisebert's case had been adjudicated upon and his successor appointed, in order that the council might not begin without a president. (Since JULIAN, q. e., the metropolitan of Toledo had presided irrespective of antiquity of ordination.) This is proved by the Decretum Judicii annexed to the acts. The decision is, however, now repeated so far as it concerned Sisebert, omitting the various translations of bishops [FELIX OF TOLEDO], and is then duly followed by the tenth canon, De his qui juramenti sui profanatores exsitternt, modelled upon C. Tol. iv. 75, and repeating three times by common acclamation, as in the earlier canon, the council's anathema upon those who shall plan the death of the king, or the forcible seizure of the kingdom. Then with thanksgiving to the omnipotent and indivisible Trinity the proceedings of the council are concluded, and a decree concerning Sisebert is inscribed immediately after the acts, and the royal confirmation of the acts follows. It is given in the form of a speech from Egica (Ecce sanctissimi in Christo patres, &c.), and contains one or two curious points. Egica represents himself as inclined to treat those who have rebelled against him with gentleness, and he asks the council's opinion as to the advisability of clemency. They know how many times he has been the victim of treachery, and how many disturbances have been raised in the state. Let them say whether the authors of them can be fitly pardoned. But although the council is asked for its opinion upon exceptional cases, the king reserves full liberty of action for himself and his descendants in all future cases of conspiracy. (For the case of Thuretundus see Epistulae noster ecce Christiani acis, see Ex. 74.) The answer of the council upon the points thus raised has not come down to us. Sixty bishops, of whom five were metropolitan, three vicars of the sees of Denia, Pampelona, and Ossoneba, five abbots and sixteen comites et tui illustres, attended the synod.

Nearly two years later, Nov. 4, 684, the seventeenth council of Toledo met in the church of St. Leocadia without the walls of the city. The king appeared et in medio nostra consistent in altum opat reclinans, commanded himself to the blessing and prayers of the council. The royal speech, drawn up probably, like that delivered at the sixteenth council, by the metropolitan Felix, puts forward in the first place all the matters to be dealt with by the council a conspiracy lately discovered between the Spanish and African Jews against the Goth rule. "Præsertim quin nuper manifestis confessionibus indubie invenimus hos in transmarinis partibus hebrasios alios consuluisse at unanimitatis contra genus christianorum agentem." Egica recalls his mild treatment of the Jews in making all possible efforts for their conversion, and in allowing them the use of Christian slaves, which had been previously forbidden to them. Now, however, seeing that all such efforts are in vain, the council is invited to proceed to extremities against them. From their decrees, however, are to be exempted the Jews living in the mountainous parts of Gallia Gothica (Galliae provinciae—infra clausuras—habitatores), because of the depopulation of that region by pestilence (plague ingenualis inferior) and invasion (externe gentis incursu), and because also no doubt of the unlikelihood of their being concerned in the plot of their southern brethren. For the connexion of this passage with a war with the Franks mentioned only by Sebastian of Salamanca see below.

Next among the subjects for legislation comes the crime of those priests who say masses for the dead in the case of men still living, meaning thus to bring harm upon persons who have injured or offended them. The law which throws light upon the debased condition of the lower Spanish clergy at the time; and finally, the council is exhorted to revive the custom of monthly litanies, with the especial object ap-
pently of countering the seditious tendencies of the time. (Tejuda y Ramiro, ii. 595.)

The first canon of the council, which ordains that only spiritual and ecclesiastical subjects are to be discussed during the first three days of the council, gives rise to a feeling on the part of those composing these synods that the councils had of late become too much secularised. The growing preponderance of the secular element in the councils of Toledo, from the eighth onwards when we first find the signatures of the palatini is indeed evident to any student of these much-debated assemblies. The seventeen and the last which has come down to us, has to some extent the air of an attempt to return to the earlier and more purely ecclesiastical traditions. Of its eight canons six are concerned with ecclesiastical matters, the closing of the gates of the baptistery at the beginning of Lent, can 2, the washing of feet on Holy Thursday, the misuse of the ornaments and properties of churches, the celebration of the missa defunctorum for those who are still living, and the monthly celebration of litanies (which is enjoined upon all the churches of Spain and Gothic Gaul, as a practice prescribed by ancient canons, and now revived because of the prevalence of crime and perjury). Of the other canons the first provides for the safety of the queen and the royal children in case of Egica’s death, and the second deals with the Jews. The canon de Munitione Conjugata atque Provisi Regni, is partly a repetition of a formula with which preceding councils have made us familiar (C. Tol. xvi. 8 and C. Tol. xiii. 4), and partly a special provision for Cisilia, Egica’s wife, and (according to later chroniclers) Ervig’s daughter. The canon de Judiciorum Donatione, the last canon of a Gothic council remaining to us, is a striking witness to the spirit of intolerance, cruelty, and persecution which marked the later years of Gothic Christianity. All Jews in all the provinces of Spain (with the exception, however, made in the fonsa) are condemned to perpetual slavery, together with their wives, children, and descendants. They are to be exiled from their homes, and dispersed wherever the king pleased. The Christian slaves of the Jews are to receive from their property whatever the king may choose to assign to them. Those to whom Jews are given as slaves are to watch them strictly lest they observe any of their own ceremonies or follow in any way the “perfidy” of their fathers. Finally, as soon as Jewish children of both sexes reach the age of seven they are to be taken from their parents and given to Christians to bring up in the Christian faith, with the object of marrying them, when grown up, to Christian wives and husbands. Then with the customary thanksgiving and lex de confirmatione concilii, the proceedings of the council come to an end.

The acts of the seventh council of Toledo bring us to an end of the historical material available for these last years of the Gothic state. Just as the plot thickens and the interest reaches its highest point all information fails us. The nearest chronicler to the events of the last seventeen years of the Gothic rule is Isidore of Seville (circa 750), from whom only very scattered fragments are to be gleaned of the three last reigns. We learn from him, however, that in the aera 736, A.D. 698, Egica availed his son Wittiza with him in the government, and that in 701 Egica died at Toledo, and Wittiza succeeded to the kingdom. Later chroniclers add that Egica assigned Tuy in Galicia on the Minho to his brother-in-law, perhaps in order to keep the scarcely amalgamated Suevi in order. Coins are extant bearing the joint names of father and son, which is the case also with various laws in the Fuero Juzgo (Maden, ix. 33-36; Heflerich, 217, note).

The repudiation of his wife Cisilia by Egica is not mentioned before the 9th century (Chron. Albed. Expos. S. Gr. 449), and is sufficiently contradicted by C. Tol. xvii. 7. The war with the Franks appears first in Sebastian of Salamanca — "adversus Francos inurumpentes Gallias, ter praemium egit, sed triumphum nullum cepit." (apud Expos. S. Gr. 477). Sebastian seems to be supported by the externae gentes incursus of C. Tol. xvii. mentioned above, and it may be easily shown that some forays of Eudes of Aquitaine into Gallia Gothica may have led to these indecisive hostilities.

With regard to the general political meaning of the reign, it may perhaps be inferred from the acts of the three councils, and from the relation of Egica’s legislation generally to that of Ervig (Heflerich, 206 seq.) Dahn, Vite Aeth. 486), that Egica represented the Gothic party as opposed to what Heflerich calls the Byzantine-Roman party of Ervig and Julian, and that his relation to the church was not so docile a one as that of his predecessor. He appointed a Goth (Siesbert) for the first time to the see of Toledo upon Julian’s death in 690, an experiment repeated later in the appointment of Gunderich or Guethnerich, about 699. We may suppose him to have been less Romanised than Ervig—more of a barbarian, and Ervig certainly appears to have recognised him as the head of Wamba’s party, the Gothic and comparatively speaking anti-clerical party, when he attempted to buy his support by the hand of his daughter, and exacted from him the oath of protection towards his wife’s relations. But in the darkness of these times it is rash to attempt to lay down with any certainty the outlines of general politics, though no doubt by a careful sifting and comparison of all materials much has been done of late years in Germany to clear up difficulties, and more light may still be hoped for. (Acts of 15th, 16th, and 17th councils of Toledo in Aguirre, iv.; Gams, Kirchengesch. von Spanien, ii. 175, 181, 183; Hefele, Conc. Gesch. iii. 295, 318, 322; or Tejuda y Ramiro, Colec. de Con. ii. 598, 553, 588; Isid. Pacenso, Expos. S. Gr. viii.; Seb. of Salamanca, ii. 32; Chron. Albed. 62; Lucas of Tuy and Rod. of Toledo, apud Schott, Hist. Illustratae; Fuero Juzgo, Madrid Academy edition, 1815; Dahn, König. der Germanen, Vite Aeth. 218, 224; Vite Aeth. 468-561. For complete list of literature see the preface to Dahn’s Vite Aeth. For an inscription at Baylen containing Egica’s name, see Jason, Hist. Christ. Hübner, p. 55.) [M. A. W.]

**Egidius** (Aegidius, Gilles), nineteenth occupant of the see of Rheims, succeeding Mamainius (A.D. 565), not to be confused with the popular St. Gilles. [Aegidius] He was a liberal benefactor of his church, and hospitably received at Rheims Gregory of Tours, whom he
consecrated to the office of bishop. But despite the zeal for his flock, eloquence, learning, and benevolence which Venantius Fortunatus discovered in him (ii. 20 in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 141), and his "amiranda sanctitas," commemorated by the biographer of St. Basulus (Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti. ii, 65, Paris, 1733), he was one of the most ambitious and intriguing prelates of his time. One of the first known acts of his episcopate was the consecration of Pro- mutius as bishop of Châlons, in contempt of the rights of Poppulus of Chartres, in whose diocese Châlons was situated. This was the occasion of the fourth council of Paris, from which emanated a letter of grave reproof to Egidius, and another of remonstrance to king Sigebert, who had encouraged the infringement. Upon the death of Sigebert in 575, and the accession of his infant son Childeric II. to the throne of Austrasia, he became largely mixed up with the plots and intrigues of the several Frank kingdoms. Employed on embassies, ostensibly on behalf of the young king, to his uncle Chilperic, to concert measures of hostility against Guntram, he contrived to ingratiate himself with Chilperic and the notorious Fredegond, in whose behalf he appears to have plotted against his kinsman. In the end he was the queen's hand-servant and haughty and unceasingly naturally especialy recommended him, and he was universally credited with aiding her in the murder of her stepson Merovechus (A.D. 577). In the end, however, he overreached himself, and became an object of suspicion. In A.D. 583 or 584, while he was in attendance on Childeric in his camp, the soldiery rose against him and the other adherents of the young king, and his life was saved only by instant flight to Rheims. A little later, being sent by Childeric on an embassy to Guntram, the latter openly upbraided him and, sent to his nephew to warn him against one who was forewarned, both to him and his father before him. The occasion of his downfall, however, was the conspiracy against Childeric of Rauschinus and Ursic, which he was suspected of having favored. For two times, by dint of his persuasive tongue and rich gifts, he reconciled himself to the king, but a little later, one of the conspirators, under the influence of torture, implicated him. He was arrested, but released again upon the remonstrances of the bishops against this indignity, and summoned to appear at the council of Metz, in the autumn of 590. The office of acusers was delegated to Eudoxius count of Tours, who charged him with being a friend and ally of Chilperic against his master and queen Brunichilde, and with receiving large sums of money as the price of treason. The bishop stoutly denied the charges, but the proofs derived from his letters and the evidence of his subordinates left no room for doubt. At evening the council was adjourned till the third day, at which he might have to say in justification. Upon the deceiving Egidius despairing of acquittal, pleaded guilty to the charge of high treason. Upon the intercession of the bishops his life was spared, but he was deposed from his see and exiled to Strasburg. The large treasure discovered in his palace was duly apportioned between the church and the royal treasury. He was succeeded by Romualdus (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 13, vi. 3, 31, vii. 14, 33, ix, 14, x. 10; Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rom. ii, 2, 3, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxv. 94, 97; Gall. Christ. ix. 14; Labbe, Sacr. Conc. ix, 865, x. 459, Florence, 1759-98). [S. A. B.]

EGILA (1), bishop of Osma from about A.D. 633 to 656. His signatures appear among those of the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh councils of Toledo. To the eighth, being then probably old, he sent a priest, Godescalcus, to represent him. There is no trace of him in the ninth council, but in the tenth, A.D. 656, an abbat, Argefreudus, signs for him. (Esp. Sagraudo, vii. 289; Aguirre-Catalanii, iii. 385, 405, 413, 423.) [M. A. W.]

EGILA (2), bishop of Eliberi (?). In the Codex Emonianensus, a MS. of the 10th century, used by Florez in the Espafia Sagraudo, as one of his main authorities for the episcopal catalogues of the various sees up to that time (see Esp. Sagraudo, iii appendix xxxvi. for a description of it) the name of Egila appears in the catalogue of Eliberi is a position which seems to suit with the end of the 8th century. On these grounds only, the Egila of Eliberi has been identified with the Egila to whom pope Adrian I. addressed two letters in the years 781 and 782, and of whom he speaks in his letter to the Spanish see (785) in which the first mention of Adoptionism occurs. [ADOPTIONISTS.] Egila, however, was a common Gothic name, and on the whole the balance of evidence inclines against the identification of the Egila of Eliberi with the Egila of Adrian's letters. Very little is known of this last Egila, but that little raises one or two interesting points. According to Adrian's second letter (the only one in which the name is mentioned), Migne, Patr. Lat. xviii. 326, but the first in date, as it was a copy of one previously sent and lost on the way) Egila was ordained bishop by Wulcharius, archiepiscopus Galliarum (identified by Florez and others with Wilichar, archbishop of Sens, who signed the Lateran council of 789, and journeyed to Rome in 777. On this subject see Ceanni's notes in a contrary sense to Cod. Ca. Migne, xcviii. 410; see Ers. Migne, xcviii. 507; see also Stosi, 68.) "Quem benevolo et prudens, dominum et virum Je- stem dimitto," says Adrian, "de vestris ordinacionibus, atque auctoritatim dirigere vos pro orthodoxae Fidei, Sanctae Catholicae Ecclesiae praedicatione in partibus Spaniensis Provinciis." As to the nationality of Egila and the history and purpose of his consecration we shall have more to say presently. In the letter to the Spanish bishops the pope adds that he made it a condition of the pretended adoptionism that Egila should act only as reginian bishop "et nullam quamlibet sedem ambiret vel usurparat." After his arrival in Mohammedan Spain, the date of which is uncertain, Egila addressed a letter to Adrian, giving an account of his work, and asking for advice upon certain points. This letter, which is not extant, was carried to Rome by two messengers, who were to bring back the answer. From some unknown reason it did not reach Egila, and Egila applied to Charles the Great for help in the matter. Charles, through his Missus Peter, bishop of Pavia, requested the pope to send a copy of the former letter. Adrian did so in 783, writing also a fresh letter, in which he shortly admonished Egila to resist the attempts of the heretics who would overthrow his faith, and to observe the Saturday fast. The first letter, of which a copy was enclosed, and
which was in answer to one from Egila, now lost, contained instructions on the following points: (1) the observance of Easter, with regard to which Adrian is informed that certain persons in Spain refuse to follow the rule laid down by the council of Trent. They do not keep the full moon on a Saturday, instead of celebrating Easter on the following Sunday, they postpone it to the Sunday after. (Hefele, Conc. Gesch. i. 315, ii. 590.) (2) The eating of things strangled, and of the blood of swine and other animals. The pope reports on Egila's authority that certain persons in Spain had denounced any one who refused to eat such things as "luxuriae inimicius." [EVMATIUS.] Adrian, however, forbids the practices, (3) Intercourse between believers and unbelievers. "Many calling themselves Catholics lead a common life with Jews and unbaptized pagans, both in eating and drinking, and in divers false doctrine, declaring that they are thereby in no way polluted." Such persons give their daughters in marriage "sacramentulibus," and their pseudo-sacerdotes ordained without preparation, marry women whose husbands are still living. All these, says Adrian, are Priscillianist errors. (4) Predestination and free will. Some say, "Why should we trouble ourselves to win everlasting life if, notwithstanding, all depends upon God only?"—and others say, "Why do we pray and lead us not into temptation, when our will is free?" Adrian lays down the orthodox doctrine. The letter winds up with an exhortation to Egila to be watchful and constant, lest old errors should break out afresh, and his own faith be overthrown. The next mention of Egila occurs in Adrian's letter to the Spanish bishops in 785. (Esp. Supr. v. app. or Migne, i.e.) From this we learn that Egila, whom Walcharius, according to Adrian, had "too much praised," had been led away by the errors of his master, Mingentius" [MENGITIUS], and the Spanish bishops are warned to grant him no authority or obedience.

Until 1729 this was all that was known of Egila. In that year Florez discovered a MS. in the cathedral library of Leon, containing the acts of a synod held at Cordova in 839 in consequence of a scandal committed by the clergy. This MS. is preserved in the archives of Cordova, and (temporarily) of Aegabo (Cabra), and by Quiricus, bishop of Accifundis, as to the proceedings of a heretical sect, "nomine Casianorum," within their dioceses. The tenets described in the acts are evidently those of the Monetians, though some new points are added which are not to be found in Eulipandus's letter to Migetius. (Esp. Supr. v. appendix, or Hefele, Conc. Gesch. ill. 588.) The heretics are described as Acephalos, i.e. separatists, vaga clerici. [ACEPHALE.] (Isidore gives two definitions of the word. It seems to be used here in the sense described in cap. 3, lib. ii. of the De Off. Ecc.] "Advancing little by little, by a tortuous road, from the sea-shore, they have entered Epagro in the territory of Aegabo (Esp. Supr. xi. 2), and have there practised their abominable rites in corners and caves, the authors of the evil-doing giving themselves out as sent from Rome (proponentes se a Roma missos) with their traditions, which are not agreeable to our doctrines. The passage which follows is extremely corrupt and defective, but it appears to be an argument against one who had assumed the position of bishop of the sect. The council declares that no one can be a bishop "quem nec clerus nec civium conventus eligat." It is a crime to believe that anyone can be a bishop who is without place and city, "quem nec clerus nec populus propriae civitatis exquisivit." The tenets of the heretics are then described. They refuse to be baptised, hoping for an imitatio dei. They were called Monetians by Adrian to Egila (3), and Eulipandus to Migetius, (Esp. Supr. v. 543, or Hefele, Conc. Gesch. iii. 589.) They fast on Christmas Day if they should fall on a Friday. They separate themselves from the Catholic church, thus following the example of Dathan and Ahabron. They refuse to venerate the relics of the saints. They baptise with saliva, saying, "in imitation of the miracle performed by Christ upon the deaf man. They boast of being saints, "se jaquant esse Sancti" (conf. Eulipandus to Migetius, i.e.), refuse to eat with others, and communicate out of different chalices at the sacrament. They are not to be admitted into the ministry of the church, for the synod cannot hold those who have been rightly ordained who said that Egila of Emerita was "ab Agilarnem Emeritae," which Gams, Kircchengesch. von Spanien, ii. 2, 314, reads "ab Agilanem Emeritae") had alone the right of conferring ordinations, which is against all sound doctrine. (Such seems to be the general sense of an extremely corrupt passage.) Further, on the synod anathematizes, "damnallem illam doctrinam cum suorum autores, vel Antifrasium illum Quericiurn cum sociis suis," and we are told that the sect had a church in the sandy waste lands near Epagro (arenas) dedicated to St. Casian, who, in the beginning of the acts is spoken of as "sector corum Casianus." In this curious and almost unintelligible document (fast uelucanzt, as Hefeler says, and not used by Hefele), it seems tolerably clear that Egila's followers are described, and that he himself and his successor, Huneric or Guneric, ordained by him are mentioned. The bishop of the sect has no particular see, his followers speak of themselves as sent from Rome, and the sect maintain the asceticism preached by Migetius, and controverted by Eulipandus, but very possibly supported by the St. John of the Synod, which is copied from Adrian's letter to Egila, in which those who eat unlawful foods, and those also who eat and drink with Jews and unbaptized pagans are anathematized. Two things may be inferred from these acts with regard to Egila: (1) that he was dead in 859; (2) that in all probability the tradition which connects him with the see of Elberii is a mistaken one, though what the word Eumenites is to be taken to mean is very doubtful. The name Casianisti, applied to the sect and their church of "St. Casian," are not altogether easy to explain. Eulipandus, however, calls Migetius "magister Casianorum et Salibanorum," which Hefele, taking it in connexion with the predestination errors mentioned by Adrian in his letter to the Spanish bishops in the same breath with Monetianism, interprets as referring to Cassian the semi-Pelagian. (The author of the Collationes was well known in Spain. Braulio possessed his works, and Fructuosus had some of the Collations, and asked Braulio for a loan of the rest [FRUCTUOUS, ST.]) Gams mentions two recognised saints of the name (A. G. ii. 2, 515), to one of whom he supposes the church to have been dedicated, but considering that the council ex-
presily mentions Cacianus as auctor eorum, it seems most probable that their church was really dedicated to the founder of the semi-Pelagianists, whom they had made their patron saint. With regard to the connexion with Rome put forward by the sect, it should be remembered that Migetius taught that Rome was the centre of holiness, from which all good things came (Eipl. to Migetius, etc.) and that Egila was the envy of Adrian. Elipandus shows great jealousy of the Roman claims in his letter to Migetius, and Egila, a bishop consecrated abroad by permission from Rome, and appearing in their midst with an undefined position, and claims to superior authority, was probably extremely unpopular with the majority of the Spanish episcopate, which was at that time thrown into an attitude of hostility towards Rome and the empire by the influence of Adoptionism.

Of what country was Egila a native, and what is the real history of his consecration? Florero holds him to have been a member of one of the Gothic families of Galicia Narbonensis. Ferreras—in defiance of the documents—boldly makes him a priest of Eliberti, who journeys into France on the death of bishop Baldwin, to seek consecration from Wulcharius (Hist. Thes. d'Espagne, ed. D'Hermilly, ii. 511). It is at least a plausible conjecture that Egila may have been a native of Seville (or of the neighbouring Emerita?) the home of Migetianism, and that his connexion with Migetius may have begun before his journey to France, and may, in fact, have prompted it. The Spanish episcopate at the time was in a most unsatisfactory state. The right of nominating bishops had passed from the Visigothic kings to the Omaiades (Dozy, Hist. des Mussulmans d'Espagne, ii. 47), and the office was frequently sold to the highest bidder, with the natural result that many of the sees were filled with men of heretical beliefs and immoral lives. Alvaro of Cordova, in the 9th century, accuses Saul of Cordova of having paid a large sum to the emperors of the palace for his consecration (Ep. 13, Esp. Sagr. x. 169), and Samuel I. of Eliberti (Esp. Sagr. xii. 167), and Hostegisis of Malaga (Dozy, I.c.) are further instances of the degradation of the episcopate. On the other hand we have the renown of Charles the Great as the champion of the church and of Christendom. Elipandus's letter to him on behalf of Felix of Urgel (Esp. Sagr. x. 550) is a sufficient proof of the respect with which even the isolated and disaffected Adoptionist bishops regarded his position. It seems allowable, therefore, to take Egila's career, and to some extent Migetianism in general—as a protest against the disorganised and corrupt state of the Spanish church under the Mohammedans. He belonged apparently to a strict ascetic party, which disapproved of the various compromises effected between the rival religions, and especially resented the manner of ecclesiastical elections. Hence the journey into Charles's dominions, the consecration by Wulcharius, and the close connexion both with Charles and Rome, which the various Egila documents disclose. The whole story, with its strange sequel, throws a ray of curious light on Spanish ecclesiastical history during the 9th and 9th centuries. (Esp. Sagr. xv. preface. x. 2nd ed. Madrid, 1792, pp. 363, 525; Hellefich (Ad.), Der West-
EGILWARD (2) (EGILWARD, AGILWARD, EGILBERT, EGILHART), fifth bishop of Würzburg, succeeding Linterich, and followed by Wolfgar. Little is known of him. He is stated to have received the episcopal office (episcopate munus) on June 16, 803, and Usameron understanding this expression to mean his episcopal consecration, assumes that the year must have been 804, (and not in 803) June 16 was a Sunday. According to the same authority he died April 24, 810. Gams also accepts these dates. (Usameron, Episcopatus Württerburgensis, 1794, i. 18; Gams, Ser. Episc. 324.) [C. H.]

EGINHARD, biographer of Charlemagne. [EINHARDS]

EGINO, twenty-first bishop of Constance, succeeded Johannes Ill. and was followed by Wolfhez (A.D. 781 to 813). At this time the traditional policy of the see was the annexion of the monastery of St. Gall. Egino threw himself into the contest with unscrupulous energy. By heavily bribing the nobles about the king he influenced Charlemagne in his favour, who tried to settle the quarrel by subjecting Waldo, the abbot, to the jurisdiction of the bishop. But Waldo refused to exchange the fief he owed to the king for obedience to any "villar persona," and preferred to withdraw to a neighbour monastery, of which he afterwards became abbot. Egino thereupon appointed a secular priest ("presbyterum forensis"), a tool of his own, to the abbey. The monks demurred, and Werdo, yielding, adopted the garb of a monk, and was then received. Henceforth the bishop and abbat together did very much as they wished with the monastery. (Kapferinus, de Concordia Mon. S. Galli, cap. iv. v.; Migne, Patr. Lat. cxixvi. 1053.)

We know nothing more of him than that he gave to the church of Constance a cross made of gold and silver and set with precious stones, on which were three dedicatory lines in Latin to the Virgin (Chronicon Constant. Jac. Manili, to be found in Pistorius, Beren German. Scriptores, tom. iii. p. 704; Gall. Christ. v. 896). [S. A. B.]

EGINO, bishop of Verona in 796. He gave up his see and retired to the monastery of Reichenal in 799, and died there in 802. (Cappellelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, x. 783.) He built and dedicated the church of St. Peter at Angia (Reichenal), where he was buried. (Herimann Angiensis Chronicus, in Pertz, Monum. v. 101; Bouquet, v. 365 G, E.) [A. H. D. A.]

EGLAF (Stobs, Regist. Soc. 168), bishop of Dunwich. [EGLAF.] [C. H.]

EGNACIUS (Colgan, Acta SS. 598, c. 4, Irish saint. [EDNICH.] [J. G.]

EGNATIUS (Cypr. Ep. 34, ed. Migne), uncle of Celerinus, martyr. [IGNATIUS.] [C. H.]

EGOALDUS (EPPOALDUS), twenty-fifth bishop of Geneva, succeeding Aridanus and followed by Albo. The compilers of the Gallia Christiana mention an unauthentic tradition that he was expelled from his see by Chilperic II., but restored later on, between 660 and 672, at the bidding of pope Vitalian. (Gall. Christ. xvi. 383.) [S. A. B.]

EGREAS (EGRAD, EGGRAD) appears in Caradoc's Life of Gildas (Albanus), as brother of St. Gildas [GILDA], son of Caw. With his brother Allaecus and sister Peteona, he renounced the world and retired into Somersetshire; there the three built monasteries for themselves near each other, and all at some distance from the monastery of their brother St. Maeog or Meilig, at Llows, in the rural deanery of Efael ("Lynheu in pago Eimal"). But Professor Rees is of opinion that Egreas, his brother, and sister, when they withdrew "in extremis partes regionis illius," went to Anglesey, in the extreme north-west of Wales, and are known as Eigrad, Galigo, and Peithen, their names being given to Llanefrog, Llanallgo, and perhaps Lingswy. In Myr. Arch. iii. 42, 51, he is called Eugrad, brother of Peirio at Rhooseirlo. (Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 15, wks. vi. 217; Rees, Welsh Saints, 298, 324; Glyn, Trans. Camb. antiq. Soc. i. 476; Lib. Landau. 399, 529; Skene, Celt. Scot. i. 116-118.) [J. G.]

EGRED, a son of Eata, and brother of Egbert, archbishop of York, and Eadberd king of Northumbria. When his brother Egbert went to Rome in early life, Egred accompanied him and died there. (Skeat, Hist. E. D. 1. ii. cap. iii.) [J. R.]

EGREGORI (Epyfropons, watchers), a name for angels, derived from Dan. iv. 13 (versions of Aquila and Symmachus) and used by Clement of Alexandria (Fac. ii. 9, p. 218). In the book of Enoch (Civireus, Comp. Hist. viii.) this title is given to the last of the angels who married the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 2), and so Suidas interprets epyfropons as denoting the sons of Seth. For the patristic references as to the names of the different orders of angels, see Coteleri (Const. Ap. viii. 12), and as to the interpretation of Gen. vi. 2, see Suicer (e. v. "Agγελοι", p. 38). [G. S.]

EGRIC (1), king of the East Angles. He was allowed by his kinsman Sigebert, who acquired the kingdom after the usurpation of Ricbert, to share his authority, and when Sigebert retired to his monastery, obtained the entire sway. When Penda invaded East Anglia, the people drew Sigebert from his monastery to assist them in battle, but he was slain, and Egric with him. Anna succeeded to the kingdom (Bed. H. E. iii. 18). There is great uncertainty about the dates of these events; they are noted by Florence of Worcester (M. H. E. 529) under the year 636, which may, perhaps, be the year of Anna's succession. Smith (on Bede, H. E. iii. 19) places the death of Egric and Sigebert in 635; and the same may be inferred from the evidence of the Liber Eliensis, which gives Anna, who fell in 654, a reign of 19 years (Lib. Eliensis. ed. Stewart, p. 23), but places the fall of Egric in 637 (ib. p. 14). If, as seems probable, bishop Felix began his ministry in East Anglia as early as 630, the whole reign of Egric will fall within the period of his episcopate. [B.]

EGRIC (2) (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. '71 in
EGRILUS

M. H. B. 364 a, also in Twysl. x Scriptt. col. 107, "Egrie et Lector;" Chron. de Mailros, ed. Stevenson, "Egrie lector"), reader. [ECRIC.] [C. H.]

EGRILUS (AGRICOLA), martyr at Caesarea in Cappadocia, commemorated Nov. 2 (Hieron. Març.; Tillen. Men. iv. 812; Migne, Hagiogr.) [C. H.]

EGRYN is given by Professor Rees (Welsh Saints, 71, 304) among the Welsh saints of the latter half of the 7th century, as the son of Gwyrd Drwn ab Gwdrog of the line of Cadell Dyrvallog, and founder of Llanegryn, Merionethshire (Myn. Arch. ii. 40). [J. G.]

EGTAN, king of the Scoti (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1013, in M. H. B. 777). [AIDAN.] [C. H.]

EGULF (Wend. F. H. ann. 675, ed. Coxe), bishop of London. [EGULF.] [C. H.]

EGUALD (1), a bishop witnessing a spurious charter of Cadwalla, king of Wessex, Aug. 3, 683, bestowing land at Selsey on Wilfrid for a monastery. The charter bears the signature also of Archbishop Brihtwald, who was not consecrated until 693 (Kemble, C. D. 992). Perhaps the forger intended ECKENWALD bishop of London. [C. H.]

EGUALD (2) (Kemble, C. D. 104), abbat. [EGUALD.] [C. H.]

EGWALD is placed by Professor Rees (Welsh Saints, 298, 330) among the Welsh saints of the first part of the 7th century, as son of Cyaddilig ab Ceunyd ab Gildas, and as founder of Llanegwd and Llansmwedd, Carmarthenshire. [J. G.]

EGWALT, abbat. [EGWALT (2).]

EGWIN (EGWINE, EGWINE, EGWIN), third bishop of Worcester (M. H. B. 623), and founder of the abbey of Evesham. He is not mentioned by Bede; his history has therefore to be made out of the very questionable biographies, the Chronicles and Cartulary of Worcester, and the History of Evesham.

According to Florence of Worcester, he succeeded to the see in 692 (M. H. B. 539), and died in 717 (3. 341). The first date probably requires correction, as the names of Brihtwald archbishop of Canterbury and Offor bishop of Worcester occur in the same charter of Oshere (Kemble, C. D. 36; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 232); Brihtwald only returned from France in 693, and must have been archbishop when Egwin was appointed. Egwin's name does not appear in dated charters before the year 704, in which the caldorman Ethelward, with the consent of Coenred, king of Mercia, granted him lands at Ambersley for his church at Crouchame (Kemble, C. D. 56; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 279). All the Evesham charters are liable to the charge of spuriousness, and cannot be cited safely. The name of Egwin appears, however, in some Worcester grants which are of better authority: in a grant of Ethenward and Ethelheard to Cudewirtha, which is also attested by Coenred (Kemble, C. D. 53); and in a gift of Ethelwald to the "family" at Worcester of land at Salwarp, which must belong to 716 or 717, as Ethelwald's reign began in the former year, and Wilfrid, Egwin's successor, was in office in 718 (Kemble, C. D. 67, 69).

The evidence is thus very slender, but so far as it goes, it tends to establish the dates given by Florence. Egwin took part in the council of Cloveshore in 716, in which the privilege of Wilhred was confirmed (Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 300).

The biographers are much more circumstantial. According to these, Egwin was a member of a royal house in Mercia, who had quitted the world and become a priest in the days of Ethelred, and, against his will, was appointed by the wishes of king, clergy, and people to the see of Worcester. In this office he was very zealous, converted the heathen, enforced the sanctity of marriage, and preached strongly in favour of reform in morals. By his strictness in the last point he lost his popularity, and complaints against him were laid before both the king and the pope. He determined to clear himself at Rome, and therefore set out thither, having first bound his feet with iron fetters, fastened by a key which he throw into the Avon. On his arrival at Rome he was lodged by St. Peter's, and prepared to celebrate Mass; whilst he was doing so, his servants brought a fish in the belly of which the key was found. Egwin then released himself from his fetters, presented himself to the pope, and, having obtained from him a favourable determination of his cause, returned home, where he was immediately restored to his see, and undertook the tuition of the king's sons. His next act was to obtain from Ethelred a gift of land on which he built the monastery of Evesham, so called from the shepherd Eves, who had seen in the wood where the monastery was built a vision of three holy virgins, one of whom was the Blessed Virgin Mary. The apparition was reported to Egwin, who went to the place, saw the same vision, and determined to build there. From Ethelred he obtained also the gift of an old monastery at Flandbury. Coenred, Ethelred's successor, was a close friend of Egwin, and gave him more land in the vicinity of his monastery. After the death of Aldhelm, whom he buried at Malmesbury, Egwin went to Rome in 709 with Coenred of Mercia and Offa of Essex. On this second journey he obtained from pope Constantine a great privilege of exemption for Evesham in the consecration of his monastery; Egwin is said to have been assisted by St. Wilfrid, a story which, if it contains any vestige of truth, shews that Evesham was dedicated before the second visit to Rome, and not in 714, to which year it is referred by the biographer. After this work was completed, Egwin devoted himself to sacred studies and preaching. The castle of Alcester, which was inhabited by men who despised his preaching, was destroyed by an earthquake. The biographer gives his last words to his disciples, and gives as the day of his death Dec. 30, about the year 720. Such is a sketch of Egwin's career as described in the life written by a monk of the 11th century, and printed by Mabillon. There is another life, ascribed without authority to one Brihtwald, who was not, as has been supposed, the archbishop of that name, which is said to have been written based on Egwin's own narration; this is still unprinted, but fragments are given by Mabillon, and in Wright's Biographia Literaria, pp. 228, 229. It seems to contain much the same matter.
but more copiously told, and apparently with more regard for chronological probabilities. It is described by Macray in his preface to the Chronicle of Evesham (pp. xii. sq.), where also is a full account of the legendary materials for Egwin's life.

According to Florence of Worcester, Egwin died Dec. 30, 717, Wilfrid, his successor, having been appointed before his death (M. H. B. 541).


[S.]

EGWULF, the seventh bishop of London (H. M. B. 617), and successor of Ingwald, who died in 745 (Sleman. in M. H. B. 695). Egwulf was present at the council held at Clovesho in 747 (Hadda and Stubbs, iii. 360); and his name appears among the subscriptions to charters of 748 and 758 (Kemble, *C. D.* 98, 193), and to a grant of Osa to Worcester, which, being attested also by archbishop Jaelbert, must be dated at least as 766. His successor, Wighed, is first heard of in 772. (Hadda and Stubbs, iii. 402.)

[S.]

EGYPTIANS, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO. [GOSPEL, APOSTHIAL.]

EHOARN, hermit and martyr in Brittany, cir. a.d. 520, mentioned in the anonymous *Vita* of Gildas the Senesch (cap. vii. § 40, in *Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 965). He dwelt in a cell adjoining the church of the monastery of St. Gildas de Rhuis in the diocese of Vannes, placed by the Sammarthani on the coast south of Vannes (Gall. *Christ.* xiv. 1, map), but by the Bollandists (Acta SS. Feb. ii. 586) on the left bank of the Ilave. Ehoarn's abode was broken into by a band of robbers, one of whom, Leonardus, dashed out the hermit's brains with an axe on the threshold of the church. He was commemorated Feb. 11.

[C. H.]

EHRENFRIED (Gams, *Sscr. Episc.* 271), bishop of Constance. [EHRENFRID.] [C. H.]

EIBEACHTA, one of St. Patrick's attendants (Four Mast. a.d. 448). [J. G.]

EICHBERICHT (Ann. Ul. A.D. 728), Egbert the priest. [EGBERT (S).] [J. G.]

EIDDIGHRN, abbat of the monastery of Docunmus, in the diocese of Llandaff. He witnessed several grants to that see in the time of St. Oudocus, but the site of his monastery is unknown (Lib. Land. by Rees, 381–87).

[J. G.]

EIDDILFRED, clerical witness to the grant of the village of Is-pant by Cuchein, son of Glywi, to Guodolouc bishop of Llandaff in the 6th century (Lib. Land. by Rees, 415).

[J. G.]

EIDDILG, Welsh saint. [IDDAWEN.] [C. H.]


EIGEB, the legendary accounts of Wales, has the honour of being regarded as the first female saint among the Britons. She was the daughter of Caradog (Curnacenn) ab Bru, the chief of the Silures, who fought so long and manfully against the Roman legions in the middle of the 1st century, and obtained the favour of the emperor Claudius, who carried him captive to Rome to grace the imperial triumph. 

Eigeb was married to Sarillog, lord of Caer-

Sarillog, now Old Sarum. If any reliance is to be put upon the legend (and difficulties surround it on all sides), Eigeb was the daughter who, with her mother and uncles, was made captive and conveyed to Rome, as related by Tacitus (Ann. Lib. xii. c. 33 sq.), and was liberated with her father and friends. (On the whole question, as treated in the Welsh Triads, see Rees, Welsh Saints, sec. iv. 17 sq.)

[J. G.]

EIGILWARD, bishop of Würzburg. [EIGILW.
ORD.]

EIGRAD, Welsh saint. [EGRAS.

EIGRION is enumerated among the many sons of Caw the father of Gildas, and founded a church in Cornwall in the 6th century (Rees, Welsh Saints, 230).

[J. G.]

EILUNWY, a Welsh saint in the first half of the 7th century, was brother of Drydaw, and son of Heliog Fael ab Glanawg; he thus belonged to Carnarvonshire, but has left no trace in feast or church dedication (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 599; Rees, Welsh Saints, 298).

[J. G.]

EIMBETHA (EINBETTA), ST., a virgin, commemorated with two others, Vorvetta and Villibetta, on the 18th of September. They are unknown to the older martyrologies, but in the *Auctaria* of Molanus to that of Usuard occur the words "In territorio Argentinensi (in Alsace) sanctae Einbeth virginis, præclarae sanctitatis" (Bligny, Patr. Lat. cxxiv. 478). The legend is that they were three of the companions of St. Ursula left by her to tend St. Aurelian when the fell sick of a fever on the return journey from Rome to Cologne (Boll. Acta SS. Sept. v. 315).

[S. A. B.]

EIMHIN (EMIN, EVIN), son of Eoghan, bishop of Ros-glas and Ros-mic-Triuin, commemorated Dec. 22. The name is evidently a phonetic form of the Irish *aimhinn* [pron. evin], joyous, delightful, beautiful, written with *m* aspirated (aimhín), instead of *b*, or without aspiration (*aimhín* and *aimhín* (Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 2 ser. p. 63). An account of this saint is given in the *Life of St. Corbanus* (Mar. 29), his brother, which Colgan (Acta SS. 761) has abridged from the *Book of Leinster* and rendered into Latin. [CORBAEG (S).] He belonged to Muster for birth, and was son of Eoghan, son of Murcadh, of the race of Fiacha Muilethan, son of Eoghan Mor, son of Oiliill Olum; his mother was Iamhna, daughter of Sinell (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 345). According to the *Life of St. Corbanus* he left Muster for the province of Leinster, and when on the banks of the Barrow, in a town near the top of the frith, he built his noble monastery, the place being formerly called -Rog-mic-Treoin or Ros-mic-Triuin, and now New Ross, in the county of Wexford. There he
EINHARDUS, EINHARD (Einhard) is not found in contemporary documents, biographer of Charlemagne. He was the son of Einhard and Eulgilritta, persons of good birth and station in Francia, was born circa 780, and received his education in the monastery of Fulda. He is described as of small stature "homuncilo," "statura despicabilis" (Walfrid, *Prot. in Einhardi Vitam Car. ap. Jaffé, Monum. Car. 507–8), and there are epigrams extant by Alcuin and others directed against him on this account. (*Mon. Car. 492, and Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen, vol. i. 139.) He married Emma or Imma, sister of Bernhard bishop of Worms. (*Einh. Epist. 3, Jaffé.) The tradition that Emma was the daughter of Charlemagne, and the romance of Eginhard and Emma do not date before the 12th century. (*Mon. Car. 492, note 6; Hist. Pet. de Charlemagne, par Gaston Paris, pp. 404–5.)

His intelligence and industry soon made him known at Fulda, and he was sent by the abbot Bernulf to the court of Charles the Great, and Theodulf of Mopsuestia, and the latter became most intimate with the king, who looked upon him as a son. He was distinguished also as a craftsman, probably in the precious metals, whence he got the literary name of Beziebel (*Exodus xxil. 2, xxiv. 30) at Charles's court. In one of his letters he speaks (*Ep. 56, Jaffé) of his studies in Vitruvius, and appears to have superintended some of Charles's architectural works, though it is doubtful whether he possessed any architectural skill himself (cf. Jaffé, 490 note, and Wattenbach, i. 140). His removal to Charles's court probably took place after 791, for there are six documents in the *Codex Dipl. Fuldensis* (cited by Jaffé, 488) written by Einhard, the latest of which is dated Sept. 12, 791. Einhard was an important personage at the Frankish court, and was charged, amongst other duties, with ordering the annals of the court (see below). In 806 he went on a mission to the pope with regard to a proposed scheme for the division of the empire (*Einh. Ann. s. a. *), and in 813 it was at his advice that Lewis was nominated emperor (*Nigellii Carm. ap. Pertz, Script. ii. 479).

Einhard's position suffered no diminution as Charles's death. Lewis made him counsellor to Lothar, the young emperor, in 817, and in 830 he acted as a mediator between father and son. His public life, however, had become less active during these latter years; several abbots had at different times been conferred upon him (*Mon. Car. 493–494), especially that of Michelstadt is the Odenwald, to which, and from 828 onwards to Mullainheim (Seiligenstein on the Main), he began to retire more and more from court and the world.

To the latter place he had transferred his precious relics of SS. Marcellinus and Petrus, and there his wife Emma died in 836, and Einhard himself on March 14, 840. (For the date, Jaffé, 499, note 6.) His epitaph by Rabas Maurus is extant, e.g. in Jaffé, 506. Besides the *Vita Caroli* and the *Annales* attributed to him Einhard is the author of a *Libellus de suppliciis crucis* (not now extant), and a treatise *De trast-*
Einion and Einthea

There was a late inscription on the tower of Llanengan containing the words Eincawm rex Walliae, and the name Einiau occurs on an inscribed cross at Margam in Glamorganshire (Hübner, Inscr. Brit. Christ. No. 73): "Einiau pro anima Guergoret fecit." Einion's festival day was February 9.

[From ETHNE]

Einon (Eithne, Ethne) appears to have been a common name among the women of Ireland, so that we find it often among the saints and the mothers of the saints (Colgan, Acta SS. 416; Reeves, Almanac, p. lx.).

(1) Daughter of Bait, Mar. 29. On this day are commemorated in Mart. Dom. (by Todd and Reeves, 89) "Eithne and Sodhelabh, two daughters of Bait, by the side of Sord Coluim Cille;" the entry in Mart. Talleght (Kelly, Cal. Ir. SS. p. xx.) is "Ingena Baite, quee nutribient Christum, Ethne osce Sodheliba nomina earum." Colgan (Acta SS. 785) gives some account of the two virgins Ethne and Sodheliba, daughters of Aith, king of Ireland, and says that they were killed about or after the middle of the 6th century, but he thinks that Bait may have been a surname of Caireb his grandfather (To. 416 n. 1), or that "daughters of Bait" should be interpreted as "daughters of ardent charity," from the love they bore to Christ, who is said by Cath. Maguire, in his Additions and Scholion to the Felic of Lencog, to have come into their arms in the form of an infant to be embraced and kissed. They and their sister Cumian were daughters of Aith, son of Caireb, king of Leinster; and we read in the Life of St. Machog (Jan. 31), bishop of Ferns, how that bishop visited them, and how the ox he brought with him to plough their land, and gave to a leprous woman, had his plow supplied by sea, and that daily came up from the sea. No account is given of their own dates, but their grandfather Caireb, son of Cormac, died a.D. 549 according to the Four Mast. Their chief festival is Mar. 29, but others are appropriated to them. Their abode called Tech-inen-baite, or the House of the daughters of Bait or Charity, was near Swords in the barony of Nethercross, co. Dublin, and Killnais, another place where their memory was honoured, seems to have been near the same (Kelly, Cal. Ir. Saints, 108). Lanigan (Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 14, § 7) affirms only the certainty of their being distinguished by their piety, and of their living in a nunnery, "but the history of Ethne, Sodheliba, and Cumian, and whether such were the names of the holy daughters of king Aith, or how many were these daughters, is so involved in the obscurity of jarring documents, that I shall do no more than refer to Colgan who treats of them at Mar. 29."

(2) The Fair, daughter of Laegaire. Colgan (Acta SS. 54–6, 415–6) at Jan. 11, and Feb. 26, has given extracts from the Lives of St. Patrick regarding the two daughters of king Laegaire, named Ethne the Fair and Fedelim the Ruddy, who, he thinks, may be commemorated on these days, though in the calendars there are merely
the names, without place or parentage. The story of the two sisters Ethne and Fedelmina is given at less or greater length in Colgan's Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Lives of St. Pat. Seen, Conveyed to Thomas (Book of Armagh, fol. 12 A.). Colgan places it in a.d. 432. King Lochaire had sent his two daughters to Connacht to be under the charge of two Druids or Magi, named Mael and Caplit. St. Patrick had come to the royal cemetery of Crochan or Cruachan, now Rathcoroghany, the very ancient residence of the kings of Connacht in Roscommon. On the side of the fort there was a well called Clebach, and when St. Patrick and his attendants or synod of bishops were assembled there one morning at sunrise, the two virgins came early to the well to wash, and, finding St. Patrick and his companions there, the young maidens thought they were supernatural beings. St. Patrick, however, entered into conversation with them, as related by Tirenach, and the result was that they believed and were baptized; and on their departing, the bishop they received the sacrifice of Christ and soon passed in death to see the Unseen. They were buried beside the well of Clebach, and upon them was placed a Farta, Relec, or sepulchral mound, which became the property of St. Patrick and his successors. The two Druids, their guardians, were also converted by St. Patrick. (Tod. St. Patrick, 451-55; O'lanlon, Irish Saints, i. 183-71, ii. 716; Skeen, Celt. Scot. ii. 108-9; O'Curry, Lect. Anc. Ir. ii. 201-2.)

(3) Daughter of Cormac or of Manius, virgin, commemorated July 6. The Mart. Tallaght. (Kelly, Cal. Ir. SS. p. xxvii.) has on this day "Tri inenna Maíne in Airidh-Bóinne, i.e. Cormac ete ocus Cúmmín," and Mart. Doney. (by Todd and Reeves, 189) has "Dormor, daughter of Maíne, of Aridh Baine," also as a separate entry "Etne, and Cummann." To this last Dr. Todd (p. 189 n.) has appended the note, "Etne and Cummann vás both virgins and sisters, daughters of Cormac, son of Ailill, of the race of Cathair Mór, king of Ireland (Sanct. Gen., B. of Leom)." But Colgan in his note, commenting upon the story, in the Tripartite Life, concerning the chiefman Manius and his wife being converted, and of the latter who was blessed by St. Patrick, bearing "duis prætos fœdemalem," accepts the reading of the Martyrology of Tallaght that there were three daughters, and that July 6 was their feast (Tr. Thum. 149, c. 2, 1184 n., 270, col. 1). Cormac, son of Ailill, died a.d. 535, according to the Four Masters.

EITHRAS has no pedigree given him among the Welsh saints; it is merely stated that he was one of Cadfan's companions, when the latter came from Armoric into Britain in the beginning of the 6th century, and that afterwards he was with Hennawy in Bardsey (Myg. Arch. ii. 24, 40; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 594, 595; Rees, Welsh Saints, 213, 234).

ELADIUS, St. (HELADIUS), fourth bishop of Anzorre, cir. a.d. 387. He followed St. Valerianus, ruled for twenty-three years, and was succeeded by St. Amator, whom he had admitted to the priesthood, and who wrote his Acta. He is commemorated on May 8. (Gall. Christ. xii. 262; Acta SS. Mai. viii. 300.)

ELAETH, surnamed Frenhin or Vrenin "the king," was a bard and saint, but though his genealogy is traced to Coel Godogog, and thus is purely Welsh, Elaeth is only found in his latter days living in Wales. In the Pedigrees of the Saints it is said:—"Elaeth (king) was the son of Meyric, the son of Idno; and Onnengrec, daughter of Gwallawg, son of Lleeanawg, was his mother." He seems to have been in early life a chieftain in the north, and, on being driven from his possessions, to have found refuge in the monastery of Bangor, or in Seiriol's College at Penmon in Anglesey, in the middle of the sixth century, or, according to others, in the seventh. He was founder and patron of the parish church of Amlwch on the north coast of Anglesey. His festival is November 10. As a bard there are several poems attributed to him. The Myvyrian Archaiology, i. 161, has a collection of Moral Triplets. From the Black Book of Carmarthen (fol. 35 b), Dr. Skeen (Four Ancient Books of Wales, i. 501-503, ii. 35-37) has printed The Myvyrian of Elaeth, an elegy on seven stanzas, and another poem of the same length, both written in a strain of deepest piety; in the latter he says he loves "to praise Peter, who can bestow true peace," and, "in every language is, with hope acknowledged as the gentle, high-famed, generous porter of heaven." (Myv. Arch. ii. 25, 40-1; Rees, Welsh Saints, 271; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 596; Skeen, Four Anc. Books of Wales, i. 19, ii. 344.)

ELAFIUS (1), a British chief who appears in the story of Germanus returning to Brittany to put down the Pelagian heresy. Hearing a rumour of the saint's coming, Elafius went to meet him, taking his son, who was suffering from a withered leg, and all the country flocked after him. Germanus and his company of priests arrived; the youth was healed by their prayer, and by this miracle the Catholic faith was confirmed in the minds of the people. See the life of Germanus by Constantius, copied by Bede and subsequent writers. (Bed. H. E. i. 21; Hen. Hunt. Hist. Angl. in M.H.B. 709; Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vii. 216; Baron. Annal. ann. 435, xvii.)

ELAFIUS (2) (Ruricius, Epp. ii. 7, in Patr. Lat. viii. 86), founder of a church. [ELAFIUS.]

ELAFIUS (3) (Greg. Tur. H. F. v. 41), bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne. [ELASius.]

ELAGABALUS, the short reign of this feeble and profligate emperor, though not presenting any points of direct connexion with the history of the Christian church, is not without interest as a phase of the religious condition of the empire. His grandmother, Julia Moesa, was the daughter of a Phoenician named Bassianus. Her sister, Julia Domna, became the second wife of the emperor Septimius Severus, and was the mother of M. Aurelius Antoninus Augustus, commonly known as Caracalla, and of Geta. By her husband, Julius Avitus, Moesa had two daughters, Julia Soemia and Julia Mammea, of whom the former became the mother of Elagabalus by Sextus Varuis Marcellus, and the latter the mother of Alexander Severus by Gessius Marcianus.
ELAGABALUS

The name given to the young prince on his birth, Varius Avitus Bassianus, recorded the main facts in the genealogy just given. He was born at Emesa, in Syria, about A.D. 205. Both his mother and his aunt were devoted to the worship of El-gabal (= God the Creator, or, according to another but less probable etymology, God of the Mountains), and he and his cousin Alexander Severus were in early childhood consecrated as priests in the temple of that deity in his native city, and the young Bassianus took the name of the god to whom he ministered. On the murder of Caracalla by Macrinus, his grandmother, who had shared with her sister Julia Domna the splendour of the imperial court, was compelled to retire into Syria, where she watched for an opportunity of revenging herself on the usurper and regaining her lost power. The discontent caused among the troops of the empire by the rigid discipline of Macrinus presented an opening which she was not slow to use. A report was circulated that Caracalla was the real father of the son of Soemia. Largesses were given to the soldiers stationed on the Phoenician border, and they received the boys, with his mother and grandmother, into their camp, and saluted him by the title of M. Aurelius Antoninus, on the 16th of May, A.D. 218. Macrinus, after an unsuccessful attempt to quell the revolt by sending Julianus with a body of troops, came in person, was defeated in a pitched battle on the border of Syria in Phoenicia, and after an attempt to escape in disguise was taken and put to death. A letter was at once despatched in the name of the young prince to the Roman senate, in which, without even waiting for their formal consent, he assumed all the titles of imperial sovereignty, Caesar, Imperator, Pius, Felix, Augustus, with the tribunitian authority, and with vague promises of reform declared that he proposed to himself to follow in the footsteps of the first and greatest of the emperors. Neither senate nor people offered the slightest opposition; and when the Flavii Arvales met in the Capitol on the 14th of July, within five weeks after the death of Macrinus, they offered up their prayers for the welfare and prosperity of the new emperor.

The letter was written from Antioch, where the young emperor for some time held his court. His mother would seem to have been simply a devotee of the Syrian sun-god, but his aunt Julia Maximae had more eccentric tendencies, and by her invitation the great Origen came to Antioch (probably, however, after the death of Elagabalus), and was received with many marks of honour. Eusebius, who relates the fact (Hist. E. vi. 21), speaks of her as a woman of exceptional piety (πολίτις θεοφανεστάτης εἶ καὶ τε ἐλαία γεγομενή), and we may legitimately trace her influence in the character of her son Alexander Severus. [SEVERUS].

After spending some time at Nicomedia, where he settled on his return from Antioch, the young emperor proceeded in A.D. 219 (we may note, in passing, that it was the year in which Callistus succeeded Zephyrinus as bishop of Rome) to the capital. His short reign there may be described as a frenzy of idolatrous impurity. He laid the foundation of a splendid temple on the Palatine in honour of his patronymic god, and transferred thither the conical stone which had been the symbol of his divinity at Emesa, and which was now carried to its new abode in a triumphal chariot, drawn by the six white horses and driven by the emperor himself. To that temple was also brought the sacred stone of Cybele from Pessinus, and the image of the Syrian Astarte from Carthage. Preparations were made for celebrating the nuptials of that goddess with the sun, and a heavy tax was levied on the people of Rome to defray its expenses. The dignity of the senate was outraged by his nominating a council of women, over which his mother was to preside. As if disposed to recognise the religion of his Jewish subjects, he abstained from swine's flesh and accepted the rite of circumcision, while, at the same time, dark stories were current as to his offering boys in sacrifice, in order that he might divine the future by the inspection of their viscera.

The subserviency of the senate and people of Rome to the master of the legions, so long as he could count on the support of the Praetorian soldiers, led them to tolerate even these enormities. His jealousy and suspicion caused him to imprison his cousin Alexander Severus, whose virtue attracted the admiration both of soldiers and people, and whom, in deference to his mother's advice, he had adopted and proclaimed as Caesar soon after his arrival in Rome, and the troops rose and rescued their favourite. The two sisters, each with her son, appeared at the head of their supporters, and the followers of Severus were victorious. Soemia and the boy-emperor were thrown into the Tiber (hence the epithet Tiberinus afterwards attached to him in derision), and the senate met and branded his name with eternal infamy. (Dion Cass. lxxvii. 30-41, lxix.; Herodian, v. 4-23; Lapid. Faks. 9, 12, 7, 12; Auct. Victor, de Caes. xxiii. Epit. xxiii.)

[II. B. P.]

ELAIR (ELARIUS, HILLARIUS, HILLARIUS), of Inis Locha-Cre, commemorated Sept. 7. This saint is commemorated in the Mart. Donuc. and Mart. Tallaght on this day. To him was dedicated the church built upon the island in Lough Cre; this lough is now a bog, with the ruins of the well-known church still standing in it, in the middle of Monashinch or Mounshinch, from which the bog takes its name, in the parish of Corbally, barony of Ikerrin, and county of Tipperary. The ruins stand about two miles south-east of Roscrea. St. Elair, anchoret and scribe of Loch-Cre, died A.D. 802 (recte 807) according to the Four Mast. (by O'Donovan, 412 n. 1, 413, the note giving an account of Loch-Cre and its ruins; Irish Kenniss, by Todd and Herbert. 216 n. 1; Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. Ir. iv. c. 30, § 15; Skene, Celt. Scit. ii. 253). But Colgan treats Elair of Loch-Cre as one with Elair or Hilary, nephew of St. Columba by Sinch St. Columba's sister. This other Elair was son of Fintan, descended from Cian, son of Oillil Olum, and hence was one of the Moekeine; but though placed by Colgan on Sept. 7, both this and the connecting him with Loch-Cre have sprung from Colgan's desire to find a place in the calendars for the nephew of St. Columba. (Colgan, Tr. Trans. 478 n. 4, 479 n. 23, 490 n. 11.)

ELANO, bishop of Menerva, now St. David's, but possibly the same as Elvaed (Stubbbs, Reg. Sacr. Angl. 155).
ELAPHIUS (1), a notary to whom, in reward for his services, Gregory Nazianzen bequeathed some articles of clothing and twenty pieces of gold. (Greg. Naz. Testam. 203, in Migne, Patr. Gr. xxxvii. 394.) [E. V.]

ELAPHIUS (2), a gentleman residing in a castle among craggy rocks, in the diocese of the Ruthenian (Rodez), addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris bishop of Auvergne (Sid. Apol. Ep. iv. 15, in Patr. Lat. Iviii. 520). Elaphius had built a church on his estate, but as the diocese was without a bishop, like many other dioceses in the south of Gaul then in Gothic occupation (G., vii. 6), he requests Sidonius to come and consecrate it. Sidonius consents, and hopes, in common with the Ruthenians, that Elaphius, now offering altars for himself, may one day offer sacrifices for them. This was a hint of the priestly office, or even perhaps, considering Elaphius's rank and the dearth of bishops, of the episcopate, and so Cellier understands it, who adds an excellent confirmation an epistle that Eutropius, bishop of Limoges, addressed “Domino sublimi semperque magnifico fratri Elaño” (Rur. Ep. ii. 7, in Patr. Lat. Iviii. 86). The lists do not sustain the inference (Cellier, Ant. Sacr. x. 382.). [C. H.]

ELAPHIUS (3), bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne. [ELAUNCHIUS.]

ELAPIUS (ELAPHIUS), fifteenth bishop of Poitiers, succeeding Adelphius and followed by Daniel, about A.D. 535 to 540. His name only appears in the list of the bishops of that diocese (Coll. Christ. ii. 1154; Le Conte, Ann. Ecol. Fran. ann. 533, n. xii., tom. i. p. 402.) [S. A. B.]

ELASIPPIUS, Melasippus, and Speusippus, “jurgemini frateres,” were Cappadocians by birth, horse-breakers by profession, and martyrs in the reign of Trajan. They were still heathens at the age of 25, when, having invited their grandmother Neanilla to a feast, she discovered of Christ while they made offerings to Jupiter. Convinced by her words, they rose from table and broke their idols in pieces. In vain their masters sought to reconvey them, and after cruel tortures the brothers suffered death in a furnace. They were commemorated on Jan. 17 in the church of Langres, whether their relics were subsequently conveyed (Bas. Menot; Mort. Adon., Usuard.; Acta SS. Jan. ii. 76-80). [C. H.]

ELASIVUS (ELAPHIUS), ST., seventeenth bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, succeeding Tattonius and followed by his brother, St. Lendomer, was a native of Limoges. He is said to have granted large estates to his church, and to have obtained the subscription of Egidius, archbishop of Rheims to the deed of gift (see Bull. Acta SS. Aug. iii. 747). He died of fever, with which he was seized while on an embassy from Queen Brunhilda to Spitalk, i.e. A.D. 590. His remains were brought back to Châlons for burial, and were translated in A.D. 1164 to the church of St. Pierre-aux-Monts in the same diocese. He is commemorated Aug. 19. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 41; Bull. Acta SS. Aug. iii. 747; Gall. Christ. ix. 862.) [S. A. B.]

ELAVE, bishop of Meneria, possibly the same as ELVAUD (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. Angli. 155). [J. G.]

ELBODG (Annal. Camb. ann. ccclxv. i.e. A.D. 808, in M.H.B. 884), ELBODUGUS (Annal. Camb. ann. ccclxv. i.e. A.D. 768, in M.H.B. 834), ELBOT (Brut y Tywysog, in M.H.B. 843; Nenn. Hist. init. in M.H.B. 47 b), archbishop of Gwynedd. [ELBODG.] [C. H.]

ELBODUS, ST., became bishop (or archbishop) of Bangor in 755, and induced the people of North Wales to adopt the Roman cycle of Easter, the one really important revolution in the Welsh church from the 5th century to the 12th. The bishops of South Wales refused to comply, and the dispute continued until 777, when the time of Easter was altered there also. On Elbodus's death, in 809, the controversy was again renewed, and there is reason to think that the Welsh were still slow to surrender their ancient custom (Haddan and Stubbs, Councils i. 148, 203-4).

Nennius used the nineteen years' cycle which Elbod had introduced; but it is first used in the Liber Landavensis under the year 1022, and by the credo y Tywysogion, 1005, and by both erroneously. Ussher traces the last echo of the British Easter controversy in a statement of the anonymous Life of St. Crysostom, written about 950, which says that certain clerics of those who dwell at the ends of the earth amid the ocean, came to Constantinople in the days of the patriarch Methodius (842-847), to inquire of certain ecclesiastical traditions, and the perfect and exact computation of Easter. [C. W. B.]

ELBIVALD, king of the East Angles. [ELFIVALD.]

ELCHASAI. [ELKERASAI.]

ELCWOULD, styled by William of Malmesbury (G.R.A. i. § 87, ed. Hardy) to have been king of East Anglia, the brother of Alulf (Aldulf (1)) in the latter part of the 7th Century. They were the sons of Ethelhere king of East Anglia and St. Hereswitha, succeeded their uncle Ethelwald, and according to Malmesbury were succeeded by Beorn. Wendover calls him Elswald. (Flor. Wig. Geneal. in M.H.B. 628; M. Ad Chron. Appr. in M.H.B. 636; Wend. F. H. ann. 655, ed. Coxe, note.) [ELFIVALD.] [C. H.]

ELDAD (HELDAN) is the name of two Welsh saints mentioned by Prof. Rees.

(1) Son of Arth. This person, whose pedigree the Welsh genealogists profess to trace in an unbroken line from Caractacus, the British chieftain in the time of the emperor Claudius, was son of Arth ab Arthwyg Frych ab Cystennan Goronog (A.D. 542). He is said by Rees to have been a member of the college of St. Illtud, at Llantris Major, and is classed among the Welsh saints of the beginning of the 7th century (Rees, Welsh Saints, 89, 288).

(2) Son of Geraint ab Carannog. He was in the fifth degree of descent from Cadell Dwyrain, and a member of St. Illtud's College. He afterwards became bishop of Gloucester, and is said to have given Christian burial to the followers of Vortigern when they were slain by the treachery of Hengist and his Saxons near Salisbury.
Piteseus attributes to him Orationes infectæs, lib. i. and places him after A.D. 490, but laces includes him in the list of the Welsh saints who flourished from A.D. 600 to A.D. 634; he was slain by the pagan Saxons. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 161, 298; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 12, wks. v. 475–476; Stubbs, Reg. Sac. Angl. 153; Piteseus, de Hl. Brit. Scrup. 90.)

[J. G.]

He is mentioned by Geoffrey of Monmouth as having buried the British nobles slain by Hengist (lib. vi. 15), and as urging his brother Eildo to kill Heugist and spare his son Ootca. (Jb. viii. 7, 8.)

He deserves a place here only as having sometimes been identified with St. Aldate, an unknown saint, to whom churches in Oxford and Gloucester are dedicated. He is commemorated on June 14. (Parker, Augl. Kalend. p. 181; Peshall, Hist. Oxon. p. 144.)

[8.]

ELEDERT, impostor. [ALEDERT.]


[J. G.]

ELEAZARUS, martyred with eight sons at Lyons, in company with Minervius; commemorated Aug. 23. The Martyrology gives the names only in the genitive, Eleazar being in the form in Aed and Eleazarri in Usuard. Grevenus and Molanus in their notes to Usuard alter (but on conjecture alone, and contrary to manuscript authority) "cum filio et octo" into "cum aliis octo." (J. B. 1.)

Eleazar was regarded as being more holy than the Audetors, and seem to have been under restrictions from which the Audetors were exempt (Augustus. de Morb. Manich. ii. 18; Contr. Faust. xx. 23). It was from the Electors that the Minacæans chose their officials; "Princeps," "Magistri," "Episcopi," "Presbyteri," and "Decani." (Privatan ia. de Haeres. xlvii.)

Augustine was one of these Electors for some time (Possidius, u.s.). [MANICAEANS.]


[T. W. D.]

ELECTION. [PREDETERMINATION, Vocation.]

ELECTUS, chamberlain. [ELECTUS.]

ELDE-SANUS, legendary bishop of Alclu or Dumbarton, said to have been appointed by king Arthur in 519 (Gall. Monum. ix. 15; Stubbs, Reg. Sac. Angl. 153). [J. G.]

ELEMO-SINARIUS. [INDEARCAIGH.]

ELEFANTUS, bishops. [ELEPHANTUS, ELIFANTUS.]

ELELETH, one of the four luminaries in the Barbelioit system (Ironeaus, i. 39, p. 108). [G. S.]

ELEN (HELENA). Elen or Helen Llywyddawai, daughter of Coel Ceodehebawg, has been represented in mosehsh legend, the Welsh Brus, and the equally fabulous history of Geoffrey of Monmouth, as the wife of Constantius Chlorus and mother of the Emperor Constantine the Great. Eglwys Ilan, co. Glamorgan, Tref Ilan, co. Cardigan, and Llanelan, co. Monmouth, may be dedications to Elen or St. Helena (Myg. Arch. ii. 207; Cressy, Ch. Hist. Brit. i. 12; Williams, Emn. Welsh. 90, 138; Tanner, Ibid. 588–90.)

[8.]

ELENARA (ELEVARA), martyr with Sponsaria, virgins, in Gaul, under Rictovar for the reign of Diocletian; commemorated at St. Riquier, May 2. (Chron. Centuriae. lib. iii. c. 29, in D'Achery, Splics. i. 328, ed. 1723; Boll. Acta SS. 2 Mai. 186.)

[8.]

ELENOG, a Welsh saint of the 7th century (Rees, Welsh Saints, 307). He might be the same as Elnog son of St. Tuddlyd of Holyhead, but that the latter must have flourished in the preceding century (Rees, Camb. Brit. Saints, 599).

ELEOCADIUS (Ughell. Ital. Sac. ii. 327).

ELEOCHADUS (Gams, Sac. Episcop. 718), bishop of Ravenna. [ELEOCHADUS.]

ELEPHANTUS (ELIFANTUS) I., eleventh bishop of Uzes, succeeding Armimundus and succeeded by Walfridus, is said by the compilers of the Gallia Christiana (vi. 616) to have been living in A.D. 800. All we know of him is that in the year following the death of Louis the Pious he was commissioned by Bernard duke of Septimania to conduct his infant son from Uzes, where he had been lately born, to his presence in Aquitaine. (See the preface to the Liber Manualis given by Dodani the wife of Bernardus to her son, quoted by Bouquet, tom. vii. p. 23 n., and Migne, Patr. Lat. cxi. 109.) [S. A. B.]

ELEPHAS has been placed seventh in the list of the bishops of Valence, succeeding Ragnaloidus and followed by Salvius I, at the close of the sixth century. But the old authorities are silent, and his existence is very doubtful (Gall. Christ. xvi. 294; Gams, Series Episc. 648).

[8. A. B.]

ELERI (ELERI, MELERI) I. In the Pedigrees of the Welsh Saints, Eleri is entered as *daughter of Brychan, and wife of Ceredig, the son of Cunedda Wledig, and mother of Sandie, the father of Dewi* (St. David). As belonging to the family of Brychan, one of the "three stocks of saints of the island of Britain," Eleri is numbered among the saints, and is placed by Prof. Rees in the middle of the 5th century.
In the Account of Brychan of Breconigion she is called Meleri (Myn. Arch. ii. 41; Rees, Welsh Saints, iii. 137, 147; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 600, n. 1.)

(2) Another is placed among the saints of the end of the 6th century, and lived at Pennant, in Gwytherin, Denbighshire. She was daughter of Dingad ab Nudd Hael, and has her genealogy traced from Macsen Wledig, i.e. Maximus the Roman emperor of the West; her mother was Thenol, Tievoc, or Tenwy, daughter of Lleuddyn Liweddawg, of Dinas Eiddin or Edinburgh, and she had five brothers, saints and members with her of the college of Barddion (Myn. Arch. ii. 24, 42; Rees, Welsh Saints, 108, 275; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 594).

J. G.

ELERIUS was a Cambrian monk, who lived in the vale of Clwyd, Denbighshire, and is to be distinguished from Elerius or Helerius, a martyr in Jersey. In the legendary Life of St. Winefred (Nov. 3), she is represented as receiving the veil from St. Elerius at her monastery of Gwytherin in the county of Denbigh, and as being soon afterwards buried by him there. The Vita S. Winefredi Virginis et Martyris (in MS. Cott. Claud. A. v. ff. 138-141, and printed by Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 191-209) is said to have been written by Elerius, and is only slightly different from that published by Surius and Capgrave, and attributed to Robert, monk and prior of Shrewsbury, who flourished about A.D. 1140.


J. G.

ELESBAAN. The difficulties which beset the biography of this king, hermit, and saint (Rome, Oct. 27; Ethiopia, Gibbot, xx. May 15; cf. Ludolphus, p. 415), are acknowledged by all who have tried to trace consistency in the history of Ethiopia during the 6th century. (Cf. Ludolphus, History of Ethiopia, ed. 1884, p. 167. Lebeau, Histoire du Bas Empire, ed. 1827, vili. 47, note 4; Walch, in Novi Commentarii, xii. 359.)

The importance of those crusades on which his fame rests is attested by Gibbon, who justifies the mention of his wars by the assertion that, had their purpose been attained, "Mahomet must have been crushed in his cradle, and Abyssinia would have prevented a revolution which has changed the civil and religious state of the whole world." (Decline and Fall, ch. xiii. sub fin.)

It may be well to mention, and very briefly to estimate, the authorities from whom come both the records of his life and the confusion in which they are involved. First in importance are two Syriac writers, of whose work fragments are extant in manuscripts in the Vatican library and edited by Asseman, with a Latin translation, in the first volume of the Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana, pp. 341 seq.; Simeon, surnamed Sophistus, bishop of Beth-Arsam in Persia, between 510 and 525 A.D., a Catholic according to Asseman's estimate, though he accepted the Henoticion; and John, the Mono-

physite bishop of Asia (for his life cf. Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. ii. pp. 83 seq.), a native of Amida in Mesopotamia, during the latter half of the 6th century, and the author of an ecclesiastical history, written from the reign of Theodosius the younger, and carried on to the death of Justinian. To these must be added Procopius, Theophanes, and Joannes Malala: (cf. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Bonn., pt. x. vol. i. p. 104 seq.; Id. pt. viii. p. 433 seq.; Id. pt. xxi. pp. 346-7); but the witness of the first, though contemporary, is incomplete, and becomes untrustworthy if his notorious inconsistency and secret attachment to Paganism be considered (cf. Gibbon's Decline and Fall, ch. xi.): while Theophanes (who only contributes an evident blunder in saying that the king of Ethiopia was a Jew), and Malala, a native of Antioch, in the earlier and more important part of this period, closely and uncritically follow John of Asia; the importance of the last being further impaired by the great uncertainty of his own antiquity and character, Walch placing him later than Theophanes, while others hold him to be contemporary with Justinian. A most valuable fragment is the record of Nennosus, himself an ambassador to Eleusbaan, preserved in the Bibliotheca Photii (Cod. 3). But the details of the saint's wars and character are drawn from the Acta S. Arethas, extant in two forms: of which the earlier and more authentic, found by Lequien in the Colbert Library (Orina Christianus, ii. 428), is referred by the Jesuit author of the Acta Sanctorum, to a date not later than the 7th century; while the later is, at best, but the recension of Simeon Metaphrastes, in the 10th century. Not much is contributed for the elucidation of the period by the Arabic historians adduced by Walch; and very little by the Ethiopian documents to which Job Ludolphus had access in the 17th century. (Cf. the translations from the Senkessar appended to the life of Eleusbaan in the Bollandist Acta; October, vol. xii.)

Of the majority of the later writers who have used or abused these authorities (as Baronius, Gedees, Migne, Gieseler, Rohrbacher, Alban Butler) it is not proper to enumerate; but of them are eminent, by their sense of the difficulty of the period, and their critical treatment of its records. First should be cited J. G. Walch, as author of two papers, contributed to the Novi Commentarii of the Royal Society of Göttingen (vol. iv.), and entitled "Historia Rerum in Homeriide Sacro vi. Gestarum, p. 4.
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Physite bishop of Asia (for his life cf. Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. ii. pp. 83 seq.), a native of Amida in Mesopotamia, during the latter half of the 6th century, and the author of an ecclesiastical history, written from the reign of Theodosius the younger, and carried on to the death of Justinian. To these must be added Procopius, Theophanes, and Joannes Malala: (cf. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Bonn., pt. x. vol. i. p. 104 seq.; Id. pt. viii. p. 433 seq.; Id. pt. xxi. pp. 346-7); but the witness of the first, though contemporary, is incomplete, and becomes untrustworthy if his notorious inconsistency and secret attachment to Paganism be considered (cf. Gibbon's Decline and Fall, ch. xi.): while Theophanes (who only contributes an evident blunder in saying that the king of Ethiopia was a Jew), and Malala, a native of Antioch, in the earlier and more important part of this period, closely and uncritically follow John of Asia; the importance of the last being further impaired by the great uncertainty of his own antiquity and character, Walch placing him later than Theophanes, while others hold him to be contemporary with Justinian. A most valuable fragment is the record of Nennosus, himself an ambassador to Eleusbaan, preserved in the Bibliotheca Photii (Cod. 3). But the details of the saint's wars and character are drawn from the Acta S. Arethas, extant in two forms: of which the earlier and more authentic, found by Lequien in the Colbert Library (Orina Christianus, ii. 428), is referred by the Jesuit author of the Acta Sanctorum, to a date not later than the 7th century; while the later is, at best, but the recension of Simeon Metaphrastes, in the 10th century. Not much is contributed for the elucidation of the period by the Arabian historians adduced by Walch; and very little by the Ethiopian documents to which Job Ludolphus had access in the 17th century. (Cf. the translations from the Senkessar appended to the life of Eleusbaan in the Bollandist Acta; October, vol. xii.)

Of the majority of the later writers who have used or abused these authorities (as Baronius, Gedees, Migne, Gieseler, Rohrbacher, Alban Butler) it is not proper to enumerate; but of them are eminent, by their sense of the difficulty of the period, and their critical treatment of its records. First should be cited J. G. Walch, as author of two papers, contributed to the Novi Commentarii of the Royal Society of Göttingen (vol. iv.), and entitled "Historia Rerum in Homeriide Sacro vi. Gestarum." Lebeau's history of the period has been greatly increased in value by the careful annotations of his scholarly St. Martin. (Histoire du Bas Empire, vol. viii. It may be noted that Baronius and Pagi had access only to the Greek authors, and are therefore useless.) Lastly, the Bollandist Acta Sanctorum give, under the name of St. Eleusbaan and the date of October 27, a very full and fairly critical account of all the evidence which has yet been gathered. (Cf. also their history of St. Arethas and his fellow-martyrs: Oct. vol. x.) It is here impossible to follow at length the arguments which these writers confute and urge: it is therefore intended in this article to give those facts in the life of Eleusbaan which seem most clearly attested; and to speak paren-
thetically of the mistakes by which it has been obscured, and whose correction must presuppose a knowledge of the disputed events.

One confusion must however be resolved at the outset. The wars against the Homeritae which form the central interest of Elesbaan's reign in Ethiopia are associated by different historians with at least ten different names; nor can these be corruptions of less than three originals. The hero of these wars is called Caleb in the Ethiopian Senkessar (cf. Acta Sanc-
torum, Octob. xii. p. 328), Caleb, by Gibbon: Elzatabab, by the central of Cosmas Indicopleustes." Where-
temporary writer: Elesbaan, Elesbaan, and Elesbaan, by other Greek writers: Elzatabab, in the Ethiopian rendering of his name given in the Bollandist Acta: Hellestheaeus by Procopius: Aidog, by John of Asia: Andas, by John Malalas, and Adad by Theophanes. It seems probable that the first two forms express his proper name, which may be written Olvzatabab; the following six are variants of Elas-Atzabab (i.e. benedictus), the vernacular title of canonization; the last three misrepresent Ela-Ameda, the name of his grandfather, with whom, as will be seen, he was confounded by John of Asia and his followers. The name Elesbaan will be most convenient for understanding, since it has supplanted its most writings the more distinctive name of Caleb.

It was probably during the later years of Anastasius's reign, and shortly before the ascention of Justin in 518, that Elesbaan succeeded his father Tazena on the throne of Ethiopia. The diverse lists of the Ethiopian kings have been reduced to three reigns, whereas one is confused at this period; the other two give the following order of succession:—

Salaloba,
His son Al-Ameda,
His son Tazena,
His son Caleb,
His son Ghibra Masul.
(Ch. Dillmann, in Mon. Subaud., p. 348.) In two inscriptions of Tazena, discovered at Axum in 1830, and translated by Saper and by Dillmann, the king calls himself the son of A1-Amida; and in the second he uses language which could only be used by a Christian. It will presently be seen that there are reasons for thinking that the faith was restored throughout Ethiopia in the reign of his father, Al-Ameda, the grandfather of Elesbaan.

The kingdom of Elesbaan was greatly dependent for its welfare upon the good will and good order of the people of Yemen, the Homeritae, from whom it was separated by the narrow strait of Bab-el-Mandeb: for through the territory of the Homeritae the merchants of Syria and of Rome came to the great port of Adulis (cf. Assemanii Bibl. Orientalis, i. p. 360), near whose

ruins in Annesley Bay the Arabian traders still unload their ships (cf. Henry Salt, A Voyage to Abyssinia, ch. ix. p. 451). A Greek inscription discovered at Axum, and a law of Constantius bearing date in the year 356, prove that even in the 4th century the province of Axum bore the style "King of the Homeritae" (cf. Id., ut. p. 411; Lebeau, Bas Empire, viii. 46, n. 2); but the range and reality of their power in Arabia seems very uncertain; Lebeau (Matériaux pour l'His-
toire du Christianisme en Nubie, p. 39) speaks slightly of the "sanfronnerades communes chez ces royaumes de l'Abyssinie." While Elesbaan bore the title of king of Ethiopia, the Homeritae had greatly obscured the Christianity which they had received in the reign of Constantius, but the lan-
guage of Cosmas Indicopleustes (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxxviii. p. 170), shows that it was not wholly extinct. They were subject to a king whose name is variously written as Dunaan and Dhu Nowas; also writing the name of John of Asia as Dumen by Theophanes as Damian. He had been raised to the throne about 490, by the people whom he had freed from their gross tyrant Laknias Dhu Sjenati; and having shortly after his accession forsworn idolatry and embraced Judaism, he determined to enforce his new creed with the sword (cf. Acta Sanc-
torum, Octob. xii.). Professing a zeal of retaliation for the sufferings of the Jews throughout the Christian empire, he exacted heavy tolls from all Christian merchants who came through his territory to the port of Aden and the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, and, according to the account given by John of Asia (cf. Assemanii Bibl. Orientalis, i. 360), put many Christians to death. The effects of this action were felt in the commerce of all the neighbouring peoples, but nowhere so injuriously as in the kingdom of Ethiopia; and Elesbaan soon after his accession sent to Dhu Nowas an useless remonstrance, and then prepared for war. About the year 510 he crossed the straits, attacked and utterly defeated the Arabian forces, and driving the Jew to the hills, left them to bear Christian rule over the Homeritae, and returned to Ethiopia (Asseman, ut. p. 362). Of this expedition and victory no details are re-
corded; its time is incidentally and approxi-
mately marked by Cosmas Indicopleustes, who tells us that he was at Adulis "αν τη φερει τη Βασιλεια Ισωντου του Ρωμου Βασιλεως" (A.D. 518-527), when the king of the people of Axum, being about to undertake an expedition of war against the Homeritae, sent to the king of Adulis to ask for a copy of a certain inscription; which copy Cosmas and another monk were charged to make (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxxxviii. p. 102).

It is necessary at this point to consider the first great error by which the witness of the bishop of Asia and of those who follow him in regard to these events is marred (Johannes Malalas, and Theophanes). The conqueror in this war, while proved by the sequel of their story to be identical with Elesbaan, is called by them Aidog, Adad, or Andas: he is said to have vowed before leaving Ethiopia that, since he fought as the champion of Christ, he would, if victorious, renounce his false faith and become a Christian; and after the defeat of Dhu Nowas it is told how, in fulfilment of this vow, he sent to Alexandria to pray that a bishop and clergy
might come to form the church of Christ in Ethiopia. Then John of Asia goes on to record that this message was forwarded from Alexandri a by one Lucius to the emperor, who bade the ambassadors choose a bishop; that they chose John, the Paramonarius of the church of St. John, at Alexandria, by whom Aidog and all his princes were presently baptized, and the church, which St. Frumentius had founded in the 4th century, was quickened afresh (Assemaeli Biblioth. Orientalis, i. 362-3).

But this is scarcely consistent with the language of the Arabic, which speaks of Elesban at the time of his first war as Rex Christianissimus (cf. Bollandist Acta, October x. p. 697). Or with the inscription of Tazena discovered at Azum, and shewing that he, the father of Elesban, was a Christian; or with the Ethiopian Senkesser, which tells that Elesban about the year 525 consulted St. Pantaleon, who had at that time a 340 forty-four years in Ethiopia (cf. the translation from the Senkesser, jointly with the Acta S. Actae in the Bollandist Acta, October xii. 331); or lastly, with the Ethiopian chronicle of great antiquity, extant in MSS. in the Bodleian Library and British Museum, which says that in the reign of Alamedon, son of Saladosa, nine saints, whose names are especially commemorated in the Senkesser, came to Ethiopia and brought the true faith; while another copy says that in that reign many monks came from Rome, or the Graeco-Roman empire. All these authorities would make it clear that Elesban was from the first, and by birth, a Christian; and that there must be some error in the accounts which make his victory over Dhu Nowas the occasion of his baptism.

The error may probably be traced to a confusion of the exploits of Elesban with a previous defeat of the Homeritae by his grandfather Al-Ameda, and the consequent conversion of that king and of his people. The evidence of these events is fragmentary and inconclusive: but the balance of probability seems in favour of the belief that they occurred. No slight force must be allowed to the connexion of names which seems to represent that of Al-Ameda with the victories of Elesban over the Homeritae; for such a connexion would be inexplicable unless like exploits had been associated with the earlier reign. Again, it appears from a letter written by Justin to Elesban in 523 or 524, that Dhu Nowas' accession to the throne of the Homeritae had required and received the sanction of the king of Ethiopia (cf. Bolland. Acta S. Actae, Oct. xii. 311), and in a phrase in a letter of Dhu Nowas to Mandibhir, king of the Arabs of Hira, on the skirts of Arabia Deserta, seems to imply a like relation of dependence: a relation such as would ensue upon a recent defeat. But two stronger reasons remain to be urged in support of this theory: it solves two difficulties with a simplicity which greatly commands it. For first,

---


4 "Ut Christianum Regem de more constitutum." The letter is extant in the Syriac MS. of Simeon of Beth-Arama, Assemaeli Bibl. Orientalis, i. 360.

John of Asia ends his account of this expedition with the death of the Arabian king whom he calls Dimon, and for whom no place can be found in the list of the Arabian kings at this time, unless he be identified with Dhu Nowas. But Dhu Nowas reappears in the persecution which provokes Elesban's second expedition in 525, as an event attributed to him alike by Greek, Syrian, and Arabic historians. Here then the story of John of Asia seems unaccountably wrong, save on this supposition of the defeat and slaughter by Al-Ameda (or Andas) of a previous king of the Homeritae, whom John has confused with Dhu Nowas just as he confuses Al-Ameda himself with Elesban. And this supposition is at once confirmed by the Arabic historians, who hide in significant silence the end of Hassan, second from Dhu Nowas on the throne of Yemen, the last of a long dynasty, and succeeded by the despot Dhu Sjenatir; while the time of his death is marked by a revolt by the Magi, a sign of weakness among the Homeritae (Bollandist Acta, October, vol. x. p. 310), and a likely result of such a blow as they may have received by the defeat and death of Hassan at the hands of Al-Ameda. Secondly and lastly, the supposition that it was Al-Ameda's victory over Hassan which led to the mission of the bishop and clergy from Alexandria, John the Paramonarius and his companions, exactly coincides with the witness of the Ethiopian Senkesser, telling how in that reign the nine great saints came from the Graeco-Roman empire to revive the church of Ethiopia; and also with the statement of Theodorus Lector (ii. 58) that Christianity was introduced among the Homeritae in the reign of Anastasius; for the new faith of Al-Ameda would not be slow to reach across the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb towards the people whose conquest had given it birth.

These convergent lines of circumstantial evidence seem to point to the belief that those parts of the bishop of Asia's story of Elesban's life, which are irreconcilable with other authorities, are taken from an imperfect knowledge of an expedition into Arabia, wherein the grandfather of Elesban defeated and killed Hassan, predecessor of Dhu Sjenatir; for John has confounded Dhu Nowas; and that to this earlier date, towards the close of the 5th century, must be referred the name of Aidog or Andas, the religious revival in Ethiopia and Yemen, and the death in battle of the Arabian king, so much of the bishop's account being retained as was given before this long digression, which might well be lengthened by the consideration of the probable orthodoxy of John the Paramonarius. Henceforward the historians are more nearly consistent.

It was probably in the year 522 or 523 that the death of the viceroy whom Elesban had left in Yemen, encouraged Dhu Nowas to come down from his hiding place in the hills ("tanquam daemon carne induitus," Acta S. Actae, Oct. xii. 316), and reassert his self as king of the Homeritae and champion of Judaism. Choosing a

---


f From which patriarch of Alexandria did he come? Cf. article ETHIOPIAN CHURCH, p. 249.
season when the Arabian Gulf would be an impassable barrier to the intervention of Elesbaan, he gathered a force which presently numbered 120,000 men, and having put to death all the Christians whom he could find, and turned their church into a mausoleum, he pressed on to Negran, the head-quarters of the Ethiopian vice-royalty, and held at this time by Arethas, the pylarch. Here he found the garrison forewarned and the gates closed; nor were they opened to the terror of his threats, when coming to the wall and holding up a wooden cross he swore that all who would not blaspheme the Crucified one would suffice. The gates were shut, the citizens might die. At last by treachery Dhu Nowas won an entrance, promising that he would hurt none of the citizens, and demanding nothing harder to be yielded than an exorbitant tribute; but having entered he began at once the reckless massacre which has won him a title in Arabian history and left its mark even in the Koran (cf. Walch's paper in the Göttingen Commentarii, p. 25, and article ETHIOPIAN CHURCH, p. 250). Arethas and Ruma his wife died with a defiant confession on their lips: more than four thousand Christian men, women, and children were killed (commemorated in the Roman calendar on October 24); and from the fiery dyke into which the victims were thrown, Dhu Nowas received the name Saheb-el-Okhud, "Lord of the Trench."  

It happened that at this time, probably in the January of 524, Simeon, the bishop of Beth-Arsam, had been sent by Justin, together with one Abraham, a priest of Constantinople, to gain the alliance of Mundhir III, king of the Arabs of Hira, a friend valuable alike for reasons of commerce and in regard to the war with Persia. As the ambassadors drew near to the royal presence (the story is told by Simeon in a letter to the abbot of Gabala) they were met by a crowd of Arabs crying that Christ was driven out of Rome and Persia and Herodias; and they learnt that messengers were present from Dhu Nowas. Abbot Simeon sent letters to Mundhir, which presently they heard read. They heard at great length the recital of the treachery by which Negran had been taken, of the insult done to the bishop's tomb, of the slaughter of the Christians, of the triumph of Judaism; they heard the confession of the martyr Arethas, and the speech wherewith Ruma urged the women of Negran to follow her to the abiding city of the divine Bridgroom, praying that the blood of the martyrs might be the wall of Negran while it continued in the faith, and that she might be forgiven for that Arethas had died first. They heard the story of her brutal murder, and then the appeal of Dhu Nowas that Mundhir should at once enact a like massacre throughout his kingdom. For a moment their own end must have seemed very near; but the courage of a soldier who stood forth as spokesman of the many Christians in Mundhir's army decided the hesitation of the king, and the ambassadors went on their way unhurt (but apparently unanswered) to Naaman, a port in the Arabian Gulf. There they heard more fully the story of the massacre, especially in regard to the constancy of a boy, who was afterwards known to the bishop of Asia at Justinian's court. Simeon of Beth-Arsam thus closes his letter, praying that the news of the martyrdom may be spread throughout the church, and the martyrs receive the honour of commemoration, and that the king of Ethiopia may be urged to help the Hermitae against the oppression of the Jew. (Cf. Assemani, B. S. D. 1. 364-379.)

When this message reached Elesbaan, it was reinforced by a letter from the emperor Justin, solicited by the patriarch of Alexandria, who, at the request of Justin, urged Elesbaan to invade Yemen, offering him a little sign and appointing a vigil on his behalf, and sending to him the Eucharist in a silver vessel. Without delay Elesbaan collected a great army, which he divided into two parts; 15,000 men he sent southwards, in order that they might cross at Bab-el-Mandeb, and marching through Yemen divert the strength of Dhu Nowas's forces from the movements of the main body of the Ethiopians, which Elesbaan intended to send by sea to some place on the south coast of Arabia. For the transport of these latter he appropriated sixty merchant vessels then anchored in his ports, adding ten more, built after the native fashion, the planks being held together by ropes. On the eve of the enterprise he went in procession to the great church of Axum, and there, laying aside his royalty, he sued in forma pauperis for the favour of Him whose war he dared to wage; praying that his sins might be visited on himself, and not on his people. Then he sought the blessing, the counsel, and the prayers of St. Pantaleon; and received from within the doorless and windowless tower, where the hermit had lived for forty five years, the answers of Mundhir, and some from present miracles; and, again, "Hεϊχω τον θρυ- πολεμον Αλεξανδρειας κα τα διακα τινών και θου τί θωσε (και ευδοκέως των μαρτυριων ειναι τον νοορ θυσιαστιρων.)" And so the armament was sent on its twofold route.

In regard to the chief facts of this expedition, the Arabic historians quoted by Wright and Walch agree fairly well with the Greek writers and with the brief account of the bishop of Asia; differing chiefly in regard to the presence of Elesbaan himself, which is asserted by the Greeks, denied by the Arabsians, and in regard to the manner of Dhu Nowas's end. For the 15,000 Bab-el-Mandeb was indeed a gate of tears: they died of hunger, wandering in the desert. The rest of the force were safely embarked, and sailed southwards down the Gulf of Arabia towards the straits; which Dhu Nowas had barred by a huge chain, stretched across the space of two furlongs from side to side. Over this chain, however, first ten ships and then seven more, were lifted by the waves, the Ethiopian admiral being on board one of the seven; the rest were driven back by stress of

---

1 Thought by Walch and by Wright to be identical with the Abdaillah Ibn Athamis of the Arabian historians.
2 All mention is here omitted of the many details of this great narrative which are given in the Acta S. Aethiae, and the MS. of Simeon of Beth-Arsam.

1 Walch seems rather to overstate the discrepancy (cf. p. 56), Lohndolphasis greatly understimates it (p. 165).
weather up the Gulf, but presently, the chain being, according to one account, broken, forced the passage, and, passing the smaller detachment of seventeen, cast anchor farther along the coast. Meanwhile Dhu Nowas, having been encamped on the western shore, where he thought the hindrance of his chain would force the Ethiopians to land, hurried from his position, and leaving but a few men to resist the smaller fleet watched with his main army the movements of the rest. Those on board the seventeen ships under the command of the Ethiopian admiral easily effected a landing near the port of Aden, and defeating the troops opposed to them, pressed on to the chief city, Ta'far or Taphan, which surrendered immediately. (Cf. Wright, *Early Christianity in Arabia*, 58–60.) Broken in courage by the news of this disaster, the main body of the Arabs offered a feeble resistance to the rest of the Ethiopian armament: and Dhu Nowas saw that the end of his reign and of his life was very near. According to the Arabic historians he threw himself from the cliff and died in the waves; according to the *Acta S. Arethas*, he bound his seven kinmen in chains, and fastened them to the throne on which he sat, lest they should fail to share his fate; and so awaited the death which Elesbaan inflicted with his own hand. The Arabic writers are unsupportive in their story of the useless resistance of a successor Dhu Gidanan; it was probably at the death of Dhu Nowas that the kingdom of the Hermitae ended, and Yemen became a province of Ethiopia. At Ta’far Elesbaan is said to have built a church, digging the foundations for seven days with his own hands: and from Ta’far he wrote to tell the patriarch of Alexandria the news of his victory. A bishop was sent from Alexandria and appointed to the see of Negman, where again questions are raised both as to the orthodoxy and as to the identity of this bishop. This town the king restored, and entrusted to the care of Arethas’s son; rebuilding and endowing the great Church, and granting perpetual right of asylum to the place where the bodies of the martyrs had lain. And so Elesbaan returned to Ethiopia. (Bell. Acta SS. October, xii. 322.)

Here again begins a period of confusion and infection of justiciary. A reaction against the Arab that among all other histories that of the Hermitae is the most imperfect (Ludolphus, p. 167): it is impossible to harmonize the diverse accounts of the course of events in Hermitae after the departure of Elesbaan. The great preponderance of authority is with Procopius, who is here at one with the Arabic writers, and followed by Walsh, Ritter, and for the most part by the Bollandist *Acta*. It may be enough therefore to give his account, since reconciliation is impossible, and since the events bear only indirectly upon Elesbaan’s life.

It would seem then, that the king, when he returned to Ethiopia, left a Christian Arab, named Esmiphaeus, otherwise known as Arianthus to be his viceroy over the conquered people. But he also left an element of discord, a part of his army being detained by the luxury of Arabia Felix, and refusing to leave the land which they had won. These soldiers not long after set up a rival to Esmiphaeus, in the person of Abraham or Abraham, the Christian slave of a Roman merchant, who was strong enough to shut up the viceroy in a fort and seize the throne of Yemen. A force of 3000 men was sent by Elesbaan, under the command of a prince of his house, whom some call Aryates or Arethas, to depose the usurper; and it seems that Abraham, like Dhu Nowas, sought safety among the mountains. But his retreat too was only for a time: about the year 540 he came down and confronted the representatives of Elesbaan; and at the critical moment the Ethiopian troops deserted and murdered their general. Determined to maintain his supremacy and avenge his kinman, Elesbaan sent a second army; but this, loyally fighting with Abraham, was utterly defeated, and only a handful of men returned to Ethiopia. The Arabic historians record the great oath with which Elesbaan swore that he would yet lay hold of the land of the Hermitae, both mountain and plain; and that he would pluck the forelock from the rebel’s head, and take his blood as the price of Aryates’ death; and they tell of the mixed cunning and cowardice by which Abraham satisfied the Ethiopian oath, and evaded his anger; winning at last a recognition of his dignity. Procopius adds that Abraham paid tribute to Elesbaan’s successor; and the Hermitae remained in free subjection to the kings of Ethiopia till the century had almost ended.

In this continuous history of those relations between Elesbaan and the Hermitae, which are the most vivid part of his life, no mention has been made of the two occasions at which he appears near the main course of the life of his age, in contact with the history of the Roman empire. For two reasons the alliance of Ethiopia and Yemen was attractive to Justinian; for not only might their armies do good service in the Persian war, but it was also possible that their merchants might draw the silk-trade of China from its normal course through Persia, so that the Byzantine court might neither lose its supply in time of war nor in time of peace enrich its enemies. Records are extant of two embassies sent by Justinian, recorded in *Bibliotheca* as the very words of the ambassadors. Joanna Malala, in writing the history of the first, had before him the autograph of the envoy whom Procopius (de Bello Persico, i. 20) calls Julian: Photius has preserved in the third codex of his *Bibliotheca* his fresh memory of Nonnos’s story of his experience in the second mission. Julian must have been sent before 531, for Cabaden was still living, and according to Procopius Esmiphaeus was viceroy of Hermitae. He was received by Elesbaan, according to his own account, with the silence of an intense joy; for the alliance of Rome had long been the great desire of the Ethiopians. The king was seated on a high chariot, drawn by four elephants.
ELEUCHADIUS

expatriated with gold: he wore on his shoulders a broad robe studded with pearls, and round his loins a covering of linen embroidered with gold. He received Justinian's letter with every sign of respect, and on learning that he was called to take part in the Persian war, he began to prepare his forces even before Julian was dismissed from his court with the promise of peace. (Johnannes Malalæ Chronographia, xviii. Bonn. edit. pp. 457, 458.) Malala records no sequel of these preparations, Procopius complains that none occurred.

The second embassy, which was sent primarily to Raisus or Imru'lays, the prince of the Chindini and Mazdati, and only secondarily to the Homeresite and the Ethiopians, seems to belong to the last years of Elephas's reign. Nonnosus the envoy belonged to a family of diplomatists, for his father and grandfather had been employed in like missions. But Photius has copied from his manuscript no details of the purpose or result of this journey: only telling of the great herd of 5000 elephants which Nonnosus saw between Adulis and Azam, and the pigmy negroes who met him on an island as he sailed away from Pharsan. (Photii Bibliotheca; Bekker's edit. pp. 2, 3.)

The story of Elephas's abdication and seclusion is told in the Acta S. Arctae: the last years of his life are embalmed in Ethiopian hagiography, with many strange miracles which their Jesus critic unhesitatingly disbelieves. Having accepted the fealty and recognized the royalty of Abraham, and having confirmed the faith of Christ in Homeritis, "pro tanta Dei beneficitione nihil se dignum reddere posse aequum Elephas: hoc tantum invent ut coronam regioni deposuerit et indutum vestrum monasticam." The cell to which he betook himself is still shown to the traveller: it was visited in 1865 by Henry Salt, and has been elaborately described by Mme de Lencz and Le Fèvre. There nothing remained in solitude and great rigour of asceticism; and the year of his death is lost in the darkness of his hermit's life. His crown he sent to Jerusalem, praying that it might be hung "in conspectu jamnon viventis sequelquii; in quo principium resurrectionis et incorruptionis nobis extendit Christus Filii Dei a mortuis resurgentibus cujus gloria cum Patre est Spiritu Sancto nunc et semper in saecula saeculorum." [F.P.]

ELEUCHADIUS, 100 a.d., bishop of Ravenna; commemorated on the 14th of February. He is the subject of the sixth sermon of Peter Damianus, in the 11th century. His name is also given in the Martyrologium Romanum, and in Heremans Creven's Additions to Usuard. His life is given by Johannes Camansius (Bolland. AA. SS. Feb. 747) from a MS. in a monastery in Westphalia; and by Hieronymus Rubeus (Historiarum Ravennatam, libri decem. Venice, 1572, folio). By these he is said to have been one of the four pupils of St. Apollinaris who succeeded him in Martyriology; in his line he bore the name of Adericus, Eleuchadius, Martianus, Calocerus. He is described as an eminent Platonic philosopher, converted to Apollinaris on a visit to Rome. He accompanied his master and fellow disciples to

Ravenna, to rule the church in that place. Apollinaris was martyred under Vesperian, and Eleuchadius succeeded Aderitus a.d. 100. He died a.d. 112, and his remains were buried outside the walls, where a church was afterwards dedicated to his memory, existing in the time of Peter Damianus. It is thought that his bones were carried by king Aulf to Ticinum. Peter Damianus believed him to have written books on the Old and New Testament, and probably on the Incarnation and Passion. He was not actually a martyr. (Pit. Dam. Opp. part ii. 29, etc.; Patr. Lat. exv. 534, etc., Ughell. Ital. Sacr. ii. 327.) [W. M. S.]

ELEUSINIUS (1), a very reverend person (μισθωτατος) despatched by Eustathius of Sebaste, a.d. 571, to apprise Basil of the approach of the Emperor Valens, and to express the apprehension he felt for the safety of the Catholics at Caesarea, and especially for Basil himself. Basil wrote thanking Eustathius for sending him such an ally and supporter in the spiritual contests he was engaged in. (Basil, Epist. 79 [318], p. 300.)

ELEUSINIUS (2), (ELESIUS, Baron. A. E., ann. 449, xii.), one of the deacons in the monastery of Eutyches at Constantinople. At the meeting in November, a.d. 448, of the council of bishops by whom he was eventually condemned, Eutyches sent round a "cure" or doctrinal treatise, by the hands of Eleusinus and a brother deacon, Constantine, to be signed by the heads of the chief monastic establishments of the city, with the view of committing them to his cause against Flavian, his bishop. In this they met with but little success. (Labbe, Concil. iv. 198, 210.) When the messengers of the synod presented themselves at Eutyches' convent, demanding to see him, Eutyches came forward to receive their messenger, and on their refusing to give it to any one but the archimandrite himself, they were conveyed by him to Eutyches' presence. (Ib. 200.) Eutyches refusing to appear before the council on the plea of illness, Eleusinius was commissioned with Abraham and others, to represent him at the fourth session. (Ib. 204–207.) Eleusinius of this said five cited as the six titulars who lobbied the substance of the charges brought against Eutyches by Eusebius of Doryleum (Ib. 213). He successfully urged a claim to be present, with other members of Eutyches' monastery, when sentence of excommunication and deposition was pronounced. (Ib, 238.) On the meeting of the "Latrocinum" at Ephesus, a.d. 449, Eleusinius was one of the members who lodged a formal complaint against Flavian for the condemnation of Eutyches at Constantinople. (Ib. 280.)

ELEUSINIUS (1), tribe of Thamugada, in Numidia, bearer of a request from the people of that place to St. Augustine that he would reply to the letter of Gaudentius concerning Donatism. (Aug. Ep. 204, 9.) [H. W. P.]

ELEUSINIUS (2), (Baron. Annal. 512, xxiii.,) bishop of Sasima. [ELEUSINIUS (5).] [C. H.]

ELEUSIPPUS (Baron. Annal. ann. 179, xxvii.; Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 716, in M. H. E. 541a; Sim. Dun. G. E. A. in M. H. E. 533 d), martyr. [ELISIPPUS.] [C. H.]
ELEUSIUS (1), a deacon and philosopher in the reign of Constantine, quoted by Codinus as one of the authorities for the events at the foundation of Constantinople. (Codinus, p. 8, A.D.)

ELEUSIUS (2), bishop of Cyzicus, one of the most prominent and influential members of the Suniarian party in the second half of the 4th century, intimately connected with Basil of Ancyræ, Eustathius of Sebaste, Sophronius of Ioupeopolis, and other leaders of the Macedonian party. He is uniformly described as a man of high personal character, holy in life, rigid in self-discipline, uniting in his soules for what he believed to be the truth, and, according to St. Hilary, more nearly identified with the orthodox doctrine than most of his associates (Hilar. de Synod. p. 133). The people of his diocese are described by Theodoret as zealous for the orthodox faith, and well instructed in the Holy Scriptures and in the doctrines of the church, and he himself as a man worthy of all praise. (Theod. H. E. ii. 22.) He is said to have occasionally found acting with the tyrannical and unsparingly party, of which Macedonius was the original leader, and sharing in the discredit of the measures directed by them against the holders of the Homoeouarian faith, Elesius was uncompromising in his opposition to the pronounced Arians, by whom he was persecuted and deposed; and a calm view of his career, as far as we know it, leads us to acquiesce in the substantial justice of the condemnation passed upon him by the voice of antiquity.

Elesius had held a military office in the Imperial household with considerable distinction, when he was suddenly elevated to the episcopate by the notorious Macedonius, the bishop of Constantinople. He was appointed bishop of Cyzicus, on the Propontis, at the same time that Marathonius, paymaster of the prefects of the Praetorian Guard, was appointed to the see of Nicomedia, a.d. 350 (Socr. H. E. iv. 20; Suidas, s. v. Eλευσιος). Elesius signalized the entrance on his episcopal office with a vehement outburst of zeal against the relics of paganism at Cyzicus. He demolished the temples, heaped contempt on their gods and their rites. He even had the power to arrest merchant vessels. This, as will be seen, was remembered against him on the accession of Julian. He showed no less decision in dealing with the Novatians, with whom a community of persecution had caused the Catholics to unite. He destroyed their church, and forbade their assemblies for worship. (Socr. H. E. ii. 38; Socr. H. E. iv. 21. v. 15.) He soon acquired great influence over his clergy, not by the eloquence of speech, of which he was destitute, but by his religious zeal, the austerity of his life, and the consistent gravity of his manners. He established in his diocese a large number of monasteries, both for males and females (Suidas, s. v.) He took part in the semi-Arian council which met at Ancyræ 358 a.d. (Hilar. de Synod. p. 127), and was one of the members delegated, with Basil of Ancyræ, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Leontius, to lay before Constantius at Sirmium the decrees they had passed, condemnatory of the Anomoeans, and obtain their ratification. (Hilar. u. s.; Socr. H. E. iv. 13; Labbe, Concil. ii. 790.) We find Elesius again taking part in the indecisive Council of Seleucia, a.d. 359 (Socr. H. E. ii. 39-40), at which he met the proposition of the Acacians to draw up a new confession of faith, by the assertion that they had not met to learn anything they had not previously taught, nor to receive a new faith, but to plead for themselves for death to that laid down by the fathers (Socr. H. E. ii. 40). Having been commissioned with Eustathius of Sebaste, Basil of Ancyræ, and others, to communicate the result of the synod to Constantius, Elesius denounced the blasphemies attributed to Eudoxius so vigorously that he was compelled by the emperor's threats to retract them (Theod. H. E. ii. 234; Eutrohis. Eustathius de Sebaste). The Arians speedily gained the ear of Constantius, and, turning the tables on them, secured the deposition of their semi-Arian rivals, of whom Elesius was one, a.d. 360. The nominal charge against him was that he had, without due examination, baptized and ordained one Hercules of Tyre, who, being accused of magic, had fled to Cyzicus, and that with the facts usually to the contrary, he had refused to depose him. He was also charged with having admitted to holy orders persons who had been condemned by his neighbour, Maris of Chalcodon (Soz. H. E. iv. 34; Soz. H. E. ii. 42). His old patron, Macedonius of Constantinople, who had been got rid of at the same time on equally frivolous grounds, wrote to encourage him and the other deposed prelates in their adherence to the Antiochene formula, and to maintain the "Homoioasian" as the watchword of their party (Socr. H. E. ii. 45; Socr. H. E. iv. 27). The subtle Anomoean Eunomius was made bishop of Cyzicus in his room by Eudoxius, who had succeeded Macedonius as bishop of Constantinople (Socr. H. E. iv. 7; Philost. H. E. v. 3). Eunomius, however, failed to secure the goodwill of the people who refused to attend the church where he officiated, and built a church for himself outside the town. On the accession of Julian, a.d. 361, Elesius, in common with the other deposed prelates, returned to his see, from which he was soon expelled a second time by Julian, on the representation of the heathen inhabitants of Cyzicus, on account of the zeal he had shown against paganism (Soz. H. E. v. 15). The death of Julian's dream made it easy for Elesius to regain possession of his see. He took the lead at the Macedonian council of Lampsacon, a.d. 365 (Socr. H. E. iv. 4). At Nicomedia, a.d. 366, he weakly succumbed to Valens' threats of banishment and confiscation, and declared his acceptance of the Arian creed. Full of remorse at his cowardly submission, on his return to Cyzicus, he assembled his people, confessed and deplored his crime, and expressed a holy desire, since he had denied his faith, to resign his charge into the hands of a worthier bishop. The people of Cyzicus, who were devotedly attached to him, refused to accept his resignation (Socr. H. E. iv. 6; Philost. H. E. iv. 13). In a.d. 381 Elesius was the chief of the thirty-six bishops of Macedonian tenets summoned by Theodosius to the eccumenical Council of Constantinople in the hope of bringing them back to Catholic doctrine. This anticipation proved nugatory, and Elesius and his adherents obstinately refused all reconciliation, and maintained their heretical views on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, in spite of their condemnation by the council. (Socr. H. E. v. 8;
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ELEUTHERIUS (3), one of the fourteen bishops (of these unnamed) mentioned by Augustine as composing the synod of Diopolis (Lydda) on Pelagianism, A.D. 415 (Aug. contr. Julianum, I. 5, § 19, in Patr. Lat. xlv. 632). In that list was also a bishop Eutonius. There was at the same time at Diopolis the presbyter Julianus, known for the invention of the body of St. Stephen, and in his account of that matter (in Lipomani at inf.) he mentions two bishops that accompanied him from Diopolis to the place of the invention, Eultherius of Sebaste, and Eultherius of Jericho. Their identification among the fourteen synodal bishops (one only of whom is called Eultherius by Augustine) is made out by supposing that Eutonius was otherwise or properly Eultherius. It then remained to conjecture which of the two was the bishop of Sebaste and which of Jericho. Mansi assigns Eultherius to Jericho and Eutonius "sive Eultherius" to Sebaste; Le Quien, vice versa; (Lipomani, de vitis SS. ed. Suris, Aug. 3, iv. 147, Venet. 1581; Mansi, iv. 315, 316; Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 692; Baron. 415, xiv.)

ELEUTHERIUS (4), bishop of Geneva in the 5th century. No credit is due to the story of the abbé Besson, the historian of the diocese of Geneva, that he was a native of Britain contemporary with Constantine, and died in 334. He is placed between Cassianus and Dominianus I (Gall. Christ. xvi. 378; Gams, Ser. Epis. 277.)

ELEUTHERIUS (5) (Gall. Christ. i. 863), archbishop of Avignon. [ELEUTHERIUS.]

ELEUTHERIUS (6), St., 8th in the list of bishops of Terracina, about A.D. 443. He was an African by birth, and succeeded his son St. Silvanus. He governed the see for "some years," and died Sept. 6, on which day he was commemorated at Terracina. The next bishop in the list, Martyrinus, was living in the year 502. (Ugolini. Ital. Soc. i. 1296.)

ELEUTHERIUS (7), a bishop addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (vi. 11), who recommends to his notice a Jew, on the ground that there is hope while a Jew lives that he may become our brother. (Coll. Ant. Eccl. x. 390.)

ELEUTHERIUS (8), bishop of Chaledon, at the time of the council A.D. 451, whose decree he signed among the metropolitan. He also signed the synodal decree of Gennadius of Constantinople against the simoniacs, A.D. 459. He received a letter from the emperor Leo concerning the murder of St. Proterius of Alexandria, as if he held metropolitan rank, A.D. 458. (Le Quien, Oris. Christ. i. 602; Mansi, viii. 137, 322, 917.)

ELEUTHERIUS (9), said to have been elected patriarch of Constantinople, by the orthodox A.D. 484, in the time of the Eutychian Acacius and the emperor Zeno. Acacius had been communicated by pope Felix III. and a council at Rome. Eleutherius is said to have suffered much from Acacius and Zeno, and after a rule of seven years to have died towards the close of that reign (Migne, Encycl. Thesal. vi. 815). Fravitta succeeded Acacius; and no mention of
ELEUTHERIUS (10), ST., commemorated Feb. 20, was the third bishop of Tournai, succeeding Theodorus and preceded by St. Melarius. The authorities for his life are of a late date, the earliest of them an anonymous one (to be found in Boll. Acta SS., Feb. iii. 187), being probably of the 9th or 10th century, and the recital is overlaid with legend. He was born at Tournai in the year a.d. 456, of Christian parents named Sereus and Blanda, whom the legends, ignoring the interval of about 150 years he converts years, St. Pius I. While he was still a young man a persecution of the Christians arose in Tournai, and the Franks, who were not yet converted, expelled the whole of them from the city. Eleutherius and his family, with many others, settled at Blandinium (presumably Blandain), a village a few leagues distant, where a church was built and Theodorus consecrated bishop. Upon his death Eleutherius, having first been sent by the Christians to Rome to obtain the sanction of the pope, was consecrated to the see. The date is variously given in 470, 483, 484, 487, 501, and 502. The weight of authority seems, however, in favour of the year 487. The first nine years of his episcopate were spent at Blandinium, but the conversion of Clovis and his followers enabled him to return to Tournai. His episcopate which lasted forty-five years, seems to have been chiefly passed in struggles with the pagans and heretics. The latter belonged to sects of the Arians, whose doctrines at this time influenced the greater part of Christian Gaul except the Franks. He is said to have visited Rome three times in all: first, on the occasion already mentioned, and twice when bishop during the pontificates of Symmachus and Hormidas, the two latter visits being in connexion with his efforts against heresy. With the same object he conveyed a synod about the year 527, in which he expounded the true faith and confuted his opponents. These efforts entailed much persecution, and finally in a.d. 531 or 532 his enemies lay in wait for him as he quitted a church, and so mistreated him that he was left for four years disabled of the injuries received on that occasion. He was buried at Blandinium, and his remains are said to have been translated twice. Among the miracles ascribed to him are the raising of a girl from the dead (see the somewhat romantic account in the first of the Lices, Boll. Acta SS. ut sup.) and the curing of a cripple, a blind man, and a leper. The following writings have been assigned to him: Sermo, seu Confessio de SS. Triumeate, said to have been presented by him to pope Symmachus in the fourteenth year of his episcopate; Transitus S. Eleutherii Episcopi; Sermo de Triumeate; Sermo de Incarnacione Domini; Sermo de Notabilis Domini; Sermo in Annumfianis Festum; and Oratio Beatii Eleutherii (see Migne, Patr. Lat. lxv. 89-102), but without sufficient authority. (Rivet, Hist. Lit. de la France, iii. 154; Gall. Christ. i. 863.)

[S. A. B.]

ELEUTHERIUS (11), ST., was the fifteenth bishop of Auerre, preceded by St. Droctoaldus, and followed by St. Romualdus. He is said to have sat twenty-eight years, from a.d. 532 to 561, the date of his death. Nothing further is known of him than that he was present at the four councils of Orleans, held in the years 533, 538, 541, and 549. He is commemorated on Aug. 16. (Gall. Christ. xii. 246; Boll. Acta SS. Aug. iii. 298; Bar. ann. 530 exxiv., and 552 xxvii.; Labbe, Sacrae Conc. v. 929, 1282, 1371, 1384.)

[S. A. B.]

ELEUTHERIUS (12), a bishop in whose diocese, on an estate named Pancellus, the demon Maximus had erected an oratory in honour of the saint Cantiana. Eleutherius was requested by Pelagius I., bishop of Rome (555-560), to consecrate this oratory. (Pelag. Epist. fift fragm. Patr. Lat. lxix. 414; Ceillier, Antiqu. Sac. xi. 333.)

[T. H.]

ELEUTHERIUS (13), bishop of Cordova, signs the acts of the third council of Toledo in 589. (Esp. Segr. x. 227; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 238; Gomez Bravo, Catálogo de los Obispos de Cordoba, p. 64, ed. 1739.)

[M. A. W.]

ELEUTHERIUS (14) (LEUtherius in some MSS.), the first bishop of Salamanca of whom any record remains. He signs the acts of the third Council of Toledo, 589. The bishop of Salamanca was a suffragan of Merida up to the Moorish conquest, and is now under Valladolid. (Esp. Segr. xiv. 273; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 238.)

[M. A. W.]

ELEUTHERIUS (15), erroneously said by Gervase (Acta Pontif. in Tywsyl. 1630. 15) and after him by Dugdale (i. 81) to have been bishop of Arles, and to have consecrated Auchinleck (i.e. Auchinleck), bishop of Canterbury. The bishop named by Bede (H. E. i. 27) is Aetherius, and he was bishop of Lyon, not of Arles.

[C. H.]

ELEUTHERIUS (16), bishop of Lucca, signed the second Epistle of pope Agatho, which was sent in 680 after a synod in Rome to the third council of Constantinopel. (Mansi, xi. 307; Hefele, § 314.)

[A. H. D. A.]

ELEUTHERIUS (17), martyr in Persia under Sapor II. After he had become a Christian and had been instructed by Simees, a bishop, he began to preach amongst his countrymen; they judged information against him, and he was brought before the king, by whose orders he was tortured and put to death. He is commemorated April 13. (Menol. Bas.; AA. SS. Ap. ii. 130.)

[T. S. B.]

ELEUTHERIUS (18), soldier and martyr at Nicomedia in the Diocletian persecution. He was amongst those whom the emperor commanded to be put to death in consequence of his palace having been burned, as he supposed, by the Christians. (Mart. Hier., Ad., Us.) He is commemorated Oct. 2.

[T. S. B.]


[T. S. B.]

ELEUTHERIUS (20), martyr at Tarsus in Bithynia, commemorated on Aug. 4. He was
native of Byzantium, a senator, and a cham-
berlain in the palace of Maximian at Nicomedia.
Having embraced the Christian faith, but fear-
ing to avow it, he procured some land beyond
the Sanganus, where he built a house with an un-
grounded chapel in which he set up altars and
silver lamps. He also employed a priest to
minister in it, and here he was secretly baptized.
He returned to court, but retired as often as
possible to his retreat. The emperor, becoming
suspicious, visited him there, discovered the
crypt, learned the whole truth, and finally
came to do it be put to death. (Cotel. Mon. iii.
193; Boll. Acta SS. Aug. i. 318.) Tillemonr
identifies this martyr with Eleutherius of Oct. 2
(No. 18), but Papebroche argues against that
view (Tillen. Men. v. 25, art. ix.; Boll. ut sup.
p. 320 c).

[ C. H. ]

ELEUTHERIUS (21), mentioned by Bar-
onius among the martyrs of Byzantium, A.D.
311. (Baron. Annual. ann. 311, xix.) [C. H.]

ELEUTHERIUS (22), abbat of St. Mark,
at Spoleto, 6th century.
From him, whom he styles venerable father,
Gregory the Great had the story of Isaac the
Ixxvii. p. 244), who settled at Spoleto. Eleuth-
erius was his authority for various anecdotes
mentioned in the Dialogues, as that of the young
noblewoman of Spoleto dishonored by her father
for refusing to marry (Dialog. iii. 21), that of
the possessed boy at a convent (iii. 33), and that
of Eleutherius's own brother John having sum-
mmoned with his dying breath the monk Ursus,
then in a distant monastery, to follow him
(iv. 35).

He was a greatly honored friend of Gregory,
who relates (Dialog. iii. 33) his being rescued
one from the devil, which, however, he con-
siders to have only heard of from some of his
disciples (u. s. 33). Gregory's own recovery
through the abbot's prayers is also related by
Adrian I. in one of his letters to Charlemagne,
which is given in full by Baronius (a. a. 604,
xxxiv.). Eleutherius died in the monastery of
St. Andrew's at Rome, where he frequently
stayed, and, it is said, expired in the arms of
Gregory, a.D. 585. The Canonists have much
about him. (Act. Sanct. Sept. 6, ii. 685; see also
Peter de Natal. Catal. SS. viii. 45, and the Mar-
tyrologies.) His body was first buried in St.
Mark at Spoleto, but was afterwards removed
to the church of St. Peter in that city (Act.
Sanct. u. s.).

[T. W. D.]

ELEUTHERIUS (29), exarch of Ravenna, a.
D. 616, 620. He is called "patriicus et cubi-
cularius," and never actually "exarch," in the
Liber Pontificalis, the only authority for his life,
but there can be no doubt that he should be
ranked among the exarchs. He came to Ravenna
a. D. 616, and executed all who had been
concerned in the death of his predecessor, John
Lemigius. He then went to Rome, where he was
well received by the pope Deusdedit. He passed
on to Naples, where he defeated and killed John
Cempisina, who had set himself up as a rebel
against the empire. He then returned to Ravenna
annually, for a time in peace; but in 619 Deusde-
dit, in Liber Pontificalis, Migne. ccxxvii. 685.) About
A.D. 620 we find that he set himself up as
emperor in Italy; he was, however, killed (by his
own soldiers according to one reading of the
Lib. Pont.), and his head sent to Constantinople.
He was a cunning, like one at least of his pro-
cessors, and like the rest of his successors. (S.
Bonnifi. V. in discussion of his pontificate, Migne,
h 693; Paulinus Diaconus, iv. 34; Erch and Graber,
Encycl. "Exarch und Exarchat," xxxix. i, p. 318.)

[A. H. D. A.]

ELEUTHERIUS (1), Bishop of Rome in the
reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus,
during 15 years, 6 months, and 5 days, according
to the Libyan catalogue as compiled by Turkish
pope, places his accession in the 17th year of
Antoninus Verus (i.e. Marcus Aurelius), viz.
A.D. 177; which date would involve A.D. 192 as
that of his death. But the consuls given in the
Liberian catalogue as contemporary with his
election and death (a cons. Veri et Hereniani
usuque Paterno et Bradus) are those of 171 and
185. For a discussion of the more probable
dates see "Lipsius, Chronol. der römischen
Bischöfe."

Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 22),
states that at the time of his own arrival in
Rome Eleutherus was deacon of Anicetus, who
was then bishop, and that he became bishop on
the death of Anicetus. The successor of Anicetus
(cf. Irenaeus adv. Haeres. iii. 9, and Jerome de
Vir. ilustr. c. 22).

As is the case with the generality of Roman
bishops of the earlier centuries, the episcopate
of this prelate is memorable rather for contem-
porary events and celebrations than for anything
certainly known of himself or his influence on
the age. He was contemporary with the Aure-
lanian persecution. There is, however, no evidence
of the Church of Rome itself having suffered
under it to any great extent; and after the
death of Aurelius the Christians there, as el-
sewhere, are known to have had peace, in conse-
quence, it is said, of Marcian, the conciliator of
Commodus, being favourably disposed towards
them; the only recorded exception in Rome
being the martyrdom of Apollinaris in the reign
of Commodus (Euseb. H. E. v. 21, Jerome, Cata-
l. c. 42). The chief sufferers under Aurelius
were the churches of Asia Minor and Southern
Gaul. With the persecution in the latter region, which
took place A.D. 177, and of which the Christians
of Lyons and Vienne were the victims, the name
of Eleutherus has become connected from the
following circumstance. Eusebius has not only
preserved long and interesting extracts from an
account of the persecution, addressed by the
Christians of Lyons and Vienne. to those of Asia
and Phrygia (H. E. v. 1), but states further
that, opinions being divided as to the claims
to inspiration of Montanus and his colleagues
(Montanus having asserted his pretensions about
the middle of the century), these same Christians
of Gaul expressed their own judgment on the
question, setting forth also divers epistles which
had been addressed by their martyrs, while still
in prison, to the churches of Asia and Phrygia,
and to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome; which letter
had been sent by the hands of Irenaeus, described
as still a presbyter, "for the sake of the peace of
the churches" (H. E. v. 1). The fact of the
bishop of Rome having been
especially addressed on this occasion has been
added as an instance of the acknowledgment
difficulty in placing the sojourn in Rome of these heresiarchs in the episcopate of Eleutherus, Valentinus certainly, according to other accounts, having died previously. (See Tilmont on Eleutherus.)

Besides these noted heresiarchs, Florinus and Blastus, two degraded presbyters of Rome, bronched during the episcopate of Eleutherus certain heresies of their own, of which nothing is known except what may be gathered from the titles of certain lost treatises written against them by Ireneus, viz. De Schismate, De Opifcio, and Of Monarchianism in the West, about which there is no dispute. Of the course taken by Eleutherus with respect to Montanus nothing can be alleged with certainty. By some he is supposed to have believed in him for a time, and countenanced him, the grounds of this supposition being these. Tertullian (adv. Prax. c. I.) states that a bishop of Rome gave credence for a time to the claims of Montanus and his two pupils, though his predecessor had condemned them, and issued letters of peace in their favour, but afterwards, after the arrival at Rome, and at the instigation of Praxeas (the author subsequently of the Patrispanian heresy) retracted his temporary approval. Some have thought this bishop of Rome, whom Tertullian does not name, was Eleutherus, the supposition being supported by the statement of Eusebius that the mission of Ireneus by the martyrs was "for the sake of the peace of the churches," from which it is concluded that they recommended conciliatory measures. This view is taken by Pearson, Cave, Valerius, and Neander. Others, however, as Tilmont, Bower, Giesler, and Milman (though the last of these somewhat doubtfully) prefer the supposition of Victor, the successor of Eleutherus, being the bishop referred to, as agreeing better with the probable dates of the rise of Montanism and of the arrival of Praxeas in Rome. Baronius supposes Anicetus, the predecessor of Soter, to be the bishop of Rome referred to, and accounts for his temporary approval of heretics by supposing the superior sanctity of their lives, for which they were at that time principally notorious, and not their errors, to have called forth his letters in their favour.

Montanism was not the only heresy that troubled the episcopate of Eleutherus. The Alexandrian and Syrian forms of Gnosticism developed by Basilides and Valentinus, and by Cerdo and Marcion, were at their height, and gained many adherents in Rome. Valentinus and Cerdo came thither between A.D. 138 and A.D. 142; Marcion a little later. Having attached himself to the Syrian Gnostic Cerdo, he developed his own peculiar system. According to Tertullian (de Praescript. Haeres. c. 30), both Valentinus and Marcion were in Rome during the episcopate of Eleutherus, under whom they were twice excommunicated, two hundred sestertia which Marcion had offered to the church being restored to him on his dismissal. Tertullian adds that Marcion again sought re-admission into the church, which was accorded him on condition of his bringing back with him those whom he had seduced into heresy, a condition which he accepted, but was prevented from fulfilling by death. There is, however, some
story with Llandaff, saying that there ' Lleirwmg made the first church, which was the first in the isle of Brittain, and gave lands and privileges to those who embraced the faith of Christ'. The book of Llandaff also, written in the 12th century, repeats the story. In the same century William of Malmesbury and Geoffrey of Monmouth tell the tale with many details: the former, in his Antiquitates of Glastonbury, connects the mission with that place, and from both together we learn that Elvan and Medwin were the founders, and that Lucius was Pope, and that they were by him consecrated bishops; that Fugacius (or Fagan) and Damian were the Pope's legates sent to Britain, and that three archbishops and twenty-eight bishops were founded in the island. A further connexion of the tradition with Llandaff is found in the dedication of certain churches in the diocese to Lleirwmg, Dyfyan, Fagan, and Medwy.

Thus the history of the story as far as we can trace it is this. It is found first in its simplest form in the Pontifical annals at Rome, in the 6th century. It is introduced into Britain by Bede in the 8th: it grows into the conversion of the whole of Britain in the 9th; it appears full-fledged, enriched with details, and connected with both Llandaff and Glastonbury in the 12th. What ground is there for believing in a fact for its foundation? The accretion of details is of course untrustworthy. Two suppositions involved in the story as told by Bede, that Lucius was king of the Britons generally, and that a mission from Rome to him was the main origin of Christiani in Britain; the other that the Pope of the first, as inconsistent with the known political condition of the country under the Roman empire; the second on the ground that the resistance to Roman claims on the part of the British bishops when Augustin came from Rome A.D. 597, and the difference at that time of their customs from those of Rome point to some source of their Christianity other than the Roman Church. See the question remains whether the statement in the Eusebian catalogue may not be true, involving as it does no more than this: that a British prince called in Latin Lucius, having gained some knowledge of Christianity from Gallie or native believers, applied to Eleutherus for instruction in the faith, and that a mission from Rome followed. Some of the arguments adduced by those who discredit the whole story are inconclusive. Ist. It is said that Bede is at fault in his dates, giving A.D. 158 instead of 161 as the date of the accession of Marcus Aurelius, and being otherwise confused or inaccurate. But, even if the error above noticed could not be so easily accounted for by the want or resemblance between the Roman numerals CLVI and CLXI, chronological inaccuracies in the transmitter of a tradition do not invalidate the truth of the story itself, if otherwise probable. 2ndly. The silence of all general ecclesiastical historians is alleged: to which argument it may be replied that such a transaction as this may be supposed to have been between a bishop of Rome and an obscure British prince may easily have escaped the notice of such writers, or been deemed of less importance than to claim admission in general histories of the Church. But 3rdly. The silence of Gildas, and his apparent ignorance of the whole story, is a valid argument against its truth; as is also the entire absence of any mention of the mission to Lucius in the earlier edition of the Pontifical catalogue, viz. the Liberian, A.D. 354. Such complete silence on the subject of the early British and even Roman records suggests strongly the probability that the story was first fabricated at Rome in or before the 6th century, and owed its origin to the same motive that has caused many other successive additions to the Pontifical annals, the desire to trace the origin of all western churches to some bishop of Rome. On the other hand, it may be argued that there is nothing improbable in the original story itself, that it is more likely to have had some fact than pure invention for its origin, and that the Welsh traditions about Lleirwmg, though unnoticed by Gildas, may have been ancient and genuine ones, independent of Bede's account. Lingard takes this view, laying stress on the dedication of churches in the diocese of Llandaff to Lleirwmg and the saints associated with him, and supposing him to have been an independent British prince outside the Roman pale.

In confirmation of the truth of the story it is alleged further the fact that, shortly after the death of Eleutherus, the writer of the Liber Pontificalis at Rome begins to speak of British Christianity. For Tertullian, Cyprian, and Arnobius are the first to allude to the triumphs of the Gospel, though partial, in this remote island. What they say, however, is quite consistent with the earlier, and other than Roman, origin of the British church; and it may be that it was the very fact of their having borne this testimony that suggested the idea of Eleutherus, a pope shortly anterior to their date, being the one to whom the mission might be assigned. It may be remarked in conclusion that undue heat has been introduced into the controversy on the subject from advocates of one or the other view being anxious, on polemical grounds, to prove or disprove the connexion with, and subordination to, Rome of the early British church.

In the Liber Pontificalis Eleutherus is said to have ordained that all kinds of food were to be allowed to Christians; and there is a spurious decretal attributed to him, addressed to the provinces of Gaul, containing this ordinance about food, with others about the trial of clerics by provincial synods, with an appeal to Rome. In some later MSS. of the so-called laws of Edward the Confessor there is also a letter from Eleutherus to king Lucius, undoubtedly spurious.

He is commemorated in the Roman Calendar on the 26th of May as a saint and martyr, having however no claim. resting on any ancient authority, to the latter title. [J. B.—Y.]

**ELEUTHERUS (S), a resident in a village of Lydia, by whom Lampetius, one of Chrysostom's partisans, was hospitably received during the persecution of the Joannites. (Pallad. Dial. p. 195.) [E. V.]

**ELEUTHERUS (S), a martyr at Caesarea in Cappadocia. Commemorated Sept. 27. (Mart. Hier., Wand.) Ferrarius says he was put to death during the reign of Hadrian, but this seems very uncertain (AA. SS. Sept. vii. 482). [T. S. E.]

**ELEVARA (Chron. Centulens. Ill. 29), martyr. [ELENARA.]

**G
ELFAN (ELVAN) appears in the legend of King Lucius and his application to pope Melch-etherus for instruction in the Christian faith. According to Bale he was surnamed Avalonius. As the account of Lucius is considerably uncertain, that of Elfan or Elvan must be infinitely more obscure, though in monkish legend there is no hesitation in accepting him. [LUCIUS.] According to the Welsh Triads, and the Silurian Catalogues of Saints, the application was made to Rome by Lleuder Mawr or Lleuwrg ab Coel ab Cyllin, otherwise more usually known as king Lucius, and Elvanus sent four persons, named Dyfan, Plegan, Medwy, and Elfan, to inform him in the Catholic truth. ButElfan is generally spoken of as messenger, along with Medwy, from Lucius to the pope, as having received baptism and the orders of a bishop from Elvanus, and then as having been sent back with two additional companions to teach his countrymen the faith. The Welsh authorities say that Elfan presided over a body of Christians at Glassonbury, where Harp- ofield says he was educated; but according to Jocelyne of Furnes, he succeeded Theunan, and thus became the second bishop of London. As contemporary with pope Elvanus, Elfan must be placed in the end of the 2nd century. Piseus, following Radulphus Niger and Bale, attributes to him a work entitled De Origine Ecclesiae Britanniae, and Demeter cites this by saying he was the first who illustrated Scotch affairs, and wrote in the ancient Scotch tongue Historia Scotiae, lib. 1., De origine Scotiae, lib. i.; but none of these extant or otherwise known. (Baronius, Ann. ii. a.D. 183; Radulphus Niger, Chron. a.D. 179, § 37; Bale, cent. i. c. 19; Piseus, de Hist. Angl. Scrip. 14, 79; Holland, Acta SS. Jan. i. tom. i. 10; Geoffrey Monm. Hist. l. cc. 19–29; Demeter, Hist. Inf. Gent. Not. l. 264; Usher, Hist. Inf. c. 31, u.s. v. 53 sq. ; Roes, V. Script. Sci. 32 sq.; Lib. Landar. 230 sq.; Gille, Hist. Anc. Brit. l. 255 sq.; R. Nicolson, Th. Hist. Libr. 96, 3rd ed.; Tanner, Bibl. 264; Creasy, Ch. Hist. Brit. l. 3 sq.)

[J. G.]

ELFIN (AELFFYN, AELFYW, ELVIN), Welsh saint of the 6th century, and son of Didan by Daudlow, daughter of Grynwr of Cefnogawr. The church of St. Elfin, co. Pembroke, is dedicated to him, and his name is probably derived from St. Ailbe, who may have baptized him when living at Menevia (Res, Welsh Saints, 162–3; Williams, Eloc Welsh. 11).

[J. G.]

ELFIN (ELPHIN) (1) was a saint of the college of St. Illtyd in the beginning of the 6th century. He was son of Gwvdan Garanhir by Garonhaw, descended according to the Welsh tradition from Maeen Wledig (i.e. Maximus the Roman emperor of the West). In the Myrygian Archaeology, vol. i. 17, and more fully in the Cambrian Quarterly Magazine, vol. v. 200, there is a prose tale or Mabinogion, entitled Hanes Taliesin, which gives a weird-like account of the saving of Taliesin by Elfthin from death in infancy and of Taliesin's gratitude, which among other things prompted the composition of the Dduadant Elphin, or The Consolations of Elfthin (Mgy. Arch. l. 20). This is in reality a romance, probably belonging to the 12th or 13th century. The Hanes Taliesin is also given, with a translation and notes, in Lady Cl. Guest's Mabinogion, iii. 321 sq. As Elfthin and Elphun his name often occurs in the poetry of Taliesin. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 108, 236–7; Skene's Peer Anc. Books of Wales, i. eu. 2–11; Williams, Eloc. Welsh. 138.)

ELFFYN (2), clerical witness to a grant made to Grecelis bishop of Llandaff, about the close of the 7th century (Lib. Land. by Recr. 421–22).

[J. G.]

ELFFRITT (Brut y Tywysog), text in M. H. B. 842, king of Northumbria, son of Oswy. [ALGFRETH (1), ALGFRETH.] [C. H.]

ELFLED (Nemius, Hist. Brit. cap. 66, in M. H. B. 74, b. marg. EANFED), daughter of Edwin king of Northumbria, an error for Eanfled, who had a daughter Elfled. [C. H.]

ELFLED (1) (AELFFLED, AELFLED, AELFLED), abbess of Whitby, daughter of Oswy king of Northumbria, and of Eanfled daughter of king Edwin. In 655 her father vowed that if she succeeded Penda king of Mercia, he would dedicate his child to God's service, and send her from him full-handed as well. The vow was achieved, and Elfled, then scarcely a year old, was set apart for a conventual life. Her father gave her a noble fortune, and sent her to the monastery of Heretau (Hartlepool), over which Hild was abbess. After two years Hild acquired some ground at Streaneshalh (Whitby), where she built a monastery, which became a house of renown. Thither Elfled went, and there, first as pupil and lastly as abbess, she spent the remainder of her life. She died at the age of fifty-nine, and was buried at Whitby, where her father and mother were interred (Bed. H. E. iii. 24). In the management of her house Elfled had for a long time the valuable help of Trumwine, sometime bishop of the Fricts, who died and was buried at Whitby. (Bed. H. E. iv. 26.)

In the latter days of Wilfrid, Elfled took a strong part in alyning the animosity against him, and it was chiefly her recollections of the last wishes of king Aldfrith which brought about his recall at the synod on the Nidd. Elfrith, full of gratitude, calls the peace-making abbess, "semper totius provinciae consolatrix, optimum consolatrix" (Vita Wilfridi, cap. xliii. lix. 1.)

Elfled was a friend and a great admirer of Cuthbert. On one occasion he is said to have cared her of an infirmity with his girdle (Bed. Vita S. Cath. cap. 23). In A.D. 684 she and Cuthbert had an interview on Coquet island, in the course of which he revealed to her the nearly approaching end of her brother Egfrith, and his own elevation to the episcopate (H. cap. 24). Elfled also gave an account to the anonymous biographer of Cuthbert of a vision in which the saint had beheld Hwadwald, one of the brethren at Whitby, carried up into heaven (Vita, inter Bed. Opp. Mss. 280–1, and Bed. Vita S. Cath. cap. 34).


ELFLEDA (2) (AELFLEDA, ADELEFLEDA, ASELEFLEDA), a daughter of Osra king of Mer-
ELFOD.

ELFOD (Elford). [S.]

ELFIRA (1), abbess of Repton (Ripon), the monastery in which St. Guthlac received the tonsure. (Msb. A.A. SS. O. S. B. sec. iii. pt. 1, p. 260.) [S.]

ELFIRA (2), daughter of Ofa king of Mercia. [ELFETHRITHA (2).] [C. H.]

ELFRYT (Bryt y Tywryd, Eng. transl. in M. H. B. 442), king of Northumbria, son of Oswy. [ALFETHRITHA (1), AELFRYTHA (1).] [C. H.]

ELFETHRITHA (1) (AELFRYTHA), a lady mentioned in the letter addressed by Wulhere, bishop of Lichfield, to Archbishop Rhyddodd, a widowed mother under Ceolwulf, king of the Mercians, had lately been held, in which “the reconciliation of Elfethritha was discussed. Nothing more is known of the matter; as the dates run, she may be identified with the abbess of Repton (ELFIRA (1)).” (See Haddon and Stubbs, vol. 275; Smith’s Bede, app. n. 24, pp. 700, 747. [S.]

ELFETHRITHA (2), daughter of Ofa, king of Mercia, betrothed to Ethelfred, king of the East Angles. (Dor. Wig. M. H. B. 619.) She is not mentioned by 0fa in the Charters (Kemble, C. D. 1.41) in which he names his other daughters, but she is described in the legendary life of St. Ethelred as a noble and claret; she was the sister of Ceolcan (Cirencester, Spec. Hist. ed. Mayor, i. 286, 287). Brompton (Twycoten, c. 730) adds that she retired as a solitary to the anchorites at Crewland, and that she prophesied that her brother Ethelfred would reign only three years after Ethelbert’s death. The author of the lives of the two Ofs calls her Aelfreda. (Vir. Hist., O.C. Ed. Wits, p. 24.) See ELFETHRITHA (3). There appears no authority for the spelling Elfida adopted by Hume. Florence writes it AELFRYTHA (Geneal. in M. H. B. 630), and ALFRYTHA (Ad Coro. App. in M. H. B. 638) ed.; Richard of Cirencester (Spec. Hist. i. 286, ed. Mayor) writes ALFRYTHA in the heading, and AELFRYTHA in the text; Brompton (Coron. in Twycoten X. Scrivitt, col. 750, 39), ALFRYTHA. Among later historians, Turner (Hist. Engl. i. 414, ed. 1839) writes Elfethritha; Lappenberg (Hist. Engl. ed. Thorpe, 1845, i. 235, 237), AELFRYTHA and (p. 291, Steamma) AELFRYTHA; Lindarg (Hist. Engl. i. 144, ed. 1849), Ethelreda. [S.]

ELFETHRITHA (3), the wife of Kenulf, king of Mercia. [KENULF. [S.]

ELFWAD (Chron. de Maires, ann. 791, ed. Stevenson), king of Northumbria, son of Oswulf. [ELFWAD (2).] [C. H.]

ELFWALD (1) (AELFWALD), king of East Anglia. According to the Chronicle of Malmesbury, he succeeded Szelred in 747 and died in 749, whereupon East Anglia was divided between Hunbain and Albert. Simeon of Durham also states, without mentioning Szelred, that Elfwald died in 749, when the kingdom was divided between Hunbain and Albert. William of Malmesbury is silent as to Elfwald, and states that Brunno, ie. Hunbain, was succeeded by Berulf and Ealduf, and the two by Elfwald (ob. 664). This last statement suggests the inquiry whether Malmesbury’s Elfwald may not be identical with the Elfwald of the Chron. Mcl. If he be, then this king and his brother Aulduf between them reigned eighty-five years (664-749), which is very difficult to conceive. Lappenberg assumes the identity, but does not appear to have observed what it involves. Hickes also assumes the identity, and makes Beorra succeed in 690, so reducing the united reigns of the two brothers to the reasonable period of twenty-six years, but he does not attempt to justify his chronology, and is evidently dissatisfied with it. The 80 years appears too conjectural. It appears preferable then to assume the non-identity of Ecclewood and Elfwall, and to attribute to Malmesbury an omission of the two kings mentioned by the Chron. Mcl., Szelred and Elfwall. Hardy takes this line, making the succession run thus:—Elfewald (ob. 664), Aulduf, Ecclewood, Szelred (ob. 747), Elfewald (ob. 749), Hunbain. The objection to this scheme would be that Szelred, whom the Chron. Mcl. reckons a king of East Anglia, was in reality king of the East Saxons. It is met by Hardy concluding that there must have been two Szelreds. It might also be met by an alternative hypothesis, that one Szelred ruled both the contiguous states.

In the correspondence of Boniface of Maltot occurs a letter to him from Elfwald, king of East Anglia, variously written by the editors Elfwald (Migne), Aelfwald (Jaffé and Sertrunus), Ashewald (Wurtzwein). It is dated by Migne A.D. 733, and by Jaffé 747-749. The king assures Boniface that his instructions as to masses and the frequency of prayers shall be followed in the monasteries of his kingdom; that Boniface’s name shall be held in perpetual memory in the services of the seven hours; that the royal bounty in support of the monasteries shall be regulated in accordance with Boniface’s recommendation; that Boniface shall be regarded as their patron; that the names of those who through Boniface’s prayers die in the faith of the undivided Trinity shall be introduced in the public prayers. (Chron. de Mailt, ed. Stevenson, pp. 4, 5, or in Gale’s Script. i. 137; Sym. Dun. ed. Surtess Soc. p. 19; Malm. G. R. A. i. 98, ed. Hardy, and note; Wend. F. H. ed. Cole, i. 154, ann. 655, note; Lappenberg, Hist. Engl. ed. Thorpe, i. 243, 244, Thorpe’s note 3, 287 General; Hickes’ Thesaur. pars 3, tab, chron. p. 184.) [ECLWALD, EAST ANGLES]. In 747-749 the see of Elfwall was occupied by either Ethelfrith or Eanfrith, and the see of Dunwich by Eardred or Eardulf, one of whom, if they are different persons, attended the council of Clovesho in 747. [C. H.]


G 2
ELFWIN

665 a, b, 666 c, 667 a, b, 668 a; Chron. de Maltros, ed. Stevenson, 758, 793; id. ann. 791, ed. Gale, Script. ii. 139, where Stevenson has Elfward, king of Northumbria, son of Oswulf [Alfwold].

[C. H.]

ELFWIN (Aelfuin, Aelwin, Elwin, Aelfwine), son of Osywy, and brother of Egfrid, kings at Northumbria. He was present with his brother of the dedication of Ripon minster (Eddi Viða Wiffridi, cap. 19). When Wilfrid appealed to Rome against the decision of Egfrid the courtiers were driven out on that day their laughter would be turned into tears. On that very day the corpse of Elfwin was brought to York amidst the lamentations of the whole kingdom (Id. cap. 19). This took place in a.D. 679. Elfwin was slain in a battle between Egfrid and his brother-in-law Ethelred king of Mercia, near the river Trent, being then only eighteen years of age. By the intervention of Archbishop Theodore Egfrid was satisfied with the payment of a blood-money from Ethelred, and peace was restored (Bed. H. E. iv. 21; Sax. Chron. Flor. Wigm. i. 35).

[J. R.]


[C. H.]

ELGAR, ST., the hermit, a life of whom is printed in the Liber Laudensis, p. 1. The life says that he was born in Devonshire, and taken by pirates as a slave to Ireland. He at last escaped to Bardsey, off Carnarvonshire, called in the British tongue Ynys Enlli, or the Island of the Current, from the violence of the current, now called Bardsey Race, between it and the mainland. The only dates mentioned are that Ructri, grandson of Conchor, was ruling in Ireland, and that North Wales was desolate for seven years (? by plague). His remains were removed to Llandaf, in 1120, after which date the life must have been written (see Haddan and Stubbs, Concilia, i. 161, who point out the very doubtful character of these lives. The legends are unhistorical, but the persons for the most part really existed).

[C. W. B.]

ELGISIL (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. 615.)

[ElwyStyl-]

ELGUSD lived in the latter half of the 6th century, but has no festival or church dedication. He was son of Cadfarch ab Caradog Fraithfocs ab Gwen. Gwen is known as St. Gwennelin of Talgarth, and was daughter or grand-daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog (Rees, Welsh Saints, 150, 202, 280).

[J. G.]

ELGWGORD. [Elwrgord.]

ELHAEARN (Aelhaiarn, Aelmayarn, Elmear), son of Hygfaerel ab Cynlynw of Llanon, Montgomeryshire, in Caernarvon, Montgomeryshire. His festival is Nov. 1, and he founded Llanelaia, Carnarvonshire, and Cegidvy, or Guilsfield, Montgomeryshire (Myvn. Arch. ii. 24, 41; Rees, Welsh Saints, 275; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 593; Williams, Emais. Welsh. 11). [J. G.]

ELHAEFED, a clerical witness to the grant of the village of Bertus by "King Ithael in the presence of Meirig (Ithael’s father), before the chief-tains of Glevysig, to bishop Berthgwyn,” as bishop of Llandaff, in the end of the 6th or opening of the 7th century (Lich. Land. by Rees, 440-41).

[J. G.]

ELI (Itu), a clerical witness to many grants to the church of Llandaff, while Berthgwyn and Trychan were the bishops, in the end of the 8th and beginning of the 7th centuries (Lich. Land. by Rees, 454 sq.).

[J. G.]

ELIAB, deacon and martyr of Ethiopia. He was one of forty martyrs, viz.: two bishops, Abdas and Elaneus, sixteen presbyters, nine deacons, six monks, and seven virgins, who were slain on Saturday, May 15, in the sixty-sixth year of Sapor II. king of Persia (309-381), a.d. 375. Eliab was one of the clergy of a city called Casarea, of which Abdas was bishop. Eliab is commemorated in the Ethiopian calendar on December 2 (see Assemari Acta SS. Martyrum Orientalum et Occidentalis, 1748, part i. p. 144; Ludolf, Historia Ethipica (ed. Baldus; Robertson, Ch. Hist. i. p. 291)). [J. W. S.]

ELIAN, Geimlad (the pilgrim), a Welsh saint, whose name is confused with that of Hilary. His churches at Llanelliai, Anglesey, and Llanelsi, Denbighshire (near Montgomery, of which is a famous well), were renowned for the care of diseases. His wake was held in August (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 297). [C. W. B.]

ELIANUS (Aelianus), the proconsul of Africa, before whom Felix bishop of Aptum, the successor of Caecilian of Carthage, was tried, and acquitted on the charge of having been a "traditor," a.d. 314. Optatus (Migne, Patr. Lat. xi.; De Schismate Donat. i. 25) narrates the actual words of the proconsul’s decision. Aelianus also received letters from the emperor Constantine about the conveyance of the African bishops to the council of Arles. (Ibid. Hist. vii. note 7; Ceillier, v. 112.) [L. D.]

ELIANUS (Aelianus), a pagan, with whom St. Gregory Thaumaturgus disputed. Certain expressions in the exposition of the faith that Gregory composed on this occasion were wrested by the Sabellians to the support of theiretical views, but St. Basil exposes the fallacy of their reasoning (Basil. Ep. 210, in Migne, Patr. Gr. xxxii. 316; Greg. Thaum. Frag. de Tris. in Migne, Patr. Gr. x. 1103, 1143; Ceillier, ii. 442.) [L. D.]

ELIANUS (Aelianus), one of the leaders of the rebellion of the Bagaudae in Gaul, to subdue which the Theban legion was brought by Maximian from the East. Aelianus was slain in the battle which decided the fate of the rebellion. (Entrop. Hist. ix. 20; Oros. vii. 25; Baroz. A. E. ann. 297, iv.; Martin, Hist. de France, i. 281; Ceillier. Aut. Eccl. ii. 473.) [R. T. S.]

ELIAS (I), bishop of Jerusalem, a.d. 494-513; he was an Arab by birth and received his education with his friend Martyrius, also bishop of Jerusalem, in one of the Nitrian monasteries. Being driven from Egypt by Timothy Aelurus, the two friends took refuge, a.d. 494, in the laura of St. Euthymius, who received them with great favour, admitted them to frequent converse, and predicted that they would both be bishops of Jerusalem. Euthymius took them to...
his companions in his periodical retreats and administered the Eucharist to them every Sunday (Cyril. Scyth. Vit. S. Euthym. nos. 94, 95). After a time Elias quitted the laura with Martyrius, and constructed for himself a cell at Jericho, which in process of time, by successive enlargements, became a monastery. The first friends met at Euthymius' death-bed in A.D. 473, though not present at his actual departure (ib. nos. 109, 110). Anastasius, the bishop of Jerusalem, having come down to the laura for the translation of the body of St. Euthymius, took Elias and Martyrius back with him and ordained them to the priesthood on the roll of the church of the Anastasis (ib. No. 111). Five years later, A.D. 478, Martyrius succeeded Anastasius as bishop of Jerusalem, and was followed by Sallustius in A.D. 486, who dying in A.D. 494, Elias became his successor. Moschus records that having practised total abstinence from wine as a monk he observed the same rule as bishop. In 535, according to the practice of the times his residence became the nucleus of a collection of cells of ascetics, which developed into a monastery adjacent to the church of the Anastasis (Cyril. Scyth. Vit. S. Sabae, c. 31). At the time of Elias' succession to the patriarchate, the Christian world exhibited a melancholy spectacle of discord. There were at least four great parties mutually anathematizing one another. The church of Rome denounced the whole of the East as heretical, with the exception of the monks of Constantinople, who thought more highly of communion with the bishop of Rome than with their own bishops, on account of their refusal to recognise the excommunication of Acacius. The Eastern church, though comprehended under the general ban, and forced into seeming unity by the Henoticion of Zeno, was split into three by intestine divisions. While Alexandria and the bishops of Egypt subscribed the Henoticion and rejected the decrees of Chalcedon, the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Constantinople, though also accepting the Henoticion, maintained themselves independent in law and fact; they were unwilling to enforce them. Besides this, there was the extreme section of the Eutychians or Monophysites, as they now preferred to be called, known as Acephali, who regarded the council of Chalcedon as tainted with Nestorianism, and cherished the memory of Dioscorus and Eutyches. Elias, as a leader of the party of the centre, was in communion with Euphemius of Constantinople, and on his deposition and banishment, in 496, ostensibly on the ground of treasonable practices, he maintained communion with his successor, the gentle and peaceable Macedonius, on being assured of his orthodoxy, though without expressing his approval of Euphemius' removal, much to the annoyance of the emperor Anastasius. When the Monophysite party in Syria, under the leadership of Xenias of Hierapolis, broke out into open insurrection, treating as heretics all who acknowledged the two natures, Elias was one of the chief objects of their attack. In A.D. 509 they demanded a confession of his faith, and Anastasius required him to convene a council to repudiate the decrees of Chalcedon. He declined to summon a council, but he drew up a letter to the emperor, containing a statement of his belief, accompanied by anathemas of Nestorius, Eutyches, Diodorus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. This letter was entrusted to members of the Acephali to convey to Constantinople. When it was opened, it was found to contain an anathema against the two natures. According, however, to the emperor, having falsified the document and thus laid him open to the charge, which he found it very hard to refute, of having condemned the council of Chalcedon (Evagr. H. E. iii. 31; Theodor. Lect. p. 561; Theophan. Chronogr. pp. 128, 130). Macedonius having been deposed A.D. 511, and Timotheus, the patrocles, summoned on the former occasion, he with Flavius declined to acknowledge the justice of Macedonius' deposition, and with the same result. Communion with Timotheus was of no avail, unless they would recognise him as the rightful bishop. On their refusal, the long-stifled wrath of Anastasius broke out vehemently against his two feeble and wavering antagonists, and he availed himself of the ready services of Soterichus, bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea, and Xenaisa, to accomplish their ruin. In obedience to the emperor's directions, a synod was convened at Side, A.D. 512, to condemn the decrees of Chalcedon and remove the two unaccommodating prelates (Theophan. p. 131; Marcellin. Chronicon; Coteler. Mon. Eccl. Gr. iii. 300; Lobbe, Concil. iv. 1414). Elias, in alarm, despatched St. Sabas to Constantinople to plead his cause with the emperor (Cyril. Scyth. Vit. S. Sab. No. 50). Meanwhile, he and his companion Flavius by their diplomatic address succeeded in breaking up the council before it had pronounced any sentence on them. After its separation they addressed complimentary letters to the emperor, acknowledging his disposal of their real sentiments. By this mean compliance they succeeded in keeping their see a short time longer. Their implacable enemies, Soterichus and Xenaisa, furious at having missed their aim, represented to the emperor that he had been imposed upon by these adroit masters of language, who were really at heart supporters of the impious doctrines of Nestorius. Anastasius, ready to believe the worst of those who had repeatedly opposed his wishes, gave them permission to do what they pleased with the culprits. St. Sabas, however, had not yet left Constantinople, and pleaded the cause of Elias so effectually that Anastasius revoked the order for his deposition (Coteler. s. a. p. 300). But all his concessions were in vain. Flavius' sentence of deposition was carried into effect, and Severus, the leader of the Acephali, having been made patriarch of Antioch in his room in A.D. 512, Elias steadfastly refused all token of communion with him. Once and again the synodal letters of the intruder and the act of deposition of Flavius were contemptuously rejected by the patriarch, together with the clergy and laity of Jerusalem (Evagr. H. E. iii. 33). St. Sabas supported them in their resolution.
complained to the emperor in strong terms of this insult. Anastausius, determined to bring matters to a point, despatched Olympius, count of Palestine, to give Elias his choice between submission or deposition. To damage his cause with the orthodox, the emperor put in Olympius' hands Elias' former letter, in which to save his see he repudiated the decrees of Chalcedon. Elias was now in a great strait. He lacked the strength for prolonged resistance. But for the earnest entreaties of St. Sabas and the monks of Jerusalem he might have yielded again, but, backed by their moral support, he persisted in his refusal, and was forcibly driven from his episcopal seat by Olympius, and banished to Aila, on the shores of the Red Sea, A.D. 513. He survived his banishment five years, breathing his last A.D. 518, during a visit of St. Sabas and other abbas, having previously, it was said, seen a vision which announced the death of his old enemy, the emperor Anastausius, and bade him follow in ten days (Moschus, Prat. Spirit. c. 35; Cyril. Scytoph. Vit. S. Eob. no. 80). Before he expired, he gave directions for the government of the monasteries he had founded, the oversight of which he had continued during his banishment. He was eighty-eight years old at the time of his death. (Tillemont, Mémo. Eccl. vii.; Cyril. Scytoph. Vita S. Euthymii; Vita S. Sabae; Joannes Moschus, Prat. Spiritual.; Evagrius, H. E. iii. 31, 39; Theophan. Chronogr.) [E. V.]

ELIAS (3) II., bishop of Jerusalem, c. A.D. 760-797, of whom very little is certainly known. His see was invaded by an ambitious monk named Theodorus before A.D. 763. In this year Theodorus joined in the condemnation of Cosmas, bishop of Ephesus, on the charge of Iconoclasm (Theophan. p. 260). Theodorus also sent synodal letters to Rome, concerning the worship of images, in A.D. 767 and 769. Theodorus is charged with having secured the deposition of Elias, by accusing him of crimes to the chief-counselor (πρωτοσύμβουλος) of Arelia, by whom he was thrown into prison, loaded with fetters, and banished. The date of his restoration is uncertain. He, together with the other patriarchs of the East, was represented at the second Council of Nicaea, A.D. 787, by Joannes, a presbyter, and Thomas, the provost of the convent of St. Arsenius, near Egyptia, Babylon. (Papebroch, nos. 167, 172; Leontius, Vita S. Steph. Sabattae, c. 5; Le Quen, Or. Chríst. iii. 300.) [E. V.]

ELIAS (3) (AELIUS, HELIAS), bishop of Lystra, next but one after St. Ireneus. No particulars of his life are known, but Gregory of Tours (de Glórdi Consecr. c. 62) relates a curious legend that a robber coming to spoil the corpse of Helias was seized in its arms and held fast till found by the authorities and condemned to death; but the corpse would not let him be taken away for execution, and retained him until he was forgiven. (Gall. Chríst. iv. 13; Gams, Scr. Ep. 569.) [R. T. S.]

ELIAS (4) (HELIAS), bishop of Sedunum (Sion, Sitten). In the island of St. Julianus on the lake of Orta, not far from Lago Maggiore, rest the remains of Elias, who is venerated in that place as a hermit who brought the bones of St. Audensius into Italy. An ancient inscription, however, is said to have described him as bishop of Sion in the Valais. But his age is very uncertain. If, as some say, he succeeded St. Julius, he must have lived about the beginning of the 5th century, but others assign him a later date. The Sammarthani relate that he transferred the see from Octodurum to Sion, in consequence of the prevalence of floods in the former place. (Gall. Chríst. xii. 735; Acta SS. 21 Mar. iii. 360.) [R. T. S.]


ELIAS (6), bishop of Balandus, or Blandes, a town of unknown position in the province of Lydia, present at the ecumenical council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quen, Oriens Chrísti. i. 890; Mansi, vi. 1089.)

ELIAS (7), bishop of Seleucia-belus on the Orontes, in Syria Secunda. He signed the synodal letter of the bishops of Syria Secunda, addressed to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 551; Le Quen, Or. Chrísti. ii. 922.) [J. de S.]

ELIAS (8), bishop of Majorca, A.D. 484. His name appears in that year among the suffragan bishops of the Sardinian see of Cagliari, who attended the colloquy held at Carthage between the Catholic and Arian bishops under the Vandal rule, by command of Hunnerich, king of the Vandals (see Dahn, Könige der Germanen, i. 250). In the 9th century the Balearic islands are found attached to the bishopric of Gerona; in the eleventh they were transferred to Barcelona. At the present time the bishop of Palma is a suffragan of the archbishopric of Valencia. (Villanueva, Vía Litéraria d' las Iglesias de España, xii.; Gams, Series Episc. Harduin, ii. 875.) [M. A. W.]

ELIAS (9) (EOLIA), bishop of Fezoumi in the canton of Dourourperan in Great Armenia, succeeded Isaac III. as catholicos or patriarch of Armenia. According to the list of Saint-Martin he ruled from A.D. 703 to 718. The same author gives Ardishch as his birth-place. (Saint-Mart. Hist. Armen. i. 438; Le Quen, Or. Chrísti. t. 1390.) [ARMENIANS.]

ELIAS (10), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. [HELIAS.]

ELIAS (11), bishop of Rachlena in Phocis. He took part in the synod of the Phocianian province, held at Tyre, A.D. 518, to condemn the heresy of Severus. (Mansi, viii. 920; Le Quen, Or. Chrísti. ii. 831.) [J. de S.]

ELIAS (12), bishop of Joppa, who, in the synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 518, signed the letter of John of Jerusalem to John of Constantinople against the errors of Severus (Labbe, v. 191), and in A.D. 556, the sentence of Peter of Jerusalem against Anthimus (Ibid. 283). (Le Quen, Or. Chrísti. iii. 628.) [E. V.]

ELIAS (13), bishop of Botrys in Phocis. He adopted the heresy of Severus, and was executed...
thematized in the synod of Tyre, A.D. 518. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 827.)

ELIAS (14) (Heliæa), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, who signed the sentence against Anthimus in the synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 536. His name stands second after Peter of Jerusalem. (Labbe, v. 283; Le Quien, Ori. Christ. iii. 572.)

ELIAS (15), bishop of Hadriana (Iambouli; Lat. version, Adrianopolis) in Bithynia, of which town coins are extant. He is mentioned in the accounts of the synod of Constantineople under Mennas, which condemned Anthimus, A.D. 536, though his name is found nowhere in the subscriptions. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 625; Mansi, viiii. 879, 880 A.)

ELIAS (16), bishop of Areopoli (Rabbath-Moab), on the left bank of the river Arnon. Mansi’s Greek text names the see Ραββαθος, but the Latin has Hadrianaeopoli, with Areopoli in the margin. Elias was present at the synod held at Jerusalem under the patriarch Peter, A.D. 536, and signed the sentence upon Anthimus. (Mansi, viii. 1175, 1174 A; Le Quien, Ori. Christ. iii. 736.)

ELIAS (17), metropolitan of Thessalonica, c. A.D. 548 to 553, subscribed the profession of certain bishops concerning the three chapters, which is included in the “constitutum” of pope Vigilius addressed to the emperor Justinian (Mansi, ix. 64). At the fifth general council, Benignus bishop of Heraclea in Macedonia, one of his suffragans, acted as his proxy. (Mansi, ix. 389; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 38; Gams, Series Episc. 429.)

ELIAS (18) (Heliæa), bishop of Diocletianopolis. It is doubtful whether this was the see situated in Thrace or the one in Palestine. (See Wiltisch, Handbuch der kirchlichen Geographie, i. 172, and note 4, 210, and note 21.) Harduin mentions a third Diocletianopolis in Phrygia, which, as well as the other, is now impossible to trace. An Elias, bishop of one of these sees, was present at the fifth general council at Constantinople, A.D. 553. Le Quen places him under the Thracian see as well as under the Palestinian, without deciding to which he belongs. Gams assigns him to both sees, as though there were an Elias in each that year. (Mansi, ix. 176 B, 392 C; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 1164, iii. 464; Gams, Series Episc. 427, 455.)

ELIAS (19), archbishop (or metropolitan) of Aquileia, c. 572, successor of Probus. (Paulus Diaconus iii. 14.) His predecessor, Paulinus, had fled before the Lombards in 568 to the island of Grado. Elias is said to have held a synod in 579 (in hoc castro Gradensiac nostram confirmare metropolitam), with nineteen other bishops, to confirm the translation of the see to Grado. (Chronica Patriarcharum Gradensiae in Mon. Bolland. 1878, p. 393.) According to this, probably the earliest authority, the synod appears to have been held in 582. This synod has given rise to much discussion. It is probably apocryphal, and the letter of Pelagius II. consenting that Grado shall be the metropolis of Venetia and Istria spurious. (Hefele, § 472; Mansi, ix. 929; and Jaffé, Regest. Pont. i. 168.) A full discussion of the matter is found in De Rubris, Monum. Eccl. Aquil. p. 227.

Elias and others had been unwilling to subscribe to the condemnation of the Three Chapters passed by the council of Chalcedon, and he was at the head of those bishops of Venetia and Istra who refused to hold communion with Rome on account of her views in the matter. Gregory the Great, then a deacon, intervened between Pelagius II. against them, and it is thought that he himself wrote them the letters which bear his master’s name (Pelagii Epist. 3, 4, 5; Greg. Mag. Epist. ii. num. 86). The authority for Gregory’s authorship is Paulus Winfridus, A.D. 784 (Patr. Lat. xcv.; De Gestis Langobardorum, cap. 10, xx.). The letters were unsuccessful, and Pelagius stirred up the exarch Sumaragus against Elias and three other Istrian bishops, Joannes Parentinus, Severus, and Vin- demius. Sumaragus dragged Elias from the basilica at Grado, and carried him off with his suffragans to Ravnena, where he forced him to communicate with Joannes, metropolitan of Ra- venna, who was consecrated by Grado, the end of a year they returned to Grado. The people and the other local bishops refused to communicate with them. Sumaragus afterwards fell into disgrace, and returned to Constantinople. A synod of bishops subsequently accepted Severus as their patriarch, on his re- cantation of his weakness in submitting to communion with the Catholic patriarch of Ravenna. Elias is said to have died about the time of Greg- ory’s mission of Augustine to England. But the account of Paulus Winfridus Daciaeus is obscure, and it is not perfectly clear that Elias was really dragged to Ravenna with the other bishops by Sumaragius. Baronius also points out his mistake in describing John, patriarch of Ravenna, as in ecclesia communicatis in 558, and not in 553, as charged by Grado. (Paulus Winfr. De gest. Langobardorum, iii. 26, in Patr. Lat. xciv. 557; Baronius, A.D. 586, 26; Jaffé, Regest. Pont. c. ann. 585, letters 686-688.) He was succeeded by Severus. [A. H. D. A. & W. M. S.]

ELIAS (20), bishop of Poreno, in Istra, c. 558, of somewhat doubtful authenticity. (Gams, 799; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia, viii. 785; Ughezzi, Italia Sacra, v. 396.)

ELIAS (21), circ. A.D. 640, bishop of the Jacobites and writer of a letter to Leo bishop of Charsa (Haran), in which he gives apologetic reasons for having passed from the faith of Chalcedon to the sect of the Monophysites. He mentions the work of George bishop of Tagrit against Probus and Philoponus, and his letter to the monks of St. Matthew. He also mentions Constantine bishop of Haran, and three books which he had written against the Monophysites (Anonymi Biblioth. Oriental. i. 465, 466; Cellier, vii. 107.)

ELIAS (22), bishop of Coria, signs the Decretum Gundemarii, 610. (See Giesenhain; Expag. Sagra. xiv. 56; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 324.)

ELIAS (23), bishop of Libyaeum, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 844.
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which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Hefele, § 307; Mansi, x. 967.) [A. H. D. A.]

ELIAS (24), bishop of Syracuse, a Benedictine, c. 656. (Cappelletti, La Chiesa d’Italia, xxi. 659.) [A. H. D. A.]

ELIAS (25), bishop of Iconium, the metropolis of Lycaonia, present at the synod held at Constantinople A.D. 692, called Quinisexta or Trullan (Mansi, xi. 992; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1071). [L. D.]

ELIAS (26), bishop of Seville in the 8th century, appears thirty-seventh in the catalogue of the bishops of Seville contained in the Codex Aemilianensis in the Escorial (A.D. 962–994; see Gonzalez, Collectio Canon. Eccl. Hist. præf.). He is the second bishop after the Moorish invasion, and comes next after the tritorus Oppas. [MARCELJUS.] (Eosp. Sapr. ix. 124, 293.) [M. A. W.]

ELIAS (27) CRETENSIS, bishop of Gortyna and metropolitan of Crete, at the second council of Nicea, A.D. 787 (Labbé, vii. 39, 323, 661, 704). Several works are ascribed to him, is a commentary on these nineteen orations of St. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 19, 23, 24–30, 33–37, 51, 52). The commentary is not continuous, but takes the form of explanatory notes on various words and expressions. These commentaries were first published in Latin by Billius, at the end of his editions of Gregory Nazianzen, the first of which appeared at Paris, in 1583; and in Greek by Albert Jahn, Berne, 1858, and in the Patrologia of Migne (xxvi. pp. 737–902). Jahn has added a satisfactory proof (printed also by Migne, u.s.) that the author of the commentaries was a different person from the Elias who attended the council of Nicea, in the fact that he quotes Basilius, surnamed 'Edysapros (to distinguish him from Basil the Great), who lived in the first half of the 10th century, and his contemporary Gregorius (Oudin, de Script. Eccl. i. 649; ii. 428, 443). Jahn places this Elias in the middle of the 11th century.

To Elias is also ascribed a huge commentary in these volumes, on the Symbol Parodiun of Joannes Climacus, MSS. of which exist in the collection of Cardinal Bessarion at Venice, and in the Cosinian and Chigian libraries. Nic. Commersus mentions a work of Elias, de Moribus Ethnorum (p. 213), also several series of answers to the questions of monks in cases of conscience, the whole of which Jahn considers variant forms of the Response ad Monachum Dionysium, printed in v. Juris Graeco-Roman. (pp. 335–341; Oudin, de Script. Eccl. ii. 1066; Ceiller, ii. 691; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 641; Fabr. Bibl. Graec. viii. 430; ix. 525; xi. 615.) [E. V.]

ELIAS (28), bishop of Jabruda in Phoenicia Secund, north-east of Damascus. He is known only by the mention in a Greek Codex of Joannes Damascenus. Gams places him in the 8th century. (See Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 846; Gams, Spec. Ep. 435.) [J. de S.]

ELIAS (29), sent from Egypt with some companions to minister to the necessities of the confessors in Cilicia. They were all arrested in the city of Ascalon by the spies appointed to watch the gates, and like those to whom they had come to minister were mutilated in their eyes and feet. Three of them, Ares, Elias, and Promus, were martyred. Ares was burned, Elias and Promus were beheaded by orders of Firmilian, governor of Palestine (A.D. 308), during the reign of Galerius and Maximian. They are commemorated Dec. 14. (Eus. Mart. Pal. x.; Ruinart, AA. Sincera Mart. 330; Men. Bas.; Baron. 307, xiv.) [T. S. B.]

ELIAS (30) had also gone to Cilicia from Egypt with four companions; they were all arrested and brought before Firmilian. After they had been tortured, they were asked their names, and (doubtless because they had been originally named after some of the idol gods) they replied that their names were Elias, Jeremias, Elias, Samuel, and Daniel. They were then asked what country they came from; their reply was that Jerusalem was their city. The judge, not understanding their meaning, thought that the Christians must be about to establish collectively a city in opposition to the Romans, and so he put them to further torture, hoping to gain information from them. Failing in this, he sentenced them to be put to death (A.D. 309). They are commemorated Feb. 16. (Eus. Mart. Pal. xi.; Men. Bas.; Ruinart, 380; Baron. 308, iv.) [T. S. B.]

ELIAS (31), a priest who suffered martyrdom in Palestine during the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 305. On the dispersion of the Christians who were working in the copper mines, he was sent with three companions to the military governor, and on his refusal to abjure Christianity was burnt alive. Eusebius in his Martyr. Pal. does not give his name, but it is mentioned with those of his fellow-martyrs in the Menaes of Basilii, 19th Sept. (Basil. Men. i. 53; Ceiller, iii. 13.) [L. D.]

ELIAS (32). [SEBASTE, FORTY MARTYRS OF.]

ELIAS (33), March 27 (Symeon Metaphrast.), Dec. 24 (Assennat). Martyr in Damascus under Sapor II. A.D. 327 with Erichus and nine others. Ruinart and Tillemont would postpone this martyrdom to the persecution which began in A.D. 343, denying that there was any persecution at the earlier date. However the exhortation against persecuting the Christians contained in the letter of Constantine to Sapor looks as if a persecution had already taken place. (Euseb. Vita Const. lib. iv. cap. xi.; Boll. Acta SS. Mart. iii. 691; Assenn. Mart. Or. et Occ. i. 215.) [G. T. S.]

ELIAS (34), a martyr of the 5th century. Commemorated Jan. 14. (AA. SS. Jan. i. 553; Ruinart, AA. Sincera Mart. 334.) [T. S. B.]

ELIAS (35), governor of a monastery for women, described as of Atritibus in the Delta, an excellent disciplinarian (optimus exercitator) and an especial friend of unmarried females (amanissimus virginum). Having property at Atritibus, he erected there a large monastery for the reception of vagrant persons of that condition under his own management, he being between thirty and forty years of age. He supplied all the wants of his inmates, about three hundred in number, and provided gardens and implements for their occupation. But they
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won’t not live in harmony among themselves, and in the discharge of his duties as peacemaker he was brought into close and frequent intercourse with them. So great did he find the snares of such a position for himself as well as for them that he one day fled in despair from the monastery. The same night he had a vision of angels, who so strengthened his mind while he slept that he awoke a different man, and soon returned to his charge, in which he continued for forty years, without any further annoyance from his carnal nature. (Pallad. Laua. Hist. viii. 35, in Patr. Lat. lxxiii. 1135.)

[CH.]

ELIAS (38), solitary near Antinous, capital of the Thebaid, 4th century. The same account of him is attributed to Palladius (Hist. Lausiac. viii. 51, in Patr. Lat. lxxiii. 1154), and to Rufinus Aquileienses (Historia Monachorum, 12, in Patr. Lat. xxi. 452). The writer, whoever he was, saw him with his own eyes; they said he was about 110 years old, and that he had passed seventy years in that awful solitude, the horror of which no tongue could express. It was high on the bare mountains, approached only by a narrow and rugged path, hardly to be discovered by travellers. The place where he sat was a terrible cavern; and more horrid dread seized the minds of those who dared to look in. For from his extreme age he shone visibly in every limb. He was said to effect many cures. Nobody remembered the time when he had retired to this desert. He was believed to eat three ounces of bread daily, and three olives of an evening. In his youth he had only touched food once a week.

[W. M. S.]

ELIAS (37), a solitary of Palestine, near the Dead Sea. His cell being near one of the chief roads, he showed hospitality to all wayfarers who needed it. (Pallad. Hist. Laus. c. 110-111, p. 1026.)

[E. V.]

ELIAS (38), abbot of a monastery in Syria, celebrated for his personal holiness and the wisdom of his rule. Alexander Acacemites spent four years of his early life (c. A.D. 378) under his discipline, but left him on the plea that the precepts of the Gospel were violated in his community because what was necessary to supply the daily wants of the brethren was provided beforehand, and something was left for the wants of the morrow. (Bolland. Jan. 15, p. 1021, § 4-6.)

[E. V.]

ELIAS (39), abbot and presbyter of Isauria, in the diocese of Antioch, towards the close of the 5th century. He sent Epiphanius, one of his monks, to Gregory L., A.D. 555, with an apology for not coming to him in person, on the plea of illness and old age, and a request that a copy of the Gospels might be sent to him, and a sum of money for his monastery: he also prayed that his messenger might receive orders. Gregory complied with all his requests, but detained Epiphanius at Rome, refusing to allow him to return to the monastery, on the plea that no one who had received orders in “this church” was ever permitted to leave it. (Greg. Ep. V. xiii. 38; Baron. Mar. xcv., xxvi. 1xxx.)

[T. W. D.]

ELIAS (40), circ. A.D. 621, presbyter at Jerusalem. He is said by the writer of the Acts of Anastasius the Persian to have been in charge of the church of the Holy Resurrection; his holiness is spoken of in the highest terms; and it was to him that Anastasius (at that time named Magundat) was brought for baptism by his host the silversmith. Elias consulted Modestus bishop of Jerusalem, and then gave him the rite. (Symeon Metaph. Vit. S. Anastasii Perae, § 5, in Patr. Gr. citiv. 778 c; quoted in Surius de Prot. Hist. 22 Jan. i. 362, ed. 1617, and in Baron. A. E. an. 621, xl.)

[W. M. S.]

ELIAS (41) (ELIAS), president of Cappadocia, to whom on his entrance on his government Basil wrote, A.D. 372, to defend himself from the calumnies brought against him by his enemies in connexion with the hospital he had recently established in the suburbs of Caesarea. (Basil. Epist. 94 [372?].) [BASILII OF CAESAREA, vol. i. p. 291, b.] In the same year Basil wrote to Elias in behalf of an aged man, whose orphan grandson, only four years old, had been placed on the senatorial roll, thus compelling his grandfather to serve again (Epist. 94 [389]). Garnier and Cellini probably right in identifying Elias with the governor of Cappadocia, who, to the grief of the province had been removed from his office after a brief rule, through the calumnies of those whom his highminded uprightness had displeased, in whose behalf Basil wrote in A.D. 373 to his early friend and fellow townsman, Sophronius, prefect of Constantinople (Epist. 96 [392]). Basil commends this governor most highly for his incorruptible integrity, his justice, his impartiality, his accessibility, as well as for the favour he had shewn to the Christians, and begs Sophronius to plead his cause with the emperor, and dispel the calumnies of his enemies. This governor is identified by Tillemont with Theresius, but was probably mistaken.

[V. E.]

ELIAS (42) SCHOLASTICUS, an advocate of Cynicus, to whom Theodoret transmitted the chief of a band of robbers, named Abram, together with the persons he had plundered and the evidence of the case, with the desire that Elias would compel the evildoers to restore their plunder. (Theod. Epist. x.)

[V. E.]

ELIAS (43), friend and slayer of Justinian II. A.D. 711. As the tyranny and cruelty of that prince grew darker, Bardanes and Elias, an officer in high command, conspired against him. Justinian, in the violence of impotent anger, had the children of Elias slaughtered in the bosom of their mother, and gave her to his own Indian cook, a monster, according to one MS., of deformity. After the defection of his fleet and army, and the death of his heir Tiberius, Justinian was made a slave, Sinope by Elias, cut off his head with his own hand. (Theophanis, Chronographia, 317, 318, 319, Patr. Gr. evii. col. 368; Baron. Annal. ad ann. 711, viii.)

[W. M. S.]

ELIAS, APOCALYPSE OF. An apocalyptic work under this title was current in the 2nd century, and was supposed by Origen (35 in Mith. 27, vol. iii. p. 916) to have been the source whence Paul took the quotations he hath not seen.” &c. (1 Cor. ii. 9). This view is controverted by Jerome, who refers the quotation to Isaiah lxxiv. 4 (xvii. in Isaicam, iv. 761
ELIDIUS

Vallar.; Ep. ad Pammach. 54, i. 919). See HIER-EPHEM. It is no doubt the same work which is rejected, Ap. Const. vi. 16, and in the Synopsis Sac. Script. ascribed to Athanasius, ii. 154.

[G. B.]

ELIDIUS (1), ST., from whom one of the Scilly Isles is named. The name is now corrupted into "St. Helen's Isle"; but we find in William of Worcester's extracts from the Calendar of Tavistock, "S. Elidii episcopi 8 die Augusti. Jacet in insula Syllya;" and again, "Saint Lyda filius regis;" and see Leland, Rit. 3, p. 9. Some Geraldine chapels in Cornwall seem to be dedicated to him under the name of "St. Lyde," once in conjunction with the Irish saint, St. Ida, and hence Elidius also has been supposed to have come from Ireland. His name is sometimes confused with that of Loy or Eloy, i.e. Eligius, bishop of Noyon (see Monasticon, l. 596, 1002, and Whitaker's Cathedral of Cornwall, ii. p. 211).

[C. W. B.]

ELIDIUS (2), martyr. He was an acolyte of St. Praesulius (Prix), bishop of Clermont, and was slain with St. Ammaeus at Volvic, in the Auvergne, as they were returning from the court of Childeric II. (674). He is commemorated Jan. 25. (See the second Vita S. Praesulii, cap. iii. 18-20, in Boll. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 635.)

[S. A. B.]

ELIEZER B. HYRCANOS, also called Eliezer the Great, or simply R. Eliezer, one of the most distinguished Jewish teachers during the 1st century of the Christian era. He was brother-in-law of Gamaliel II., who succeeded to the presidency of the Sanhedrin about A.D. 80. His father, Hyrcanos, who was a wealthy farmer, intended him to cultivate his estates, but he found that a quiet rural life was uncongenial to his active mind, and having felt an uncontrollable desire for study, he betook himself, contrary to his father's wishes, to Jerusalem at the age of twenty-two. Here he placed himself at the feet of the celebrated R. Johanan b. Saccai, and soon became one of his most distinguished disciples. When Hyrcanos, a few years afterwards, came to the metropolis to disinherit his son for having acted contrary to his wishes, he found that Eliezer had already attained the position of a prominent teacher, and that well-known disciples attended his public lectures. Instead of discarding him, Hyrcanos now offered him all his property, but this Eliezer declined, declaring that he would only accept an equal share with the other children. His prodigious memory made him a living depositary of the canon and civil laws, which were developed in the course of time, and which were orally transmitted from school to school for generations. His teacher, R. Johanan b. Saccai, therefore aptly described him when he said that "he was like a well-cemented cistern, which never loses a drop of water" (Mishna Aboth, ii. 8). He moreover declares that "if all the sages of Israel were put in one scale, and R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos in the other, he would outweigh them all." (Mishna Aboth, ii. 8). After the destruction of Jerusalem, he went with R. Johanan b. Saccai, and other doctors of the law, to Yabne. Here the Sanhedrin continued to hold their sittings under the presidency of R. Gamaliel II. Of this distinguished assembly he was a prominent member. But his deep originality, his independence of opinion, and his determination not to be overruled by any pretensions in matters of conscience, soon brought him into serious collision with the president and with his colleagues. Gamaliel, who feared lest the dissolution of the Jewish state and the dispersion of the nation, should bring about the loss of some of the traditional laws, and thus produce diversity of opinion, determined to secure once for all uniformity of faith and practice. To effect this, the distinguished doctors of the law who constituted the Sanhedrin brought forward the different cases with their different interpretations, which were handed down in the respective schools, and the president ruled that the decision of the majority was to carry every point, and that it should henceforth be unalterably binding. The canon thus carried was at once shewn to be implied or expressed in some verse of the Mosaic law by the elastic rules of interpretation or application which were in vogue in the time of Christ.

For such work of co-operation and compromise, Eliezer was ill-fitted. His principles of interpretation were adverse to those of R. Joshua, R. Akiba, and others who were distinguished members of the Sanhedrin. They maintained that every particle, to the very sign of the accusative (Pn), represented some recondite law, and ought to be explained accordingly. He advocated the literal meaning of the Bible, and declared that when a canon obtained in the course of time, having been called forth by circumstances unforeseen in the Mosaic law, it should be regarded as an independent oral law, and no attempt should be made to find it into the Bible. He moreover could not recognize the principle that the majority is infallible, and hence on one occasion would not abide by their decision, especially when the point at issue was a question of memory, involving the accurate record of ancient tradition. The immediate cause of rupture between him and the Sanhedrin was a difference of opinion about the treatment of an oven of parallel construction. The majority decided that it comes under the category of earthenware, and hence is capable of defilement. R. Eliezer, who remembered an ancient tradition to the contrary, would not submit to the decision, and practically acted against it. For this insubordination R. Gamaliel II., the president of the Sanhedrin, his own brother-in-law, excommunicated him (Jubia Metzia, 50 b).

The manner in which this Rabbi who lived in the Apostolic age was excommunicated, and the issues involved in it, as described in the Talmud, strikingly illustrate those passages in the New Testament where this penalty is spoken of (John ix. 22, xii. 43, xvi. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15). Before the sentence of excommunication was pronounced, the offender was admonished three times on three different occasions, generally on Monday, Thursday, and Monday. It was only when he persisted in the offence after these several admonitions that the excommunication was pronounced, which was called Nidah (Yid), and Shematha (Shemepr). If the offender was present, the judge stepped forward, rent his garments, and said, "A, thou art punished as an excommunicated person." During the period of this penalty, which at first was only for a week or month, thus allowing time for repentance, the sufferer had to tear his garments, wear mourning, sit on the ground, and be excluded from free intercourse with his friends.
It was only on very exceptional occasions that the nature of the guilt was publicly proclaimed, and that a horn was blown to announce it. If the offender was absent, the judge declared, "A has the penalty of excommunication inflicted upon him," and the sentence was then conveyed to him by an official. If the offender died during the period of suspense and submission, the tribunal ordered a stone to be put on his coffin "to indicate that he who is excommunicated and dies in his excommunication is stoned in his coffin." (Mishna Eduyoth, v. 6). In the case of R. Eliezer, his own favoured disciple, R. Akiba, conveyed to him the sentence of excommunication, and the mournful narrative which records the event gives a vivid picture of the religious life and practices in the time of Christ. "Everything which R. Eliezer declared was collected and burnt with fire, then the majority of the members of the Sanhedrin was counted against him, and he was sentenced to excommunication. Whereupon the question was asked of his teacher, 'What can I do to help?' R. Akiba answered, 'I will go, lest some inferior person should go and announce it, and thereby cause irreparable damage to the world.' R. Akiba then dressed in mourning, and wrapped himself up in black, and sat down on the ground before him at a distance of four cubits. R. Eliezer exclaimed, 'Akiba, why differest this day from all other days?' He replied, 'Rabbi, it seemeth to me that thy colleagues have separated from thee.' He too, then, tore his garments, took off his shoes, left his stool and sat down on the ground, tears rolling down from his eyes." (Baba Metzia, 59 b). Never was so bitter a message conveyed in a more tender manner.

Thus excommunicated, R. Eliezer left Yanniah, and removed to Lydda and Caesarea, where he established schools, and had numerous disciples. The sympathy which the people felt with this distinguished scholar is seen in the public apology which the president of the Sanhedrin was obliged to make for his rigorous measure. When R. Akiba conveyed the sentence of excommunication to R. Eliezer, he told R. Gamaliel was at sea. "A fearful storm arose against him, threatening to swallow him up. He exclaimed, 'It seemeth to me that this cometh upon me because of R. Eliezer b. Hycranos.' He then stood up and said, 'Lord of the Universe, it is revened and known to Thee that I have not done it to exalt myself, or to exalt my father's house, but to exalt Thee, and lechism should take place in Israel.' Whereupon the sea became calm." (Baba Metzia, 59 b). Though the storm of public opinion against the president of the Sanhedrin was thus allayed, the kindly feelings towards the learned Rabbi, discharged from his membership of the national assembly, increased in intensity. His schools, both at Lydda and Caesarea, were much frequented, and his teachings greatly influenced and moulded Jewish doctrines and practice in Palestine during the Apostolic age. His frequent intercourse with the disciples of Christ, and with the first preachers of the Gospel, tended to preserve feelings of amity between those of his brethren who believed, and those who did not believe, that Jesus was the Christ, thus affording a peacable platform for discussion of the claims to the Messiahship of Him who was sentenced to death by some of the same members of the Sanhedrin which afterwards excommunicated R. Eliezer. As it is of the utmost interest and importance to the student of ecclesiastical history and theology to know what doctrines were propounded by eminent expounders of the law, and what were the phases of faith which competed with the teachings of the Apostles in the infancy of Christianity on its native soil, we subjoin a brief summary of the teachings and sayings of this excommunicated member of the Sanhedrin.

The cardinal doctrines which R. Eliezer urged on his disciples were absolute faith in the goodness, justice, and mercy of God as our heavenly Father, and a corresponding filial confidence in Him, which should manifest itself in loving Him above all things, in walking before Him in holiness and righteousness, in scrupulously obeying His commandments, and in living a life of union with Him from whom all our blessings flow, and from whom no evil can proceed, who punishes the evil-doer, but shews mercy to the penitent. On the passage "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thine might," he remarks, 'Why this treble expression of heart, soul, and wealth?' It is to teach thee that there are some who love life more than mammon, and that there are others who love mammon more than life. Now, the love of God is to be above both life and wealth" (Pessachim, 25 c).

Man should pray for his daily bread. To be anxious for the future betrays a want of confidence in the goodness of God, and is evidence of little faith. 'He who hath stili bread in his basket and saith what shall I eat to-morrow, belongeth to those of little faith' (Sota, 48 b). This is a striking illustration of Matt. vi. 30-34. Next to the love of God He laid the greatest stress on the reverence and obedience due to parents. He was once asked, 'To what extent is the honouring of parents to go?' To which he replied, 'Go and learn it from a heathen who resided at Ashkelon, and whose name was Dama b. Nethina, what he did. The sages came to him to buy precious stones for the ephod for a very large sum, but the key of the box containing them was under the power of the king of the Medes. The king was very apprehensive. The son refused to give his father, though he thereby lost the sale of the costly gems' (Babylon Kiddushin, 31 b, with Jerusalem Pesa, i. 1). Equally exacting were the lessons which he inculcated about the sacred jealousy with which the honour of our fellow-creatures is to be guarded. 'Let the honour of thy fellow-man be as precious to thee as thine own, and be not easily provoked' (Aboth, ii. 10). In opposition to the celibate practices which obtained among the Essenes, and which began to find favour among the Jews generally immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, he laid it down that "he who abstains from marriage and propagating the race is like one who commits murder" (Tebanot, 63 b). The form in which he inculcated into the minds of his disciples about the sanctity of marriage, and his denounced of being influenced by wealth or rank in contracting this sacred tie for their children to the disregard of the disparity of the respective ages, may be gathered from his remark on Levit. xix. 29: 'Do not prostitute thy daughter, to cause her to be a whore,' he declares; 'this refers to one who causes his young daughter to be married to an old man.'
(Sanhedrin, 76 e). He moreover urged that girls should be well educated and be instructed in the divine law (Baba, 20). Considering the general condition of women in the East and the opinion which some of the doctors of the law shared in common with other nations of antiquity on this subject, it will be seen how far R. Eliezer's teaching was in advance of the age, and how it harmonizes with the teaching of the gospel. Again he maintained that Gen. ix. 5 denotes, "Your blood I will require from your persons," deducing from it that the Mosaic law forbids suicide (Baba Kama, 91 b), which contradicts the statement of Josephus, that it positively enjoints it under certain circumstances (War, III. viii. 9; VII. vii. 7; with L. xiii. 10). He deprecates the practice of offering up fixed, formal, and lengthy prayers, declaring that "he who offers up his prayer as something fixed, his prayer is not with devotion," and he has bequeathed the model of a collect for travellers, which for terseness, earnestness, beauty, and brevity would do honour to any liturgy. "Let Thy will be done in heaven above, and grant a contented mind to those who worship Thee here below, and do Thou keep close in Thine holy angels the Thine, O Lord, who hearest prayer" (Berachoth, 93 b). To him, moreover, biblical students are partly indebted for Aquila's Greek version of the Old Testament, for we are distinctly told that "Aquila the proselyte made the translation under the auspices of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and they praised him for it" (Jerusalem Megilloth, i. 9). Prompted probably by a discussion on Christ's conduct in anthropomorphizing the woman taken in adultery, thus apparently setting aside one of the laws of Moses on adultery, R. Eliezer wanted to know if Christ also interpreted another law on the same subject with equal leniency. He relates the story as follows. "Once upon a time I was walking in the upper street of Zipporith when I met one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth. He said to me, 'James of Kefher-Sachnia. He said to me, 'It is written in your law thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore into the house of the Lord thy God' (Deut. xxii. 18). May a water-closet be made with it for the high-priest? This question I could not answer. Whereupon he said to me, 'Jesus of Nazareth taught me thus on the subject. It is written she gathered it of the hire of an harlot, and it shall return to the hire of an harlot (Mich. i. 7); that is, it came from an impure source, and it may be applied to an impure use.' When I heard this explanation, I was pleased with it." (Aboda Zara, 17 a.) This James is also mentioned as having offered to cure a nephew of R. Ishmael of the bite of a serpent, but the rabbi, not being so liberal as R. Eliezer, declined his services (Aboda Zara, 27 b).

Having himself profited so much from liberal intercourse with heathen philosophers, with Jewish Christians, and with those who held the different phases of faith which agitated the minds of people at the advent of Christ and immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, and knowing moreover the benefit to be derived from personal contact with the learned at a time when books were of the extremest rarity and of forbidden price, R. Eliezer laid down the maxim, "He who has read the Bible and studied the Mishna, but has not cultivated personal intercourse with the sages and the doctors of the law, is an Ann Ho-Aretz = ignorantus." But with all his appreciation of their society, he almost fathomed the depth of theological rancour, and no modern satirist could more witheringly chastise this undivine spirit of divines than R. Eliezer did in his earnest advice to his disciples. "Warm thyself at the fire of the sages, but beware lest thou come too near their glowing coals and burn thyself, for their bite is the bite of a jackal, their sting is the sting of a scorpion, their hissing is the hissing of a venomous serpent, and all their words are like burning coals" (Aboth, ii. 10). Towards God he admonished that we should cultivate a spirit of increasing devotion. The cry " repent " which was raised by John the Baptist, was urged by him with the earnestness of voice of a dying man to his dying fellow-creatures. "Repent one day before thy death" (Aboth, ii. 10) was his watchword. But as it is impossible to say on which day we may die, we are to repent daily. This he not only preached, but practised. At Caesarea, which was the last scene of his active life, he felt that he was called to die, and he assembled his followers in the presence of his former colleague and friend, and now his great opponent, the learned R. Joshua b. Chanina, he put the phylacteries on his arm and head to meet his Creator. Arrayed in these symbols of prayer, which had the name of the Lord inscribed on them, and in this attitude, he gave up his spirit to the Father of all spirits about A.D. 118-120. R. Joshua embraced the helpless body, took off the phylacteries and cried, "My father, my father, the charriot of Israel," in allusion to 2 Kings ii. 12. He annulled the sentence of excommunication, and the body was removed with great obsequies to Lydda. Here, where he first established a school, and where he delivered public lectures on a stone in an old racetrack, R. Akiba, who conveyed to him the sentence of excommunication, delivered a most solemn funeral oration. R. Joshua kissed the stone on which he used to lecture, exclaiming "This is Mount Sinai, and the man who sat on it was like the ark of the Lord," and the whole nation said, "With the death of R. Eliezer the book of wisdom is buried" (Babylon Sanhedrin, 68 ; Jerusalem Sabbath, ii. 7).

As he is often quoted in the Mishna and in the Talmud by the simple abbreviation ר"ל, R. Eliezer, and as there was a R. Eliezer of a later period, who is likewise quoted by the initial רל, R. Eliezer, the two have often been confounded. To guard against this confusion, it is to be remarked that when the name occurs in full, that is, when רל b. Hyronas is meant, it is spelt רל in with Yod, and when רל b. Shamma is meant it is spelt רל without Yod. If the abbreviation רל is used, which is the same for both, it is to be distinguished by the association of other names. When R. Eliezer, R. Gamaliel, and R. Akiba are associated with רל, R. Eliezer is meant, and when it occurs in connexion with R. Meier or R. Jehudah, R. Eliezer is intended (comp. Frankel, Darks Ha-Mishna, 73-83; Leipzig, 1859; Hamburger,
ELIFFANTUS

Real-Encyclopädie für Böbl und Talmud, p. 102, &c.

[C. D. G.]

ELIFFANTUS (Elefantus, Alphantus), thirty-third archbishop of Arles, between Rhet-terus, or, according to Le Coite, Arladis, and Johannes II., was one of the subscribers at a synod held in the church of St. Just, at Narbonne, in the year 788. At the council of Frankfort, in 794, a long standing difference between the sees of Arles and Vienne, concerning the limits of their metropolitan jurisdiction, which had broken out afresh between Eliffantus and Ursio of Vienne, was settled by the eighth canon, giving to the former nine suffragan sees (Le Coite, Ann. Eccl. Franc. tom. vii. ann. 791, n. xx, 794, n. xviii; Gall. Christ. i. 545; Labbe, Baron. Conc. ix. 4, 103.)

S. A. B.

ELIPIUS, martyr. [Eliipius.]

ELIGIUS, bishop of Noyon (640-648), saint. The only authority is the Vita S. Eligii, Nonio nensis Episcopi, auctore Dado neve Audono, Episc. Rotom. The extant biography is really a later work, modelled perhaps upon the original of St. Ouen. It is printed in the 2nd vol. of D'Achéry's Episcopologia, and extracts from it in Besonnet, vol. iii. pp. 552-561. The French translation, with notes, etc., has been published by M. Charles Barthélemy, being the first part of his Études Historiques, etc. sur le vœu Siècle, Paris, 1847.

Euligius was a native of Aquitaine, born near Limoges. A skilled worker in gold, he emigrated to the Northern Frankish land, where, by his construction of a chair of state, he won a place at the court of Clovis II. He was equally in favour with Dagobert I., Clovis's son. He continued to work at his art, but acquired at the same time great fame for piety and humility. His generosity was exhibited in the ransom of slaves; when a band of captives arrived, "of Romans, Gauls, and Britons, and of Moors and above all of Saxons," he would buy the freedom of the latter all. He is described by the biographer as tall, of high colour, bearded, with finely-shaped hands, and of graceful figure. Whilst still a layman he founded and built the monastery of Solemniac, near Limoges, besides numerous churches. In 660 he was ordained a priest and consecrated bishop of Noyon. His diocese comprised all the semi-heathen lands to the north, principally inhabited by the Frisians; to their conversion and to the permanent establishment of Christianity by the foundation of churches and monasteries he devoted himself unremittingly. In 658 Eligius died, but was not buried until a contention had arisen over his body at Noyon. Both in life and after death, according to the biographer, he was a great miracle-worker, and largely endowed with the gift of prophecy. The sermon in the Vita (ii. 15) is really taken from the works of Caesarius of Arles. The festival of Eligius is on the 1st of December. The Officium S. Eligii is given by Barthélemy, pp. 464 sqq. For much legendary matter connected with Eligius, see Annales de l'Eglise Cathédrale de Noyon, par Jacques le Vaseur, Paris, 1633. Compare also for his place in the conversion of the Frisians, Retberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. p. 508.

T. R. B.

ELLEUS. Given by Epiphanius (Haer. 26, p. 91) as the name of one of the seven ruling spirits in one of the Gnostic systems. This name does not occur in the corresponding lists (Irenaeus, l. 10; Origen, adv. Cels. vi. 31), but it may be compared with the name Eleleth (Irenaeus, l. 29).

G. S.

ELIMAS, martyr. [Elymas.]


ELIN (Aelvedha, Aed, Almedha, Elyvedha, Eluned, Lunned, Lusette) is given in the Pedigree of Welsh Saints as "daughter of Brychan in Crug Gorawl," but she is more likely to have been a grand-daughter. Her festival is on August 1. The chief authority on her life is Geraldus Cambrensis, who (Hist. Camb. i. c. 2) mentions the site of her chapel on the top of a hill, called Penginger, near the town of Brecon or Brecknock (Aberthomeli), where, "rejecting the proposals of marriage of an earthly prince and espousing herself to the Eternal King, she triumphed in happy martyrdom." This hill is identified with Slwych, where there was a roofless chapel in the end of the 17th century, and the saint locally called Taylau (i.e. St. Aylded). The hill may have received the descriptive title of Crug Gorawl or Gorseddall, the hill of Judicature, a name connected with Elined in the Mynegian Archeology. In the Arthurian legends of the 12th century this maiden has her praises celebrated, and by the Welsh bards she is called Luned, while in the French romances of the same period she is better known as Lunette. By the former name she appears as one of the leading characters in the Mabinogion, The Lady of the Fountain, given in Lady Charlotte Guest's collection, and by the latter in that of Gareth and Lynette, reproduced by Tennyson. It is most probable also that Enioll is the same as the patient and faithful Enid, daughter of Earl Ynyw, whose bow, bending the arms of the Romancists seem never tired of extolling, as in the Mabinogion, Geraint ab Erbin, in the same Collection of Mabinogion. "Enid, Yniol's only daughter," is one of the sweetest characters of Tennyson's Rhymes of the King. In the Mort d'Arthur (b. vii. c. 36) Lynet is sister of dame (or lady) Lyones, and King Arthur makes Sir Gaherys "to wed the damosel sausage that was dame Lynet," probably named the "damosel sause" from the properties and effects ascribed to her magical ring, which was one of the thirteen varieties of the royal jewels of Great Britain. (Geraldus Camb. Rin. Camb. vii. 32, Myv. Arch. ii. 41; Rees, Welsh Saints, 149-50, 318, 323; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 600; Williams, Elin. Welsh. 13, 143; Baring-Gould, Welsh Saints, July 6, pt. i. 148, and Aug. 1, pp. 6-8; Bolland. Acta SS. Aug. 1, tom. i. 70; Lady Ch. Guest, Mabinogion, i. 113-14, ii. 164.) [J. G.]

St. Elined is the Aelvedha of Giraldus Cambrensis (Rin. Cambriae, i. c. 2, p. 32). St. Almedha's day is August 1 (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 149). See Acta Sancorum, August 1, vol. i. p. 70, where she is assigned to the 6th century. Perhaps the name of Elyw, who has given name to Llanelli, Brecknockshire, and Llanell, in the same county, where her wake is held on the
Sunday next before August 1, O. S., is only an abbreviation of Eined (Rees, 156). [C. W. B.]

ELINGAUDUS, bishop of Aradshad, and a near mount Ararat, the people of which were named Amadunians, after the prince house that ruled the district. Eliseaus as bishop of the Amadunians was one of the eight fathers of the Armenian church who assembl into synod at Aradshad, the capital, in 490, and in reply to the persecuting edict of Isidorig, king of Persia (to whom Armenia was then subject), signed a truly noble manifesto of the Christian faith and their resolution of adhering to it. An insurrection, headed by Vartan, fol. Vartan perished, and Eliseaus was compelled to fly. In his exile the bishop composed the work on which his literary fame rests, The History of Vartan and the Battle of the Armenians. About A.D. 480 he was in Persia, where he had some relations with the Nestorian Baranas, to whom he presented another work (now unknown) which he had then written, a History of the Armenians. In his old age he lived a retired life in the canton of Ershedunuk (also written Ershchoudiun and Reschoudiun) on the southern shore of the lake Van.

The History of Vartan was first printed in 1764 at Constantinople. In 1830 an English translation by professor C. F. Neumann of Munich was brought out by the Oriental Translation Fund (Murray). In 1840 Giuseppe Capellelotti published an Italian version under the title Eliso, storico Armeno (Venice), and in 1844 a French translation by G. K. Garabed came out, entitled, Souvenirs National de l’Arménie Chrétienne (Paris). To the valuable preface of Neumann and notes of Garabed this article has been chiefly indebted. The History of Vartan is not the only work of Eliseas in existence. There is appended to it and included in the translation a panegyric on the monastic life, containing many interesting historical notices. Professor Neumann mentions other works, unprinted according to his belief, namely, exceptional illustrations of Joshua, Judges, the fourth book of Kings, and the Lord’s Prayer, besides numerous sermons. [T. W. D.]

ELISEAUS (2), bishop of Arezzo, 713. (Cappellelotti, Le Chiese d’Italia, xviii. 73; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 410.) [A. H. D. A.]


ELISEAUS (4), thirteenth bishop of Noyon, following St. Eutudius and preceding Adalbodus, is only known as one of the recipients of a letter of pope Zacharias addressed to Boniface and various other Gallic and German bishops, which may be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxix. 948. (Baron. an. 748. xil. Gall. Christ. ix. 986.) Le Counte (Ann. Eccl. Fran. an. 748, n. lxiv. vi. p. 199) says he was made bishop of Tournai and Noyon in A.D. 747. [S. A. B.]

ELISEAUS (5), forty-third bishop of Aach, or Auz, succeeding Galinus and followed by Joannes, about the close of the 6th century. Nothing is known of him except that he is not found in the list of Bams, the place being filled by Mainfridus (Maurifredus). (Gall. Christ. i. 977; Bams, Seric. Episc. 497.) [S. A. B.]
ELISENIUS, a Cretian, is placed by Spotswood (Hist. Ch. Socf, p. 5, A.D. 370) among the companions of St. Regulus, but the name is probably a mistake for CHIENIUS.

[O. G.]

ELISSAEUS (1), bishop of Dioctelianopolis, in Palestine Prima, one of the forty-three bishops who signed the semi-Arian formula at Seclucia, in A.D. 359. Adrian Reland has been cited without reason for an opinion that this bishop was called also Epictetus. (Epiph. Haeres. lixiii. No. 26, p. 874; W. Quinr. Or. Christ. iii. 845; Reland, Palest. Itin. ii. 706.)

[O. V.]

ELISSAEUS (2), a priest, who, by the eighth act of the council of Seville, A.D. 615, was condemned to slavery as a punishment for his ingratitude, because, having been made free by the kindness of his bishop, he had broken the canons and discipline of the church, and had entered into plots against his bishop. (Manesi, x. 559; Cellier, xi. 915.)

[O. D.]

ELITHIR (Allither, Alitir, Alitherius, Alithir, Elithir, Eulithir). There are three of this name in the Irish calendars, and though the word signifies a pilgrim, yet it seems at an early period to have become a proper name. Adamnan (Vit. S. Col. I. c. 5) and O'Donnell (Vit. S. Col. III. c. 17) mention that when St. Columba was founding Durrow, he paid a visit to the brethren in the monastery of Cloonmacnois, where Alithierus, Alitherius, or Eulithierus was then abbot. This was the fourth abbey; he died A.D. 599 (Ann. Tig.), and is mentioned to Muskerry in Munster (Reeves, Adamnan, 24 n.; O'Fiainn, Irish Saints, Jan. 7, l. 100). Colgan (Tr. Thom. 373 n. 24, 434 n. 18) says he is the Alither or Elithir of May 12, but on that day Mart. Doneg. (by Todd and Reeves, 125) has "Elithir, of Muic inis, in Loch Derg derge," and Mart. Taltyhot "Allither Muccinsi:" Muic inis is now Muckishin in Lough Derg, on the Shannon. Elithir of Cluaingeil is commemorated in the calendars on April 25, but without farther notes for identification or place in history. And at Doneg. li. 125, his name is confirmed by that of the Twelve Pilgrims of Inis Uachtair ("De Allither de Inse uchtair," Mart. Taltyhot), now Upper Island, in Lough Sheelin.

[O. G.]

ELIUD, a Welsh saint. [Tt.]

ELIZABETH Thaumaturge, or the wonder-werker, commonly called of Constantinople. A short account of her is given in the menology of the emperor Basilius Porphyrogenitus, who lived in the 10th century. She appears to have flourished long before; no date is given and few details, except the usual general tributes to piety. The principal characteristic related of her is that during the whole course of her life she never once washed her body with water. For three whole years also she never looked at the sky, in order to fix her mind more uninterruptedly on the invisible heaven. (Basil. Menolog. iii. 70, April 24, Patrol. Græc. orvii. 421; Molanus, ap. Usuard. Auct. Ap. 24, Patrol. Lat. cxiii. 970.)

[W. M. S.]

ELKESAI, ELKESAITES (Μακεσας, Hippolytus; Μακεσας, Epiphanius; Μακ-κεσας, Origen). A book bearing the name of Elkessai, and purporting to contain angelic revelations, was, at the end of the 2nd century, in high repute among certain Ebonite sectaries, who were most numerous in the district east of the lower Jordan and of the Dead Sea. This book first became known to orthodox writers in the 3rd century, and we have accounts of it from three independent primary sources, Hippolytus, Origen, and Epiphanius. Hippolytus (Ref. ix. 12, p. 292) states that this book, several extracts from which he gives, was brought to Rome by a certain Alcibiades, a native of Apameia in Syria, and indicates that the time was either during or immediately after the episcopate of Callistus, A.D. 89, about the end of 292AD, which was agitating the church of Rome at the time was the question whether, and with what limitations, forgiveness might be bestowed on grievous sin committed after baptism, a dispute in which Hippolytus took the side of rigour and Callistus of leniency. This book of Elk sas announced a new method of forgiveness of sins, asserted to have been revealed in the third vision of Tranjan, by which any person, no matter of what sins he might have been guilty (some of the very grossest are expressly mentioned), might obtain forgiveness by submitting to a new baptism with the use of a certain formula of which we shall speak presently. The use of a similar baptism was prescribed as a remedy to be used by a person bitten by a mad dog or by a serpent, or otherwise afflicted with disease. Hippolytus takes credit to himself for the resistance which he made to the teaching of Alcibiades, and blames Callistus for having, by the laxity of his doctrine and practice concerning church discipline, predisposed men's minds for the easy methods of forgiveness of sins expounded in this book. Origen, in a fragment of a homily on the 82nd Psalm, preserved by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 38) and assigned by Redepenning to the year 247, speaks of the teaching of the Heseeai, some specimens of which he gives, as having then but lately troubled the churches. Epiphanius, though a later witness, professes to speak from personal acquaintance with the book, and this is confirmed by his concurrence in a number of particulars with the other authorities. His notices are distributed between his accounts of the Jewish sect which he calls Osseans (Haer. 19), of the Ebonites (Haer. 30), and of the Synagogue (Haer. 53). Under these names the same people seem to be described, those who honoured the book of Elk sas (whom it probably was never accurate to speak of as constituting a distinct sect of Elkessai) being found among those Ebonites who owed their origin to the acceptance of Christianity by Jewish Essenes. But we may infer that the book had some extent of circulation in the time of Epiphanius, being held in honour among different Jewish sectaries whom he counted as distinct from us. We may conjecture that these Pseudo-Clementine writings as a fourth source of information concerning the book of Elk sas; for although these writings do not mention that name, and although the question of relative priority is not absolutely settled, yet we have already (see vol. i. p. 575) enumerated coincidences between these books sufficient to authorise us in looking on them as works of the same school, and in using the one to throw light on what we are told about the other.

Hippolytus states that the book of Elk sas,
In giving an account of the doctrine of the book it will be convenient, first, to state the points in which it agrees with the doctrine of the Clementine writings, and afterwards those in which it goes beyond them. The book is evidently of Jewish origin. Jerusalem is made the centre of the world’s devotion, and it is described as the right of prayer, though the pilgrimage to the Holy City was not necessarily to the East, but towards Jerusalem in whatever quarter of the world the suppliant may be. It has been already noted that the names of the book are formed from Hebrew roots, and a further mark of Aramaic origin is the representation of the Holy Spirit as a female. The influence of the use of a noun of feminine form to denote the Holy Spirit shews itself also in some of the Gnostic theories as well as in the well-known passage from the Hebrew Gospel,  

*Aρτι σαβεί η μητέρα μου το σιω πνεύμα* (Origen in Joann. tom. ii. 6, Opp. iv. 63).

Epiphanius also quotes from the book of Elkesai a Hebrew form which the Greek and Roman versions were constructed to use without trying to understand it. Epiphanius gives a literal interpretation of this formula on which others have attempted to improve (see Bagad, *Annot. ann.* 104, pp. 12, 13); but the right key seems to have been found in a highly ingenious solution given by Stern and Levy (see Hilar. *Nov. Testamenta extra Can. Rec.*, iii. 105). The book ordained compliance with the other ordinances of the Jewish law, but commanded the rite of sacrifice, and this condemnation involved the rejection of certain parts of the Old Testament, and was coupled with aversion to the eating of flesh (see vol. i. p. 575). The superiority of the method of forgiveness of sins by the washing of water over that by the fire of sacrifice is based on the superiority of the element of water to fire (Hipp. ix. 14; *Epiph. Haer.* 19, p. 42; *Clem. Rec.* 1. 48; *Hom. xi. 26*). It is taught that Christ is but a created being, and, as has already been said, He is in the introduction spoken of as an angel; but He is the greatest of creatures, being Lord over angels as well as over every other created thing. The name Great King is applied to Him (Epiph. *Haer.* 19, p. 49; *Hipp. ix. 15*; *Hom. viii. 21*). The formula of baptism is found in the name of the Most High God and of His Son, the Great King; but this Great King is not exclusively identified with Jesus of Nazareth, for it is taught that He appeared in the world as successive incarnations, Adam being the first. The book of Elkesai agreed with the Clementines in complete rejection of the apostle Paul. It is said to have been hostile to virginity, and to have compelled men to marry (Epiph. *Haer.* 19), and this agrees with the inculcation of marriage upon all (*Hom. iii. 68*; *Epistle of Clement*, ch. 7). The book contained some astrological doctrine recommending the abstention from certain works on days under the influence of evil stars (Hipp. ix. 15, p. 286). Compare *Hom. xii. 22*, where the saints of God are healed on the days on which the race is ascribed to the non-observance of proper times for cohabitation. The book taught that it was lawful to deny the faith in time of persecution (Eus. vi. 38; *Epiph. 19*), thus annihilating at once the class of offences as to the forgiveness of which there was most controversy at the time; and so the Recognitions (i. 65) describe Gamaliel...
as really a Christian, but, by the apostle's advice, concealing his profession; and, similarly (x. 55), represent Christians by a like dissimilation conversing with Simon Magus and acting as spies upon him.

Presided to the Homilies is a protestation of secrecy to be taken by all to whom the book should be communicated. This does not take the form of an oath to God, but of an appeal to witnesses, viz. heaven, earth, water in which all things are contained, and air which pervades all things and without which we cannot breathe. In this it appears that this appeal was made to that made at the time of their regeneration when they promised to sin no more. After making this protestation the candidate was to partake of bread and salt with him who administered it. We read constantly in the Homilies of this partaking of bread and salt* (iv. 6, xii. 8, xiv. 2, xxi. 25), and among those Ebionites who do not seem to have used wine, this rite takes the place of the Eucharist of the church. We have here marks of very close affinity with the book of Elkesai. The formula of baptism already spoken of contains a solemn promise to sin no more, made before the seven witnesses who are enumerated as heaven, earth, water, oil, salt, the holy scriptures and the prophetess Hagar. This tells us that the witnesses are elsewhere in the book enumerated as salt, water, earth, bread, heaven, sether, and wind. The interchange of the sether and wind for the spirits and angels has its explanation perhaps in a theory that these regions were the abode of the spirits in question. The mention of oil among the seven witnesses is illustrated by the affirmation made in this sect as a necessary preliminary to baptism (Rec. iii. 67; see also the discussion on omitting Rec. i. 46-48). At all events it seems plain that the protestation in the Clementines, referring as it does to the witnesses appealed to in the baptismal formula, harmonizes completely with the account of the baptismal formula given by Hippolytus.

* The text here has been altered. It was previously: the seven witnesses between the Clementines and the book of Elkesai; Hippolytus states, p. 239, that the book taught the necessity of circumcision, and if this be correct it went beyond the teaching of the Clementines. In the addresses to the heathen therein contained they are never told that they must be circumcised; yet it is to be noted that a statement of the non-necessity of circumcision found in the Recognitions (v. 34) disappears from the corresponding passage of the Homilies (xi. 16), and in the preface to the Homilies, which is more strongly marked with Elkesaiite features than the work itself, it is ordered that those Homilies should be communicated only to a circumcised believer — a phrase rather suggesting the inference that the circumcised were regarded as a higher class of believers than all were circumcised. With regard to baptism the Clementines are silent with respect to all that is most peculiar in the doctrine of Elkesai. The heathen addressed by Peter are exhorted to a single baptism in the account of which no mention is made of the appeal to the witnesses. This

baptism is represented as the divinely appointed means for forgiveness of sins and new birth unto righteousness through the power of the Holy Spirit which since the creation of the world works through the water (Rec. vi. 8, 9; 1 Hen. xi. 28). Peter is represented as practising a daily religious washing; but this is never spoken of as a special means for obtaining a new forgiveness of sins. On the other hand, it is to be owned that the Recognitions state a principle from which the repetition of baptism might logically follow. The Ebionite theologians have generally done, make baptism correspond to circumcision, a view from which they were probably precluded by the fact that in their community both rites were simultaneously observed: but they make baptism take the place, as a means of forgiveness of sin, which sacrifice had occupied under the old dispensation (Rec. i. 29). Hence it was possible to draw the inference that baptism should be used as frequently as sacrifices had been as an atonement for constantly recurring sin.

The differences here noted bear on the question of relative priority between the Clementines and the book of Elkesai. Ritschl had counted the latter as the later. Uhlhorn in opposition pointed out the greater development of the Jewish and heathen elements in greater and the Christian element in less prominence in the book of Elkesai than in the Clementines, and that the latter are therefore to be regarded as the product of a time when the Essene doctrine of the former had been modified by Christian influences. It may be added that the violent hostility to the rite of sacrifices which appears both in the Homilies and in Elkesai is likely to date from a time antecedent to the destruction of Jerusalem, and is hardly intelligible if supposed to originate in times when sacrifice was only a rite practised by heathen. Uhlhorn's arguments are conclusive in proving that the doctrine of the book of Elkesai is considerably older than the time when it became known to the orthodox, but the question still remains open, what was the date of the embodiment of the doctrine in this particular book? — a point which our information is too scanty to determine. There would be no question as to the date of the book if we could accept its own account, that the revelation in which it originated was made in the 3rd year of Trajan; but though many have attributed to this statement some historic value, it deserves absolutely to go for nothing. If we refuse to believe on the author's word that the two gigantic angels ever appeared, why should we accept the date that he assigns to the occurrence? We have noted, however, already (i. 575) that the work which was the common groundwork of the Recognitions and Homilies asserts that a new Gospel was published (the Homilies add "secretly") after the destruction of the Holy Place. And it seems on other grounds probable that a number of Essenes, who had always held the Temple sacrifices in abomination, were brought to recognise Jesus as the true Prophet when the destruction of the Temple and the abolition of its sacrifices fulfilled the promises which he was known to have made. At this time then probably had their origin those Ebionite sects which combined a certain reverence for our Lord's utterances, and an acknowledgment of

\[H\]
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Him as a divine prophet, with the retention of a host of Essenian usages and doctrines; and this date would be remembered as an epoch in the history of these sects. It is likely that we are to connect with this the statement of Hesegippus (Euseb. H. E. iii. 32; iv. 22), that the reign of Trajan was the time when the church, till then a pure virgin, was corrupted by the breaking out of heresies. There seems to be no foundation for the opinion that Hesegippus was himself of Eikonite tendencies, and Jewish heresies are those of which the context would suggest that he was speaking. In sum, then, though it may be the more probable opinion that the book of Elkessai had been, as it professed to be, a considerable time in secret circulation among the Eikonite sects before Alcinobis brought it to Rome, yet it is possible that it may have been then of quite recent manufacture. We have elsewhere given reasons for thinking that the Clementine Homilies are not earlier than the beginning of the 3rd century, and that the corresponding story, that this work had been in mysterious circulation, under a pledge of secrecy, since the days of Peter was only a fiction intended to explain why the book had not been heard of before.

It would seem to be long before the sect of Elkessiates disappeared. Ex-hedim, an Arabic author who wrote about A.D. 987, quoted by Chwolson (Die Schiit, i. 112, ii. 543), tells of a sect of Sabaeans of the Desert who practised frequent religious washings and who counted one El-Chassach as their founder.

The primary authorities with respect to Elkessai have been already mentioned. Of recent dissertations on the subject most information will be found in Ritschl, Zeitschrift für histor. Theol. 1853, p. 573 sqq., and Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche, p. 234 sqq.; Hilgenfeld, Nov. Test. extra Canones receptum, iii. 153, where all the fragments of the book are collected; Ullhorn, Historia et Recognovit des Chelmen Rumanus, p. 392; and Lightfoot's Dissertation on the Essenian, 'Epistle to Colossians,' p. 118 sqq.

[8.]

ELLA (3) (AELLA, AELLI, ALLA, ELLI, Ulli), king of Deira, and, according to his recorded pedigree, a lineal descendant of Woden. (Nennius, 51; Sax. Chron. ann. 588.) The Saxon Chronicle makes him king of Northumbria, but it was only over the southern portion of it that he reigned. The same authority places his accession in A.D. 560, and says that he was king thirty winters. It also states, along with Florence, that Ella died in A.D. 588.

The only interest attaching to Ella's reign arises from the well-known story of the English youth, whom he is said by Gregory in the slave market at Rome, and replying that they were Angles from the province of Deira, and the subjects of king Alla. (Bed. H. E. ii. 1; Malms. G. R. i. 63-4.) Bede gives the story as one of hearsay only, and in the chronicle of Ethelward the incidents are somewhat differently narrated. The young men are not spoken of as slaves; there is no mention of Ella or Deira, and Gregory's play on their names is omitted. Ella left two children, Edwin, who, after a long interval, succeeded him on his throne, and Acha or Aca, a daughter, who was the second wife of Ethelfrid son of Ethelric, who intruded himself into Edwin's heritage.

[9. R.]

ELLENUS, bishop of Siguenza (Segontia) c.e. A.D. 680-685. His signature appears among those of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth councils of Toledo. [Photogene.] (Ep. Sagra. viii. 126; Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 270, 287, 304.)

[6. A. W.]

ELLADIUS, presbyter of the palace. [Elladius.]

ELBBRIgh, abbot of Clonain-Bronagh (Cloonbroney, bar. Granard, co. Longford), died A.D. 785 (Four Mant. A.D. 780; Ann. Ul. A.D. 784). This is said by Archibalt (Mon. Hdb. 346) to have been one of the earliest patronic foundations, and the earliest abbots mentioned is St. Samthann virgin, who died A.D. 734 (Four Mant.). [J. G.]

ELLEYRYN (1), according to the Aedh y Saint, was son of Gwrtheyrn (Vortigen), and must have flourished towards the end of the 5th century. His name is preserved in Llanelltyr or Llaniltenr chapel, in the parish of St. Fagan's, Glamorganshire (Rees, Welsh Saints, 152, 186, 358).

ELLEYRYN (2), chorepiscopus, of Caerles, prior to the time of St. Dubrittios (Llb. Land. by Rees, 623 n. 2; Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. 154).

ELLDYD. [Illtyd.]

ELLE, king of Deira. [Ellla.]

ELLEBICHUS (1), Gregory Nazianzen addressed his two hundred and twenty-fifth letter to this man, wherein he regrets his inability to visit him through ill-health, and consigns to his care Mamas, a reader, the son of a soldier. Mamas had been enrolled, and Ellebicus is requested to obtain his discharge. (Greg. Naz. Ep. 235, in Migne, Patr. Gr. xxvii. 368.)

[6. B.]

ELLEBICHUS (2), a military official (præfet urbi) attached to the imperial court, sent with Caesarius by the emperor Theodosius ii. to Antioch to seize the guilty parties connected with the throwing down of the statues. Chrysostom delivered his seventeenth homily to the Antiochenes in the presence of these officers. (Chrysost. Homil. xvii. in Migne, Patr. Gr. xi. 171.)

ELLEJ, a Jewish patriarch, who lived in the time of Constantine, and was baptized on his death-bed (Epiph. Haer. 30, p. 128).

[9. G. S.]

ELLENUS succeeded St. Cadoc in the abbey of Llanccarvon (Cadoc), but Ussher gives too early dates, when he says Ellenius became abbot in A.D. 514, and was succeeded by St. Brendan, of Cloonert, in the year 520. Cadoc probably died about A.D. 570, and St. Brendan about A.D. 577. (Brendan 2.) Ellenius is said to have been an excellent disciple of an excellent master, and to have done much in making the college at Llanccarvon so famous. Of his own kindred or previous life we know only the tradition that he was "reginae cucismatic transmarinae filius," and one of the principal disciples of St. Cadoc. But the Welsh authorities (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 354, 383, 393) trace an entirely different order of succession, and make Cynog immediately
fellow St. Cadoc as abbat. [ELLI.] (Usher, Eccl. Ant. cc. 13, 14, wks. v. 538, vi. 50; O'Flaharan, Irish Saints, i. 423; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. 9, § 11.) [J. G.]

ELLI, "unmarried disciple," the "very dear unmarried auditor" of St. Cadoc, is said, in the Life of St. Cadoc, to have been the child of a queen long barren, and born on the islands of Grimbail. He lived at the White Court (probably Whitten, near Llanrannian) in the time of Mearig ab Tewdrig, king of Morganwg and Gwent, and seems also to have been connected with Cruycegreif or Garallwyd, near Llanfechan, in the same neighbourhood. He is one of those who are said to have been the immediate successors of St. Cadoc in the abbacy of Llanrannian [ELENION]. St. Cadoc having divested himself of the office in his favour, with procession of relics, etc., on a Palm Sunday. We find him as witness to several grants to St. Cadoc or his church in the 6th century (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 332, 363-4, 379, 582, 387-9). [J. G.]

ELLOC, of Cill-moelloc, is given by O'Clery (Mrt. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 3) and Colgan (Acta SS. 312, c. 5) among the sons of Bracan, or Brychan, and the brothers of St. Canoc (Feb. 11) and St. Dabnoegg (Jan. 1); the latter places Cill-moelloc near Loch-garmar, now Wexford Harbour. Elloc is unknown in the Welsh and Cornish genealogies of Brychan. Colgan (ib. 313, c. 17) puts his commemoration on July 24, where Mart. Tallagh (Kelly, Cat. Ir. SS. p. xxx.) has "Olleoc Ciuana Etchen." This is the probably the same person as stands in Mart. Doneg. on July 13, "Mathiold, of Cill-Moelioth, in Ui Ceinnmacailch, or Mathiold, of Cruinan Athcinn." Cill-moelloc and Cill-Moelioth are now two parishes, called Killmallock and Kilmaclanchogue or Gorey, in the barony of Ballyliscane, and part of the latter in the barony of Gorey, co. Wexford. (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 14; Skeene, Cat. Scott. ii. 23; and on the sons of Bracan or Brychan of Brycheiniog, see Brychian and Dabnoegg.) [J. G.]

ELLI'TIN (1) Son of Maelan of Seanchus, commemorated Jan. 11 in the Martyrologies of Donegal and Tallaght. His church was one which is said by Trechane, and in Colgan's Lives of St. Patrick, to have been founded by St. Patrick. It is now Shancroe, in the barony of Tirerril, co. Sligo, on the borders of Leitrim. (Colgan, Tr. Thurn. 89, c. 105, 134, c. 35, 271, c. 24, and notes; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 176.)

ELLI'TIN (2) of Kinsale, confessor, commemorated Dec. 11. He was brother of Seina (Mar. 10), son of Eren, and native of a district in Munster, called Altairige Cliahe. He was revered at Kinsale as one of its patrons, and is known by the affectionate title Melteog, "My little-Elitin," or "My Elitin-dear," now corrupted into St. Multose. (Mrt. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, xliii. n. 4, 332 n. 1, 333; Colgan, Acta SS. 575; Colgan, Cens. and n. 4; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 94; Caulfield, Life of St. Finbarre, 15 n. by.) [J. G.]

ELLYW (ELYW) is given by Professor Rees as a grand-daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog, yet he does not think it unlikely that she is really identical with St. Elined, or Alvedha, on whose festival that of St. Ellyw depends, the former being on Aug. 1, O. S., and the latter on the Sunday immediately preceding. She is patron, or has probably given her name to Llanelli in Pembrokeshire, and to Llanllowel and Llanelly, both in Brecknockshire (Rees, Welsh Saints, 156, referring to Hist. Brocyn. ii. 473). [J. G.]

ELMERUS (ERMELIUS), patron saint of a collegiate church at Molianium, in the diocese of Liege, near Mazimburg. What is known or believed of this obscure saint, who is placed in the 7th or 8th century, and where Molianium was, is discussed in Boll. Acta SS. Aug. 28, vi. 485. [C. H.]

ELMGAUDUS, officer of Charlemagne. [HELMGAUDUS.]

ELNOG. [ELENOR.]

ELIOASUS (Eloes, Irenaeus; ADeatu, Origens; EEnoas, Epiphanius), one of the seven ruling spirits in the Ophiite system (Irenaeus, i. 30, p. 109; Origens, adv. Cels. vii. 31; Epiph. Haer. 26, p. 91). These authorities differ both as to some of their names and to the order in which they are placed. On the obvious derivation of the present name from the Hebrew name of God, see Irenaeus, in. 35, p. 170; Epiph. Haer. 40, p. 296. [G. S.]

ELOC, clerical witness to the grant of Mafura by king Cynyn, son of Peblau, to Aidan, bishop of Lladaad, probably in the 6th century (Lid. Land. by Rees, 409). [J. G.]

ELODIA, a virgin martyr, put to death, together with Nunilo at Oca (Huesca). Commemorated Oct. 22 (Mrt. Us.). [T. S. B.]

ELOHIM, Easulio, Hippol. Ref. v. 20, pp. 150-159. [JUSTINIANUS.] [G. S.]

ELOI, ST., bishop of Noyon. [ELIGUS.]

ELOPHIUS, martyr of Tol. [ELPHIUS.]

ELOQUIUS, abbot of Lagny, commemorated Dec. 3. He was one of that illustrious stream of missionaries which flowed from Ireland and flooded the continent of Europe in the sixth and following centuries. He was an Hibernian Scot, and accompanied St. Fursey (Jan. 16) to Lagny, where he associated with such other saints as St. Fursey's two brothers, Paolan or Pohlan and Uitan, with Mumbulius, Eto, Aedelgous, and Fregedan, but it seems an anachronism to make him contemporary with St. Tressan (Feb. 7), who flourished at least a century earlier. Probably setting out from Lagny, he went with twelve disciples and taught in Belgium, and on St. Fursey's death he is said to have become abbot of the monastery at Lagny, as being the special friend of the late superior, but it is probable that Emilian [ELIANUS (10)] came between, and this succession is adopted by the Gall. Chr. (vii. 492). He flourished about the middle of the 7th century. Colgan had a Life of St. Eloquius in contemplation for the Acta SS. and Sect. Acod. vii. 575, which was probably that one given by Mirraeus (Belg. Fast.) and Molanus (Not. Sanct. Belg.) on the same day. (Colgan, Acta SS. 51 n. 1, 96, c. 6, 273 n. 4, 436 n. 2; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 16, § 10; Reeves, Adamnan, 299; O'Hanlon, Irish
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Saints, i. 264—86; ii. 378 sq.; Camerarius, De Scot. Fort. 501, Dec. 4; Ware, Irish Writ. c. 3.) Dempster says he flourished A.D. 651, and wrote Echatariae ad Gentiles, lib. i.; Homiliae, lib. i. (Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 250; Tanner, Bish. 260.) [J. G.]

ELO THEORY (ELO BETHUS), twenty-seventh bishop of Avignon, succeeding St. Saturninus and followed by Julianus. He is said to have been a priest of that church before his elevation to the see (A.D. 475), and to have been remarkable for his learning, faith, humanity and integrity. The authors of the Gallia Christiana (l. 883) conjecture he has too been the Elothearius addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (Epist. vi. 11 in Migne, Patr. Lat. xvi. 552), who has also been assigned to Tournai. He does not appear in Gams’s list of the bishops of Avignon. (Series Episc. 503.) [S. A. B.]

ELOY, ST., bishop of Noyon. [ELPIDIUS.]

ELPENIPSA (ELPHE, Bull. Acta SS. Jan. i. 155), one of the forty-eight martyrs at Lyons. [LYONS, MARTYRS OF.] [L. D.]


ELPIDEPHORAUS (1), a Persian of senatorial rank, converted to Christianity by witnessing the constancy of the martyrs Acidynus, Pegasus, and Anempodistus. He was cruelly tortured by order of Sapor II., king of Persia, and afterwards beheaded, circ. A.D. 320. He is commonly commemorated Nov. 2 (Men. Bap.; Cal. Byzant.) [T. S. B.]

ELPIDEPHORAUS (2) (ELPIDEFORTHUS), bishop of Cuiculis or Cuizis in the province of Numidia, was present at the council of Carthage under Gratian, A.D. 349, and was the mower of the eleventh canon against the pride of the junior clergy. (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 147, ii. 253; Mansi iii. 148.) [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (1), bishop of the Tauric Chersonese. [EUGENIUS.] [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (3), bishop and martyr, sent during the reign of Diocletian, after the death of Basili the bishop, together with Agathodorus, Capelo, and Eupentas, to Cappadocia, where they were all slain by the Greeks. They are commemorated March 8. (Men. Bap.) [T. S. B.]

ELPIDIUS (3), bishop of Comans in Cappadocia, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 448; Mansi, ii. 694.) [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (4), a bishop of Palestine, who subscribed the council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (Athanasii Opera, I. 133, in Patr. Graec. xxv. 339 B; Mansi, iii. 89 A). He also subscribed the letter of a synod at Jerusalem (Ath. edit. 139). [W. M. S.]

ELPIDIUS (5), bishop of Satala in Armenia, deposed by the triumphant Acacian party in the council of Constantinople, Jan. A.D. 360, together with Basil of Anacyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, Silvanus, and others. The nominal grounds were his participation in the violent acts of Basil, his having occasioned great disorders in the church, and particularly his having violated the decree of the council of Melitene by reinstating a presbyter named Eusebius, deposed for having appointed one Nectarius as deaconess, though excommunicated for perjury. (Socr. H. E. ii. 42; Soz. H. E. iv. 24.) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (6), bishop of a maritime town in the East, A.D. 375, separated by Eustathius of Sebaste from his communion ostensibly on account of his holding communion with the intruded Arian bishop of Amasea, but more truly as a friend of Basil (Basil, Epist. 251 [72]). Basil wrote to Euplius, A.D. 375, by a presbyter Meletius, requesting him to arrange with his brother bishops of the seaboard of Pontus a time and place for Basil’s meeting them in the hope of removing mutual suspicions and confirming mutual charity (Epist. 205 [392]). Soon after this Euplius lost a little grandson. Basil wrote to console him exhorting him to Christian fortitude, and expressing his hope that this bereavement would not prevent their meeting at Comana (Epist. 240 [384]). His see is uncertain, but Bloudel is certainly wrong in placing it at Neocassarea. (Tillenium, ix. 674.) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (7), bishop of Dionysia or Dryasias in the ecclesiastical province of Bostra, present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 370; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 865.) For Dionysia, see Hierocles Symmachus, Corp. Script. Hist. Byz., pt. 5, vol. iii. p. 399, Beaus, 1840, and Wesseling’s note, p. 535. [J. de S.]

ELPIDIUS (8), bishop of Laodicea in Syria at the close of the 4th century and opening of the 5th. He was originally a priest of Antioch under Meletius, whose confidence he enjoyed and with whom he resided (συνήπατος) as we shall now call bishop’s chaplain, and of whose moderation and gentleness of disposition Theodoret tells us he afforded a more exact copy than the word does of a seal (Theod. H. E. v. 27). He shared in his master’s sufferings under Valens, and accompanied by Flavian, attended Meletius at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). We next find him bishop of the Syrian Laodicea, in succession to Pelagius, in which capacity he attended a council at Constantinople, A.D. 394 (Labbe, ii. 1151). We again find him at Constantinople at the close of A.D. 403, as a member of the council summoned by Chrysostom’s enemies, and issuing in his deposition. Elpidius had been an intimate friend of Chrysostom at Antioch, and lent the weight of his advanced years and his well-deserved reputation for learning and piety to the defense of his friend and associate. When the validity of the canons of the council of Antioch, of suspected orthodoxy, used by Chrysostom’s enemies as an instrument to secure their object, came into question before the emperor, Elpidius adroitly turned the tables on Acacius and his party by proposing that the advocates of the canons should declare themselves in the same case with those who had promulgated them (Pallad. Dial. c. 9, p. 80). After Chrysostom’s deposition and exile Elpidius exerted himself strenuously in his behalf, despatching letters to the bishops and faithful
ELPIDIUS—Bishops

ELPIDIUS (12), ST. The first of the four recorded bishops of Atella in Campania cir. A.D. 400. Great sanctity and many miracles were attributed to him and to his brother St. Cyo a presbyter and his nephew St. Eclipus a deacon, both of whom also lived at Atella. St. Eclipus was buried at Salerno, and his festival was on May 26. Some suppose that he is an African refugee in the Vandal persecution. (Ug. Ital. Soc. x. 17; Boll. Acta SS. 24 Mai. v. 282.)

[ELPIDIUS (13), a bishop who with eleven companions is commemorated on Sept. 1 (A.D.SS. Boll. Sept. i. 210). The accounts concerning him are obscure, but he is supposed to have been one of the African bishops exiled by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 434; by others he is identified with Eclipus, bishop of Atella in Campania, who might have been an African refugee (No. 12).]

[ELPIDIUS (14), (HELPEPIUS), bishop of Tamathis (Damietta), in Egypt, one of the orthodox Egyptian bishops, who, with some Alexandrians, fled to Constantinople in A.D. 487, to escape from Timotheus Aelurus and the Eutychians. (NESTORIUS, bishop of Pharamacon.) His name does not appear in their petition to the emperor Leo, but it does appear at the head of the letter addressed to them by the pope Leo (Leo, Mag. Ep. clx. 1330). It appears also in the list of bishops subscribing the synodal letter of the council held at Constantinople under Generius in A.D. 489 against simony (Harduin, ii. 783; Orosius Christianus, ii. 599).]

ELPIDIUS (15), bishop of Volterra, present at the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth Roman synods under pope Symmachus in Oct. 501, Nov. 502, in 503, and Oct. 504, according to the reckoning of Dahn (Die Könige der Germanen, ii. 209), who accepts with a slight alteration the arrangement of Hefele, § 220. (Masai, viii. 253, 269, 299, 315.)

[ELPIDIUS (16), bishop of Ancyræ, the metropolis of Galatia Prima, in the early part of the 6th century. (Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, i. 334; Gams, Series Episc. p. 441.) He sent Gaiana, a presbyter, as his legate, to the council of Constantinople, A.D. 536. (Masai, viii. 879 b, 938 d, 951 a.)]

ELPIDIUS (17), one of four brothers, all bishops (the others being Justianus, Justinianus, Nebridius), who flourished in Spain during the first half of the 6th century. Isidore, de Vir. Ill. cap. 33, has two or three lines about Eclipus, whose reported writings, he says, together with those of his brother Nebridius (bishop of Egara), had remained unknown to him. (Ximeno, Escritos del Reyno de Valencia, i. p. viii; Ceillier, Aut. Soc. xi. 265.)

ELPIDIUS (18), bishop of Thebes Phthioticæ in Thessaly, A.D. 531, mentioned in the petition of Stephen of Larissa to pope Boniface II. and the Roman synod against the conduct of Epiphanius of Constantine, bishop who had excommunicated bishop Stephen, and had summoned him and his co-conspirators to appear at Constantinople. The
Thessalians rejected the jurisdiction of the bishops of Constantinople. (Mani, viii. 743; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 121.) [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (19), bishop of Catania, c. 580. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xxi. 636.) [A. H. D. A.]

ELPIDIUS (20), a bishop most probably of some Eastern see, to whom, along with two other bishops, pope Gregory the Great addressed a letter (Epist. vii. 7), blaming him for crying out, "This is the day which the Lord hath made," at the ordination of Cyriacus the patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 597 (Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixvi. 859). [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (21), bishop of Tarazona (Turesso), signs the acts of the fourth and sixth councils of Toledo (A.D. 633, 638), being fifty-second out of sixty-nine bishops in the former, and eighteenth out of fifty-three in the latter. [Leon.] (Mani, x. 643 A, ELPIDIUS, 671 C; Esp. Sgr. xiii. 114; Aguirre-Catalan, iii. 385, 413.) [M. A. W.]

ELPIDIUS (22), bishop of Astorga from about 654 onwards, signs the tenth Council of Toledo A.D. 656. His name is variously written—Elpidius, Hilpidius, and Hiplidas. [FELIX OF ASTORGA.] (Mani, xi. 43 C; Esp. Sgr. xvi. 114; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 158.) [M. A. W.]

ELPIDIUS (23), a Roman presbyter, who, with Philexenus in 341, transmitted the letters of Julius I. to the Eusebian bishops in the East by whom Athanasius had been condemned at the Council of Dedication, inviting them to a council in December in that year. Elpidius and his companions were sent back in January, A.D. 342, with the reply of the bishops couched in grossly defamant terms. (Ath. Opp. i. iii. in Patr. Gr. xvi. 282; Labbe, ii. 494, 514; Baron. A. E. 340, iii.) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (24), priest of the Roman church sent by pope Liberius to the bishops of Ilyricum, A.D. 355, who, the provincial synod being assembled, commissioned Elpidius as their delegate to the Asian bishops. Their synodal letter containing his credentials, warning the Asians against the Macedonian heresy, and exhorting them to preach the Nicene faith, is preserved in Theodoret. Baronius thinks he may be the same as the legate of Julius in the preceding article. (Theodoret, H. E. iv. c. 8; Migne, Patr. Græc. Ixxii. 960; Baron. A. E. 365, xvii; Mani, Concil. iii. 385-386.) [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (25), a deacon by whose hands Basil received a letter from Eusebius of Samosata A.D. 373 (Basil. Epist. 138 [80]; and by whom, A.D. 376, Basil sent a letter of consolation and sympathy to the Egyptian bishops Eulogius, Alexander, Harpocrates, in exile for the faith in Palestine. (Epist. 265 [293].) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (26), St., abbot, and patron saint of the town of St. Elpidius in Picenum (the March of Ancona), where his relics are preserved. According to the traditions collected by the Bollandists, he was a Cappadocian by birth, who visited Rome, and preached the Gospel in Picenum, where he died A.D. 393. According to another tradition, he was an abbot in his own country, and moved to Palestine, his remains only being translated into Italy. (A. A. S. Boll. 2 Sept. i. 378.) [L. D.]

ELPIDIUS (27), Spanish presbyter, who with the Spanish bishop Hilarus appealed to pope Innocent on the prevailing dissentions in Spain, occasioning innocent to address the bishops assembled at the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400. (Innoc. Ep. 3, cc. 1, 2; Mani, Concil. iii. 997.) [C. H.]

ELPIDIUS (28), presbyter of Constantinople, who deposed against Chrysostom at the council of the Oek, A.D. 403 (Phot. cod. 59). One of the attempts to assassinate Chrysostom after his condemnation, A.D. 404, was made by a slave of Elpidius, who asserted that he had been bribed by his master with fifty pieces of silver. (See H. E. vii. 21; Pallad. Dialog. cap. 20.) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (29), presbyter, who laboured with much zeal and success as a missionary among the heathen tribes inhabiting the mountain range of Aramans between Cilicia and Syria. Many were converted by his means, and several churches and monasteries built. Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus, A.D. 404, to commend Elpidius and his work to the liberality of his ancient friend Agapetus (Chrysost. Epist. 175). [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (30) OF CAPPADOCIA, priest and abbot. Having passed his earlier years in a monastery founded in Cappadocia by Timothy, a chrysopiscus under Basil the Great, he became the abbot or superior of an anchorit community in the mountains in the neighbourhood of Jericho, originally founded by Chariton, with whom Paladius passed some time in his twentieth year shortly after embracing the solitary life. Paladius speaks of his austerities as surpassing those of all the hermits of that district. The last twenty-five years of his life he spent in a cavern on the mountain side, only partaking of food on Saturdays and Sundays, passing the whole night in singing the praises of God, with his face constantly turned to the east, night and day, not changing his posture even when suffering intensely from the poisonous sting of a scorpion. He became priest after Paladius left him, and died before A.D. 420. (Pallad. Hist. Lucian. cc. 106-108, pp. 1024-1026.) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (31) (HELPIDIUS), presbyter and archimandrite of Constantinople, who subscribed the deposition of Eutyches at the council of Constantinople in 448 (Labbe, iv. 232 a). He, among the other orthodox archimandrites, is addressed by Leo I. (Leo. Mag. Ep. 71, 1012, FAUSTUS). His name does not appear among the orthodox archimandrites who petitioned Marcian, the emperor, in 451 (FAUSTUS), but he or one of his name does appear as subscribing the almost contemporary appeal to that emperor from the Eutychians, headed by Charinus, who were, or claimed to be, archimandrites [Alexias, 793 (Labbe, iii. 479); Theod. Hist. xiv. 3, Tillemont, c. 638]. In the 4th session of the council of Chalcedon, the orthodox archimandrites, who had been summoned to sit there before their Eutychian brethren were introduced, recognized the name of this Elpidius as that of
ELPIDIUS—DEACON AND POET

the μεροφόρος τῶν Ἴδρων, for as it is implied in this that he could not rightly claim the title of archimandrite, we must probably distinguish him from his orthodox nameake.

[C. G.]

ELPIDIUS (32) RUSTICUS (HELPIADIUS), a deacon of Lyons, and, according to some, an ex-monk (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 545 n.), who studied medicine, and became one of the physicians of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths (Procop. Bell. Goth. lib. i. cap. 1), to whom intimate friendship he was also admitted (regia potestas ac sedulo famulatu intimus, Cyprian. Tolones. Caeasar. Arist. Vita, lib. i. 25, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 1016). His skill in his profession is evidenced by a letter from St. Avitus bishop of Vienne, begging him to cure the son of one Celerius, and speaking of his "peritia singularis" (Avitus, Epist. 35 in Patr. Lat. lxxii. 251), and by another from Eudocius bishop of Ticinum, informing him that he is daily afflicted with such a complication of diseases that he desists from his life (Eusebius, Epist. 10, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 155; cf. too lib. viii. ep. 8, Migne, lxxii. 135). The facts of his life known to us are scanty. He was on intimate terms with Eudocius (see the letters above quoted, and a fourth, lib. vii. ep. 7; Patr. Lat. lxxii. 117). Cyprian in his life of Caesarius bishop of Arles (lib. i. n. 29, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 1016), tells a story of his having a haunted house, apparently at Arles, which the bishop, by the sprinkling of holy water, freed from the spirits. In the Epist. Var. of Cassiodorus (lib. ix. ep. 24, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 612) there is preserved a letter addressed to him by his master Theodoric, towards the close of his reign, in the highest terms of respect and admiration. Euplontius had seemingly petitioned the king for a grant to enable him to restore some of the buildings of Spoleto, which had suffered from age. The letter readily conceals his request. From this it has been inferred that he was, at least temporarily, a resident at Spoleto.

Two short poems by him are extant, both on sacred subjects, and both written in the hexameter metre. The former is in two twenty-four separate stanzas of the lines, each consisting of a different subject from the Bible, but for the most part alternating between the Old and New Testament, a stanza on a subject from the former being followed by a corresponding one from the latter, the type by the antitype. For instance, one on the confusion of tongues at the destruction of Babel, has for its complement the miracle of tongues at Pentecost, that on the selling of Joseph by his brethren, the selling of Christ by Judas. The other poem is somewhat longer, and not distinguished by this peculiarity. It is a hymn on the blessings conferred by Christ, and the language is perhaps more spirited. Both are classical for the age. They may be seen in


ELPIDIUS—MARTYR; LAYMAN

8. [Epiphanius (2).]

ELPIDIUS (34), a martyr under Julian with Marcellus, Eustachius, and others. Special cruelty was practiced towards Euplontius as he was a man of senatorial rank, and had been made "praefectus praetorio" by Constantius (Baron. Annal. 362, 15). He is commemorated Nov. 16. [T. S. B.]

ELPIDIUS (35), HELPIADIUS, a Paphlegonius who held several important offices under Constantine and Constantius. A law of 323 was addressed to him by Constantine, when he was perhaps vicarius of Italy (Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 5; see Gothofredus). He was a man of mean aspect and a poor speaker, but of very gentle and honest character. He succeeded Hermogenes as praetorian prefect in 361, but begged to resign his office when Constantius ordered him to torture an innocent man in his presence (Amm. xx. 6, 9). Before he became prefect he paid a visit, with his wife Aristsetia and his children, to St. Anthony of Egypt. On his return his three sons were taken ill of fever at Gaza, and were healed by the prayers of St. Hilarion (S. Hieron. De Vit. H. tom. i. p. 249). Libanius addressed a complimentary letter to him, in which the wife and children are also mentioned (Lib. Ep. 1301). Baronius identifies him with the Roman senator martyred by Julian (no. 34), commemorated by the Roman church on Nov. 16; but this is improbable (see Tillemont, Emp. iv. p. 691). It is uncertain whether he is the "count of the private estate" in the next article who is said to have apostatized under Julian. (Theodore, H. E. ii. 12, and Tillemont, l.c.)

[J. W.]

ELPIDIUS (36), nicknamed "the Sacrificer" (Δεσπότης, Philostorg. H. E. vii. 10), a friend of the emperor Julian, under whom he held the office of Comes Rerum Privatarum. During the reign of Constantius he had professed himself to be a Christian, but under Julian he became an earnest pagan (Philostorg. u. s.; Theodoret, H. E. iii. 12). Libanius, a great correspondent of his, describes him as, though inferior in learning to Maximus and Priscus, two other friends of Julian's, yet their equal in zeal for the gods and in affection for the emperor. (Liban. Orat. pro Aristoph. ed. Reiske, pp. 435, 436.) When Julian commanded him to sacrifice, he told his master that Constantine had erected at Antioch to be spoiled of its treasures and closed, Euplontius was one of the three officers who were sent to execute the mandate. (Theodoret, H. E. u. s.) He survived Julian, the uncle of the emperor, and Felix, his associates on that occasion, but being implicated in the treason of Procopius, A.D. 365 he was deprived of all his property and cast into prison, where he died amid universal detestation. (Philostorg. u. s.; Theodoret, u. s.;Niceph. x. 29.) Euplontius is frequently mentioned by Libanius in his letters, and always in terms of great praise. (Epp. 29, 33, 136, 208, 237, 302, 303.) [T. W. D.]

ELPIDIUS (37), A.D. 371, assessor of Tha-
ELPIDIUS—LAYMAN

ELPIDIUS (38). A.D. 375. bearer of a letter from Basil to Amphilochius bishop of Iconium. He was servant to Amphilochius and was hastening to him to refute certain calumnies about himself (Basil. Epist. 231, Patr. Græc. xxxii. p. 861).

ELPIDIUS (39) (HELPIUS), a Spanish rhetorician of the 4th century, one of the promoters of the Zoroastrian opinions in Spain which culminated in Priscillianism. He is mentioned by Jerome (Ep. cxxxiii. 4; see also Ep. lxxv. 3, and Vallarini's note) as having been misled by Agape [Agape] and as having imbibed his opinions from Mark the Egyptian; and by Sulpicius Severus (Chron. ii. 46, 47) as having been condemned together with Priscillian (both of them being laymen) by the synod of Caesar Augustus (Sara-gossa) A.D. 380. It is singular that in the letter of Pope Innocentius on the synod of Toledo, about A.D. 402 (Inn. Ep. 3), the name Elpidius appears as that of a presbyter who had come with others to lay before the apostolic see the state of the province of Baetica, which was distracted by Priscillianism. [ELPIDIUS (27)]. [W. M. S.]

ELPIDIUS (40), a Spanish nobleman, cousin to Theodosius I. The emperor endeavoured to obtain for him the hand of Olympia shortly after her widowhood. On her steadfast refusal of his overtures, Elpidius, imagining that she would yield to the emperor's authority, suggested the use of forcible measures. Theodosius ordered the confiscation of her property till she should be thirty years old, and forbade her to hold any intercourse with the bishops, or to go to church, but without affecting Olympia's resolution to remain a widow. ( Pallad. Dial. p. 164.) [E. V.]

ELPIDIUS (41), an Arian gentleman, who, having sent to Bonosus and Jason a work of St. Augustine's, afterwards sent to the latter a treatise by an Arian bishop, in the hope of clearing up the whole question, and reclaiming him from his supposed errors of doctrine. The reply of Augustine is directed to the object of illustrating the Catholic doctrine in this question, and is remarkable for its studious yet genuine courtesy and moderation of tone. (Aug. Ep. 242.) [H. W. P.]

ELPIDIUS (42), one of the two imperial commissioners (Eulogius being the other) sent by Theodosius II. to represent him at the infamous "Robbers' Synod" of Ephesus, 449 A.D. Elpidius was a man of high official rank, "count of the divine assembly," a president of the council. (Labbe, Concil. iv. 105.) His whole behaviour exhibited the most unblushing partiality and a determination to intimidate the party opposed to the emperor's wishes. Stephen bishop of Ephesus having shown hospitality to Eusebius of Dorylaeum and other members of Flavian's party, Elpidius and Eulogius paid him a demis- cilliary visit, with a band of 300 men, partly his own soldiers, partly disorderly monks, and threatened him with punishment for receiving the emperor's enemies (ib. 112). On the opening of the council he unblushingly took part against Flavian, delivering a long and rhetorical harangue, at the close of which he produced the emperor's letter to Dioscorus, postponing the reading of that from pope Leo (ob. 128, 145). The request of Flavian that the accuser of Eutyches, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, might be heard, was con- tumeliously refused by Elpidius, who rebelled the venerable prelate for daring to speak with- out permission of the council, and told him that the accusation was a thing of the past, and could not be entered on again (ob. 145). In the scene of excitement and disorder which followed the revocation of the condemnation of Eutyches and the sentence of deposition pronounced on Flavian and Eusebius, Elpidius and Eulogius resorted to the grossest measures of intimidation, calling in the provost of Asia, attended by a tumultuous body of soldiers and monks, bearing swords, clubs, and chains (ob. 112, 129). These guards of public order, if not actual abettors of Barsumas and his brutal adherents in their assault on Flavian and the other orthodox bishops, certainly did nothing to restrain their violence. (Tillemont, Mémo. Eccl. vol. xv. passim.) [E. V.]

ELPIDOFORUS, an apostate from the ranks of the Catholics during the general persecu- tion of the orthodox in Africa by the Vandal king Hunneric, c. A.D. 484. Elpidoforus was ap- pointed to superintend the punishments of the catholics, and amongst those brought before him was Muritta the deacon, who had received him from the font on his baptism. Muritta before his burning produced the very towels or sheets in which he had received Elpidoforos or stepping out of the font, and reproached him with so much force that Elpidoforus was burned with fire of conscience before he entered the eternal fire, as Victor Vitensis narrates. (De Persec. Vandal. v. 9, in Migne, Patr. Lat. Iii. 246.) [L. D.]

ELPIDOPHORUS (1) (Mansi, Concil. iii. 148), bishop of Cuicilus. [ELPIDIPHORUS (2)]

ELPIDOPHORUS (2), bishop of Anastasie- polis, in Cariæ, present at the fifth general council, A.D. 553. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 813; Mansi, ix. 394.) [L. D.]

ELPIN, of Glais-Naidheen (Glasevin, an ancient monastery founded by St. Berchan, who is better known as Mobhi Clairenehc (Oct. 12), on the Lifey, near Dublin [BRECHAN (4)]), died A.D. 753. (Four Mast.) [J. G.]

ELPIS (1), one of the auxons in the system of VALENTINUS (Iren. i. i. p. 7; Hippol. Ref. vi. 30, p. 187; Epiph. Haer. 31, pp. 165, 169). [G. S.]

ELPIS (2), martyr with Pistas, Agape, and their mother Sophia. [CARIAS].
ELPIUS (5) (also written Helpis), daughter of Festus, a Roman senator, and, according to a doubtful tradition, wife of Boethius, who at one period of his life was certainly married to Rustici, the daughter of Symmachus [Boethius]. The only evidence for the double marriage of Boethius to be found in his writings is the passage in the "Consolatio Philosophiae" (Lib. ii. Pros. 3), "Quis non te telicissimum ... tanto splendore socerorum ... praeclari?" which is obviously capable of a different interpretation. Elpis is the reputed authoress of two hymns in the breviary addressed to the Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, Deo cara lacrantes acearum, and Beate Pastor Petri clementis accepis (Migne, Patrologia, vol. liii. p. 558). An epitaph upon this lady in six elegiac couplets (ibid. p. 558) speaks of her as "Siculae regionis alumnis," and records the fact that she followed her husband into banishment. It has been ascribed, but without authority, to Boethius himself (Vallini, Vit. Beoth. praefat.). [E. M. Y.]

ELPISTUS, a contemporary of Dionysius bishop of Corinth. [DIONYSIUS (3)]. Eusebius relates that Dionysius attributes his letter to the Amastriani and other churches of Pontus to the influence of Beccylides and Elpestus (Guseb. H. E. iv. 23). [W. M. S.]

ELRIG, son of Ealdwulf (or Aldulf) king of East Anglia, according to Nennius, who is the only authority for his existence. He would thus be the brother of Eadberht abbess of Ripon. (Nenn. Hist. Brit. in M. H. B. 744; Lappenberg, Hist. Eng. i. 267.) [C. H.]

ELTUTUS (Nennius, Hist. Brit. in M. H. B. 744), Welsh saint. [ILTUTUS.] [C. H.]

ELVEUS, ELVUIUS, bishop of Menevia. [ELVEUS.] [C. H.]

ELUOC (ELNUT, ELNUT, ELWAD) was bishop at Carygyl in Anglesey, and in the Achan Saint ysgy Frayddin is identified with ELWAD, bishop of Bangor. (Myn. Arch. ii. 42.) [J. G.]

ELURION, A.D. 347, Egyptian bishop, present at the Council of Sardica (Mansi, iii. 66 d; Athanas. i. 130). [W. M. S.]

ELUSIUS (Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 199), deacon. [ELUSIUS (1).] [C. H.]

ELYAVED (ELANG, ELAVE, ELVODE, ELWAED), are probably all names of the same person who is numbered among the bishops of Menevia or St. David's, but beyond the names we know nothing; it is suggested by Professor Stubbs that he may be Elyad or Elob, bishop of Bangor (A.D. 755-809) [ELMOI], but it is very doubtful for many reasons, though the names are similar. (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. Angl. 155, 157; Girald. Camb. Hist. Camb. ii. c. i. vita; Godwin, de Prasulis Angl. 601.) [J. G.]

ELYAN (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. p. 159), legendary bishop of London. [ELYAN.] [C. H.]

ELYEIS, Welsh saint. [ELYEIS.] [C. H.]

ELYETUS, bishop of Arretio, 775. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xviii. 76; Ugheili, Ital. Sacr. i. 412.) [A. H. D. A.]

ELVIANDUS (HELVIANDUS), bishop of Treviso (Tarvisium). When Attila had sacked Aquileia, Concordia, and other neighbouring cities, and was approaching Treviso the bishop saved the town by a prompt surrender, A.D. 452. (Ugheili, Italia Sacra, v. 410; Games, Series Episc. 806.) [L. D.]

ELYVOD (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. p. 157), bishop of Bangor, archbishop of Gwynned. [ELYVOD, ELVAD.] [C. H.]

ELYVODUGUS, educated at Bangor in Wales, and author of Historia Britonum, lib. i., is probably the same as St. Elod, whose contemporary he is otherwise said to have been, though his reputed date (A.D. 590) is at least two centuries before St. Elod's time. Piseus (de Hist. Angl. Script. 103) calls him Elvedugus Probus, and adheres to the early date; he also gives a separate account of Elodus, and yet he appears to give an account of the same individual in both memoirs. [ELYVOD.] (Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. 153; Tanner, Bibl. 262.) [J. G.]

ELYVOED, bishop of Menevia (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. p. 155). [ELYVOED, ELVAD.] [C. H.]

ELYVOGUS (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. p. 156), bishop of Llandaff. [ELYVOGUS.] [C. H.]

ELYWAED. [ELYWAED.]

ELYWAED (ELWOED), a clerical witness to grants of land to Llandaff when Teilo and Arwystyl were the bishops in the 6th century (Llib. Land. by Rees, 308-60, 412-13). When St. Oudocus was chosen to succeed St. Teilo, Elwaed was one of the most prominent electors. According to the Life of St. Oudocus, he, Mercwych, and Cyanwyf went, apparently as delegates from the clergy, to present the bishop-elect to the Archbishop of Canterbury for consecration. (Ib. 372.) There can be little doubt but he is the Elgwared who attended the school of St. Durtigius at Hertland on the Wye (Dubriction 16, 324). [J. G.]

ELWINUS (1), ST., or Aluanus, one of Breca's companions in her voyage from Ireland to Cornwall. A life of him was extant in Leland's time (Itim. iii. p. 5, 15, 16, 21). His day was Feb. 22. The parish named after him, St. Allen, is a little way north of Truro, and the parish between it and the sea is dedicated to St. Perran, also an Irish saint. [C. W. B.]

ELWINUS (2) (Munm. G. R. A. i. § 77, ed. Hardy), brother of Egfrid. [ELWINUS.] [C. H.]

ELYWOED (ELWOED, ELWOD), abbat of St. Illtys, now Lantwit Major, and witness to several grants of land to the see of Llandaff, when Oudocus and Berthwyr were bishops, in the 6th century (Llib. Land. by Rees, 402 sq.). [J. G.]

ELYWOG (ELYVOGUS) was bishop of Llandaff in the time of Meurig, Rhys, Fierwael, and Ichodri, sons of Isfeal, king of Owainysg (Glamorgan). He is said by Ussher to have been the sixteenth bishop of Llandaff, and the Liber Landavensis places him next to bishop Trychan, but the editor inserts three bishops between them and
counts Elwog only the ninth prelate at Llandaff. He must have flourished in the second half of the 8th century. Professor Stubbs suggests his identity with Elbo, bishop of Bangor. (Lb. Londav. 400, 626; Usher, Eccl. Ant. c. 5, wks. v. 110; Godwin, de Praesatul. Angl. 625; Stubbs, Regat. Sacr. 156.) [J. G.]

ELWORED. [ELWIREDE.]

ELWYSYTL (ELOISTIL), one of the clergy under St. Druirci, is placed among the bishops of Llandaff, but only as one of the suffragan, according to the system instituted by St. Telio, who raised (suitable persons) to the episcopacy, sending them through the country, and giving dioceses to them to suit the convenience of the clergy and the people.” Elwysyt appears to have been stationed in Ergyng, and flourished in the first half of the 6th century, in the times of Cyfrif and Gwyddai, sons of Pechain, kings of Ergyng. (Lb. Londav. by Rees, 352, 408, 624; Godwin, de Praesatul. Angl. 622; Stubbs, Regat. Sacr. Angl. 156.) [J. G.]

ELXAI (Ephian. Haeres. xix.), founder of Elkesaites. [ELKEISIAL.] [C. H.]

ELYMAS, a presbyter, martyr in Persia, together with Polychronius bishop of Babylon, and several other presbyters and deacons during the Decian persecution. Commemorated April 22. (Boll. Acta SS. Apr. iii. 11; Tilmel. Hist. Eccl. v. 561; Baron. Annal. 254, 27.) [T. S. B.]

ELYW. [ELYW.]

EMA or AMA—May 22. Martyr with six other nuns, captives with Eliabas. [ELIABUS.] They were offered freedom on condition of marriage and offering sacrifice. They refused, and were once beheaded. (Assem. Mart. Orient. i. 144.) [G. T. S.]

EMAGOLA. [MULUSC.] [MULUSC.]

EMAN, a clerical witness to a grant made to Grecilin, bishop of Llandaff, late in the 7th or early in the 8th century (Lb. Londav. by Rees, 417-18). [J. G.]

EMANT, of Cluain, commemorated July 1. He is called a bishop by Mar. O'Gorman, and his name is inserted by the second hand in the Martyrology of Donegal (by Todd and Reeser, 183 and n. 7). It appears in the Kalendar of the Arubhchnitt Missal (Bp. Forbes, Col. Scott. Saints, 102), in the phonetic form of St. Evan, bishop. [J. G.]

EMMANUEL, archimandrite. [EMMANUEL.] [EMMANUEL.]

EMANUS, martyred at Chartres in the 6th century with St. Mauritius and St. Almerus. According to the legend he was a Cappadocian, who in early youth made a pilgrimage to Rome, where pope Leo befriended him and furthered his education. After a stay of seven years, he conceived the desire of visiting the shrine of St. Nazarius at Milan. Here he stayed two years, and then proceeded to that of St. Symphorian at Autun, but a little later, warned by a vision, quitted that city to preach the Gospel at Chartres. In a remote part of that district he was set upon by thieves, who received with con-

EMERITUS, bishop of Cambrai. [HILARUS.]

EMERENTIANA, a virgin, martyr at Rome, A.D. 304. She was the foster-sister of Agnes [AGNES]; as she mourned for her at tomb, she was stoned by a crowd of people. She was at the time a catechumen. She is commemorated Jan. 23. (Men. Bas. Mart. Act. 304, 31.) [T. S. B.]

EMERIA (1) is the name given by Joceline and Erinus in their Lives of St. Patrick to the two daughters of St. Patrick's master Milcho, and sisters of bishop Guassacht (Jan. 24) of Granard. While Joceline (c. 36) gives few particulars regarding them except their place of burial, Erinus (Vita. v. c. 39, ii. cc. 56, 57) gives first an account of a wonderful dream of Milcho, and then tells how St. Patrick placed bishop Guassacht over the church of Granrod, co. Longford, and the two sisters were put in charge of the neighbouring nunery of Claisbranach, now Clonbroney, where at death they were interred, and are now venerated on July 11 (Colgan, Acta SS. 741, col. 2, and Tr. Thams. 73, c. 36, 100 n. 36, 120, c. 20, 183, c. 30, 148, c. 135, 170, b. 9). Lanigan (Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. 146, 219, 405) allows that there may have been such persons in Ireland, and even at Clonbroney, but many difficulties in the way of their receiving them and Guassach as children of the unfortunate Milcho or Maelchul.

EMERIA (2), one of St. Trinian's two companions at Rescob, Forfarshire [TRIDIANA] (Brev. Aberd. Prop. SS. p. aestiv. f. 122.) [J. G.]

EMERINUS (EAMENUS), a bishop of Limoges, whose name is found in the catalogues between Atticus and Hermogenian, who flourished in the 3rd century. He is not mentioned in the letter written by Jordanus bishop of Limoges to pope Benedict VIII., in which he gives a list of the early bishops of the see in their chronological order. (Gallic. Christ. ii. 501, Instrumenta, 165; Gams, Series Episc. 564.) [L. D.]

EMERITA (1), supposed sister of the British king Lucius. Her death by martyrdom, after she had followed her brother in his missionary journeys, is placed at Trinum or Trinomeum, near Curia, now Coire, or Chur, the capital town of the Swiss canton Grisons, a.d. 193. Her feast is Dec. 4. Dempster has her commemoration at May 26 and Dec. 3, and with other Scotch authorities gives her nativity to Scotia (Usher, Eccl. Ant. c. 5, 6, wks. v. 53 sq. 186; Creasy, Ch. Hist. Brit. iv. 18; Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 261; Res. Welsh Saints, 83, 316.) [J. G.]
EMERITA

EMERITA (2), virgin martyr at Rome, together with Digna. They were put to death during the Valerian persecution, circ. A.D. 257. Consecrated Sept. 22. (AA. SS. Sept. vi. 302.) [T. S. B.]

EMERITA (3), sister of Cornelia, confessress. (Cyp. Epp. 21, 22.) [MACARIUS.] [K. W. B.]

EMERITUS (1), Donatist bishop of Julia Caesarea, or Jol, once an important town on the coast of Morocco, now called Scherschell (Shaw, Trav. p. 18).

A conference between the Catholics and Donatists was held at Carthage in June, A.D. 411, by command of Honorius, at which Marcellinus the proconsul presided. For the general character of the discussion, and the part taken in it by Emeritus, see above, vol. i. pp. 893, 894, but some remarks may here be added to illustrate his own character. He may be described as showing himself inquisitive and adroit, and to this extent able, partisan and special pleader, exhibiting much profession of fairness and anxiety that the case should be decided on its real merits, but meanwhile making it his business to divert attention from them, affecting a mock modesty as to his own slowness of comprehension, and on this ground repeatedly asking for more time to consider the whole matter, declaring his inability to understand the grounds taken by his opponents, and complaining of their alleged attempt to regard the Donatists and not themselves as the challenging party. He attempted also to shew that the ground taken by them in their invitation to discuss the disputed questions was different from that laid down by the imperial commission, that the genuineness of the invitation itself was doubtful, and that there was on the part of the Catholics a wish to conceal the truth in this matter. At the same time he disclaimed any obligation of being bound by the result of the discussion, insisted on regarding the question as merely an African one, and protested against its being extended beyond the limits of the province.

When Augustine replied that it affected not the African church only, but the universal church of Christ, Emeritus accused him of shifting his ground, and of taxing him with a fault of which he himself was guilty. When the president recalled the attention of the Donatists to the real question, viz. whether the case was to be argued on the ground of fact or on that of doctrine, Emeritus replied, that if there were two grounds there ought to have been two commissions, and to the remark of Augustine, that if facts were to be judged, they must be attested by evidence, if doctrine, arguments taken from Scripture must be used, Emeritus repeated his former protest against treating the Donatists as challengers of the discussion. When Augustine asked whether they abandoned their objection to the consecration of Cascellanus, Emeritus complained that if they did so they were treated as challengers; if not, the Catholics claimed the right of replying to them as objectors. He protested against the importation into the controversy of the name of Cascellanus. Had the proceedings concerning him made him a righteous man or not? The church ought to be pure, and is vitiated by the presence of impure persons.

The world is not the church, nor does God in any way regard the two as identical. The above account is taken from the Monumenta Vetera de Don. Hist. in Oberthur's edition of Optatus, No. 55, pp. 285-482; see also Ribbek, Don. und Aug. pp. 515-608.

On Sept. 20, 418, a meeting of Catholic bishops was held at Caesarea by desire of Zosimus, bishop of Rome, at which Deuterius, the metropolitan, presided. Emeritus, who happened to be in the place at this time, was invited to attend. Having mentioned the insinuations which were current as to the unfairness of the inquiry, whose decision it was said had been purchased by the Catholics, Augustine called on him to give a reason why, after the decisions against him and his party, he still refused to rejoin the church. Having recited the declaration of the Catholic bishops previous to the inquiry, in order to shew their candour and spirit of fairness, Augustine gave a summary of the Maximianis proceedings, in which Emeritus had taken a prominent part as a member of the council of Bazaia, and by assisting in drawing up its decision, if not, as Augustine appears to say, actually dictating it. He shewed that these had been pressed without effect upon the Donatists at the inquiry, and pointed out their inconsistency therein. But he failed in drawing from his opponent any satisfactory reply. (Ang. de Gratia cum Eoner. vol. ix. p. 698; Tillemont, lxvi., lxvii.; Donatism, sup. 887.)

Two days after this Emeritus was present at a discourse delivered by Augustine in the principal church of Caesarea, in which, while he justified the imperial proceedings against the Donatists, proceedings which they chose to call persecution, he entreated his former opponent to return to the communion of the church. Augustine mentions in his Retractations that shortly after this he addressed a letter to Emeritus, containing an account of the points in which he thought the Donatists had been vanquished in argument, but this letter is not extant. From this time we hear no more of Emeritus. (Ang. Retract. i. 46, 51; Ep. 190, 193, c. Gens. i. 14; Possidius, V. Aug. c. 14; Ribbek, u. s. pp. 645, 649.) [H. W. F.]

EMERITUS (2), bishop of Macri in the African province of Mauritania Cidna, summoned to Carthage to confer with the Arians by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 484; at the conclusion of the conference he was sent into banishment, where he died. (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 207; Gams, Series Episc. 466.) [L. D.]

EMERITUS (3), eleventh archbishop of Embrun, succeeding Salonius, who was deposed for treason and followed by St. Alphonse, who seems to have held the see from A.D. 585 to 610. He was present at the second council of Mâcon in 585, and himself convened a provincial synod in A.D. 588. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. lib. v. cap. 28; Labbe, Conc. vi. 681, 692; Ceillier, Hist. des Ant. Sacr., xi. 896; Gall. Christ. ii. 1063.) [S. A. B.]

EMERITUS (4), a reader, who suffered martyrdom along with Saturninus and many others at Abitina in Africa during the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 303. He openly avowed that an
assembly had been held in his house on a Sunday, and refused to surrender the sacred books, for, as he said, "they are written on my heart." He was commemorated on Feb. 11 or, according to some, on Feb. 12. (Boll. AA. SS. Feb. ii. 513-519; Beluze, Mucchi. Hist. i. 14; Ceilier, iii. 20; Vict. Vit. de Pers. Vand. lib. iii.; Ruinart, A. A. Sacra. Mart. 382; Baron. Annal. 303, 38, 49.)

[Porta.

EMERIUS (1), bishop of Treves. [EYERMUS.

EMERIUS (2), the eighth bishop of Saints, succeeding Eusebius, flourished in A.D. 562 or 563. His election was irregular, for he had usurped the see on the sole authority of a mandate of king Clovis, without the consent of his metropolitan, who was absent, and apparently without having obtained the suffrages of the people and clergy. Accordingly, Leonius the archbishop of Bourges convened a council of the bishops of his province at Saints, and having deprived Emerius, put Heracleus a priest of Bourges in his place (Labbe, Conc. vi. 527; Gueydon, Mem. doc. 237). The document attesting the fresh election, subscribed by the archbishop and bishops, was forwarded to king Charibert, who had succeeded his father C lovis. Charibert at once ordered Emerius to be reinstated, and sent his officers to exact a thousand gold pieces from Leonius, and from the rest according to their ability, and so avenged the insult. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. 36; Coll. Hist. des Auctores Sacros., xi. 896-7.) This was one of the high-handed impieties to which Baronius (ann. 566, n. xviii.) ascribes Charibert's death. But he infers from some verses of Venanius Fortunatus, lib. i. (given in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 74), that Emerius continued to hold the see, and was reconciled to Leonius.

[S. A. B.]

EMERIUS (3), St., son of St. Candida, founder and first abbot of the monastery of Benzoles (Balmeolum) in Catalonia. He lived during the time when the Gothic inhabitants of Spain were hard pressed by the Mahometans, during the life of Charles Martel, A.D. 739; other traditions assign to him the time of Charlemagne. (AA. SS. Boll. 27 Jan. ii. 761.)

[Porta.

EMERIUS, bishop of Treves. [EYERMUS.

EMETERIUS, bishop of Tarentaise. [EMI-

EMETERIUS (1) AGRICOLA (MATINS, St. MADIR), said to have suffered martyrdom near Barcelona about A.D. 890. He was commemorated on March 3. (Boll. AA. SS. Mart. i. 244.)

[Porta.

EMETERIUS (2) only known as a subscriber of the fifth council of Arles, A.D. 554. He was not present, but was represented by Claudianus, a deacon. The name of his see was not added, and he has been claimed conjunctively as the sixth bishop of Riez, and the eighth of Marseille. The latter is Le Cointe's conjecture, and is the more probable. (Le Cointe, an. 554, n. xvii. vol. i. p. 799; Gall. Chist. i. 394, 637; Labbe, Conc. vi. 462.)

[S. A. B.]

EMETERIUS (HAEEMETERIUS,HEME-

EMETERIUS, HEMETERIUS), martyr, who is said to have suffered along with Cledonius, at Calais, in the modern Calabshara, on the river Elbe. He must have lived before Prudentius, but at what period is quite uncertain (Gregor. Turon. de Glor. Mart. i. 83, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 825). He was commemorated on March 3. Prudentius composed a poem (Peristep. Hymn i) in honour of the two martyrs (ibid. lx. 275; AA. SS. Boll. Mart. i. 228). The Galliandt distinguish between this martyr and Emeterius. (Vet. Rom. Mart., Usuard, Adon., Notker, Wadulb. In Mart. Hieron. he occurs as Eremitas.)

[Porta.

EMILIA

EMIGDIUS (EMYDIDUS), first bishop and tutelary saint of Asculum or Ascoli in Picenza. In the reign of Docietian he came out of Germany, with twelve brothers, to visit the tombs of the martyrs at Rome, where by his zealous preaching, overthrowing a statue of Aesculapius and casting it into the Tiber, he so exasperated the prefect that Marcellus bishop of Rome ordained him bishop and sent him for safety to Asculum. Here he eventually suffered martyrdom under the prefect Polimius, A.D. 303 or 304. The Roman Martyrology commemorates him on Aug. 5. His Life has been written by Lebertus, the Jesuit Historian of Ascoli, but the authorities for his highly legendary Acta are allowed by Boschius to be conflicting and suspicious. (Ugel. Ital. Sac. i. 439; Baron. Annal. 309, iv.; Boll. Acta SS. Aug. ii. 25; Paolo Antonio Appiani, Vita di San Emilico, Rom. 1702.)

AMPLIA (1), bishop of Barcelona (2) from about A.D. 600 to about 615. His name appears among the signatures to the disputed decreetum Gundemarii [GUNTUMARI], which professes to date from 610. An Emilia is also found among the subscriptions to the synod of the province of Tarraconensis, held at Egrara in 615. No see is mentioned, but as Barcelona is one of the suffragan bishoprics of Tarraco, it seems justifiable to identify this Emilia with the Emma ecclesiast Barcinonensis episcopus in Gundemarius's decree, which, even if not of the date it pretends to be, was probably put together with the help of documents now inaccessible to us. It is not pretended in any case that the decreetum is later than 681 (Esp. Supr. xxii. 128; Aguirre-130atalia, iii. 942 and 984). [SEVERUS, 52.]

[Porta.

EMILIA (2), bishop of Mentessa. After the (disputed) synod of Carthaginensis bishops at Toledo, in 610, and the decree of Gunthamar in the same year [GUNTUMARI] (which documents are appended to the Acts of C. Tol. iii.), there appear in the most ancient MSS. three letters, or Suggestions, from the clergy and people of Mentessa, the first from Sossul in the name of the clergy, the second from Sussil, which latter takes to have been the chief civil authority, and the third from John, Ermengild, and Venedus, in the name of the people of Mentessa, asking that one Emilia of noble birth and character, should be consecrated "per Dei et vestrum ordinacionem." There is no name given of the church to which these letters are addressed, and we add further mention of Emilia; but if the letters, together with the synod and decree, are genuine, and not a forgery of the time of Julius, it is probable, as Gams has suggested, that the letter

[Porta.]
were tacked on to the Acts of the synod and to
Guthimir's decree, as documentary evidence in
support of the claim to supremacy then brought
forward by, and formally conceded to, Toledo, and
that Emila must be dated, not after 610, but
before 599. The charter belongs to the name of
the bishops of Mentasa are known (Esp. Sagra.
vii. 255, Aguirre-Catalani; Gams, Kirchengesch.
vol. ii. pt. 2, 77).

[M. A. W.]

EMLA (8), bishop of Ilicii (Elche), subscribes
the acts of the fiftieth council of Toledo under
Egica, a.d. 688, as "Ellicianae, qui et Elotanae
sedis Episcopus." For the connexion of the see
of Ilicii with the older bishopric of Elotana vid.
Serpentinae. (Esp. Sagra. vii. 241; Aguirre-
Catalani, iv. 313.)

[M. A. W.]

EMLA (4), the last bishop of Coimbra under
the Gothic rule whose name remains to us. He
signs the acts of the sixteenth Council of Toledo,
der Egica, a.d. 693. (Esp. Sagra. xiii. 76; 
Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 333.) [LUCRINCIUS.]

[M. A. W.]

EMILIA (8), dean of Cordova, martyr with
Hierenia, a layman, under the Saracens. They
were beheaded in the Arabin town, in which
they so eloquently denounced the false prophet
beyond all previous example that the Saracens
mutilated the extirpation of the whole Christian
church at Cordova. Eulogius of Toledo gives
Sept. 15 as their day (Eulog. Tolet. Memor. SS.
t. 12, in Patr. Lat. cxxv. 793). Emila is named
also Emilianus. [EMILIANUS (15).] [C. H.]

EMILIANUS (1) (AEMLIANUS), reckoned
by the Sammariath, according to their author-
ities, the first bishop of Valencia in Gaul. He
is mentioned, without any see, among the bishops
who attended the council of Valence in
the year 374. (Bruno, Canon. Apost. ii. 111;
Ital. Chrift. ari. 201; Ceilier, iv. 600.) [C. H.]

EMILIANUS (2) I, eleventh bishop of
Vercelli, cit. a.d. 500, present at the third and
fourth councils of Rome under Symmachus
(Nanai, viii. 225 a, 268 a), buried in the church
of St. Eusebius, where his remains were dis-
covered in 1081; commemorated Sept. 11. It is
stated that he was born in Spain in the town
of Libyum, that he was a disciple of bishop
Felis, and a hermit for forty years, and that
his great fame caused him to be unanimously elected
bishop by the clergy and people of Vercelli
(Boll. Acta SS. 11 Sept. iii. 797; Ugelli, Ital.
Sacra. iv. 782). The story of his life thus crosses
that of the famous Spanish San Millan. [EMIL-
IANUS (9).] [C. H.]

EMILIANUS (3) II., twenty-second bishop of
Vercelli according to Ugelli (Ital. Sacra.
iv. 783), who is followed by Gams. The period
assigned to him is the year a.d. 653, and he is
stated to have received many privileges from the
Lombard king, Aripert I. Some confusion with
Emilianus III. may be suspected. [C. H.]

EMILIANUS (4) III., bishop of Vercelli. In
a deed of Aripert I., king of the Lombards, dated
Oct. 5, 626 (Proc. Cor. Diom. 3, p. 80), Emili-
anus receives a confirmation of the lands which
Gandersius ("olim nostro miles suae Antonii
abas") had given to the monastery known after-
wards as that of St. Michele di Luccedo near
Vercelli. Aripert also decrees that the monastery
which Emilianus had consecrated should be under
the control of himself and his successors. (See
also Historiarum patriarca Monumneta Chartarum,
vol. i. 15-15. The charter belongs to a.D. 706
or 707, according as the "fifth indiction" is
reckoned. Ugelli (Ital. Sacra. iv. 783) has no
Emilianus III., and calls this bishop, of whom
he relates the same facts, Magnetius, the twenty-
fifth in his list. See the preceding article.)

[A. H. F. A.]

EMILIANUS (5) patriarch of Grado 749 to
757. See Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, ix. 749.
For the relations of Grado and Aquileia, see
Elias and Epifanius. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacra.
v. 1090.) [A. H. D. A.]

EMILIANUS (6) (AEMLIANUS), an Irish
bishop, patron of Fquentia, now Faenza, in the
north of Italy (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 16, 
§ 10; Camerarius, de Lond. Port. Nov. 12, p. 198;

EMILIANUS (7) (AEMLIANUS), a hermit
who retired into the forest of Ponticiacum in
Auvergne. This locality has been thought to be
either Pontgibaud at the sources of the Sioule,
west of Clermont beyond the Puy de Dôme
mountain, or Pionsat at the north-west angle of
the dep. Puy de Dôme. Here he passed his life
in prayer and manual labour, with the birds and
wild beasts for his familiar companions. He
died at the age of ninety, a.d. 538, leaving what
possessions he had to his disciple Brachio. (Greg.
Tur. VIII. Patr. c. 12, in Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixii.
1210; Ceiller, xi. 381.) [L. D.]

EMILIANUS (8) (AEMLIANUS, SAN
MILLAN), solitary; one of the most famous
and ancient of Spanish saints, claimed by the
Spanish Benedictines as joint patron of Spain with
St. James (Sandoval, Fundaciones de San Benito en
Espafia, Madrid, 1601). The only original source
of information about him is the life of him by
St. Brulio, bishop of Saragossa, written about
fifty years after his death, on the testimony of
four of his disciples—Citoctaus, Sophrosnius,
Gerontius, and a holy woman Potamia. St.
Brulio died about 657, and we have a mention
of his life of Emilianus by St. Idefonso (de
Script. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 12), which must have
been written before 657. The life was written
for the express purpose of being read on the
saint's feast-day, November 13, and was sent to
the bishop's brother Frontimianus, accompanied
by an Iambic hymn, which appears at length in
the Mazarabic Breviary. It was first published
by Sandoval in 1601.

St. Brulio gives no dates and no names of
parents, but the common tradition is that St.
Emilianus was born about 475, and died about 572, not long before the destruction of the town
of Amaya in Castilea (Otho, v. 150), by Leo-
vigid in 575, a fact mentioned in the Acta as
having been prophesied by the saint "ante annu
fere migrationis suae centumverso vita." His
birth-place and the site of his oratory have
given rise to endless controversy, Castile claiming
him as a native of the Ronja, a district of Old
Castile, born at Berceo, close to the existing
monastery of San Millan, while Aragon puts
forward Verdeyo, near Calatayud. The name of
his native place is given by St. Braulio as Vergegüm. The question then is, is Vergegüm represented by Bereco in Castile or Verdeco in Aragon? and which relics are genuine—those at Torrelapaja near Verdeco, or those at San Millan near Bereco? In the fifthieth volume of the *España Sagra*da, Señor Lasante devotes a good deal of space to these difficulties, and comes to the following conclusions: (1) that Vergegüm, He is Verdeco, and that San Millan was therefore a native of the Arragonese diocese of Tarrazona; (2) that the cult of the saint at or near the present San Millan is extremely ancient, and springs from the fact that the saint passed the first forty years of his anchorite life on the mountain of La Cogolla, which overhangs the monastery, being recalled thence by command of the bishop of Tarrazona; (3) that his oratory, of which St. Braulio speaks as the scene of his last years ("ubi unus ejus habetur corpusculum gloriosum"), is rather to be identified with Torrelapaja, near Verdeco, than with the site of the upper and elder monastery of San Millan de Suse, near Bereco. The archives of the monastery, from the 12th century onwards, have been so hopelessly tampered with and falsified that it is almost impossible to arrive at the facts of the original cult or of the early history of the community. The present Benedictine house was probably founded in the 11th century in the time of the Oligaric reform, though there may have been an elder community there, and the cult of the saint on the Cogolla mountain is certainly very much older. (Exp. Sagra*da*, vol. i. p. 2.)

Emilianus began life as a shepherd, and it was while following his flock over the mountains that the dream overtook him which was the cause of his conversion. Moved by what seemed the direct call of God to a holy life, he betook himself to St. Felix, a neighbouring hermit, living at Bili*bu*m (absorbed in the 12th century into the modern town of Haro), and was by him instructed in Catholic belief and practice. Thence he returned to Vergegüm (Verdeco), but finding his life there too public on account of the strangers who flocked to see him, he soon left it for the mountains, wandering north-west into the remotes of his mountainous sendzit between Burgos and Logroño ("ad remotiores Disterti montis secreti"). For 40 years he lived a hermit's life there, for the most part on or near the peak of La Cogolla (according to the tradition of the monastery; there is no mention of the Cogolla of St. Braulio's life), whence the above name of the monastery which commemorated him—San Millan de la Cogolla. At last, attracted by the fame of the holy father, Bishop Díindsay, bishop of Tarrazona (Turiasso), sent for him, and much against the saint's will ordained him presbyter, imposing upon him at the same time the cure of Vergegüm, his birthplace. In this office his entire unworldliness (locupletem redens ecclesiam Christi virtutibus non opibus; religione non redditiis; Christianis non rebus) drew upon him the hatred of his brother clergy. He was accused before Díindsay of wasting the goods of the church, and deprived of his cure. Thus released from an unwelcome office, Emilianus retired to an oratory near Vergegüm, and there passed the rest of his life. During this second period of retirement, although the severity of his personal asceticism increased rather than diminished with time, he allowed himself to be surrounded by a small circle of disciples and became widely famed for his charity and tenderness towards the poor. In extreme old age he even allowed himself to be nursed by certain holy women (habitabant cum sacris virginibus), a fact which, taken together with the manner of his possessing a horse at one time upon which he rode to church, seems to dispose of the absurd assertions of later times that St. Emilianus was the founder of a Benedictine monastery and himself a Benedictine abbot. St. Braulio nowhere speaks of him as monachus, but only as presbyter; there is of course no mention of any monastery, though we hear of friends and disciples, and we are told that he died in the arms of a certain "Arellum presbyterum, cum quo habebat collegium." Ildefonsus indeed speaks of St. Braulio's life as "vitam ejusdam monachi," and Braulio himself applies the title of abbat to Citonatus, one of the four disciples and eye-witnesses, a fact however which proves nothing for the Benedictines, as monachism in Spain is at least as old as the reign of the Christian princes of the Council of Saragossa in 380. On the whole it seems most likely that the Benedictine rule was unknown in Spain during the whole Visigoth period. (Mem., de la Real Acad. de Hist. de España, vol. viii. p. 469. See arts. FROMSTAN and ST. MARTIN of Braga.) About the beginning of the 13th century there was a curious upgrowth of legends, of miraculous appearances, forged privileges, and so forth, round San Millan and his monastery. Of this the Latin and Castilian versions of the famous "Privilegio de la Vota" (Sandoval, Fundaciones, &c. i. fol. 40), and the "Vida de San Millan" of Gonzalez Borco, written about 1240, and one of the earliest monuments of Spanish vernacular poetry are well known instances. (Tamayo de Salazar, Mart. Hosp. vi. 109; Exp. Sagra*da*, l. 2; Mobilet, saec. i.; Yepes, Cron. Benedict. i. ann. 572; Sanchez, Poesias Cast. ant. al Siglo XV. vol. ii.)

[8. A. W.]

**EMILIANUS (9) (AEIMILIANUS), a notary who was retained by Gregory the Great amongst his clerics, and with his company wrote down from the pope's delivery (excepted) the forty homilies on the Gospels, as we learn from the life of Gregory by John the Deacon (lib. ii. 11, in Migne, Patul. Lat. i. xiiii. 48; Ceillier, r. 550).

[8. D.]

**EMILIANUS (10) (AEIMILIAN, EMILIAN, EMIAN), abbot of Lagay. At March 16, Colgan (Acta SS. Mat. 574) gives a memoir, "De S. Emilianis, Abate Latiniae et Magnae Britanniae Desmaiyo et alii," This was a disciple of St. Fursey (Jan. 16), and a follower in his footsteps, first in study and discipline, and then across the sea. He left Ireland and joined St. Fursey at Lagay, in France. When St. Fursey set out for England, shortly before his death by the way, he gave his monastery at Lagay (Latinenses) in charge to Emilianus. St. Eloquiuous was chosen by the brethren successor of St. Fursey at Lagay, continued to rule it until his own death. The date of this is unknown, but he must have flourished about A.D. 648, and his festival at Lagay was on Mar. 10, as we gather from Marcardius in the Benedictines,
EMILIANUS.—MARTYR

and from Sausaegus in the Gallican Martyrologies. (U’lanon, Irish Swis., i. 278-79; Gall. Christ. vii. 491; Mabill. Acta SS. O.S.B. saec. ii. 624, ed. 1733.)


EMILIANUS (12), martyr in Numidia with bishops Agapius and Secundius, during the persecution of Valerian, A.D. 259. He is commemorated April 29. (Mart. Ad., Us.) [T. S. B.]

EMILIANUS (13)(Aemilianus), the Spanish governor who condemned St. Fructuosus and his companions to death at Tarragona, A.D. 259. (Fructuosus.) (A.A. SS. 21 Jan. ii. 340; Ceillier, ii. 387.) [L. D.]

EMILIANUS (14), martyr at Dorostorum, in Moesia, during the reign of Julian. He entered an idol temple, broke the statues of the gods, and scattered the victims. He then went and informed himself to the governor of the province, by whom he was condemned to be burned alive. (Men. Bas.; Mart. Us.) Commemorated July 18. [T. S. B.]

EMILIANUS (15), a deacon, martyred at Cordova with Hierennias. Commemorated Sept. 17, according to Usuard, but Eulogius assigns him (under the name of Emilia) a different day. (Mart. Us.) [Emilia (5).] [T. S. B.]


EMILUS (4)(Aemilus), a bishop, the father of Is, whose epithalium on her marriage with Julian of Elana was written by St. Paulinus of Nola, who speaks in flattering terms of her father. (Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixi. 607; Ceillier, viii. 86.) [L. D.]

EMILUS (5) (Aemilus), St., bishop of Beneventum, was sent to the emperor Arcadius by pope Innocent and the Roman council concerning the affairs of St. John Chrysostom, A.D. 405. He is identified by some with the bishop Aemilus mentioned by St. Paulinus of Nola in the epithalium on the marriage of Julian and Is. (Paulin. Nolan., Poem. xxvi., in Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixi. 638, 922 note 292; Sarnelli, De' Vescovi Benev. 23; Mansi, iii. 1162.) [L. D.]

EMILUS (6)(Aemilus), father of Remigius (St. Remi) bishop of Rheims. According to the traditions embodied in the lives of St. Remi, Emilianus was an illustrious man, and he is said by some to have been a count. (A.A. SS. Bell. Oct. i. 65, 135.) [L. D.]

EMILUS (7) (Gall. Chr. ii. 500), bishop of Limoges. [Eumou.] [C. L.]

EMIN, EMINUS. [Eimhinn.]


EMINIANUS, abbat of Lagy. [Eimilianus (10-)].

EMINO, bishop of Tarentaise. [Emmo.]

EMITERIUS, EMITERIUS, twelfth bishop of Tarentaise, succeeding Budemarus and followed by Widenars, about the middle of the 7th century. The name alone survives. (Gall. Christ. xii. 702; Gams, Series Episc. 829.) [S. A. B.]

EMITERIUS (Adon. Mart. Mar. 5).

EMITHERIUS, (Wand. Mar. 3), martyr. [Emetheriuis.]

EMMA, the wife of Eadbald king of Kent, 616-640; daughter (according to Florence of Worcester, who probably followed the Kentish hagiographers) of a king of the Franks, who is identified by Pagi with Theobert king of Austrasia. (M. H. B. 635.) Thorn, the Canterbury historian, says that she died two years after her husband, and was buried beside him. (Thorn, ap. Twysden, col. 1769.) She is said to have been the mother of all his children. (Eldham, pp. 175, 176.) Her name appears in a spurious charter of Eadbald. (Kemble, C. D. No. 6; Eldham, p. 144; see Will. Malmesb. G. R. lib. i, § 11.) [S.]

EMMANUEL (Manuel), presbyter and archimandrite of Constantinople. In A.D. 448 he appears as informing the archbishop Flavian, through the presbyter Asterius, that Eutyches, the heretic, had sent to him a "tome" which he had drawn up and had endeavoured to secure his signature to it. (Labbe, Concil. iv. 197.) It appears however that when Flavian sent messengers to the archimandrites to ascertain the truth in this matter, Emmanuel was one of those who said the tome had not been sent to him. (Labbe, Concil. iv. 211.) This contradiction has not been explained. Tillemont suggests the possibility of there having been two Emmanuels, contemporary archimandrites (as there were two Enseblises), but of this there are no traces. Nor, again, is it possible to suppose two archimandrites, one Manuel and one Emmanuel, for wherever Manuel occurs, he stands in the place which Emmanuel occupies in other lists.

Emmanuel is addressed by pope Leo, Oct. 15, A.D. 449, together with Faustus, Martinus, and Petrus, other archimandrites of Constantinople, in a letter exhorting them to constancy, faith, and charity, and denouncing the acts of the second council at Ephesus (Epp. 51, 71, 937, 1012, Migne). In 451 he signs the address of the orthodox archimandrites to the emperor.
EMMANUEL, bishop of Adrianople, present at the seventh general (second Nicene) council, A.D. 787, where in the acts he is called Manuel (Origen Christ. i. 1173) with the Manuel bishop of Adrianople who was carried away and cruelly murdered by Crumus the Bulgar chief. Another account says that he was carried off by Crumus along with the parents of Basil the Macedonian, who afterwards became emperor; that he converted many of the Bulgarians, and was murdered with others by Cutrago or Mutrago, the successor of Crumus, who was enraged at his missionary success, but that Basil, being a mere lad, was allowed to escape. This latter version is that adopted by Constantine Porphyrigenitus in his life of his grandfather Basil (c. 4). (Migne, Patrol. Graec. cix. 216.) [L. D.]

EMME (Bel. H. E. iv. 1, in M. H. B. 210), bishop of Sens. [EMXO.] [C. H.]

EMMELIA (EMELIUM), the mother of St. Basil, who supplied her son and Gregory his food while living as anchorites in Pontus, as we learn from Gregory's fifth letter (Migne, Patrol. Graec. xxxvii. 5). On her death, Gregory wrote an epitaph for her, in which he extols her on account of her children, three of whom were priests (ibid. xxviii. 1128, 1129; Baron. A. E. 363, lxxxviii.). [L. D.]

EMMERAMMUS, EMERAMNUS, ST., martyr and missionary bishop. There is no distinct authority for his see, but it has been inferred, with great probability, that it was Poitiers, and in the list of the Gyllia Christiana (ii. 1151) he appears as 25th bishop of that diocese, succeeding Johannes L and followed by Dido. We know, however, that about A.D. 649, he resigned his see, whichever it was, and, after providing a successor, left country, family, and large possessions to seek the wilds of Pannonia, where he had heard the people were still idolaters. He was accompanied only by a priest named Vitalis to act as interpreter. On his way he arrived at Ratisbon, the residence of Theodon, who governed Bavaria for king Sigebert III. Here he learnt that the country before him was so hostile as to be impassable, and reluctantly yielded to the entreaties of his host that he would stay, and, as bishop, or if his humility declined that office, as abbot, charge himself with the spiritual jurisdiction of the district. He allowed himself to be persuaded with the less regret, as he saw that the recently converted people of that part mingled the worship of their old gods with their new-found Christianity. For three years he preached and worked in all parts of the country round, and his labours were crowned with success. At the end of that period, A.D. 655, he obtained permission to make a pilgrimage to Rome. Accompanied by a few priests he set out on his way amid the lamentations of his flock, but when he had been three days only on the journey, and was resting at a place called Helfendorf, where there was a pleasant spring of clear water, he was overtaken and slain by Lantbert, Theodon's son, and a band of armed followers. An almost incredible story is given as the reason of his murder. He was buried at Aschaim, but his remains were later on translated to Ratisbon. Two churches were built, one on the spot where he was struck down, the other at the place where he breathed his last. Both were reputed to be the scene of numerous miracles. Before the close of the century, the well-known monastery called after him was erected at Ratisbon. He is commemorated Sept. 22. The authority for this account is the life by Aribio, who calls himself Cyrus, bishop of Freising, who lived about a century later, in Surius de Prob. Sacr. Sept. 22, v. 367, and Boll. Acta SS. Sept. vi. 474. There are also extant a treatise, De Passione B. Emmeram, by a priest called Constans, written at the end of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century (Patr. Lat. xcvii. 1397), a Vita B. Emmeram, by Megistus, provost of Magdeburg, and two books of Miracula S. Emmeram by Arnoul, a monk of the monastery, both in the 11th century (Canisius, Lect. liii. pt. i. p. 105; Pertz, Script. iv. 543; Migne, Patr. Lat. cxii. 973, 995), but they add nothing to the account of Aribio. (Cf. Ceillier, Hist. des Autres sacrés, viii. 94, 95; Usuard. Mart. Sept. 22.) [S. A. B.]

EMMETIUS, bishop of Nantes. [EMELIUS.]

EMMANIUS (Gall. Christ. vii. 491), abbot of Lagny. [EMILIANUS (10).] [C. B.]

EMMIA, abbess. [ENIMIA.]

EMMO, ST., twenty-fifth bishop of Sens, succeeded Arnulpus. In 659 he subscribed a preceptum or privilegium for the abbots and monks of the monastery of St. Columba, and another for the monastery of St. Peter of Sen (both given by Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxviiii. 1168, 1171). In 662 he was one of the subscribers of a charter of Berthefredus, bishop of Amiens, in favour of the monastery of Corbie (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxi. ii. 1178). He entertained anias, the companion of Theodore archbishop of Canterbury, during part of the winter of A.D. 669, which they spent in France, on the way to their new country (Beute, Hist. Eccl. iv. 1). He is said to have died in A.D. 675, and to have been buried in the monastery of St. Peter Vivus. His successor in the see was Landeburchius, or according to the Bollandists, St. Amatus. (Gall. Christ. xii. 9; Boll. Acta SS. Sept. iv. 124-5.) [S. A. B.]

EMMO (EMINO), eighteenth bishop of Tarentaise, succeeding Bunimondus and followed by Possessor, towards the close of the 8th century. Nothing but the name survives. (Gall. Christ. xii. 702; Gams, Series Episc. 829.) [S. A. B.]

EMNERUS, deacon of Nantes, whose servant Leudarius was cured of blindness. (Greg. Tur. de Mirac. SS. Martyr. iv. 20.) [C. H.]

EMNERUS, bishop of Nantes. [EMERIUS.]

EMPIRE, ROMAN. The religion of the empire at the time when it came in contac-
with the church of Christ may be best described as one of confluent polytheism. Following in the line of the great Macedonian conqueror it had recognised the religions of the nations it had conquered, and had, with some natural exceptions, tolerated their introduction even at Rome itself, in the name of Romanism. But the Romans were not without their votaries at Rome (comp. Apuleius, *Metam.* bk. xii.; *Juvenal*, vi. 526-541, ix. 22, xiii. 93). The exceptions, which proved the rule, were significant in their character. Rome had been startled, even in the days of the Republic, by the introduction of the new rites of the Bocchanalla. A secret society with mysterious orgies, which drew within its influence men and women of the higher classes, and in which licence of the worst character was practised, or reported to be practised, alarmed the Senate. Edicts were issued for their suppression, and those who were suspected of joining in them were watched with jealous suspicion (Tib. *Legal.* xix. 13, 14).

When the course of conquest brought the Roman government into contact with the Jews a new phenomenon presented itself. Here was a people unlike the rest of the nations, professing a religion which stood out in marked contrast with theirs, which worshipped one God and not many gods, and in whose hearts dwelt a sense of the reality of the Deity, as anthropomorphic or thermomorphic, but as invisible and apart, not capable of being represented by any human art. Political considerations made it expedient to court the support of the Jews in the conflict of Rome with the kings of Syria, and the Jews, on their side, welcomed the protection of the great republic. When the outbreak of war brought large numbers of Jews to Rome, they were allowed to settle in the Trastiberine quarters of the city by themselves, and, although belonging mostly to the slave or freedman class, they gained, partly by their higher culture, partly by the mysteriousness of their faith, a considerable influence over both men and women of the higher classes. Horace alludes sportively to his reluctance to offend them (Sat. 1, 9, 69). *Juvenal* notes it as a sign of the degeneracy of the times that the groves of Egeria had been let to them, either as a quarter where they might take up their abode, or for purposes of worship (Sat. iii. 12-15), and speaks of their oratories (*proseusecher* as more or less frequented by cottars (Sat. iii. 298), of their women as beguiling the minds of others of their sex by whispering the secrets of the future, or unfolding to the them mysterious lore of the books of Moses (Sat. xiv. 102). Judaism also took its place as a *religio licita*, though it was regarded with a feeling of unapproachability, its ceremonies, as far as they were practised, affinities with the magic arts practised by the *Claudii* and *mathematici*, who cast horoscopes, and whose predictions were at times a disturbing element in the state. Traces of this feeling are found in the edicts of expulsion which either included Jews, as under *Tiberius*, or were specially directed against them, as under *Claudius*.

In the edict of the latter we may probably find the first trace of the followers of the new faith. The Jewish quarter had been for some weeks or months in a state of tumult, and that part of the city was occupied under the name of Christia. We can scarcely fail to recognise in that name the fact that the question whether the name of the Christ of right belonged to Jesus of Nazareth had become, as in other cities of the empire, a bone of contention between hostile parties, and that the Romans, looking at the matter as one of civil sanitation and public order, and taking Christia (or, as they afterwards, and, probably, then also, pronounced it (Tertull. *Apol.* c. 3) Christus, for the leader of one of the parties, thought it necessary, as a measure of police, to eject the whole body of the Jewish population. This was, however, only a transitory measure of precaution. The salutations in *Rom.* xvi. 19 show that the Jews soon returned, and with them a considerable number of those who were now known as Christians. They, too, we must believe, so far as they distinctly recognised at all, were regarded at first as professing a *religio licita*.

Soon, however, a more hostile feeling began to show itself. When *St. Paul* arrived at Rome (see above, p. 243, where speaking of *Scrib. epist.* iv. (22)), and possibly also among the soldiers and centurions of the Praetorian camp (Phil. i. 13), there was a counter-current of feeling which led men to look on the Christians with the hatred which grows out of fear, and when *Nero*, in what is reckoned as the first general persecution, exposed their men to the constant threat of public outrages yet worse than torture, he fell in with, rather than shocked, the current of popular feeling. It was easy to turn the tide of suspicion after the fire of Rome, against those who spoke of the vengeance revealed in fire that should destroy their enemies. Disciples might honour the remains of St. Peter and St. Paul, and other martyrs, but statesman, men of letters, and the crowd of sightseers looked on with indifference. The death of Nero, however, brought with it a temporary relief. There was no law or edict of the senate forbidding the practice of the new religion, and as it had its meetings for worship, and its organised government by a bishop and his elders, it must either have continued to profit by its identification, for legal purposes, with Judaism, or have been recognised as having a distinct existence as a *religio licita*. Under *Domitian*, however, they were again in danger, not from

---

*It has been maintained, and, I think, fairly proved, in Hindekofer’s *Judaism at Rome* (1877), that the senatorial patrician party, who looked back with regret to the days of the republic, were all along the advocates of a rigorous and repressive policy against both Jews and Christians, while the popular party, represented commonly by the emperors, were in favour of a wider tolerance, or were secretly inclined to a monolithic faith.*
any systematic persecution, but from the jealous suspicion which marked the policy of that emperor, and which turned the bureaucracy of the empire into a vast army of delatores. His victims were not many, but they were illustrious. The emperor's cousin, Flavius Clemens, was put to death, and his wife and daughter, each bearing the name of Flavia Domitilla, banished, on a charge of feeling the fire in which the martyrs of Christian writers enables us to recognise the profession of the new religion. The traditions that the grandsons of Judas the brother of the Lord were brought to Rome as possibly dangerous rivals, that with this there was a local persecution in Judaea, and that St. John was only delivered by a miracle from the caldron of boiling oil, are probably all connected as parts of the results of the same policy [Domitianus]. The conversion of these members of the imperial family may at any rate be taken as shewing the extent to which the church was gaining followers among the upper classes, and it is a noticeable fact that from this time to the conversion of Constantine no name appears so frequently among the Christian inscriptions as that of the Flavian gens.

The reign of Trajan (A.D. 98-117) presents the first instance of a persecution set on foot, not by a brutal or cruel emperor, but by one whose general policy was one of vigorous equity. The letters, however, that passed between him and Pliny, the proconsul of Bithynia, shew that it was forced on him against his will, and that his own nature was inclined to tolerance. He was told that the temples were deserted, that sacrifices were no longer offered. The vested interests that were connected with the established worship were threatened by the growth of the new society. Vague rumours were current that its members met together for Thystean banquets and orgies of frightful licence. The truthful report of the proconsul shewed that there were no grounds for the charges, but he tried against the tranquility of the province had to be maintained, and the aggressive movement of the new sect to be checked, and the directions given by the emperor issued in the rule against which Tertullian protests as a "sentientia necessitate confusam" (Apol. c. 2), flagrantly at variance with the first principles of justice. Christians were to be punished if they confessed that they bore that name, to be set free if they disclaimed it. The very plea of not guilty, which in other cases was but the prelude of a trial, was in this to be tantamount to a sentence of acquittal (Pliny, Ep. x. 96, 97). In the report of the trial of Ignatius of Antioch before the emperor, we trace, with all allowance for the exaggeration of the martyrologist, the half-conscious feeling that the empire was coming into contact with a new force, acting upon society as well as upon speculative thought, which would in the long run prove incompatible with its religion, and therefore, as it seemed, with the authority with which that religion was identified. The members of the Christian church acknowledged "another king, our Jesus," and his supremacy as a matter of the Flavian authority. The reigns of the two Antonines (Antoninus Pius, A.D. 138-161, Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161-180) presented nearly the same features as those of Trajan. They too, were wise, liberal, equitable in their general administration. They were content to treat Christianity as a religio licita, so long as it did not thrust itself forward in real or apparent antagonism to the supreme authority of the state. They had their places of meeting and of burial. They had, as Tertullian (Apol. 37) boasted, with perhaps some pardonable exaggeration, filled the courts and the camps, and were set without regard to the testimony in the civil forum. They claimed the protection of the law so long as they were not guilty of crimes against social order. They numbered among them men of education and culture who were not ashamed of their religion, and were prepared to undertake its defence. The 2nd century, especially in its second half, was emphatically the age of the apologists, of Quadratus (temp. Hadrian), of Justin (d. 167), of Tertullian (d. 240), of Minucius Felix (fl. 270). Their tone is for the most part that of those who are contending against vague calumnies and a widespread suspicion, threatening a future persecution, rather than of men who are themselves at the time suffering from it. Justin, it is true, earned the same of Polycarp, the first martyr, and of Irenaeus, the great father of the church. He had to the passions of the populace at Smyrna, backed by the vindictive hatred of the Jews, but there are no traces of any active persecution at Rome itself, or throughout the empire generally, and the very stress which Justin lays in his second Apology on one or two individual cases in which Urbicus the prefect of the city had punished Christian propagandism with death shows that they were exceptions to the general tolerance (Apol. II. c. 2). Apart from propagandism, there was nothing to prevent the Christians of Rome from meeting for worship and burying their dead in peace, and holding undisturbed possession of their catacombs. The reigns of Septimius Severus and his sons (A.D. 193-235) were marked by no fresh legislative or executive activity against the Christians, and the influence which Origen had exercised over the mind of Julius Mamarea when he visited her at Antioch, were seen in their treatment by her son Alexander Severus (A.D. 222-235). In the eclectic worship of that emperor busts of Christ and of Moses were seen, even in his private oratory, side by side with those of Orpheus and Lycurgus, and when a question arose as to the contesting claims of the church at Rome as a corporation (the very dispute shews that it was recognised as having a right to hold property), and that of a guild of butchers, the emperor gave judgment, on ethical grounds apart from the legal merits of the case, in favour of the former, as likely to make a better use of the property for which the two parties were contending. Under these conditions it was natural that the inherent vitality of the Christian church should assert itself, and that men and women should turn to it as affording a refuge alike from the sullenness of heathen life and the scepticism which had been the outcome of the decay of the old faiths of Greece and Rome and the conflict of rival schemes of philosophy. The beautiful and powerful poetry which filled your senate, your camps, your courts, may perhaps, as has been said above, be exaggerated, but it bears testimony, after all due discount has been allowed for its high-flown rhetoric, to the spread of the new faith among.
the upper ranks of Roman society. The foreign
origin of PHILIP THE ARABIAN, even if we set
aside the doubtful tradition that he was himself
a Christian, naturally made him indifferent to
the maintenance of the national cultus, and was
so far favourable to the church's peace. It was
not till the accession of DECUS (A.D. 249–253)
that the officials of the empire, under an emperor
best upon restoring the old vigour of Roman
policy and checking all innovations on its reli-
gion, awoke to a sense of the seriousness of the
situation, and began to take active measures for
the suppression, or at least the repression of the
Christian movement. There was accordingly a violent
though brief persecution in which all the
provinces of the empire. Some sought safety by
flight, some retired to the hermit life of the
wilderness, some languished in prison, many died
under cruel and varied tortures. Not a few, the
_theriaca_, the _lapis_, of ecclesiastical history, pur-
chased their lives by apostasy. Others, techni-
cally known as _libellatores_, without participat-
ing actually in the idolatrous act which was
made the test of conformity to the religion of
the state, purchased a certificate (libellatum) that
they had complied with the emperor's edict and
so escaped.

The immediate effect of the Declan persecu-
tion was to throw into confusion and weakness the
followers of Christ, and to strengthen the energy of those
who continued faithful. The martyrs gained new
honours, the confessor's greater influence, and the
very controversies which arose as to the treat-
ment of the _lapis_ and the _libellatores_ bear testi-
mony to the church's freedom of action. The
first eight years of Valerian (A.D. 253–260)
were a time of rapid increase in numbers and
growing consciousness of strength. In A.D.
259, Xystus, bishop of Rome, had had
the courage [Cyprian] to transfer the supposed
remains of St. Peter to the catacombs, afterwards
known as that of St. Callistus, on the Appian
Way, those of St. Paul to a burial-place on the
Oval, which had been active supporters of the policy of Decius felt that
there was a fresh necessity for supporting it, and
at the instigation of Macrinus, the emperor issued
an edict which was the signal for a fresh perse-
cution. Xystus and four of his deacons were
apprehended as he sat teaching in his episcopal
chair in the cemetery of Prætestatum [Cyprian].
Cyprian was seized and condemned to death by
Galenus at Ucits, and the last three years of
the emperor's reign witnessed sufferings in all
parts of the empire, like those under Decius.
When Galenus came to the throne (A.D. 261–
268), as if shrinking from the possible issue of a
prolonged struggle, he adopted a more temporiz-
ing and tolerating policy, restored to the Christians
the places of assembly of which his father had
deprecated them, and for the first time formally
recognised their faith by name as a _religio
licita_ (Euseb. _H. E._ vii. 13). The taunting
speech of Aurelian to the Roman senate, when he
reproached them for not consulting the
Sibylline books in a time of national danger, that
"it would seem as if they were sitting in a
church of the Christians, and not in the temple
of the gods," implied at once that he recognised
the effect of Galenius's edict, and was more or
less alarmed by it, and it is probable that had
his life been prolonged he would have followed
in his footsteps, and rescinded the edict of tolera-
tion. As it was, however, he so far acted on
that edict as to recognise the authority of the
church of Rome in determining a question affect-
ing property in the church of Palmyra.

The edict of Galerius remained in force as yet
and other, till A.D. 303, when Diocletian (A.D.
284–305), who had begun his reign with the policy
of toleration, who had Christians, recognised
such, among the officers of his household, and whose
wife and daughter were more than suspected of
being proselytes to the rival faith, issued the
decree which made his reign memorable for the
sacrifice of many, and gave the signal for the last
great struggle. Churches were burnt or desec-
crated. The sacred books of the Christians were
destroyed. Christians were to be deprived of all
official dignities and civil rights, and reduced
to the level of slaves. The test of sacrificing
or burning incense was applied with a ruthless
severity. Every one was compelled to content himself, in spite of all the leanings to a
more tolerant policy, which were due probably to
the influence of his wife, Helena, with endes-
vouring to save the lives of Christians while he
acquiesced in the destruction of their buildings
and their books. The eight years that followed
were the work that the policy had
countered. The first signal of a return to
the older policy was given in A.D. 311, in the decree
issued by Constantine, Licinius, and Galerius,
which gave Christians permission to rebuild
their churches, and restored their faith to the
position of a _religio licita_, but by another edict
in A.D. 312, propagandism was still treated as
criminal, and the early Christian church was
recognised as a corporation that might be
dealt with as having a legal existence, all sects
outside the church were excluded from the ben-
ecit of the decree. The edict of Milan, A.D. 313,
gave an ample measure of freedom in allowing
conversions to the church, as well as protecting
those who were already in it, and in ordering
the removal of all marks of paganism that had
been taken from them in the time of persecution.
The battle of the Milvian bridge, in which Con-
stantine, after the memorable vision of the _In
hoc signo vinces_, adopted the monogram of Christ,
so familiar in the Christian inscriptions of the
catacombs, and ordered it to appear on the
shields of his soldiers as they marched against
Licinius, closed the long struggle, and the
decrees which followed in A.D. 319, giving to
the ministers of Christian churches immuni-
ties from public burdens, in A.D. 321, allowing
the enfranchisement of slaves in churches as well
as temples, and ordering the observance of the
_Dies Solis_, by the suspension of public works and
judicial business, placed an end on the footing of
the most favoured faith. The religion of the
empire was avowed, and it tended naturally,
even without actually repressive measures against
the religion of his fathers, to become the religion
of the empire.

It is difficult to form any accurate estimate of the
actual amount of suffering caused by the intermit-
tant persecutions of the fluctuating policy which
we have traced for nearly 300 years. Probably
not more than fifteen or twenty years out of that
period were marked by any very rigorous
measures of repression. The tendency of Gibbon's
mind may have been to underrate the severity of the sufferings of the early Christians as that of the martyrologists was to indulge in enormous exaggerations, but some weight must be given to the language of Origen that those who had died for their religion were "few and very easy to be counted" (Conf. Celsum, iii.), and to the fact that Dionysius of Alexandria, giving an account of the sufferings of the Christians there, names only ten men and seven women as having suffered martyrdom (Euseb. Hist. vi. 41). The calculation which, starting from the fact that Eusebius names only ninety-two Christians in Palestine as put to death in the persecution of Diocletian, in which for the first time the cruelty of panic was added to the policy of repression, and which was therefore at once more violent and more protracted than any that had preceded it, and that as Palestine was about the sixteenth part of the Eastern empire, the total number of sufferers may be reckoned at 1500, or throwing in Italy, Africa, and Spain, at about 2000, is open to the charge of being a somewhat precocious method of statistical inquiry (Gibbon, c. xvi.), but it must be admitted that such conclusions were drawn by the Christian church at the hands of Roman emperors ever approximated to those which Christians afterwards inflicted on each other; and the aera of Diocletian falls into insignificance as compared with the crusade against the Albigenases under Innocent III., or that against the Protestants of the Netherlands under Charles V. and Philip II., or the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, or the Dragondades that followed on the Revocation of the edict of Nantes by Louis XIV.

The difference was indeed natural, looking to the motives that prompted the persecution in either case. There was no odium theologicum in the policy of the Roman emperors, no intense conviction that those whom they persecuted were enemies of God, and bringing others into peril of a condemnation, compared with which the state and the sword, and the torments of the Inquisition, were light and temporary evils. With them persecution was but a measure of police, necessary to uphold the religion of the state when its existence was threatened by the active propaganda of men who were not content with exterminating the roots of conscience for themselves. Among those who occupied a lower position than that of emperors and statesmen there were doubtless other motives. There were the vested interests, which, like those of Demetrius and his craftsmen, gathered round the established worship, and which made every great temple, with an organisation like that of a cathedral or medieval abbey, the people's Church (Ephes. iv. 4-5) the centre of a resistless movement to a new faith. There was the feeling prevalent at first among the lower classes, but finding its way afterwards to the more educated, for whose instruction Augustine wrote his De Civitate Dei, that the gods were offended at the spread of those who said that they were demons and not gods, and which led the people, was it not suffered from inundations or earthquakes, famines or pestilences, to cry, "Christianos ad Leones!" There was the irritation caused in the minds of the people by the presence of a purity and holiness that reproved their vilness, presenting features such as have been seen in later times in the outrages endured at the hands of mobs by Puritans and Methodists. There were the calamities inversely propagated, and telling, probably, on the more decent and respectable classes, which represented the eucharistic feast of Christians as a Thracian feast upon flesh and blood, and their feasts of love as polluted by incestuous and unnatural licence. There was the dread, telling upon men of the official order, and reproduced in the feeling of English politicians towards the Jesuits of the court of Rome, and of the despotic monarchies of Europe towards freemasons and other secret societies, caused by finding themselves face to face with a vast organised community spreading throughout the empire, and owing other laws of duty as superior in authority to theirs. At one period there seemed, indeed, something like the fanaticism of a rival worship. The cultus of Mithras, the Sun-god, introduced at Ostia in the time of Pompeius, had gradually spread throughout the empire. Mithraic groups have been found in well-nigh every province from Cyprus to Pannonia. The basilica of St. Clement at Rome stands over what was once a sanctuary of Mithras. With this worship the main action of the last battle of the Germans was more or less closely identified, and Constantine's edict for the observance of the Dies Solis was probably intended as a concession to the worshippers of Mithras as well as to those of Christ. These influences, varying from time to time in their effects, led doubtless in many cases, to great brutality and cruelty, like that of the reign of terror in the French Revolution; but putting aside legends like those of the 10,000 martyrs slaughtered in a single day at Ararat, and the 6000 soldiers of the Thessalonian legion in the valley of the Rhone, commemorated by the abbey of St. Maurice, the history of the church and the empire presents nothing like a massacre. It was the aim of stateful-like emperors, and they for the most part were the only persecutors, to repress rather than to exterminate. To plead "not guilty" to the charge of being a Christian was to secure acquittal. The forms of law were carefully observed. The accused was allowed time for his defence; and opportunities for flight so frequently given and used that Tertullian thought it necessary to write a tractate (De Fugis in Persecutione) against it. Compromises like that of the libellarii in the Decian persecution were readily contrived; and the question which arose within the church as to the treatment of those who had accepted it, or had actually burnt incense, and so placed themselves among the lapsi, shows how widely the door of escape had been thrown open.

What was it, then, which sustained the Christians of the first three centuries in their conflict with the empire? What was the secret of their final victory? The answer, looking for the present to human causes only, is found first, and chiefly, in the fact that they had faith, and that the statesmen and emperors had none. They did verily believe that they were worshipers of the Son of God, through whom they found access to the Father; that heaven and hell, their future destiny through long, it might be, endless ages, depended on their steadfastness in that faith. Few philosophers were willing to suffer or die for a theory about the Supreme Good. The disciples of Christ were ready to suffer and die for their belief in the Supreme
EMPODIUS, bishop of Volterra. [ELPIDIUS (15.)]

EMPTACIUS, bishop of Sessa, a town in all probability to be identified with Siga, in the African province of Mauretania Caesariensis, at one time the royal residence of Syphax. He was one of the catholic bishops summoned to Carthage and subsequently banished by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 278; Gams, Series Episc. 468.) [L. D.]

EMUNDUS is said to have been the fifteenth bishop of Avignon, following St. Maximus, and succeeded by St. Magnus; about A.D. 630 to 644. The evidence on which this assertion rests is an old manuscript list of the abbots of the monastery of Mons-Major near Arles, to which he belonged before he was made bishop. This list is said by Le Cointe to have been published by Francis Nouquier, a priest of Avignon, in 1659. (Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc. an. 941, n. vi. tom. iii. p. 132; Gall. Christ. i. 800.) [S. A. B.]

EMYGDUS, bishop of Asculum. [EMPODIUS.]

EMYR LLYDAW, though not the ancestor of any of the "three stocks of saints of the island of Bangor," i.e. Branwen, Cunedda, and Caw, yet had many descendants among the saints, a list of twenty-two being given by Rees. He was an Armorican prince, nephew of St. Germanus, and flourished in the 5th century (Rees, Welsh Saints, 165; Williams, Edwin, Welsh, 144).

ENAN (HENAN). (1) Son of Gemman, commemorated Jan. 30. Mart. Doneg. places him at Roe-Mor in Ul-Denagh, in Ul-Cellinseanlaigh, in the south of Leinster, but this Rees or Rosmore is unidentified. It is also conjectured, but against probability, that he may be the person who wrote the lives of the saints. In this, Enan is evidently regarded as the same person with St. Evin, to whom is attributed the writing of the so-called Book of Killemany and the Life of St. Patrick. [REMMEN.]

H. H. D. Doneg., by Todd and Taylor, Mts. 31 407; Rees, Adamnan, 137; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 361 n. 41, 511-12.) In the Kal. Drummond, Jan. 30 (Bp. Forbes Kal. Scott. Saints, 4), it is said "apud Hiberniam S. Enan confessor migravit ad Christum." [J. G.]

ENAN (2), son of Muadan, commem. Mar. 25. When St. Patrick came into Dalriada and adjacent districts, and was building churches there, Etnnaus (Pat. S. Patr. ii. c. 130) mentions his erection of the church of Drum-indh, in the region of Cathriga, and his placing over it St. Enan, whom in his note Colgan (Tr. Thom. 146 col. 2, 182 n. 204) identifies with the son of Muadan, though in another place (Acta SS. 747) he had doubted as to assigning the dedication of Mar. 25 to this saint, and not rather to a disciple of St. Comgall (May 10), of Bangor, whom M. Comgall brought back to life: Lanigan (Ecc. Hist. Ir. i. p. 158) rejects the old doubt, and says Enan must have lived late in the sixth century; but Lanigan's great and seems to be to controvert the statements of Archdall in his Monasticon Hibernicum, where an abbey is raised on St. Patrick's foundation. There is little doubt, however, but that this is the saint who is called in the Kalendr of Marian O'Rowan, "Ennus egregius, diurnae qui, quietis, ut Muadanili filius," and who had his church in the townland Drumsey in Glenesh, in the parish of Ramoan and barony of Cary, co. Antrim, where there is also an old burying-ground, now under cultivation, called Killeena: in the same neighbourhood there was a church given to St. Ercalch, called Rath-muadan, "Ar Muadan," from Muadan, the father of Enan, and this, being contracted, has given its name to the parish, Ramoan (Rees, Ecc. Ant. 79, 284-5, 323). Colgan thinks he flourished about A.D. 460. [J. G.]

ENAN (3) of Drumrath, commem. Aug. 19. He was son of Ermeus, of the race of Eochaidh Finnauchtair, and thus cited by Colgan (Tr. Thom. 613, col. 29) among the saints belonging to the family of St. Briga (Feb. 1). His church, which some call an abbey, was at Drumrath, a parish in the barony of Kil-
ENAN

kenny West, and county of West Meath, and this, which was built about A.D. 586, is said to have been destroyed A.D. 946, by the foreigners, and again by Brian Mc'Coninide fifty years later (Nat. Gazet. "Drumraney "; Mart. Doneg. Todd and Reeves, 225). In the Life of St. Aedh (Nov. 19), this bishop is said to have paid a visit to St. Enan, the hermit, who lived in the place where the famous monastery of Drumraney now stands in his honour, but nothing is really known of St. Enan's history. According to Tigernach (O'Connor, Rec. Hid. Scrip. ii. 192) he died A.D. 633.

ENAN (4) of Glenn-Faidi. Commemorated on Dec. 29. [Monoc.]

ENAN (5) of Inis-Aego, commem. April 29.

He was one of the successors of St. Donnán (Apr. 17), after the island of Egg again became a religious abode, but his date and history are unknown, unless he be the be man mentioned in the Annals of Ulster. "A.D. 724, Qan princeps [superior ecclesiastically] Ego mortuus est." (O'Connor, Rec. Hid. Scrip. iv. 79; Reeves, Adamnan, 296.)


ENCHONIUS (Baron. A. E. ann. 608, xi.), bishop of Maurienne. [ICONIUS] [C. H.]


ENCRIATIS, ST., or ENGRATIA, " Santa Engracina " in Spanish parlance, one of the Saragossa martyrs in the persecution under Diocletian, who suffered at the hands of the well-known Dacian. She is not one of the famous eighteen martyrs of Saragossa, but her name and sufferings, together with those of St. Vincent, are celebrated in the hymn devoted to them by Prudentius (Peristeph. Hymn iv. vv. 109 sq.). The peculiarity of her passion is that she did not die under the hands of her persecutors, but survived for some time in an inextricably torn and mutilated state, until at length the release of death came. In certain epigrams attributed to St. Eugenius II. (III.) of Toledo (Esp. Sagra. v. 273), who is known, from his life by St. Ildesorus, to have had a special devotion to the Saragossa martyrs, she is mentioned as buried in the same church, but not in the same tomb, as the eighteen.

Hic etiam separe meritis Engratia Martyr Sorte septemviri dissociata Joact.

For an account of the discovery of the relics of Engracia and Lepercius at Saragossa in 1389 in the foundations of the cathedral and of the present cult of the saint, see Esp. Sagra. xxx. 289. The late Acta, together with Prudentius's Hymn, are given in Tamayo de Salazr, Martyr. Hisp. ii. 645. Engracia is also mentioned in the well-known Panormitanus Martiriorum Constantinopolitanorum Martyrum, attributed to Basilie of Saragossa. (Esp. Sagra. xxx. 260, 307; Gams, Kirchengesch. von Spanien, i. 320; Boll. Acta SS. Ap. ii. 410-412.)

[ENRATISTAE (Cod. Just. i. v. 5), heretics. [ENRATISTI.]

[ENRATISTES ("Epigrarcs", Irenaeus; "Epigrarcs", Clem. Alex.; "Epigrarcs", Hippol.), heretics who abstained from flesh, from wine, and from the marriage bed, not temporarily, as in the earliest ages of the church, with a view to more intense devotion, but permanently, and from a belief in the essential impurity of the things renounced. Persons who so abstained called themselves continent ("Epigrarcs", Iren. i. 28, p. 167); and the slightly modified form, Encratites, soon became a technical name to denote those whose asceticism was regarded as of a heretical character (Clem. Alex. Pæd. i. ii, p. 182; Strom. i. 15, p. 359; eccl. ii. 17, p. 900; Hippol. Ref. vii. 20, p. 276). We are not bound to suppose that all who were known by the name formed a single united sect. Irenæus, for instance (i.e., c. ii. 25, § 4), says that some of the early followers of Saturninus and Marcion; and it is reasonable to understand by this, not that followers of Marcion coalesced with followers of Saturninus to form a single new heretical body, but rather that followers of these two heresiarchs, independently using the same mode of life, and making the same boast of continence, were known by the orthodox under the same name. The practice of abstinence of the kind in question was anterior to Christianity. Not to speak of the Indian ascetics (to whom Clemen of Alexandria refers as predecessors of the Encratites), the abstinence of the Essenes, both in respect of food and of marriage, is matter of notoriety. Josephus's account of the Essenes is referred to by Porphyry, who, like Irenæus, objected both to the use of animal food and to animal sacrifices. An interesting specimen of Pythagorean doctrine on this subject is his work, ἡ βαθείαν τῶν ἐφισάχων, addressed to a friend who after trial of abstinence had wickedly relapsed into the use of flesh diet. He insists on the importance of keeping the soul, as far as possible, free from the bonds of matter, under which the use of animal food tends to enslave it; on the wisdom of avoiding everything over which evil demons have power, viz. all material things, and especially the use of animal food; and on the injustice of depriving of life our pleasure animals who are akin to ourselves, and in everything like ourselves, having reason, emotion, sentiments, completely like our own.

The account given by Hegesippus of James the Just (Eus. H. E. ii. 23) shows that righteousness of the Essene type was early held in admiration in the Christian church; and we learn from 1 Tim. iv. 3-6 that at the date of that epistle teachers who had aroused who indulged such abstinence as a duty. But it does not appear that they held the Gnostic doctrine that matter is essentially evil, and its creation the work of a being inferior or hostile to the Supreme; for the apostle's argument with them assumes it as a point still uncontroverted that the things they rejected were...
creatures of the good God. We find from the Clementines that the Ebionite sects which arose out of Esseneism, though they permitted marriage, disallowed the use of flesh meat and wine; and that their doctrine respecting God's work of creation was quite orthodox. Hippolytus, too, who lived about the year 240, knows not the Encratites, not as in several other cases, from Irenæus, but from his own acquaintance with them as a then existing sect, describes them as orthodox in their doctrine concerning God and Christ, and as only differing from the church in their manner of life. But the Gnostic teachers named in the passage cited from the Clementines, and the Ebionite sects, are different from the Encratites on the doctrine of the evil of matter which they denied to be the work of God; and in consequence they deemed it wrong, by generation, to bring new souls under the dominion of death, and expose them to the miseries of this life. A full discussion of the arguments which they used will be found in the third book of Clement's Stromata (though in this book the name Encratites does not occur), the principal writers whom he combats being Marcion, Tatian, already mentioned by Irenæus as a leader of that sect, and Julius Cassianus. It appears that the Gospel according to the Egyptians contained alleged sayings of our Lord, which they used in support of their doctrines. Epiphanius mentions that they used other apocryphal writings, such as the Acts of Andrew, John, and Thomas. This controversy seems to have been actively carried on in the last quarter of the 2nd century. Eusebius (H. E. iv. 28) relates that Musanatus, a writer of the beginning of that period, addressed a very effective disusasive argument to certain brethren who had turned aside to that sect, then newly come into existence; and Theodoret (Haer. Eeb. i. 21) mentions that another writer of the same date, Pollinarius, wrote against the Severian Encratites.

Eusebius (iv. 29) derives this name Severians from a certain Severus, who became an Encratite leader shortly after Tatian. He adds that these Severians received the Old Testament and the Gospels, only putting their peculiar interpretations on them, that they reviled Paul, rejecting his Epistles, and not even receiving the Acts of the Apostles. There are Ebionite features in this description, and it is quite possible these Severians may have been of Ebionite origin, for we have already said that great diversity may have existed between the teaching of persons known by the common name of Encratite. The Severians are described by Epiphanius (Haer. 45) with all the features of an Ophite sect; but he seems to have had only a hearsay knowledge of them, for he speaks of the sect as having almost died out of his time; and Lipsius (Q—E. de Epiph. 215) gives good reason for thinking that he did not find any article on them in previous heretical treatises. In his chapter on the Encratites (Haer. 48) Epiphanius describes them as widely spread, enumerating seven different countries where they were then to be found; and we may at least conclude that he had reason to know that there were in these countries heresies leading an ascetic life, though, as has been already remarked, it would be unsafe to assert an absolute identity in their teaching. We may set it down as a mistake of Epiphanius that he places the Encratites after the Tatianites, as if they were a branch of the latter sect, the true relation between the two names being just the opposite. Some additional information about the Encratites is contained in the lately recovered work of Macarius Magnes, published in Paris, 1876. In this work (ii. 43, p. 151), written about the year 400, Macarius refers to some of the countries where the Encratites (whom he also calls Apocactites and Eremites) were to be found, which so far agrees with that of Epiphanius as to suggest that Macarius was acquainted with the work of Epiphanius. But he adds that a defence of their doctrines in eight books had been published by a heretic named from Ambrosius a Cilician, in which he inveighed against marriage, saying that "by sexual intercourse the world had had its beginning, but by continence would receive its end," and equally condemning as abominable the tasting of wine or the partaking of flesh meat. In his account of the Samaritan Doctheus, Epiphanius introduces some Encratite features not attested by other authorities; and perhaps it is not incredible that Epiphanius may have allowed his knowledge of the doctrine of the one Doctheus to affect his account of the other. We cannot give much weight to the account of Philaster, who (72) assigns the name and doctrine of the Encratites to the followers of Ambrosius (see Alciat:アメリカンテス); and we may wholly disregard the inventive "Fresetinatus," who represents the Encratites as refuted by an Epiphanius, bishop of Anepry. It is worth while, however, to repeat the last writer's distinction between Encratite and Catholic abstainers; viz. the former asserted the food which they rejected to be evil; the latter owned it to be good, too good for them.

With the advance of asceticism in the church care was always taken to distinguish in some such way between orthodox and heretical abstinance. At first the distinction seems to have been between occasional and permanent abstinance, the latter being regarded with suspicion in the church. We learn from the 4th and the 5th centuries that Vienne and Lyons (Fix. H. E. v. 3) that Alciatides, one of the confessors who had been in the habit of living on bread and water, reformed his practice on the exhortation of his fellow prisoners, who represented to him that he did not well in refusing to use God's creatures, and in causing a stumbling-block to others. In like manner the 53rd (45th) of the apostolic canons deprives any clergyman who refuses to partake of flesh and wine on festival days. Perhaps this willingness to partake of flesh and wine on festival days may have been intended as a test of the distinction made in the 51st (43rd) canon between those who abstained from the flesh (βυδονομία) and those who abstained from βεβαλωμα, as abominating God's creatures. The 14th canon of the council of Anepry permits clergy to abstain from flesh, on condition of their first tasting it. This would show that they had no heretical horror of the food itself. (See ASCETICISM, DICT. CHRIST. ANT.) For the controversy raised on the subject of asceticism by Eustathius of Sebastea, see that article and GANORA, DICT. CHRIST. ANT. Canons of St. Basil on the subject of Encratite baptism (clxxxviii. can. 1; cccix. can. 47) have given rise to some dispute, but it seems to us...
ENOTHININ

clear that St. Basil wished to reject the baptism of the Encratites in question, not because they did not use the orthodox formula of baptism, but because, regarding them as tainted with Marcionite error, he could not accept the verbal acknowledgment of the Father in the baptismal formula as atonement for the insult offered to the Creator, whose words they looked on as evanescent. Reference has been already made to these canons in the article APOSTOLICI, as well as to the law of the Theodosian code (A.D. 381) against the Manicheans, who sheltered themselves under the name of Encratites. Not many years earlier we have mention of the Encratites as a then existing sect in Gaulia; for Sozomen (v. 11) records the sufferings of Busiris, who was at that time one of them, in the persecution under Julian.

[HYDROPARASTATE] [G. S.]

ENOTHININ, a crocodile-shaped archon presiding over the first division of the place of punishment (Pistis Sophia, p. 320). [G. S.]

ENDA, ENDE. [ENNA (1.1)]

ENDDWYN is a Welsh saint of uncertain date, whose name remains in Llanddwynt, Merionethshire. (Myv. Arch. ii. 42; Rees, Welsh Saints, 307, 341.) [J. G.]

ENDELECHIUS, a rhetorician, who is said to have held the chair of rhetoric at Rome, mentioned by St. Paulinus of Nola in his twenty-eighth letter as a Christian man, and the inspirer of his panegyric on Theodosius. He is identified by some, but without any sufficient reason, with "Sanctus" to whom Paulinus wrote his forty-sixth and forty-first letters. (Vit. Paulin. cap. 25, Paulin. Ep. 28, § 6 and 75, Epp. 40, 41, in Patr. Lat. Ixi. pp. 66, 312 b, 367, 377, 870 c; Ceillier, viii. 70.) [L. D.]

ENDELIENTA, ST., daughter of Brychan, king of Brecknock, one of the numerous Welsh devotees who settled on the Cornish coast opposite to Wales. The parish of St. Endellion is on the Bristol Channel, west of St. Tēth (also named from a daughter of Brychan). In it exists a very early sepulchral pillar, with the inscription, "BROÉGAN HIC IACIT," which some connect with the name of the Welsh king (see Whitaker's Cathedral of Cornwall, ii. p. 85; Rees, Welsh Saints, p. 160; Sir J. Maclean, Trigv Minor, i. p. 485.) [C. W. B.]

ENDEUS, (Hardy, Descr. Cat. Mat. i. 86), Irish abbat. [ENNA.] [C. H.]

ENDRIGHETTUS, bishop of Feltre, received a grant of certain privileges from Charles the Great between 769 and 781. (Cappellari, Le Chiuse di Itala, x. 134.) [A. H. D. A.]

ENDULUS (ENDULANUS, ENTLANUS, ETULANUS), fourteenth bishop of Toul, following Autmundus and succeeded by Theodofridus, was born at Toul, and was believed of the kings of Germany. He obtained for his church several fresh possessions, which are said to have been confirmed by a charter of Theodobert II., king of Austria, in the eighth year of his reign (A.D. 602 or 603), but it does not appear to be extant. (Gaul. Christ. xiii. 962.) [S. A. B.]

ENEAS of GAZA. [AEMEPAR.]

ENCELEPHANTUS (ENCELEPHANTUS, ENSCLEPHANTUS), a Frank of good birth ("hand ignotae familiae" Nithard, iv. 5), brought up from his earliest years in the palace of Charlemagne (Epist. Hadrian; see Jaffé's Mon. Alcini, 464, and Ep. 112, p. 458), and employed by him on political missions of importance. He was appointed abbot of St. Riquier about the year 796. He had previously (circa 783) been attached to the court of Pippin, king of Italy, Charles's son, as "primicerius" and chief counsellor (Mon. Alc. 149), and in 794 he was entrusted by Charles to carry the carillones of the synod of Frankfort relating to the worship of images to pope Hadrian (Mon. Alc. 245, and V. Caroli Libri). In 796 he was again sent to Rome as the accession of Leo III. nominally to congratulate him, in reality to secure his fidelity to the Frankish king. The instructions given to him by Charles show the confidence reposed in him. (Ep. Carol. 9, ap. Jaffé's Mon. Carol. 353.) Originally a pupil he always remained a close friend of Alcini, by whom he was specially recommended to pope Hadrian. (Mon. Alc. 344. Compare also Ep. Alc. 51 and 54, in Mon. Alc. 279 and 281, the latter of which, addressed to Engelbert himself, shews the very intimate character of the friendship; cf. also Ep. 163, Mon. Alc. 603–4.) It was not only affection and religion, but of books and of literature. Engelbert is said to have collected a library of 200 MSS. for his monastery. Alcini continued to entertain Engelbert, when at Rome or elsewhere, to bring him relics, also books (e.g., a copy of Jordanes, de Getarum Origine, Ep. 164, Mon. Alc. 602–3), and the latest letter in Jaffé's collection is one in which Alcini elaborately discusses certain grammatical points with Engelbert. (Ep. 259, Mon. Alc. 802 sq.) Engelbert in the literary round table of the court of Charlemagne, bore the name of Homer, and even in the letter of instructions above referred to (Mon. Car. 553) he is addressed by the king as Homer and "Homerianus poeta." So, often by Alcinus, see especially Ep. 54, Mon. Alc. 281–3. Charles and Alcini both spent Easter of 800 at Engelbert's abbey of St. Riquier, and Alcini was requested by the abbate to write a life etc. of the patron saint, which he subsequently sent to the emperor. (Ep. 238, Mon. Alc. 755.) Engelbert apparently accompanied Charles to Rome, and was present at his coronation. In 811 he was consecrated bishop of Charlemagne. (Einhard, Vita Karoli, 33.) He died a few days after the emperor, on Feb. 18, 814, and was buried at St. Riquier. (Nithard, iv. 5.) His remains were translated from the porch to the choir of St. Riquier with great solemnity, twenty-nine years later. (Nith. l. e.) His epitaph is to be found in Bouquet,
ENGLUNDUM, presbyter, abbot, and patron saint of Velgona, a fortified spot four miles from Hanlem. He was an Englishman of Frisian descent, born of Christian parents, and in the time of Willeibrord, the apostle of the Frisians, came among these people, and preached in Kennemari, the district about Hanlem. He died in the pagus Velgona, where was formerly one of the five mother churches raised by Willeibrord between the Meuse and the insula Tenelia. He was commemorated on June 21. (Bell. Acta SS. June iv. 115.)

[ENHENEL was son of Cynan Garwyn ab Beochwel Yaghthrog, descended from Cadell Deyrslugg. Rees (Welsh Saints, 161, 397) says he is the saint to whom Llanegunedden, under Liaschwarf in Anglesey, is dedicated, and places him in the beginning of the 7th century. (Myr. Arch. ii. 41.)

ENGLATTUS, ENGLACIUS, abbot, commemorated Nov. 3. This saint appears in most of the Scottish Calendar, but is not in the Litanies of Dunkeld. Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 248) says he wrote Lectures sacrae, lib. i., Scriptura ad scrutinium, lib. i., Epistolae ad Varios, lib. i.; but Dempster's literary assertions are usually extremely doubtful. Englattus's dedication is Nov. 3, but Camerarius places him on Nov. 5, and Dempster gives him a double dedication, pointing to a two-fold history. (Cf. Bell. Scot. Nov. 5.)

In Scotia Englatii episcopi, qui Picti cum Haldus vidit et ante bellum delevit. Kat. A. King.† Adam King calls him bishop and confessor in Scotland under Kenneth III. A.D. 966, and Dempster says he flourished in the year 1010; but Kenneth III. was not King in that year: Spotswood (Hist. Scot. 27) classes him with Blane O'Moressen, and Monteanus in the 10th century. But there is evidently much confusion, and of the place, time, and circumstances of the saint's death we are altogether uncertain. No details of his life are known. The collect in the Aberd. Breviary (Prop. SS. p. est. f. 146a), prays that by his intercession we may be saved from the concurrence of the world, and neither be corrupted by its blandishments nor crushed by its frowns. His only known dedication is at Tarves, Aberdeenshire, where he is locally called St. Tanglan. (Bp. Forbes, Col. Scot. Saints, 122, 136, 166, 212, 217, 352; Vinc. Dio. Aberd. 359; Camerarius, de Scot. Forth, 185, Nov. 5; Tanner, Bibl. 283.) [J. G.]

ENGRATIA, Spanish Martyr. [ENGRATIS.]

ENI, brother of Redwald and father of Anna, kings of East Anglia (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 97, ed. Hardy; Wend. F. H. ann. 852, ed. Coke).

[ENIMIA (ENYMA, ENNYA), abbess; said to have been the sister of Dagobert king of the Franks and daughter of Clotaire II., though some traditions make her the daughter of Clovis II. and even of Clovis I. She founded a double monastery, one for monks and another for nuns, in the mountains overlooking the river Tarn (dep. Tarn), and was consecrated the first abbess by Isus bishop of Meude, her diocesan. She was commemorated on Oct. 6. (Boll. Acta SS. Oct. iii. 408; Gall. Ch. i. 111; Le Coindre, Ann. 714.)

ENNA (ENDA, ENDE, ENNE, latinised ENDEUS) (1) Son of Connall Derg, and abbat of Ard, commemorated March 21. The primary authority on the life and acts of St. Enna is Magrinius's Vita, in which both Colyer (Acta SS. 704–10) and the Bollandists (Acta SS. Mart. ii. 287–72) have printed, as taken from MS of the Island of All Saints, Loch Ree (Hardy, Descript. Cat. i. 86, 779). With probably much that is fact, there is also mixed up much which must be purely fabulous, and drawn from the customs and notions of the writer's own age, the fourteenth century. St. Enna belonged to the noble house of the princes of Oriel, in Ulster, and was born in Louth, where his father was a ruler. His father was Connall Derg, son of Daimhin, son of Coigrin Domhairg, of the race of Colla-da-Crioch, and his mother was Briga, or Aeabhshin, daughter of Aimeire, son of Ronan, king of the Ards, in the county of Down. He had a brother, probably sterile, called Libes, or Molibbs, and four sisters, Fanchres, Lochnia, Carecha, and Darenia, the first three having been dedicated to the Lord in virginity, and the last espoused to Aengus, king of Cashel, becoming thereby the mother of a royal and holy race; she must have been his first wife, as his second, the infamous Ethne Vathoch of the Deisi, was slain with King Aengus in battle. On the death of his father St. Enna was unanimously chosen chief of the Orielis, but the future celebrated soldier of
Christ did not long retain an earthly magnificence, and the sophraneous life in Colgan begins by relating how, as a rude warrior, triumphing over his enemies, he came with his soldiers to the nunnery of his sister Fancha, and was converted by the sudden and voluntary death of one of Fancha's virgins, whom he demanded for his wife. [FAINCHE.] After resigning his position among the Oriers, he was under the tutelage of his brother, and engaged under the direction of the monks engaged in heavy manual labour, a very common employment for one in his condition in those days, and then was sent to Rosnait, in Britain, to be a pupil in the monastery of Mansenus, that is, in all probability, to the great monastery at Candida Casa, to be under St. Ninian, or rather one of his successors (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. 437; Bp. Forbes, SS. Nin. and Kent. xiii.-iii.; Todd, Book of Hymns, Fasc. i. 103-8). From Rosnait he is said to have proceeded to Rome, where, after building a monastery called Lateinum, or, as Colgan suggests, Laetinum, expressive of his spiritual joy, he was joined by his sister St. Fancha, who came to induce him to return. In the course of a year he followed her to Rome, and in the same place, in Meath, where St. Patrick also had landed, and after founding many churches on the banks of the Boyne, he applied to Aengus, son of Nadrach, the first Christian king of Cashel, for a grant of the Island of Aran. After some delay on account of Aengus's desire to have St. Eanna's monastery in the neighbourhood of Cashel, this request was granted, and most of the remaining part of his life is taken up with the account of St. Eanna's voyage to Aran, his taking possession of it, and his subsequent division of it into ten portions, with ten monasteries under as many abbots, his own monastery being built on the east side of the island, at a place called to this day Killeeney, on Killynan Bay. This was on Inishmore, the most westerly of the Aran group, and his monastery was the resort of the saints of God. His monks are said to have been one hundred and fifty, and the training he had received at the Magnun Monasterium of Whithera, he imparted to the younger race of founders of monasteries, whose fame remains to this day. Among his disciples are enumerated St. Kieran (Sept. 9) of Clonmacnoise, St. Brendan (May 19), St. Finnian (Sept. 10) of Moville, St. Columba (June 10), and other well-known abbots and bishops. The celebrity of Aran as an ecclesiastical seat is still attested by the ruins of churches and monasteries which cover the area of Inishmore, and which to this day are visited as objects of special veneration. Mingled with the cyclopean architecture of a former military era are the stone-roofed oratories, and little bee-hive stone cells of the sixth and seventh centuries, pointing to a period and place of religious activity and earnestness. From the numbers who flocked to it, the island received the name of Ara-na-naomh, or Aran of the saints, and the occupants, living and dead, were said to be innumerable.

Eanna is said by Ware to have his name in the register of bishops at Clogher, in the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century, but this can hardly be, as he must have lived earlier, and his name is not elsewhere connected with Clogher. St. Eanna himself belongs to the second order of Irish saints, but his dates are for the most part conjectural. If Inishmore was given him by the king of Cashel, it must have been before A.D. 489, as in that year Aengus fell at the battle of Cell-Usnaitha, now Killistown, in the barony of Feth, co. Carlow. The time of his death is uncertain, but he probably died in A.D. 542, the date usually accepted; he was buried in or near the sandy mound on which the little church of Teaglach-Einne now stands, and his memory is held in great veneration throughout the west of Ireland. His feast has always been attached to March 21. (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. cc. 8-10; O'Flaherty, Ear-Connamph, 42, 74 seq., 626-63, and Ogygia, vol. ii. pt. iii. c. 76; Ware, Tr. Ant. cc. 26, 28; Geneal. Hy-Finch, by O'Donovan, 462-63; Journ. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir. 3 ser. i. 79-80; Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc. iv. 263-4, new ser.; Butler, Lives of the Saints, March 21; Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, i. 376-7; O'Halloran, Irish Saints, i. 231-2. Colgan, Historia Hibernica, son, Irish Hist. Lab. 45, London, 1736; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, p. 83; Skeene, Celt. Soc. 47, 60, 62, seq. 245.) The only Scotch Calendar in which St. Eanna appears is that of the Drummond Missal (Bp. Forbes, Kol. Soc. Saints, 8), which is closely affiliated to the Irish Martyrology and Calendars, and he is always called Eanach or Eanna. Doubtless, however, as is nearly always the case, there is none of his acts recorded in any of the Irish Annals, so that these give us no direct clue to the time when he lived.

[J. G.]

ENNA (2), son of Nuadhan, and abbis of Imleach-foda, commem. Sept. 18. O'Donell (Iv. S. Columb. i. c. 104) relates how St. Columba founded a church on the west side of a hill called Tulach-Segra, in the district of Corran (now Tully, in Toomour), and gave it to his pupil Enna, son of Nuadhan. The place was called Imleach-foda, now Emlaghfad, or Emlyfad, a parish in the barony of Corran and Aran; Enna is also called Anua, and Co., Colgan (Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. c. 8, § 7; ii. c. 12, § 10) believes that this Enna, rather than the saint of Aran, is the Eanach who is named among the Irish saints of the second class. But there is no Enna, son of Nuadhan in the Irish Kaleders, and Colgan may have connected this Ean with Sept. 18, because Eanach of Drumnath is so placed in the Martyrology of Tallaght. It is also questionable whether Enan, son of Nuadan (ENAN (2)), and Enna, son of Nuadhan, be not the same person, though usually referred to the different eras of St. Patrick and St. Columba (Colgan, Tr. Thom. 406, c. 104, 451 n. 80, 49, 460; Reeves, Adamnan, 292).

[J. G.]

ENNA (3) of Cill-na-manaich, commem. Dec. 31. Mart. Doneg. (by Todd and Reeves, 351) has the dedication at Dec. 31, of Enda and Lochan, of Cill-na-manaigh in Ui-Dunchada (probably in the county of Dublin), or of Cill-mac-Cathail, in Ui-Baireich (in Quee's County); and of Beal an-Cathailin (now Gowran, and in the county of Kilkenny). But in tracing out the topography of Kilkenny, Mr. John Hogan says St. Enna is one of the patron saints of Kilmashag, co. Kilkenny, where his holy well is still recog-
ENNA

used as "Tober Edaun," and Cill-mac-Cathail is now anglicised Kilcassociated in Gowran Pass. (Farr Mast., by O'Donovan, i. 359; Mart. Hibern., by Todd and Reeves, 351; Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc. v. 300 n. 1.) [J. G.]

ENNA (4) (ENNA CSON), son of Amhalaghshíl, of Tirawley, co. Mayo. Having, with his son Consil, been favoured by St. Patrick at Tara before king Laeghaire, he was the means of saving the apostle of Ireland from the plots of the Magi (Colgan, Tr. Thaum. 140-41, cc. 76-84; Luigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. 253). [J. G.]

ENNA (5). In the Lives of St. Patrick attributed to Joceline (c. 100), and Ervinus (ii. cc. 17-19), Ena and Fiacc, brothers of king Laeghaire, are represented as resisting and then embracing the Christian faith as proclaimed by St. Patrick. On his conversion Ena gave to the church and St. Patrick, not only the holocaust of a devout mind, but his first-born son Cormac, and the ninth part of all the fields and property he had in Ireland (Colgan, Tr. Thaum. 88, 131). This Cormac is by some identified, but most improbably, with St. Cormac of Armagh. [CORMAC (2)]. King Laeghaire seems never to have had brothers so named (Luigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. 238, 258).

ENNA (6) (ESDEUS), son of Cathabhath, has his death entered in the Irish Annals about A.D. 455 (Ann. Inf. a.d. 459; Ann. Coll. a.d. 456; Farr. Matt., a.d. 456), and it is supposed by O'Conor (Rer. Hibern. Script. ii. 109 n. 44) to be the same as St. Enna of Aran; but it is most unlikely. [J. G.]

ENNA (T). [MOENNA.]

ENNATHAS, a virgin, martyred in Palestine during the Dioncletion persecution. She was brought before Mary the tribune, who caused her to be led through the city of Caesarea by men who kept scourging her with thongs all the time; after this she was condemned to be burned. Modernized the name is Enathas i. 185, she is named Manetho, and is commemorated Nov. 13. [T. S. B.]

ENNEIM, one of five virgins martyred in Persia under Sapor II. (A.D. 309). Commemorated June 9. (A.A. 826 June 172.) [T. S. B.]

ENNEPIUS, bishop of Maximianopolis (formerly Impara) in Thrace, near Rhodope. He was present at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1365; Le Quien, Or. Christ. i. 1192.) [J. de S.]

ENNIUS (1) (EUNUS), appears in the ancient lists of bishops of Nantes as second among them, and is said to have built the first church in that place, but everything concerning him is uncertain. (Gall. Christian. xiv. 795; Gams, Serv. Ep. 581.) [R. T. S.]

ENNIUS (2) (EUNUS, EUNUS), sixth bishop of Vannes, succeeding Maciarius and followed by Bepalis. In the third year of Childerich or the 17th of Chilperic (A.D. 578) he was sent to the latter king with an unwelcome message by Warochus a Breton leader, whose offence he expiated by sending him into exile with reproaches. The sentence, however, was relaxed in the following year so far that he was permitted to dwell at Angers, though not to return to Vannes. Subsequently he visited Paris, and while celebrating mass fell down in a fit. He was carried out and recovered, for, as Gregory explains, "siamium vine deditus erat, et plerumque its deiformer invidiae unguum nostrum sacra non vulnerat." (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 27, 30, 41; Albin, Hist. Franc. lib. iii. 25 in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxix. 703.) [S. A. B.]

ENNOIADUS (CHAIANOILUS), twenty-third bishop of Poitiers, the successor of Caregisisus and predecessor of Johannes I. We know nothing of him unless he may be the bishop Chaianoilus or Chaianoilus (both forms are used) whom St. Bertram, bishop of Le Mans, in his will speaks as of a relation, and begs to bury him. The date of St. Bertram's will was A.D. 616, and as Ennoiatus was alive in A.D. 615, the theory is not improbable. (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxx. 405; Gall. Christ. ii. 1151.) [S. A. B.]

ENNOIADUS (1) MAGNUS FELIX, bishop of Pavia, was born at Arles (Ennod. Epist. lib. vii. 8) about 473. Through his father, Camillus (ibid. ii. 25), he was connected with Faustus, Boethius, Avienus, and other Romans of distinction, though he constantly dwelt in humble terms of his family. The invasion of the Visigoths, and the consequent loss of his patrimony, caused him to migrate at an early age to Milan, where he was educated in the house of an aunt. At this time study had no attraction for him, as we learn from one of his letters addressed to Arator (Epist. ix. 1). In 483, the year in which Theodoric invaded Italy, his aunt died, and he was again reduced to destitution, but having rendered himself acceptable to a young lady of family and fortune he was happily saved from beggary by marriage (Euchariest. de Vit.): A dangerous sickness, from which he recovered by the aid of St. Victor, martyr, who administered extreme unction to him (Epist. viii. 34), first led him to reflect about his thoughts, and in an interview with his Eucharisticus, in which he reviews his past life with many expressions of penitence. He was subsequently ordained deacon by Ephianius, bishop of Pavia, whose exhortations determined him to renounce his marriage. This he did with the consent of his young wife, who retired into a convent. In 494 he accompanied Ephianius (Ennod. Vit. Epiph. 234 A) on a mission to Gundaeber, king of the Burgundians, to procure the ransom of certain Ligurian prisoners. Upon the death of Ephianius two years later he visited Rome, and gained reputation by composing an apology for pope Symmachus and the synod which acquitted him, as well as by a panegyric which he pronounced publicly in honour of Theodoric. The former of these discourses was inserted in the Acta Conciliaum; the latter is generally included in collections of the Panegyrici Veteres. Under pope Hormisdas, who succeeded Symmachus, he was advanced to the see of Pavia in the room of Maximus II., and on the strength of this decision was sent in 515, and again in 517, on an embassy to the Emperor Anastasius, in order to oppose the spread of the Eutychian heresy. In the first instance he was accompanied by Fortunatus, bishop of Catania, in
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the second by Peregrius, bishop of Missenum. Both embassies were unsuccessful. Anastasius continued to favour the heretics, and failing to corrupt or bend the bishop, he had him placed at his second departure from Constantinople, on board an unseaworthy vessel, with orders not to put into any Greek port. Ennodius, however, arrived safely in his diocese, which he continued to administer for the space of four years. He died in an early age of forty-eight, and was buried in the church of St. Michael at Pavia, July 17, A.D. 521, which day is observed as his festival by the Roman church.

The following is a list of his works:—
(1) Epistolarum Libri ix., consisting of 297 letters addressed to various correspondents.
(2) Dictiones xxviii., comprising six sacred, seven scholastic, eight controversial, and five ethical discourses.
(3) Panegyricus Theodoreci regi dictus.
(4) Apologeticus pro Synodo.
(5) Vita bestissimi viri Epiphanius Ticinensis Episcopi, on the whole his best written work.
(6) Vita Beatonii Antonii monachi Lirinensis.
(7) Enchiridion de vita.
(8) Paraenesis didascalica ad Ambrosium et Beatum.
(9) Praeceptum de cellulis in aepiscoporum, an ordinance relating to the Count商用车es, or associates, whose office it was to protect the chief pastors of the church from slander.
(10) Petitorium quo Gerontius pleur Agapiti absolutam est, of interest as showing that slaves were emancipated at this time with the accompaniment of a religious form.
(11) Correi paschalis benedictiones duae.

To these works a supplement was added by Martene and Durand (Nov. Thesaur. Anecdot.), from a MS. of St. Remy, of Rheims, comprising a discourse, "In nuntiali Laurentii Mediolanensis episcopi," and a short letter addressed to one Venutius.

The writings of Ennodius exemplify throughout that profound tendency of thought and expression which the Christian writers of Gaul were so slow to abandon. Many of his letters would seem to have proceeded from the pen of a heathen rhetorician, rather than of a Christian bishop. His illustrations are commonly drawn from Greek mythology. He speaks of divine grace as descending "de Superia," and sets the Fates side by side with Jesus Christ. His letters addressed to the other sex breathe a spirit of gallantry, little in keeping with his sacred office. Most of his poems were written before his conversion, but even in those which were composed subsequently the old Adam occasionally reappears. His style is turgid, involved, and affected. He seems to shrink from making himself intelligible lest he should be thought commonplace, and the result is anything but attractive to the reader.

The works of Ennodius were first collected and printed among the Augentes Orthodoxographici, Bale, 1569, fol. Two editions were published in 1611, that of Andrew Schott at Tournai, 4vo., and a more complete edition by Sirmond at Paris, 1709, with notes, which is reprinted in Migne's Patrologia Latina, vol. lxxiii., together with the supplement above mentioned.

For the life of Ennodius, see Funcicius, de inertia ac decrepita, L. L. senecute, c. iii. § xx. c. vi. § viii. c. vii. § x. c. 11, § 31: the Vita Ennodii prefixed to Sirmond's edition, Collier, Annales Ecclesiastiques, v. 569; and for a just estimate of his literary merits, Amphiara, Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. ii. ch. vii.

ENODIUS (2), addressed by Sidonius.

ENNOEA ("Ennoai"). In the attempts made by the framers of different Gnostic systems to explain the origin of the existing world, the first stage in the process was usually made by personifying the conception in the divine mind of that which was to emanate from Him. We learn from Justin Martyr (Ap. l. 26), and from Irenaeus (I. 23, p. 99), that the word Ennoea was used in a technical sense in the system of Simon. The Latin translation of Irenaeus either retains the word, or renders "mensa conceptiva." Tertullian has "injictio." (De Anima, 34). In the "Arbaaaria "Meydan" cited by Hippolytus (Ref. vi. 18, 19, p. 174), the word is used as "Ennoia" but "Ennoia" [HELENA, SIMON]. Irenaeus states (I. 23, p. 100) that the word Ennoea passed from the system of Simon into that of Mereanens. In the Barbelo system early in the third century Irenaeus also counts as derived from that of Simon (I. 29, p. 107). Ennoea appears as one of the first in the series of emanations from the nameless Father.

In the system of Valentinus (Iren. i. i. p. 5) Ennoea is one of several alternative names for the consort of the primary Aeon Bython (CHARIS, SIEGE). For the somewhat different form in which PROLEMAEUS presented this part of the system see Irenaeus (I. xii. i, p. 56). Irenaeus criticises this part of the system (II. xiii. p. 195). The name Ennoia is similarly used in the Orphic system described by Irenaeus (I. xxx. p. 108). [0. 8]

ENOCH, APOCRYPHAL BOOK OF. In Gen. v. 24 it is said of Enoch that he walked with God. This expression was interpreted to mean not only that he led a godly life, but also that he had been vouchsafed the privilege of Divine intercourse, and of receiving Divine revelations. Jewish antiquity regarded him therefore as a prophet, equally familiar with heavenly things and the future fortunes of the human race. These views of his character gave occasion for attributing to Enoch the apocalyptic writing which constitutes one of the principal monuments of the apocalyptic literature of later Judaism. This Book of Enoch, which was already cited in the Epistle of St. Jude (v. 14), and much used by Jewish and Christian writers in the following centuries, was subsequently almost entirely lost—a few fragments only having been preserved in the chronography of Georgios Syncelloclus—till rediscovered in the last century in an Ethiopic translation. James Eusebius in 1773, brought back two MSS. into Europe, to which some others have been subsequently added. Silvestre de Sacy was the first to publish, in 1800, some particulars concerning the contents of this writing (Magasin Encyclop. vi. 383 seqq.). Archbishop Laurence was the first to edit an English Translation (The Book of Enoch, an Apocryphal Production, &c. Oxford, 1832, 1st ed. 1833, 3rd ed. 1838), followed by the original Ethiopic text from Bruce's manuscripts (Liber Enoch Versio Aethiopica, Oxford, 1838). A German translation, with learned introduction and com-
tensive commentary, was published by Prof. A. G. Hoffmann in Jena (Das Buch Henoch in vollständiger deutscher Übersetzung, etc. Theile, Leipzig, 1833–1838). The first part is translated from the English, but the second is based likewise on the Frankfort manuscript of the Ethiopic text. The Latin version of Griesbach, made from the English and German translations, is of no value (Propheten etc. pseudographi, Stuttgart, 1840). The best edition of the Ethiopic text is that of Prof. Dillmann, who made use of five manuscripts (Liber Henoch Aethiopicus, Leipzig, 1851). Of the improved text of his journey, Dillmann published another German translation with critical introduction and copious commentary (Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt, Leipzig, 1853). The Ethiopic version was not made immediately from the Hebrew original, but from the Greek. There is no reason to doubt its substantial fidelity, though it not unfrequently differs from the Greek text of fragments preserved elsewhere, one at least of which is not to be found in the Ethiopic text. The whole work as it now lies before us is divided into five books, but closer investigation makes it evident that this text has passed through various hands, and is a composite work. It has been assumed by various critics that we have before us a collection of several books of Enoch independent one of another. This hypothesis, however, is untenable; we must, on the contrary, assume the existence of an original document, which at different times was enriched with additions from various sources. The critical treatment of the book has occupied, beside de Sacy, Lawrence, and Hoffmann, the following scholars, whose labours deserve a special mention here: — Ernurt Krieger [Lützelsberger] (in the Heilige zur Kritik und Exegese, Nürnberg, 1845, Lücke (Einleitung in die Offenbaring Johannis, 2nd ed. Bonn, 1852), Dillmann (as above), Ewald (Uber das äthiopischen Buches Henoch Entstehung und Zusammenstellung), K. R. Linnemann ("Uber die Entstehung des Buches Henoch," Theologia Aethiopica et Osyria, 1856), and Hilgenfeld (Südliche Apokalypse, Jena, 1857; Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1860, p. 319 sqq., 1861, p. 212 sqq., 1882, p. 216 sqq.).

Excluding first the so-called Parables (cc. 37–71), the following chapters — 1–19, 21–36, 72–105 — form a well-connected whole, which professes to be a variety of revelations committed to writing which had been vouchsafed to the prophet Enoch, partly in ecstatic visions in the heavenly world, partly in prophetic dreams. The introduction (cc. 1–5) announces first a benediction of the prophet on the righteous, and then a prophet of the great day of judgment, on which the impious will receive well-merited punishment for their disobedience to the ordinances of God. Whereupon follows (cc. 6–16) an account of the origin of the universal corruption of the human race, induced by the fall of the angels and their carnal intercourse with the daughters of men. In consequence of the abominations resultant from this fall God is about to impose a heavy judgment, which Enoch has to announce to the fallen "Watchers." These are to be in future bound in subterranean prisons for the whole period of earth's history, the duration of which is fixed at seventy gene-

rations, until the day of final judgment, whereon they will be cast for ever into the lake of fire. In what follows, the original text appears in a somewhat fragmentary form in the Ethiopic version. As in the introduction, a reference to the fixed Divine laws which heaven itself and the whole created universe are subject to is exhibited in the strongest light the guilt of sinners in transgressing the will of God, so now is made to follow (cc. 17–19, 21–36) an account of the mysteries of heaven and earth which have been exhibited to Enoch by angels during a ecstatic rapture from earth to heaven. In this miraculous journey, the universe Enoch sees first the place of the winds and the regions whence lightning and thunder come. After that the water of life, and the sea of fire which is destined to receive the setting sun, the streams of Hades, the dwelling-place of the dead, the mountains of black winter clouds, the waters of Oceanus, the winds which support the universe, seven fiery mountains of precious stones, the mid-one of which, being the throne of God, reaches to heaven, the hell of fire, and in the vacant spaces of the universe the prison-houses of fallen star-spirits, and the future place of punishment for the angels who had held sinful intercourse with the daughters of men. In a subsequent journey Enoch is taken a second time to the same places. First to the place of punishment for the fallen angels; then into Hades and its different compartments; to the fire at which the stars are kindled; to the place of future judgment; to the seven mountains, the middle one of which rises in the form of a throne; and then into the Holy Land and the vale of Hinnom, the future place of punishment for impious men; and then further eastward to the legendary home-lands of noble spicae, and on as far as Paradise. In a third journey Enoch arrives at the gates of heaven, and the places whence issue stars and winds. Thereupon follows (cc. 72–82) the book concerning the courses of the heavenly lights, which describes once more in the form of a journey the change in the appearance of the constellations, the courses of sun and moon, and the relation of the solar to the lunar year, to which are attached a series of further communications regarding the various winds, their origin and operations, concerning the seven mountains, seven streams, and seven islands. The laws of the lights and powers of heaven are announced to Enoch on his journeys by the instrumentality of angels. All this he imparts to his son Methuselah, who is to commit it in his turn to following generations. In some parts of this section the original order seems to have been disturbed. Chapter 82 sought properly to stand before chapter 79, while chapter 81 forms the conclusion of this section. Enoch in this chapter contemplates the writing on the heavenly tables, wherein are recorded the actions of the men to the latest generations, and then returns from his journeys to earth, in order to spend one last year in the circle of his family.

The revelations which follow concerning the future form of mankind (cc. 83–91, 11: 9–93) are presented in the form of visions which Enoch has vouchsafed at different times of his life, but now for the first time, on the conclusion of his wondrous journey, related to his son Methuselah.
The first vision, seen by him while still a boy, in the house of his grandfather Mahalaleel describes the flood (c. 83); the second, which had been imparted to him before his marriage gives in apocalyptic figures a general survey of the history of the chosen people, from the first human pair to the struggles of the Israelites against the Syrians, in the time of John Hyrcanus. The account of these struggles is immediately followed by that of the approaching universal judgment (cc. 84–90). A third description of the future, introduced by exhortations to his children, gives once more a rapid survey of the world’s history divided into ten great weeks. At the end of the seventh week, which is the actual writer’s own time, the righteous receive a sevenfold instruction concerning the whole creation; in the eighth week the righteous celebrate their triumph and enter on their kingdom; in the ninth, judgment is passed on the ungodly; to the tenth is assigned the judgment of the fallen angels and the renewal of heaven and earth. The last section (cc. 92; 94–105) contains the Doctrines of Wisdom which Enoch, the writer imports to his children and all future generations, warnings against sin in its various forms, admonitions to righteousness, fidelity, and perseverance, comminations against the ungodly, and promises for the righteous.

The text of this comprehensive work appears in some parts not to belong to the original form. Apart from the lacunas between chapters 16 and 17, and some smaller interpolations of which we shall have to speak farther on, it strikes one with surprise to find several things seen by Enoch in his journeys repeatedly told again in the same words. The revelations, moreover, vouchsafed to Enoch on his first journey (cc. 17–19) are for the most part repeated, chapters 21–36. The section about the Winds, on the other hand, chapters 76 and 77, together with the additions subsequent to the Mountains and the Lights of Heaven. It repeats also, in more detail, what has already been treated of (chapters 33–36), only much more briefly.

As there is little probability that these repetitions were intentional, we are warranted in supposing that there may have been different recensions of the text which held their ground side by side, and were put together by some simple-minded collector.

There is also much probability in Ewald’s supposition that the author of our Book of Enoch had another and older book before him, perhaps in different editions, a “book of celestial physics,” which is mentioned as part of the description of the mysterious regions above the earth, under the earth, and at the world’s ends; and in its second part comprised the laws of the motions of sun, moon, and stars. This original work, more or less revised, seems to have been comprised in chapters 17–19, 21–36, 72–79, and 82. As a “scribe of heaven” to whom all the mysteries of creation and the courses of the stars were known, Enoch appeared to be the most suitable person to be represented as teacher of the higher wisdom. The second author, who regarded Enoch chiefly as a preacher of repentance and foreteller of judgment to come, adopted this other view of his character the more readily as the description of the place of torment prepared for the ungodly, in the lower world, fitted it well with his special purpose. At the same time he worked out the thought that the whole universe is governed by fixed laws and ordinances, and that every disorder or disturbance is simply a consequence of the sin of the fallen angels and of the impious among mankind. To him belong the form of representations somewhat late and abruptly introduced, according to which Enoch is imparting to his son, Methuselah, the mysteries which have been revealed to himself. The apocalyptic pictures drawn of the future (a main object with the second writer) are somewhat awkwardly presented in the form of dream-visions, related by Enoch, long after he had seen them, to his son. This second Book of Enoch seems never to have existed as an independent work, but only as an expansion and completion of the former. The pieces peculiar to the second author are chapters 1–18, 80 and 81, 85–105.

The date of the original work cannot be determinedly fixed, while that of its revision is clearly indicated in the Victoriae of seventy-shepherd-times which begin after the destruction of the first Temple are the times of heathen dominion over Israel, till the rise of the Hasmonene monarchy. The seventy shepherds, each of whom obtains dominion for a definite period over the sheep, can indeed hardly be regarded as so many heathen princes, but rather as punitive angels who destroy more sheep than were included in their commission. At the same time the longer divisions into which these shepherd-times are distributed, though in detail the reckoning may be somewhat uncertain, correspond on the whole with the ruling periods of Babylon, Persia, Macedonia, and Syria; the last twelve appearing to answer exactly to the reigns of twelve kings of Syria, from Antiochus IV to John Hyrcanus. In any case the rams, born in the last twelve shepherd-times, whose horns grow, and which call the sheep together to fight with the ravens, are the pious zealots of the Hasmonene period, and the great horn which the rams, along with other birds of prey, vainly endeavour to cast down, is John Hyrcanus, the victorious Hasmonene (cc. 125–106). The author looks forward to the close of Gentile domination and the day of final judgment as soon about to follow these days of victory. The date of composition might be still more definitely made out could we fix more exactly the dates of the seventy shepherd-times. They do indeed evidently correspond, as Hilgenfeld was the first to observe, to the 70 weeks of Daniel or 840 years. This, reckoning exactly, would give us the period from 588 B.C. to 84 A.D., and so bring us down to the early years of Janneaus Alexander (105–79 B.C.). On the other hand, we do not certainly know that the date fixed in the author’s own mind for the destruction of the first Temple was exactly B.C. 588. Putting this in round numbers at 600 B.C. we are brought by the 70 weeks down to 110 B.C., which Dillmann fixes as the approximate date of composition. In any case, the young whelp (chap. 90, 13, 14) is not distinguished from the great horn, and cannot therefore refer to Janneaus Alexander but to John Hyrcanus himself.

The reckoning according to 70 generations
The book, in any case, remains a remarkable monument of Jewish theological opinion at the close of the second and beginning of the first century before Christ. It is without sufficient foundation that criticism has been made of its having proceeded from Essene circles. It neither advocates Essene asceticism nor rejects the Temple worship; the angelological speculations are still very undeveloped, while the writer's imagination is so much the more occupied with final judgment and consummation, with futurity blisslessness of the righteous, and the torments of the ungodly. It is further noteworthy that the Messias plays a quite subordinate part in its Eschatology. The specimens given of Jewish natural science are of special value.

What must be regarded as a third Book of Enoch is formed by the three Parables. These contain a most interesting and at the same time a very interesting and most surprising, a story how, in the midst of a thousand times ten thousand and ten thousand times ten thousand. In the older writing, on the other hand, Uriel occupies throughout the place of Phanuel (the name Suriel for Raphael, 9, 1, is not confirmed by the parallel passage in the Greek text, nor is it met with elsewhere). The Seraphim and Ophanim are not mentioned at all. In the older writing represents Enoch as under the guidance of Uriel, Raguel (Gabriel?), Raphael and Michael, he now appears under the guidance of the angel of peace, and sees the archangels in their lofty station round the throne of God. Azazel, moreover, is here placed at the head of the fallen angels (54, 5; 55, 4) rather as in chapters 6, 3-7, and 9, 7 (compare 10, 11) Sennaja is the first, Azazel the tenth in the list of those unhappy beings. In the passage 69, 2, the catalogue of fallen angels is an interpolation disturbing the context which treats only of originally evil spirits. Azazel is indeed in the older work also represented as the author of all kinds of iniquity, who teaches mankind the use of murderous weapons, luxurious living, and covetousness (8, 1; compare 9, 6; 10, 4; 13, 1), whereas in the second, those functions are ascribed to the evil spirit Gudroel, who (69, 9) teaches mankind the construction and use of instruments of slaughter. It is yet more significant that the Parables of the second work presuppose a host of intermediate beings, that is, evil spirits by whom the angels have been seduced (69, 4, sqq.; compare 40, 7; 55, 4; 54, 6), and in accordance with this, they appear also to teach the existence of two races of mankind. As God originally divided light from darkness, so has He also divided the spirit of men, conforming in goodness those of the righteous (41, 9). This dualism is not, however, carried out to its legitimate consequences. We may further reckon among the pecularities of these Parables the teaching of the development of the church concerning the heavenly wisdom (chap. 43; compare 37, 2 sq.); 48, 1, 7; 49, 1-3; 51, 3); the doctrine of the general resurrection of the dead (chap. 51); and the doctrine of an endless blessed life of the righteous in heaven (37, 4; 58; 71, 16 sq.). The designation of the Messias as "Son of Man," which, as is well known, is elsewhere applied to our Lord, only by Himself, is borrowed from Daniel, and this alone accounts for the representation of Heaven as the native home of the Messias. The name, "Son of Woman" (65, 5), occurs once in a passage in which the text appears to have been corrupted, while "Filus Viri" in another passage (69, 29), instead of "Filius Hominis," may simply result from a mistranslation. The name Son of Man
ENODOCUS

(Filius Hominis) is, in fact, the regular predicate of Massias, and this, combined with other somewhat developed Christological ideas in the Parables, has led to the supposition of a Christian authorship, in favour of which may also be alleged the expression “church of the elect,” and the sharp antithesis between elect and reprobate, which is by no means identical with that between Israelites and Gentiles. Neither of these notes can, however, be regarded as decisive. The work is in the main directed against the kings who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits (38, 5; 41, 2; 46, 4, sq.; 48, 10; 53, 5; 54, 2; 55, 3, 63), and oppresses the theocracy. This indicates a time not earlier than that of the later Hasmonaeans and the Herods. That we cannot go farther back than such a time is determined amongst other circumstances by the mention of the Parthians (56, 5) who then first began to be formidable neighbours to the Jews. Hilgenfeld contends that by “the kings,” Gentile or heathen sovereigns are designated, and that because they are spoken of (chap. 46, 7) as the “chafers whose own hands have made;” this view is contradicted, however, by other passages, while the Gentile proclivities of the later rulers of Palestine, and specially of Herod and his sons, may be held to justify the expression on which his theory is founded.

These Parables, moreover, are not on their side free from interpolations. Such beyond doubt are the so-called Noachian sections, which not only disturb the context in which they stand, but also introduce Noah as the speaker instead of Enoch. They all refer to the first divine judgment, that of the Deluge. The limits of these Noachian sections are variously determined; Dillmann and Köstlin make them include chapters 54, 7, to 55, 2; 60; 65 to 69, 25, the former adding also chapter 70. Ewald, on the other hand, would assign only a few verses of chapters 69 and 60 to the interpolator. But the section chapter 68, 2–5, which is immediately connected with chapter 64, and the whole chapter 69 (with the single exception of the Catalogue of Angels, vv. 2 and 3, and perhaps the note of Time, v. 1), together with chapter 70, must have already belonged to the Parables, but of chapter 60, on the other hand, only vv. 1–6. As certainly Noachian sections then can be regarded only chapters 54, 7, to 55, 2; 60, 7–25, and 65 to 68, 1. Another passage which seems to have proceeded from the same interpolator as Ewald already has perceived, is the passage interpolated in the older writing; chap. 10, 1–3, 23 containing the announcement of the Deluge to Noah by an angel, not elsewhere mentioned as Arsalalj lur. Whether he also inserted the Catalogue of Angels, chapter 20, and the list of fallen angels (chap. 69, 2, 3), repeated from 6, 7, cannot be definitely ascertained. It is however highly improbable that these additions are fragments of an independent Book of Enoch. The other hand we must regard as mere interpolations in part the close relation in which Noah is placed here and afterwards to Enoch, and in part the circumstance that the Noachian additions borrow various expressions from the Parables (Lord of Spirits, Angel of Peace, &c.).

It is more difficult to determine the origin of some other sections. To these belong among the Parables some pieces which break the connexion of thought, and remind us of The Book of Celestial Physics (41, 2–9; 43; 44; 45; 48, 23). A comparison of these with the section 60, 11–23, which belongs to the Noachian additions, makes it probable that they also proceed from the same interpolator. To the same source may likewise be referred the story of the birth of Noah and the Deluge which is told in his time, but here Enoch is the speaker and not Noah. Chapter 108, on the other hand, is certainly the work of another author, as is clear from the title, “Another Treatise which Enoch wrote for his son Methuselah, and for those who came after him.” It was evidently after the insertion of the Parables with which it has several points of resemblance, as, for instance, the antithesis of light and darkness. For the date of composition of the Noachian additions, we have no certain indications. One passage, 67, 5 sq., is important, which speaks of the custom of kings to seek for healing by bathing in warm springs; the allusion seemed to be to Herod the Great and perhaps the baths of the Dead Sea (Antt. xiv. 6, 5); that these baths are placed “the west” appears to have arisen from a thoughtless reproduction of what had been said about localities in chapter 52, 1. Hilgenfeld prefers to think the allusion to be to the warm baths of Campania, so much frequented in the imperial times as really situated in the “west” of Palestine. This information, presupposing the Christian origin of the Parables, would indeed be necessary. Chapter 108 is, at any rate, the latest piece of the whole collection.

The result of these observations seems to be that the Book of Enoch must be regarded as a collective work, consisting of various parts, about the composition of which it will be difficult to form a certain judgment until the Hebrew original, or at any rate the Greek version from which the Ethiopic is derived, shall have been recovered. Apart from the question of the interpolations and especially the Noachian fragments, the chief point of interest for us at the present time is whether we are to regard the Parables as a Jewish or a Christian work; could it be proved that they were made use of in the Book of Jubilees, the question would be decided in favour of a Jewish origin. The Christian authorship of the whole book as maintained by Lücke (in the first but not the second edition of his Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannes), Weiss (Evangelienfrage, 1856, p. 214 sq.), J. Chr. K. Hofmann (Zeitschr. f. deutschem Morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1852, p. 87 sq.), and Philippi (Ezechiel und Enoch, Stuttgart, 1860) is quite inadmissible. Volkmar’s theory on the other hand is still more fanciful (Zeitschr. f. deutschem Morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1860, p. 87 sq. and Eine Neuentstehende Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung, Zürich, 1862), namely, that the book proceeded from the school of Rabbi Akiba, A.D. 132, and was written to invite his followers to the apostolic church, the importance to the Antiochians, Bar-kochbas, and join the Jewish revolt against Hadrian. [R. A. L.]

ENODOCUS (GUINEOCUS), ST., to whom a chapel in the Cornish parish of St. Miewt (Menefrida), on the Bristol Channel, is dedicated, was probably a Welsh saint. William of Wor-
ENO DORUS, Bishop Lacy, of Exeter, in 1434, allowed the parishioners to celebrate their dedication day, to all future time, on the 13th of July, instead of on the 54th, which was the feast-day of St. Christina (Oliver's "Monasticon Dioc. Ebor."
p. 441). In the parish of St. Cubert, also on the northern sea, is a sepulchral stone with the inscription, "CONOTOCI FILLI TEGERNOMALLI," which some connect with this saint. The inscription is very like those on the sepulchral stones of Brecknockshire (compare those given in Bidwell and Stubb's "Councils," i. pp. 169, 825), which seems to have been a central point for missionary enterprise.

[ C. W. B. ]

ENO DORUS, ST., an Irish saint, who gave his name to St. Enoder, or Enolder, in Cornwall. His feast is the Sunday nearest the last Thursday in April. The name is Celtic, and not the same as Athenodoras. He is said to have died in Cornwall late in the 5th century. The church dedicated to him, just south of St. Columb Major, is called Egoseneaton in Dominges. The prefix Egos is comparatively rare and early in Cornish names. The old fair-day of the parish was Sept. 25. (See Cressy's "Church History of Brittany," i. 19, [C. H.]

ENOGRAS, said to have been bishop of Marbrium (St. Malo) in Brittany, and to have died A.D. 531 (Migne, "Hug.""). But the Samaritans do not feel certain enough about him to include him among the occupants of this see ("Jd. Christ, xiv. 995").

[ C. H. ]

ENON, martyred together with Quirio and forty others under Gallienus, A.D. 260. He is commemorated Jan. 13. ("Mart. Hier.; A.A. SS. Jan. i. 767.)

[ T. S. R. ]

ENTHEUS, a monk, commemorated by the Ethiopian church on the 17th of the month Naha—as (August 10). Lindoulus adds no note to his name ("Lindolph and Swani Historiarum Aethiopicarum Commentarioria"); Franchetti (1691, p. 425). In the Ethiopian MS. of the Senkessar in the Bodleian Library, the 17th of Naha—as is marked thus: Martyrium Entei, Amoraei; and the martyrdom of his brother, Acrates, is commemorated on the same day (cf. Dillmann, in "Catalogus Cod. Mss. Bibl. Bodleianae," pt. viii. p. 67).

[F. P.]


[ G. S. ]

ENTHYSIME, one of the six "roots" in the system of Sinox (Hippol. Ref. vi. 20, p. 177). "Orphani (Iren. l. xxx. 6, 7, p. 110) and Vales tines."

[ G. S. ]

ENTICUS (EUTICUS), of Caesarea in Cappadocia ("Scheffer"), one of the numerous Christians who were required to surrender their sacred books during the period of the persecution of Diocletian, A.D. 303-4. ("Monum. Vet. de Den. Hist. Oberthur, p. 171; -d. Migne, Patr. Lat. viii. 733 a.")

[ H. W. P. ]

CHRIST. BIOL.—VOL. II.

ENTULANUS, bishop of Toul. ("Endulsa.")

ENTYCHITAE, a sect of the followers of Simon, who, according to Clem. Alex. ("Strom. viii. 17, p. 900"). Derived this name from the unlawful things which they had the audacity to practice (δύνατόν εὐθεῖας τῇ ἐν ἐννομον). We know that Christians believed the charge to be true of certain of the Gnostic sects which had been brought by heathen against the Christians, viz. that hap hazard sexual intercourse took place at their nightly meetings; and this would seem to be what was referred to in this nickname. Theodor ("Haer. Fab. i. 1") copies the name in the form Eutyctaeae. Coteler notes ("Mon. Eccl. Gr. iii. 640") the occurrence of Eutyctaeae as a transcript's error for Euchitaeae, and conversely Euchitaeae in a passage where Sophronius intended the name Eutyctaeae, derived from Theodor. [G. S.]

ENUTUS, bishop of Noyon. ("Envitus.")

ENVAEL, Welsh saint. ("Enval, Envalp.")

ENYMIA, abess. ("Enymia.")

EOAIN, Irish saint. ("Ioain.")

EOALDUS (EOLDS, GOALDS, EDALDS, CAEOLDS), ST., was an archbishop of Vienne. In the "Gallia Christiana" (xvi. 35) he is placed forty first in the list, succeeding St. Agratus, and followed by St. Barolinus II. He flourished about the year 710. He has sometimes been confused with Cadeolus, who preceded him by about forty years in the same see. Almost the whole of his authentic history is summed up in a sentence from the "Chronicon" of Ado, abbishop of Vienne, for the year 718 (see Migne, "Patr. Lat. xxviii. 120," to the effect that at that time Eoldus enriched the church of Vienne, for he was related to the kings of the Franks, and built within the city a chapel crypties, in honour of the Thebaean martyrs, St. Maurice and his companions, and there placed a considerable number of relics, both of these and other martyrs, and the church was thenceforth called St. Maurice's. Eoldus is commemorated on the 27th day of July. ("Gall. Christ. xvi. 35.") [S. A. B.]

EOALDUS, bishop of Lyons. ("Fuloldus.")

EOBANACH (EOBANUS), martyr, commemorated June 5. His name occurs in the list of martyrs in the Dunkeld Litany, and Camerarius, calling him St. Eobanus, martyr, places him on this day. ("Bp. Forbes, "Eod. Scott. Saints," ivii. 239, 539; Camerarius, "De Scot. For." 153.") [J. G.]

EOBANUS, presbyter of Boniface, of Mentz, in whose correspondence his name is also written "Eaba" and "Eobo." The archbishop calls him his son and a bearer of his letters. In the latter capacity Eaba visits the abbots Dudo, Eadburga abbes of Thanel, and Siegald, apparently abbot of Chertsey. Boniface once addresses him from Italy among the friends he had left behind in Germany, viz. Geppan, Tatwinus, and Wygibertus. ("Mon. Mogunt." ed. Jaffé, pp. 98, 99, 100, 166.) He is mentioned as amanuensis of Boniface in a letter from the latter to the abbess Edburga. He was sent by
EOBE

Pippin on an embassy to pope Zacharias to consult in the name of the princes of Christendom on questions of church discipline (Baron. A. E. 744, 3). He assisted Boniface as a choric presbyter in his preaching and baptizing among the Frisians, and was afterwards appointed by him bishop of Trajectum (Maastricht). (Vit. Willibr. in Momms. Mag. ed. Jaffé, 463; Baron. Annals Eccles. a. D. 724, 8; 755, 98.)

[I. G. S.]

EOBE, an abbat who attests a charter of Ethelbald, king of Mercia, between 723 and 737. (Kemble, C. D. 83.) He is probably identical with Ibe, who attests a Worcester charter of the same king in 736 (ib. 80; Mon. Angl. i. 585) and Iebe, whose name is appended to a similar undated charter. (K. C. D. 89.) All the three charters are of respectable authority, and coincide in other points besides the attestation of this otherwise unknown person. As he was distinctly a Mercian abbat it would be hazardous to identify him further with Eaba of Malmesbury, who flourished at the same time. [Eaba.]

[3.]


[C. R.]


[T. S. B.]

EOCHAUA TUIATHAIL, anchoret, bishop and abbat of Lughmhadh (Louth), died A.D. 820 (Four Mast.).

[J. G.]

EOCHAIHID, pronounced Oby, and derived from the Irish each, a horse, is literally a horseman (Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 2 ser. 135). It is latinised Eochaidh and Echuidh, and retains also the Irish forms Eochaidh and Echuidh.

(1) Abbat of Lisnare, commemorated Apr. 17. The Irish annals mention the death of this saint in the year 694, and seem to make him abbot of an monastery at Lisnare before St. Carthach Mochuda (May 14) was driven from Rahan. But however we may get over the special difficulty involved in the chronology, the truth seems to be that while Carthach was bishop, Eochaidh was the second abbat of Lisnare in Waterford. [Carthach (2.), Reeves, Chdnea, 87; Br. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 335.]

In times of his being either an abbot of Lismore in Scotland, or else the same as Eogoluid (Jan. 25), of Iona.

[J. G.]

EOCHAIHID (3), son of Gearóid, steward of Armagh, died a.D. 796 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 399). Ann. Ult. (A.D. 795) call him Echua mac Cernaig, and say he died "immutura morte."

[J. G.]


[J. G.]


Joyce (Irish Names of Places, 2 ser. c. 3, p. 124 seq.) has a very curious and interesting chapter on the Irish love for attaching nicknames to persons, either as descriptive of some personal or hereditary peculiarity or as based on similarities or contradictions. It is from this custom we have the name of Eochaidh, son of Colla, entirely supplanted by the nickname Dallan Forgaill, "the blind son of Forcaill." [Dallan Forgaill.]

[J. G.]

EOCHAIHID (6), son of Conall Menna, abbat of Faebhban (Foyran, in the barony of Fore, co. Westmeath) (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, vii. 35, but cf. t. 537 n.); died A.D. 759 (Ann. Tyg.; Four Mast. A.D. 754.)

EOCHAIHID (7), son of Diarmait, bishop and abbat of Armagh. He succeeded St. Caerlian (Mar. 24) at Armagh in 588, and was there for ten years, dying A.D. 598 (Stuart, Armagh, 91; Lanigan, Hist. High. ii. c. 14, § 9).

In his work the Irish annals say Eochaidh, son of Dermot, called abbat of Armagh, died in January 598, but his reference to January is probably taken from Colgan's vague suggestion that if this Eochaidh is to be numbered among the saints, he is likely to be the one who is venerated on Jan. 1, though the person there is said in the Kalendars to be Eochaidh of Ulseanach. (Colgan, Tr. Thom., 293, col. 2; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 5; Ware, Bishops, by Harris, 38.)

[J. G.]

EOCHAIHID (8), son of Fiacrach, a wise man, died A.D. 759 (Ann. Tyg.; Four Mast. A.D. 754.)

EOCHAIHID (9), son of Fogarta, abbat of Fochaidh and Inisalothairn (the former a woody district near Killala, barony of Threavy, co. Mayo, and the latter an island in Lough Eo, in the Shannon), died A.D. 785 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 386-7).

[J. G.]

EOCHAIHID (10), son of Nathri or Dathri, was converted by St. Patrick on the restoration of his wife Eochaidh to life before the churchyard of Kilmore, as related by Jocelin and Eriwan. Dathy, son of Fiacrach, was the last pagan king of Ireland, and killed by a thunderbolt at the foot of the Alps, a.D. 428 (Colgan, Tr. Thom., c. 145, 141, c. 91, 180 n. 142).

[J. G.]

EOCHAIHID (11), of Uisnech—Jan. 1.

There is an account given by Ervins (Trip. V. St. Patr. ii. c. 123) of St. Patrick's arrival in the country of Enna, who was brother of King Lasghaire, and of his request for ground to build a church. Without apparently giving his full consent at the time, Ervins next day brought his son Eochaidh or Eochan Lucus to St. Patrick to be made a bishop, and, failing to meet with St. Patrick at Alltech-Airtech, prevailed upon two of St. Patrick's disciples, who were bishops to consecrate Eochaidh. But when St. Patrick heard of this transaction he was highly incensed, and pronounced a doom upon both the young bishop and his consecrators. Colgan thinks this Eochaidh must have been the Eochaidh of Ulseanach, who is commemorated in the kalendars of Jan. 1, chiefly because Ulseanach or Uisnishill is in Westmeath, which belonged to the sons of
Eochaídh

Laeighair, and Aileach-Airtreach was probably on the other side of the Shanoon, in Roscommon. (Colgan, Acta SS. 737, c. 4, and Tr. Thom. 131, c. 17, 145, c. 123, 181 n. 160; O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, l. 19.)

Eochaídh (12) of Cill-Toma. In the Irish annals is the death of Eochaídh (Eochadh, Ann. Uí), of Cill-Toma, now Killtoor, a hamlet in the barony of Fore, near Castlepollard, co. Westmeath. He died in the year 751 (Ann. Tg.), and was succeeded by Coibhdeanach.

Eochaídh (13) of Cluain-ratha, brother of St. Magister of Killmagister, descended from the Ui Baireach who occupied Slievemargy, Queen’s County, and some adjoining districts. He was thus related to and nearly contemporary with St. Fiac, of Sletty, who, by his mother, was a step farther removed from the common ancestor Dubh Barrach (Book of Rights, 212; Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir. 4 ser. ii. 547).

Eochod, apostle of the Picts. [Eochadius.]


Eodberht, by a deed dated the 16th of May, in the tenth year of king Childerbert (704), sold all his possessions at Rumiacum, in the district of Therouanne, to Rigobert abbot of the monastery of St. Bertin at Sithium. This document is by some mistake given twice over in Aigile, Patr. Lat. lxviiii. 1248 and cxxxvii. 1198, the author of the Index biographicus evidently supposing there were two distinct deeds of different purport.

Eodwald (Eadwalde), the son of a poor woman whom Wilfrid is said to have restored to life at a place called Outladunferi (7 Twyscon). Wilfrid desired that the child should be brought to him when seven years old, to enter into his service. When the time came, the mother, at the instigation of her husband, fled from home with her child, and was concealed among the Britons. They were discovered by Hocca, one of Wilfrid’s elders, and the boy was brought to him. He was generally called “bishop’s son” (filius episcopi), and died at Ripon in the great mortality. He was in some religious service there. (Eddi, Vita Wifr. n. e. cap. 18.)

Eoghan (Eogenus, “well-born” Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 2 ser. 150). (2) Son of Caithnech, and bishop of Ardras, commemorated August 23. He was of the royal blood of Leinster, his father being Caimnech, of the race of Laighair Lorc, son of Uaigne Mor, and his mother Muindecha, of the race of the Medorni, probably in the county of Monaghan. He is said by Colgan and others to have been in the court of Patrick, but he does not appear to have really been such, unless we are to suppose that his age was of a prolonged nature. It is more likely that he was under St. Finian (Dec. 12), of Clona; and on his liberation from the captivity in which he was held when the pir-es

carried him off in his early youth, along with Tighernach (Apr. 4) of Clones, and Canire (Nov. 11) of Coleraine, and others, to Britain, he studied for some years at the great monastery of Rosnatt or Whithern, founded by St. Ninian. He founded a monastery at a place called Killmagheragh in the county of Wigtown, where, according to Ussher, he flourished in the year 570, and had under him St. Kevin (June 3) of Glendalough, his kinsman. St. Etichen (Feb. 11) of Clonfadd is said to have been related to him as belonging to the same sept in the Dal Messianore. St. Eoghan afterwards was bishop at Ardstraw, now Ardsraw, in the barony of Strabane and county of Tyrone, where the bishop’s seat was fixed before it was transferred to Maghera and thence to Derry; he was also bishop at Rathkeal, now Rathkeal or Rashee, in the barony and county of Antrim, and as such is usually entered in the Annals. At Ardstraw he had also a monastery. To Utter history probably came from Wicklow, on account of its being the province of his paternal relationship. He was a great and industrious preacher, and after a life of zealous labour in declaring the gospel, he fell asleep in the Lord in the beginning of the seventh century. In all the Irish annals his death is associated with that of St. Coemgen, or Kevin, of Glendalough, and took place in the year of grace 618 (Ann. Tg.). The Bollandists (Acta SS. Aug. 23, tom. iv. 624) have a memoir, “De S. Eugenio vel Eogano, Episcopo Ardrasathanii in Hibernia. Vita ante aeternum anonimo ex MS. Salmanticensium;” and Baring-Gould (Lives of the Saints, Aug. 25, p. 251) compares the short notice, but gives no other date or evidence of a date. In Ann. Clonmacon, he is called “Owen, bishop of Ardarsthy,” and Caldwell or Cawder, a parish in the counties of Nairn and Inverness, was dedicated to St. Ewan and anciently called Borrowin, properly Bar Ewan or Ewan’s Midight. He was patron also of Collare, Porthshire. O’Donnell (Vit. S. Columb. i. c. 11) gives an account of the bishop of Ardstraw, for which reason the name of Eoghan was given to the birth of St. Columba, and O’Clery refers to it as a fact, but as St. Columb was born about A.D. 521 and bishop Eoghan died about A.D. 618, we must doubt the genuineness of the prophecy. (Marti. Doney, by Todd and Reeves, 159, 227; Colgan, Acta SS. 406, 438, and Tr. Thom. 391, 460, c. 31; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 12, § 3; Todd, Book of Hymns, favo. i. 103–6; Reeves, Eccl. Ant. 68, 250; O’Connor, Rev. Hk. Script. ii. 184, iv. 40; Bp. Forbes, Cal. Scott. Saints, 335; Survey Prov. Moray, 202; Ware, Bishops, 48, and Ir. Ant. 131; Butler, Lives of the Saints, Aug. 23, vili. 397; Ulster Journ. Arch. 1. 197 n. 1 Book of Oibly, C.C. Dublin, Inx. ix. ; Hardy, Descript. Cat. i. pt. ii. 194.)

Eoghan (2), son of Laiscre. “Eogenius mac Laiscreus” is given in Ussher’s Irish saints of the second class, who were few bishops and many saints, to the number of three hundred, and extended for a period of about sixty years up to the close of the sixth century. But nothing satisfactory is known of him: he could not have been bishop of Ardsraw, as Caimeach was that bishop’s father’s name, nor could he well have been master of St. Kevin (Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 17, works, vi. 478, 538; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 10, § 4, c. 12, § 7).

EOGHANAN, commemorated Dec. 20 (Mort. Doneg.), but 19, Mort. Talk. He was son of Aenghus, and had his residence or dedication at Ardleigh, in Magh-Ene, near unto Eas-Rath, that is, in the plain of Moy, and Donegal, and near the cataract of Assaro or Essaroe, on the river Erne. "Mort. Doneg." by Todd and Reeves, 343; "Mort. Tullagh" in Kelly's Col. Ir. SS. xxxix. 13). Eoghanan is the diminutive of Eochaidh, and probably the double diminutive of Eog or Eocha.

EOGLIDUS, Irish saint. [CECHADUS]

EOGN, son of Tripot, an abbat, died a.d. 745, but the entry in the Stowe copy of the Four Masters is modern (O'Conor, Rev. Ir. Scir. iii. 270).

EOGUIN (Nennius, Hist. Angl. in M. H. B. 76 A), king of Northumbria. [C. H.]

EOIL, Irish saint. [EUHEL]

EOIN, son of Carlan, of Tech-esin in Uith, commemorated Aug. 17. Eoin is the Irish form of the name John, and this saint is commemorated in Mort. Doneg., and Mort. Tullagh. His church Tigh-Eoin, "John's House," has given its name by contraction to Styrou, now St. John's Point, a detached townland of Rathmullan parish, co. Down. (Reeves, Eccl. Antiq. 32, 33.)

EOLANG (EULAGUS, EULOGUS), of Achadhe, commemorated Sept. 5. O'Clery (Mort. Doneg.) by Todd and Reeves, 237 has on this day "Eolag of Achadh-bo-Cainnigh in Osraigh [now Aghabo], founded by St. Caineach (Oct. 11) in the barony of Clandonagh and Clarnamagh, Queen's County," and he is of the race of Cumaire, son of Noglich, Monarch of Erin." In the calendar of the Drummond Missal (P. Forbes, Kol. Scit. Saints, 23) he is Eulag Confessor. A saint called Eulangius or Eulogius is mentioned among the twelve disciples or companions of St. Barry or Finnbar (Sept. 25) in his journey to Britain, and at his monastery of Loch Ire or Ere; but this was really St. Ollan or Olan, of Aghabollige, in the barony of East Muskerry, in the county of Cork. [OLLAN.] (Caulfield, Life of St. Fin Barre, 19 n.; Colgan, Acts SS. 232, c. 2, 607, col. 1.) Another homonymous saint, Eolang of Lecan, had his feast on Dec. 29.

EOLDUS (Adon. Chron. ann. 718 in Patr. Lat. cxiii. 120 b), bishop of Vienne. [EODULON]
EOLLA

EOLLA, the second bishop of Selsey (M. H. B. 618). He is mentioned by Bede as the successor of Edbert, and as dead some time before the Ecclesiastical History was completed (H. E. v. 19). His name is inserted in a spurious or interpolated charter of 714 issued at a South Saxons vigenagemost (Kembie, C. D. 899), and in need of a charter he appears as his suzerain, king of Nunno (85. 1001). Unfortunately the text of the Selsey charters is in such a state that nothing can be argued from these facts.

EONAN (AEONIA), a singer, who, with Eddi accompanied Wilfrid during his sojourn in Mercia and Kent in A.D. 644, teaching the people, no doubt, church music and the Gregorian tones. (Eddi Vita & Wilf. cap. xiv.)

J. R.

EONIUS (1), bishop of Vannes. [ENNIUS (2).]

EONIUS (2), twenty-second bishop of Auch, succeeding Aieclus and followed by Paulinus, towards the close of the 5th century. The name in the ancient catalogue has also been read as Conus, Conius, and Genius. (Gall. Christ. i. 975; Gams, Series Episc. 497.)

S. A. B.

EONUS (APONIUS), of noble birth in the territory of Chalon-sur-Saône, succeeded Leonius as bishop of Arles. The Sammarthiani date his accession in 492. The Bonollandists suppose it possibly earlier. Pope Gelasius writes to notify him, and through him to the other bishops of Gaul, his accession to the pontificate. He was present at the discussion held at Lyons between Vitalis and Aratus, which inspired king Gundobaud with a certain leaning towards Catholicism [AVitus] (see Hefele, Conc. Gesch. i. iii., sec. 219). In a long-standing dispute between the churches of Arles and Vienne, regarding primatial rights, pope Anastasius II. had made certain arrangements favourable to Vienne, by which more ancient regulations were restored. He was also infructuous, and having been made to pope Symmachus, he wrote a letter to Eonus (Petr. Lat. xlii. p. 40), in which he directs both churches to send delegates for his information. Crescentius was sent on the part of Arles, but it does not appear that Vienne sent any one. Upon hearing his statement, Symmachus again wrote to Eonus in the year 500. After perusal of the great accumulation of documents relating to the case (quibus eclesiasticum gravem scrinium) he rescinds the innovations of Anastasius and maintains the ordinances of St. Leo, on the ground of the reverence due to antiquity, and the need of maintaining the consistency of the apostolic see. The letter bears the appearance of a final decision on the question; but Avitus of Vienne having remonstrated, the pope replies to him that the case is still open, and in fact it was only in 513 that it was finally decided in favour of Arles. [CAESARIUS.] Eonus was the relative and fellow countryman of St. Caesarius, whom he placed over a monastery on an island near Arles, and recommended to the people as his successor. His death occurred Aug. 16, A.D. 502; but the feast of St. Roche being in possession of that day, Eonus is commemorated on Aug. 30. (Acta SS. Aug. 30; Gall. Christ. i. 534; Cell. x. 504 and 523; Tillemont, Mémo. xv. 96.)

R. T. S.

EOPA

EOPA (Wend. Flor. Hist. ann. 661, ed. Core); EOPPA (A. S. C. ann. 657, 661, in M. H. B. 316, 317), presbyter. [EATPA.]

C. H.

EOPPA, son of Ingeld, who was brother of the king of Wessex. Eoppa was great-grand- father of Egbert. (Chr. S. M. H. B. 348.)

S.

EORCMBERT (ancient Cotton MSS. fragments described in Hardy, Descr. Cat. i. 259), king of Kent. [Earcombert.]

C. H.

EORCNGOTHA (Flor. Wig. Geneal. Reg. Cant. in M. H. B. 627), daughter of Earcombert. [Eorcongota.]

C. H.


C. H.

EORMENBEORGE, or -GA (Flor. Wig. Geneal. Reg. Merc. in M. H. B. 630; id. Geneal. Reg. Cant. in M. H. B. 627), daughter of Eormenred, king of Kent, wife of Merewald, king of Mercia. [Eormenburga (1).]

C. H.

EORMENBURGA (1), (EORMENBURGH, ERMENBURGA), otherwise called Dompneva or Domniva, a name probably derived from Domina Eaba, the latter being the name given to her in Kentish charters, supposing the two to be identical. She was a daughter of Eormenred, son of Eadsdalf king of Kent. She was married to Merewald, son of Penda, who was called king of the West Mercians or West Hecaul of Herefordshire, to whom she bore three daughters, Milburga, Mildreda, and Mildgith, and a son, Mildreda. According to the Canterbury hagiographers she received from her cousin, king Egbert of Kent, an estate in the Isle of Thanet, in composition for the death of her brothers Ethelred and Ethelbert. Upon this she built a monastery, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, at the place now called Minster, in Thanet, where she herself became the first abbess, and was blessed by archbishop Theodore. In this dignity she was succeeded by her daughter Mildrida or Mildreda, who gave her own name to the monastery. (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 534, 635, 638, 648; Will. Malmsb. à P. ed. Hamilton, p. 319; Elmham, pp. 207, 215.) In Thurn's Chronicle of St. Augustine's he names of St. Mildred's, his predecessor at Minster is given as Aebba, and to Aebba the forged grants of Whittred and Swebbear are given. (Kembie, C. D. 15, 37; Elmham, pp. 234, 288.)

It is extremely difficult to unravel the Kentish hagiography, and it would not be safe to say that the three names Eormenburh, Dompneva, and Aebba represent the same person. Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 635 c) calls the wife of Merewald Ermeneberga, and makes another sister Ermenburga, of whom nothing more is said but that she was "sancta virgo" (ib. p. 627).

EORMENBURGA (2) (IREMENBURGE, IRREMBURG), 2nd wife of Egfrid king of Northumbria,
and sister-in-law of Countwine king of Wessex.

(Eddi, cap. 40.) She is charged with stirring up
the wrath of her husband against bishop Wilfrid, reflecting
upon his wealth and influence, in consequence of which the
diocese of York was subdivided by Theodora and Egfrid, and
Wilfrid appealed to Rome. This was in A.D. 678. (Id.
cap. 24; Simeon, de Arch. Ebor.) On his return
from Rome, Wilfrid was received again at Ermengoruga,
and used it as a personal decoration. (Id. cap. 34.)
Eddi tells us how for this conduct she became
darnged, or possessed, at Coldingham, and how
her ailment went away when Wilfrid was released
and restitution made. (Id. cap. 39.)

When her husband fell, in A.D. 685, Ermengoruga
was in her husband's monastery at Carlisle, await-
ing the news of the expedition, and there she
had an interview with Cuthbert. (Bede, Vita Cath.
cap. 27.) After this Ermengoruga seems to have
taken the veil, as her name appears in the Book of
Life of Durham among the queens and abbesses
(p. 3). See also Malm. G. P. p. 232. ed. Hamilton; Hist. Elenas. lib. i. ed. Stewart,
p. 38. [J. R.]

EORMENGILDA, EORMENHILD, a
doughter of Eorcomeht, king of Kent, by his
wife Sexburga; married to Wulfhere king of
Mercia. (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 634, 635, 637; Elm-
ham, p. 191; W. Malm. G. P. p. 338, 329.)

The history of Eormenhild as the wife of Wulf-
here is crossed by that of Edburgha abbess of
Gloucester. [EADBURGA (4)] A life of St. Eormen-
hild, which exists in several MSS., appears
abridged by Capgrave in the Novea Legenda
Angliana. (Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 368, 369; A.A.
SS. Boll. Feb. 13, ii. 686-691.) Her name,
“Eormenhilda,” as abbess, is attached to the
spurious form of the privilege of Witfred.
(Haddan and Stubbes, iii. 246.) [S.]

EORMENGITHA (ERMENGITHA), daughter
of Eormenred, son of Eadbald king of Kent.
(Flor. Wig. Gen. Reg. Cont. in M. H. B. 627.)

[C. H.]

EORMENRED, son of Eadbald king of Kent.
According to the Canterbury tradition, as
delivered by Simeon of Durham (M. H. B. 648),
he was the elder son of Eadbald, but set aside
by his father in favour of Eorcomeht. Elmhams
(p. 173) makes him die before his father, whilst
Thorn (c. 1906) seems to favour the notion that
he survived his father and left children to the
care of his brother Eorcomeht. The fact that
his wife Oslawa is called “regina” by
Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 627), and it was in
favour of the latter supposition. On the other
hand Eormenred is never mentioned by Bede.
By Oslawa he was father of Ermengoruga, oth-
erwise called Domnena, Ermengitha, Ethelredrytha,
Ethelred and Ethelbert, to whom the “Genealo-
gia” of Florence (M. H. B. 627) adds Ermengor-
uga. His name is known chiefly as that of the
father of a family of saints, of whom the
father of a family of saints, of whom the
two sons were, in legend at least, reputed as
martyrs. (See Will. Malmebi. G. R. i. § 11, 13;
iii. 209, &c.; Elmhams, pp. 175, 176, 184; Ors.
S. M. H. B. 310.) [S.]

EORPNELAII (Wend. F. H. ann. 634,
632, 635). EORPNELAL (Bede, B. Z. ii. 15,
in M. H. B. 167 a); EORPNELAII (A. S. C.
ann. 632, in M. H. B. 309; Flor. Wig. Calp.
ann. 632, 636, in M. H. B. 528 c, 529 a; id.
Chron. App. in M. H. B. 636 a; Malm. G. R. A.
ed. Hardy, i. § 97), king of East Anglia. [Eor-
PNELAII.]

EORPNWIN, abbot of the northern monastery
described by the monk Ethelwulf (AA. SS.
O. B. S. Sacc. vi. part 2; pp. 323, 327). See
Ethelwulf (2). His name appears among the
priests, abbats, in the Liber Vitae Dunctmeni,
P. 6. [S.]

EORTASUS of Sardis. [HEORTASUS]

EOSTERWINUS (MSS. described in Hardy,
Cat. Mat. i. 419; Sim. Dun. G. R. A. in M. H. B.
561 c), abbat. [EASTERWINUS.] [C. B.]

EOYVALDS (Hou), saint and martyr
who, along with Sittus, suffered under Dacian
the governor of Spain, during the Dacian
persecution, at Gerunda in Catalonia. The
Bollandists give an account of the discovery
of the bodies of these saints taken from an original
Spanish authority. They were confirmed on
May 7. (AA. SS. Boll. Maii ii. 134.)

[1. B.]

EPACHIUS, presbyter of Ricomagius (Rien-
auvergne, spoken of by Gregory of Tours in
the 6th century. Being of senatorial rank and
of better birth than anybody else at Ricomagus,
he was asked to celebrate mass on the feast of
the Nativity. Having accordingly to keep the
vigil in the church, he was ordered to go to
the church, he was ordered to go to
during the day to his house from hour to hour,
during the day to his house from hour to hour,
and drink “wanton cups from foaming tankards.”
He was even seen drinking after cock-crow, ac
and therefore not in a state of fasting on the
day of communion. While administering the
elements to the congregation he had an epileptic
fit, and was carried out of church. The
fit returned monthly. Gregory relates this story,
to which he adds another from his personal
history, to enforce the special sanctity of
the vigil of the Nativity.
(Greg. Tur. lib. i. De
Glor. Mart. cap. 87.) [W. M. S.]

EPAENETUS, bishop of Carthage, according
to Baronius (Annal. s. a. 58, iv.), who, howev-
er, gives no authority for his statement but that of
Dorotheus (De Ixx. Discip., Patr. Grac. xi.
1061). He is the person mentioned in Rom.
xxv. 5. In the Greek Menaeus he is said to have
preached in Carthage, as well as in Italy and
everywhere, but there is no mention of his par-
pate (Menaeus, Jul. 30, ed. Constantinople, 1843;
Calmet in Rom. xvi. 5). The anonymous Com-
ment. de SS. Pet. et Paul (cap. 3, § 11) printed by
the Bollandists represents Epainetus to have
been placed by St. Peter as bishop at Sirmium
in Spain. No Spanish Sirmium is known.
Flavius Dector makes it Seilirmus, identified
EPAGATHUS

by his editor with Pfeiderhita. (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. v. 416 n.; Dext. Chron. ann. 50 and Bivar’s Comment. in Patr. Lat. xxi. 103.) [T. W. D.]

EPAGATHUS (1) VETTIUS, one of the martyrs at Lyons under Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 177); commemorated June 2. (Euseb. H. E. v. 1; Mart. Hier., Ad., Us.) [T. S. B.]

EPAGATHUS (2), bishop of Marcianopolis in Moesia Inferior, south of the Danube, present at the synod held at Constantinople under Nectarius, when the dispute between Apænius and Bagarius for the bishopric of Bostra, the metropolis of the province of Arabia, was settled in favor of Bagarius, A.D. 394. (Le Quien, Orient Chris. i. 1218; Manzi, iii. 852.) [L. D.]

EPAPHRAS (Col. i. 7, iv. 12; Phil. 23), legendary bishop of Colossae. Jerome in his Commentary on the Eph. to Philemon, vv. 23, 24 (Patr. Lat. xvi. 617), mentions a tradition relating to the connexion of Epaphras with St. Paul, but nothing of his episcopate. Epaphras is first called bishop of Colossae by Ado archbishop of Vienna (Adon. de Festiv. SS. Apost. in Patr. Lat. xxiii. 193), who records the tradition that he was ordained a bishop at Colossae by St. Paul, and that he was martyred and buried in the same city, his natalis being July 19. Usuard under this day repeats the statement. The anonymous Life of St. Augustine (said to have been bishop of Soli in Cyprus, A.D. 102) gives a different tradition; that St. Paul, in consequence of the death of Barnabas and there being no longer an apostle in Cyprus, sent Epaphras, Tychicus, and others to Hercules archbishop of Cyprus, directing the latter to ordain Epaphras to be bishop of Paphos, and the rest for other towns. (Vit. S. Anunci, cap. 2, § 8, in Boll. Acta SS. Feb. iii. 126 e; Le Quien, Orient Chr. i. 155, ii. 1050.) [C. H.]

EPAPHRODITUS (1), reputed bishop of Philippi, and imagined to have been the 4th bishop (Clement of Phil. ii. 25). This E. (Comment. in Isc.) interprets the word as implying that Epaphroditus was the ecclesiastical superior of the ἤλεσθον (i.e. ἐλέος) of Phil. i. 1; and this father, although writing as a commentator rather than as a historian, was afterwards added as the authority for making Epaphroditus first bishop of Philippi. (Baron. A. E. ann. 60, iii. i; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 87.) [T. W. D.]

EPAPHRODITUS (2), reputed bishop of Andraca and one of the seventy disciples (Dorothos, de Septuag. Dom. Discip. in Migne, Patr. Græc. xxii. 1053; Basil. Menol. ii. 17, Dec. 19, Patr. Græc. cxvii.). Andraca was the port town of Myra in Lycia; Baranios erroneously writes it Hadrin or Hadrian, and places it in Syria. (A. E. ann. 60, iii.) [T. W. D.]

EPAPHRODITUS (3), reputed bishop of Terracina in Italy or Tarragona in Spain, and supposed to have been either one of the seventy or the companion of St. Paul. The authority is an anonymous (Commentarius de SS. Pet. et Paul. prolixi) by Surius and the Bollandists, Surius attributing it to Symeon Metaphrastes. Terracina is the reading in Surius (cap. x.) and the Bollandists (cap. 3, § 11); but Salazar and other Spanish writers read Tarraco, so transferring Epaphroditus to their own country. (Surius, de Prob. Hist. tom. ii. p. 353, ed. 1618; Boll. Acta SS. 22 Mart. iii. 369, 370, § 6, 29 Jun. v. 411; Salazar, Mart. Hist. tom. ii. p. 356; Ugh. Ital. Sacr. i. 1283; Constatore, Hist. Terracin. p. 490; Cappellari, Le Chiese d’Ital. vii. 517; Baron. A. E. ann. 60, iii.) [T. W. D.]

EPAPHRODITUS (4), A.D. 431, reader and notary to Hellanius, bishop of Rhodes. He was with three bishops to give a formal and solemn summons to Nectarius to attend the Council of Ephesus on the first day of its session. A deposition the previous evening had been unsuccessful. (Concil. iii. 453; Ceillier, vii. 577; Pope Paul V.‘s Concilia Gener. i. p. 325, Rome, 1628.) [W. M. S.]

EPAPHRODITUS (5), bishop of Terracina in Cyprus, present at the oecumenical council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, where he acted also as proxy for Didymus of Lapithus in the island; at the sixth session he signed for Olympus the metropolitan of Constantia (Salamis) and the absent sufragans of Cyprus. (Manzi, vii. 165; Le Quien, Orient Chris. ii. 1060.) [L. D.]

EPARCHIUS (1), bishop of Sicca, in the proconsular province of Africa. His name is found in the preface of the acts of the council held at Carthage, under Gratus, A.D. 348 or 349 (Morcelli, Africa Chris. i. 277; Manzi, iii. 144, margin, the text reads PATRICKIUS; ib. 1515.) [L. D.]

EPARCHIUS (2), tenth bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, between St. Namatius and Apollinaris Sidonius, held the see from about A.D. 462 to 472. Gregory of Tours calls him vir sanctissimus atque religiosus. It is said that he built a monastery on the summit of the Mons Cantobenicus, where now is a chapel, and used to shut himself up there during Lent, but on the day of the Ecce Domini would return to his church with singing of psalms, accompanied by the clergy and people. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. ii. 21; Gall. Christ. ii. 231.) [S. A. B.]

EPARCHIUS (3), St., a recluse of Angolène (Egolisma), was born at Périgoux in the early part of the 6th century of parents named Aurilius and Principia. At the close of his school days he became the cancellarius of his grand-father, Felicissimus, a count; but his heart was not in his duties, and after fifteen years of unwilling servitude, he escaped secretly to the monastery of Sedacium, and throwing himself at the feet of Martin, the abbot, besought to be made a monk. His prayer was granted, and he underwent the usual drudgery of a novice in the field and vineyard. Feeling drawn towards the solitary life, he selected a desert spot, and built for himself a hut. According, however, to the account of Gregory of Tours, he was not altogether solitary, but was accompanied by a few monks. He passed his time in constant prayer, and devoted the offerings made him to the relief of the poor and the redemption of captives. He provided no food, but was supported by the charity of his neighbours. It is said that he died four, or, according to another account, thirty-nine years of this existence, he was seized with a fever, and died in A.D. 581, or, according to Baronius, 584. He is commemorated on the 1st
EPARCHUS (4) [EPARCHUS], said to have been a bishop of Poitiers, the *Galitza Christiana* (ii. 1154) placing him twenty-eighth on the list. His existence, however, seems to rest for proof on a passage occurring in a charter of Louis the Pious, as king of the Aquitanians, in favour of Gaas (Mobilianus). The king confirms to Nantes amongst other provisions, "illæ conjunctiones quas anteriori pontifici Pictaviensis, quem nos recognovimus, Ænsaludus, Ebazius et Grosbertus ad ipsum cellam detulerunt" (*Gall. Christ. ii. Instrumenta*, p. 346), but making the fullest allowance for the barbarisms of the kings of this passage, as the later compilers of the *Galitza Christiana* tinted out (xii. 30), can scarcely be made to imply the existence of a bishop Eparchus at Poitiers. [S. A. B.]

EPARCHUS (Aparcius, Huparchus), bishop of Haliac (Ecclesius), from about 630 to 655. He was the acts of the fourth Council of Toledo (a.d. 833) in the fifty-seventh place, preceding five only. In 636 Eparchus was present at the death of St. Isidore, who had sent for him and for Joannes bishop of Elepa, to receive from them the penitential habit and the last sacraments. The signature of Eparchus is also found to the acts of the sixth, seventh, and eighth Councils of Toledo. In the seventh he signs fifth after the Metropolitans, in the eighth second. (*Epig. Soyr. ix. app. 7, xii. p. 206; Aguirre-Catalanii, iv. 385, 413, 423, 426."

EPATHIMITUS (Uph. Ital. Scr. vi. 20), bishop of Naples. [Epithemius] [C. II.]

EPHEBUS (1). CLAUDIUS, one of the bearers of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians (ch. 45). He must have been at the time (about A.D. 95) in advanced years; for he is described as "walking among us from youth to old age unblamably." Lightfoot conjectures that he and his companion, Valerius Bilo, may have been freedmen of the imperial household, and that they may have received their names at the time (A.D. 41-48) when Claudius was emperor and a Valeria his consort. [G. S.]

EPHEBUS (2) (EPHEBUS), a martyr at Terni. He was arrested by order of Leo the consul, and was beheaded A.D. 288. He is commemorated Feb. 14. (Mant. Ato, Rab, Notker.) [T. S. B.]

EPHEBUS (3) (Gams, Scr. Episc. 904), bishop of Naples. [EPHEBIIUS] [C. H.]

EPHEBUS (Faustin et Marcellin. Libell. Proc. in Migne, Patr. Lat. xiii. 99), Lucerian bishop at Rome. [Kiiiihius; Luciferians] [T. W. D.]

EPHEBUS, THE SEVEN SLEEPERS OF. The first person in the West to relate the legend thus entitled appears to have been Gregory of Tours (Greg. Tur. de Glor. Mart. cap. 95, in Migne, Patr. Lat. ixx. 787 a. Ruinart). According to him the names of the seven were Maximianus, Malchus, Martinianus, Constantinus, Dionysius, Joannes, Serapion. They were Christians, and all related to one another. When the emperor Decius visited Ephesius they were brought before him, and on refusing to adore were put to death for the time; the custodian of the temple concealed themselves in a cave, where they abode many days, their food being fetched from the city by one of them who is described as a lad. Decius heard of their proceedings, and commanded the cave to be closed upon them. While they were thus being entombed a certain Christian caused their story to be engraved on leaden tablets, which he hid at the entrance of the cave. After many years Theodosius, a Christian, succeeded to the empire, and then arose the "foul heresy" of the Sabaeans, "who deny a future resurrection." At that time it chanced that a citizen of Ephesius in constructing a sheepfold made use of the stones that blocked up the cave, and so opened it. The Lord thereon sent the spirit of life upon the seven who rose up, and thinking they had slept but a single night, set out "the lad" to buy food. On coming into the city he was astonished to see everywhere the symbol of the cross and to bear the name of Christ. When he offered the money for his purchases he was seized and taken before the bishop and the magistrate as one who had discovered hidden treasure. The cave was visited, the leaden tablets read, and the entire story revealed. Theodosius came in person, and the seven said to him: "A heresy has arisen, glorious Augustus; the Lord has therefore hidden us arise, that we should say to you, according to the apostle Paul, we must all appear at the bar of Christ; see that you are not deceived and shut out from the kingdom of Christ." On this they again lay down and fell asleep as before. Gregory states that he had their passage from a certain Syrian who translated it for him into Latin. It is quite possible that the original from which the story was related to Gregory was the source from whence the Syrian bishop Jacobus (ob. a.d. 521) derived his version, which is commented on by Assenam (Or. 535, p. 221), and quoted at least by the Bollandists (Act. SS. 27 Jul. vi. 375). Jacobus gives eight as the number of sleepers, and varies as to their names. Photius (bibl. cod. 253) varies from both Gregory and Jacobus. In Basil's Menology (Oct. 23) the legend is very briefly related, and again differently. Symeon Metaphrastes (Patri. Graec. ekt. 427) gives the fullest and most graphic version of all. Similar legends are met with both in the East and West. One of another "seven" is attributed to Gregory of Tours (Opp. ed. Migne, p. 1106); another occurs in Paulus Diaconus (De Gest. Lang. i. 4, in Patr. Lat. xcv. 441); another in the Korn (Sale, transp. cap. 18, p. 238, ed. 1834), while others are referred to by Baranius (Mart. Rom. Jul. 27), Hensch (De Fest. Christiani, Lib. 3. cap. 4, p. 1612), Gibbon (D. F. c. 33, vol. iv. p. 188, ed. Smith), Hampson, Med. Anti. Cole. 355). July 27 was the day of their commemoration. [T. W. D.]

EPHRAIM (1), bishop of Alexandria. Le Quien (Or. Chr. ii. 389) says that the fourth bishop, called Primus by Eusebius (Chron. ann.
my boyhood understood not the greatness of the benefit, I knew it when trial came."

In his Testament (Opp. Gr. ii. 408) he tells us that his childhood was one of early promise.

"When I was a child, and lay in my mother's bosom, I saw as in a dream that which has become a reality. From my mother's bosom, the city, sprang a vine twig, which grew and reached to heaven: it brought forth fruit without end, and leaves without number. It spread, it grew, it lengthened, it expanded itself, it went round about, it stretched abroad till it reached the whole creation. All beings gathered of it, and there was no lack, yea, more they plucked, so much the more its clusters multiplied. Many were the warriors, those leaves were hymns, and God was the giver. To Him be glory for His grace, whereby He has made me receive according as He willed from the storehouse of His treasures."

This also seems to suggest that Ephrem from the first was educated as a Christian, and the statement that he accompanied St. James to the council of Nicæa is probable enough. Of course it would be in an inferior capacity: but as Ephrem was from the first a diligent student of Holy Scripture, and a keen disputant, the bishop might not unwillingly have taken with him a youth of such promise. Of the council itself, he speaks with great reverence, describing it as "the illustrious synod, gathered by the memorable king, at which the Creed was committed to writing," and condemns heretics for not submitting to it (Opp. Gr. ii. 488 D).

In the year 337 Constantine the Great died, and Sapor, king of Persia, at once seized the opportunity of invading Mesopotamia. After ravaging the open country, he commenced the siege of Nisibis in A.D. 338, and at the end of seventeen days had brought it to the verge of surrender. For having dammed up the waters of the Mydonus, he suddenly set them free, and they rushed with such great violence against the walls of the city as partially to overthrow them. In vain the citizens raised inner walls of defence; but when all seemed hopeless, Ephrem prevailed upon the aged bishop, James, to mount the walls, and in the presence of the besiegers, to pray for the divine succour. Shortly afterwards so great a multitude of mosquitoes and horseflies, bred probably in the swamps lately covered by the waters of the river, assailed the Persian camp, that the horses and elephants, being rendered unmanageable, threw the whole army into confusion; and Sapor, recognising that the scourge was divine, withdrew his forces, lest he should bring upon himself heavier chastisement.

Before the end of the year St. James died, but according to the Acts Ephrem remained at Nisibis till its surrender by Jovian, and he even afterwards, when he withdrew into Roman territory, having previously been baptized at the age of twenty-eight years. But the surrender of Nisibis took place in A.D. 363, when Ephrem was about fifty-five years of age; and besides, the same Acts describe him as living at Edessa, in the reign of Vologes IV. Probably he left Nisibis upon the death of James, and after a short stay at Amid, to which city his mother is said to have belonged, travelled onwards to Edessa, the chief seat both of Christ-
tianity and of learning in Mesopotamia. As he entered the city a number of women were engaged in washing linen on the banks of the river Daisan, and as one of them looked at him more intently than seemed becoming, he rebuked her, saying, "Be modest, O woman, and fix thy look upon the ground." "It is quite right, she answered, for men to look upon the ground; for God, it they are taken, yet for the same reason I may surely look at thee, for woman was taken out of man." "If the women here," he said, as he passed on, "are so wise, what must the men be?" With some slight modification, this story is also told by Gregory of Nyssa, in his Encomium referred to above.

Not having been taught any handicraft, and having no means of living, Ephrem entered at Edessa the service of a bath-keeper, but devoted his spare time to teaching and reasoning with the natives. While so engaged one day his words were overheard by an aged monk who had descended from his hermitage into the city, and being rebuked by him for still mending with the world, Ephrem withdrew into a cavern among the ruins, adopted the ascetic dress, and commenced a life of extreme austerity and asceticism, while at the same time he also gave himself up to study, and began to exercise that wonderful facility for writing which has made him the most prolific of authors.

Of course many portents foretold his future greatness. In one, which is vouched for by Gregory of Nyssa, an angel was seen descending from heaven with a roll inscribed within and without. He asks the aged hermit for whom he supposes it to be intended, and the answer is remarkable, as shewing who were regarded as the most famous writers of the time, "Origen or the monk Julius in the land of the north." The marvellous roll was really Ephrem's commission to declare heavenly mysteries. And quickly his reputation grew, his works were diffused far and wide, and disciples gathered round him, of whom many rose to eminence as teachers, and several of whom he commemorates in his Testament.

Many years were probably spent in this way, but the growing fame of Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, inspired Ephrem with a strong desire to visit one who had been shown him in a dream as a column of fire reaching from earth to heaven. The Acts, however, represent him as travelling first into Egypt, and though there is no corroborative evidence, still it is not in itself improbable, as Egypt was the favourite home of multitudes of ascetics such as Ephrem himself. His narrative exceeds the bounds of probability when it represents him as having spent eight years there, as having been divinely gifted with the power of speaking the Egyptian language, and as having not only reasoned against Arianism in the vernacular tongue, but as having even composed in it expositions and discourses.

This reference to Cæsarea rests upon sure evidence, as it is vouched for by Basil's brother, Gregory, and by Ephrem himself in his Encomium on Basil. Accompanied by an interpreter, he arrived there on the eve of the Feast of the Epiphany, and so deficient were the people a hospitality that they allowed Ephrem and his companion to spend the night in the streets. The next morning they took their place in an obscure corner of the church, and Ephrem groaned in spirit as he saw Basil seated in a magnificent pulpit, arrayed in bright and shining garments, with a mitre sparkling with jewels on his head, and surrounded by a multitude of clergymen with almost equal splendour. "Alas!" he said to his interpreter, "I fear our labour is in vain. For if we, who have given up the world, have advanced so little in holiness, what spiritual gifts can we expect to find in one surrounded by so great pomp and glory?" But when Basil began to preach, it seemed to Ephrem as though the Holy Ghost, in shape like a dove, sat upon his shoulder, and suggested to him the word. From time to time the people murmured their applause, and Ephrem twice repeated sentences which had fallen from the preacher's lips. Upon this Basil sent his archdeacon to invite him into his presence, which, offended at the saint's ragged attire, he did reluctantly, and only after he had been twice bid to a sumptuous dinner. After embracing another with many florid compliments Basil asked him how it was that knowing no Greek he had twice cheered the sermon, and repeated sentences of it to the multitude? And Ephrem answered, "It was not I who praised and repeated, but the Holy Ghost by my mouth."

Shortly afterwards the same miracle was repeated which has already been told of him in Egypt. Under pressure from St. Basil he had consented to be ordained deacon, while his disciple, the interpreter, was admitted to the priesthood. When Basil had laid his hands upon him, being suddenly endowed with the knowledge of Syriac he said to Ephrem in that tongue, "O Lord, bid him arise," upon which Ephrem answered in Greek, "Save me, and raise me up, O God, by thy grace."

But in an age when Greek was the current language of the learned we cannot imagine an able man like Ephrem travelling about with an educated companion, and not picking up some slight acquaintance with it. He had grown also to eminence as a teacher at Edessa, a place famous for its schools: and as a commentator also he must have felt the need of some knowledge of the New Testament, and of the Septuagint, though the loss of his exposition of the former deprives us of the means of testing the extent of his learning, which seems to have been real, though perhaps not very great. We may add that Ephrem also speaks of himself as a priest, though all external authorities conspire in calling him only a deacon. The value of the story lies in the general testimony it bears to Ephrem being an uneducated man. Even upon this we must not lay too much stress. We shall endeavour, however, in due time to gather from his own writings evidence as to the extent of his knowledge both of Greek and Hebrew.

Two instances are given in the Acts of the

---

* In Opp. Epp. iii. 481 n, Ephrem says, "Christ gave me the talent of the priesthood, and I, in my reverence, hid it in the ground." Vossius always speaks of him as a presbyter, but in opposition to his own chief authorities.
Influence of Ephrem's teaching on the mind of St. Basil. It had been usual at Caesarea in the Doxology to say Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, to the Holy Ghost; but after Ephrem's visit Basil inserted the conjunction and before the third clause. Whereat the people in church murmered and forestook him from their displeasure at his interference with so familiar a formula by saying that his Syrian visitor had taught him that the insertion of the conjunction was necessary for the more clear manifestation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The other instance is as follows: In Gen. i. 2, the Septuagint has “Spirit of God brooded upon the surface of the water.” In this sense St. Basil had understood it, but the Peshito-Syriac version renders it, “The Spirit of God brooded upon the face of the waters,” which Ephrem explained of the Spirit resting upon them with a warm and fostering influence as of a hen sitting upon her nest, and so endowing them with the power of life, and making them crowded with life. In the loose phraseology of Benedict St. Basil is made to talk of the affinity between Syriac and Hebrew, and so on. Really he gives two reasons for trusting his Syrian friend. The first, that Ephrem led very ascetic life; “for in proportion as a man abandons the love of the world, so does he excel in that perfection which rises above the world.” The second reason is more in accordance with modern notions. “Ephrem,” says St. Basil, “is an acute thinker, and has a thorough knowledge of the divine philosophy,” i.e. of the general sense of Holy Scripture. There is nothing to suggest that any appeal was made to the Hebrew, though as a matter of fact the Syriac and Hebrew words are the same; and curiously enough in his own exposition (Op. Syr. i. 8) Ephrem says that the words simply mean that a wind was in motion; for the waters were instinct, he argues, with no creative energy till the fourth day. 4

From Caesarea Ephrem was recalled to Edessa by the news that the city was assailed by numerous heresies. On his journey he rescued the people of Samoanta from the influence of false teaching by a miracle, and on reaching home took the step which has made his name so famous, of encountering heresy by teaching orthodoxy in hymns. The fatalistic tenets of Bardean, a Gnostic who flourished at the end of the 2nd century, had been embodied in a hundred and fifty psalms, a number fixed upon in irreverent imitation of the Psalter of David. His son Honorius had set these hymns to music, and so sweet were both the words and tunes that they were known by heart to the very girls and children, and sung by them to the sound of the guitar. To combat their influence Ephrem both composed numerous hymns himself, and trained young women, who were aspirants after the conventual life, to sing them in chorus. These hymns have no rhyme, nor do they scan, but are simply arranged in parallel lines, containing each, as a rule, seven syllables. 5 Their poetry consists in their elevated sentiments, and richness of metaphor, but their regular form was an aid to the memory, and rendered them capable of being set to music. The chosen subjects of these hymns were the Life of our Lord, including His Nativity, Baptism, Fastings, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. He wrote also on Repentance, on the Dead, and on Martyrs. Upon the Festivals of our Lord, we read, on the first days of the week, and on the days kept in honour of martyrs, Ephrem gathered round him his choirs, and so well had he instructed his singers in the variousmodulations of music, that the whole city flocked together to hear them, and the poems of Bardesnian lost their influence.

While thus occupied Basil endeavoured to prevail upon him again to visit Caesarea, intending on his arrival to make him a bishop, but the saint even feigned madness rather than consent. Meanwhile, Ephrem went on channelling his talent for his subjects the devastation committed by the Persians, the Maccabees, the Tetrarchy of Constantine, and so on, until the accession of Julian to the throne ruddy disturbed his studies. On his expedition against the Persians Julian had advanced as far as Haran, a town so famous for its obstinate adherence to heathenism, that Haranites in Syriac is equivalent to pagan, and there he determined to hold a great sacrifice, to which he commanded the Edessenes to send chosen citizens to do him homage, and grace by their presence his restoration of the old cult. But the emperor's messengers were met with such fierce opposition on the part of the people, and such an eager desire for martyrdom, that the embassy withdrew in haste, and Julian threatened Edessa with bitter vengeance upon his return. And now Ephrem, who had exerted himself to the utmost in this crisis, resumed his hermit life, quitting the mountains only for controversy with heretics or for services of a more charitable nature.

As a controversialist, Gregory of Nyssa relates of him with the utmost approbation that an act entirely contrary to modern views of morality. The "insane and irrational Apollinaris" had written a treatise in two volumes containing much that was contrary to Scripture. These volumes he had entrusted to the charge of a lady at Edessa, from whom Ephrem obtained a loan of them by pretending that he was a disciple of Apollinaris, and was preparing to defend his views. But before returning them he glued the leaves together, and then challenged the heretic to a public disputation. Apollinaris accepted the challenge only so far as to consent to read from these books what he had written, declining more on account of his great age. They met, but when he endeavoured to open the books he found the leaves so firmly fastened together that the attempt the success, and he withdrew mortified almost to death by his opponent's unworthy victory.

Far more creditable is the last act recorded.

4 This, which is the Jewish interpretation, is the only one ascribed to Ephrem by Bar-Hebraeus in his Gunv of Myriarchs; and in Basil's own treatise on the Hexameron, Hom. 2, all that is said is that Ephrem told him that the word meant "fostered," and not "was borne."

5 Ephrem also uses metres of four syllables, of five, and of lines of varying length. For discussions upon Ephrem's versification, see the works of Hahn, of Zingerle, and of Burgers.

6 Extant in the Carmina Nisibena: see below.
of Ephraim's earthly labours. While withdrawn in his rocky cavern he heard that Edessa had been visited by a severe famine. Leaving his seclusion he came down to the city, and so wrought upon the minds of the richer citizens that they brought out their secret stores of food, on condition, however, that Ephraim should himself take charge of them. He did so, and managed what was given him with such skill and prudence, as well as honesty, that it sufficed not merely for the Edessenes, but for numerous strangers also. The next year was one of great plenty, and Ephraim resumed his solitary life amidst the prayers and gratitude of all classes.

His death followed shortly afterwards, fully foreseen by himself, as his Testament proves. In this hymn written in heptasyllabic metre, after playing upon his own name and professing his faith, he commands his disciples not to bury him beneath the altar, nor in a church, nor amongst the martyrs, but in the common burying-ground of strangers. They were to wrap him in no mantle of silk, but bury him in his gown and cowl, with no spices nor waxlights, but with their prayers. The rest is too long for quotation. Ephraim was buried with an account of Lamprotata, daughter of the prefect of Edessa, who earnestly sought permission to be buried in due time at Ephraem's feet. In consenting to some extent to her request, the saint commanded her and her friends never again to permit themselves to be carried in litters on men's shoulders, because such a thing was degrading to those of whom the apostle had said that the head of every man is Christ.

The works of Ephraem were most voluminous. Sozomen (Eccl. Hist. iii. 16) says of him that he wrote three million lines (three hundred times ten thousand), but a large proportion of them has perished. For at the time when so great activity prevailed in gathering manuscipts for the Vatican, an Egyptian vessel laden with books for pope Clement XL unfortunately sank in the Nile, and many of Ephraem's writings were lost, and others rendered illegible. The general character of what remains is briefly but aptly said by Bellarmine to be "pious rather than learned." The great edition of his works is that in six volumesfolio, published at Rome in 1732–43, under the editorship of the Maronite Peter Mobarek, better known by the Latin translation of his surname Benedict, and completed after his death by J. S. E. Asseman, titular bishop of Apamea, who is answerable however for the translation of only vol. vi. pp. 425–687. The first three volumes consist of sermons and discourses in Greek with a Latin translation; many of these are probably genuine, for Sozomen says that already in his lifetime works of Ephraem were translated into Greek, and as both Chrysostom and Jerome were acquainted with them, and Gregory of Nyssa quotes his Testament, it is certain that several of his writings were very soon thus made available for general use. But among them are pieces which must be received with caution, and one, for instance (Opp. Gr. ii. 356 sq.), arranged after the order of the Greek alphabet, can scarcely be genuine. The idea that Ephraem himself wrote discourses in Greek is to be altogether rejected. As there is generally a slavish adherence to the Septuagint version in these Greek works, we must suppose that the translation was as loose as that of Benedict himself. Certainly, the translation of his Testament into Greek (vol. ii. 230–247) is inaccurate and periphrastic in the extreme, and as the object of Ephraem's writings is edification, the translators may have thought that it was best to use the version that was generally received. These three volumes are however but a sample of the numerous works ascribed to Ephraem existing in translations into Latin, Greek, Arabic, and Armenian, some published and some unpublished, and which are to be found in most of the great libraries of Europe. In due time many of these may be useful in giving us a critical edition of his writings.

The three other volumes of the Roman edition contain Syriac works of Ephraem, the most important of which is his Exposition of the Old Testament. Though affirmed in the Acta to be the earliest of his writings, it is really one of the latest, for he says in the preface that when asked to write a commentary on Genesis he declined, because it would only be to repeat what he had said before in his homilies and hymns. The text of this commentary occupies 115 pages, but is followed by a second taken from another manuscript, arranged as a catena by a monk of Edessa named Severus. In this form a large portion of it consists of passages taken from the writings of James, bishop of Edessa, and the rest is full of interpolations, of notes, and of additions intended to correct Ephraem's views, probably by Severus himself. Besides this double commentary on Genesis, vol. i. contains expositions upon the other books of the Pentateuch, on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; in vol. ii. we have Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Zechariah, and Malachi, occupying pp. i–315. The exposition of Lamentations consists only of two notes extracted from a catena of Severus. From the Bibliotheca Orientalis of J. S. Asseman (l. 70, 71) we learn that commentaries in Syriac by Ephraem upon the other prophets are to be found among the manuscripts of the Vatican, and Ebed Jeu, bishop of Soba, ascribes to him a commentary on the Psalms (ib. iii. i. 83), of which some remains in Greek exist in Cod. Vat. Dec. (G. i. 157). Of the commentary upon the Gospels few traces remain, but Dionysius Barsalibi, bishop of Amid, says that Ephraem had followed in it the order of the Diatessaron of Tatian. As copies of Dionysius's own commentary exist in the British Museum, the Bodleian Library, and elsewhere, some portions of Ephraem's work, as well as some idea of Tatian's

---

\[a\] The first important publication of works of Ephraem extant in Greek was that of Gerhard Voss in three folio volumes at Rome in 1649, and often republished afterwards. It contains, however, only a Latin translation of them. The first publication of a Greek text was that of Thwaites at Oxford, in folio, 1709. It contains 94 discourses collected out of eighteen MSS. in the Bodleian Library.

\[b\] Cardinal Wiseman, Hor. Syl. 157 sq. has affirmed, not without probability, that all we have really consists only of extraneous remains. This criticism is supported by the remark of Lengoreto, De Ephra. Socr. Artis Her. p. 93, note, that whole chapters are often passed by without a single observation, though full of interesting matter.
arrangement, might be obtained from it. An Armenian translation of the commentary on St. Paul's epistles may be found in the third volume of a collection of Armenian translations of Ephrem's works, published in four vols. octavo by the Mejjitarists at Venice in 1836. The commentary are twelve metrical expositions of portions of Scripture, such as the creation of man in God's image, the temptation of Eve, the translation of Enoch, &c., occupying pp. 316–319. Some of these, especially that upon the mission of Jonah and the repentance of the Ninivites, have been translated into English by the Rev. H. Burgess, London, 1856, the author also of Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephrem Syrus; two vols. London, 1853.

These expositions are followed by thirteen metrical homilies upon the Nativity, pp. 396–436. Assenev says, however (B. O. i. 80), that in Cod. N. S. viii. fifteen (or really twenty-seven) such hymns exist, and as they possess much poetical and imaginative power, and, as they are not inferior to the most learned, it is to be hoped that the rest may soon be published.

Next come fifty-six homilies against false doctrines (pp. 437–560), leveled chiefly against Bardean, Maron, and Manes. Some use has been made of these by Hahn, and also by Cursius (com. on Isaiah, ii. 339 sqq.) and others.

In vol. iii. after the Acta S. Ephraemi (i.–xiiii.) the first place is held by eighty-seven homilies on the Faith, in answer to freethinkers. The last seven are called sermons upon the Pearl, which Ephrem takes as an emblem of the Christian faith, and works out the idea with great beauty, though with that diffuse style which is the common fault of his writings. Three very long controversial homilies (pp. 164–208) follow, repeating many of the thoughts urged in the previous eighty-seven.

A sermon against the Jews, preached on Palm-Sunday (pp. 209–224), has been translated by the Rev. J. B. Morris into English.

Eighty-one funeral hymns succeed (pp. 225–309) to be used at the burial of bishops, presbyters, deacons, monks, princes, rich men, strangers, matrons, women, youths, children, in time of plague, and some for general use. Translations of these will be found, into English in Burgess's Select Metrical Hymns, into German by Zingerle, in the fourth volume of his Translation of Select Works of Ephrem, six vols., Innsbruck, 1851–45; and into Italian by Paggi and Lasario, Florence, 1851. These are some of the most striking of Ephrem's poems, containing passages upon the horror of death, the ravages of pestilence, the punishment of the lost, the pains of hell, the blessedness of faith, the love of the Redeemer, of great power and eloquence, as these are the subjects which most strongly influenced his imagination. Some, however, of these hymns are mere compilations for liturgical use, notably the first six, (see Beckell, Carm. Nis. p. 6).

Next come four short homilies on Free-will (pp. 359–360), partly following the order of the Syriac alphabet; then seventy-six homilies on Repentance (pp. 367–501), being chiefly earnest exhortations to this duty. Next, twelve sermons on the Paradise of Eden (pp. 502–508), and finally eighteen sermons on miscellaneous subjects (pp. 509–517).

Considerable activity has been displayed in recent years in editing other Syriac works of Ephrem, as, for instance, by Dr. J. J. Overbeck, in 5. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae, Balaei, aliorumque Opera Selecta, Oxonii, Clarendon Press, 1865. This selection contains a Discourse against Julian, Hymns, Select Homilies against False Doctrines, against Hypatius, Marxism, Manichaeism, and Bardesane; Expositions on Adam's Fall, on being created mortal, on Satan's Fall, on the coming of the Holy Ghost and the Gift of Tongues, on the Love of Supremacy, a Letter to the Tyrians, Selections from a Discourse against Bardesane, and finally Ephrem's Testament, extant also in the Roman and the Syriac, in Opp. Gr. ii. 395–410, and in the loose Greek translation referred to above.

Almost more important is "S. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena," edited by Dr. G. Bickell, Lipsiae, 1866.

Of these hymns, the first twenty-one treat of the long struggle between Sapor and the Romans for the possession of the city of Nisibis, beginning with its siege in a. c. 350, and carrying down its fortunes to the year 363, but stopping short of its miserable surrender by Jovian at a later period of the same year. The next five hymns have perished; in the next five, 36–30, the scene is changed to Edessa, and the subject is the sacrifice made by the Edessenes in the Holy and the Body of Haran, a. c. 361–370. Bickell considers that these were written about a. c. 370, and therefore towards the close of Ephrem's life. Hymns 31–34 treat of Haran and the many troubles which its bishop Vitius had to endure from the pagans there. The other hymns (35–77) treat of the Overthrow of Death and Satan by our Lord, of the intervention of the Body in the restoration of the views of Bardasane and Manes, of Dialogues between Death Satan and Man, and of hymns upon the Resurrection, not of a controversial but of a consolatory character. It is evident from this enumeration that the title Carmina Nisibena is taken from the twenty-one hymns placed at the head of the collection. From the directions for singing them given at the beginning of each hymn, and the existence in most of them of a response or refrain noted in the manuscript by its being written in red, it is plain that the collection was made for liturgical use.

Bertheau edited a Syriac homily of St. Ephrem from a manuscript at Rome (Göttingen, 1837), and another from the Museum Borghianum was published by Zingerle and Mosinger in Monumenta Syriaca, Innsbruck, 1866, vol. i. pp. 4–12; in vol. ii. published at the same place in 1878 numerous fragments collected from manuscripts at Rome may be found in pp. 33–51. In most Chrestomathies specimens of Ephrem's writings are given, and that by Hahn and Siedentopf consists entirely of them.

As a commentator Ephrem holds a middle place between Theodore of Mopsuestia, who contended for the literal interpretation alone, and Origen, who cared only for the allegorical.
As Basil and Gregory were both strongly influenced by Origen, Ephraim’s independence is the more remarkable. In commenting on Lev. xxxv. 7, vol. ii. 61, he gives a statement of his method as follows: “Though the prophet is speaking of Sennacherib he has a covert reference to Satan. For the spiritual sense is usually the same as the ecclesiastical. The words therefore of the prophets concerning those things which have happened or were about to happen to the Jews are mystically to be referred to the future propagation of the church, and the providence of God and His judgments upon the just and upon evil-doers.” Benedict, followed by Lengerke, instead of ecclesiastical translates historical; what Ephraim really says is that there is first the literal interpretation, and secondly a spiritual one, which generally refers to the church. But not always. When a text is explained of God’s Providence, &c., or used for homiletic purposes, and for personal edification, such an interpretation is spiritual without being ecclesiastical. Ephraim’s habit accordingly is to give first the literal and then the mystical exposition. Some of these passages are actually fished out of Lev. 316 he explains Paradise of the human body, the four rivers being the four operations of the mind; or where on Judg. vi. 37 he says that Gideon’s fleece signifies the conception of Christ by a virgin; while the bowl into which the water is wrung out is the baptismal font, and the floor which remained dry is the world. So also his use of types is constantly overhanging, as where the stone, set up between Mizpeh and Shen (1 Sam. vii. 12), is explained as a type of Christ, the corner-stone placed between the Old and the New Testaments. But we must remember in his excurse that ancient commentators too generally delighted in ingenious and fanciful interpretations. But as a rule he also cares to explain the literal meaning, explains hard words, and gives geographical and other notes, generally valuable, though one or two are erroneous enough, as where he says (i. 171) that Dibloth was Daphne near Antioch, and the river Pison the Danube (i. 23). Throughout, however, his object is rather edification than knowledge.

As to his scholarship the question has often been asked whether he really possessed any competent acquaintance with Hebrew and Greek. Now Ephraim confessedly was not a man who had had a learned education, but he nevertheless displays considerable knowledge. Many of his interpretations of Scripture are drawn, as Lengerke has shown, from Jewish sources; but this is not surprising, for the Jews were very active in Mesopotamia in the 3rd and 4th centuries, and Nisibis abounded with those whom Ephraim calls “circumcised vagabonds” (Opp. Syr. ii. 460), but who must have made people acquainted with the current views of their nation. Subsequently his home was at Edessa, a place crowded with schools and educated people, and Ephraim was himself a teacher, and not a man to cast such opportunities away. For in Opp. Syr. ii. 316–318 in his expository homily on Gen. i. 27 he says that wisdom is not to be acquired without labour and study, and therefore he exhorts his hearers to read Greek writers, especially Porphry, Plato, Aristotle, and authors acquainted with physics like Galen and Hippocrates. He shews himself in this homily some knowledge of physical science, as also elsewhere; and generally in his discourses on fate, freewill, and so on, he manifests, without parading it, a sufficient mastery of Greek philosophy to be able by its help to refute the Gnostic errors so prevalent in the East. We need not be surprised, therefore, at what Sunni says (Hist. Eccl. iii. 10) that Basil wondered at his learning. The wonder was that one who had spent his life as a monk “in practicing ascetic philosophy” (ibid.), should know so much; but he seems to have acquired it chiefly by hearsay. And this is, I think, the key whereby to unlock the difficulties which beset the question as to his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew.

The chief places which suggest that Ephraim knew something of Hebrew are as follow. Commenting on the creation of whales in Gen. i. 21 (Opp. Syr. i. 18), he says that while they are leviathan inhabit the waters, behemoth inhabits the land, quoting not only Job xii. 15, but Ps. xi. 10, which he translates, “And behemoth upon a thousand hills.” Now these words the Septuagint and the LXX translate “cattle upon the hills and bulls.” But Ephraim’s rendering, though not correct, is perfectly possible, and must have been obtained by him from some Jewish source.

On 1 Sam. iii. 11, he explains the verb to taste of the effect produced upon the ears by the beating of cymbals, and rightly says that both the Syriac and Hebrew names for cymbal resemble the word to hear or understand.

In 1 Sam. xxi. 7 he correctly explains the word “detained” by noting that the Hebrew word Neasar signifies pressed or hidden away.

In 1 Kings xviii. 44 the note that the Hebrew word yamin rendered sea also means the south is probably an addition by James of Edessa; as also is that on 2 Kings viii. 10, noticing that the Hebrew word Taranon means “Thou hast not recovered.”

In 2 Kings iii. 4 he rightly says that the Syriac Nokodo is really a Hebrew word, and means “head shepherd.” Other instances might be quoted from his commentary on Job xii. 13 (in our version 21), and on Isa. xvii. 9, where, however, though he knows that Horeb, in our version bough, means in Hebrew a wood, he does not know that Azubah does not signify a rod, and Amir he leaves altogether without explanation.

In his Sermon against the Jews (Opp. Syr. iii. 218) he quotes Gen. xlix. 11 thus: “and his ass, my son, unto the choice vine.” But in his Commentary on the passage (Gen. 108, 190) he twice reads “his ass’s son,” i.e. the foal of his ass, and so even in this sermon (iii. 224). Now “my son” is the apparent, though not the real, meaning of the Hebrew, and the quotation is curious. Probably, however, it is only a false reading, the difference between my son and as of being in Syriac very slight, and Ephraim makes no use of nor any allusion to strange rendering.

These are the main passages in which Ephraim makes any use of Hebrew, and all might have been picked up from conversation with others. On the other hand there is a marked absence of acquaintance with the language in his commentaries as a whole. Thus, in Gen. i. 1, he explains the Syriac particle yuqadda as signifying the person...
or substance of the heavens, and the person of the earth (vol. i. p. 0). In the Cateca (p. 116)
this is quoted, but only to be condemned, and the true explanation is given, probably by James
of Edessa, that the Hebrew word is merely a sign of
the accusative case.

Thus, at first sight, the Hebrew word, in places where a
knowledge of the Hebrew language would have
greatly aided him, he makes no appeal to it.

The firmament, for instance, is something com-
pact, and the cause of darkness: "For darkness
does not exist," he says, "of itself, but is caused
by the clouds and the firmament, which lies
between them and other waters like a child in
its mother's womb, or, as others say, it is itself
the womb of the universe."

So again on Gen. ii. 6. The word mist is
rendered there in the Syriac version fountain,
and Ephraim speculates upon its being the
outflow from a subterranean reservoir into
which the lower waters were gathered at the
discharge of the seas; whereas, in our days, it
would be an act of bursting forth, caused the flood.

No man acquainted with Hebrew could have so written.

On Gen. xi. 9, he says that Sarah was called
Ischah, because of her beauty, i.e. she derives the
same name from their meaning in Aramaic, as
Ischah. But as it would be impossible to go through
even a tenth part of the places in which Ephraim
shews a more or less complete ignorance of
Hebrew, where one would have expected the
contrary, I shall content myself with an exami-
nation of those places where explanations are
given of Hebrew or other rare words retained in
the Syriac version.

In Gen. i. 1 the Peshito keeps the original
words, rendering "the earth was tohu and bohu," a
word, says Ephraim, "desert or empty, showing
that nothing existed but the bare earth." In p. 116,
Sevnuus tells us that in another copy Ephraim
explained the words as meaning "fantastic," because
the waters covered the earth on all sides, and
water was brought in on account of the desert
for man's use. These explanations were probably
given from Jewish sources, but show no knowledge
of the language.

The names of Job's three daughters (ch. xiii.
14) he explains thus:—The first, Jemima, sig-
nifies daylight, its Syriac meaning. Bezai, though
the word is more than once rightly translated
cauze, the spice, in the Septuagint, he renders
a log of wood, i.e. the Syriac kasa; while Kere-
happuch, the antimony-horn, or, as we should say,
the rouge-box, is again explained from the Syriac
as the twisted-horn, the fast two interpretations
being painfully far-fetched. In 1 Sam. viii. 5, where
the Hebrew has Askorokh, in complete ignorance of
this, he explains the Syriac word as meaning
shady gardens. In 1 Sam. ix. 4, the land of Shalisha, triangle-land, is in the Syriac
the hill of Gumare, which he renders cat-land,
absurdly translated by Benedict cucumber-field.
Bose, in ch. xiv. 4, is explained as meaning slim,
its Syriac signification; while Shen, a common
Hebrew word meaning figure, becomes Ska in
Syriac word signifying a wall or fence of loose
stones. We might go on indefinitely with this
examination, and always with the same result,
that Hebrew names and words are explained
from the Aramaic with no reference to the He-
brew, except where, as in Bethel, the Hebrew
and Syriac words are the same, but with nothing
to show that Ephraim was aware of their identity.

Once or twice he does appeal to the Hebrew,
but only to go wrong. Thus he says that for I
prayed, in Deut. xi. 18, 25, the Hebrew has
I fasted. But thus I fell down, I threw
myself down. I fasted is a false reading of the
Syriac text. So, in Josh. xiii. 6, he says that
Hamath is called Misrephoth-Maim, and that
this means a gathering of waters, i.e. a lake.
Benedict inserts hot before waters to connect the
name with the Hebrew root saraph, "to burn."

The Aramaic word from which the Hebrew
saraph is derived has the meaning of running
together, though probably derived from the fusion
of metals. Ephraim knew its Aramaic meaning,
but Benedict has to supply him with its meaning
in Hebrew.

From his errors, therefore, and still more from
his general neglect of the original language in
places where he would have known the true
meaning of the word or passage on which he
was commenting, we conclude that Ephraim
had no independent knowledge of the language,
though he had picked up some useful informa-
tion concerning it, probably by verbal commu-
nications with Jews; from which source also
seems to have derived considerable acquaintance
with Jewish expositions of Scripture.

One more passage must be quoted. Upon
Ezek. vii. 17, he says, "The Hebrew has, 'All
thighs shall be polluted with water.'" The
Hebrew here is really the Syriac version of the
Hezodla of Origen, made at a date subsequent to
Ephraim's death. So manifest an interpola-
tion confirms the suspicion that many similar
notes have crept from the margin into the text.
Such interpolations are usually found appended
at the end to Ephraim's own exposition.

Of Greek he also shows a very moderate
knowledge, though his acquaintance with it was
more real than with Hebrew. His own words in
Opit. Syr. ii. 317 are to the point, as follows:

But from that time forward, after I had
opened these things for thy drinking, for I am
poor and destitute alike of meat and drink; but,
like a bottle from the sea or drops from a cal-
dron, I have begged these things from just men,
who were lords of the fountain." After men-
tioning Moses, whose words he was expounding,
he explains these just men of the philosophers
and medical writers of Greece. Without much
knowledge of the language, he had apparently
been able at a learned place like Edessa,
which shortly afterwards became even famous
for the numerous translations made there of Greek
authors into Syriac, to acquire considerable
acquaintance with their views. It is not
sheweworthy that in his controversies with Gnostics he
gives Syriac equivalents for all their philosophic
terms, and never uses the original Greek
words.

Possibly some Syriac compendia of their writings
and of those of the chief Greek philosophers
were in use in the schools of Edessa.

But an example will best shew how much
more at home he is in Greek than in Hebrew.
In 1 Kings xiv. 3 (Opit. Syr. i. 480) the Syriac
version has, instead of cracknels, a rare word
signifying sweetmeats. Ephraim notices that
the Greek has grapes, and gives this as an explana-
tion of the Syriac. But he makes no reference
whatevertsover to the Hebrew word, which certainly signifies some kind of cakes, such as might rightly be called sweetmeats, but certainly is no kind of fruit.

As a poet, we have seen that he possesses merits of no common order, marred only by too great diffuseness. From his intense devotion and piety, hymns were largely adopted into the services of the church, and prayers also composed by him are found in most Oriental liturgies. His personal character deserves high praise. He was an extreme ascetic, passing his whole life in poverty, in raggedness, in humility, and also in gentleness. The latter has been denied on account of the fierce language he sometimes uses in his controversial writings. Certainly the trick he played upon Apollinaris was disgraceful, though too much in accordance with the temper of the times. But as regards those whom he chiefly assailed, the Gnostics, he had no personal feelings of antipathy against them; most of them had been long dead; but his hatred, with his intellectual feelings curbed back, like all ascetics, he bursts forth into turbulent declamations, entirely devoid of malice and ill-feeling, but giving the necessary relief to a strong but repressed temperament. We may take his words in his Testament as literally true where he says, Opp. Gr. ii. 396: "Throughout my whole life, neither by night nor day, have I reviled anyone, nor striven with anyone; but in their assemblies I have disputed with those who deny the faith. For if a wolf is entering the fold, and the dog goes not out and barks, the master beats the dog. But a wise man hates no one, or if he hates at all, he hates only a fool."

Of his other virtues, and especially of the reality and depth of his humility, there can be no doubt; as also that the Syrian church has not without reason extolled him as its greatest orator and poet, and styled him its teacher, its prophet, its pillar, and even, as its hymn writer, "the harp of the Holy Spirit." Roediger concludes his account of him in Herzog's *Encyclopaedia* with the following eloquent words: "His doctrines were those prevalent in the church in his day, but he sets forth not didactically in dogmatic form, but hortatively with pathos. He urges their acceptance without refining upon them. It is moral earnestness and self-denial, even to asceticism, for which he strives, while he blames and despises all seeking after worldly good. The holy Scripture in its general sense and verbal expression forms the groundwork of his intellectual activity, but he allows himself largely to amplify it in a poetical and even rhetorical manner, for which purpose he calls in the aid not merely of the Apocrypha, but of legends. He states his subject in a picturesque and lively manner, and even dramatically (not always in this respect keeping to the rules of good taste, as where, in *Opp. Syr*. ii. 415, he introduces actual activity, but he allows the infant Saviour); he loves exclamation, apostrophe, antithesis, and plays upon words; he piles up metaphors and images, and knows how to employ them to bring out the manifold meaning of a passage, but is occasionally guilty of exaggeration, and of using far-fetched allusions. As a rule, however, his manner is tasteful and that of a master in the art of description, and where he fails, it is from diffuseness and from overloading his ideas with eloquent words. But his words reach the heart; for they treat powerfully of human joys and cares; they depict the struggles and storms of life, and sometimes its calm rest. He knows how to awaken terror and alarm, as he sets forth before the sinner his punishment, God's right to punish wickedness, his destined condemnation; he knows, too, how to build up and comfort, where he proclaims the hopes of the faithful and the bliss of eternal happiness. His words ring in mild, soft tones when he paints the happy rest of the pious, the peace of soul enjoyed by those who cleave to the Christian faith; they thunder and rage like a storm wind when he denounces heretics, or chastises pride and folly. Ephraim was an orator possessed of spirit and taste, and his poetical gifts were exactly those calculated to give weight and influence to his authority as a teacher among his countrymen."

As such venerated him, giving him especially the title of Malaphohn, the teacher, but one of his greatest services to the ecclesiasth as a whole is the marvellous variety and richness which he gave to its public worship.

[R. P. S.]

**EPHRAIM (8), ST., bishop of Mylasa is Caris, mentioned in the life of St. Eusebius, a Roman virgin of the 5th century, ecclesiasth stated (cap. iii. § 12, Boll. Acta SS. 24 Jan. ii. 600) that she died at Mylasa on the feast day of St. Ephraim, a former bishop of Mylasa, whose body lay in the neighbouring village of Luce. Leo Allatius mentions Ephraim of Caris among the hymn writers of the ancient Greek church. (Allatius, de Eccl. Eccles. Grac. Dissert. i. 20, Paris, 1649; Le Quien, Ori. Chr. i. 923.)**

[CE. H.]

**EPHRAIM (6) (Ephremus, Ephraemus, etc.), Theophanes gives the name, *Ephraimitus*, bishop of Antioch and patriarch, 527-545 A.D. The title, 

*Amias*, given him by Theophanes, indicates that he was a native of Amida in Armenia. He devoted the early part of his life to civil and political employments, and rose to high distinction in the service of the emperor, and became count of the east in the reign of Justin I. The city of Antioch having been nearly destroyed in the years 552 and 556 A.D. by successive shocks of earthquake, and by the conflagration which broke out among the ruined buildings, Ephraim was sent by Justin as commissioner to take measures for the relief of the sufferers and the restoration of the city. The high qualities manifested by him in the fulfilment of these duties gained the affection and respect of the people of Antioch, who unaniomously chose him as the bishop in room of Euphrasius, who had been crushed by the falling buildings. (Evagri. H. E. iv. 5, 6.) His consecration is placed in 397 A.D. Moschus records (Prud. Spirit. c. 37) that his elevation to the episcopate had been shortly before predicted to him by a deposed bishop who appeared to him in a dream working for his livelihood. As bishop he continued to manifest the same benevolence, and care of the poor and exhibited an unwavering firmness and zeal against the heretical tendencies of his day. Theophanes says that he shewed "a divine zeal against schismatics" (Chronogr. p. 118). Moschus tells a story of an encounter he had with one of the pillar ascetics, a follower of Severus as
the Aecaphi, in the neighbourhood of Hierapolis. This Stylite having proposed as a test of orthodoxy that they should each walk through a fire, drew back when he found that Ephraim was ready to accept the ordeal, and was eventually brought back to the orthodox faith on the bishop's casting his "emphorion" or stole into the flames, and its remaining unharmed. (Prat. Spiritual. c. 36.) He examined synodically the tenets of Syncreticus, metropolitan of Taras, who was suspected of Eutychian leanings, but who was acquitted. (Phot. Cod. 228.) In 537 A.D., at the bidding of Justinian, acting under the influence of the archipriscus (the archbishop of Virgilius, afterwards pope himself) he repaired with Hypatius of Ephesus, and Peter of Jerusalem to Gaza to hold a council in the matter of Paul, the patriarch of Alexandria, who had been banished to that city on account of supposed complicity in the death of Psino, a deacon and treasurer of the catechumens, and as well as a Nestorianist, and who was there deposed from his primatial see. Pelagius having been urged by the turbulent monks of Palestine to secure the condemnation of their Origenistic brethren, obtained a rescript from Justinian, addressed to the patriarchs of the East, requiring them to order the condemnation of the Origenist. On the advice of the emperor's command, Ephraim held a synod at Antioch, which repudiated the doctrines of Origen as heretical. (Liberat. c. 23, apud Labbe, Concil. v. 777 sq.; Baronius, Annal. 537, 538.)

He was a very copious writer, being the author of a large number of theological treatises directed against the errors of Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus, and Pelagius, and in defence of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon. In 548 A.D., he yielded to the severe pressure put upon all the bishops by Justinian, and to escape deposition voluntarily subscribed the edict the emperor had put forth condemning "the three chapters," saec potius honoris quam virtutis dilecte rerum asservationem. (Pro Defens. Cath. 6. 4.) He did not survive the disgrace of this cowardly concession, and died 347 A.D.

Ephraim's copious theological writings, and his own works, have almost entirely perished, and we have little knowledge of them save through the prolix account given by Photius (Bibliothech. Cod. 228, 229). He speaks of having read three of the volumes, but gives particulars of two only. The first of these volumes contained (1) a letter to Zenobius, a layman of Emesa, of the sect of the Aecaphi, defending the orthodoxy of the Oriental addition to the Triasion, δ ἀναφυλάξεις & φασμα; (2) three letters to the emperor Justinian; (3) two letters to Anthimus, bishop of Tarsus, to the Emporion, bishop of Tarsus; (4) a letter to a Person named Bazes, containing scriptural proofs of the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, &c., to certain monks of Nestorian proclivities, and others; (4) synodical acts respecting certain Eutychian books; (5) eight panegyric discourses delivered on Christmas Day, Maundy Thursday, and Lent, &c. The second volume contained four books, the first and last two of which were devoted to a defence of Cyril of Alexandria and the Synod of Chalcedon against their heretical opponents, and the last comprised his replies to five inquiries, more curious than edifying, proposed to him by his correspondent, the advocate Anatolius; e. g., whether Adam was of compound substance; in what Adam's immortality consisted; the prolonged existence of St. John, &c. Some few fragments of his defence of the council of Chalcedon, and of the third book against Severus, and other works, are given by Mai (Bibl. Nov. iv. 63, vili. 204) and are printed by Migne (Patrolog. xxi. pars 2, pp. 2009 sq.). A sermon of Ephraim of Antioch on the Transfiguration has been erroneously included in the works of Ephrem Syrus (Tillemont, v. p. 757). (Photius, Biblioth. 228, 229; Theophanes, Chronographia, p. 519; Moschos, Prat. Spiritual. c. 36, 37; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 507; Fabric. Bibl. Grac. lib. v. c. 38; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 733.)

Ephraim (2.)

Ephesus, bishop of Jerusalem. (Ephraim (2.)

Ephesus was born at Jerusalem in the third century. His parents were pagans, and when Ephesus came to reside in Rome he still adhered to his religion. He was appointed governor of Sardinia by Diocletian, and a short time after this he was converted to Christianity. This fact soon became known to the emperor, who at once appointed him a new governor, Julius, to supersede the former. He arrived at Rome during the once instituted proceedings against Ephesus, and finding that he was determined to stand to his Christian profession, he ordered him to be put to death about A.D. 303. He is commemorated Jan. 15. (Mart. Rom.; A.A. SS. Jan. i. 997.)

Ephesus, bishop of Beneventum, the subject of a letter of pope Leo I. to Dorus, bishop of Beneventum, March 8, A.D. 448. Paulus, another presbyter of Beneventum, had complained of the uncannonic transgression of Epiphatius above his seniors, many of whom of the first and second rank had yielded precedent. Pope Leo strongly blaming Dorus for the favouritism, praises Paulus for not going away, and is indignant with the other prebendaries for their subservience. (Leo. Mag. Epist. 18, al. 19 in Patro. Lat. liv. 708.)

Epiphanius, a martyr at Rome under Diocletian. She was arrested by Caesarion the prefect, tortured, and put to death. She is commemorated Sept. 27. (Men. Bas.; Baron. Annal. 303, 15; A.A. SS. Sept. vii. 478.)

Epiphatius (1.) This philosopher was born at Hierapolis in Phrygia. Afterwards he finds him a slave at Rome; his master was Epaphroditus, one of the courtiers of Nero. He obtained his liberty, but when or how is uncertain. In the reign of Domitian, all the philosophers were banished from Rome, and Epiphatius retired to Nicopolis, a city of Epirus. There he discoursed on morals; and one among his hearers, Arrian, preserved notes of his lectures, which have come down to our own time. He is reported to have returned to Rome in the reign of Adrian, and to have enjoyed the friendship of that emperor. Some even say that he lived in the reign of M. Antoninus, but this seems very unlikely. That emperor was however a great admirer of his works. The stories told about him evince at once his excessive poverty (at any rate as far as the extant part of his life is concerned) and the resignation and sweetness of his character. In
his old age he saved the child of one of his friends, that would otherwise have been exposed to perish; the nurse whom he procured for this child, it appears, the first servant he had ever had.

Epictetus lived strictly according to his philosophy; and hence his writings have that vital power which can be attained by no other means. They have indeed the characteristic marks of Stoicism; and among those marks there may perhaps be found in them the defect, that they treat the desires which men commonly experience in the course of their life too much as aberrations to be subjugated and put down. This character does of course belong to some desires, but not to all, nor to the greater part. Again, Epictetus is perhaps liable to the charge that as he deprecates too much the desires, so he exalts too much the power of the will; he thinks it far more capable of governing the desires than, by itself, it can be.

But when these defects are admitted (and they belong to all Stoical writers, though we, following Horace, are generally disposed to exagerate them and to forget the merits of the philosopher thus criticised) it must also be said that they do but slightly mar the excellence which appears on almost every page of the writings of Epictetus. His spirit was, indeed, of a higher order than the system which he nominally followed. "A poor man, a slave, a cripple, but beloved by the gods;" such was the account which he, not untruthfully, gave of himself. A few extracts will, probably, give a better idea of his teaching than any description. The following are from the Discourses:

"When you have shut your doors, and darkened your room, remember, never to say that you are alone, for you are not; but God is within, and your Genius is within; and what need have they of light to see what you are doing? To this God you ought likewise to swear such an oath as the soldiers do to Caesar. For do they, in order to receive their pay, swear to prefer before all things the safety of Caesar: and will not you swear, who have received so many and so great favors; or, if you have sworn, will you not stand to it? And what must you swear? Never to disobey, nor accuse, nor murmur at any of the things appointed by him: nor unwillingly to do or suffer anything necessary." (1.14.)

"When one consulted him, how he might persuade his brother to forbear treating him ill; Philosophy, answered Epictetus, does not promise to procure anything external to man; otherwise it would admit something beyond its proper subject matter. For the subject matter of a carpenter is wood; of a statuary, brass; and so, of the art of living, the subject matter is each person's own life. 'What, then, is my brother's? That, again, belongs to his own art of living; but to yours is external, like an estate, like health, like reputation. Now, philosophy promises none of these. . . . But how, then, is my brother to lay aside his anger against me?' Bring him to me, and I will tell him; but I have nothing to say to you about his anger." (1.15.)

The following are from the Enchiridion:

"Seek not things to happen as you wish; but then let them happen as they do happen, and you will go on well." (T. B.)
EPITETUS (8) I., bishop of Centumcellae (Civita Vecchia) in Eturia, on the sea coast, a see which was afterwards incorporated in that of Viterbo. This bishop is found amongst those who attended the council of Arles, A.D. 514, which was assembled at the order of Constantine to inquire into the question of the Donatists. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. x. 58; Mansi, ii. 477, where, together with the bishop of Porto, he subscribed the canons after the African bishops.) [L. D.]

EPITETUS (8) II., bishop of Centumcellae, a violent Ariam, a persecutor of the Catholics, and a friend of the emperor Constantinus. Athanasius describes him (M. Arian. 307, Migne, Patr. Gr. xxv.) as a neophyte, audacious, and prepared for every evil; he narrates how Epictetus with two others consecrated Felix as pope in the place of the exiled Liberius, when three eunuchs from the imperial household represented the people in the election, as the place did the church. (Baron. 355, li. lix.; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. x. 56.) [L. D.]

EPITETUS (7), circ. A.D. 369, bishop of Corinth. He received a celebrated letter from Athanasius in reply to his request for arguments against certain errors then in controversy at Corinth. Some had maintained that the human body of our Lord was consubstantial with His divinity; others that He was a man adopted only to be the Son of God. Athanasius blames Epictetus for having even allowed these opinions to be set forth. The letter has been quoted by Epiphanius (Haer. lxxvi. p. 997), by Theodoret, Cyril, Leo, by the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and by Justinian in his letter to Neman. It was early corrupted for party purposes, as Paul of Emesa found to his cost in his controversy with Cyril. He imprudently quoted a false edition, and was corrected by Cyril. (Patrol. Græc. xxvi. p. 1049, § 720; Athanas. Epist. Ad Epictetum; Ceillier, iv. 142; Gams, Novæ Episq. 430.) [W. M. S.]

EPITETUS (8), deacon of Rome, A.D. 432, hero of the condemnation of Nestorius to pope Cyril I. The pope in his constitution to the synod of Ephesus calls him and his companion the presbyter John, “my devout sons, beloved of God.” (Coelae. Pap. Epist. xx.; Patr. Lat. i. 538.) [W. M. S.]

EPITETUS (9), bishop of Diodaticanopolis, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Concil. Gener. ii. 326 b, ed. Rome, 1828.) His see town was probably the Diodaticanopolis of Thrace. He has been confused with Eliasaeus, bishop of Diodaticanopolis in Palestine. (Reland, Pansl. Illust. ii. 736; Le Quien, Or. Che. iii. 445; Gams, Series Episc. 427.) [Eliasaeus (1).] [C. H.]

EPITETUS (10), bishop of Claudianopolis (Scythium) in the province of Honorias, present at the council held at Constantinople, A.D. 536, under Menas. (Le Quien, Oriens Chrest. i. 569; Mansi, viii. 878.) [L. D.]

EPIDAUROS, bishop of Side, the metropolis of the first Pamphylia, subscribed the canons of the council of Ancyræ, A.D. 314; Pisidænsis in the subscription should be altered to Sideæns. Some MSS. have Pergamæus, whence it has been supposed that a second Epidaurus, bishop of Perga, the metropolis of the second Pamphylia, was also present. (Mansi, ii. 534; Gams, Series Episc. 450; Le Quien, Orient. Chrest. i. 997, 1013.) [L. D.]

EPIGNIUS, an African bishop, one of two legates sent by the first African council, A.D. 399 or 401, under Anastasius (Mansi, iii. 979), to the emperor Honorius, praying him to issue an edict for the protection of the privilege of sanctuary, which had long been enjoyed by the churches (Cod. Th. IX. lxi. 1, 2, 3), but which had been seriously invaded by Masceæ, during the recent rebellion of Gildo. Epignius also took an active part in the third council of Carthage, A.D. 397 or 398. (Mansi, iii. 887, cc. 42, 44; Brun, Canon. i. 130, 131.) [T. W. D.]

EPIGNUS, a disciple of Noetus of Smyrna, who came to Rome about the year A.D. 200, and there promulgated his master’s opinions (Hippol. Ref. ix. 7). He seems to have passed from the school of Hippolytus wrote having been succeeded as leader of the monarchical party at Rome by his pupil Cleomenes. But it does not appear that either of them was in formal separation from the church, for we are not told of the excommunication of any of this school prior to that of Sabelius by Callistus (Hippol. ix. 12). [CLEOMENES.] On De Rosal’s proposed identification of Epignus with Praeaces (Bulit. di Arch. Chrest. 1866, p. 69), see PRAXEAS. [G. S.]

EPIMACHUS (1), a martyr at Alexandria with Alexander during the Decian persecution; commemorated Dec. 12. They were kept for a long time in prison, and finally burned. (Eus. vi. 41; Mart. Us.; Baron. Annal. 253, 105.) [T. S. B.]

EPIMACHUS (2), a martyr at Rome with Gordianus during the reign of Julian. They were scourged and tortured, and then cast into prison; upon refusing to renounce their faith they were beheaded. They were commemorated May 10. (Mart. Rom. Vet.; Hier., Bedæ, Ad., Us.) [T. S. B.]

EPINOEA. [ENNOEA, SIMON.]

EPIPHANES, a Gnostic writer, who taught about the middle of the 3rd century, or earlier. Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iii. p. 511) gives the following account of him. He was the son of Carpocrates, by a mother named Alexandria, a native of Cephalenia. He died at the age of seventeen, and was honoured as a god at Same, a city of Cephalenia, a handsome temple and other buildings having been raised in his memory; and at the new moon the Cephalenians being wont to come together to celebrate his apotheosis by sacrifices, libations, banquets, and the singing of hymns. He was prepared by his father in the ordinary circle of arts and sciences, and in the Platonic philosophy. He was the founder of the "Monadic Gnosis," and from him flowed the heresy of those afterwards known as Carpocratians. He was the author of a work on Justice, which he made to consist in equality. He taught that God having given his benefits to all alike and in common, human laws are consumable which instituted the distinction of .msan
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and *τύμημα, and which secure to one as his peculiar possession that to which all have an equal share. This communitistic doctrine he extended to the sexual relations. It was injustice in a man by marrying a woman, in whom he had no more rights than any one else, to claim that she should be considered as peculiarly belonging to himself. The commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," the condemnation was absurd. It was ridiculous to imagine that the same Being could make concupiscence a part of man's nature and then issue to him the command Thou shalt not covet. Whatever may have been the origin of the phrase "Monadic Gnosis," the doctrine here described seems the direct opposite of Dualism. Instead of accounting for the existence of evil as the work of a hostile principle, this theory would represent moral evil as having no existence, but as being a mere fiction of human laws, perversely instituted in opposition to the will of the Creator.

We may well believe on Clement's authority, the existence of the work on Justice bearing the name of Epiphanius. Very likely he was too well informed as to his relation to Carpocratia. But it has seemed to some improbable that if he had died so young he could have held the place ascribed to him as head of the sect of Carpocratians. This perhaps may be explained by the fact that we are not told of any book written by Carpocratians, so that it may have been through the writings of the son that the sect was really extended itself. Though we never find the name Epiphanius, the sect is described by Epiphanius (Hær. xxv. p. 77) as οἱ τῶν Ἐπιφανῶν. But the honours said to have been paid to Epiphanius at Sime have appeared to many quite incredible. Dodwell (Diss. 4 in Irenaeum, §§ 29) suggests that he might have held his school at his mother's native place, and there have enrolled a multitude of disciples. But Mosheim (De Reliis Christ. ante Const. p. 370) conjectured that Clement made the same mistake that Justin Martyr is supposed to have committed in the case of Simon Magus, and imagined a heathen festival that he witnessed at Sime, and which was there known as καὶ Ἐμπαθάνει, to have been instituted in honour of the Epiphanius with whom he was then familiar. Volkmar has worked out this hypothesis with much detail (Monatschrift des wissenschaftlichen Vereins, Zurich, 1856). The God worshipped was the Moon God, nor, however, the ordinary lunar deity worshipped at the full moon, but ή Ἐμπαθάνει, the new appearing moon. The story that Epiphanius died in his 17th year mythically represents the fact that the new moon no longer exists when 17 days (or more than the half of the month) are over. And licentious community of women accompanied all moon worship. However little confidence the details of this theory inspire, we must admit the possibility that Clement may have been mistaken in supposing the Cappadocian rite to have been in honour of the Cappadocian Epiphanes.

There is a passage in Irenaeus (I. xi. 3, p. 54) which, it has been contended, gives us another specimen of the teaching of Epiphanius. In giving an account of the doctrines of some followers of Valentine, after stating the theory of Secundus, he goes on to mention the description which another "illustrious teacher of theirs" (clarius magister) gives of the origin of the primary Tetrad. In this the first principle is stated to be one existing before all things, surpassing all thought and speech, which the author calls Oneleness (αὐτοτροπία). With this Monotes co-existed a power which he calls Unity (νομότητα). This Monotes and Henotes constituting absolute unity (οὐ δὲ ἕνα ἐκεῖνο) emitted (though not in any proper sense of that word) a principle the object of thought only, which reason calls Monad. And with this Monad co-existed a power consubstantial with it, which the author calls Unit (οὐ δὲ νομότητα). From this Tetrad came all the rest of the Aeons. Pearson conjectured (see Dodwell, Dissert. in Iren. iv. §§ 25) that this "clarius magister" of the old Latin translation represented ἐνεργείας διαδοχαίος, and that this Epiphanius was a proper name, or at least that there was a play upon words referring to that name. The doctrine of the extract then, which seems an attempt to reconcile the theory of a Tetrad with strong belief in the unity of the First Principle, might well be a fusion of Monadic Gnosis, of which Epiphanius was said to be the author. Pearson's restoration of the Greek has since been pretty nearly verified by the recovery of the passage as reproduced by Hippolytus (Ref. vi. 38), where it runs ἐνεργείας διαδοχαίος αὐτοῖς. Here the word in question is plainly an adjective, and the author thus understood it, which makes (Ad. 37) "insignioris apud eos magistri." On the other hand, Epiphanius understood the passage of Epiphanius. On examining what he tells of that heretic (Hær. 32) it is plain that Epiphanius has been following Irenaeus until, on coming to the words ἐνεργείας διαδοχαίος he goes off to Clement of Alexandria, and puts in what he there found about Epiphanius. But Neander has made it almost certain that the person to whom Irenaeus really refers is Marcus. He points out that these four names for the members of the primary Tetrad, Monotes, Henotes, Moes, and Hen, which the "illustrious teacher" (ch. 11) speaks of as names of his own giving, occur again with a καὶ ἐρμηνευτη γεννημένοις in a passage cited from Marcus by name (Iren. i. 15, p. 79). The assertion of Epiphanius that Epiphanius comes chronologically after Secundus has been treated with more respect by Dodwell and others than the statements of so careless a writer deserve. He does not seem to have had any ground for his assertion except that he found in Irenaeus, after the mention of Secundus, what he supposed to be a mention of Epiphanius.

[85] EPIPHANIA (1), wife of the general Heracleus, and mother of the Eastern emperor of that name. (Theoph. Chron. A.C. 602.) (Eutocia (5.).)

EPIPHANIA (2), also called Eutocia, daughter of the emperor Heracleus by his first wife Eudocia. She was born July 7, 615; baptized August 15 by the patriarch Sergius in the church of the Deipara in the district of Blachernae at Constantinople, and on October 4 was crowned in the palatine oratory of St. Stephen. In 629 she was betrothed to Zacharias, prince of the Chazari, from whom her father had received considerable reinforcements in his wars; but I
EPHINAPHNIUM

her way to be married she heard of the prince's death, and returned to Constantinople. The Chazarii were also called Gazarii, and were Turks. (Theop. Chronogr. 250 in Patr. Graec. civili. 627; Du Cange, Hist. Byzant. p. 101, ed. Venice, 1729; Baron. A. E. ad ann. 635, ill.)

[W. M. S.]

EPHINAPHNIUM (Eumæus), a niece of Chrysostom's friend Constantina, the presbyteress of Antioch. To her godly education Constantius entrusted her mother to devote especial care. (Chry. Ep. 238.)

[E. V.]

EPHINAPHNIUS (I), bishop of Salamis, in the island of Cyprus, and one of the most zealous champions of orthodox faith and monastic piety, was born at Besanduke, a village near Eleutheropolis in Palestine. The year of his birth is unknown, but we see that in A.D. 392, twelve years before his death, he was already an aged man, we may conjecturally set the date of his activity in some part of the decade between A.D. 310 and A.D. 320. Much of his early lifetime was spent among the monks of Egypt, among whom he not only acquired a burning zeal for ecclesiastical orthodoxy and the new forms of ascetic life then coming into vogue, but also came for the first time into contact with various Gnostic sects and the Nestorians. It is probably a reminiscence of life in Egypt, when he tells us that in his early youth, Gnostic ladies of seductive beauty had endeavoured to obtain his adherence to their sect and given him some of their books to read. But the youthful anchorite, successfully resisting all temptations, revealed the matter to the bishops of the neighbourhood, and caused an investigation to be set on foot, which resulted in the banishment of eighty persons (Haer. xxvi. 17). At twenty years of age he returned home and built a monastery near Besanduke, of which he himself undertook the direction. It appears that he was ordained presbyter by Eutychius, then bishop of Eleutheropolis. With St. Hilarius, the famous anchorite of the same see, Ephinius early stood in intimate relation, and at a time when the great majority of Oriental bishops favoured Arian or semi-Arian views, adhered unshaken fidelity to the Nicene faith, and its persecuted champions, Eusebius of Vercelli and Paulinus of Antioch, whom Constantius had banished from their sees. In A.D. 367 he was elected bishop of Constantinia in Cyprus, the ancient Salamis, where, for six and thirty years, he discharged the episcopal office with a zeal to that with which he had presided over his monastery in Palestine. Under his influence the whole island was soon covered with monastic institutions. With the monks of Palestine, and especially those of his own monastery at Eleutheropolis, he continued as bishop to hold uninterrupted communication; and these last were unwearied in their efforts to extend his renown for piety, orthodoxy, and learning. It soon came to pass that people consulted him on all important questions of doctrine and discipline, and Ephinius found it no difficult in convincing himself that a watchman of the church must reckon it among his chief duties to let his voice be heard in all the ecclesiastical controversies of the time. Some years after his elevation to the episcopate, he addressed a letter to the faithful in Arabia, in defence of the perpetual virginity of Mary, which was afterwards incorporated, almost without alteration in his great work, Against all Heresies. (Haer. xxviii.)

Soon after this several presbyters of Suedra, in Pamphylia, invoked his assistance in their controversy with Arians and Macedonians, by drawing up for them a detailed exposition of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.

Similar applications were at the same time made to him from various other quarters; by an Egyptian Christian, for instance, named Hylaphe, who himself undertook a journey to Salamis for that purpose, and by a Thracian, Conops, apparently a Pisidian, who, in his own name, and that of his co-presbyters, sought instruction from Ephinius in reference to a long series of disputed doctrines. This was the origin of his Ἀνακοροτὰ (Anacoretus) published in the year 374 A.D., being an exposition of the true faith, which he had begun to teach in the church, which, anchor-like, might fix the minds of its readers, and save them from being tossed about by the malice of Satan amid the stormy waves of heresy.

A similar occasion gave the impulse to his great heresiological work, written in the years 374 to 377 A.D., commonly called his Haeremata, on which his fame as a combater of heresy chiefly rests. He wrote this work at the request of Acacius and Paulius, two presbyters and heads of monasteries in Coele-Syria, and in it attacks with like zeal the numerous Gnostic sects of the second and third centuries, and the ecclesiastical opposition of his own time, Arians, semi-Arians, Macedonians, Athanasians, and others. Through various opinions he regards as so many corruptions of the true faith, as it had been handed down from the apostles themselves, but a merely literary activity could not satisfy his pious zeal; we find him also embracing every opportunity of personally opposing what appeared to him soul-destroying error. So, about the year 376 A.D., when Vitalis, a presbyter of Antioch, undertook a journey to Antioch for the purpose of recalling Vitalis from his error, and reconciling him to the orthodox bishop Paulinus. His utmost efforts, however, proved unsuccessful. Though not himself present at the oecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, which ensured the triumph of the Nicene doctrine in the Oriental churches, his shorter confession of faith, which is found at the end of his Anacoretus (c. 120), and seems to have been the baptismal creed of the church of Salamis, agrees almost word for word with the Constantinopolitan formula. He took no part in the synod held at Constantinople in the following year, A.D. 382; but towards the end of that year we find him associated with St. Jerome, Paulinus of Antioch, and the three legates of that synod, at a council held under bishop Damarus at Rome, which appears to have dealt with the Macedonian and Apollinaris controversies. During his residence in the Eternal City he was domiciled at the house of the elder Paula, who, under the spiritual guidance of St. Jerome, had dedicated her ample fortune to the support of the poor and sick, and he
seems to have strengthened her in her resolution to forsake home and children in order to lead an ascetic life at a great distance from Rome. At the beginning of the following spring, when the bishops were returning to their sees, Paula also went on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. On her voyage to Syria she stayed with Epiphanius in Salamis, remaining there about ten days. Somewhat later St. Jerome also came to visit Epiphanius, on his return from Rome and way to Bethlehem, bringing with him a train of monks to Cyprus, to salute "the father of almost the whole episcopate, the last relic of ancient piety." From this time onward we find Epiphanius in almost unbroken intercourse with St. Jerome. In alliance with this father he began in the last years of his life those miserable Origenistic controversies, in which monkish fanaticism combined with personal hatreds and jealousies, to brand with heresy the greatest theologian of the primitive church. Epiphanius had indeed already, in his Anecoraticus (c. 54), and still more copiously in his Panarion, attacked Origen as the ancestor of the Arian heresy, in a most violent manner. It has been conjectured that his zeal in these sermons, when among the Egyptian monks, had been already filled with horror at the erroneous doctrines of Origen himself. In confirmation of this view appeal has been made to what is related in the Vita Pachomii (Bull. Acta Sanctorum, Mai., tom. iii. Appendix, pp. 25 sqq.), that St. Pachomius had not only forbidden his monks to read the writings of Origen, but that he had even intercessed with those who did so. But this was probably a mere invention for the sake of ascribing to the founder of Egyptian monasticism the glowing hatred with which St. Jerome and his circle were afterwards inspired towards the great theologian. It is contradicted by the fact of the extreme reverence in which Origen was held by these very Egyptians in the time of Epiphanius and St. Jerome. It is far more probable that the zealous confidence with which the Arians were wont to appeal to Origen in support of their doctrine directed the attention of Epiphanius to the writings of the great Alexandrine father, and in them, though held in the highest esteem by Athanasius himself, to detect the hidden sources of Arian pravity. Incapable as he was of impartially estimating the various sides of Origen's speculative theology, Epiphanius seems to have fixed his whole attention on those passages which appear to teach the creaturely nature of the Son, and which in reality did emphasize His filial subordination to the Father in a stronger way than later orthodoxy found admissible.

Origen's predilection for Hellenic philosophy he regarded as the source of all kinds of error, as well as his audacious undertaking to explain the mystical doctrines of Holy Scripture. He had also a particular aversion from Origen's allegorical interpretations and the whole idealizing tendency of his speculation, which seemed to Epiphanius to destroy the reality of the objective facts of Christian faith. The sourness of the flesh, for instance, that is of our mundane corporeity, was zealously maintained by Epiphanius against the spiritualistic conception of Origen.

St. Jerome himself had originally belonged, like the friend of his youth Rufinus, and John bishop of Jerusalem, to the warmest admirers of the great Alexandrine father. But, attacked as he now was, with remonstrances from different sides, he began out of anxiety for his own reputation for orthodoxy to separate himself with the utmost care from the heresies with which he was charged on this account. Epiphanius, moreover, on hearing that Origenism had made its appearance in Palestine himself hastened thither, in advanced old age (A.D. 394), to combat these audacious heresies. His appearance sufficed to drive the ci-devant Origenist, St. Jerome, into the camp of the opposition, and into the bitterest enmity with his old friends, who with greater independence of character refused even now to repudiate their old attachment. Epiphanius, received with all honours by the bishop of Jerusalem, proceeded at once to abuse the rights of hospitality by preaching in the most violent manner in the Church of the Resurrection. Bishop John, after listening for a time in silence, and expressing by gestures only his disapproval, set at last his archdeacon to the preacher to beg him to abstain from speaking further on those topics. When this was done, he walked by the side of John to the Church of the Holy Cross, was thronged by the people, as St. Jerome tells us, who pressed upon him from all sides with tokens of veneration; those thought themselves happy who were able to touch the hem of his garments or to kiss his feet. Mothers held up their little ones before him to receive his blessing. This blessing became the greater that Epiphanius stood still. This homage was possibly spontaneous or possibly artificial; however that might be, bishop John, irritated as he was by the sermon, evidently preached against himself, reproached Epiphanius for the vanity and self-conceit which he showed in not leaving the spot where these honours were press upon him, and towards Epiphanius himself of the next opportunity to preach for his part against certain simple and uneducated persons who represented God to themselves in human form and corporeity. Whereupon Epiphanius rose, and expressing his full concurrence with what John had said, went on to declare that it was quite necessary to repudiate the heresies of Origen as that of the Anthropomorphists. He then hastened to join his friend Jerome at Bethlehem, and required the monks of that community to renounce at once all church-fellowship with the bishop of Jerusalem: they, on the other hand, entreated him unanimously to return to John. Epiphanius yielded, and went back to Jerusalem the same evening, but immediately regretting the step he had taken, and without so much as speaking to the bishop, he left Jerusalem again at midnight, and betook himself to his old monastery of Eleutheropolis. From these quarters he continued to press the monks of Bethlehem, with demands to renounce church fellowship with the Origenist bishop John, and finally availed himself of the occasion provided by a deputation, sent to him from Bethlehem, to ordain a new bishop, in a somewhat violent manner, St. Jerome's brother Paulinus, and impose him on the community, as one who should in future administer the sacraments among them. This intrusion into the rights of another bishop Epiphanius endeavoured subse-
EPHIPPANIUS OF SALAMIS

Epiphanius of Salamis, as an act of Christian charity supplying a spiritual want long felt by the community at Bethlehem, and even on the ground that the ordination had taken place in a monastery, exempt from his episcopal jurisdiction. He also alleged that he had himself empowered his neighbour bishops in Isidore and two of the "Long Brothers," who went to the patriarch, St. John Chrysostom, a formal complaint in writing against Theophilus. Chrysostom endeavoured to persuade them to withdraw their complaint, and meanwhile refused to admit them to the Mysteries till the matter had been decided by a synod, according them, at the same time, a friendly reception, and intervening on their behalf with Theophilus A.D. 401. But Theophilus, irritated by false reports, replied with an anathema against Dioscurus, and accused his colleague in Constantinople of acting against the canons, in setting himself up as judge in the affairs of another pro-
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About three hundred monks are said, at that time, in order to escape the violence of Theophilus, to have fled from Egypt. An Alexandrian synod, at which Theophilus presided, confirmed this condemnation of Origenist heresies. But the zeal of the bishops in their behalf was not without a certain measure of satisfaction. He not only continued to abuse Origen in his Paschal letters, but reporting at once to foreign bishops what had been done in Alexandria, he required them to condemn the heresies of Origen in similar terms. A synodal letter addressed to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus (first published by Vallarsi in his edition of St. Jerome—Hieronym. Opp. tom. i. Ep. 92, p. 557) contains a long list of errors in doctrine said to have been discovered in the works of Origen. Similar writings were also sent to the bishop of Rome and other heads of the church. Theophilus wrote to Jerome that, "If he and the other bishops, theotrepi and the schismatics, had not been treated by them sharply," he had with prophetic sickle cut down the adherents of the Origenist heresy, and Jerome answered in triumphant strain—"The old serpent hisses no longer, crushed and disembowelled (devicerata); she has crept away into caves of darkness." "Still greater joy was expressed at this. More than once he expressed the idea that at an advanced age such happiness had beenfallen him, and to see what he had always himself maintained now confirmed and established by the witness of so just a bishop. "Know, my beloved son," he writes to Jerome, "that Amaelek is destroyed to the very root; on the hill of Rephidim has been erected the banner of the cross. God has strengthened me and the sickle of the TRENOWH, pro- viously church communion with the bishop of Jerusalem, and with his old friend Rufinus. In the subsequent renewal of personal strife between St. Jerome and Rufinus Epiphanius took no part. On the other hand, a few years after the close of the first Origenist controversy he found himself involved in much more the philological and ecclesiastical disturbances. Amongst the monks of Egypt, the controversy between Anthropomorphists and Origenists continued to rage, and found no end. Theophilus of Alexandria, having in the a.d. 398, directed a Paschal epistle against the Anthropomorphists, a wild army of monks from the wilderness of Scete rushed into Alexandria, and so frightened the bishop that he thought his life depended on immediate concession. From that time and onwards Theophilus suddenly appeared as a violent opponent of Origen. In the paschal epistle of the following year, a.d. 399, he hastened to controvert the heresies of Origen in the most violent manner, and even named his old friend Isidore, and with the so-called "Long Brothers," Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius and Euthymius, who all enjoyed, on account of their piety and learning, the highest esteem amongst monks of Origenist proclivities, were added to the causes of strife, and inflamed the wrath of the passionate and violent bishop. Isidore and two of the "Long Brothers" had found a refuge among the monks of the Nitrian mountains. Theophilus followed them into the wilderness, assembled there a number of bishops, who under his influence condemned them as erroneous teachers, and persuaded the secular authorities to issue a decree for the banishment of Origenists.

According to another account, he accused him, as he himself states, that Anthrapomorphis in this controversy little or no support from other bishops. He returned to his Cyprian diocese, and was followed thither by his newly ordained presbyter Paulinianus. In this way, the main point in dispute between bishop John and the monks of Jerusalem was set at rest, and St. Jerome, as if from lands of personal and provisionally church communion with the bishop of Jerusalem, and with his old friend Rufinus. In the subsequent renewal of personal strife between St. Jerome and Rufinus Epiphanius took no part. On the other hand, a few years after the close of the first Origenist controversy he found himself involved in much more the philological and ecclesiastical disturbances. Amongst the monks of Egypt, the controversy between Anthropomorphists and Origenists continued to rage, and found no end. Theophilus of Alexandria, having in the year a.d. 398, directed a Paschal epistle against the Anthropomorphists, a wild army of monks from the wilderness of Scete rushed into Alexandria, and so frightened the bishop that he thought his life depended on immediate concession. From that time and onwards Theophilus suddenly appeared as a violent opponent of Origen. In the paschal epistle of the following year, a.d. 399, he hastened to controvert the heresies of Origen in the most violent manner, and even named his old friend Isidore, and with the so-called "Long Brothers," Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius and Euthymius, who all enjoyed, on account of their piety and learning, the highest esteem amongst monks of Origenist proclivities, were added to the causes of strife, and inflamed the wrath of the passionate and violent bishop. Isidore and two of the "Long Brothers" had found a refuge among the monks of the Nitrian mountains. Theophilus followed them into the wilderness, assembled there a number of bishops, who under his influence condemned them as erroneous teachers, and persuaded the secular authorities to issue a decree for the banishment of Origenists.

About three hundred monks are said, at that time, in order to escape the violence of Theophilus, to have fled from Egypt. An Alexandrian synod, at which Theophilus presided, confirmed this condemnation of Origenist heresies. But the zeal of the bishops in their behalf was not without a certain measure of satisfaction. He not only continued to abuse Origen in his Paschal letters, but reporting at once to foreign bishops what had been done in Alexandria, he required them to condemn the heresies of Origen in similar terms. A synodal letter addressed to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus (first published by Vallarsi in his edition of St. Jerome—Hieronym. Opp. tom. i. Ep. 92, p. 557) contains a long list of errors in doctrine said to have been discovered in the works of Origen. Similar writings were also sent to the bishop of Rome and other heads of the church. Theophilus wrote to Jerome that, "If he and the other bishops, theotrepi and the schismatics, had not been treated by them sharply," he had with prophetic sickle cut down the adherents of the Origenist heresy, and Jerome answered in triumphant strain—"The old serpent hisses no longer, crushed and disembowelled (devicerata); she has crept away into caves of darkness." "Still greater joy was expressed at this. More than once he expressed the idea that at an advanced age such happiness had beenfallen him, and to see what he had always himself maintained now confirmed and established by the witness of so just a bishop. "Know, my beloved son," he writes to Jerome, "that Amaelek is destroyed to the very root; on the hill of Rephidim has been erected the banner of the cross. God has strengthened me and the sickle of the TRENOWH, pro- viously church communion with the bishop of Jerusalem, and with his old friend Rufinus. In the subsequent renewal of personal strife between St. Jerome and Rufinus Epiphanius took no part. On the other hand, a few years after the close of the first Origenist controversy he found himself involved in much more the philological and ecclesiastical disturbances. Amongst the monks of Egypt, the controversy between Anthropomorphists and Origenists continued to rage, and found no end. Theophilus of Alexandria, having in the year a.d. 398, directed a Paschal epistle against the Anthropomorphists, a wild army of monks from the wilderness of Scete rushed into Alexandria, and so frightened the bishop that he thought his life depended on immediate concession. From that time and onwards Theophilus suddenly appeared as a violent opponent of Origen. In the paschal epistle of the following year, a.d. 399, he hastened to controvert the heresies of Origen in the most violent manner, and even named his old friend Isidore, and with the so-called "Long Brothers," Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius and Euthymius, who all enjoyed, on account of their piety and learning, the highest esteem amongst monks of Origenist proclivities, were added to the causes of strife, and inflamed the wrath of the passionate and violent bishop. Isidore and two of the "Long Brothers" had found a refuge among the monks of the Nitrian mountains. Theophilus followed them into the wilderness, assembled there a number of bishops, who under his influence condemned them as erroneous teachers, and persuaded the secular authorities to issue a decree for the banishment of Origenists.
vines, whereupon the "Long Brothers" presented their complaint to the emperor Eutocia, who called upon the bishop of Alexandria to answer in person for himself at Constantinople. Theophilus made the most strenuous efforts to gain the assistance of the aged Epiphanius. He had already, on hearing of the arrival of the monks in Constantinople, called upon Epiphanius to pass judgment upon Origen and the worthless heresy, by means of a Cypriot synod, to inform the bishops of the neighbouring provinces of what had taken place in Egypt, and, above all, to forward the Alexandrine synodal decree to Constantinople by the hands of a trustworthy messenger. Epiphanius complied with his usual zeal; assembled a synod, at which he prohibited the works of Origen, and called on Chrysostom to do the same. He was then moved by Theophilus, as an ancient combatant of heresy, to appear personally at Constantinople, while Theophilus intentionally delayed his own departure. The astute plan succeeded. In the winter of the year 402 A.D. Epiphanius set sail for the imperial city, convinced that only his appearance was required to destroy the last remains of the Origenistic poison. Meanwhile a party at court which had long been displeased with Chrysostom's administration, were earnestly endeavouring to make use of the opportunity for deposing the stern detector of moral evils. This opportunity appeared to be given by the arrival of a bishop with such a name for piety as Epiphanius. The object was to make use of the approaching council in order to pass judgment less upon Theophilus than upon Chrysostom himself. Full of suspicion against the protector of the Origenistic heretics, Epiphanius, accompanied by several of his clergy, landed in the neighbourhood of Constantinople. His first step was, at the request of some fanatical monks of the party of Theophilus, to ordain a deacon in a monastic church. Notwithstanding this breach of the canons Chrysostom sent the whole of his clergy to give him the most honourable reception possible at the gates of the city, with a friendly invitation to take up his abode in the episcopal residence. This was rudely refused by the passionate old man, who declared himself unable to hold church communion with Chrysostom until he had expelled the "Long Brothers" from the metropolis, and had subscribed a condemnation of the writings of Origen. This Chrysostom gently declined with reference to the synod about to be holden, whereupon Epiphanius at once assembled the bishops, who had already gathered in considerable numbers at Constantinople, and by means of his own provincial council against the writings of Origen, and required them all to subscribe them. Some of the bishops present consented willingly to do this, others, on the other hand, like the Scythian bishop, Theotimus, steadfastly refused. Whereupon the opponents of Chrysostom urged Epiphanius to come forward at the service in the Church of the martyrs, and open the doors to the people to preach against Origes, the Origenists, and Chrysostom, as their protector. The latter, however, received timely notice of these intentions, and warned Epiphanius to abstain before it was too late from his passionate undertaking. The honest zealot may by this time have begun to suspect that he was but a tool in the hands of others. On his very way to the church he tumbled back, and soon after, at a meeting with the "Long Brothers," was obliged to confess that he had passed judgment upon them on hearsay evidence only, and, growing weary of the miser- able business, determined to return home as soon as possible. A legend says that he rode farrever to the bishops who accompanied him to the ship and was wont to say to the world, "I leave you the city, the imperial palace, and their hypocrisies." According to another narrative, he sent a message to Chrysostom before his departure, "I hope the- wilt not die a bishop," to which the other replied, "I hope thou wilt not return hither." Unhistorical as this narrative may be, it clothes in the form of two prophecies the fate which befell them both. Chrysostom soon after this, at the instance of the empress, was deposed from his see of Constantinople by a synod composed of his personal enemies, and presided over by Theophilus. Epiphanius died on board ship before he reached home in the spring of A.D. 403.

The end of the controversy proved so little that it had to do with any real interests of faith. Theophilus, having once gratified his thirst for revenge, made up his quarrel with the banished monks.

The character of Epiphanius is well illustrated by these last transactions. An honest, but credulous and narrow-minded zealot for church orthodoxy, and notwithstanding the repressions in which he was held by episcopal collations, and still more in monastic circles, he was often found promoting divisions, where a more moderate course would have enabled him to maintain the peace of the churches. His violence of temper too often led him, especially in the Origenistic controversies, into an ill-considered and uncanonical line of conduct; and the narrow-minded spirit with which he was wont to deal with controverted questions contributed in no small degree to impose more and more oppressive fetters on the scientific theology of his time. His contemporaries, nevertheless, regarded him as an ideal of ecclesiastical piety. His charity to the poor was loudly praised, it went so far that when his own means failed he distributed without hesitation the rich possessions of his church among them. It is related that once when all had been given away, and his steward was complaining of such prodigality, an unknown benefactor suddenly appeared with a sack full of gold pieces. In practical life he often manifested that sound common sense which in theological conflicts too frequently failed him. It is related for instance how, after the deposition of the ascetic zeal of St. Hilary by a word of genuine evangelical spirit, Hilariot, at a common meal, had refused to partake of some fish which was offered him, alleging that he never partook of anything that had life. "And I," said Epiphanius, "since I commenced monastic life have never suffered any one to go to rest with any ground or offence of his mouth." "Thy rule, my father," replied Hilariot, "is better than mine."

Less success had he with the elder Paula, whom, at St. Jerome's instance, he vainly endeavoured to persuade to relieve her physical infirmities by the use of a little wine. On Jerome's asking him what he had accomplished, his reply
was, “Only this, that she nearly persuaded an aged man to abstain likewise from the use of wine.” In opposition to the attempts that were then being made to enlist pictorial art in the service of the church, Epiphanius maintained the full puritanical rigour of primitive times. Having examined on one occasion a village church in Palestine he found a curtain adorned with a picture of Christ or some saint; in sudden anger he tore it in pieces, and then promised the local presbyter to send him another curtain in its place. It was natural, therefore, that in the iconoclastic controversies of a later time the image-breakers appealed to the example of St. Epiphanius.

His learning was much celebrated, he was said to have spoken five languages, Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and also a little Latin, for which Rufinus satirised him with the remark that he thought it his duty as an evangelist to speak evil of Origen, among all nations and in all times.

His frequent journeys and extensive reading enabled him to collect a large but ill-arranged store of historical information, and this he used with much ingenuity in defending the church orthodoxy of his time, and opposing every kind of heresy. But as a man attached to dry literal formulism, he exercised really very small influence as dogmatic theologist, and his theological polemics were more distinguished by pious zeal than by impartial judgment and penetrating intelligence. He is fond of selecting single particulars, in which to exhibit the abominable nature of the errors he is combating. When on one occasion his whole life was occupied in the Origenistic controversy, his refutation of the doctrine of the Alexandrine theologian is quite astoundingly superficial, a few menagere utterances detached from their context, and in part thoroughly misunderstood, is all that he has to give us by way of characterising the object of his detestation, and yet at the same time he has at least 3500000 of Origen’s works. According to Rufinus, he was much occupied in the refutation of the heresies, as Rufinus remarks, than the man had written. His credulity allows the most absurd relations to be imposed upon it; a heretic was capable of any abomination, nor did he think it at all necessary quietly to examine the charges made. He nevertheless enjoys the fame of having been, if not the most powerful champion of orthodoxy, yet certainly the most learned opponent of heretical pravities in his time, and one who, however deficient in critical acumen and orderly arrangement, had collected an enormous material for his purpose. In the eyes of contemporaries, his credulity and want of criticism detracted as little from his credit as the passionate violence of his mode of action.

The whole age regarded him as a saint; wherever he appeared, he found himself surrounded by troops of admiring disciples, and crowds waited for hours to hear him preach. Already in his lifetime all kinds of miracles were said to have been worked by him, and immediately after his death rumour said that demons had been exercised and sick persons healed beside his grave.

His biography, written in the name of Ptolemaeus, as alleged companion of the saint (printed in the editions of Epiphanius by Petavius and Dindorf), is little more than a collection of such legends. His day in the calendar is the 12th of May.

Among the writings of Epiphanius the two most important are the Ancoratus and Panarion already mentioned. The Ancoratus comprises in 121 sections a prolix exposition, full of repetitions, of the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as of those of the true humanity of Christ and of the resurrection of the body, with a constant polemic against Origen and the heresiarchs of his own time, especially Arians, Sabellians, Pneumatomachi, and Dimorites (Apollinarisians). The whole is concluded with the Nicene creed in a twofold form with various additions. Epiphanius having had a taste peculiar to himself, this work has no other interest for us than as a witness to the orthodoxy of its time. The Panarion is of much greater importance. It is so called as being a kind of medicine chest, in which he had collected means of healing against the poisonous bites of the heretical serpent. It embraces in three books, which again are divided into seven sections, not less than 80 heresies. The catalogue of heresies is essentially the same as that which he had already given in his Ancoratus (chap. 11 and 12). He begins with not less than 20 heresies existing at the time of our Lord’s birth; Barbarism, Scythianism, Hellanism, Judaism, Samaritanism, last year the third, divided again, each into several heresies; Hellenism and Samaritanism into four each, Judaism into seven, making 20 in all. Then follow 60 heresies after the birth of Christ, from the Simonians to the Massalians, and among them some which, according to the acknowledgment of Epiphanius himself, are not to be reckoned so much as heresies as schisms. Otherwise, each division into seven, every variation from the orthodoxy of the time is in his view a heresy. The extraordinary division of pre-Christian heresies is founded on a passage he often quotes (Col. iii. 11). Barbarism lasted from Adam to Noah, Scythianism from the time of Noah to the migration of Peleg and Ken to Scythia. Hellenism, he thinks, springs up under Oriental culture, and thereby idolatry proper. With regard to the various Greek schools of philosophy, which he regards as particular heresies belonging to Hellenism, and offers a complete list of them in the conclusion of his work, he shews himself but poorly informed. His communications, likewise, concerning the various Jewish sects are for the most part worthless; and what he says of the Nasarenes and Essenes (Hær. xviii. and xix.) is derived purely from respectable but misunderstood narratives concerning the Ebionites and Elkesaites. The accounts he gives of the Jewish-Christian, and Gnostic sects of the 2nd and 3rd centuries exhibit a marvellous mixture of valuable traditions with misunderstandings and fancies of his own. His pious zeal to excel all heresiologists who had gone before him, by completing the list of heretics, led him into the strangest misunderstandings, the most adventurous combinations, and arbitrary assertions. He often frames out of very meagre hints long and special narratives. The strangest phenomena are combined with total absence of criticism, and things which evidently belonged together are arbitrarily separated. On the other hand he often copies his authorities, with slavish dependence on them, and so puts it in the power of critical commentators.
to collect a rich abundance of genuine traditions from what seemed a worthless mass. For the section extending from Heresi. xiii. to lvii., from Dositheus to Noetus, he used as clue a writing now lost, but of very great importance, which is also made use of by a contemporary writer, Philastrius of Brixia, the work namely of Hippolytus, Against all Heresies. Besides this he made use of the well-known book against heresies by Ireneaus of Lyons, as a welcome mine of information. The narratives derived from both sources are often pieced together in very mechanical fashion, and hence frequent repetitions and contradictory statements are found perpetually.

In addition to these two main authorities, he had at his command many original works of heretics themselves and numerous oral traditions derived from trustworthy witnesses. Very valuable are the extracts given from an old Valentinian work (Haer. xxxii.), the Epistle of Ptolemaeus to Flora, which is quoted entirely (Haer. xxxiii.), and the copious extracts from Marcellus's gospel (Haer. xliii.). For his section against the Montanists (Haer. xlviii.) he makes use of an anonymous work on the same heresy, from which Eusebius also (H. E. v. 17) gives large extracts; in his article on the Alogi (Haer. lii.) he probably makes use of the work of Porphyry against the Christians. In the section against Origen (Haer. xlv.) copious extracts are introduced from the work of Methodius ὁ ἀναδεικνυτικός.

Several notices of heretical parties existing in Epiphanius's own time are derived from his own observation. The last main division of the Panarion (Haer. lxv. to lxxx.), which takes special care to note the different opinions of Arians, semi-Arians, Photiniats, Marcellians, Pneumatomach, Arians, Aetians, Apollinarists, or Dinoiritae, is one of the most important contemporary authorities for the history of the Trinitarist and Christological controversies since the beginning of the 4th century. Although a fanatical partisan, and therefore not always to be relied on in his statements, Epiphanius speaks almost everywhere from his own knowledge, and moreover enhances the value of his representations by the liberal communication of important documents. Of far inferior value to these historical sections are the refutations of various heresies attempted by Epiphanius. Apart from his strange fancy for calling his adversaries by the names of various animals, he has acquitted himself in a marvellous fashion in all kinds of fanatical terms of abuse, misrepresentation of opinions, and attacks on character. He takes pleasure in describing real or alleged licentious excesses on the part of heretics; his refutations proper contain sometimes really successful strokes of argument, but are for the most part weak and unhappy. The conclusion of the whole work is formed by the section ἡ ἀναδεικνυτική, a glorifying description of the Holy Catholic Church, its faith, its manners, and its ordinances. This description is of great and manifold significance for the history of the church of that time. Each section is preceded by a short summary. An Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, the work of Epiphanius himself (preceded by a short extract from an epistle of Epiphanius to Acacius and Paulus, and followed by an extract from the

section setting forth the Catholic faith), is itself an almost literal repetition of the contents of these summaries. This Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, a work made use of by St. Augustine and St. John Damascene, seems to have circulated as an independent writing in a similar way to the oikoumenae of the Philosophumena and the summary added to Hippolytus's άνθυγμα against all heresies, preserved in a Latin translation in the Priscianicæ of Tertullian. Of another somewhat more copious epimetheus, occupying in some measure a mid-position between the brevity of the Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις and the details of the Panarion, a large fragment has more recently been published by Dindorf from a Paris MS., No. 854, in his edition of Epiphanius, vol. i. pp. 339–399, from a transcript made by Fr. Duembner (cf. also the various readings given by Dindorf from a Cod. Crypt. ferrari. vol. iii. p. 2, praef. pp. iv. to xii.).

Among the other writings of Epiphanius shall first be mentioned his book, De mensuris, et ponderibus (περὶ μετρῶν καὶ σταθμῶν), written in the consulate of Arcadius and Rufinus, a.d. 392. The title is unsuitable, inasmuch as only the smallest part of the work gives any account of bibliographical knowledge or antiquity. This book is a somewhat irregular collection of different notices, serving to introduce the reader to the Greek Bible of the Old Testament, with remarks on the accents and critical and grammatical signs concerning the origin of the Septuagint, the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the Hexapla of Origen, etc. The section on the Greek version of the Old Testament was published by Montfaucon as a work by itself, with the help of two manuscripts (Prologi. et Orig. Hexap. p. 77 sqq.), and also by Dindorf (vol. iv. part i. praef. p. viii. sqq.). The treatise De Geminis, that is, concerning the 12 jewels is the breastplate of the Jewish high priest, is preserved in only two Greek extracts, the one first published by Bode, the other in the Quaestiones of Anastasius Sinaita (chap. xi.), and in an old Latin version, incomplete towards the end, first published by Foggial at Rome (a.d. 1743). This treatise, which is preceded by an epistle of Epiphanius to bishop Diodorus of Tyre, contains bits of information concerning names, origin, nature, and use of the different precious stones, together with all manner of spiritualisations.

Further, there are two letters of Epiphanius in reference to the Origenist controversy, one, longer, addressed to John of Jerusalem; the other, shorter, to Jerome, preserved in a Latin version made by that father (found in the best form in Vallarsi's edition of St. Jerome). Among his lost writings must be reckoned an Eulogium on St. Hilarion, of which Jerome makes mention. Of doubtful origin is the so-called Physiologus, a short treatise on the nature of beasts, and with somewhat tasteless pious meditations (Pitra, S. P. V. E. S. n. Paris, 1855).

Cassiodorus (de Instr. in Literar. Opp. ed. Venet. tom. ii. p. 515) mentions a commentary by Epiphanius on the Song of Songs, of which he had caused a Latin translation to be made. This work is supposed to be identical with the mystical interpretation of the Song first published by Foggial, from a Vatican Codex, Rome, 1750. But of this work there also exists
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another somewhat amplified reduction, bearing the name of Philo of Carpathus, one of Epiphanius's suffragan bishops, first published with the Latin translation of Stephanus Salutis, Paris, 1537, and afterwards by Giacomelli, Rome, 1772. Further are ascribed to Epiphanius the following works: A fragment of An Exposition of the Creed of St. John (in Codexis Augustae, Novae. Bibl. Patr. tom. i. p. 300). Seventeen Apophthegmata (in Cotelierii Monumenta Eccl. Græc. t. i. p. 426) and a lately discovered tractate, containing under 102 heads a collection of passages from the Old Testament, in which the author found the history of our Lord, announced beforehand (Quasusulm S. Epiphani Si de Divina Incarnatione, ed. Steph. Ant. Mornellus, Mutiaeae, 1828). Unquestionably spurious is the work De Vitis Prophetarum, which is full of fables, and nearly related to that of Pseudo-Dorotheus, concerning the prophets and disciples of the Lord (recently published by H. A. Hamaker, Amsterdam, 1859). And so are likewise several attributed to Epiphanius.

The Epitome Princes is that of Basle, edited for the printer, Joh. Hervagius, by Joh. Oporinus, 1544. This edition contains the Panarion with Anacophaloseis, the Anoratus, and De Meneuris und Ponderibus. The first part of the MS. was used by Oporinus, sent him by Ersart, such a one that contained the Panarion up to p. 604, of Petaurus's edition. The second part of the MS. remains in the university library at Tena. It was written in the year 1304. The same MS. had before Oporinus been already made use of by Janus Cersarius for his Latin translation of Epiphanius, Basle, 1543. The second edition of Epiphanius is that prepared by the learned Jesuit, Dionysius Petaurus, Paris, 1622, in two volumes. It contains the Greek text with a new Latin translation, and numerous and still valuable Latin notes. To the writings contained in the epitomes, a few smaller ones are added, most of them doubtful or spurious. A reprint of this is the Cologne or rather Leipziger edition of 1892, which contains many doubtful or spurious, of the Paris MS. used by Petaurus (Bibl. Nat. 833, 835) is derived from the same source as that of Tena, but is more recently written, 16th century. To the same class of MSS. belong another Codex Membr. sec. xv. in the Bibl. Rhetoricae, at Breslau, and a Codex chart. Findemionis, sec. xiv. (127, in suppl. Kollarii, p. 738), which contains only fragments of the Panarion and of the Anacophaloseis. To another and better family belong a MS. now no longer heard of, in the Vatican (Codex Vatican.), and another in St. Mark's library at Venice (Cod. Marcian. 125). Of the former Petaurus used a collation made by the Scaliger, as is evident from the collation of the Ist Book of the Panarion (pp. 55-395, ed. Petaur.). This collation appears attached to the margin of a still existing copy of the Basle edition, which fell accidentally into Oehler's hands.

The Codex Marcianus, 125, in the year 1507, is reliance on which the brothers Coleti began to prepare a new edition, contains, alas, only the first part of the Panarion, to p. 604 (ed. Petaur.). This manuscript contains a much more original text than those of the first-named family. With its help not only are we enabled to correct innumerable corruptions and arbitrary alterations of text made by later writers, but also to fill up numerous and some very considerable lacunae. A complete collation of this MS. was first made by W. Dindorf as ground work of his edition of Epiphanius (Leipzig, 1853-1862, 5 vols. Sm. 8vo.). This, now the best edition, contains all of Book 2 of the Anacophaloseis (the Anoratus, the Anacophaloseis, the Panarion, and the De Meneuris et Ponderibus in the Greek text, De Gemmis, in all three text forms, and the two Epistles, in Jerome's translation), and beside these the spurious homilies, the above-mentioned epitome, and the Vita Epiphaniis of Polibius. Vol. iii. pt. 2, contains the critical apparatus to the Panarion, vol. v. the Annotationes of Petaurus. An appendix, which has not yet appeared, besides several supplements, not further described, is announced to contain various readings of two MSS. of the first part of the Panarion, rivaling in value the Venetian Codex, as well as the remaining doubtful or spurious writings of the same author.

The Greek and Latin edition of the Panarion by Franz Oehler, in the Corpus Harensiologicum, vol. ii.-iii. (Berlin, 1850-1861), has only made use of a few specimens of the text of the Codex Marcianus, and that for its two first sections containing the first and second books of the Panarion. The third division of the original Panarion, containing the third book of the Panarion and the Anacophaloseis adds, pp. 592-676, addenda et corrigenda, by way of making up for neglected revision of the text. The third volume contains, besides the Annotations of Petaurus, valuable contributions by Albert Jahn, to the criticism and exegesis of the Panarion. Compare reviews of both editions by Lipsius, in Litterarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland, 1859, N. 15, 1860, N. 42, 1864, N. 23. A worthless edition is that of Migne, in the Patrologia (Series Graeco-Latina, tom. xli.-xliii. Paris, 1863-64). This edition contains the Panarion, the Anacophaloseis, the Anoratus, the book De Meneuris et Ponderibus, the treatise De Gemmis, the two letters addressed to John and to Jerome, the pseudo-autographa, De Vita Prophetarum, De Numerois Mysticis, Seven Homilies, and the Physiologia. A Syriac translation (so-called) of the Panarion, which has found its way from the Nitrin monastery of St. Maria Delnara into the British Museum, appears to contain nothing but the Anacophaloseis. This last is found not only in MSS. of the Panarion, but in several other Greek Codices. A Syriac translation of De Meneuris et Ponderibus is found in two Syriac MSS. of the British Museum, Cod. add. 17148 and 4820. A number of various readings of this treatise have been published by F. de Lagarde (Philologus, 1863, 2nd series, 34), and indications of the Biography of Epiphanius are pretty numerous and scattered; beside the notices found here and there in his own writings, the reader may compare especially Socrates, Hist. Eccl. vi. 10, 12-14; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vii. 32, vii. 27, viii. 14-15; Palladius, Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi (in Chrysost. Opp. ed. Montfaucon, tom. iii.); Hieronym. Catalog. Veror. Illust. 114; Epist. ad Pamnach. 38 (61), ad Theophil. 39 (62), Vita S. Hilariam, tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 72, ed. Martianay; Apol. ado. Rufin. ii. passim. Compare also Vitei' Patrum, ed. Rosweye, tou.
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[ R A. L.]

EPIPHANIUS (2), bishop of Crata or Flaviopolis, in the province of Honorias adjoining Paphlagonia, present at the occumencal council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Orients Christ. i. 577; Mansi, iv. 1213.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (3), according to Iadius, the unlawful possessor of the see of Seville from A.D. 441 onwards, in which year Sabinius, the rightful bishop, was driven out. (Idat. Chron. s. vii. Olymp. 305, in Miero, Patr. Lat. iii. 831; Exp. Sagris. iv. Ann. 441.) The con quest of Seville by Rechila, the Arian king of the Suevi, in 441, probably led to the expulsion of Sabinius and the intrusion of his successor. (Exp. Sagris. iv. 137.) [Marcellus.]

[ M. A. W.]

EPIPHANIUS (4), bishop of Arce in Phoenicia. He was present at the synod of Antioch, A.D. 448. (Mansi, vi. 405; Le Quien, Orients Christ. ii. 925.)

[ J. de S.]

EPIPHANIUS (5), bishop of Perga, the metropolis of the second Pamphylia, present at the Latrocinium Ephesinum, A.D. 449, where he spoke against Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum (Mansi, vi. 918); he afterwards attended the council of Chalcedon, and subscribed to its decrees, A.D. 451 (Mansi, vii. 140). He received a letter from the emperor Leo, and sent back a synodal reply, concerning the murder of St. Proterius and the faith of Chalcedon, A.D. 458 (Mansi, vii. 573; Le Quien, Orients Christ. i. 1015.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (6), bishop of Colossae in Phrygia; his name was subscribed in his absence by his metropolitan, Nunchesius of Laodicea, to the definition of the faith that was read before the emperor Marcian at the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 165; Le Quien, Orients Christ. i. 815.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (7), bishop of Soli in Cyprus, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, by Soter of Theodesiana in Cyprus as his proxy. (Le Quien, Orients Christ. ii. 1072; Mansi, vii. 159.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (8), bishop of Cestrus, in Isauria, to the north of Antioch (Wittsch, Händbuch der kirchl. Geographie, i. 203, note 15). He was present at the fourth general council at Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and also signed the synodal epistle of the Eusebian bishops to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 402; Le Quien, Orients Christ. ii. 1025.)

[ J. de S.]

EPIPHANIUS (9), bishop of Epiphania in Syria Secunda. He signed the synodal letter of the province of Syria Secunda, addressed to the emperor Leo, referring to the murder of Proterius, and the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 523; Le Quien, Orients Christ. ii. 917.)

[ J. de S.]

EPIPHANIUS (10), bishop of Asponsa, Galatia, subscribed to the synod of the province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458, to his enquiry concerning the murder of St. Proterius of Alexandria, and the faith of Chalcedon. The signatures are corruptly written; Julianus is called bishop of Asponsa, and Epiphanius (Eusenius) of Spona. (Mansi, vii. 616; Le Quien, Orients Christ. i. 481.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (11), bishop of Hierapolis (Spello), a town about three miles from Perugia in Umbria. He was present at the synod held at Rome by pope Felix III. A.D. 487. The reading Spoleitus has been corrected to Spoleto, both on the authority of MSS., and because Amasis was at that time bishop of Spoleto. (Mansi, vii. 1177; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. x. 115.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (12), bishop of Satalis in Lesser Armenia, subscribed the letter of his province to the emperor Leo concerning the faith of Chalcedon and the murder of St. Proterius, A.D. 458. Atalenus, in the subscription, should be altered to Satalenus. (Mansi, vii. 589; Le Quien, Orients Christ. i. 434.)

[ L. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (13), ST., bishop of Paris. We are indebted for all our knowledge of this estimable prelate to a Life of him written by St. Eansodius, who was intimately acquainted with him. He was born A.D. 438, and was from his infancy regarded with affectionate interest by St. Crispinus, bishop of Paris, who ordained him deacon at the age of twenty. Designated by Crispinus as his successor, he was unanimously elected bishop by the clergy and people of Paris in the year 467. His life was one of marked austerity and devotion; but what is most interesting about him is that he was largely employed as a peacemaker and public benefactor in the stormy strifes of the 6th century. In 469 he succeeded in bringing about a reconciliation between the emperor Anthemius and his son-in-law Ricimer; in 474 he made peace between the emperor Glycerius and Euric, king of the Visigoths. Euric was much impressed by him, and invited him to dinner, but Epiphanius, knowing that he was accustomed to have Arian bishops dining with him, excused himself from accepting the invitation. When Paris was stormed by Odoacer in 476, Epiphanius was able to save his sister St. Honorata and other women from being taken as captives. He had influence enough with Odoacer to obtain for the town a five years' exemption from taxation. His reputation commended him equally to the conqueror of Odoacer, the great Theodoric, who sent him on a mission to Gundobald and his Burgundian vassals to redeem the captives whom they had carried away from Italy. Epiphanius is said to have brought back 6000 persons, partly given up freely by Gundobald, and partly purchased with a very moderate payment. "Such deeds," observes Gibbon, "are the best of miracles." In 496 he travelled to Ravenna, to ask of Theodoric the remission of the next year's tribute. Two
EPHIPANIUS—Bishops

thirds of what he asked was granted. But the journey proved fatal to him, and he died some days after his return to Pavia, A.D. 405, in the 50th year of his age. Ennodius's Life may be found in Sirmund, tom. 1.; see also Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 1078; Bull. Acta SS. 21 Jan. ii. 364.

[J. L. D.]

EPHIPANIUS (14), bishop of Beneventum, present at the first synod in March 493 under pope Symmachus at Rome. (Mansi, viii. 235; Heldt, § 220.)

[A. H. D. A.]

EPHIPANIUS (15), bishop of Mildamum (Mildamur, written also Mildasum and Mildamum) in Paphgia Salutaris, present at the council of Chalcedon; his name occurs also among the bishops signing the synodal letter of that council to Leo I. (Leon. Ep. 98, 1106; Oriens Christ. i. 841). His name appears also in the list of bishops signing the decrees of the council held at Rome in 503, but this list certainly belongs to some earlier council (Baron. ann. 503, ix.).

[G. G.]

EPHIPANIUS (16), 14th bishop of Nastes, succeeding Clematius and followed by Eume- rius. He was present at the first council of Orleans in 511. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 708; Labbe, Sac. Conc. viii. 356; Flor. 1758-88.)

[S. A. B.]

EPHIPANIUS (17), 16th bishop, 5th patriarch of Constantinople. He succeeded John II. A.D. 520 (Theophanes, A.D. 512), and died in A.D. 535, after a rule of 16 years.

He appears to have been a quiet, prudent, amiable person, living unobtrusively in strictness and regularity, and giving the council that respect due to the ecclesiasticity of his emperor. Seven years he was under the peasant general Justin; the other eight under Justinian. The contemporary popes were Hormisdas, John I., Felix III., Boniface, and Agapetus. The kings of Italy were Theodoric, Athalaric, and Theodahad, the ungrateful murderer of his queen Amalasuntha. The modern empire was hearkening to a high degree of splendour through the victories of its generals, Belisarius and Narses. Melatry was universally suppressed, heathen books were burnt, pagan images destroyed, the professors of the old religion imprisoned and dragged. At Constantinople, the zeal of Julian for a church policy was shown during the patriarchate of Ephipanius by such laws as those of 528 and 529, which regulated episcopal elections and duties. These enactments, and the passivity of Ephipanius and his clergy, are remarkable proofs of the entire absence in these times of any claims such as the clergy of later centuries assumed, an exclusively clerical legislation for the spirituality.

The chief civil event in the city was the great sedition in 531, called Nika, which arose from the celebrated quarrel between the greens and the blues in the Hippodrome. The church of St. Sophia and other public monuments were burnt. Julianus even thought of flying to Heracleae, in Thrace; but Narses and Belisarius put down the insurrection of the slaughter of 30,000 of the insurgents. Through these varied scenes Ephipanius lived. His first conspicuous office was the charge of the catechumens of the church of Constantinople. In 519, the year before his election, he was sent with bishop John and Count Licinius to Macedonia, to receive the documents "libellus," or subscriptions of those who wished to accept reunion with the catholic church, at the request of the apospraiarius of Dorotheus bishop of Thessalonica.

In 530, February 25, he was elected by the emperor Justin, with the consent of the bishops, monks, and people. He is described in the letter of the synod of Constantinople to pope Hormisdas as "furnishing in virtues, reproofs, Scripture meditations; holding the right faith, and maintaining a fatherly care for orphans; in fact, too good to be praised" (Patrol. Lat. liii. 453). He accepted the conditions after a feud between east and west concluded by the patriarch John, his predecessor, with pope Hormisdas, and ratified them at a council held at Constantinople, where he accepted also the decrees of Chalcedon. Dioscorus, agent of Hormisdas at Constantinople, writes thus:—"His beginning does not look bad, for he takes reasonably, and promises that he will keep the rules of the fathers, and, far from dissipating the unity and peace that has been arranged, will increase them. So much he promises: what he can fulfil we don't know. He has not yet asked us to communion." (Patrol. Lat. liii. 482.)

Four letters of Ephipanius remain, addressed to Hormisdas, telling him of his election, sending him his creed, and declaring that he condemned all those whose names the pope had forbidden to be recited in the diptychs. Hormisdas had written to Ephipanius, complaining that he had not heard from him, and that he had sent no deputes according to custom; that he might have congratulated him, and sent the seal which he had shown for unity. Ephipanius adopts the symbol of Nicæa, the decrees of Ephesus, Constantinople, and Chalcedon, and the letters of pope Leo in defence of the faith. His second letter was accompanied by a chalice of gold surrounded with precious stones, a patina of gold, a chalice of silver, and two veils presented in the name of the Roman church. In order to make the peace general, he advises the pope not to be too rigorous in exacting the expression of the names of former bishops from diptychs, about which the people of the see concerned might be reluctant. His excuse for the bishops of Pontus, Asia, and the East is composed in very beautiful language. The answers of Hormisdas are given in the Acts of the Council of Constantinople held under Mennas. He trusts to the prudence and experience of Ephipanius, and recommends lenity towards the returning, severity to the obdurate. Ephipanius is to complete the reunion himself. (Labbe, Concil. iv. 1524, 1597, 1545, 1546, 1556, ed. 1671; Patrol. Lat. liii. 497, 507, 523.)

The severe measures by which Justin was establishing the supremacy of the Catholics in the east were arousing Theodoric, the Arian master of Italy, to a policy of retaliation in the west. Pope John I., the successor of Hormisdas, became thoroughly alarmed, and in 553, at the demand of Theodoric, proceeded to Constantinople to obtain the revocation of the edict against the Arians, and et their churches restored to them (Marcellin. Chron. ann. 525; Labbe, Concil. iv. 1600). Great was the honour
paid to him in the eastern capital. Twelve miles the whole city went out to receive him, bearing ceremonial tapers and crosses. The emperor Justin prostrated himself before him, and wished to be crowned by his hand. The patriarch Epiphanius, with great civility, invited pope John to perform mass; but the pope, mindful of the traditional policy of encoachment, refused to consent until they had offered him the first seat. With high solemnity he said the office in Latin on Easter-day, communicating with all the bishops of the East except Timothy of Alexandria, the declared enemy of Chalcedon. Nothing was omitted at Constantinople which could do honour to the pope; there was universal joy because the old men of the Greeks declared that since the days of Constantine the Great and pope Sylvester the saint, no bishop of Rome had come into "Greece." John was less happy on his return. He was thrown into prison at Rome, and died in his cell. The reason assigned is that he refused to ask that Arians who had become Catholics should be allowed to return; and perhaps he owed part of his disgrace to his excessive honours at Constantinople. Theodoric, in fact, though once just and tolerant, had now become cruel; witness the deaths of Boethius and Symmachus (Baron. 555, 8, 10; Pagi, ix. 349, 351; A.A. SS. May 27; Schröckh, xvi. 102, xvii. 214-16; Gibbon, iii. 473; Milman, Lat. Chris. i. 309).

In April, 537, Justinian was associated with Justin, in August became sole emperor. In 532 he rebuilt the church of St. Sophia. In 529 he succeeded in extinguishing the last Pagan philosophy, Neo-Platonism, by the closing of the schools of Athens. In 529, also, pagans and heretics were excluded from civil and military office; a great mass of pretended conversions followed, some sectarians put an end to their lives; the Monastists in Phrygia burnt themselves in their churches (Procop. Hist. Arcam. xi. 34-5). How far Epiphanius acquiesced in all these measures we do not know; the medlesse nature of Justinian allows us to give him the benefit of the doubt.

In 531 the dispute between Rome and Constantinople was revived by the appeal of Stephen, metropolitan of Larissa, to pope Boniface, against the sentence of Epiphanius. Stephen was eventually deposed, notwithstanding his appeal.

In 535, on June 5, Epiphanius died, after an episcopate of sixteen years and three months (Theoph. a.c. 529 in Patro. Grac. civii. 477.) All that is known of him is to his advantage.

Besides his letters to Hormisdas, we have the senatus consultum of his council, against Severus and Peter (Patro. Grac. lxxxi. 783-786). Forty-five canons are attributed to him (Assemani Bibl. Orient. 619). [W. M. S.]

**EPHINIANUS (18).** Bishop of Ascoli (Asculum), one of the four Italian bishops present at the synod at Constantinople, in May, 536, presided over by Mennas, the patriarch. (Manii, viii. 969; Hefele, § 250.) [A. H. D. A.]

**EPHINIANUS (18).** Bishop of Pitane in the province of Asia, on the Eulatec gulf, present at the synod held at Constantinople by Mennas, a.d. 536. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 706; Manii, viii. 1147.) [L. D.]

**EPHINIANUS (20).** Bishop of Baratta, a town in Lycaonia, whose position and exact name is uncertain; present at the synod held at Constantinople under Mennas, a.d. 536. (Manii, viii. 974; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1079.) [L. D.]

**EPHINIANUS (21).** Bishop of Hersedia Pontica, in the province of Honorias, present at the council held at Constantinople under Mennas, a.d. 536. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 573; Manii, viii. 974.) [L. D.]

**EPHINIANUS (28).** Bishop of Raphia (on the seacoast of Palestine, to the extreme south), who in a.d. 518 signed the synodical letter of John of Jerusalem against Severus (Labv. 191), and in a.d. 536 the sentence against Anthimus (Gist. 283). (Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 629.) [E. V.]

**EPHINIANUS (23).** Bishop of Tyre and metropolitan at the beginning of the 6th century. He was strictly orthodox, and refused to hold communion with Severus of Antioch, and rejected his synodical letters. (Evagri. E.E. iii. 23.) A letter from him and his friend Epiphanius to Theophilius, bishop of Heraclia and his synod, detailing the evil deeds of Severus, was read in the fifth day's proceedings of the synod of Constantinople under Mennas, a.d. 536. (Labv. 193-202; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 809; Baron. A. E. ann. 518, xl.) [E. V.]

**EPHINIANUS (24).** Metropolitan (or possibly called patriarch) of Grado, to which place the see of Aquileia had been transferred after the Lombard invasion, c. 612. "Ex illo tempore" (says Paul Diac. iv. 33) coeperunt duo esse patriarches. The earlier metropolitans had been in schism with Rome on the subject of the three chapters, but Candidianus, the predecessor of Epiphanius at Grado, had made peace with Rome. At Aquileia itself, however, with the consent of the Lombard king and Gisulf, duke of Friuli, a metropolitan (or patriarch) was appointed. Probably the name of patriarch was usurped by the bishops of Aquileia, and therefore allowed by the pope to the bishops of Grado. See the Chronic. Patri. Grad. Moret. Egitani Latiari. 1878, p. 295. Those who think the patriarchs of Aquileia are spoken of as schismatics, in the year 707 the schism was finally brought to a close by a synod at Aquileia. See Paulus Diac. vi. 14, quoted from Bede. The two patriarchs of Aquileia and Grado—with no powers really beyond those of metropolitans—had controversy as to their rival jurisdictions. Their limits were ultimately defined by Leo IX. in the 11th century. (Wiltsh. Handbuch der kirch. Geog. Engl. transl. vol. i. p. 296; Hefele, § 283.) [A. H. D. A.]

**EPHINIANUS (25).** Bishop of Albaneum (Albano), at the first Lateran council, a.d. 498. (Manii, x. 895; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 250.) [L. D.]

**EPHINIANUS (26).** Commonly called the Younger, bishop of Constantinople or Salamin, the metropolis of Cyprus, in the latter half of the 7th century. He was represented at the council of Constantinople, a.d. 680, by Theodorus of Stratoniceus, Stratoniceus of Selii, and Tycho of Citrus. Several of the discourses printed in the collected works of his eminent namesake and
predecessor are suspected to be his, as also is a treatise "in Hexameron," which is still in MS. (Fabric. Biblioth. Gr. ed. Harles, i. 94; ii. 113, 129; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 1038, et seq.; Epiphanius (9), Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biogr. ii. 38 n.) [T. W. D.]

EPHIPPUS (27), bishop of Euchaita in Helenopolus. His name is found both in the subscriptions to the canons of the sixth general council, A.D. 580, and in those of the "Trullan" or Quinisext symod, A.D. 692. (Mansi, xii. 693, 992; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 543.) [L. D.]

EPHIPPUS (28), bishop of Selymbria (Sadokopolis) in Thrace, following Georgius, who was bishop in 692. He took part in the Iconoclastic controversy, according to Suidas, and wrote an useful work against the image-burners. (Index Scriptorum, ap. Migne, Patrol. Græc. cxxv. 1258.) [J. de S.]

EPHIPPUS (29) (Theophanus), bishop of Silva Candida, not far from Rome, on the Via Aurelia, an episcopal seat combined in later times with Portus. This bishop lived during the pontificate of Zacharias, and was present at the councils held at Rome A.D. 743 and 745. (Mansi, xii. 387, 388; Hefele, § 387; Ughelli, Italia Sacra, ii. 91.) [L. D.]

EPHIPPUS (30), bishop of Perugia, subscribed a letter of pope Paul I. in June 761, to the abbot John about the privileges of the monastery of St. Stephen and St. Silvester in Rome. (Mansi, xii. 649; Jaffé, Regesta Pont. viii.) [A. H. D. A.]

EPHIPPUS (31), bishop of Mileto, present at the seventh general council, A.D. 787, when he signed, not among the Carian bishops, but among the archbishops, as if he claimed the metropolitan chair; whilst Theophylactus, a deacon, signed as locum tenens for the bishop of Nauplius (Aphrodisian), the proper metropolitan of Caria. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 919; Mansi, xii. 1093.) [L. D.]

EPHIPPUS (32), bishop of Porta in Lyconia, present at the second Nicene council, A.D. 787. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1088; Mansi, xii. 998 n.) [L. D.]

EPHIPPUS (33), bishop of Lappa, in the west of Crete. Present at the council of Nicaea, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xiii. 735; Or. Christ. ii. 268.) [J. de S.]

EPHIPPUS (34), bishop of Eleutheriana, in central Crete, present at the seventh general Council at Nicaea, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xiii. 391 and 735; Or. Christ. ii. 270.) [J. de S.]

EPHIPPUS (35), bishop and martyr in Africa with Donatus and others. Commemorated April 6 (Mart. Hier., Notker); April 7. (Us.) [T. S. B.]

EPHIPPUS (36), archdeacon of Alexandria; author of a letter in reply to one received from Maximian, bishop of Constantinople, about the end of 432 or beginning of 433 A.D. The letter is preserved only in a Latin version. After some account of the state of the contro-

very between St. Cyril and the Nestorians, the writer of the letter says that St. Cyril is vexed because Maximian has not been as zealous as he might be for him, and gives him various directions and suggestions as to services expected of him. He states that letters have been sent by St. Cyril to Pulcheria and other persons attached to the court, and that presents have been sent as well. So many gifts (benedictiiones), the writer proceeds, were sent from Alexandria at this time that the clergy complained that the Alexandrian church was stripped naked (undata), and already owed 1500 pounds of gold besides 20,000 pounds of silver. (See appendix, Concil. Baluz. pp. 907-909; Ceillier, Actes Conc. Tunis. viii. 385; Robertson, Ch. Hist. i. p. 453.) [J. W. S.]

EPHIPPUS (37), presbyter of Constantinople, sent with Memnon and Germanus to summon Eutyches the third time to the Council of Constantinople in 448. Their report was received on the 17th of November. (Mansi, vi. 496 a; Barcinus, ad ann. 448, xxix.) [W. M. S.]

EPHIPPUS (38), the bearer of letters from the presbyters and archimandrites of Constantinople, A.D. 476, to pope Simplicius, informing him that Basiliscus had restored Timotheus Aelurus to the see of Alexandria (Simplic. Pont. Patr. Lat. in Migne, Patr. Lat. xii. col. 140; C. C. 43; Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 50). Epiphanius seems to have also carried letters to Simplicius, from the patriarch Acacius a few months later (Simpl. ep. 19; Jaffé, s. v.). Ceillier (x. 402) calls Epiphanius a layman; but Simplicius, replying in the letters just cited, styles him "filius" and "discipulus." [T. W. D.]

EPHIPPUS (39) SCHOLASTICUS, an ecclesiastic about the beginning of the 8th century, A.D. 510, but of whose personal history almost nothing is known to us except that he was the friend of Cassiodorus, the celebrated founder of the Monasterium Victoriam. (Cassiodor. Histor. x. 7.) He seems to have taken the same name Scholasticus, not so much because of any devotion to literature or theology, but in the sense frequently borne by that word in the middle ages, when it was applied to the chaplain, or amanuensis, or general assistant of any dignitary of the church (Du Cange, Glossarium s. v.). It was in this relationship, in all probability, that Epiphanius stood to his distinguished master, by whom he was summoned to take a part in the great work then engaging his attention, that of urging his monks to classical and sacred studies, and especially to the transcription of manuscripts. The task assigned to Epiphanius was the translation into Latin of the histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. Cassiodorus himself revised the work, corrected its faults of style, abridg'd it, and arranged it into one continuous history of the church. It is then published for the use of the clergy. The book attained a high reputation. It was known as the Tripartite History; and, along with the translation of Eusebius by Rufinus, it became the manual of church history for the clergy of the West for many centuries. The book is generally published as if Cassiodorus were its author, under the title of Historiae Ecclesiae Tripartitae Epitome.
EPIPHANIUS—MONKS; CLERGY

EPIPHANIUS translated several additional works, such as the commentaries of Didymus upon the Proverbs of Solomon and the seven Catholic Epistles, those of Epiphasis, bishop of Cyprus, upon the Canticles, and perhaps others, all of which are said by Caez to have perished. One, however, survives, and may be found in Llibe (Conc. tom. v.), his Codex Epiphasis, a work to which he was also urged by Cassiodorus, and which consists of a collection of synodal letters addressed by different synods to the emperor Leo in defence of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon against Timotheus Aelurus. [TIMOTHEUS AELURUS.]

[W. M.]

EPIPHANIUS (40), presbyter in Thessalonica, cir. 520, apparently one of the mission from pope Hormisdas for regulating the disordered affairs of that province, and possibly author of a novel which is given the 60th letter of Hormisdas (Hormed. Pap. Epist. et Decret. Patrol. Lat. ixii. 481).

[W. M. S.]

EPIPHANIUS (41), deacon, to whom Lcinian bishop of Cartagena and Severus bishop of Cariaga, addressed a letter on the incorporeal nature of angels, and of the human soul (Gams, Kirchengesch. ii. 1, 53; Exp. Sgrv. Append. 4. p. 426).

[M. A. W.]

EPIPHANIUS (42), abbot of St. Remigius at Rheims, by whose evidence mainly Aquilus bishop of Rheims was convicted of treason against king Childbert II., A.D. 590. Epiphasis was himself deprived of his abbacy about the same time. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. x. 19.)

[T. W. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (43), subdeacon of Rome, commissioned by pope Gregory I. to associate himself with Scholasticus, the "judex company," in investigating an outrage perpetrated at Nort upon Paulus bishop of Nepesina. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. iii. ind. ix. Append. 1, 2, A.D. 593, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxvii. 603, 604; Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 102.)

[T. W. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (44), presbyter in Sardinia, accused of serious crimes. Gregory the Great, writing to Sabinus, Defender of Sardinia, orders him to be sent to Rome. Writing later to Januarius bishop of Cagliari, Gregory sends him back, and declares him innocent. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. iii. indict. xi. Ep. 36; lib. iv. indict. xi. Ep. 27; Migne, ixvi. 632, 697.)

EPIPHANIUS (45), Abbot of Caralis (Cagliari) in Sardinia, who bequeathed money to found a monastery in that town. Januarius the bishop objected to the house selected for the purpose, as it adjoined a monastery of "ancille Dei," and pope Gregory, to whom the decision was referred, directed either that the females should remove into another house, or that the founder of Epiphasis should take effect in an unoccupied monastery outside the city. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. xi. ind. iv. ep. 25, Nov. 600; Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 141.)

[T. W. D.]

EPIPHANIUS (46), archbishop of Caralis (Cagliari) in Sardinia, present as a witness at Rome in Oct. 508 (Greg. Magn. Ep. lib. ix. ind. ii. ep. 7; Migne, Patr. Lat. lxvii. 948; Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 126). In a subsequent letter of Gregory (lib. xiv. ind. vii. ep. 7) Sept. 603, he is called oecumenus of the church of Caralis, and Vitalis the defender is charged to see that he takes proper care of the Xeno-
dochias, which had been greatly neglected in consequence of the age and ill-health of Januarius the bishop of Caralis. [T. W. B.]

EPIPHANIUS (47), ordained deacon by pope Gregory I. [ELIAS (39)].

EPIPHANIUS (48), deacon, who with Theodore bishop of Catania was ordered by the governor to accompany the envoy of the patriarch Tarasius to the pope Adrian in 785. At the Council of Nicaea in 787 he was the representative of the archbishop of Sardinia. He pronounced a panegyrick, which is contained in the synodal acts of the Council, on the council itself, on Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, on the empress, whom he compared to St. Helen, on the emperor, and on the town of Nicaea, already famous for the council held there against Arius. (Mansi, xii. 1076; xiii. 442; Hefele, § 545; § 557; Cellarius, xiii. 830; Patr. Græc. xviii. 1313–1332, from Mansi.) [A. H. D. A.]

EPIPHANIUS (49), an archimandrite of Constantinople sent by Theophorus Studites, when he was exiled and in prison, to implore the aid of Leo III. bishop of Rome, A.D. 805. (Theod. Studi. Lat. xiii. 523; Jaffé.) He was kindly received by the pope, and when he returned brought letters from him to Theodore. Epiphasis was also sent by Theodore to Paschall I., A.D. 818, when the Studite was once more an exile and a prisoner. Theodore addresses him as "great Ephaphon," and with a play on his name bids him "manifest himself a faithful messenger." Paschall also received him kindly, and on his return was brought with him letters of sympathy and encouragement for Theodore. (Baronius, Annu. a. a. 818, ix.)

[T. W. B.]

EPIPHANIUS (50), a Sophist, friend of Apollinaria. [APOLLINARIS THE WISE, EPIPHANIUS (10) in Dict. G. and R. Dig.]

EPIPHANIUS (51), a young man challenged by Gregory Nazianzen in a playful letter to contest of friendship in the form of an epistolary correspondence. (Greg. Naz. Ep. 239, in Mige, Patr. Gr. xxxvii. 381.)

[T. W. B.]

EPIPHANIUS (52), tribune, carried a letter, Ep. 44, among the letters of Leo, dated October 13, 449, from pope Leo I. to the emperor Theodosius (Leo. Magn. Ep. 54, 656, Migne) and a letter, Ep. 60, dated Oct. 15, 449, from Leo to the clergy and laity of Constantinople (cf. Ep. 59, § 1. 976).

[C. G.]

EPIPHANIUS (53), a person in Sardinia who left the income of his property to Maternus his wife, for the support of a monastery in the house of her mother Pompoziana. Vitalis, the defender of the Roman church in Sardinia, and bishop Januarius, were charged between them with diverting this property both from Maternus and the monastery, A.D. 603. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. xiv. ind. vii. ep. 2 in Patr. Lat. lxvii. 1305.)

[C. B.]

EPIPHANIUS (54), Patricius of Constantin-
EPIDuDUS

people, who was active in the prosecution of
Maximus the Confessor, for his opposition to
Monothelitism, towards the commencement of the
latter half of the 7th century [Maximus, Con-
fessor, Dict. Gr. et Rom. Biog. ii. 908, et seq.].
...CAPIT. No character has been more
persistent in not treating the Confessor with some
consideration, but afterwards he allowed himself
to indulge in very strong and abusive language,
which he followed up by harsh and cruel treat-
ment of him (Maximi, Opp. in Migne, Patr.
Gr. xc. 114, 120, 163, 165, 168; Freyry, H. E.
xxviii. 12-20).

[T. W. B.]

EPIDUIDUS (1), one of the martyrs of
Lyons. When the persecution had commenced, he retired,
together with his friend Alexander, to a villa in
the neighbourhood of Lyons, where they remained
in safety for a considerable time, owing to the
watchful care of a widow named Lucia. At
length, however, they were discovered, brought
before the governor, and Epipodius, after having
been tortured, was put to death, a.d. 178. He
is commemorated Ap. 22. (Mart. Hier. Ad.,
R; Surius, Ap. ii. 22 and 24; Greg. Tur. de
Glor. Conf. cap. 64; Baron. Annal. 179. 36.)

[T. S. B.]

EPIDUIDUS (2), St., appears in the Cata-
logues as ninth bishop of Le Puy, between St.
Scratius and St. Suscarius, before the year
451. (Gall. Christ. ii. 689.)

[S. A. B.]

EPISMENON. The word ἐπίσημον is
included in this dictionary, being strangely absent
from the lexicons, ancient and modern, in the
sense in which it occurs in ecclesiastical writers.
The Gnostic Marcus laid much stress on the
mysteries derived from names by calculating the
numerical values of their letters. In the
account of his system given by Irenaeus (xv.
p. 65 sqq.), copied by Hippolytus (Ref. vi. 45)
and by Hippianus (Hier. 34), ἐπίσημον is
repeated at the beginning of the letter to
three, six; the number 3 is δ ἐπίσημον ἀριθμὸς;
the six-lettered name ΙΩΝΙΩΝ is δ ἐπίση-
μονος ιωνιων, &c., language perplexing to the
old Latin translator, who renders the word by
"insignis." A similar use of the word is found
in Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vi. 16, p. 815);
but this cannot be called a quite independent illu-
stratio, for an comparison of the sections just
quoted from Clement and from Irenaeus the
coincidences are found to be such as to put it
beyond doubt that Clement, in his account of
the mysteries of the number 6, makes un-
acknowledged use of the same writings of
Marcus as were employed by Irenaeus. Eusebius
(Quest. ad Eugen. iii. 2) and Tertullian (Ap. Pat.,
loc. cit. iv. 25) probably accept the view
copied by Jerome or Pseudo-Jerome (Bren. in
Psalm. 77, vii. 198, ed. Vallarini), suggests, as a
way of reconciling the difference between the evan-
elists as to whether our Lord suffered at the
third or the sixth hour, that a transmitter's
ever may have arisen from the likeness of
Gnomon and the Episemon, i.e., apparently P
and F.
The source whence all modern writers have
learned their use of the word epismenon is
Scaliger's essay on the origin of the Ionic letters
(Anon. in Chron. Euseb. p. 110). He there
(p. 116) quotes as from Bede, de Indigatione
but we have not been able to verify the refer-
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ice), a statement of an old grammarian, who,
having mentioned that the Greeks denote
numbers by letters, and for this purpose join
the letters of their alphabet three other char-
ters, goes on as follows:—"Prima est γ quae
dicit Epispomenon et est nota numeri VI.;
secunda est Γ quae vocatur kophê et valet in
numero XC.; terzis est Ψ quae dicitur enneaconsa
quia valet DOCCC." Here, as well as in the
preceding passages, episemon is used with special
reference to the character for six; but Scaliger
turns into Greek the phrase "not aumeri VI.";
τὸ ἐπίσημον τοῖς ἄρðμοις, and seems to have
inferred that the marks for the numbers 6 and
900 had equal rights to the same title; and
he also gives the name Episemon to each of
the six Phoenician letters said not to have been
received by the Ionians, saying, for instance,
that the letter Σα was originally an episemon,
and distinguishing between the episemon of the
number 6 and the digamma or episemon of
Van. He does not name his authority for this
way of speaking, and we have not been able to
find any; nor do we know that the character
which was by some called βα, and by others
τὸ ἐπίσημον, was ever called by any one before
Scaliger by the combination ἐπίσημων Σα.
However this may be, Scaliger has been followed
by all who have written on the subject since his

The true account of these three characters
seems to be that though the Phoenicians them-
selves did not use the letters of their alphabet
for purposes of numerical, the Greeks, who
derived their alphabet from them, did so in the
5th century for certain purposes: their alphabet
then still contained two of the Phoenician letters
which in the next century were disused, viz.,
βα and ἕνθημα, the Roman Q, coming after ψ;
that these letters then took their natural place in the system of numerical,
which was afterwards made complete by the
addition, at the end of the characters of the new
alphabet, of another letter to denote 900, which
from its shape was at a considerably later period
called ἐπίσημον (Hankel, Geschichte der Mathematik,
p. 34; Kirchhoff, Studien zur Geschichte des gr.
Alphab.). The character for six had not come
to be identified with the abbreviated for σ in
the time of Marcus, as known through Hippo-
lytus. In calculating the numerical value of
his inscription he counts the δ and τ separately;
and it is to be noted that he calls the former σ
and the latter San. It is possible that
Marcus expressly identified his episemon with
the digamma, though for Irenaeus, p. 71, line
91; p. 72, line 7, the reading is undoubtedly δδα
διαμεμέρητα, against Hort, conjecture.
Hort's conjecture that Marcus wrote γδια-
He says that this number added to the number
of the twenty-four letters makes thirty.
Now the double letters are already included in
the twenty-four, but the Digamma stands outside
the alphabet, and therefore its number might
properly be added to that of the letters.
With regard to the properties of the number 6,
Marcus and Clement were in part indebted to
Philo, who explains (De Op. Mund. 8) that it is
the first perfect number, i.e., according to Euclid's
definition, one equal to the sum of the numbers 1,
2, 3 which divide it without remainder (Aug.
de Civ. Dei, xi. 30), the second such number
M
being 28, which is the sum of its divisors 1, 2, 4, 7, 14 (Orig. t. 28 in S. Joann.); that being 2 \times 3 it arises from the marriage of a male and female, i.e., odd and even number; that there are six directions of motion, forward, backward, right, left, up, down; &c. Marcus observed that not only was the world made in six days, but instruction and education ended after six days went up to the Mount of Transfiguration; that there, by the appearance of Moses and Elias, the number of His company became six; that He suffered at the sixth hour of the sixth day of the week; and thence concludes that this number has the power not only of production, but of regeneration. As seven is the number of the heavens, and eight is the super- celestial odgol, so six denotes the material creation (see also Heracleon, Orig. iv. 221); and, in particular, the material body through which the Saviour revealed Himself to men's senses, and conveyed to them that enlightenment of their ignorance in which redemption consisted. Clement, if not Marcus, finds the Saviour's life in the Scripture epitomized by the episodion, which is not taken into account by one who looks merely at the order of the letters in the alphabet, but reveals itself in the system of numeration.

Irenaeus points out that the mysteries of Marcus all depend on the employment of the modern form of the Greek alphabet, and that they disappear when a Semitic alphabet is used. He shews also (ii. 24) that it is possible to say as fine things about the properties of the number 5 as about those of the numbers which are glorified by Marcus. [G. S.]

EPITHEME, martyr. [GALACTON.] EPISTLE TO DIONETUS. The Greek text known by this name has been known only since its publication in the year 1592 by Henricus Stephanus, in whose handwriting it is extant at Leyden (MS. Voss Q 30), as taken both by him and by Beurer, whose transcript is lost, from a single faded exemplar, the same which (as Gebhardt has shewn) was collated latterly by Cunitz at Strasburg, where it perished in 1870. In this codex the text given under the heading To Dionetus was broken into three fragments by two clear breaks with marginal notes from the old scribe in Greek manuscripts of the 13th century, saying, "Thus I found a break in the copy before me also, it being very ancient." and "Here, too, the copyist had a break." No other copy of any portion has yet been found.

The author of the discourse directed To Dionetus is thus known to us only through a single medieval transcript by a very ancient and defective original, and is reported through this solitary channel of our knowledge to be "the same" as the author of a preceding oration To Greeks, preserved only by the same transcriber, and of some other previous work which bore his name in the title. No reason has ever been shown for doubting this tradition taken by its own; but the medieval transcriber had no more such unique treasures to offer, and the place at the head of the series was usurped by the tailpiece of the series that preceeded. For the codex contained in the same old hand, 1st, two pieces, each of "the holy Justin, philosopher and martyr," demonstrating the divine monarchy and adorning Greeks; 2nd, a discourse of a man said to be "Justin, philosopher and martyr," and after an accidental error, 3rd, the discourse of the man said to be the same, To Greeks ad To Dionetus; and lastly, after a few pages left blank and filled in by a later hand; 4th, "Athesagoras On behalf of Christians," and "the same On Resurrection." Thus the pleader with Greeks and with Dionetus seemed to be identified with the ambiguous person of the Expositor said to be Justin, and so was ushered before the world by Stephanus as none other than Justin himself.

In the discourses To Greeks and To Dionetus the author never says who he is, except that To Greeks, he begins: "Think not, men and Greeks, that my succession from your custums was unreasonable or unjust, for I found nothing right nor comprop. in the episcopion which is not taken into account by one who looks merely at the order of the letters in the alphabet, but reveals itself in the system of numeration.

Irenaeus points out that the mysteries of Marcus all depend on the employment of the modern form of the Greek alphabet, and that they disappear when a Semitic alphabet is used. He shews also (ii. 24) that it is possible to say as fine things about the properties of the number 5 as about those of the numbers which are glorified by Marcus. [G. S.]

EPITHEME, martyr. [GALACTON.] EPISTLE TO DIONETUS. The Greek text known by this name has been known only since its publication in the year 1592 by Henricus Stephanus, in whose handwriting it is extant at Leyden (MS. Voss Q 30), as taken both by him and by Beurer, whose transcript is lost, from a single faded exemplar, the same which (as Gebhardt has shewn) was collated latterly by Cunitz at Strasburg, where it perished in 1870. In this codex the text given under the heading To Dionetus was broken into three fragments by two clear breaks with marginal notes from the old scribe in Greek manuscripts of the 13th century, saying, "Thus I found a break in the copy before me also, it being very ancient." and "Here, too, the copyist had a break." No other copy of any portion has yet been found.

The author of the discourse directed To Dionetus is thus known to us only through a single medieval transcript by a very ancient and defective original, and is reported through this solitary channel of our knowledge to be "the same" as the author of a preceding oration To Greeks, preserved only by the same transcriber, and of some other previous work which bore his name in the title. No reason has ever been shown for doubting this tradition taken by its own; but the medieval transcriber had no more such unique treasures to offer, and the place at the head of the series was usurped by the tailpiece of the series that preceeded. For the codex contained in the same old hand, 1st, two pieces, each of "the holy Justin, philosopher and martyr," demonstrating the divine monarchy and adorning Greeks; 2nd, a discourse of a man said to be "Justin, philosopher and martyr," and after an accidental error, 3rd, the discourse of the man said to be the same, To Greeks and To Dionetus; and lastly, after a few pages left blank and filled in by a later hand; 4th, "Athesagoras On behalf of Christians," and "the same On Resurrection." Thus the pleader with Greeks and with Dionetus seemed to be identified with the ambiguous person of the Expositor said to be Justin, and so was ushered before the world by Stephanus as none other than Justin himself.

In the discourses To Greeks and To Dionetus the author never says who he is, except that To Greeks, he begins: "Think not, men and Greeks, that my succession from your custums was unreasonable or unjust, for I found nothing right nor comprop. in the episcopion which is not taken into account by one who looks merely at the order of the letters in the alphabet, but reveals itself in the system of numeration.

Irenaeus points out that the mysteries of Marcus all depend on the employment of the modern form of the Greek alphabet, and that they disappear when a Semitic alphabet is used. He shews also (ii. 24) that it is possible to say as fine things about the properties of the number 5 as about those of the numbers which are glorified by Marcus. [G. S.]

EPITHEME, martyr. [GALACTON.] EPISTLE TO DIONETUS. The Greek text known by this name has been known only since its publication in the year 1592 by Henricus Stephanus, in whose handwriting it is extant at Leyden (MS. Voss Q 30), as taken both by him and by Beurer, whose transcript is lost, from a single faded exemplar, the same which (as Gebhardt has shewn) was collated latterly by Cunitz at Strasburg, where it perished in 1870. In this codex the text given under the heading To Dionetus was broken into three fragments by two clear breaks with marginal notes from the old scribe in Greek manuscripts of the 13th century, saying, "Thus I found a break in the copy before me also, it being very ancient." and "Here, too, the copyist had a break." No other copy of any portion has yet been found.

The author of the discourse directed To Dionetus is thus known to us only through a single medieval transcript by a very ancient and defective original, and is reported through this solitary channel of our knowledge to be "the same" as the author of a preceding oration To Greeks, preserved only by the same transcriber, and of some other previous work which bore his name in the title. No reason has ever been shown for doubting this tradition taken by its own; but the medieval transcriber had no more such unique treasures to offer, and
EPISTLE TO DIOGENETUS

(Add. 14,658 in the British Museum), is a version of what appears to be another set of notes or Hypomnema of the same discourse To Greeks, which is there ascribed to one "Ambrosius, a chief man of Greece, who became a Christian". The author of this work raises a clamour against him," and this was his Reply, Cureton's English rendering of the Syriac and Otto's recension of the Greek are collated on pp. 61-89 of the Specilagioum Syriacum, and the two reports are plainly reports of the same discourse.

Thus the only tradition respecting the writer To Greeks is that there was another as a certain writer To Greeks, concerning whom there is no further tradition, except that he is clearly the same as one concerning whom the only tradition is that he is a certain Ambrosius.

It is natural enough from facts otherwise known to us to find an Ambrosius addressing a dialogue to Marcellus in the old Greek world, the only Digenetus known to us in times after Christ was a pointing master, who, about the year 333, had charge of the boyhood of a young noble, and led his little pupil, even through his failures art, to turn from dilettante ways, cockfighting, and belief in charmed charms of their mind, and to attend the lectures of philosophers and begin writing dialogues, and to sleep on a hard bed, and live with Attic simplicity, for which lessons the younger recorded his thanks, and probably gave substantial expression to his gratitude, when he had grown to manhood as the emperor Marcus Aurelius. The Greek names became Roman surnames, and were transmitted from generation to generation, and those who received the Roman franchise not seldom took the gentle name of the reigning house. So, looking back from Aurelius Ambrosius, the royal defender of British Christianity against the Severii, and from the senatorial Marcellus, sprung of illustrious martyr lineage, to the Ambrosius and Marcellus of high station in the palace, encouraged to confession by Origin in the usurper Maximin's persecution in A.D. 236, and led into the church by the same father, probably at Athens in A.D. 239, from some Valentinian, Marcionist, or Sabellian heresy, we turn to the more ancient Christian presence converted from actual heathendom, and to a first rise of the Ambrosian family of the gens Aurelia from a Grecian magistrate of the age of the Antonines (cf. De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, lli. 23). It is natural enough, therefore, to be told that such an Ambrose became a Christian in the desert when pen and pencil took our place, in outbursts of local clamour rather than in imperial onslaughts interrupting a guaranteed repose, before the sanction of Christianity by Alexander Severus, and before the commencement of imperial concomitant at Christians in high places under Commodus. It is natural to find such a convert by such a path, and to find him a man of his own kind among others of his peers, still keeping all his wits about him on the unworldly quest of a wisdom not offered by the art of the rhetoricians, nor supplied by the ideals of the poets, nor to be hoped from the debates of the philosophers, nor to be found but in the heroes of the King incorruptible, nor to be learned except from the Divine Word, and when found and when learnt to be offered to all
who will come to it to share. He repeats the same succession of echoes, first of psalmist and prophet in their warnings, not their predictions (Ad Gr. 4. Is. i. 14; ὅ, 5; Ps. ii. 10; lvii. 5; Ad Dogn. 2. Ps. cvx. 8; ὅ, 7, Mal. iii. 3); then of the simplicity of the Galilean teaching (Ad Gr. 5. Jas. iii. 17. Lu. xv. 18; Ad Dogn. 4. Matt. xii. 13; ὅ, 6. Matt. v. 44); then of the summons to devotion and an eating of the word heralded by Paul (Ad Gr. 5. 1 Tim. i. 17. Heb. iv. 12. Gal. iv. 12. v. 21; Ad Dogn. 4. Gal. iv. 10; ὅ, 5. Rom. viii. 12. 1 Cor. iv. 10. 2 Cor. vi. 9. x. 3. Phil. iii. 18; ὅ, 6. Eph. v. 29; ὅ, 7. Heb. xi. 10); then of the new commandment that was from the beginning as recorded by John (Ad Dogn. 6. Joh. xvii. 16; ὅ, 7. Jn. iii. 17. v. 22). He shews the same liberal culture, as of one who has made the history of the Greek mind the story of his own, and the same plain independence of tone, as of one who has sworn fealty to no human dogmatist, and the same manly adhesion to that which he has now discovered to be the law of his being. And the same ingenious desire to establish not immunity for his creed but community with the apostles and the ascendants to #venerate in not choosing to give holy things to dogs till they have been brought to hunger for the crumbs of the Master's table. He never even says expressly that he is a Christian himself.

The connexion of the various portions of the treasure-trove of Stephanus, one with another and especially of the last appended fragment with the discourse to Dionetus remains to be considered. We shall distinguish the answers to Greeks and to Dionetus, no longer as orations and epistles, but as Reply and Responses. The author's peculiar position, as through study of the apostolic writings directly and immediately a disciple of apostles becoming in turn a teacher of Gentiles, whether of Greeks at large or of a single inquirer like Dionetus in particular, is awowed after the second break. But in this concluding fragment, where the author is excusing himself for frank communication of Christian mysteries to Gentiles, a change of style is soon discernible. It is no longer a pleading of Greek with Greek, but the voice of a steward of the ancient revelation among his disciples, promising Paradise to the upright, but warning a new-comer that knowledge must not be parted from life, and that no serpents may touch the fruits. Even as he silences the scruples of the believers he passes on to unfold such depths of doctrine as seemed to Stephanus far too profound for the ears of Dionetus. Hence both Stephanus and nearly all the critics of the whole text will have insisted on this whole section for an accidental accretion. As either of the gaps might represent a chasm in which the commencement of a fresh piece had dropped out, the question whether the appended peroration be proper to the body of the discourse is to be decided on internal evidence only, and therefore, before approaching it, it is needful to have a clear and just conception of the writer to Dionetus himself, and of the scope of his discourse. Now Stephanus is already found guilty of giving rise to four several misconceptions of the preceding discourse. If the writing were Justin's, if it belonged to any of the authors supplied by conjecture, if it were an epistle, if it were up to this point continuous, it would be impossible to suppose the oration really to belong to it. Stephanus directly ascribed it to Justin, prefixed it to the oration To Greeks, distinguished it as an epistle, and omitted to print it as fragmentary. The two pieces, To Greeks and To Dionetus, being once disjoined from their true order, so obviously belonged to different classes of writing that they have never again been so treated as printed side by side, and though they have been denied to Justin on precisely similar grounds, yet nobody seems to have thought of comparing them together till just the other day. Thus the writer to Dionetus has been set down to the first century, and supposed Apollos, or at least regarded as an apostolic father and referred to the reign of Trajan, or again he has been assigned to some school of thought, real or imaginary, that was antagonistic to Justin, in a supposed division of the early church between Judaizers and Helenizers; but only in his capacity of writer to Dionetus, not as writer to Greeks. On all these hypotheses it has been found difficult or impossible to credit him with the entire Peroration, whereas the second section as it is actually printed is capable of being restored to that part of the letter to the Apostle which is of the whole. However, the early date assigned to the whole by Borners (who supposed it prior to Justin) is rejected for the body of the discourse by the most recent German verdicts, but is still more difficult to accept in the case of the Peroration and has never been even suggested for the oration To Greeks. Again, it has been argued that the Peroration could not form part of a first lesson in Christianity, but if the Response be the sequel to the Reply To Greeks, and that to a preceding refusal of conformity, the lesson was really not the first but the third. Again, the Peroration is manifestly not the conclusion of an epistle, but of a homily before the uncleanness departed, and there is no reason whatever against accepting the previous discourse as such. Again, the piece has never been printed as three fragments, the second fragment so obviously belonging to the author of the first, and yet the former gap is presumably as important as the latter.

We claim, then, to have presented on ancient authority a view of the writing To Dionetus, which is (strange to say) novel in modern times, though really the oldest accessible, and thus we are entitled to demand a reconsideration of the current opinion regarding the connexion of the Peroration with the rest. For we have shewn grounds for believing that we have a complete discourse of the same author for comparison with this discourse, which is incomplete, to assist us in determining what kind of completion might have been intended, this whole section for an accidental accretion. As either of the gaps might represent a chasm in which the commencement of a fresh piece had dropped out, the question whether the appended peroration be proper to the body of the discourse is to be decided on internal evidence only, and therefore, before approaching it, it is needful to have a clear and just conception of the writer to Dionetus himself, and of the scope of his discourse. Now Stephanus is already found guilty of giving rise to four several misconceptions of the preceding discourse. If the writing were Justin's, if it belonged to any of the authors supplied by conjecture, if it were an epistle, if it were up to
been denied to Justin also. Now, we have suggested that the Reply and Response, so similar yet so dissimilar, belong not only to the same author, but to the same argument. The resemblance between them is shewn by the recurrence in each, not only of the same style, but of the same two successive contrasted styles, and an author who has two styles, must have three. The change of style in each piece is necessitated by the progress of the argument, and the contrast between the two pieces themselves is due to their difference of standpoint and of object. Having denounced wordlings and their rhetoric in renouncing the world, he replies upon the bigots with a review of their poetry, and then offers to introduce a desirous and candid inquirer to a better school than was to be found among the hypocrites with their philosophies. Thus, in the second discourse he is able to begin to take religious ground, but he is not yet able to withdraw his own person into the background, and so with his boldness like Justin’s naivety, frankness, he gives a review of his own past error and tests false religion by its incompatibility with common human morality. But in the third discourse he prays that speech may be given him, and then that the Speaker may not be grieved (Eph. iv. 30), and throughout he strives to persuade; but that it is possible to sin not only against self or against a neighbour, but against God, and that redemption is needed not only for the soul but for the world.

Thus, the Reply To Greeks alone might have left us in doubt whether the author were a Christian or a Gnostic; but in the Response To Diognetus he shows himself manifestly catholic, as revealed in his slight, in the breadth and display in creation, his admiration for the unworldliness of a simple, unpretentious, Christlike life, his reverence for the Son as author, not only of salvation, but of all harmony. There is nothing Marcionistish in the Reply, but in the Response every word uttered against Judaism tells of the equivalence. In the Reply at the last he speaks of the Maker of the soul; but it is in the Response that he begins to speak with reverence of the God of the Jews, the Maker of the world. In the Reply he speaks of a Divine Word; but in the Response he shews that with him the Divine Word is the gospel of Christ, and though at first he merely opposes Christianity and Judaism, he says that God alone can reveal Himself, and yet that the Jews thought rightly of Him, and so he shews quite plainly that he regarded the old revelation as divine, and we might expect to find him saying so at last. Thus, again, though in the Reply he tells his own story, and in the Response he almost with unconsciousness, begins to put his Jewish friends of himself in the Response than in the Reply. For in the Reply he is engaged on the common task of refuting Hellenism, in the Response he girds himself to his proper task of proving Christianity to be ordained the only possible substitute. But all the doctrines which are first brought to Justin’s attention belong to him as he sketches himself in the Reply. In shewing the possibility of sin against God, he appears the same man who could find nothing higher to adore than such virtues as may be human, who was, like the Hebrew prophets, unlike the Platonist Justin, led to abhor idolatry by the very anthropomorphism of his theology. In discovering his catholicity he shews himself to be the same man who unlike Marcion was quite averse to asceticism, and yet was not repelled, but attracted by discipline. He shews himself in the latter piece, as in the former, to be opposed to that philosophizing tendency in the church of which Justin and Marcion were themselves opposite representatives.

Now as the earlier piece changed in style when its work was accomplished, and a fresh standpoint was reached, so we might expect it to be with the latter. Moreover, we perceive that the Author’s task was now reconstituted. He has been called along with the speaker in his renunciation of the ways of the Greek world and in his reply to Greeks. It was important that he should hold back no longer.

"If any chose to come to me," says Justin, speaking of his abode in Christian medicine, his house (Acta 3), "I imparted to him the words of truth." The great danger of the Christians in the reign of Marcus was that they could not celebrate the Eucharist in the presence of unbelievers. If a great man found his way into a Christian meeting, it must have been hard to induce him to withdraw to win the catechumens. Now the Peroration is manifestly the conclusion of a homily before the withdrawal of the catechumens, and if Diognetus himself had shewn his desire for instruction by coming as men came to Justin, the whole discourse may have been delivered before just such an audience as is addressed in the Peroration at the close. Thus the whole discourse is one of the growing out of the other, and each a brave act, as well as a solid work, though each successive act was less memorable, and each successive work more valuable.

The first question of Diognetus starts from the point to which he had been led in the previous discourse. He asks, "On what God relying and how worshiping, Christians all look above the universe itself and despise death, and neither reckon those gods who are so accounted by the Greeks, nor observe any superstition of Jews." He is answering that the reasons for non-compliance with Hellenism or Judaism are obvious, but the Christians’ God is the one God of the Jews, and their religion consists of purity and charity, and was founded by the mission of the Son, whom God will send again. The answer probably continued after this fashion. An end of all things is the doctrine of your God even Jesus, which he enunciates as the perpetual earthly kingdom, and when Christ proclaimed a kingdom not of this world they killed Him. Yet (he resumes) you see He is not dead, and Christian worship is not to deny Him.

Thus far, then, Christianity has been vindicated as a sect, and as such has been vindicated completely. Diognetus has been able to shew that it was a thing religious and heroic, not quite unnatural, and perhaps not quite unphilosophical, but he had been offended by the seeming impertinence of Christian nonconformity, and he is now made to see that this is a proof not of contempt, but of loyalty. Far from being clandestine enemies to
society, they live openly and mingle freely with others, and only escape notice because they are peaceable good citizens, while the doings for which they are condemned are confessedly unknown, for their worship remains unseen. This passive submission to persecution does not make them less active as patriotic citizens. Even their close union and their recent origin are shewn to be no grounds for suspecting them, for they love all men, and their Founder was not man but God. Christian miracle is shewn to be conformable to the law of nature.

The second question of Diognetus is still unanswered. It yet remains to say, "What the kindly affection is that they have one for another." So the author passes to vindicate Christianity as a doctrine, as that question touched the inmost springs of Christian life. Christian love is indeed supernatural, as it comes from belonging to the family of God the Father. Now, having shewn Christianity to be superior to natural religion, and to Judaism, it remains to notice philosophy as a last refuge of lies, and to shew that it is the philosophers who are the charlatans and the dupes of whom are the dupes, while Christian love is just the natural expression of the knowledge that comes of Christian faith.

Thus having named the Lord of Christians, he goes on to speak of faith, revelation, the Saviour, a ransom, the Servant of God, the Only Begotten, &c., all which Christian notions were absent from the former part of the discourse. In the tenth chapter a fresh section seems to commence with the fruits of faith, first of all in the Father; but before he has gone any further into the Christian creed the piece is broken off. But the author has shewn that as his sect is not Marcionish but Catholic, so his doctrine is not Sabellian but orthodox. For if in the reply to Greeks he spoke of God and the Divine Word in the usual terms of the pleroma of the Word, as each personal, without setting them forth as a triad, and if in the first fragment of the response he described God as doing all the works in the Son, and thus shewed his deep sense of the unity of the Godhead, he here again sets forth the everlasting communion of the Divine Persons, as God shared His counsel with His Servant (wait) from the beginning.

The third question asked by Diognetus was "What, in short, this new race or practice might be that has invaded society now and no earlier?" This question was the sum of the other two, and in answering the other two completely it would be answered with them. But the answer would not be complete and catholic and orthodox, till it is further than merely saying that "it was God who implanted the Word," or that He did so "when the time came." "The Word that appeared new" must have been "found old," and this is the answer given in the third fragment. Again we are led into quite a new region, but the course is still straightforward, and the guide is still the same. The style is not really different, except so far as a difference is necessitated by the difference of subject. There is the same anarthrous use of nouns; there is the same accumulation of clause on clause, not pursued too far; there are the same unexpected turns at the close of the sentences. There is the same union of dignity with sweetness; there is the same blending of Pauline and Johannine teaching; there is the same persistent subordination of doctrine to life. To the last the writer never uses the word Spirit. If "the fear of the law is chanted," and "the grace of the prophets is known," so it was before. We say without any hesitation that no other terminus was probable from that author to that discourse than that which we now actually appended to it, and again that the peroration itself must have belonged to some such discourse as that to which it is found appended.

The frank unfolding of doctrine is justified by the example of the Word who was believed among Gentiles. "This is He that is from the beginning, who appeared new and is found old, and is always young in hearts of saints being engendered. This is He that is ever reckoned a Son to-day." At His bidding in presence of His Grace, which rejoices and may be grieved, the man is stirred to speak with pain, out of love. But those who love rightly become a paradise yielding all manner of fruits. Knowledge and life grow side by side, for the knowledge that (as the apostle says) puts to death the workings of the bidding of truth unto life. "Let thy heart be knowledge, and life, the true Word entertained. Whose soul if thou bentest and fruit if thou choosest, thou shalt eat those things that with God are desired, which the serpent toucheth not, neither doth error approach, nor is it ever corrupted, but a virgin is trusted, and a salvation is shewn, and apostles are made intelligible, and the Lord's passover cometh forth, and wax is bright together and is fitted up in order, and teaching saints the Word is gladdened, through when the Father is glorified, to Whom be glory world without end." We have adopted Beuer's interpretation of the phrase Κυριος συνάγεται και μετά ακόμην αριστερά. Compare Virg. Georg. iv. 57, "Excedunt ceres." Stephonius renders "wax that is bright", and again of the word, Syllburg conjectures καιρόι; Massius, χροί; Lachmann, ταυροί; Bunsen, λίκνου. It is worth while comparing with this whole Peroration a homily ascribed in the MSS. to Cyril of Jerusalem on the feast of the Hypapante, or Presentation in the Temple, where Christians are told to bring their tapers to the true light (Migne, Patr. Gr. xxxiii. col. 1187). This discourse has been denied to Cyril, because its style is contrasted with the style of his catechetical homilies much in the same way in which the style of this Peroration is contrasted with the style of the preceding discourse, and also because the observance of the Hypapante and the ritual use of wax lights have both been supposed later than Cyril; but the two never say, however, of Cyril's discourse was the Hypapante on the day before the Epiphany, the old manner of observing the feast, which we find noted in the Feiler of Aengus and in the Hieronymian Martyrology. Thus the meeting of Christ by Simeon the day before His manifestation to the Magi, and the meeting of the Lamb of God by Nathanael the day before the manifestation at His glorification at Cana, were in a typical of the meeting of the Lord in the air by the church before His manifestation to the world. This manner of observing the feast may very well be as ancient as the 2nd century, and be the occasion of the present discourse. At that time wax lights were neces-
EPISTLE TO DIOGENETUS

The epochs to which we should assign the whole group of writings may be determined with great probability, not with absolute certainty, except that, if genuine, they cannot be Post-Nicene. The picture of the church presented to Digenes, and the account given of the life of Ambrosius, pretty plainly belong to a date earlier than the accession of Constantius. The chief school of Christian thought would seem still to be at Athens, though on the eve of its transference to Alexandria by Athanasius.

In the reign of Marcus it was death either to confess Christianity, or to accuse another of being such. Hence Ambrose is arraigned, not for Christianity, but for abstinence from Grecian rites. Yet he defends himself, not for atheism, but for fanaticism. The charge of atheism had been exploded by Justin; it revived in A.D. 177 as a fresh charge of atheistic priest-worship, to be met by a new argument.

It is among the writings of Tatian, Melito, and Theophilus and the fragments of Apollinarius, Abarcius, &c., that these pieces seem most at home. The writer seems to appear in his freshness beside Justin in his ripeness, and to be the meeting-point of the teachings of Justin, Tatian, and Melito; the point of departure of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Origen on the one hand, and Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius on the other.

It is worth noticing that the Ambrose of the 3rd century was accused of Marcionism and Sabellianism, and that the writer to Digenes has been taken for Marcion himself; while the perversion furnished a model for a Sabellian formula found in an inscription at Rome, "Qui filius dieris et pater inveniens" (De Rossi, Bulletins, 1866, pp. 86, 95). The words, "This is he that is ever reckoned a Son to-day," seem to furnish the germ both of Hippolytus's doctrine of the fresh birth of the Virgin's Son in every man, and Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God. In the second fragment we find two phrases unwarranted by scripture, which seem to be derived from reminiscences of heathen poetry. The "wrought-less" God gave His Son, "the deathless for the dying." The doctrine of Irenaeus that "violence appeareth not to God" is anticipated in this piece.

Lost in the crowd of predecessors whom Irenaeus and Clement hardly ever name and merged in Justin's shadow, convinced that God alone can reveal Himself and, content to be hidden in his Saviour's righteousness, the old writer has gradually emerged by virtue of an inborn lustre, somewhat at once and most brilliant of his contemporaries, and has cast a glory on the early church while remaining himself unknown. It is time that he should take his own place, and receive his proper name, for some have begun to take him for a forger, though when or why or how a man should have forged such masterpieces in Justin's name no one has ever been able to say.

Authorities.—Stephanus (Justini Philo sophi et Martyris Epist. ad Digenetum et Oratio ad Graces, 1592), Sylburg (Justini Opera, Heidelberg, 1593), Maranus (Justini Opera, Paris, 1742), Gallandi (ap. Migne, Patr. Gr. ii. 1159 E), Bickersteth (Christian Fathers, 1838), Dorner (Person of Christ, i. 260 ff), Hefele (Patres Apostolici, Tübingen, 1842), Otto (de Justini Scripta, Jena, 1841), Semisch (Justin Martyr, i. 84 ff, 193 E, Clark), Neander (Church History, ii. 420, 425, Bohn), Westcott (Canon ed. 1875, p. 85 E), Luthardt (St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel, p. 67), Otto (Justini Opera, ii. Jena [1842, 1849], Hollenberg (Der Brief an Digenet, Berlin, 1853), Bunsen (Hippolytus, i. 187 ff, Analecta Antenomica, i. 103 ff), Credner (Kanon, p. 58 ff), Kayser (Reue de Théologie, p. 265 ff, 1856), Donaldson (History of Christian Literature, ii. 126 ff), Davidson (Introduction to the New Testament, ii. 399), Overbeck (Ueber den pseudoumittelsten Brief an Digenet, Basel, 1872), Gebhardt and Harnack (Patres Apostolici, i. 205 ff, Leipzig, 1878, 2nd ed. 1878), Supernatural Religion (ii. 37 ff, 554 ff. ed. vi.), Church Quarterly Review, April, 1877, and references supplied to us by the writer of this article, Cebrellon, the editor of the Syriacum, London, 1854, Ceillier (Auteurs sacrés, i. 412, ed. 1865).

EPISTLES, APOCRYPHAL. I.—1. The Epistles of Abgarus or Abgarus, King of Edessa, to Christ and the Answer of our Lord are given by Eusebius (HE, 15.12) to have been found among them from the archives of Edessa, and to have carefully translated them out of the Syriac. Abgarus expresses his faith that Christ must be "either God or the Son of God," requests the cure of a disease, and since the Jews reject Him, offers Him a share in the kingdom of Edessa. The Lord replies by blessing Abgarus, since it is written of Him that they who see Him should reject Him, that they who see Him not, believing, may obtain life. He must accomplish that for which He is sent, but after his departure one of His disciples shall come to cured Abgarus, and endow him with the gift of life. And to this is added, according to Eusebius, a narrative in the Syriac of the message of Abgarus to Jesus in the last of the seventy by "Judas, who is also called Thomas," to cure Abgarus and many of his subjects, and convert them to the faith. The story and the letter of Abgarus are found in a different form in the Acta Thaddaei, first published by Tischendorf (Acta Ap. Apoc. p. 201). Thaddaeus (as in St. Jerome's version of the story, vii. 57, ed. Vallarsi,) appears as one of the twelve, and is said to have been an Edessene by birth. The name Ananias is given to Abgarus's messenger; the letter contains the offer of the kingdom, and far more severe expressions against the Jews, but not the alternative supplications concerning the nature of the Lord. Ananias also receives from Abgarus the commission to bring back an exact description of the appearance of Jesus, who, miraculously discerning the man's desire, gives him a napkin on which He has impressed His portrait by wiping His face in it after washing. At the same time He delivers a verbal message to Abgarus, promising the visit of Thaddaeus by name. Abgarus, to conceal the sacred picture, is cured before the arrival of Thaddeus, who baptizes him and his people. Tischendorf (Proleg. p. ixxi) supposes these acts to have possibly been drawn from some very ancient original. Ephe mer Syrus (in Testam., quoted by
Reading in his note on Eusebius, L.c.) gives the legend without the addition concerning the picture, quoting Abgarus’s letter, but representing the answer of Christ to have been an invocation of blessing upon the city of Edessa. The whole story is probably a local legend invented for the glory of Edessa; see Heinichen’s note on Eusebius, L.c. The epistle of Christ to Abgarus is said by Fabricius (Cod. ap. l. 517), who accepts the authority of Hicke, to be extant in an Anglo-Saxon MS. in the Bodleian. 2. Other supposed writings of Christ, Augustine (De Conven. Eclog. cc. ix. and x.) mentions some who believed in writings of Christ revealing the secret by means of which His miracles were worked, and in letters of His to Peter and Paul. Augustine denies their ignorance in supposing that because Peter and Paul were placed with the Lord in sacred pictures they were therefore the most likely persons to have received letters from Him. The same father (contra Paustum, xxviii. 4) mentions a pretended letter of Christ alleged by the Manicheans. St. Leo (Serm. iv. de Episc.) accuses the Manicheans as confinings sub apop tếpsia from vius loci theogony, i.e. nullius volitionis falsitatis. Timotheus, presbyter of Constantiopole, in his epistle published by Meursius (Var. Div. p. 117), gives a long catalogue of Manichean apocrypha, third among which is ἡ τῶν ἐκτυπωμένων ὑμας, ἡνικὸν εἰπτολομοῦναι. Licinius, bishop of Carthage, reproves Vincentius, a bishop, for believing in an epistle of Christ sent down from heaven, and from the doctrine which he gives of its contents, it appears to be the same which Adelbert, a Gallic bishop of the 8th century, declared to have fallen from heaven into the city of Jerusalem. It is chiefly directed to urging the observance of our Lord’s Day. (Fabricius, Codex Apost. l. 314.) II. Epistles of the Blessed Virgin. 1. To Ignatius. This letter fills but nine short lines in Fabricius (Cod. Ap. l. 843). It is an exhortation to faith and courage. The letter of Ignatius to the Blessed Virgin, is said by Ussher (Dis. ad Epp. S. Ign. c. 19) to be quoted by St. Bernard. But this is owing to a mistake in the earlier editions of that saint, who is really referring to the well-known letter to Mary of Castabala. (Zahn, Ig. de Ant. l. 81.) The letter of the Blessed Virgin was first printed at Paris, 1495, with that of Ignatius to her, and one to the Apostle John—a blank page at the end of a Life of Saint Becket. They do not appear ever to have existed in Greek, and their genuineness is surrendered by Baronius, Bellarmine, and Suarez (Fab. l. c.). 2. Epistola S. Mariae ad Messanenses, ten lines in Fabricius, conveys an exhortation to faith in the latter writing. The text, who seems to have forged it (see Mabillon in Fabricius) pretended that it existed in Hebrew, but it is unknown in any language but Latin. 3. Epistola S. Marie ad Florentinos was expounded by Savonarola in a sermon, Oct. 25, 1495; but no ancient testimony to it exists. It is but of four lines, exhorting to peace (placatus), Fab. i. 852.) III. Epistles of St. Paul. 1. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans. This forgery is founded upon Coloss. iv. 16. It is only extant in Latin, and has been generally supposed to have been originally written in that language. The Greek version given by Fabricius (Cod. Ap. l. 873) is that of Elias Hutter, published in his polyglot New Testament. 1590. But Professor Lightfoot, in his exhaustive treatise upon this epistle (appealed to his edition of Coloss, p. 347 sqq.) gives reasons to think that it was originally composed in Greek, and he appends a new Greek version of his own, in which the Pauline phrases which constitute the staple of the work are given as they stand in the Greek Testament. Rejected by St. Jerome (Commentary on James), and by the heathen, it was not until it was met with by Theodoret, that obtained a species of recognition (or what seemed such) from Gregory the Great (Mor. in Job, lib. xxv.), and under the sanction of his name was widely used. Professor Lightfoot gives a list of nineteen MSS. of the Vulgate which contain it, and two pre-Reformation English versions. It consists of twenty brief verses, most of which are extracted from St. Paul, but the connecting matter is so rapid that the result is inexpressibly poor. It has no doctrinal object whatever, and must have been a mere exercise of perverted ingenuity, or composed upon the idea that it was well by a pious fraud to obviate the supposition that an inspired epistle had been lost. 2. A third (or rather first) Epistle of St. Paul is extant, the question whether 1 Cor. v. 9 refers really to an earlier epistle now lost, see Meyer and Stanley in loc. Ussher, in a note upon Ignat. ad Traill. (see Cotel. Pot. Apost. ed. Cler. ii. 67), mentions a spurious Epistle of the Corinthians to St. Paul, with the reply of the apostle, as existing in an Armenian MS. in the library of Gilbert North. The text was published by Wilkins (Ant. 1715; see Fab. Cod. Ap. i. 918; iii. 670). The Corinthians announce that Simon and Cleobis had come to Corinth preaching that it is not right to read the Prophets, that God is not omnipotent, that there is no resurrection, that man is not the creature of God, that Jesus was not born of Mary in the body, that the world is not the creation of God, but of some angel; these errors the apostle himself should reply, St. Paul replies that he had taught what he himself received from the apostles who walked with the Lord, that Jesus was born of Mary, was sent to her from the Father in order that He might be made one with the world, and might free every body by His body, and might save us from death, who showed His person in an example that man was created by the Father, and was not left in his perdition but sought, that by the hand of adoption he might remain living. It has been conjectured that this epistle, of very doubtful orthodoxy, was composed by some Armenian Christian after the condemnation of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, and was written to foster a blessing, without really existing in Armenia; the Eutychian doctrine being aimed at under the names of Simon and Cleobis. Ussher, however, considers it to have been written in reference to Gnosticism, while La Croze (quoted by Fabricius) ascribes it to some monk of the 10th or 11th century, who intended it against the errors of the Bogomil. The names of Simon and Cleobis were probably taken from the Apost. Constit. (Clemenh.) 3. The correspondence of St. Paul and Seneca. The whole question of the relations of this philosopher to Christianity and to St. Paul is discussed by Professor Lightfoot (on Philipp. 268 sqq.). The extant correspondence, including eight letters of Seneca and six of the apostle, may be read in
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Hase's edition of Seneca (Teubner). They are given in a less correct text in the earlier editions of that author, and in Fabricius (Cod. Ap. i. 892 sq.). They are first mentioned by St. Jerome (Vit. Ill. cap. xii. ed. Vallars. ii. 851). But he speaks of them as so widely received that he considers their existence a sufficient reason for placing Seneca in his catalogue of sacred writers. St. Augustine also apparently accepts them. (Seneca, cujus quaedam ad Paulum Ap. legatur epistolae, Ep. cliii. ad Macedoniam. See, too, De Cœlit. Dei, vi. 10, where the allusion seems very doubtful.) The correspondence was very widely read in the middle ages. Among the moderns Faber Stapulensis ventured to append these pretended letters of St. Paul to the genuine epistles and to defend their authenticity. But they have been generally given up both by the Romanists and the Reformers. Baronius (ad ann. 49, num. 13) supposes himself to have discovered the origin of the fiction in the spurious Acta passionis Pauli ascribed to Linus, in which mention is made of the friendship of the apostle and philosopher. But these Acta Pauli were little known (see Fabricius, i. 888); and the early belief that Seneca was at least half a Christian, suggests that the object of the forgery may have been the mere satisfaction of the curiosity of Christian readers as to an intercourse which would have so naturally taken place during the apostle's visit to Rome. If any more deliberate motive be looked for, it may be found in Professor Lightfoot's suggestion that the letters were written "either to recommend Seneca to Christian readers, or to recommend Christianity to students of Seneca." Certainly the reader will search in vain for any of that interchange of spiritual ideas which a qualified forger of such an imaginary correspondence might have devised. They are little more than an interchange of empty compliments. The date of the forgery is placed by Professor Lightfoot in the 4th century. See the subject amply discussed in his appendix to the essay above mentioned. (On Phil. p. 237.)

IV. Epistles of other Apostles. 1. An Epistle of Peter to James is mentioned by Photius (Cod. 113) as prefixed with the epistle from Clement (printed by Cotet. Pat. Ap. i. 611) to the Recognitions of the latter author. The import of Peter's letter according to Photius is, that he sends his Acts in consequence of a request to that effect from James. This letter, therefore, appears to be different from the letter of Peter to James, first printed by Turrianus (Pro Ep. Pont. lib. 4 and 5), and given by Cotelerius (i. 608). For the latter is an admonition from Peter to keep his preaching strictly secret. Both these letters belong to the same literary period, and their genuineness falls with it. 2. An epistle of St. John to a dropical man, healing his disease. It is given by Pseudo-Prochorus in a forged narrative of the acts of St. John (Fab. i. 927).

[Epictatius] (Epitatus, Epistotus, Epicotius, Epoctitus, Epicotitus), said to have been Bishop of Tudes (Teudus) in Gaul and afterwards of Ambriata in Lusitania, where he suffered martyrdom, A.D. 57. Ambriata is the modern Placentia in Estremadura, still preserving, says Bivar, a memory of its earlier name in a small tower named Torre de Ambriz.

He was commemorated on May 23. (Dossi. Chron. ann. 37., Biver's note 8, in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxi. 124a; id. ann. 268, note 4, p. 398; Mart. Rom. May 23; Boll. Acta SS. 23 Mai. v. 248; Sandoval, Antigüedades de la Ciudad y Iglesia de Tuy, 1610, fol. 11.)

[T. W. D.]

EPITHYMIA in a Gnostic system described by Irenaeus (i. 29, p. 108), one of the evil offspring of the Maker of the world. [G. S.]

EPITITIMUS (Epaphitimus), bishop of Naples in the 1st century according to the received lists; he stands third, following Petrobas, in one reckoning, and second, Petrobas being omitted, in another. He is commended for his munificent charities; his body was translated to the church of St. Stephen. (Ugel. Ital. Sacr. vi. 26.)

[C. H.]

EPITYNCHANIIUS, bishop of Germa in the province of the Hellespont, present at the synod held at Constantinople under Menaus, A.D. 386. (Le Quen, Orient Christ. i. 788; Mansi, viii. 974.)

[L. D.]

EPELECIUS, EPLETUS. [Explecius.]

EPODIIUS, bishop of Opitergium in Italy, A.D. 421, according to Ughelli (Ital. Sacr. i. 152) on the authority of an ancient inscription which he gives (v. 1178). (T. W. D.]

EPOLONUS, one of three children baptized by Babylas (Babylas (1)), and martyred with him at Antioch during the Decian persecution. Commemorated Jan. 24. (Mart. Bedae, U.; Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. i. 28.)

[T. S. B.]


EPPA, bishop of Illisi (Eleche), subcribes the acts of the sixteenth council of Toledo, under Egles, A.D. 693. (Expugna Sagrada, vii. 241; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 533.) (Serpentinus.)

[Epollandus.]

EQUITIES (Egoaldus.), tribune of the first schola of scutarii at the time of the death of the emperor Jovian, 364. His name was proposed as successor to the empire, but without success, his want of polish ("asser et subagressit") being felt to disqualify him (Amm. xxvi. 1, § 4). In the following year he was made commander of the army in Illyria, and afterwards magister for his services during the rebellion of Procopius (Amm. xxvi. 5, §§ 3, 11). He still held this office in 371 (Amm. xxix. 6, § 8). The Ostrogoths suspected him of being the instigator of the murder of their king Gabinius (Amm. xxix. 6, § 12), and St. Jerome (Coron. sub ann. 376) accuses him of being the real author of the troubles in Illyria, which Ammianus attributes to Probus. On the death of Valentinian I. Equitius was instrumental in raising to the young Valentinian to the purple (Zosim. iv. 19).

[M. F. A.]

EQUITIES (1), a deacon of Apamea, about 389. Theodoret tells us that when Marcellus the bishop of that city was trying to destroy the temple of Zeus, the fire refused to burn until Equities sprinkled holy water upon it,
after which the building was quickly reduced to ashes (Theodoret, H. E. v. 21, § 19).

[M. F. A.,]

EQUITIUS (3), bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus, notorious for his turbulence and misconduct, but in what respect the latter consisted is not known. The Council of Carthage, A.D. 401, in consequence of his repeated misbehaviour, appointed a commission of twenty bishops to take steps for deposing him and appointing a bishop in his stead. But their purpose was not carried out immediately, for we find that in 404 Thaeusius and Erasius, the deputies appointed by the council to convey to Honorius its request concerning the Donatists, are desired also to request the emperor that Equitius might be expelled from his diocese. This was in accordance with the law of Gratian, A.D. 378. (Cod. Ecol. Afr. 78, 93; Bruns, Canon. i. 175, 185; Cod. Theod. lib. XVI. tit. ii. 35; Tilmont, art. 134, vol. XIII. p. 356; Mansi, Concil. iv. 490, 500; Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 180.)

[H. W. P.]

EQUITIUS (4), one of three bishops addressed by pope Simplicius, Nov. 19, 475, on the subject of Gaudentius bishop of Auxinum (Simplic. Pap. Ep. 3 in Pat. L. vii. 37, and Mansi, Concil. vii. 973; Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 49; Ceillier, Aut. Soc. x. 402). [C. H.]

EQUITIUS (5), bishop of Matelica, a town at the source of the Esino in the March of Ancona; present at the third council of Rome, A.D. 487, under Felix III. (Mansi, vii. 1171 c.)

[T. W. D.]

EQUITIUS (6), a Roman noble, father of the abbot St. Maur, whom at the age of twelve he placed under St. Benedict, A.D. 522 (Greg. Mag. Dial. ii. 4 in Migne, lxvi. 140). Faustus, the contemporary biographer of Maurus (Vit. S. Maur. cap. i. § 8), has Eutychius instead of Equitius, and the Bollandist editor notes Eutius, Aequitius, Euthitus, as other variants of the name (Acta SS. 15 Jan. i. 1040).

[T. W. D.]

EQUITIUS (7), abbot of a monastery in the province of Valeria, of whom an account, mixed with legend, is given by pope Gregory I. (Dial. i. 4) and quoted by Baronius (A. E. ann. 504, xi. sq.) and the Bollandists, the latter assigning his commemoration to March 7 (Acta SS. Mart. i. 449), while the Roman martyrology commemorates him on Aug. 11. The "province of Valeria" is explained to be that district about the Lucus Fucinus in the land of the Marsi (Abruzzo Ultraiore) traversed by the Via Valeria, which reaches it from Rome through Tibur. The small town of Pescina near the east shore of the lake is thought to represent the general locality of Equitius (Ferrarius, Lex. Geogr. voc. "Valeria"). Basilius the Magnus, expelled from Rome in the reign of Theodoric the Great, sought an asylum under Equitius, having disguised himself as a monk, but the abbot soon detected and repelled him. Baronius places this story under the year 504. Equitius lived as an humble rustic, working on his monks' property, often preaching as an itinerant in the neighbourhood, poorly mounted, meanly clad, but with the Holy Scriptures in his satchel. Jealous of these proceedings, the Roman clergy complained of him to the pope (Symmachus in the chronology of Baronius, but unnamed by Gregory), who invited him to an interview, and ultimately stood his friend. (Cf. Fuller, C. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 260, 261, ed. Brewer.)

[ERACL.] [ERACL.]

ERACLIANUS. [HERACL.]

ERACLUS (1) (Heracles, in the older editions Eradus), deacon of the church of Hippo, A.D. 425. He had inherited a considerable property, part of which he spent in raising a "memoria" of the martyr Stephanus; the rest he offered as a gift to the church of St. Augustine, fearing that the acceptance of such a gift from so young a man might be the subject of future reproval or regret, would not receive it in the form of money to be spent; but casul Eracleus first to invest the money permanently in the purchase of land, which might be given back to him, should any unforeseen misfortune or replacement arise. On becoming one of Augustine's clergy, Eracleus made his poverty complete by setting free a few slaves whom he had retained. (Aug. Sermon. 356, vol. v. 1387.) In the year 426 Augustine was summoned to Millesium, to obviate some threatened dissensions. Severus, the late bishop, had designated his successor in life-time, but had only made his choice known to his clergy, without publishing it to his people. This caused some discontent, and the interference of Augustine was judged necessary to secure the unanimous acceptance of the bishop so chosen. Augustine, being then in his seventy-second year, was thus reminded of the experience of taking steps to secure his own church from similar trouble in the event of his death, and he made the choice of Eracleus, then apparently the junior presbyter of the church, to be his coadjutor and designate successor. (See Dict. Christ. Ant. i. 228.) Only, though he had himself been ordained bishop in the lifetime of his predecessor, Valerie, he now held that this had been an unconscionable violation of the Nicene canon against keeping two bishops in the same church, and therefore resolved that Eraclesus, while discharging all the secular duties of the see, should remain in the office of presbyter until his own death. To remove all possibility of future dispute, he assembled his people (Sept. 26, 426), to obtain their consent to the arrangement, having the notaries of the church in attendance to draw up regular "gesta" of the proceedings, which the persons present were asked to subscribe (I. e. p. 213, vol. ii. p. 788). These gesta contain an interesting specimen of the recording of popular acclamations. According to present English parliamentary usage, interruptions to a speaker are usually inarticulate, or at most amount to an "Oh, oh," or "hear, hear." In the Roman Senate usage permitted the interruption of a speaker by calling out a short sentence, which was duly recorded by the reporters of the proceedings. When the cry found favour, it was often taken up by the assembly and repeated by them (probably in a kind of chant), and the acts then carefully noted the number of times it was repeated. The
ERADIUS (Trebellius Pollus, Claud.) "Auguste Claudii di te nobis presertum; dictum sacrovum; principem te aut qualis tu es semper optimum; dictum quadriges; te republicae requiverebat, dictum quadriges," etc. Similar instances are common in the Augustan historians. On the whole subject of such acclamations, see Ferrarius, de Veto. Aen. in Grativ. Thuc. Ant. Rom. Christian assembly of course followed the usage of their time; and the reader of the acts of councils will be familiar with the record of acclamations sometimes as interrupting the proceedings, and ordinarily as testifying the assembly's approval of the final result. In the present instance the gesta record the different acclamations by which the discourse of Augustine was interrupted, and the final acclamations made at his special request, "Fiat, fiat, dictum vicis quinquevis, Dignum est justum est dictum vicis octies decies. . . . Exaudi Christe, Eradulcium conserva dictum octies decies."

The fall of Hippo into the hands of the Vandals prevented the arrangements of Augustine from taking their course, and it appears to have hallowed any successor in his see. Eradius, in 427, held a private discussion with Maximinus, the Arian bishop, which led to the subsequent public dispute between Maximinus and Augustine. (Coll. cun Max. viii. 650.) Two sermons by Eradius are preserved, the first of which, preached in the presence of the bishop, is almost entire and has been taken up with compliments and apologies (v. 1523 and 72, Append. p. 131). [G. S.]

ERADIUS (2). Isidore (Orig. viii. 634) commences a heretic of this name and a sect of Eradius; but on comparison with Augustine (Brev. 47) it becomes apparent that Hinnan and his followers are intended. [G. S.]

ERADIUS (1), martyr at Tuderum in the Becelian persecution, together with Cassian the bishop. (Baron. Annal. 363 B.) [T. S. B.]

ERADIUS (2), bishop of Orange, mentioned in the letter of the bishops of the province of Vienne, A.D. 355, as a supporter of Saturninus, the Arian bishop of Arles. (Gall. Christ. i. 785; Gams, Scr. Ep. 591.) [R. T. S.]

ERADIUS, deacon. [ERADIUS (1).]

ERAMBERTUS, bishop of Sensia. [ERAMBERTUS (2).]

ERAMBOLDUS (Gall. Christ. xi. 350), bishop of Bayeux. [FRAMBOLDUS.] [C. H.]

ERARD (Eberhard, Erhard), bishop at Ardeag and Ratisbon. Commemorated Jan. 8. The life and acts of this saint are involved in great obscurity which is much undoubted as to the time when he lived and the places where he exercised his ministry. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. tom. i. 533-546) give three Lives: two of these are also given by Colgan (Acta SS. 22-38), who says six lives of this saint have come into his hands, but the other four contain nothing which makes them worthy of publication; he adds extracts, however, from two Breviaries of Augsburg, the Breviary of Herbipolis (Würzburg), and the Breviary of Ratisbon, and gives an Appendix of four chapters upon the commemoration, see, time, and country of St. Erard. Yet even these form but a small portion of the accounts compiled of this very celebrated missionary preacher. St. Erard is generally allowed to have been a native of Ireland, and to have had companions, whom some call his brothers, Albert and Hildulphe. Before leaving Ireland, he was bishop at Ardeag, in the county of Longford. With nineteen companions he set out for Germany, and first, quitting Ireland, to St. Hildulphe in his place of retirement in the Vosges Mountains in the east of France; whether this was St. Hildulphe of Treves, or another of the same name and brother of St. Erard, is matter of dispute, and for decision will depend upon the time when it is supposed that St. Erard lived, as Hildulphe, bishop of Treves, is stated to have retired about A.D. 676 to the Vosges, and there founded a monastery. From the Vosges St. Erard went to Bavaria to proclaim the Gospel, and is said to have become a great favourite with Pepin, king of the Franks (A.D. 741-88). But here there is evidently, on the one side or the other, a mistake, for Erard has not begun attempts to extol by supposing that the Pepin now spoken of was not the father of Charlemagne, but the father of Charles Martel, Pepin d'Heristal, Mayor of the Palace.

While in Bavaria, he had his chief place of abode at Ratibon or Regensburg, where the Regen falls into the Danube, and it is almost certain as to what position he occupied there. Tradition asserts that he built a church, which he dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and seven different monasteries; but Mabillon (Ann. O. S. B. tom. i. lib. xvi. sec. xx. 507), while affirming this, does not believe that he was bishop of Ratibon, or acting otherwise than as a zealot missionary. There he spent the remainder of his life, and we hear of only one journey which he undertook beyond the Bavarian frontier, namely, to baptize the infant daughter of Etto or Ethicus, duke of the Alemani, who was living in Alsace, near the Rhine. This infant was afterwards known as the famous St. Odilia, of whom Mabillon (Ann. O. S. B. tom. i. lib. xvi. sec. xxx. 489-90) gives an account. From the Rhine St. Erard returned to the banks of the Danube, built in Ratisbon the Lower Monastery, which he dedicated also to the Blessed Virgin, and, after a lingering illness in the scene of his labours, died there on Jan. 8. The year is unknown. Colgan thinks he flourished A.D. 750, and in this Waræ agrees; so also does Baronius, whom Colgan follows. But Mabillon and Lanigan, with more probability, maintain that he lived before Charles Martel (A.D. 714-41) and belongs at latest to the end of the seventh century. The Bollandists also seem to prefer an early date, but do not fix a year. (Tanner (1749) gives mention of A.D. 675, and his ascription of the work Ad Bavaros fidei rubricantos, lib. i. St. Erard's tomb was, as usual, surrounded with miracles, and multitudes of pilgrims attended to partake in the gifts of healing. And such was the celebrity it had attained, that about A.D. 1055, when Pope Nicholas II. visited Germany, in his stay at Ratibon, the saint received formal canonisation, and his relics were removed to a more spacious shrine. (Colgan and Bollandists, ut supra; Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 18, §§ 7, 8; Ware, Bishops, by Harris, vol. i. "Bishops
ERERIC, one of the tribe of the Rugii who had accompanied Theodoric into Italy, and always kept themselves distinct from the Ostrogoths. He was elected king by his own people after the murder of Ildibald, whom the Ostrogoths had chosen as king when Vitigis was carried prisoner to Constantinople. The Ostrogoths, however, were thoroughly discontented with the inefficiency of Ereric, and called Totila, nephew of Ildibald, to be their head, a.m. 541. But Ereric entered into secret negotiations with the emperor Justinian to betray Italy to him, and receive the title of Patrician. During the absence of his messengers Ereric was murdered by the Goths after a few months' reign, and Totila became sole king. His life illustrates one of those phases of disunion which existed among the followers of Theodoric after his death. (Procopius, de Bell. Goth. iii. 2, ed. Bonn. ii. pp. 287-290; Dahn, Die Könige der Germanen, ii. 237.)

[ERASISTRATUS, bishop of Corinth, present at the robber-synod of Ephesus, a.d. 449, where he spoke in favour of Éutyches (Mansi, vi. 837). Le Quien (Or. Chr. ii. 151) puts him thirteenth bishop of Corinth, between Perigenes and Peter. Pope Leo I., addressing certain bishops in Illyricum (ep. 13, cap. 3, in Patr. Lat. liv. 695), mentions a certain metropolitan of Achaia (unnamed) who was slitting the papal authority. In 462, an inquest into the murder of Anastasius bishop of Thessalonica, the papal vicarius, who had, moreover, offended the Theophans by consecrating for their bishop a stranger whom they had never seen. This metropolitan is identified with Erasistratus bishop of Corinth by Migne's editor, and Ceillier (x. 206) takes the same view. Jaffé (Reg. Pont. 35) dates Leo's letter a.d. 444.

[ERASMAS, a noble Roman virgin, said to have suffered martyrdom at Aquileia with Euphemia, Dorothea, and Thecla, under Nero; commemorated Sept. 3. (Rom. Martyrolo. Boll. Acta SS. Sept. i. 606.)

[ERASMUS (1), sent, together with Onesimus and fourteen others, to Rome to Licinius: by him they were delivered to Diomedes the prefect, who had them conducted to Puteoli, where they were beheaded. They are commemorated May 10. (Men. Bas.)

[ERASMUS (2) (HERASMUS, Us.), bishop and martyr in Campania, during the Diocletian persecution. Commemorated June 3. (Marti. Ad., Us., Notker, Flor.)

[ERASMUS (3), bishop of Cibyra, on the borders of Caria and Phrygia, present at the fifth general council, a.d. 553. (Le Quien, Oriens Christian. i. 904; Mansi, ix. 393.)

[ERASMUS (4), a martyr at Antioch; commemorated Nov. 25. (Mart. Us.)

[ERASTUS, the econtouos of the city of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23), reputed bishop of Philippi. The pseudo-Dorothean, confusing his title and his locality, says he was first coconsacrist of the church of Jerusalem an i afterwards bishop of Panæa, or Caesarea Philippi, in North Palestine (Clement, Dial. ii. 62. Yu. 465. xi. 10683). Other traditions place Erastus at Philippi in Macedonia (Rom. Mart. July 28; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 67, 833; Boll. Acta SS. 26 Jul. vi. 298 e.)

[ERATOAITH, the name of a dogma two de in the diagram of the Ophites (Origen, adv. Cels. vi. 30). [HEEODOMAD.]]

[ERBIN, brother of St. Digine, and son of Cystennin Garanu, a prince of Devon, was himself included among the Welsh saints, and was the ancestor of many holy persons; he flourished in the 5th century, but is remembered in a dedication. (Myn. Arch. ii. 42; Resc. Welsh Saints, 113, 134.)

[ERO (1) (EARG, ERCUS, HERCUS), bishop of Slane. Commemorated Nov. 2. He was son of Deg or Dece, of the race of Corb O Emer, descended from Budrhuige, king of Ireland (A.D. 491-4) by the Irish calculation; he himself died immediately to the royal house of Ulster, but his progenitors came from the province of Munster, and he is always spoken of as belonging to Munster (Colgan, Tr. Thurn. 544 n. 4, for his kindred; Mart. Donny. by Todd and Reeves, 253). As the Four Masters (by O'Donovan i. 197) say his age was fourscore and ten years when he died in A.D. 515, he must have been born in A.D. 622, or, as Usher prefers, A.D. 624, which is the date assigned for his birth by the Annals of Tigernach. When St. Patrick landed at Colpa Isibeal Colptha or Colbdi (now Colp in the barony of Lower Duleek, at the mouth of the Boyne), and had travelled with his companions to the great plain of Brega, he arrived at nightfall on Later Eve, A.D. 433, at Pertuis-de-Feix (the "graves of the men of Fice"), now Slane, on the north bank of the Boyne, in Meath (Four. Mast. by O'Donovan, i. p. 167 n. 11). He set up his tent and kindled his Paschal fire; but this was the time when, according to the Pagan custom, every fire had to be extinguished in Ireland, and kindled again from the sacred fire on Temora or Tara Hill at the idolatrous feast. Whether knowingly or ignorance, St. Patrick began his Paschal fire at usual by lighting a fire, and his fire on the hill of Slane was seen in amazement by King Laeghaire on the hill of Tara. The king at once took counsel with his people, and set out to see the reason, but as his Druids would not permit the king to enter the Christian enclosure for fear of magic, St. Patrick was required to come before the king and give an account of his doings. St. Patrick entered the royal assembly, intoning the verse of the Psalm (xx. 7): "Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses; but we will remember the name of the Lord our God." But while the king had commanded that none should rise to shew the Christian bishop
REVANCE, there was one of the king's pages, "Venus ex juvenibus regis, nomine Ercus," &c., who rose up, is said by some even to have offered St. Patrick his seat, received, at any rate, his blessing, and became the famous bishop of Naen, the place where the assembly was then held. (This story of the first meeting between St. Patrick and Naen, then a church, and of the first appearance of Erc, is told in the Lives of St. Patrick, as given by Colgan, and also by Trench in his Annotations in the Book of Armagh: see also upon it Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. c. 5, § 5; Todd, St. Patrick, 414 sq., and the account of St. Erc's coming from Trench, in ib. 442–5; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. i. 17, wks. vi. 409 sq.; Petrie, Tara Hill, 84 sq.) By the four Masters (by O'Donovan, i. 136 n. 137) he is included among the family of St. Patrick as "Bishop Erc, his sweet-spoken Judge," and Erninus (Vit. Tripl. S. Ftr.) calls him "Sanctus Ercus Episcopos, Cancellarius, et Supremus Judex in spiritualibus." He is spoken of as a speaker and the orator of St. Brendan (May 16) of Clonfert, who also received the monastic garb from him: this may have been the case, as both belonged to Munster, and may have been related by kindred. He was also a friend of St. Brigid (Feb. 1), and accompanied her into Munster, where they attended a large synod for some days. His obit is given by the Four Masters at A.D. 512. "St. Erc, bishop of Liscalp and of Parata-feur-féig, by the side of Sléithe-Truin, to the west, died on 2 Nov. His age was fourscore and ten years, when he departed," and the Mart. Doneg. gives the same entry, adding his genealogy, and the testimony of the "very ancient old vellum book" that in his last and life he was as great as St. Martin; but Ussher places his death in A.D. 514, and this Lanigan accepts as the true date. His relics appear to have been enshrined with those of St. Finnan of Clonard in 770 (Ann. Ulter.). In the Annalisa of Trenchan (preserved in the Book of Armagh, fol. 10, a.) St. Patrick would appear to be the head of the Havil cathedral, in which St. Ia and the other Irish devotees landed. His feast was on the vigil of All Saints, i.e. Oct. 31, and the parish feast at St. Ethel is still on the Sunday nearest to the festival of All Saints (Whitaker, Cathedral of Cornwall, i. p. 291, ii. p. 4 and 210; see, too, Lealand, Hist. iii. p. 20). Some identify him with St. Patrick, and eight churches in the plain of Leigh (in Meath), in which he first preached the gospel and built churches; of these in order is, "i. sickelis Cerne, in qua sepultus est Hercus qui portavit mortaliitatem magnam," but the reference in the closing words is unknown, though pointing apparently to his dying of the plague. (Colgan, Tr. Tanaum, 167, c. 98, 535, c. 71, 536, c. 72; Ussher, Eccl. Antiqu. vi. Ind. Chron. A.D. 514; O'Connor, Rev. Hibern. Scrip. ii. 88, 128; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. c. 8, § 4, c. 16, § 7; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 80 sq.; O'Connor, Ep. Nasc. 106; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 64, 75 n., 263.)

[ J. G. ]

EBC (3), bishop of Domnach-mór-Maigh-Leodhath in the north of Ul-Faolain. Commemorated Oct. 27. O'Clery says this may be Erc, bishop, son of Fergna, son of Folacha, of the race of Bresal Brec, from whom the Osraigh are descended. Erc, son of Fergna, is included by Colgan among the saints belonging to the house of St. Íker (Mar. 5) of Clogher. If so, he belongs to Leinster, about Kilkeney or Waterford, but O'Donovan (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, ii. 1138 n. 1) is of opinion that Magh Luadhath or Magh Luaghath, though the name is now obsolete, is probably the ancient name of the plain now called Maghera-Cregan, situated near Newtown-

Stewart, in the barony of Omagh, and county of Tyrone. Colgan thinks he may be the Erc who was a disciple of Senann, but the identification of this Erc is very uncertain (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 31, 91, 95). Colgan calls him "Martyr," and the Drummond Calendrical "confessor." (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 297; Colgan, Acta SS. 472, c. 3, 540; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 10, § 7, c. 11, § 4; bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 28.)

[ J. G. ]

EBC (3) Nasce, of Tulach-ulis, now Tullisky, in the barony of Lower Iveragh and county of Down, commemorated May 12. O'Clery's full entry on this day (Mart. Doneg. 125) is: "Hero Nasce, of Tulach-ulis, in Ui-Eachach Uladh. And Eare is of the race of Art Corb, son of Fioncha Suigheirdhe," but Dr. Reeves' version (Eccl. Antiq. 316 n. *) is: "Beanogsua of Tulach-ulis ('hill of the fort') in Ireach of Ultiaca, while Mart. Tidignt (Keller, Col. Ir. SS. p. xxvii) gives "Nasci" as a different individual, and the Drummond Kalendrical (Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 13) has "apud Hibernian sancto confessoris Erci utale celeberrum." Among the saints who are descended from the family of St. Mida or Itsa (Jan. 16) Colgan (Acta SS. 73, c. 2) includes an Erc, virgin daughter of Magh Luadhath. His feast is May 12, but Erc of Tullyish is the only person of the name who stands in the calendars on that day.

[ J. G. ]

EBC (4), ST., or Herghy, brother of St. Ia gives name to the Cornish parish of St. Eth or "ecclesia St. Eth," in early documents known as the head of the Hayle estuary, on which St. Ia and the other Irish devotees landed. His feast was on the vigil of all Saints, i.e. Oct. 31, and the parish feast at St. Ethel is still on the Sunday nearest to the festival of All Saints (Whitaker, Cathedral of Cornwall, i. p. 291, ii. p. 4 and 210; see, too, Lealand, Hist. iii. p. 20). Some identify him with St. Ia or with the fourth bishop of Cornwall (Iselin 11), in Ireland, who died A.D. 514, and whose day is also at the beginning of November. William of Worcester makes St. Ercy the patron saint of Chitlehampton, in Devonshire, as well, and calls him a bishop, and adds, "jacet in quadrum ecclesias sita sub cruco ecclesiae Sancti Pauli Loundiarum." [C. W. B.]

ERC A (1), virgin, daughter of Eruin, of the family of St. Ia, is confirmed by Colgan with Erc of Tullisky. [EBC (3)].

ERC A (3) (Erbha), mother of St. Blane. [BLANE.]

ERCAMBERT is given in the list of the bishops of Beauvais as twentieth, succeeding the Ragingus and followed by Rocoaldus. (Gall. Christ. ii. 696.)

[ S. A. B. ]

ERCANBALD (Ercubald, Baron. Annal. ann. 801, xx. ed. Theiner), an officer (notarius) of Charlemagne, sent by him to Liguria in 801 to bring home the presents of the king of Persia. (Einhard Ann. s. a.) An Erkanbaldus 'cancellarius' (possibly identical with the above), is mentioned by Leo III. in a letter to Charles,

[ERCANRAD, bishop of Paris. [ERCHENRAD]]


[ERCENUALD (Kennel, C. D. 35, 38, 40), ERCEWALD (v. 18), bishop of London. [ERKENWALD]. [C. H.]

[ERCHAD, ERCHAN, ERCHARD. [IRCHARD]. [J. G.]

ERCHAN, clerical witness to the liberation from laical possession of the church of Tryleic Lann Mainiouc (Trelech, Monmouthshire) by Meurig, son of Arthfael, in the time of Cenethir, bishop of Llandaff (Lév. Land. by Rees, 453). [J. G.]

[ERCHANFRIDUS, named as bishop of Lau- rarecum, and likewise of Juvaviam (Salzburg), in the 6th century (Gama, Ser. Ep. 307, 327), the former town having been the primitive, and Juvaviam the later, seat of the Noricum bishopric. The transfer of the see is discussed by Friedrich, Das wahre Zeitalter des heil. Rupert. 1866, pp. 13-44). Laurarecum, on the right bank of the Danube, near the junction of the Leina opposite Mauthausen and below Linz, is the modern Lorch (Ferrarius, Lex. Geog. ; Witsch, Handb., i. 120). Neither in Friedrich nor in Hund (Metrop. Salisburgiens. 1582) does the name of Erchanfridus occur. Hainz (Germ. Sterc. i. 100) makes him bishop of Passavia (Passau) from 598 to 623. [T. W. D.]

[ERCHANWALDUS (Fredugar, Chron. continuit. i. 91, in Patr. Lat. ixxi. 665), mayor. [ERCHINOALDUS]. [C. H.]


[ERCHENEGODE (Gaimar, Estoric, v. 1285, in M. H. B. 780), daughter of Ercombert, king of Kent. [ERCOGONOTA]. [C. H.]

[ERCHENRADUS I. (HERCHENRADUS) was the forty-third bishop of Paris, following Deo.sfridus, and succeeded by Ermenfredus. The 1st extant a placitum dated in the seventh year of king Charles the Great (A.D. 775), in which judgment is given against Herchenradus in a dispute between him and Folraudus, abbot of St. Divodurum concerning the monastery of St. Mary and St. Peter, at Plaisir (Placium), near St. Germaines (Cod. Dipl. xxv. in Migne, Patr. Lat. xvii. 945, reprinted from Mabillon, de Re Diplom. lib. vii. num. 50, p. 518. The document does not occur in the collections of either Baluze or Pertz). In a diploma or charter of Louis the Pious given in the seventh year of his reign (A.D. 820) to the church of Paris, it is recited that Charles the Great had, upon the petition of Erchenradus, given a charter to the same church confirming it in the possession of property which the title-deeds had been burnt or lost. (Migno, Patr. Lat. civ. 1102.) He is said to have been present at the council of Frankfurt in A.D. 794 (Gall. Christ. vii. 29). [S. A. E.]

[ERCHERBRICHT (Gaimar, Estoric, 1275; M. H. B. 780), king of Kent. [ERCOMBERT]. [C. H.]

[ERCHINOALD succeeded Aega as mayor of the palace in Neustria to Clovis II. in 610. Erchinoald was of the Merovingian royal race, and is described by the chronicler (Fredugar, 84) as a man full of long-suffering and kindness, gentle and respectful towards the clergy, and without pride or rapacity. On the death of Fiochat in 642, Erchinoald became the ruler of Burgundy, if not titular mayor of the palace. (Pertz, Geschichte d. Merovingischen Hausern, p. 46.) On the death of Sigebert III. of Austrasia in 656, when Clovis became king of the united Frankish realm, Erchinoald became mayor of the palace in all three kingdoms (Pertz, 83; Bonnell, Anfänge d. Karolingischen Hause, p. 113), being the first to unite in his own person these three dignities. Shortly afterwards (c. 658) he died (Gesta Reg. Fr. 45), and Ethelwulf was appointed in his place in Neustria and Burgundy, Wulflof in Austrasia. [T. R. E.]

[ERCONAT (ERONAT, ERCA HERENAT), virgin, of Dun-la-er, now Dunów, in the barony of Upper Toome and county of Antrim. Commemo- rated Jan. 8, Oct. 30. Colgan (Acta SS. 41-2, Jan. 8) gives an account of this virgin from the references made to her in the Lites of St. Patrick. Her father was Daire, Dergs, or Dair, son of Finacht, son of Eugenius, son of Niall, of the race of Colluchachrioch, a tribal chief of the Hy-Néill, in that part where Armagh now stands; he gave Drummisleighe, now Armagh, to St. Patrick. So worthy in grace and virtue did St. Ercnat appear that St. Patrick gave her the charge of the sacred vest- ments, to make, cleanse, and repair them. This charge she received along with St. Luqita St. Patrick's own sister, and St. Cruibhresia, daughter of Britagh; but failing in her work with St. Benignus (Nov. 9) through her foolishness for that art in which the psalmist of St. Patrick excelled, she is said to have actually died of love and been brought to life again, thenceforward to love the saint only spiritually. She rests in Tamlacht-bo, a church in the prov- ince of Ulster, supposed by Dr. Reeves (Ecol. Antiq. 300 n. 2) to be Tamliaght, an- ciently called Tawlagahts-bo, a towanland in Eglash, near Armagh, and her feast is observed there and at Dunasane. According to Colgan she flourished A.D. 460, and had a double commemoration, Jan. 8 and Oct. 30; on the former the Mart. Doneg. commemorates "Ercnat, virgin, of Dún-da-éen, in Dal Araidhe," and on the latter "Herencat, virgin, of Dún-da-éen, in the Field- bhand, in 8 Dal Araidhe." The Four Masters calls her Erca, and count her one of the three embroderers of St. Patrick. But in the Réit of Aemnys the Culdees, there is a curious note on "Cuch, virgin, of Cill-Cuache in Caibre-Ua- Cardhha, she is called by the yellow bird (A.D. 789) at Jan. 8): "Ercnat, the virgyn nun, was cook and rooke-master to St. Columb Cillé, and her church Cille Ciocca, in Caibre-Ua-Cardhha.
ERECBERT

Erect was her true name, which means an embroidery, because Erwood, in the ancient Gædicæ, was the same as drawing and embroidering for: it was for that virgin who was the embroideryer, cutter, and sewer of clothes to St. Columba Gillæ and his disciples. ” [COCOA.]

(O'Curry, Lect. Anc. Ir. iii. 122; Mart. Doney, by Tedd and Reeves, ii. 599; Reeves, Ecl. Ant. 300 sq, and Anc. Ch. Aranagh, i–2; Four Mast. by O'Neavon, l. 138 n. 8, 139; Bp. Forbes, Ed. Scotti. Saini, p. 27; O'Hallan, Irish Saints, i. 124–6.)

[3. G.]


[3. H.]

EREBERT, king of Kent. [EREBERT.]


[3. H.]

ERCONVALD (Bed. H. E. iv. 11, in M. H. B. 221 a), ERECONVALD (Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 664, 675; in M. H. B. 529 c, 535 a, b; id. Rom. Episc. Land. ib. 617 b; Boll. Acta SS. Ap. iii. 781), bishop of London. [ERKONVALD.]

[3. H.]

ERCONBERHT (Nennius, Hist. in M. H. H. 74 c), king of Kent. [EREBERT.]

[3. H.]

ERCUBALDUS (Bed. H. E. iii. 19, in M. H. B. 193 a), patrician in Gaul. [ERECHAR.-D.]

[3. H.]

ERCUIS, Cornish saint. [ERcu.]

ERECHOREUS (ERECHTIUS, ERETIUS, ERREDHORUS, ERYTHERUS), bishop of Lagnaria, in the province of Galatia Prima. (Wiltch. Handbood, i. § 104.) He was present at the Council of Nicaea, a.d. 314, and also at that of Nicaea, a.d. 325. The MSS. only give the name differently, but also the designations of thesee, some having Damasianus, others Gadatianus, Galatianus, Laganensis, Platonensis, Phoceanus, and Platanensis. Le Quen supposes all these variations to have arisen with Latin transcribers, who mistook the Greek letters of their originals. (Orosius Christ. i. 488; Gams. Sr. Episc. 441.) Lagnaria is the only known Galatian see to which the designations can apply. [T. W. D.]

ERECHTHIUS, bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, c. 440. A fragment of a sermon delivered by him in the great church at Constantinople before Proclus, at the Theophania, is given by Mai (Script. Vet. v. 165; and Migne, Patrolog. ix. 2, p. 3321).

[3. H.]

ERECHTHIUS, bishop of Lagnaria. [ERECHOREUS.]

ERECHTHEUS (ERECHTHEUS), commemorated March 3. Colgan gives a short memoir of St. Erecleth, presbyter and confessor, from the Triparty Life of St. Patrick. He was the friend and fellow-traveller of St. Patrick; when St. Patrick was in the region of the desertus, he was probably the father of Eochaidh Mainreamhar, and had built the church of Fothłam, in the same region built the church of Rathmadian which was so called from Muadan, father of Enan [ENAN (2)], and gave it to Erecleth. Colgan thinks this must have been about a.d. 450. (Colgan, Acta SS. 653–6, and Tr. Acta SS. 146, c. 130, 180 n. 147; Reeves, Ecl. Ant. 79, 284, 392; Lanigan, Ecl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 14 n. 8; Kelly, Cat. Ir. SS. p. 82.)

[3. G.]

EREDNAT (EREDNAN, HEREDNAT), commemorated Apr. 10. Known under these names in the Irish Martyrologies, she is identified with the Erniat, virgin daughter of a king of Cillauchan, in Ulster, who went south and took up her abode at Tulach Bennain, which is unidentified but appears to have been in Munster, and was a cell of St. Fintan (Jan. 3), abbati of Dunblaimise. (Colgan, Acta SS. 11 c. 7, 13 n. 14, 14, O'Hallan, Irish Saints, i. 46.)

[3. G.]

ERELEVA, a concubine of Theodemir, by whom she was the mother of Theodoric the Great, c. 454. She became a Catholic, and was known by the name Eusebia. (Excerpta Valesiana, i. e. the Chronicle of Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna; so Waits and Holder, Egger's, Montanis Recurum Ital. et Langob. 1878, p. 273; ed. Gardthausen, 1875, 58, p. 295.) She was living in 490, and probably later. (Jordan. ed. Closs, 180; Dahm, Die Kunst der Germanen, ii. 63.)

[3. A. H. D. A.]

EREDERRICH (Willehalm, Vit. Bonif. ii. 22, in Patr. Lat. lxixiiii. 605 n.; Baron. Ann. i. 739, 1), bishop of Freising. [ERLEMIRK]

[3. H.]

EREBERTUS (1), St., eleventh bishop of Toulouse, succeeding Willegisius. He was born at a place called Villollocorte, on the Seine, about five leagues above Paris, in the time of Dagobert I. or his son Clovis II. He joined the monastery of Fontanelle, where Wandregisius, or, according to another account, Lantbertus was abbot. At this time he must have been no longer young, as from the Life of St. Wandregisius it appears that he already had a son, Harthamius, who is spoken of as vir illustris and a benefactor of the monastery. In the time of Clotaire III. he was elected to the bishopric of Toulouse (c. 650). Nothing definite is related of his acts while bishop, except that he miraculously quenched a fire which broke out during a visit to his native place. After twelve years' labour in his see, he retired to his former monastery of Fontanelle, now ruled by Lantbert, afterwards archbishop of Lyons. His successor in the bishopric was Arduin. He is said to have died in a.d. 671 or 676, and was buried in the church of St. Paul, though his remains were more than once translated. He is commemorated on the 14th day of May. (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. iii. 389; Gall. Christ. xiii. 8; Vita S. Wandregisii et Vita S. Anserii in Bouquet, tom. iii. pp. 593, 617.)

[3. A. B.]
EREMBERTUS, bishop of Thessalonica. [HEREMIUS.]


EREFA, sister of pope Damasus (Boll. Acta SS. 21 Feb. iii. 244.) [IRENE.] [J. G.]

ERENAUUS (ERENNEUS), confessor and Eremite, is a saint in Mra, Aberdeen-shire, mentioned by Dempster and Camerarius, but he is probably a Scotch reflection of the Irish Ermian (Aug. 18), son of Crecan, of Rathno. Dempster calls him the friend of St. Columba and author of Acta St. Columbae, lib. i. He says he flourished A.D. 587, and had his feast on Feb. 15, but Camerarius says Apr. 26. [ERINNUS (3.)] (Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 192, 237; Tanner, Bd. 263; Camerarius, de Sot. Fort. 135; Dempster, Hist. Ecc. Gent. Scot. i. 265.) "Reliques celebantur in Sutherlandia" (Ferdun, Scotiah. iii. c. 14.) [J. G.]

ERENBREHTUS (ERENBREHTUS), tenth bishop of Worms, succeeding Folcwinus, and followed by Bernhardus. From a distinguished abbait at Weissenburg, he became bishop. He is said to be mentioned as bishop in a diploma of Charles the Great, dated in A.D. 798, confirming a gift made by king Dagsbert I. to St. Amandus, fifth bishop of the see, and to have died in the same year. The document attesting the original gift of Dagsbert is in Limog, Patr. Lat. ix. 505. (Gall. Christ. v. 663.) [S. A. B.]

ERENDRUDA (ERENDRUDA, ERENTROD, EREDRODA, AERODRUDA), abbess at Salzburg cir. 585 or later. She was niece of Rudbert or Rupert bishop of Worms, afterwards of Salzburg, and the apostle of Bavaria (first Vita S. Rudol. cap. 2, § 9, Boll. Acta SS. 27 Mart. iii. 704 a; second Vita, cap. 2, § 5, ibid. 705 e). Owing to the title "seror" by which Rudbert addressed the abbess in her spiritual capacity, they have been, as observed by Pagi (vii. ad Baron. 719), erroneously considered brother and sister (vid. Boll. Acta SS. 30 Juni. v. 580 c, marg.: Hund, Metrop. Salisb. i. 2, ii. 409, ed. Ratisb. 1719), while some have increased the confusion by making the Irish St. Trudpert their brother (Boll. 26 Apr. iii. 425 b; ibid. 427, Sylabyrinth. 3, 7, note). As Rudbert belonged to the royal stock of the Franks (Boll. 27 Maii. M. Rudol. ii. 2, 3, note), his niece was a lady of rank, "nobilitis virgo," and she was residing at Worms when invited by her uncle to preside over the female monastery he was founding at Salzburg. Thither she proceeded, accompanied by a body of matrons and virgins, one date of the event being A.D. 585; but much uncertainty attaches to the precise chronology of this abbess (second Fas. cap. 2, ut sup.). The monastery was seated high up the hill beyond the city walls, and was originally named Cella, but it subsequently became known as Nonnenberg, "Nunnarum mons" (Hund, ii. 409). The Bollandists, who reckon Erendruda's period cir. A.D. 630, commemorate her death on June 30 (ut sup.), but the feast of her translation was observed at Salzburg on Sept. 3 (ibid. 582 e). An account of this abbess will be found also in Hainaut, Germ. Sac. ii. 46. [C. B.]

ERENFRIDUS, bishop of Constance. [ERENFRIDUS.]

ERENIUS (HERENIUS; IRENUS, Jerome; *Aphthonos, Soc.; *Epiphanius, Soc.; Epiphanius, Epiphanius), one of the bishops invited to the see of Jerusalem by the Arians after the deposition of Cyril in A.D. 348. Jerome places him second, as successor to Eutyches. Eutyches is ignored by Socrates (H. E. ii. 45), Sozomen (H. E. iv. 30), and Epiphanius (H. E. iv. 30), who all place Erenius immediately after Cyril's deposition. See on this perplexed and intricate subject, Tillemont's note, Mem. Eccl. viii. 782. [E. V.]

ERENWALDUS (Baron. Annales Ecle. A.D. 724, 13), bishop. [ERENWALDUS.] [L. O. S.]

EREPTOLUS, bishop of Coutances, died about A.D. 475. He was, according to some accounts, a native of Coutances, sent from Rome as a missionary to his countrymen; according to others he was sent thither by St. Germanus while in Britain. (Gall. Christ. xi. 864; Gens. Eccl. Ep. 542.) [R. T. S.]

ERETIUS (Labbe, Conc. i. 1488 n, ed. 1671), bishop. "Eretius Placentensis Galliae Primus." [ERECHERUS.] [T. W. B.]

ERFO, A.D. 762. His name occurs in an ancient charter of a monastery of Friuli, found in the monastery of S. Mary, Val d'Aoste. In a corresponding copy found elsewhere the name is printed Herto. Whatever his name was, he states that he and his two brothers have founded certain monasteries at Friuli. In one of the copies he signs as abbot (Patr. Lat. xcl. 627). [W. M. S.]

ERFOINUS, A.D. 720. In a charter dated at Annunziata, February, in the reig of Chilperic II., Erofinus and his sons Tautarius and Rotarius make a grant of lands and goods in favour of the monastery of St. Coll. The lands are Oppenwiller (probably Poppenwiller, near Pfaffenweiler, near Freiburg), and Efferingen (Ecclesiast. Monum. iv. 51. sac. cci. vii. et viii. Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 1268). [W. M. S.]

ERFURWIN (EVURWIN, EFORWIN), a benefactor, with his coheirs Hildirad and Immerin, to the monastery of St. Virginia, at Venterode, the Aller, founded by St. Ludger the apostle of Saxony. Erfurwin's deed, dated at Diessen, Sept. 17, in the thirty-second year of Charlemagne, grants land in the wood of Hoist to the presbyter Ludger "and the relics of the Holy
ERGNAT, Irish saint. [ERGNAT.]

ERHARDUS (Gama, Gr. Ep. 304), bishop of Katisbon. [ERARD.]

ERHART, a Northumbrian abbot who attended the synod in which the legates canons of 787 were accepted. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 460.)

ERIBALDUS, eighteenth in the list of the bishops of Vivilres, succeeding Arcandius, and followed by Thomas I. at the beginning of the 9th century. There is an instrument of gift in favour of the church of Vivilres bearing his name, but without date. (Roucher, Hist. religieuse etc. du Vincais, tom. i. p. 556; Gall. Christ. xvi. 547.)

ERIBALDUS CERNUUS, praepositus or provost of the cathedral of Arles, mentioned in the years 796, 799, during the pontificate of bishop Elixandus. From an early period it progressed to modern times the head of the chapter of Arles has borne the title of provost; though that of dean, which was a distinct office, occasionally occurs. Eribaldus Cernnus commences the extant series of provosts; but no successor occurs until A.D. 809. (Gall. Christ. i. 595 c.)

ERICIUS (ABRICO), bishop of Lausanne, present at the council of Chalon-sur-Saône, A.D. 650, (Gall. Christ. xv. 329; Manas, x. 1194.)

ERIMBERT (EREMBERT, ERMBERT), second bishop of Freising, brother (apparently the elder brother) of Corbinian, his predecessor, and the son of Waldekis, a Frankish noble (vil. Corbinian. by Aribus, cap. 1, § 1, in Bull. Acta SS. 8 Sept. iii. 281, and cap. 5, § 43, vid. p. 291 a, note ce; Swyss's Comment. cap. 7, § 84, vid. 276). He was consecrated to the see by Boniface, the apostle of Germany, according to the biographers of that saint (Otholin. cap. 31, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxiv. 645; Willibald, cap. 23, 623), and the date of this event is computed by Barbinius (A. E. ann. 739, i.) to have been A.D. 739 (see also Witsch, Handboek, i. 370). Not much reliance can be placed on this date. Hund (Metrop. Salisbury, i. 70, Ratisp. 1719) quotes one ancient authority, making Erimbert to have sat twenty-eight years, and another, which he prefers, giving him only thirteen. His successor Joseph was (according to Hund) elected in 755. Hansia (Germ. Soc. ii. 73) believes he did not live later than 748. The Annales Alamanici Majores (Pertz, Monum. Germ. xxiii. Script. xx. p. 782) give 750 as the year of his consecration. Erimbert's episcopalsee appears to have comprised a territory with the reign of Ulfo duke of Bavaria, Freising (on the Isar, north of Munich) being then the capital of Upper Bavaria and the ducal residence. In Erimbert's time the dioceses of Bavaria are said to have been definitely marked out. During his rule also many benefactors of the church of Freising appeared, a certain Mandebert with his wife Gisabur being especially named. Erimbert condu-
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ERKND, thirteenth-seventh bishop of Auch, succeeding Amerius and followed by Lupus and Anzor, about the middle of the 9th century. (Gall. Christ. i. 976; Gams, Series Episc. 497.)

ERINYS, in a Gnostic system described by Irenaeus (v. 19), who describes it as the solemnities of the feast of St. Justus at Lyon. (Cell. x. 389.)

ERKEMBODUS, or ERKEMBOD, ST., fifth abbey of the monastery of St. Bertin (also called the monastery of Sithiu from its position) in the diocese of St. Omer. There are extant a charter of Chilpéric II., given in the third year of his reign (718), confirming to Erkemodus and the monastery gifts of his predecessors, and two of Theoderic IV. in A.D. 721, of similar import, all making mention of venerabilis vir Erkemodus (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 1120-1132). In 723, upon the death of Ravengerus, he was made bishop of Teroianne (ecclesia Morinensis), but retained the government of the monastery, and in the same year enriched it by the purchase of various lands, the deed conveying which may be seen in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 1279. He died April 12, on which day the ceremony was observed, about the year 737, and was succeeded in the bishopry by Adalgerus. He was buried in the church of St. Omer. (Boll. Acta SS. Ap. ii. 92; Gall. Christ. iii. 487, x. 1531; Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc. ann. 723, n. x㎡. tom. iv. p. 699.) [S. A. B.]

ERKENEBERT (1) (Gama, Gr. Episc. 294), bishop of Minden. [HERKEBERT.]

ERKENEBERT (2) (Wend. F. H. ann. 640), ERKENBRIGT (Gnaimar, Estoríc, v. 1263, in M. H. B. 789), king of Kent. [EARCOBERT.]

ERKENGOTA (Wend. F. H. ann. 640), daughter of Earconbert, king of Kent, abbess of Brie. [EARCONGOTA.]

ERKENWALD, the fourth bishop of the East Saxons, whose capital and episcopal see was London (M. H. B. 617); brother of St. Ethelberga, founder of the abbey of Bucking and Chertsey, and specially honoured at St. Paul's. On the early life of Erkenwald we have no historical light, but the legendary biographers assert that he was born at Stallington, in Lindsey, and was connected by birth with the family of Offa, king of the East Angles, by which statement probably the "Ulfings," the family denomination of the East Anglian kings, is to be understood. (Capgrave, f. 130.) According to the same authorities he was brought early under the influence of Mellitus, who was bishop of London from 604 to 619. From Bede we have more trustworthy information as to the next stage in his career. We learn that before he was raised to the episcopate he had gained a high reputation  

N
for sanctity, and become the founder of two monasteries: one at Chertsey in Surrey, in the kingdom of the West Saxons, the other at Barking in Essex. Chertsey he governed himself; Barking he committed to the care of his sister Ethelburga as a school for women. (Bede, *H. E. iv. 6*) In the foundation of Chertsey Erkenwald was assisted by Frithewald, who is called by William of Malmesbury (G. P. ed. Harland, p. 89) a regius canonicus, or canon regular, of Wulfhere, king of Mercia. This statement is to some extent supported by charters of Chertsey, in which Erkenwald and Frithewald are mentioned as joint founders, and which, though not beyond suspicion as charters, are good evidence of ancient tradition. In one of these (Kemble, *C. D. 35*) Frithewald bestows estates on the monastery which Erkenwald rules, and which had been founded in the days of Egbert, king of Kent; in a third (ib. 988) Erkenwald and Frithewald join in a full settlement of the monastery, whose offfice, a unit of 131* CNA, in 787, confirms the grants of the two founders settled a century before. If these documents are to be trusted Chertsey must have been founded whilst Surrey was in the hands of Egbert of Kent, who died in 673; it must later have come under the rule of Frithewald, the future saint, whose death is mentioned in 675, and who was Egbert's brother-in-law; the foundation could therefore have preceded Erkenwald's elevation to the episcopate by a very few years. The foundation at Barking probably kept pace with that of Chertsey. To instruct his sister in the monastic rule, Erkenwald, according to his late biographers, invited Hildebold, bishop from Chelles; the nun Eadgifu died of the plague in 684 (Bede, *H. E. iv. 8*), Barking must have been founded before that year; the Chertsey register, however (Mon. Angl. i. 436), gives 663 as the year of the foundation of Barking, and there is a charter of Erkenwald, no doubt spurious but ancient, in which the year 677 is given (ibid. p. 435).

[Erinthelwulf (3.)]

On the death of Wina, to whom Wulfhere had sold the see of London, and probably, after the death of Wulfhere, to whom the East Saxons kings Sebbi and Sighere were subject (Bede, *H. E. iii. 30*), Theodore consecrated Erkenwald as Wina's successor, or rather, as the legendary life puts it (Dugdale, *Hist. Poul. ed. 1658*, p. 182), as successor to St. Cedd, the apostle of the East Saxons. The exact date of his appointment is not given by Bede, but as it is placed directly after the deposition of Winfrith, bishop of Mercia, in 675, it was probably in that or the following year, and may denote the reconstruction of the church of Barking for the East Saxons after the death of Wulfhere. In 676 the name "Friuginaldus," which probably represents Erkenwaldus, is found attached to a copy of a charter of the Hwiccian prince Osric. (Kemble, *C. D. 12*). The other charters throw no light upon this point, unless we may trust the abstract quoted by the charter of 684, in which Erkenwald is made to say that he had visited Rome in the time of pope Agatho and in the year 677; even this he might have done as abbot.

The length of his episcopate is uncertain: eleven years are assigned to it in the notice of his life cited by Wharton (Episc. Lond. p. 17); if this be accepted, his death would fall in 687, but 685 is the year assigned by the same authority (Dugdale, *Hist. Poul. p. 113*); in the Barking charter he is represented as alive in 685, eighteen years after his visit to Rome. On this point we have two important evidences in the king of Wessex, who began to reign in 688, in the preface to his laws, issued in or about 690, describes himself as legislating with the counsel of Eorcenwald his bishop. (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, p. 45; Haddan and Stubbs, *cii. 214*). With this the evidence of charters agrees; there are two attested by him in his closing years, in one of which, undated, he witnesses a grant to Barking made by Hildilirid, a kinsman of King Sebbi, attested by bishops Wilfrid and Haedde, and therefore probably belonging to the period of Wilfrid's exile in Mercia after the year 692. (Kemble, *C. D. 35*). In another which is less trustworthy and dated 698 (ib. 594) he attests a charter of an archdeacon, and it appears probable, then, that Erkenwald survived Theodore, who died in 690, and did not live to see the consecration of Britwald in 693. When Sebbi king of Essex, shortly before his death in 695, went into a monastery, he received the monastic habit from Wulfhere, Erkenwald's successor. The year of Erkenwald's death is not fixed about 693; the day as observed among the festivals at St. Paul's was April 30.

Erkenwald is one of those early prelates whose posthumous fame, bearing no property to the known events of their history, shews that their whole life and character impressed their generation more than any single act or trait. He was in close relations with three if not four of the rival dynasties of southern England, Kent, Wessex, Essex, and Mercia. He was summoned by Theodore when on his deathbed to advise him as to the restoration of Wilfrid in 686. (Edw. *Y. Wilfr. c. 42*). He was the founder of two famous monasteries, and such a benefactor to his cathedral foundation that he was reputed to have founded its first at Erkenwald. His personal sanctity is spoken of by Bede in language which even his professed enemies in the biographies do not exceed; and the tradition that miracles of healing were ordinarily wrought by the horse-carcass which he had used in his illness is recorded with no expression of doubt by the venerable historian himself.

To the details of his life, as given by Bede, the biographers add little, except the story of a miracle in which his carriage is represented as running on one wheel when the other had parted from the axle, and some circumstances about his death and funeral. According to this story he was attacked by robbers at the Mannau, for at the East Saxons he called his friends and servants around him and blessed them before he breathed his last. Whilst he was dying the chamber was filled with a sweet odour. As soon as he was dead the monks of Chertsey and the nuns of Barking each claimed his body for burial in their own church. During the struggle the citizens of London broke in, and insisted that, as he had been ordained bishop in their city, he should be buried there. They then proceeded to carry off the body, followed by the monks and nuns. As soon
as they quitted the monastery the torches were put out by a storm of wind and rain. When they came to the river Lea, they found it swollen and impassable without boats, which were not at hand. The monks and nuns claimed this as a divine interposition on their behalf; the Londoners stoutly resisted, and declared that they would not yield. The quarrel was allayed by the mediation of one of Erkenwald's clergy, who advised both parties to pray for a sign from heaven that might determine the question; and the multitude immediately betook themselves to prayers and hymns. Thereupon the water divided and allowed the procession to advance to Stratford, where the torches were miraculously relighted and the storm ceased. The remains of the bishop were carried into London, being met by a crowd of rejoicing citizens, and placed in a shrine in the body of the church of St. Paul. On Feb. 16, 1140, the body was placed in a new shrine in the same place. From that place the relics were removed in 1143, and on Nov. 11, 1148, and placed in a new shrine on the east side of the wall above the high altar. (M. Westm. p. 245.) In 1386 bishop Braybrooke decreed that the feasts of the deposition and translation of St. Erkenwald should be kept on equal terms with the highest festivals; offerings were made and masses were said at the shrine till the Reformation; it had considerable endowments, and was the centre of a religious gild. (Dugdale, pp. 20–22.) An engraving of the shrine is given by Dugdale, who has likewise preserved the short biography of the saint which was hung by the side of it, and which gives 675 as the date of his consecration, 625 as that of his death. (Ch. 113.) The tablet containing this was erected apparently in 1632.

At St. Paul's Erkenwald received all the honours due to a founder. His festivals were kept as first-class feasts, "sicut sanctum diem Dominicam," by bishop Braybrooke's ordinance (statute of St. Paul's, ed. Simpson, p. 393); on them bishops and priests officiated, and the personal attendance on the service (so p. 11); there were special forms of S. Acta and Post-communion. (So p. 394.) Among the muniments was preserved a privilege brought by the saint himself from Rome (So. p. 379; Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i. 161), by which pope Agatho (A.D. 678–681) among other benefices secured to the clergy (congregatio) of the monastery the right of electing their bishops, who were to be confirmed at Rome. The continuity of the miracle-working at the shrine is remarkable even in an age of such wonders; and the indulgences granted were in proportion to the reputation of the sanctuary.

The memory of Erkenwald was cherished as long and as continuously. Besides the charters already noticed, the cartulary contained a privilege of exemption granted by pope Agatho to Chertsey, probably forged in the time of Edgar, but seemingly the model on which the privilege of St. Paul's was framed; by which the monastery was exempted from all interference from without, and the election and confirmation of the abbot were provided for. (Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i. 161-163.) A more genuine as well as more ancient evidence is found in a letter addressed by Sigebald, abbot apparently of Chertsey, to St. Boniface, in which he entreats him to allow himself to be recorded as a patron of the writer, together with bishop Daniel of Winchester, his diocesan; and, should Sigebald survive, the saint's name is to be inserted with that of St. Erkenwald in his prayers. (Mon. Mogetini, pp. 166, 167.) The Cartulary (MS. Vitellius A. 13) also contains a history of the foundation of the abbey, which is placed in 665. (Mon. Angl. i. 426.) At Barking also the memory of Erkenwald was had in honour. The charter granted by Erkenwald himself secured to the monastery privileges analogous to those contained in the papal grants to St. Paul's and Chertsey (Mon. Angl. i. 453, 499), which privileges the grantor had been empowered by pope Agatho to bestow when eighteen years before the granting of the charter, in 677, he had visited Rome. If this charter was genuine, which it is not, it would prove that Erkenwald lived until 695; it is attested by the same witnesses as those who attest the charter of Hildirex above mentioned. The fact that Erkenwald's name rests on the evidence of these charters and on the words of the biographer, that he was "de urbe Romulea destinatus." (Dugdale, p. 183.) It is not in itself improbable, but cannot be accepted as true without better evidence.

The historical materials for St. Erkenwald's life and miracles are less rich than those concerning Cedd, quoted, a Vita S. Erkenwaldi, preserved in two 12th century MSS., Cotton, Claud. A. 5, and C.C.C.C. 161, is printed by Dugdale (ed. 1658, p. 181; ed. 1818, p. 289). This life is supposed by Sir T. D. Hardy to be the work of a canon of St. Paul's, nephew of bishop Gilbert of Universalis (1128–1134), who also wrote the book on the miracles, which is found in the same C.C.C. MS. (Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 299, 293.) Two other lives, one based upon this and printed by Capgrave, and in the Acta S. Ruperti, Holland, Apr. 30, vol. iii. p. 780; and another unprinted of the 14th century are also noticed by Sir T. Hardy. But all these are really of too late date to add anything trustworthy to the account of Bede, or the local tradition exemplified in the charters, which were probably fabricated in the reign of Edgar. The real fame of Erkenwald must rest on the fact that under the guidance and advice of Theodore he developed the condition of his great and influential diocese from the missionary stage in which Cedd had left it to the full-grown state in which it became a well-organised church. Unfortunately the history of London during the whole Anglo-Saxon period is very obscure, but the great fame of Erkenwald, and the continuous honour shewn to him, seem to prove that he had been the greatest founder at Westminster for whom the memory was cherished. It is not, however, recognised through the space of the four centuries that followed the conversion. More can scarcely be said; the continuity of his cultus and the permanence of the work ascribed to him, tell more than the most minute biography.


[S.]

**ERLAUREUS.** Twenty-eighth bishop of Meaux, following Sigebaldus; and succeeded by Aidenerus, in the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. viii. 1902.)

[1 A. B.] 2
ERLEFRIDUS. In the Chartulary of Saint Bertin, compiled by Folquinus, a monk of that abbey, about A.D. 875, chapter xix. recounts the succession of Erlefridus to Rigobertus as abbot of the monastery of Sithun; chapter xx. is a deed of purchase of certain lands executed by him; chapter xxi. relates the death of St. Bertin (the founder of the monastery), under the rule of Erlefridus; chapter xxii. the death of Erlefridus and succession of Erlemman as abbot. For an inscription on a stone which is declared to have been found in 1753 in the cloisters of the monastery of Samos, in the diocese of Lugo, in which Ermeferdus appears as the founder or restorer of the monastery, see Exp. Sagra. xiv. 367. Hubner has not admitted it into his Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae, and the authority of the stone for the attribution of the work in matters of inscriptions. (Exp. Sagra. xvi. 80; Aguirre-Catalanii, iii. 448, iv. 158.) [M. A. W.]

ERLINGUS, an archbishop of Tours, said to have been the forty-third, succeeding Gaviusus, and followed by Josephus I., but there is great uncertainty as to the order of the bishops of this see, between Gregory and Josephus I. He lived towards the close of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 33; Game, Series Episc. 560.) [S. A. B.]

ERLOMANN had been kept in chains by Moenach, king of Munster, but on being released at the intercession of St. Fechin, he embraced the monastic life, lived under Fechin's rule, and died in sanctity. He does not appear in the calendars. (Colgan, Acta SS. 137-38; O'Healon, Irish Saints, i. 370, 371.) [J. G.]

ERMACICUS appears among the signatures of the third Council of Toledo as Ermanicus Laniobrencis. The see of Laniobris cannot, however, be identified. The name appears in three councils—the third, thirteenth, and sixteenth, and nowhere else. Florrez supposes the name to be a copyist's error for Britonicius, a theory which Game has adopted in his Series Episcoporum. (Exp. Sagra. xvii. 20; Gama, Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, vol. ii. part ii. p. 15; Aguirre-Catalanii, iii. 236, iv. 257, 353.) [M. A. W.]

ERMERT (Annales Altabenses Major, ann. 750; Boll. Acta SS. 8 Sept. iii. 201 A) bishop of Freising. [ERMERT.] [C. H.]

ERME, Cornish saint. [Hermes.]

ERMEDHACH (Airmedhach, Airmedhach, Ermedhach, Ermedhach, Hermid), abbot of Craealaisa, commemorated Jan. 1. He was the founder and patron of the monastery of Craealaisa ("the tree of St. Laisre"), now Crevagh, near Clonmacnoise, and on the banks of the Shannon, King's County. He is called Ermidhach in the Ann. Four Masters, which places his death on Jan. 1, A.D. 681. In attempting to identify Athinem or Ermedus, bishop of Clochar (Clogher), who is named in the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick among those who wrote the acts of that saint, Colgan suggests that he may be this Ermighach or Hermid of Craealaisa, but the only likelihood lies in the similarity of names. (Colgan, Acta SS. 742, c. 8; and Tr. Thom., 62. 8c. 129 127 n. 44; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 268, n. t, 269; O'Healon, Irish Saints, i. 19, ii. 261; Irish Nunnery, by Todd and Herbert, 208; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 5.) [J. G.]

ERMEFRIDUS, bishop of Lugo from about A.D. 655 onwards, signs the eighth council of Toledo in 653, under Rekeasvitha, and the death in 656. He was, therefore, the contemporary and, after the tenth council of Toledo, the sufragans of St. Peter of Salamanca. For an inscription which is declared to have been found in 1753 in the cloisters of the monastery of Samos, in the diocese of Lugo, in which Ermeferdus appears as the founder or restorer of the monastery, see Exp. Sagra. xiv. 367. Hubner has not admitted it into his Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae, and the authority of the stone for the attribution of the work in matters of inscriptions. (Exp. Sagra. xvi. 80; Aguirre-Catalanii, iii. 448, iv. 158.) [M. A. W.]

ERMEGUNDIS, an Anjouin woman, healed of blindness and contraction of the limbs on the feast day of St. Martin at Tours. (Greg. Tur. Mirac. St. Martin, iv. 23, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxi. 1000.) [T. W. D.]

ERMELENDIS, a virgin anchorite in Brabant, c. A.D. 600. She was born of noble parents, Ermenoldus and Ermesindis, and was related to Pippin and his daughter, St. Gertrude, a saint whose virtues she was desirous of emulating. As she was resolved to spend her days in celibacy and solitude, contrary to the wish of her parents, they assigned her the profits of their little village of Odene. The spot, where was probably their abode, is the modern Donck, not far from the left bank of the Demer, near its junction with the Gete or Gette, its principal affluent, below Hasselt. She would not remain however, but, divesting herself of her locks, set out alone, and, after a narrow escape with her honour in one place where she attempted to settle, reached the village of Nielst. Now Meldert, some eight miles distant, beyond the Demer, on a little beck named the Zwart that runs into that river. Here she subsisted on wild herbs for the rest of her days. Forty-eight years after her death her obscure tomb was discovered in a vision to a wayfarer, who built a chapel over it in her honour. She was canonized on Oct. 29. Her life and feast are in an ancient manuscript belonging to the church of Maestricht, is given by Surius. (De Prob. Hist. SS. 29 Oct. iv. 398.) [C. H.]

ERMELIUS, a Belgian saint. [Elmerus.]

ERMEMBERTUS (Erminbertus, Mon. Carol. 278), thirty-ninth occupant of the see of Bourges, succeeding Decudatus. There is extant a letter of pope Adrian to Charlemagne, assigned to the year 786, from which it appears that the king had sent Ermenbertus to Rome to obtain from the pope the pallium, which at this time was worn by archbishops only. Bourges being the metropolitan see of Aquitaine, the request was granted, as appears from Adrian's letter. Ermembertus is said to have died A.D. 788, and was succeeded by Serquitus (Cass. Greg., De Ord. Hier., ii. 20, and Instr. 2; Migne, Patr. Lat. xxvii. 392; Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc. anno 760, n. 59-60; anno 788 n. 19, tom. vii. pp. 315, 370.) [S. A. B.]

ERME, virgin, commemorated on Feb. 13, and perhaps to be identified with Mar. O'Germain's Ermita of the same day, but otherwise unknown (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 49, and n. ; O'Healon, Irish Saints, i. 516). [J. G.]
ERENALDUS, bishop of Senlis. [Ericinus.]

EREMARIUS (1), bishop of Limoges. [Ericinus.]

EREMARIUS (2) (Hermennarius, Herminarius), twenty-sixth bishop of Autun, succeeding St. Leodegarius (Léger) and followed by Ansebertus. Our information concerning him is derived from the earliest and best of the Lives of St. Léger dedicated by the anonymous and contemporary author to Eremarius himself. During the persecution which ended in the martyrdom of his predecessor, Eremarius was abbot of the monastery of St. Symphorian. St. Léger being shut up in Luxeuil, the people, wishing for the presence of a bishop among them, asked Childeric II. to appoint Eremarius, and it seems that the latter at the same time begged earnestly of the king that St. Léger might not be brought forth from Luxeuil, fearing that his enemies meant him harm. It appears that the motives of Eremarius were misunderstood, and he was accused of being his bishop's foremost enemy, in order that he might obtain his place (a. 6). Later, when St. Léger was lying in the custody of Wanigus with his features mutilated, Eremarius obtained access to him, tended his wounds, and gave him food and drink (a. 13). Lastly, he came forward to claim, though unsuccessfully, the body of the martyr for his own church of Autun (a. 17). This life is published by Mabillon in the Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti, sec. ii. p. 680 seqq., Paris, 1928-1701. Eremarius's episcopate began in 678, the year of St. Léger's death, but its duration is unknown (Gall. Christ. iv. 356).

[S. A. B.]

ERENBERGA (1), daughter of Bettero or Witieric, king of the Spanish Visigoths. In 697 she was sought in marriage by the Theuderic king of Burgundy, and was allowed to be conducted to him by his ambassadors, Aridius bishop of Lyon and two others, after they had engaged by oath that she should never be degraded from her royal dignity. She became, however, the victim of court intrigues, which made her disliked by Theuderic, who sent her back to her father, but kept the treasure she had brought with her. (Fredeg. Chron. ann. 697, § 30, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxi. 631.)

[T. W. D.]

ERENBERGA (2) (Flor. Wig. od Chron. App. in M. H. B. 635 c, 638 a), queen of Mercia, daughter of Eorean king of Kent. [Eormenburgh.]

[C. H.]

ERENBERGA (1) (Flor. Wig. Gen. Reg. Cont. in M. H. B. 627; id. od Chron. App. in M. H. B. 635 c), daughter of Eorean king of Kent, sister of Erenberga queen of Mercia. Wendover (F. H. ann. 654, 676) makes her daughter of Eorean king of Kent, wife of Merewald king of Mercia, and the foundress of an abbey; but see Eormenburgh (1). [C. H.]

ERENBURGA (2), supposed abbess of Eastry [Eormenburgh (1)].

ERENBURGA (3), queen of Northumbria and abbess. [Eormenburgh (2)].

EREMFRIDUS (1), son-in-law of Aega or Aequae the mayor of Nucastria. Having in 640 slain count Aenulf or Ainsulf in a gallus held at a place named Albiederum (unidentified; see Bouquet, Recueil, iii. Geog. Index), he fled for sanctuary to the church of St. Remigius at Rheims. (Fredeg. Chron. cap. 83, ann. 640, in Patr. Lat. lxii. 658; Aimoin, iv. 37, in Patr. Lat. cxxix. 37.) [C. H.]

EREMFRIDUS (2), forty-fourth bishop of Paris, succeeding Erchenradus I. and followed by Inchadus. He is said to have been present at the council of Aix-la-Chapelle in A.D. 809, but it is only a conjecture. (Gall. Christ. vii. 30.)

[S. A. B.]

EREMFRIDUS (1), abbot of Cusantia (Cusae) in Franche-Comté, a spot about seven miles from the left bank of the Doubs at the source of a little stream, the Cuisancin, which flows into that river near Beaune-des-Dames, above Besançon. It is still marked by some castle and monastic ruins. Eremfridus was born of noble parents, and with his brother Wandalen passed some years of early life at the court of Clotaire III. About 627 he entered the religious life under abbot Waldebert at Luxovium (Luxeuil), the foundation of Columbanus, and at that time in the freshness of its fame. A monastery had been already erected at Cusantia by a nobleman named Iserius, and the property came by inheritance to Eremfridus, who restored or enlarged the buildings, and, with the help from Luxeuil, went to preside there in person. Before the third year of Dagobert he subjected the house as a priory to Luxeuil. After a good old age he was buried near his brother in the church of St. John the Baptist at Cusantia, and his memory was long afterwards venerated in those parts. He was commemorated on Sept. 25. His life by Egilbert or Gilbert, a subsequent prior of Cusantia, is given by the Bollandists (Acta SS. Sept. vii. 111). The monastery was in the 12th century made a priory of St. Eugenius Jurenensis, now St. Claude, on the southern slopes of the Jura, at the junction of the Bienne and its affluent the Tacon. [T. W. D.]

EREMFRIDUS (2) (Ermefrundus, Hermefrondus), the slayer of Ebroin mayor of the palace, was a Frank noble, who held a fiscal office in the kingdom of Theodoric III. Ebroin had deprived him of the greater part of his property, and threatened him with death. Eremfridus, driven to despair, resolved to anticipate his persecutor. Stationing himself one Sunday morning at daybreak before Ebroin's door, he struck him down with his sword as he issued forth to attend matins (A.D. 681). He made good his escape to Austrasia, where he was welcomed by Ebroin's foe, duke Pippin. (Vita S. Leodegar. aucl. anon. xvi.; Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti ii. 694, Paris, 1868-701; Fredeg. Chron. Cont. xviii.; Gest. Regum Francorum, xlviii.; Siegb. Gembl. Chron. ann. 688; Chron. S. Denis, v. 24; Breuv. Chron. in Bouquet, iii. 385.)

[S. A. B.]

EREMFRIDUS (3) (Gall. Christ. v. 894), abbot of Augia Dives, and bishop of Caestia. [Eremfridus.]

[C. H.]

Slaughered by Google
ERMENGITHA

ERMENGITHA (Flor. Wig. ad Chron. App. in M. H. B. 635 c), daughter of Eormenred king of Kent. [EORMENGITHA] [C. H.]

ERMENHILDA (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 76, ed. Hardy; Wend. F. H. ann. 676, ed. Coxe)

ERMENILDA (Flor. Wig. ad Chron. App. in M. H. B. 635 d, 637 e; Thom. Eliens. in Angl. Sac. i. 580; Dagbl. Monast. i. 458, ii. 48; Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 368, 369), daughter of Eorcumbert king of Kent, queen of Mercia, abbess. [ERMENGHILDA] [C. H.]

ERMENY, thirty-first occupant of the see of Arignon, succeeding Eucharius and followed by Antoinius. The compilers of the Gallia Chris
tiana (i. 865) quote an old codex to the effect that he was born in Burgundy, and that, when ordained bishop by St. Caesarius of Arles, he was a priest or abbot of the monastery of the Holy Cross at Arles. Pope Boniface II., in a letter to Caesarius, speaks of Antoinius, presbyter and abbot, as the bearer of letters from Caesarius (A.D. 530). The variation in the initial letter is of no great weight. He is said to have died in A.D. 547. (Gall. Christ. i. 865; Migne, Patr. Lat. Liv. 31.) [S. A. B.]

ERMENO, bishop of Senlis. [ERMINTUS]

ERMENRED (A. S. C. ann. 840, in M. H. B. 310; Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 875, in M. H. B. 534 k; id. ad Chron. App. in M. H. B. 638 A; Wend. F. H. ann. 640, 654; Malm. G. R. A. i. § 78, ed. Hardy), son of Eadbad king of Kent. [ERMENRED] [C. H.]

ERMETHIEUS, nineteenth bishop of ToUL, succeeded Adeodatus, after whose death the see was vacant for some months, owing to the wars between Dagobert II. of Austrasia, and Theodoric III. of Burgundy. He flourished about 890, and is said to have obtained from Theodoric the restitution of a piece of land called Occiavilla, wrongly held from the church by count Hild
eranus. He was succeeded by Magnaldaus. (Gall. Christ. xiii. 904.) [S. A. B.]

ERMENRANNUS, an archdeacon who subscribed the council of Ronen, held in A.D. 682. (Baron. ann. A. E. 682, n. xi.; Labbe, Conc. vii. 1449.) [S. A. B.]

ERMENTRUDA, a matron of rank, who be
quathed certain possessions to certain churches at A.D. 700 at Paris. A long fragment of his will remains, signed by her friend count Mt. mmolus and other distinguished persons. Its Latinity is extremely barbarous. Among churches she mentions the basilica of the Holy Cross or of St. Vincent of Paris, also that of St. Symphorian. Among her bequests is the chariot in which she was driven, with the oxen that belonged to it. This was the custom of noble ladies under the Merovingian kings. (Greg. Turon. Hist. iii. 26. The will is given in Eccles. Monum. sac. vii. et viii. in Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 1243.) [W. M. S.]

ERMENUS (ERMIARIUS, ERMENUS), 23rd bishop of Limoges, succeeding Caesarius, and followed by Salutaris. In A.D. 690 he is said to have buried the remains of St. Tillo (St. Thillo) the recluse of Solignac, and to have been the cause by which he was miraculously healed of an infirmity. (Gall. Christ. ii. 505.) [S. A. B.]

ERMESINDA (BERMESINDA), Pelayo's daughter and the wife of Alfonso the Catholic duke of Cantabria. Through her marriage (? before 737) with Alfonso the two small Christian states of Cantabria and Asturias were, after Faviola's death, united, when Alfonso succeeded his brother-in-law, in right of his wife, and in the absence of other sons of Pelayo. The union thus achieved of the whole of the country north of the Asturias mountains, between the Pyrenees and Galicia under one head, is of course an important step in the history of the infant kingdom. [ALFONSO I.] Ermesinda was the mother of Fruila I. (q. v.) and Vimarauns, and of Adosinda, who afterwards became the wife of Silo, and who is mentioned in the Liberius of Beatius and Etherius against Elipando. [ADOSINDA.] Alfonso the Catholic and his wife were buried together in the monastery of St. Mary, near Oviedo, (Seb. Sal. cap. 15, and Esp. Sagra. xiiii.), but her tomb, together with Alfonso's, is now shown in the church of Covadonga (Flores, Regnum de España, i. 44). [M. A. W.]

ERMINA. [ERMIN (7)].

ERMINFRID, son of Eadbald king of Kent. [ERMIRNRED]. [C. B.]

ERMINSUS, ST., born at Laudunum (Laroix) in Picardy. Becoming famous for his learning and piety, he was removed to the monastery of Laubium (Lobbes), on the left bank of the Sambre, nearly opposite Thuin, in Hainault, where he succeeded St. Ursus as abbot and bishop. He excelled as a preacher, and was held in great repute as a prophet. He died A.D. 737, and was commemorated on April 25. (Acta SS. 25 Apr. iii. 374; Baron. Annates Eccles. a.d. 737, 3.) [I. G. S.]

ERMINSUS (ERMENUS, HERMINUS, ERMENYSUS, ERMENALDUS), twenty-fifth bishop of Senlis, following Ragnaldus, and succeeded by Godsfredo. All we know of him is that he was present at three councils held at Rheims in A.D. 815, at Noyon in 814, and at Aix-la-Chapelle in 815. (Gall. Christ. x. 1834; Pliodratian, Hist. Eccl. Eiren. ii. 18; Labbe, Conc. ix. 339, 393, 399.) [S. A. B.]

ERMUS, bishop of Nantes. [ERNUS].

ERMOALD I., a Frank noble near Chartres in the 8th century, who after an ill-spent life sent a present of forty solidi on his death-bed to the abbot Launomarus with a request that he would pray for his recovery. The abbot returned the money with this text: "The sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination to the Lord." (Vita Launomari, cap. iv. § 19, Boll. Acta SS. 19 Jan. ii. 233.) [T. W. D.]


ERMILOUNDUS, bishop in Brittany, 710.

ERMULFUS, bishop of Coimbra in 633, in which year Renatus, archbishop of Coimbra, signs his name as his vicar, and the men of Toledo. (Ep. Sagra. xiii. 73, Aguirre-Catalan, iii. 385.) [LUCNISIUS] [M. A. W.]
ERNUFOLUS (Bar. A. E. ann. 733, iv.), heretic. [ERNUFOLUS] [C. H.]

ERNUCHUAG, of Dun-da-en, is given in the Fechtir of Aengus at Oct. 30 as "Ernachuag, son of Jairn his name, and of Dun-da-en in the Fhearch (wood) of Daladrach he is commemorated" (Reeves, Eccl. Ant. 300, 380). The place is now Dunane, in the barony of Upper Toome, co. Antrim, and the person is to be distinguished from Ernacht or Herenart virgin of Dunane (Oct. 30), and Ernacht, son of Echin (Oct. 30).

J. G.

ERNADHACH (EIKHNAK), son of Echin, abbot of Leithghlinn (Leighlin, co. Carlow), died A.D. 774 (Ann. Uit. 773; Four Mast. 769).

J. G.

ERNEUS (ERNEUS, ERNEUS, HERNEUS), founder and abbot of the monastery of St. Martin, near Le Mana, in the 6th century. His name appears only in modern martyrlogies. (Boll. Acta SS. 9 Aug. ii. 423; Gallia Christ. xiv. 432.) [T. W. D.]

ERNAN is a name which assumes many forms, such as ERNAN, ERHAN, etc., and MARNOCH (from the use of the affectionate prefix Mo- sad of the diminutive oc), and is sometimes turned into the Latin equivalent FERREOLUS; it frequently occurs in the Scottish and Irish Hagiologies. O'Harlon (Irish Saints, i. 175 n. 9) gives a list of twenty-five with their days of dedication in the calendars.

J. G.

ERNAN (1), son of Aedh. Commem. May 16. O'Clery (Marti. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 133) supposed this to be Ernán, son of Aedh, of the race of Brid, son of Conn Cearnaich, as he does not find any other Ernán, son of Aedh, in the Saint History or Naomhscanaich. Colgan (Acta SS. 17 n. 11) says he was buried in Ulster about A.D. 690.

J. G.

ERNAN (2), son of Eoghan. Commem. Jan. 1. Colgan (Acta SS. 7–9) gives a short memoir of this Ernan, and in a note adds an interesting account of this and the other Ernans, associated with the name of St. Columba, namely, the uncle and two nephews of that saint, and the little boy whom he blessed and declared would be in course of time so famous. St. Ernan of Jan. 1 was nephew of St. Columba, being son of Eoghan, son of Felim or Feidhilmidh, and thus was connected with the ruling families of the Dalrisc Scots. In the Appendix to Adamnan (Vit. E. Col.) in Codex E we find "illeges germanus frater Columbae junior." But concerning Ernan Boethius and Dempster have these serious mistakes, which Colgan has generally accepted; they have confounded him with Ernan, the uncle of St. Columba and prepositus of Hina, and thus have included him among the twelve who accompanied St. Columba from Ireland; they have given his name of Eterhan, and made him brother of Cithbachus or Cobthach, brother of St. Baithen (June 9) Etherhan; and based on these, they have, rightly or wrongly, supposed that he was many years with his uncle in Scotland before returning to take up his residence in Ireland (Usheer, Eccl. Anti. c. 15, works, vi. 287; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 157; Colgan, Acta SS. 7, 8). Whether he was in Scotland or how long he remained we really do not know, but he outlived St. Columba by a long time, as when he was a very old man he related to St. Adamnan (who was born A.D. 624) the wonderful vision vouchsafed to himself and others when they were fishing in the river Finn, in Donegal, on the night of St. Columba's death; he assured St. Adamnan, who was then a youth, that the whole vault of heaven suddenly became illuminated, and, when he raised his eyes and looked to the east, he saw something like an immense pillar of fire, which seemed to be ascending into heaven, and when it penetrated the heavens it was followed, as if the sun had just set. St. Adamnan's informant was, he says (Vit. St. Colum. iii. c. 24), "a very old man, a servant of Christ, whose name may be called Ferredel, but in the Scotch tongue Ernane, of the race of Mocufirriude, who, as being himself a holy monk, is buried in the Riges of Tomna (now Drumhorne), amidst the remains of other monks of St. Columba, and awaits the resurrection with the saints" (Reeves, Adamnan, 237–8). He is called Mocufirriude, because he was descended from Fergus, son of Conall Gulban. He established himself, apparently neither as abbot nor bishop, in the Diocese of Tomna, in the region of Tyr-Aedna (now Drumhorne, in the barony of Tighruh, co. Donegal), and, as said above, died and was buried there about A.D. 640 or a few years later (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 11; § 10; O'Harlon, Irish Saints, i. 21, 429; Bp. Forbes, Adv. Scot. Saints, 332–3).

With so many Ernans identification is difficult, but this point is said to be patron of St. Killern, the (Church of the Son of Eoghan), in Mull, and of Killernan. He may also have given its name to Killern, Killernail, or Kilkenarnalice, a parish in Jur, Argyleshire, and now united to Colouay (C. Innos, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. 278; Monre, West. Isl. 117; Martin, West. Islands, 232).

Usheer (C. E. Col. i. 17, 18) works, vi. 287 notes the similarity between the name and characters of this Ernan and the Ernan who appears in pope John's pastoral letters, but the person was really St. Ernan (Aug. 17), of Torach or Tory. In the Scotch kalendar he is called Etherhan, and commemorated on Dec. 21 and 22. Thus Adam King has "Dec. 22, St. Etherhan, bishop and confessor, notable to St. Columba in Scotland under king Aidanus, A.D. 582." Dempster has on the same day, "In Scotia Ethernetani episcopi qui in Insulis Scotticis natus, sancti Columbae discipulus fuit;" and Camerarius completes the identification, "Dec. 21, S. Eterhanus, abbas et confessor, S. Columbae, ex fragre nepos." [ETHERHAN.] (Bp. Forbes, Adv. S. 176, 222, 243.)

J. G.

ERNAN (3), abbot of Hinba. He was uncle of St. Columba, and accompanied him to Iona. Being brother of St. Columba's mother Eithne, he was son of Dina, son of Nioe, of the race of Cathair Mór. He was placed by St. Columba in charge of the mission for the north by St. Columba at Hinba, but the place, though evidently a favourite resort for St. Columba and the scene of many wonders, such as the appearance of the fiery pillar above St. Columba's head when he celebrated the Eucharist in the presence of St. Connolig (May 10), of Eanger, St. Coinnech (Oct. 41) of Aghaboe, St. Brendan (May 10) of Cien...
fert, and St. Corbiac or Luthain or O'Lethan (June 21) of Derry, and again the "glorious and unseparable visitation" made for three days and three nights by the Spirit to St. Columba (Adamnan, Vit. S. Columb. iii. cc. 17, 18), is not clearly identified, though probably it was Eileith, one of the Garvagh group of islands. He died at Iona immediately on his arrival from Hima, and before St. Columba and he could meet, according to the prophecy of St. Columba (Adamnan, Vit. S. Columb. l. c. 35). (On his life, see Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 11, § 13; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 15, works, vi. 237 sq.; Trench, E. B. 266; Colgan, Acts SS. 8, n. 4, and Tr. Thom. 379-80, 409; but Colgan err in regarding him as the same with Ernin or Mernoc, of Rathnooth; Reeves, Adamman, 26, 87, 246-7, et al.) Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. l. 253) ascribes to him Excortations ad fratres in Hima inani, lib. i., and In regulam S. P. Columbae, lib. i., but they probably never existed. [J. G.]

ERNAN (4), nephew of St. Columba, son of his sister Cumania and his husband Degillus, but it is doubtful as to whether he has any dedication, either as Ernin or Mernoc, the latter name being given him in the list, in Codex B, of St. Columba's relations (Colgan, Acts SS. 8, n. 2, and Tr. Thom. 490 n. 41, 491 n. 41; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 15, works, vi. 231; Reeves, Adamman, 246). [J. G.]

ERNAN (5) of Cill-na-sagart, Oct. 26. In the Martyrologies he is "Ernan of Moidhlanchair, of Cill-na-sagart" (Mart. Doneg). Moidhlanchair being the name of the great road which led from Leinster to Armagh, but beyond this we have no information regarding his time, place, or history. Dr. Reeves, however, suggests the probability of his being Ternoc, son of Cronin, who died A.D. 716 (Anna. Tigh.), and whose memorial is still seen in the form of a pillar-stone at Kilnasagart, near Jonesborough, co. Armagh. [Ternoc.] (Uist. Journ. Arch. i. 223-24; Mart. Doneg., by Todd and Reeves, 285.) [J. G.]

ERNAN (6) of Cluain-deochrigh, Jan. 11. In St. Fedhina's Life (Colgan, Acts SS. 138, c. 38, 142 n. 28) there is a notice of his paying a visit to St. Ernan in his monastery of Cluain-deochrigh, in Meath; he was so annoyed with the sound of the mill beside the guest-house or hospice that he gave it his blessing, and thereby delivered the guests of all future time from the noise of the grinding. O'Clery, by his entry in the Mart. Doneg. (by Todd and Reeves, 13) evidently seeks to identify this Ernan as Ernin, son of Crasen, but they are probably different persons; others regard him as the same with Ernan, of Torach; and Archdall has placed Cluain-deochrigh at Clonare on the Bresna, co. Westmeath. But by either name the place is unknown, and the facts regarding the saint remain uncertain (Archdall, Mon. Hibern. 703; Reeves, Adamman, 238; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 174-75, ii. 448). [J. G.]

ERNAN (7) of Togher-ernan, Jan. 17. He is thus designated in Mart. Doneg.; in Mart. Tallaght on this day is "Ernan ocus Herind o Tigh-Uilfan," "Tigh probably being the place, and Ulltain the name of another person, as in Mart. Doneg. Colgan somewhat doubtfully suggests his identification with Ernin or Mernoc, nephew of St. Columba and son of Degillus (see above, No. 4); efforts also are made towards localising Tigh or Tigh-ernan, in the counties of Meath and Westmeath, but with no very marked success. (Colgan, Tr. Thom. 491 n. 41; Mart. Doneg., by Todd and Reeves, 21; Kelly, Cal. Ir. SS. xii.; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 297, 298.) [J. G.]

ERNAN (8) of Torach, Aug. 17. He was son of Colman, son of Maenam, son of Muireadhach, of the race of Eoghan, son of Niall, and thus second cousin to Damongoch, son of Saran, pilgrim of Tory. O'Donell (St. Columb., l. c. 73) relates the wonderful history connected with the foundation of the first church on the island of Torach or Tory, on the north coast of Donegal, and the placing St. Ernan over it as its first abbot, but Colgan is mistaken in trying to identify him with Ernan (Jan. 11) of Cluain-deochrigh, in Meath. He was evidently a well-known person in his day, and his name appears as Ernanaus or Hernanans in the famous letter which John the pope-elect sends, ii. c. 19) addressed to the Canons Regular in 640 to the clergy of the north of Ireland, urging them to conformity with the rest of Christendom upon the Paschal questions and to a firm opposition to Pelagianism. [Chonan (11).] St. Ernan, of Torach, flourished about a.d. 650 (Colgan, Acts SS. 17 n. 11, and Tr. Thom. 401, 431 n. 40, 490 n. 41; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. 162, § 11; Reeves, Adamman, 238; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 17, works, vi. 540-1; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 174; Uist. Journ. Arch. 150 n., 153; Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 253.) [J. G.]

ERNANIA was a nun in a monastery called Drumf-farachaidh or Kill-Ua-sona, in Carbery, co. Longford, who is said in the Via St. Fechini to have drawn milk from a hind for the use of those labouring in the mill (Colgan, Acts SS. 138, c. 41, 140 n. 28). [J. G.]

ERNDBUDA, abbess. [ERNDBUDA.]

ERNENUEUS, Scottish saint. [ERNENUEUS.]

ERNENGILDA, Irish saint. [ERNENGILDA.]

ERNESTUS, abbey, mentioned as present at a council held at Dingoltinga, or Dingolling, in Bavaria (Baron. Annuales Ecle. a.d. 772, 24.) [L. G. S.]

ERNUEUS, abbot of Le Mans. [ERNUEUS.]

ERNFRIDUS (ERNFRIDUS, ERNFREDUS), abbate of Angia Dives, and 18th bishop of Ca- stance, succeeding Rudolthus or Rodulfo, and followed by Sidonius or Sidoinus. In the Chronicle of Hermannus Contractus (ad an. 738, Migne, Patr. Lat. col.iii. 157), he is given as the successor of Audoinus, who preceded Rudelthus, but a letter addressed by pope Gregory III. in 738 to various German bishops, of which amongst them Rudolfo (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxix. 580), has induced the authors of the Gallia Christiana (v. 894) to insert his name between those of Audoinus and Ernfrid. The latter's episcopate lasted ten years, and his death is placed in the year 748. [S. A. B.]

ERNIN (ERNIN) is only another form of the name of ERNAN, and often, like it, becomes MERNOC, MARNOC, and MARNAN. In the Irish Martyrologies there are many Erinis, but com-
paratively few admit of identification or present any point of use or interest.

(1) Of Clusian-righeach, commemorated Aug. 5. In the Life of St. Faraman (Feb. 15) this Ernin is included in the list of those prelates who met St. Columba on one occasion of his retiring to Ireland, but from this, which is so full of anachronisms, nothing can be deduced as to his time or history; Clusian-righeach is said to be in Carlow (Martyr. Donagi. by Todd and Reeves, 213; Colgan, Acta SS. 337, c. 7, 339 n. 27).

(2) Of Cremechoill, commemorated May 31. He has his commemoration on this day in Martyr. Donagi., but in Mart. Tadhgait he is mixed up with Eochain, abbot of Magh-bile. [Eochain (9.)] The name of his church has passed through a series of changes, Crockamill, Croghill, Craughill, Crewill, to the present Cranfield, a parish in the barony of Upper Toome, co. Antrim. (Reeves, Eccl. Ant. 97 et al.; Joyce, Ir. Names of Places, 2 ser. 329; Colgan, Acta SS. 650, c. 8.)

(3) Of Rathooi, commemorated Aug. 18. The entry in Martyr. Donagi. (by Todd and Reeves, 223) is "Erenin, i.e. Mernog, of Rath-nee, in Ui-Garadach, i.e. in Fotharta, of Leinster; and of Cill-draighneach, in Ui-drona;" and the entry in Mart. Tadhgait (by Kelly, Cal. Ir. SS. xxiii.) is "Errini Mac Creisini, o Rathaibh, in h. Garchoch." The person thus designated is the saint who in Meath is usually known as Ernin or Ernog, and in Scotland as Marnoc, i.e., "my dear little Ernin." [Marnoc.] He was son of Crasen or Cressin, and probably belonged to the neighbourhood of Connemarocke, in the barony of Garrycastle, King's County. On one occasion when St. Columba visited that monastery, he was found in the company of Erenin, as related by St. Adamnan (Vita St. Columba, i. 3), and was being conveyed with great state and acclamation by the assembled monks into the precincts of the monastery, where came, among the crowd, a poor lad, mean in dress and bearing, and evidently not much thought of by his seniors. Yet St. Columba passing by his piety, eloquence, and renown. "This," says St. Adamnan, "was Erenan, son of Crasen, who was afterwards famous and most highly honoured in all the churches of Scotia" (Ireland) (Reeves, Adamnan, 25–6). This was about A.D. 590. His death, unnoticed in the Ann. Four Mast., took place in the year 636 (Ann. Tyg.). Ussher says he flourished about that time in Ireland, but evidently that great antiquity's mind was in the utmost confusion regarding the saint. His churches are Rathanao, now Rathnew, the parochial name of Wicklow, and Kill-draighneach, in Ui-drona, now Killdree-ragh, a townland in the parish of Dunleekay, barony of Idrone East, and county of Carlow. (Reeves, Adamnan, 256; Montalembert, Monks of the West, ii. 29–10, Edinb. 1881; Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 17, § 1; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 17, wks. vi. 502, 540–41; Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 5 ser. 4; Colgan, Trahaum. 340, c. 3, 573 n. 29, 401, c. 71, 434, c. 17, 450 n. 42.)

(4) Son of Flannach, abbot of Leithghinn (Leighlin, co. Carlow). Commemorated Nov. 12 (Martyr. Donagi.).

(8) Cas, of Leithglinn (Leighlin, co. Carlow) is commemorated in Martyr. Donagi. and Martyr. Tadhgait on Feb. 23, but otherwise unknown (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 681).

(6) The sons of one of this name had their dedication on Sept. 22, in Inismac-u-Erin or Inismacinerin, now Church Island, in Lough Key, co. Roscommon (Martyr. Donagi.).

(7) Ernin or Ermina, daughter of Archeus or Archenn, and by some identified with Fehbr or Fedbair (Nov. 6), is commemorated in the Irish Martyrologies on Feb. 28, and placed among the Bollandists among their praesterniss. (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 733.)

[Q. G.]

ERNIESUS, presbyter, one of two who are said to have founded Lianthon, Monmouthshire, in the time of St. David, its original patron (Giraldus Camb. Hist. Camb. i. c. 5, vsa. vi. 40).

[Q. G.]


ERONUS (Hero), twenty-eighth bishop of Langres, succeeding Garobaldus, and followed by Astoricus. In the chronicle of the Monastery of St. Benignus (quoted Le Coute, Anna. Eccl. Franc. an. 666, n. xxixi, tom. iv. p. 153, and Gall. Christ. iv. 524), it is related that in the time of Wulfranerus, the abbot, the head of the church of Langres was the venerable bishop Eronus, who, among other benefits which he conferred upon that monastery, obtained from popes Johannes and Sergius a mandate that none should dare to make or consecrate any cemetery besides that belonging to the church of St. Benignus. And, in accordance with this, there is extant a charter given by pope Sergius in the tenth year of his reign, confirming to the monks of St. Benignus the privileges of their cemetery. The genuineness of this instrument, however, is called in question by Le Coute, from internal evidence (Gall. Christ. iv. 524; Le Coute, an. 697, n. iii., tom. iv. p. 336, and an. 713, n. xxxvii, tom. iv. 526). [S. A. B.]

EROS." (Eros, Heroes, Hérons), fifth bishop of Antioch, coming between Cornepheus and Theophilus (Euseb. H. E. iv. 29; Niceph. Coll. H. E. iii. 25, p. 258; Georg. Syncell. p. 350 a). He has been called (as by Constantius, ut infra.) Heroes II. through the mistake of supposing that the name of the third bishop (Heron, Héron) might be a slight variety of Eros. Fleury (lib. iii. 33, 39) miscalls him Heron. There is some discrepancy as to the dates of Eros. The Chronicle of Eusebius places his accession under A.D. 143, there stating that he ruled twenty-four years, while Theophilus is made to succeed under A.D. 170, so that either there was an interregnum or there must be an error in the "twenty-four years," which, however, is the authoritative reading: it is the one assigned by Migne. The episcopate of Eros is stated to have lasted twenty-six years by Syncellus, who is here followed by some in preference to Eusebius, as e.g. by Boschius, who gives A.D. 142–168. Constantius (in Neale's Patriarchii of Antioch) has 151–168. Eros of Antioch is thought by Neale (Pat. Ant. p. 24) to be the "Eros of a
Greeks imbued with at June 24 of the Messina.

EROS, bishop of Arles. [HEROS.]

EROTEIS, martyr. [CAPITOLINA.]

ERPUILLON (ERPUILLON), son of Wiziza king of Spain. On his father's death he fled with his brother Farmanius or Furmalus to Africa, where count Julian (the husband of their father's sister) espoused their cause against Roderick, and occasioned the Moorish conquest of Spain. Mariana calls the two brothers Eba and Sibebutsus. (Lucas Tudens, Chron. ann. 748 in Schott. Hist. Illust. tom. iv. p. 70; Marian, De Reb. Hispan. lib. vi. cap. 19, vol. i. 239, 240, 243; Baron. A. E. 713, 19.)

[EDD.]

ERPWALD (Her. Hunt. Hist. Angl. iii. ann. 582, in M. B. 720 D), king of East Anglia. [ERPWALD.]

[CH.]

ETHLA, Irish saint. [BLANE.]

ERTHAD, Pictish saint. [IRCHAD.]

ERVIGIUS (1), ERVIG, ERWICH, Gothic king of Spain from A.D. 680 to 687. Sebastian of Salamanca, Hist. Lang. i. cap. 175, says that his father Arpadustus was a Greek exile from Byzantium, who married a relation of his to King Kindravith. What is more probable is that Arpadustus was a native of one of the coast towns which remained under Byzantine rule up to 625, or possibly of Tingis or Septum, which still obeyed Byzantine governors at the time of the Moorish invasion. Anyhow, his marriage had brought him within the circle of the Gothic nobility, and we find his son Ervig among Wamba's builders at the time of the extraordinary conspiracy which overthrew that king. [WAMBA.] What was Ervig's share in the plot cannot now be made out with certainty. The story, however (Sebastian of Salamanca, in Esp. Sagra. xii.), seems to be a legendary secretion of later times. What probably happened was that in the unconsciousness of illness Wamba was hurried into the penitential habit (see for an account of this custom and its abuses, legislated upon before Wamba's time by Kindravith, Masleu's Hist. de Espafia, vol. i. Espafia Goda, p. 272), that when he returned to his senses he found arrayed against him a conspiracy of the nobility and clergy, headed by Ervig and the famous Julian of Toledo, too formidable to be resisted, and by which he was forced first to surrender his crown, and secondly to subscribe to two documents: (a) nominating Ervig his successor; (b) making the metropolitan of Toledo to anoint Ervig king. Accordingly, on the 22d of October, 680, eighteen days after the monastic habit had been imposed upon Wamba, Ervig was anointed bishop by Julian (the second instance of anointing known in Spanish history; Wamba's is the first). On the 5th of January the twelfth Council of Toledo, called by Ervig, met in the church of the Holy Apostles. It consisted of thirty-four bishops, four abbots, three proxies, and fifteen viri illustres officii palatini. The king appeared, asked, knelt, for the prayers of the bishops, implanted in them to find remedies for the dangers of the state, and handed to them a tomos containing his wishes and recommendations. He then retired, and the tomos was read. In it the council was asked to confirm his election to the throne, to approve his fresh laws against the Jews, twenty of which had been drawn up by himself and Julian in the interval between his accession and the assembly of the council, as well as to reaffirm the existing laws (Lex iug. gotorum, edition by Spanish Academy, Madrid, 1815, tit. 12, lib. 5). The modification of Wamba's law of military service, De his qui ad bellum non evadant, is recommended also on the ground that the half of Spain had forfeited civil rights under its over-strict provisions. The king had indeed resolved to amend the law for the future, but the council is asked to reinstate those who have already suffered from it.

The four canons which follow are of considerable historical and constitutional interest. The first records the legality of Ervig's rise to the throne. The council have, it says, examined three documents laid before them: (1) a declaration signed by the seniores of the palace, describing the assumption of the ecclesiastical dress and tonsure by Wamba; (2) a paper in which Wamba names Ervig his successor; (3) a document addressed by Wamba, in which Julian is directed to anoint Ervig king. After inspection of these it declares Ervig elected king by the unanimous consent of all the bishops, and releases the people from the oath of allegiance to Wamba. May anathema and the reverence of God overtake any who lift a hand against Ervig.

The second canon provides that all who have assumed the garb of penitence, even against their will, shall thenceforward be compelled to keep their oath, and to refrain from all temporal employments. The argument that the vow was made for them, and the dress assumed by them without their consent and consciousness, is to have their heads shaven. Of these are not to be excepted those in baptism of what is done for them, but the baptismal vow is none the less binding. Notwithstanding the priest who rashly imposes the penitential dress upon an unwilling or unconscious person is to be punished by a year's excommunication. It shall be sufficient, however, if he can prove that the penitential dress was asked for by signs only, manumissius. (Under Kindravith, Co. Tol. 3, 3, a declaration in writing had been required.) This canons is of course levied against the still living Wamba.

The third canon provides for the readmission into ecclesiastical communion of certain political offenders who had been pardoned by the king and invited him to the royal table. It is not fitting that those who sit with the king should lie under the ban of the church. Daha (Könige der Germanen, Vite Abtheilung, 477) takes this as referring to Ervig's co-conspirators, who had been the traitors of Wamba's reign, and most probably concerned in Paul's rebellion and by whose help, together with that of the church, Ervig had risen to power.

Stephen, metropolitan of Merida, is then introduced, and implores the pardon of the assembled bishops for his complicity in certain acts of Wamba. Wamba had attempted with "his
acustomed self-will" to institute two new bishoprics, upon his own responsibility only. Stephen pleads compulsion by the king, and the fourth canon absolves him, and arranges what is to be done with regard to the bishoprics. The fifth canon restores to all those who had suffered outlawry for the violation of Wamba's military law, the capacity of giving evidence, together with the titles of their former rank and class. In the ninth canon the laws against the Jews, of which the titles as given in the acts correspond exactly with those now standing in the above quoted book and title of the Fuero Justo, are confirmed. The sixth canon is perhaps the most important of the council. It provides for the transference of the right of election to bishoprics to the metropolitan of Toledo and the king only, abolishing thereby at one fell swoop all the constitutional process of election by clergy and people, consecration by metropolitan and suffragans, and confirmation by the crown, which had been decreed in C. Tol. iv. 19. We shall have more to say of this famous canon under the head of Julian. In connexion with Ervig it is interesting, as throwing light upon the character and objects of the conspiracy to which he owed his throne.

The twelfth council of Toledo, as Hefele states (Entwicklung und Geschichtliche Verhältniss, &c. 194), was imitated in all points from the eighth council under Revesviinth. "Like Revesvith, Ervig calls the council in January, makes a speech, brings forward proposals of legislation, has the decisions drawn up in twelve canons, the thirteenth canon being merely a thanksgiving which has its parallel also in the eighth council, contains the complete list of signatures, and that decreetum and lex shall not be wanting (see C. Tol. viii. ; Aguirre-Catalani iii. 448) appends a decreetum and constitutio from Gundemar's time." [Guntzmur.]

The intention seems to have been to connect the new reign immediately with that of Revesviinth, Ervig's relation, pitting over the reign of Wamba, and thus to give it, if possible, an air of legitimacy.

Nearly three years later (Nov. 4, 683) Ervig summoned the thirteenth council of Toledo, which, under the presidency of Julian, consisted of forty-seven bishops, nine abbots, twenty-six provys, and twenty-six viri illustres. The same ceremonies were observed as at the preceding council, and we have again the king's appearance among the bishops, his prostration before the fathers (coram coetu vestri reverentia humillis deortusque posterior), and the delivery of the bolla. In this council those who had suffered outlawry and confiscation of goods under the previous councils of rebellion were still further propitiated. Canon 1 ordered the restitution of the forfeited property except in cases where the property had been already bestowed on others. All that still remained in the royal treasury (fisci—juribus applicata) of the confiscated goods was ordered to be restored. Cases of the most severe imprisonment, ill-treatment of palatini or ecclesiastics. Accused persons of high ecclesiastical or secular rank were not to be tortured or chained or robbed of their goods before trial. They were to be brought without delay before the tribunal of their peers, and there judged after a fair hearing.

By canon 3 all arrears of taxes up to the first year of Ervig's reign were remitted, a measure which looks like a bid for popularity on the part of a consciously weak government. Canon 4, de Munitione Regis Prolicitis, is the first appearance of a form which recurs in later councils under Egica. Decrees on the same subject, differently worded, are found in C. Tol. vi. 2 and C. Tol. vi. 16. Attempts to murder the queen or the royal family, to despoil them of their goods, to impose the tunique upon the sons or the religious habit on the daughters or daughters-in-law, to inflict exile, mutilation, or stripes upon any of them, are described and denounced with singular minuteness. We shall find this canon first attacked and then imitated by Egica, Ervig's successor (q. v.). Canon 5, which no doubt had a clear political meaning at the time, is now inexplicable to us. It forbids the marriage of a king's widow with any one, even though a king himself, much less with a subject. It cannot be said that a female, queen, a part of the body of the deceased king, should give herself to a subject. The third council of Saragossa, held in 691, went further than this, and drew up a canon (Can. 5, Hefele, Conc. Gesc. iii. 297) directing that a royal widow should be compelled to retire into a cloister immediately after her husband's death. Canon 6 provided that henceforward no slave or freedman should ever be admitted to the palace offices. "Exceptis servis vel libertis facillibus," no no-noble person should be made administrator of the fiscus or of the royal property. The canon contains an interesting reference to past slave revolts.

For the remaining six canons of C. Tol. xiii. on matters of ecclesiastical discipline see Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 285, or Hefele, Conc. Gesc. iii. 289. The council was scarcely over, and all the members of it had not yet left Toledo, when legates arrived from pope Leo II. (towards the end of Nov. or Dec. 682) asking for the confirmation in council by all the Spanish bishops of the acts of the sixth general council against the Monothelites. The king and Julian, however, replied that it was impossible immediately to reassemble the national council which had just broken up, and to compel distant bishops to undertake another winter journey. They consented, however, to call a council for the following year, and meanwhile copies of the acts of the Council of Constantinople were sent to every metropolitan to receive the signatures of the bishops of his province. In Nov. 684 the fourteenth council of Toledo met. Only seventeen bishops from Carthaginensis were present, though the metropolitan of Tarragona, Narbonne, Merida, Braga, and Seville sent a council. At the same time with the canon of the twelfth council upon which rests the primacy of Toledo, it is noticeable that here, as in the thirteenth and fifteenth councils, Julian alone signs as metropolitan out of the six Spanish metropolitan. All the rest (Merida, Braga, Tarragona, Narbonne, and Seville) sign as plain episcopi. Julian's antagonism was at once against the Spanish bishops generally and the great power of the state, and seems to have completely governed the vacillating and often conscience-stricken Ervig.

At the C. Tol. xiv. the acts of the sixth general synod were approved, and the acts of the council of Chalcedon were ordered to be incorporated in
ERVIGIUS (2) or ERVIGIUS, sixth bishop of Beziers, succeeding Paetasis (Gall. Christ. vi. 299). Among those present at the sixteenth council of Toledo occurs "Beterrensis ecclesiae episcopus" (Manzi, xii. 84 c). See the following article.

ERVIGIUS (3), bishop of Calabria, subscribes the fifteenth and sixteenth councils of Toledo, 688 and 693, under Egica. The Ervig of the sixteenth council has been held erroneously to have been a bishop of Beziers (Biterres), in Galla Narbonensis. Florcz gives various reasons against this (Exp. Supr. vi. 927), and certainly the order of the signatures in the fifteenth and sixteenth councils seems to identify the two Ervigs. Ervig is the last bishop of Calabria (Exp. Supr. iv. 47; Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 313, 353.) [Sanctus-Dei] [M. A. W.]


EWALD (2) (Annual., Annual, Ewald, Ercaldus) was a Scotch monk, companion and disciple of St. Kilian of Frasconia; he was mart- tyred Jan. 19, a.d. 650, but is not found in the Acta St. Kiliani, and much doubt surrounds his history. The Bollandists place him among their praetermissi of Jan. 19, Feb. 15, July 8, and Oct. 2, while the Scotch annalists also commemorate him, but can give no authentic information. (Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 244; Camerarius, de Scot. Pet. 178; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 565.) [I. S.]

ERYTHARIUS, praetorian prefect under Leo I. and Zeno. (Cod. Just. lib. i. tit. 4, 16) Finding that the taxes which Zeno was trying to levy were excessive, he asked leave to retire from his office, to the universal regret of the state (Suid. ad nom.) [M. F. A.]

ERYTHRAEUS (ERYTHRAEUS), bishop of Amissa, in the province of Heleneopoli, who signed the letter addressed by the bishops of that province to the emperor Leo on the subject of Timothaeus Aelurus, c. A.D. 458. (Acta Chalcad. pt. iii. c. 54; Mansi, vii. 608 a; Le Quien, Orb. Chr. i. 536.) [T. W. D.]

ERYTHRIUS, bishop of Lagonia. [EREBITUS] [T. W. D.]

ESADDAEUS, the name of one of the paternal angels in the system of JUSTINUS (Hippol. Ref. v. 26, p. 151). The name is apparenly the same as that given by the NAZARENES to the Maker of this world, Ἄρχων τῶν τῶν κυρίων ζωῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἰδρυμάτων (Hippol. Ref. v. 7, p. 104). Both forms do not represent the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים, as the Gnostic systems the Hebrew names for God are commonly used to denote subordinate agents; and Epiphanius (Haer. 40, p. 296) notes this in particular of the name Άρχων. Harvey (Irenaeus i. 225), adopting the form Esaddaeus, attempts, with little probability, to connect the word with ΛΑΡΑ, a tree. [Seeдоб.] [G. S.]
ESAIANI, heretics. [ESAIAS (8).]


[ T. W. D.]

ESAIAS (2). a Persian knight of the royal guard, and the son of Adabus of Arzun in Armenia. He was present at the torture and execution of Brichjunos, Elias, and their companions under Sapor II. in 327. [ELIAS.] He wrote the narrative of their acts in Chaldee, whence Metaphrastes translated it into Greek. (Assen. Martyr. Orient. i. 211, 224.) [ G. T. S.]

ESAIAS (3). [ISAIAH], an Egyptian abbot. There are assigned to one of this name and designation twenty-nine Orationes on the monastic life, apparently addressed to those who were under the author’s care, and nineteen Capitula on the monastic life, entitled De Religiosa Exercitatione et Quietur. Both these works are given by Gr Migne (Patr. Gr. xx. 1106-1211). Cotelerius, in his Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta, has published several sayings of an abbot Esaias, as well as the saying of an ascetic who mentions Esaias as one well known (Apophth. Patr. in Eccl. Gr. Mon. i. 445, 586, 801, 808). Among the works of Benedict of Aniane (708-721) there are sixty-eight Regulae of Monachos by “Isaias abbas” (Patr. Lat. ciii. 427-437). John of Damascus also has preserved two fragments of an abbot Esaias (Patr. Gr. xii. 1212). Whether all these works are to be ascribed to the same person or not is by no means clear. Ammonius, a bishop (apparently Egyptian, possibly Ammon of Antinoe, c. A.D. 394) writing to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria (385-412), mentions an Esaias whom he had known, and respecting whom Theophilus had made some enquiries; but he acquaints us with nothing more than his name and the fact of his being an ascetic. Rufinus of Aquileia (c. 410), in his Historia Manochorum (Patr. Lat. c. 427), speaks of three monastics (Esaias, being one) who met on the banks of the Nile and went in company to visit the anchorite Anuph, and he adds that they were present at Anuph’s death. Anuph, otherwise known as Anub, seems to have died c. A.D. 401 (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. i. 643). Palladius (c. A.D. 420) relates a story very similar to that of Rufinus (Hist. Lusec. cc. 55-56, in Patr. Gr. xxxiv. 1138). He also (cc. 15, 16) speaks of an Esaias, the son of a wealthy Spanish merchant, devoting himself along with his brother Pasius, on the death of their father, to an ascetic life, one of them founding a monastery, the other becoming an anchorite; but which of them it was that became an abbot cannot be determined from the narrative. (Galland. Notit. præf. Orationes Is. Abbat.; Tillemont, vii. 711; Vie Mace Abbé en Thebaïde; Cave, Hist. Lat. i. 254.)

[ T. W. D.]

ESAIAS (4). bishop of Hermopolis Parva (Damanhur) on the Egyptian Delta. He took part in the Epiphene “ Lairacium,” A.D. 449, but also in the fourth general council in 451, having apparently changed his opinions. (Mansi, vii. 404; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 516.) [J. de S.]

ESAIAS (5), bishop of Elaesa, in the province of Asia, signed the decree of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 699; Mansi, vi. 1085.)

[ L. D.]

ESAIAS (6) [ISAIAH], bishop of Naucratis, in the province of Aegyptus I., in the latter half of the 5th century (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. ii. 523). He was one of the Egyptian bishops who wrote to the emperor Leo, after the murder of Proterius bishop of Alexandria by Timotheus-Aelurus and his followers, A.D. 457 (Act. Or. Chalced. pt. iii. c. 22; Mansi, vii. 530 c), and also one of the signatories to the synodal letter of Gennadius bishop of Constantinople, condemning simony, A.D. 459 (Mansi, vii. 917 s). When the emperor Zeno restored Timotheus Solofacius, the successor of Proterius, to his see, Esaias was one of the legates who sent to Simplicius, bishop of Rome, to announce the fact of his return (Simpl. Pap. ep. 11, in Migne, Patr. Lat. viii. 49; Baron. A. E. ann. 478, ix.; Le Quen, ii. 523.)

[ T. W. D.]

ESAIAS (7), bishop of Rhodes and metropolitan, under which designation his name is attached to the report of the synod of Constantinople, A.D. 520, to pope Hormisdas, respecting the ordination of Epiphanius (Mansi, viii. 492 D). In the following year, as related by Theophanes, Esaias of Rhodes was deposed and punished for corrupt morals by the emperor, together with Alexander of Diospolis in Thrace. (Theoph. Chron. ann. 521, p. 151, in Patr. Gr. xviii. 407; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 925.) [O. H.]

ESAIAS (8) [Heracles], a deacon, apparently of Palestine, who was ordained bishop of Alexandria in succession to Peter Mongus (Liberat. Brev. c. 18, in Migne, Patr. xvii. 1029 a; Le Quen, Oriens Chr. ii. 420). Sophronius calls him “a disciple of another Peter,” whence he denomines in no measured terms (εἰς Ἐραταν καὶ πρεσβύτερον μαγία, Ep. Simod. ap. Act. Const. Const. A.D. 680, actio xi.; Labbe, vi. 889 n, ed. 1671; Conc. Gener. iii. 167, ed. 1628). His election being opposed, and the validity of his ordination being challenged, on the ground that the hands of the ordinary, Epiphanius of Perga, the metropolis of Pamphylia Secunda, had been laid on him by others after that prelate was dead, on which account his opponents called Esaias τερασκασιστόρστρυς, and numbers still adhering to him, a schism took place, and his followers were designated “Esaians” (Liberat. s. a. 1029 a; Theoph. Presb. de Recup. Introct. in Migne, Patr. Gr. xxxiv. pt. i. 45, § 14; Assenian. D.iss. de Mono- physit. Bibli. Or. ii. s. l.). Sophronius (s. a.) charges Esaias and Peter with having originated “another Acasthalian heresy among the Aca- phalici” (Nestle, Patriarchate of Alexandria, iii. § 3, p. 29).

[ T. W. D.]

ESALDAEUS. [ESALDAEUS.]

ESCHATOLOGY. The word, of comparatively late origin in theological language, is applied to that branch of theology which deals with the ultimate destinies of mankind, with the four last things (εἰς ἐκκαίρων)—death and seq-
and that the "Gospel was preached to the dead" (1 Pet. iii. 18; iv. 6). It cannot be wondered at that these conclusions of Christian eschatology have, for the most part, affirmed the endlessness alike of the rewards and punishments which shall be awarded by the Judge after the resurrection, that they have looked to the intermediate state with both hope and fear; that there, if anywhere, they have seen the region in which a work of illumination and purification might be carried on behind the veil.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the teaching of the New Testament tends not to a few passages to the thought of an universal restoration. The very term "restoration of all things" (Acts iii. 21) seems to imply a return to the primordial state in which God looked on the work of His hands, and saw that it was good (Gen. i. 31) before sin and pain, evil, moral or physical, had marred its perfection. If evil is both its aspects was the devil's work, Christ came to destroy the works of the devil (Heb. ii. 14; I John iii. 8), and that destruction is hardly accomplished by accomplishments in which even as he was, one soul in a thousand. He is to reign, this reigning apparently being closed by the judgment, and therefore including the whole intermediate state, until He has put all enemies under His feet (1 Cor. xv. 25). And among these enemies are death and Hades (1 Cor. xv. 26, 55), and that destruction is accomplished, the power of death as to its hold on the human race narrows in its range than that of the first. The many who "shall be constituted righteous" are represented as corresponding with "the ungodly who were constituted sinners (Rom. v. 19), and the language of the previous verse shows that "the many" are equivalent to "all." The hope of St. Paul for his kinsmen that "all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. xi. 26) is not satisfied by the conversion of a few, or even of many, individual leaves in their works of condemnation. Even those who stumbled at the root of offence had not so suddenly as to fall irretrievably (Rom. xi. 11). All, Jews and Gentiles alike, have been concluded under unbeknown that God might have mercy upon all (Rom. xi. 32). Lastly, there were not a few passages in the apostolic writings which might suggest, and, as a matter of fact, have suggested, rightly or wrongly, the idea of "destruction" in the sense of "annihilation" as the ultimate punishment of the wicked. There is the constant use of the word "destruction," and its equivalent "perdition" (ἀπώκτησις) of the various forms of the cognate verbs "destroy" and "perish." There is the present of the judgment, the long sleep, in which the soul is unconscious, between death and the resurrection, while this again is, in its turn, balanced by the language which speaks of death, as others spoke of it, as a sleep (1 Thess. iv. 15, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Matt. xxvii. 52; John xi. 11). That the sleep was not one of unconsciousness, but a period of external life, represented as the gift of God (Rom. vi. 23); that unrepented sin brings the loss of that life; that the King destroys his enemies; that the extremest penalty is described as the second death (Rev. xx. 14; xxi. 8). The language of the New Testament writers, it has been shown, deviated not of rising on equal grounds, as Plato did, the natural immortality of the soul. It speaks of God only as having immortality as belonging to His essential being.
ESCHATOLOGY

(1 Tim. vi. 15): of the gospel of Christ as having brought to light or illuminated that hope of immortality (2 Tim. i. 10). Death, which is, at least, the ever-recurring symbol of the punishment of evil, suggests the thought of the loss of conscious existence rather than of a perpetual consciousness of misery (Gen. iii. 17; Rom. vi. 23).

It is obvious that as the language of the New Testament was, for the most part, addressed to those who had been trained in the popular beliefs of Judaism, it was likely, so far as it did not protest against them, to be interpreted by those beliefs. We have to ask, accordingly, what they were, what sense was attached to them such terms as "death," "destruction," "hades," "Paradise," "Gehenna." As far as one Jewish sect, that of the Sadducees, is concerned, there is no room for doubt (Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xxiii. 25). They denied the resurrection, and did not fall back, as the Greek thinker did, upon a belief in the immortality of the incorporeal souls. They confined the action of the retributive justice of God, following, as they urged, the teaching of Moses, to the rewards and punishment of the present life. With the Pharisees and the great body of the Jews of the dispersion, who attached themselves to no school or system of thought, otherwise, they believed in a resurrection (Acts xxii. 26), and, if we accept the statement of Josephus (Ant. xviii. 13), in the natural "immortal vigour" (Tyrus libenter) of the soul. They spoke of the joy of Paradise, of the flames and torments of Gehenna. There is no room for doubt that they looked upon the state of the dead as that capable of being influenced for good by the prayers of the living (Death and the Dead). Prayers for the dead were an established part of the ritual of the synagogue at the time of the Maccabees, and is that of the temple sacrifices were added to the prayers (2 Macc. xii. 43-45). They are apparently implied in St. Paul's prayer for Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i. 14). They appear in the earliest inscriptions, probably in the 2nd century after Christ, in Jewish cemeteries (Garucci, Cimitero degli Ebrei). How far the Pharisees, or the popular, belief accepted the endlessness of punishments is, from this point of view, a question of great importance. It has been broadly asserted by those who speak with the authority of experts that the Talmud is altogether silent on that point; that the punishment even of the worst sinners is, in the judgment of the Rabbis, but for a season, and that the sacrifices, or even the prayers of the day of atonement avail to obtain pardon for those who have deserved condemnation. But the evidence, Eusebius (p. 35, and the authorities cited in Farrar's Eternal Hope, Exc. v). It may be questioned, however, whether this is not a somewhat one-sided statement. Josephus, who, at least, represents a widely diffused form of Hellenistic Pessimism, speaks of the Pharisees not only as holding the natural immortality of the soul, but as thinking that those who have done evil are kept in an everlasting (aiōnos, not aitoos), prison-house (Ant. xviii. 1, f. 3), and Schöttgen (Hor. Hebr. in Matt. xxiv. 46), quoted from the Midrash on Koheleth (col. 74), "In hoc mundo quae peccata sunt possunt reparari, sed futuro tempore quod pecatum est non potest reparari." "If a man prepares no food before the sabbath, how can he expect to share in the sabbath meal?" Taking, however, the great stream of Rabbinic traditions, as represented e. g. in Kisenmenger's Antichristus Judææ (part ii. c. 6), it may be admitted as true that they surround the idea of Gehenna with well-nigh all imaginable alleviations. They think of the condemned as allowed to rest on sabbaths and new moons; Abraham and Moses and Elias, and the prayers of kindred and of friends have power to deliver from it; the souls that are tormented praise God in the midst of the fire for the mercy that is mingled with His judgments. Some are punished for a few days, or weeks, or years (Ugoioli, Thes. xxx. p. 177), and when they are purified pass to Paradise. A few only, apostates and "Epicureans" (i.e. unbelievers in the resurrection), suffer for "many generations;" but in the end, Gehenna, which even now is separated from Paradise only as by a party-wall two hand-breadths thick, shall be itself purged, and made fit for the habitation of the blessed.

Lastly, there were the beliefs which Gentile converts, who were not deterred by physical or metaphysical difficulties from accepting the doctrine of the resurrection, would bring with them, and which were likely to modify more or less, consciously or otherwise, the re-creation of the teaching of Scripture. It is, of course, admitted that the cultivated intellect of the age had engendered a widely-spread scepticism as to the existence of a life after death —

E esse aliquos manes et subterranea regna
Noe pueri credunt ... .

Juvenal, Sat. ii. 140.

The hopes of Tacitus did not go beyond, "Si quis piorum manibus locus; si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguantur magne animae," holding, as it were, an aristocracy of immortality, while the great mass of mankind kept the dead soul in the fixed and stereotyped formula of Greek and Roman epitaphs (Agric. c. 40). Cicero, after an eloquent utterance of his hope, confesses his misgiving, "Quod si in hoc erro, quod animos huminum immortales esse credam, infector erro" (c. Senect. c. 23); and though he speaks much of the glory of the just, is silent as to the punishment of evil doers. Julius Caesar urged torture and imprisonment rather than death as a punishment for those who were traitors to the republic, on the ground that, as men looked for nothing after death that penalty had lost its deterring power (Sallust, Catil. c. 50). On the other hand, the old belief was not without its fatal effects. The teaching of Plato in the Phaedon, the Gorgias, and the Republic, had been popularised by Virgil in the sixth book of the Aeneid, and those who accepted it thought of the unseen world as a scene partly of retribution, partly of purification. Some pass to the Elysian fields, and some are cleansed in the Stygian lake, and some are sent to Tartarus for ever, and some remain there for ever (Phaed. p. 113).

... allis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum culitur solum, aut exturrur igni;
Quiesce suas patimur manes. Extinde per amplum
Mittimus Elysium et pucri laeta arva tenemus."

Verg. Aen. vi. 743-746.
The Eleusinian and other mysteries, perhaps, helped to diffuse and sustain this belief among those who were initiated, and the language of Lucretius is that of one who sees in the belief in endless punishment not an extinct superstition, but one against which the philosopher has to do vigorous and earnest battle.

"Nam si certam finem esse viderent Avernorum homines, aliquis ratione valenter Religiosus aegre minus oblesset vanum. Nunc ratio nulla est restandii, nullus facultas, Aeternas quoniam nonas in morte timendum." De Nat. R. III. 107-111.

II. It remains for us now to trace the course of Christian thought working upon these materials. For the most part it will be necessary to notice only those who held some modification of what may be recognized as historically the general belief of Christendom, that the punishment assigned to evildoers after the resurrection will be endless as the blessedness of the righteous, or who taught that a redeeming and purifying work might be carried on in the intermediate state, giving fresh opportunities, and therefore the fresh probation to some of not so many; who, at the time of their death, were not qualified by their faith or works for the peace and rest of God.

Of the two methods which present themselves,—that of noting chronologically the views maintained by the great fathers and teachers of the church on the point now before us, or classifying them, still retaining as far as may be, subject to that classification, a chronological arrangement, according as they represented this or that school of thought,—the latter will be adopted, as presenting, on the whole, most advantages.

1. It would not be true to say that the theory of the annihilation of the wicked after they have endured, subsequent to the resurrection, a penalty commensurate with their guilt, is altogether without patristic authority; but Taylor’s language (Christ’s Advent to Judgment, vol. v. p. 45, ed. Heber), that it was what “the primitive doctors were willing to believe,” is unduly coloured by his own manifest leaning towards that view, and his shrinking from the popular belief in equal and endless torments for all the lost. The passages that look in that direction are, indeed, very few, and their main purpose is less to assert the finite character of punishment than to protest against the Platonic assumption of an inherent immortality involving, as that seemed to do, an eternal pre-existence, and a perpetual series of transmigrations. Thus Justin speaks: “Our souls are not immortal nor uncreated, yet I say not that all souls die, for that indeed would be a godsend (ἐγκομιόν) to the wicked, but that those of the godly abide in a better place, and the unrighteous and evil in a worse, waiting for the time of judgment. And thus some, appearing worthy of God, die no more, and some are punished (καταδίωξο) so long as God wills them to exist and to be punished” ( Dial. c. Tryph. c. 5). The words clearly admit the thought of an ultimate “cessing to be” in the lost, but they cannot be said to do more. Elsewhere, in the same treatise (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 130), he speaks, in reference to Isai. lxxv. 24, of the very bodies of sinners as consumed by the worm and the ceaseless fire, and yet remaining immortal (ἀθάνατα), and in his Apology he speaks freely of ἄνευς θάνατος as contrasted with the thousand years of Plato (Reg. p. 615; Phain. p. 240; Apol. i. 192), of the punishment lasting for a limitless period (ἀτείχον αἰών), (Apol. i. 28). What has been said of Justin holds good also of Irenæus. He, too, speaks of life as the gift of God: “And he who shall reject life and prove himself ungrateful to his Maker . . . deprives himself of continuance for ever and ever” (v. 34, § 2). “God’s fixed things are eternal, and without end in God, and therefore the less of them is also eternal and never ending” (v. 27, § 2). Taken by themselves, these words, though they are compatible with, and perhaps even suggest, the thought of the annihilation of the wicked, cannot be said to affirm it. Irenæus, like Justin, argues against the Platonic theory of the pre-existent immortality of the soul. Eternal life is God’s gift to those who are worthy of it, but the privation of that life may mean the loss of the blessedness of being rather than of being itself, and his language elsewhere shows that this is what he actually did mean. “Those who fly from the eternal light of God . . . are themselves the cause of their inhabiting eternal darkness, destitute of all good things” (iv. § 39, 4). “The word of God prepares a fitting habitation for both those who seek and those who shun the light . . . for those who are in the light that they may rejoice in it, for those in darkness that they may partake in its calamity” (v. 29, § 1). So a passage in the Epistle to Diognetus (c. 10), which speaks of the eternal fire as punishing ἐπίθετοι τοῦ ἀποκαταστάσεως being interpreted of ultimate annihilation. Hints of the annihilation of the lost after this period are few and far between. Arnobius, however (Dopp. adv. Gentes, ii. 15–54) teaches that the soul has no natural immortality, and that after the resurrection souls and bodies are gradually consumed and annihilated in Gehenna. [ARNOB.] 2. The belief in a universal restoration is commonly associated with the great name of Origen. It would be truer to say, and this was afterwards treated as the vulnerable point in his system, that he taught the perpetual freedom of the will, and therefore set no time-limit to the capacity for restoration. The fullest statement of his views is found in the treatise Ἐκκόλογιον, noticeable as the first attempt at the systematic and scientific treatment of theology in Christian literature. He is brought face to face with the question, What does the whole scheme of redemption amount to, in what is the end and consummation of all things? He opens, after half fearing the charge of heresy from prejudiced hearers, and premises that he speaks with caution, discussing rather than dogmatizing. But he openly proclaims his belief that the goodness of God, when each sinner shall have received
the penalty of his sins, will, through Christ, lead the whole universe to one end. This seems to him involved in the promise that all enemies shall be put under the feet of Christ (Ps. cx. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 25). The end will be like the beginning, and all shall be very good. The statement in Phil. ii. 10, that "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things under the earth," seems to him to involve a willing subjection, and therefore the cessation of a rebellious and resistent evil. Even the angels who kept not their first estate may, some of them at least, profit by the help of their unfallen brothers and be capable of restoration. The prayer of Christ for unity (John xvii. 21), which embraces the universe, as also does St. Paul's vision of the "perfect man" in whom all shall be united (Eph. iv. 13). This hope to be extended to the devil and his angels, or has inveterate habit hardened in them into a second nature? He, for his part, will not refuse to extend this grace to them, as they may deserve, greater punishments be endured; but if the will is free, any nature endowed with reason may pass from one order of being to another, each act of volition bringing with it its own punishment or reward (De Princ. i. c. 6). The change, as distinct from the destruction, of the heavens or the earth or the human frame, shall be the work of God (2 Pet. iii. 5, 12, witnesses for him to a like change, and not destruction, of those who are wending their way to that final blessedness. He is led to examine into the nature of the fire which tries every man's work and is the penalty of evil, and he finds it in the mind itself—in the memory of every sin committed before his eyes as an open scroll, and he looks on it with shame and anguish unspeakable. The Physician of our souls can use his own processes of healing. The "outer darkness" and Paradise are but different stages in the education of the great school of souls, and their upward and onward progress depends on their purity and love of truth (Princ. i. 6). It is his wish that "all these things" may come to pass; and in his mind he has the ideas of the resurrection as well as the nakedness; all alike need a sacrament to cleanse and purify us" (Hom. xiv. in Luc.). The fire of the last day will, it may be, be at once a punishment and a remedy, burning up the wood, hay, stubble, according to each man's merits, yet all working to the destined end of restoring man to the image of God, though, as yet, men must be treated also as they treat the servants of the judgment rather than the final restoration have to be brought before those who can be converted only by fears and threats (Cont. Cels. v.). Gehenna stands for the torments that cleanse the soul, but for the many who are scarcely restrained by the fears of eternal torment it is not excepted to go far into that matter, hardly indeed to commit our thoughts to writing, but to dwell on the certain and inevitable retribution for all evil (Cont. Cels. vi.). God is indeed a consuming fire, but that which He consumes is the evil that is in the souls of men, not the souls themselves (Isa. 41. 24). The hope of Origen colours even his view of the guilt of Judas, and he sees in his suicide the act of one who wished to meet his Master in the world of the dead, and there to implore forgiveness (Tract. xxxv. in Matt.) It is noticeable, however, that he does not there speak of the final salvation of Judas, and that his doctrine of reserve shows itself in his dwelling on the separation of the evil and good in Matt. xxxv. 46 as final, without speaking of the hope of a restoration as lying beyond it in the remote future.

What Origen thus whispered, as it were, to the ear in the secret chamber was proclaimed by Gregory of Nyssa as from the house top. His universe is an unseen and unknown work of God, that of bishop Newton of Bristol. The whole course of life was for him a discipline leading to virtue. If any one remain uncurbed by its health process (θεραπεύει) is continued in the life that follows. It may take for some, sharp and severe forms, the work of the knife and the scythe, "the golden chisel" (de Mon. 1). The creature of God's hands to its original likeness will be sufficient (Orat. Catech. viii.). Those who are not sharers in the purification by baptism will be purified by fire (Orat. Catech. xxxv.). Men are angry often with those who use severe remedies, but afterwards they thank them, and so, in like manner, when evil has mingled and implanted in their nature has been, after long periods of time, eradicated, and there shall be a restoration (ἀφοδησώσει) of those who are now lying in evil to their primal state; there shall be an accordant thanksgiving to God from all creation, both of those who needed and those who did not need purification (Orat. Catech. xxxvi.). This same idea has been developed more systematically in the treatise de Anima et Resurrectione. "The process of healing shall be proportioned to the measure of evil in each of us, and when the evil is purified and blotted out, there shall come in its place to each immortality and life and honour" (vol. iii. pp. 255, 260, ed. 1837). Now the race of men is by its evil shut out from the divine, but the barriers by which sin excludes us from that within the veil will one day be broken down, and when our nature shall be reconstructed, as in a new tabernacle (Σάλβος), and all the corruption that sin has brought in shall be blotted out, then shall God be the great feast of God for all whom the resurrection has brought together as His guests (iii. p. 245). In the end there shall be one common joy for all, and those who are now through sin outside the sanctuary of the divine blessedness will then cling to the horns of the altar, e.g. to the Founder of the world above (De Animi, Opp. ii. p. 672). It is true that he, who seeks his punishment through seems to which no limit can be assigned (De Animi, Opp. ii. p. 650) of a chastisement that shall extend through an eternal interval (εἰς αὐλον διαστήμα). But it is clear, as indeed the last word shews, that he looks forward beyond this to the ultimate...
mate extirpation of evil and the restoration of mankind, to a time "when there shall no longer be a sinner in the universe (in Psalm. iii. vol. ii. p. 289), and the war between good and evil shall be ended (ὅσις), and the nature of evil shall pass into nothingness, and the divine and unmingled goodness shall embrace all intelligent existence." (vol. i. 946). What is noticeable in Gregory of Nyssa is the admission of an apparent consciousness that he is deviating into the by-paths of new and strange opinions. He claims to be taking his stand on the doctrines (δόγματα) of the church in thus teaching with as much confidence as when he is expounding the mysteries of the divine nature as set forth in the creed of Nicaea (ii. p. 663). And the same absence of any sense of being even in danger of heresy is seen in most of those who followed in his footsteps or those of Origen. The Apologia for Origen, which was the joint work of Eusebius and Pamphilus, defends him without any hesitation. Theodore of Mopsuestia teaches that "those who have sinned evil all their life long will be made worthy of the sweetness of the divine bounty. For never would Christ have said 'until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing,' unless it were possible for us to be cleansed when we have paid the penalty. Nor would He have spoken of the many stripes and few unless after men had borne the punishment of their sins they might afterwards hope for pardon." (Fragment, ed. Fritzsche, p. 41.) Even Gregory of Nazianzus, when speaking of the filters that is not quenched, throws out the thought, as though it were at least admissible, that there may be a πῦρ φιλαθροῦντος καὶ τῶν καλῷστων ἐκαστῶν (Orat. xi. 36), destined to receive not in the fire of evil punishment, but in the fire of the divine, and filled with a sweetness of immortality, and was followed by Stephenus, bishop of Edesa, and Solomon of Bassora, and Isaac of Nineveh. "Even those who are tortured in Gehenna are under the discipline of the divine charity" (Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. iii. p. 329); and they were followed in their turn by Constantine, bishop of Soba (ibid. iv. p. 204). Timotheus II. patriarch of the Nestorians, wrote that "by the prayers of the saints the souls of sinners may pass from Gehenna to Paradise" (ibid. iv. p. 344). Many of these teachers were, it is true, like the last-named, followers of Nestorius, and were so far in communion with the orthodox churches of the East, but it is obvious that the special point on which Nestorius was condemned had no direct connexion with this or that form of eschatology, and that it was derived by them from those whose orthodoxy, like that of Gregory of Nyssa, was unquestioned. We have no evidence that the belief in the αἰωνιοῦν νόμισμα, which prevailed in the 4th and 5th centuries, was ever definitely condemned by any council of the church, and so far as Origen was named as coming under the church's censure it was rather as if involved in the general sentence passed upon the leaders of Nestorianism than singled out for special and characteristic errors. So the council of Constantinople, the so-called fifth general council, A.D. 553, condemns Arius, Æmonius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and Origen in a lump, but does not specify the errors of the last-named, though they differed in kind from theirs, and it is not till the council of Constantinople known as in Trullo (A.D. 696) that we find an anathema which specifies, somewhat cloudily, the guilt of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Origen and Didymus and Evagrius as consists in their inventing a mythology (μυθολογία) after the manner of the Greeks, and inventing changes and migrations for our soul and body; there is no mention of the drunken ravings (μυθομαστήματα) as to the future life of the dead" (Conc. Quinis. can. i.). It deserves to be noted that this ambiguous anathema pronounced by a council of no authority under the weak and vicious emperor Justinian II. is the only approach to a condemnation of the eschatology of Origen which the annals of church councils present. So even in the West, where the harder nature of the African and the practical character of the Roman section of the Latin church made men indisposed to share in the wider sympathies and hopes of the great Alexandrian thinker, there was no form of sect that have dared to denounce him as a man without horror in the language of individual writers. Jerome, who does not accept Origen's view, speaks of it with a tolerant fairness, as though it were almost or altogether an open question: "Those who think that the punishment of the wicked will one day, after many ages, have an end rely on these testimonies," he writes on Rom. xi. 25, Gal. iii. 22, Mic. vii. 9, Isai. xii. 1, Ps. xxx. 20, which he gives in extenso. "And this we ought to leave to the knowledge of God alone, whose torments, no less than his compassion, are in due measure, and who knows how and how long He ought to punish. This only let us say, as suitting our human frailty, 'Lord, pass over the fault of thy servant,' which means 'Lord, berate me in thine anger.'" (Hieron. in Essai, iv. 1, v. 13.) So in commenting on Isai. xxiv. "post multos dies visitabitur." "This," he says, "seems to favours those friends of mine who grant the grace of repentance to the devil and to demons after many ages, that they too shall be visited after a time." He explains the text in a way to which it is said God's necessity forbids him to proceed this, and then, as before, falls back upon man's ignorance. "Human frailty cannot know the judgment of God, nor venture to form an opinion of the greatness and the measure of His punishment." (Hieron. in Essai, xxiv.)

The drift of Augustine's mind, with his exclusion of all outside the visible church from the hope of salvation, his leniency damnum for unbaptized infants, his doctrine of the divine decrees, hardly leads us to expect anything at his hands less than an absolute rejection of the Origenistic views. It deserves to be noted, however, that it was Pelagius rather than Augustine who laid stress upon the eternity of future punishments, insisted on Matt. xxv. 41, adding new objections over their endlessness, and taunted his Catholic opponents who held a remedial discipline as applicable at least to Christians dying with an imperfect holiness as being followers of Origen (de Gest. Pelag. c. 9–11). The taunt apparently had its effect. Augustine shrank from the term "Origenism" as the framework of the forty-second article of 1552 shirked from being classed with the Anabaptists who revived Origen's wider hope in the 16th century, and was led to disclaim more emphatically any approach
to the special view of Origen. On the other hand, he continued also to assert even more definitely his own view of a purgatorial punishment for the baptized. Even in him, however, there is at times a strange absence of the horror and alarm with which the assertion of the hope of universal restoration has not unfrequently been greeted; later, however, he admits that that view was held by "nonnulli, itu quum plurimi," who were led by feelings of human pity. He does not accept it, but he allows men to believe, if they like, that there will be "mitigation and lumen" of the punishments of the lost (see infra). When he deals more systematically with the question it is in the same half-supercilius tone as Jerome: "We must now enter on a peaceable discussion with our compassionate friends"... He names Origen as holding that even the devil and his angels would after long ages of punishment be restored to fellowship with the holy angels. On this ground, he says, and for other reasons, especially for the "unceasing alternations" of blessedness and misery which Origen's theory was supposed to have involved, the church had rightly rejected (reprobavit) it. He condemns two modified forms of the Origenistic view—(1) that of the universal restoration of all mankind, but not of fallen angels, or even spirits, through the goodness of God, or (2) that of a like restoration obtained by the intercessions of the saints, as inconsistently stopping short of their logical consequence. If the assumption that the divine compassion will include the whole human race, why should it stop short there? Those who held the latter view, and Augustine states that he had met many who held it, in the preceding chapter on the belief that the saints in Paradise will not cease in their perfection to pray for those for whom they used to pray on earth; (2) on the words of Ps. lxxvi. 10 in the Latin version, Num obliviscor misericordiae tuae, aut continebit in ira et miseratione tuae sanctus? and (3) on the fact that the history of Jonah's mission to Nineveh proved that punishments threatened in the future were not to be withdrawn. He notices further modified forms of the wider hope which held out the promise of salvation to all who have been baptized, even though it be with heretical baptism, or to all who have received baptism in the Catholic church, even if they have fallen afterwards into heresy, or, at least, to all who have kept the Catholic faith, irrespective of holiness of life, or have not failed, whatever other sins they may have committed, in works of charity. He urges against all these views that the scriptural word aeternum, with its equivalent in saecula saeculorum, can only mean "quod fera non habitum" and that it must be the same meaning in Matt. xxv. 46, whether describing the blessedness of the righteous or the punishment of the wicked (de Civ. Dei, xxi. 17–27). It may be noted that in this discussion of all the views on this matter that seemed to him at variance with the language of scripture, Augustinus seems not to have the theory of the manifestation of the impetuous doers of evil. That view, if it had been ever really held in the Christian church, had clearly been thrown altogether into the back-ground, and was practically nowhere. From this period, with the authority of the great African father thrown into the scale against it, the doctrine of universal restoration tended to fall into the same position, as far as the Western church was concerned, and though never formally condemned, may be said to have virtually been rejected. It was, perhaps, partly as a consequence of that rejection that the intermediate view, the history of which now remains to be traced, came into greater prominence.

3. Those who shrank from the consequences, real or supposed, of the teaching of Origen were able to cherish the hope of an undefined though not an universal restoration, even in the case of those who departed this life in a state so imperfect that it is called for punishment. As the greater includes the less, it is obvious that the followers of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa would admit both the beliefs and the arguments of those who maintained the more moderate and cautious view. The dominant thought in the mind of these latter was that the redeeming work of Christ and the possibility of repentance, and the special agency of the oblation in the prayers and sacraments, and the sanctifying work of the Spirit, are not confined within the narrow limits of this life, but have a wide range of action in the period that lies between death and judgment. Here again it is in the church of Alexandria, as represented by Origen's master, Clement, that we find the earliest and most distinct utterances of the wider hope. He recognises that Christ preached the gospel to those in Hades, and that it brought repentance not to the souls of patriarchs and Jewish saints only, but to heathen seekers after righteousness. Then also the apostles had been fellow-workers with their Master in proportion to their likeness to Him, some working, according to the task assigned to them on earth, among the souls of the Hebrews, some among those of the Gentiles (Strom. vi. 44, 45). The punishments (κολλοδεία) of God in Hades are remedial and reformatory (σωτήριον καὶ παθετηρίαν), and lead to repentance, and this work is easier for those who are no longer under the temptation of the flesh (ibid. c. 46). God is all-good and all-powerful, and is able to save all who turn to Him, whether it be here or there (ibid. c. 47). He quotes the Κηρυγμα Πέρατος as showing that the moral government (μετακομη) of God requires that those who have had no opportunity of knowing the truth in this life should have that opportunity elsewhere, since otherwise they would have no adequate probation (ibid. c. 48). He recognises in the κερκυραίος of the Stoics an anticipation of the Christian doctrine of the purification by fire of those who have lived evil lives (ibid. v. 9). The souls that are punished (κακάφηλα) are yet purified by the fire (Phragm. 14).

The wide acceptance of the gospel of Nicodemus, with its vivid pictures of the descent into Hades, and the work of deliverance accomplished there, robbing death and Hades of all their prisoners (Evang. Nicod. c. 24), wiping away the tares from the wheat (ibid. c. 23), and rescuing those whom Satan had held bound, and placing him in chains in place of Adam and his sons (ibid. c. 23), testifies to the prevalence of the belief which Clement thus asserts, and we must not forget that when the article "He descended into hell" was received into the
Apostles’ Creed, in the earlier text of which it does not appear, it came weighted, so to speak, with all the associations that had thus gathered round it. It was received because it spoke to men of Christ as the cornerstone of this world, but extending to the unseen. Even in Hades the cross had been set up as the symbol and pledge of deliverance. Even there He was drawing all men unto Him. So Athanasius (if the treatise de Passione et Cruci Domini is his) speaks of Satan as cast out of Hades at the time of the deliverance, all whom he had kept in prison set free by the victorious Christ (Opp. ii. p. 1017, ed. 1586). So Chrysostom (de Coen. et Erope, Expos. in Ps. xlvii.) speaks of the descent into Hades as binding the devil and bringing his prey, the human race, into the treasury of the eternal King. So Cyril of Jerusalem, almost reproducing the very language of the gospel of Nicodemus, speaks of Christ as descending to Hades that He might ransom the just. He descended alone, but He returned with many following Him. The souls that had been long in prison were set free (Catech. i. xiv.). So Epiphanius describes the descent as made to rescue those who had not fallen away utterly from the Church, but whose frailties in Hades, by giving them, as it were, an amnesty (ampierein) (adv. Haer. i. 3). And in this view the Latin fathers are at one with the Greek. Ambrose refers the gospel preached to the dead of 1 Pet. iv. to the descent into Hades “utquotque cupidit ejus essent, liberarentur” (50). So the message with the saving of the souls that He had rescued (in Rom. x.). Some of these were they who appeared to many after His resurrection (in Ep. iv.). Comp. also the statements in the De Myst. Pasch.

It was natural that men like Origen and his school should interpret the “fire that tries every man’s work” of 1 Cor. iii. 13, the “fire” of 1 Cor. vii. 9, of purifying punishment in the intermediate state, and should extend that idea even to the “seasian fire” of Matt. xxv. 46, and the “unquenchable fire” of Mark ix. 43. It is more suggestive to note that even those who strayed from that path, did not confine the redeeming or purifying work in Hades to the brief period of the actual descent. So Symeonis (Ep. 44), though he speaks of the deathless soul paying, if its guilt is incurable, a deathless penalty, teaches that there are δαιμωνια, whose work it is to purify souls, as fullers cleanse a soiled garment. Even Tertullian (de Anim. c. 58) teaches that the last fasting “of the sinner’s debt, if it be not a medicum delictum,” may be paid by sufferings there. Even Cyprian (Ep. ix.) holds that some of those who are sent, on death, into the prison-house may come forth when they have paid the uttermost fasting, while martyrs receive their crown at once; that it may be necessary for some to be cleansed and purified by fire before they can enter into the suffering, waiting for the judgment of the great day. Even Jerome, while holding that there are eternal torments for the rebprobate and godless, speaks of the works of Christians as “having to be tried and purified by fire” (in Eus. lixi. ad fin.); of Christians who have fallen into sin as “salvandos post poenas” (Dial. c. Pelag. i. 28), and adopts the general (“a plerique”) explanation of the undying worm and the fire that is not quenched, of the anguish of conscience (in Essai lvi. 24). Even Augustine admits that between death and judgment there may be punishments that endure for a season only (de Civ. Dei, xxii. 13); that some sins not forgiven in this world are forgiven in the world to come, sc. in that interval (de Civ. Dei, xxii. 24) and are purgatorial in their nature (ibid. xxii. 16; Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 18). We pray for those who have not fallen utterly from grace, that after their punishment the right of being shewn to them, so that they may not go into eternal fire (ibid. xxii. 24). The fire which tries and purifies is not eternal, and of this view that each soul will suffer according to its need of suffering, Augustine says: “Nee redarguo quod forsitan verum est” (ibid. xxi. 28). The effect of this earlier doctrine of purgatory on devout souls is well illustrated by the touching prayer at the close of the Hemartogeneia of Prudentius already quoted (Art. DEATH AND THE DEAD, vol. i. p. 796). Those that are suffering that “ignis purgatorius” may be helped in the interval between death and the resurrection by the prayers and alms of the faithful, and the “saltatio altaris.” The fact that that sacrifice was offered in the liturgies of Augustine’s time for all souls, and not for the elect only, to whom his theory limited the hope of salvation, presented a difficulty which he meets with a characteristic subtlety. These sacrifices differ in their effects from prayers with their object in mind, of which there are “valde bonis gratiarum actiones sunt; pro nee valde malia propitiationes sunt; pro valde malis etiamis nulla sunt adventus mortuorum, quae deorum vivorum consolationes sunt.” Quibus autem prosum aut ad hoc prosum, ut sit plena remissio, aut certa ut tolerabilis fat damnatio” (Enchirid. c. 20). But after the resurrection the doors of the dead will be closed. Admitting the fact that the belief is a regret or cessation of the “aesterna damnationum poena” was held by “nonnulli imo quas plurimi” (a doctrine so held must have been at least regarded by the church as not incompatible with the faith of which she was the keeper) be for his part rejected. He barely allows (non ide conspico quia non resistis, de Civ. Dei, xxii. 24) the possibility of a levamen of the cruciatius or poena sensiis of the lost, but the poena damnii, the alienatio a vita Dei will be the common portion of all (Enchirid. c. 29).

And so the dark shadow of Augustine fell on the theology of the Western church, and condemned its thoughts of the love of God to many centuries of disastrous twilight. It started from the assumption that the whole human race was, through the sin of Adam, una massa perdification. From this Divine grace elected some to salvation. But none are elected outside the range of those who believe and are baptized. The whole of this world, therefore, was left to eternal torments: its virtues were but “splendidis vita” (de Civ. Dei, xix. 25). Even for unbaptized infants dying before they had done good or evil there was but the “levissima damnatio” of the alienation from the life of God, which was the common lot of all the lost, and compared with the eternity of which, any torments enduring for ages and then ceasing.
would be a light thing to bear (Ezech. v. 29). And baptism, though indispensable, was yet not sufficient. To hold the true faith, to live a holy life, these they rightly saw were conditions of eternal blessedness, and these were possible only for those who came under the decree of God's electing grace. The narrowness of medieaval scholasticism, the hardness of Calvinistic Protestantism are each of them traceable to the influence of the great bishop of Hippo. And to that influence also, it must be added, is traceable the whole scholastic and Tridentine doctrine of purgatory, with all its practical corruptions. The instincts of mankind led them to turn to the one mitigating feature in the terrible theology that shut out ninety-nine hundredths of mankind from all hope of escaping hell, and the "ignis purgatorius pro non valde malignis," admitting of mitigation, capable even of being short-cased by prayers, alms, the sacrifice of the altar, came into greater and greater prominence. Practically even in the next great Latin father, Gregory the Great, it is thought of by each man his own kindred and friends as non valde mali, and natural affection, or even the conventional decorum which required the shew of affection, led men to provide the means of mitigation. They could repeat prayers, give alms, pay for masses. The indulgences of Tetzel were but the natural development of the theology of Celistantianism. It was reserved for Calvinism and popular Protestantism to reproduce all that was hardest in it without even that element of mitigation. The teaching of the Western church from this period offers hardly any exception to the reproduction of Augustine's leading lines of thought. The language of the next great Latin father, Gregory the Great, is indeed even more sternly: "There is a purgatorial fire, but it is only for very small sins." Admitting the natural meaning of Matt. xii. 31, it is only for such sins as "an idle word or immoderate laughter" that remission may be looked for in the other world, and then only by those who have deserved remission in this world. (Dialog. iv. 34). Even the "mitigatio" of Augustine has passed into the back-ground, and he teaches a progressive increase in guilt and therefore in punishment: "ad deteriora quotidie impulsus est."

**K. H. P.**

**ESCHROPOEI** (Alexaprovot), mentioned by Antichus, the monk of St. Saba, as a designation of the later Origenist sect (Antioch. Monach. Homil. 130, p. 1246, Patr. Gr. Lxxix. 1847 a).

**T. W. D.**

**ESCONN,** bishop of Bochlinuad, commemorated Nov. 20. He is thus designated at his commemoration in *Mart. Doneg.* but in Dr. Reeve's Calendar he is said to be "of Drumidaganda." The attempt is made, though not very successfully, to identify this Esconn with the heretic name, Mo-Esscon, with Maxentius, Virgin Martyr, who is venerated on the same day, and also on April 16 and Oct. 24. [Makentia] [Mart. Doneg.] by Todd and Reeves, 314-15, 406-7; Reeves, Eccl. Ant. 381; Butler, Lives of the Saints, Nov. 20, xi. 429; Sp. Forbes, Kut.

**ESDRAS** (Ezr, Jeser.) catholicos or metriarch of Armenia. He was born at Pharhajagerd in the canton of Nik or Nica, and the province of Ararad in Great Armenia, and in 628 succeeded Christopher Abrahamita. Le Quien (Or. Chr. i. 1386), who does not date his accession, quotes a catalogue which assigns ten years to his rule, but Saint-Martin makes him...
succeeded by Nersea III. in 640 (Mém. sur L'Arménie, i. 438). For the important synod of Charanum (a.d. 672 or 673) which distinguishes the pontificate of Eudes, see Armenian, Vol. I. p. 165. [C. H.]

ESEWINE (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1419, in M. H. B. 781), king of Wessex. [ESWINE] [C. H.]

ESL, abbat. [ESL.]

ESCHIUS. [ESCHIUS.]

ESCHIUS I. and II., bishops of Poitiers, stand respectively eleventh and twelfth in the episcopal lists of that see, but nothing whatever is known of their history. (Gall. Christ. ii. 1143; Gams, Ser. Ep. 50.) [R. T. S.]

ESICIA (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. i. ind. ix. ep. 6, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 450), a lady. [ESCHIA.] [C. H.]

ESIMPHAES (ESIMPHAES), king of the Homeritae or Himyari, the people of Yemen in Arabia Felix. He was a Christian, and was raised to the throne of his country by Hellestheues the king of Anthiphaios, on the condition, however, that he became his tributary. During his reign, he rendered valuable aid to Justinian in his war with the Persians. After the death of Hellestheues Esimphaes was deposed, and Abraham, who also was a Christian, was chosen in his stead. (Procop. de Bell. Pers. i. 20.) [T. W. D.]

ESITUSS, bishop of Grenoble. [ESCHIUS.]

ESLINGUS, bishop of Tours. [ESLINGUS.]

ESNE (AEINE), the tenth bishop of Hereford. (M. H. B. 631.) Under the form of Peine his name appears among the signatures to the legatine canons of 787. As his predecessor Alderbert was at Brentford in 781, and his successor Coelmonud attests charters in 788, the date of Esne is so far ascertained, but nothing more is known of him. The name, which signifies a servant, or a serving man (see Schmidt, Ges. p. 569) seems to be peculiar to this bishop as a distinctive appellation; but it appears in the will of king Alfred as belonging to a bishop of his time, unassigned to any see, and may there be an interpolation: see Lib. de Hyda, p. 65; Kemble, C. D. No. 314. [S.]

ESNIG, Armenian patriarch. [EZNIK.]

ESOTUS. [ESOTUS.]

ESPASANDUS, bishop of Complutum (Alcala de Henares), subscribes the acts of the fifteenth and sixteenth councils of Toledo, under Egica. He was bishop from about 686 till after 693 (Esp. Syns. vii. 189; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 313, 333) [ASTURUS]. [M. A. W.]

ESPERAINDOW, bishop of Italica, signs the twelfth council of Toledo, called by Ervig, and presided over by Julian. [ERVINO.] His name comes eleventh among thirty-five. He died probably a.d. 682, and was succeeded by Cuniald, whom Wamba had endeavoured to make bishop of Aquit (Esp. Syns. vii. 267, Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 270). [EUALUS.] [M. A. W.]

ESPIAN, venerated at Beaumais in France is said, by Guerin and Girry, to have been son of Ella, king of Scotland and Northumbria, and of his queen Pantihomena in the 9th century, and that the brother of SS. Maura and Brigida (the first Ella reigned in Deira 559-588; another Ella, or Aella usurped the throne of Northumbria, a.d. 867. Anglo-Saxon Chron.). On the death of his father he declined the throne, and went with his sisters to France, where, after visiting Rome, they were seized upon by barbarian hordes and murdered at Balangry, near Creil, in the diocese of Beauvais. Their bodies were exhumed at Nogent-la-Vierges in the 12th century. But the whole story is legendary, and does not rise to the value of history (Saring- Gould, Lives of the Saints, July 23, p. ii. 306-308). [J. G.]

ESPIUS, fifth bishop of Syracuse, probably early in the 2nd century. He succeeded Eusias I., and was followed by Ethmotheus (Rcsa- Pirri, Sicilia Sacra, i. 600.) [R. S. G.]

ESSENES or ESSAEANS ('Esseni or Essowen). One of the three sects of Judaism at the time of Christ, the other two being the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The etymology and import of this name will best be considered after an examination of the tenets and practices of this sect or brotherhood, as well as of their rise and development.

1. The Doctrines and Practices of the Essenes.—Being Hebrews of the Hebrews, the Essenes firmly believed in God as the Creator and Disposer of all things. They believed in the immortality of the soul, and in a future state of retribution, where the righteous and the wicked will be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body. They regarded death as a great gain, inasmuch as it was the entrance into glory. With the discarding of this corruptible body, the incorruptible soul obtained her liberty from bondage, and mounted upwards to the region of pure spirits, whilst the souls of the wicked were consigned to a dark and tempestuous dungeon, full of never-ceasing punishments. But if we are to accept the opinion of Josephus, which, as we shall hereafter, is seen to be correct, they did not believe in the resurrection of the body. Their faith in the inspired law of God was so intense that they were led thereby to pay the greatest reverence to Moses the lawgiver, and to consider blasphemy of his name a capital offence. They divided their doctrines into three classes: 1. Love to God; 2. Love of virtue; and 3. Love to mankind. "Of their love to God," Philo tells us, "they give innumerable demonstrations, by their constant and unalterable holiness throughout the whole of their life, their avoidance of oaths and falsehoods, and by their firm belief that God is the source of all good, but of nothing evil. Of their love of virtue they give in signs their contempt for riches, fame, and pleasure; their continence and endurance; in their satisfying their wants easily; in their simplicity, cheerfulness of temper, modesty, order, firmness, &c. As instances of their love to man, are to be mentioned their benevolence, equality, and their having all things in common." Their aim in life was: to be separate from the world with its evil practices, to live a life of holiness and devotion to God, to benefit mankind,
to become the temple of the Holy Spirit, so as to be enabled to prophesy and perform miraculous cures, and to prepare themselves for a future state of bliss and reunion with the Father of Spirits. To obtain this end they had to adopt stringent regulations which should keep them from the contaminations of the world.

The Levitical and ceremonial laws of purity which were developed after the restoration by Ezra, and especially during the Maccabean period, and which were observed with more or less rigour by the different schools of the Jewish nation, constituted the foundation upon which the Essenes reared the whole edifice of their domestic arrangements and regulations, according to these laws, contact with any one who did not observe the rules of purity, or even did not observe them to the same degree, rendered the faithful followers impure, the Essenes had to form themselves into a separate society or community. Moreover as contact with things manifestly unclean was forbidden by any one who did not keep the same rules, likewise produced impurity, the Essenes were also obliged to cultivate and manufacture all the articles of food and dress which their commonwealth required. The rigorous observance of the laws of purity also led some of the Essenes to choose a celibate life as a profession of consecration, and the periodical defiled state of women arising from their courses and childbirth were a perpetual source of defilement to a sanctified life. Their regulations were therefore religio-industrial.

II. Their Daily Occupation and Manner of Life.

—To raise the supplies, all the members took their share in the common labours, whether by tilling the soil, or by the trade or art which they possessed. They got up before sunrise, and never talked about any worldly matters till they had all assembled together, and, with their faces turned towards the sun, offered up their national prayer for the renewal of the light of day. Immediately after this religious duty they betook themselves to manual work under the direction of the stewards whom they elected by universal suffrage, to their respective employments. The farmers among them cultivated the ground and reared the bees; the shepherds tended the flocks, the bakers prepared the food, the tailors and shoemakers made and repaired the articles of dress. At this work, they remained till the fifth hour, i.e. 11 o'clock A.M., when the labour of the forenoon regularly terminated. Hereupon all of them assembled together, submitted to their daily rite of baptism in cold water, discarded their working-clothes, arrayed themselves in white garments, being the symbol of purity, and resorted to the repast which was brought by the priest, who entered in solemn silence, as if it were the holy Temple. Having seated themselves according to their age and order, the brethren who were the bakers and cooks placed before each a little loaf of bread and a dish of the most simple food, consisting chiefly of vegetables. The silence which was continued all through the meal was broken by the priest of holiness, of whom as descendant, who invoked God's blessing upon the repast. The mysterious silence was again resumed, and continued during the meal, which had the character of a sacrament. After the meal, the priest offered thanks to the bountiful Supplier of all wants, which was the signal of dismissal. All then withdrew, put off their white garments, dressed in their working clothes, resumed their several employments till the evening, when they again assembled to partake of a common meal, under the same regulations. All of them devoted certain hours of the day to the study of the mysteries of nature and revelation, as well as of the celestial hierarchy. Such was their manner of life during week days. The Sabbath they observed with the utmost rigour. Even the removal of a vessel from one place to another, they regarded as a violation of this holy day. They took special care not to forsake the assembling of themselves together. Ten persons constituted a complete and legal assembly. As Divine worship in the synagogue. In the presence of such an assembly they would never spit. As at meals, each one took his seat in the synagogue according to age, and in becoming attire. They had no ordained ministers, whose exclusive right it was to conduct the service. Any member who felt moved to ask up from the Bible and read in it, whilst those who had much experience in spiritual matters expounded the portion thus read. The distinctive ordinances of the brotherhood, and the mysteries connected with the Tetragrammaton, as well as with the angelic worlds, constituted the principal theme of their Sabbatic intercourse. The study of logic and metaphysics was eschewed as injurious to a devotional life.

III. Candidates for and Mode of Admission into the Brotherhood.—Every candidate for admission into the order had to pass through a noviciate of two stages, extending over three years. Upon entering the first stage, which lasted twelve months, the candidate adopted all his possessions into the common treasury, he then received (1) a copy of the regulations of the brotherhood, which he had carefully to study, and rigidly to follow the rules contained therein; (2) a spade to bury the excrement (comp. Deut. xxiii. 12-15); and (3) a white robe to put on at meals, bring the symbol of holiness to himself in the midst of these symbols, he was an outsider during the whole of the twelve months, and was not admitted to the common meals. At the expiration of his probationary period, the novice was admitted into the second stage, if the community found that he had properly acquitted himself. He was now called an "approacher," (προσαγωγής), and during this stage, which lasted two years, he was admitted to closer fellowship with the brotherhood, and shared in their lustral rites. But he was still excluded from the common meal, and was ineligible for any office. If he passed satisfactorily through the second stage of probation, he then became an associate or full member of the society (ζυγανος), when he bound himself by solemn oaths, * First to fear God, and next to exercise justice to all men; neither to wrong any one of his own accord, nor by the command of others; always to detest the wicked, and side with the righteous; ever to keep faith inviolable with all men, especially with his fellow associates; for no one comes to office without the will of God; not to be proud of his power, nor to outshine his subordinates, either in his garments or greater finery, if he himself should attain to office; always to love truth, and strive to reclaim all inns; to keep his hands clear from stealing and
his mind was unholy gain; not to conceal anything from the brotherhood, nor disclose anything belonging to them to those without, though it were at the hazard of his life. He has, moreover, to swear not to communicate to any one their doctrines in any other way than he has received them; to abstain from robbing the common treasury of the sect, and from writing or dictating any of their communications, their writings of the society, and the names of the angels" (Josephus, War, II. viii. 7).

The whole brotherhood was divided into four classes—(1) the novices, (2) the approachers, (3) the new full members, and (4) the old members.

Each class advanced so much in holiness above the others by the longer number of years of their membership, that if the senior member of a class happened to touch the member of a class below him, he had to purify himself by lustration in the same way as if he had been defiled by contact with a stranger. If a brother was accused of sin as he was brought before the brethren, and could not be judged unless there were, at least, a hundred of the community present, and agreed in their verdict.

If he was pronounced guilty, he was excommunicated, yet was he not regarded as an enemy, but was admonished as a brother, and received back after due repentance.

IV. The Relationship of Essenes to Judaism.—The fact that the Essenes professed to be guided by the teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures, that a rupture between them and the Jewish community is nowhere mentioned, and that, on the contrary, they are described by the orthodox Jews themselves as the holiest and most consistent followers of the Mosaic law, would, apart from anything else, show that they were an orthodox Jewish sect. We have, however, more minute and definite data, which incontestably prove that in doctrine, as well as in practice, Essenesim is simply an intensified or exaggerated form of Pharisaism, which was the national religion in the time of Christ. It is unfortunate that the only two contemporary Jewish accounts of the Essenes as a separate body are in the writings of Josephus, which is manifestly shaped to exhibit the Jews to the cultivated Greeks in a Hellenistic garb.

In spite, however, of this mystification a careful examination of these strongly-coloured records will show the identity of the cardinal doctrines and principal practices of Essenesim and Pharisaism. Passing over their belief in God the Creator and Disposer of all things, as requiring no proof that this also constituted the most essential article of the faith of the Pharisees, we shall examine the other doctrines and practices which Josephus describes, and which might be deemed to be distinctive features of Essenesim.

1. The Essenes, we are told, believed in the immortality of the soul, and in a future state of reward and punishment. So the Pharisees, "This world is the outer court to the world to come; prepare thyself in the outer court so as to be admitted into the palace" (Aboth, iv. 16).

"Those that are born are destined to die, those that die are destined to live again, and those that live again are destined for judgment" (Aboth, iv. 22).

2. The Essenes considered blaspheming the name of Moses a capital offence, so did the Pharisees. It was to bring him under the penalty of this law that Stephen was charged with having spoken "blasphemous words against Moses" (Acts vii. 11).

3. The Essenes were divided into four classes, according to the age of membership, and according to the degree of holiness which they practised, and the member of a higher class became defiled if it is at all possible for a member of the lower class to be the member of a higher class. The Pharisees, in consequence of a conscientious desire to discharge their religious duties in a state of legal purity, prescribed in Levit. v. 2; vii. 20, 21; xi. 1-8; xv. 19-31; Num. xix. 14-22, the authoritative exponents of the canon law ordained that since one does not know whether he has been defiled by contact with any unclean person or thing, every member of the Pharisaic association is "to wash his hands before eating his ordinary food, the second tithes or the heave-offering; to immerse his whole body before he eats the portions of holy sacrifices; and to bathe his whole body before touching the water absorbing the holy sacrifice, even if it is of unclean fruits which are unclean. If one immersed himself for ordinary food (טומא), and designed it only for ordinary food, he could not eat second tithes; if he immersed for second tithes (טומא) he could not eat of the heave-offering; if he immersed for the heave-offering (טומא), and meant by it the heave-offering, he was not allowed to eat the portion of the holy sacrifice; if he immersed for the holy sacrifice (טומא), and meant it for the holy sacrifice, he could not as yet touch the water absorbing from sin (טומא), but he who immersed for the more important could share in the less important (טומא)."

This gave rise to four degrees of purity, and to four divisions in the Pharisaic association. Each degree of purity required a greater separation from the above-named Mosaic defilements. Hence "the garments of an Am Ha-Aretz (טומא), or a non-member of the Pharisaic association) defile the Pharisee (i.e. him who lived according to the first degree of the Pharisees); the Pharisee defile those who eat the heave-offering (i.e. the second degree); the garments of those who eat the heave-offering defile those who eat the holy sacrifice (i.e. the third degree); and the garments of those who eat the holy sacrifice defile those who touch the water absorbing from sin (i.e. the fourth degree) (comp. Bava Kamma 7a; Tosephoth, v. 5).

Hence it is declared that "he who takes upon himself to become a member of the Pharisaic association must neither sell to an Am Ha-Aretz moist or dry fruit, nor buy of him moist fruit, nor become the guest of an Am Ha-Aretz, nor receive him as guest in his garments into his house" (Mishas Demai, ii. 3).

4. A candidate for admission into the order of the Essenes had to go through a novitiate of twelve months. The same was the case with the Pharisees. When any one applied to become a member of the Pharisaic association he had to pass through a novitiate of twelve months (Berachoth, 60 a).

5. The novice among the Essenes received an apron the first year of his probation. The same was the case in the Pharisaic association. The newly-admitted associate received a garment called דרי, and having duly qualified himself
11. The highest aim of the Essenes was to attain to such a state of holiness as to be able to perform miraculous cures and to prophesy. So the Pharisees. Thus Josephus, among other things, foretold the coming of Vespasian and Titus to the Roman empire (comp. Antiq. iii. 8, 9; Life, ed. Zinzendorf, iii. 7). The Essenes “being bound by oaths and customs cannot receive food from any out of the society, so that when any are excommunicated they are forced to eat herbs” (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 8). So the Pharisees. Josephus himself tells us when at Rome while Felix was procurator of Judea, he pleaded for Caesar the cause of certain captive priests who were his friends, and who were so God-fearing that even under affliction they subsisted on figs and nuts (Life, § 3).

12. The Essenes had esoteric doctrines and ancient books on magical cures and exorcisms, and the novice had to swear that he would not seek to “preserve” or “keep” or “transmit” any writings of the society that were “names of the angels” (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 8). So had the Pharisees. Josephus himself assures us that “God enabled Solomon to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and sanative to man. He composed such incantations also by which distressers are alleviated. And he also taught him the manner of using exorcisms, by which they drive away demons so that they never return, and this method of cure is of great force until this day. For I have seen a certain man of my own country whose name was Eleazar releasing people that were demoniacal in the presence of me, one of the Jewish priests, and the whole multitude of his soldiers” (Antiq. VIII. ii. 5). The esoteric doctrines of the Jews which comprised the mysteries connected with the Tetragrammaton (שִׁמְרֵי-אִישֶׁ תְּאָוִית) and the other names of God and the angels, the theosophy (תֵּשּׁוּפָה) and the cosmography (תֵּשֶׁבּוּת) could only be communicated to the initiated, hence the injunctions of the Mishna. “The mystery of the cosmography (תֵּשֶׁבּוּת) must not be explained when two present, and the mystery of the theosophy (תֵּשּׁוּפָה) not even to one unless he is a sage” (Chagiga, ii. 1).

The real differences between Essenism and Pharisaism are—(1) The Essenes, or rather a portion of them, led a celibate life; (2) they were not present at the offering of their sacrifices, though they sent their holy gifts to the temple; and (3) they did not believe in the re-surrection of the body, though they firmly believed in the immortality of the soul and a future state of reward and punishment. The first and second differences, as we shall see hereafter, were exaggerated, but still strictly logical developments of the Levitical and Pharisaical laws of purity, whilst the third was not peculiar to the Essenes, if it can be attributed to them at all.
hand it is as firmly asserted that the supposed coincidence in doctrine and social institutions of the two communities simply exhibits the natural outgrowth of the moral sense common to mankind which may be seen wherever and wherever circumstances favour its development. As is often the case in controversies both these antagonsist views suffer from admixture of truth and error. The advocates of the former betray prejudice against Christianity and a want of sympathy with its nature; that the existence of the latter shew ignorance of the varied opinions and institutions which obtained among the Jews before the time of Christ, and are equally prejudiced against Judaism. They seem, moreover, to be possessed by an unworthy fear lest the admission that Christ belonged to a branch of the national synagogue established by law, into whose membership He was admitted by the prescribed rites, and whose services He attended and publicly took part in, and that He found some excellent doctrines and commendable practices in the religion of His people which He deemed worthy to incorporate into His own teaching would betray the undue spirit of the enemy. The truth will be found between these two extremes, as will be seen from the following comparison.

The ruling principle of Essenism was, above all, to seek the kingdom of God. Christ urged on His disciples to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness. (Matt. vi. 33; Luke xii. 31.) The Essenes demanded of those who wished to join their community, to sell their possessions and give to the poor. (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 8.) Christ told the young man who kept the commandments, and whom He loved, “If thou wilt be perfect, sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow Me.” (Matt. vi. 33; Mark x. 21-23; Luke xii. 31.) The Essenes regarded the laying up of treasure upon earth as injurious to leading a spiritual life, hence they despised riches, and were content with self-imposed poverty. (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 3.) Christ told His disciples, “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth...” (Matt. vi. 19-21; xix. 23, 24.) Love of the brotherhood was the soul of Essenea life, and was the basis of all their actions. So intense was this feeling amongst them, that the love which they manifested for the brethren called forth the greatest admiration, and was declared to be without a parallel in the rest of the Jewish nation. (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 2.) Christ made love the basis of His teaching: “This is My commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you.” (John xvi. 12, 17.) “This is the message which ye have received from the beginning, that ye love one another.” (1 John iii. 13-17.) “We know that we have passed from death to life because we love the brethren.” (1 John iii. 14.) To realise the idea of brotherhood, the Essenes lived together like one family; had all things in common, and appointed one of the brethren steward to manage the common bag. (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 3.) So the primitive Christians: “All that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need.” (Acts ii. 43, 44.) One managed the common bag. (John xii. 8; xiii. 29.) Even in travelling the Essenes “go to those whom they have never seen before, as if they had been most intimate, so that they take nothing with them when they go on a journey.” (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 4.) Christ, too, commanded His disciples that they should take nothing for their journey, neither bread, nor scrip, nor bread, nor money in their purses; but be shod with sandals, and not put on two coats. (Mark vi. 9, 10.) As a result of this mode of living together like brethren, the Essenes put all their members on the same level, forbade the exercise of authority of one over the other, and enjoined mutual service. (Josephus, Ant. XVIII. i. 5.) Christ declared that all His disciples are equal; forbade them to lord one over another; but commanded them to be servants to each other. (Matt. xx. 25, 28; Mark x. 35-37; i. 42-45.) Again, as a result of the great moral law which was the foundation of Essenism—viz. love to God and to one’s fellow-man—none could be absolutely proscribed slavery. (Josephus, Ant. XVIII. i. 5.) Though no single detached precept can be adduced in which Christ explicitly condemns this social institution, yet who can fail to see that the whole spirit and genius of His teaching is antagonistic to this degrading practice? Owing to the same great moral law, the Essenes proscribed all who wished war and warlike pursuits; they even refused to manufacture martial instruments, and only took weapons with them when they went on a perilous journey. Christ, too, who declared that “all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword” (Matt. xxvii. 52), told His disciples, when about to start for the Mount of Olives, “He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.” (Luke xxii. 36-38.) The aim and end of Essenism were to be meek and lowly in spirit, to mortify all sinful lusts, to be pure in heart, to hate evil but reclaim the evil-doer, to be merciful to all men. (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 7.) The same qualities Christ sets forth as constituting the blessedness in the Sermon on the Mount. (Matt. v. 1-10.) With the Essenes, therefore, truthfulness was the natural result of their life. Hence, swearing to attest the veracity of a statement was strictly forbidden; their communication was “Yea, yea,” and “Nay, nay.” (Josephus, War, ii. viii. 6.) So sacred was their word, that Herod the Great, who exacted the oath of allegiance from the other Jews, exacted the Essenes. (Josephus, Ant. XV. i. 4.) Christ enjoined His disciples, “Swear not at all... but let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay.” (Matt. v. 34-37.) The Essenes especially devoted themselves to alienate the ailments of the sick, thus combining the healing of the body with that of the soul; and regarded the power to perform miracles as the mark of Christ and the cast out evil spirits, &c., as belonging to the highest state of discipleship. Christ, too, combined the two functions, and gave His true disciples power “to heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out evil spirits,” &c. (Matt. x. 1-8; Mark xvi. 17, 18; Luke x. 17.) It was the aim of the Essenes to live such a life of purity and holiness, and so to devote themselves to the
study of the sacred Scriptures, as to become the temples of the Holy Spirit, and to be able to prophesy; and Josephus assures us that they hardly ever failed in their predictions. (Josephus, War, II. viii. 12.) And this eye-witness describes several of their prophets, and the fulfillment of their predictions. (War, I. iii. 5; II. viii. 3; Antiq. XII. ii. 11; XV. v. 5.) St. Paul urges the Corinthians to desire, of all spiritual gifts, the gift to prophesy. (1 Cor. xiv. 1, 39.)

Though all the Essenes as a body waited for the kingdom of heaven, and aimed to live a life of more immediate communion with the Deity, which involved abstention from conjugal intercourse, yet it was not given to all to attain to this command, invested in the words "once fruitless, only a portion of the brotherhood attained to that elevated spiritual life which enabled them to be celibates, or, as it is called in the language of the New Testament, "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." (Josephus, War, II. vii. 2, 13.) It is the striking after this gift which is to be "defiled according to the law of Moses." (V. 11.) The reach that state of holiness which will enable one to abstain from marriage for the kingdom of heaven's sake, is indeed not within the power of all, for it is a special gift of God; "but he that can receive it, let him receive it." (Matt. xix. 10-12.) Hence the declaration of St. Paul, who had a legal standing: "I have already received the gift of the Spirit, I am myself married; but every man hath his proper gift." (1 Cor. vii. 7.) This agreement between Christ and the Essenes on the doctrine of celibacy in connexion with holiness is all the more remarkable, inasmuch as it is at variance with the general Pharisaic opinion. The Talmudic law regards marriage as a Divine command, and multiply" (Gen. I. 28), which is binding on all. Hence it declares that "a man without a wife is without the law of God, and without a wall of defence against sin;" and, "a man without a wife is without joy, without a blessing, and without happiness." (Yalkomoth, 92b.)

V. VI. Origin and Date of Essenes and its Relation to Philo-Semitism. - Essenes, like its less intensified form, Pharisasim, arose out of the rules which were enacted after the return from the Babylonish captivity for the observance of the Mosaic institutions. Besides the feasts and fasts, the national religious party bound themselves by solemn promise (1) to keep the tithes lawfully, (2) to observe the sabbath, and Levitical purity. According to the Mosaic law, the neglect of these two enforcements was a heinous sin. The non-separation of the tithes rendered the whole produce unlawful, thus affecting every article of food, whilst the non-eschewing of defiling objects hampered every action in public life, and even those in family intercourse. Thus not only are numbers of animals proscribed as food, but contact with their carcasses pollutes both man and things (Levit. v. 2; xi. 1-47). A man who has an issue not only defiles everything upon which he lies, or which he touches, but his very spittle is polluting (Levit. xv. 1-13). The same is the case with every one who comes in contact with a corpse (Numb. xix. 14-22), with a woman in menstruum and childbirth (Levit. xii. 1-8; xv. 19-31), and with a husband after conjugal intercourse (Levit. xv. 18). Individuals thus defiled were forbidden to come into the sanctuary (Numb. xix. 20), and were visited with the severest punishment if they had ever touched the flesh of a peace-offering (Levit. vii. 20, 21). The effect of these laws was that thousands upon thousands were daily rendered unclean, that these thousands of unclean men and women legally defiled myriads of people and things by
contact with them either wittingly or unwittingly, and that it therefore became absolutely necessary for those who were conscientiously desirous of discharging their religious duties in a state of legal purity to adopt such precautionary measures as would preclude the possibility of violating those laws. Hence obtained those rules and those four different degrees of purity with the four corresponding classes of persons which the body of the Pharisee was divided, already described (sec. iv. 3). Anyone who did not belong to the established national religion, that is, to one of the four classes, was termed an _Am Ha-Aretz_ (אַם הָאָרֶץ)—one who lives for earthly things, publican, sinner. Contact with him was defiling, and no articles of food or drink would be purchased by the religious from such an one. It was for eating with such persons that Christ was upbraided (Matt. ix. 10–13; Mark ii. 16, 17, etc.), which showed beyond doubt that he belonged to the national religious body, else the rebuke would have no meaning, since all the unattached, that is, _Amme Ha-Aretz_ could have intercourse among themselves. Besides, as an unattached or defiling person, Christ could not mix with the national and religious body. Of St. Paul we know, from his own words, that he was not only a Pharisee, but that he belonged to the strictest order, that is, he practised the fourth degree of holiness. (Acts xxvi. 5.)

With such a wide field for difference of opinion before them, with the tendency of some to regard the ritual observances as paramount and the only vehicle of divine grace; with the conviction of others that though necessary they are secondary emblems, and that a holy consistent life is the bond of union and communion with God; and with the teachings of others again that they are altogether useless, and are only to be observed because to disregard them would offend the national conscience and expose the nonconformists to penalties and disabilities, different schools arose among the ranks of the Pharisees, who represented the national religion. It is only by a careful study of the post-biblical Jewish writings, and by thoroughly analysing their spirit, that one can appreciate their sentiments and minute shades of differences, and is able to see that the apparent outstanding and mal-shaped sections are in reality only different but genuine branches of the same parent stem, deriving their sap from the same root. The two somewhat different lists in the two recensions of the Talmud—the Jerusalem and the Babylonian, enumerating the different branches of Pharism, show how fully alive the spiritually-minded Pharisees were to the conscientious extremes and the unconscionable abuses to which these stupendous observances gave rise among the various schools of thought comprised in the national religion. As the Talmud gives the Babylonian recension elsewhere, we here give the one from the Jerusalem Talmud:

"There are seven kinds of Pharisees: (1) the _Shoulder Pharisee_ (זרע מסלך), who carries, as it were, his good works on his shoulder that they may be seen by all, in order that he may be praised of men; (2) the _Talmud-Reading _Pharisee_ (מרדו תלמוד), who, when asked for anything, always says, 'Let me go first and perform a divine command'; (3) the _Deducting Pharisee_ (קביל nedin), who says, 'My few sins will be deducted from my many virtues'; (4) the _Seeing Pharisee_ (визר אף 논), who says, 'I save from my scanty income in order that I may perform a good deed'; (5) the _New-searching Pharisee_ (职务 nuevo), who always searches for any sin which he may have committed, in order that he may atone for it by an act of piety; (6) the _Pharisee from fear_ (פוער פחד), who dreads Divine punishment; and (7) the _Pharisee from love_ (פוער כלות), who is one from pure love to God like Abraham." (Jerusalem Berachoth, ix. 5, with Jerusalem Shochah, v. 5.) These seven classes comprise all the different ramifications, all the various tendencies, and all the offshoots. It is in the seventh class, the Pharisees from pure love to God and His divine commands, which the Talmudic sees, and it is from this class that Essenes proceeded. What those who belonged to this class had to practise, and how identical they are with Essenism, will be seen from the following declaration in the Talmud, which describes the gradual growth in holiness:— (1) "The study of the divine law leads a man to circumcision; having passed the circumspection, he (2) accepted as a novice, and receives the symbol of purity, whence he attains (3) to the state of outward purity by lustrations. Thence he progresses (4) to that stage which imposes abstinence from connexion of intercourse from celibacy he advances (5) to the stage of inward or spiritual purity; thence (6) to the higher stage of holiness; thence (7) to meekness and lowliness; thence (8) to the dread of every sin; thence (9) to the highest degree of holiness; thence (10) to becoming the temple of the Holy Spirit and to prophesy; and thence, finally (11), to the stage which enables him miraculously to heal the sick and raise the dead." With impartial students who have no special theories, we believe this will sufficiently show the origin of Essenism. It will demonstrate that the individuals here described exhibit an ultra type of Pharismism, and are none other but the Essenes. Bearing in mind that the name Essene does not exist in the whole range of Talmudic literature, and that the brotherhood has to be identified from the descriptions of its features, simply because they were a branch of the Pharisees, it will readily be conceded that this is as faithful a picture of the Essenes as can be expected.

We have now to examine several practices which obtained among the Essenes which some maintain are heterodox and of non-Jewish origin, and which we are assured constituted their heresies and separatisms. 1. "The most crucial note of heresy which is recorded of the Essenes" —

---

* There are less than five recensions of this _Bavli_—two in the Jerusalem Talmud, _Sotaita_, ii. 3; _Shochah_, iii. 3; two in the Babylonian Talmud, _Aboda Sara_, b. 101b, 102a; Tract._ _Shab, _b. 101a, 102a, 102b; _Bab_, b. 103a, 103b. The erudite Dr. Jellinek, who we believe was the first to call attention to this important _Bavli_ (Ben Chaim iv. 374) most unhesitatingly declares that it is a description of Essenism. Those who are Talmudic scholars will readily concede that this distinguished Rabbi understands the Talmud, knows what his own Judaism is, and will accept his opinion about the traits of his brethren.
n that "they declined to take part in the sacrificial offerings." Josephus, who mentions their abstention from offering sacrifices in the temple, distinctly says that it is owing to the different degrees of holiness which they practised. His words are, "Though they send offerings to the temple they do not offer the sacrifices themselves on account of the different rules of purity which they observe, hence, excluding themselves from the common sanctuary, they offer sacrifices in themselves" (Antiq. XVIII. i. 5). To understand the meaning of Josephus, we must advert to the sacrificial regulations which obtained during the second temple. Those who had the arrangement of the temple service aimed at making the people at large realise that they were a nation of kings and priests. Hence they ordained that every individual should personally participate as much as possible in the offering up of the sacrifices. Not only had the offerer, who was present, to bring his own victim, but it was made, by the representatives of the people (υπηρέται ἄνδρες) represented the entire nation, which could not be personally present at the daily sacrifices. These were divided into twenty-four divisions, answering to the twenty-four divisions of the priesthood. Even the slaughtering of the sacrifices was done by the priests. The priest was responsible, and the sprinkling of the blood and the actual altar work were left to the priests. Now the Essenes, who were more rigorous about the laws of defilement than the other Pharisees, were afraid to enter the temple, and thus to participate personally in the sacrifices, lest they had not been properly purified. Therefore they sent thither their sacrifices and partook of their sacrificial meal at home. It is therefore evident that they did not break off their connexion with the national sanctuary, for they periodically sent their consecrated gifts, for its maintenance, and for the keeping up of the temple worship, nor did they repudiate sacrifices in themselves. If they were simply excluded from being present in the temple to participate in offering by a difference of opinion about the degree of holiness which those practised who officiated in the sanctuary. The specific nature of this difference Josephus was precluded from giving by the plan of his work, which was intended for the cultivated Greeks. However, as rightly pointed out, the Mosaic law ordained the burning of a red heifer, the ashes of which mixed with water were to be used for the sprinkling of those who were defiled by a corpse (Numb. xix. 1–22). The entrance into the sanctuary was made dependent upon the purification by this "water of separation," and he who entered the tabernacle of the Lord without his process was "cut off from Israel" (Numb. xix. 13, 20). The sacred nature of the ashes and the momentous consequences involved in the use of "the water of separation" required the utmost care and the most minute ceremonial in the preparation thereof, as the efficacy of the water, and the validity of the purification depended upon the fulfilment of all the conditions prescribed in connexion with the burning of the heifer. The omission of a single item rendered the ashes ineffectual. In consequence of this the Mosaic law on this subject was minutely explained by the canon law, and a whole treatise in the Talmud is devoted to it. Children were trained from their birth to engage in this ceremonial. "There were special courts in Jerusalem built upon a rock which was hollowed underneath to prevent the penetration of any Levitical pollution. Thither pregnant women were brought to be confined; here they brought up the children" (Mishnah Para, iii. 2). "An arched bridge was made from the temple mount to the mount of Olives, constructed in such a manner as to preclude defilement from beneath. On this bridge only the priest, and those who assisted him in burning the heifer, and the heifer itself were allowed to cross to the mount of Olives" (Babli. iii. 6). But the most extraordinary part connected with this ceremonial was that the Pharisees, contrary to the law laid down in Levit. xxii. 6, 7, commanding the defiled person who had undergone the necessary lustration to be unclean till sunset, purposefully defiled the priest on the very day in which he had to burn the heifer, and demolished the baptistery on the mount of Olives, and immediately after perform the service, because of the Sadducees, who maintained that it must be done after sunset" (Mishnah Para, iii. 7). As the Essenes regarded this act as illegal, and hence "the water of separation" ineffectual, they had no means of purifying their temple and their sanctuary, as prescribed in the Mosaic law. They demanded another purification than the one practised by the managers of the temple service; their water of purification the Essenes regarded as impure (Frankel, Monatschrift, iii. 64, 65).

To this must be added, that throughout the whole of the prophetic writings and the hagiographa sacrifices are regarded as of very inferior value, and that the greatest importance is attached to inward purity and to holiness of life. Of the numerous passages we can only quote a few:—"Sacrifice and burnt offering thou didst not desire" (Ps. xi. 6); "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offering; the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," &c. (Ps. li. 16, 17). I will praise the name of God with a song, and will magnify him with thanksgiving; this shall please the Lord better than an ox or bullock that hath horns and hoofs (Ps. lxi. 30, 31). "I hate, I despise your feast days... though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them," etc. (Amos v. 21, 22).

More remarkable still is the declaration of Jeremiah that sacrifices as a part of worship were no divine ordinance at all. "I spake not

Professor Lightfoot's assertion that "Frankel suppose that their only reason for abstaining from the temple sacrifices was that according to the Essene notions the temple itself was profaned, and therefore unfit for sacrificial worship" (Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, p. 371, 2nd ed. London, 1876), seems due to a mistake. What he says in seinen Schleife, also das Mittel sich euch respektieren sie hatten kein Reinigungswasser für den sich einer Lache Verunreinigten, also i.e. the Essenes, accordingly had not the means to purify themselves, they had no water of purification for one who contracted defilement by a corpse. Professor Lightfoot has therefore mistaken Frankel's meaning; they themselves are not the temple.
unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the
day I brought them out of the land of Egypt
concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices" (Jerem.
vii. 21, 22). Hence Rashi (1040–1105) who is the
highest authority in Talmudic matters, and
represents traditionally the doctrines of the
Pharisees (Cautlin, 5 a); Maimonides (1135–
1204), who is called the "second Moses," and who
for the first time formulated and introduced into
the Talmud the system on which it is received by the orthodox Israelites to this day (Mose
Nebuchim, iii. 32, 46), and Kimchi (1163–1235),
the celebrated expositor and lexicographer
(Levit. i. 1; Jerem. vii. 20), maintain that sacrifi-
ces were altogether optional, they were per-
mitted on account of the hardness of heart, and
that the Mosaic ordinances aimed to restrict them
as much as possible. The Essenes could therefore
easily be satisfied with sending their gifts to the
temple to mark their union with the national
sanctuary, and believe that "the sacrifices of
God are a broken spirit," which they con-
scioniously endeavoured to offer. It is for this
reason that Josephus, through himself or a Pharisee,
does not describe them as cut off from Judaic
orthodoxy in matters of sacrifices, and that he
tells us himself of distinguished Essenes frequen-
ting the temple and instructing their disciples there
without let or hindrance (War, I iii. 5).

(2) It is maintained that the Essenes offered
up prayers to the Sun, and that this practice
not only shows a Yankee influence, but cuts them
off from the body of orthodox Jews. The ground
for this assertion is the statement of Josephus,
"their piety towards God is extraordinary, for
they never speak about worldly matters before
the sun rises, but offer up, with their faces
towards it, certain prayers, handed down by
their forefathers, and composed to "rise." (War,
ii. vii. 5). But the most inconceivable part about
it is that those who advocate this opinion make Josephus, who was a Pharisee (1)
describe their extraordinary piety towards the God of Abraham to consist in offering up prayer
to the sun, i.e. in an idolatrous practice expressly for-
bidden in the very law of Moses (Deut. iv. 10), which
Josephus himself, as a Pharisee of second degree, and that (2) for this idolatrous worship
they used the national orthodox prayers trans-
mitted by their forefathers, thus insulting the
national conscience by this degradation of the
prayers of the faithful. The prayer here spoken
of is the well-known national morning hymn of
praise ("YHWH NADH") for the return of the
light of day, which forms a part of the Jewish
services to the present day, and which accord-
ing to an ancient canon had to be offered up
at sun-rise (Mishna Bereareth, i. 4). The
orthodox or Pharisaic Jews to this day offer up
the following prayer, every month, on beholding
the new moon, "A good sign, good fortune be to
all Israel! (to be repeated three times) Blessed
be thy (the moon's) Creator! Blessed be thy
possessor! Blessed be thy Maker (repeated
three times)! As I leap towards thee (i.e. the
moon) but cannot touch thee, so may my enemies
not be able to injure me (said three times, leaping)," (Sopherim, xx. 2). It would be
farther almost to charge the Pharisees with moon-
worship, than to draw from the remark of
Josephus that the Essenes were cut off from the
Pharisees by sun-worship.

(3) On the subject of marriage again, we
are told the antagonism between the Essenes
and the Pharisees is a vital matter. The fol-
lowing are Josephus's remarks. "They disregard
marriage, but they do not repudiate marriage
and its consequent succession of the race is
themselves, but they are afraid of women, and
are persuaded that none of them preserve their
fidelity to one man" (War. II. viii. 5). "There
is another peculiar feature of the Essenes, which
is their living, customs, and laws exactly agree with
the others, excepting that they differ from them
about marriage, for they believe that those who
do not marry cut off the principal part of human
life" (ibid. ii. viii. 13). The reason which
Josephus here assigns for the celibacy of some
of the Essenes, like that of Philo, is simply shaped
to suit the taste of those cultivated Greek
readers whose maxim was "a handsome wife
would be common, one deformed a punishment,
therefore we should have none" (Whitby's Com-
mentary, I Cor. viii. 3). He tells his Greek readers
that in Exod. xxii. 27 Moses forbids the Jews to
revile the heathen girls, which is exactly the
expression used in the Contr. Apion. ii. 37. That
the law prohibits to spoil our enemies (Contr.
Apion. 26), that the law of Moses commands the Jews to kill
themselves rather than go into slavery among
heathen (War, III. viii. 9; VII. viii. 7; with I.
xxii. 10), etc., and in order to expose the
Egyptian custom of married men being sub-
divided to their wives he positively declares
"the Scripture says a woman is inferior to her
husband in all things" (Contr. Apion. ii.
25). Because the Greeks and Romans ridiculed
the Jewish rite of circumcision, he actually sup-
presses the fact that the sons of Jacob imposed
it on the Shechemites, and says that the brothers
of Joseph sold him at all events, whilst they were
revelling and feasting (Antiq. I. xxi. 1). For
the same reason he alters the text of the Bible,
which says that Saul demanded of David a
hundred foreskins of the Philistines as a dowry
for his daughter, into six hundred heads of the Philistines (Antiq. VI. i. 2).
The reason, therefore, which he assigns for
the celibacy of some of the Essenes, is to be
accounted for to the same category. The very nature of
Essenism supplies the cause of it. The
foundation of their arrangements is based upon
the avoidance of every kind of defilement. According
to the law connubial intercourse was defiling,
and required sanctification (Levit. xv. 18), and
Josephus himself says "the law enjoins that
after the man and wife have lain together, in a
good way, they shall bathe themselves, for there
is a defilement contracted thereby both in
soul and body" (Contr. Apion. ii. 25). Even
Bathsheba underwent this humiliation after
violating her conjugal fidelity (2 Sam. xi. 4).
Keeping from women was, therefore, considered
indispensable to a holy life (Exod. xix. 15; 1 Sam.
xxii. 5, 6; 2 Sam. xi. 4; Enoch, Ixxxi. 3; Ixxxv. 3).
Even Ben-Azai, who agreed with the
theory that men should marry to propagate the
race in accordance with Gen. i. 28, was himself
a celibate, and when asked for the answer he
replied, "What can I do? my soul is wedded to the
Divine Law, and the world can be propagated
by others." (Yoma, 63). The Essenes,
therefore, who felt themselves constrained to be
celibates, because they were devoted to a holy
life, were quite as orthodox as the Pharisees. But it must, however, be added that Josephus most explicitly states that the Essenes did not repudiate marriage in itself, that celibacy was quite optional, since it was an open question, and that a portion of them were married, and still were faithful members of the brotherhood. How such statements can be made, that "marriage was to him (i.e. the Essene) an abomination" (Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, etc. p. 85), and that "R. Channah's wife is a prominent person in the legends of his miracles reported in Tanith, 24 b., and thus we need hardly stop to discuss the possible meaning of פָּנֹא יִשָּׁר, since his claims to being considered an Essene are barred at the outset by this fact" (Yad. p. 363) is surpassing strange.

(4) The Essenes did not believe in the resurrection of the body, which the Pharisees held as a cardinal doctrine. What Josephus says on this subject is not false but he believes that the bodies perish, and that their substance is not enduring, but that the souls are immortal" (War, II. viii. 11). Any impartial student will carefully read the whole of this section will at once perceive that Josephus's aim here is to show that the Essenes, to use his own words, "agree in the opinion of the Greeks, they say that for the good souls there is a life beyond the ocean, and a region which is never molested either with showers or snow or intense heat, is always refreshed with the gentle gales of wind constantly breathing from the ocean." To take this piece of Paganism as a sober description of an article of creed believed by a Jewish brotherhood whose distinguishing features were as excessive veneration and a more rigorous observance of the Mosaic teachings than the rest of their co-religionists, is betraying a want of appreciation of evidence. Speaking of the Pharisaic doctrine on this subject, Josephus says, "the soul by being united to the body in after-life, is not separated from it, but is renewed again by death" (Contra Apion. i. 25). Here Josephus represents the Pharisees as maintaining that "the soul was confined in the flesh as in a prison-house. Only when disengaged from these fetters would it be truly free. Then it would soar aloft, rejoicing in its newly-attained liberty." Unfortunately, however, the stupendous Jewish literature which has come down from ancient times enables us to correct this anti-Jewish view contained in a piece of special pleading whilst in the case of the Essenes we are obliged to Hippolytus (Ref. ix. 27), who distinctly declares that they did believe in the resurrection of the body (comp. also Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift, xiv. 10, "the Essenes and Josephus, to say the least, as firmly believed by the Pharisees as the doctrine of the resurrection. The orthodox Jews expected the Messiah to be not only of Jewish descent but the son of David. Yet Josephus declares that "the oracle found in the sacred Scriptures certainly denoted the government of a Messiah, and was appointed emperor in Judaea" (War, VI. v. 4).

(5) Again, great stress is laid on the Essene abstention from the use of ointments. Josephus says "they regard ointment as defiling, and if one of them happens to be anointed against his will he immediately wipes it off his body" (War, II. viii. 3). This is not only declared to be a point of divergence between them and the Pharisees, but a distinct proof of Buddhist influence. But as Geiger has pointed it out, the question about the use of ointment constituted one of the differences of opinion between the older conservative Pharisaic school represented by the followers of Shammait, and the younger progressive Pharisees represented by the followers of Hillel. The latter, who opposed vehemently the arrogance of the Romans, regarded this custom, though practised among the Jews from time immemorial, as an aristocratic luxury. Hence they laid it down as a principle that "it is not seemly for a learned disciple-Pharisee to walk about anointed" (יִשָּׁר יְבִא הַמַּעַל לְכָלָּה) Josephus Berachoth, v. p. 13; ed. Zuckermandel, 1877; Babylon Berachoth, 43 b. The Essenes, therefore, in this respect, as on all other points, simply followed the practices of the more rigorous portion of the Pharisees (Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift, vi. 105-121; vii. 174; ix. 32).

VIII. The Name and its Signification.—It has already been said that the name Essene does not occur in the whole range of Talmudic and Midrashic literature. Not even of the gate of the Essenes, such as Josephus, who arrived at Jerusalem (War, V. iv. 3), is a trace to be found in the description of the temple and of the holy city given in the Mishna and Talmud. This is all the more remarkable when notice is taken of all other sects and offshoots of Judaism. We have the Samaritans, the Sadducees, with the Beithusans, and the Tanna'im, the Talmudic and Chassidim, both earlier and later; the Daily Baptists, and all shades of Pharisees. It is this which makes it so difficult to ascertain its etymology and signification. It is still disputed whether it is Greek, Hebrew, or Aramaic; whether it is to be derived from a proper name, of a person, or of a place. Some idea of the difficulty may be gathered from the various enumerations, which we arrange according to the sequence of the letters in the alphabet. It is derived from סָנָה (SDN), to hearken, whence assa (SDN), a physician, because they paid great attention to the healing of diseases; from צָוָּה (TN), to bind, to associate, whence assimim (TN), associates, because they united together to keep the law; from קַשְׁתָּה (KN), to see, whence chazyah (TN), a seer, because they possessed prophetic powers; from קַשָּׁה (TKH), watchman, guardian, whence chazzanim (TKH), watchmen, servants of God, because this was the whole aim of their life; from the Hebrew chazan (TN), to be loving, good, pious, whence chazans (TKH), the ministers of their extraordinary piety; from the Syriac chodi (TN), pious, or chazay (TN), pious for the same reason; from chasen (TN), powerful, strong, because they were morally strong to subdue their passions; from chasay (TN), a fold of a garment, an apron, because each neophyte obtained this symbol of purity; from chashap (TN), to be silent, whence chasam (TN), the silent ones, because they meditated on mysteries; from chasok (TN), endowed with the gift of prophecy; from isso (TN), the disciple of R. Joshua b. Perachia; from sechah (TN), to bathe, which with Ateb..."
ETCENIUS. [ETCHEN.]

ETCEN (ECHEN, ECHINES, ETCHENIUS, ETIAN), bishop of Clunia-foda in Fur-Bile, is Meth (Mart. Doneg.), commemorated Feb. 11. Of this saint the Bollandists (Acta SS. Feb. 11, tom. ii. 551–2) and Colgan (Acta SS. 305–6) prefix short memoirs, neither taken from the Lives of St. Brigid and St. Columba. The witness of these two is decisive, since the former is the Life of St. Brigid and the latter of St. Columba. The Life of St. Brigid of the 5th century is descriptive of her, and Echino was born in an illustrious family of Leinster, ennobled by both his parents. His father was Egan Eges (or the Sage), son of Fergus Laiderg, of the Race of Laeghaire Lorc, through Mesincorb, the Milesian ancestor of the Dal Mesincorb, and the kings of Leinster (see his genealogy traced through twenty-four generations in Todd, St. Patrick 253). His mother was Briga, daughter of Connacht, descended by a collateral line from the same Mesincorb, and his birth is said to have been through the special blessing of St. Brigid. He had three uncles brothers, bishop Aidan of Killmore, abbot Segene, and Aedh, son of Aisnire, who was slain by Bran Dubh, son of Eochaidh, in the battle of Duinebolg, in Leinster, in the year 598. He is represented by Colgan as a great physician, who was consulted by St. Brigid for the cure of his ailments, and Colgan quotes a long passage from the Life of St. Brigid, by Laurence of Durham, in which a bishop Echus is mentioned

ESTHA, according to the account given by Africanus to reconcile the two genealogies of our Lord, the name of the wife of Matthew, who afterwards married Melchi. (Ep. ad Aristid. ap. Euseb. H. E. i. 7.) [G. S.]

EGisti, given by Procopius of Gaza on (2 Kings xviii. 4) as another name for Philoctetes. He came by this name from a corrupt reading in his copy of Theodoret's Commentary on the same passage, where the title Naassenes is connected with the word Naassan (see Coteler, Mon. Eccl. Gr. i. 769). [G. S.]

ESUS (EIS), an abbot from whom Bede obtained his few details respecting the foundation of the East Anglian Church. (H. E. pref.) [S.]

ESYCHIA (EICHA), a lady to whom, along with two others, Dominica and Eudochia, pope
ETECUSA

as contemporary with her and St. Mel (Feb. 6) of Ardclog, but as St. Mel died A.D. 488, St. Etchinius, who was probably born about A.D. 490, could not have been a bishop in his day, and the whole story is extremely doubtful. That, however, for which he is most famous, and of which there appears to be no reason for doubt, was his ordination of St. Columba, though the form of the legend may be largely fictitious. The point of it is the showing how by mistake on the part of the consecrating bishop, that is, of St. Etchinius, the presbyterate only was conferred on the candidate for episcopal orders. It is preserved in a section of the Acta of Denys, and is given in the original Irish with an English translation by Dr. Todd (Quisit et Martyrologie Christ Church, Dubhlinn, introd. lili., iv.,) by Colgan (Acta SS. 306 n. 11) and in an English translation by Dr. Todd (St. Patrick, 71). O'Donell also (Vita. S. Colman, l. c. 47) gives his own version of the same story, and this version is what Colgan gives in his memoir of the saint. [COLUMBA (1.)]

(To see O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 472-75, on the legend, its origin, and general teaching.) St. Etchinius also ordained St. Berach (Feb. 15) of Clonmacnoise, now Kilbarry, in Roscommon, St. Cosma (June 3) having brought him to bishopric from Glendalough for the purpose (Colgan, Acta SS. 306, c. 10.) St. Etchinius seems first to have lived on the borders of Ossory, then at Clonfad in Westmeath; and at last, after many illustrious works, he exchanged the earthly life for the heavenly in the year 578 (Ann. Tlg.); his festival is Feb. 11. He is commemorated in all the liturgies of the western world and was an important character in the Scotch calender of the Drummond missal. (Lasagna, Eccles. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 11, § 9; Todd, St. Patrick, 70 sq. 253, and Book of Hymns, Fasc. i., 171 n.; O'Connor, Iter. Hdb. Scrip. ii. 153, iv. 28; Íep. Forbes, Kal. Scoit. Saints, vii; Reeves, Adamnan, ixixi. 22, 348, 371; Archdall, Monast. Hdb. 709; Kelly, Cal. Ir. SS. 73; Marty. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 45.)

ETETUS, also called Numeria, a Carthaginian woman, who, with her sister Candida, landed at Rome under the Decian persecution. Fell causes the confusion which he claims of them when he makes three sisters. Their brother, who was also martyred, was indeed the priest of a church near Carthage (Cyp. Ep. xxi.) that she had bribed officers in order to be exempted from sacrificing, and he begs that the first martyr selected for death among those in prison at Carthage may “iatis sororibus nostris Numeriis et Candidae tale pecatum remittat. Nam hanc ipsam Ercusam semper appelleri sollemnitatem ut se dona numeraviti ne sacrificaret.” As translated, “our sisters Numeria and Candida, for this latter I have always called Ercusam . . . because she gave gifts”; the passage is, as Dr. Wallis himself says, “altogether unintelligible.” Hence the conjectures et urcos, for acrocor, áyxyeran, áyxyeran (Dodwell, Diss. loc. cit.), and even Hartelius’s excusat. There is no various reading, except etecusam and et recusam, which confirm the usual one.

We must observe, however, that Numeria is not a real praenomen (Varro, Ling. Lat. ix. 55); that the whole letter is incorrect in taste and in grammar; that hanc ipsam may perfectly well be predicative; and that hanc need not refer to CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. II.

ETYRELATU, bishop. [HADULAC.]

ETYELIG is witness, as a cleric, to two grants of land made to the see of Llandaff, in the time of bishop Berthw Wyn, in the end of the 6th or early in the 6th century (Lb. Land. by Rees, 428, 442).

ETYRRNITY, from a patriotic point of view solely, which, however, was not original, but culled from Greek and other philosophies in agreement with Scripture. Aión, the Greek equivalent, may, according to Aristotle (de Cael. i. 9), have several meanings, but all deducible from, and subordinate to, the idea it was meant to express: the past, present, and future; duration without beginning or end: ἀδίν ἡ ἡ ομορρία τῆς ἡμερας. In this sense it cannot, of course, be predicated of anything short of God. Of His existence alone could this and nothing short of this, be truly said—as Tertullian puts it, writing against Hermogenes, who asserted that matter was co-eternal with God—“qui omnino aliis Dei censuris, quam æternitatis; quis alius æternitatis status, quam semper fuisse, et futurum esse, ex praecognitâ nullius intitii et nullius finis . . . . Aedacqualtijur Deo matreia, cum æterna consentur” (ad. Hermog. c. 4). Which last is a pregnant remark.

This definition of matter, he tells us in an earlier chapter (de Frinc. iii. 3), “is opposed to the Stoic; for he refutes it himself at great length, and with much point. “Veritas autem,” he maintains, “só unum Deum exigit, defendendo ut solius sit, quicquid Ipsius est” (c. 5). Origen (de Frinc. iii. 3) was of opinion that as this world was not the first that God created, so neither would it be the last. Others, of course contrary, saw no reason why the world should not have been eternal, had God so willed it (Estius, Diss. in II. Sent. dist. i. § 11); orthodoxly, they thought indeed, would not allow them to follow Aristotle in asserting it was this in fact. Origen expressed what strict orthodoxy required in terse terms, as follows:—“Species eorum, quae per passiones Apostolorum et sanctorum traduntur, istae sunt. Primo, quod unus Deus est, Qui omnin creativ atque compositum: Quicque, cum nihil esset, esse fecit universum.” (Ib. i. 4). This position was accepted, uso ore, by all; and it was within its enclosures solely that they considered themselves free to speculate. “Qui quaeque quemadmodum sentit,” says Minucius, P
Felix (Oct. § 18): “magnitudinem Dei qui se putât nosee, minuit: qui non vult minuere non novit... Cum palma sit parentem omnium Deum nec principium habere nec terminum; Quí nativitatem omnibus praestet, Sibi perpetui
tatem; Qui, ante mundum, fuerit Sibi Ipsus pro mundus?” Eternity was from their point of view the negation of time, and infinity the negation of place. First they held that they had obtained their notions of both, as St. Thomas says: “Sicut enim ratio temporis consistit in numeratio
tione prioris et posterioris in motu; ita in apprehen
done uniformitatis ejus, quod est omnino extra
tum motum consistit ratio aeternitatis...” Síc er
gó ex duobus notificatur aeternitas; primum ex
c hac, quod id quod est in aeternitate est inter-
minabile: id est, principio et fine carens, ut
terminus ad utrumque referatur; secundò per
c hor, quod ipsa aeternitas successione caret, ita
e nec principium aut finem habere potest.” (S. Theol. P. i. q. x. art. 1.) This was analogous to getting to a conception of God from His works, and in the same way to the first cause of all. As St. Augustine says (on Ps. cx. 9), “Quod est ante luciferum, hoc est ante sidera: et quod est ante sidera, hoc est ante temporis: si ergò ante
tempra, ab aeternitate. Noli quaerere quandò: aeternitas non habet quando; Quàndò, et ali-
quandò, sunt verba temporum...” And again (on Ps. cxv. 29), “Non enim aliud sani Dei, et aliud Ipsè; sed aliud Dei aeternitas Dei est: aeternitas, ipsa Dei substantia, quae nihil habet mutabile. Ibí nihil præteritum, quia jam non sit, nihil est futurum, quasi nundinum sit: non est ibi, nisi est. Non est ibi, fuit et erit; quia et quod fuit, jam non est: et quod erit, nundinum est, sed quicquid ibi est, nonnisi est.” Conséquenté, when aeternitas were measured by the standard of His immutability, there were some that might deserve to be called eternal from their approaches to it. Though there could be no duration without beginning—retrospective
erenity—but His; there might be, and there
was actually, duration without end—prospective
erenity—by His gift: “Solus Deus est omnibus immutabilis; omnibus aeternus; immutabilis et aeternus; Deus est divinus et immutabilis.” Secun
dum tamen quod aliqui ab Isti immutabilitatem percepunt secundum hoc aeternus ejus aeterni
tatem participat. Quædam ergò quantum ad hoc aeternitatem sortiuntur a Deo, quod nunquam esse desinunt... Et sic aeternitas
angelis attribui potest.” (Ib. art. 3.) Such, he adds, will be the portion of those who inherit
eternal life. 

Creatio in time, whether everlasting or not,
are thus harmonised by St. Augustine with eternal purpose. “Novimus, Domine, novimus quoniam in quantum quicquid non est quod est, et quod erat, in tantum moritur et ortur. Non ergò quicquid Verbi tali sed quicquid menditum; quoniam verò immortale atque aeternum est. Et ideo Verbo tibi custodier simul et sempiternè dicis omnia quae dicis, et fit quicquid dicis ut fiat; nec alter quam dicendo facis: nec tamen et simul et sempiternè sunt omnia quae dicendo facias. Cur queso, Domine, Deus meus? Ut cumque video: sed quomodo id eliguer nescio; nisi quia omne quod esse incipit et esse desinat, tunc esse incipit et tunc esse desinat, quando debuisse incipere vel desinere in aeternò Ratione cognoscitur, ubi nec incipiet alicujus nec desinat.” (Conf. xi. 7, 8.) Whether all things, once
created, are to last for ever, is a further point.

Scripture says of the earth itself, that it “abideth for ever” (Eccl. i. 4); besides speaking of the everlasting hills (Gen. xlix. 26). Here, no doubt, the general view taken by the Fathers is, that by the phrase “for ever” is expressed “a relative eternity, an unbroken perpetuity for a given period of time.” Hence our Lord (apart from the system of things”) (Divinaton, On Proph. p. 205),
and ending only when that system ends. At the same time we nowhere find them affirming categorically, that anything, once summoned by God into being out of nothing, would return to nothing again. Porphyry, says St. Augustine, “Christians ob hoc arguit maximæ stultitiae etiam ex oraculis Deorum suorum, quod istam mundum dicunt esse peritum” (de Cr. D. xx. 24). This he shews was an unfounded
charge. “Peracto quippe judició, tunc esse desinat hoc caelum et hanc terram, quando incipiet esse caelum novum et terram novam. Mutatio nànque rerum, non nisi modo interea transit hic mundus, Unde et Apostolus sit: Petrus enim figura hujus mundi; volo vos sine sollicitudin
ede esse. Figura ergò præterit, non aeternus.” (Ib. c. 14.) When they talked of the world perishing by fire, they meant no more than St. Peter, who talked of its having already perished by water. “Indicat quippe his, qui scripi non sunt in libris vel in aeternitate munda
missias (qui ignis, cauæmodi et in quæ mæsi vel rerum parte futurus sit, hominem scire arbi
tor neminem, nisi forte cui Spiritus Divini ostendit) tunc figura hujus mundi mundationem ignati confugurationis præteribit, sicut factum est mundanarum aquarum inundatione dilutor. Ilia itaque, ut dixi, confuguratione mundi elementorum corruptilibus qualitatis, quæ corporibus nostris corruptibilibus coegebant, ardendo penitus interibant: atque ipsa substan
tia eas qualitates habebit, quæ corporibus immortalibus mirabilis mutatione conveniebat; ut scilicet mundus in melius immutabatur spatia commodeuetur hominibus etiam curae mæsæ innovationem donaret. Et ideo dicimus a Deo, quod nunquam esse desinat...” (Ib. art. 2.) Thus, the absurd things, however, they were unanimous in holding that there was to be no further change. “Quod igitur de sempiterno supplício damas
torum per suum prophetam Deus dixit, sit omnino fit;—Vermis eorum non moriétur, et ignis eorum non extinguébitur...” (Ib. xii. 8.) Neque enim toti sancti et sacris veteribus se novis litteris eruditi mundationem et regni aeterno be
studium in post quavisqueque et quavisqueque supplicia qualiscunqueque et quasia
quaque ignis invaderunt: sed potius viserunt Divinam vacui vel infirmari non posse sedé
tiam, quam se Dominus præsenativit in judicio prolaturum atque dicturum: “Discidete a me, malesciti, in ignem aeternum, qui pascat et diabolum et angelos ejus forum, qui erit aeterno igne diabolum et angelos ejus aram...et quod scriptum est Apocalypsi: ‘Diabolum, qui sedebat eos, missus est in stagnum ignis et sulphuribus, qui et bestia et pseudopropheta: et cruciabantur die et nocte in saeculo sae
culum.’ Quòd igitur dictum est aeternum, hic dictum est in sæculum sæculorum, quibus vero nihil Scriptura Divina significare conueri, nisi quod finem non habet temporis.” (Ib. c. 23.) Órigen, says St. Augustine, was more merita in
pleasing for the ultimate release of the devil and his angels from their abys of woe, than some of his own contemporaries, who were for assigning a limit to the torments of the better class of the wicked amongst men. "Sed illum," he adds, "et propter hoc, et propter alia nonnulla, et maximè propter alterantias sine cessationebeatitudines et miseriae, et, statuas saeculorum intervallassub istis ad illas atque ab illis ad istasius ac reditus interminabiles, non immorteto prorebut ecclesia: quia et hoc, quod misericors videbatur, amisit, faciendo sanctis veras miseriaiquibus poenas inerent, et falsas beatitudines inquis verum ac securum, hoc est sine timorecertum, sempiterni boni gaudium non habebant. Leagutatem istorum misericordiarum humanoerat affectus, qui hominum filo judicio damnatorum miserias temporales, omnium verò qui vel cius vel tardiis liberantur, aeternam felicitatem putant. Quae sententia, si propertia bona et vera, quia misericors est, tantò erit melior et verior quantò misericordissor. Extensur ergò ac profundior fons hujus misericordiae, quae nos angelorum et superemulta atque prolixa quantitatem saecula liberandos. Cur usque ad universam naturam maest humanam, et omnem angelicam ventum fuerit, mox aesscit? Non aetern tamen se ulterior miserando porrigrat, et ad liberationem ipsiusque diaboli pervenire. Verum si aliquis aeterni remedium aeternum tanto inventurerrare formosius, et contra recta Dei verba perversius, quanto sibi videtur sentire cementius."

These passages may suffice to illustrate the teaching of the Fathers on the points to which they relate; but the fundamental principle which underlies them all, is what Butler calls "the probability that all things will continue as we experience them, in all respects, except those in which we have some reason to think they will be altered." (Anat. c. 1.) And the Fathers found no change propounded or foreshadowed in Scripture which implied annihilation even where immortality alone was concerned; nor, again, any probability suggested, that wills which had deliberately resisted Divine grace in this life would ever be persuaded or coerced into receiving and being influenced by it in the next.

Other secondary senses of the Greek αἰών, and the Latin aevum, are noticed by the Fathers as being current, in explaining their own views. "Aetas," says St. Isidore, "plerumque dicitur pro uno anno, ut in annalibus, et pro septem, ut hominis: et pro centum, et pro quovis tempore. Usque et aetas, tempus quod de multis saeculis instructum est: et dicta aetas, quasi aevitas, id est temporum circitus, ut et quies. Nam aevitas est tales perpetua, cujus neque initium neque extremum nocet, quod Graeci αἰών vocant, quod aliquando apud eos pro saeculo, aliquando pro aeterno ponitur. Usque et aevitas Latinos est derivatum." (Etym. v. 38.) On the other hand, St. John Damascene says, even of the Greek αἰών, that it means occasionally no more than the life of a man, or present life in the abstract. He notices other meanings, of course, which are wider. A period of 1000 years, for instance, and life beyond the grave that has no end. According to the first of these meanings, he adds, there are commonly said to be seven aetae, or ages, of this world from its creation to its consummation, that is from the second coming of the Saviour. His definition is perhaps of a primary sense. "Οὐτε γὰρ τούτο ἢ χρόνος ἢ καὶ τούτο τούτου τοὐτοῦ χρόνου, τούτοι τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὗ αἴώνων (De Fide O. ii. 1). And the same view had been expressed, centuries before, by the author of the treatise de Div. Hom., ascribed to Dionysius (c. x. 2). Διὰ καὶ οὖν ἐπὶ αὐτῆς καὶ χρόνος οὐκ ἑκατέρων, αἰῶνας δὲ καὶ θεοὺς ἐθνοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἥκεν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ τῶν αἰώνων ἐφεκτείνα. Eternity, without beginning or end, was the primary meaning according to both, which aorism bore. Its other meanings were derived from, and dependent on, this one; and so far they were both in accord with Aristotle and with Scripture.

See Suicer, s. v. Aetos; Petavius, Thol. Dogm. iii. 3–6; Estius (and the older commentators) in Sent. i. Dist. 8 and iv. Dist. 47, § 14–16; Cajetanus in S. Thom. Sum. Theol. i. 9, 10; D. Scoti, Quaest. Quodib. vi. 13; Pearson on the Creed, Arts. i. and xii.; King, On the Origin of Evil, c. 1, § 3, with the remarks note 18; Hagenbach, Dogm. Theol. 866, § 106; Marshall's Concord. Pat. continued in Schramm's Analysis; Fessler, Inst. Patrol. [E. S. F.]

ETERNITY OF PUNISHMENTS. [Eschatology.]

ETESIUS (Aedebius), bishop of Claudopolis in Lazania, on the river Calcybonus. He was present at the first general council at Nicæa, A.D. 325. (Mansi, ii. 695; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 1027.) [J. de S.]

ETFRID, presbyter of Leominster, Herefordshire, whose legend is recorded in a manuscript (Harl. 2253, ff. 132, 133) described by Hardy. On his journey from some northern locality to convert Merewold, a pagan king, he has a vision of a lion. Merewold is converted and founds a monastery (A.D. 660), which, in consequence of the vision, is named Leominster. (Hardy, Cat. Nat. i. 257.) [C. H.]

ETGAL, abbot of a monastery on one of the Skellig islands, off the coast of Kerry, was taken by the Northmen, whom the Irish monks represent as exceedingly active at the time in their attacks upon the Irish coasts, and was starved to death A.D. 824 (Ann. Ult. A.D. 823; Ann. Infis. A.D. 811). [J. G.]

ETGFIRD (Nennius, Hist. Angl. in M. H. B. 75 n), king of Northumbria, son of Oswy. [Esfrid.]

ETGUN (Annal. Camb. ann. clxxii. i.e. A.D. 826, in M. H. B. 832 a.), king of Northumbria. [Edwin.]


ETHAN (Gismar, Extorie, v. 1456, in M. H. B. 793), bishop of Lindisfarne. [Eata.] [C. H.]

ETHBALDE (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 39, ed. Hardy), king of Mercia. [Ethelbald.]

ETHBIN (Ebrin, Ethen), commemorated Oct. 19. Dec. 30. Of this saint a life is given by the
ETHELA

Bollandists (Acta SS. Oct. 19, viii. 474, and by Capgrave (Nos. Leg. Angl. 122; and see Surius, De Prob. SS. Hist. Oct. 19, iv. 307). He was a Briton, and said to have belonged to a noble family; he died in the Danish immigration soon after he arrived in Armorica; he too passed over to France and was a disciple of St. Samson of Dolé, and of St. Winwaloe; he retired to the abbey of Taurac, and lived there till the community was dispersed by an attack of the Franks in A.D. 560. He went thence to Ireland, and remained there 10 years. The 20th cent took place about the close of the 6th century; he is said to have attained the age of 83 years, and to have died on Oct. 19, the day on which his name stands in the Roman Martyrology, but the Scotch calendars commemorate him on Dec. 30. Yet even his existence at all is not without suspicion, as its evidence is entirely legendary, and his time is placed by some in the 6th and by others in the 7th century. (Haddan and Stubbs, Concilia, &c. i. 160, ii. pt. i. 89; Butler, Lives of the Saints, Oct. 19, vol. ix. 539–40; Camerarius, de Scot. Hist. 204; Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 259; Pitsenus, de Ill. Angl. Scrip. App.; Hardy, De Scot. Hist. i. 385–377, 781; Tamplin, 584, 287; Cursus, CH. Hist. Brit. i. 10.) Pitsenus calls him a "scriptor egregius," whose writings are lost even to the titles, but Dempster does not scruple to supply the missing names. (Acta Sasanis Magistri, lib. i., Meditationes et Preces, lib. i. He is placed among the holy confessors and monks in the Dunblane Litany. Bp. Forbes, Kol. Scoti. Saints, pp. 13, 353.)

[J. G.]

ETHELA. [Attilla.]

ETHELARD (Dugd. Monast. i. 255), abbot of Malmsbury. [ETHELHARD (2, 3).] [C. H.]

ETHELARDE (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 39, ed. Hardy), king of Wessex. [ETHELHARD (1).] [C. H.]

ETHELARDEUS (Malm. G. R. A. i. §§ 89, 94, ed. Hardy), archbishop of Canterbury. [ETHELHARD (3).] [C. H.]

ETHELBALD (1), king of Mercia, 716–757. He was the son of Alwine or Alwino, son of Ethfrith, the brother of Penda (Chr. S. A.D. 716). He succeeded Ceolred, the son of Ethelred, who died in 716, and whom it seems to have been the last descendant of Penda. According to the life of St. Guthlac, the anchorite of Crowland (A.A. SS. C.S.B. spec. iii. pt. i, pp. 267–271), Ethelbalad had been in exile during the reign of Ceolred, and had been accustomed to visit the anchorite in his retirement; on these occasions he and his attendants, Wilfrid, Egis, and Obba, seem to have witnessed some of the miraculous acts of Guthlac. Ethelbalad also received from Guthlac a prophecy of his future exaltation; he had come, after exhausting all means of human help, to seek divine assistance; Guthlac encouraged him, and told him that he knew the misery in which all his life hitherto had been spent; he had prayed for him, and God would shortly deliver him. He would obtain his kingdom "non in praeside nec in rapina," but from God's hand. His enemy would be crushed without his agency. The prediction was fulfilled, and Ethelbalad succeeded quietly on the death of Ceolred.

After the death of Guthlac, Ethelbalad honoured his burial-place with special buildings and gifts, and frequently visited Crowland; but unfortunately the history of the monastery there is so obscure that the gifts cannot clearly be stated as to his share in the foundation. (V. Guth. ut supra, pp. 273, 275.)

Ethelbalad's career as a warrior and as the great creator of the Mercian power, which reached its climax under Offa, seems to have begun soon after he obtained the crown. Bede, who only mentions him in his history, describes Offa as the supreme in 731 over all the south of England from the Humber to the sea (H. E. v. 23). How this supremacy was attained we are not told; but, in point of fact, Wessex was the only competing power, and Wessex, which had been disturbed by intestine war during the latter years of Ine, was, at the moment when Bede wrote, under the rule of Ethelheard, who had not yet made any struggle for independence. It was on the side of Somersetshire that the struggle was renewed. In 738 Ethelbalad conquered Somerton, and so probably completed the humiliation of Ethelheard. Ethelheard died in 739 or 741, and Cuthbert, his successor, made a bold struggle for the independence of the West Saxons.

This part of Ethelbalad's reign has some illustration on the ecclesiastical side. Almost immediately on his accession he is introduced as patronising and furthering the work of Egwin at Evesham (Chr. Evesham, ed. Macnay, pp. 72, 73; Kemble, C. D. no. 95, 68, 75). Under Egwin was founded also the church of Worcester (Kemble, C. D. 67), which was followed by other donations under bishop Wilfrith (Kemble, C. D. 69, 70, 79, 80, 81). Many of these, however, were grants to smaller monastic establishments which afterwards were absorbed by the cathedral church. Other charters made a period testify to the fact that Ethelbalad's influence extended far beyond Mercia.

He appears as a benefactor to Glastonbury (Kemble, C. D. 71; Mon. Angl. i. 49), to Rochester in 734 (Kemble, C. D. No. 78; Mon. Angl. i. 184), and to Abingdon (Kemble, C. D. 81; Chr. Abbas. i. 38). In a Worcestershire charter of the date of 735, he entitles himself as "rex unius solum Marche anunu, sed et omnium vicinorum quae generali nomine Sutengil dicatur" (Kemble, C. D. 80; Mon. Angl. i. 585; see also Kemble, C. D. 83). It was also possibly by Ethelbalad's influence that three archbishops of Mercian connection were successively chosen to the see of Canterbury—Tatwin, Nothel, and Cuthbert; the last of whom was translated from Hereford. Ethelbalad was during the episcopate of Cuthbert regarded as the leading king in ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs. In a council held at Clovesho in 742 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 340, 341), in which the privilege of king Wïhtred was confirmed, Ethelbalad is said to have presided. Soon afterwards St. Boniface and five other German bishops were sent to Guthlac to excoriate him a letter of exhortation and remonstrance, from which it appears that Ethelbalad had never married a lawful wife, but was accused of adultery and fornication, especially with virgins dedicated to God. They likewise tell him that infanticide prevails in the monasteries, that he has himself been accused of seizing ecclesiastical property, and subjecting the clergy to undue insults;
ETHELBALD

and they especially warn him of the fate of his predecessor Coelred, who had died suddenly as at a feast (Mon. Mogunt. No. 59; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 351-357). Notwithstanding this plain speaking, Boniface was on friendly terms with Ethelbald; made him presents of a hawk and two falcons, two shields, and two dishes (ib. p. 357); and wrote also to Herefrith, a Mercian priest, on whose influence with Ethelbald he seems to have relied, asking him to urge the king to comply with the advice given him (ib. 357).

A similar letter was addressed to the archbishop of York (ib. 358-360). In consequence of this urgency a great church council, the decrees of which are extant, was held in September, 747, at Clovesho (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360-376). It is clear from these facts that the character of Ethelbald had not improved as his power increased. It is not surprising that the religious state of the king was very bad, and that his conduct instead of emulating that of his pious predecessors, resembled that of the Frank and other German princes after the first decline from the Christianity of the conversion.

The temporal supremacy of Ethelbald was not as yet endangered by the hostility of Cuthred and the West Saxons. In 740 he took up arms against Eldef, king of Northumbria, and devastated the country as far as Landaff (Cant. Bed. M. H. B. 288). In 743 (Cant. S. M. H. B. 329) Ethelbald and Cuthred appeared united in war against the Welsh. Ethelbald's liberality to the monasteries continued, Worcester especially owning him as a patron (K. C. D. 88, 89, 90, 91, 95). In 744 Ethelbald and Cuthred appear conjointly in a grant to Glastonbury (K. C. D. 92; Mon. Angl. i. 47). The grants to Minster in Thanet, dated 747 and 748 (K. C. D. 97, 98), are probably spurious. In 749 Ethelbald seems to have completed his series of benefactions by a general grant, dated at Godmanseleah, in which he releases the clergy from all ordinary taxation except the building of bridges and the national defence (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 386-387). Ethelbald's benefactions to the churches of his kingdom after the year 749, noted above, were much fewer than before; a grant to abbot Eanberht, who possibly was abbot of Malmesbury, is given in Kemble, C. D. 100; attested also by Cynwulf of Wessex, who began to reign in 753 or 755. The long supremacy of Ethelbald, however, was now contested. In 750 a struggle between Cuthred and Ethelbald the proud ealdorman, probably a potentate who had prevented him from acquiring supreme control in Wessex, is recorded; and in 752 the West Saxon king, in a battle at Beergford or Burford, put the great Mercian ruler to flight. Cuthred died in 755, and Wessex after his death was disturbed by intestine division. Ethelbald, however, did not recover his power.

In 757, at Secundunae, or Segeswold, perhaps Seckington in Warwickshire, Ethelbald was killed. Henry of Huntingdon affirms that he fell in battle, but the older authorities say that he was killed in the night by his guards (Cont. Bed. M. H. B. 289; Sim. Dun. ib. p. 662). His ill success or growing infirmities had probably wearied out his servants and his people as well. Beornred, who is called a "tyrannus" or usurper, may not improbably have put himself at the head of a conspiracy among the "comites" or "gesiths" of Ethelbald, who thus perished in the same way as many of the Northumbrian kings. The date for his death, 757, as given by the continuator of Bede and Simeon of Durham, is preferable to that given by the Chronicle, 755, which, like many of the dates between 731 and 849 requires to be adjusted by the addition of two years, as suggested by Sax. Chron. S.; Sim. Dun. M. H. B. 288, 688.)

He was buried at Repton. In a vision recorded in one of the letters preserved among the memorials of St. Boniface, Ethelbald's soul was seen in torments (Monument. Mogunt. ed. Jaffé, pp. 375, 376). His character seems to have combined the lust, violence, and pride, which are specially noted by historians, with an amount of official liberality to the churches and a great neglect of the duty of spiritual supervision. But it is not impossible that it underwent a change during his long reign, and that the earlier uneventful years were not devoid of promise. His position as a great consolidator of the Mercian state, and as a king regarded by the continent as a great sovereign, is less unquestionable. He was no doubt the most powerful king since Ethelbert of Kent, not excepting the Northumbrian rulers.

A letter to St. Aldehelm, when abbot, accompanied by a long poem, written by a certain Aeddialwaid (Mon. Mogunt. ed. Jaffé, pp. 35 sq.), are ascribed by Jaffé to Ethelbald, afterwards king of Mercia. The writer refers to the troubles of his country, and compares himself to Rehoboam; but few allusions in the poem are to Devonshire and Cornwall. There is no doubt about the reading "Aeddialwaid," and it is most probable that it is the work of a West Saxon pupil of Aldehelm.

ETHELBALD (2) (AETHELBALD, EADHALD), abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow. See references under EADHALD (4). He does not appear in Duggleby (i. 502), nor is he included in Birch's Eadmonitici (p. 63). His existence is known from a letter addressed to him by Alcuin, an extract of which was given by Keynes, and afterwards copied by Bede, while the letter was preserved in full by Jaffé (Mom. Alcuin. 830).


ETHELBERHT (2), called king of Wessex and Kent in a spurious or doubtful charter of 781, bearing the signatures of archbishop Jaenbert and Diora bishop of Rochester (Kemble, C. D. 144). No king of the name in Wessex is known from any other source, and no king of Kent after the death of Ethelbert II, until the reign of Ethelbert, son of Ethelwulf, in the following century.

ETHELBERHT (3) (Sim. Dun. G. E. A. ann. 790, in M. H. B. 667 c), bishop of Candida Casa. [ETHELBERT (7)].

ETHELBERHT (1) (properly AETHELBERHT or ETHELBERHT; Bede, AELDBERHT), king of Kent. He was the son of Irminric, and greatgrandson of Oeric, surnamed Oisc, the son of Hengist, and succeeded to the kingdom of the Kentishmen as the heir of the "Aescings," in 569 (the date 565, given in the Chronicle, is
inconsistent with Bede's reckoning given below).

Some years after his accession, he provoked a conflict with Cutha, another Saxon king, and his brother, Cutha, was defeated at Wimbledon with the loss of two of the cildarmen, and driven back into Kent (Sax. Chron. a. 654). He had already married Bertha or Berhte, daughter of Charibert, king of Paris, on the under-

Ethelbert faithfully observed this compact, but showed no curiosity to hear more about his wife's creed. She and her episcopal chaplain worshipped undisturbed in the old Roman-British church of St. Martin, on a hill to the east of Ethelbert's city of Canterbury (Bede, l. 28). Ethelbert succeeded on the death of his old enemy Cælin in 593, to that pre-eminence among the Saxon and Anglican kings which is usually described as the Bretwaladom (see Freeman, Norm. Conq. i. 542). And four years later, in the spring of 597, he was brought face to face with the first Christian missionaries, led by Augustine, whom pope Gregory the Great sent to "bring him the best of all messages, which would ensure to all who received it eternal life and an endless kingdom with the true and living God." (Bede, i. 29).

Ethelbert had sent word to the foreigners to remain in the city, and the clergy that they had landed, and "supplied them with all necessary until he should see what to do with them." He soon came into the isle, and sitting down with his "gesiths" or attendant thanes in the open air, (for he feared the effect of spells under a roof), listened attentively to the speech of Augustine [Augustinus]. Then he spoke in some such words as these: "This is a new and uncertain kingdom, I cannot give in to them, and leave the rites which I, with the whole race of the Angles, have so long observed. But since you are strangers who have come from afar, and, as I think I have observed, have desired to have your faith and customs to be true and thoroughly good, we do not mean to hurt you, but rather shall take care to receive you with kindly hospitality, and to afford you what you need for your support; nor do we forbid you to win over to your faith, by preaching, as many as you can." He gave them also a dwelling in Canterbury, somewhat to the north-west of the present cathedral precinct. They took possession of their new home, and began to make converts, as Bede tells us, through the charm of their preaching, and the still more powerful influence of lives consistent with what they taught. In a short time afterwards Ethel-

Ethelbert himself expressed his belief in the truths of those whom he had welcomed as unheard of; he believed and was baptized; the time, according to Canterbury tradition, was the Whitsun-eve of 597, which fell on the 1st of June; the place, undoubtedly, was St. Martin's. The king thenceforward proved himself to be one of the truest and noblest of royal converts. He even removed from Canterbury to Regulbium or Regulphi, where he built a monastery, abandoning his old abode to Augustine, now consecrated as archbishop, and adding to it the gift of various "needful possessions" (Bede, i. 28).

He assisted Augustine in the work of converting an old Roman-built church into "the cathedral church of the Holy Saviour," and also built "after exhortation," a monastery outside the eastern wall of the city, dedicated in the names of SS. Peter and Paul, but afterwards known as "St. Augustine's." He received by the hands of Mellitus, who, with others, joined the mission in 601, a letter from the pope Gregory, and he sent his aid as a present to the arrangements for a conference, near the Bristol channel, between his archbishop and some bishops of the ancient British church. Among the many "good services which he rendered to his people," Bede reckons those "dooms" or decrees which, "after the example of the Romans, he framed with the consent of his wise men"... and among which he first of all set down what satisfaction (bó) was to be made by any one who robbed the church, the bishop, or the clergy. For he was "mindful to afford his protection to those whose doctrine he had received" (Bede, ii. 5). For these dooms, extant in the "Regulbium Constitutiones," he is held by Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, p. 1. They are 90 in number; the first, just as Bede says, establishes a scale of penalties for wrong done to the property of the church, of the bishop, of a priest, of a deacon, of a cleric.

Ethelbert's nephew Sabert, the son of his brother Rieula, held the kingship which he had inherited from the East Saxons, and embraced the faith under the persuasion of his uncle and overlord, who built a church of St. Paul in London for Mellitus as bishop of that kingdom. He also built at "Hro's Castle," i.e. at Rochester, a church of St. Andrew for a bishop named Justus; "gave many gifts to both priests and added lands and possessions for the use of those who were with them." It was, we may be sure, in Ethelbert's reign and under his influence that Redwald, king of the East Angles, while visiting Kent, was prevailed on to receive baptism, although, as his after conduct shewed, his convictions were not deep (Bede, ii. 19). After Bertics's death, Ethelbert married a young woman whose name is unknown. His last days must have been saddened by anxiety as to the future reign of his son Eadbald, who refused to receive the faith of Christ. Ethelbert died, after what Bede describes as a most glorious reign of 56 years, on the 34th of February, A.D. 616, and was buried beside his first wife in the "porticus" or transept of St. Martin, within the church of SS. Peter and Paul, leaving behind him a memory long held in grateful reverence as that of the first English Christian king. (Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 176, 214-216, 250.)

[W. B.]

ETHELBERT (3) II., king of Kent. He was a son of Wihtred, probably the eldest left on his father's death in 725, coheiir with Eadbald and Alric. [KABBERHIT, ALRIC.] If the act of the council of Beckancold, in which the privilegium of Wihtred was granted be received as genuine, Ethelbert, who attested it on behalf of his brother Eadbald and himself, must have been of age to be given a share in the proceedings; Haddan andStubbs, iii. 240. Although, however, there is a presumption that Ethelbert was the eldest son,
the chronicles give more prominence to Ead-
bert, who is said to have reigned from 725
to 748, leaving Ethelbert as his successor in
the latter year. From charters the inference may
be drawn that the brothers reigned contempo-
raneously or concurrently; but if Eadbert really
died in 748, Ethelbert must have then assumed
the position of chief king; sole king he could
hardly be, as Eardulf appears in 747 as king, and
other competitors appear before Ethelbert’s death,
of whom it is uncertain whether they were partners
or mere pretenders to the crown. The joint acts
of Eadbert and Ethelbert have been noted under
the article EADBERT (2). Ethelbert reigned after
Eadbert’s death, or at least after the year 748,
and reigned for about fourteen years, dying in 762 or there-
abouts. Ethelbert is best known as the writer of
a letter to St. Boniface, written before the
year 755, in which he reminds him of a
promise made some years before to the abbot
Bugga, that he would pray for him. He also
sent presents, through his messenger Ethelhaun, a
man ‘cuthneagtus’ (pl, ‘cuthneagta’) or lord, of
pounds and a half, and two ‘reptae;’ and
ask Boniface to procure him two falcons, such
dons being scarce in Kent. He also begs
to have an answer in writing. (Bonif. Ep.
ed. Wurdtwein, Ep. 84; Mon. Monast., pp.
254–255.)
The only charter of Ethelbert after the death
of Eadbert is a grant to St. Augustine’s of a mill
at Chart, attached to the royal township of
Wyth, on the condition that the tenant should
have the pannage of a herd of swine in the wood
of Andreid. (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, p. 325; Kebkle, C. D. no. 108.) The charter is dated
762, and the same year appears in the same
chartulary of St. Augustinians, a grant by Dunwald,
a thegn of Ethelbert, of a property in Queen-
gate, Canterbury, in memory of Ethelbert, for
whose soul also he was going to carry money to
Rome. (Elmham, p. 326; K. C. D. 108.) It
appears from this charter that Ethelbert was
buried at St. Augustine’s of Canterbury. (Hawkins, English Silver Coins, ed. Kenyon, pp. 30–31.)

EATHELBERT (3), ST., king of the East
Angles. Heir to known history as one of the victims
of the aggressive policy of king Offa of Mercia. In
the year 792 (rather 794) Offa ordered him to be
beheaded. Such is the brief statement of the
Chronicle, which Florence of Worcester expands
by the statement that the most glorious and
most holy king of the East Angles, ‘Aegel-
britone’ (Arbuthnot’s ‘Aegaelphig’) reigned
in splendour and the virtue of his life, and passing
the test of the court of Offa, at the instiga-
tion of his wife Cynethritha, deprived of his
life and kingdom, and, as a king and martyr,
established the court of blessed spirits. (M. B.
545.) The same writer (M. B. 650) says
that he was the son of Ethelred, king of the
East Angles, and his wife Leoruna. William
of Malmsbury says that Ethelbert was treacher-
ously allured by Offa, and killed within the
precincts of the palace (G. R. § 86), having been
enticed thither in hope of becoming Offa’s son-in-
law. (Tob. § 210; Gesta Pontificum, § 170.) He
also mentions that St. Dunstan regarded
Ethelbert as a martyr. It is obvious that the
name of Ethelbert gained ground as years went
on, and we have the complete form of his
legendary history in the Life of Ethelbert, in-
corporated by Richard of Cirencester in the
Speculum historiale, and existing in more or less
complete form in Capgrave, in the so-called
Chronicle of John Brompton, and in several
MSS. According to this legend Ethelbert was
the son of Ethelred and Leorona, a Merican
lady of royal descent, piously educated, and
raised to the throne on his father’s death by
the lords of the kingdom. After winning the good
will of all by wisdom and piety, he was urged
by his mother to take holy orders, and on his
advice an ealdorman named Gwero specially recom-
manded Sodelria (or Seledritha) the daughter of
a ruler named Egeo, who had succeeded to her
father’s kingdom. Ethelbert declined this prop-
sal because Egeo had been a traitor to his
father Ethelred, and by the advice of another
ealdorman, Gwinbert, determined to marry a
daughter of Offa. After prayer and other prepa-
rations Ethelbert set out for Offa’s court, although
strongly pressed by his mother not to proceed;
he left his city Buderog (Bedrichesworth = St.
Edmonds), and in spite of an earthquake and
eclipse of the sun, which was ended at Ethel-
bert’s prayer, he sent presents to Offa as he
approached “Villa Australis,” where the king
was enwrapped. He had next a vision which
Oswald unfortunately misinterpreted, but which
was honestly explained by subsequent events. On
his arrival he found acceptance in the eyes of
Alfrida [ELFRITHHA (3)]. Offa’s daughter, who
expressed the same admiration in language as
she had done in action, that Ethelbert should
procure her mother to special hatred of
Ethelbert. Cynethritha warned Offa that Ethel-
bert would supplant him, and Offa determined
to sacrifice him. A courtier named Gwinbert
offered to contrive the murder, and induced
Ethelbert to visit Offa in his chamber, where he
was seized, bound, and beheaded, by Gwinbert
himself. His body was ignominiously buried,
but, being discovered, owing to the heavenly
light which marked the spot, was translated
to Hereford, and there buried in the cathedral,
where many miracles attested Ethelbert’s
sanctity. His head was preserved in a magnifi-
cent shrine at Westminster. (Ric. Cirenc.
Spec. Hist. i. 262–293.) Some additional part-
culars are supplied by Brompton: (Twysden,
ca. 748 sq.) Alfrida became an anchoret at
Crowland: Ethelbert was buried in the first
instance on the bank of the Lugg; three nights
after he appeared to a man named Brithfrith,
and bade him remove his body to “stratus
Way,” or the wide land to the west; the banks of the
Wye at Taunton, but Brithfrith obeyed, and with the help of Egnumul
removed the body, with the head, which by the
way fell off the waggons and restored to sight the
blind man who picked it up; they then buried
it at Fernlegh, which was afterwards called
Hereford. In after times a king of the Mercians
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named Milfrith exalted Hereford, in honour of St. Ethelbert, into a cathedral city. (See also Capgrave, ff. 137–139.)

However the legend grew, it is certain that Ethelbert soon became the patron saint of Hereford. The story of Milfrith is of course apocryphal (Mon. Angl. vi. 1210), but bishop Ethelstan, 1012 to 1058, was the first to mention it in his honour; and although this was burned by the Welsh in 1055, it was rebuilt soon after the Conquest by bishop Robert of Lorraine. The services of St. Ethelbert occupy an important place in the Missal, Breviary, and Hymnal of the use of Hereford. The 20th of May is observed in his honour, and to him are dedicated, besides the cathedral, the churches of Marden in Herefordshire and Little Dean in Gloucestershire, besides six churches in Norfolk, three in Suffolk, and one in Essex in honour of St. Mary and St. Ethelbert. The author of the life of St. Ethelbert is said to have been Osbert of Clare, a monk of Westminster in the reigns of Edward the Elder, Ethelred, and Henry II. (See Hardy, Cat. Med. i. 495, 496.)


Matthew Paris, or the author of the life of Offa, who tells the story of Ethelbert's martyrdom more favourably to his hero, throwing all the blame upon Cynethritha, and making Offa ignorant of the plot until after the murder was committed. He also called Offa's daughter Aelfleda, ed. Wats, p. 24. [8]

ETHELBERT (4), king of the South Saxons. He is known only from the Selsey charters, in which he appears as a contemporary of Offa, and possibly he is to be identified with one of the claimants of the Kentish throne during the latter half of the 8th century (Kemble, C. D. 1010, 1011.) More probably the charters are fabricated without any regard for dates. [8]

ETHELBERT (5), ST., martyr with his brother St. Ethelred at the court of their cousin Egbert king of Kent. Their father Eormenred was a brother of Eorcumbert the predecessor of Egbert, and their murderer was one of the royal household named Thuron. Neither the princes nor their father are mentioned in Bede, and the Saxon Chronicle cursorily relates (sub ann. 640) only that Eormenred's two sons (unnamed) were afterwards martyred by Thuron. A detailed legendary account of the murder (for it was no true martyrdom) occurs at the commencement of the Gesta Regum Anglorum of Simeon of Durham in all the editions of that author until Mr. Binde's, in which it is made a separate piece. In Simeon's story Eormenred was an elder son (which the Saxon Chronicle also implies, naming him before his brother Eorcumbert), Thuron proposed the murder to Egbert for the security of the succession, and the king connived. The crime was committed at a royal residence in the vicinity of Eorcatun, which must be Eastrig, a short distance south of Sandwich, and the bodies when discovered were solemnly interred at the "famosissimum monasterium Wracinene." Eorcatun or Domneva, a sister of the martyrs, received from the conscience-stricken king a grant of land in Thanet, where she founded a memorial monastery and made her daughter Mildred abbess of it. A council that was held to investigate the murder was presided over by archbishop Deusdedit, who also consecrated the nuns of the new foundation; but as, according to Bede, Deusdedit and Eorcumbert died the same day, Eorcumbert in his monastery in honour of that, it was impossible. The account in Goscelin makes the archbishop to have been Theodore, and so defines the period as that between 669, when Theodore arrived in England, and 678, when Egbert died. Simeon's narrative does not name the spot in Thanet where Eormenberga's monastery was built, but Thuron in a later censure as Minster, a place to which he himself belonged. In Dugdale's list the monastery occurs as that of St. Mildred in Thanet (Monast. Anglic. i. 447). As the tradition of this martyrdom involves the question whether there ever existed, besides that monastery at Minster, a second one at Eastrey and another at Wakering, it becomes necessary to follow the story in other early sources.

Goscelin, about A.D. 1090, a few years before Simeon, introduces the tragedy of St. Ethelbert and St. Ethelred at the commencement of his life of St. Mildred (MS. Harl. num. 105, ff. 137–139, see Hardy, Cat. Med. i. 376), but makes no mention there of the burial-place or of the subsequent translation, after description of the fate of Thuron, to the main subject of his saint. Thoro, three centuries afterwards, in his life of St. Mildred closely follows Goscelin (Twysd. Scriptt. col. 1905). Goscelin, in another of his lives, briefly introduces the martyrdom of the princes, but there again he is silent both as to sepulchral dedication and translation (Vis. S. Winters. cap. 1, § 1, in Boll. Acta SS. 3 Feb. i. 386 e). A few years later (cir. A.D. 1124), and about the time of Simeon, the story is related by William of Malmesbury (G. P. iv. § 181, pp. 318, 319, ed. Hamilton), who states that the martyrs were buried at a place in East Anglia "cujus nomen excitid;" but according to Sivile's reading (Scriptt. p. 292, 7), which is endorsed by the Bollandists, it is "cujus nomen Estrea," which means either that the burial-place was at an Estrea in East Anglia, or that the burial-place was in East Anglia a province also called Estrea. Malmesbury evidently had not identified Simeon's "Wracinene." He goes on to say that Ethelwulf the earl of East Anglia conveyed the relics of the martyrs "celebris poma" from the "obscure church" of their sepulture to the abbey of Ramsey, and this is the first intimation we have met of the connexion of St. Ethelbert and St. Ethelred with that house, of which Ethelwulf was himself a founder (cir. 974 or 991), dying in 992. (A. C. C. ann. 992; Flor. Wig. Chron. ann. 991, 992, in M.R.R. 580 a. 581 l. H. Hist. vi. in M. H. B. 747 e; cf. Tanner, Notitia, Huntingdonshire, v.) Here it may be mentioned that the Historia Raveseniensis (Gale. Scriptt. iii. 405) makes the martyrs to have been buried in a villa of the earl Wachinger, who caused them to be translated to Ramsey; clearly showing that the Ramsgate of Eastrey of the Chronicle must be ignorant of the place meant by Wracinene. John of Timnouth (cir. 1347) devoted a separate title to our two martyrs in his Sanctiogium (MS. see Tanner, Bibloth. p. 439), a list of the lives of which work is given by Dr. Thomas Smith.
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(Catalogus Librorum MSS. Biblioth. Cotton. 1696, p. 28), and Timouth's legend of St. Ethelbert and St. Ethelred (num. 121 in Smith) was one of those transferred to Capgrave's collection (see Nov. Leg. Angli. i. 143). Here it is stated that the martyrs were buried at "Wakering" and afterwards translated to Ramsey. Thorn, whose chronicle is later than Timouth, repeats Goscelin, as already stated, and adds the information that Eormenburga's monastery was at Minster. (Thorn has also a brief mention of the martyrs sub ann. 686, col. 1770.) From Timouth and Capgrave then "Wakering" has been adopted as representing Simeon's "Wacrincense" (M. H. B. praef. p. 89; Stevenson's Eng. trans. of Simeon, p. 430). The only Wakering known is that in Essex, near Shoeburyness. It is a very ancient manor, the history of which is detailed in Wright's History of Essex (vol. ii. p. 614), but without a hint of a monastery having ever existed there; as to which matter Camden also is equally silent. Nor do either Tanner or Dugdale speak of Wakering monastery. The absence of all local trace and all literary record is noticed by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 17 Oct. viii. 94 #) as an objection to the proposed identification, and the editors of the M. H. B. in the body of their work (p. 648 note) are doubtful as to "Wakering Essexiae.

Monasteries at Eastry arising out of our story, it is to be noted, in the first place, that the spot is exterior to Thanet, within the limits of which it was Eormenburga received her grant. In recent times Harpsfield (Hist. Eccles. Angli. 1622, sec. viii. cap. 10), calling the princes Ethelbert and Ethelbriht, makes their martyrdom give birth to two monasteries, one at Eastry and the other at Minster, intending probably to combine the statements of Matthew Paris (with whom agrees Matthew of Westminster, cir. 1320) and Thorn, the first two writers placing Eormenburga's monastery at Eastry and saying nothing as to Minster. Harpsfield, lib. xi. cap. 4, § 6 puts "a church" at Eastry, perhaps to place himself in conformity with Malmsbury. On the joint authority of Harpsfield and Cressy, Tanner (Notit. Kent, xxii.) inserts an Eastry monastery, but without vouching for it, and the Monasticon (vi. 1920) simply copies Tanner's paragraph without observation.

As for the legend itself in its present form, perhaps a clue to its origin may have been furnished by a remark of the editors of the Monasticon (praef. 89) that Simeon's silence about the translation to Ramsey implies a date for the story prior to that event (i.e., prior to 591) and that in Britain lib. ii. cap. 4, § 6 puts "a church" at Eastry, perhaps in conformity with Malmsbury. On the joint authority of Harpsfield and Cressy, Tanner (Notit. Kent, xxii.) inserts an Eastry monastery, but without vouching for it, and the Monasticon (vi. 1920) simply copies Tanner's paragraph without observation.

As for the legend itself in its present form, perhaps a clue to its origin may have been furnished by a remark of the editors of the Monasticon (praef. 89) that Simeon's silence about the translation to Ramsey implies a date for the story prior to that event (i.e., prior to 591) and that in Britain lib. ii. cap. 4, § 6 puts "a church" at Eastry, perhaps in conformity with Malmsbury. On the joint authority of Harpsfield and Cressy, Tanner (Notit. Kent, xxii.) inserts an Eastry monastery, but without vouching for it, and the Monasticon (vi. 1920) simply copies Tanner's paragraph without observation.

For the legend itself in its present form, perhaps a clue to its origin may have been furnished by a remark of the editors of the Monasticon (praef. 89) that Simeon's silence about the translation to Ramsey implies a date for the story prior to that event (i.e., prior to 591) and that in Britain lib. ii. cap. 4, § 6 puts "a church" at Eastry, perhaps in conformity with Malmsbury. On the joint authority of Harpsfield and Cressy, Tanner (Notit. Kent, xxii.) inserts an Eastry monastery, but without vouching for it, and the Monasticon (vi. 1920) simply copies Tanner's paragraph without observation.
well-known passage enumerates many of the works which the library contained. He mentions forty-one authors, a few out of many, whose works were in the collection at York. Among these are some of the fathers, Christian poets, and grammarians. The classical writers are only Cicero, Pompeius, Pliny, Virgil, Statius, Lucan, and Suetonius. Their names are in Latin and in Greek. Alcuin speaks of treatises in Greek and Hebrew without telling us what they are. In the western world there was probably no library out of Rome itself so large and important as this. Certainly there was nothing to be compared with it in France, which was just beginning to awake to the long-dormant claims of learning.

In A.D. 768 archbishop Egbert died, and Albert, by the popular voice, was appointed his successor. He was consecrated on 24th April, A.D. 767, and in A.D. 773, pope Adrian sent him the pall (Saxon Chron.; Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc. 22, 24). Albert made an excellent archbishop. He was a strict disciplinarian, but was considerate and accommodative in such things as made no difference in his personal habits. He was as frugal and simple as before.

Albert, however, was by no means sparing in what he did for God's house. In A.D. 741 the minster of York had been burnt (Symeon, Chron. p. 14). What mischief the fire actually did we do not know. It is probable that some portion of the building, which was of stone, would be temporarily patched up for the celebration of divine service. Albert, however, took in hand the erection of what must have been a new building. The old minster contained as its most precious feature the chapel or oratory in which king Edwin was said to have been baptized in A.D. 627. Here Albert set up an altar dedicated to St. Paul, which he decorated with silver, jewels and gold. Above it hung a large candelabrum with three branches. A tall crucifix or rood was set up at the altar, also made of precious metals. Albert built another altar dedicated to the Martyrs and the Holy Cross. This, too, was covered with silver and precious stones, and he provided flags of pure gold to contain the wine which was to be poured into the chalice.

The new basilica, or cathedral church—minister it has always been called in York, although it has never been tenanted by monks—was built under the superintendence of Eanbald and Alcuin, and is to the pen of the latter that we owe the only description of it which we possess. Alcuin speaks of a lofty temple uplifted by pillars, which stand in their turn over crypts below. He says that it is bright with ceilings and windows, which were probably coloured. Around it were a number of porches, or apsidal chapels, and the whole building contained as many as thirty altars. Some remains of this structure may still, I think, be discerned in the crypt beneath the present fabric.

About two years before his decease, Albert retired from the cares of office to end the remnant of his days in solitary devotion. In preparation for this he made Eanbald his coadjutor in the see, consecrating him bishop; the charge of his school and books he gave to the faithful Alcuin. Ten days before his decease he emerged from his cell to dedicate the minister which it had been his privilege to begin and complete. This was a last effort. Alcuin saw his old master die, and among the last wishes of Albert was the desire that Alcuin should visit France and Rome. He died at York on the 8th of November, A.D. 781 or 782, at the sixth hour of the day (Fl. Wigorn. i. 58), and was laid to rest in his cathedral, a large procession of ecclesiastics and laymen accompanying him to his grave. Albert's body was brought from Alcuin's cell (Saxon Chron. and Symeon in A.D. 780). They have, I think, mistaken the time of his retirement for that of his decease. Eanbald probably became coadjutor bishop in A.D. 780.

Albert was undoubtedly one of the most able men in Europe in the 8th century. His learning, his educational powers, his widespread sympathies and acquaintance with the scholar and great men of other countries gave him a position and a power for good which no one perhaps possessed to a greater degree. Under him the city of York became the centre of a great educational system which developed in every direction. It was famous at the same time for its literary than for its ecclesiastical existence. It kept up its missionary fame, for Northumbria was the country of Wilfrid and Willibrord. Boniface had kind friends in Egbert and Echt helm (Epp. ed. Giles, i. 87–9, 113). Albert, under the name of Coena, seems to have been also a correspondent of Lullius, archbishop of Mainz, and a letter is preserved from Albert, king of Northumbria and his queen, addressed to the same dignitary, asking for and promising prayers (Bonifaci Epp. ed. Giles, §§ 83, 21, 242, 247; Haddan and Stubbs, iii.). About the same time a council was held in Northumbria to send Willehad as a missionary to the Frisians and Saxons (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 450). To his efforts and those of Alberht and Liudger, who were connected with the school of York in its brightest days, the church of North Germany is under inestimable obligations (Maclear's Christian Missions, 222–27).

The principal authorities for the life of Albert are Alcuin's poem De Sanctis et Pontificibus Ebor., his Letters, and the Life appended to them in the editions of Froben and Jaffé. [E. C.]

ETHELBERT (7) (ÆDELBERHT, AEDIBLECHUS) was consecrated bishop of Withern, in Galloway, at York, on June 10, A.D. 777. (Saxon Chron.; Flor. Wigorn. i. 58.) In A.D. 785, in the death of Tilbert, he left Withern for Hexham. (Symeon, Chron., ed. Surtees Soc. p. 30.) In A.D. 791 he was one of the consecrators of Badulf, bishop of Withern, and of archbishop Eanbald II. In A.D. 796 (Symeon, pp. 30, 34), also of Eardulf, king of Northumbria, in the same year. He died on Oct. 16 in the following year at a place called Barton, probably on the Tees. His body was brought to Hexham, and was interred by the brethren in the church. (Fl. 34; Ric. of Hexham, p. 34.)

Ethelbert, as bishop of Withern, signs the decrees of the Northumbrian legatine synod in A.D. 787. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 460.) There is a letter to him and his congregation at Hexham from Alcuin, speaking of their old friend ship, and asking for his prayers. The great scholar advises Ethelbert to collect books and to organise a school at Hexham. (Epp. ed. Jaffé 374–5.)

Dempster states that Ethelbert wrote a
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treatise against Ellipandus of Toledo, one of the
opponents of Alcuin, but this is more than doubt-
ful. (Wright, Beogr. Lit. i. 998.) [J. R.]

ETHELBRITH (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 9, title
§ 10, ed. Hardy), ETHELBERT (ibid. § 9)
ETHELBRITH (ibid. § 17), king of Kent
[ETHELBERHT (1).] [C. H.]

ETHELBRCT (Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 264),
martyr. [ETHELBERHT (5).] [C. H.]

ETHELBRICH (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 86,
ed. Hardy), king of East Anglia. [ETHEL-
BERHT (9).] [C. H.]

ETHELBURGA (1) (TATAE), daughter of
Ethelbert, king of Kent and his queen Bertha.
She was bestowed in marriage by her brother
Eadbald king of Kent on Edwin king of North-
umbria, after the latter had promised to do
nothing hostile to the spread of Christianity,
both to her and her attendants in freedom
of worship; whilst he himself would re-
ceive the faith if on examination it should be
found more holy and worthy of God than the
religion he professed. Ethelburga accordingly
was sent to Northumbria, accompanied by
Paulinus, and the conversion of the king and his
people would be very shortly. Bede has pre-
pared a letter from pope Boniface to Ethelburga,
encouraging her to attempt the conversion of
Edwin (H. E. ii. 11); the king himself was moved
to the change on the occasion of the birth of his
daughter Eanfled, and was baptized April 12,
627, less than two years after his marriage.
[EDWIN.] After Edwin had fallen before the
arms of Peada in 633, Ethelburga, accompanied
by Paulinus, her daughter Eanfled, her son
Wulfhere and Ulf, son of Osfrith and grandson
of Edwin, returned to Kent, bringing with her
many of Edwin’s treasures, especially a golden
cup and cross, which were preserved at Canter-
bury in Bede’s time. (H. E. ii. 20.) The royal
bequest was a source of education for Ethelberht,
where king Dagobert took charge of them. In this
Ethelburga showed some mistrust of Eadbald,
who was now in alliance with Oswald, the head
of the rival dynasty in Northumbria. Dagobert
died in 638, and the two boys also died in infancy,
and were buried in France with royal honours.
Ethelburga had by Edwin two sons, Ethelhun
and Wuscelm, the former of whom died soon
after baptism; and two daughters Eanfled and
Ethelthritha; Ethelthritha died in infancy and
was buried, as was Ethelhun, at York. (H. E.
ii. 14.) Eanfled became the wife of king Oswy
(Oosin) of Northumbria. Bede gives no account
of Ethelhun’s life during her husband’s, but we
learn from the Canterbury traditions, and on
the testimony of Florence of Worcester that she
founded a monastery at Liming in Kent (M. H. B.
635; Elmharn, ed. Hardwick, p. 176; Dugd.
I. 452), where she was buried. (Elmharn, p.
177.) [S.]

ETHELBURGA (2), daughter of Anna
king of the East Saxons, sister of Sexburga
the wife of Eareombert king of Kent, and sister of
Ethelreda abbess of Ely; she, with her
half-sister Saethryd, took the veil in the monas-
tery of Fumouttier in Brie, where Ethelburga
became abbess. (Bede, H. E. iii. 5, for
Wig. M. H. B. 636; Liber Eliensis, ed. Stewart,
p. 15; Hardy, Cat. i. 265.) [S.]

ETHELBURGA (3), sister of Erkenwald
bishop of London, and first abbess of Barking.
[ERKENWALD.] Bede gives (lib. iv. cc. 7, 8, 9,
10) an account of several miraculous events
which happened during her period of rule, and
which he extracted from a book which had already
been written on the history of the
monastery. One of these is a vision which Torg-
yth, one of the nuns, bad of the death of Ethel-
burga, a few days before it occurred, and a vision
of Ethelburga herself a few days after her death
(c. 9). What little is known of the foundation
of Barking will be found under ERKENWALD.
Capgrave (N. L. A.) gives a life of St. Ethel-
burga, according to which she was born, like
Erkenwald, at Stallington, in Lindsey, was
doughter of Offa, who was subsequently con-
verted by her agent; in order to avoid mar-
riage she fled from her father’s house; Earecon-
bald built her a monastery out of his patrony
and invited Hildelitha [HILDELETH] from France
to teach her monastic customs. This writer also
expands the miraculous stories given by Bede.
(Acc. Leg. Angli. ed. 1516, fol. 139, 140.) The
biography of course proceeded from the same mait
as that of Erkenwald. The date of Ethelburga’s
death, given by Florence of Worcester under
676, is very doubtful; and even the dedication
day of the church in Bishopsgate, London, can only
hesitatingly be ascribed to her. Oct. 11 is the
usual date of her commemoration. (A.A. S2. Boll.
Oct. 11, tom. i. 649-652.) There is, however,
confusion between Ethelburga and the abbess
Eadburga [BUGGA] of Minster, which appears in
the life of St. Werburga (Mon. Angli. i. 452), but
is corrected by Elmharn, p. 224. (See also Hardy,
Cat. Mat. i. 365.) [S.]

ETHELBURGA (4), abbess of Repton,
doughter of Ealdwulf king of the East Angles
[AULDULF], more properly called Ealdinga.
(Wallingford, ap. Dale, p. 528.) [EADBURGA (4).]

ETHELBURGA (5), the wife of Ine king of
the West Saxons. She is described by William
of Malmesbury (G. G. & Lib. i. § 25; ed. Hunt.
M. H. B. 649) as a woman of royal race and mind, and this
is borne out by the testimony of the Anglo-Saxon
Chronicle which represents her as capturing and
destroying Taunton in 722, during the struggle
in which Ine was engaged with the Etheling
Eadbriht. (Chr. S. 327; H. Hunt. M. H. B.
724.) William of Malmesbury tells the story of
the way in which she impressed upon Ine the
Corruptible nature of all worldly things. Having
held high festival at one of his palaces, which is
described as exceptionally sumptuous, the king
and queen set out for another place. After
going a little way she prevailed on him to return,
and showed him his palace filled with filth and
rubbish, in accordance with a command which
she had secretly given to the steward. The
lesson was obvious. Ine determined to renounce
his crown; he resigned the kingdom to Ethel-
hard (who appears in a spurious charter,
Kemble, C. D. no. 73, as Ethelburga’s brother),
and, accompanied by his wife, went to Rome,
where they lived, employed in works of humble
charity among the poor, and died in the odour of sanctity. According to another tradition which is less plausible and less probable, Ethelburga retired to Barking, where her sister is said to have been abbess, and died there; but this story is of later date, and probably originates in a confusion between the two Ethelburgas. The name of Ethelburga is appended as a consenting party to the great charter of Ine to Glastonbury (Kemble, C. D. 73; Mon. Angl. i. 25); and occurs in the body of another charter to the same monastery. (K. C. D. 74; Mon. Angl. i. 49; Elpham, pp. 267, 268; W. Malmesb. G. R. i. § 35-37; ed. Hardy, pp. 49-55; Higden, Polychr. ed. Gale, p. 258; Mon. Angl. i. 456 sq.)

ETHELBURGA (6), daughter of Alfred; a Mercian abbess of some importance in the Worchester cathedral. Her father was a kinsman of the ealdormen of the Hwicci, who were hereditary friends and patrons of the cathedral monastery at Worchester. In 774 she had, by the gift of bishop Milred, a grant of the monastery founded by Dunna at Withington, for her life (K. C. D. 124; Mon. Angl. i. 586), and a few years afterwards (778-781) a similar gift from Aldred, the ealdorman, of the monastery of Fladbury, also for life. (K. C. D. 146.) The reversion in each case was secured to the cathedral monastery. The idea that Ethelburga was the first abbess of a monastery of St. Mary at Worchester (Mon. Angl. i. 567), which was afterwards transferred to monks, is without any historical or even legendary foundation. [S.]

ETHELBURGA (7), wife of Wihtred king of Kent (Kemble, C. D. 41, 42, &c.). Possibly Wihtred was more than once married; for a spurious charter (Kemble, C. D. no. 37) gives him a wife Knygghtha; and in the Privilegiosa (Huddan and Stubbe, iii. 240) his queen calls herself Werburga; cf. note, &c. p. 242. [S.]

ETHELBURGA (8), daughter of Offa king of Mercia, and abbess. She is mentioned by Offa, together with her mother Cynethritha and her sisters Ethelfleda, Eadburga, and Ethelswitha, in the grant of Offa to Chertsey (K. C. D. 151) and attests the same charter. She is not, however, noticed in the Mercian genealogy given by Florence of Worchester. (M. H. B. 630, 638.) To her, without the title of abbess, Alcuin addressed one letter by name (Ep. 59), probably another without name (Ep. 60), and possibly two others under the name of Eugenia. (Ep. 229, 278.) In the first of these he reminds her of the instructions which she has received from him, sends consolations to her sister Ethelfleda [ELFLED], the widowed queen of Northumbria, and presents from Laidgards, the wife of Charles the Great. The second is of similar purport, and the other two mere consolations and good advice. (Mon. Monunt. pp. 293, 295, 737, 857.) These are referred by Jaffé erroneously to the abbess of Fladbury. [S.]


ETHELBYRHT (2) (Ethelward, Chron. iii. init. in M. H. B. 509 d), king of East Anglia. [ELFLETH (3.)] [C. H.]


ETHELRED (1) (Hardy, Cat. Mud. i. 264), young prince of Kent, martyred. [ELFLETH] (9.). [C. H.]

ETHELRED (2) (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 798, 799, in M. H. B. 669 n, 671 b), king of Northumbria, son of Æthelreda. [ELFLETH (14.)] [C. H.]

ETHELRED (1) (ÆDELETH), a daughter of Edwin king of Northumbria and Ethelreda his second wife. She was baptised at York in A.D. 627, and died in her infancy (Bed. H. E. ii. 14). [J. R.]

ETHELRED (2) (ÆDELETH, ÁEDELÚTH, AUDRY, ÆDELETHA), queen of Northumbria and abbess of Ely; a daughter of Anna king of East Anglia. Anna had four daughters, Sexburga, Ethelburga, Ethelreda, and Withburga, all of whom were great in the medieval calendar. Of these daughters Ethelreda seems to have been the third. The Ely histories (ed. Stewart, p. 157), who confound the family of Anna with that of his brother Ethelhere, makes Hereswitha the wife of Anna and mother of these daughters. According to Thomas of Ely, Ethelreda was born at Exning or Ixning in Suffolk. When she grew up she was married to Tondert, a Saxon prince, who bestowed on her the isle of Elie, or Ely, as a dowry. The marriage was sorely against the lady's will, as she had practically devoted herself already to a conventual life, but her husband seems to have allowed the union to remain nominal. This so-called marriage is said to have taken place two years before Anna's death, which occurred in A.D. 654. Tondert died soon after his marriage, and his widow retired to Ely, where it seems to have been her intention amid the general wreck of her family, to devote herself solely to a religious life. But in A.D. 650 a second and an illustrious alliance was in store for her. She became the wife of prince Egfrid, son of Æswy king of Northumbria, her own kinsman, and a husband whom her own family would think it by no means prudent to refuse. The union lasted for eleven or twelve years, and was of the same nature as that with Tondert. No entreaties or threats could induce Ethelreda to break her resolution of perpetual virginity. Egfrid ascended the Northumbrian throne in A.D. 670, and was then too free to act with much regard to the matter of his marriage. To bring Ethelreda over to his views he sought the help of Wilfrid, who had very great influence with husband and wife. He promised him a great reward if he could succeed; but the monk of Ely does not hesitate to say that the influence of Wilfrid was secretly exerted to confirm the resolution of the queen, and that it was through his means that a divorce was suggested and carried out, after great opposition from Egfrid. The desires of Ethelreda, it is plain, were directed only towards an ascetic life, and she was at all times a kind
patron of religious work and men. It seems pretty evident, from a passage in Eddi (cap. 22), that Elyham was at one time her property, before it was passed over to Wilfrid, who erected there a church of stone, without a peer in his day on this side of the Alps. For Cuthbert, Etheldreda wrought with her own hands a stole and maniple, rich with gold and precious stones, which, as the monk of Ely says, were preserved in his day in the great shrine at Durham.

In A.D. 671, the ill-sorted couple separated—Egfrid to seek a second consort, Etheldreda to take the veil at the hands of Wilfrid. She was placed as a nun in the house of Coldingham, in Berwickshire, which was then presided over by Ebba, king Egfrid’s aunt. She continued there for a year. The monk of Ely says that Egfrid tried in vain to carry her off, but Bede does not mention this attempt, and it may therefore be discredited; still it is easy to understand how Etheldreda’s stay at Coldingham might be unpleasant to her. She had the 101 hand and had of her husband a self a second wife. She would be happier in her old home, and among her own people. Etheldreda therefore made her way to Ely. Thomas of Ely mentions some incidents in the journey. Etheldreda was attended by two companions, called Sewenna and Seware. She crossed the Humber at Holderness, with a chariot at Allhill, where the party made a short halt. Her priest was a person of the name of Huna, who afterwards died in the sound of sanctity. The isle of Ely at that time was a waste of rushes and waters, out of which arose here and there little eyes or eyots, bright with green pasture land, on the edges of which the scene of unnumbered buildings were built. It was necessary to take a boat to travel from village to village, There was but one church in the district, at Ely itself, built originally by Augustine, and recently destroyed by king Penda. This Etheldreda restored, with the help of king Aelfred, her brother, and endowed with the island, of which it became the gem and glory, and in addition to the house for nuns, which Bede calls a nunery, whilst the monk of Ely speaks of it as a twin monastery, like Coldingham, with the working of which Etheldreda would be perfectly acquainted. Over this house Wilfrid made her the abbess, and when he visited Rome next he made it his business to secure for Ely and his old friend a grant of privileges from the pope. Bede gives a short account of Etheldreda’s ascetic life, which Shows that it was of the severest kind. She was thoroughly in earnest, and made Ely a devotional centre for the whole of the eastern counties. Her life, however, was only a short one. She was attacked by the plague, and died on the third day of her illness, on the 23rd of June, A.D. 679. Her physician, Cryfrid, mentioned to Bede one or two circumstances in connexion with her complaint.

The remains of Etheldreda were deposited in a coffin of wood, and interred at Ely. Her elder sister, Sexburga, succeeded her as abbess. In A.D. 688, Etheldreda resolved to translate Etheldreda’s body. Where could she find a fitting tomb? There was no stone in the neighbourhood of Ely, and so the abbess sent off several of the brethren of the house in a boat, to find elsewhere, if possible, what was unattainable at home. They made their way to Grantham, the site of the modern Cambridges, where, near the walls of the Roman town, they found a white marble cut or coffin, rifted pithily of the remains of its former tenant, which was the very thing they required. They brought it back with them to Ely, and therein Etheldreda’s body was deposited. Like that of Cuthbert, it is said to have been undecayed, and to have been the means of effecting a number of miraculous cures. The authorities for this account of Etheldreda are, the notices of her in Bede and the Life by Thomas, a monk of Ely.

The present “stately pace” of Ely owes its existence to the fame of Etheldreda, who was regarded as one of the greatest of the mediaval saints. The church which she constructed herself perished in the Danish instead of A.D. 866-7, but the marauders did no harm to the coffin of the saint. The building was restored about a century afterwards, under whose auspices it became a house of Benedictine monks, and acquired by degrees great estates and influence. In A.D. 1107 it was made a bishopric, and the see of Ely was founded, and the series of abbots came to an end, the monks thenceforward being ruled by a prior. One of the last official acts of Richard, the last abbot, was a solemn translation of Etheldreda’s remains, necessitated by the progress of the new Norman fabric. The monk of Ely describes the wall as being of red bricks, with an interesting nature. The old marble coffin was taken into the new church and laid near the high altar (cf. Malmes. Gest. Pontiff. 322-3). Over this arose a portable shrine of wood-work, richly ornamented, which was borne about on festival days. In A.D. 1144 the monks stripped the shrine of the mass of useless wood for the pecuniary necessities of bishop Nigel, who acknowledged their kindness by giving the manor of Hadstock to the convent, for the special purpose of decorating and repairing the shrine. It was afterwards richly ornamented by bishops Ridel and de Burgh. In A.D. 1235 bishop Northwold commenced the fabric of the present magnificent church, and erected a beautiful house for Etheldreda and the saints of the house in the centre of the presbytery. Of this a sketch has been preserved. The shrine perished at the Reformation (Bentham’s Ely. var. loc.). The life and merits of Etheldreda were a fertile theme for the mediaval writers, of whom the following are the most conspicuous.

The earliest notice of the saint is that by Bede, which is really the kernel of every subsequent biography. Appended to this notice is a poem by the same author, in elegiac verse (H. E. iv. 19, 20).

Next in order comes the Life contained in the first of the three books of the Liber Eliensis, written by Thomas, a monk of Ely. Thomas, who seems to have lived in the reign of Henry II., has availed himself of the work of a brother of the same house of the name of Richard, which is now lost, and he is also much indebted to Bede. His narrative is exceedingly diffuse. This Life is printed in the Anglia Sacra, i. 53, et seq.; Acta SS. 23 Jun. iv. 489; and in Mabillon’s Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben. ii. 707, et seq. The best edition is that printed in 8vo. in 1848, for the Anglia Christiana Society, and edited by the Rev. D. J. Stewart. Unfortunately it carries the Liber Eliensis only to the end of the second book.

The next in importance, although earlier in
date, is the Ibis, written in hexameters, in the time of Henry L., by Gregory, another monk of Ely, to commemorate the foundation of the church and the bishopric. It is unpublished, and contains some curious passages describing the church and neighbourhood of Ely (cf. Hardy's Catalogue, i. pt. 1, 780–1). In MSS. Cotton, Faustina B. iii. is another Life in English verse, unfortunately imperfect, but running to the length of 1200 lines (id.).

There is a Life in Capgrave, a compilation (ff. 141–2), and several others, very brief and of little importance, all of which are described in Hardy's Catalogue, i, 278–84. [J. R.]

ETHELREDIDA (Adilhryche, Ethelhrythu, Ethelhrytha) became the wife of Ethelwald Moll, king of Northumbria, Nov. 1, 762, at Catterick (Syeneum, Chron. 21). Ethelwold lost his kingdom in A.D. 765. Their son Ethelred afterwards became king, and was slain in A.D. 796. After the death of her husband, Ethelredida took the veil, and became the abbess of some religious houses. She was a long letter from Alcuin in that capacity, between A.D. 793 and 796 (Ep. ed. Jaffé, 274 et seq.). He also wrote to her in A.D. 796, consoling her on the death of her son (id. 297). [J. R.]

She is identified with the Aedilithyda "sambula Dei olim reginae" to whom Alcuin addressed a letter of thanks for prayers and some exhortations (Mon. Alcuin. Ep. 50, p. 274). [S.]

ETHELFLIDA (Malm. G. R. A. i. § 50, ed. Hardy), daughter of Oswy king of Northumbria, abbess of Whitby. [Ethelfleda (1).] [C. H.]

ETHELFRID (Ethelfrith, Ethelfrith, Ethelfrid, Eadberht Flesaurs, Ethelfrach) was king of Northumbria. He was the son of Ethelric, and grandson of Ida. Ethelric was king of Bernicia, and on the death of Ella seized the kingdom of Deira, to the injury of Edwin, Ella's youthful son. Ethelfrid, who afterwards married Acha, Edwin's sister, did not scruple to continue his father's usurpation of Deira. Ethelfrid became king in A.D. 593. Pagan although he was, Bede speaks of him in terms of the highest eulogy, comparing him with Saul, king of Israel, for his military genius, and proud of the boldness and persistence with which he subjugated or exterminated the Britons. The Britons, in Bede's view, were irrelatable heirs. One famous onslaught was made upon Ethelfrid in A.D. 603 by Aedan, king of Dalriada, which ended in his utter defeat. In this fight Theobald, brother of Ethelfrid, fell with all the army that he led. It seems probable from this that Theobald had been fighting against his brother on the side of the invading Scots. In one of the versions of the Saxon Chronicle we are told that Hering, son of Hussa, led the hostile army. In the annals of Tighernac (ed. Skene, p. 68), Ethelfrith's brother is called Esnafrith. The scene of the battle is said to be Dignostr, i.e. Dignostr (Bed. H. E. i. 34). But in several versions of the Saxon Chronicle it is called Eghesan stane. It has been conjectured that this may be Eggleston, near Barnard Castle. An invading force from Scotland might well descend the Tees to strike a deadly blow at Northumbria, on the very boundary line between Bernicia and Deira. (Arch. Astiana, n.s. pt. 22, p. 109.) The defeat of Aedan was so decisive, that up to the time of Bede's History so Scottish monarch had ever entered the field against an English kingdom. (Bed. H. E. 25.)

In A.D. 607, according to the Saxon Chronicle (A.D. 613, Annals of Uster and Cambro-Annals), Ethelfrid struck another very terrible blow at the British race and church. He was carrying his victorious arms beyond the Dee. He nears the city of Chester, then in British hands, called by its inmates Caerleon and by the English Legnovaest. When the battle was about to begin, Ethelfrid's attention was attracted by a crowd of men remaining aloof from the combatants. They were monks from Bangor and other places in the neighbourhood, who had come to assist their compatriots with their prayers. Ethelfrid ordered his men to attack them first, alleging that they were his enemies, inasmuch as they were fighting against him with their prayers. His wish was carried out so terribly that only fifty monks escaped, whilst two thousand were slain. A chief of the name of Brocnail had been charged with their defence, but fled on the first onset, leaving the power helpless to destroy their enemy. This was followed by the overthrow of the whole British army, but without great loss to the victor. And thus, says Bede, somewhat triumphantly, the prediction of Augustine came fearfully to pass upon those who had spurned his warnings and advice (Bed. H. E. ii. 21; Malm. G. R. i. 65, 66).

We are told in the Bedae Nennii Genealogies (53) that Ethelfrid gave to his wife Bebb a place called Dingoaroyg, which was renamed Bebbanburh after her death (cf. Bed. H. E. iii. 6, 10). Bebb was Ethelfrid's first wife. About A.D. 608 he re-married Acha or Aces, the daughter of Ella, and sister of Edwin, who was the mother of St. Oswald and St. Edwin. Ethelfrid had seven sons—Esnafrid, Olaf, Olof, Oswald, Osric, Olic, and Oswin; but it is not known for certain which of his two queens was their mother. It seems probable that Esnafrid was the first born.

The reign of Ethelfrid, prosperous although it seemed to be, was by no means free from anxiety and care. He was sitting unjustly on his brother-in-law Edwin's throne, and the thought of some possible retribution made him very jealous of his kinsman as he grew up to man's estate. Edwin also was afraid and left Ethelfrid's court, hiding himself where he could, until at length he found shelter with Redwald, king of East Anglia. Ethelfrid discovered his retreat; and by promises, gifts, and kindness endeavoured to make Redwald violate the ties of hospitality. So urgent was his importance that Redwald began to waver through fear; and it was only in consequence of Edwin's appeals, and the earnest intervention of his own queen, that at last he became firm. Firmness is such a case means war; and Redwald was so active in his preparations and onset that he overthrew Ethelfrid's army, and slew its leader, in a battle on the bank of the river Idle, in Nottinghamshire, in A.D. 616. Among the
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ETHELFRITH (ETHELFRIT, ETHEL-
FRITH), the fourth bishop of Elmham (M. H.
B. 618). He was consecrated by archbishop
Notohelm, who received his pall in 736 (Sim.
bus. M. H. B. 659). His successor was En-
frith, who was bishop in 758. As no bishop of
Elmham attended the synod of Clovesho in 747,
the see may have been vacant in that year.

ETHELGITHA (ETHELGITHA, ETHEL-
GITHA), a Northumbrian abbess, probably of Coldingham,
whose relics were brought to Durham by Elfred
the sacrist in the 11th century, and deposited in
St. Cuthbert's shrine (Symeon, H. E. D. iii. c.
vii.). Her name is in the Liber Vitae of
the church of Durham (p. 3).

ETHELHARD (1) (ETHELHARD, ETHEL-
HARD, ADIELHARD, EDELHARD), king of the
West Saxons, 725-739 (Cont. Bed. M. H. B. 288;
728-741, Chr. S.). He succeeded to the West Saxon
thronc on the departure of Ine for Rome. Ine
was childless, and Ethelhard, although he is described
as kinsman to Ine (Chr. S. M. H. B. 327) was not
a near relation, and is not definitely fixed in the
general list of the kings of the West Saxons (M. H.
B. 632), but generally assigned to the house of
Cerdic (ib. 641). The charter of Glastonbury
(Kemble, C. D. no. 75), in which Ethelhard is
described as brother of queen Ethelfheburga, is
not genuine. It is probable that Ine left the
succession unsettled among the junior mem-
bers of his family, and that his
settlement was disputed by the family,
for Ethelhard in the first year of his reign had a
struggle with the etheling Oswald, who was
despatched in another line from Cuthwin, the son
of Ceolwin. As Ethelhard retained his throne,
we may infer that Oswald was forced to submit.
The Chronicle mentions only two events in the
year of his reign, viz. the victory of Somerton
(probably representing Somersetshire) by Ethel-
hard of Mercia in 733, and the departure of
queen Frithgith for Rome in 736 or 737. Of
these the former indicates one phase of the ever-
pressing struggle between Mercia and Wessex on
the side of the Hwicce, and the enormous pre-
ponderance acquired by Ethelhard, which is
attested by the composition of Bede, who, at the close of his
work, describes the Mercian king as supreme over
the southern provinces. It is probable that the
weakening of the West-Saxon power on the
western border was followed by the loss of
territory on the Welsh and Cornish border,
and some unrecorded victories are claimed by
the later Welsh writers over the king Adelrad.
(Torpe's Lappenberg, i. 267.) All that can be
argued from this, however, is that Ethelhard
failed to recover the territory or restore the
peace which had been lost in the later years of
Ine. The documentary history of the reign is
very slightly illustrated. Neither Ethelhard
nor Frithgitha is mentioned in the letters of
Boaiface. In charters the name of Ethelhard
occurs in the year 729 as granting land of sixty
manesates at Pobolt to Glastonbury, in a witena-
genom held at Pencricle (Kemble, C. D. 78); and
in an Abingdon charter unrolled, Ethelhard
appears as confirming a grant made by Ethelhard
of Mercia. (K. C. D. 81.) Neither of these
documents is of good authority, and additional
doubt is thrown on the latter by the circum-
stantial character of the attestation which pur-
ports to have been granted "in expeditio ultra
fluvium Sabrina adversum Britonum gentem"; it
is, however, the form rather than the sub-
stance of this statement that excites suspicion.

There is likewise a grant made by Ethelhard,
at the request of Frithgitha, of land at Taunton
to the cathedral of Winchester, which, if genuine,
belongs to the year 737 (K. C. D. 1002).

Cuthred, the successor of Ethelhard, is called
by Simeon of Durham (M. H. B. 659), his brother;
by other writers his kinsman. Ac-
cording to Radburne (Ang. Sac. I. 194) Ethel-
hard was the brother of Frydewith, mother of St.
Frideswide of Oxford, and both he and his
sister were buried at Winchester. The mother,
however, of Frideswide is called in the legend
Sefrida, although it is given as Frisedwisa in the
life printed by Mabillon. See also W. H. Labb.

ETHELHARD (2), the ninth bishop of
Winchester. (M. H. B. 619). As his name occurs
between that of Cynewulf, who was bishop in
754, and that of Egel, who was bishop in 778,
he cannot be identified with Ethelhard, who
became archbishop of Canterbury in 793. William
of Malmesbury held the bishop of Winchester,
the archbishop, and an abbat Ethelhard, abbat of
Malmesbury, to have been the same person,
but this is impossible.

ETHELHARD (3) (ETHELHARD), fourteenth
archbishop of Canterbury (M. H. B. 616). His
appointment is noted by Simeon (M. H. B. 667), on
the authority no doubt of the ancient Gesta Regum
Northanobrorum, under the year 791; "Abbas vero
Ethelhardus Hildensis monasterii ad can-
dem sedem est electus et ordinatus episcopus."
The more precise date given by Flodoard of
Canterbury, July 21, 793, probably marks the
day of consecration. The Chronicle places the
appointment in 790. As Jaenbert died in the
month of August his successor's consecration, if it occurred
in July, could not take place earlier than the
next year. As July 21 was a Sunday in 793, it
may be accepted as the true date; it is not con-
tradicted by any evidence in charters, and the
apparent delay may easily be accounted for by
the circumstances of the Kentish church and
kingdom; Offa was attempting to consolidate his
rule, and the church of Canterbury was shorn of
half its power by the creation of the arch-
bishopric of Lindisfarne, which was not
annexed with the see of Canterbury until 813; the
consecration was performed, but it is not
impossible that it was by archbishop Higbert of
Lichfield himself. Ethelhard before his election
to Canterbury was, according to Simeon, abbot
of a monastery called "Hild," which may either
have been some obscure place, as e.g. Lydd in
Kent, or a more important one, such as Louth in
Lincolnshire; but there is no record of the existence
of any monastic foundation at this early period in
either of those places. It may be argued in favour of
Louth that Ethelhard must almost of necessity
have been a Mercian abbot, as it would be
impossible for Offa, in the existing state of affairs,
to have allowed the appointment of a Wikt
Saxon or Kentishman; and the later attitude of the Kentish men towards Ethelhard shews that he did not belong to the patriotic party. William of Malmesbury, finding the name of Ethelhard in the lists of the bishops of Winchester, and either finding or placing it in that of the abbots of Malmesbury, has not scrupled to identify the archbishop of Canterbury with Ethelhard (G. D. C. ed. Hamilton, pp. 160, 389.) As for the bishop of Winchester, his date is irreconcilable with any such theory; and of the abbot nothing is known except from William of Malmesbury himself; that supposition may then be set aside.

Ethelhard, as has been said, found the church of Canterbury at its lowest ebb, and so long as Offa lived he could make no attempt at its emancipation. In a council held at Clovesho in 794, he was obliged to sign the documents there issued after the rival archbishop (Kemble, C. D. 167; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 484, 485). During these years he stood it would seem high in Offa's favour, for he despatches the latter addressed letter to him, asking him to intercede with the Mercian king for certain English exiles. (Monumenta Carolin, p. 352.) Early in his episcopate Alcuin had written him a letter full of pious advice (Mon. Alc. Ep. 28; p. 202; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 474), and one of his first acts may have been a participation in the measures taken for declaring the mind of the English Council at Frankfort in 7917; but of this there is no evidence.

Before the death of Offa the troubles of Ethelhard had begun; early in 796 Eadbert Pnaen had raised the standard of revolt, and met with such support among the Kentish nobles that Ethelhard was compelled or induced to fly from his see (Mon. Alc. Ep. 44; p. 468; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 496) urging him to support the archbishop; he wrote to Ethelhard himself entreating him not to desert his flock (Mon. Alc. Ep. 44; p. 265; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 495), and to the Kentish men urging them to recall their archbishop (Mon. Alc. Ep. 86; p. 989; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 500).

The position of Ethelhard, although an important part of the imperial policy of Offa, was not such a great object of desire with Kenuill, who no doubt thought that the archbishop was much more valuable as an ally than as a subject, and who intended to rule Kent as a subordinate kingdom through his dependent Cuthred. If, as seems likely, Ethelhard, on leaving Canterbury, sought an asylum at the Mercian court, he would take the opportunity of impressing on Kenuill the injury done to Christianity in England by the degradation of the mother church. However this may have been, the exact professions of obedience made to Ethelhard by the Mercian as well as by the English bishops, which contain a distinct recognition of the authority of Canterbury, seem to shew that Higbert, after the death of Offa, could have retained but little more than the title and precedence which Adrian I. had accorded to him by bestowing the pall. Of these professions that of Eudulf of Lindsey, Tidforth of Dunwich and Deneberht of Worcester, seem certainly to belong to this period. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 506, 511, 525.)

As soon as Eadbert Pnaen fell into the hands of Kenuill (798) Ethelhard returned to his see. Alcuin wrote to advise him to be peaceable for having deserted his see (Mon. Alc. Ep. 86; p. 989; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 518), and the proceedings of the synod at Clovesho held the same year shew that both the archbishop's authority and the Mercian power had been re-established. In that synod Ethelhard exchanged lands at Cookham in Mercia for an estate in Kent, with the abbess Cyanethira [Cynethiria], and Kenuill bestowed state at "Hrempingius", on the monastery of Liminge. In the charter by which this gift was conferred, the attestation of Ethelhard takes precedence of that of Higbert, but the latter is still called archbishop. (Kemble, C. D. 1019, 175; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 512-515.) It scarcely need be the pressing advice of the prior of Reims, told to Ethelhard to attempt the restoration of church unity, to induce the archbishop to reopen the question of the Lichfield archbishopric. (Mon. Alc. p. 369; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 520.) Alcuin in particular recommended him to take the advice of the archbishop of York on the subject. Accordingly the discussion recommended by a letter of Kenuill to Pope Leo III., in which this subject was put before the pope the scheme of St. Gregory for the provincial arrangement of Britain, tells the story of Offa's quarrel with Jænsbert and the men of Kent, and mentioned likewise a full statement of the case which had been exhibited by Ethelhard before all the bishops of the province (Proc. lat. episcop, p. 427; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 521-523.) Although Ethelhard's letter has not been preserved, the pope's answer to Kenuill is extant. (Mon. Alc. Ep. 84; p. 363; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 523.) In it he explains that pope Adrian's division of the archbishopric was the result of a synod at Rome, of the English bishops, which Offa had represented as unanimous; he refers to the conduct of Eadbert Pnaen, who had been still in arms when Ethelhard wrote, and pronounced him anathema; he declares that the primacy belonged not to London, as Kenuill had hinted, under St. Gregory's direction, but to Canterbury; and further reminded the king of the annual payment which Offa had promised to the apostolic see at the time of the legation of George and Theophylact. He did not, however, decide or hold out any promise of a decision on the all important question.

In 799 there was a synod at Clovesho, and likewise a great witenaemot at Tamworth; in the latter assembly Higbert took precedence of Ethelhard, and certain lands in Kent were restored to Canterbury (K. C. D. 1020). The state of affairs continued for two years longer. In 801, after a synod held at Cleschlyth (K. C. D. 1023), and an interview with archbishop Eardhold II. on the subject, a letter was sent to that prelate that Alcuin had advised him (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 532.) Ethelhard set out for Rome. He was met by Alcuin's servant at St. Judoc's (Saint-Josse-sur-Mer). Alcuin sent his own horse, saddle and servant to meet him, and wrote him...
a letter of encouragement, inviting him to visit Tours on his way home, and also wrote to the emperor to help him on his journey. He was accompanied by Colunm, a thegn of Offa, Terthinum, the friend of the late King Ethelred of Northumbria, bishop Riwbert of Winchester, and another bishop whose name does not appear. (Mon. Alc. Epp. 172, 173; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 533.)

Ethelhard's mission was attended with complete success. He reached Rome, found favour with Leo III., and on Jan. 18, 802, received from the pope a letter, which, without even mentioning the hostile archbishopric, he declared the ancient rights of Canterbury to be unimpaired, denouncing deprivation against any archbishop or bishop, and excommunication against any layman, who might infringe them. (W. Malmesb. G. P. lib. i. 36, ed. Hamilton, pp. 57–69; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 538, 539.) At the same time he wrote to Kenulf acknowledging the receipt of letters and money, mentioning the visit of Ethelhard, and announcing his decision that both the episcopal seats subtracted from the province and the monasteries withdrawn from the church of Canterbury should be restored, and that the provincial see restored in the dignity defined by the letters of St. Gregory to Augustine. (W. Malmesb. G. k. i. 89; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 538, 539.)

It appears from this letter that Ethelhard's appeal touched not only the integrity of the province but the property of the see, and this explains some measure of the long-continued litigation for the recovery of the Canterbury estates which marks the next thirty years, and was the subject of discussion in many councils.

Alcuin, on hearing of the success of Ethelhard, wrote to congratulate him, and advised him to use his victory with firmness and discretion. The long struggle came to an end at the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 806. In that assembly, which was attended by all the bishops and a large body of clergy from each diocese of the province, the right of the see of Augustine was solemnly recognised according to the tenour of the pope's letter, and to this not Kenulf and his witan gave their full adhesion: "Coenwulf Magnus Rex et suorum senatus suis"; the archbishopric of Lichfield was abolished, and the letters of pope Adrian I. under the authority of Leo III. declared null (Kemble, C. D. 185; Mon. Angl. i. 107; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 542–544). The same day, by a synodal act, Ethelhard and the clergy assembled in obedience to the papal orders, forbade the election of laymen as lords of the monasteries (K. C. D. 1624; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 445–547). This latter act is attested by the whole body of the synod; among the signatures Aldulf appears as bishop of Lichfield, Higbert the deposed archbishop signing as "Higberht Abbas" first among the clergy of that diocese. Alcuin in his letter of 798 (Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 620) had urged that the pious archbishop should not, so long as he lived, be stripped of his pall, but the recommendation was not adopted, or the necessity for degradation was avoided by resignation.

In the year 804 there was a synod at Acle, at which Ethelhard was present with the Mercian bishops (Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 548); and in 805 he secured the restoration of an estate given by Aldhun to Christchurch, but alienated by royal tyranny, and now recouped by synodal decree.

This is the last recorded act of Ethelhard, who died on May 13 in the same year, 805. Alcuin had died a year before him. Besides the letters cited above, some other epistles of Alcuin to Ethelhard are extant; the whole may be found in Jaffe's Monasticon Alcuinianum, pp. 202, 366, 616, 619, 620, 669, 719, 794. See also, in Alcuin's letters to Charles and others, mention of Ethelhard, pp. 288, 290, 365, 371, 618. In one of these letters, printed for the first time by Dr. Jaffé, Ethelhard is exorted to put down the custom of carrying "ligatures" or charms containing relics, and phylacteries (Mon. Alc. p. 719); and also to prevent the conventicles or meetings on the hills, at which the people instead of praying indulged in drunkenness.

In the chronology of Ethelhard's Life, as given above, the computation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Florence of Worcester has been altered by two years in order to harmonise it with the undisputed dates of documents and other certain authorities.

The correspondence of Alcuin with Ethelhard, together with the general history of his episcopate, exhibits him to us as a man of high reputation for devotion, and of no small power in the conduct of affairs. The fact of his using the power which he had received as a dependant of Offa, to circumvent and overthrow the design which was so important a part of Offa's policy, is scarcely to be regarded as a blunder on the character of the age and the changed circumstances of the Mercian kingdom be taken into account. The appeal to Rome is one link of the scanty chain which bound England to the apostolic see in this obscure age; and the whole episode, falling in one of the darkest periods of the early middle ages, but singularly well illustrated by documentary evidence, is perhaps the most important piece of English church history between the death of Bede and the age of Dunstan.

ETHELHEARL (1) (Ethelheard), a Northumbrian "dux" who adopted the religious habit, and died at York, August 1, A.D. 794 (Symeon, Chron. ed. Surtees Soc. 33). [J. R.]

ETHELHEARD (2) (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 791, in M. H. R. 687 q.), archbishop of Canterbury [ETHELHEARL.] [C. H.]

ETHELHERE (Edelhere), son of Ead, the brother of Redwald, succeeded his brother Anna as king of the East Angles in 654. As his brother had been defeated and slain by Penda, it is probable that he obtained the succession by Penda's influence. The next year, 655, he fell fighting on Penda's side, at the battle of Winwaedford; and Bede charges him with having been the 'auctor bellii' on that occasion. His wife Hereswit was the sister of St. Hilda, a great-niece therefore of Edwin of Northumbria. As the connexion between Edwin and Redwald had been very close, and the family of Edwin had fallen before the rising fortunes of Oswy, the quarrel of Ethelhere with Oswy may have been a result of the old rivalry between the descendants of Ella and Ida. By Hereswithe Ethelhere was the father of Aldulf and Aifred. Whether
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Jurwinus or Jurminus was the son of Ethelhur of Annia, our authorities are not sufficiently in accord to prove. Ethelward was succeeded by his brother Ethelwold. (Bede, H. E. iii. 24; Hist. Ebor. ed. Stewart, pp. 14, 15, 23; Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 636.) [S.

ETHELHILD, a sister of Ethelwold bishop of Lindsey, and Aldwine abbot of Partney. She was abbess of a monastery near Partney, and survived until the time of Bede, who reports a miracle which was wrought in her monastery by a relic of St. Oswald. She had also seen a pillar of light reaching from heaven to the place where his relics were laid. (Bede, H. E. iii. 11.) [S.

ETHELHUN (1) (Aedilhun), a son of Edwin king of Northumbria and his second wife Ethelburga of Kent. He was baptized by Paulinus soon after his father in A.D. 627, and died shortly afterwards, whilst still wearing his white baptismal robe. He was buried in York minster. (Bede, H. E. ii. 14.) [I. R.

ETHELHUN (2) (Oddilhun), a brother of Ethelwold bishop of Lindsey, who went with the famous Egbert to study in Ireland. They were together in the monastery of Rathmelsigi (Mel- font) in 664, the year of the great plague. The two friends were attacked by the disease; Egbert vowed that if his life were spared he would give the life of a pilgrim and ascetic. (Egbert [5].) Ethelhun, in his sleep, had miraculous information of this vow, and said to Egbert, "O brother Egbert, what hast thou done? I hope we might live in eternal life together; yet know that what thou hast asked shall receive." Egbert recovered, and Ethelhun died the next night. (Bede, H. E. iii. 27.) [S.

ETHELHUN (3), a monk who carried letters and presents from Ethelbert II. king of Kent to St. Benifacce (Mon. Mogunt. p. 255). [S.

ETHELINGA, third priestess of Minster in Thanet, according to Weever (Fun. Monum. p. 309) as noticed by Dugdale (i. 448, note a), but without reference to authority. [BULGOA (2).] [C. H.

ETHFALED (Arthelmod, Ethelmod, Adalmundus), fourth bishop of Sherborne (M. H. B. 620). His name occurs in the charters first in the year 778 (Kemble, C. D. 132); his predecessor, Herewald, appears for the last time in 766. A MS. of Florence of Worcester (H. M. B. 545) places Ethelmod's succession in 782, but the notice is a mere interpolation; for Ethelmod not only attested the dated charter of king Cynewulf in 778, but took part in the synod of Brentford in 781 (K. C. D. No. 143; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 439). He was present also at the legatine council of 787 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461), and attested a grant of Offa to Canterbury, at a council at Celchyt in 788 (Kemble, C. D. No. 153, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 464), and a synodal act of a council at the same place in 790 (K. C. D. No. 156, cf. 157). Deneolith, his successor, is first heard of in 794. See also Will. Malmesb. G. F. ed. Hamilton, p. 175. [S.

ETHELNOTh (1), the twelfth abbot of St. Augustine's, according to Elmham. He succeeded Eanbald, who became archbishop in 766, and was blessed by him after he had received his pall; probably in 787. Elmham, however, gives the dates 765 and 764 for the two events (p. 331). The same authority gives 787 as the date at which his abbacy ended. There is a grant made by Offa to Ethelred and Godwine at Beaufield, dated in the fifth year of Offa. (Kemble, C. D. No. 119; Elmham, 331; Thorn, ap. Twysden, c. 1775.) [S.

ETHELNOTh (2), the fifteenth bishop of London (M. H. B. 617). He succeeded Godwin between 805 and 811, and subscribed charters from 811 to 816 (Kemble, C. D. 197, 207, 210). His profession of obedience made to archbishop Wulfred on the occasion of his consecration is preserved. Besides the printed charters already mentioned, he attested an unpublished grant of king Kenseil (MS. Lambeth, 1212, p. 301). He was present as "Lundonie civitas episcopi" in the council held at Cælchity in July 816. How much longer he lived is uncertain; his successor, bishop Ceolbert, appearing first in 824. (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 586, 589, 574.) [S.

ETHELRED (1), St., young prince of Kent, martyred with his brother Ethelbert. [ETHELBERT (5).] [C. H.

ETHELRED (2), king of Mercia. He was the son of Penda and brother of Wulfhere, whom he succeeded in 675 (Bede, H. E. v. 24), his nephew Coenred, the son of Wulfhere, being too young to govern. In 676 he was at war with Kent and destroyed Rochester. (Bede, H. E. v. 12.) This expedition was probably connected with the internal divisions in the Kentish kingdom itself, where the Mercian influence seems to have alternated with the West Saxons. Before his accession, or shortly after it, Ethelred married Æthritha, daughter of Oswy, and sister of Egfrid of Northumbria. This near alliance did not secure peace between the two kingdoms; Egfrid had a few years before wrested the province of Lindsey from Wulfhere, and had regarded it as so safe a conquest that in 678 he obtained from Theodore the consecration of a bishop for it. In 679 Ethelred and Egfrid were at war; in a battle near the Trent Ethelred, the brother of the one and brother-in-law of the other, was slain, and it was only at the strong entreaty of archbishop Theodore that a wergild or money compensation for the life of Elfwine was accepted by the Northumbrian king. The balance of advantage remained, however, with Ethelred, who recovered Lindsey for Mercia. The peace between Egfrid and Ethelred was permanent, and the latter king seems not to have engaged in external warfare during the remainder of his reign. He devoted himself to the care of his people and the consolidation of the Mercian church. One immediate result of the peace was the division of Mercia into five dioceses; a measure which was probably adopted by Theodore in the council of Hatfield, or about the year 680 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 141 sq.), although the decree of Theodore which directs it is apparently spurious. This must have been done with the co-operation of Ethelred, and is indeed said by Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 622).
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The last document in which his name appears as king is a grant of Swanholme of Essex to bishop Waldhere of London, dated June 13, 704. This is confirmed by his successor Coenred. (Kemble, C. D. 52.) This date may furnish the exact time of the resignation; see Lappenberg (ed. Thorpe), l. 223.

Although so little there is definite is known about Ethelred, it is clear that he was one of the typical princes of Anglo-Saxon hagiography; that under him the organisation of the Mercian church was perfected, the monastic life devoutly cultivated, and peace fairly well preserved. He was the close friend both of Theodore and Wilfrid, the patron of Medeshamstede, Worcester, Ely, Malmsbury, and other obscure monasteries; and he died in the odour of sanctity. Possibly the years of peace which Mercia enjoyed under his rule enabled her to take the place among the English kingdoms which she attained under Ethelbald and Offa.

ETHELRED (3), king of the East Angles. He succeeded Beorn, and by his wife Leofrunga was father of St. Ethelbert, the king of the East Angles who was one of the victims of the policy of Offa. (Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 636); The succession of the East Anglian kings is very obscure. According to Simeon of Durham, Ethelwald, the correspondent of St. Boniface [Eldward], died in 749; and after him Hunbeanna and Alred divided the kingdom. According to Florence (M. H. B. 636), Beorn reigned in the time of Offa, and, more definitely, under the date 758 (M. H. B. 544). Thorpe, in his edition of Lappenberg, supposes Hunbeanna to be a corrupt reading for Beorn. Nothing more is heard of either Beorn or Alberht, and Ethelred is only known as father of St. Ethelbert. (ETHELBERT (3)).

ETHELRED (4). (ETHELRED, ETHELRED, EADMUND, ELMHEDRED, called also by Florence M. H. B. 653, ETHELHELM), king of Northumbria. He was the son of Moll Ethelwald, who had occupied the Northumbrian throne from 759 to 765, and succeeded Alred, the king in whose favour Moll Ethelwald had been set aside, in the year 774. If he were a son of Moll Ethelwald by his wife Ethelmesta, whom he married in 762, he must have been a child at the time. He was apparently promoted by a triumphant faction, as Alred had been, and was obliged, in order to maintain his position, to authorise some cruel acts; for in 778 he ordered two of his exiled subjects, Ethelbald and Heardberht, to put to death three of the Northumberland "duces," Aldulf, Cynwulf, and Egea. In consequence, probably, of this, he was deposed and driven into exile the next year, Alfwald the son of Oswulf being substituted for him. Ethelred's exile lasted until Alfwald, in 788, was murdered, and Osred, son of Alred, who succeeded, was deposed within a year. In 790 Ethelred recovered his throne. The cruelties which had disgraced his first reign were repeated in his second. In 791 he seized the ealdorman Eardulf, and ordered him to be executed at Ripon, where having been left for dead, he was rescued by the monks; the same year, apparently, the sons of king Alfwald, Olf and Olfthir, were put to death at Wirksworth; and in 792 Osred, who had returned from...
banishment, was put to death. The same year, 792, Ethelred, in order to strengthen himself by an alliance with Offa, married Ethlæda, daughter of that king on Sept. 29, at Catterick. The rest of Ethelred's reign was a period of domestic quiet and barbarian invasion. In 793 and 794 the coasts were devastated by the Norsemen, who destroyed the monasteries at the mouth of the Tyne. In 796 Ethelred was killed at Corbie (Corbridge?) on April 18, the result of another of the faction quarrels which had placed him on the throne. (Sim. Dun. in M. H. B. 665-668; Chr. Sax. 69. pp. 337, 338, 339.) As Alcuin was in close correspondence with York and the Northumbrian church during Ethelred's second thronery, the name of the king frequently occurs in his letters; in 790, writing to his steward Joseph, he mentions that Ethelred had been just transferred from a prison to a throne, and that he himself was detained in England in consequence of the change of sovereign (Mon. Alcuini ed. Jaffé, p. 170). In 793 he wrote to command his bishops to condemn the devastation of Lindisfarne, and declared the calamity to be a divine judgment called down by the sins which had been practised since king Alfred's death (ib. pp. 180, 181); another letter to the same effect was addressed about the same time to Ethelred and his great men, one of whom, Osbald, afterwards became bishop. In 798, ib. pp. 184-186, and there is another short letter of good advice (ib. p. 264). From a letter of Charles to Offa, we learn that after pope Adrian's death (Dec. 27, 795), the emperor had sent presents to the several sees of Ethelred's kingdom in memory of the pope (ib. p. 268), whilst from a letter of Alcuin to Offa it appears that the presents had not arrived until after Ethelred's death (ib. p. 269). Charles was greatly distressed on account of the king's murder (ib.). Lastly, in a letter written in 801 to the emperor, Alcuin states that Torthmund, one of Ethelred's servants, had valiantly avenged his master's death (ib. 619). (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 488, 492, 496, 498, 533.)

ETHELWITHA, a daughter of Offa, mentioned in the Chertsey charter of 787. (Kemble, C. D. 151.)

ETHELWALCH (ÆDELWALCH), the first Christian king of the South Saxons. He was baptized in Mercia at the suggestion of king Wulfhere, who was his godfather, about 661. His wife Eafa, daughter of Easfrith, ealdorman or under king of the Hwicedi, had been baptized in her own country previous to her marriage with Ethelwalc. Of the ancestry of Ethelwalc we have no account, but he was probably the hereditary ruler of the South Saxons, and patronized by Wulfhere as a thorn in the side of the West-Saxon kingdom. When Wulfhere in 661 had ravaged the Isle of Wight and the province of the Meawars (the district of Meon in Hampshire) he bestowed them on Ethelwalc. The conversion of the South Saxons did not follow the baptism of Ethelwalc for many years. The Scottish missionary Dieul had his small monastery at Bexley, but little success in his labours. And this state of things continued until Wilfrid in 681, having failed to recover his see in Northumbria, undertook the conversion of the nation. In this work he was very successful. Ethelwalc gave him land of eighty-seven fami-

lies or hides at Selsey, and there was founded a monastic mission, which in 709 became the head of a new diocese. In the year 686 (Flor. Wig. 537) Ethelwalc was killed by Caedwalla, the young aspirant to the West-Saxon throne, who had been driven into exile among the South Saxons. Caedwalla was still a heathen or unchristened; Centwine, against whom he was in rebellion as a devout prince, but, on his connexion with the Northumbrian kings, disclined to receive Wilfrid, who at this time had no friends in Mercia. It is, however, difficult to unravel the string of the obscure quarrels, in which Sussex was involved as an outpost of Mercia and a debatable land between Kent and Wessex. After the death of Ethelwalc, the country was governed by two ealdormen, Berchtun and Andhun. In the two following years it was devastated by Caedwalla, and afterwards remained subject to the king of Wessex. The Selsey charters furnish the names of South Saxon kings during the next century, but always depended on Wessex. William of Malmesbury (ed. Hardy, G. R. p. 46) gives Ethelwalc a successor named Eadric, who was killed by Caedwalla, but this was no doubt the Kentish king of the name whose strength lay in Sussex. (EADRIC.)

ETHELWALD (1) (OEDILWALD), a son of Oswald king of Deira, and nephew of Oswy. He ruled some portion of Northumbria under Oswy after Oswin's death, and on one occasion took up arms against him (Bede, H. E. iii. 14). His importance in ecclesiastical history is owing to his friendship with Cedd, to whom he gave land for the foundation of the monastic church of Lastingham (Bede). Cedd, brother of Cedd, was minister in Ethelwald's household. Notwithstanding his piety and his relationship to Oswy, Ethelwald joined Penda in the attack upon his uncle in 655; but he withdrew from the battle in which Penda fell at Winwaed. It is uncertain at what period of his reign he founded Lastingham, but it was after Cedd had become a bishop, and therefore later than 654. Nothing seems to be known as to the date of Ethelwald's death; but Alchfrith, the son of Oswy, is called by Florence of Worcester his successor.

ETHELWALD (2) (ÆDLWALD), king of the East Angles. He was brother of Anna, and son of Eni. He succeeded his brother Ethelhere, who fell in the battle of Winwaed in 655, and reigned until 664, when he was succeeded by Aelfulf, the son of Ethelhere. (Flor. Wig. M. E. B. 533, 636.) Bede mentions him as godfather to Suidhelm, son of Seaxwald, king of the East Saxons, who was baptized by St. Cedd at Redes- sham (H. E. iii. 22).

ETHELWALD (3) (ÆDLWALD, ODILWALD), the successor of Cuthbert, a.d. 687, in his oratory or hermitage on Farne island. Much of his early life had been spent in the monastery of Ripon, where Cuthbert, no doubt, had been for a while his companion in his labours. It is believed which Ethelwald wrought in rescuing three of the brethren of Lindisfarne from a storm. In his Life of Cuthbert the same writer tells us the condition of the oratory on Farne. It was made of wooden planks, which were in great decay.
ETHELWALD

Cuthbert had stopped up the cracks and holes with hay and clay. When Ethelwald came he begged a calf's skin of the brethren who visited him, and made himself up in the corner where he and Cuthbert used to pray, to keep the wind and rain out. After a twelve years' sojourn at Farne Ethelwald died, and was buried at Lindisfarne about A.D. 699. Bishop Edfルド then reconstructed the oratory for the use of Feldgeld, the new abbot. Feldgeld made a relic of the calf's skin and believed it, from his own experience, to be gifted with miraculous powers. (Bed. H. E. r. 1; Vita S. Cuth. cap. xlv.)

There is a notice of Ethelwald in the Acta SS. for March, iii. 463. His day was March 23. His name occurs the first on the list of auntures in the Liber Vitae of the church of Durham (ed. Surtees Soc. p. 6).

[ F. E.]

ETHELWALD (4), an obscure writer, who addressed a letter and a small collection of poems to St. Aldhelm whilst the latter was abbot of Malmesbury. These compositions, which have been, with very little show of probability, attributed to Aldhelm king of Mercia, are printed among the works of St. Boniface. (Ed. Wurdtein, Epp. 149, 81 b; Mon. Mogn. ed. Jaifie, epp. 5, 6, pp. 35-48.) The writer of the letter describes himself as having been a pupil of Aldhelm during a summer fatally marked by civil wars, and as having been fostered by him from his infancy; he also compares himself to Beohboam, Aldhelm apparently being the Solomon from whose teaching he had degenerated, and asks him to continue his instructions. He describes the poems which he sends; one is in dactylic metre in seventy verses; the second and third are in octosyllabics, and the second is sent by their common client, Wynfrith. Of the poems subjoined the first mentions the travels of the writer in Domnonia and Cornubia; this makes it possible that he was the bearer of Aldhelm's letter to Gerontius. (Aldhlm.) All five poems are in octosyllabics; and although the name of Ethelwald occurs in one of them, it is questionable whether any of them very answers to the description in the letter. In Seren's MS. of Boniface, these poems are added to another letter, addressed by an anonymous person, to a sister, after Boniface had been made a bishop; with this letter the poems can have no connexion. Dr. Giles, however, followed Serenus.

[5.]

ETHELWALD (5) (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 732, 740, in M. H. B. 657 a, 659 b), abbat of Melrose, and bishop of Lindisfarne. (Ethelwold (2)).

[C. H.]

ETHELWALD (6) Moll, king of Northumbria, succeeded after the murder of Oswulf, July 24, 759. The accession of Ethelwald is dated Aug. 5, which seems to imply that a short interregnum must have occurred. (Sim. Dun. M. H. B. 663.) He may possibly be identified with the sirederman Moll, brother of abbot Forthred, who is mentioned in the letter of pope Paul I. to archbishop Egbert in 757 or 758 (Haddan and Stubbs, ill. 385). His surname may be a contraction for Muciul, i.e. Great; but this is very uncertain. In 761, he had to resist the attack of a competitor, Oswin, who fell in a great battle at Eldunam (Eldon Hills, near Melrose), or Edwinesluffe (Chr. S. p. 343), on Aug. 6. The next year Ethelwald married at Catterick a lady named Etheldritha. In 765, Ethelwald was deprived of his kingdom by his nephew, king Aelfthred at Winchenhealle (Sim. Dun. p. 963), and was succeeded by Alphred. Nothing seems to be known of his lineage, or his ultimate fate. He was father of Ethelred, who succeeded Alphred in 774. (See Lappongen, ed. Thorpe, i. 214, 215.) There are coins attributed to Ethelwald Moll, which bear on the obverse the head of archbishop Egbert, but the ascription is very uncertain. (Hawkins, English Silver Coins, ed. Kenyon, pp. 67, 68.)

ETHELWALWUS (Malm. G. R. A. l. § 76, ed. Hardy), king of the South Saxons. (Ethelwold.)

[C. H.]

ETHELWIN (OEdlwin). (1) A prefect or reeve of Osywy king of Bernicia, who at his master's command put to death Oswin of Deira in 651 (Bede, H. E. iii. 14).

[5.]

ETHELWIN (2) Second bishop of Lindsey (M. H. B. 624). He was an Englishman of noble race, brother of Ethelhun the companion of the presbyter Egbert and of Aldewin abbot of Partney, and of the abbess Ethelhild (Bede, H. E. iii. 11). Like his brother Ethelhun he studied in Ireland (H. E. iii. 27), and after his return, when in the year 679 the province of Lindsey had been reconquered by Mercia, he was appointed bishop in succession to Eadred, who retired to Ripon (H. E. iv. 12). As this was the first formal division of Mercia into dioceses, Ethelwin is by Florence of Worcester counted as properly the first bishop of Lindsey (M. H. B. 622; ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 128-130). Of the duration of Ethelwin's episcopate we have no evidence. He was succeeded by bishop Eosgar before the year 716. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 716.)

[8.]

ETHELWOLD (1), second abbot of Evesham. (Chr. Aethelw., ed. Myn, p. 76.) He is said to have succeeded St. Egwin, but nothing is known about him. (Mon. Angl. ii. 1.)

[8.]

ETHELWOLD (2) (AEdlwulfaun), bishop of Lindisfarne, A.D. 724-740. There is some doubt as to the duration of his episcopate. The best authorities (Chronol. apud Bedan; Symeon, Chron. ed. Sertes Soc. p. 13) place his death in A.D. 740, and Symeon (Hist. Ecc. Duclm. i. 12) says that he was bishop sixteen years, which fixes his consecration in A.D. 724, the date generally received. But if this is correct, the see of Lindisfarne must have been vacant for three years after the death of Edfrith, a fact which it is not easy to account for.

Ethelwold was an officer or servant under Cuthbert, and was afterwards abbot of Melrose, a house which was most intimately connected with Lindisfarne. He ruled there when king Aelfthred visited the monastery to hear the visions of Drythelm (Bede, H. E. v. 12). The anonymous biographer of Cuthbert, who wrote between A.D. 698 and 705, mentions Ethelwold as abbot, and records a miracle wrought upon a cousin of his which he had no doubt described to the narrator. (Bed. Opp. Hist. Min. ii. 107, 108; Vita S. Cuth. cap. xxx.)
ETHELWULF

Before Ethelwulf became abbot, he caused to be made a beautiful cross of polished stone, which was probably designed by himself. His own name was carved on it, but he no doubt intended it to be a memorial of Cuthbert. The cross was one of the ornaments of Lindisfarne until the Danish invasion in A.D. 793, when the marauders broke off the head. This was afterwards fastened to the base and then thrown forward, wherever the Cuthbertines wandered the cross accompanied them, an object of great veneration to the Northumbrians, who were reminded of it by Cuthbert and Ethelwold. In the 12th century Symeon speaks of it as standing erect in the cemetery of the church of Durham. (Hist. Eccl. Dun. i. 12.) The cross was probably ornamented with that delicate interlacing work which was then at its highest point of excellence.

The taste of Ethelwold gave a cover to the famous Lindisfarne Gospels which were written by his predecessor Eadfrid. [EADFRID (2).] This was of gold, enamel, and jewels, and was brought by Bilfrid the anchorite, who was a cunning goldsmith. (Symeon, Hist. Eccl. Dun. ii. cap. xii; Lindisfarne Gospels, ed. Surtees Soc., ad finem.) An attempt has been recently made by the authorities of the British Museum to restore it. There seems to be no authority for crediting Ethelwold with the beautiful illuminations with which the MS. is adorned. The honour of these must belong to Eadfrid the scribe.

Among Aldhelm's letters there is one addressed to him by Ethelwold, but it is doubtful whether it can justly be ascribed to the bishop. (Ed. Giles, 100-2.) Dempster, in his History of Scotland (25, 13), attributes to Ethelwold a life of Cuthbert and a chronicle of the abbots of Melrose, but his statement is unsupported.

Ethelwold's remains accompanied the monks of Lindisfarne in their wanderings with those of Cuthbert, Eadfrid, &c., until they found a resting-place in Durham, where they were deposited in the shrine. (Symeon, Hist. Eccl. Dunelm. ii. 6, 7.) It is said in one place that Ethelwold died in the calendar, and his day is Feb. 12. There is an account of him in the Acta SS. for that month (ii. 604-6 and 897). [J. R.]

Ethelwold's episcopate fell in the early part of the Northumbrian troubles, which began after the death of king Aldfrid; he witnessed the great Northumbrian struggle in 731, which probably shook the fabric of church and kingdom, when Ceolwulf was deposed and restored, and Aethelred had to fly from his see at Hexham. He lived through the first seven or eight years of the archiepiscopate of Egbert, under whom the pall was restored to York, and the Northumbrian schools began their career of brilliance and usefulness.

[8]

ETHELWULF (1) (AETHELWULF), the sixth bishop of Elmham. (M. H. B. 618.) He was present at the council of Brentford in 781 (Kemble, C.D. 143; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 439). In 787 a place was made for Ethelwold in the legatine synods of 787. [8]

ETHELWULF (2), the author of a poetical history dedicated to Egbert bishop of Lindisfarne (803-821), which is printed by Mabillon in the Acta SS. O. S. B. saec. iv. part 2, pp. 317-335, MSS. of which are found in the Bodleian, Cottonian, and Cambridge libraries. (Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 509-511.) The poem contains the history of a monastery and the lives of its abbeys. A certain ealdorman named Eammand takes refuge from the persecution of King Northumbria (703-716) in a monastery dedicated to St. Peter. From a bishop, Egridr (Eadfrith of Lindisfarne, 689-721), he obtains instruction, and a learned priest to instruct his little company, and from Egbert, a bishop of the Scots, he receives rules of monastic life. Among others whose holy lives have shed honour on the place is Ulltan a Scottish priest, Frigedil, and Cunin the smith. Eammand on his death is succeeded by Eororp, and Eororp by his brother Aldfrid. The fourth abbot is Sigebald, who greatly increased the beauty of the monastery, and who at his death is succeeded by his brother Sigwin. During Sigwin's episcopate the monastery flourished. Sigwin's successor was Wulfisig, under whom the writer was brought up. Of all these the only persons otherwise known are Sigebald, who is probably identical with the abbot Sibwald, whose death is noticed by Symeon of Durham under the year 771, and Higlac the reader. It is very difficult to understand how these facts can be reconciled with the history of any monastery at Lindisfarne, to which they are, according to the MSS., applied. Mabillon points out that the history of the foundation, the date and institution of the monastic rule, the differences in the list of abbots, the fact that the monastery of the poem was situated in a town, and the account of the situation of the church are quite inconsistent with such a theory. Yet the connexion with Lindisfarne and the memory of St. Cuthbert was very close. Mabillon conjectures that Eammand had founded a monastery on the mainland, to which he may have given the name of Lindisfarne, as the new Corby was called after the old Corvei. No explanation seems to be to be found in 816 since the days of Mabillon. The names of Sigwin, Ulltan, Eammand, and Wulfisig are in the Liber Vitas Eclesiae Dunelmensis. [8]

ETHELWULF (3) (AETHELWULF), the tenth bishop of Sebye. (M. H. B. 618.) He first appears as taking part with archbishop Wulfred and bishop Deneberht of Worcester in a council at London, in which king Kenulf sold certain lands to the archbishop, Aug. 1, 811. (Kemble, C. D. 196; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 571.) His name is also attached, with the interpolated description 'East Anglorum' episcopus, to the Winchelcomb charter of the same year. (Kemble, C. D. 197; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 574.) As 'Aethelwulfs Selesegae episcopus' he attended the Council of Clovesho in 816 (Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 579); after which no more is heard of him; but his successor Cenred was bishop in 824.

ETHEMBRIA. [CETHUBERIS.]

ETHERIANUS. [FIDELIS.]

ETHERIUS (1), (EUTHIRIUS, EUCHERIUS), fourth bishop of Antibes, following Agnellus, and
succeeded by Eusebius. He was present at the second council of Orange in 509, and at the fourth council of Orleans in 541, subscribing his name Eucherius at one and Eutocius at the other. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. ii. 390) give from old MSS. a narrative of the acts of the Spanish martyrs Vincentius, Orontius, and Victor, the writer of which (c. 4) speaks of himself as the successor of Aethierius, Anticiacae Ecclesiae Antistes." This Anticiacae has been supposed to be Antibes, and the writer to have been Eusebius the successor of Eutocius. (Gall. Christ. iii. 1148; Ceillier, Hist. des Ant. Soc. xi. 308; Labbe, Conc. v. 814, 1371.) [S. A. B.]

EUTERIUS (2) (Aethierius, Eutherius, Hetherius), sixteenth bishop of Chartres, succeeding St. Aventinus, and followed by St. Leobinus, was one of the subscribers of the second, third, and fourth councils of Orleans, held in A.D. 533, 538, and 541 respectively. His name occurs several times in the life of his successor by Venantius Fortunatus, but in no important connexion. He is said to have built a church about three miles from Chartres, and dedicated it to St. Prisces, whose relics he placed there. (Gall. Christ. viii. 1059; Venant. Fort. Vita S. Leobini, 8, 13, 14 in Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 553, 554; Labbe, Conc. v. 929, 1282, 1371.) [S. A. B.]

EUTERIUS (3) (Aethierius), ST., seventeenth bishop of Auzerre, following St. Romanus, and succeeded by St. Aunacharius. He is said to have held the see nine years and six months, and to have been buried in the church of St. Germans. He flourished probably about A.D. 577. Ursard, in his Martyrologium, under the 27th July, has "Antiniodoro, deposito Eutierii episcopi." (Patr. Lat. exxiv. 301; Gall. Christ. xii. 267; Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vi. 446.) [S. A. B.]

EUTERIUS (4) (Aethierius), thirty-first sovereign of the see of Lyons, following St. Prisca. In a Life of St. Austregisilus (given in Boll. Acta SS. 20 Maii, v. 230* & there stated to be by a contemporary author) it is said that at the court of King Guintran, distinguished among the other senators was one Aethierius, a man of the highest wisdom and endowed with unusual cauntion, to whom the king confided beyond any other the secrets of his policy. He was worthy at that time of a bishopric, and afterwards was made bishop of Lyons, the most famous state of Gaul. St. Austregisilus, whom he loved exceedingly, was ordained by him priest and abbat. In or about 589 Eutierius, with other bishops, subscribed the rescript to the letter of Gundegeolus on the subject of the payment of the authors of the disturbances at Poitiers. (CRODELDUR.) In 584, he was summoned by Guintran to Nanterre to be present at the baptism of that king's nephew Clotaire II. He died in A.D. 602, and was succeeded by Secundinus. Gregory of Tours relates of him that he made for St. Nicetius a little bed, which after the saint's death worked many miracles in the cure of diseases.

Three letters to him from Gregory the Great are extant; the first addressed to him jointly with several other Gallic bishops, being directed against simoniacal practices, the ordination of laymen to high places in the church, some of whom, Gregory states, did not adopt the tonsure till a see was vacant, against the practice of women other than those permitted by the canons dwelling with the clergy, and the neglect of the yearly synods; the second being addressed to Eutierius alone, again insisting on the holding of synods, and commending to his care the monks whom he was sending to St. Augustine in Britain; the third as to his acquiescence in the incapacitation of a bishop for his duties by disease or failing faculties. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. lib. ix. c. 41, lib. x. c. 28; Fredegar, Chron. c. 52, Greg. Tur. Vit. Pat. viii. 5, 8; Greg. Mag. Epist. lib. ix. ep. 106, lib. xi. ep. 56, lib. xiii. ep. 5 in Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 1028, 1173, 1258; Gall. Christ. iv. 58.) [S. A. B.]

EUTERIUS (5), according to Bede (H. E. i. 24, 26), bishop of Arles, who consecrated Augustine bishop of Canterbury. But the Eutherius of that date was bishop of Lyons (see the preceding article), and the bishop of Arles was Virgilius.

C. H.

EUTERIUS (6), bishop of Basii (Baza), one of the fifteen suffragan bishops of the see of Cartagena, summoned to the synod at Toledo, A.D. 610. (GUTHINIAN.) He signs eleventh on the list (Mansi, x. 507 b; Esp. Sagra. vii. 86; Aguirre, iii. 322). [ETYCHIANUS (4)]. [M. A. W.]

EUTERIUS (7), bishop of Basti, signs the acts of the eleventh council of Toledo (A.D. 675), at which only bishops of the province of Cartagena were present (Mansi, xi. 147 a; Esp. Sagra. vii. 88; Aguirre-Catalana, iv. 247). [ETYCHIANUS (4)]. [M. A. W.]

EUTERIUS (8), bishop of Elberi from about A.D. 630 to about 646. His signature appears among those of C. Tol. iv. 633, and his vicar signs for him in the seventh council, 646. Losayn and Aguirre are wrong on this point (Esp. Sagra. xii. 156; Aguirre-Catalana, iii. 385, 423). [FLAVIANUS (1)]. [M. A. W.]

EUTERIUS (9), titular bishop of Osmo towards the end of the 8th century. He is known as having, together with Beatus, published a defence of orthodoxy against the Adoptionist heresy of Elipandus and Felix. (ADOPTIONISTS.) Osmo was at the time under Saracen rule, and as we find Eutierius writing, jointly with Beatus, from Asturias, and speaking of himself as "Osmonis sedis dignissimae nominatis episcopus," or, according to another reading, nuncupatus, the inference seems to be that he was titular bishop only. To him were dedicated the commentaries on the Apocalypse ascribed to Beatus. The friendship between Beatus and Eutierius seems to have been a very close one. Elipandus speaks affectionately of him, as well as of the youth of Eutierius, in his letter to the abbat Fidelis A.D. 785. [ELIPANDUS.] The dates of his birth, consecration, and death are alike unfixed, but we may put his consecration probably about A.D. 780, and his death in the early years of the 9th century (Esp. Sagra. vii. 282, viii. 253, Nic. Antonio, Biblioth. Latina, 1058, 35; Migne, Patr. Lat. xviii.). [M. A. W.]

EUTERIUS (10), according to Anastasius (Eh.Pontif. pp. 318, 319), chaplain and notary of Charlemagne at Rome in 774, drew up the
ETHERNAN (1) (EDRAN, IPHRANAN), bishop and confessor, commemorated Dec. 2. This holy bishop lived in the 6th century, and is often confounded with the Ernanus, uncle and nephew of St. Columba, as the names may be used interchangeably, but he is different from both. From his legend as given in the Brev. Aberd. (Prop. SS. p. hymn, ff. vi. vii.), we learn that, born of noble parents, and early devoted to religion, he went to Ireland in pursuit of learning and was made a bishop. When he returned to Scotland he brought with him some learned men, presbyters and clerics, with whom he traversed the country, labouring indefatigably for the salvation of souls, teaching, baptizing, confirming, visiting the sick, and consecrating churches. His cell was in the parish of Rathen, Aberdeenshire, where the church was dedicated to him. That cell is still known by his cell in the supposed to have been still called “Edran’s slack.” He had also a dedication in the priory of the Isle of May, and the church of Madderty, Perthshire, was St. Iphranan or Ethernan’s. His feast in the Aberdeen calendar is Dec. 2, but King, Camerarius, and Dempster place him on Dec. 31 or 22, mistaking him for others. Various attempts at identification have been made, but there appears no distinct record of him in the Irish Annals, unless he be the Starnan or Tarman (read by Skene Itharnan), in Ann. Utt. A.D. 688, and Ann. Tig. 689, who died among the Picts. (Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 333-4; View Duran. A.D. 133-44; V. Disp. Hist. Eccles. Gent. Scott. i. 251; Camerarius, De Scot. Fort. 203; Old Stat. Soc. Scot. vi. 15; Rec. Pr. Isle of May, pp. xv-xvi. 19; Ogilvie, Christ. in Buchan, 15, 17, 34-5; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 168.)

J. G.

ETHERNAN (2). Dempster has a St. Ether nanus, nephew of St. Columba, and “monasterii Divinii Bursis, ut vacant, praepositus,” who wrote Gesta Columbae auream.” Commemorated Dec. 22. This St. Ethernanus is not to be confounded with Ethernan of Rathen; there seems little doubt but he is identical with Ethernaise, venerated on Dec. 22 at Clane, co. Kildare. He is associated in the calendars with St. Ultan Tua, and the two are said to have been brothers of St. Maighbearn (Dec. 18), of Kilmainham, and thus belonged to the Ordels on the side of their father Aedh, and to the Dalcorrains on the side of their mother Sinell. St. Ethernanus must have flourished in the beginning of the 7th century; Skene (Celt. Scot. ii. 311) suggests the day of the end of the ninth. In the Brevary and Martyrology of Aberdeen he is called a bishop; his dedication in Scotland was at Lathrisk, now Kettle, Fife, which probably had its name of Leathress, or Lathrisk, corrupted from Llu-Ethernan. (Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 334 et al.; Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Asoc. Ir. & ser. iii. 281-2; O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 199, 431.)

J. G.

ETHI (Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 8), followers of Aetius. [AETIUS, Vol. I. 51.] [T. W. D.]

ETHICOPROSOPTAE (Ἡθικοπροσωπώ ντα), literally “offenders (προσωπούντες) in matters of ethics,” is the title under which St. John of Damascus (De Haeresibus Liber, § 96) describes the holders of certain erroneous opinions, who had come into notice before the age of Heraclius (610-642). They are spoken of as “erring in ethical, that is to say, in practical virtue; gallanising some precepts of it which are praiseworthy, and following as good other precepts which are to be blamed.” The expression, ἐν τῇ ἴστη ἰδίας ἐπικρατεῖν, is somewhat difficult, since Damascenus elsewhere makes ἐν τῇ πραξείν τα δικαία not an explanatory equivalent of ἰδίας ἐπικρατεῖν, as he appears to do here, but as the whole, of which the ethicus is one of three parts, the economical and political being the other two (Dialectica, c. iii.). In any case it is plain that the reference in the name Ethicoprosopetae is not to any erroneous tenets of theology, but to upholding morality in the conduct of life, and the description given is too vague and general to admit of our applying it to any particular sect or persons.

J. H. L.

ETHILAU, bishop of Edessa. [ETHIUS (2).]

ETHILBALD (Sim. Dun. G. R. A. ann. 732 M. H. B. 687 p, 686 c; ann. 750, ii. 662c), king of Mercia. [ETHILBALD (1).]

ETHILMU, sixth bishop of Vaison, succeeding Fonteius and followed by Gemellus, is said to have sat at a synod at Orange in 501, not to be found, however, in Labbe. One of the subscribers of the first council of Orleans in A.D. 511 was “Ethillus episcopus ecclesiae Venetiæ,” whom some have thought without sufficient reason to be identical with Ethilius of Vaison. (Gall. Christ. i. 922; Labbe, Conc. v. 548.)

S. A. B.

ETHIMOTHUS, sixth bishop of Syracuse, early in the 2nd century. His predecessor was Euplius, his successor Venatus. (Pirri, Sicil. Sacra, i. 600.)

R. S. G.

ETHIOPIAN CHURCH. The designation “Ethiopia” (Ἀθηνία, Ἡ Ἑλλάσ of Herod. iii. 114, and also of Strabo and Pliny; the LXX translation of the Curt of the Hebrews, Esth. xxxix. 10; Amos ix. 7; Ps. lviii. 31) is a geographical expression of great indefiniteness, and must be distinguished from the civilised “Aethiopia” limited to the province or kingdom of the island of Meroe (ἡ Ἑλλάσ ἡτρ Αἰγύπτου of Herod. ii. 146), of which we find memorials in the Greek writers and in the Coptic, not in the monumental records of Egypt. According to Pliny, Ἡ Ἑλλάσ consisted of forty-five kingdoms, of which Meroe was the chief. The term is used very vaguely to denote the whole of Africa south of Libya (Herod. iv. 197), and also...
is confounded with India, and appears to denote occasionally large portions of Arabia. Jerome regards Arabia Felix as the home of the Ethiopian chamberlain (Cat. Script. Eccl. i. 265); and the account of the foundation of the church in Ethiopia is undoubtedly described in Socrates (i. 15) and Sozomen (ii. 24) as the conversion of the Indians. Thus Hen. Valesius, commenting on Sozomen, ii. 24, says: "Fantauze autem Frumentium dictum verbum Dei praedicavisse, sed nullos ibi reliquisse episcopos." Baronius supposes that there were two Frumentii; one for the Indies, and one for Ethiopia.

It is not necessary here to attempt to penetrate the ancient history of Ethiopia, even where it crosses the Biblical history. The Shishak of Scripture and of the monuments conquered Ethiopia—i.e. the seat of Ethiopian power in Meroë; but his successor was killed by the Ethiopians. Shortly afterwards Zerah not only subdued Egypt, but menace Asa, king of Judah (2 Chron. xiv. 9), who nevertheless overthrew and scattered his vast host (B.C. 941). There is grave difficulty in identifying the kings with any personage, either of Ethiopia or Egypt, though attempts have been made to identify him with Oserkon I, the son and successor of Shishak. The Ebed-melech mentioned by Jeremiah (xxxviii. xix.) was in ready sympathy with the prophet and his career. This fact indicates the prevalence of pro- or other sympathies to the Jewish faith among those who bore the designation of Cush. The boundaries of the African Ethiopians are necessarily indefinite. If they were, as seems probable, the ancestors of the Shangilals, Bishiries, and Nubians, their positions may be loosely stated as having to the north the African highlands; to the west, the Libyan desert; to the north, Egypt and Armenia; and to the east, the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea (Dict. Geog. art. "Aethiopia"). But Abyssinia itself is the principal portion of these lands which went under the name of Ethiopia, and may, according to Hofmann (Herzog's Noms. art. Ethiopia) be divided into three parts: (1) the north-east highlands, including Axum; and the whole district of the Tigré; (2) the south-west highlands, Amhara, Shon, and Gondar, including the capital city; (3) the surrounding lowlands. The aim of the present article is to deal with the religious condition and ecclesiastical relations of that portion of the Ethiopian peoples which, after the decline of the kingdom of Meroë, recognised the supremacy and submitted to the authority of the emperor of Abyssinia. The extraordinary development of the power of Abyssin or Abyssinia is rather the transference of the hegemony or supremacy to what was once a dependent province. Even after the transfer, Nubia must not be altogether shut out from the political and ecclesiastical relations of Ethiopia. The chief seat of the empire was at Axum (cf. Dict. Geog. Adiäboes, Axœmos, Ptol. iv. 7), the modern Axum. This city was extensive, and its power was considerable, in the commencement of the second century of our era.

The identity of the Ethiopic or Geez language with the Amharic, or the Homerite, makes it probable that we have here an ancient branch of the Arabic race. Here Gesenius (Erzäch und Gritzker, art. "Abessinische Kirche") and Adelung are opposed; but Ludolf strongly emphasises the dialectical and tribal identification of the Habes- sini and Homerites: "The land of Ethiopia is a connected and concentric speculation that the city Axum and Tigré generally were colonised from Arabia, and even leading to the belief that Egyptian civilisation descended in early times from the sources of the Nile. It should be observed that, while one-third of the roots of the Ethiopic tongue are found in the Arabic, and there are numerous Syro-Arabian peculiarities and many Greek roots, no trace of Coptic can be found. The ancient Ethiopic language has now passed away from living use, and the Amharic variety has taken its place (Gessenius).

There is a valuable tradition that the Abyssinian Ethiopians became proselytes to Judaism under the influence of the queen of Sheba, who visited Solomon, and on her return to her own land introduced the rites and customs resembling those of the Hebrews, which no one disputes to have prevailed in the past, and even to prevail at the present day in Abyssinia. The name of the queen is said to be Rehabeam, and her son by Solomon is said to have been called Menilehec and Ebn-el-Haqim. The title here given to the king is Araemic in form, and may easily be referred to his reputed royal birth, "Son of the wise man, or Solomon." Such a prince may have lived, but his prominence in the midst of legendary names is itself confused. The catalogues of kings are reckoned differently, some giving twenty and some twenty-four names between Menilehec and Basenus, in the eighth year of whose reign we are told in Ethiopian history that our Lord was born. Customs analogous to the Hebrew rites did prevail, and were still capable of recognition, in the 18th and 17th centuries, as may be seen at large in the Historia Ethipica, by Telleseus (Father Tellez), and Hist. Ethiopica of Job Ludolf (lib. ii. c. 4 and lib. iii. c. 1). Among these customs were circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, the distinction of clean and unclean food, the levirate law. There are many ways in which the people of Abyssinia observe these customs without resorting to the mythical proselytism of an Ethiopian queen. The Egyptians practised circumcision. Phoenicians, Colchians, and other nations borrowed it from them. The Arabians practise it still, but do not profess to have derived it from the Jews. It is not a religious rite with the Mussulman, nor is it referred to in the Koran. The confessio fidei of king Claudius, who reigned in Abyssinia 1541–1559 (Ludolf, v. ii. 6, 18, and Commentarium, xxvii. xxviii.), is a rather late authority, but it counts for something. He said: "We do not circumcise as the Jews (giving Christian reasons and quotations from St. Paul on the subject), but like as incisions on the face are made in Ethiopia and Nubia, perforations of the ear in India, so that which we do is not in observance of the laws of Moses, but is a human and national custom." The same argument was used by him with reference to abstinence from swine-flesh and other unclean meats. Doubtless abstinence from blood and things strangled obtained far beyond the limits of Judaism. The observance of the Sabbath may be accounted for on other grounds than on that of the general prevalence of Jewish ceremonial before the introduction of Christianity. The form of Christianity which
prevailed was of the primitive and ante-Nicene type. There is no doubt that in the earliest form of the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 33 and vii. 24) we find reference to an early Christian observance of the seventh day as well as the first. The Ethiopian king Claudius in his confession of faith discriminated between the two, as a manner which led us to infer that both days have been regarded with reverence by the first preachers of the gospel to this people, and that the Sabbath observance was due to Christian rather than Jewish influences. The custom has prevailed in the Ethiopian church to the present day. We have not only the effort made in the 15th and 16th centuries to disprove the Jewish charge of Judaism, but the repeated testimony of modern travellers and missionaries (Isenberg and Krafft, Journals; Major Harris, Highlands of Ethiopia, ii. 177, iii. 144).

Hofmann (Herzog's Enzy.) appears to reckon the peculiarity as akin to the extraordinary love shown to the observance of a number of special days. There prevails among them another custom, which has been held to prove a wide diffusion of Jewish ideas, viz. the marriage of the childless widow of a deceased brother under what has been termed the levirate law. Alvarez used this as an argument. Ludolf urged that the Ethiopians and Jews show some tribal or religious associations which cannot be disposed of with a sneer. It would be more to the purpose to observe that some law of the kind import prevailed in many oriental nations, as, e.g., the Mosbites (Ruth i. 11–13), the Persians (Zendav. iii. 228, quoted by Lehrer, arms. i. 349), the Egyptians, and certain Arabian tribes will endure great sacrifices with a view of preserving in this way the name of a family. Hence the custom prevalent among the Ethiopians which resembled the Mosaic law (Deut. xxi. 5–10; vide treatise of the Mishna called Jeb moth) may simply indicate a common practice of the custom among both peoples without giving a warrant to the charges brought by the Jesuits.

The interesting narrative in Acts xvi. 24 of the conversion by Philip the Evangelist of an Ethiopian, alike a Jewish proselyte, and a chamberlain of Candace, queen of Ethiopia, is naturally the starting-place of Ethiopian legend as to the origin of Christianity, and is a still further confirmation of the suspicion that Jewish ideas, Scriptures, and observances were already familiarly known to some branch or division of this great family. The Codex Aethiopicus to which Ludolf continually refers contains the simple narrative of the conversion, but adds no further details. Zaganazabo in his "Confession of faith," as given by Ludolf, states the bare fact and knows nothing more of the subsequent history of Christianity. It should, moreover, be observed that in the lists of Abyssinian princes, from the time of Ezana to the date of the undoubted introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia, there is no mention of any queen Candace or of any female ruler at all. On the other hand, Candace was the royal title of the queens who ruled for some centuries over the kingdom of Meroë. From the days of Alexander to the Roman general Petronius, and from Petronius to the time of Ezana (B.C. 350), this name, title, and honour had prevailed. Pliny (lib. vi. 29) said: "Regnasse quodam foeminae Candacensi atque id nomen multis annis ad reginas transisse" (cf. Strabo, vii. p. 820). Eusebius does not hesitate to say that this Ethiopian convert was the first preacher of the gospel to his own people, and gives him the name of Indian. It is doubtful whether the Ethiopia referred to was on the eastern or western side of the Red Sea, but most probably on the latter, and thus in the earliest times of Christianity it is not impossible that the idea of Meroë at least may have received the tides of the way of life, that other Jewish proselytes may have imported the observance for use in Abyssinia as well as willing to receive the Christian interpretation of the ancient oracles as was the Ethiopian eunuch. Ecclesiastical writers referred the first offer of the Gospel to the apostles themselves; thus Jerome (Cat. Script. i. 262) said St. Andrew; Rufinus (Hist. Eccl. iv. 9) and Socrates (i. 19) made Sts. Mary and Agnes; Theodoret (Hom. 31) St. Thomas as the first preacher of the Gospel to the Ethiopians. This great diversity is probably due to the cause already adverted to, viz. the extreme indefiniteness of the term Ethiopia, and the confusion of India and Arabia with it.

Whether the gospel had been introduced by apostolic or sub-apostolic hands among any of the subordinate kingdoms of (Abyssinia) Ethiopia or not, it is tolerably clear that no authentic proof of the existence of any Christian ideas, worship, or organisation can be traced to an earlier period than to the visit of the Tyrian youths Frumentius and Aelesius, about the year A.D. 358. The basic story is a marvellous and curious one. Rufinus has preserved (Hist. Eccl. i. 9), having personally gathered the facts from one of the two brothers. The narrative is repeated by Socrates (i. 15), Sozomen. (ii. 24), Theodoret (i. 22), cf. Baronius. Ann. 327–8, and Ludolf, H. Eth., and is to the following purport. Between India exterior and Parthia lies India interior, inhabited by numerous and various tribes and nations untouched by any apostolic influence or preaching. This India is thus discriminated from Ethiopia, which Rufinus says had been entrusted by lot to St. Matthew. A philosopher, Metrodorus by name, of whom some mention is made in the Chronicles of Jerome, penetrated "ulterior India," being surnamed by the love of travel. Meropius (also Rufinus), a Tyrian philosopher (and it is supposed by some that he was the same as the above), imitated his example, and sought to enter India, taking with him two youths, his relatives (according to some accounts these youths were his sons), whom he instructed in the liberal arts. The name of the younger was Aelesius, and that of the elder Frumentius. The vessel in which Meropius and the lads were travelling touched at a port to obtain food or water. The barbarians, who had just thrown off their alliance with the Romans, were ready to put to the sword all and sundry who claimed affinity with
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there, if they fell into their power. It was the
case on this occasion: the whole ship's crew
with the philosopher, were murdered, but the
barbarians took compassion on the youths, who
were found meditating and reading under the
shadow of a tree. They were brought to the
king of the barbarians, and secured at once his
interest, confidence, and love. This king, if we
identify the narrative with the Ethiopian version
of the story, must have been the father of the
Abreha and Atzabea of the Ethiopian annals.
He made Aedesius his cupbearer and Frumentius
the keeper of his rolls (scrinia) and his finances
or business affairs (rationes suas). Sozomen
describes him as his treasurer. Rufinus says
that on his approaching death he left his wife
regent, and gave full liberty to the Tyrian youths
to take their own course. The widowed queen
besought the youths to remain at her court until
her infant son (?) some should become of age.
She earnestly entreated them, especially Fru-
mentius, whose mental faculties and knowledge of
affairs were renowned, to assist her in the
management of the kingdom. They consented
to remain, and Frumentius was led by some
divine impulse (Deo mentem et animos ejus
instigante) to make diligent inquiry whether
there were any Christians among the Roman
merchants who visited or resided in the land,
and in the churches of Tyre, and to adopt the
houses of prayer, and to adopt all necessary
and opportune methods, so that there the
Christian seed might spring up among them.
When the young man reached man's estate,
Frumentius and Aedesius, notwithstanding many
eventfuls on the part of the queen and her son
to remain, returned to their own country. A-
desius proceed to Tyre to revisit his friends and
relatives. He was shortly afterwards made a
presbyter of the church in Tyre, and from his
liis, not from common report, Rufinus tells us
that he received the above narrative. Meanwhile
Frumentius, thinking it was not just to con-
ver from his work at this time, went to A-
ndia. He arrived in Alexandria and laid the whole matter before the
bishop Anthanasius, who had recently been
appointed, urging him to send a bishop to the
Christians who had been gathered together, and
the churches that had been formed in that
barbarous locality. Anthanasius having given
much consideration to the recital of Frumen-
tius, and in a council (concilium sacerdotum)
"What other man shall we find such as thou
art, in whom is the spirit of God, as He is in
thee, who will be able to discharge these duties?"
He was at once ordained and ordered to
return to the place from which he had come.
When he arrived at the court of the emperor, apo-
estic signs accompanied his ministry, and an
infinite number of the barbarians were converted
to the faith."

Frumentius, or Frumentatos, received the title
of Abbuna, or Abba Salama, father of peace, and
by that name he is chiefly known in the Ethiopi-
cannals. The bishopric of Auzzume assumed a
metropolitan character, and was always renewed
at the instigation of the king, by the patriarch
of the Coptic church. The title of "Abba
Salama" is borne by this dignitary to the present
day.

The Ethiopic annals, the Ethiopic liturgy, and
the Ethiopic poetry from which Ludolf per-

petually quotes, confirm this narrative of Rufinus, and thus increase our knowledge.
We learn, e.g., that there were thirteen kings
between Bazenus and the two kings under whose
name fromontos (Frumentius) and Sidracus
(Aedesius), or Abba Salama, as the former was
afterwards called, diffused the knowledge of
the gospel. The names of those two kings were
Abreha and Atzabea. The Ethiopic poet praises
these kings "for their brotherly love, and because
they obeyed the laws of Moses, diffused the gospel
of Christ, and built a house to his praise" (Ludolf,
L. c. ii. c. 4). In the Ethiopic liturgy Ludolf found
the following encomium on the same kings:
"With joyful voice I hail them, extolling and
exalting Salama, door of pity and mercy, who
caused the glory of Christ to shine in Ethiopia,
where before all was dark, murky night."
Elsewhere, Abba Salama is described under the
image of the "Light-bringer." This appears
somewhat inconsistent with the statement of the
Codex Auctorissimus, to the effect that the Tyrian
women, in their husband's absence, disguised
themselves with the sign of the cross, when they had
never received the gospel from an apostle.
Ludolf advances a number of subjective reasons
and argumenta e silentio which appear to him
conclusive that Christianity could never have
been diffused prior to Frumentius. The silence
of the Ethiopic Church to the patriarchal
bishops, presbyters, or baptism, and of
the church historians of earlier times as to the
diffusion of the gospel in this remote neighbour-
hood, weigh strongly with him; also the absence
of any record of conflict, persecution, or martyr-
dom. These considerations deserve weight, but
they are not conclusive. Many inhabitants and
half-developed forms of Christianity diffused
themselves widely in the East, without leading
to conversion, to the formation of churches or
the creation of literature. And, moreover, the
representation which Frumentius gave of the
success of his own labours implies that there
were Christians who were converts of prayer, and
churches in existence before he was entrusted with
the episcopate. It is not impossible that Christian
merchants, that Ethiopian proselytes, that wan-
dering Jews converted to the faith of Christ had
the way for Frumentius. A discussion was raised by Hen. Valesius, Com-
menting on Socrates (H. E. i. 15), he disputed the consecration of Frumentius to the episco-
pate of Auzzume by Anthanasius, on the ground that Anthanasius was made archbishop of Alex-
andria, A.D. 326. Further, that Meropius is
said to have imitated the example of Metro-
dorus in his Oriental travel. Now Metrodorus
did not return from his travel till 328, when he
brought Indian treasures to Constantinople. This,
says he, could not have occurred until Constantine
had been victorious over Licinius. If the journey
of Meropius had not commenced until that year,
then it is in the highest degree improbable that
Frumentius could have passed through the
several stages of his career, or become in age or
character fitted for the office until 340, or still
later. There are many ways of avoiding this
apparent conclusion. Metrodorus may have paid
two visits to the East. Meropius need not have
waited for his return before being smitten with
the love of travel, or again Metrodorus may
have returned from his wanderings long before
he presented his trophies to Constantine. The explicit statement of Rufinus that Athanasius had been recently (supper) appointed to his high office, or reueri, as Socrates phrases it, is rather too strong to be overthrown on a conjectural argument. Besides, the authentic proof that Constantius wrote to the prince of Ethiopia to ask him to replace Frumentius by Theophilus, a second Arian patriarch of Alexandria, shows that the appointment of Frumentius must have taken place before 337, when Constantius came to the throne of the East. This letter, which is preserved in "Apology of Athanasius, addressed to the emperor Constantius" (Athenagoras, Historic Tracts, Book I. N. pp. 182, 183; Athan. Opp. ed. Ben. I. i. p. 158), assured the princes, "Azaanes and Sazaanes" (either the Greekized form of Abreha and Atzbeha or else the Christian names adopted by the sons of the late king) that Athanasius was "guilty of ten thousand crimes," that the canonical appointment of Frumentius as the successor ought to be tried, and that he must be examined on these matters and instructed by the "most venerable George." Constantius confessed, moreover, his alarm lest Athanasius might himself find his way to Auzume and corrupt the people with his accursed and impious doctrines. The advice and threats of Constantius appear to have produced no effect at Auzume, for Athanasius never crossed the Red Sea among them (cf. Le Quien, Orient Christ. ii. 644).

This bright flash of light reveals the presence of churches, Christians, dogmatic beliefs, and the commencement of hierarchical order; moreover, it confirms the truth of the traditional and vague utterances of the Ethiopic annals and poets. But the dark image is only one of the history, and we are led to grope our way onward by the register of a few names and facts, by the occurrence of certain peculiarities in the subsequent constitution of the church, by the deference paid in the Ethiopic church to extra-canonical Scriptures and ancient canons of church order, by some confusing traditions with reference to a lady of Christian name, a moving into the latter centuries, and by the unquestionable adhesion of the Ethiopian church of later days to the Monophysite (Jacobe) church of Alexandria and Egypt. Each of these sources of information may be briefly touched upon.

The names of the following bishops of Auzume are gathered from the Ethiopic calendar* by Gams, Series Episcoporum, viz.: Frumentius, Theophilus (Arian Missionary to the Homeriotes), Alexander, Bartholomaeus, Joannes, Jacobus (cf. Le Quien, 642-660).

The two great names of Abreha and Atzbeha are praised by the Ethiopic poet (Ecc. 4, Ludolf, I. c. li. c. 4) for their brotherly love. They are commended for obeying the laws of Moses, as well as diffusing the gospel of Christ and building a house to his praise. The annals of the Ethiopian poet mention as reigning subsequently to these brothers three contemporaneous kings, whose names were Atzfa, Atzfed, and Amey, who are said to have ruled by turns most harmoniously, but in what way we can only conjecture. To them succeeded Arad, Aladota, Alamid, the latter called elsewhere Amiadi, son of Sulodoba (cf. Ludolf, ii. ii. c.) is the reign of Amiadiam or Alamid, we are told that many monks came from Rome and filled the kingdom with the renown of their virtues. Mendesius says this event must have occurred between 460 and 480. If so, it must have been coincident with another event of immense importance. It is the year of the emperor Constantine, the schism in the church of Egypt, which followed upon the council of Chalcedon. In the first ardours of that conflict these monks arrived. They were probably called "Roman," in the sense in which all Greeks were called Roman at that time from being submitted to the Eastern Roman empire ruling from the throne of Constantinople. Several of these great saints are enumerated—(1) Aragawi, (2) Pantaleon, (3) Gavima, (4) Alef, (5) Saham, (6) Af, (7) Likanos, (8) Adumata. With the exception of Pantaleon, all these names are Ethiopic, and are the translation of the Greek appellatives of these worthies. Thus Likanos is the Greek name of Michael. It may be borne in mind that the archangel Michael is the patron of the Ethiopian church and kingdom, and to him is consecrated the twelfth day of every month in the calendar (Ludolf, Comm. cf. Harris, i. c.). The poet sings about him that his life was wise, and his death prudent; that the Trinity was with him, and he destroyed the kingdom of the serpent (arwe), probably some form of heathen serpent worship, which prevailed up to his date. The poet tells us that temples were erected, and churches dedicated to the memory of Pantaleon. This great saint is credited with raising the dead and causing the widow and orphan to sing for joy. In the song of the Ethiopic poet concerning Likanos, all the nine saints are mentioned as making a crown for his brow. When Likanos prayed, the fingers of his upturned hands burned like lamps of fire, and when he held a staff, his hands were seen to be perforated. Is this an anticipation of the legend of the stigmata of St. Francis of Assisi? The Ethiopian poet, Greek and Latin, going into the latter centuries, and the martyrs of the Ethiopian church, wrought astounding miracles—walked on the sea, moved mountains, drew water from the rock, and raised the dead. Latatzaans lives on leaves and herbs, and that so sparingly that his body became light as air (Ecc. xvii). Gabra-Monies clothed himself in the leaves of trees, and the Ethiopian poets record the fabulous history of twenty or thirty workers of the most astounding miracles, who not only raised men but even animals from death; and of one saint who restored the same person three times from death to this miserable life. Special ascriptions of praise are made to Eustathius, Jacobus, Horus, Marthanos, Biones, and the Jesuits who subsequently sought to convert the Ethiopian church to the communion of Rome, made no account of the astounding miracles wrought or the extreme asceticism practised by the Ethiopian monks. They did not repudiate the thinny evidence on which they are based, but discounted it being any proof of the Divine approval of their communion because they were separated from the true church. Nevertheless, the eremitic life is traced back to the great Anthony, who in time of persecution
devoted himself to the life of abstinence and prayer. [Antony.] The well-known Macr
ius, well-known on the tradition of self-mortifica
tion. Pachomius was his successor, and Aragasi,
one of the nine saints, the destroyer of the serpents, kept the succession alive, and was reg
arded as the first "general" of the whole monastic order of Ethiopia. His place was subsequen
tly filled by Christus-Bezana, by Nestel-Mos, by Johann, who left his robe (askema) to Tecla-haimonos, the Benedict of Abyssinia, who in the 15th century founded the great monastery of Debra-Libanos. The part
played by this great ascetic leader of the regu
lar clergy appertains to a later period of the history than that contemplated in this work. The successors of Tecla, the president, antistes, and visitor of all the monks, acquired a position
equal to that of the occupants of the see of Azum (Auzume), who successively derived their
orders and consecration as their prototype from Frumentius had done, from the patriarch of Alexandria. In other parts of the Christendom, the contest was often sharp and protracted between the chief of the monastic order and the Abuna.

Another story of the introduction of Chris
tianity into Ethiopia is told by Nicephorus Calli
stus in his annals, and it has the support of Simeon of Athos. Assemani (Bibli. Orient. tom. i. pp. 358 f.) gives the Syrian authorities for a narrative which represents Adad or Aigod, emperor of Axumites, avenging vengeance on the Homerite King, a Jewish warper, who had cruelly murdered "Roman" merchants, on the ground of their Christian activity in his dominions, as well as numerous Homerites. Assemani's authority is a history written by "John, bishop of Asia," and preserved in the Chronikon of Dionysius, and it is followed up by the Syriac letter of Simeon, bishop of Ith Aimasen, whose statements coincide with those of Simeon Metaphrastes (in Surius, l. p. 943), Theophanes, Cedrenus, and of the Portuguese visitor of the times, who refers to the martyrdom of three Homerites. The story of Nicephorus, however, is that Adad or Adad (or, as Greek and Roman writers call him, Elebran), emperor of Ethiopia, uttered a vow that if he conquered the Homerites of the Red Sea coast he would embrace Christianity; further, that he was successful, fulfilled his vow, and appealed to Justinian, who sent bishops to effect the conversion of the Ethiopians, that a Christian-Ethiopian kingdom was thenceforward extended to the Homerites. There are many improbabilities in the latter portions of this statement. Not the least of the difficulties is that if Justinian had sent bishops to Ethiopia, he would not have sent Jacobites, but Melchite or Catholic bishops, and there can be little doubt that the church of Ethiopia in its inception and a hundred years before the reign of Justinian had accepted the Jacobite patriarchry, and repudiated, as it has done to the present day, the Roman Church. As for the Church, which makes a strange blunder in appealing to the spurious Nicene canons in proof of the existence, presence, and position of the Ethiopian patriarch at the date of the council of Nicaea in 325! In his commentary (p. 282) he admits the anachronism involved in a statement which would utterly overthrow all his Ethiopian authority, for the conversion of Ethiopia by Frumentius, and the annals and writings of Constantius by Athanasius before the accession of Constantius. Strangely enough Selden led Ludolf into this blunder, which was pointed out by Fabricius, and corrected by himself. It is not impossible to see through the appar
ently conflicting accounts. The Greek and Latin authorities, the Syrian and Ethiopian annals and writers all combine to throw some light on the curious vow, from which, as reported by John, "bishop of Asia," who flourished in the reign of Justinian, it has been supposed by no less an authority than Assemani (Bibli. Orient. tom. i. 359), that Ethiopian kings and princes had given up their faith in Christ until it was renewed in the time of Justinian. All authorities combine to include among the Homerite sufferers one Aretha and his wife, and a number of his companions, variously estimated as 280 and 340. The Syrian writer, John, speaks of 280 provincials being a white curtain of Christianity in the region. Aretha had been a distinguished man at Auzume, and there built himself a palace. He was appointed governor of Nigran by the emperor of Ethiopia, whose dominions must have included a nominal suzerainty over portions at least of Arabia Felix. The Homerites inhabit the eastern coasts of the Horn of Africa, north and east of the Red Sea, but their principal seat must have been in Arabia. They appear to have received an Arian form of Christianity during the reign of Constantius, under the teaching of Theophilus Indicus (Philos. Frag. lib. iii.). How
ever that may be, they suffered cruelly at the hands of Dunaam, a Jewish sectary who had usurped the authority, besieged Nigran, and punished the Christian with various forms of refined cruelty. The date of the persecution in which Aretha and his wife and companions fell is differently given. Theophanes, quoted by Asse
man (i. 358), gives the year A.D. 535, and Niciphorus assigns it to 541. Bonnus places it under the reign of Theodosius II. The authorities quoted at length by Bas
nius (Ann. 532), viz. Niciphorus, Zonaras, and Cedrenus describe the courage of the martyrs, the bold answers made by Aretha to his tor
ments, his refusal to submit to the rites of Judaism, and his unflinching confession of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and his cruel death. The Arabian authorities, Abjaamuatis, and Ahmed Ibn Jusef, confirm the story of the cruel death of those who would not conform to the Jewish faith. Philostorgius (iii. c. 4) refers to the fact, and in Sour la nxv., of the Alcoran, Mohammed is supposed by his commentators to have condemned the cruel act in these words: "Cursed were the contrivers of the pit of fire supplied with fuel, when they sat round the same, and were witnesses of what they did against true believers, and they afflicted them for no other reason, but because they believed in the mighty glorious God, unto Whom belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth, and God is witness of all things" (Sale's translation). The specula
tion, based by some on this passage, that the Christian Homerites, or Christian Ethiopians,
days were "days of peace." A few other names of princes occur down to the rise of the Zangane family in the 10th century.

During the whole of this period one important fact must be borne in mind. The Ethiopian church derived its orders from the patriarch of Alexandria, but shared throughout the fanatical rejection of the decisions of the council of Chalcedon, which illuminated the Christian church; it regarded Diocletian as the pillar of orthodoxy, and took sides throughout the long and weary strife with the Jacobite schism. [COPTIC CHURCH; DIOSCURIUS] Ludolf endeavours to minimise the monophysitism not only of Armenian and Ethiopian churches, but of Eutyches himself, and excites an indignant condemnation of himself and his "miserable Ethiopic poet" on the part of Renaudot in his Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinarum. It is, however, remarkable that though the Ethiopian church was cut off ages from all intercommunication with the rest of Christendom, it continued in connection with the patriarch of the Nubian church by the Mohammedans, yet that it retained so many Christian ideas unimpaired. The Jewish element prevailed from the first, and in fasting, circumcision, sabbath observance, and in their reverence for the Temple at Jerusalem, and their confident belief that they possessed the ark of the covenant which had been miraculously transported to them, the Ethiopians present a curious and almost unique amalgam of religious sentiments. Notwithstanding the vehement repudiation of Chalcedonian formulæ, the very phrases of Chalcedonian orthodoxy are actually inwoven into their liturgy. Ludolf quotes the following (Comm. lib. iii. c. 9): "... sanguis Domini ... quod subest ex Maria ... et fecit illud unam cum divinitate suae, sine mixtura, neque praestiones, sine separatione, neque distinctione Divinitatia. If the whole question had been merely one of words, and if they did hold the whole thing, and the same thing with the Catholic church, the age-long controversy would be very important in the history of the most remarkable facts in the history of Christianity. 4 It is unnecessary to repeat the story of the strife. The Ethiopian church, believing itself pre-eminently orthodox, accepted the Jacobite patriarch as the supreme fountain of its hierarchy. The same Jacobite seems lost in obscurity, though variously explained. Thus Nicephorus (lib. viii. cap. 52) says that Jacobus was a Syrian of the name of Tzanzalus, that he was a disciple of Severus, i.e. the monk who harmonised the conflicting Monophysite sects, in the days of Justin (cf. Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 1346). Eutychius (Alex. Ann. ii. 147) calls his name Baradaeus, and states that he diffused his opinions, those of an extreme Monophysite, throughout Armenia, Mesop-
The Coptic Christians use the Coptic Bible in their churches and monasteries without comprehending a word of its meaning, and the Ethiopians have followed the same unedifying example. The origin of the translation (Dillmann, art. Herzog, Enc.) is lost in obscurity. The tradition of the Ethiopic poet to the effect that either Frumentius, in the 4th century, or that the nine saints in the 5th century translated the Bible from Arabic into Ethiopic, does much to refute itself. Doubtless the books of which the poet speaks (Encycl. xxi.) were in the main the Old Testament and New Testament, but it is certain that the Ethiopic text was made from the Alexandrine text of the Old Testament, as it follows the LXX, where they differ in arrangement from the early Arabic version, e.g. in Exodus xxxvi, and Numb. xxvi. The names of animals retain their Greek names; and very frequent conformity with the Alexandrine text renders the speculation of Renaudot that it was made from the Coptic quite superfluous. Moreover, Frumentius could not have made use of the Arabic, since it seems proved (Bryan Walton in his prolegomena to the Polyglott), that the Arabic version was made between the years A.D. 340 and 350. It is equally unsatisfactory to contend, as some Romish writers have done, that it was made from the Latin Vulgate. The only evidence for this is its correspondence with the Vulgate in some places where our codices of the LXX reveal lacunae. The simple supposition that the Ethiopian scholars had more ancient codices than those we possess is sufficient to account for these facts. Chrysostom (Hom. in Jon. ii. § 36, tom. viii.) recognised a translation of the Bible into Ethiopic. Bruce and Cajetan averred that fragments of both the Old and New Testaments existed in the Ethiopic language before the time of Frumentius; Dillmann repudiates the opinion as a mere guess. According to this great authority, the historical books of the Old Testament reveal manifested study of the Greek Testament, and knowledge of the Greek language. Many changes have occurred in the text to accommodate it to the changes in the Ethiopic language. The names of the books have been ignorantly Arabized. Thus, Πραξης comes to be Abridziz, and Apocalypsis, Abadal-Imapia. The earliest codices contain no division into chapters and verses. The canon contains the Apocalypse, and other works, and these are not discriminated from the canon. There are 81 books, 46 of the Old Testament and 33 of the New Testament. The Old Testament is divided into four parts.

(1) The Law, including Joshua, Judges and Ruth: 8 books in all.
(2) The Kings, including Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, 2 books each; Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job and Psalms, 13 in all.
(4) Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lam., Ezekiel, the minor prophets (12) and 2 Macc. 18 books.

Sometimes Henoch, and 4th Ezra are reckoned as in the canon of Old Testament.

The New Testament is divided into 4 parts.

---

* Le Quen (Oriens Christianus, ii. 1346 B, Dioecesis Jacobitica) makes it probable that Severus appointed a Jacobus as bishop of Edessa. Severus died in Alexandria, 533, having nominated Sergius as his successor, who took the title of patriarch of Antioch. From him the Jacobite series of patriarchs has proceeded unto this day. The Severian Monophysites of Syria and Theodotian Monophysites of Egypt, also called Jacobites, were alike called Jacobites.
and often indicates some trace of the Peshito Syriac, and of the Vetus Itala.

(1) The Gospels; (2) Acts; (3) Paul; 14 Epistles, including the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistles to the Hebrews; (4) The General Epistles and Apocalypse.

In close association with the New Testament are the collection of canons, headed by a very profound and apostolic canons, which appears first of all to have been translated into Arabic and thence into Ethiopic. There are three copies of this great Codex, one is still in Abyssinia, two copies are in the Vatican library. Ludolf saw and examined one of these in the year 1643. The Codex enumerates 470 or 480 canons in all, which are thus enumerated: (1) The canons of the 12 Apostles, 127; (2) Canons of Hippolytus, 38; (3) Of the 318 bishops of Nicaea (7). (4) Of Ancrea, 25; (5) Of Neoacademia, 15; (6) Of Gangra, 20, 21; (7) Of Caesarea, 124 (7). (8) Of St. Basil, 106; (9) Of St. Chrysostom, 17; (10) of Constantius, 123; making a total of from 470 to 480.

The most important of these are the 48 canons of the 12 apostles." The ordinary Greek and Latin copies of the apostolic canons in the 8th Book of the Constitutions enumerate 85. Of these there are only 71, inaccurately and inharmoniously arranged in the Greek codex, and another collection of 56, which Ludolf printed from the Ethiopian texts; making in all 177. To these are added in the great codex, the statutes or precepts, or the διακοσμοί of the apostles. The list of the apostles by which they are introduced is very strange, e.g., John, Matthew, Peter, Philip, Simon the Cananaite, James, Alpheus, Nathanael, Thomas, Cephas, Andrew, Simon Peter, and James the Brother of the Lord. The 38 canons of Hippolytus (of Abulides) are given by Ludolf from a French translation of them by Wannsleh, and they differ from 38 canons called διακοσμοί of the apostles, and of which mention is made by the Ethiopic king Claudius in his Confession of Faith as of paramount authority. These canons, identified with apostolic forms of the apostolic canons, were edited (at least 21 of them) in Ethiopic, with an English translation by Thomas Pell Platt, London, 1834. It is admitted that this διακοσμοί is more ancient than the Nicene canon. Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25), Irenaeus (in the Fragmenta Pseudo-, Athanasius (Epist. Fest. 39), Euphranius (Iber. xl. 5, lxx. 10) all refer to these canons. The pastoral epistles are the framework on which they are obviously raised, and the very varied opinions have been entertained about their genuineness. Dr. de Pressense has recently argued (Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church, p. 4 ff.) that the Coptic form of these canons (edited by Yatzam), and with which these Ethiopic texts agree, indicates a more ancient Greek text than that which is current in the Greek form, and that the original Greek has been interpolated by a very similar hand as that which interpolated the letters of Ignatius; and also that in all the canons, in the interpolation of the direction of sacred tomatism and the interpretation of the apostolic forms in this business, but as in the case of the Ignatian letters, the shortest Syriac recension contains the germ of the full-grown episcopal order which is so prominent in the larger Greek form. The Ethiopic form of the canons and of the διακοσμοί was free of all admixture of elements introduced into this antiquity of the church of the council of Chalcedon. Their authority in their Ethiopic form led to the most thorough-going rejection by the Ethiopians of the 16th century of the supremacy of the Roman see.

The Liturgy of the Ethiopic Church (Intro- greges, De ecclesiae canonis,) is a large subject to be discussed here. There are many forms of Ethiopic liturgy referred to by Ludolf. One, he edits is full, under the title of Oratio Eucharisticae Domini et Salvatoris nostri J. C. (Comm. iii. c. 4, xxxi.). It contains many noble sentiments. There is, however, an invocation of apostles, the mother of God, of the patriarchs, martyrs, etc., as "the prayer of the deacon," and in the prayer after the words of institution there is a petition that the bread and cup may become the body and blood of the Lord. There is no passage resembling this in the liturgy of St. Mark or St. James, or in the liturgies edited in parallel columns by Dr. Neale.

The so-called Book of Henoch (Enoch, Book 96), which was said to have been found in Abyssinia in the 17th century, was proved to be a forgery of the Abba Babaila Michaelis, and rejected by scholars. Two hundred years afterwards three copies of an Ethiopic translation of that remarkable work were actually found by the traveller Bruce, and introduced him to Ethiopian scholarship. Archbishop Laurence, Moses Stuart, Ewald, Dillmann, have annotated, edited or translated it, and thus restored it to the students of early literature. The contents of this book do not concern us here. It is not Ethiopic in its origin, but one can judge a little by the prolongation of Gnosticism in Ethiopia, when all other traces of it had perished, that was the daily bread of the Ethiopian church during the silent years.

Some further idea may be gained of the primitive condition of this church, by enumerating some of the ideas, customs, and tendencies, which have survived the contest with Rome, and come under the observation of European travellers.

There has been no common name or term for "sacraments." The word "mystery" was applied to baptism and the eucharist; but the church knew nothing of episcopal confirmation or extreme unction. Transubstantiation was set classically held. The Ethiopians maintained a vigorous tradition of the doctrine of original sin. They prayed for and invoked the dead, but they had no doctrine of purgatory. They have had many objects of worship, but have laid the greatest stress on the unity of the Trinity. Special homage has been paid to the Virgin Mary as the Queen of heaven. There are still thirty- three ancient rites and ceremonies; and has unquestionably conserved the strong Jewish element which is more conspicuous in the remains of the Ethiopian church than in any other Christian community. The
The marriage rites were very repulsive. Polygamy is not condemned by civil law, but only by ecclesiastical law. Kings and magistrates have many wives; bishops and clergy are limited to one. The levirate marriage was legitimate by civil law, and second marriages of the clergy were repudiated. Some funeral rites which are seen throughout the Mohammedan world astonished the early travellers, such as running with the dead body to the tomb, and clapping hands and shouting ballehulah over the grave. Dancing still forms part of their ritual, as it did in the Jewish temple. (Dean Stanley, Eastern Church.)

The supreme hierarch of the Ethiopian church is the Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria, the metropolitan or abuna, or Abba Salama, bishop of Aujuma, but since the fall of Aujuma taking his residence with the dominant court. The abuna is for all practical purposes, but Chalcedonian, the Coptic patriarch as Frumentius was in the first instance, and sent into Ethiopia at request of the monarch. The statement of Tszaazabas, that he is elected by the monks of Jerusalem has no truth in it. The condition of the patriarchate was for many ages so deplorable that humble Egyptian priests, hired to the priests immediately afterwards. The supposed baptism with fire was only an application of cautery used as a sanitary precaution against catarrh.

The mode of celebrating Epiphany led the Portuguese travellers to accuse the Ethiopian Christians of indecent practices, and of an heathenish ceremonial. Major Harris describes scenes of extraordinary character, where, by way of celebrating the solemnity of our Lord's baptism, the entire population of a district, men, women, and children, plunged at a state of perfect nudity into the same font, by torchlight. It would seem that the ceremony is not a repetition of their own baptism, but a commemoration of the Lord's, and at all events a barbaric and grossly indecent ceremony. In the celebration of the Eucharist, leavened bread signed with the cross is generally used except on the fifth day of Passion week, when unleavened bread is used. The wine used is mixed with water. The Eucharist is administered to the workbook, but never by the priest in a private house, not even to a king or to the metropolitan himself. The Jesuits accused the Ethiopians of celebrating the Eucharist in neither kind, because that which they used was not wine but water, being merely the unfermented juice of the grape.

The fasts practised were unusually severe and frequent. The great fast of 40 days, in imitation of our Lord's fast, followed immediately on the wild nocturnal baptism of Epiphany. Demetrius, the twelfth patriarch, thought it better to associate this fast with that of Passion week, and he is credited with the cruel commendation of fasting from water as well as from food. Their feasts were in honour of the conception, nativity, circumcision, baptism, passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, and of the return of Christ at Pentecost, and in the midst of Pentecost a feast called Rekeb, in which bishops held "synods" of their clergy for the settlement of dogma, ecclesiastical and disciplinary disputes (cf. Apost. Const. 38). The calendar is of great length and complexity, many saints are commemorated, none are canonized.

CHRIST. HIGHER.—VOL. II.
ETTOPHONES "(Eθνοφώνες), z same given to certain heretics by St. John of Damascus (De Haereticis Liber, § 84). They are placed among the sects which came into prominence between the times of Marcianus and Hercilius, that is, between A.D. 450 and 610. We are prepared, therefore, to meet them in Epiphanius; but beyond this their name does not occur in Timotheus Presbyter, or in Sophronius of Jerusalem, or indeed, so far as the writer can discover, in any other ancient author down to Nicetas Choniates (c. 1200), who repeats the account of Damascenus with some trifling variations (Thesaurus Orthod. Fidei, lib. iv. c. xiii.). They are described as "following the language of the heathen, though in other respects Christians, introducing the casting of nativities, fortunate-telling, and destiny; accepting the whole system of astronomy and astrology, with all manner of soothing and augury." They "give heed to omens, expiations, prophetic sounds, observation of times, and similar fables of the profane, as well as to the rest of the pagan customs." Further, they "hold in honour certain Gentile festivals, and observe days, months, and times, and years."

It will be apparent from this that those whom St. John of Damascus had in view, under the name of Ethnophorians, or "Gentile-minded," were not so much the members of any particular sect, as the class of people, doubtless a numerous one in that age, whom sought to combine, in varying proportions, the old pagan superstitions with the profession of Christianity. An interesting light is thrown on their practices by the 61st and 62nd canons of the second Trullan council, which was held in 680, and which is analogous to that of Damascenus, the having recourse to σάτων καὶ έμπροστήριον καὶ γενεαλογία, κ. τ. λ. (Concill. Gener. Romae, 1828, iii. p. 323). The reference to "Gentile festivals" (διάδας των ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ) is illustrated by the provision in the 62nd canon of "Calendae, as they are called, and Vota and Brumalia, and the associated festivals on the 1st of March. It would thus appear that the old Matronalia and Bacchoi festivals (Brumalia), and others, were still lingering on in the Eastern church, as the Lupercalia had done till the time of pope Gelasius in the Western. The Vota, hardly re-recognisable under its Greek form Βόρδη, were votive offerings for the welfare of the emperors at the beginning of the year (Suicer, Thesaurus, s. v. Βόρδη; Gibbon, c. xxxii.). It is not improbable moreover that the return of Damascus from the court of Persia, about 533, may have had some influence in stimulating the efforts of a paganism not yet extinct. There is no evidence to show that he returned to the city from which he, as well as St. John of Damascus, took his name; but his presence would be sure to be felt in whatever part of the Byzantine territories he was settled. The extraordinary portsents related by him in connexion with his Life of his tutor, Isidorus of Gaza, if we may trust the confused abstract of it preserved in Photius (Biblioth. cod. cxxi.), will quite explain the severe language of the Trullan canons, and justify the name of hιμετερε Μαμωνατου, which Nicetas borrows from the Romans to apply to such Ethnophorians as believed in them. [J. H. L.]

ETTIA (Etna). The twen	second bishop of Straburg, is said to have been the son of Hugh, whose wife was St. Odile, the abbess of Hohenburg, and popular saint of Alsace. Little is known of the details of his life, though the outline and dates are determined by letters and other documents. He ruled the monastery of Augia Dives (Reichenau in Baden) for seven years before he was made bishop by Charles Martel upon the death of his predecessor, Wiggerinus, A.D. 734. Soon after his consecration he built the monastery named after him, Ettenheim or Etteinheim, and it must have been about the same time that he, with other bishops, received a letter from Gregory III. (d. 741), commending bishop Bosiface to his care (Patr. Lat. lxxiv. 580). The next occasion on which we hear of him is a German council summoned by Bosiface in A.D. 745 at Ratibson or Augsburg, of which he was a subscriber (Labbe, Conc. viii. 273). Under the name of Hedius he is addressed, together with a number of bishops of France and Germany, in a letter of pope Zachary, which has been assigned to both A.D. 744 and 748 (Nigle, Patr. Lat. cxxx. 1165). About the latter date he subscribed a charter confirming old and granting new privileges to the monastery of Schwarzachum (Arnulph-Augs) in Lower Alsace (Patr. Lat. ixixv. 1314). In A.D. 762 he published his will, making large gifts of land to his monastery (Le Coite, Ann. Eccl. Franc. sae. 762, n. i. tom. v. 643), and three years later his signature appears with those of twenty-six other bishops to the placitum Attiinacese, which regulated for the subscribers the service to be said for the souls of the dead (Patr. Lat. xcv. v. 669). He died about A.D. 778, and was buried at Etteinheim. His successor in the see was Formigus. (Hermannus Contractus, Chron. Colbr Angiensis in Patr. Lat. cxxiiii. 157; Gall. Christ. v. 784; Le Coite, Ann. Eccl. Franc. tom. v.) [N. A. K.]

ETHOLIUS (Aitallahas), ordained bishop of Edessa, the metropolis of Orshothon, A.D. 524, and present at the council of Nicea, 325. He constructed the cathedral and the monastery and the tomb of the church at Edessa. (Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 394, e Chron. Edess.; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. 956; Mansi, ii. 694.) [L. D.]

ETIANUS. [Ethien.]
ETTO

ETTO (1) (HETTO, OTTO, ZE), bishop, confessor, communit. July 10. Of this bishop and confessor the Bollandists (Acta SS. Jul. 10, tom. iii. 47-80) give a Life "ex perpetuo MS. monasterii Marchianensis." He was a disciple of St. Fursey at Lagny, and contemporary with Emilian, Elocuus, Amandus, Hoernert, Mimbibus, Prefegandus, &c. He had accompanied St. Fursey into Gaul; in the course of time he visited Rome, and at last, after much labour and spiritual increase, died in the monastery he had founded at Fisciacum, which became afterwards a priory, dependent on the abbey of Laetitia (Lesse), near Avenue, in the French department of Nord, on the borders of Belgium. Molanus (Not. Sacr. Belgii at July 10) mentions Ettô being called "Hibernensis Episcopus," and speaks of a church under his name at Byam as the confines of Arras. He flourished about a.d. 550 or 670 (Lanigan, Ecle. Hist. Fr. ii. c. 16, § 10; Dupont, Hist. Eccl. Gend. Sot. i. 281, ii. 340; O'Conor, Rev. Eccl. Script. iv. 186 a; Colgan, Acta SS. 51 a. 1, 96 c. 6, 436, col. 2; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 227, 246). His relics were translated to Mons, and then on July 25, 1555, to the abbey of Liesse; he is the same as the French St. Ze, and is the special patron of cowherds, to one of whom, the legend says, he gave speech. (Bollandists, Acta SS. Jan. 7, tom. i. 447; Baring-Gould, Lices of the Saints, July 10, pt. i. 261.)

[C. G.]

EUBULUS (1), bishop of Avignon. [Eubul.]

EUBULUS (3), martyr, together with Julianus, both disciples of Arcadius bishop of Cyprus. They were beheaded during the reign of Julian, and were commemorated March 7. (Men. Bas.)

EUBULUS (5), bishop of Lysstra in Lycaonia, R 2
EUCADDIRES

cir. A.D. 621. Le Quien (Or. Christ. i. 1076) mentions having seen a fragment of his in reply to a profession of faith submitted to the emperor Heraclius by Athanasius, a Severian bishop. The fragment formed a part of a MS. Panoplia Graecia in a Paris library, and appears to have been the same manuscript as that which Cave found quoted by his correspondent of Labbe's year, the printed edition of Joannes Damascenus (Cave, Lit. Hist. i. 582). Le Quien refers to this consecutus in sec. 10 of his general preface to the works of that father (see Patr. Gr. xcv. 74). Theophanes, however, who relates the conversation of Athanasius and Heraclius at some length, makes no mention of Eubulus (Chronogr. ann. 621, p. 274 in Patr. Gr. cviii. 678). The bishop is called by Cave Eubulus Lyrensis, and his episcopal city Lyra, which Cave believed to be in Syria. [T. W. D. J.]

EUCADDIRES, a burlesque name for pagan priests, suggested by St. Augustine (Ep. 17). [H. W. P.]

EUCAPRIUS, a monk of the 5th century, a friend of St. Nilus, who terms him γέροντας φίλος μακάριονας. St. Nilus's correspondent Pionius was his son. (Nil. Epod. iii. 31 in Migne, Patr. Gr. Ixxix. 588 d.) The fact of his having been a monk is known from Anastasius Sinai, who quotes one of St. Nilus's writings to that effect addressed to Eucarpius. (Anast. Sin. Quares. iii. p. 189 in Patr. Gr. Ixxix. 358.) [T. W. D. J.]

EUCAPPUS, A.D. 347, subscribed the council of Sardica (Athan. Opp. i. 132; Mansi, iii. 46 b). [W. M. S.]

EUCAPRIUS, EUCAPPUS, bishop of Messana, present at the 6th Roman synod of Symmachus, A.D. 501 (Mansi, viii. 315 d). There is a letter addressed by pope Pelagius, "Eucarpo episcopo Messanensi," who is charged to see to the election of a fit person to the vacant bishopric of Catania (Mansi, ix. 907; Patr. Lat. Ixxxii. 747). The letter also appears in Grattian (Dist. ixi. cap. 17). Mansi (ut sup.), Baluze (Miscell. iii. 3) and others ascribe the letter to Pelagius ii. (579-596), and if they are correct the Eucaropus of Peligius must be different from the Eucaropus of the council. But that the writer of the letter was Pelagius I. (555-560) is clearly shown by Jaffé. (Bequest Pont. 85; see also Berard on Grattian, Canon. tom. ii. p. 2, p. 475, ed. 1783; Bues, Comment. Praen. de S. Pucidio, sec. viii. § 124 in Boll. Acta SS. 5 Oct. iii. 94; Samperi, Iconolog. della Gloria. Virg. Protettrice di Messina, 181, 185.) [T. W. D. J.]

EUCADUHIS (Eogodudois, Eoglodach, Eogludius), commemorated Jan. 25, Oct. 13. The identity of this saint is obscured by the later Scotch annalists changing his name into Eoglodius; this is done by Hector Boece (Scot. Hist. lib. ix. f. 116), and adopted from him by Lesley, Dempster, and Camerarius; Fordun (Chron. Gen. Scot. iii. c. 29) has Eoghodius. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. 25, tom. ii. 610 c) follow the Scotch tradition in noticing "Eoglodius Pictorum Apostolus," but show their hesitancy by inserting his name among their praetermissi of that day. The true form of the name is Echid, Echoid, Echaidh, or Euchadus. He was one of the twelve who are said to have accompanied St. Columba from Ireland to Iona (Adamnan, St. Columb, append. to Book iii. Codex B). Colgan (Acta SS. 163) gives a short account of him from the Annalists already named, where he is called Apostle of the Picts and Scots. In his Kalendar at Jan. 25, Camerarius has "S. Eoglodius, monachus et confessor apud Galba- dianos [people in Glenelg's way] sanctus," from an Irish ms. of the Sacramentum miraculosum glorias celebres. Fuit magis illius Columbiis socius, et Pictorum alter Apostolus." He is by some supposed to have died A.D. 587, but Colgan thinks it more probable that he survived his master, who died A.D. 597. Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 265) places his death in the year 606, and says he wrote Colombe magistri vitam, lib. i.; Epistolam of Hibunos, lib. i., but builds his assertion on a wrong identification. Euchadius's feast is variously given as January 25 and October 13, and his name occurs in the Dunblane Litanies among the monks and confessors as Eogladoch. (Up. Forbes, Kat. Scot. Sincts, 334, et al.; Tanner, Bibli. 262; Kelly, Cat. Ir. ss. 61; Colgan, Tr. Thum, 468, 470, 489 n. 45; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 356; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 431-33.) Colgan (Acta SS. 163 n. 1, 164 a.) cites several who are called Eochodus, in order to find a higher place for this Eunchadus, and suggests that he may be Eochaidh Dallán (January 29), who wrote a life of St. Columba, but Colgan is evidently at fault in his suggestions, and probably refers to Eochaidh, son of Cella, better known as Dallán Forgall, who wrote the Amhrá Cuchnincille. [Dallán Forgall]. [J. G.]

EUCHAITAEE (Baron. Annal. ann. 329, xxxivii.), heretics. [EUCHITAE.] But it may not be amiss to add the caution that Euchaitis is also a geographical word, concerning which see Bolland. A.D. SS. Jan. i. p. 595, they were in Migne, P. G. cxx. 1039; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. viii. 627; Labbe, Soc. Conc. ii. 55.) [G. S.]

EUCHARIST, the sacrament of the Christian Church, commonly so designated in the writings of the Fathers, and here treated solely with reference to their teaching on it. For the term itself, see Dictionary of Christian Antiquities (i. 624, 625); of its application in primitive times to this sacrament Casaubon is probably right on both points when he says, "Non estat in Scripturis haec dictio pro sacramentii hujus nominis: quam tamen apostolorum tempore natam non dubitamus" (Exerc. ad Evarn. xvi. 40). Certainly, the well-known words of St. Justin, εις αυτη καλεσαι παρα μεν Ευχαριστη (Apol. i. 65), and Tertullian's "Eucharistias sacramentum" (De Cor. In. c. 3), go far to establish the last; and as regards the first, it cannot be doubted that "breaking of bread" (St. Luke xxiv. 35; Acts ii. 42 and 46 and xxi. 7) and the "Supper" (1 Cor. i. 7) must have been more familiar equivalents for it to the contemporaries of St. Paul and St. Luke; the former of whom, again, in enumerating its component parts, calls one "the cup of blessing." not thanksgiving (1 Cor. x. 16). There is just one passage where the term ευχαριστη occurs in the sense of meaning in St. Paul which it has in the Fathers: viz., 1 Cor. xiv. 16 (see Palmer's Orig. Lit. i. 14); but, on the other hand, such is not
the interpretation put upon it by the Fathers themselves, viz. Chrysostom, Tertullian, and Pris- 
masius, &c., in commenting on this passage. 
Besides, even in their day, the term “Eucharist.” 
had other well-known meanings, as well as the 
sacrament other well-known names. (See par-
iii.; comp. Cassian, Exær. ad Bar. xvi. 30, 
et seq.). Their gradual preference for this 
term arose probably from tacit agreement, that 
is solemn a commemoration of the death of 
Christ by man, the act of thanksgiving absorbed 
all men. There is one “locus classicus” in 
St. Chrysostom at least to this effect (Hom. xxxv. 
in St. Mith.). 

However, the term “Eucharist.” has long 
since passed out of popular use, and is now only 
retained by the learned. Latin theologians still 
speak of the “Sacrament of the Eucharist.”; 
but it is called “the sacrament of communion” by 
the Greeks. And as the majority fre-
quently each celebration of it in both churches 
has a common origin, it is really the 
service, not the sacrament, which is the promi-
nient idea with the many. This, in primitive times, 
was called everywhere “the liturgy;” and the 
Greeks speak of “attending the liturgy” still. 
But the popular term for it everywhere with 
the Latins has long been “the Mass,” and it is at 
this that everybody with them talks of assisting. 
Now in neither is the distinctive character of 
this sacrament recognised, except by the faintest 
implication. In this respect it stands out in 
marked contrast to baptism.

Baptism was best known to the Fathers, and 
is still popularly best known everywhere by its 
sacramental name, both as a sacrament and as a 
service. There are two points of ritualistic and 
dogmatic import, on the contrary, where the 
accord of one sacrament with the other is no 
less striking. 1. Both alike had their formal 
counterparts in the legal ordinances of circum-
cision and of the passover; yet their material 
parts were not taken, that custom from which 
had become custom in “the middle ages” of the 
synagogue than from anything actually pre-
scribed in the law. 2. Both alike seem not 
seem to have been administered in the church, 
though they had been instituted by Christ, previously 
to the descent of the Holy Ghost.

Each of these remarks will assist us in esti-
nating the teaching of the Fathers on the sacra-
ment in question.

The passages in the New Testament we find 
interpreted by them in connexion with it, and 
on which they ground their teaching, are: I. The 
fourfold account of its institution by St. Matth. 
xxv. 35–30; St. Mark. xiv. 22; St. Luke 
xxii. 17–20; and St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23–29. II. 
The sermon in anticipation of it, recorded by St. 
John alone (vi. 26–53), whose gospel alone con-
tains no account of its institution. III. Two 
more passages in the epistles of St. Paul, where 
it is contraeted, first with idolatrous altars and 
sacrifices, and then with Jewish (1 Cor. x. 15–21, 
and Heb. xiii. 10). IV. All the passages above 
gespoke from the Gospel of St. Luke, the Acts, 
and St. Paul, where the Scriptural names for it 
occurred. V. Possible references to it should be, 
perhaps, added. Of these, 1 Cor. xiv. 16 has 
been anticipated; and the remark there made 
holds equally good of 1 Cor. ii. 4, where, because 
that quotation occurs word for word in the 
liturgy of St. James, we may contend it may have 
been taken from hence (Neume’s Prim. Liturg. 
p. 79); and again of 1 Pet. ii. 5, though the 
transition, so far as words are concerned, from 
this passage to the Primitive Liturgies is direct 

And, as it is in the Primitive Liturgies that we 
shall find the best clue to the collective teaching 
of the Fathers from the first, it is to these that 
we shall most conveniently turn next.

At first it would seem that liturgies were not 
written, as Renaudot says (Disc. c. 1), but oral, 
like the creed—Bunyan, in arguing against Re-
naudot (Hist. iv. 143), has overlooked Le Brun 
(Expos. de la Messe, vol. iii. p. 4 sqq.)—and like 
the creed everywhere substantially the same.

We must appeal in the first place, therefore, to 
accounts given of them before they were written; 
and referring to them solely for dogmas, we must 
be brief in our references. Of these St. Justin’s is 
the earliest document.

“Him also who has been baptized . . . we conduct 
to where the brethren are assembled . . . then 
bread and wine, mixed in a cup with water, are 
brought to their president, which he receiving 
offers up praise and glory to God the Father of 
all, through the name of the Son and of the 
Holy Ghost, together with prayers and thank-
givings at which we, after having blessed 
us these things: to which, when he has finished, 
the people respond, Amen. . . . For it is not 
as ordinary bread, or ordinary drink, that we 
receive these things: but as Jesus Christ our 
Saviour was incarnate by the Word (i.e. the 
Spirit: comp. c. 33, where St. Luke, i. 35, is 
quoted) of God, so we have been taught that the 
food from which our flesh and blood derive nour-
rishment by assimilation, having been blessed 
by invocation of the Word that is from Him (viz. 
the Holy Ghost, once more) is both the flesh and 
the blood of that same Jesus who was made flesh.

For so the apostles, in the books of re-
membrance which they caused to be 
written, have handed down that Jesus commanded 
them: that having taken bread, and given 
thanks, He said, Do this in remembrance of Me: 
This is My body. And, in like manner, having 
taken the cup, and given thanks, He said, This is 
My blood: and gave to them alone” (Apoc. i. 
66, 66). Elsewhere, contrasting Nalchik i. 
10 and 12, he says: “With regard to those 
sacrifices which are offered to Him everywhere 
by us Gentiles, that is, of the eucharistic 
and of the eucharistic cup equally, He there 
foretells that we should glorify, but that you 
should profane, His name” (c. Troph. c. 41).

And again, “Get thee to anticipate all the 
sacrifices made by Christians in all the earth 
through this name, which Jesus, Who is the 
Christ, ordained to be made, viz. in the eucharist 
of the bread and cup—that they are well-
plessing to Him” (9. c. 117).

St. Cyril of Jerusalem agrees with St. Justin 
in the main, but writing to instruct his flock 
is naturally plainer spoken. He begins his 
twenty-second lecture by referring to 1 Cor. 
xi. 23, &c., on which he says, “This teaching of 
the blessed Paul alone should suffice to satisfy you 
thoroughly respecting these holy mysteries, by 
admission to which you have been made one 
body and blood with Christ . . . His body is
given you in the shape of bread, and His blood in the shape of wine. . . . For thus we become possessed of Christ by having His body and blood distributed throughout our members; and thus, as St. Peter says, are we made partakers of the Divine nature . . . (6. § 3). Fully persuaded, then, that what appears bread is not bread although tangible by the taste, but the body of Christ, and that what appears wine is not wine, though the taste pronounces it to be so, but the blood of Christ . . . stabilish your heart by partaking of Him as spiritually present, and gladden the face of your soul” (6. § 9). In the next lecture, which treats of the liturgy then in use, he explains how it becomes what he says it is: “After we have sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns” — the prelude to which consists in the well-known words, Ἐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, by the priest— “we invoke the God of mercy to send the Holy Ghost on the offering exposed to view, that He may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Him; and that the Holy Spirit touches is hallowed and transformed” (§ 7); or, as he says further on: “Αγνά τά προσκείμενα, ἔκτοτας δέξαμεν Ἀγίου Πνεύμ.-ματος (§ 19). Then he proceeds: “After that the spiritual sacrifice, the bloodless service, has been consecrated, we supplicate God, in presence of the congregation, for the common peace of the churches, for the weal of the world, for kings, for soldiers and allies, for the sick and afflicted; in a word, we all pray and offer this sacrifice for all who need help. Then we commemorate those who have fallen asleep in time past: first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God by their prayers and grace may accept our petitions. Then, also, for the holy fathers and bishops, and for all among us in general, who have fallen asleep similarly, believing it will be of the greatest advantage to those souls for whom prayer is offered up, with that holy and awe-inspiring sacrifice lying exposed to view” (6. §§ 8, 9). We must not expect, of course, to be able to discuss at all this part of the subject; this and the next are treated by Origen speaks for the bulk of his contemporaries, when he says, in reference to St. Matt. xxvi. 28, “He that has been initiated in our mysteries knows both the flesh and blood of the Word of God. Let us not dwell, then, on what is already known to the faithful, and must not be divulged to the unlearned” (in Levit. ix. 10). Incidental allusions, indeed, are not wanting in parts. Fir- milian, in his well-known letter to St. Cyprian, for instance (Ep. lxv. 10), speaks of a possessed woman who went about Cappadocia, where his see lay, “pretending, by a no means despicable innovation, to consecrate bread, and celebrate the Eucharist. . . . besides administering baptism in such form as to seem to adhere to the ritual of the church throughout.” But the written liturgies of the East, to which we must shortly refer, all witness to the account just given of them in their unwritten state, besides shewing how they were added to, or departed from, in later times. Africa, rather than Rome, being the Latin-speaking church, and the liturgy of Africa seeming to have come to an end, before it had been put into writing at all, there is the more probability that what members of the African church tell us of it at any time, may be so much testimony to it as its original form. Tertullian is explicit enough, as far as he goes, though his references are inci- dental. “Many think,” he says, “that on station days they ought not to attend the prayers at the sacrifices because the station would be broken by receiving the Lord’s body. What! the Eucharist breaks the sacrifice? Does it not bind us to God all the more? Will not your station be all the more solemn, if it include standing at the altar of God? Then by receiving and preserving the Lord’s body, both the participating in the sacrifice, and the per- forming of the service, are secured equally” (De Ovlt. c. 14). This shews what the char- acter of the liturgy then in use must have been, so far as it goes. Elsewhere we find him speaking of the Eucharist as a “sacrament,” the “banquet of the Lord,” or “of God,” the “sacra- ment of the bread and cup” (Kaye’s E. H. p. 447). St. Cyprian attests another point, where he is blaming those presbyters, who, without waiting for the episcopal authority, dare to offer and to give them the Eucharist; in other words, to profane the Lord’s body, as it is written, “Whosoever shall eat the bread, or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord” (Ep. x. 2). And another as follows: “When water is mingled in the chalice with wine, Christians are joined with Christ, and the multitude of believers knit and united to Him on whom they believe . . . but if wine be offered alone, it begins to be the blood of Christ without us; or if water, it begins to be the multitud of believers without Christ” (Ep. liii.). St. Fulgentius is no less explicit on a third point, where he speaks “of the descent of the Holy Ghost being asked to sanctify the sacrifice of the whole church” (ad Monit. ii. 9), and of “the church asking for the descent of the Holy Ghost to consecrate the sacrifice of the body of Christ” (6. c. 10); having explained just before how it is that “the sacrifice should be offered to the whole Trinity, and yet presumed to be made to the Father alone for the descent of the Holy Ghost alone” (6. c. 6, 7). St. Optatus attests the same, though his allusion to it is incidentally, 150 years earlier. “What can be more sacrilegious,” he asks the Donatists, “than to break, raze, and remove the altars of God, where ye yourselves offered formerly, where the prayer of the people, and members of Christ, are de- posited, whither Almighty God is invoked, and whither the Holy Ghost having been asked for descends?” . . . (c. Parm. vi. 1). St. Augustine is habitually reserved, even when addressing children; but there is one passage (Serm. cviii. Ed. Ben.) where he says: “You ought to know what you have received, and what you are going to receive, and what you ought to do. The bread which you behold on the altar, sancti- fied by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That chalice, or rather what it contains, sancti- fied by the word of God, is the blood of Christ.” Here the context shews, that by “the word of God,” he means the Holy Ghost; and in addi- tion to the old meaning of τὸ ῥῆμα, those that imply the spiritual matter, he virtually repeating St. Ireneaus (Ies. iv. 18, 5; and v. 2, 3), and he St. Justin, in the first pass- age quoted and explained above from the latter. Theophilus, in conclusion, whose nephew and
successor St. Cyril was, may answer for Egypt, in an encyclical which St. Jerome thought so orthodox as to deserve translation. According to Origen of having denied that the Holy Ghost ever acts on irrational or inanimate natures, he remarks, that in asserting this, ‘‘Origen could not have reflected, that the mystic waters in baptism are consecrated by the advent of the Holy Ghost; or that the Lord’s bread, for exhibiting the body of the Saviour, which we break for our sanctification, with the holy chalice which we set on the table of the church, being both inanimate, are both sanctified by the invocation and advent of the Holy Ghost’’ (St. Hier. Ep. xcix. § 15).

We have thus before us in a few words the teaching exhibited by the liturgies in their unwritten state. Ordinary bread and wine mingled with water having been placed on the altar, an act of thanks and praise followed, after which God was invoked to send His Holy Spirit to make the bread Christ’s body, and the wine Christ’s blood. This is followed by the breaking of the bread, or the wine, and praying. Both served a double purpose, viz. as symbols to indicate, and as veils to hide, what was never intended to meet the eye. Then, over this spiritual and bloodless sacrifice, as it was then called and considered, and in union with it, prayer was offered for the welfare and conditions of men in the church militant, and commemoration of all the faithful departed in the church triumphant; everybody present joining in by responding ‘‘Amen’’ at their close. Lastly, the words ‘‘Corpus Christi,’’ ‘‘Sanguis Christi,’’ were pronounced in administering communion to each person; and each person in communicating replied ‘‘Amen’’ (St. Cyril, Cat. xxii. 21, 22, with Toutée’s Adm. § 6, and St. Aug. Serm. ccxlii. Ed. Ben.). It was thus a service, from beginning to end, in which all joined, and to which all subscribed, and of which in conclusion, the only recorded acts were, first and foremost, one of praise, followed by prayers.

Here we have several points requiring explanation: 1. The absence of any mention of the act of blessing, used by St. Paul as well as our Lord; or of the breaking the bread either, which according to Paul was also symbolical; and 2, the prominence given to the invocation of the Holy Ghost, which, so far as appears, was neither used nor enjoined by our Lord, nor by St. Paul. Certainly there must have been a very strong tradition for both one and the other, or both are inexpressible. When our Lord instituted the Eucharist, no mention was made by Him of the Holy Ghost, as though according to the remarkable words of St. John, ‘‘the Holy Ghost was not as yet’’ (vii. 30, ‘‘given,’’ in the A. V., is a gloss). Yet He had ‘‘descended and remained’’ on Jesus at His baptism, and co-operated with Him throughout His ministry, as the following passages prove (St. John i. 22, et seq.; St. Luke iv. 1, 2, and 18; St. Matt. xii. 28; with St. Mark x. 39–40; Heb. ix. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20); and of Him our Lord had Himself said emphatically, though to those who then heard Him obscurely, with special reference to this sacrament: Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐντοῦ Τὸ Κυριο-ωσόν. St. Paul too, as we have seen, in contradistinguishing between the ordinances of the law and the gospel, had expressly laid down that the reality characterising the latter was due to His action, and to that alone. How was His action to be secured then, except by prayer? As it was said even of our Lord: ‘‘It came to pass, that Jesus being baptized and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended . . . on Him’’ (St. Luke iii. 22). Man’s act in blessing and breaking was of inefflably small account, in comparison with the part performed by the Spirit of God in ministering to this sacrament its hidden gift. His descent was required in each case to make the Eucharist all it was designed to be. Naturally, therefore, what we find preoccupied the mind of the church most in celebrating it, is the prayer for His descent. Indeed, it is as though less heed had been taken of what Christ had said and done, than of what He had taught. The importance that has for so long been attached to the recital of His ‘‘ipsestima verba’’ is far from resting on any command of His. For His command was not ‘‘say,’’ but ‘‘do.’’ Further, the command that this be done is not repeated in the act of posturing, or gesture, nor the quantity nor the kind of bread, nor the mixing of the wine with water, nor the employment of any prayer whatever, can be deduced from it. But His teaching on it fills a whole chapter, and it is to this that the Fathers are certainly most alive. St. Cyprian, to be sure, writes in his Epistle to the Corinthians: ‘‘Qua passionis Ejus mentionem in sacrificio omnibus facimus . . . nihil aliud quam quod Ille fecit, facere debemus’’ (Ep. lxiii. 17). But this is indefinite. Whether His words were recited in early times, whether His actions were copied minutely, we are nowhere told—just possibly they were—but the key-note to the unwritten liturgy beyond dispute consists in what the Holy Ghost is asked in it to do for man. As St. Ambrose says in a parallel case: ‘‘They ask, Divinity grants; they officiate, Heaven confers the gifts’’ (De Ep. S. iii. 18). And St. Jerome more distinctly: ‘‘What can a server of tables (or of altar) mean by placing himself above those (priests and bishops) at whose prayers (not acts or words, gestures or bidding) the consecration of the body and blood of Christ takes place?’’ (Ep. clxi. ad Ec. § 1).

Further, ‘‘Which of the saints left us this prayer in writing?’’ asks St. Basil (De Ep. S. § 86). Lastly, the principle of this prayer was maintained long after it had been shaken virtually by the additions that, in process of time, found their way into the Western liturgies, and from them came to be copied even in the Eastern at last.

This is proved incontestably from the following fact: viz. that all through the period of which we treat, that part of the liturgy where consecration takes place was called in the West 'preces' or 'oratio,' and not 'canon,' as now. Thus Tertullian in a passage before quoted speaks of those ‘‘who thought that on station-days they should absent themselves from the prayers at the sacrifice.’’ And St. Cyprian, in the singular number, opposes the "prayer" at the sacrifices to the "private prayers" that were said at home (Ep. xv.). Elsewhere he speaks with reprobation of those schismatics ‘‘who dared to erect another altar, and frame with unlawful expressions another prayer . . .’’ (De Unit. Eccl. c. 17), that prayer, for which the priest, after a
suitable preface, prepared the minds of the brethren by exclaming "Lift up your hearts" (De Orat. Dom. c. 31). And St. Augustine no less explicitly: "We call that the body of Christ which taken from the fruits of the earth, and duly consecrated by the mystical prayer, we receive for our spiritual health, in remembrance of His dying for us; and which invested with its visible form by the hands of man, is not sanctified to be so great a sacrament, but by the unseen action of the Holy Ghost" (De Trin. iii. 4 ad fin.). Upon another occasion, indeed, he tells us that he preferred making a distinction, in common with nearly the whole church: "Ut procioniones acipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, aequum illud, quod est in Donum mensae, incipiat benefici: orationes, cum benedictur, et sanctificetur, et ad distribuendum communitur: quam totam petitionem fere omnis ecclesia Dominici oratione concilitat" (Ep. clxxii. 16). Notwithstanding, in the next century, pope Vigilius, after distinguishing between the variable part of the liturgy and this which is always added, says: "Quoniam et ipsoe communicacione precis textum diecrimus subter adjectum, quem Deo propitio ex apostolica traditione accipimus..." (Ep. ii. ad Profut. § 5). Similarly, pope Gregory, who perhaps was the first to apply the term "canon" to this prayer in one place (Ep. lib. xiv. 2 ad fin.), says in another (lib. ix. ind. 2, Ep. 12): "Orationem Dominum in imprimis misericordiam suscipiendam, quia nos Apostolorum fuit, ut ad istam solummodo orationem obligationis hostiam consecrarent." On the other hand another contemporary, St. Isidore, following St. Augustine, throws additional light on his distinction thus: "Sexta exhine oratio: sucede conformitati sacramenti: ut oblati quae Deo offeratur, sanctificatae prie Spiritum Sanctum, Christi corporis et sanguinis conformetur" (De Exe. Off. i. 15). Even Amalaritus had not forgotten this term in the 9th century, commenting on the ritual then in use: "Perseverant retrò stantes inclinati, usque dum finiatur omnis processus oratio: id est, usque dum dicitur post orationem Dominicam: Sede libera post officium, sicut Neor had another commentator of the Roman school forgot its intention: "Quam consecrationem corporis et sanguinis Dominici ideb semper in silentio arbitror celebrari, quia Sanctus in suis manens Spiritus eundem sacramentorum latenter operatur effeclum: unde et Graecè mysterium dicitur, quod secretum et reconcitiam habeat dispositionem" (Martene, de Ant. Rit. i. 4, 11). But in the 11th, Berno, while letting pope Gregory speak in his own words, as before quoted, resumes the general subject as follows: "Hac de canonie, qui et actio dicitur, licet sunt." The old terminology, vigorous as was its protest to the last, had at length crumbled away before new dogma. To say all ad more noteworthy, as the Greek equivalent, ἐκκορομάστηκας, was of much later date. Suicer (s. v. Κορομάστηκας, II. B.) volunteers an assertion respecting this prayer, unsupported, as was natural, by any proof, because totally groundless. We consider that it has been shown on the clearest evidence that all the liturgies without exception, including the Roman, in the earlier times, made consecration, or sanctification, of the elements consist in this prayer.

Of written liturgies, probably, but one remains in the original form in which it was penned, in whatever age it was penned, viz. that of the eighth book of the so-called 'Apostolical Constitutions.' St. Epiphanius may be supposed to refer to it, with some probability, when designating the apostles ἀντίγραφος ἀρχήρ (Haer. ixxix. 3, quoted by Le Brun, Épisc. iii. 38). It was never altered or simplified because it was never used in any church, as Mr. Palmer says (Orig. Lit. i. 38). Who composed it is a question variously answered by conjecture, but never solved (n. Cotel. i. 195). It affects to have been the joint work of the apostles, like the creed called after them: but, unlike the creed, it belonged to no church. It is thus a pseudo-demonic composition that acquired prestige solely from the honoured name—St. Clement of Rome—that was made to vouch for it. Its consecration prayer (c. 12) is called the Constitution of St. James the Great, and that part of it which alone concerns us here, translated in the main by Bingham (xv. 3, 11), runs thus: "We therefore in common with all the things which Christ suffered for us give thanks to Thee, Almighty God, not as Thou deservest, and as we ought, but as we are able, so fulfilling our command. For He in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread in His holy and immaculate hands, and looking up to Thee His God and Father, He brake it and gave to His disciples saying: This is the mystery of the New Testament: take of it and eat this: it is My body, which is broken for many, for the remission of sins. This do in remembrance of Me. Likewise the cup mingled of wine and water, after He had sanctified it, He gave them saying: Drink ye all of it: for this is My blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins in My remembrance of Me. For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew forth My death till I come. "We therefore being mindful of His passion, and death, and resurrection from the dead, and His return into heaven, and also of His second coming, when He shall return with power and glory to judge the quick and the dead, and His works, do offer unto Thee, our King and God, this bread and this cup according to Thy apointment: giving thanks to Thee by Him, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to let us stand before Thee and minister unto Thee, and we beseech Thee to look propitiously upon these gifts here set before Thee, and to accept them favourably to the honour of Thy Christ, and to send Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice—the Spirit that is witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus—that He may (ἀφορμήσῃ) declare this break the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ: that all who partake thereof may be confirmed in godliness and obtain remission of sins: may be delivered from the just deserts of his errors; may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and being made worthy of Christ and sanctified to Thee, O Lord Almighty, may obtain eternal life." Strange as it may seem, the portion of this most familiar to English ears—for he is the same night... till I come"—was to primitive ears almost certainly, or we should have found some reference to it in the earlier Fathers, had it entered into the untranslated
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liturgies. It is scarcely credible, for instance, that had it stood in the liturgy commented on by St. Cyril, he should have passed it over without a word. Now what was the liturgy commented on by St. Cyril, if not that of Jerusalem? But is that same liturgy, as it stands now, we have this very passage reproduced nearly word for word, or in some cases amplified. There can be no question, therefore, which borrowed from the other. It is reproduced in the Alexandrian, in St. Basil's, St. Chrysostom's, and in all the other written liturgies extant similarly, not excepting the Roman, with this difference: that in the Eastern, the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost which follows it is uniformly retained; in the Roman, and those which copied subsequently from the Roman, this prayer is as uniformly discarded: "Itaque memorae passionis Eius" being there made to take a new turn just at that point: and the prayer preceding the words of institution being so framed as if to compensate for its omission in some depictions without impairing the effect of what followed.

For in the West this picture of the Last Supper, apocryphal though it was in part, as it professed to come direct from St. Clement, became the parent of a modification of dogmas, though this also was of spurious birth. It is not St. Ambrose who first of all brought it to the West, as he is said for the first time: "Quomodo potest qui panis est, corpus esse Christi? Consacratae. Consacratum autem quibus verbis est, et cujus sermo- moenus? Domini Jesu... Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficet sacramentum." (De Sacr. iv. 4.) And: "Antequam consecrarit panis est: ubi autem verba Christi accesserint corpus est Christi... et ante verba Christi calix est vini et aquae pienus: ubi verba Christi operata fuerint, ibi sanguis Christi efficitur... Ergo sive quoties gnobilis potens est sermo Christi universa convertere" (ibid. 5), thus making their being pronounced by the priest or by Christ all one, and attributing to their bare recital the exact efficacy ascribed to the Holy Ghost (Cant. xxiii. 7). It may be urged that St. Ambrose, in a work generally thought to be his, had expressed the same view (De Myst. § 52-4); but it is expressed just in three sections, which are consecutive, and too unlike the rest to be genuine. Besides, at the end of it, the treatise we have the following: "In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi. Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est... corpus enim Dei corpus est spiritale: corpus Christi corpus est divini Spiritus, quia Spiritus Christi" (§ 58; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 45). This passage is studiously kept out of sight in De Sacramentis, in the work, St. Ambrose says of the Holy Ghost: "Qui in oblata" (De Esp. S. § 112): and of the effect of His action: "Nos autem quotiescumque sacramenta sumimus, quae per sacra orationis mysteriwm in carne transiguntur et sanguinem mortem Domini annuantum" (De Fide et Grat. § 124). On the other hand, the Pseudo-Cyprian agrees doctrinally with the Pseudo-Ambrose: "Ex quo a Domino dictum est: Hoc facite in Meam commemorationem; haec est caro Mea, et hic est sanguis Meus: quotiescumque hic verbis et hic foed actum est, panis iste super-substantialis et calix benedictionis solenni sacra-...
strangely fails to recognised, and by his instance would prevent others from recognising what this prayer was. It was no prayer peculiar to these liturgies by any means. It was the old prayer common to all liturgies in primitive times, which the Roman church had by then not only transposed, but transformed. Its substitution of the terms "canon" or "action," for the "prayer" this part of the liturgy was conceived in the same spirit. Other Western churches, by adopting the Roman canon, gradually lost sight of their ancient doctrine. In the East, where this prayer was and is still maintained in every liturgy, whatever else may have been changed, the teaching of the Fathers on the Eucharist was never departed from—either among the sects, or by the orthodox—in the period of which we treat. Two passages may serve for its commencement and close. "These coals," says St. Ephrem, on Ezek. x. 2, "and the man clothed in fine linen, that bringeth and casteth them upon the people, are a type of the priest, by whose mediatorship the living coals of this altar of Eucharist of our Lord are given away. But see, there is another cherub that reacheth them forth, and placeth them in his fists; this is a type of shew that it is not the priest who is able to make the body of the bread, but another: to wit, the Holy Ghost" (Oxford Tr. p. 146, note d). And St. John Damascene: "God said, this is my body a remembrance of Me: and by His Almighty command it is done till He come. Till He come, for thus He said: and being invoked, the rain descends on this new corn-land, to wit, the power of the Holy Ghost overshadowing it... Do you ask now, how the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine and water His blood? I do not know of what this body is composed, and works what is alike beyond thought and word." (De Fid. orthodox. iv. 13). "Sextcenta sunt testimonia veterum quibus idem astraire," says Le Quien (ad 1. Comp. Pfaffi's Dis. de Concass. ad S. Iran. Prag. vol. ii). And it is equally true that none can be produced where this is denied. Controversialists have made the most of a passage from the sermon on the rich man in the New Testament: "the betrayal of Judas" (torn. ii. 384, ed. Montf.), which runs thus: "The same Christ who prepared that table, prepares ours now. For it is not man who makes the elements become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, who was crucified for us. The priest in the discharge of his office pronounces those words: but it is the power and grace of God. 'This,' he says, 'is My body.' This word transforms them. This word, once spoken, effects the sacrifice prepared in the churches on every table from then till now, and till His coming." St. Chrysostom, it is quite possible, may have been engaged just then in accommodating the form of consecration in the Cenacle liturgy to that of his own church, which it, at any rate, bears now. Yet the point of his teaching, after all, consists in this: that he asserts consecration distinctly not to be the act of the priest, but of God; so that the question is merely, to which of the three persons in the Trinity should his phrase "the power and grace of God" be applied? Not to his first person on the Feast of Pentecost: "when your bishop," he says, "stands at this holy table, about to offer that tremendous sacrifice—the initiated know what I mean—and when, before touching the gift thereon, he prays that the grace of the Lord may be with you, and you answer, with thine spirit: you remind yourselves by the very words you use, that he who stands there is not the agent, neither is it human nature that operates on those gifts in any way; but it is the grace of the Holy Ghost descending on them, and present in every case that sanctifies that main sacrifice" (q. ii. 463). Thus, when he expands his meaning, it amounts to this: that consecration is due to Christ in one sense, as is shewn by using His words; in another to the Holy Ghost, as is shewn by invoking Him; but in no sense to man. Man, therefore, cannot obtain it, without distinctly praying for it, under say circumstances. Such, again, is the doctrine, not of St. Chrysostom merely, but of all the Fathers (v. Toutoudi, Dia. iii. § 96, de Doct. S. Cyr.).

One more set of passages, and we shall be able to exhibit their meaning in the clearest light. St. Irenaeus (Haer. iv. 33; and v. 2) and Tertullian (adv. Marc. iv. 40; and v. 8) both appealed to the Eucharist as the body of which our Lord assumed. How, asked Tertullian, can there be a figure of a nonentity? What he meant by this was, not that the Eucharist was no more than a figure, but that its outward and visible part was a figure of what was hidden under it that was truly real, and to which it points. To this in Proculius, patris calich sacramentarium, probavimus corporis et sanguinis Dominici veritatem adversus phantasmatum Marcionis," as he says. In later times, when Eutyches asserted of our Lord that His human nature was absorbed in His divine, the Eucharist was brought forward again in disproof of this, and in a way that explained all the previous teaching of the Fathers thereon to ainity, beyond cavil.

Nowhere could this be found expressed more lucidly than by Pearson on the Creed (Art. iii. 202 et seq., with the notes). His authorities are St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ephremius, and the tract of Pope Gelasius already cited. It is true, though not surprising, that strong objections have been made to his sermon on times on these arguments. Rambler, as a work of Gelasius: but the fact of its being quoted as such on dogmas, within about thirty years of its being written, by two such authorities as St. Fulgentius (Ep. xiv. 19) and Pope John II. (Ep. iii. add fin.) alone disposes of them. "That then which he disputes against," says Pearson, "is the transubstantiation of the human nature into the divine." The argument which he employs against it is drawn from the Eucharist: "Certé sacramenta quae summinus corporis et sanguinis Christi divina res est, propot quod et per eadem diviniae efficiuntur consortes naturae: et tamen esse non deminut substantia vel natura ponis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudine corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysterii celebratur. Satis ergò nobis evidentur ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Denimo sentiumd quad in Ejus imagine profectum, celebramus, et suminus."... We curtail this passage, to give what follows from Thodoret entire (Dial. ii. p. 122): "You have discussed on the divine mysteries, most opportunely," says the heretic Eunapius: "for I will shew you that the body of our Lord is changed into another nature. Please,
then, answer my questions." Says the Orthodoxos; - "E. "What then do you call the gift which is offered, before the invocation of the priest?" O. "I must not speak too plainly, lest there be some present who are not initiated." - E. "Answer then enigmatically." O. "Food of such and such grains." - E. "And the other symbol, how do you call that?" O. "This toe has a common name, signifying a kind of drink." - E. "But, after consecration, how do you call them?" O. "The body and blood of Christ." - E. "And is it your belief that you receive the body and blood of Christ?" O. "Yes." - E. "As, then, the symbols of the body and blood of our Lord are one thing before the invocation by the priest, and after that are changed, and become another, so the body of our Lord after His ascension was changed into the Divine substance?" O. "You are taken in the net you have just woven. For neither are the mystical symbols after consecration robbed of their own nature; but, on the contrary, they remain in their own substance, and there are seen and touched just as before. That which they have become is indeed an object of thought and faith; and is adored as being what it is believed to be. Compare, then, the image with the archetype, and you will see their resemblance. For the type must needs correspond with the prototype. This body has its origin to be in the substance, shape, form, and figure; in a word, its bodily substance, though it has become immortal since the resurrection, and superior to decay; and having been placed in a seat on the right hand, is adored by every creature, being styled the body of the Lord of all." - E. "But the mystical symbol changes its former appellation—for it is no longer called by its former name—but it is called the body. The truth, then, should be called God, and not the body." O. "You betray your ignorance, as it seems to me. It is called not only body, but the bread of life. It was so designated by the Lord Himself. And of the body itself we say that it is divine, life-giving, and ever-blessed; just as it is common to no man, but belongs to our Lord Jesus Christ, who is both God and Man..."

Praising the passage from St. Chrysostom, as only known as yet through a translation, through Nestathion admits its full force (Op. iii. 742), we cannot refrain from adding the following sentence from Ephraim, at the close of a singularly dogmatic argument, in his own words: Eλήντη καὶ ἐν τῷ πρωσάετε κατένευ, ἀλλ’ οὔτως εἰ εἰσέχει δύναυτά τούτον ἔχουσαι, δι’ ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ψυλαργοῦ καὶ ἀλφατρυγμίτης, καὶ δρατός καὶ δοριτώς· ὡς καὶ τὰ πάρα τῶν πιστῶν ἑκατέρους, σώμα Ἱησοῦ καὶ τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ, ἑτέρως εἰς ἁγία καὶ ἀμώμην, ἕνως μὲν, ἑνώς δὲ ἑνώς ἀδικίας ἡμῶν μείναι χάριτος (ap. Phot. Bibl. cxix. p. 794, ed. Schott). Ephraim was patriarch of Antioch in the 6th century; Theodoret a suffragan of Antioch in the 5th; St. Chrysostom, before becoming patriarch of Constantinople, was ordained priest at Antioch in the 4th; Gelasius, who was the abbot of the monastery of St. John at Mount Sinai, founded the foundation of the monastery in the 5th century, and after his death it was continued by his monks. Thus in these four authorities, besides the weight that belongs to them respectively, we have the dogmatic teaching of the churches of Antioch and Constantinople, Africa and Rome, represented for three centuries, as evoked by heresy. Yet this, after all, is not their chief merit. It is their chief merit, that they prove what the mind of the Fathers was, on all the points to which they relate, the sacristies, all their various modes of expressing it to the minutest details. For they show that, in the judgment of their predecessors and contemporaries, the Eucharist consisted of two parts, that ever remained, and were to be kept, therefore, distinct: one cognerible by the senses, the other by the mind alone. "Bád dicasum sacramenta, quia in alias videtur, alius intelligitur," as St. Fulgentius quotes from St. Augustine (Ep. xii. 25). Consequently, the sign and the thing signified belonging to a different order all along—the spiritual and material—the laws regulating the one could not affect the other. Hence too, there could be neither substantiation, nor consubstantiation, nor impanation, in the manner of their connexion: the difference between them being as radical as the difference between soul and body. Yet they were far from being connected in the same way. They never constituted one substance any more than the soul is constituted as a substance. Only in the state of grace, for a temporary purpose, so it left them uncombined. The sole change wrought by it consisted in the accession of a new element distinct from, although to be conveyed with, the other. Both passed into the mouth of the receiver simultaneously, yet separated the next moment: the sign by a profession of faith, the substance by a profession of grace. The body of Christ, as a part of his bodily frame: the other, conversely, to be the means of assimilating his soul to Christ, not Christ to him: or else to be withdrawn instantaneously, should he have partaken in unbelieving or unrepented sin. Thus to confound them—to say that one was merged in the other, or otherwise done away with—was sacramental Eutychianism. The condition of their conjunction was held to be, that the substance, no less than the properties or characteristics of both, was preserved intact: so that the whole might be designated to the last, and without impropriety, by either name: though in practice devout Christians ordinarily preferred one name to the other. Yet, even in what concerns the ascertainment of the Liturgy, the priest is made to say: "Fac nobis hanc oblationem sacramentum, nautam, rationalem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis D. N. I. Christi..." (Op. ii. 371). And St. Fulgentius, in his most dogmatic work: "Firmissime tene, et nultaneus dubites, quia unigenitum Deum varhum carmen formem... S. pro nobis obtulisse sacrificium, et hostiam Deo in orodem suavissit: Cui, cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto... sacrificium panis et Vinis, in fide et caritate, sancta catholica ecclesia per universum orbem terrae offere non esset... in isto autem sacrificio, gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulimus, et sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus esuisit..." (De Fide, c. 19). Yet compare this with what he says in the same dogmatic of his epistles, where the ordinances of the Old and New Testament are contrasted: "In ipso sacrificio corporis Christi a gratiarum actione incipimus, ut Christum non solum mundum Sanctum, sed ipsum nobis, natiua veritate resupcrans in sanguinem nostrum, et non sanguinem quem pro nobis idem Deus esuisit..." (Ep. xiv. § 44). Here we have the same father teaching in each...
case, and what he had called in one "the sacrifice of bread and wine," he calls in the other differently, "the sacrifice," or "oblation, of the body and blood of Christ." Albeit his consistency comes out in a moment, when he is understood to be speaking of the outward part of the sacrament in one place, and of the inward in the other.

Another African bishop, Facundus of Hermoinae, says: "Sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrate, corpus Ejus et sanguinem dicimus, non quod prærior corpus Ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguin: sed quod in se mysterium corporis Ejus sanguinique continent —that is, veiled under them (Def. Trium Corp. ix. 5).

On the same principle, whether the priest said "the body," as in the Gelasian; or "the figure of the body," as in the Ambrosian Liturgy, when he prayed, made no difference. He meant the same thing. It mattered not that St. Cyril, in c. 20 of his discourse, told the faithful that what he offered in baptism was "the figure of the body and blood of Christ:" and in putting the same into their hands, said "the body," or "the blood, of Christ," to which he bade them respond "Amen," in c. 21 and 22. Universally, when the Fathers speak of this sacrament as a type or figure, they mean only so far as its other effect is concerned; when they speak of it as a reality, they are just as far from asserting that it had ceased to be, or could be no longer called, a type. True, there was no reference to the type, when it was administered, or after it had been received, for the type went for nothing to the receiver. "Auditis corporis," says St. Augustine, "et respondetis, Amen. Et sumit corpus Christi, ut verum sit Amen." Eating and digesting the outward part could do nobody the least good, unless the inward part was similarly fed upon in the soul.

It should be added that, in this passage, the phrase "corpus Christi" bears two senses, not one. In other words, Christ has two bodies; one, with which he was born and rose, the other which is the sum of his Church or, his mystical body, called the Church. Of these the last owes all its life to the first: yet so, that participation in the life bestowed by the first is limited to those who compose the last. The act of the Holy Ghost at the font engraves men members of the last: and then, subsequently, the act of the Holy Ghost at the altar supplies them with the first to be their food through life. "For we, being many, are one bread—one body—for we are all partakers of that one bread": as the apostle says. And this, as St. Augustine sees, is also symbolised in the Eucharist: "Unus panis: quis est iesus panis us? Unum corpus multi. Recolite quia panis non sit de una grae, sed de multis . . . et sic de vine. Fratres, recolite unde sit vinum. Grana multa pendent ad botrum: sed liquor granorum in unitate confuditur. Ista et Dominus Christus nos significavit, nos ad se pertinere voluit, mystericum pacis et unitatis nostrae in suum meum consecravit." (Serm. ccixii. ed. Ben.)

Thus, as long as the Holy Ghost was invoked, and wherever he is invoked still, to consecrate, never was any confusion of terms or extravagance of thought, or unwise reasoning witnessed in discoursing on the Eucharist. God being held to be the actor throughout exclusively, reason was never applied to for explanations; nor was any miracle pre-supposed, beyond that of love. It was the natural action of the Infinite upon the finite which the Fathers considered to be sought in that prayer, and the answer to it they held to be that Christ became present on earth, yet being still in heaven, was communicated to thousands, yet received entirely by all; multiplied without increasing in bulk, consumed without the withdrawal of a particle from his actual body. Infinite agency being assumed, such results would ensue naturally, just as naturally as finite results from a finite cause.

To, then, to the same extent that they held Christ to be present in the Eucharist, they held the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, though they denied it to be distinct from the sacrifice offered upon the cross. Hence the same varieties of expression occur that were noticed before. If St. Chrysostom applies to it the epithets "awful" and "tremendous," he calls it also "spiritual" and "holy", but never "sacrament"; he speaks of it as a "propitiation." SS. Guadens and Augustine speak of it as a "figure" of the Passion. Indeed, the latter goes so far as to say, in one of his most careful works, that morality forbade too literal a construction of St. John vi. 53. "Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubens Figura cum pax et pacificis processit passionem communicandum; et suavitatem utilem recondendum in memoriam, quod pro nobis eam Ejus crucifixus et vulnerata sit." (De Doct. Christ. vii. 16). "One sacrifice cleansed us," says St. Chrysostom, "there is no other . . . . The apostle, consequently, keeps repeating this at every turn, one priest, one sacrifice, lest thees that there were many should encourage people to think they might sin with impunity" (1 Heb. vii. Hom. xiii. 3). "What, then, do we not offer daily? Of course we do, but in remembrance of His death; and this is one, and not many. How one, and not many? As having been once offered, like what was offered in the holy of holies, which perished not; for our offering is always, one lamb to-day, and another to-morrow, but always the same; so that it is one sacrifice. Or else, from being offered in many places, must it not follow that there are many Christs? Certainly not. Christ is one everywhere, and entire everywhere— one body. He, then, who is offered in many places being one, not many bodies, so the sacrifice is also one, our High Priest being the offerer of the sacrifice that cleanses us. And this, which both was offered then, and is inexhaustible, we still offer; and offer in remembrance of what then took place in obedience to His command. Unlike the high priest under the law, who offered a different sacrifice from day to day, what we offer is always the same; or rather, what is done is in the commemoration of a sacrifice" (ib. c. x. Hom. xvii. 3). "Far from offering," says Theodoret, "another sacrifice, we perpetuate the memory of that saving one" (ad Heb. ix. 4, 5). Thus it was a sacrifice of remembrance, from their point of view; and whatever efficacy they ascribed to it in this way was active, not absorptive.

Still, as St. Paul taught that Christ had an "unchangeable," that is, an "abiding" priesthood, and "ever liveth to make intercession for us" (Heb. vii. 24; comp. 3 and 25), it could not...
be but that He had an abiding sacrifice, "some-
what also to offer," in the words of the same
teacher (ib. viii. 3). And what could that be
but His own human nature that was crucified
once for all? He was "the Lamb slain from
the foundation of the world" in the words of
another apostle (Rev. xii. 8), "that taketh,"
not takest, "away the sin of the world"; in the
words of the Baptist (St. John i. 29). He had
described His body as being given, and His blood
as being shed, Himself before the actual event
occurred, to signify that the offering of both on
His part was continual. His humanity was thus
a ceaseless and abiding sacrifice wherever it was.
It was being offered whole and entire by Himself
in heaven. It was being offered whole and entire
by His Spirit on earth. Hence, whenever Fathers
term the Eucharist a "spiritual sacrifice" from
this point of view, they mean not only that it was
immaterial and impalpable, but that it became
this strictly, by the action of the Holy Spirit in
making Christ crucified present, and that repre-
sentation, as it were, transformed the sacrifice
no less as a sacrament, its real as well as its
figurative side. For though the sacrifice of the
cross was not renewed, the Eucharist was
identified with it in each case through Christ,
who was present; and therefore, so far, each
celebration of the Eucharist might be called, and
was called, by this light, that it was not
more natural than the heart-stirring prayer
for the whole church which, in all the primitive
liturgies without exception, immediately follows
consecration, while Christ was present objec-
tively through the action of the Holy Ghost
previously to His being received. Surely this
was to address God "in a time when He might
be found," as the Psalmist says (xxx. 6); and, as
in words already quoted from St. Cyril, was
believed then.

Lastly, this description of sacrifice both ori-
ginal and received illustrates another, in
which St. Paul elsewhere dwells (Rom. xi. 34). For this was an immediate and objectively due to their having
been made temples of the Holy Ghost: and ultim-
ately, to the redemption wrought by Christ
for man. Further, it is a sacrifice which is at
core real and spiritual. Our bodies are there,
but they are to be mortified, not slaughtered,
says Theodoret (ad. 1). There is to be no more
repetition even of the crucifixion in their case
than in Christ's. What is required is that
they should be presented to God in the full
spirit of that sacrifice, whole and entire, their
acceptability with Him depending upon it alone.
As Origen says: "Paulus obsercat credentes in
Christo, ut aliquid in suis templo hostiam
sanctam, placentem Deo, viventem dicit
hostiam, quae vitam, hoc est, Christum in se
gerit. . . . sanctam dicit, in quâ Sanctus Spiritus
habitat . . . placentem Deo, utpote a pecca-
tatis separatam?" (ad loc.). St. Chrysostom adds:
"By reasonable service, is meant walking after
the Spirit; leading the life which Christ led."
(ad 1). This offering of our bodies, then, is not
real, because it is spiritual; nor has the sacrifice
upon the cross to be repeated to be thus applied.

It is true that the references in the Fathers to
this subjective sacrifice are neither full nor fre-
quent. Johnson only quotes two such in his
Appendix: one from St. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat.
li. Apol. c. 95, the other from Eusebius (Dem.
Evangel. ii. 10, ad fin.) who says: "Accordingly
we offer both sacrifices and incense; at one time
celebrating the memorial of the great sacrifice,
according to the mystic rites delivered to us by
Him, and presenting the thanksgiving for our
salvation to God in pious hymns and prayers;
at another, consecrating ourselves wholly to
Him, and to His high-priest, the Word; dedi-
cated to Him in soul and body?"

Eusebius makes a distinction here between the
objective and subjective offerings: calling the one
sacrifice, and the other incense. More than this,
from the order in which he has named them, he
may be supposed to refer to the consecration and
post-communion prayers in his own Liturgy. Of
these the first is common to all liturgies; the
second, which may compare with the second of
our own post-communion collects, occupies the
same place in that of St. James alone, but the
prominence given to the subjective offering in
our first post-communion collect is probably
without parallel "in this part of the ancient
liturgies," as Mr. Palmer says (Orig, Lit. c. iv.
§ 22).

In conclusion, the Fathers often apply the
term "sacrifice" to the Eucharist, objectively
as well as subjectively, from other points of
view besides the above. No celebration of the
Eucharist could pray, or should pray, in
which the sacrifice of prayer and praise was not
included, and this was of course subjective.
No celebration, again, could take place without
a solemn oblation of the bread and wine. This
was objective, but it was also material; and
hence was bloodless, without being spiritual.
Thus there was a material oblation of the outward
part of the sacrament as well as a spiritual of
the inward to be taken into account. Now,
as the Fathers frequently pass from one point
of view to another in their varied descriptions,
all the more care should be taken to discriminate
between their different meanings, and to render
to each its due weight. Perhaps, too, their attention
on some points is as deserving of notice as their
"consensus" on others.

1. Their "consensus" is very marked in inter-
preting the following passages of the Eucha-
rist: Gen. xiv. 18-20; Malachi i. 11; St. John
v. 51-53; and Heb. xiii. 10—for which mod-
erns have tried to find other meanings. It is
unnecessary to do more than refer to the pas-
sages quoted in Johnson's Appendix, supplemented
or elucidated by Wilberforce (Euch. chap. vii. xi.)
on this head. But two inferences were drawn by
them from these texts, one which has been aban-
doncd long since, the other which regulates prac-
tice still. From the first, they inferred that it was indispensable for every
baptized person to communicate. Accordingly for
eight centuries, according to Bingham (xiii. l. 2,
and xiv. 4, 1), communion was administered regu-
larly to infants as well as adults—as soon as
they had been baptized and confirmed—and in
both kinds of course. From regarding the
Eucharist as a sacrifice, they were led to infer
it could not be celebrated by any below a priest.
Now the words, "Go ye, and teach all nations,
baptizing them," &c., were spoken as exclusively
to the apostles as the words, "Do this in remem-
brance of me." Why, then, should either com-
mand have been relaxed at all, or if at all, why not
both in the same degree? Besides, in the New Testament, we read of the apostles ordaining deacons, presbyters, and bishops, but never priests. However, the Fathers are both unanimous in considering the offices of presbyter and priest identical, and in denying that the Eucharist would be celebrated by any who were not priests, while conceding that, in emergencies, even a layman might baptize (sac. Baptism). Nor was unworthiness in the minister held to invalidate this sacrament any more than the other. Further, they were no less unanimous in looking upon it as prefigured in the passover, the manna, the shew-bread, the offering of fine flour, &c., and here, too, there were several maxims current among them in consequence. "Una est domus Ecclesiae," says the Pseudo-Cyprian, epitomising them (App. ad Op. S. Cyr. p. cxv. ed. Ben.). "In qui agnus editur: nullus ei communicat, quem Israelitici nominis generisitas non commendat;" excommunication, as well as the exclusion of the unbaptized, may be traced to this. "Hijus panis figura fuit manna, quod in deserto sustinebat Alitum versus sanitatem in sacramento promissionis ventum est, cibus iste defect. . . . Panis iste Angelorum omne delectamentum habens virtute mirifici, omnibus qui digné et devoté sumunt, secundum desiderium sumum sapit, et amplius quàm manna illud eremi implicit et satiat edendum appetitus" (ib.); spiritual communications may be traced to this.

2. Contrariwise, such passages as St. Luke xxiv. 36-39; St. John x. 19, 20, and 26, 27; and 1 Cor. xiv. 42-50, are passed over, comparatively, by the Fathers untouched: as though they shrank from measuring the facts recorded in the two first by the dogmatic teaching of the third. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." . . . As it is written: "the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." For this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." And certainly Christ, in shewing Himself to His disciples after His resurrection, said: "Flesh and bones are not able"—not flesh and bones, but a body like this—"to have everlasting life and dominion." Notwithstanding, we talk of His "natural body" to this day, as though St. Paul had never spoken: as though its properties and composition had undergone no change, when it was "raised in glory:" as though it was still held in subjection to all the laws, physical and material, under which He was graciously pleased it should be born.

Assuredly the Fathers never asserted this, or anything like this, in maintaining its identity. What dispensed them from speculating on its glorified attributes in this case was, that they looked to nothing short of omnipotence to effect its presence: and affirmed, "unus ore," consecration to be the act of the Third Person in the Godhead.

It only remains to be shown that, in the opinion of the Fathers, to receive the Eucharist without proper dispositions, was to receive the sign without the thing signified: and to room damnation in so receiving. (Art. EXCOMMUNICATION.) There was no place for the "onus operatur," as it is called, in the system. The words of two writers of the 7th and 8th centuries respectively—whose works consist of passages from the Fathers dovetailed—are sufficient to attest this. St. Hildegardus says: "Post regenerationem nativitatis spirituale, post gratiam coelestis uctionis . . . convenit jam per venire ad participationem coelestis refectionis." Eorum enim est diocere, Pater noster, Qui est in coelis, qui jam Patre tali regenerati sunt et aqua et spiritu, ut confidenter petant dicere, Paternum quominus illum meum hic possum Christum dari nobis quotidie petimus, ut qui in Christo manemus et vivimus, a sanctificatione et corpore Christi non recedamus . . . Hoc enim et manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potass, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc, qui non manet in Christo et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio sec manducat Eius carmen, nescibit Eius sauginem: etiamtati teae sacramentum ad judicium sibi maiusculert et habuit" (De Cps. Bapt. c. 136). And Leidrad, still more explicitly: "et illum est: et illum est in Christo, ut illum sit in virtute sacramenti. Salus autem et vita aeterna non est ex terris in sacramentum: nam hoc etiam infeudes sumere possint: sed interius sumon potest in virtute sacramenti, quae non sumitur nisi ab his qui veraciter sunt pi et fideis: et imitatores Dei, sicut filii carissimi, et ambulant in dilectione, aut et Christus dilexit eos . . . Quod autem interius sit in virtute sacramenti, quare invisibilis praestat ablationem, sanctificationem, et vitam—sicut aqua baptismatis, uctio christmatis, et corpus ac saugus Domini—nullus utique fidelinor ignorat . . . Proper quot aula esse secures debet de perceptione sacramentorum, nisi virtutem invisibilitatem tenet et custodit. Haec igitur omnia ideo tali modo diciunt. Quo nisi sumus exponem opusculo plebeo dominus nobis commissam." (De Sacram. Bapt. c. 16)

This is as outspoken as it is true.

Works on the Eucharist illustrative of the teaching of this period are not as easily named as might be supposed. Learned, but not always impartial or exact exponents of its dogmas, are not to be found in Marchedd, Concord. Patr.; Kep, Tertullian; Bingham, Hist. xiii.-xv.; Assenini, Diss. ad Cod. Liturg. vol. iv.; Renaudot, Diss. ad Liturg. Orient. vol. i.; Le Brun, Diss. in Explic. de la Messes, vol. iii.; Mabillon, de Liturg. Gall.; Muratorii, Diss. in Liturg. Rom. vol. i.; Gour, Euchol. Illustrat.; Palmer, Diss. in Orig. Liturg. vol. i. and vol. ii. c. iv.; and Neile, Eastern Ch. Introd. bk. iii. To another class belong the Schoolmen on Bk. iv. Diss. 8-13 of the Sentences, or extracts from the Fathers, of Peter Lombard. Tracts of Bessarion and others at the time of the Council of Florence in Renaudot, Gennadii et al. Opusc.; De la Bigue, Bibl. Pat. vol. iii. and the Libriepistul. of the Euchologion, &c., in Greek and Latin, Paris, 1560. To a 3rd, Albertin, de Euchar. Sacram.; Tottet, Diss. ad S. Cyril. ii. 9-12; Sausaux, Panop. Socor. ii. 1.; Suicer, Thesaur. a. v. "Synaxis," Pfaff, Diss. ad S. Iren. Praem. vol. i. and ii.; Mede, Christian Sacrifice; Hicks, Christian Priesthood; Wurder, A. Br. de De Sacri. Conc. N. C. tr. of the S. opus. by M. de Smet, an execution course, &c.; Lake, Sermon on St. Matt. xxvi. 26-8; Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, and Willerforce, Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. [E. S. H.]}
EUCHARIUS (Eucharius), bishop of Valerina c. A.D. 492. He was deprived by Gelsius I. for maladministration of the revenues of his diocese. Ammianus and Ugelhi suppose him to have been deprived by Gelsius II. and consequently to have lived a.D. 1119. Cappelletti gives reasons for considering this an error. (Sulpicio Ammiano, Vercorin di P. v.; Valerina, Ec. p. 91; Ugelhi, Itat. Sacr. i. 349; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xviii. 213.) [R. S. G.]

EUCHARIUS (1), brother of Ephrius, and martyred at the same time [Euphlius], is said to have been a bishop, about a.d. 362, and by some is considered founder of the church of Treves. In the legend of Maternus, bishop of Cologne, the see of Treves was founded in the 1st century, and Maternus, Eucharius, and Valerias were the first bishops. (Greg. Tur. Vit. Pat. cap. 17, § 4, p. 1237; Gall. Chef. xiii. p. 371; Ozanam, La Cie. Cn. chez les Francs, c. 20, 21.) [J. G.]

EUCHARIUS (2), the head of the clerical body of Constantinople after the deposition of Nestorius. He is addressed as "Iliustri-simus" by the council of Ephesus in 431 on the day when sentence was passed on Nestorius, and enjoined, along with the presbyters, the deacon, and the rest of the clergy, to take charge of every thing pertaining to the church of Constantinople, and render an account to whoever should be appointed in the room of Nestorius. (Mansi, Concil. iv. p. 1226.) [C. H.]

EUCHARIUS (3), bishop of Durrbachium (Durnes) in Epirus. Present at the council of Ephesus, a.d. 431. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 240; Mansi, iv. 1153.) [J. de S.]

EUCHARIUS (4), Eucharius, 17th bishop of Tongres (afflata Linea), following Quirinus. The Sammaritani place his accession about a.d. 487, while others say 527 or 535. He is believed to have been the brother of his successor Falco, (Ital. Christ. iii. 817.) [C. H.]

EUCHARIUS (5) II. appears in the Gallis Christianis (iii. 818). 19th bishop of Tongres, succeeding Falco and followed by Dominianus, consecrated in a.d. 512. Though an anonymous catalogue asserts that he was a son of a count of Flanders and a princess of England, and that after an episcopate of three years he died and was buried at Utrecht, such a statement is of course absurd; nothing certain is known of him, and the Series of Gams (p. 248) does not recognise his existence. His name, however, is found in Herigerus in the order above given, and Agitius accompanies some rather vague praise with the statement that he was believed to have died Feb. 27. (See Chapeaule, qui Gesta Pontificium, fol. om. p. 37.) [S. A. B.]

EUCHARIUS (6), fifteenth in the list of the bishops of Châlons-sur-Marne, succeeding Papius and followed by Tattinodus, about the middle of the 6th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 862; Le Comte, Ann. Eccl. Franc. a. 580 n. iii. tom. ii. 197; Gams, Series Episc. 554.) [S. A. B.]

EUCHERIA, wife of Dynamius Patricius, according to an ancient epiphany. (Duchesne, Hist. Franc. Scriptores, i. 518.) [C. H.]

EUCHERIUS (1), St., bishop of Lyons in the 5th century. The date of birth is uncertain, but it most probably falls within the last quarter of the 4th century. He became bishop about a.d. 434, and may perhaps be considered as the most distinguished occupant of the see of Lyons, St. Irmenius alone excepted. He died in a.d. 440 or 450.

Name.—Eucherius is a Latinized form of the Greek ëxuchêos (skilled-of-hand), which, in its earlier shape ëxûros, first appears in legendary narratives, as a fitting name for an artist (cf. Sophocles, Oed. Col. 472, árphs ëxûros têxên) and was subsequently assigned to real persons. The feminine form, Eucheria, is also found.

Authorities.—Sidonius Apollinaris, Epist. Lib. iii. 8. St. Ildorius, de Ecclesiastica Scriptoribus, cap. xv. Genadius, de Illustriis Ecclesiis Scriptoribus, cap. lixiIII. Cassianus, some of whose Collationes (xi.—xviii.) are addressed to Eucherius and Honoratus. [CASSIANUS.] Also notices in the works of mm. Claudianus, St. Dodocus of Nola, and others; the acknowledged writings of Eucherius (see below) and the acts of the first council of Orange (Concil. Aroacum) in a.d. 441. (Labe, Concil. tom. i. p. 1783, ed. Parisii, 1715.) Alone, among the fourteen prelates signing the acts of this council, Eucherius adds, after the word subscrit, "sanctorum sacrodocum commovit super his expectaturus assensuum;" thus apparently claiming the rights of a metropolitan, inasmuch as the term sacerdotes here seems from the context to mean bishops.

Life.—Eucherius was born in a high social position, and it seems probable that either his father, Valerianus, or else a cousin of the same name, was nearly connected with Avitus, who in a.d. 455 exchanged the comparatively safe position of a noble among the Arverni (Auvergne) for the more precarious one of an emperor of the West, at Rome, from which he was deposed in the following year. Eucherius married a lady of his own station, named Galla. The issue of this marriage was a family of four children; two daughters, Consortia and Volusia, and two sons, Salonius and Veranius. The sons received an ecclesiastical education in the monastery of Lerinum under St. Honoratus and Salvianus; and both were consecrated to the title of the bishop of the monastery on the Books of Kings falsely ascribed to Eucherius, to have been raised, during the lifetime of their father, to the episcopal dignity.

The civic duties of Eucherius (we do not know their exact nature) appear to have been discharged conscientiously and vigorously. Sidonius Apollinaris is loud in the praise of his friend as a layman, and compares him (Epist. viii.) to the Brutus and Torquati of old. But the world, certainly at that date in a very turbulent and unsettled condition, palled upon Eucherius, and he became desirous of some tranquil retreat from its cares and temptations. Accordingly, while in the vigour of life, he retired to the island of Lerinum, the smaller of the two islands now known as the Lérins, off Antibes, in the modern French department of Var; and subsequently to the larger one of Lero, now called Sainte-Mar-
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quam amoena sunt quereantibus Christum illa secretae, quae longe latique, naturali excelsae, prorecta sunt. Silent omnia. Tunc in Deum suum laeta mens quisquidam silentii stimulis excitatur, tunc inefabilibus vegetatur excelsibus. It seems possible, that some real love of nature is here combined with religious transport.

2. Epistola paraenetica ad Valentinum aquatum. "De contemptu mundi et vacuaria philosophia." The tone of this letter much more resembles that which would be adopted towards a kinsmen than a parent. Moreover the parental relationship would have been given in the title. Its date is probably about A.D. 492. Eucherius evidently intends to induce his highly-placed and wealthy kinsman to resign his station and riches, and follow him in retirement from the world. Valerian is reminded of the many saintly doctors of the church who had once occupied an exalted secular position; such as Clement of Rome, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius Basilius, and others. The Latin of this epistle is flowing and even elegant. Despite a certain amount of rhetorical redundancy, characteristic of the age, it was the approbation of the slightly fastidious Ermias, who published an edition of it, accompanied by Scholia, at Basle, A.D. 1520.

3. De orator spirituallis intellectu [al formis spirituallis intellectu] ad Veranum filium. This work has been sometimes mistakenly ascribed to Bede, who frequently quotes it. It is a defence of the lawfulness of the allegorical sense of Scripture, pleading on its behalf the testimony of Scripture itself; as e.g. Ps. cxix. [cxvii. A.V.] 2, and the use of such phrases as "the land of God," "the eyes of the Lord," etc. which cannot be taken ad literam. However, the literal sense has its place for history, as well as the moral, and allegorical. This treatise occupies nearly seventeen folio pages. It certainly does display a very extensive acquaintance with the Bible and anticipates many favorite sages
eresults of modern commentaries. It is known by the term amagoge (traversy) for the application of scripture to the heavenly Jerusalem, identification of the digites Dei with the Holy Spirit (St. Luke xi. 20, with St. Matt. xii. 28) and the like.

4. Instructionum Libri duo ad Salomonem filiam. Of this treatise a book discoursing in allegories in the Old and New Testament, the latter of Hebrew names. In lib. i. the author discusses the scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; the permission of polygamy to the patriarchs; the existence of evil, which (with many other divines) he makes simply the privation of good, &c. The second book does not seem to display any very deep and mystic acquaintance with Hebrew, but it was something to denote any study to a language known to few of the fathers except Origen and Jerome. Eucherius quotes with much respect the version of the O.T. by Aquila.

5. Homiliae. These are given at the end of the second Oecesiastic of Theodosius Vitalis in an edition published by Livinus at Antwerp a.d. 1602.

6. Epitome Operum Cassianiem. This is ascribed to our author by some; but it is lost, so that we have no internal evidence to guide us. The
respect entertained for Cassian by Eucherius makes such a compilation on the part of the latter by no means improbable.

8. Historia Passiones S. Maurici et Sociorum Martyrum Lejionis Felicia Theobalds Agaunensis. There is no cognate internal evidence in favour of the ascription of this narrative to Eucherius, and hence it is reckoned by some as doubtful. But there does not seem to be sufficient ground for impugning the traditional belief concerning the authorship. For a discussion of its contents see MAURICIUS.

9. De Statu Animae. This is assigned to our author by Claudianus Mamertus, bishop of Vienne.

Other treatises and homilies are extant, which must, however, be decidedly abjured from Eucherius; such are the following.

1. Commentarius in Genesis. 2. Commentarium in Libros Regum Libri IV. 3. Sacrorum Capitula Scripturam. These works are all composed in a style very different from that of the works of Lyons. That one of the books of Kings contains an eulogy (lib. iii. cap. 18) on the senator Cassidorus, who was not born until some twenty years after the death of Eucherius. Moreover St. Gregory the Great is cited, who was born about 540, nearly a century after the same event. In the same category must be ranked 4. Epistola ad Paulum; 5. Epistola ad Piiatium; 6. Regula duplex ad Monachos. 7. Homiliarum Collectio, a set of sermons which is variously ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa, or to Gallicanus.

Editions.—There is no complete edition of the writings of Eucherius. For this article recourse has been had to the Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum (Lugduni, A.D. 1677 (tom. vi. p. 822), for Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4: with which may be compared the Bibliotheca Patrum (Colom. A.D. 1618, tom. v. p. 1) of an edition by Brasius (Basill. A.D. 1551); the Chronologia et Fastae Lejonesis by Vincentius Barnalis (Lugduni, A.D. 1613) and the list of Eucherius contained in their continuation, which was begun in his Biblioth. Patr. Lat. tom. ii. cap. v. § 36. The account of St. Maurice (No. 5 in the above list) was edited in an inconsistent and indefinite shape by L. Surius, and in a not much better condition by Mommitzus. At length Father Chifflet, S. J., found a copy in a celebrated monastery of the Jura, and his copy has been adopted by Ruinart, who has given it, with copious notes, in his Acta Martyrum (2nd ed. Amstelodami, A.D. 1713).

Some confusion has arisen from the existence of a second Eucherius, who must have flourished a century later. [EUCHERIUS (4).] Some have maintained that Lyonnais was also the see of this Eucherius. But of this there is no trustworthy evidence. It has been made the subject of a dissertation by Jos. Antelmius Assertio pro unico S. Eucherio Lugdunensi episcopo (Paris, 1728).

[J. G. C.]

EUCHERIUS (2), ST., placed first in the series of the bishops of Viviers by Gams, and fourth by the authors of the Gallia Christiana, succeeding St. Maupicius, and followed by St. Firminus, but his position in the list is a matter of conjecture, and his date is unknown. Gams dates the fifth bishop A.D. 432. (Gall. Christ. rrr. 542; Gams, Series Episc. 556.) [S. A. B.]
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later elevated to a position of honour by France, bishop of Liège. He is commemorated Feb. 20.
(Gall. Christ. viii. 1417; Baron. A. E. an. 741.
i. Sigeib. Gmbhac. Chron. in Bouquet. iii. 346.)

[S. A. B.]

EUCHERIUS (9) (LEXICIARUS), twenty-eighth in the very untrustworthy lists of the bishops of Geneva, succeeding Huportonus, and followed by Gubertus, in the last half of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. xvi. 384; Gams, Series Episc. 277.)

[S. A. B.]

EUCHERIUS (9) FLAVIUS, consul, with Flavius Evagrius, when Gregory Nazianzen made his will. (Greg. Naz. Test.)

[E. V.]

EUCHERIUS (10), eldest son of Stilicho by Serena. His birth, which took place at Rome in 389, is celebrated by Claudian (de Laud. Stil. iii. 176 foll.). Orosius (Hist. vii. 37, 38) and Philostratus (Hist. xii. 2) accuse Stilicho of having designs upon the empire for his son (cf. Soz. Hist. vi. 46). Zosimus (v. 39) represents Eucherius, son of Stilicho, as the charge as a lamb of Olympius. Eucherius, who, according to Orosius (vii. 38), was from his early years an enemy of the Christian faith and bent on persecuting it, in order to please the barbarians restore the heathen temples and destroyed Christian churches. When his father was seized at Ravenna (A.D. 408), Eucherius fled to Rome, and took refuge in a temple. Orders arrived from Honorius to put him to death, and they were executed by the eunuchs Arscarius and Terentius, just before the arrival of Alaric (Philost. xii. 3; Zosim. v. 34).

[M. F. A.]

EUCHERIUS (11), addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (Eppl. iii. 8), who describes him as exercising the virtues of the old Roman statesman with slight reward from the degenerate times. He was probably the senator whose death by the treachery of duke Victorinus, the officer of Eutric the Visigoth, is related by Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. ii. 20).

[E. R. S.]


[J. G.]

EUCHITES. Doctrines and Practices.—At the beginning of the last quarter or 4th century or a little earlier, fanatics made their appearance in Syria, whose manner of life was said to have been introduced from Mesopotamia, and who were known by the Syriac name of Messalians or Messalians (τῆς Μεσσαλίας, praying people, Ἡρακλ. οὖσα τῆς Βαλδαίς. found in the Chaldee (Daniel vii. 11, Ezra vi. 10). Epiphanius, whose account of these people is the last article (80) of his work on heresies, translates the name (ἐβύθριος, but in the next generation the Messalians had obtained a technical name in Greek also, and were known as Euchites (ἐβύθριος or ἑβύθριος). Their chief characteristic was that they professed to give themselves entirely to prayer, refusing to do any work, and living by begging; in this differing from the Christian monks of the time, who supported themselves by the labour of their hands. A further difference was that they were of both sexes, who went about together; nay, in summer weather lying down and sleeping in the streets, men and women promiscuously, as persons who had renounced the world, and had no possession or habitation of their own. Epiphanius willing to believe that much impurity resulted from this practice, but does not pretend to have any knowledge of this as a fact. Epiphanius dates the commencement of this sect from the reign of Constantius, who died A.D. 361. Theodoret, who speaks of it (Hy. E. iv. 11; Haer. Fab. iv. 13), places its beginning a few years later under Valentinian. There does not seem to be any real foundation for the charge that the Euchites were derived from the Manichees. Epiphaniusconnects them with the heathen devotees whom he calls Euphemites, and who it seems had also been known as Messalians, and it is quite possible that before the Christian Euchites, sages had gone about in these regions, unconnected with Christianity, who under pretence of devotion lived an idle life. The Euchites appear never to have made any entrance into the West, but in the East, though probably at no time very numerous, they are heard of for centuries; and when the Bogomiles of the 12th century appeared, the name Messalian still survived, and the new heretics were supposed, and perhaps with truth, to be descendants of the ancient sect.

In the time of Epiphanius the Messalians would seem to be scarcely entitled to be called a sect. He describes them as having no settled system and no recognised leader; and he does not impute to them no error of doctrine, but only criticizes their manner of life. He tells, for instance, that they had no regard for the church times of fasting, and no fixed times for eating, but, when after their prayers they were hungry, they ate and drank such food as they could get, no matter what the hour or season might be. Epiphanius states also that one of these people would claim to be any person you might name to him: name our Blessed Lord Himself, or any angel, prophet, or patriarch, and he would say that that was himself.

Two accounts of Euchite doctrine are apparently of greater antiquity than the authors who preserve them. One is given by Timotheus (de Exceptione Haer. in Coteller's Mon. Eccl. Gr. iii. 400). This writer was a presbyter of the church of Constantinople, and his date cannot be more closely assigned than as of the 6th century. The coincidences of his account with the notices of Theodoret are too numerous to be well explained except on the supposition that both used common sources. These sources probably were the acts of the councils of Antioch and Side, presently to be mentioned, which contained summaries of Messalian doctrine. Theodoret may possibly also
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have used a Messalian cook called Asceticus, the doctrines of which, Photius tells us, had been exposed and anathematized at the council of Ephesus 431. But in any case it is likely that the same book furnished the heads of the ignoble doctrine of the Messalians taken from their own book," which are given by Ioannes Damascenus (de Haer. ap. Coteler, Mon. Eccl. Gr. L. 302, and Opp. Le Quen. l. 95), but which would seem also (see Wolf, Hist. Bogomil. p. 11) to have been separately preserved in two MSS. at Leipzig (Acta Eruditorum, 1696, p. 299; 1699, p. 157; and in the Bodleian, Cod. Baroc. 185). From these sources we derive either the theory in which the Euchite practices originated, or else one which was soon devised to justify them.

They held then that in consequence of Adam's sin every one had from his birth a demon, substantially united to his soul, which incited him to sin. For the expulsion of this demon baptism was ineffectual. Dealing only with past sin it did but shear off the surface growth, and did not touch the root of the evil. The true remedy was intense, concentrated prayer, continued till it produced the restitution and the volitions banished (καταδίωκε). In this the soul felt as sensible a consciousness of union with its heavenly bridegroom as an earthly bride in the embraces of her husband. Then the demon went out in the spirit or in the mucus of the nose, or was seen to depart in smoke or in dust, and there was in like manner sensible evidence of the entrance of the Holy Spirit. St. Augustine (Haer. 57), who here had some sources of information independent of Ephphanius, whom in this part of his work he has been abridging, ascribes to them a fancy that the Holy Spirit might be seen to enter in the appearance of innocuous fire, and the demon to pass out of the man's mouth in the form of a sow with her farrow. Possibly language intended by them metaphorically was misunderstood; for they described the soul of him who had not Christ in him as the abode of serpents and venomous beasts. They further thought he who was possessed and passioned in a demoniacal state could see the Holy Trinity with his bodily eye; that the three hypostases of the Trinität coalesced into one, which united itself with worthy souls. This doctrine no doubt furnishes the key to the account given by Ephphanius of the effacement of the sense of distinct personality in members of this sect. They held that in the passionless state at which they aimed a man might attain a perfection in which sin was impossible to him; he needed neither instruction for his soul nor fasting to discipline his body, for delicate food and luxurious living, which might be a temptation to others, could stir no evil desire in him. It is probably a misconception of their doctrine to suppose that they held his privileges extended to being guilty of licentious conduct without falling from his perfection. The soul of him who was "spiritual," for such they boasted themselves to be, was changed into the divine nature; he could see things invisible to others. It is not improbable of them used to dance by way of trampling on the demons which they saw, a practice from which they were called Choreutes. It is not wonderful to read that, absorbed in their mystic contemplation, they used to sleep great part of their time away; but the things they saw in their dreams, they took for realities, and boasted that they then acquired a knowledge of future events, that they saw the right road to the departed souls, and that they could read men's hearts. Both sexes might partake of this divine illumination, and they had female teachers, whom they honoured not only more than ordinary laymen, but more than the clergy. The use of the Lord's Supper they looked on as a thing indifferent; it could neither benefit the worthy nor harm the unworthy receiver; but there was no reason for separating from the church by refusing to partake of it. Indeed, so little did they wish to break with the church that they were said to have no scruple about denying and anathematizing their doctrines, a charge which seems to have been founded on the behaviour of the first convicted heretics of this sect, concerning which we shall speak presently. It has been already said that they refused manual labour, and lured by begging; and they disregarded all the ordinary forms of Christian charity in comparison of the merit of bestowing alms on one of their number. They had anything to say about our Lord's humanity, of which the most intelligible is that the body which He assumed had been full of demons, which it was necessary for Him to expel.

History.—The first whom we read of as a leader of the sect is Adelphius, and Adelphians was one of the many names which were known. He was neither priest nor monk, but an ordinary layman, and was of Mesopotamia. Ephphanius speaks of the Messalians of his time as not having any recognized leader, but he mentions that they came from Mesopotamia. Theodoret tells us that Flavian bishop of Antioch, having learned that Messalian doctrine was being propagated at Edessa (probably from the statement of Messalians in his own diocese that they had there been taught), sent a body of monks to bring the false teachers to Antioch. There they denied their doctrines, and charged their accusers with calumny. Flavian then used an artifice to have the accused by Adelphian means in the case of the Bogomiles. He affected to take the part of the accused, treated Adelphius, who was an old man, with great respect, and led him to believe that he would find in an aged bishop one able to understand and sympathize with views, which younger men rejected only from want of experience. Adelphius, having been thus enticed into a full disclosure of his sentiments, was rebuked in the words addressed by Daniel to the wicked elder (Susanna, 52) and punished as convicted out of his own mouth. He and his party were beaten, excommunicated and banished, and were not allowed, as they wished, the alternative of recantation, insomuch as no confidence was felt in their sincerity, especially because they were found communicating by writing in friendly terms with Messalians whom they had anathematized. We consider that it was on this occasion Flavian held a synod against the Messalians (Photius, 52) attended by three other bishops, namely of Seleucia, of Mesopotamian bishop, Martines, described by Photius as bishop of the Sulpicians, and Samus), and by about thirty priests and deacons. Besides Adelphius there were condemned on this occasion two persons named
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Sabas, one of them a monk and a synuchus, Eustathius of Edessa, Dadoes, Herman, Symeon, and others. Flavian wrote to the bishops of Edessa and its neighbourhood, acquainting them with what had been done, and received from them an approving reply. The Messalianists who had been banished from Syria went to Pamphylia, and there met new antagonists. They were again condemned by a council of twenty-five bishops held at Side and presided over by the celebrated Amphiloctius of Iconium. The council sent a synodical letter to Flavian, informing him of their proceedings, and in the Acts Amphiloctius gave a full statement of the Messalian tenets expressed in their own words. It is possible that the substance of this statement is preserved for us in the work of Timothy already referred to. Photius represents the synod at Antioch just mentioned as having been called in consequence of the synodical letter from Side, but this is more than doubtful. On comparing Photius with Theodoret, it seems plain that both narratives contain truth and falsehood. Amphiloctius and Theodoret mentions only one set of proceedings at Antioch, viz., that which ended in the banishment of the Euchites to Pamphylia. It is unlikely that after their expulsion they would or could have returned to Antioch to receive a new condemnation; and the synodical acts at Antioch contain no letter to Photius giving the council’s approval of anything done at Side, but only a letter to Edessa, as might be expected if the occasion of the council was that which we have assigned to it. We regard, therefore, Photius as misled by finding in the volume which he used the acts of the synod at Side coming before those of that at Antioch; and it is remarkable that Theodoret also, in his Eccl. Hist., mentions the proceedings in Pamphylia before mentioning those which resulted in the banishment of the Messalianists to Pamphylia. We cannot pretend to fix the year of these proceedings, but a date somewhere about 390 will not be very far wrong.

Other measures were taken against the Messalianists in Armenia also. Lecius bishop of Melitene by letter asked and obtained information from Flavian as to the proceedings against them in Antioch. Finding some monasteries in his diocese infected by this heresy, he set fire to these dens of robbers, and hunted the wolves from his sheepfold. A less zealous Armenian bishop was rebuked by Flavian for favour shown to these heretics. In Pamphylia the contest with them lasted for several years. The leaders on the orthodox side were another Amphiloctius, bishop of Side, and Verininus bishop of Perga. They were stimulated to their task by energetic letters from Atticus bishop of Constantinople, and later, in a.d. 426, from the Great Synod of Sisinius, the successor of Atticus, in which Theodotus of Antioch and another bishop named Neon are mentioned by Photius as having taken active parts. Messalianism had probably at that time given some trouble in Constantinople itself. Nilius (de Vol. Pap. ad Magnan, 21) complained to the bishop of Morina, Mesopotamia, Alexander, who polluted Constantinople with like teaching, and against whom he contends that the idleness they inculcated, instead of being an aid to devotion, gave scope to evil thoughts and evil passions, and was inimical to the true spirit of prayer. Tillemont has conjectured that this was the Alexander who about this time founded the order of the ademéte (see Dict. Christ. Anti.), but the identification is far from certain. There is no corroborative evidence that the latter was a heretic save that his name has not been honoured with the prefix of saint; and it is not likely that his institutions would have met with the success it did, if it could be represented as a scheme devised by a notorious Messalian to carry out the notions of his sect as to the duty of incessant prayer.

During the interval between the accession of Sisinius and the council of Ephesus in 431, John of Antioch wrote to Nestorius about the Messalianists, and Theodosius legislated against them (xxvi. Cod. Theod. de Haer., vol. vi. p. 187). At Ephesus Valerian of Iconium, and Amphiloctius of Side, in the name of the bishops of Lycaonia and Pamphylia, obtained from the council a confirmation of the decrees made against the Euchites at Constantinople in 428. They also desired the bishops of the Galatian church to read the Messalian book called Ascetics, passages from which Valerian laid before the synod. (Mansi, iv. 1477.) Fabricius names Agapius, and Walch Adelphius as the author of this book, but the writer is really unknown. These proceedings at Ephesus were unknown to Gregory the Great (Ep. ad Alex., ad. Norsem., ad. Nysa, c. 361), but are mentioned by Photius, and the decree was read at the second council of Nicæa. (Mansi, xii. 1025.) The cause of Gregory’s oversight may have been that his correspondent cited to him as Ephesine the acts of the council of Antioch, and that Gregory searched the Ephesian acts in vain for the names of Adelphius and Sabas. We learn from the Ephesian decree that Messalianism had also been condemned at Alexandria, and Timotheus mentions Cyril as an antagonist of these heretics. There is a passage (Pp. ad Caloryrium, prefixed to the tract Ad. Anthymop., vii. 363) in which Cyril rebukes certain monks who refused to work, and made picture for licence, but it is not even sure that these monks were Euchites. The articles of the Ascetics were the subject of twenty-four anathemas by Archelaus (who occupied the see of Cæsarea in Cappadocia some time between the two Ephesine synods of 431 and 440, being at the latter date a different bishop in that see) and of two letters by Hippolytus of Nysa, who also may be placed about 440. The next Euchite leader of whom we read is Lampetius. He was so prominent that his followers were called after him Lampetians, and he is said to have been the first of the sect who attained the dignity of the priesthood. He had been ordained by Alypius, whom we know, from a correspondence as being the bishop of Cæsarea, the successor of the first bishop of Cæsarea (Cappadocia) in 458. He was accused to Alypius by the presbyter Gerontius, superior of the monks at Gilitis, on the charge of undue familiarity with women, of unseemly language on the subject, of scoffing at those who took part in the musical services of the church, and of being a melos when they ought to make melody only in their hearts, and of other Euchite doctrines and practices. The examination of the charge was delegated by Alypius to Hermias, bishop of Comana, and the result was that Lampetius was
EUROBERRY

deemed and degraded from the priesthood.
He wrote a work called the Testament, to which
an answer was written by the Monophysite
Severus, who afterwards became bishop of
Antioch. A fragment of this answer is pre-
served in a catena belonging to New College,
Oxford. (Wolf, Ascendota Graecos, iii. 182.) It
insists on the duty of praising God, not with
the heart only, but with the voice also.
The same catena contains an extract from another work
of Severus against the Euchites, an epistle to a
bishop Solomon. This extract accounts for the
cessation of miracles in the Christian church.
Photius tells that in Rhinocorura two persons
named Alpheus, one of them a bishop, defended
the orthodoxy of this Lampeitus, and were in
consequence deposed. He learned this from a
letter written by Photias, another bishop of the
same district, to Timotheus of Alexandria.
There have been at Alexandria several bishops of that
name, but it is likely that the Timotheus
intended is he who was contemporary with
Lampeitus, and who died from 460 to 482.
The next Messalian leader of which we read
(ju Timotheus) is a money-changer named
Marian, who lived in the middle of the 6th
century, and from whom these sectaries came
to be called by the somewhat confusing name
of Marcionites. The correspondence of Gregory
the Great, already referred to, arose out of the
controversy which used this term. The See was
tr建立 in the West, in 595, of one John, a presbyter of
Chalcedon. He appealed to the pope, who pro-
nounced him orthodox, complaining that he had
not even been able to make out from his accusers
what the heresy of Marcionism was.

In the 7th century Maximus, in his scholia on the
Pseudo Dionysius (II. 89), charges those whom
he describes by the various equivalent names of
Lampetianus, Messalianus, Apollonis, and Marcianis,
with writing but three years to ascetic
life, and abandoning the rest of their life to all
manner of debauchery. Assemani (Bibl. Or.
vel. ill. pt. 2, p. 170), in his account of the
schisms, states that the Syrian Nestorians
fleeing from Oriental sources several notices, reaching from the
year 577 to 694, of the attempts of the
Nestorians to put down Messalianism, in which
mention is made of the averse of these heretics
to the use of the Lord's Supper, to fasting, and
to church psalmody. The article in Photius on
anti-Messalian literature, already cited, implies
that the sect was, in his time, not yet extinct.

We hear no more of the Messalians till the
breaking out of the Bogomil heresy in the
12th century. The history of that controversy
lies out of the period embraced by this
dic-tionary. What was asserted by the writers of the
period concerning the early history of the
sect may be conveniently consulted in Tellius
(Joseph Itin. Ital.), where is found the work
on the Messalians of Euthymius Zigabenus, with
extracts relating to these heretics from Con-
tantine Harnopolus, and Michael Psellus.
Euthymius, for instance, ascribes the origin of the
sect to a certain Peter, or Wolf, Peter, so
called because the spectators, assembled to
witness the fulfillment of his promise that after three
days he would rise again, saw only the demon
in the form of a wolf escaping from the cairn
under which he lay; and he speaks of a certain
Tychicus, his disciple, who corrupted and mis-
interpreted the Scriptures, especially the Gospel
according to St. Matthew. Harnopolus com-
plies of their abominating the cross, holding
the Virgin and John the Baptist in no honour,
breaking marriages, and allowing those who
would to mutilate themselves, and he ascribes
certain immoral teaching to one Eleutherus, a
Paphlogian. Psellus circumstantially tells of
these heretics the old stories of "Oedipodean
intercourse" and "Thyestean banquets." All these
things, for which no early authority can be cited,
may safely be set aside. A later revival of
Messalian ideas took place in the mysteries
of Mount Athos of the 14th century.

To the various names already mentioned by
which the Euchites were known may be added
that of "Enthusiasts," given by Theodoret, which
is used in some of the decrees against them; and
"Eustathians," given by Timotheus. There was
a Messalian Eustathius of Edessa, but this name
was probably derived from the better known
Eustathius of Sebaste. The name Psalliani only
originated in a transcriber's error. We have
already referred to the corruption of this article by
the principal ancient writers who speak of the
Messalians. We have only to add references to
Ephrem Syrus (Opp. Syr.-Lat. ii. 485). A
passage quoted from his Testament is proved by
the Syriac to have been an interpolation in the
Greek text (Opp. Gr.-Lat. ii. 242, 403; Assemani,
Bibl. Or. i. 145). There is also reference in Jerome
most usefully be consulted are Tillemont, viii.
530; Walch, Hist. der Ketz. iii. 418; and
Neander, Ch. Hist. iii. 323.

[ G. S. ]

EURODOLIS (EURODOLIS, ASCIALIZUS, ACHOS-
lius), a man at Constantinople sobemared to
assassinate the Patriarch Macedonius. The attempt
failed, and Macedonius showed a questionable
kindness by ordering gifts to be presented to him.
xxxvi. part i. 576; Thoph. Chronicon. 108.)

[W. M. C.]

EUROSOCIA (Eurosocia), wife of the orator and poet
Delphius, described as a noble matron of
Bordeaux. After the rescript of Gratian,
381, against the Priscillians, when Priscillian,
accompanied by Instantius and Salvianus, under-
took a journey through Gaul to Italy to clear
themselves and their party before pope Damasus
of the charges against them, after being repelled
by the bishop of Bordeaux, Delphius, they
found a refuge on the lands of Eurosocia. There
they successfully sowed the seeds of their heresy.
They went on thence to Milan and Rome, accom-
panied by Eurosocius and her daughter Procula.
A crowd of others, women especially, accom-
panied them. Injured calumniations were vigor-
ously circumvented against mother and daughter
by their religious opponents. Eurosocius was
beheaded at Trevires, 386, with Priscillian and
his chief associates (Sulp. Sev. ii. 45, 51; L. Pac.
Drep. in Panayrici Vetere, xii. 29; Prosperi
Chronicon, s. a.; Ausonius, de Profess. Burdeogal.
Carm. vi.).

[M. B. C.]

EURODULIS [EUCONIUS]

EUROCRATUS, bishop, who consults Cyprian
as to the Christian lawfulness of the calling of a
EUDAEMON

stage-tutor (Cyp. Ep. 2); probably the same as Eucratius bishop of Thess, a seaport in the Byzacene province (Sant. Epiph. 29 in Concil. Carth. sub Cyp. de Bapt. 3. Cf. August. de Bapt. vi. 36). [E. W. B.]

EUDAEMON (1), bishop of Smyrna, who was prevailed upon to offer sacrifice during the persecution of Decius. A.D. 250. He was standing by when Pionius the martyr refused to sacrifice. (Euseb. vi. 15; Act. Synod. Feb. 1, 40). [T. W. D.]

EUDAEMON (8) (Eibadaur, Eusthemon), a Mysian bishop, who with others was sent by his party to the emperor Constantine, with frivolous charges against Athanasius, A.D. 328 (Socrates, H. E. i. 27; Athanasius, Apol. § 60; Baronius, s. a. 329, 1; Pagi, Crit. in loc. and s. a. 327, v.). He was bishop of Tania in the province of Augustana Prima (Le Quien, Oriens Christ., ii. 355), and was one of those who withdrew from the council of Sardica, A.D. 347, and met at Philippopolis. He also signed the synodal letter of that assembly (Mansi, iii. 139). In the Acta his name appears as Eusthemon. [T. W. D.]

EUDAEMON (3), A.D. 389, presbyter at Constantinople, who prevailed on Nectarius the metropolitan to abolish the office of Pententary Presbyter, an example followed almost throughout the Eastern church. The office had lasted rather more than 130 years, when about 389 a noble lady who had confessed to the pententary and received disciplinary advice came back shortly to confess that she had since committed adultery with a deacon. Great popular excitement arose, and Eudaemon represented to Nectarius that the only way to save the church from obloquy was to abolish the office altogether and leave participation in communion to be decided by the individual conscience. Socrates the historian received this account from Eudaemon himself. Socrates appears to have been conservative in the matter, for he said to Eudaemon, "Whether, O presbyter, your counsel has been profitable to the church or otherwise, God will make it known. But I see that it takes away the means of rebuking another one's faults, and prevents our acting upon that precept of the apostle, Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reproue them." (Socr. Eccl. Hist. v. 19; Sozom. Eccl. Hist. vii. 16; Bingham, xviii. 3, vol. p. 138.) [W. M. S.]


EUDAEMON (5), bishop of Lampacus, a confessor for images, commemorated by the Greeks on March 14 (Basil. Menol. 5. Baron. ad ann. 375, iii.). Baronius, who places him under Leo the Isaurian, writes the name Eudama, but his name appears to be more correctly Eusebium. There is a letter to him (num. 298) among the Epistolae Frederici A.D. 316. Theodore Studite (Patr. Gr. xxix, 1671). The Basilian Menology places him under the Iconoclasts generally. Le Quien (Or. Chr. i. 774) under Theophilus. [C. H.]


EUDO

EUDEM, clerical witness to the grant of the village of Bertus by King Ithael to the see of Llandaff in the time of bishop Berghewy, is the end of the 5th or early in the 6th century (Lid. Land. by Rees, 440-41). [J. G.]

EUDEMUS I, bishop of Patar in Lycia, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 977; Mansi, ii. 695.) [L. D.]

EUDEMUS II, bishop of Patar, one of the Lycian bishops who in A.D. 375 were reported to Basil as holding orthodox views and as desiring to enter communion with him. (Basil. Epist. 218 [405]). Eudemus of Patar was present at the council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. [E. V.]

EUDO, duke of Aquitaine at the beginning of the 8th century. Aquitaine, which in 530 had been brought directly under Frankish rule by Dagobert, in the confusion of the ensuing century became practically, though not technically, independent. The date of Eudo's accession and his origin are unknown. The supposition that he was a Merovingian, and a grandson of Charibert, on whose death in 530 Dagobert had annexed Aquitaine, has been disproved by Rabanus (Les Mérovingiens d'Aquitaine et la Chartre d'Aston, 1856, quoted by Richter and Breysig), who has shown that the document on which the theory rests is spurious.

In 719, Chilperic II. and his mayor Ragnfred made an alliance with Eudo against Charles Martel, and one of the conditions of the alliance was the recognition of the independence of Aquitaine ("Regnum et munera tradunt," Cont. Cont. 105, ap. Breysig, Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reichs, 714-741; Die Zeit Karl Martels, 1909, quoted by the same author, p. 50). The intended combined attack on Charles was unsuccessful [Charles Martel]. Eudo apparently retiring without fighting ("Eudo territus quod resistere ne valeret auffuit," Cont. Fred. 107; ap. Breysig, Karl. Mart., i. 31, note 10). Chilperic returned to Paris and was defeated at Soissons, took refuge with Eudo beyond the Loire (Gesta Fr. 58). The next year, 720, Cлотaire IV. having died, an arrangement was concluded between Charles and Eudo, by which Chilperic returned to Paris and was recognised by Charles as king of the Franks. What the position of Aquitaine was under the compact is obscure. Fauriel looks upon the treaty as a partition of the Merovingian kingdom between Charles and Eudo (Histoire de la Gaule méridionale, iii. p. 105); anyhow Eudo was to all intents and purposes independent. In the year 721, the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees, conquered Narbonne, and laid siege to Toulouse. Eudo at first defended the city, and when his leader El Samah, and drove them out of Aquitaine. (Chron. Meroving. s. a.)

There is some obscurity with regard to Eudo's connexion with the great Saracen invasion of Aquitaine ten years later, but the facts, as interpreted by Breysig, pp. 83 sqq., Fauriel, i. 115 sqq., and Drav Richter, Annalen der Geschicthe im Mittelalter sub anno, appear to be these. In the year 731 Eudo renounced his alliance with Charles, having given his daughter in marriage to Othman (Munusa), a military chief of the Saracens. (Ibid. ap. Bouquet, ii. pp. 270, 721.) Charles crossed the Loire twice during
EUDOCETUS, where she spent the few remaining years of her life in emulating the piety of her grandmother [EUDOCIA (4)], whose name she bore, and beside whom she lived. Meanwhile, however, Othman had risen against Abderrahman, and had been defeated and slain. In the following year, 732, Abderrahman made the grand Saracenic invasion, not in alliance with Eudo. On the contrary, Eudo met the invaders on the Garonne, was defeated and fled to Charles (Chron. Moissac, v. 7.) Eudo fought with Charles at the battle of Tours (Paul. Disc. Hist. Lang. vi. 45), where Abderrahman was shortly after defeated and slain. All the Frankish chronicles, except the Chron. Moissac, make Eudo the ally of Abderrahman (knowing nothing of Othman), and omit all mention of Eudo’s resistance to the invaders, or his fighting at Tours on the Frankish side (Breyssig, p. 65, note 5). Eudo was reinstated in Aquitaine, but compelled to own allegiance to Charles (Ann. Mett. 732, Breyssig, 69). In 735 Eudo died, and Charles immediately invaded Aquitaine, and brought it into direct subjection. Eventually he allowed Eudo’s son Camoul or Huimold to be duke, on condition of recognising the superiority of the Frankish king. (Cont. Fred. 109 and Ann. Mett. s. a. 742.)

EUDOCETUS. For the account given by a section of the Valentiniens why this name was given to the Saviour see Irenaeus (I. vi. 4, p. 58).

EUDOCHELIA, a lady to whom, along with two others, Euchelia and Dominica, pope Gregory the Great sends greetings through Narses Patricius, A.D. 590. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. i. ind. ix. ep. 6. Patr. Lat. Lxxvii. 450.) In another letter of 597 to Narses, here called "religious" (ib. vii. ind. xv. ep. 50), he salutes her again with Dominics, "gloriosa filiae moans," Euchelia being then dead (Patr. Lat. 880).

EUDOCIA (1), martyr, Mar. 1, born at Samaria during the reign of Trajan. In her early days she lived an immoral life, but upon hearing a report of the repentance from a tomb named Germanus she resolved to live differently, went to Theodotus the bishop, and was baptized by him. Her former admirers giving information against her, she was arrested and brought before the emperor Aurelian (? Aurelius), and as she refused to relinquish her faith she was tortured and put to death. (Men. Bas.)

EUDOCIA (2), Aug. 4; called in Rom. Mart. i. She was seized at Bethabara (Bezasbaba) with 9000 others in a raid which Saper II. made into the Roman territory in 360. She was tortured and put to death. (Assem. Mart. Orient. i. 133; Bas. Menot.; Rom. Mart.)

EUDOCIA (3) (Eucodia), eldest daughter of Valentinian III. and Eudoxia. She was carried off to Africa by Genesius with her mother and sister, and given in marriage to his son Huneric. (frag. H. E. ii. 7; Priscus, de Leg. Gent. ch. xiv.; Nicoph. H. E. xvi. 11.) She lived sixteen years with her husband, and bore him a son, Hilderic, who afterwards succeeded to the throne. At the end of this period, hounding the society of an Arian consort, she escaped to Jerusalem, where she spent the few remaining years of her life in emulating the piety of her grandmother [EUDOCIA (4)], whose name she bore, and beside whom she lived. Meanwhile, however, Othman had risen against Abderrahman, and had been defeated and slain. In the following year, 732, Abderrahman made the grand Saracenic invasion, not in alliance with Eudo. On the contrary, Eudo met the invaders on the Garonne, was defeated and fled to Charles (Chron. Moissac, v. 7.) Eudo fought with Charles at the battle of Tours (Paul. Disc. Hist. Lang. vi. 45), where Abderrahman was shortly after defeated and slain. All the Frankish chronicles, except the Chron. Moissac, make Eudo the ally of Abderrahman (knowing nothing of Othman), and omit all mention of Eudo’s resistance to the invaders, or his fighting at Tours on the Frankish side (Breyssig, p. 65, note 5). Eudo was reinstated in Aquitaine, but compelled to own allegiance to Charles (Ann. Mett. 732, Breyssig, 69). In 735 Eudo died, and Charles immediately invaded Aquitaine, and brought it into direct subjection. Eventually he allowed Eudo’s son Camoul or Huimold to be duke, on condition of recognising the superiority of the Frankish king. (Cont. Fred. 109 and Ann. Mett. s. a. 742.)

EUDOCIA (2), AELIA, empress, wife of Theodoricus II. Marcellinus in his Chronicle calls her Achiva, and places her marriage in 421.

EUDOCIA (4), AELIA, empress, wife of Theodosius II. Marcellinus in his Chronicle calls her Achiva, and places her marriage in 421.

EUDOCIA (4), AELIA, empress, wife of Theodosius II. Marcellinus in his Chronicle calls her Achiva, and places her marriage in 421.

EUDOCIA (4), AELIA, empress, wife of Theodosius II. Marcellinus in his Chronicle calls her Achiva, and places her marriage in 421.

EUDOCIA (4), AELIA, empress, wife of Theodosius II. Marcellinus in his Chronicle calls her Achiva, and places her marriage in 421.
of each, Evagrius (H. E. i. 20, 22) tells us that she restored the walls of the city and many churches, including that of St. Stephen.

Hitherto her life had been happy, but her last years were overclouded by a misunderstanding between herself and her husband, the precise cause for which it is not easy to discover. Sovereign Marcellinus tells us (sub anno 444) that during a second visit of the emperor to Jerusalem (cf. Evag. i. 20, εξ Ιωαννο- λίμας δια δεμενίαν), Theodosius sent Saturninus with orders to put to death Severus the presbyter and John the deacon, who were in attendance on Eudocia, and that she, in her indignation at this act, had Saturninus also put to death. Marcellinus assigns no cause for this. The Chron. Pasch., Nicoporous, Zonaras, &c., give a different story. They say that the emperor having been presented by a peasant with a remarkably large apple, sent it to the empress. She gave it to Paulinus, the master of the palace, who was laid up with an attack of gout. Paulinus, not knowing its provisoratory, gave it to the emperor. This roused his suspicions, and he sent for his wife, and asked her what she had done with the apple. She protested that she had eaten it; and the consequence was that Paulinus was put to death and the empress divorced. Since this account is not given by the ancient historians, it seems fair to assume that it has been exaggerated, and we may exonerate the empress, of whom all the old authorities speak so highly, from blame. Still, there was apparently some misunderstanding between her and the emperor, which led to her second visit to Jerusalem. There it was that she died. She was buried in the church of St. Stephen at Jerusalem. (Evag. H. E. i. 22) Evagrius says that there is a doubt whether this was before or after the death of Theodosius, i.e. 450, but Nicoporous (H. E. xiv. 50) places her death in 460, the fourth year of the emperor Leo, which date is accepted by Gibbon. Nicoporous further tells us that she fell for a time into the Eutychian heresy, but finally returned to the orthodox faith, on the entreaty of Pulcheria, and after consultation with Euthymius (H. E. xv. 13). This temporary lapse does not alter the general judgment of the historians, who unite in lauding her piety and manifold benefactions to the church. (See also Du Cange, Fam. August. ii. 52, 58.)

EUDOCIA (5), FABIA (FLAVIA, Isid. Pacensis, Chron. ser. 649 in Pat. Lat. xxvi. 1253 a), empress, first wife of the emperor Heraclius. She was the daughter of Rogatus, an African noble, and was already betrothed to Heraclius when he revolted against Phocas in 606. At that date she was at Constantinople with Euphania the mother of Heraclius, and Phocas, on hearing of the revolt seized them both and imprisoned them in the monastery of the New Repentance. They seem however to have escaped further violence. On Oct. 3, 610, Heraclius arrived at Constantinople, and on Oct. 6 he and Eudocia were married and crowned. Both ceremonies took place according to Theophanes in the oratory of St. Stephen in the palace, but according to the Chronicon Paschale it was at St. Sophia. Sergius the patriarch officiated. Her daughter Euphania (also called Eudocia) was born July 7, 611, her son Heraclius Junior on May 3, 612. She herself died of epilepsy on Aug. 13, or as others say, Aug. 14, 612, and was buried in the Church of the Apostles. (Chron. Pasch. ann. 610, 611, 612, 624, in Migne, Patr. Gr. cxxi. 981, 985, 1002; Theoph. Chronog. A.D. 6102, 6104, in Migne, cxxxvi. 628, 639; Du Cange, Fam. August. Byzant. 100, ed. Venice.) [T. W. D.]

EUDOCIA (6), empress, third wife of Constantine Copronymus. She is said (Du Cange, u. inf.) to have been related to the Melissian family. The date of her marriage with the emperor is not mentioned; but her predecessor Maria died in 750 and Eudocia's third see by Constantine was born in 784. At her coronation on Saturday, Apr. 1, 769, the emperor declared her Augusta, and on Apr. 3, which was Easter Day, her two elder sons Christopher and Nicoporous were by the emperor declared Caesars, and Nicetasia her youngest son Nobilissimus. All three were invested with the robes and coronets of their respective ranks, and the patriarch said the prayers. On each day the ceremony was performed in the splendid Christmas banqueting hall of the palace known as the Tribunalia or Tribunal of the Nineteen Couches, i.e. Nicetasia (cf. Du Cange, Gloss. s. v. accebiut: s. d. Constantii Episcopi Constantinopolitani, Chron. Pasch. sec. 5, p. 107, ed. Venice, 1729; p. 135, ed. Paris). Subsequently to her coronation Eudocia gave birth to a fourth son, Eudocius or Eudosius. (Theoph. Chronog. A.D. 6200, 6208, in Patr. Gr. cxxxvi. 985, 988; Du Cange, Fam. August. Byzant. p. 105, ed. Venice.) [C. H.]

EUDOCIA. See also EUDOXIA.

EUDOCIMUS (Theoph. Chronog. 395, Patr. Gr. cxxxvi. 12, ed. cxxix. 1350 a), son of Constantine Copronymus. [EUDOXIA (14)].

EUDOCIUS, a youthful member of a monastic community at Caesarea, who, having quarrelled with the superior, Sacerdos, laid complaints against him before Heliodius, Basil's successor in the episcopate, which led to Sacerdos being deprived of his office. Gregory Nazianzen wrote three letters to Eudocius on this subject, rebuking him for his ill-feeling towards his superior, and calling upon him to become reconciled to one who still retained his old affection for him. To persevere in a quarrel was to admit the devil into the heart. Gregory expresses a readiness to receive a visit from Eudocius if the winter did not hinder him. (Greg. Naz. Epist. 224, 235, 236.)

EUDOLIUS, bishop of Toul. [EUDULUS].

EUDOXIA (1), martyr at Alexandria with Athanasia her mother, and two sisters, in the reign of Diocletian. Commemorated Jan. 31. (AA. SS. Jan. ii. 1081.)

EUDOXIA (2), wife of the emperor Arcadius, and mother of Eudoxia, Pulcheria, Arcadius, Theodosius II. and Marinus. She was a daughter of Bauto (Βαύτω) the Frankish general of Gratias (Philostorg. xi. 6; Zosim. v. 33), but was brought up in the house of one of the sons of the general Promotus (Zosim. v. 3). Her marriage with the emperor was arranged by the eunuch Eutropius.
EUDOXIA

(Εὐδοξια. ad loc.). Philostorgius tells us that she inherited the qualities of her nation (εὐδοξοί θεωρόμενοι ἀνδρὶς γενέσθαι τὸν ἀνόητον). If we may trust George of Alexandria in his Life of St. Chrysostom, her parents were Christians, for the bishop is represented as appealing to their well-known piety (Vit. Chrys. ch. 41). Philostorgius attributes the degradation and subsequent execution of Eutropius to Eudoxia's emnity against him. Sozomen and Socrates, however, do not assign any particular cause for it. After the death of Eutropius, she succeeded to his influence in the state, and by her overbearing conduct made the lives of all moderate men intolerable (Sozim. v. 24). In the year 400 she received the title of Augusta (Chrom. Pasch.). During the latter years of her life she comes into notice especially as the enemy and persecutor of St. Chrysostom, and for this period Sozomen is the chief authority. At first indeed we find her supporting him in his efforts to quell the Arian heresy (viii. 8, 4), but a short time afterwards her hatred for the matter of Severianus (viii. 10, 6). Shortly afterwards, some denunciations of the bishop against women in general were represented as being directed in reality against the empress, and she begged that the council might be summoned (ch. 16), by which he was subsequently deposed. The shame which this elicited compelled her to intercede with the emperor for his recall (18, § 5). The next cause of offence was a sermon which the bishop delivered against the honour paid to a statue of the empress which she had set up near the great church (Soz. vi. 18, § 1; Soz. viii. 20). She again tried to summon a council, and St. Chrysostom inveighed against her with the words, πάλιν ἡμῶν μαῖης, πάλιν δραχύει, πάλιν ἱδανὼν τὴν κεφαλὰν οὕτως σωκεῖσθαι λαβών. Her death, which occurred on Oct. 4, 404, soon after the second banishment of the bishop, was regarded by the people as a judgment of heaven (Soz. vi. 19). Some, however, and those most clearly represented by these historians as dying before St. Chrysostom, the letter attributed to Innocent I. communicating her and her husband after the death of the bishop must be regarded as spurious. (See also Du Cange, Fam. August. 66.)

EUDOXIA (3), LICINIA, empress, wife of Valentinian III., daughter of the emperor Theodosius II. and Eudoxia. She is described by Procopius as exceedingly beautiful. Marcellinus (Chron.) places her birth in 423, one year after the marriage of her parents according to his reckoning. She was the only one of their children who lived to mature age. In 424 she was betrothed to Valentinian, upon his assumption of the title of Caesar, she being two years old, and her future husband five. The marriage took place in 437 (Marcelli). The first arrangement was that it should be solemnized at Thessalonica, as midway between the two divisions of the empire, but Valentinian in his gallantry insisted upon coming the whole way to Constantinople (Soz. vii. 44). The day of the marriage in the Chronicon Paschale is Oct. 29. Whether she had two or three children is uncertain. The Chronic. Pasch. in one place (sub ann. 457) gives the names Eudocia and Placidia, and in another (sub ann. 455) Placidia and Honorina. Tillemont supposes that Honorina and Eudocia are different names of the same child. After the death of Valentinian in 455 Maximus espoused her by force, and also married her daughter to his son Palladius. (Idatius, Chron.; Prosper. Chron.) Preferring any danger to this disgrace, she sent to Generici, and promised to betray the capital into his hands. The plot succeeded, and Maximus was put to death. Eudocia and her daughters were carried off to Africa by Generici, who married the eldest, Eudocia, to his son Hunneric. The other daughter he sent with her mother to the emperor Michael at Byzantium. (Evag. H. E. ii. 7.) This is the account of Evagrius, but the truth seems to be that she remained in Generici's hands until the reign of Leo, and that the real year of her release was 462 as it is given in Idatius's chronicle. (Cf. Priscus, Hist. Goth. c. 7.) Procopius (De Bell. Vand. i. 5) leaves the matter doubtful, since he does not give the name of the emperor. This is the last known of Eudocia, in which he appears. She then passed the rest of her life quietly at court. Her second daughter was married to a senator, Olybrius. (Evag. ad loc. &c.; Du Cange, Fam. August. 59.)

[M. F. A.]

EUDOXIA. See also EUDOCIA.

EUDOXIANI, party of Eudoxius bishop of Constantinople. [EUDOXIUS (2).]

EUDOXIUS (1), bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, mentioned in the monographies (June 23) as baptizing and ordaining St. Eustochius during the reign of the emperor Maximian, c. A.D. 290. (Basil. Hist. c. 141; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1055.)

EUDOXIUS (2), eighth bishop of Constantinople (380-370), previously bishop of Germanicia and of Antioch, one of the most influential of all the Ariums. In 311 was martyred, at Antioch, and, according to Sophronius, he was one of those whom the Roman emperors were manifestly prepared to put to death. Eudocius was one of the chief men in the Church, who showed nobler elements in his death. This was his father. The son is said to have been of a mild and agreeable disposition, talented and clever but extremely timid, and given up to pleasure. Between 324 and 331 St. Eustathius presided over the see of Antioch. Eudocius came to him seeking holy orders. Eustathius found his doctrine unsound and refused him. But in 331 Eustathius was deposed. The Ariums or Eusebians then had everything their own way, and not only admitted Eudocius to orders, but made him bishop of Germanicia, on the confines of Syria, Cilicia, and Cappadocia. This bishopric he must have held at least seventeen years, the dark period of the principal intrigues against Athanasius, and of the reigns of the sons of Constantine.

In the year 341 was held, at Antioch, the Council of the Dedication or Eucenasia, under Placillus. Eudocius of Germanicia attended. He was an Arian pure and simple, a disciple of Arius, a friend of Ennomus, and subsequently the leader of the Anomoeans party, who held that the Son was necessarily unlike the Father, not only in substance but in will. The council produced four creeds, in which the Eusebian party succeeded in making their doctrine as plausible as might be, and the second of three
became known as the "Creed of the Dedication." Athanasius says that Eudoxius was sent with Martyrius and Macedonius to take the new creed of Antioch to Italy. This new creed may, however, have been the Macrostich, or Long Formula, drawn up a few years later at another Council of Antioch. On 26 or 347 the rival councils of Sardica and Philippopolis were held. At the latter was drawn up a creed more Ariant than those of Antioch, and it was signed by Eudoxius. At the end of 347 Eudoxius was in attendance on the emperor in the West, when news came of the death of Leonius of Antioch. Exonerating himself on the plea that the affairs of Germania required his presence, he hastened to Antioch, and represented himself as nominated by the emperor to the vacant chair. Regardless of the rights of George of Laodicea, Mark of Antioch, and others who should have taken part in the election, he got himself made bishop; the matter would come to the ears of Constantius, and to preoccupy the ground, Eudoxius immediately sent off a presbyter of Antioch, named Asphalus, to make the best of the case at court. Asphalus obtained a letter from Constantius in favour of Eudoxius, and was thinking of returning to Antioch, when there arrived the deputation of the Council of Ancyrax, with sixty bishops present, who were not to be mocked. They obtained silence, and offered this explanation. "The Father is ἄνεμος, the Son is ἄνεμος." But although for twenty years Constantius had been accustomed to Eusebius of Nicomedia and Macedonius, it was not prepared for such a wretched travesty of theology. A great tumult of indignation arose on all sides in St. Sophia. The orator who was not least abashed. He obtained silence, and offered this explanation: "The Father is ἄνεμος because He honours nobody; the Son is ἄνεμος because He honours the Father." This was too much even for the resentment of the congregation, and the new cathedral re-echoed with peals of uncontrolable laughter. It is thus, says Sozomen (ii. 40), that these heretics threw to the church pieces by their captious subtilities.

The next occupation of Eudoxius must have been highly agreeable to him, the consecration of his friend Eunomius to the see of Cyrrhus. Warned by Eudoxius to conceal his opinions before so orthodox a population as that of Cyrrhus, Eunomius, before the assembly, protested that such complaints were brought to the emperor that he ordered Eudoxius to depose him. Eudoxius, terrified by menaces, wrote to Eunomius and persuaded him quietly to retire from his see.

In 356 an attack was made on Eudoxius by the Semi-Arians, who had adopted the name of his predecessor (now dead), and were called Macedonians. From Valens they got leave to hold a meeting at Lampascus. Here they signed the "Creed of the Dedication," cited Eudoxius and his party before them, and as they did set come sentenced them to deprivation; but Valens refused to confirm the proceedings. In 356, Valens, as he was setting out for the Gothic war, was induced by his wife to receive baptism from Eudoxius. In the same year he issued, doubtless under the advice of Eudoxius, an order that such bishops as had been banished by Constantius and had returned under Julian should again be exiled. Athanasius was saved only from a fifth excommunication, through the representations of the people of Alexandria.

The years during which Eudoxius and Valens acted together were troubled by portents, which many attributed to the anger of Heaven at the cruelty of Valens in banishing bishops who would not admit Eudoxius to their communities. Eudoxius died in 358. He well deserves the character which is given him by Eunomius, "the worst of all the Arians." Soc. H. E. i. 26; Socr. H. E. ii. 19, 37, 40, 43; Theoph. Chronog. § 38; Nicæph. Callist. H. E. xi. 4; Theodoret, H. E. ii. 25; Haeret. Fadh. iv. 3; Epiphanius, de Haeres. lxxiii. 2; Athanas. Ad Sörm. in
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Pater Gr. xxvi. 572, 219, 589, 274, 580, 713, 601; Hilarius, de Synod. Patr. Lat. x. 471, &c.; Liber cont. Const. Imp. §§ 685, 686, 575, &c. This Eudoxius is identical in Kollar's edition of Lambeius, Comment. de Biblioth. Casen. (1776, tom. iii. p. 418) with the author of an Oratio de Incorruptione Verbi, some excerpts of which Kollar enumerates among the MSS. of the imperial library of Vienna. [W. M. S.]

EUDOXIUS (3), a bishop in the reign of Constantius addressed in a letter by Serapion bishop of Thmusis. The letter is published by Cardinal Mai in his Classici Auctores (vol. v. p. 364), and likewise in the Patrologia Graeca (vol. xii. p. 923). The Eudoxius of this letter was a confessor who had fallen ill under the hardships he had endured, and Serapion exhorts him not to give way to despondency. (Celllier, iv. 336.) [T. W. D.]

EUDOXIUS (4), bishop of the Cimmerian Bosporus, present at the synod of Constantinople, A.D. 446 (Mansi, vi. 760); also at the second council of Ephesus, also in the list of bishops of the same council, A.D. 449 (Mansi, vii. 612). His name is also subscribed to the synodal decrees of Gennadius of Constantinople against simoniacal ordinations, 459. (Mansi, vii. 917; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1377.) [L. D.]

EUDOXIUS (5), bishop of Etenna (Tissena) in Pamphylia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1004; Mansi, vii. 161.) In the list of bishops said to have been present at the fifth Roman synod under Symmachus, A.D. 503, occurs "Eudoxius Ille bicennis," who is said to be the same (Mansi, viii. 301 b and note). [L. D.]

EUDOXIUS (6), bishop of Choma in Lycia, present at the council of Ephesus in A.D. 431 (Mansi, iv. 1123 c), and at Chalcedon in 451 (ibid. vii. 162 b). His name appears (Leo. Mag. Ep. 98, 1105, Migne) among the bishops subscribing the synodical letters of this latter council to Leo I. (Le Quien, Ori. Christ. i. 983.) His name appears also in the list of bishops deciding the council at Rome in 503 (Mansi, viii. 301 b). But this list certainly belongs to some earlier council. (Baron. ann. 503, ix.) [C. G.]

EUDOXIUS (7), count, who had during the reign of Trajan the command of some soldiers in Gaul. An officer named Romulus suggested to Trajan to send persons to compel the soldiers to offer sacrifice, and when they refused to comply with this command, they were banished to Melitinas in Armenia. Romulus himself afterwards became a Christian, and was beheaded. The soldiers at Melitinas, including Eudoxius their commander, were shortly after put to death. Commemorated Sept. 6. (Men. Bas.) [T. S. B.]

EUDOXIUS (8), martyr with Atticus and Agapius at Sebastae during the time of the emperor Licinius. Commemorated Nov. 2. (Men. Bas.) [T. S. B.]

EUDOXIUS (9), a professional rhetorician of Cappadocia, a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote in his favour to Sophronius the prefect of Constantinople, A.D. 369 (Epist. 183, p. 580), and to Saturninus the consul, A.D. 383 (Epist. 132, p. 862), as well as toThemistius, the sophist (Epist. 139, p. 865). In all, Gregory speaks of Eudoxius in terms of warm affection, and highly commends his "learning and his natural gifts." Eudoxius wishes to gain reputation by his discourses, in order to get his living out of them. We have also a long letter from Gregory to Eudoxius himself (Epist. 63, p. 819), urging him to give up the pursuit of human knowledge and betake himself to the study of divine philosophy; and another (Epist. 39, 297) depicting, as to an intimate friend, the loss of Basil and of Caesarius; his personal trials of old age and sickness; the unfaithfulness of friends, and the storms which threaten to overwhelm the church. [E. V.]

EUDOXIUS (10), the son of the preceding; also a rhetorician by profession, to whom was entrusted the education of Gregory Nazianzen's great-nephews, Nicobulus and his brothers, the sons of Alypians, Gorgonia's daughter. Gregory manifested the interest he felt in them, especially Nicobulus, by his frequent letters to Eudoxius on the subject of their training, c. A.D. 383. (Epist. 115-117, 119-121, 139.) [E. V.]

EUDOXIUS (11), monk, probably abbait, of a monastery in the island of Caparria (Capraia), to whom St. Augustine wrote in affectionate terms, exhorting the brethren not to make their monastic retirement an excuse for declining active service in the church, but to be strenuous at all times in discharging their conventual duties, and to remember their liability to temptation even within their peaceful abode. Augustine mentions a visit paid to him by two of the brothers, Andreas and Eustathius, during which it seems that the latter had died. (Aug. Ep. 48.) [H. W. P.]

EUDOXIUS (12), consul, A.D. 442, with Dioscorus, in the 18th year of Valentinian III. He had been prefect of the praetorians under Theodosius in 427. (S. Prop. Aquitan. Chronicon, 748, Patrol. Lat. ii. 599; Baron. ad ann. 442, Pagi, note.) [W. M. S.]

EUDOXIUS (13), a gentleman twice greeted by pope Gregory the Great, who styles him "glorious," through Ruspiciana Patricia. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lii. ind. x. ep. 27, lib. viii. ind. i. ep. 22, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 503, 924.) [C. H.]

EUDOXIUS (14) (Eudocimus), son of the emperor Constantine Copronymus by his third wife Eudocia. He was created "nobilissimus" by his brother Leo IV. On the death of Leo, the empress Irene his widow had Eudoxius seized and tonsured, in order to disqualify him for the succession, and on Christmas Day, 780, he was forced to administer publicly the sacrament of the Eucharist. In August, 787, he and his brothers Christophorus and Nicetas had their tongues cut out by order of Irene's son Constantine on the plea that they were implicated in a conspiracy against him. (Theophanes, Chronogr. in Migne, Patr. Gr. crviii. p. 952; Du Cange, Fam. Aug. 106.) [T. W. D.]

EUDOXIUS (15), philosopher, frequently cited in the Catena in Danielom, edited by Mai in his Scriptores Vetores (tom. i. In Daniel, pp. 166, 169, 170, 171, 188, 192, 199, 201, 215). Mai
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observes (p. xxxv.) that he is similarly cited in Corderius on the Psalms and in Zephyrus on the Pentateuch. He is to be identified according to Mai (ibid.) with Eudoxius the Ariban bishop of Constantinople (3).

[T. W. D.]

EUDOXIUS (18), physician at Bagauda (St. Maur des Fosses) on the Marne, about seven miles from Paris. In the 25th year of Theodorus II. (i.e. A.D. 432) he was implicated in a local sedition, and on being informed against fled to the Huns (Tiron. Prosper. Chron. sub ann. 335. Theodot.). The period was eighteen years before Attila invaded Gaul, and it must have been beyond the Rhine that Eudoxius fled, and there he would doubtless report the disaffected condition of part of Gaul. He is described as "pravi sed exercitati ingenii." [T. W. D.]

EULALIUS, a layman of Laranda in Lycaonia, whose permission to preach to the congregation by Neon, the bishop of that city, is mentioned in the letter of Alexander of Jerusalem and thecistius of Caesarea to Demetrius of Alexandria, without reference to the preaching of Neon. (Euseb. H. E. vi. 19.)

[E. V.]

EULALIUS, according to the acts of Justin Martyr, one of the emperor's slaves, who suffered martyrdom at the same time with Justin. He is represented as a native of Cappadocia, and as the son of Christian parents.

[G. S.]

EULALIUS, a choristerscopus, who subscribed for Florentius of Lesbos (q. v.) at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

[C. G.]

EUMERUS of Treves. (EVMERUS.)

EUVENTUS, a presbyter, martyred at Rome with pope Alexander under Hadrian (A.D. 117). He is commemorated May 3. (Marti. Hier., Us., Wand.)

[T. S. B.]

EUVENTUS, martyr. [SARACOSSA, MARTYRS OF]

EUROTIUS. (EORTUS.)

EUETHIUS. See also EVETHIUS.

EUFIMIA, wife of Sergius, archbishop of Ravenna, c. 750. When, having been a lacon, he suddenly became archbishop, he consecrated Eufimia as a deaconess. (Agnell. Liber Pontificalis Eccli. Rom. cap. 154.) [A. H. D.]

EUFORUS bishop of Cordova. (EUFORUS.)

EUFРОSIUS (1), said to have been sent, along with six others, by the apostles to preach in Spain, and to have died at Liturgis (Andujar). He was commemorated May 15. (Marti. Usuard.) [CAECILIUS (4).]

[T. S. B.]

EUFРОSIUS (8), ST., thirteenth of, according to Gregory of Tours, twelfth bishop of Clermont in Auvergne. He was represented at the council of Agde (506) by Paulinus, a priest, and was present in person at the first council of Orleans (511). He entertained St. Quintus, the bishop of Rhodes, who had been forced to flee from his see to save his life from the Goths. Two letters of Ruricius (Ep. xlii. and xi.iii. Migne, Patr. Lat. lviii. 101, 106) are addressed to him, and he may possibly be the recipient of the thirty-eighth letter of Avitus. (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 254.) According to Gregory he was bishop twenty-five years, and lived four years after the death of Clovis. This brings his death down to A.D. 515. He is commemorated Jan. 14. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iii. 3; Vit. Patr. c. iv. Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxi. 242, 1023; Mansi, viii. 337, 356; Gall. Christ. ii. 235.)

[S. A. B.]

EUFРОSIUS (8) (EUFРАSIUS), presbyter of Auvergne, son of an ex-senator Eodusius, Eudovius, or Eudius. On the death of Catus bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, A.D. 372, when many were seeking to obtain the appointment by gifts and promises, Eufrasius sent to the king, by the hand of his kinsman Berengnius, a large sum of money, which he had procured from the Jews. The attempt failed, and archdeacon Avitus was elected by the clergy and people. Eufrasius is described as elegant in conversation, but more given to feasting barbarians than feeding the poor. (Greg. Tur. H. F. iv. 36, p. 176; Gall. Chr. ii. 242.)

[E. B.]

EUFРОSIUS. (EUFРАSIUS.)

EUFЕIАTES, a presbyter to whom, together with Saturninus, St. Augustine wrote to congratulate them on their return from Donatism to Catholic unity, setting forth the universality of the church, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and to discharge zealously their ministerial duties. (Aug. Ep. 142.)

[H. W. F.]

EUFРИDIUS, deacon of Toledo (Baronius, s. a. 507, xlii.; Hildes. de Vit. Illust. praef. 6). [LEONTIUS, deacon of Toledo.] [T. W. D.]

EUFРОNIUS(1), fifth bishop of Nevers, succeeding St. Aegius, and followed by St. Aelius, flourished about A.D. 560. He subscribed a charter of St. Germanus of Paris in favour of the church of the Holy Cross and St. Vincent, a m.
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known as St. Germain des Prés, Paris. He was also present at its dedication. (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixiii. 84; Vita S. Ducchonii, Bouquet, iii. 437; Gall. Christ. xii. 296.) [S. A. B.]

EUFRONIUS (2), eighteenth bishop of Tours. Upon the death of Guntram, the seventeenth of the series, king Clotaire named as his successor Catia, a priest of Clermont. But Catia's desires were fixed upon the see of his own city, and he declined. After the bishopric had stood vacant ten months, the clergy and people elected Eufro-
nius, a priest of senatorial rank, grandson of St. Gregory of Langres, and, according to Gregory of Tours, "vir egregiae sanctitatis." Clotaire, upon learning the circumstances, confirmed their choice (a.d. 555 or 556). In 557 Eufronius took part in the council of Paris. In the civil wars of this period a great part of Tours, with its churches, was burnt to the ground. Two of these he rebuilt at his own charge. The famous church of St. Martin also owed its reconstruction on a nobler scale to him. The neigh-
bouring districts, too, were enriched by him within many new churches, the names of which are given by Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. x. 31). Like his successor, he was the champion of the citizens against the rapacity of the count of Tours, at this time Gaiso, who tried to enforce the taxes which Clotaire had remitted. He suc-
cessfully resisted the attempt, but not with-out appealing to king Charlesbert. In 562 he refused to subscribe the decree of the council of Santes, which deposed Emerius from that see, foreseeing, no doubt, the scandal which occurred. [EMERIUS (2).] In 567 he presided over the second council of Tours, and in the same year, together with several other bishops, he sub-
scribed a letter to queen Radegundis, who had late-ly founded and retired to the monastery of the Holy Cross at Poitiers. It was on the sub-
ject of those nuns who after entering the monas-
tery desired to quit it again for the world and marriage. Against them and their wishes, the bishops by the strength of their anthems were determined. This letter (to be found in the Hist. Franc. ix. 30) was read by Gregory, by way of admonition, to Chrodegildis, when she, with fifty other nuns, seceded from the same monastery, and arrived on foot at Tours to claim the protection of the bishop, but with-out effect. [CHRODEGILDIS.] About the same time Eufronius joined three bishops of his pro-
vince in a sort of circular letter addressed to his flock, speaking of a "cladis gravissimae neces-
sitatis," which seemed to be overhanging the pro-
vince, and which he exhorted them to seek to avert by deferring their intended marriages, paying their tithes, and breaking off all incess-
tuous connexions (Gall. Christ. xiv. Instruments, 3). The impending disaster may possibly have been the civil war between Sigebert and Chil-
peric (Cf. rivet de la Grange, Hist. Let. de la France, iii. 290). It was at the request of the former prince that he officiated at the solemn reception of the messengers of queen Radegundis on their return from the East with a piece of the true cross and other relics for her monastery of the Holy Cross. From Sigebert too he obtained the restoration of those church lands of which Charlesbert had deprived the see. In 568 he was present at the dedication of a church at Nantes, as we learn from the verses of his friend and eulogist, Venantius Fortunatus. He died in 572 or 573, in the seventeenth year of his age and the eighteenth of his episcopate, and was buried in the church of St. Martin. He was commemorated Aug. 4. His successor was Gregory the historian, and it is noteworthy that, contemporaries though they were, the latter relates his miracles with the same gravity as undoubted historical facts. [Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. ix. 30, 39, 40, x. 31; de Harr. Confess. xviii.; de Mor. S. Martinii, i. 50; Vita S. Radegundis, 19; Man. Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict., ii. 331, ed. Paris, 1668–1701; Venant. Fort. Misc. i. 2, 3, 6; Man. Actx. 747, 805; Gall. Christ. xiv. 21.) [S. A. B.]

EUFRO;—see also EUPHR.

EUGAIN. [EUGAIN.]

EUGENDUS (1), Carthaginian. [AUGEN-
DUS.]

EUGENDUS (2), ST., abbot of the monas-
terium Condatiscone or (as written by Gregory of Tours) Condatiscenone, subsequently called after him St. Oyan, and finally after St. Claudius of Besançon. It was one of three built by St. Romanaus in the Jura. Eugendus was born at Lasnordor in the same district. At seven years he entered the monastery, which he never afterwards quitted. The abbott Minasius, or Nennasius, named him as his coadjutor during life and successor after death. But the choice was not agreeable to the monastery generally, and the dissensions between the two monks by envy, advanced even to the extent of a partial secession. During his rule, the monas-
tery, which was of wood, was totally destroyed by fire, and built up again on a grander scale. He was remarkable for the humility of his demeanour, and, as his biographer especially notes, he did not desert the common table. He was severe too in enforcing the community of goods. Feeling the approach of death, he called that one of the brethren on whom he had enjoined the duty of anointing the sick, and bade him touch his breast with oil. This has been cited as an early instance of the rite of extreme unction. He died about the year 510, and was commemorated Jan. 1. The authority for this account is a life by an anonymous disciple and monk, to be found in Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict. aec. i. 570, ed. Paris, 1668–1701, and Boll. Acta SS. Jan. i. 49 (Cf. rivet de la Grange, Hist. Let. de la France, iii. 60–2; and Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacres, x. 610–2). [S. A. B.]

EUGENIA (1), a daughter of Philippus, who was appointed by Commodus governor of Alexandria. There she became acquainted with Christian literature, and chiefly through having read the epistles of St. Paul she was led to embrace Christianity. She disguised
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herself in male attire, and went to a monastery; but in course of time she was found out, and sent back to her father. It is said that she induced all her family to become Christians, and that her father was shortly after made a bishop. Eugenia was martyred subsequently, and was commemorated Dec. 24. (Cal. Byzand., Mon. Bas.) [T. S. B.]

EUGENIA (3), a virgin, martyred at Rome with Agape. (Marti. Rom. Vet.; Mart. Hier., Bedae, Us.) Fortunatus (de Virginibus lib. viii. cap. 4) celebrates her in the following extraordinary verses, where the strange treatment of the names may probably have arisen from some confusion between accent and quantity.

"illo Euphemia, pariter quoque plrandit Agatha,
Et Justina simul, conseconate Thelia,
Et Paulina, Agnese, Restituta, Eugenia regnans,
Et quasamque sacer vestis ad stara pudor."

Baronius describes this Eugenia as a daughter of an imperial prefect in Egypt, and as having suffered under Gallienus. She is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on Dec. 25, and in the Byzantine Calendar on Dec. 24. [J. G. C.]

EUGENIA (5), martyr. [Nicomedia, Mar-
tyres of.]

EUGENIA (4), a niece of Gregory Nazianzen, one of the three daughters of his sister Gorgonia. She was brought up most carefully by her grandmother, who had encouraged her to expect a considerable share of her property, but at her death left her only a small legacy, some of which she was in danger of having wrested from her. Her uncle consequently wrote to Theodorus bishop of Tyana to request his aid for her (Greg. Naz. Epist. 85). Eugenia's conduct proved far from pleasing to Gregory, who mentioned her, together with her sister Nonnus, with severe reprehension in his will. (Greg. Testam.) [E. V.]

EUGENIA (5), virgin, daughter of Adalbert duke of Alasht, and niece of St. Odiilla. She became abbess of Hohenburg in the diocese of Straubing, and died in A.D. 735. (Acta SS. 16 Sept. v. 322.) [I. G. S.]

EUGENIANUS, a martyr, commemorated Jan. 8 (Murt. Usuard., Wandalh.). No other ancient writer seems to be acquainted with a martyr of this name. The Bollandist conjectures that he has been confused with Hegemonius bishop of Autus in the 4th century (A.A. SS. Jan. 1. 473). The Sammarthani (Gall. Christ. iv. 334) do not admit that there are any grounds for supposing Eugenianus to have been this bishop. [T. S. B.]

EUGENIUS (1), bishop of Rome during the breach between Rome and Constantinople in consequence of the Monothelite controversy; consecrated Aug. 10, 654, buried June 3, 657 (Jaffé, Reg. Pont. p. 164). The emperor Constans having issued a declaration known as 'the Type', in which the use of either of the phrases contended for, either the Single or Double Will in Christ, was forbidden for the future, and pope Martin I. (who had in council denounced this Type, and excommunicated Paul the Eastern patriarch) having been seized in 653 and removed from Rome by the emperor's order, the clergy of Rome were ordered by the latter to elect a new pope. The order was not obeyed till the 8th of September in the following year, when Eugenius, a native of Rome, was chosen and consecrated (who had protested by letter from Constantinople against a new election) being still alive. The ultimate, though tardy, compliance with the imperial will was probably due to a fear lest the emperor himself should interfere and intrude a heretic into the see. Martin lived in exile until September A.D. 655, and thus during the first year of his pontificate Eugenius was canonically an intruder and antipope, though reckoned a lawful bishop after Martin's death in virtue of his acceptance by the Roman church. After his election he sent messengers to Constantinople to announce it to the emperor. These were induced by Peter, who about this time became patriarch of Constantinople, to assent to a declaration of faith in order to reconcile the disputants, in which the curious compromise was adopted of acknowledging One Will in Christ, and also two (unam super duas); one, which was called the Substantial Will, and two besides, called Natural Will. Having on such terms of union publicly communicated with the patriarch, they returned to Rome carrying from him to pope Eugenius a confession of faith expressed (according to Anastasius) in very obscure terms. From the circumstance, mentioned also by Anastasius, that, when the patriarch's letter was read at Rome in the church of St. Mary ad Prenese (now Santa Maria Maggiore), it was the clergy and people that tore up the document, and refused to permit the pope to celebrate mass till he had pledged himself to repudiate it, it would seem that the pastor was less resolute in orthodoxy than his flock, and disposed to accept the compromise. There is in fact no evidence of his having anything of the orthodox zeal or spirit of his predecessor Martin. The latter, during the last years of his life, was an agent in exile, conversations with this latter in extant letters of being neglected by his former friends, especially by the clergy of Rome, who, though having it in their power to relieve him, had left him destitute of even the necessaries of life. Eugenius, as the head of the Roman clergy, though not named, must be considered as involved in this reproach. Nor is it inconsistent with the apostacy and readiness to accept compromise, of which evidence has been given, that he is described kind, gentle, affable, and charitable to the poor. (Anastas. and Platina.) He held the see, from the date of his election, 2 years, 8 months, and 24 days. Notwithstanding the absence of any recorded acts or characteristics to entitle him to the character of a saint, he is commemorated as such by the Roman Church on the 2nd of June. No writings, genuine or spurious, attributed to him, remain. (Anastas. Biblioth. de Vit. Rom. Pont. num. lxxvii. § 134 in Pat. Lat. cxxviii. 763; Platina, de Vit. Pontif. p. 85.) [J. B.-r.]

EUGENIUS—BISHOPS

EUGENIUS (3), an early bishop of Toledo, said by Spanish antiquaries to have been sent as a missionary by St. Dionysius the Areopagite [Dionysius the Areopagita (4)] and Dionysius (2), and to have suffered as a martyr in one of the persecutions of the early church; the breviary of Toledo names that carried on under Domitian. It is, however, admitted by Flores (España Sagrada, tomo v.) that by the time of Ileodorus the memory of this Eugenius had entirely perished. But his tomb is reported to have been found at Paris in 1148 by Raymond archbishop of Toledo, and his remains transferred to Spain by king Philip II. in 1565. Flores appeals to the abbot Ildinus and to St. Gerard for his existence, and he is commemorated, in some lists, on Nov. 11. Rainart (Acta Martyrum, Amsterdam, 1713) gives, in an appendix, a Kalendarium Carthaginense (the old province of Carthage used to include Toledo and some other sees in Spain) with the entry: "Nonas Jan. deposito B. Deogratia et Eugenii episcoporum." [J. G. C.]

EUGENIUS (4), bishop of the Tauroc Chersonese, mentioned with Eripidius and other bishops of the see in the Menology of Basil, March 8. These bishops lived before the reign ofConstantine the Great, 306-337. (Migne, Patrol. Graec. cviii. 9; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1329.)

EUGENIUS (8), bishop of Laodicea, the metropolis of the province of Phrygia Pacatiana, c. A.D. 300-324. He was originally in the army, and had married the daughter of a senator, but during the Maximian persecution was deprived of his military rank owing to the constancy of his faith, and fled to Laodicea, where he became bishop. He entirely built the church and adorned it with vestibules and porticoes. An inscription has been found at Laodicea having reference to this bishop. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 784.)

EUGENIUS (6), bishop of Ecarpius, in the province of Phrygia Salutaris; one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 845; Mansi, ii. 695.)

EUGENIUS (7). Among the subscriptions to the letter of the Eusebian seceders to Philipopolis from the council of Sardica, A.D. 347, there occurs Eugenius de Lysiatis, intended, as Le Quien thinks, for Eugenius bishop of Lyons in Pampylia Secunda. In the same list there is another bishop Eugenius, the name of the see being lost. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1029; Mansi, iii. 138, 140.)

EUGENIUS (8), bishop of Nicea, one of the thirty bishops who met in synod at Antioch A.D. 355. (Soz. H. E. iv. 8; Till. Mscr. Eccl. vi. 594.)

EUGENIUS (9), bishop of Paphos in Paphlagonia, present at the ecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 570; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1057.)

EUGENIUS (10), bishop of Heraclea, the metropolis of Thrace. He was originally a presbyter of Constantinople, one of Chrysostom's bitterest enemies, and was deposed, together with Isaac the anchorite, by the Council of the Oecumenical Council of Constantinople. The summons to appear before them. For his services on this and other occasions Eugenius was rewarded with the see of Heraclea, from which Serapion had been deposed. (Pallad. Vit. Chrysost., in Migne, Patr. Gr. xlvii. 29; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1108.)

EUGENIUS (14), bishop of Hermopolis Magna, in the Thebais. Gennadius, who precedes him in the list, is dated A.D. 449. He is mentioned by Joannes Musaeus (Proton Spiritu, § 182, Patr. Gr. lixxxvii. 3053) as having formerly been the abbât of the monastery of St. Sergius called Neronion near Bithynia. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 609.)

EUGENIUS (15), bishop of Barcinum, a town in Lyconia whose position and exact name is uncertain. His name was subscribed in his absence by his metropolitan, Onesiphorus of Iconium, to the definition of the faith that was read before the emperor Marcian at the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 165; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1079.)

EUGENIUS (18), supposed bishop of Nisibis, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1084; Mansi, vii. 157.)

EUGENIUS (17), bishop of Cotena in Pamphylia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1010; Mansi, viii. 164.)

EUGENIUS (18), bishop of Nisibis, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1084; Mansi, vii. 157.)

EUGENIUS (17), bishop of Cotena in Pamphylia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1010; Mansi, viii. 164.)
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EUGENIUS (19), bishop of Ercoua in Vetus Epirus, signed the synodical letter of that province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 619 B; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 145.)

[ L. D. ]

EUGENIUS (20), bishop of Nicopolis, in Vetus Epirus. The emperor Leo I., hearing of the murder of Proterius, bishop of Alexandria A.D. 457, commanded him to assemble a synod of the bishops under his jurisdiction to consider the matter. He obeyed, and the synod wrote a letter to the emperor, which was signed by Eugenius and eight others (Mansi, vii. 619 A; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 134). Hermisdas, bishop of Rome, in his letter of 516 to the synod of Vetus Epirus, greatly praises his conduct on that occasion. (Horn. Ep. 8 in Migne, Patr. Gr. lxii. 391 and in Mansi, vii. 405.)

[ T. W. D. ]

EUGENIUS (21), bishop of Siniandus in Pisidia, signed a synodical letter to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 571; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1055.)

[ L. D. ]

EUGENIUS (22), bishop of Carthage in the 5th century. He was elected to the see A.D. 479 (see Morrelli, Africa Christ. iii. 191, but Cave gives the following year), with the approval of the Arian Hunneric, but after five years was exiled to the deserts of Tripoli (Victor Vitensis, de Persec. Vandal. ii. 2-13, Patr. Lat. lxi. 203). On the accession of Gundamund, in the following year, he was recalled (Victor Tunnunensi, Chronic. Patr. Lat. lixii. 940). During the reign of this prince the orthodox party was not molested, but upon his death, in the year 496, his successor Thrasimund renewed the earlier persecutions (Procop. Bell. Vandal. i. 8). Eugenius was banished to Gaul, and settled near the town of Vienne, where he founded a monastery in honour of St. Amaranthus. He died there in the year 505. Eugenius left a creed, drawn up for presentation to Hunneric, which is printed in the 58th volume of Migne's Patr. Lat. (see also Gennadius, de Script. Eccl. cap. 97, ibid. p. 1118; Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. ii. 3, p. 46).

[ J. de S. ]

EUGENIUS (23), bishop of Tium on the Black Sea in the province of Honorias, present at the council held at Constantinople, A.D. 536. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 575; Mansi, viii. 971.)

[ L. D. ]

EUGENIUS (24), a Cilician tritheite bishop in the second half of the 6th century, who supported Conon of Tarsus in disseminating that heresy. John of Ephesus, who states that Eugenius was a bishop in Cilicia, assigns him no definite locality in that region, but according to Bar-Hebraeus (Assemani, Bibl. Or. ii. 325) his see was Seleucia in Isauria, and his period contemporary with the Jacobite patriarch Sergius Telenis (539-541). It was at this early period perhaps that they began to declare their views and to call them heretical and finally deposed by their fellow bishops. Retiring to Constantinople, they found a zealous patron in Athanasius, a grandson of the empress Theodora; and supported by his fortune they established an active propaganda. Three bishops were requisite, according to the canons, for episcopal ordinations, and they found a third to act with them in Theonas, a deposed provincial bishop who had wandered to the capital. By this means they sent out in every direction numerous episcopal emissaries, who gathered congregations in Rome, in Corinth, in Athens, and in Africa. The public disputation held with Cilicia, and for this they were admonished by direction of the emperor Justin II. is noticed under Conon. The tritheite leaders were condemned and banished to Palestine; but this had no effect on the activity of their agents, who travelling through Syria, Cilicia, Isauria, Cappadocia, ordained priests and deacons in churches and monasteries, cities and villages, bringing over whole districts to their views. Eventually Eugenius and Conon visited Pamphylia, where Eugenius in the earlier days of his orthodoxy had zealously laboured for the conversion of the Arians, who had colonised that province in large numbers. Here Eugenius died, and Conon once more retired to Constantinople; particulars are gathered from the Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus (lib. i. 31, v. 1-8), which has been translated from the Syriac into English by Dr. Payne Smith, and into German by Dr. Schöpfelder, the latter of whom appeals to a dissertation on the tritheite controversy. (Joannes Philoponus; Tarnanensis; Agatho-Catalani, i. 385.)

[ M. A. W. ]

EUGENIUS (25), bishop of Egara, subscribing the acts of the fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633, under Sisinian (Esp. Esp. xii. 195; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 385).

EUGENIUS (26) I., bishop of Toledo, in Spain, and metropolitan, between the years 636 and 646 or 647. Date of birth unknown. His life ended with his episcopate.

Name.—A Latin translation of ἄγιος into Bona-natus occurs as a proper name in the title of the 6th century (as e.g. in Cyrillic's life of Cassianus of Arles, where a man so named is stated to have acted unworthily of his name). Few names have remained more popular in both the masculine and feminine forms in modern Europe than Eugenio, Eugène, Eugénie.

Authorities.—St. Isidoreus, bishop of Toledo, De Vitaeum Illustrum Scriptorii (capp. xii. xiii.). This series of short biographies, apparently suggested by the similar one of St. Jerome, is printed at the end of some editions of the works of St. Isidore of Seville; as for example, in appendix I. to tom. vii. of the edition of Arevalus (Romae A.D. 1803): Acts of the fifth, sixth, and seventh councils of Toledo, held respectively A.D. 636, 638, 646 (Labb, tom. iii. Pp. 597, 601, 613, ed. Paris, 1714).

Life.—This Eugenius was a fellow-student of Justus, his predecessor in the see of Toledo. He was trained as a monk from infancy. His superior, Heliodorus, has the merit of bringing forward both him and Justus, when he himself became a bishop. Eugenius was a man of dignified demeanour, and not only versed in sacred learning, but also, we are assured, so skilled in astronomy as to astonish his auditors, whom he allured, through the influence thus gained, to the reception of religious doctrine. His signature to the fifth council of Toledo stands as follows: "Ego Eugenius, Dei micena-
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The above council of Toledo, over which the two prelates, Eugenius I. and II., presided, in which they took a leading part, deserve attention in connexion with—(1) the confessions of faith which they set forth; (2) the relative position of the monarchy; (3) the occasional subscription of laymen; (4) the treatment of the Jews living in Spain. A few words must be said upon each of these points.

1. Some profession of faith appears to have been recognized as almost a necessary and normal preface to the canons passed by each successive council. In some cases, however, it amounts to little more than a statement of the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the incarnation, or to a recital of the Apostles' Creed. But in others it is more ample, especially in the sixth council, summoned in A.D. 638, in the reign of Chintila, and attended by fifty-two bishops, where the articles of the creed drawn up deserve comparison with those proclaimed in the earlier third council of Toledo held in A.D. 586 under the first Catholic Bishops, Bernardo and Redo. The creed before us, in language of much dignity, and with a tenuity of statement which resembles the better features of the scholastic terminology of a later day, proclaims not only the truths insisted on in the Nicene Creed as enlarged at Chalcedon, but is even more distinct on the doctrine of the Trinity or the Personæ Patris, and also includes a recognition of the double procession, and of the doctrine of original sin. We subjoin a few sentences by way of evidence, italicizing phrases illustrative of these remarks. "Illocre credimus et professuram sacramissimam et omnipotentissimam Trinitatem, Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum, unum Deum, solum non solidarium; unius essentiae, virtutis, potestatis, uniusque naturae; discretam inseparabiliter personis; indiscernabilis essentiae substantiam deitatis, creaturam omnium creaturarum; Patrem ingenium, incertum, fontem et originem totius divinitatis; Filium a Patre in temporalibus et in angelicis creaturis, esse initio genitum non creatum. . . . Spiritum vero sanctum, neque genitum neque creatum, act de Patre Filioque procedentem uniusque esse Spiritum. . . . Ex iis igitur tribus divinitatis personis solum Filium fatemur ad redemptionem humani generis, propier culpam nostra (quia per inconditionem Adam originatus, et nostrum librum contentum creaveramus) resolvens a secreto Patris arcanoque proprion, et hominum sin peccato de sancta semper Virgine Mariæ assumptiæ, ut idem Filius Dei Patris esset filius homini; Deus perfectus et homo perfectus, ut homo Deus esset unus Christus naturis in duas in personam unius; ne quateretaea Trinitatem acceadis, si in Christo persona geminata esset."  

2. The king is evidently at this period in close and intimate relation with the Spanish church, sanctioning its councils, giving coactive force to its canons, and even anticipating its desires. The church in turn gives honour and support to the throne. But the notion of an indefeasible hereditary claim to the monarchy is unknown; as in truth it was unknown to the early and even to the later medieval church. It never thrived in Spain, though we may find it prevalent in the France of Louis XIV., and the England of the Tudors and the Stuarts. That the crown should rest in certain families, so long as they
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flourished, was indeed an admitted principle, but that was all. Thus in the fifth council of Toledo, A.D. 658, the third canon treats: "De reprobatione personarum, quae probavit ad se adipsi regnum," and excommunication is threatened against the man, "qui talis meditatus fuerit, quem nec electo eos nominat, nec Gothicae gens nobilitas ad hono honoris apicem trahit." This canon is of the greatest importance, and not without reason of note. That the monarchy was still in a rather unsettled condition appears from the succeeding canon of the same council directed against those who attempt to find out, by divination, the time when the reigning sovereign will die, with a view to their own acquisition of the throne. With these fourth and fifth canons of the fifth council should be compared the cognate ones (the 16th and 17th, and 18th) of the sixth council of Toledo, to which reference has been made above.

3. The rights of the laity to appoint incumbents to churches which they have built or restored, are guarded with much strictness (council ix. canons 8 and 9). In fact, the prescriptive regulations are censured (counsel x. canon 3). The canons of the 8th council, held in A.D. 655, are signed by fifty-five bishops, thirteen abbots, ten archdeacons, and sixteen counts. This admission of the signatures of laymen had occurred also in the earlier council, the third, held under Recared, where we find not only a royal edict in confirmation of its acts, but likewise the participation of all the senators (five leading names being given) in its anathemas against Ariusism, and the other heresies condemned by the first four oecumenical councils. The same feature occurs again at a later date, in the twelfth council of Toledo, held in A.D. 689 (Labbe, vii supra, p. 2115), where fifteen counts palatine sign after the bishops, abbots, and archdeacons.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor has called attention to this circumstance in one of his controversial works. He calls these councils the fourth, sixth, and eighth of Toledo. Either bishop Taylor numbers the councils in a way differing from that of Labbe, or he has made a mistake, as the fourth has not any laic signatures appended, beyond those obtained in the sanction given by king Chintila. Compare the case of the second council of Orange held under Caesarius of Arles.

EUGENIUS (28), bishop of Trappeolis in Phrygia, subscribed the canons of the synod called Trulliana, or Quinisexta, held at Constantinople, A.D. 692. (Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 810; Mansi, xi. 1001.)

EUGENIUS (29), bishop of Forum Cornelli (Imola), A.D. 801. He was a native of that city, and his episcopal see was "vir magnaneutus" (UgHELLi, Ital. Sac. ii. 624; Manzoni, Euseb. Conciliarum. 44.)

EUGENIUS (30), martyr at Tibur with Symphorosa his mother, and six brothers.

EUGENIUS (31), martyr at Paris; commemorated on Nov. 15. (Mart. Us., Wadd.)


EUGENIUS (33), martyr with Valerians during the Diocletian persecution, commemorated Jan. 20. (Men. Bas.)

EUGENIUS (34), a presbyter of Antioch, martyred with Macarius during the reign of Julian. He appeared before the emperor and reproached him for his idolatry. The emperor, enraged at this, banished him to Mauritania, where he was beheaded. Commemorated Dec. 20. (Men. Bas.; Baron, Annal. 992, 90, 91.)

EUGENIUS (35), martyr with six others in Africa during the Vandal persecution at the close of the 5th century, commemorated Jan. 4. (Mart. Alon.) In Usuard, Netker, and the Mart. Hier. the name appears as Eugenius.
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EUGENIUS (38), martyr at Cherson, together with Euplatus [ELPIDIUS (3)]. Commemorated March 8. [Men. Bas.] [T. S. B.]


EUGENIUS (40), a deacon; one of the four legates sent by Sylvester bishop of Rome to the Council of Arles, a.D. 314. [Labbe and Casserat, i. 1453.] [T. W. D.]

EUGENIUS (41), a monk by whose Basil wrote to the Catholics of Alexandria, in a.D. 373, to encourage them under the persecutions and sufferings which followed the death of Athanasius. [Basil. Epist. 139 [711].] [E. V.]

EUGENIUS (42), deacon of Ancyra, sent by his bishop Marcellus cir. a.D. 347 to Athanasius with a confession of faith of the church of Ancyra. [Eugen. Diacon. Legat. ad S. Athanas. in Patr. Gr. xviii. 1302; Ceillier, iv. 308.] [T. W. D.]


EUGENIUS (44), deacon, addressed by pope Gregory the Great, who empowered and requiring him to transfer some of the land of the Roman church to the monastery of Bleri or Bielda, a town near Sutrium and Viterbo. [Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. xii. ind. v. ep. 45, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 1250.] [C. H.]

EUGENIUS (45) (Eugenius), common Latinized form of the Irish Eoghan. [Eoghan.] A person called Eugenius is said to have been one of the seven hermits from the island in the Tiber, who accompanied St. Regulus (Legend of St. Andrew, in Sven's Chron. Picts and Scots, 187; J. Forbes, Kol. Scatt. Santa, 335). [Mart. Tuathach (Kelly, Col. Ir. SS. xxxix.)] commemorates a Eugenius Peregrius on December 26, and Mar. O'Gorman on the same day has "Eugan mór an nara," Eugan or Eugenius, the mariner or traveller (Mart. Doug. by Todd and Reeves, 346 n. 6). [J. G.]

EUGENIUS (46) HERMOGENIANUS, a praeconian prefect, at whose instance Maximian is said to have issued a rescript for the persecution of Christians, c. A.D. 301, and under whom many afterwards suffered death (Boll. Act. Sanct. 29 Mai. vii. 11). [T. W. D.]

EUGENIUS (47), a usurper in the reign of Diocletian, a.D. 303. Libanios tells us that the 500 soldiers whom he was commanding in Seleucia, being indignant at the amount of work which was expected of them, thought to better their condition by proclaiming Eugenius emperor. They marched to Antioch, plundering as they went. At Antioch, however, the whole population, including even the women, rose against them, and the usurpation of Eugenius ended on the same day on which it began. [Libanios, Gr. xiii. xiv. xv.] [M. F. A.]

EUGENIUS (48), "magister officiorum" under Constans. He was present when Athanasius had an interview with that emperor at Milan, a.D. 343. [Athanasius, Vol. ii. 190; Athanas. Apol. ad Const. sec. 3, p. 255.] [T. W. D.]

EUGENIUS (49), a wealthy eunuch of Constantinople, who had been expelled from court because of his disaffection to the emperor Jovian. He befriended Procopius with money and otherwise during his rebellion, a.D. 362-366. [Zosim. iv. 5; Procopius, Hist. Gr. et Rom. [piagi, 538.] [T. W. D.]

EUGENIUS (50), procurator under Theodosius and Valentinian II. a.D. 434. The princess Honorina, sister of the emperor Valentinian, had a child by him, and was consequently expelled from the palace and sent from Italy to Theodosius. [Marcellin. Comit. Chronicon, a.D. 434; Patrol. Lat. ii. p. 926; Baronius ad an. 455, xxvii. Pagi, note.] [W. M. S.]

EUGENIUS (51), a notary addressed along with the subdeacon Felix and others by pope Gregory the Great, who desires them to see the regulations carried out by which bishops or clerics are prohibited from having women residing with them. [Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. ix. ind. ii. ep. 60; Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 998.] [C. H.]

EUGENIUS, martyr. [Eugenius (35)].

EUGIPPUS (1), ST. (EVIPPUS), abbot of Lucullanum, born at Carthage about the middle of the 5th century, and at the age of twelve sent by his parents to Rome (Patrol. Lat. lxii. 580), where he was educated and afterwards ordained. He was with St. Severinus when the latter was proclaimed Bishop of Noricum (Austria) and entered his monastery near Favianum (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. 8). It was near Vienna according to Mabillon (Annales O. S. B. i. 85, "Monasterium Favianense"). Here St. Severinus died in a.D. 482, and in 488 Eujippus accompanied his body when it was transferred to the villa of Lucullus between Puteoli (Pozzuoli) and Naples, where a monastery ("Monasterium Lucullanum," Mabili. 53) was founded in honour of, and called by the name of, the saint. Of this monastery, which belonged to the Benedictine order and was under the rule of Monte Cassino, Marcianus was the first abbot, and Eugippus the second (Ceillier, xi. 85). Here he wrote many theological treatises, which are printed in the Patrologia, tom. lxxii., and in a.D. 511 he composed the life of St. Severinus (Potthast, Biblioth. p. 887). He was addressed by St. Fulgentius, who wrote to him a letter on "Charity" and was author of another monastic rule, not extant. There has been some controversy as to whether there was a second writer of the name of Eugippus, and called the African. Sigerbit says that "Eugippus" was author of a collection from the writings of St. Augustine, about 580, from which date it would follow that he was a different person from the Eugippus who was with St. Severinus at his
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death in 482, and who wrote the life of the saint in 511. But it is evident that he makes a mis-
take, for Cassiodorus had seen the Eugippius, author of the "Collection" to which Sigebert refers, and Cassiodorus died at the age of ninety-
three before the year 567. (Ceillier, xi. 88.)

We may add that both the Bollandists and Cave treat of only one Eugippius, and the Patrol.
Lat. places the Vita S. S. Geremi among the works of Eugippius Africanus. Upon the whole it
would seem to be proved that Eugippius abbot of Lucullanum and Eugippius the African were
the same person. (Acta SS. Jan. i. 483; Migne,
Patrolog. Lat. xiii. 550, &c.; Ceillier, Histoire des 
Auteurs ecclési. xi. 85, &c.; Cave, Histo. 
Litter. i. 498; Surius, de Prob. Sancta Historia, 
Jan. 8.)

T. G. S.

EUGIPIUS (3), a priest to whom Dio-
nysius Exiguus dedicated his Latin translation 
of Gregory of Nyssa's work De Conditione seu 
Opipublico hominis. The translator's preface 
letter states that his task was undertaken
at the request of Eugippius. (Patrol. Lat. 
iv. 346; Ceillier, xi. 124.)

T. W. D.

EUGNOMON, a bishop of Asia, one of those
who presented a complaint against Chrysostom
at the Council of the Oak, for having unjustly
deposed him from his see. (Photius, Cod. 59, p.
60.)

E. V.

EUGNOMONIUS (EUGNOMON) appears
among the Euchthians, who as Ékùxiuoi éph
maupbrpofal, made an appeal to Marcian the
emperor for a general council in A.D. 451 (Lalle,
iv. 524 a). The orthodox archimandrites, how-
ever, at the council of Chalcedon, refused to
recognize him as archimandrite or anything else,
"We do not know Eugnomonius" (Lalle, iv.
522 a).

C. G.

EUGRAPHIA (1), a rich widow of Constan-
tinople, an intimate associate of the empress
Eudoxia, and a leading member of the female
cabal for the destruction of Chrysostom, who
had aroused their enmity by his unsparking de-

motions and his excesses, and extravagant.
Her house was the meeting-place of all, both clergy and laity, who were disaffected to
Chrysostom. (Palai. Æcli. p. 35.)

E. V.

EUGRAPHIA (2), a lady to whom Theodoret
expresses himself as under great obligations, and
whom on the death of her husband he addressed
in a long and beautiful letter, offering her various
grounds of consolation. (Theod. Epist. 69.)

E. V.

EUGRAPHUS, a martyr at Alexandria
with Menas and Hermogenes, under Maximin;
commemorated Dec. 10. (Men. Bas.; Baron.
Annal. 307, 38); Dec. 3 (Col. Armen.).

T. S. B.

EUGYPIUS, abbat. [EUGIPIUS.]

EUHEL (EOIL), commemorated November
14 with F町hina of Cill-tomna, and Gabhran, his
two companions. They are called the three sons of
Dubhthach, in the Irish calendars, and in the
Drummond Missal there is commemoration made "trium trium trium Gabran, Eoil et F町hine."

One of this name, "Euhel de Ros-coenech" is
said to have been a pupil at Lorch Eriuchne.
St. Barry (September 25) of Cork (Col.).
Acta SS. 607; Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Sants, 
28).

J. G. E.

EUIN, duke of Trent (Tridentum), one of the
dukes who ruled Italy for ten years after the death
of Magnus, when there was no legitimate
king. During this time he repelled an invasion
made upon his duchy by the Franks. He had
charge of an army sent by king Autharius, c. 598,
to Istria, and was sent by king Agilulf, c. 591,
to make peace with the Franks. He died c. 595.
(Paulus Diaconus, ii. 32; iii. 9, 27; iv. 10, who
 derives this local information probably from
Secondus of Trent.)

A. H. D. A.

EUPIPIUS, a bishop of long standing, holding
Arianizing doctrines from whom, though there
was much reason for his being united to him,
Basil felt it due to the cause of truth to separate
altogether (Bas. Epist. 57 [56], ad Melitianum,
128 [265]). Eustathius of Sebastie, in A.D. 360
violently denounced against Euippus as not
deserving the name of bishop, being one of those
by whom Eustathius had been deposed, yet in
A.D. 376 Eustathius united himself to Euippus,
and recognized the bishops and presbyters he had
ordained. (Epist. 225 [73], 239 [10], 344 [82],
251 [72]).

E. V.

EULALIDUS (EULALITUS), placed by the
diptychs of the church of Arles as bishop
between Patroclus and St. Honoratus (Mabille,
Vet. Anecdot. p. 220, nov. edit. 1723). Tille-
mond (Mén. ii. 481) argues that his episcopate
could have occupied only a brief period in 426.
He is not recognized in the Gallia Christiana
(i. 526).

C. H.

EULALIDUS, bishop of Bourges. [EULIDUS.

EULALIDUS, ST., said to have been the first
bishop of Nevers. In the twenty-fifth year of
his reign (506) Clovis sent for St. Severinus,
abbot of St. Maur (Agaunum), who performed
miraculous cures were then noised abroad. On his
way to Paris, the saint came to Nevers, and
asking for the bishop found Eulalidus lying dead
and dumb. He straightway healed him by the
sound of his voice. Coquelle (Hist. du Nièvre, 
Paris, 1812, sub fin.) apparently identifies him
with Oesidius or Eleodius, whom he places
seventh, others sixth, in the list of the Nevers
bishops. He is commemorated Aug. 26. (Vita
im 589, Paris, 1669-1701; Gall. Christ. xii. 626.)

S. A. B.

EULALLA (1), virgin martyr, born in the
4th century, of noble parents, at Merida (St.
Emerita) in Spain. At the age of twelve, during
the persecution of Diocletian, she was offered to
the idols. After she had been burnt to death, it
is said that her soul came forth like a white dove
and hovered over her body till snow fell and
EULALIA

covered it. (Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs ecclés. iii. 39; Baron. Amable. Ecles. a.d. 594, 158.) She is commemorated Dec. 10 (Mart. Rom. Vot., Ad., U. 11, Wund.) Prudentius has a hymn in her honour (Peristep. hymn. iii.). Bede in his hymn on Etheldreds gives her the following line:

"Eulalia et perfect ignibususta ferat."

(H. E. iv. 20.)

[I. G. S.]

EULALIA (2), saint of Barcelona. The very existence of this famous saint, to whom the cathedral of Barcelona is dedicated, has been disputed, and is, indeed, extremely doubtful. The story of her martyrdom is almost identical with that of St. Eulalia of Merida. Both saints are represented as living with their parents in the country. Both hurry to the neighbouring city when the news of the Diocletian persecution reaches them, both seek out the Præses, and both see the gods, both are tortured and burnt over a slow fire. On the bodies of both after death snow descends, and covers them from sight. From the mouths of both a white dove ascends to heaven at the moment of death, and both are visited after death by a certain Felix who had been converted by their example. The points of difference are, (1) Eulalia of Merida is represented by Prudentius as twelve years old, Eulalia of Barcelona is fourteen; (2) in the case of the Barcelona saint the Præses is the famous Ducián, in the case of Eulalia of Merida, Calisperian; (3) in the Acta of Eulalia of Barcelona the dead face smiles miraculously at Felix, in the Acta of Eulalia of Barcelona the smile is not there. It is extremely difficult to fix the date of the earliest mention of Eulalia of Barcelona. In the Mozarabic Liturgy each saint has a complete office, and a complete Mass. The feast of Eulalia of Merida falls on the 10th of December, that of Eulalia of Barcelona on the 12th of February. The timeliness of this Mozarabic liturgical veneration, in honour of Eulalia of Barcelona, by Quiçirius, bishop of Barcelona, and which Gams dates about 630, is doubted by Arevalo (see his edition of Prudentius, Migne, L. 339). We may consider the cult of this saint however to have been established by the seventh century, and to have been connected with the Mozarabic liturgy, in which Eulalia of Merida is emulated. Bede, in common with various later authors, says that she was beheaded, a variation from the Acta, which must surely have been a conscious or unconscious attempt to distinguish between the two Eulalias. It seems scarcely possible to doubt that the one story is a reflection of the other. Nevertheless, opinion has been always greatly divided, and Gams, the latest ecclesiastical historian of Spain (Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. p. 306), has succeeded in persuading himself of the existence of the two Eulalias. The silence of Prudentius, who devotes an entire hymn to Eulalia of Merida, and who might so easily have introduced the name of Eulalia of Barcelona into his mention of that city when he speaks of the martyr Cecufa (Prudentius, Peristep. hymn 4, 33), together with the similarity of the stories and the lateness of the Acta, has seemed conclusive to many hagiographers against the existence of Eulalia of Barcelona. The cult of the saint is, however, one of the most famous in Spain, and her supposed relics rest in a subterranean chapel of the cathedral of Barcelona, which was consecrated in 1339, and whither they were transferred from the older fabric of 1058, built in its turn upon the site of the still earlier church into which, in 878, bishop Frodo of Barcelona is said to have transferred the remains from the church of St. Mary without the walls (Bell. A.D. 1122, Feb. ii. 376).

Tillemont, Mem. v. 713; Eulogius, Mem. Sanct. i. 24; Tamayo de Salazar, Martyr. Hisp. i. 102; Flores, Esp. Sag. xxii. 287; Vide, martirio y grandezas de santa Eulalia, hija, patrona y basilar de Barcelona, Ponsich y Campo, 1770.)

[E. A. W.]

EULALIA (3), wife of Probus, and cousin of Sidonius Apollinaris, who addresses her husband in terms of great affection, recalling the early days when Probus was his teacher. (Sid. Apoll. Epv. iv. 1.)

[R. T. S.]

EULALIA (4), lady at the court of Charlemagne, addressed by Alcuin. (Gundrada.)

EULALIA (5), an antipope, elected and ordained as bishop of Rome after the death of Zosimus at the close of the year 416, in opposition to Boniface I, who was finally established. In the see, Eulalius being expelled from Rome, by the emperor Honorius in the April of the following year. The official letters which passed have been preserved in the Vatican, and are quoted at length by Baronius (A. E. ann. 416, lxxix. 419, 12—xxiii.). A summary of their contents, and of the facts deducible from them is here subjoined, since they throw light on the conflicts attending the election of bishops, and on the powers exercised by the emperors in connexion with such elections. First we have a letter (Dec. 29, 418) to Honorius at Ravenna from Symmachus the Praefectus Uribis, who had entered on his duties as such only a few weeks before the death of Zosimus. He states that, after he had warned the people to proceed to a new election without disturbance, Eulalius the archdeacon had been taken to the Lateran church by the clergy and people, duly elected, and ordained; that in the meantime certain presbyters, accompanied by the bishop, went to him in the name of the presbytery, to the church of Theodora, and, though warned by himself to do nothing rashly, had persisted in ordaining him in the church of S. Marcellus, and thence proceeded with him to St. Peter's basilica. He concludes by requesting the instructions of the emperor, with whom, he says, it rests to give judgment in such a case.

Honorius, taking for granted the correctness of this ex parte statement, replies (Jan. 3, 419) by ordering Boniface to be expelled from the city, and the authors of the sedition in his favour punished; the reason given for such order being that Eulalius had been duly appointed according to the rule of Catholic discipline (completes numerus ordinantium, solemnitas temporis, loci quae qualitas), the election of his rival being deficient in these respects. Symmachus replies (Jan. 5) that he has carried out the emperor's order, though not with resistance on the part of Boniface; that the latter had caused a messenger, sent to summon him and to forbid a procession which he was about to commence, to be beaten by the
people; had proceeded with the procession in spite of the prohibition; had entered the city again by violence, though the gates were guarded to keep him out; but had been since again expelled by an opposing mob; and that Eulalius had in the meantime celebrated divine service in the basilica of St. Peter amid the acclamations and approval of almost the whole city.

In the meantime the Roman presbyters who supported Boniface had sent the emperor a different account of things from that given by Symmachus. They had been unable, they say, to assemble for a new election in the customary place, namely, the Lateran church, because of its being taken possession of by Eulalius with a very small number of presbyters and an excited mob; they had been compelled therefore to assemble elsewhere, representing themselves as the great majority of the clergy of Rome, and as supported by the better part of the laity; that amid general acclamation of the people they had elected Boniface who, in addition to other merits, was in his unwearied efforts to accept the dignity offered him; that seventy priests and nine bishops of provinces had concurred in his ordination, whereas his rival had the support of but a small number of clergy, the bishop of Ostia, a sick old man almost at the point of death, having been brought against his will to assist in the ordination. They then petitioned the emperor to revoke his former edict, issued under false information, and to summon Eulalius and his abettors to his presence, promising on their side the attendance of Boniface with as many of the presbyters of his party as might be required, for the settlement of the dispute.

Having received this counterstatement, Honorius writes to Symmachus (Jan. 15), revoking his former edict; bidding him command the attendance at Ravenna on a prescribed day (Feb 8) of Boniface and Eulalius, with their respective supporters, prepared to support their cases by reference to ecclesiastical precedent before a synod which was being summoned from various parts of Italy to hear the case. In the meantime the matter in dispute was to be considered entirely open and awaiting judgment, with the proviso that the non-appearance of either claimant would be construed as fatal to his claim. Symmachus in reply (Jan. 25), while he repeats in curtly phrase his diligent execution of the imperial commands, no longer writes as the supporter of Eulalius, being anxious to represent himself as entirely impartial, and accuses both parties (whom he had forbidden to resort together to the same church from fear of conflict) of endeavouuring to support their positions by calumnies and lies.

There appears next a communiement of the emperor to the bishop summoned by him to hear the case, in which any who had taken part in the election or ordination of either claimant are forbidden to be either judges or witnesses, and in which the rest are warned to approach the question without prejudice, and decide after full examination under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

It appears from the documents that follow that the members of the synod thus summoned were divided in sympathy or opinion and unable to come to a decision before Easter (Mar. 30), when custom required the presence of a bishop in Rome to celebrate the solemnities of the season. Honorius therefore decided on deferring the consideration of the case till after Easter, when he proposed to refer it to a fuller synod, and in the meantime commissioned Achilles bishop of Seleto to celebrate Easter in Rome after the usual manner, forbidding both claimants to the see to appear there for the present. In the letters addressed by the emperor to Symmachus, to Achilles, to the senate, and to the people generally, on this occasion, considerable apprehension of disregard of his injunctions and of disturbance is evident. While on the one hand he takes pains to justify his prorogation of the question, on the ground of its importance, the number of new points that had arisen for consideration, and the duty of the emperor to see that episcopal synods decided nothing in haste, though not to arrogate the function of decision; on the other hand he exacts obedience to his orders in a high tone of authority, and threatens with summary punishment all disturbers of the peace of the city.

Having thus, as he hoped, provided for the peaceable celebration of Easter, he lost no time in summoning bishops from far and wide for the intended full synod to be held at Spoleto on the 13th of June. To this end he sent private letters to several of the more important prelates, such as Paulinus bishop of Nola, whose influence had prevented his attendance at the previous synod, Augustine, and Aurelius bishop of Carthage, together with circular letters to the bishops of Africa and of Gaul. The proposed assembly however never took place. Eulalius and his party, disregarding the imperial orders, entered Rome at mid-day, Mar. 15, came into violent collision with Achilles and his supporters, so that a fray ensued, during which Symmachus and the Vicarius Urbis, interposing, narrowly escaped with their lives. On hearing of this the emperor ordered (Mar. 25) Eulalius to be immediately expelled from the city, declaring that his refusal to go would be fatal to his claim to the see, as well as injure him in future consequences. Having not only refused to comply, but also taken violent possession of the Lateran church, he was eventually dislodged thence and from Rome; and his expulsion was followed by an imperial edict (Ap. 3), excluding him from the see and confirming Boniface as bishop of Rome. Accordingly the latter was forthwith conducted into the city, and accepted as bishop, being welcomed (if Symmachus is to be believed) by the whole population with joy, and gratitude to the emperor for his celestial edict. An imperial rescript (Ap. 7) to the proconsul Largus countermanded the summons sent to the bishops of Africa and Gaul, speaking of the question at issue being now finally settled by imperial authority.

Eulalius seems to have acquiesced in this decision. At first he retired to Antium, near Rome, expecting the death of Boniface, who fell sick after his accession, but, this hope failing, he made no further attempt to recover the see, though invited to do so by his partisans in Rome on the death of Boniface in 423. According to the Liber Pontificalis he afterwards became bishop of Nepete. Honorius in a letter to Boniface after his establishment in the see endeavoured to provide against future scandals by forbidding all canvassing for the bishopric, and ordering that
In any future case of a double election neither of the candidates should be accepted, but a new election made with general consent.

From the account given above, extracted from authentic contemporary documents, the following facts are evident. First, that the ancient custom, prevalent at the time, of election of a new bishop by the clergy, with the assent of the laity, and confirmation by provincial bishops, was allowed in this case, with no desire apparent on the part of the civil power to interfere with it. Secondly, that elections had come to be conducted in an irregular and tumultuous manner, the claims of rival candidates giving rise (as had been also the case on the election of Damasus) to violent party conflicts, attended with bloodshed in the churches as well as in the streets. Thirdly, that it was the necessity of restoring order, and adjudicating between rival claims, that called forth the interference of the emperor in such church affairs. Fourthly, that in this case the emperor at first claimed no right to decide on the validity of either of the two elections on his own mere authority, or without first submitting the question to an episcopal synod; though, on the other hand, he assumed the power of selecting the members of such synod, directing its proceedings, and dissolving it at his pleasure, as well as coercing authoritatively the clergy of Rome penitentibus, and commissioning whom he chose to supply the place of the Roman bishop for the time. Fifthly, that eventually he settled the whole question on his own mere authority, without either the sanction of a synod, or regard to the canonicity of the original election of the candidate whom he established in the see. A statement, contained in the Liber Pontificalis, that Eulalius was deposited by a synod of 252 bishops, is entirely inconsistent with the evidence of the contemporary documents above referred to, and, as such, cannot give it up. It is true that in the letters in which Honorius announces his final decision that Eulalius had already held without result, as well as himself, had decided that such an attempt as Eulalius had made should involve the deposition of either claimant; but in one letter (that to the procopius Largus) he speaks of this doubtfully.—"Id quod nostrae sententiae ordinavert, et quod statuisse synodi sententiu videbat,"—and elsewhere he takes the whole responsibility on himself; and the letters of Symmachus and Largus refer the entire decision to him; nor is there evidence of such exercise of power being on this occasion challenged.

With regard to the real claims of the two rivals on the ground of canonical election, it is generally taken for granted, and probably with truth, that the letter of the Roman presbyters who supported Boniface gives a correct account of things, and hence that his claim was the valid one. Still it should be remembered that the previous letter of Symmachus gave a different account, that the synod summoned to consider the question was unable to come to a decision, and that the imperial verdict in favour of Boniface was irrespective of the original merits of the case.

EULALIUS (2), reputed to have been the fourth bishop of Syracuse, succeeding Chrestus II. c. A.D. 90, and followed by Epinnus. (P'irrii, Sicilia Sacra, i. 630.)

EULALIUS (3). A bishop of this name is said by Socrates (H. E. ii. 43) and Sozomen (H. E. iv. 24) to have presided over Caesarea in Cappadocia, in the early part of the 4th century, and, to have had as son the notorious Eustathius of Schesina, whom he deposed from holy ordination for adopting a dress unsuitable to his office. As no bishop of the name is found at Caesarea at this time, it is probable that these not over-accurate historians have fallen into an error. (Tillemont, Mem. Eccl. ix. note 24, S. Basilic.)

EULALIUS (4), a presbyter, otherwise unknown, chosen by the Ariana party of Antioch, as bishop after the deposition of Eustathius, c. A.D. 322. He died a few months after his consecration. The only act recorded of his episcopate is the banishment of Aetius the Anomoosan from Antioch (Theod. H. E. i. 22; Hieron. Chron. sub ann. 3234; Philostorg. H. E. iii. 15). There is considerable uncertainty as to the succession and dates of the intruded bishops of Antioch at this period. According to Socrates (H. E. i. 24) the see was vacant for eight years after the deposition of Eustathius, and was then filled by Euphranius. Sozomen also (H. E. ii. 19) makes Euphranius the next successor to Eustathius. Philostorgius, on the other hand, states that Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, was translated to the vacant see, and, having occupied it only six months, was succeeded by Eulalius of Ephesus. Condr. Marcell. c. 4; Valesius in Euseb. H. E. x. 1; in Socr. H. E. i. 24; Kaye, Council of Nicea, p. 60, note 4). [EUSTATHIUS (3) OF SCHESINIA. EUSEBIUS (23) FAMPUELI, p. 315, lxxi.] (E. V.)

EULALIUS (5), bishop of Iconium, the metropolis of Lycaonia, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1068; Manci, ii. 695.)

EULALIUS (6), bishop of Sebasto, the metropolis of Lesser Armenia, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. In some MSS. the name is written Astrino (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 421; Gumm. Series Episc. 440; Manci, ii. 694.)

EULALIUS (7), bishop of Antamnia in Epirus, A.D. 343. (Farlati, Ilyr. Sacr. vii. 394.) One of the Eusebian party who attended the synod of Philippopolis, A.D. 347, and signed the manifesto to the African church. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 267.)

EULALIUS (8), bishop of Doara in Cappadocia Secunda. Shortly before his appointment the church at Doara had suffered severe persecution from the Arians. The orthodox party, however, succeeded in expelling the Ariana prelate and electing Eulalius in his room, A.D. 375. Gregory Nazianzen delivered the sermon at his enthronement, in which he commends him highly (Greg. Naz. Orat. 30). Three years later, A.D. 378, the deposed bishop, of whom Basil gives the lowest character, speaking of him as a runaway slave, the paramour of a powerful matron of the place, recovered his see. (Basil, Ep. 231, 208 [385, 103].)
EULALIUS—BISHOPS

EULALIUS (9), bishop of Amasea in Pontus, banished by Valens and restored by Gratian (A.D. 378). His love of peace and fear of schism led him to prefer that the intruded Arian bishops should retain their posts rather than that the catholics by the assertion of their own just claims should rend the church. Eulalius on his restoration proposed to the bishop whom he found occupying his throne to share the government with him, giving him the precedence. His proposition was refused by the Arian bishop, who soon lost to the orthodox party the small following he had. (Soz. H. E. vii. 2.) [E. V.]

EULALIUS (10), bishop of Nazianzus, a cousin of Gregory Nazianzen (Ep. 195 [182]), the brother of Heliandus, sons of a mother worthy of such offspring (Carm. 48). The two brothers embraced a solitary life, and purchased a farm on which they might live apart from the world. The field was surrounded by a broad ditch. The seller proved a knave, and their neighbours so unneighbourly, that after the brothers had expended a considerable sum on the estate, they were fain to beg to be allowed to resign it at the original price (Ep. 105). Gregory was much attached to his cousin, as is shown in their joint letter to Caesenna, bishop of Constantinople (ibid.) and to Lollani (Ep. 182). Heliandus died before A.D. 372, leaving the care of his sick mother to Eulalius alone (p. 108, Carm. 48). Eulalius subsequently became a presbyter and choriposicus, and was deputed by Gregory, in conjunction with Celestius, to apprise Theodorus of Cyrrha of the doings of the Apostatists (Ep. 88; cf. Tillemont, i. p. 722; “St. Greg. Naz.” note liv.). In A.D. 382 Eulalius was living with other solitary lambs at Lamia. Gregory visited him during the Lent of that year, which season Gregory had vowed to pass in absolute silence. His sights and gestures were so correctly interpreted by Eulalius that the visit was one of great mutual edification. When Lent was over Gregory wrote condemning Eulalius for the excessive severity of his self-denial, and proposing to visit him again, now that he could once more hold converse with him (Ep. 98–102). Tillemont reasonably identifies him with Eulalius, Gregory’s successor in the see of Nazianzus, 383, who was consecrated by the bishops of Cappadocia Secunda (Ep. 228). Gregory commended him warmly to his namesake of Nyssa, as one in whose arms he would be glad to die. He must not credit the tale that Eulalius’s consecration had been in defiance of his wishes; on the contrary, he had repeatedly begged the bishop of his province to relieve him of his episcopate and appoint a successor. (Ep. 42.) [E. V.]

EULALIUS, bishop of Nepete, previously autopope (No. 1). 

EULALIUS (11), one of the bishops of Armenia, to whom and to his brother bishops during the terrible persecution of the Christians by the Persians, e. A.D. 420, described by him in his “Ecclesiastical History” (Theod. H. E. v. 38), Theodoret writes letters exhorting them to courage and endurance; reminding them that the bishops, some of whom were evidently waverers, ought to be the leaders and champions of their flocks, and not to desert them like hirelings; and exhorting them to exercise tender watchfulness over the weaker members, raising the fallen, and bringing back the straying, and at the same time exercising a strict and faithful discipline to deepen their repentance and ensure their recovery. Theodoret assures them that he does not write as one possessed of authority over them, but as a friendly counsellor. The letter was written in reply to a paper which Theodoret had brought Theodoret the news of the persecution. (Theod. Epist. 77.) [E. V.]

EULALIUS (12), bishop of Chalcodon, a contemporary of Nestorius, 430, ministering in the life of St. Hypatius the hegumen [Herranz (19)]. His lukewarmness is contrasted with the zeal of Hypatius, in refusing to break with Nestorius before his condemnation, in not resisting Leontius and the Olympic games, in expelling Alexander and his monks. The Bollandist, however, throws doubts on his existence, his name not appearing at the council of Ephesus, 431, nor at the Latrocinium, 449. At the council of Chalcodon, 451, Eleutherius was bishop. (A.A. SS. Boll. 17 Jun. iii. 331, 337; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 601.) [G. H.]

EULALIUS (13), bishop of Ponia in Myus, present at the oecumenical council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 780; Mansi, vii. 152.) [L. D.]

EULALIUS (14), bishop of Silbium in Phrygia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 809; Mansi, vii. 156.) [L. D.]

EULALIUS (15), supposed bishop of Viviers. The name without a see appears at the second and fourth councils of Arles, A.D. 452 and 453 (Sirmont, Conc. Gall. i. 102, 129). It has been contended that Viviers was his bishopric. An undecipherable name in an ancient MS. list of bishops of Viviers is thus supplied. This view involves a correction of the chronology of Tillemont (Med. xvi. 106), who believes Aemilius to have filled the see of Viviers up to A.D. 464. (Gall. Christ. vi. 544; Gams, Ser. Ep. 36.) [R. T. S.]

EULALIUS (16), bishop of Syraeae, c. 500. He is mentioned by the writer of the life of St. Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe prefixed to the works of that author. (Migne, Patrol. Lat. lxxv.) [Fulgentius (53.)] Smitten with the love of the monastic life, Fulgentius had sailed from Carthage with the intention of proceeding to the Thebaid. The vessel touched at Syracuse, and the biographer gives a very pleasing picture of the Syracusan bishop, who was greatly impressed by the young traveller. Eulalius held the monastic life in the highest esteem, but dissuaded Fulgentius from going to a country not in communion with the see of St. Peter. Eulalius told him that as a youth he himself had entertained the intention of going as a monk to these very regions, but had been deterred by this difficulty. He entertained Fulgentius for several weeks, finding him in lodgings and supplying all his wants (Migne, vi. sup. pp. 128–130). In the letters of Eunodius (lib. iii. 18), we have two to a Eulalius, which were probably addressed to this bishop. Eulalius was present at the fourth synod of Rome.
EULALIUS, a heathen Phrygian philosopher of the 6th century, who in company with Damascius a Syrian, Friscianus a Lydian, Hermias and Diogenes, Phoenicians, Isidorus of Gaza, Simplicius a Sicilian, all of them the most eminent of their time, withdrew into Persia, hoping to enjoy greater liberty and meet with more general sympathy under King Chrorses than under the Byzantine Christian emperors. They soon found themselves disappointed, and were glad to return. (Agathias, Hist. ii. 30, ed. Dürrer. 1828, p. 131.) [T. W. D.]

EULAMPIA (1), a martyr together with Eulampius her brother. They were natives of Nicomedia. When the Diocletian persecution broke out, they left their home and retired to a mountain where a number of Christians had taken refuge. One day, however, Eulampius went into the city to purchase provisions; he was recognized as a Christian, arrested, and tortured. As soon as Eulampius received intelligence of this, she came down to the city, threw herself at the side of her brother, and confessed that she was one with him in his faith. They were then both beheaded. They are commemorated Oct. 10. (Men. Bas.) [T. S. B.]

EULAMPIA (2), mother of the historian Philippus, and known to us through a slight mention preserved of her by Photius in his abridgment of the ecclesiastical history of her son. As Philippus was born about A.D. 364, we may consider her as belonging to the middle of the 4th century. It would appear that she was the only surviving daughter of an orthodox neophyte of the name of Anyius, who lived at Dorissus, a village of Cappadocia, and had likewise four sons. Eulamia, we may be sure, was brought up in the orthodox faith, at that time safely tried by the prevalence of the Ariam or Semi-Arian heresy. But Eulamia did not continue orthodox. She married one Cartherius belonging to the sect of the Eunomians, the keenest and most zealous inheritors of the now condemned Arianism, and whose attachment to the faith which they had inherited was strengthened rather than weakened by the cruel persecutions which they had to endure in maintaining it. Eulamia must have been a woman of ardent dispositions, for she embraced her new faith with great warmth and earnestness. We are told that she gave over to it first her brothers, then her father, and lastly, by degrees, the remainder of her relatives. What is of more consequence, however, is that she brought up her son Philippus in the same principles. The notice of her to which we have referred is contained in Philostorgius (lib. ix. c. 9). [W. M.]

EULAMPIUS, martyr. [Eulamia (1).]

EULANCIUS, a friend of Basil, residing at Neocaesarea. Basil wrote to him, A.D. 375, complaining of his unwonted silence, and expressing his fear that he was beginning to look coldly upon him on account of his unpopularity with the Neocaesareans. (Bas. Ep. 208 [281].) [E. V.]

EULODIUS (EULADIUS), fourteenth bishop of Bourges, was father of St. Simplicius, his successor, as we learn from the oration of Sid. Apollinaris upon the election of the latter. (Gall. Christ. ii. 8; Gams, Ser. Ep. 522.) [R. T. S.]

EULOGIUS (1), bishop of Sebaste. [Eulalius.]

EULOGIUS (2), bishop of Ambianiun (Amiens), at the council of Sardica, 347 (Athana.
treating some of the bishops and presbyters who were banished to Palestine for their adherence to Chrysostom's cause (Pallad. Dialoq. p. 290). Two bishops of Gaul, Heros of Arles, and Lazare of Aix, having brought an accusation of false doctrine against Pelagius during his residence in Palestine, before Eulogius, as metropolitan, he was summoned to Dionysius the ancient Lydias, in December, A.D. 415. Fourteen bishops assembled under the presidency of Eulogius. The accusers failing to appear under plea of sickness, Pelagius was left to defend himself unopposed, and succeeded in clearing himself of the errors with which he had been charged to the satisfaction of the synod, the members of which were but little acquainted with the subtle questions involved in the controversy. Jerome, as was natural, speaks of this synod with the utmost contempt—*in illa miserabili synode Diospolitano* " (Hieron. Ep. 79). Augustine, who gives its Acts, is more favourable to it. (Asc. Refutat. ii. 47; Contra Julian. i. 5; Labbe, ii. 1552.) Eulogius is identified by Mén. Eccl. xi. 518] with the bishop of Caesarea, who deposed Eustathius, a reader of that church, on the false charge of corrupting the virgins of a presbyter (Pallad. Hist. Lec. c. 141). He died c. 417. [K. V.]

EULOGIUS, (5), bishop of Trinithis, Ternuthia, Taranin, in the second province of the Thebaïs. He was present at the third general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1117; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 613.) [J. de S.]

EULOGIUS, (7), bishop of Athribis in the Egyptian Delta. He was present at the fourth general council at Chalcedon, A.D. 451, where, together with Dioscorus of Alexandria, and the other Egyptian bishops, he mainly opposed the influence of Leo. (Mansi, vii. 51; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 555.) [J. de S.]

EULOGIUS, (8), bishop of Philadelphia, is Coele Syria, who signed the acts of the council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) as metropolitan of Arabia. (Labbe, iv. 83, 329, 454, &c.; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 861.) [K. V.]

EULOGIUS, (9), bishop of Eporedia (IVOKE). Present at the council held under Euchius of Milan in A.D. 451; appears as subscribing the synodical letter of the council to Leo I., by the hand of Photius, a presbyter, because the sanctity was too great to allow him to sign with his own hand. (Leo. Mag. Ep. 98, 1063, Migne.) [G. C.]

EULOGIUS, (10), a bishop mentioned by Photius (Cod. 130, p. 285; Patr. Gr. ceii. 1086) as presiding in a council in the seventh year of the emperor Marcian (i.e. A.D. 457), and issuing a Decree against the Samaritans. Photius appears to confuse him with the patriarch of Alexandria (No. 14), who lived much later. Tillemont (xxv. 762) and Ceillier (ai. 552) suggest the possibility of his being the bishop of Philadelphia (No. 8). [C. H.]

EULOGIUS, (11), bishop of Melitene, the metropolis of the Greater Armenia, signed the letter of the synod of Constantinople to pope Hormidas concerning the ordination of archbishop Epiphanius, A.D. 520. (Le Quen, Greci Christ. i. 413; Mansi, viii. 493.) [L. D.]
EULOGIUS—BISHOPS

EULOGIUS (12), bishop of Perga, the metropolitan of the second Pamphilus, present at the fifth general council, A.D. 553, at Constantinople. (Le Quien, Orisae Christ. i. 1015; Mansi, ix. 380.) [L. D.]

EULOGIUS (13), bishop of Danaba in Phœnicia Secunda, west of Palmyra. He was present at the fifth general council held at Constantinople, A.D. 553. (Mansi, ix. 384; Le Quien, Orisae Christ. ii. 848.) [J. de S.]

EULOGIUS (14), forty sixth bishop of Alexandria and patriarch, between John I. and Theodorus Scribo, 579–607. He was originally a priest and head of the monastery of the Deipara at Antioch. Some time about 582–584 he had become acquainted with Gregory, afterwards pope Gregory the Great, at Constantinople, from whose letters and from Photius's Bibliotheca the best account of his life and writings can be drawn. He adhered to the Catholic faith, passing his life in struggles with the various forms assumed by the Manichæan and other heresies, and as a saint both by the Greeks and Latins, being commemorated by the former on Feb. 13 (Basil. Mem.) and by the latter on Sept. 13 (Mart. Rom.; Bull. AA. SS. Sept. iv. 85). The principal modern accounts of him are those of Stilling the Bollandist (ut sup.), Le Quien and Neale (ut infra), and of Eulogius and that of John the Almoner who followed him soon afterwards, shed a partial lustre on the Alexandrian church before the Saracen invasion came and overwhelmed it. The bishops of the Jacobites with whom Eulogius had to contend were Danianus and Anastasius Apozygarius; but the Alexandrian Jacobites were then in a dejected state and found a powerful antagonist in the learned and energetic patriarch.

It was a matter of dispute whether in 588 Eulogius held a synod at Alexandria to settle a dispute among the Sunnarians concerning the term “a prophet like unto me” (Deut. xviii. 15), which some of them referred to Josiah, some to David, and others to John the Baptist. The latter were right (Photius, Cod. 230; Mansi, ix. 1021). As Photius, the authority for this synod, says it was held in the reign of Marcian, either its president was a different Eulogius or Marcian was not the emperor. Those who adopt the latter view, Stilling among them, conclude that Photius wrote Marcian by mistake for Maurice. For another solution of the difficulty see Eulogius (10). Photius gives a detailed account of the writings and orations of Eulogius against Narsus a Novatian (Codd. 182, 208); against Severus and Timothenus, heretics; against Theodorus and Gaius, the orontian; also the extant orations of Eulogius (Cod. 250); and a work against the Novatians divided into five books (Cod. 280). The extant correspondence between Eulogius and Gregory, who were united to one another by a very warm friendship, ranges from 583 to 600, but only Gregory's letters are preserved. In 588 Eulogius is urged to offer strenuous opposition to the title of Universal Bishop assumed by the patriarch John the Faster of Constantinople (Greg. Epp. lib. v. ind. xiii. ep. 43). In 596 Gregory dwells upon the intimate union there should naturally exist between the sees of Alexandria and Rome on account of St. Mark having been placed over the former by St. Peter (lib. vi. ind. xiv. ep. 60). In 597 Eulogius on the vigil of St. Francis displays his conflict with heresy (lib. vii. ind. xv. ep. 40). In 598 he is inquiring for a work on the gesta martyrum by Eusebius distinct from that historian's account of the martyrs in his extant works. (Eusebius (23), p. 321.) Gregory, who can find no such book either in the archives of the Roman church or in the libraries of the city, takes occasion to send him some interesting information as to how the martyr festivals were then observed at Rome. Gregory is at that time sending him a cargo of timber, but the timber is too small for Eulogius, and no ship will carry no little share of the timber requires (lib. viii. ind. i. ep. 29). It might be surmised that the timber was for a new church. The most interesting letter of all the series is that which Eulogius received in 598, written in June according to the computation of Jaffé (Regest. Pontif. p. 125). He is congratulated on the ground he is gaining on the heretics, that he is a bishop of the Catholic Church and he often goes to Jerusalem, and that he is a great lover of the Roman Catholic Church and on their growth in numbers. Gregory can gladden his heart by a narrative of similar prosperity in another quarter. The race of the Angli, placed in an angle of the world, hitherto the victims of a perverse belief and an idolatrous worship, are at length yielding to the gospel. The month of April is now a bishop and doing marvels. News has come that at the preceding Christmas more than ten thousand Angli had been baptized. Eulogius then may show his Alexandrians how much can be effected at the farthest extremity of the earth by prayer (lib. viii. ind. ii. ep. 30). Gregory's expressions in one passage seem to attribute to Eulogius the right of giving himself as a new bishop and doing marvels. News has come that at the preceding Christmas more than ten thousand Angli had been baptized. Eulogius then may show his Alexandrians how much can be effected at the farthest extremity of the earth by prayer (lib. viii. ind. ii. ep. 78); perhaps the titular encroachment concerned Alexandria less than it did Rome. Larger timber has now been procured, but as only a small trunk has been brought in, what would Eulogius have had to do? The latest letters received from Gregory were two in the year 600 on the subject of the Agnæae (lib. x. ind. iii. ep. 35, 39). From Photius (Cod. 230) it appears that Gregory found fault with a synodal letter received from Eulogius, because it did not make definite mention of the four councils, of Leo's tome, and of the phrase "in two natures"—that test of the true faith; whereupon Eulogius wrote back defending and explaining his orthodoxy. The death of Eulogius is placed by Le Quien in 607; by Stilling about 605 or 606 (Le Quien, Orisae Christ. ii. 442; Neale, Patriarch Alex. ii. 46–52). [L. D. & C. H.]


EULOGIUS (16), martyr at Constantinople during the Arian persecution in the reign of Valens. He is commemorated July 3. (Mart. Rom. Vét., Hier., Adj., Us., Wand.) [T. S. B.]

EULOGIUS (17). An Egyptian monk and presbyter of the 4th century, renowned for his
wonderful insight and strictness of discipline, which often made him repel men from the communion, on account of evil thoughts which he had detected in them. (Rufinus, Hist. Mon. cap. 14; Sozomen, vi. 28; Niceph. Call. H. E. xi. 34; Cassiod. Hist. Trip. viii. 1, p. 523, in Pat. Lat. ixx. 1107 n.) [W. H. F.]

EULOGIUS (18), a monk to whom St. Ephrem Syrus addressed his 47th Paraenesis, which consists of counsels and exhortations chiefly relating to the monastic life. (Ephr. Syr. Opp. ii. 170, ed. Rom. 1745; Ceillier, Hist. des Autres ecclés. vii. 94.) [T. W. D.]

EULOGIUS (19), a presbyter of Constantinople, and an adherent of Cyril, who wrote to inform him of what had occurred at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Cyrill. ep. 23, Migne, al. 21, p. 84, Patr. Gr. Ixxvii. 132.) [G. H.]

EULOGIUS (20), a monk to whom St. Nilus addressed one of his treatises on the ascetic life. (Nil. Opp. in Patr. Gr. ixxxix. 1094; Ceillier, Hist. des Autres ecclés. viii. 317.) [I. G. S.]

EULOGIUS (21), deacon of the church of Constantinople, A.D. 449. On the appointment of the imperial commission to investigate the charges against Ibas of Edessa, consisting of Eustathius of Berytus, Photius of Tyre, and Eunaius of Himera, Eulogius, as the deacon of Flavian, communicated the necessary letters of authority from the bishop to the commissioners (Labbe, Concil. iv. 627). He accompanied the commission to Berytus, and was present during the investigation, as well as at the further proceedings which were held at Tyre, and at the signing of the concordat between Ibas and his accusers (Ibid. 635). [E. V.]

EULOGIUS (22), ecclesiarch of the church at Constantinople, who had himself contended for the orthodox faith, to whom Theodoret wrote A.D. 449, when Dioscorus and others were clamouring for his deposition as a heretic, calling upon Eulogius, as being well acquainted with his teaching, to bear witness to the soundness of his belief, and stop the mouths of his calumniators. (Theod. Epist. 105.) [E. V.]

EULOGIUS (23), a tribune, one of the two imperial commissioners deputed by Theodosius II. to the "Robbers' Synod" of Ephesus in A.D. 449. (Epiphan. (42).) [E. V.]

EULOGIUS (24), an officer of rank carrying despatches from the Byzantine court to Pope Honorius in the year 519. He is designated "vir sublimis (Manus, vii. 447), vir spectabilis et magistrius (482), vir strenuus (484), vir sublimis (485), vir sublimis tribunus et notarius (516). The letters are undated, but they are assigned by Jaffé (Reg. Pont. 69 sq.) and Baronius (ann. 519, sciv.) to the above year. [C. H.]

EULYSIS, bishop of Apamea in Bithynia, one of Chrysostom's most loyal adherents. He was one of the leading members of the body of forty bishops who gathered around Chrysostom in the dining-hall of the episcopal palace when the Synod of the Oak was holding its session. On his remarkable reply to Chrysostom's counsel "not to abandon their sees in case of his being deposed," that "it would be necessary for them if they retained their dioceses to communicate with his enemies and to subscribe to his condemnation," Chrysostom answered that "it would certainly be desirable to communicate with them to avoid rending the unity of the church, but that they should refuse to subscribe, as that would be to allow the Justianists' deposition." (Pallad. Dial. p. 70.) Eulysius was one of the deputation of five, "all men of sanctity and high repute," entrusted with the remonstrance of the assembled bishops against the lawless proceedings of Theophilus, and with Chrysostom's reply to his summons. He shared in the personal indignities and ill-treatment with which the enemies of the saint vieded their disappointment at his refusal to appear. (Ibid. pp. 71, 74.) When Chrysostom was finally expelled from Constantinople, Eulysius accompanied him in the vessel which conveyed him to the Bithynian coast, where, with his companion Cyriacus, bishop of Surnada, he was apprehended and detailed in chains on suspicion of complicity in the privy to the confiscation which succeeded Chrysostom's departure. The two bishops were carried back to Chalcedon, and after examination were dismissed as innocent. (Ibid. p. 93.) In A.D. 405 Eulysius was bearer of letters from fifteen of the forty friendly bishops to pope Innocent, representing the troubles caused to the church by the violent proceedings of Atticus and his adherents, together with one from Anysius bishop of Thermoponcia. (Ibid. p. 26.) Chrysostom addressed a letter from Cucusius in 406 to Eulysius and the bishops who were with him, expressing a high sense of the labours and trials they had undergone for the sake of the church, which could not fail to procure for them a divine blessing. (Chrysost. Epist. 148.) In A.D. 406 Eulysius and the eastern bishops accompanied the western deputation to Constantinople, and shared their maltreatment. (Pallad. Dial. p. 81.) On the disastrous termination of the embassy, Eulysius and his companions disappeared, and it is not known that they had been taken out to sea and drowned. It proved, however, that they had really been deported to remote places of exile. That selected for Eulysius was the fortress of Misphas (Mizpah), three days' journey beyond Bostra or Bozrah in Arabia, where he probably died. (Ibid. p. 194.) [K. V.]

EUMACHIUS, 7th bishop of Vivières, about the beginning of the 5th century, succeeded by Auctorius. (Gall. Christ. xvi. 546.) [R. T. S.]


EUMENES (HYEMENEXUS), bishop of Alexandria. According to the chronicle of Eusebius, he succeeded Justus in A.D. 130, and occupied the see for thirteen years. (Patrolo Gr. xiv. 557; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 389.) [J. de S.]

EUMENIA, servant of Afa the converted courier of Augsburg, and martyred there with
EUMENIUS

Afra's mother Hilaria under Diocletian. Commemorated Aug. 12. ([Mart. Aedon., Usuard., Notker; Bas. Men.], Mart. Or. et Chro. ii. 225.) She is by some writers called Kunenia. (Baron. A. E. ann. 303, cxxv.; Celli. iii. 80.)

T. S. B.

EUMENIUS (1), ST. Thaumaturgus, bishop of Gortyna, in Crete, holding the see after the Diocletian persecution, during which his predecessor Cyrilus suffered martyrdom. He is stated to have passed the later part of his life in the Thebaid, and to have died at Thebes in Boiotia. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 258, and see Memora for September, ed. Constantinople, 1843, p. 141.) Basil's Menol. (Sept. 18) states that he held the see for many years, and performed miracles.

L. de S.

EUMENIUS (2), bishop of Aphrodisias (Stauropolis), the metropolitan sec of Caria, present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; some MSS. of the acts of the councils read Eudoxius. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 899; Mansi, iii. 571.)

L. D.

EUMENIUS (3), a bishop mentioned with another, Maximianus, by pope Innocent I. in a letter to Rufus and other bishops of Macedonia, in the year of Emacrius, Pat. Lat. xx. 538 and notes.) From the name of Maximianus being followed by that of Eumenius in Ep. 17, as likewise in Chrysost. Ep. 163, both of these epistles being addressed to Macedonian bishops, it has been conjectured that Eumenius in Ep. 18 is the transmitter's error for Eudoxius.

C. H.

EUMENIUS (1) (EUMERIUS, EUMELIUS), bishop of Nates at the council of Valence, A.D. 374. (Cell. i. 600; Gall. Christ. xiv. 798; Tillmont, Mem. viii. 554; Bruns, Can. ii. 111; Mansi, iii. 491, 493.)

R. T. S.

EUMENIUS (2) (FUMERIUS, FUMARIUS, THUMERIUS), according to old catalogues seventh bishop of Angers, succeeding Tulasius and followed by Eustochius (cir. A.D. 477). (Gall. Christ. xiv. 547; Gams, Series Episc. 488.)

C. S. A. B.

EUMENIUS (3), a priest, was the bearer of the letter of pope Anastasius to Clovis, on the Frankish king's conversion. (Thiel. Ep. Rom. Pont. p. 624; Bouquet, iv. 50.)

T. R. B.

EUMENIUS (4) (EUMELIUS, EMERIUS, EUMERIUS), fifteenth bishop of Nantes, succeeded Epiphanius, and followed by St. Felix. He was present at the second council of Orleans (A.D. 533). At the third, in 538, he was represented by a priest, Marcellianus. At the fourth, in 541, he was again present in person (Mansi, viii. 538; lx. 21, 121). A letter addressed to him is extant, from Trojanus bishop of Saintes, in answer to one of his as to a boy who did not know whether he had been baptized or not (Patr. Lat. xlvii. 995). There is said to be another from Ruricius, of Limoges, but it is not in the collection of that bishop's letters in the Patrologia Latina. We learn from some eulogistic lines of Venantius Fortunatus (Miscell. iv. 1, in Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 151) that he built a church at Nantes. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 798.)

S. A. B.

EUMORPHIUS, the son of a Roman widow named Galla. She resided near Gregory the Great while he was yet a layman. Eumorphius, being at the point of death, sent his servant to an old friend of his, a certain Stephanus, desiring him to come daintily as there was a vessel ready to take them both to Sicily. The servant thought his master mad, but Eumorphius insisted, and he went. On the road he met Stephanus's own servant, who told him his master had just died. Returning to Eumorphius, the servant found him dead likewise: both, indeed, had died simultaneously. The story was told by Gregory to show that the dying are sometimes allowed to know who are their equals in good or evil, and in whose society they are to pass eternity. A similar story is told of another dying man. (JOANES, monk of Spoleto.) (Greg. Mag. Dal. iv. 35; Patr. Lat. xlvii. 376.)

C. H.

EUNAPIUS. The biographer of many of the Neoplatonist philosophers. Born at Sardis in A.D. 346 or 347, he received his earliest instruction from the philosopher Chrysanthus, to whose wife he was related. In his sixteenth year he took a voyage to Athens to attend the lectures of Proserenus; in an interesting passage, he describes a dangerous fever with which he was seized during his voyage (so that on his landing he was unconscious) and the hospitality with which he was received by Proserenus and others at Athens. On his return from Athens, where he remained five years, he was again treated with paternal care and affection by Chrysanthus, from whom he used to receive instruction in the afternoon, while he himself gave lectures to others in the morning. It would appear that he depended on his professorial art for his livelihood; for he had himself intended to study in Egypt on leaving Athens, had not his parents (of whom no report) recalled him to Lydia to pursue this occupation. He was also skilled in medicine. Of the latter part of his life little is known; he lived, at any rate, till the year A.D. 414 (cf. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, art. EUNAPIUS). Besides his biographies, which are extant, Eunapius wrote a continuation of the history, by Dexippus, of the Roman empire. This continuation was in fourteen books, and extended, according to Photius, from A.D. 270 to A.D. 404. Only a few fragments of this latter work are extant; the principal is that known as de Legationibus. The best edition of Eunapius is that by Boissonade (Amsterdam, 1822, 2 vols. 8vo.).

Photius represents Eunapius as a reckless calumnator of the Christians of the imperial court, and especially of Constantine himself (Διαβάων κατάλεγε Σταυρός, Photius says). This may probably be true; but to speak of Eunapius, as is sometimes done, as a systematic and bitter assailant of Christianity can hardly be correct. Of his two teachers, Chrysanthus, as we learn from Eunapius himself, was but a negligent follower of heathenism (though appointed by Julian high priest of Lydda) and tolerant towards Christianity (of which he was a member of the office); while Proserenus was actually a Christian. Nowhere in his extant works is Eunapius bitter against the Christians, except, indeed, where he mentions the monks; of these he says that their manner of life was piggish, and their behaviour in public indecent. But with the story of
EUNICIUS

Hypatia before us, it can hardly be said that the monks did not lay themselves open to still worse charges than these. Eunapius was not a Lucian or a Celsus; the attitude of extravagant admiration towards his teachers was the one into which his mind naturally fell; he was the credulous, subservient disciple of a decaying mysticism. He relates, with apparent belief, how the statues of Hecate visibly laughed under the conjuration of the philosopher Maximus; and how the philosopher Jamblichus called out of two wells two boys, called Eros and Anteros, who embraced him, and were then replaced by him in their watery abodes. He intimates, indeed, a very slight doubt as to the truth of this latter story. This credulity is worth noticing for two reasons. First, it shews the disposition of the age to believe in marvels, and the absence of the critical spirit. Secondly, it can hardly be doubted that these and similar marvels were invented as a counterpoise to the Christian miracles. Certain it is, that Greek and Roman philosophers took to themselves a number of practices till Christianity became a power in the world; and that from the moment Christianity did become such a power, these trances are plentiful. For the rest, notwithstanding the mediocrity of ability of Eunapius, his writings are not quite unworthy of perusal for the sake of the information they contain as to the general views of the Neoplatonist writers and their relation to the world at large.

[J. R. M.]


EUNIUS, bishop. [Ennius.]

EURO, in the system of the Peratae, one of the heavenly powers, the ruler of the day, and identified by them with that which ignorance had called Isis (Hippol. Ref. v. 14). [G. S.]

EUROCUS is spoken of by Demster as a disciple of St. Columbanus (November 2), and a Scot, who wrote Gesta Columbani Magistri, flourished a.d. 606, and was venerated as a saint on October 2 (Demster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 253; Tanner, Bibl. 271). [J. G.]

EUROCIUS, martyr. [Segaste, Forty Martyrs of.]

EUNIOBIUS, bishop of Mitylene, in the island of Lesbos, subscribed the synodal decree of Gennadius of Constantinople against the Simeoniaci, a.d. 459. In his subscription Mitylene is called a metropolis, but other subscriptions of bishops of this see do not confirm him. (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 955; Mansi, viii. 917.) [L. B.]

EUNOMIA, martyr. [Eumenia.]

EUROMIEUTYCHIANI (Ἑρωμιεύτυχιανοι, Soc. v. 24), one of the sects into which the Eunomians of Constantinople became divided after the banishment of Eunomius. [Eunomius (6).] Theology of Euthychius a layman, in controversy which arose among the Eunomians as to the foreknowledge of our Lord, and especially as to the meaning of Matth. xxiv. 37 and Mark xiii. 32, maintained that, as he had "absolutely received all things of the Father," he had also received that foreknowledge, and therefore that those passages must be interpreted accordingly. Finding that his opinions were strongly opposed, Eutychius went to Cappadocia to submit them to Eunomius, who approved them. The controversy still continued however, and after the death of Eunomius Eutychius was expelled from the community. He and his followers formed themselves into a separate party. They also differed from the main body of the Eunomians as to the formula which should be employed in the administration of baptism. The question which thus divided the Eunomians afterwards caused a similar schism among the Monophysites. (Sozom. H. E. vi. 26; vii. 17; Cassiod. Hist. Tripart. ix. 40; Theodoret, Hist. Fab. iv. 3; Agnostae, Vol. i. 62 b, l.) [T. W. D.]

EUNOMIOEUPSYCHIANI, an Eunomian sect, called from their founder Eupychus (Nicesph. Call. H. E. xii. 30). They seem to be the Eunomioeuchian (cf. Sozomen, H. E. vii. 17; and note 33 of Volatus). Eupychus being apparently a variant of Eutychius. [T. W. D.]

EUROMIOTHEOPHORIANI (Ἑυρομιο- θεοφόριανοι, Nicesph. Call. xii. 30), one of the sects into which the Eunomians became divided on a question raised by Theophorus, a Cappado- cian, as to the Divine omniscience. They also differed from other sections of the body on the subject of baptism. (Soz. H. E. v. 24, vii. 17; Cassiod. Hist. Tripart. ix. 40; Philostorg. H. E. x. 4; Agnostae, Vol. i. 62 b, l.) [T. W. D.]


EUNOMIUS (2), a bishop, of what see does not appear. He was sent with Olympius to Africa by Constantine, after the decision of the Roman council, a.d. 315, to make further inquiries as to the heresies of Caesarian. The two commissioners spent forty days at Carthage, and concluded that the council's decision must be maintained. (Opt. i. 25; Dict. i. 367.) [H. W. P.]

EUNOMIUS (3) of Cappadocia, bishop of Cyzicus (360–364) after the exposition of Eusebius. He was the pupil and secretary of Aetius. He completed and formulated his master's heretical system with a preciseness and logical consistency which stamped the name of Eunomius on the Anomoean heretics instead of the name of Aetius, to whom the party owed its existence. Eunomius stands conspicuous among the controversial leaders of the 4th century for the neatness with which he pursued and urged his own theological convictions, free from the taint of self-interest which characterized others, especially the Arian court party, as well as for the purity of his life, and the high tone of his personal character. He appears to have been a thoroughly honest man, with a "fierce disdain of compromises and dissimulation" (Newman, Eccl. Hist. v. 4 § 4), never shrinking from following his dogmatic conclusions to their legitimate issues and declaring them with all boldness, careless of the horror with which the orthodox were filled by what appeared to them such open blasphemies.
EUNOMIUS—ARIAN

His mind was cast in a rigid Aristotelian mould, and was written to a philosophy of dogmatic enunciation, to his doctrine demanding of every process. He was distinguished by a faculty of subtle disputations, and hard mechanical reasoning, (Newman, ibid.), which subjected the Christian verities to strict logical processes, and rejected every doctrine that could not be shewn to be consistent with human reason. Neander describes him as characterized by a doctrinal tenacity which narrowly confined itself within the province of the understanding, and regarded all truth in an outward mechanical way, with a strong opposition to the contemplative and mystical element, and looking on religious feeling as a despotic weakness; the decided enemy of asceticism, as well as of the growing disposition to the worship of saints and relics—in fact, the "Rationalist" of the 4th century. (Neander, Ch. Hist. vol. iv. p. 78, Clark's translation.) His uncompromising honesty, resolute boldness, and freedom from all vacillation and self-seeking, attracted attention, and to a certain extent secured respect. (Newman, ibid.) "It is always respectable, and if it be allowable to speak with a sort of moral catachresis, the Anomoeans merited on this account, as well as secured, a success which a false conclusion must not hope to obtain." (ib. p. 350).

In our ignorance of the minor geography of Asia Minor, we shall content ourselves with the birth-place of Eunomius precisely. The name is given as Daciae by Sozomen and Philostorgius, and as Olatatype by Gregory Nyssen. It is probable that the former was his small paternal estate, and the latter the village to which it belonged. Sozomen describes it as situated under the slopes of Mount Argeus, not far from Caesarea, but Gregory Nyssen is certainly correct in placing it on the confines of Cappadocia and Galatia. (Soz. H. E. vii. 17; Philost. H. C. E. x. 6; xi. 5.) Eunomius was proud of his Cappadocian birth, and resented it as an insult when Basil called him a Galatian. Basil's brother says in excuse that Olificate was too small to bear the name, and Gregory Nyssen remembers on which side it was. (Basil, in Eunom. lib. i. p. 396; Greg. Nyss. in Eunom. lib. i. p. 307.) Eunomius came of an honest, industrious stock. His grandfather, Priscus, had been a slave, who had purchased his freedom, as well as a small farm, with his savings. His father was an unpretending, hard-working man, supporting his family by the produce of his land, and the teaching of a few of the neighbours' children in the winter evenings. (Greg. Nyss. ibid. p. 291.) Eunomius inherited his father's and grandfather's independent, earnest spirit. Determined to rise, he got himself taught shorthand writing, and learning his paternal farm himself became enamoured to a kinsman, and tutor to his children. The restlessness of an ardent, youthful spirit soon rendered the country distasteful to him, and he repaired to Constantinople, where he hoped to satisfy his desire of studying rhetoric. Gregory Nyssen, who makes it his object to blacken his character as much as possible, hints that Eunomius's life at Constantinople was not very easy. (ib.) He specifies no charges. It was reported that at one time he worked as a tailor, making clothes and girdles. Before very long he returned to Cappadocia.

The fame of Aetius, who was then residing as a teacher at Alexandria, reached Eunomius; he conceived an ardent desire to attach himself to him as a pupil, and after a most animated colloquy with Severus the Arian bishop of Ptolemais, who was intimately acquainted with Aetius, went to Alexandria, about A.D. 356, and placed himself under Aetius's instruction, acting at the same time as his amanuensis (Socr. H. E. ii. 35, iv. 7; Soz. H. E. vi. 27; Philost. H. E. iii. 20; Greg. Nyss. in Eunom. i. p. 299). After two years of study at Alexandria, Eunomius accompanied Aetius to Antioch at the beginning of A.D. 358, to attend the Arian council summoned by Eudoxius, who had through court favour succeeded to the see of Antioch on the death of Leontius the year before.

The bold front which was displayed by the pure Arian party at this council, and the favour shewn to the flagrant blasphemies of Aetius and Eunomius, who did not scruple to assert the absolute unlikeliness (ἀνομοίως) of the Son to the Father, excited the violent opposition of the semi-Arian party, of which George of Laodicea, Basil of Ancyra, and Eustathius, the Constantinopolitan, were the highly respectable leaders. Under colour of the dedication of a church a council was speedily held by them at Ancyra, in which the Anomoean doctrines and their authors were condemned. A synodical letter was sent by them to the emperor, denouncing the blasphemous teaching of Eunomius and his master, and charging the latter with being privy to the conspiracy of Gallus. (Philost. H. E. iv. 8.) Intelligence of these proceedings struck dismay into the Arian clique at Antioch. It was felt essential that an able advocate should be despatched to Constantinople to defend them; and Eunomius, who, having previously declined Eudoxius's offer to ordain him because he had not sufficiently broken with the semi-Arian party, had now been ordained deacon, was selected as their advocate. But on his journey through Asia Minor he was apprehended by some imperial officers (indismissively designated by the Arian Philostorgius, emissaries of Basil) and banished by the emperor. Of his residence in Phrygia, Aetius was at the same time banished to Pepusa, while Eudoxius found it prudent to retire to his native Armenia, till the storm of the weak Constantius's wrath had blown over. (Greg. Nyss. ibid. p. 291.) Eudoxius soon found means to restate himself in the emperor's favour, and on the deposition of Macedonius by the council of Constantinople at the close of A.D. 359 he was chosen as his successor in the imperial see. Constantius had the utmost abhorrence of the Anomoeans and their teaching. Aetius was therefore sacrificed by the Arians as a scapegoat, while Eunomius was reluctantly persuaded to separate himself from his old master, at least to conceal his heterodoxy, that by thus accommodating himself to the times he might secure a position of influence, where he might secretly disseminate his views. Eudoxius procured for him from the emperor the bishopric of Cyzicus, which was vacant by the deposition of the semi-Arian Eleuthius (Eleutherus). In compliance with Eudoxius's advice, Eunomius at first maintained a discreet reserve on the points of controversy between the Anomoeans and the orthodox, but, weary of a dissimulation alien from his straightforward nature he soon began to propound his doctrines, at first privately, and then in public assemblies. Complaints of his heterodoxy were
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Laid before Eudoxius, who, vexed with Eunomius for having paid so little regard to his counsel, put the informers off with a promise to investigate these complaints, a promise he never intended to fulfil. The people of Cyzicus, weary of delay, applied to the emperor himself, who sent an order to Eudoxius to summon Eunomius to answer the complaints, and Eunomius, not satisfied with this, adopted the same policy of delay, until Constantius indignantly threatened that unless he attended to his commands he would banish them both. Eudoxius was now compelled to act. He summoned Eunomius to appear before a council of bishops at Constantinople, at the same time sending him a secret message to warn him of his danger, and counselling flight. Eunomius, not appearing, was condemned in his absence, and was deposed both from his see and his episcopal office, and banished. (Theod. Hist. Fab. iv. 3; H. E. ii. 29; Philost. H. E. vi. 1.) Eunomius on this broke altogether with those with whom he had a certain correspondence, and made himself a traitor to Eusebius, and became the head of a party of his own, called after him Eunomians, professing the extreme Anomoean doctrines of the general comprehensiveness of the Divine Essence, and the absolute unlikeness of the Son to the Father. The accession of Julian in A.D. 361 recalled Eunomius and a few of his followers, who had been banished by Constantius. They both settled in Constantinople, where they continued preaching during the reign of Julian, and that of his successor Jovian. (Philost. H. E. vi. 7, vii. 6.) The growing popularity of Eunomianism at Constantinople was a cause of jealousy to Eudoxius, who took advantage of the commotions caused by the rebellion of Procopius against the government of Acrabates in A.D. 364, to expel both Eunomius and Aetius from the city. Eunomius retired to his country house near Chalcedon. Procopius having also taken refuge there in Eunomius's absence, Eunomius was accused of favouring his designs, and was in danger of being capitally condemned. ACod. Theodosii, the prefect of the Praetorian guards, was actually passed upon him, A.D. 367. But on his way thither, passing through Mursa, the Arian bishop, Valens, interested himself greatly in his cause, and by personal application to the emperor Valens obtained the release of his sentence. (Philost. H. E. ix. 4–8.) He was again sentenced to banishment in the same year by Modestus, the prefect of the Praetorian guards, as a disturber of the public peace. (Philost. H. E. ix. 11.) But he was again at Constantinople, or at least at Chalcedon, at the beginning of the reign of Theodosius, A.D. 379, to whom in A.D. 383, he, in common with the other bishops summoned by him, presented a confession of faith, which was approved by the emperor.

Theodosius, finding some of the officers of the court infected with Eunomian views, expelled them from the palace, and having seized Eunomius himself at his house at Chalcedon, banished him to Halmyris, a town of Moeonia, on the Danube. This place having been captured by the Goths who had crossed the frozen river, Eunomius was transported to Caesarea in Cappadocia.

The fact that he had attacked their late venerated bishop, Basil the Great, in his writings, rendered him so unpopular there that his life was hardly safe. He was therefore permitted to retire to his paternal estate at Dacora, where he died in extreme old age soon after A.D. 392, when according to Jerome (Vit. Illust. c. 129) he was still living, and writing much against the church. He was buried at Dacora, whence his body was transferred to Tyana, by the order of Eutropius, c. 396, and there carefully guarded by the monks, to prevent its being carried over into Galatia by adherents of Caesarius against the wish of his master Aetius, to whom he had himself given a splendid funeral. (Soz. H. E. vi. 17; Philost. H. E. ix. 6, xi. 5.)

The portrait drawn by Philostorgius (H. E. vi. 6), though that of an ardent admirer who extolled his defects as beauties, is by no means flattering. Though he speaks of his face, body, and limbs as full of grace and dignity, when he proceeds to describe the white scrobicular blains, "which marked his face as it were with brands and scars," as adding to the majesty of his person, and his lips as increasing the attractiveness of his speech, we know what weight to give to his words. According to Eusebius, his constitution was poisoned with jaundice within and without ("interius externusque morbo regio corruptus").

Eunomianism, as a cold, logical system, wanted the elements of vitality, and notwithstanding its wide popularity at its commencement, did not make much headway. In the following century, when Theodoret wrote, the body had dwindled to a scanty remnant, compelled by the hatred their blasphemies had excited to conceal themselves, and holding their meetings in such obscure corners that they had gained the name of "Troglydites" (Theod. Hist. Fab. iv. 3). St. Augustine remarked that the time the few Eunomians existing were all to be found in the East, and that there were none of the sect in Africa (Aug. de Past. Car. c. 8, p. 278).

The efforts of Eunomius as a religious teacher were directed to the formal development of Arianism as a doctrinal system. He starts with the concept of God the Father as alone God, Being, of whom neither self-communion nor generation can be predicated. His essence is in this, that He is what He is of Himself alone, undervived, unbegotten—and as being the only unbegotten One, the Father, in the strict sense of Deity, is alone God. And as He is unbegotten, inas much as begotten necessarily involves the division and imputation of being, so it is impossible for Him to beget. If also, that which was begotten shared in the Œkōmos of the Deity, God would not be the absolute unbegotten One, but would be divided into a begotten and an unbegotten God. A communion of the essence of God, such as that involved in the ideas of eternity, would transfer to the Absolute Deity the notions of time and sense. An eternal generation was to Eunomius a thing absolutely inconceivable. A begetting, a bringing forth, could not be imagined as without beginning and end. The generation of the Son of God must therefore have had its beginning, as it must have had its termination, at a definite point of time, therefore, incompatible with the predicate of eternity. If that can be rightly asserted of the Son, He must equally, with the Father, be unbegotten. This denial of the eternal generation of the Son involved also the denial of the
likeness of His essence to that of the Father, from which the designation of the party, "Anomoian" (ἀνομοιαν) was derived. That which is begotten, he asserted, cannot possibly resemble the essence of that which is unbegotten. The unbegotten continues ever unbegotten, and the begotten begotten as long, therefore, as the two essences are what they are, the notion of equality of essence, "Homousian," or even similarity of essence, "Homoiousian," is plainly untenable. Were the begotten to resemble the unbegotten in its essence, it must cease to be begotten. Were the Father and the Son equal, the Son must also be unbegotten, a consequence utterly destructive of the fundamental doctrine of generation and subordination. Such generation, moreover, Eunomius held to be essentially impossible. For what could the unbegotten Absolute One take out of His essence to impart to the begotten One, but that which is unbegotten? If it be objected, according to the teaching of the church, the Son, who is begotten, were of the same essence as the Father who begets, there must be both an unbegotten and a begotten element in God. The essence of the Father and of the Son must therefore be absolutely dissimilar in the same way as it is in the soul, so also is it in their knowledge of themselves different. Each knows Himself as He is, and not as the other. The one knows Himself as unbegotten, the other as begotten. Since, therefore, the Son did not share in any way in the essence of the Father, what is His relation to God, and to what does He owe His origin? Eunomius's answer to this question lay in a distinction between the essence (σωφία) and the energy (ἐνεργεία) of God. Neither movement nor self-communication being predicable of the Divine Essence, it is to the divine energy, conceived as separable from the Μορφή that we must ascribe the calling into existence out of nothing of all that is. It is in virtue of this ἐνεργεία alone that God can be called Father, as it is by this that all that is, besides Himself, has come into being. Of these creations of the divine energy the Son or Logos holds the first place, as the instrumental creator of the world. And in this relation likeness to the Father is that of the Son. In fact, the Son may be in this sense regarded as the express image and likeness of the ἐνεργεία of the Father, inasmuch as He had conferred on Him divine dignity in the power of creation. This was the ground of the immeasurable difference between the Son and all other created beings. He was produced by the Father, as an alone Being, the first or most perfect of all Beings, to be, by His will, His instrument in the creation of all other existences. God called Him into being immediately, but all other creatures mediatel) through Him. This teaching introduced a dualism into the essence of God Himself, when it drew a distinction between His Essence and His will—the one being infinite and absolute, and the other relative and limited to finite objects. On the ground of this dualism He is charged by Gregory Nyssen with Manichaeism. Eunomius regarded the Paraclete as sharing in the Divine nature in a still more secondary and derivative form, which seems more or less the highest and noblest production of the Only-begotten Son, given to be the source of all light and sanctification.

CHRIST. BISH.—VOL. II.

The entire want of spiritual depth and life which characterized Eunomius is evidenced by his maintaining that the Divine nature is perfectly comprehensible by the human intellect, and charging those who denied this with an utter ignorance of the first principles of Christianity. He accused them of preaching an unknown God, and even denied their right to be called Christians at all, since without knowledge of God there could be no Christianity; while he repudiated the claim of those who did not hold the same views as himself as to the nature of God and the generation of the Son of God, to the possession of any true knowledge of the Divine Being. He held that Christ had been sent to lead other creatures up to God, the primal source of all existence, as a Being external to Himself, and that believers should not stop at the generation of the Son of God, but having followed Him as far as He was able to lead them, should seek above Him, as above all created beings whether material or spiritual, to God Himself, the One Absolute Being, as their final aim, that in the knowledge of Him they might obtain eternal life. It is evident how poor and low Eunomius's idea of the knowledge of God placed on man. It was, placed in him and in his understanding, and a theoretical knowledge of God and spiritual truth, instead of that fellowship with God as made known to us in Christ, and that knowledge which comes from love, which the church has ever held to be the true life of the soul. In harmony with this formal, intellectual idea of knowledge as the source of Christian life, Eunomius assigned a lower place to the sacraments than to the teaching of the word, depreciating the liturgical element of Christianity as compared with its doctrinal element. As quoted by Gregory Nyssen, he asserted that "the essence of Christianity did not depend for its ratification on sacred terms, on the special virtue of customs and mystic symbols, but on accuracy of doctrine." (Greg. Nyss. in Eunom. p. 704). For fuller statements of the doctrinal system of Eunomius, see Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Div. i. vol. ii. p. 204 ff., Clark's translation; Neander, xxvi. 326 ff., xxvii. 308 ff., Clark's translation; Herzog, Real-Encycl., "Eunomius und Eunomianer" (from which works the foregoing account has been derived); Klose, Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius, 1833; Bauer, Dreieinigkeit, i. pp. 365-387; Meyer, Trinitateslehre, pp. 175 ff.; Lange, Arianaus in seiner weiteren Entwicklung.

Eunomius, as a writer, was more copious than elegant. Photius exhausts a whole vocabulary of vituperation upon the style of his Refutation of St. Basil (Cod. 198, p. 314), which he asserts to be so far removed from all grace and elegance that he seems not even to know these words. His meaning is very hard to arrive at, as by a studied obscurity he seeks to conceal the jejuneness of his thoughts, and the weakness of his arguments. Photius speaks very deprecatingly of his logical power. He says that he took up logic late in life, never fully comprehended it, and often used it erroneously. He despises, eneans ground without more than the highest and noblest production of the Only-begotten Son, given to be the source of all light and sanctification.
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no easy task to read his interminable periods. Socrates estimates Eunomius's style no less unfavourably. He accuses him of perpetual repetitions, of heaping up words without ever advancing a step, and evidencing weakness both in conception and in argument (Socr. H. E. iv. 7). Notwithstanding these alleged defects, his writings, which Bahiæus states were very numerous and directed against the Christian faith (Hist. Eccl. i. 25) were in much esteem among his followers, who, according to Jerome, valued their authority more highly than that of the Gospels, and believed that the very light of truth resided in Eunomius (Hieron. adv. Figul. tom. ii. p. 129). The bold blasphemies contained in these books were the cause of their destruction. Successive imperial edicts, one of Arcadius, dated not more than four years after his death A.D. 398 (Cod. Theod. tom. vi. p. 152; Lib. xvi. 34), commanded that his books should be burnt, and made the possession of any of his works a matter of capital crime. Little, however, of his has come down to us save some few fragments preserved in the works of his theological adversaries. His Exposition of Faith and his Apologeticus are the only pieces extant of any length.

The works ascribed to him are (1) A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in seven books. It represents the views of Henry of cent. A.D. 200, and is a work of capital crime. Little, however, of his has come down to us save some few fragments preserved in the works of his theological adversaries. His Exposition of Faith and his Apologeticus are the only pieces extant of any length.

The works ascribed to him are (1) A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in seven books. It represents the views of Henry of cent. A.D. 200, and is a work of capital crime. Little, however, of his has come down to us save some few fragments preserved in the works of his theological adversaries. His Exposition of Faith and his Apologeticus are the only pieces extant of any length.

(2) Epistles, of which Photius states he had read as many as forty, and found in them the same affectation of subtility compared with shallowness and a disgraceful ignorance of the laws of epistolary composition (Cod. u. s.).

(3) Euseius adversus, Fidei libellus. A confession of faith presented to Theodosius, A.D. 383 (Socr. H. E. vii. 12). This was first printed by Valerius in his notes to Socrates, and afterwards by Baluze in Concilia. Nov. Collect. i. 89. It is now found in the Bibliothèque Nationale and Fabricius, lib. v. c. 23. Valerius says of it, "etsi totam Eunomii impietatem complicitur, quaedam tamen habet minime spemenda."

(4) Apologeticus, in twenty-eight sections. This is his most famous work, in which, with much subtility, he seeks to refute the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, especially the co-eternal and consubstantial divinity of Christ. Basil the Great thought the book worthy of an elaborate refutation, which we possess in his five books, Adversus Eunomium. A considerable portion of the Apologeticus was written by Cave from a MS. in the possession of archbishop Tenison, with a Latin translation from the Greek of Henry Wharton (Cave, Hist. Lit. i. p. 220 sq.), and the whole is given by Fabricius, with a Latin translation (Bibl. Græc. lib. v. c. 23, ed. Hamburg, 1717). It has been also published by Canisius (Lect. Ant. ed. Basnage, i. p. 181), and more recently by Thilo (Bibl. Doctr. ii. p. 180, and Migne, Pat. Gr. xxi. 358). An English translation of it was published by Wharton in his Eunomianismus Restitutus, London, 1711, 8vo.

(5) Απολογίας ἀπολογίας. A defence of the preceding work from the attack made on it by St. Basil. Philostorgius absurdly states that Basil died of despair after reading this work, feeling himself incapable of answering it (Philost. H. E. viii. 12). Photius, on the other hand, tells us that, after Eunomius had devoted many years of close study to the composition of the reply, conscious of its inadequacy, he was afraid that Basil should see it, and kept it unpublished till after his death, and even then put it into the hands of his friends and adherents alone. On the other hand, the most recent critics, as others, however, got hold of it, and treated the wretched thing with the contempt it deserved (Phot. Cod. 138).


EUNOMIUS (4), a bishop intruded by the Arians into the see of Samosata, on the deposition of Eusebius Samosatensis by Valens in A.D. 374. His episcopate was short and unhappy. The people of Samosata resented the loss of their bishop so keenly that they all, from the highest to the lowest, refused to hold any intercourse with Eunomius. No one visited him, or exchanged a word with him. He officiated in an empty church. When he entered the public baths no one would bathe with him, nor even use the water contaminated by a heretic. Thinking it useless to remain where he was, he became the object of general aversion, Eunomius resided his episcopal and left the city. He was succeeded by Lucius. (Theod. H. E. iv. 15.) [E. V.]

EUNOMIUS (5), bishop of Berol in Thracia, an Apollinarian. His period was somewhere between Danophilus, A.D. 370, and Sebastianus, A.D. 451. (Le Quen, Orient. Chr. i. 1167.) [J. de S.]

EUNOMIUS (6), bishop of Marazana, or Marazana, in Byzas, who was present at the Carthagian conference A.D. 411. (Nov. Vit. de Don. Hist. Obscurth, p. 425.) [H. W. P.]

EUNOMIUS (7), bishop of Raecina (Theodosiopolis) in Syria, whose city was besieged by Varanes king of Persia, in the reign of Theodosius II., c. A.D. 420. The bishop vigorously opposed the Persian attacks, desiring the threets of burning down the church, and ultimately killed one of the kings present in the besieging army by a stone shot from a ballista inscribed with the name of the apostle St. Thomas, the supposed founder of the Edessean church, whereupon the siege was abandoned. (Thedorch, H. E. v. 36 al. 37; Le Quen, Orient. Chr. ii. 978.) [L. D.]

EUNOMIUS (8), bishop of Nicomedia, 451.

The thirteenth session of the council of Chalcedon was taken up with a dispute between Eunomius and the metropolis of Nicomedia and Anastasius bishop of Nicæa, with regard to jurisdiction over the see of Basiliopolis. It is an instance of an appeal, in a purely ecclesiastical matter, to the secular authority of the emperors Valentinian and Marcian. A prominent part in the proceedings was taken by the judges, who were the commander-in-chief Anastarius, the prefect of the Praetorians Palladius, and the master of the offices Vincentius. Anastasius had excommunicated the clergy of Basiliopolis, claiming that city as belonging to his province. Eunomius, quoted Valentinian, Anastasius Julianus and Valens. The
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magistrates and synod declared Nicomedia to be metropolis of all Bitinia, setting aside a claim proposed by Athanas archdeacon of Constantionpoul, to the effect that that see had the right of consecrating for Basilinopoul (Mansi, Concil. vii. 302; Cellier, r. 695).

[W. M. S.]

EUNOMIUS (9), bishop of Amida (now Durbekir), on the Tigris, the metropolis of the province of Mesopotamia, consecrated A.D. 546. (Assemanii, Bibl. Orient. ii. 48 n.; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 984.)

[L. D.]

EUNOMIUS (10) appointed count of Tours in the place of Leudastes, who was deposed for oppression of the people and persecution of Gregory, A.D. 580. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 48, 50, viii. 23.)

[S. A. B.]

EUNUS, Feb. 27, the surname of a martyr named Cronio, who together with Julian was carried through Alexandria on a camel, scourged, and afterwards burned, during the Decian persecution. (Euseb. vi. 41; Mart. Usuard., Rom. Vit., Adon.)

[T. S. B.]

EUNUTIUS (Evunidus), ST., bishop of Nosa. In the majority of the catalogues after the name of Huanutus, the twenty-seventh bishop, is found that of Guido, and next to him that of Eunutius, but some have “Guido cum Eutici sancto.” This has puzzled the commentators, and several explanations have been attempted. It has been suggested (1) that Eunutius was a priest only, (2) that he was a sort of suffragan bishop, who performed the duties of the office for Eunutius, (3) that one was bishop of Nosa, and the other of Tournay. Le Coite again rejects all these views, and believes that at the synod of Soissons (A.D. 744), either because Guido had become too old to discharge the duties of the episcopate, or for some other good reason, Eunutius was consecrated bishop, while the other was yet living. The dates are an objection to this theory, as there is an extant letter of pope Zacharias to Eunisius, the successor of Eunutius, which is ascribed to the year following the council, while by some of the catalogues six years are allotted to the joint reign of the two bishops. He is commemorated Sept. 10. (Le Coite, Auct. Franc. a. 475, n. xii. tom. v. p. 121; Gall. Christ. iii. 985; Boll. Acta SS. Sept. iii. 616.)

[S. A. B.]

EUO.- [See under Evo-]

EUPARDO was a bishop of Autun, and is placed by the compilers of the Galica Christiana (iv. 345) seventeenth on the list, between St. Nectarius and Remigius or Benignus, about A.D. 550. This position, however, is matter of conjecture, some putting him rather earlier, while others place him about forty years later. (Le Coite, Auct. Franc. a. 500, n. v.; Gams, Series Episc. 499.)

[S. A. B.]

EUPATERIUS, a layman who, together with his daughter, had written to Basil requesting that he would declare his faith. Basil replies that he adheres strictly to the Nicene creed, but that the false teaching of others with respect to the Holy Spirit had rendered some addition to it necessary. For his part he would communicate with no one who asserted that the Holy Spirit was a created Being. (Basil, Ep. 159 (387)).

[EV.]

EUPATERIUS (8), AELIA MARCIA, empress, wife of the emperor Justinus. Her original name was Lupicina, and she was first

EUPATERIUS (9), EUPHANES, EUPHRAIUS, EUPHILUS, bishop of Naples. Ughelli states that his date cannot be positively ascertained, there being no extant narrative of his life. Baronius, following Paulus Regius, states him to have died A.D. 713. Others placed him much earlier. Joannes Diaconus calls him the eighth bishop of Naples, and successor to St. Eutapia, who was "S. Agrippino subrogatus" c. A.D. 180, but the date of whose death is uncertain. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. vi. 37; Boll. Acta SS. Mai. v. 238.)

[R. S. G.]

EUPHENDRIUS (9), Aelia, in the time of Sardianus, a woman who had been a slave of the imperial household. She was seized and imprisoned by the soldiers of Otho, and was afterwards burned to death. Her relics were venerated as early as the middle of the 3d century. (Mansi, Concil. iv. 236.)

H. U. B.]

EUPHENA (9), ST., a virgin who died at Chalcédon under Galerius, A.D. 307, and celebrated over the east and west. She was arrested by order of the proconsul Priscus, and after various tortures was killed by wild beasts. For the circumstances of her martyrdom we have very early evidence. Asterius [Asterius], bishop of Amasea, A.D. 400, tells us that he saw the sufferings of the martyr depicted on a tablet in the great church of Chalcédon, which was built over her tomb. In the same church the council of Chalcédon met A.D. 451, and the fathers attributed the success of their efforts against Eutychianism to her prayers, a circumstance commemorated afterwards on July 11 (Col. Byzant. and Neale’s note). Her relics were transferred to the church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, where amid the struggles of the Iconoclastic controversies she has been regarded as a special friend of the aspalled cultus. Constantine Copronymus, therefore, sought to sling them into the sea about A.D. 766, but they were rescued by the opposite party. There was a church at Rome dedicated to her as early as the time of Gregory the Great, while Codinus tells us that there were no less than seven churches dedicated to her in Constantinople, the most splendid of which was built in her honour by Constantine the Great, and, after the lapse of 450 years, profaned and turned into a public stable by Constantine Copronymus, but restored and beautified afterwards by the empress Irene (Codinus, de Orig. Constant. § 81; Du Cange, Opera. Christ. lib. iv. pp. 100-102). Her acts are contained in Symeon Metaphrastes; Surius; Ruinart. The work of Asterius treating of her will be found in Mansi incorporated with the acts of the seventh general council, A.D. 787. Venantius Fortunatus in his poem De Virginiate (Miscell. lib. viii. carm. 6) represents himself as an attendant on the blessed Virgin in the character of patroness of Chalcédon. (Mart. Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi; Cartthag. Kalender; Sacramentar. Greg. Mag.)

[G. T. S.]

EUPHORIA (8), AELIA MARCIA, empress, wife of the emperor Justinus. Her original name was Lupicina, and she was first
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called Euphemia by the acclamations of the populace at her coronation. Her praenomen Aelia is known from her coins. She died in her husband's lifetime, not long after his accession, and was buried in the church of St. Euphemia. (Victor. Tununens. Chron. in Patr. Lat. lxvii. 552 b; Theoph. ann. 501, p. 141, in Patr. Gr. xviii. 358 a; Du Cange, Fam. Asg. p. 78.)

[C. H.]

EUPHEMITAE, also known as MESSALIANS, "praying people," and therefore reckoned by Epiphanius (Haer. 80) as predecessors of the Christian sect so called. Epiphanius, who is our sole informant about them, tells us that they were neither Christians, Jews, nor Samaritans, but were heathen, believing in a plurality of gods, but offering worship only to one whom they called the Almighty; that they built for themselves oratories, which in some places were made completely to resemble Christian churches; that in these they used to meet at evening and at early morning, with great abundance of lights, to join in hymns and prayer. We learn from him next with some surmise that some of the magistrates put several of these people to death for their perversion of the truth and unwarranted imitation of church customs, and that in particular LUPICIANUS having thus punished some of them gave occasion to a new error; for that they buried the bodies of those who had been thus executed, held meetings for their dead, and served at the spot, and called themselves MARTYRIANS. In fine Epiphanius charges a section of the Euphemites with calling themselves SATANIANS, and with worshiping Satan under the idea that by such service they might disarm the hostility of a being confessedly of great strength and of immense power to harm. It does not appear that Epiphanius means to assert that the Christian Euchites were historically derived from these heathen Euphemites, but merely that there was a general resemblance of practices between the two. It has been conjectured (Tilletmont, viii. 529) that the Euphemites of Epiphanius may be identical with the HYSANARIS of Greg. Naz., and less probably with the CONGOLIAE OF AFRICA. [Evanchester]

[G. S.]

EUPHEMIUS (1), bearer of a letter from Ascholius bishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 373, to Basil, who speaks in warm terms of him, and also of his wife, whom he calls κοινωνότρι. (Basil, Ep. 154 [397].)

[E. V.]

EUPHEMIUS (2), the owner of a farm at Apenianus, wrongfully occupied by Meletius, brother-in-law of Gregory Nazianzen. Gregory in his will declared that the farm was the property of Euphemius, whom he had often reproached for his want of proper spirit in abstaining from claiming it. (Greg. Naz. Testam.)

[E. V.]

EUPHEMIUS (3), bishop of Sophene, a district in the province of Mesopotamia; his name is found in the Latin list of the subscriptions to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 1001; Mansi, vii. 103.)

[L. D.]

EUPHEMIUS (4), 3rd patriarch of Constantinople, succeeding Fravitta and followed by Macedonius II. He ruled six years and three months A.D. 489-496, and died in 515. Theophanes calls him Euthymius. Euphemius was a presbyter of Constantinople, administrator of a hospital for the poor at Neapolis, untiring with any suspicion of Eutychian leanings, and is described as learned and very virtuous. Finding that Peter Mongus, the patriarch of Alexandria, anathematised the council of Chalcedon for being so indigent that before he took his seat on the patriarchal throne, he solemnly separated from all communion with him, and with his own hands effaced his name from the diphychs, placing in its stead that of Felix III. of Rome. For a year the war raged strongly between Mongus and Euphemius. Each summits which was against the other: Euphemius even thought of persuading a council to depose Mongus; but at the end of October, 490, Mongus died.

To pope Felix the patriarch sent letters, as was usual, to announce his election. Great must have been his indignation when he received the reply that he might be admitted as a private member of the church Catholic, but could not be received in communion as a bishop, because he had not removed from the diphychs the names of his predecessors, Acacius and Fravitta.

Soon after his accession two interesting scenes occurred. One was at the death (probably in 489) of Diodor of the Styliite on the pillar where he had lived for thirty-three years. Euphemius came with others to the foot of the pillar to attend his last moments, as a tribute of respect to so renowned a personage. The other scene was in Constantinople. Anastasius, the future emperor, then an aged officer of the emperor Zeno, was an adherent of Eutychian opinions, and according to Zosimus, formed a sect, which met in some church of Constantinople. The patriarch appeared before the conventicle with menacing gestures and drove them from the spot. "If you must frequent the church," he exclaimed, "agree with her! or else no more enter into her gates to pervert men more simple than yourself. Do otherwise, and I will put your head, and lead you in triumph with the people." Henceforth, says the annalist, Anastasius kept quiet, for the sake of the glory that he coveted. As the emperor Zeno died in 491, this must have occurred within two years after the consecration of Euphemius, and it witnesses alike to his intrepidity and his influence.

After the death of Zeno, the empress Ariadne procured the election of Anastasius, on the understanding that he was to marry her. The patriarch openly called him a heretic and unworthy of reigning over Christians. Vain at first were the entreaties of the empress and the senate that he would consent to crown him. At length Euphemius came to terms; Anastasius capitulated on all points; he must give a written profession of his creed, promise under his hand to keep the Catholic faith intact, without making any attempt upon it after he should have become emperor, make no innovation in the church, and follow as his rule of belief the decrees of Chalcedon. These were severe conditions for Anastasius; but he gave the promise under the most solemn oaths, and Euphemius put it into the hands of the saintly Macedonius, chancellor and treasurer of the church of Constantinople, to be stored in the archives of the cathedral. (Evagr. iii. 52.)
At the end of 491, or on Feb. 25, 492, pope Felix died. His successor Gelasius immediately announced his elevation to the emperor Anastasius, but took no notice of Euphemius. Euphemius, in his ardent way, had written to him at once to express his joy on his appointment, and his desire for peace and for the reunion of the churches. Not to be chilled even by obtaining no answer, he wrote a second letter, and sent it by the deacon Synceleius. Neither letter remains; it appears however from the reply of Gelasius that Euphemius had congratulated the Roman church on having a pontiff who needed no instruction from any one, but was able to judge with his own eyes all that was necessary for the reunion of the churches; adding that, for himself, he was not sufficiently his own master to do what he wished; that the people of Constantinople would never agree to disgrace the memory of their late patriarch Acacius; that if that measure were necessary, the pope had better write to the people about it himself, and send somebody to try and persuade them. Gelasius, however, had never anything to say against the faith, and that if he was in communion with Mognus, it was when Mognus had given a satisfactory account of his creed. Euphemius subjoined his own confession, rejecting Eutyches and accepting Chalcedon. It seems also that Euphemius spoke of those who had been baptized and ordained by Acacius, and was by Gelasius accused of having submitted to the sentence pronounced against him at Rome, and pointed out how embarrassing it would be if the memory of Acacius must be condemned.

(Cullier, x. 486.)

Replying to these temperate counsels, Gelasius allows that in other circumstances he would have written to announce his election, but early observes that the custom existed only among those bishops who were united in communion, and was not to be extended to those who, like Euphemius, preferred a strange alliance to that of St. Peter. He allows the necessity of平原ness and tenderness, but remarks that those who refused to throw yourself into the ditch when you are helping others out. As a mark ofCodecension he willingly grants the canonical remedy to all who had been baptized and ordained by Acacius. Can Euphemius possibly wish him to allow to be recited in the sacred diplchy the names of condemned heretics and their successors? Euphemius professed to reject Eutyches; let him reject also those who have communicated with the successors of Eutyches. Acacius had not advanced anything against the truth; was it not even worse, then, for him to know the truth and communicate with its enemies? Euphemius asked when Acacius was condemned? No condemnation was needed! It was per facto according to the decrees of ancient councils. If Peter Mognus did purge himself, why did not Euphemius send proofs, instead of contenting himself with asserting the fact? He is much vexed with Euphemius for saying that he is constrained to do things which he does not wish; he could talk so about that truth, for which he ought to lay down his life. He refuses to send a mission to Constantinople, on the ground that it is the pastor's duty to converse his own flock. At the tribunal of Jesus Christ it will be seen which of the two is bitter and hard. The high spirit of the orthodox patriarch was fired by this dictatorial interference. He even thought of summoning the pope himself to account. And as it is certain that Gelasius was even more suspicious of the emperor Anastasius, who was, in spite of the recantation which Euphemius had enforced, a real Eutychian at heart, so it is very likely that, as Baroinus asserts, the patriarch did not attempt to conceal the pope's antipathy to the emperor.

Meanwhile nothing cooled the zeal of Euphemius for the council of Chalcedon. Anastasius harboured designs against its supporters; to thwart him the patriarch gathered together the bishops who were at Constantinople, and invited them to confirm its decrees. According to Theophanes and Victor of Tarsus this occurred in 492 (Vict. Tarn. Chron. p. 5); but in Mansi (vii. 1180) the event is placed at the beginning of the patriarchate of Euphemius, and the decrees are said to have been sent by the bishops to pope Felix III.

Various jars showed the continued rupture with Rome. Theodoric had become master of Italy, and in 493 sent an envoy to the emperor Anastasius to ask for peace. During their sojourn at Constantinople the envoys received complaints from the Greeks against the Roman church, which they reported to the pope. As was likely, Anastasius and Euphemius had much to say on the subject, the chief point of the patriarchate being that the emperor could not have been condemned by one prelate only, but that to excommunicate a metropolitan of Constantinople nothing less was needed than a general council. On this Gelasius observed that it had been done in virtue of Chalcedon, according to the custom with all heresies; pope Felix had only put in force an old decree, and had invented nothing new; the same could be done by any bishop, not by a pope only. Gelasius also accused Euphemius of hindering the peace with Theodoric, not for faith's sake, but only to strengthen his own party. (Mansi, viii. 165.) At that time it occurred that imprudence of Euphemius which unhappily cost him his throne. The emperor Anastasius, tired of his war against the Isaurians, was looking about for an honourable way of stopping it. He spoke confidentially to Euphemius about it; asking him to beg the bishops at Constantinople (there were always bishops coming and going to and from the metropolis) to pray for peace, that he might be thus furnished with an opportunity of entering on negotiations. Euphemius betrayed the secret to John the patriarch, father-in-law of Athenodorus, one of the chiefs of the Isaurians. John hurried to the emperor to inform him of the patriarch's indiscretion. Anastasius was deeply offended, and from that time forth never ceased to persecute his old opponent. He accused him of helping the Isaurians against him, and of corresponding with them. On one occasion when he had gained an advantage over them, he sent Eusebius, his Master of the Offices, to the patriarch with the taunting message, "Your Grace's prayers have covered your friends with confusion." (ταυς φιλαγας σου ἡμιώνας, Theoph. Chron. a.d. 488.)

At another time an assassin, either by Anastasius's own order, or to gain his favour, drew his sword on Euphemius at the door of the
EUPHRANOR

EUPHRIUS (5) (Baron. Annal. xxxvi. 537, xiv.), bishop of Antioch. [Ephraim (6)].

EUPHIUS (6), bishop of Toledo from c. A.D. 574 to c. 590. He signed the acts of the third council of Toledo, 589, as "Metropolitanae Ecclesiae Catholicae Toletanae Provinciae Carpentaniae." His signature is remarkable for the use of the word "Catholic," which also appears in the signatures of three other Metropolitanas at the same council: Merida, Braga, and Sevilla, and refers, no doubt, to the existence of Arian bishops in those sees before the council. It is worthy of notice that, although in the case of certain suffragan bishops, Tortosa, Oporto, Tuy, Grancas, and Lugo, the Arian bishop is allowed after conversion to keep the episcopal dignity, so that each of these sees appears with two bishops at the council, there is no trace of this indulgence in the case of the Metropolitan sees, which no doubt were felt to be too important to be allowed to run any risk. The title Metropolitanae Provinciae Carpentaniae is the title of the position of the church of Toledo at the time (and which reappears after the Moorish conquest; see Acts of the Synod of Cordova in 839, Exp. Sgr. x. 525), led either to the assembling of the synod of Carthaginian bishops at Toledo in 610, or to the later forgery of its supposed acts, and of the Decretum Gelasianum. [Guthinmar]. In the same third council the well-known Peter of Ercauvica, signs as Arcavensis Celtiberiae Ecclesiae Episcopus. Ercauvica lay on the boundary between Carpetania and Celtiberia, and Peter therefore seems by his signature to have meant to imply his exemption from the jurisdiction of the "Metropolitan of Carpetania" (Gum, K. G. ii. 2, 68-77). In the Decretum Gelasianum Euphrius is said to have styled himself Metropolitan of Carpetania through ignorance; "sec ejusdem ignorantiae sententiam corrigimus;" while Flores, whose views on the primacy of Toledo are now in great measure superseded, supposed it to have sprung from modesty or unwisdom. For a discussion of the question of the primacy of Toledo to the older bishops of Carthaginiae, and of the growth of the primacy, see Guthinmar and Julian (Exp. Sgr. vi. 330, 333; v. 251, Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 238).

EUPHORUS (Euphorus, Phosphorus) signs the acts of the eighth Council of Toledo, an. 653, as bishop of Cordova. His name stands thirty-eighth on the list. [Exp. Sgr. x. 236; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 448; Gomez Bravo, Cat. de los Obispos de Cordova, p. 77.]


EUPHRANON, according to "Pradestinatus," i. 24, a bishop of Rhodes, who opposed the Severini.

EUPHRANOB, a Libyan bishop, c. A.D. 263. He was inclined to Sabellianism, on which account Dionysius bishop of Alexandria wrote him a letter afterwards quoted and commented on by Athanasius. [Ath. de Sentent. Dionys. §§ 10, 12, 13 in Pat. Gr. xxv. 494, 498, 499; Cellier, ii. 399].
EUPHRASIA

EUPHRASIA (1)—Jan. 19. Virgin and martyr at Nicomedia under Maximian, a.D. 309. Being condemned to violation, she ingeniously contrived to preserve her virginity and to secure martyrdom by pretending to the character of a sorceress. (Bas. Menol.; Nicephorus, lib. 7, c. 13; Bar. Annal. 309, 35.) [G. T. S.]

EUPHRASIA (2)—May 18. One of the seven virgin martyrs at Anchra. [Faina.] [G. T. S.]

EUPHRASIA (3), virgin. [Euphraxia.]

EUPHRASIA (4), wife of Naamatus, or Naamatus, bishop of Vienne (ob. 567). Like her husband she was of noble birth, and after his death she devoted herself and her property to "the exile, the widow, the captive, and the poor." Fortunatus wrote an epitaph in her praise. (Venand. Fort. Opp. pt. i. lib. iv. cap. 27; Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 176; Gall. Chr. xvi. 27; Baron. A. E. ann. 582, xivii.) [T. W. D.]

EUPHRASIA (5). [Euphrosyna (1).]

EUPHRASIUS (1), bishop of Andujar or Illitargi. [Euphrasius (1).]

EUPHRASIUS (2), bishop of Colonia or Tarasa in Cappadocia, one of the Nicene fathers, a.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 413; Manii, ii. 694.) [L. D.]

EUPHRASIUS (3), bishop of Calanis. [Euphrasius.]

EUPHRASIUS (4), bishop of Nicomedia, present at the council of CONSTANTINOPEL, A.D. 381 (Manii, iii. 379). He seems to have died shortly afterwards. (Greg. Nyss. ep. 17; Patr. Gr. xlvii. 1056; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 587.) [T. W. D.]

EUPHRASIUS (5), subdeacon of Edessa, who took an active part in the persecution of his bishop, signing the "Instructio et Depravatio" against him and afterwards appearing in person at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, as one of his accusers. (Manii, vii. 209, 258.) [T. W. D.]

EUPHRASIUS (6), bishop of Lugania, in the province of Galatia Prima. He took part in the council of Constantinople, A.D. 449. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 488; Acta Conc. Chalc. act. i. ii. iii. vi. xv. xvi.) [T. W. D.]

EUPHRASIUS (7), a martyr at Alexandria in Africa at the beginning of the 6th century. He was commemorated on Jan. 14. (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. i. 992.) [I. G. S.]

EUPHRASIUS (8), bishop of Antioch, A.D. 521-529. He was a native of Jerusalem. At the commencement of his episcopate he strongly opposed the council of Chalcedon, going so far as to erase the names of the fathers of that assembly, as well as that of Leo bishop of Rome, from the diptychs. He afterwards repented of this, and was excommunicated (Theoph. A. M. 6013, Patr. Gr. viii. 1186), and according to Joannes Malalas he became a violent persecutor of those whose cause he had espoused (Joan, Mal. Chronogr. lib. xvii. ed. Dindorf. p. 416). Euphrasius perished in the great earthquake which laid the city of Antioch in ruins, A.D. 629 (Theoph. A. M. 6019; Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. iv. 4, 5; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 733.) [T. W. D.]

EUPHRATAS (9), said to be the first-known bishop of PARENSANUM (Parensanum), c. 521 (Gaim, Socr. Eppic. 739; Cappelletti, Acta d'Italia, viii. 781). He is said to have lapsed into schism after one year's episcopate. Pelagius I. c. 556, in a letter (Jaffe, Kosest. Pont. 678) to Narses, speaks of a certain "Euphratas schismaticus." Cappellotti gives an inscription in which his name is recorded. [A. H. D. A.]

EUPHRATAS (10), bishop of Calahorra, signs by deputy the acts of the thirteenth council of Toledo, 683 (Esp. Sagra. xxxii. 159; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 287). [M. A. W.]

EUPHRATAS (11), bishop of Lugo from about 681 to 688, signs the acts of twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth councils of Toledo (Esp. Sagra. al. 84; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 270, 287, 313). [Agrestius.] [M. A. W.]

EUPHRATAS. See also Euphrasius.

EUPHRATAS (1), bishop of Cologne, 343, said to have been deposed for Photianism by a synod at Cologne, 346 (Manii, ii. 1379) and noted by Binius, 1375). But the acts of this assembly are spurious or have been falsified; for in 347 Euphratias attended the council of Sardica, and not only subscribed its decrees, but was one of those deputed to ask of Constantinian the restoration of the churches to Athanasius and his friends. On this mission he proceeded to Antioch, and Theodoret (lib. ii. c. 9) and Athanasius (Hist. Arian. ad Mon. 281) relate a detestable trick played on him by Stephen of Antioch for the purpose of ruining his reputation. (Poll. Christ. iii. 622; Tillemont, Mem. vi. 332, and viii. 119.) [R. T. S.]

EUPHRATAS (2), bishop of Chersonesus (Chersonesus), in Crete. Signed in A.D. 458 the synodical epistle of the Cretan bishops to the emperor Leo. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 271.) [J. de S.]

EUPHRATAS (3), presbyter of Constantinople in 454. In a letter to Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, pope Leo the Great, whose intercourse in the affairs of the East was systematic, allows Euphratas to be ordained presbyter if he promises to abjure the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies, although he had spoken ill of the late bishop of Constantinople, Flavianus, of blessed memory. (Leo Mag. Epist. cxxvii.; Patr. Lat. liv. 1278; Ceillier, x. 227.) [W. M. S.]

EUPHRATAS (4), eunuch under Justinian, by race one of the Abasgi, a people of the Caucasus. In A.D. 529 he was sent by Justinian on a mission to the Abasgi. A great number of eunuchs came from that race, and Justinian determined to put a stop to the practice of castration. He issued a law to forbid it in general, and despatched Euphratas to warn his countrymen in particular. Justinian also built a church amongst them, and supplied them with missionaries. The tribe was converted to Christianity. (Evagr. Lib. iv. cap. 25; Procop. de Bell. ii. 572, 15; Dindorf, 1838, ed. Baronon. add. ann. 536, 537; Justinian, Novell. 142.) [W. M. S.]

EUPHRATAS (5), bishop of Tyana (Euasia, Christopolis), metropolis of the second Cappadocia, present at the fifth general council, A.D.
EUPHRATES

553; at the fifth session he quoted the diphtychs of his own church to prove that Theodosius, to whom Gregory Nazianzen had written some letters, had been bishop of Tyana, not of Mopsuestia. (Le Quien, Orientis Christ. i. 400; Mansi, ix. 258, 390.)

EUPHRATES (1). [PERATAE.] Origen (contra Celsum, vi. 28) states that the Ophites boasted of one Euphrates as the introducer of their impious doctrines. And Hippolytus (Ref. iv. 2, v. 13, x. 10), followed by Theodoret (Haer. Fab. i. 17), speaks of the Ophite sect called Peratae as founded by Euphrates the "Peratic," and Aschem the Carysian. There is certainly a case for suspicion that this Euphrates the Peratic, the supposed founder of the sect of Peraticas, may be as mythical a personage as Ebiaz, the eponymous founder of the Ebianites. We do not read elsewhere of any Euphrates but the Stoic philosopher, who lived in the reign of Alexander the Great (see Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, s. v.), whom we cannot suppose to have been a teacher of Ophite doctrine.

The name of the river Euphrates was largely used among the Peratae with a mystical significance; and it is conceivable that members of the sect, knowing the name to be held in honour among them, and knowing also that there had been eminent teachers called, may have been led to claim him as their founder. On the other hand, it is plain that the Peratic treatise of which Hippolytus gives an abstract, and which may have been also seen by Origen, contained the name of Euphrates coupled with that of Aschem the Carysian, a personage whom the Ophite sect, so called, may have identified with this Euphrates, the prophet of the Old Testament, in order to demonstrate that there is nothing incredible in the supposition that these are the names of real Ophite teachers, though obscure to leave any record of their existence, outside their own sect.

The title "Peratic," as applied to the sect, is explained by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii. 176, etc.) to denote the "water." This sense may have taken its origin from the phrase σφυρας και ωραπας (Gen. xiv. 13, LXX), which was understood to mean one who came from the other side of the Euphrates (see Julius Africanus, ix. in Routh's Reliquiae, ii. 244). Pliny (Hist. Nat. xii. 19), speaking of a certain gum which came from Arabia, India, Media, and Babylon, adds that that which came from Media was called by some Peratic (Harvey, Ireneus, i. 1xxvii.). This seems to be the same as the Peratic frankincense spoken of by Arrian (Peripitus Maris Erythr. p. 148, Amst. 1663). It is probably a mere corruption of Sophronius of Jerusalem (Hodousin, Concil. iii. 1287) speaks of Sophronius of Persia, for he must have got the name from Theodoret; yet the corruption may have originated in the change of an unfamiliar word into a supposed equivalent. On the whole, we may conclude that this Euphrates, if he existed, came from the extreme east, and we may safely reject Bunsen's idea that this designation can only mean "the Euphrates," for this is contrary to the facts that Aschems, with whom Euphrates is coupled, came from Euboia, and that Euboia is sometimes spoken of as ώραπας, the other side. But this does not prove that the name "Peratic" would ever have been understood as equivalent to "Euboican;" it is nowhere stated

that Euphrates and Aschems were fellow-countrymen, and if they were, it is not likely that the one would have been designated after the other generally after the island.

Moshimuel, in his work on the Ophites (Geschichte der Schlangenbrüder) quoted by Matter (Gnomenme., i. 180), counts Euphrates as the first Gnost, on the grounds that he was the founder of the Ophites, and that this sect was anterior to Christianity. But his reasons for the latter opinion have not been found convincing. One of the strongest, viz. that Philaster counts Cainites, Sethites, and Ophites among pre-Christian sects (Cainites) loses all its weight when we find reason to believe that Philaster did not follow an arbitrary deviation from the authority he was following (see Lipsius, Quellenkritis des Ephrianos).

EUPHRATES (3), chamberlain of Constantine the Great. According to Codinus he had a great share in Constantine's conversion, but is not mentioned by the earlier authors. See Col. Orig. Constantinopol. p. 10 c. [M. F. A.]

EUPHRATES (3), presbyter. [Euphrates.] EUPHRATES (4) (Euphratias), bishop of Eleuthera in Crete; present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, viii. 404; Or. Christ. ii. 270.) [3. de S.]

EUPHRATION, bishop of Balaæas (on the Syrian coast, at the mouth of the river Eleutherus), present at the Nicene council, A.D. 325 (Mansi, ii. 693, 698). Athanasius (de Symmach. § 17, p. 584) states that Eusebius of Caesarea, in Palestine, who wrote to Euphration did not feel it necessary to repeat openly that Christ was not very God. A charge of writing to Euphratian in blasphemous terms on the same subject is made against Eusebius in the acts of the second council of Nicaea (Mansi, xii. 701 D). He was banished from his see by the Arians at the same time as Eustathius of Antioch (see also Eustathius, § 20, p. 254). In Athanasius (Hist. Arian. ad Monach. § 5) the see of Euphration is written Καλαεας, which has caused him sometimes to be called bishop of Calanis; but as the Benedictine editor there observes, the true name is Καλαεας, which occurs in Apol. de Pug. § 3. [E. V.]

EUPHRONIUS (1), bishop of Antioch, one of the prelates intruded by the Arian party after the deposition of Eustathius, c. 382. He had previously been a presbyter of the Cappadocian Caesarea. For the difficulties connected with the succession of prelates of this see, the letter of Antioch see EULALIUS (4). The see being again vacant by the premature death of Eulalius, the dominant party desired to establish their position by retaining Eusebius of Caesarea, who was then at Antioch as a leading member of the council by whom Eustathius had been deposed, and applied to the emperor Constantine to resume the appointment. Eusebius, however, wrote to the emperor to decline the proffered dignity, such translation being a violation of the Nicene canons (Can. 19). Constantine on this wrote three letters, preserved by Eusebius (de Fil. Const. iii. 60, 61, 62), one to Eusebius, highly commending his refusal of the see, a second
EUPHRONIUS, bishop of Antioch, bidding them not to erect the bishop of other cities, and a third to the ordaining prelates recommending Euphranius of Cosaeus and George of Arethusa. The choice fell on Euphranius. He added another to the list of short-lived intruded prelates, dying within less than two years of his election. (Socer. H. E. i. 24; Soc. H. E. ii. 19; Theod. H. E. ii. 27; Kaye, Council of Nicea, p. 60, note 4.)

[EUSEBIUS (29) p. 315, note.]

EUPHRONIUS (2), bishop of Colon in Armenia; afterwards metropolitan of Nicopolis (Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 428, 429). While he was at Colon, A.D. 375, Basil wrote to him apologizing for the rarity of his letters, caused by the distance and the difficulty of finding letter carriers, and asking his prayers (Basil, Epist. 195 [312]). The same year, on the death of Theodotus, the sensitive orthodox metropolitan of Nicopolis, Fronto was ordained as his successor by the party of Eustathius of Sebaste. The metropolitan of Nicopolis refused to communicate with their new bishop, and held their worship in the open air. Fronto's measures of repression only exasperated the schism. To heal the wound Poemenius, bishop of Satala, with the hearty approval of all the bishops of the province and the sanction of the civil authorities, promptly sent Euphranius to occupy the episcopal seat at Nicopolis. The people of Colon, being very indignant at the loss of their bishop, and threatening to bring the matter before the tribunals, Basil wrote to calm them (Ep. 227 [282]). He begs them to postpone their private feelings to the general good of the church. They could not be affected by the religious condition of Nicopolis, their metropolis. Euphranius had promised not to give up his superintendence of his old flock. He would have more labour, but they would have as much care. Basil wrote a similar letter to the magistrates of Colon (Ep. 228 [280]), assuring them that he would not be answerable because of the decision of the bishops. Not content with this, Basil at the same time wrote to the clergy of Nicopolis apologizing for the irritated feeling of the people of Colon at which they must not take umbrage (Ep. 229 [193]); and to the magistrates of the city, exhorting them to heartily recognize their new bishop, and do all they could to strengthen the feeling in his favour among the people of the rural districts. (Ep. 230 [194].)

EUPHRONIUS (3), Bishop of Anemurium in Lusuria. He signed the synodal letter of the Lusurian bishops to the emperor Leo, A.D. 436. (Mansi, vii. 565: Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 1017.)

EUPHRONIUS (4), Bishop of Hierapetra, in Crete, A.D. 458; signed in that year the synodal letter of the Cretan church addressed to the emperor Leo. (Or. Christ. ii. 267.)

EUPHRONIUS (5), St., ninth bishop of Autun, successor of Leonius. Before his elevation to the bishopric he had built the church of St. Symphorian, the martyr of Autun. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. ii. 15; Migne, Patr. Lat. lixxi. 214.) The date of his consecration is not quite certain, but it was probably not long before A.D. 452. That year was rendered memorable by an eclipse of the moon, a comet, and some portentous signs in the sky, following close upon Easter. With reference to the last, Hilarus (Chronicon, Migne, Patr. Lat. lii. 853) relates that Euphranius, now a bishop, addressed a letter to Count Agrippinus, which has not, however, survived. The following year, in conjunction with St. Lupus of Troyes, he wrote an epistle, which is still extant, to Talius, bishop of Angers, in answer to questions put to them on the subject of church ritual, and the discipline of the inferior clergy in the matter of marriage. (Migne, Patr. Lat. livii. 66; cf. Ceillier, Histoire des Auteurs sacrés, x. 357.) The middle years of his episcopate are bare of recorded facts, but we know that he was on intimate terms with Sidonius Apollinaris. (See the two letters expressive of friendship and esteem, lib. vii. Ep. 8 and lib. ix. Ep. 2, Migne, Patr. Lat. livii. 574, 617.) About A.D. 470 he assisted at the consecration of John I. to the see of Chalons, of which a curious account is given by Sidonius. (Sidon. Apoll. Epist. iv. 25 in Patr. Lat. livii. 331.) In 474 or 475, he is said to have been present at the council of Arles and Lyons and to have condemned the Pelagian views of the priest Lucadius (Mansi, vii. 1007). The name also appears among the signatures to a comminatory letter of Faustus bishop of Riez to the same Lucadius, the doctrine in which is said to be semi-Pelagian. The authors of the Gallia Christiana (iv. 340) refuse to admit the identity of this heretic subscriber with the bishop, and they are supported by the fact that no see is appended to the signature. (Cf. Tillemont, xvi. 423.)

In the will of St. Perpetua of Tours (to be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. lvii. 754) there is a legacy of a silver reliquary and a missal to his "consacerdos" Euphranius. This may quite possibly have been the bishop, who had a certain connexion with Tours, since Gregory (ut supra) tells us that he sent marble for the top of St. Martin's tomb there. Upon his death, the date of which we are not informed, he was buried in the church of the vicarous. He was buried in his own church of St. Symphorian, and is commemorated on Aug. 3.

S. A. B.

EUPHRONIUS. [Euphranius.]

EUPHROSIUS, Bishop of Rhodes, the metropolitan of the Cyclades, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 924; Mansi, ii. 695.)

EPHROSYNA (1). Euphresia, a virgin, of Alexandria, daughter of Papthnius born in the beginning of the 5th century. She was betrothed by her parents, but in order to escape marriage, fled disguised as a monk to a neighbouring monastery, and describing herself as Smaragdus an eunuch who had escaped from the palace, was received as a monk by the abbot. She was eventually allowed a separate cell, and lived for thirty-eight years without her sex being discovered. Her father in his grief at her loss came to the abbot, who recommended him to take his sorrow to Smaragdus. The father and daughter had a long interview—he known to her, she unknown to him—in which she instructed him in religion, but allowed him to go without betraying herself. In later years, feeling death near, she sent for him, revealed
EUPHROSYNA
herself, and died. Her father embraced monastic life in the same monastery, and died there. She is commemorated by the Roman church on Feb. 11, by the Greek on Sept. 25. (Basil. Menol.; Boll. Acta SS. Feb. ii. 537; Bailleit, Vie des Saints, Feb. 11.) [I. G. S.]

EUPHROSYNA (3)—Jan. 1. Martyr at Alexandria. (Mart. Adonis, Usuardi.)

EUPHROSYNA (3)—May 7. A female slave of Flavia Domitilla, with whom she suffered. [G. T. S.]


EUPITHIUS, bishop of Stratonicia (Hadrianopolis) in Caria, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 411; Mansi, vili. 156.) [L. D.]

EUPILIUS—Aug. 12. Deacon and martyr at Catana in Sicily in the Diocletian persecution. He was one of those who then voluntarily sought martyrdom. His acts, which are, however, very corrupt, tell us that one day he came to the tent of the praetor and proclaimed outside, "I am a Christian, and for the name of Christ I am willing to die." Upon this he was tortured and beheaded. In Basil's Menology he is noted on Aug. 11. (Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuard.; Kol. Frontonii; Sniuris, Ruinart; Baron. Annal. ann. 305, calviii.) [G. T. S.]

EULIUS (1), a member of the Ephesian church, sent by that church to meet Ignatius at Smyrna on his way to Rome. (Ignot. Ep. ad Eph. 3.) [G. S.]

EULIUS (2), son of Eusausius bishop of Agrientum. Eusausius died intestate, and Eupilius solicited from pope Gregory the Great that both his father's property and his mother's jointure may be made over to him. Gregory writes to Nazianzus bishop of Syracuse, enjoining compliance with this request. (Greg. Mag. Epp. iv. ind. xii. ep. 37; Patr. Lat. Ixxvii. 711.) [C. H.]

EUNIPUS, a magistrate addressed by Firmus bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who pleaded for justice to be done to the bearer of his letter. (Firm. Caes. ep. 40 in Pat. Gr. lxvii. 1510.) [T. W. D.]

EUPORUS (1)—Dec. 23. Martyr in Crete during the Decian persecution, with Evarustus, Euniceus and seven others. The magistrate handed him to the populace, who tortured him for thirty days and then beheaded him. (Bas. Men.) [G. T. S.]

EUPORUS (2), bishop of Hypaepa in the province of Asia, on the road between Ephesus and Sardis, present at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 695; Mansi, Concil. iv. 1216.) [L. D.]

EUPRAXIA—July 25. Daughter of a senator, Antigonus, and cousin of the emperor Theodosius, A.D. 390. Having been espoused to a senator, he died before they were married, whereupon she retired with her mother into a monastery at Thebes in Egypt, where she died. (Bas. Men.) [G. T. S.]

EUPRAXIAS (1), a slave of Gregory Nazianzen, brother of Theophilus, manumitted in his will, and bequeathed a legacy of five gold pieces. (Greg. Naz. Testam.) [E. V.]

EUPRAXIAS (2), a disciple and intimate friend of Eusebius of Samosata. While Eusebius was in exile in Thrace, A.D. 374, a letter was carried to him by Eupraxias congratulating him on his good confession, and written either by Basil or Gregory Nazianzen, Tillament inclining to think to the latter (Mem. Eccl. ix. 230). (Basil. Ep. 166 [251]; Greg. Naz. ep. 65 al. 30.) [E. V.]


EUPREPIA, A.D. 587, the sister of Euprepius bishop of Pavia. Among the 297 letters of Eunadius we have several addressed to Euprepias, and one which is probably from her (Eun. Epp. lib. iv. 4). She lived in the Gallic province of Narbonne or Arles, and seems at one time to have contemplated changing her abode. In one of the letters Eunadius sends her one of his poems, an epitaph on the wife of his friend and correspondent Faustus. He gives her advice and admonition, and frequently makes mention of her son Lupicinus. He alludes to her in other letters. [F. A.]

EUPREPIUS (1), first recorded bishop of Verona, imagined to have been one of the Seventy, and to have sat A.D. 60-72; commemorated Aug. 21. St. Cricinus follows him. Other bishops of Verona bearing this name in the list of Gams are not recognised by Ughelli. (Ug. Ital. Sac. v. 677; Boll. Acta SS. Aug. iv. 400; Mart. Rom. Aug. 1.) [C. H.]

EUPREPIUS (2)—Oct. 17 and Sept. 27. Martyr under Lysias at Aegae in Cilicia with Anthimus and Leonitus, his brothers. They were three physicians, of the class known as ἀργυρούπον, practising without fees, after the example of Cosmas and Damianus, with whom they suffered. (Cosmas (1) and Damianus (3)) (Mart. Usuardi., Sept. 27; Bas. Men. Oct. 17; Menologia Gr. Oct. 17, ed. Constantiu. 1843, Oct. p. 123; Ferrarius, Catal. Gen. Sanct. 407.) It would seem to have been in his honour that the monastery to which Nestorius is said to have wished to retire after his deposition was erected. It was situated in the suburbs of Antioch. Nestorius had been a monk there. (Evagrius, H. E. i. 7; Marius Mercator. pt. ii. pass. Garzet. in Migne, Patrolog. xliii. 702.) [T. W. D.]

EUPREPIUS (3) (ECTOTRYPHE), bishop of Adrianopoli in Thrace, deposed by the Eastern council of Constantinople, A.D. 336, according to the Libellus Synodi of the council (Mansi, ii. 1170); but as Pagi (ann. 336. vi. in Baron.) points out, Anthanaisus names this bishop Euprius, mentioning him in terms of high praise, both for his orthodoxy and the fortitude with
which he endured the trials of persecution and exile. (Athanas. Epist. de Fug. § 3, in Pat. Gr. xxix. 644; Id. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. § 5, vi. 699.) [T. W. D.]

EUPREPIUS (b), bishop of Bisra in Thrace; one of the sixty-eight bishops who demanded that the council of Ephesus should be postponed until the arrival of John of Antioch. He signed on this occasion also for Fritillus bishop of Hieraclea (Synod. adv. Tragord. cap. 7, in Theodoret. Opp. t. v. in Pat. Gr. i.xxxiv. 591). He nevertheless attended the council when it was opened, signed the sentence against Nectarius and the “decretum de Æde” (Mansi, iv. 1325 c, 1364 e). But Euprepius is chiefly of interest from the memorial termed “supplex libellus,” which he and Cyril bishop of Ctesae in the same province jointly addressed to the fathers of the council (Bod. 1478). In this document they stated that by an ancient custom in the European provinces a bishop sometimes had one or more bishops besides his own under his charge; that Euprepius was at that time administering the see of Arcadiopolis in addition to that of Bisra, while Cyril was acting similarly. The council was requested to rule that this custom might not continue, and that the titular bishop of Hieraclea might be forbidden to appoint bishops in those cities of Thrace which were then without bishops of their own. The prayer was granted, and it was decreed that the custom of the cities in question should be respected. (Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 1139, 1194.) [E. V.]

EUPREPIUS (5), one of the monks under Eutyches at Constantinople who addressed the Latrocinium of Ephesus in 449 against their bishop Flavinus. (Mansi, vii. 892.) [T. W. D.]

EUPREPIUS (6), bishop of Cyzicus, the metropolis of the Bosphoritus province, succeeded Eusebius, who was killed by the orders of John bishop of Ilium signed the decrees of the fifth general council, a. d. 553, in behalf of Euprepius his metropolitan. (Le Quien, Orins Christ. i. 754; Mansi, ii. 389.) [L. D.]

EUPREPIUS (7), confessor in the reign of Constantia II. He and his brother Theodorus, sons of Plutinos who held a lucrative public post at Constantinople, were zealous maintainers of the Catholic opinions against the Monothelites, being disciples of Anastasius the presbyter and apocrisarius of the Roman church, and the warm supporter of St. Maximus. Anastasius was banished to Trasaeus, and the brothers refusing like him to accept the Typus [Constantinop. IV.] endeavored to effect their escape to Rome, but were seized at Abydus and sent into exile to Cherson, where Euprepius sank under his hardships on Oct. 26 in the fourteenth indiction (i.e. a. d. 671). They are mentioned in the Hypomnesticon de Gestis S. Maximini. (Anastas. Biblioth. Collectanea, in Patr. Lat. cxxiv. 684.) See also Boll. Acta SS. 15 Aug. iii. 114. [T. W. D.]

EUPROBUS (Ectropius), April 30. Bishop and martyr at Saintes, whither he had been sent to preach the gospel. He died in the 3rd century. Palladius, bishop of the same see, built a church in his honour in the 6th century, the consecration of which is described by Gregory of Tours. (Mart. Adonis, Usuardi; Greg. Tur. de Glor. Mart. cap. 56.) [U. T. S.]

EUPSYCHIUS (1), martyr, who suffered in the reign of Hadrian. He was discharged after his first arrest, when he gave away all his possessions to the poor, and to those who had harbored against him before the magistrates. He afterwards suffered excruciating tortures, his sides being torn with iron hooks before he was dispatched with the sword. (Boll. Acta SS. Sept. 7.) [H. R. K.]

EUPSYCHIUS (2) (Eutychius), saint and martyr, first bishop of Melitene, the metropolis of the second Armenia. In the Menaea he is commemorated on May 28th (A.A. SS. Bolland. Mai. vi. 734), and is said to have learned Christianity from the apostles, but his martyrdom is generally referred to the time of the emperor Gordian III., c. a. d. 238. Le Quien (Orins Christ. i. 439) identifies him with the martyr of Basil’s epitaph [Euprepius (6)]. [L. D.]

EUPSYCHIUS (3), martyr. [Nicomedia, Martyrs.] [T. W. D.]

EUPSYCHIUS (4), bishop of Tyana (Eusebia, Christopolis), metropolis of the second Cappadocia, one of the Nicene fathers, a. d. 325, and a speaker in the council; his name was recorded first on the diphytis of that church, as we learn from the speech of Euphratas at the fifth council. (Le Quien, Orins Christ. i. 395; Mansi, ii. 694.) He is no doubt the Cappadocian bishop mentioned with twenty-seven others as a type and standard of orthodoxy by Athanasius, a. d. 356, in his letter to the bishops of Egypt and Libya. (Athanas. Opp. pars 1, p. 220, § 8 in Patr. Græc. xxi. 557.) [L. D.]

EUPSYCHIUS (5), whose name appears in the Roman Calendar, and whose martyrdom is celebrated on April 9 (Boll. Acta SS. April 9, i. 822), suffered from the rashness which induced him in the reign of Julian to use force in the demolition of a temple to Fortune, which had remained undisturbed in the city of Caesarea in Cappadocia. “All the actors in this transaction were condemned, some to death and others to banishment” (Sozomen, H. E. v. 11). Caesarea was struck from the roll of cities and the order was issued that henceforth it should use its earlier name Maeonia. Among the objects of the emperor’s special indignation were Damos and Eupyschius. The latter was a notary who had recently married. He was made a special example of, and after cruel torment beheaded. Julian gave orders that the temple should be rebuilt, the order was never obeyed, on the contrary, a church was erected on the spot, dedicated to the memory of Eupyschius. To the festival of the dedication of this church Basil summoned the bishops of Pontus, by a letter which is still extant. (Bas. Opp. Paris ed. Ep. ccl.) Moreover, we find Basil eagerly entreating Eusebius of Samosata to be present at the festival of Eupyschius Sept. 7, in the year 372. (Bas. Ep. c.; Gregor. Naz. Opp. Epp. xxvi. 777; Cellier, vol. v. p. 252.) [H. R. K.]

EUPSYCHIUS (6), a person deputed by Tranquillus, a bishop, to convey tidings to Chrysostom at Cucusus concerning his health and other matters by Basil, who failed to fill the commission. (Chrys. Epist. 37.) [E. V.]
EUPSYCHIUS (7), circ. 423, addressed by Atticus, archbishop of Constantinople, in a letter arguing for the union of two natures in Jesus Christ, each keeping its own essence. A fragment of the letter is cited in the third part of the Acts of the council of Chalcedon, among testimonies of the fathers establishing the two natures. (Mansi, vii. 471; Cellier, viii. 15). [W. M. S.]

EUPSYCHIUS (8), bearer, about 449, of a letter from pope Leo the Great to Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople (Leo Mag. Epist. xxxix.; Patr. Lat. liv. 889; Cellier, x. 214). [W. M. S.]

EUREDUS (EUSENDUS), bishop of Lerida; signs the acts of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and sixteenth councils of Toledo, A.D. 683, 688, and 693. He is the last bishop of the Gothic period. (Esp. Sapr. xlv. 108; Aguirre-Catalana, iv. 287, 304, 313). [M. A. W.]

EURUSIUS, a bishop of a civil diocese of Asia denounced as a heretic by an edict of the emperor Arcadius, addressed to Aurelian the proconsul, Sept. 5, A.D. 395 (Cod. Theod. xvi. v. 26); the edict extols the definition of heresies, so as to include all who "vel levi argumento a judicio Catholicae religionis et tramite detecti fuerint deviæ" (Cod. Justin. I. v. 2, § 1); and it was under that definition that Euresius was charged with heresy, and forbidden to be regarded as "of the number of the most holy bishops." Baronius, quoting the edict, marks Euresius with an asterisk, to indicate that the name is suspicious (Ann. Eccles. s. a. 395). Gothofred identifies him with the Luciferian bishop Ephesius who is mentioned in the "libellus" presented by Faustinus and Marcellinus to the emperors Valentinianus II., Theodosius, and Arcadius, a.d. 386 (Pat. L. xiii. 90), as having been cruelly persecuted by Damascus bishop of Rome, A.D. 386-384; and Pagi accepts the identification (Crit. s. a. 395, v. vi.). It would appear that after his persecution in the West, Euresius fled to the East, and that after Theodosius issued the rescript addressed to Cynegius (ob. 388, Zosim. iv. 45) granting toleration to the Lucifarians (Pat. L. u. s. 107) he peacefully exercised the episcopate until Arcadius published this edict. [EPHESIUS; FAUSTINUS.]

[EURFYL (ERVUL), ST., a Welsh saint of the 7th century after whom Llanerfyll (Llanerfyl, Llanervul) in Montgomeryshire is named; commemorated on July 6 (K. Rees, Welsh Saints, 307).]

EURGAIN (ECOGAN, EBGMIN), the foundress of Llanerugain or Norhop, Flintshire, and wife of Eilde Mwynaev (the courteous), a Lanca- shire chieftain, is given in the Pedigree of the Saints as daughter of Maighed Gwynedd, son of Cadwallawn Llawhir, son of Elion Yrth, son of Cunedda Wledig, and Rees places her among the Welsh saints of the middle of the 6th century. (Myn. Arch. ii. 7, 25, 40; Prof. Rees, Welsh Saints, iii. 261, 535; Rev. W. J. Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 593, 597). [G. U.]

EURIC (1) (EVARIUS, EIVRICH, EUTHO- RIK, EYARIX), king of the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse from 466 to 484, and from 477 onwards master of almost the whole of Spain. Under him the Visigoth power reached its highest point. In the reign of his successor it was curtailed by the Franks, while in that of his father, Theodoric or Theodored I. (d. 451), and his brothers, Thorismund and Theodoric II., the country occupied by the Goths had still been reckoned as an integral part of the empire ("auxiliares reipublicae"); says Astulf to the Goths before the battle of Chalons, "cajus membrum tenetis," (Jord. c. 35), while the Gothic state had found it necessary to submit again and again to the foedus with Rome. But under Euric it took a fresh departure. "Euric, therefore, king of the Visgoths," says Jord. c. 45, "seeing the frequent changes of the Roman princes" (and the weakness of the Roman king- dom, "Romani regni vacillationem," as he says in c. 46), "attempted to occupy the Gauls in its own right, suo jure." And again, "totas Hispanias Galliaeque sibi jam proprio jure tenes." Thus the presence of the foedus was finally set aside, and in the interval between the fall of the Western Empire and the rise of the Ostrogoths and Franks, Euric appears as the most powerful sovereign of the West (Dahm, v. 100).

The facts of his reign are briefly these. In 466, the year of his accession, Euric sent legates to the Eastern emperor Leo, perhaps with a last thought of renewing the foedus. The negotiations, however, came to nothing, and in 467 the Goths and Vandals made a defensive league against Leo, Anthemius and Rikimer, who were about to attack Genesic. Beside his Vandal auxiliaries in Gaul Euric also had the support of a certain party among the provincials themselves, as is shown by the evidence of the trial of Arvandil, prefect of the Gauls, for treasonable correspondence with the Goths (Sidon. Apoll. i. 7), and in 468 he attacked the new made Western emperor Anthemius simultaneously in Gaul and Spain. In Spain the Gothic army took Merida and Lisbon from the Suevi, while in Gaul, the Bretons under Riotimith, the faithful allies of Euric, were defeated at Denou, where the Visigoths were defeated, and Bourges was captured (470 ?). Between 472 and 474 the state of affairs at Rome prevented any help being sent to the Burgundians and Breton allies, and all over the country south of the Loire, the enfeebled Roman garrisons were no longer able to make any resistance to the Gothic attacks. By 474 the Gothic dominions in Gaul would have extended from the Atlantic to the Rhone and Mediterranean, and from the Pyrenees to the Loire, but for one obstacle—the vigorous defence of Auvergne by Eudicius, son of the emperor Avitus, and the famous bishop of Clermont, Sidonius Apollinaris (Sid. Apoll. vii. 1). The history of this dramatic struggle, preserved for us in the letters of Sidonius, is valuable light on the whole state of politics in the 5th century. It is the last desperate effort of the provincial nobility to avoid barbarian masters, and it is a fight, too, of Catholicism against Arianism. But it was an unsuccessful struggle. After besieging Clermont in 474, Euric withdrew into the western quarters of Gaul, between Sidonius and Eudicius, in the midst of a devastated country, organized fresh resistance. But with the spring diplomacy intervened. Glyceries, fearful for Italy, and hoping to purchase a renewal of the foedus, had in 473 formally ceded the country to Euric, a compact rejected by Eudicius.
and Sidonius, and now Nepos, for the same reasons, sent legates to Euric, amongst them the famous Ambassadors of Faventia (Gaulod. Vite S. Eppis. A.A. SS. Jan. ii. p. 392), to treat for peace. Euric persisted in the demand for Avarogna, and accordingly, in return for a renewal of the foodus ("fidelibus animis foederante", Sid. Apoll. iv. 5), Ecdicius and Sidonius were ordered to submit, and the district was given over to the revenge of the Goths. Ecdicius fled to the Burgundians, while Sidonius (see Ep. vii. 7, for his invectives against the peace—"Padest vos hujus foederis, nec utilis nec decori"!), after having in vain attempted to make favourable terms for the Catholics with Euric, was banished to Livia, near Nubronno (Sid. Apoll. viii. 9). By the influence, however, of Euric's minister, Leo, he was set at liberty after a year's imprisonment, and appeared at the Gothic court at Bordeaux, where, during a stay of two months, he succeeded in obtaining only one audience of the king, so great was the crowd of小事 and of business awaiting for the decision of Euric and his minister. In Ep. viii. 9, Sidonius has left us a brilliant picture of the Gothic kingdom, surrounded by barbarian envoys, Roman legates, and even Persian ambassadors. It is little to be wondered at, he says, that his own business was passed by—"Neg multum domino vacat vel tpsi. Dam responsum petit subscripta ordine."!

The Gothic territory in Gaul was now bounded by the Loire, the Rhone, and the two seas, while in Spain a great many towns—which, is not quite clear—were already held by Gothic garrisons. From these starting-points Euric's troops easily overran the whole country when the time for the next great forward step arrived. In 475 came the fall of Nepos and Augustulus, and the suspension of the empire of the West. The news startled all the barbarian races in Gaul and Spain into a movement. Euric, with an energetic and well-reasoned policy of Gothic reinforcement under Widimer, crossed the Pyrenees in 477, took Pamphelona and Saragossa, and anathematised the resistance of the Roman nobility in Tarraconensis. By 478 the whole peninsula had fallen to the Goths with the exception of a mountainous strip in the north-west, relinquished probably by treaty to the Suevi. Since 461 no Roman army had been available for the protection of Spain, while sometimes, as the allies of Rome and under the shelter of the foodus, sometimes as the enemies both of Rome and the Suevi, the Goths had gradually possessed themselves of numerous important points. Their conquest of the peninsula was now complete, and thus, says Dahn, "a place of refuge was provided for the Goths . . . . destined in the following generation to fall back before the young and all-seducing power of the Franks, called to a greater work than they" (Chron. der Germanen, v. 98). Fresh successes in Gaul followed close upon the Spanish campaign. Arles was taken, 480, Marseilles, 481, and ultimately the whole of Provence up to the Maritime Alps (Proc. b. G. i. 1, quoted by Dahn, l. c.). Resistance on the part of the provincials was impossible, and the exiled Nepos, indeed, seems to have formally surrendered almost the whole of southern Roman Gaul to Euric. Euric was now sovereign from the Loire to the Straits of Gibraltar, and appears also as the protector of the neighboring barbarian races against the approaching Franks (Cass. Vor. iii. 3), taking the same position towards them as Theodoric the Great took later in the reign of Euric's son Alaric, Theodoric's son-in-law. Euric survived the accession of Chlodwig three years, dying before September, 485.

Euric's Personal Character, and his Persecutions of the Catholics.—That Euric was a ruler of commanding gifts and personality cannot be doubted. Even his bitterest enemy, Sidonius, speaks of his courage and capacity in terms of unwilling admiration. "Pre-eminent in war, of fiery courage and vigorous youth," says Sidonius ("armas potens, acer anima, alscer anna," Ep. vii. 6), "he makes but one mistake—that of supposing that his successes are due to the correctness of his religion, when he owes them rather to a stroke of earthly good fortune." He was much interested in religious matters, and was a passionate Augustinian, not without apparent political motives, though his persecution of the Catholic bishops was dictated by sufficient political reasons. The letter of Sidonius quoted above throws great light upon Euric's relation to the Catholic church, and upon the state of the church under his government. "It must be confessed," he says, "that although this king of the Goths is terrible because of his power, I fear his attacks upon the Christian laws more than I dread his blows for the Roman walls. The mere name of Catholic, they say, curdles his countenance and heart like vinegar, so that you might almost doubt whether he was more the king of his people or of his sect. Lose no time," he adds, addressing his correspondent Basilius, bishop of Aix, "in ascertaining the hidden weakness of the Catholic state, that you may be able to apply prompt and public remedy. Bordeaux, Perigueux, Rodез, Limoges, Gébuls, Emusa, Béziers, Comminges, Auch, and many other towns, where death has reigned for a number of years, families of men, monasteries, and places of worship, have been given to the Goths. I urge you to send to Rome as speedily as possible the body of Alaric, express Christian and Roman in the hands of the church, and give no help to this new generation of wretched Christians in the hope of obtaining for the Catholics from the Gothic govern-
ment, at least the right of ordaining bishops, that "so we may keep our hold upon the people of the Gauls, if not ex foedere, at least ex fide." Gregory of Tours in the following century echoed and exaggerated the account of Sidonius, and all succeeding Catholic writers have accused Euric of the same intolerant persecution of the church. It is, however, certain that the persecution must be looked upon as to a great extent political. The Catholic bishops and the provincial nobility were the natural leaders of the Romanized populations. The ecclesiastical organization made the bishops especially formidable. (See Dahn's remarks on the Vandal king Huneric's persecutions, *Könige der Germanen*, i. 250.) Their intrigues and their opposition threatened the work of Euric's life, and did, in fact, back the arms of the orthodox Franks, destroy it in the reign of his successor. But whether the persecution was more religious or more political, it has a special interest as one of the earliest instances of that oppression in the name of religion, of which the later history of the Goths and of the Spain they conquered, is everywhere full (Dahn, v. 101).

It is certain, however, that Euric by no means oppressed the Romans as such. His minister Leo was of an illustrious Roman family (Sid. Apoll. viii. 3), and so also was the count Victor whom he trusted the government of Auvergne after its surrender (Sid. Apoll. vii. 17; Greg. Tur. ii. 35). It was probably by Leo's help that Euric drew up the code of laws by which Isidore and others speak. "Sub hoc regi Gothi legum statuta in scriptis habere coepertum. Nam ante tantum moribus et consuetudine tenebatur." (Hist. Goth. apud Exp. Supr. vi. 486.)


[M. A. W.]


EUBRIELA, Breton saint of the 7th cent., daughter of king Hoel III. (otherwise called Judicael) and sister of St. Josse. Lobineau mentions a parish church dedicated to her in the diocese of Dol, not far from Dinan. She was commemorated on Oct. 1. (Lobineau, *Saints de BreTAGUE*, vol. ii. p. 117, ed. 1839; Boll. Acta SS. Oct. 1, 198.)

[CH.]

EUROLDUS (Curoldus, Conradus) is given as twenty-fourth bishop of Besançon, between Wandelbertus and Aurelius, about the middle of the eighth century. He is said to have died in the twelfth year of his episcopate (Gall. Christ. xv. 19).

[S. A. B.]

EUSEBIA, virgin martyr at Jacoa, a town in Spain by the river Aragon, under the Saracens in the 8th century; commemorated June 25. (Boll. Acta SS. June v. 88.)

[C. H.]

EURYLY (Euppyly.)

EURYN was one of the sons of Helig Poel, who was descended from Caradog Fraichfras, and chieftain of a district which was overflowed, and is now known as the Laman Sands in Beaumaris Bay, Carmarthen-ness. Like his father and brothers, he is included among the saints, but has no feast or church dedication (Rer. Vot. Saints, 103, 298, 301-2; Williams, *Emun. Welch*, 148).

[J. G.]

EUSANIUS (1), martyr under Maximian in the Samnite town of Purganum, and is commemorated July 9. (Bull. Acta SS. Jul. ii. 601.)

EUSANIUS (2), bishop of Agrigentum. His son Euplus in 354 is to receive a fair share of the goods which belonged to Eusanius before he became bishop; so directs Gregory the Great (lib. iv. Indict. xii. Ep. 37, Migne, lxvii. 711; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* p. 109.)

[A. H. D. A.]

EUSEBIA (1), empress, wife of Constantian. We learn from Julian that she was born at Thessalonica, and was the daughter of a consul. (Or. iii. §§ 107, 108.) She had two brothers, Eusebius and Hypatius, consuls. (Amm. xxi. 6. 4.) Her marriage with the emperor took place apparently in 352 or 353. (Tillemont, *Exp.* iv. 26.) Her affection for her is shown by the fact that he called a new province of the empire, comprising Bithynia, &c., after her name. (Amm. xlvii. 7. 6.) In 354 she was instrumental in saving the life of Julia, whose firm friend she continued to be, and whose image on her is still preserved, being numbered as his third oration. (Cf. exp. §§ 118, 121 and *Ad Ath.* § 273.) It was greatly owing to her influence that he received the title of Caesar in 355, and also the hand of Helena. (Zosim. iii. 1; Jul. *Ad Ath.* § 274 and *Trübner ed.*.) In 366, during her husband's expedition across the Danube, she paid a visit to Rome, where she was received with great honour. (Jul. *Or. iii.* § 129.) In the following year apparently she persuaded Constantius to make Julia governor of the nations beyond the Alps. (Zosim. iii. 1.) Her death is only alluded to incidentally. (Amm. xxi. 6. 4.) She never had any children, and one serious charge is brought against her of Ammianus (xxi. 10. 18), namely, that through jealousy she several times induced Helena the wife of Julian to take drugs, which produced abortion. With the exception of this, all authorities speak of her with high praise. Julian of course lavishses upon her the most fulsome compliments, but besides that, Zosim (l. c.) speaks of her as highly educated and endowed with discernment extraordinary for her sex, and Ammianus (xxi. 6. 4) describes her as excelling in the accomplishment of her mind and in beauty of person.

It is possible that St. Chrysostom alludes to her (*In Epist. ad Phil. Hon.* xv.) where he speaks of an emperor whose death was the result of unlawful efforts to procure by drugs the fruitsness which God had seen fit to withhold from her. Of her attitude towards the church we have not much information. Theodoret (H. E. ii. 16. 28) states that Liberius in exile rejected her presents, as he did those of the emperor, from which he should gather that she belonged to the Ariam party, and this is probable on other grounds. Suidas (sub nom. Leontius) relates a story of Leontius bishop of Tripolis in Lydia failing to pay her the adulation which the other bishops displayed, and her anger on account of it. Leontius is called an Ariam by
EUSEBIA
Philostorgius. Baronius appears to go beyond the authorities when he speaks of her as the instigator of all her husband’s attacks upon the Catholic faith. (Baron. A. E. an. 356 cxxvi.)

EUSEBIA (2), pretended virgin of the Manicheans, mentioned by Augustine (De Haeres. cap. 40).

EUSEBIA (3), a deaconess of the Macedonian sect at Constantinople. She was an intimate friend of Caesarius, who built a church in that city in honor of St. Thyrus. [Caesarius (6).] Eusebia had a house and grounds in the suburbs of the city, where she had concealed relics of the forty martyrs who suffered at Sebaste. When on her death-bed, she charged the Macedonian monks of Constantinople to bury her remains where the relics were deposited, but to keep the fact of their concealment there a secret. They fulfilled both her requests, and built a subterranean oratory around the relics and her remains, and a dwelling house over them (Sozomen, u. s.). Caesarius and his wife agreed that whichever of them died first should bury the other by the side of Eusebia, and he therefore purchased the property for that purpose. His wife died first, and was buried there accordingly. It was on that property that Caesarius built his church, but not until after the buildings erected by the monks had fallen into ruins.

In the meanwhile the monks and left Constantinople, probably after the edict of A.D. 423 directed against the Macedonians (Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 59, 60 = 13), but without communicating the secret about the relics to any one. Not long after the erection of the church, however, they were discovered by means of Polychnorius, a presbyter of the city, who, when a youth, had witnessed the burial of Eusebia. He succeeded in tracing the only survivor of the monks, who was in possession of the secret, and through him it was revealed. The relics having thus been found, they were placed in a splendid reliquary, which had been prepared for them by the empress Pulcheria, and carried in a grand procession into the church of St. Thyrus (Sozomen, u. s.). Sozomen tells us that he was present on the occasion. Baronius relates the story under A.D. 538.

EUSEBIA (4), virgin at Mylassa, in the 5th century. (Boll. Acts SS. 24 Jan. ii. 600.)

EUSEBIA (5), mother of Theodore the Great. [Ereliева.]

EUSEBIA (6), “Patricia,” addressed by Gregory the Great in 603. (Lib. xiii. indict. vi. Epist. 32. Migne, lxvii. 1282.) From this letter it appears that her mind was either so engrossed in riches, or perhaps so occupied by the tumultuous disorders of the imperial city (regnum cristiani) that she could not be diverted to Gregory. He counsels her to turn her thoughts rather towards things spiritual; he prays that she may in this world pass a tranquil life with her most noble husband, and rejoice in the welfare of the lord Strategius, until at some distant day she reaches her eternal reward. Gussani, writing in his letters upon the current attacks upon Gregory, is not wrong in concluding that she is the Eusebia, daughter of Rusticiana Patricia, mentioned in a letter of Gregory in 598, where Strategius is also named, he being probably Eusebius’s son (Lib. viii. indict. i. ep. 22). Rusticiana had once resided at Rome, but had removed to Constantinople.

EUSEBIUS (7), abbesse, was the daughter of noble parents, Adalbrand and St. Rictrude, but was brought up by her grandmother, St. Gertrude, abbesse of Hamay or Hamaigne (Hamaichense), on whose death in 649 Eusebia was chosen as her successor. As, however, she was only twelve years old, her mother, who was abbesse of Marchiennes, on the Scarpe, between Flanders and Hainault, desired her to come and learn to obey before she tried to command others. Eusebia objected, but was obliged to obey an order which her mother obtained from Clovis II., and she came to Marchiennes (Marciana), accompanied by all her nuns. She bore ill her subjection to St. Gertrude, and would often cross secretly at night to Hamay, chant the offices there, and return next day to Marchiennes. Chastised and even seriously injured by her mother, she still remained firm, and she was at length allowed to take back her nuns to Hamay, of which convent she then became abbesse, at the age of thirteen. Here she showed extraordinary wisdom and power of command, and died at the age of twenty-three, about A.D. 660. She is commemorated on March 16. (Acta SS. Mar. ii. 452; Migne, Patrol. Lat. 149, 133; Baillet, Vies des Saints, Mar. 16.)

EUSEBIANL, followers of Eusebius of Nicomedia. [Eusebius (60).]

INDEX TO EUSEBIUS.

EUSEBIUS (1), succeeded Marcellus as bishop of Rome A.D. 309 or 310. He was banished to Sicily by Maxentius, where he died after a pontificate of four months (from April 18 to August 17). His body was brought back to Rome, and buried in the cemetery of Callistus on the Appian Way. The days of the month assigned above to his accession and death are those given in our oldest and most trustworthy authority, the Liberian catalogue (A.D. 354), which however in this case slightly contradicts itself in giving 4 months and 16 days as the duration of his episcopate. It contains no indication of the year, nor any facts. The Liberian Deposito Episcoporum gives Sept. 36 as the date of his burial, the interval between which day and that of his death being easily accounted for by his having died in Sicily and been buried at Rome. Later authorities vary much as to the date and duration of his reign, the Felician catalogue (A.D. 530) gives the latter as 7 years, Dorsenfeld, 3 days, the chronicle of Eusebius (induct. i. Galer., as 7 months. The Felician catalogue describes him as a Greek by birth and the son of a phy-
sician, and speaks of the Invention of the Cross during his episcopate, of the baptism of him by Judas Quirinus, and of his interment in the cemetery of Callistus. Judas Quirinus, other-

wise Judas Cyricus, was said to have been the finder of the Cross of our Lord, whence its name (Plistia, de Vit. Pontif. art. Eusebii, p. 41). But the authentic accounts of the finding of the supposed true cross by Helena place the event much later than Eusebius, and hence the stories connecting him with it are given up both by the Bollandists and Baronius. Hardly anything indeed was known with any certainty about this bishop till the recent discoveries of De Rossi in the catacombs threw a new light on this page of papal history. It has been already stated that he was known to have been buried in the cemetery of Callistus on the Appian Way, the fact resting on the authority of the Liberian Depos. Episc., as well as on that of the Felician catalogue, whereas his two immediate prede-

cessors, Cyprian and Marcellinus and Marcellus were spoken of as interred elsewhere, in the cemetery of Priscilla. But ancient itineraries, written by persons who had visited those tombs, while still open to view, described his resting-place as not being the papal crypt in the cemetery of Callis-
tus, where all the popes (with the two exceptions mentioned) were buried, but a Pontifical crypt, but a separate one at some distance from it. Accord-

ingly, De Rossi sought for this crypt, and found it, and therein discovered, in the years 1852 and 1856, fragments of the inscription placed by pope Damasus over the grave. This inscription was indeed previously known by means of copies taken and preserved before the closing of the catacombs. But it was uncertain whether it referred to Eusebius the pope or to some other Eusebius. Baronius, who quotes it, takes it as referring to the priest Eusebius who suffered in the time of the emperor Constantius in connection with the recall of pope Liberius. Tille-

mont, and the Bollandists, on the other hand, refer it to the pope. All doubt as to the correctness of the latter view has now been set at rest by the discovery, in the crypt referred to, not only of some forty-six fragments of a slab bearing a copy of the original inscription, but some also of the original slab, identified by some as the well-known peculiar characters of the Damascene inscriptions. The inscription is as follows:—

"Damasus Episcopus fecit. Eusebius vexit lupam peccata dolere Eusebii misero decuit sua criminis flere Scinditur in partes populus gliscentem furere Sedito caesio bellum discordia lies Exeuntia et erunt lumen Integra cum rector servaret secretis pactis Pertulit exilium domino sub Jacto laetus Littore Trinacri mundum vitamque reliquit. Euseblo Episcopo et martyri."  

On each side of the verses a single file of letters records the name of the engraver of this as well as of all the other Damascene inscriptions, thus: "Benedictus Iuvenalicius Eusebii scribuit. Damascas pappae cultor atque amator." We thus have revealed to us a state of things at Rome of which no other record has been preserved. It would seem that, on the cessation of the Diocletian persecution, the church there was rent into two parties on the subject of the terms of readmis-
sion of the lapsed to communion; that one Her-

aclius headed a party who were for readmission without the requirement of the penitential discipline insisted on by Eusebius; that the consequent tumults, accompanied by bloodshed, were such that "the tyrant" Maxentius interposed, and banished the leaders of both factions; and that Eusebius, having died during his exile in Sicily, thus obtained the name of martyr.

It appears further, from the similar Damascene inscription on Marcellus, that the contest had begun at the time of his accession, before the episcopate of Eusebius, and that in his time also the heathen civil power had interposed, banish-
ing Marcellus who, as well as his successor, had required penance from the lapsi, and so caused tumults and sanguinary conflicts. [MARCELLUS] It is possible that the person referred to by the word "alterius" in the inscription on Marcellus in the lines,

"Crimen ob alterius Christum qui in pace negavit Finibus expul sul patrisse est feritas tyrannii,"  

was the same Heraclius who opposed Eusebius. The way in which his name occurs in the inscrip-
tion on Eusebius suggests the idea that he may have been elected as an antipope by his party. This view is taken by Lipius (Christenung der römischen Bischöfe). However that might be, the whole ground of dispute was essentially the same as what had led to the first election of an antipope, viz. Novatian, after the Decian perse-

cution, some fifty years before; but with these differences; that on the earlier occasion the question was whether the lapsi were to be re-

admitted to communion at all or not, the schismatic being on the side of severity; as the later occasion the question was only about the conditions of their readmission, the disac-
tients being on the side of laxity. In both in-
stances the church of Rome, as represented by her lawful bishops, seems to have held a resi-

dent and judicious course, however adverse to the Christian community the scandals that accompanied the latter contest.

There are three spurious decretal epistles at-
tributed to Eusebius: one to the bishop of Campania and Tuscia, referring to the Invention of the Cross, and ordering the celebration of a festival in his honour, containing a special lecture on the authority of St. Peter, and direc-
tions as to the reconciliation of properly baptized heretics by the imposition of hands of bishops. Two others, addressed to the bishops of Gaul and of Egypt, relate mainly to accusations brought against bishops and clergy, the object being to afford them protection and immunity. There are also several decreets attributed to him, allowing betrothed girls to enter monas-
teries, ordering the Eucharist to be consecrated on white linen only, enjoining the observance of fasts, and regulating the banquets of bishops. None of these documents have any claim to authenticity. There is however a decreet of his which Benedict XIV. published, while allowing the pro-
bable spuriousness of the rest, refers to a apostate by Ivo of Chartres, and as genuine, the subject being Extreme Unction (Benedict XIV. de Servorum Det Beatiificatione, i. 32. 31). Matteo also (de Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, c. 7, art. 2) refers to this decree as preserved by Ivo, adducing it as a proof, among many other,
that Extreme Unction was anciently adminis-
tered before the Viaticum, and hence while the
patient was unconscious of his inability and not,
as in later times, when recovery was
expected of: "Jubet enim Eusebius illo decreto
ut Secedens circa negrotantem ponsimnetem orat-
tiones dicat, et ungu eum oleo sancto, et Eucha-
ristiam ei doneit."

Baranius, on the authority of the spurious Acta Eusebius, written by Vercellis, states that the pope
Eusebius baptized this prelate, and gave him his
own name. Tilmont gives no credence to this
story, which rests on no good authority.
Eusebius is honored as a saint and confessor on
the 28th September in the Roman Calendar.

[J. B.]

EUSEBIUS.—Bishops without See or Country
mentioned or apparent.

EUSEBIUS (2), subscribed the council of
Sardica A.D. 347 (Athan. i. 133, Patr. Græc.
xiv. 337).

EUSEBIUS (3), a bishop, deposed by the
Senatorial party at the council of Seleucia A.D.
353, together with Acacius (Athan. de Synod.
p. 380, § 12; Soz. H. E. ii. 40).

EUSEBIUS (4), a bishop, brother of Chro-
matius bishop of Aquileia (q. v.), and
closely allied with him (“non plus natura quam
morum aequalitate genus”), Jerome, Ep. 8, ad
Nicom., he was present at the baptism of
Rufinus, who speaks of him as being, though
only a deacon, yet a father to him, and his
teacher in the creed and the Christian faith
(Kaf. Apol. i. 4). He was one of the earliest
friends of St. Jerome, and drew from him
some of his letters from the Syrian Desert
(Ep. 7, 8, ed. Vall.). He was afterwards a
bishop, as known from Rufinus (loc. cit.),
but his see is uncertain. The editor of
the works of Chromatius (Migne, Patro. xx. 257)
identifies him with the bishop of Bologna,
whose name occurs as being present at the
council held at Aquileia A.D. 381. But this
is conjectural. He died A.D. 403, as appears
from Jerome’s letter to Heliodorus (Ep. 60, § 19,
ed. Vall.).

EUSEBIUS (5), of Alexandria, a writer of
sermons, about whom Galland hesitates not
to say that “all is uncertain; nothing can be
affirmed on good grounds as to his age or as to
his bishopric” (Bibl. Patr. viii. p. xxiii.). It
is needless to dwell on the attempts to identify him
with Eusebius, the Alexandrian deacon, who
became bishop of Laodicea in the 3rd century,
with Eusebius of Caesarea, with Eusebius of
Emesa. The ascetic writer, Nico the younger,
of the 11th century, cited some answers of
"Macarius, the Alexandrian, to the great Euse-
bius of Alexandria" (Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. vol.
vi. p. 285; i.e. vol. xi. p. 277, ed. 1801). This
Macarius died in 404. "But Nico lived too
late to be of any authority" (Pusey, Doct. of
Real Presence, p. 449). One of Eusebius’ ser-
mons, which on Almsgiving, was preached, at
earliest, some time after the death of "holy
Melania," which happened after the taking of
Rome by Alaric. On the other hand, he is cited
not only by John of Damascus in his Parallels
(Dunsc. Op. ii. 316, 331, 391, 393, 422, 425;
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470, 472, 561, 576, 597, 598, 637, 642, 649,
671, 675, 697, 701), but by the author of
the Parallels in the Sermone Mundi, who lived
a century earlier, in the first year of Heracleius
(Le Quien, ò. ii. 279, 749, the quotations are
in ò. 777, 783). He cannot therefore be re-
ferred (as Le Quien suggested, Or. Christ. ii.
935) to the times of the first Saracen caliphs.
The difficulty is rather increased than abated by
A Life of Eusebius, printed by Carol. Mai in his
Spicilegium Romanum, i. 703 ff., which gives
this account of him: Eusebius was a devout
monk, revered for his sanctity, who lived in the
mountain country of Egypt while Cyril was
patriarch of Alexandria. Cyril paid him a visit,
and, when dying, recommended him as his suc-
cessor. The clergy agreed; a deputation is sent
to Eusebius; he deprecates the proposed eleva-
tion; his visitors leave him; he resolves to fly
by night into the Thebaid; on the way a voice
warns him to return: he obeys, and when again
invited to Alexandria, proceeds thither, is con-
secrated by Cyril, who dies that night. Eusebi-
us is enrowned and preacheth every Sunday with
great effect: he converts an obstinate sinner
of high birth and great wealth, called Alex-
ander; after a seven years’ episcopate, foreseeing
his end, he tells Alexander of a visit paid by
him in early life to the Cross and the Holy
Resurrection at Jerusalem, and of a vision which
had assured him of Christ’s benignity even to
the negligent among His servants. Wishing
to die in his old retreat, he is escorted
thither with tarders by the Alexandrian people,
after consecrating Alexander as his successor,
and on his arrival, he commends his “most sweet
children” to the Holy Trinity and to their new
pastor, and died “with a smile upon his face.”
The biographer, John the Notary, adds that he
had received a book of ascetic maxims, drawn
up by Eusebius, from the author’s own hand,
had after his death given it into the keeping of
Alexander, and when Alexander himself died
(20 years after Eusebius) had it translated by
the calligrapher Mosseus. This account
cannot be received, for it is well known that
Diocourus succeeded Cyril in the see of Alex-
andria, and no place in the list of his occupants
can be found for Eusebius. Nor can Eusebius’
bishopric be placed at a Syrian Alexandria.
Mai abandons the problem as hopeless; and it
would seem that if Eusebius was a bishop, and a
bishop in Egypt, he was either a “vacant”
bishop (χωλόδωρος) or consecrated konoriz cae
ta, without a see, like the “John, bishop and monk,”
in the Life of St. Sozomen, c. 31, or the Lazarus
(we cannot say Bardus and Eulogius [Eulogii
(43), cf. Theod. ir. 16, 18) mentioned by Soz-
omen, vi. 34, not to speak of other instances in
the early Irish church. (See Fabricius, Bibl.
Gr. vol. v. p. 275, i.e. vol. viii. p. 295, ed. 1801.)
As to his age, we must content with uncertain-
ty as to whether he belongs to the 5th or
275) says that 18 Homilies of Eusebius were
found and cited by Turrinus, and some were
known to Holstenius and Allatius. A complete
list of these sermons is given by Mai, as follows:
1. On Fasting (in Mai’s Spicilegium Romanum,
On Thaumaturgy in Sickness (ib. ix. 622). 5. On
Importing Grace to him that lacks it (ib. ix. 659). 6. On Sudden Death, or, those that die by warres (ib. ix. 664). 7. On New Moon, Sabbath, and on not observing the voices of Birds (ib. ix. 666). 8. On Commemoration of Saints (ib. ix. 669). 9. On Meals, at such festivals (ib. ix. 673). 10. On the Nativity (ib. ix. 679). 11. On the Baptism of Christ (ib. x. 793) "What shall we do then? How should we come?" (ib. x. 895). 12. On the Coming of John into Hades, and on the Devil (ib. x. 888). 13. On the Treason of Judas (ib. ix. 693). 14. On the Devil and Hades (ib. x. 866). 15. On the Lord's Day (Galland viii. 292). 17. On the Passion, for the Preparation Day (among "Spuriae in Chrysostom, et Maunardus, ib. xii. 793"). 18. On the Resurrection (ib. x. 778). 19. On the Ascension (ib. xiii. 247). 20. On the Second Advent (Mai. Class. Auct. x. 955). 21. On "Astronomers" (Mai. Patr. Nov. Bbl. i. 522). 22. On Almsgiving, and on the Rich Man and Lazarus (ib. ii. 507). Eusebius adheres simply to the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. He uses the ordinary Eastern phrase, "Christ our God!" (S. On Almsgiving), speaks of Him as Maker of the world (ib.), as Master of the creation (On Resurrection), as present from the beginning with the prophets (Ascension), and as the Lord whom Isaiah saw in his vision (On the Baptism). He calls the Holy Spirit "our Advocate who came upon the Son," in the sermon on Almsgiving he calls the Virgin Mother "Ever-virgin" and "Theotocos," and "our undefiled Lady." He insists on free will and responsibility. "God made man capable of free choice.... He saith, 'If you do not choose to hear Me, I do not compel you.' God could not make the good against the will, but what is involuntary is unresolved.... If He wrote it down that I was to commit sin, and I do commit it, why does He judge me?" If a man means to please God, "God holds a hand to him straightforward," &c. "Time is short, eternity is long," is the point which he urges in the sermon on Almsgiving, "Provide for your salvation before the fair (μανπος) is broken up, while yet there are those who buy and sell oil." "If a man keep death ever in mind, he will sin no more." He enforces almsgiving. "Some say, there is time enough: I am like my grandfather, I shall live, long as he did; or I shall have a long illness.... Vain excuse! Remember the man who pulled down his house, &c. Do not say, I must first provide for my children. Death comes like a thief, and shuts you up in a little abode (οἰκεῖον μικρύν) of three cubits." Eusebius is repeatedly severe on Pharisaic formalism. A virginal life, self-control, sleeping on hard beds or on the ground, much fasting, arising early, and wearing a sackcloth in public, let their hair grow long, walk ostentatiously (παραμυθεία) to wish to be thought saints, and to be reverenced (προερχε- ρείσθαι) by all; but God knows their thoughts, their secret aim," &c. Before a man renounces the world (by a monastic vow) let him try himself, know his own soul. He whofasts must fast with "tongue, eyes, hands, feet;" his whole "body, soul, and spirit" must be restrained from all sinful indulgence. "Fast, as the Lord said, in cheerfulness, with sincere love to all men. But when you have done all this, do not think you are better than A or B. Say you are unpro-

Eusebius discourages a fana-
stable servants." Eusebius discourages a fana-
tical rigorism; in Lent, he who is in weak health may take wine and oil. Lent must not be broken for a friend's sake, but the station-
fasts on Wednesday and Friday may be so: he who eats not must not blame him who eats (here he even quotes Rom. xiv. 6). People are not to blame who do not eat to excess: nor riches, but the man who administers them ill. Abraham had riches, but they harmed him not, &c. Some sentences shew a true spiritual insight: "What sort of righteousness exceeds the rest? Love, for without it good comes of any other. What sin is worst? All sin is dreadful, but none is worse than cov-

Eusebius is very full on Sunday duties (Serm. On Lord's Day). Work is to be laid aside: it is no charity to assist a poor man working on the day that belongs to God. Sirens are to do no work. Never go forward to Sunday, not simply as a day of rest from labour, but as a day of prayer and Com-
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EUSEBIUS, bishop of Abida in Phoenicia Secunda. He signed the synodal epistle of the province, addressed to the emperor Leo, referring to the murder of Proterius at Alexandria. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 849; Mansi, vii. 595.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (7), bishop of Alexandria (Scandaret or lakenderum) in Cilicia. The period in which he flourished is very doubtful; he is placed by Gams (Series Episcop. p. 436) in the 7th century. There seems no ground for including him among the possible authors of the famous Homilies, except that the other clients are open to almost equally strong objections [Eusebius (5)].

(See the Homilies with prefaces by Mai and Galland, and the life of Eusebius by Joannes Monachus, in the Patrol. Or. Ixxvi. i. 287, et seq. Also Gradnand, Vir. Illust. c. 35; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 905; Thilo, Uber die Schriften des E. vom A. p. 54 ff.; and the articles in Herzog’s and Ehrlich’s Encyclopaedias by Semisch and Dähne respectively.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (8), bishop of Ancyra, c. A.D. 445, consecrated by Proclus, archbishop of Constantinople (Cellier, viii. 409). He was present at the council of Chaledon, A.D. 451 (Mansi, vi. 555 c.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (9), fifth bishop of Antioch, succeeding Etherius, and followed by Optatus. He subscribed the fifth council of Orleans (A.D. 549) by the hand of a deacon called September. The fifth council of Arles (A.D. 554) is also subscribed by a Eusebius, probably the same bishop, though the name of his see is omitted. (Mansi, ix. 137, 703.) The Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. ii. 390) give from old MSS. an account of the three Spanish martyrs, Vincentius, Orosius, and Victor, which is conjectured to have been written by this Eusebius. See Etherius, bishop of Antioch. (Gall. Christ. ii. 1148.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (10), II, the tenth bishop of Antioch in the Series of Gams (p. 554), succeeding Optatus, and followed by Juvencus (A.D. 614). He does not appear in the list of the Galia Christiana (iii. 1146).

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (11), bishop of Antioch by the Macedon in the province of Caria, one of the Niceran fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 907; Mansi, ii. 695.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (12), last of the three known bishops of Apollonia, in New Epirus near the Axios, between Dyrirachium and Auleon. He was present at the council of Chaledon in 451. (Mansi, vi. 578 c, 947 a, vii. 161 a; Farlati, Njlr. Sacr. vii. 385, 396; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 248.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (13), ninth bishop of Apt, succeeding Praetextatus and followed by Clementius, was in occupation of the see in A.D. 546. An ancient abbey in the diocese which bears his name is said to be called after him. (Gall. Christ. i. 352; Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc. 1645 n. vii., tom. i. 703.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS (14), bishop of Arles, in Syria Secunda, north of Emess. He signed the synodal epistle of the province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 501; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 916.)

[The text then continues with various sections on Eusebius, including his role as bishop of Alexandria and his historical contributions.

EUSEBIUS.-Bishops arranged in Alphabetical Order of their Sees or Countries.

EUSEBIUS (6), bishop of Abida in Phoenicia Secunda. He signed the synodal epistle of the province, addressed to the emperor Leo, referring to the murder of Proterius at Alexandria. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 849; Mansi, vii. 559.)
EUSEBIUS (15). One of the leading bishops of Armenia, to whom Theodoret wrote a letter of encouragement during the Persian persecution, c. A.D. 420, described by him (H. E. v. 38). The chief bishop of the district having vacated his post, either by death, or apostasy, or some other unexplained cause, Theodoret exhorts Eusebius, as next in authority, to occupy the place boldly, and to fulfill his duties without apprehension of what it might cost him. He sets forth in very powerful language the duties of pastors as declared in Holy Scripture; but exhorts him not to deal too severely with the lapsed, but to imitate the loving forbearance of God in leading back to repentance and amendment. (Theod. Epist. 76.)

[EUSLALYUS (19)].

EUSEBIUS (16) L, eighth in the list of bishops of Arretium or Arezzo, standing between Maximus and Gaudentius, succeeding to the see A.D. 380. (Ugheb. Ital. Sacr. i. 409; Gams, Ser. Episc. 741.)

EUSEBIUS (17) II, twelfth in the list of bishops of Arretium or Arezzo, between Laurentius and Gallus; succeeded A.D. 444. (Ugheb. Ital. Sacr. i. 410; Gams, Ser. Episc. 741.)

EUSEBIUS (18), bishop of Aspasia, subscribed the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Clemens Gener. ed. Rom. 1628, l. p. 343.)

EUSEBIUS (19), bishop of Basi (Bazas), signs the acts of the fourth Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, taking precedence of forty-five other bishops. He may therefore be supposed to have been old at the time. He signs also the fifth (an. 636), and the ninth (an. 638). He died before Oct. 646. (Exp. Sacr. vii. 87; Agnirre-Catalani, iii. 385.)

[ETTUCHIANUS].

EUSEBIUS (20), bishop of Berytus, vid. of Nicomedia. [EUSEBIUS (80)].

EUSEBIUS (21), ST., fifth bishop of Bezacon, succeeding St. Paulinus and followed by St. Hilarius. The authors of the Gallia Christiana (xv. 5) quote an anonymous canon of the monastery of St. Paul to the effect that he was a subdeacon at the church of Rome, whom pope Melchiades (A.D. 311-314) ordained priest and consecrated to the see of Chrysoopolis (i.e. Besançon, Sid. p. 2). He is said to have sat two years and a half only, and was then buried in the church of St. Peter, which he had himself dedicated in the suburbs (cir. A.D. 312). [S. A. B.]

EUSEBIUS (22), bishop of Bologna, who took part in the Council of Agilulfia, over which Ambrose presided, and joined in the condemnation of Palladius and Secundianus for Ariantism. (Ambrose, Opp. iii. pp. 820-843.)

J. LL. D.]

EUSEBIUS (23) OF CAESAREA, also known as EUSEBIUS PAMPILL\. 1. Literature. A Life of Eusebius was written by Aecius (Aecius ii. 1) his pupil and successor in the bishopric of Caesarea (Socr. H. E. ii. 4). This work, from the pen of a personal friend and disciple who inherited his books and papers (Socr. H. E. iii. 2, iv. 23), would have been invaluable; but unfortunately it has perished with leaving a trace behind. Of extant sources, the most important are the scattered notices in writers of the same or immediately succeeding ages, such as Athanasius, Jerome, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. At a later date some valuable information is contained in the proceedings of the Second Council of Nicaea (Labbe, Conc. Nicaen. i. p. 1144 sq.), as well as in the Antirhetica of the patriarch Niconphorus (Spal. Solem. i. p. 371 sq.), likewise connected with the Iconoclastic controversy. The primary sources of information however for the career of one who was before all things a literary man must be sought in his own works. The only edition of the works of Eusebius, at completeness is in Migne's Patr. Grec. vols. xix-xiv. Yet even this does not contain the works extant only in Syriac versions, especially the Theophania (Eng. transl. ed. Lee, Cambridge, 1843) and the later edition of the Martyrs of Palestine (ed. Cureton, London, 1861); and even some Greek fragments are occasionally omitted (e.g. the letters to Alexander and Ephraim). But it includes the large accessions to the works of Eusebius which were first discovered and published by Mai, and is indispensable for convenience of reference. Lists of the works of Eusebius are given by Jerome (Vir. Ill. 81), by Nicephorus Callistus (E. vi. 37), by Theodoret (Assemb. Bibliol. Orient. iii. p. 18 sq.), by Suidas (s. v. Eusebius) copies the Greek version of Jerome. Notices of individual works of Eusebius, of which some have perished, appear in Photius, Bibliothec. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 27, 39, 127.

Among modern sources of information are the standard works of Cave (Hist. Lit. i. p. 175 sq.), Tillemont (Hist. Ecr. ii. pp. 39 sq.), and Hildesheim (Hist. Ecr. vii. pp. 335 sq. ed. Hilds.), and other works. The Life of Eusebius by Index (Byz. Rec. Script. p. 1 sq.), by Valois (de l'Historique Eusebii Diction. prefixed to his edition of the Ecclesiastical History), and most recently by Heinrich in his Eusebiu Script. Hist. i. p. 142 sq. 1888, with notes of his own, and by Stroth (Praef. in loc. with Giessen Eusebii Hr. Gesch. i. p. 15 sqq., Quedinburg, 1979), should be especially mentioned; as to these should be added the Life by Bright, prefixed by way of introduction to the Oriell reprint (1872) of Burton's text of the Euseb. Hist. Valois has appended a very useful collection of testimonia or passages referring to Eusebius in ancient writers. The most complete monograph on the whole subject is Stein's Euseb. Bischof von Caesarea, Würzburg, 1835. Important contributions will also be found in the special monographs on the Ecclesiastical History, of which a list is given in its proper place.

A list of the editions, translations, and works relating to Eusebius, will be found in Hoffmann, Bibliogr. Lessic. s. v. It is very largely up to the time (A.D. 1859) when the volume appeared, but very much has been done since. The principal editions of the several works will be mentioned below under their respective heads.

II. Birth, Parentage, Education, and Early Life. Of the date of his birth we have no precise information, but the references in his own works enable us to fix it approximately. That
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he mentions Dionysius of Alexandria (H. E. iii. 26), but has occupied the throne in his own time (καθ' ἑαυτάς); and Dionysius was bishop of Alexandria from A.D. 247 or 248 to A.D. 265. So also he speaks of Paul of Samosata (H. E. v. 28) as a contemporary (καθ' ἑαυτάς); and Paul was deposed from his episcopate A.D. 276. In the same way, having occasion to mention the great heresarch of the age (Theoph. iv. 30), he calls him "the bishop of yesterday and of our own times"; while he himself elsewhere (H. E. vii. 31) places Manes during the Roman episcopate of Felix (A.D. 270-274). And, speaking more generally, he draws the line between his own and a previous generation after his account of Dionysius of Alexandria, and before his mention of the accession of Dionysius of Rome (A.D. 259) and the troubles about Paul of Samosata which followed thereupon, declaring at this point that he intends now to relate the history of his own generation for the information of posterity (H. E. vii. 26 τὸν καθ' ἑαυτάς τοῦ πατέραν γεωρκέα, ἐμίσοις λεγόμενον, καθ' ἑαυτάς). The parallels with the previous Augustus the future successor of the faith, then on his progress through Palestine, a tall and handsome prince of right royal mien, who was destined hereafter to exert an unrivalled influence on the future of the Christian Church, and with whom the interests of his own later life were closely bound up (Vit. Const. i. 12). Here he listened to the Biblical expositions of the learned Dorotheus, thoroughly versed in the Hebrew Scriptures and not unacquainted with Greek literature and philosophy, once the superintendent of the emperor's purple factory at Tyre, but now a presbyter in the church of Caesarea (H. E. vii. 32). Here, in due time, he was himself ordained a presbyter, probably by that bishop Acapius whose wise forethought and uniring meekness and open-handed benevolence he himself has recorded (H. E. ii. 44). Here, above all, he contracted with the saintly student Pamphilus that friendship which was the crown and glory of his life, and which mortuary itself could not sever.

Pamphilus, a native of Phoenicia, had studied in Alexandria, but was now settled in Caesarea, of which church he was a presbyter. He had gathered about him a collection of books which seem to have been unrivaled in Christian circles, and which, supplemented by the excellent library of bishop Alexander at Jerusalem (H. E. vi. 20), enabled Eusebius to indulge to the full his por- tentous appetite for learning. Eusebius himself left a catalogue of the books contained in the library of Pamphilus (H. E. vi. 32). Acacius and Eusebios, the successors of Eusebius in the see of Caesarea, repaired the collection and supplied the ravages of time and wear (Hier. Epist. 34, Op. i. 155). Jerome describes Pamphilus as gathering books together from all parts of the world, thus rivaling in the domain of sacred learning the zeal which Demetrius Phalerus or Paulinus had shown for profane knowledge (I. c.). Origen himself had set the example of a literary society. Aided by the munificence of his friend Ambrosius, he had kept him always a large number of shorthand writers, to whom he dictated, and of calligraphers—women as well as men—who copied out the Scriptures for him (H. E. vi. 29). His example was not thrown away on Pamphilus.
Pamphilus was a devoted admirer of Origen. He possessed the original copy of the Hexapla of Origen, which was afterwards used by Jerome at Caesarea (Hier. Comm. in Tit. iii, Op. vii. 734). He sought out the works of this father before all others (Hier. Op. i. 155; Euseb. H. E. vii. 92b). He even transcribed the greater part of them with his own hand for his library (Hier. Vitr. iii. 75). One long work of Origen in the handwriting of Pamphilus came into the possession of Jerome himself; owning it, he says, he considers that he owns the wealth of Croesus; it is signed, as it were, with the very blood of the martyr (i. c.). Like Origen too, Pamphilus paid great attention to the reproduction of accurate copies of the Scriptures. More than one extant MS has been taken from or collated with some copy which he had transcribed or corrected with his own hand (see Scrivener’s Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, pp. 51, 59, 158, 223, 228). In this work he was followed by Eusebius (Euseb. H. E. viii. 81). Hence the Palestinian manuscripts of the LXX, which Jerome describes as published by Eusebius and Pamphilus from the text of Origen (c. Rufin. ii. 27, Op. ii. p. 522). A colophon found in an extant Vatican MS, and given in facsimile in Migne’s Euseb. Op. iv. 875 (after Marc. ed. Cureton, vol. ii. 27), gives a lively picture of the common labours of the two friends at this time: “It was transcribed from the editions of the Hexapla, and was corrected from the Tetrapla of Origen himself, which also had been corrected and furnished with scholia in his own handwriting; whence I, Eusebius, added the corrections made by Eusebius and corrected [this copy].” The readings of the “Eusebian” copy (τὸ Εὐσεβίου, τὸ βιβλίον Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφιλίου) are frequently mentioned in the scholia to the Old Testament (Field’s Hexapla, i. p. 229).

Nor was it only in copying and editing that the society gathered about Pamphilus occupied itself; it must have necessarily engaged attention in a city which stood on the border land between the Greek and Syrian languages; and we are especially told of one of his associates, the martyr Procopius, that he translated from Greek into Aramaic (Euseb. Mart. Pal. p. 4, ed. Cureton).

Amidst these and kindred pursuits their friendship ripened. But Eusebius owed far more to Pamphilus than the impulse and direction given to his studies. Pamphilus was no mere student recluse. He was a man of large heart and bountiful hand; he was above all things helpful to his friends (Mart. Pal. 11); he gave freely to all who were in want; he multiplied copies of Scriptures which he distributed gratuitously (Euseb. in Hieron. c. Rufin. i. 9, Op. ii. 465). And to the sympathy of the friend he united the courage of the hero. He had also the power of impressing his own strong convictions on others. Hence, when the great trial of faith came, his house was found to be not only the haven of all who sought its shade, but of all who were martyrs. To one like Eusebius, who owed his strength and his weakness alike to a ready susceptibility of impression from those about him, such a friendship was an inestimable blessing. How else could he express the strength of his devotion to this friend, who was more than a friend, than by adopting his name? He would henceforward be known as “Eusebius of Pamphilus.” “In the midst of all” this glorious company of martyr, writes Eusebius, “shone forth the excellency of my lord Pamphilus; for it is not meet that I should mention the name of that holy and blessed Pamphilus under the title of a slave of my lord” (Mart. Pal. p. 37, ed. Cureton). It was either a blundering literalism or an ignoble sarcasm, which led Photius (Epist. 73, Bailea) to suggest the explanation that he was the slave of Pamphilus. Any man might have been proud to wear the slave’s badge of such a devotion. III. The Persecution. Eusebius was now in middle life when the last and fiercest persecution broke out. For nearly half a century—a longer period than at any other time since its foundation—the Church had enjoyed uninterrupted peace, so far as regards attacks from without. Suddenly and unexpectedly all was changed. The city of Caesarea became a chief centre of persecution. Eusebius tells how he saw with his own eyes the houses of prayer razed to the ground, the holy Scriptures committed to the flames in the midst of the market-places, the pastors of the churches hiding themselves as they were hunted here and there, and shamefully jeered at when they were caught by their persecutors (H. E. vii. 21). For seven years the attacks continued. They were fateful and intermittent. But the suspense and uncertainty must have increased the horror. No governor stayed his hands; no year was without its sufferers. Almost at any moment a devout and zealous Christian might be required to do that which his faith forbade him to do even at the cost of his life. Of some of the terrible scenes which ensued, Eusebius was himself an eye-witness; of all he had the full and exact knowledge which is derived from immediate local and personal contact with the incidents. His written account shows how deeply he was impressed with the constancy and the triumphs of the sufferers; of Procopius, from Seyout, the leader of this glorious band, who had scarcely passed the gates of Caesarea when he was ordered to sacrifice to the gods, and was beheaded for his refusal (Mart. Pal. ed. Cureton, p. 3 sq.); of Alpheus, the reader and exorcist in the church of Caesarea, who, when the emperor’s emissaries were celebrating, held back the people from sacrificing to idols, and was crowned with martyrdom after suffering cruel lacerations and rackings for his reckless audacity (p. 5 sq.); of the blameless ascetic youth Aphthius, not yet twenty years of age, who “resided in the same house with us” (p. 13), having come from Beyroot to Caesarea to be instructed by Pamphilus in the holy Scriptures, who in his edifying garrulity, in his respect for the hand of the governor Urbanus and held him back as he was offering libations, who after...
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And meanwhile, how had Eusebius borne himself in this season of peril? A quarter of a century later, when he was sitting in judgment at the council of Tyre, a grave charge was brought against him, affecting his conduct at this crisis. Potammon, bishop of Heraclea, an Egyptian confessor, started up and addressed the president, “Art thou seated as judge, Eusebius; and dost Athanasius, innocent though he is, await his sentence from thee? Nay, tell me then, wast thou not with me in prison during the persecution? And I lost an eye for the truth, but thou, as we see, hast received no injury in any part of thy body, neither hast thou suffered martyrdom, but remained alive with no mutilation. How wast thou released from prison, unless it be that thou didst promise to those who put upon us the pressure of persecution to do that which is unlawful, or didst actually do it?” Eusebius, we are told, in vexation rose and dismissed the court, saying, “If ye come hither and say such things against us, then do ye this for me, if ye have condemnation in store for me, if ye behave thus tyrannically here, much more do ye in your own country” (Epiphan. Haer. lxxxviii. 8).

On the strength of this charge he is supposed to have escaped martyrdom by offering sacrifice, or at least by some unworthy concession. But what does the evidence amount to? Is it the language of a strong partisan, bitterly hostile to him; and it is after all only a conjectural inference of his accusers. How could Eusebius have been imprisoned for the faith, and escaped from prison, if he had not been untrue to his convictions? It did not occur to the blind hatred of Potammon that possibly Eusebius might have remained in captivity till the proclamation of Galerius opened the prison doors to all alike; or that meanwhile a thousand things might have occurred to earn for him an exceptional favour which might save his life without forfeiting his honour. There is a dignity in Eusebius that even if he bespeaks rather the disdainful innocence that will not condescend to a reply, than the uneasy conscience which shrinks from investigation. Even Athanasius (Apol. c. Arisin. 8. l. p. 163), when referring to this incident, can only say that Eusebius was “accused of sacrificing” by the confessors. He does not dare to affirm that he was guilty. He himself obviously knows nothing of any such crime. He never elsewhere calls Eusebius “the sacrificer” (θυρασας) as he does Asterius. If Eusebius had been guilty, this accusation would have been flung at him again and again, surrounded as he was by angry controversialists, in an age when controversy was not too scrupulous in its personalities. Nor again is such a blot on his past history reconcilable with his appointment by universal consent to the bishopric of his own city of Caesarea, where his character was so well known. Neither would he have ventured, if he were conscious of any such guilt, to refer, as he does again and again, with fearlessness to the shameful defections which had occurred during the persecution.

So far as we have information of his movements at this time, they do not betray any such cowardice. During the long incarceration of his friend, Eusebius must have spent a great part of his time with him. There is no con-
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more fully below, is a scene of thanksgiving over the resurrection of the Church, of which the splendid building at Tyre was at once the first-fruit and the type. This incident must have taken place not later than A.D. 313. For more than a quarter of a century he presided over the Church of Caesarea, winning, with the respect and affection of all. One attempt was made to translate him to a more important sphere, but it was foiled, as we shall see, by his own refusal. He died bishop of Caesarea.

V. The Council of Nicea. When the Arian controversy broke out, the sympathies of Eusebius were collected at an early stage on the side of Arius. If his namesake of Nicomedia may be trusted, he was especially zealous on behalf of the Arian doctrine at this time (Euseb. Nicom. in Theod. H. E. i. 5 ἦ γὰρ δικαιόν μοι Εὐσεβίους συναθή ἢ ἢ συμφωνεῖν λόγῳ). But the testimony of a strong partisan, eagerly seeking to place his cause in the best light, may well be suspected; and the attitude of Caesarea throughout suggests that he was influenced rather by personal associations and by the desire to secure liberal treatment for the heresiarch than by any real accordance with his views. But, whatever may have been his motives, he wrote to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, demonstrating with him for depor-ting Arius, and urging that he had misrepresented the opinions of the latter (Labbe, Conc. viii. 1148, ed. Colet). The cause of Arius was taken up also by two neighbouring bishops, occupying important sees, Theodotus of Lodzech and Paulinus of Tyre. In a letter addressed to his namesake of Constantinople, Alexander of Alexandria complains of three Syrian bishops, "appointed he knows not how" (οἷς δὲ δοθεὶς ἐν Ζυρίῃ χειροτομηθεῖς ἑπεκεῖνοι τριὶς)—doubtless intending Eusebius of Caesarea and his two allies—as having fanned the flame of sedition (Theod. H. E. i. 3) ; while on the other hand Arius himself claims that all the bishops in the East, excepting the two in Caesarea with others, as on his side (Theod. H. E. i. 4). Accordingly, when he was deposed by a synod convened at Alexandria by Alexander, Arius at once appealed to Eusebius and others to interpose. A meeting of Syrian bishops was convened, and decided in favour of his restoration. The decision however was worded cautiously. The synod thought that Arius should be allowed to gather his congregations about him as heretofore; but they added that he must render obedience to Alexander and entreat to be admitted to communion with him (Soz. H. E. i. 15).

Such was the attitude of Eusebius towards the Arian controversy when the council of Nicea assembled (A.D. 325). In this council he took a leading part. His prominence on this occasion he cannot have owed to his bishopric, which, though important, did not rank with the great sees, "the apostolic thrones" (Soz. H. E. i. 17) of Christendom, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. But he was the bishop's successor of the most famous living writer in the Church at this time. This fact alone must have secured a hearing for him. Probably however his importance was due even more to his close relations with the great emperor. How this intimacy first grew we do not know, but at
this time he enjoyed the entire confidence of his imperial master. "He alone of the Eastern priests could tell what was in the mind of the emperor; he was the interpreter, the chaplain, the con-

(i) The Inaugural Address. It was probably owing to court favour that he occupied the first seat to the right of the emperor (V. C. iii. 11 τὸν εὐτεκοντὸν δὲ τοῦ Βασιλείου τρόφιμον), and delivered the opening address to Constantine when he took his seat in the council-chamber (V. C. i. proem. iii. 11; Sozom. H. E. i. 19). The council was held during the emperor's eumenia; his last rival and bitterest foe, Licinius, had been defeated and slain not long before; and the orator's address naturally took the form of a paean of victory, a hymn of thanksgiving (V. C. i. proem. τὸν καλλίστον, δ. iii. 11; Sozom. l. c., χαράτωρος θανόν). The speech is unfortunately not preserved, but we may form some notion of its probable character from the extracts which Eusebius delivers at the triconclusa of this same sovereign. There can be no doubt from the manner in which Eusebius describes the orator at the council of Nicæa that he is speaking of himself (V. C. iii. 11); and indeed he elsewhere incidentally mentions having delivered a panegyric of the emperor on that occasion (V. C. i. proem.; see Stræth, p. xxvii sq.). Yet this function is assigned by Theodoret (H. E. i. 6) to Eustathius of Antioch, whom he reports to have sat next to Constantine, and "crowned the emperor's head with the flowers of praise." Moreover, the very situation which parquets to have been delivered by Eustathius on this occasion is extant (Fabric. Hist. Græc. i. p. 132 sq.); but it stands self-

(ii) The Creed. When the main subject, for which the council had been assembled, came under discussion, we find Eusebius again taking a pro-
miminate part. He himself has left us an account of his doings at this stage in a letter of explanation which he afterwards wrote to his own church of Caesarea (see below, p. 344). He laid before the council the creed which was in use in the Caesarean church, which had been handed down to him from the bishops who preceded him, which himself had been taught at his baptism, and which, as first as a presbyter and then as a bishop, he had instructed others. The emperor was satisfied with the orthodoxy of this creed, inserting however the single word ὅμοοσιαν. At the same time he gave explanations as to the meaning of the term which set the scruples of Eusebius at rest. The assembled fathers however did not rest here, but taking this as their starting-point (ἐφαμάδεις τοῦ δημοσίου) made other inquiries and alterations. The creed as thus revised is still substantially the "Caesarean creed, but the additions were not unimportant. Moreover, an anathema was appended in which Arian doctrines were directly condemned. Euse-
bius took time to consider before subscribing to this revised formula. The three expressions which caused difficulty were: (1) "of the sub-

stance of the Father" (δυνάμει ὁμοιότητος τοῦ πατρὸς); (2) "begotten, not made" (γεννηθέντα, οὐ ναγ-

θέντα); (3) "of the same substance" (ὁμοόσιαν); and of these he demanded explanations. The explanations were so far satisfactory that for the sake of peace he subscribed to the creed. He had the less scruple in assenting to the final anathema, because the Arian expressions which it condemned were not scriptural, and he considered that "almost all the confusion and disturbance of the churches" had arisen from the use of unscriptural phrases. This letter, he says, was read to the council only on the condition that he would resist to the last any vital change in the traditional creed of his church, he had nevertheless subscribed to these alterations, when assured of their innocence, to avoid appearing contentious (ἀφανακενητα). On this subject, see especially Hort's Two Dissertations, p. 55 sq. (iii) The Paschal Cycle. The settlement of the dispute respecting the time of observing Easter was another important work undertaken by the council. In this work also a leading part has been assigned to Eusebius by some modern writers (c. g. Stanley, Eastern Church, p. 182, following Tillemont, H. E. vi. p. 608). The cycle of nineteen years, which ultimately pre-
vailed in the Church under the name of the Golden Number, is supposed to have been fixed by the council; and this work is attributed expressively to Eusebius. This table for determining Easter, it is maintained, "first originated in the council chamber of Nicæa; perhaps in the desire of the emperor to have the mind of his people turned towards the feelings of his favourite counsellor. . . . The council would naturally turn to the most learned of its members to accomplish the work. That member was unquestionably Eusebius of Caesarea. He had paid special attention to chronology. . . . It is creditable to the justice and wisdom of the council that they should not have allowed these recent disputes and wide theological differences to stand in the way of intrusting this delicate task to the man who on general grounds was most fitted to undertake it" (Stanley, l. c.). But the evidence does not justify either of the assumptions involved in this view. (1) There are strong reasons for hesitating to believe that the nineteen years' cycle was adopted at the council of Nicæa. It was the old Metonic cycle (invented about B.C. 432), and it had already been applied to the determination of Easter by Anastasius of Laodicea about A.D. 284 (Euseb. H. E. vii. 32). It did not therefore originate with the council. Still the council might have accorded it an authoritative sanction, and thus secured its currency in the Church at large. This would follow from the language of St. Ambrose (Epist. 23, Op. ii. p. 880 sq.), who says (§ 1) that the Nicæan fathers "congregatis peritiissimis calcul-

landi, decem et novem annorum collegere
rationem," and adds, "hunc circulum enneas-
decasterida nuncuparunt." In the next century
too Cyril (Epist. 86, Op. x. 383, Migne), writing
to Leo (A.D. 444), ascribes the adoption of
this cycle to the Nicene council; and the same
statement is made by later writers (see Butcher,
Ecclesiastical Calendar, Dublin, 1677, Appendix, p.
225), though, neither of these men are ex-
plicit, their accuracy is open to grave question.
For first, in the documents relating to the
treatment of the Paschal question at Nicaea, not
a word is said as to the mode of calculating
Easter (Euseb. V. C. ii. 18; Socr. H. E. i. 9); 
and, secondly, the churches of Rome and the West
continued long to make use of an older
cycle (Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. p. 315), and
they are hardly likely to have disregarded any
direct decision of a council which they always
treated with the highest respect. (2) But, even
if it were more certain that the Nicene council
directly sanctioned the cycle of nineteen
years, there is no ground for regarding it as especi-
elly the work of Eusebius. Jerome indeed (Vir.
III. 91) says that Eusebius "arranged [como-
suit] a canon for Easter, which was a cycle
of nineteen years, that is, an *enneasdekasteris*";
and Bede (de Temp. Rat. 44, Op. i. 483, Migne)
says the same thing, probably deriving his in-
formation from Jerome, though stating more
passively that Eusebius was the first to apply
this cycle to the Paschal computation, which he
certainly was not. But neither writer connects
this fact with the council of Nicaea. Eusebius
did indeed write a treatise on Easter (V. C. iv.
35), of which a fragment is extant (see below,
p. 342), and in it he may have advocated the
method which he actually recommended to Jer-
ome and Bede refer; but it was written many years
after the Council of Nicaea, with which it appears
not to have had any connexion. The probable
inference from the notices seems to be that the
calculation of Easter was entrusted to the bishops
of Alexandria, and that the nineteen years'
choice, being already in use in the Alexandrian
custom, obtained the sanction of the
the earliest extant authority who mentions this duty as imposed on the Alexandrian
bishops is Cyril of Alexandria (A.D. 437), Epist.
87 (Op. x. 383). The expression of Athanasius
(Festal Letters, x. p. 67, Oxft. transl.), "the
custom which has been delivered to us by the
fathers,\(^4\) seems not to refer to any authorization
of the Nicene bishops (as it has been interpreted),
but to the traditional practice of the Alexandrian
patriarchs, who, at least as early as Dionysius
(Euseb. H. E. vii. 20), are found issuing these
Pashcal letters. Leo the Great also, writing
A.D. 453, states explicitly (Epist. 121, p. 1228)
that "the holy fathers" (of Nicaea) delegated this
duty of announcing the time of Easter to the
bishop of Alexandria, because the Egyptians were
skilled in these computations from ancient times.
The Festal Letters of Athanasius (see the index
in the Oxford translation, p. xv sq.) cover the
period from A.D. 328 to 373. The nineteen years'
cycle is already the basis of the calculation here.
This appears, for instance, from the year 350, when
Athanasius places Easter on April 19, whereas,
according to the alternative eighty-four years'
cycle which obtained at Rome, it would fall on
March 22. How long it had prevailed in the
Alexandrian church, we are without means of
determining. But inasmuch as Anatolius, who
certainly advocated it, was himself an Alexan-
drian, we may conjecture that it was introduced
by him. The action of the Nicene council there-
fore would be altogether indirect in this matter;
and there is no reason for supposing that Eusebius
in particular took any prominent part in the
decision, though, these things are known to have approved the Alexandrian mode of reckoning.
(iv) Dispute with Philosophers. In the dis-
plicate between the bishops and the "philoso-
phers," as related by Gelasius in his account
of the Nicene Council, a conspicuous part is
assigned to Eusebius of Caesarea (ii. 18, 19).
The philosopher Phaedo is said to have read the
favourite Arian text, Prov. viii. 23, where Wis-
dom says (according to the LXX translation),
"The Lord created (εστηκε) me the beginning of
His ways for His works." Wisdom being a
synonym for the Logos, the Logos is thus
declared to be a created thing (εφησ). Euse-
bius answers this Aristotelian argument at
length, partly by monologue, partly by ques-
tioning his opponent. The whole discussion,
it need hardly be said, is purely fictitious; but
the fiction bears testimony to the prominent
position assigned by Eusebius in the council,
and it is not a little remarkable that a severely
orthodox part is assigned to him. (v) Metropolitans (μητροπολιταί). A more authenti-
ic indication of his influence appears in the seventh
canon of the council, in which we may perhaps
see "a slight passage at arms" between him "and
Macarius of Aelia Capitolina, not yet Jerusalem:" As custom and ancient tradition have ob-
tained that the bishop of Aelia should be honor-
ted To him now his honor is given. Jerome
had gained his point, but (and here we cannot mistake
the intervention of his superior, the metropolitan
of Caesarea) always saving the rights of the
metropolitan" (Stanley, l. c. p. 193). But if so,
the victory of Eusebius was more complete than
would appear from this translation, for the
words, *εξω έστηκεν την* έκκλησιαν της ταρανης, in this context are naturally translated, "he
has the next (second) place in point of honour," not
"let him have the honour consequent there-
on." \(^4\)

VI. Progress of the Arian Controversy. The hopes which Eusebius with others had built
upon the decisions of the Nicene council were
soon dashed. The final peace of the Church
seemed as far distant as ever. In three severe
controversies with three distinguished antag-
onsists, Eusebius took a more or less prominent
part; and his reputation, whether justly or not,
had suffered greatly in consequence.

(i) Synod of Antioch. Eustathius, bishop of
Antioch, was a staunch advocate of the Nicene
doctrine and a determined foe of the Arians.
Against Eusebius of Caesarea he had already
taken up a position of antagonism. He had
assailed the tenets of Origen (Socr. H. E. vi. 13),
whom Eusebius was an ardent champion. He
had attacked Eusebius himself, charging him
with faithlessness to the doctrines of Nicæa.

\(^4\) On this canon see Hefele, Concilien
geschichte, i. p. 357. The "metropolis" is Caesarea, not Antioch, as some
have supposed. The language of this canon is explained by the historical circumstances before and after this
date.
and was accused in turn of Sabellianism by Eusebius (Socr. H. E. i. 23; Soz. H. E. ii. 19). To the historian, however, the doctrines of the two antagonists appeared to have so much in common that he was puzzled to conceive how they managed to fall out (οι δ' ους συμφωνουσαι σωματων ουκ εγίνοντα). At all events Eustathius of Antioch and Eusebius of Caesarea were regarded as the two principals in the quarrel (Socr. H. E. ii. 18). A conflict so serious could not be confined to a paper war, and more active steps were taken. A synod of bishops was assembled at Antioch, A.D. 330, to consider the charge of Sabellianism brought against Eustathius. If we are to believe Theodoret (H. E. i. 21), this synod was got together by a vile conspiracy on the part of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicasa, in which they induced Eusebius of Caesarea and other Palestinian bishops to join; but Theodoret's account condemns itself by its false chronology (Hefele, Conciliaireg. i. p. 434). The character of the bishop of Caesarea is not stated by H. E. i. 25; on the other hand, there is no doubt that the assembly was mainly composed of bishops with Arian or semi-Arian sympathies. The charges brought against Eustathius are described in their proper place. [EUSTATHIUS.] Eustathius was deposed, and the see of Antioch thus became vacant. The assembled bishops put forward Eusebius of Caesarea as his successor, and wrote to the emperor on his behalf. The Christian populace of Antioch was divided. If the representations made by the bishops to Constantine deserve credit, the vast majority at all events of the laity were in favour of Eusebius. Eusebius himself speaks in a somewhat different strain (V. C. iii. 50). However this may be, the Eustathian party was strong, and the peace of the city was in imminent peril from the conflict. The temper in his envious, write Eusebius, "was rending the church of the Antiochenes with tragic woes, so that the whole city was well nigh overthrown from its foundations." It is not probable that such a position would at any time have possessed great attractions for Eusebius, and under the present circumstances it would appear less desirable than ever. He was a man of peace, and here was a prospect of war to the death. He was devoted to literary pursuits, and here it was proposed to tear him away from his Caesarean library and from the comparative leisure of a less important see to the arduous duties of chief pastor in the most turbulent of cities. The splendidous of a great patriarchy would hardly excite the ambition of such a man under these circumstances. At all events, with the letter of the bishops pressing the appointment of Eusebius the emperor received another from Eusebius himself declining the proffered honour. He alleged more especially the rule of the Church, which was regarded as an "apostolic tradition," forbidding translations from one see to another. In consequence of these representations Constantine wrote three letters in reply, which are preserved by Eusebius (V. C. iii. 60, 61, 62). To the people of Antioch he sent a missive enforcing counsels of peace and deprecating their wish to rob another see of its bishop. To Eusebius himself he wrote, highly applauding his decision and complimenting him in the highest terms. To the bishops he issued his injunctions that they should not seek to violate the apostolic rule, but that other fit persons should be put forward for the see of Antioch by whom he mentioned two by name. One of these, Euphronius, was elected. Thus Eusebius remained undisturbed in the see of Caesarea, which he retained till his death. Throughout this matter, if we except the pardonable vanity which leads him to insert the emperor's compliments to himself, there is nothing to the discredit of Eusebius. On the contrary, his renunciation of the honour which was thrust upon him contrasts favourably with the unscrupulous ambition of too many of his contemporaries. Of the previous incidents which led to the vacancy in the see of Antioch, he says not a word; but he intimates that he abstains from giving the emperor's letters denouncing the factions at Antioch, because they inculcate certain persons and he does not wish to revive the memory of wrongdoings in the past. It was by this synod of Antioch also that Asclepas, bishop of Hierapolis, was deposed (Op. ii. p. 554; see Hefele, i. p. 435), and we are especially told that he pleaded his cause in the presence of Eusebius of Caesarea (Athan. Ap. c. Arian. 47, Op. i. p. 130; Hilar. Op. ii. p. 626). (ii) Synods of Caesarea, Tyre, and Jerusalem. The next stage of the Arian controversy exhibits Eusebius in conflict with a greater than Eustathius. The disgraceful intrigues of the Arians and Meletians against Athanasius, which led to his first exile, are related in the biography of that saint [ATHANASIUS. p. 183 sqq.]. It is sufficient to say here that the emperor summoned Athanasius to appear before a gathering of bishops at Caesarea, to meet the charges brought against him. It is stated by Theodoret (H. E. i. 26) that Constantine was induced to name Caesarea by the counsels of the Arian party, who selected this place because the enemies of the accused were in a majority there (ἐν ψυχαῖς διοικούσις). It is equally probable that the emperor would himself have given the preference to Caesarea, since he refused the greatest confidence in the moderation (ἐνεπίταξα) of its bishop. However this may be, Athanasius excused himself from attending. He believed, and he may have so pleaded in reply to the emperor, that there was a conspiracy against him, and that he would not have fair play at such a place (Eutic. Letters, p. xvii, Oxford transl.; Theod. H. E. i. 26; Soz. H. E. ii. 25). This was A.D. 334. Of this synod at Caesarea Athanasius himself is silent in his Apology.

The matter however was not allowed to rest here. In the following year (A.D. 335) Athanasius received a peremptory and angry summons

* Euphronius is represented as the immediate successor of Eustathius by Soz. H. E. ii. 18, Soz. H. E. ii. 24; and this is the natural inference from Constantine's letter (Soz. V. C. iii. 63). On the other hand, Theodoret (H. E. i. 21) says that they appointed Eunalius first, but that he only lived a short time, and they then desired to translate Eusebius of Palestine. Jerome (Chron. L. p. 192, Schoe) gives the names of the Arian bishops who were thronged in a conspiracy to the place of Eusebius as "Eunalius, Eusebius, Ennばかり, Paschalius," &c. Perhaps Eunalius was put forward for the vacant see, like Eusebius, but never actually appointed. The statement attributed to Philostorgius, that Paulinus of Tyre succeeded Eustathius, will be considered below, p. 322.
from Constantine to appear before a synod of bishops, not now at Caesarea, but at Tyre.5 Theodoret (I. c.) conjectures (δες ουσα) that the place of meeting was changed by the emperor out of deference to the fears of Athanasius, who "looked with suspicion on Caesarea on account of its ruler. It is not improbable that Athanasius, or his friends, had taken objection to Eusebius as a partisan in this controversy; for the Egyptian bishops who espoused the cause of Athanasius, addressing the synod of Tyre, allege "the law of God" as forbidding "an enemy to be witness or judge," and shortly afterwards add mysteriously, "ye know why Eusebius of Caesarea has become an enemy since last year" (Athan. Op. c. Ariam. 77, Op. i. p. 153), as if he had taken offence at the objections then raised against him. The scenes at the synod of Tyre form the most picturesque and the most shameful chapter in the Arian controversy. After all allowance made for the exaggerations of the Athanasian party, from whose side of the proceeding, the proceedings will still remain an undying shame to Eusebius of Nicomedia and his fellow intriguers. But there is no reason for supposing that Eusebius of Caesarea took any active part in these plots. Athanasius is generally silent about him, mentioning him rarely, and then without any special blame. "Eusebius" (αὐτοῦ Ἑυσεβίου) are always the adherents of his Nicomedeans nameakes. But, though probably free from any participation in their plots, of which he may have been wholly ignorant, he was certainly used as a tool by the more unscrupulous and violent partisans of Arius, and he must bear the reproach of a too easy compliance with their actions. The proceedings of the bishops assembled at Tyre were cut short by the withdrawal of the accused himself. Athanasius suddenly took ship to Constantinople, and appealed in person to the emperor. The synod saw no other course but to condemn him by default. For a fuller account of its proceedings, the reader is referred to the biography of Eusebius and the accounts of the proceedings connected with it which relate to Eusebius, and which claim a mention here. (1) It was on this occasion that Potammon, the Egyptian confessor, flung the taunt of cowardice and apostasy in the face of Eusebius, as related already (p. 311). Hefele discredit the story altogether (Concilia-thesch. i. p. 446). He supposes it to be another version of an incident related by Rufinus (x. 17; comp. Sozom. H. E. ii. 25) respecting Paphnutius and Maximus of Jerusalem. It seems more probable however that some such taunt was levelled at Eusebius on this occasion. But whether so or not, no stain rests upon his character in consequence of this reckless accusation. (2) It will be remembered that, among the charges brought against Athanasius at this synod, Theodoret and Rufinus (x. 17) mention that he was accused of having seduced a girl, who had a child by him, and that, when con-

5 In the preface to the Festal Letters, p. xvii, it is stated that Athanasius left Alexandria, Epiph 17, A.D. 335; but this must be an error of a year, for a document given by Athanasius, Ap. c. Ariam. 75 (Op. l. p. 159), and written later than this event, is dated Thoet 10 (= Sept. 7), A.D. 335.
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Church. In doing so he was only obeying the Lord's injunction, "Be reconciled to thy brother, and then go and offer thy gift." (Comp. Matt. 5. 25.) This view of the emperor's motive is entirely borne out by Constantine's own letter to the synod at Tyre. It accords moreover with his proceedings on a previous occasion. As the council of Nicaea had been summoned with a view to re-establishing peace in the Church for his approaching ceremonies, so now the bishops were directed to meet at Tyre on their way to Jerusalem to secure a general pacification before the celebration at the close of his next decennium. Eusebius shows by his language that he was greatly impressed by the celebration; but Tiltomast, who manifests a strong prejudice against Eusebius throughout, altogether misstates the case in saying that he "compares or prefers this assembly to the council of Nicaea, striving to extol it as much as he can, for the sake of elevating the glory of that great council," &c. (vi. p. 284). So far from preferring it, he says distinctly that "after that first council" this was the greatest synod assembled by Constantine of all those with which he was acquainted (V. C. iv. 47 ταύτην μεγάλιν δε μην συνόδον διενεργεσθή μετὰ την πρώτην εκείνην κ. ι. λ.). And on the other hand, so far from showing any desire to depreciate the council of Nicaea, he cannot find language magnificent enough to sing its glories (V. C. iii. 6 sq.), when it is the proper theme of his narrative.

But the bishops assembled at Jerusalem did not content themselves with the celebration of the religious festival. They took another highly important step. Arius and Eusebius had presented a confession of faith to the emperor, seeking readmission to the church. The emperor himself was satisfied with the opinions expressed in this document, and persuaded himself that it was in harmony with the faith of Nicaea. It did not perhaps directly crawl up the crests of the Nicaean fathers in any point: it even contained a strong expression respecting the pre-existence of the Son (τὸν Ἐσωτικόν τῶν αἰώνων γεγονότος Θεὸν Λόγον); but after all that had passed, its omission was more eloquent than its admissions. These omissions however were not likely to strike Cæcilianus. Therefore dispossessed Arians and Eusebians to Jerusalem, at the same time requesting the synod to consider their confession of faith, and to restore them to communion. The request was not made in vain. The condemnation of Arians at Tyre was followed by the readmission of Arians and his followers at Jerusalem. Of the bishops who were responsible for this act, some would be instigated mainly by hostility to Arians, desiring thus to complete his defeat; others, taking the emperor's view, would regard it as an act of pacification. Hence either motive would prevail with Eusebius of Caesarea, we can only conjecture; but the stress which he lays on Constantine's desire to secure the peace of the church, on this as on all other occasions, suggests that pacification would be a predominant idea in his own mind, though perhaps not unmixed with other motives. It is strange that throughout his account of these proceedings Eusebius does not name either Athanasius or Arius; that in his allusion to the synod of Tyre he confines himself to vague generalities about the settlement of quarrels; and that in his narrative of the assembly at Jerusalem he does not so much as hint at any synodal action of any kind.

(iii) Synod of Constantinople. The conduct of the emperor at this time was strangely sickle and inconsistent. He had no distinct theological convictions on the great doctrine at issue, and was therefore at the mercy of the last speaker. Athanasius died too soon to Constantinople. Of the principal Constantine desired pacification, but he was not insensible to justice; and the personal pleadings of Athanasius convinced him that justice had been outraged (Ap. c. Ariam. 86). The bishops assembled at the dedication festival had scarcely executed the request, or the command, of the emperor's last letter, when they received another written in a very different temper (Athan. Ap. c. Ariam. 86; Socr. H. E. i. 34; Sozom. H. E. ii. 27). It was addressed "to the bishops that had assembled at Tyre"; it described their proceedings as "tumultuous and stormy" (μετὰ ἀναπλήρωσιν νεκρών καθημέρων). It contended that their judgment had been overruled by a spirit of contentiousness to the perversion of the truth; and it ended by summoning them to present themselves without a moment's delay at Constantinople. The leaders of the Eusebian party alone obeyed; the rest slunk away to their respective homes. Among those who repaired to the imperial city was Eusebius of Caesarea. Of the principal events which marked this occasion, the banishment of Athanasius and the death of Arius, it is unnecessary to speak here. But the proceedings of the synod then held at Constantinople (A. p. 336) have an important bearing on the literary history of Eusebius. The bishop wrote of this synod the condemnation of Marcellus (Марцеллуса), bishop of Ancyra, an uncompromising opponent of the Arians. He had written a book in reply to the Arian Asterius "the sophist," in which his zeal against Arian tenets goaded him into expressions that had a rank savour of Sabellianism. The proceedings against him had commenced in Jerusalem. They were taken up again at Constantinople, where he was condemned of Sabellianism, and deposed from his bishopric (Socr. H. E. i. 36; Socr. H. E. ii. 33). Eusebius is especially mentioned as taking part in this synod (Athan. Ap. c. Ariam. 87; comp. Euseb. c. Marc. ii. 4 p. 115). But the dominant party were not satisfied with this condemnation. Eusebius was urged by his friends to undertake a refutation of the heretic. The two works against Marcellus, of which an account will be given in the proper place, were his response to this request.

Meanwhile Eusebius found more congenial employment during his sojourn at Constantinople. The celebration of the emperor's trini-
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Eusebius had not yet ended, and the bishop of Caesarea delivered a panegyric which he afterwards appended to his Life of Constantine. An account of this work, which is extant under the title De Laudibus Constantini, is given below. With complacent vanity the orator records the emperor's satisfaction with his performance. This soirée was doubtless attended attentively, and was like one in an ecstasy of delight (καταφαίωμεν δι' της θείας φιλίας γαρνυμένης ἕκας); he expressed his approval afterwards at a banquet to the bishops who were his guests (V. C. iv. 46). Possibly the delivery of this oration may have been the chief motive which induced Eusebius to accompany the Arian bishops to the imperial city. It must have been during this same visit also, though on an earlier day, that he delivered before the emperor his discourse on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which had probably been spoken previously at the dedication itself. On this occasion too the satisfaction of Constantine was not less marked. He stood the whole time, though on the orator's own confession the discourse was lengthy; he refused again and again to be seated; he listened intently throughout, and would not suffer the orator to break off when he desired to do so (V. C. ix. 35, 46). This oration has unfortunately not survived (see p. 348).

VII. His Relations with the Emperor and Imperial Family. It does not appear that Eusebius had any personal interview with Constantine, when as a young man he passed through Caesarea in the retinue of Diocletian (see p. 309). The historian records the incident merely as a sightseer. The first direct communication on record is a letter from the emperor to Eusebius as metropolitan of Caesarea after the restoration of peace, giving orders for the rebuilding of the churches (V. C. ii. 46); but this does not suppose any personal acquaintance. Constantine indeed addresses him on this occasion as his "dearly beloved brother," but nothing can be built upon the expression. At the Council of Nicaea the emperor's favor, as the prominent position there assigned to him shews (p. 312 sq.); and from that time forward there seems to have been no interruption to his cordial relations with his imperial friend. The emperor was wont to enter into familiar conversation with him, relating to him the most remarkable incidents in his career, such as the miraculous appearance of the cross in the skies (V. C. i. 28), and the protection afforded by this same emblem in battle (V. C. ii. 9). He corresponded with him on various subjects. Besides official letters, such as that which has been already mentioned, Constantine wrote to compliment him on his declining the see of Antioch ("Consider thyself happy," he says on this occasion, "forasmuch as by the testimony of the whole world, so to speak, thou hast been judged worthy to be bishop of every church") (V. C. iii. 61). On receiving from Eusebius his treatise on the Paschal festival dedicated to himself, he sent in reply a letter of acknowledgment, expressing his excessive admiration (εὐθυμο- μάνεν) and urging his correspondent to write many more such discourses (V. C. iv. 45). On another occasion again he writes to him, asking him to see to the execution of fifty copies of the Scriptures for his new capital Constantinople, and supplying him with the means necessary for executing the order (V. C. iv. 38; see below, p. 334). But he not only corresponded familiarly with the bishop of Caesarea. It was a still greater mark of respect to listen with patience, and even with delight, to the lengthy and elaborate orations which Eusebius held from time to time to his court. We may well suppose that, beyond his rat learning, the bishop of Caesarea had other qualities which rendered his society attractive to the great emperor. Constantine himself praises his gentleness or moderation (V. C. iii. 60 ἄν καὶ αὐτὸς πανεσεόντες ταῦτα καὶ ἐτελεσθείλεται ὃ τευχεῖται οὕτως πέποιτο ὁ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ἠσκοῦσα ἐνεργεία) of the one who in like manner killed and again, τῆς προς αὐτὸν τασσόμενος ἐν ἐνεργείας. Nor would the unsung admiration which Eusebius entertained for his imperial host fail to recommend him to the great man. On the other hand, the bishop praises the frankness and accessibility of the sovereign, which was commendable and unpretentious: a fault, so that the emperor prayed upon his confidence (V. C. iv. 54). Nor was Constantine the only member of the imperial family with whom Eusebius had friendly relations. We find the empress Constantia, the sister of Constantine and wife of Licinius, writing to him on a matter of religious interest. To her Eusebius replies in a letter, of which a great part is still extant. In his reply we are especially struck with the frankness of expectation, almost of rebuke, which he addresses to this high personage (Spicil. Solesm. i. 830). These relations of Eusebius with a lady of the imperial family had a precedent in the life of his great opponent Arius, who was an attentive disciple in Mammee, the mother of the emperor Alexander Severus (Euseb. H. E. vi. 21).

VIII. Latest Years and Death. Within twelve months, or a little more, of the time when he had listened with rapt attention to the orations of the bishop of Caesarea, the great emperor, who the day before had breathed his last (May 22, A.D. 337); and the orator himself soon followed his imperial master. The precise time when Eusebius ended his busy and laborious life is not known, but he was no longer living in 341, for we find his successor Acacius representing Caesarea in the synod held at Antioch that year. From the connexion in which his death is mentioned by the historians, we may infer that it happened not later than the close of A.D. 339 or the beginning of A.D. 340.² In Wright's Ancient Syrian Martyrology, 

² Socmen (H. E. ii. 4) writes ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῇ γενομένῃ 

τεκτονήμασιν Ἐουσβίου ὦ κ. θ. In the previous chapter he mentions the intrigues of the Arians which led to the second exile of Athanasius, but says that he will defer the account of this exile till later (μετά τοῦ παρακολουθῆναι Ἰακώβην). In the following chapter he describes the death of the younger Constantine as happening "so long time after" (μετὰ τοῦ πάλιν). The second exile of Athanasius seems to have taken place in March, 346 (Ammianus Marcellinus xix. 4). Constantine was slain in the early months of the same year (Clinton, Past. Rom. i. 402). Socmen (H. E. iii. 1) places the death of Eusebius in exactly the same relations to all these events. It happened therefore, after the transactions which led to the exile of Athanasius had begun, but before the exile itself, and before the death of the younger Constantine.
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which cannot date later than half a century after the event, "the commemoration of Eusebius bishop of Pamphylia," is placed on May 30. If this represents the day of his death, then probably it does, he must have died in 339, for the notices will hardly allow so late a date in the following year. His literary activity was unabated to the end. Four years at the most can have elapsed between his last visit to Constantinople and his death. He must have been fast approaching his eightieth year when the end came. Yet at this advanced age, and within this short period, he composed the Panegyric, the Life of Constantine, the treatise Against Marcellinus, and the companion treatise On the Theology of the Church; while probably also he had in hand at the same time other unfinished works, such as the Theophania. There are no signs of failing mental vigour in these latest works. The two doctrinal treatises, which must certainly be assigned to the last four years of his life, are perhaps the most forcible and lucid of his writings. The Panegyric and the Life of Constantine are marred, indeed, by a too luxuriant rhetoric; but in vigour they do not fall behind any of his earlier works. Of his death itself no record is left. He passed away silently, we may suppose, as an old man of regular habits and equable temperament might be expected to pass away. Acacius, his successor, had been his pupil. Though more decidedly Ariana in his bias, he was a devoted admirer of his master (Sosem. H. E. iii. 2). He wrote a life of Eusebius (see p. 308), and seems to have edited some of his works (see p. 326).

IX. Literary Works. The literary remains of Eusebius are a rich and comparatively unexplored mine of study. With the exception of the Chronicle and the Ecclesiastical History, none of his writings have been investigated with proper diligence, and the vast majority remain still with the most meagre annotations, if annotated at all. Even in the excepted cases much remains still to be done. In wandring through this wretched guide, without guides and without tracks, a writer will necessarily go astray; and the following account must therefore be regarded as only tentative. The literary chronology of Eusebius is especially perplexing. He was in the habit of re-editing his books, and, possibly also, of adding references from later works in the earlier, even when he did not re-edit. Hence the apparently contradictory evidence with regard to dates, which meets us again and again in his writings.

His works may be arranged under the following heads: A. Historical; B. Apologetic; C. Critical and Exegetical; D. Doctrinal; E. Orations; F. Letters. The division is of necessity more or less artificial, and in some cases a work might be placed under more than one of these heads. Thus the Defence of Origen is partly historical, partly doctrinal, while in one sense it may be called apologetic; and so again the Letter to the Church of Caesarea is exclusively doctrinal, and the Oration in Praise of Constantine is mainly apologetic. But a rough classification like this is recommended by its obvious convenience.

References are given in brackets [ ] after the titles of the several works, to the edition of Eusebius in the Patrologia Graeca of Migne, whenever the works in question are included in that collection.

A. Historical.

1. Life of Pamphilius. Eusebius (Mart. Pol. 14), speaking of his friend’s martyrdom, refers to this work as follows: “The rest of the triumphs of his virtue, requiring a longer narration, we have already before this given to the world in a separate work in three books, of which his life is the subject.” He also refers to it three times in his History (H. E. vii. 32, viii. 32, viii. 13). In the first of these passages he states that in it he has given a full list of the works of Origen and of the other ecclesiastical writers collected by Pamphilus at Caesarea. Doubtless Jerome’s list of Origen’s works, which was discovered a few years ago (see Bedeppening in Zeitachr. f. hist. Theol. 1851, p. 66 sq.), is borrowed from this source. This Life is several times mentioned by Jerome (Ep. 35, Op. i. p. 154 sq.; Vit. ill. 81; c. Rufin. i. 9). In the last passage he describes it as containing “tres libros elegantissimos,” and gives a short extract from the third book. This appears to be the only remaining fragment, for the account of Pamphilus’ death, published by Papebroch, belongs, as we shall see, not to this work, but to the longer edition of the Martyrs of Palestine. The date of the Life of Pamphilus is uncertain; but it was written before the History (on the v. 1. οἱ ἀνεργοὶ ἀνέγιγγον in H. E. viii. 13, see Hollander, Euseb. 1890, p. 283; the shorter edition of the Martyrs of Palestine (l.c.).

2. On the Martyrs of Palestine (πρὸ τῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ μαρτρώσαντων) (Op. ii. 1457 sq.). This work is extant in two forms, a shorter and a longer.

(i) The shorter form is found attached to the Ecclesiastical History in most MSS of the latter, but not always in the same place. Commonly it stands between the eighth and ninth books, but in one MS at least it is placed in the middle of viii. 13, where in fact Eusebius makes a reference to it; while in some others it is relegated to the end of the tenth book of the latter. Consequently two MSS however, and notably in D. Marc. Venet. 338, perhaps the most important of all, it is wanting; neither has it any place in the Latin of Rufinus, or in the Syriac version of the History. Its fluctuating position in the MSS has a close analogy in the famous pericope (Joh. vii. 53–viii. 11) of the narrative of our Lord’s conversation with the woman of Samaria. Quite another problem, also, is the question of its preservation in the Greek. It appears that Eusebius wrote or helped to write it (Hippolytus lii. p. 217). This is a fuller account of the same incidents which are related in the Mart. Pol. 11 attached to the History. In the matter which the two contain in common they are expressed in the same words, or nearly so. Hence it followed that the one must have been an enlargement or an abridgment of the other. Both Papebroch and Fabricius supposed that the Metaphrast had extracted these Acts from Eusebius’s Life of Pamphilus, but the other hand, Valois mantained that the Meta-
phrast must have had a fuller edition of the Martyrs of Palestine than the existing Greek text. He was confirmed in this view by the fact that some anonymous Latin Acts of St. Procopius, which he printed, stood in exactly the same relation to the account of this martyr's death as the Mal lodion. The Latin Acts were evidently translated from some contemporary account, for they contained the words, "primo anno quo adversus nos fuit persecutio."

Recent discovery has established the conjecture of Valois. In A.D. 1861 Cureton published a MS in the British Museum, dated A.D. 153 (the same which also contains the Theophania), an ancient Syriac version of the Martyrs of Palestine. The portions relating to Procopius and to Pamphilus and his companions correspond to the longer forms of their respective Acts as already described. Here then is a translation of the entire work of Eusebius in its longer form.

This discovery moreover throws light on another fact. S. E. Assemani's Acta Martyrum Occidentalia, p. 166 sq. (Rome, 1748), contains accounts of the deaths of several of these Palestinian martyrs in Syriac, published from the Vatican MS Syr. 1. Assemani, starting from the finding that four of his Syriac Acts of Procopius were identical with the Latin Acts already mentioned, inferred that we had in these Syriac Acts portions of the complete work of Eusebius, of which the Greek attached to the History was only an abridgment. So far he was correct in his inference. But he went on to express his opinion that Eusebius himself wrote the Syriac, and that the Acts which he published were in fact the originals of the author. This latter theory is shattered by Cureton's publication. Assemani's Acts (so far as they contain common matter) are another and independent Syriac version of the same Greek as Cureton's. Assemani's Syriac has the following Acts taken from the work of Eusebius: (1) Procopius, p. 166 sq.; (2) Alpheaus, &c., p. 175 sq.; (3) Timotheus, p. 182 sq.; (4) Apollinarius, p. 186 sq.; (5) Aedesius, p. 195 sq.; (6) Agapius, p. 198 sq.; (7) Theodosia, p. 201 sq.; (8) Peter Abalam, p. 206 sq.

Of the genuineness of this longer work there can be no reasonable question. The Syriac MS of the Curetonian version itself was written within little more than seventy years of Eusebius's death. Moreover, it is plainly not the original autograph of the translation. The confusion and transposition of Syriac letters shew that the version has passed through one and probably more stages of transcription after it was made. The Syriac version probably was the first: "Anais into Ais, Peleus into Paulus, &c. (see pp. 58, 61, 64, 69, 78, 84, 85, Cureton). And in other words also, besides proper names, the text has been corrupted (pp. 57, 63, 83). Moreover, the Greek MS from which the Syriac version was made had either been mis-copied or so blurred by time as to be illegible in parts. Hence the name Paulus (a good Egyptian name, like Paspis, Paphnutius, &c. with the meaning "belonging to Isis"; see Tattam s. v. P&H(1)) has become Pasis by a confusion of A & (p. 57), Aedesius has become Aloisius by a confusion of A & (p. 60), &c. Allowing sufficient time for these corruptions, we are carried back to the date of Eusebius himself. Moreover, the historical notices, which this longer account supplements to the shorter narrative, indicate a contemporary and an eye-witness.

Nor again can it reasonably be doubted that the shorter form of the Palestinian Martyrs, attached to the history, is Eusebius's own. Not only does the compiler retain those notices of the longer form in which Eusebius speaks in his own person; but in those passages also, which are peculiar to this shorter form, Eusebius is evidently the speaker. Thus, in his account of Pamphilus (p. 112, where he has written a special work in three books on his martyred friend's life). Again, when recording the death of Silvanus who had had his eyes put out (c. 13), he mentions his own astonishment on one occasion (συνευαγγελίζων μετεκάλεθε ο θεός), when he heard him reading the Scriptures, as he supposed, from a book in church, being told that he was blind and was repeating them by heart. Moreover, other incidental notices, which are inserted from time to time and have no place in the longer form, show the knowledge of a contemporaneous and eyewitness.

Eusebius was in the habit of working up old matter in the form of an edifying work, a kind of book therefore is there no stumbling-block. But it is an interesting problem to inquire the motives in this particular case.

The longer edition seems to be the original form of the book. It is an independent work, and appears to have been written not very long after the events themselves. It betrays no other motive than to provide edifying matter, especially the Christians of Caesarea and Palestine, to whom it is immediately addressed. "Our city of Caesarea" is an expression occurring several times (pp. 4 twice, 25, 30). "This our country," "this our city," are analogous phrases (pp. 8, 15). The martyrs are described as "those of whom all the inhabitants of Palestine and the whole of Syria, for in the midst of this our land also the Saviour of all mankind himself arose" (p. 3). "We also," he writes, when relating a miraculous occurrence, "call as witnesses to you of these things which we have written the whole of the inhabitants of the city of Caesarea, for there was not so much as one of the inhabitants of this city absent from this terrific sight" (p. 17). The beginning and end are hortatory, and suggest a directly didactic purpose in the narrative.

In the shorter form the case is different. The writer does not localize himself in the same way. It is always "the city," never "this city," of Caesarea. The religious descriptions, in recording the miracles is left out (c. 4). The hortatory beginning and ending are omitted; and generally the didactic portions are abridged or excised. For the hortatory opening a chronological notice, and an account of the decree under which the martyrs were condemned, are substituted. The hortatory close in like manner makes room for a brief summary of the sufferings of the martyrs under Diocletian throughout the world, ending with a reference to the palindrome of the persecutors. "We must now," so it concludes, "record the palindrome" (ἀναγραφεῖν ο ωι καὶ τον βαλαμίδα). It would seem then that this shorter form
was part of a larger work, in which the sufferings of the martyrs were set off against the deeds of the persecutors. The object of this antithetical treatment would be the vindication of God's righteousness. This idea appears several times elsewhere in the writings of Eusebius, and he may have desired to embody it in a separate treatise. The work is plainly not complete, as we have it. The palinode, which is promised, never comes. Nor is this the only sign of incompleteness. In c. 12 Eusebius refers to something which he has "said at the beginning." To this there is nothing corresponding in the extant work. The preface therefore is wanting, as well as the conclusion. This hypothesis as to the intention of the work, if it be admitted, solves another difficulty. At the end of the eighth book of the History, several MSS (generally the same) contain the *Martyrs of Palestine* in a short appendix, as contained "in some copies" (ὑπὸ τῶν ἑττητάρχων). This appendix contrasts the miserable deaths of the persecutors with the happy lives of the Christians, crowned by the happy accession of Constantine. It evidently does not belong to the History itself. It is no less obviously a fragment of some larger work; for it refers to an account of the abdication of the two emperors, which has been given in a previous part of the narrative. May we not have here a fragment of the second part of the treatise of which the *Martyrs of Palestine* in the shorter recension formed the first?

(3) *Collection of Ancient Martyrdoms* (ἀρχαῖας μαρτυρίας συγκεκριμένης). The title of the work may be regarded as substantially correct, as a comparison of the references in *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 15, v. praef., 4, 21. Of this work Eusebius was not, as some have supposed, the author, but merely, as the title suggests and as the nature requires, the compiler and editor. The narratives of martyrdoms had a double importance in the eyes of Eusebius: they were not only valuable as history, but they were instructive as lessons (*Hist. Eccl.* v. praef. οὖν ἱστορεῖν αὐτὸ μάρτυρα, ἄλλα καὶ διδασκαλίαν περιέχουσαν διάγων). Hence he took pains to preserve authentic records of them. He conceived that these must have happened during the last persecution of the Greek Church. They were not only valuable as history, but were interesting as lessons. He himself undertook to record the sufferings of the martyrs of his own country Palestine at this time; while he left it to others in different parts of the world to relate those "qua ipsi miserrima viderunt," declaring that only thus strict accuracy could be attained (see *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 13, οὖν ἱστορεῖν τῶν εἰς ἡπόταμα παρελθόντων ἡ μὲν γένεσιν, with the whole context). But he was anxious also to preserve the records of past persecutions. Hence this collection of Martyrologies. The epithet "ancient" (ἀρχαῖας) must probably be regarded as only relative. Those martyrdoms were "ancient," which took place prior to the "persecution of his own time" (καὶ ἡμᾶς ἱστοριῶς, according to his favourite expression). He himself refers to this collection for the martyrdom of Polycaur and others at Smyrna under Antoninus Pius A.D. 155 or 156 (iv. 15), for the death of Alexander *Episcopius*, and for the persecutions of the Galilaeans under M. Aurelius A.D. 177 (v. I sq.), and for the death of Apollinus under Commodus A.D. 180-185.

(4) *Chronicle* [Op. i. 59 sq.]. This is the subject of a separate article [EUSEBIUS, CHRONICLE]. Little need be said here. The suggestion thrown out, that Eusebius published two different editions of this work (see p. 392), deserves every consideration. It would solve not a few difficulties which we encounter in the literary history of Eusebius. But the fuller account of theBOOK. — VOL. II. (v. 21). But it would probably comprise any martyrdoms which occurred before the long peace that preceded the outbreak of the last persecution under Diocletian.

Out of this simple fact that Eusebius made a collection of the older acts of martyrdom, much legendary matter has grown. It gave rise to a fictitious correspondence between Jerome and others (Hieronym. Op. xxii. Valeriani). Chromatius and Heliodorus, the bishops, write to Jerome asking him to search for the "feriales" in the archives of St. Eusebius at Caesarea, and instruct them that they may observe the saints' days with more regularity. He replies to them, stating how on the occasion of Constantine's visit to Caesarea Eusebius had requested that the judges throughout the Roman empire might be directed to furnish him with copies of any judicial proceedings against the martyrs. Using these materials Eusebius had compiled a narrative giving "omnium martyrum pro- vinciarum omnium Romanarum trophaeas." From this work himself and others drew up the calendar of saints' days, which he sends in answer to his correspondent's request. These letters were afterwards prefixed to the so-called *MartYROLOGIUM HIERONYMINUM*, which they are intended to recommend. Baronius (Mem. Rom. praef. oc. vii, vii), and E. Assemani (Not. Mart. Occ. p. 39 sq.) have pointed out the historical impossibilities which these letters contain. But though a forgery, they appear to have been in circulation at an early date. There is a reference to them even in Cassiodorus (Inst. Litt. 32, p. 550), if the passage be not interpolated. They seem also to have suggested the statement in the forged Acts of St. Silvester, where this imaginary work of Eusebius is described in similar language, with the additional statement that it contained twenty (v. 11, eleven) books. We may suppose also that directly or indirectly they prompted the inquiry of Eulogius of Alexandria, who wrote to Gregory of Nazianzen to send him this work of Eusebius. Gregory (Ep. viii. 29) says in reply that no such work exists in the archives of the Roman church or in the libraries of Rome, and that he himself had never heard of it, till he got the letter of Eulogius. In the middle ages however rumours of this work appeared at times in the lists of learning hopes of its discovery were excited from time to time. The story is fully investigated by Assemani (1 c.) who shews it to be incredible in itself and irreconcilable alike with the silence and the utterances of Eusebius.
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of the earlier Roman episcopate in the Armenian differ widely from those given in the History, while Jerome's dates agree with the latter. If there was only one edition, this phenomenon may be explained in one of two ways. Either Jerome reproduces the original Eusebian chronology of the Roman bishops and the Armenian translator (or else Jerome before his time) tampered with the work, and substituted a confusedly erroneous chronology for one substantially correct—a very improbable supposition; or (as assumed by Lipps and commonly) the Armenian may give the proper Eusebian dates, and Jerome may have altered them—a hypothesis which is still less credible, when we remember that Jerome's chronology in the Chronicle agrees substantially with the History, and that Eusebius was engaged on the History at the same time with the Chronicle.

(iii) The references in other works of Eusebius are best explained on the hypothesis of a first edition of the Chronicle before the tenus of Jerome than the copy which fell into Jerome's hands. Thus it is mentioned in the Ecclesiasticus Prophetae, and this latter work was certainly written during the persecution, i.e. at all events before A.D. 313 (see below, p. 339). Again, it is referred to likewise in the Prosaparato Evangelica, and there the student is in no way certain, and not only so, as in the previous case, that the earlier book of the sequel to this work, the Demonstratio Evangelica, were written during and soon after the persecution (see below, p. 329). Tillenmont (H. E. vii. p. 50) was disposed to postulate an earlier edition of the Chronicle, on the sole ground of the reference in the Prosaparato. The publication of the Ecclesiasticus Prophetae, and the discovery of the Armenian version of the Chronicle, have strengthened the position twenty-fold. If this hypothesis be correct, the Armenian must be a mixture of the earlier and later editions, for it also refers to the vicennalia (i. pp. 71, 131, 134). Petermann on entirely independent grounds (i. p. 21) has proposed a revision of this Armenian version (see below, p. 354).

(5) Ecclesiastical History [ονθαναστηκε Ιεροσα] [Op. ii. 10 sq.]. The date of the work is ascertained from the following facts. (1) Eusebius refers to the following works as already written: the Chronicle (i. 1); the Extracts from the Prophets (i. 2, 3); the Collection of Ancient Martyrdoms (iv. 15, v. proseem., 4, 22); the Defence of Origen (vi. 23, 33, 36); the Life of Pamphilus (vi. 32, vii. 32, viii. 13 [7]). On the other hand he expresses his intention of relating the sufferings of the martyrs, of which himself was an eye-witness, in another work (viii. 13), referring apparently to the Martyrs of Pamphilus. (2) His work closes with the death of Constantine and his son Crispus. As Crispus was put to death by his father in the summer A.D. 326, this gives a terminus ad quem, beyond which the publication of the work cannot be placed. (3) The last incident recorded, or alluded to, in the work is the defeat and punishment of Licinius. Licinius was defeated A.D. 325, and put to death A.D. 324 (Clinton, Fast. Rom. i. pp. 376, 378). (4) There is no reference, direct or indirect, to the Council of Nicaea, which met in June, A.D. 325. On the other hand, the theological language of Eusebius (e.g. i. 2, 3) is such as he would hardly have used after he had put his signature to the creed of this council. (5) The last book is dedicated to his friend Paulinus. Here again we have a definite terminus ad quem, for Paulinus died A.D. 324, or 325 at the latest. Those who would postpone the date of the History meet this argument in one of two ways. (1) They suppose that Paulinus was no longer alive when Eusebius wrote these words. This however is an unnatural interpretation, not being suggested by anything in the context. The expression ἐπερατορας has a parallel in the preface to his Onomasticon, where he addresses this same person, when he was certainly living, as ἑγεῖ τού Θεοῦ ἀρσενίως Παύλινον. Even if with Heinichen we interpret the words ἐπερατορας as ας to thee, as if the tenth book had been added at the instigation of Paulinus, it will still imply that he was living. The imperative however and the ἀφάντος of the context seem to point rather to a dedication. (2) They postpone the death of Paulinus to a period later in date. This however seems impossible. Paulinus was bishop first of Tyre and afterwards of Antioch (Euseb. c. Marcell. i. 4). This last see he only held six months before his death (Philostorg. H. E. ii. 15). At the Council of Nicaea however, Zenus is bishop of Tyre and Eustathius and the death of Antioch. His death therefore has already taken place before the summer A.D. 325, when the council met; and Jerome (Euseb. Chron. i. p. 192) is unquestionably right when he represents Paulinus as the immediate predecessor of Eustathius. On the other hand the language of Philostorgius (i.e.), as given by Photius, implies that he succeeded Eustathius when Eustathius was deposed, for it apparently makes him the immediate predecessor of Eulalius. If Philostorgius said this, the facts already adduced show that he was wrong, but possibly the error is due to Photius's mode of abridging.1 Theodoret (H. E. i. 6) overlooks Paulinus's short tenure of office, when he makes Eustathius the immediate successor of Philostorgius. Other passages, cited by Heinichen (e.g. Soz. H. E. ii. 18) prove nothing, for they do not require that Paulinus should be still living at the times of which they speak.

From all these considerations it seems clear that the History was finished some time in A.D. 324 or 325; before midsummer in the latter year, and probably some months earlier. But there are reasons for thinking that the earlier books were written some years before this time. "If we compare the closing sentences of the ninth and tenth books it is evident that, when the ninth book was written, Eusebius was not aware of the rupture between Licinius and Constantine, which happened in 314; and it appears also that he was not perfectly informed of the course of affairs in the west, which led to the decisive victory of Constantine over Maxentius in 312, though he

---

1 The corresponding passage in Suidas (n. Ἀρμον) shows how by a slight change of expression the same statement may be imputed to Eusebius. Nicetas Choniates (Hist. V. 9) says, "Sola vero Philostorgius libro Historiarum secundo Paulinum Tyro Antiochianum translatum est nunc est." This statement is not strictly accurate, for Eusebius himself mentions his translation to Antioch; but Philostorgius, if rightly represented, is alone in placing the incident after the removal of Eustathius. A.D. 330.
was well acquainted with the eastern campaign, which ended with the death of Maximian in 313. We may therefore suppose that the nine books were composed not long after the edict of Milan in 313, while the tenth book was added in the interval between 323 and the close of the summer of 325. In this case the words “not yet set in diaphragm” (ἔσωμεν ἄνωθεν τὰ), referring to Licinius (ix. 9), must have been a later insertion of the author; and indeed they are altogether out of harmony with the context. This early date of the first nine books will explain the fact that in viii. 13 Eusebius speaks of the Martyrs of Palestine as a projected work. “If this view of the date of the History be true, the book gains an additional interest. It becomes itself the last great literary monument of the period which it describes. It belongs not only in substance, but also in theological character to the ante-Nicene age. It gathers and arranges in a form anterior to the age of dogmatic definition, the experience, the feelings, the hopes of a body which had just accomplished its sovereign success, and was conscious of its inward strength.” [W.]

The work contains no indications that it was due to any suggestion from without, as some have supposed. If the author had been prompted to it by Constantine he would hardly have been silent about the fact, for he is only too ready elsewhere to parade the flatteries of his imperial patron. Moreover, it was probably written in great measure, or at least the materials for it were collected, before his relations with Constantine began to grow so dangerous as to lead him to seek a new sphere. In this respect it grew out of a previous work, the Chronicile. In his preface he speaks of it as an expansion (παραστάσεις τοῦ έκθέσεως) of the narrative which he had given in epitome in this last-mentioned work. Accordingly, in the opening words, in which he sums up its contents, he places the chronological element in the forefront: “The successions of the holy apostles together with the times which have been accomplished from the days of our Saviour to our own age.” But though the first suggestion of the work may have been derived from the Chronicile, the central conception is entirely different and more concrete. The Jewish priesthood, including a discussion of the Saviour’s genealogy; thus shewing that it came in the fulness of time as a realisation of the prophecies (c. 5–10). Then follows an account of the personalities employed in the announcement of the Kingdom and the foundation of the Christian church, including, on the one hand, the first heralds of the Gospel (c. 11), another to the appointment of the twelve and the seventy (c. 12); a third to the mission sent by Christ Himself to Edessa, as recorded in the archives of that city (c. 13). We are thus brought to the time of the Ascension.

So the first book ends. The second comprises the preaching of the apostles to the destruction of Jerusalem, the writer’s aim being not to repeat the accounts in the New Testament, but to supplement them with notices from external sources. The third book extends to the reign of Trajan and covers the sub-apostolic age, ending with the voluntary retirement of the apostles, Clement of Rome (c. 19).

The fourth and fifth carry us forward to the close of the second century, including the Montanist, Quartodeciman, and Monarchian disputes. The sixth contains the period from the persecution of Severus (A.D. 203) to that of Decius (A.D. 250), the central figure being Origen, of whom a full account is given. The seventh continues the narrative to the outbreak of the great persecution under Diocletian, and is made up in great measure of quotations from Dionysius of Alexandria, as we are warned in the preface (Διονυσίου άθώς φωναίς συνεχομένης). It is significant that the last forty years of this period, though contemporaneous with the history of the church, are but briefly alluded to in a single long chapter. It was a period of very rapid but silent progress, when the Church for the first time was in the happy condition of having no history. The eighth gives the history of the persecution of Diocletian till the “palinode,” the edict of Galerius (A.D. 311). The ninth gives the story of the sufferings of the Christians until the victory over Maxentius at the Milvian bridge in the West, and the death

Y 2
The two points which require consideration are (1) the range and adequacy of his materials; (2) the use made of these materials.

1. The range of materials is astonishing when we consider that Eusebius was a pioneer breaking new ground. Some hundred works, in several cases very lengthy works, are either directly cited or referred to as read. When we remember that in many instances he would read an entire treatise through for the sake of one or two historical notices, while in many others he must have done the same without finding anything which would serve his purpose, we are able to form some conception of the enormous labour involved in the work. That in is strongest point. Yet even here deficiencies may be noted. He very rarely quotes the works of hierarchs themselves, being content to give their opinions through the medium of their opponents' refutations. A still greater defect is his ignorance of Latin literature and of Latin Christendom generally; he had no knowledge of Tertullian's works, except the Apologeticum, which he quotes (ii. 25, iii. 20, 35, v. 5) from a bad Greek translation (e.g. ii. 25, where the translator, being ignorant of the Latin idiom cum maxime, makes shipwreck of the sense). Of Tertullian himself he gives no account. But in his letter to Olympius (vi. 32), he calls himself a Roman, and in this letter he only knows through Tertullian (iii. 33), and is unacquainted with the name of the province which Pliny governed. Of Hippolytus again he has very little information to communicate, and cannot even tell the name of his see (vi. 20, 22). His account of Cyril too is meagre in the extreme (vi. 45, vii. 5), though Cyril was a source of much information. He figures in western Christendom, and died (A.D. 258) not very long before his own birth. He betrays the same ignorance also with regard to the bishops of Rome. His dates here, strangely enough, are widest of the mark in the latter half of the 3rd century, close upon his own time. Thus he assigns to Xystus I. (A.D. 296) 14 years (vii. 37) instead of eleven years; to Eutychianus (+ A.D. 283) ten months (vii. 32) instead of nearly nine years; to Gaius, whom he calls his own contemporary, and who died long after he had arrived at manhood (A.D. 296), “about fifteen years” (vii. 32) instead of twelve. He seems to have had a corrupt list, and he did not possess the knowledge necessary to correct it. With the Latin language indeed he appears to have had no thorough acquaintance, though he sometimes ventured to translate Latin documents (iv. 8, 9; comp. vii. 17). But he must not be held responsible for the blunders in the versions of others, e.g. of Tertullian's Apologeticum.

2. Under the second head the most vital question is the sincerity of Eusebius. Did he tamper with his materials or not? The sarcasm of Gibbon (Decline and Fall, c. xvi) is well known: “The gravest of the ecclesiastical
historians. Eusebius himself, indirectly confesses that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace of religion. Such an acknowledgment will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of history, has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other. The passages to which he refers (H. E. viii. 3; Mart. Pol. 12) do not bear out this imputation. They are contrary to what he otherwise deprecates. The very terms which they contain, in the most emphatic terms, the evils which disgraced the church, and they represent the persecution under Diocletian as a just retribution for these wrongdoings. The ambitions, the intriguing for office, the factious quarrels, the cowardly denials and shipwrecks of the faith,—"evil piled upon evil" (κακά κακών ἐπισκέψεως)—are denounced in no measured language. But the writer contents himself with condemning these sins and shortcomings of Christians in general terms, without entering into details, and declares his intention of confining his remarks upon the events that he predicts (ὑπὲρ ὁσιολογίας) to his own and future generations. This treatment may be regarded as too great a sacrifice to edification. It may discredit his conception of history; but it leaves no imputation on his honesty. The special charges against his honour as a narrow-minded person. There is no ground whatever for the surmise that Eusebius forged or interpolated the passage from Josephus relating to our Lord, quoted in H. E. i. 11, though Heinichen (iii. p. 623 sqq., Mect. ii.) is disposed to entertain the charge. Inasmuch as this passage is contained in all our extant MSS, and there is sufficient evidence that other interpolations (though not this) were introduced into the text of Josephus long before his time (see Orig. c. Cels. i. 47, Delarue's note), no suspicion can justly attach to Eusebius himself. Another interpolation in the Jewish historian, which he quotes elsewhere (H. E. 29), was certainly known to Origen (l. c.). Doubtless also the omission of the owl in the account of Herod Agrippa's death (H. E. ii. 10) was already in some texts of Josephus (Ant. xix. 8, 2). The manner in which Eusebius deals with his very numerous quotations elsewhere, where we can test his honesty, is a sufficient vindication against this unwarranted charge.

1 It is not the substitution of an angel for an owl, as the case is not uncommonly stated. The result is produced mainly by the omission of some words in the text of Josephus, which runs thus: 'Ἀναγέννησις ἐκείνη ἐν οἴνοις τῆς ἐκείνου κοβαλίας ὑπὲρ-καθέμενον εἶναι άνδράς (καὶ σημαίνεται τυχόν), ἔγειραν τῶν τοῖν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κακοῦ σύνετον κακῶν εἶναι τῶν κακῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. The words bracketed are omitted and κακῶν is added after σύνετον, so that the sentence runs, εἶναι ἄρα τοῖν τούτον κακῶν ἐκ τοῦ κακοῦ σύνετον κακῶν εἶναι ἀνδράς. This being so, I do not feel at all sure that the change (by whomever made) was dictated by any diabolical motive. A scribe, unacquainted with Latin, would stumble over τὸν βουκάνα which had a wholly different meaning and seems never to be used of an owl in Greek; and he would alter the text in order to extend his verse out of it. In the preceding mention of the bird (Ant. xviii. 6, 7), Josephus or his translator gives it as a Latin name, βουκάνα δὲ οὖν τῶν Σαρακέων τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ κακοῦ. Miller (quoted by Bright, p. xiv) calls this "the one case in which, so far as he recollic, the..." Moreover, Eusebius is generally careful not only to collect the best evidence accessible, but also to distinguish between different kinds of evidence. "Almost every page witnesses to the zeal with which he collected testimonies from writers who lived at the time of the events which he describes. For the sixth and seventh books he evidently rejoices to be able to use for the foundation of his narrative the contemporary letters of Dionysius; 'Dionysius, our great bishop of Alexandria, he writes,' will again help me by his own words in the composition of my seventh book of the history, since he relates in order the events of his own time in the letters which he has left' (vii. praef. †). In accordance with this instinctive desire for original testimony, Eusebius scrupulously distinguishes facts which rest on documentary from those which rest on oral evidence. Some things he relates on the authority of a general' (iii. 11, 36) or old report' (iii. 19, 20) or from tradition (i. 7, ii. 5, vii. 2, 5). In the lists of successions he is careful to notice where written records fail, 'I have not the least idea how any means find the chronology of the bishops of Jerusalem preserved in writing; thus much only I received from written sources, that there were fifteen bishops in succession up to the date of the siege under Hadrian, &c.' (iv. 5). [W.] There is nothing like hearing the actual words of the writer, he says again and again (i. 23, iii. 32, viii. 23; comp. iv. 23), when introducing a quotation.

"The general sincerity and good faith of the historian appear therefore to be assured. But his intellectual qualifications for his task were in many respects defective. His credulity indeed has frequently been much exaggerated. "Undoubtedly he relates many incidents which may seem to us incredible, but, when he does so, he gives the evidence on which they are recommended to him. At one time it is the express testimony of some well-known writer, at another a general tradition, at another an observation by himself (v. 7, vi. 9, vii. 17, 18)" [W.]. The most remarkable passage bearing on the question is one in which he recounts his own experience during the last persecution in Palestine (Mart. Pol. 9). "There can be no doubt about the occurrence which Eusebius here describes, and it does not appear that he can be reproached for adding the interpretation which his countrymen placed upon it. What he voices for we can accept as truth; what he records as a popular comment leaves his historical veracity and judgment unimpaired." [W.] Gibbon (c. xvi) describes the character of Eusebius as "less tainted with credulity, and more practised in the arts of courts, than that of almost any of his contemporaries." A far more serious drawback to his value as a historian is the loose and uncritical spirit in which he sometimes deals with his materials. This shews itself in diverse ways. (c) He is not always to be trusted in his discrimination of genuine and spurious documents. As regards the canon of Scripture indeed he..."
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takes special pains; he lays down certain principles which shall guide him in the production of testimonies; and on the whole he adheres to these principles with fidelity (see Contemporary Review, Jan. 1875, p. 169 sq.). Yet elsewhere he adduces as genuine the correspondence of Christ and Abgarus (I. 19), though never treating it as canonical Scripture. The unworthy suspicion that Eusebius himself forged this correspondence which he asserted to be a translation of a Syriac original found in the archives of Edessa has been refuted by the discovery and publication of the original Syriac (The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle with an English Translation and Notes by G. Phillips, London, 1876; see Zahn, Götting. Alt. Anz. Feb. 6, 1877, p. 161 sq.; Contemporary Review, May 1877, p. 1157; a portion of this work had been published some time before in Cureton's Ancient Syriac Documents, p. 6 sq., London, 1864). Not his honesty, but his critical discernment was at fault. Yet he cannot be described as a critical historian, maintaining a position which, however untenable, has commended itself to Cave (H. L. i. p. 2) and Grabbe (Spic. Patr. i. p. 1 sq.), and other writers of this stamp, as defensible. This however is the most fragrant instance of misappreciation. On the whole, considering the great mass of spurious documents which were current in his age, we may well admire the discrimination with which he separates the false from the true, e.g. in the case of the numerous Clementine writings (iii. 16, 38), alleging the presence or the absence of external testimony for his decisions. Pearson's eulogy (Vind. Ipn. i. 8) on Eusebius, though exaggerated, is not undeserved. He is generally a safe guide in discriminating between the genuine and the spurious. (b) He is often careless in his manner of quoting. His quotations from Irenæus for instance lose much of their significance, even for his own purpose, by abstraction from their context (v. 8). His quotations from Papias (iii. 22) and from Irenæus (iii. 22, iv. 22) are tautologous by their brevity, for the exact bearing of the words could only have been learnt from the suppressed context. But with the exception of the passages from Josephus (where the blame, as we have seen, must be shifted to other shoulders) the quotations themselves are given with fair accuracy. (c) He draws hasty and unwarranted inferences from his authorities, and altogether he is loose in interpreting their bearing. This is his weakest point as a critical historian. Thus he quotes the passages of Josephus respecting the census of Quirinus and the insurrections of the Thudas and of Judas the Galilean, as if they agreed in all their points and in all their details, and does not notice the chronological difficulties (I. 5, 9; i. 11). He addsuces the Jewish historian as a witness to the assignment of a text to Lyssianas (I. 9), though in fact he says nothing about this Lyssianas in the passage in question, but elsewhere mentions an earlier (I. 21) and more authentic rule of life, which he assigns to a bishop of Antioch, named Athen (Ant. xx. 7. 1; B. J. ii. 11. 5). He represents this same writer as stating that Herod Antipas was banished to Vienne (I. 11), whereas Josephus sends Archelaus to Vienne (B. J. ii. 7. 3) and Herod Antipas to Lyons (Ant. xviii. 7. 2); but in B. J. ii. 5. 6, Spain is given as the place of exile. He quotes Philo's description of the Jewish Therapeutae, as if it related to a body of Christian ascetics (i. 17). He gives, side by side, the contradictory accounts of the death of James the Just in Josephus and Hegesippus, as if the one tallied with the other (i. 23). He entangles himself in a hopeless confusion between the imperial brothers M. Aurelius and L. Verus (v. proem., 4, 5) from a misunderstanding of his documents, though in the Chronicle (p. 170) he is substantially correct with regard to these emperors. And examples of such carelessness in the use of his materials might be largely increased. (d) He is very deficient in his treatment. We have not unfrequently to pick out from various parts of his work the notices bearing on one definite and limited subject. He relates a fact, or quotes an authority bearing upon it, in season or out of season, according as it is recalled to his memory by some accidental connexion. "Nothing can illustrate" is characteristic both of the manner in which he deals with the canons of the New Testament. After mentioning the martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, he proceeds at once (iii. 3) without any further preface to enumerate the writings attributed to them respectively, distinguishing those which were generally received among the ancients from those which were disputed. At the same time he adds a notice of the Shepherd, because it had been attributed by some to the Hermas mentioned by St. Paul. After this he resumes his narrative, and then having related the last labours of St. John he gives an account of the writings attributed to him (iii. 24), promising a further discussion of the Apocalypse, which however does not appear. This catalogue is followed by some fragmentary discussions on the Gospels, to which a general classification of all the books claiming to have apostolic authority is added. When this is ended, the history suddenly goes back to a point in the middle of the former book (ii. 15); and he has no notice of an incident for the sake of adding some new detail, yet so as to mar the symmetry of his work." [W.] Examples of this fault occur in the accounts of the first preaching at Edessa (i. 13, ii. 1), of the writings of Clement of Rome (iii. 16, 38; iv. 22, 23, &c.), of the daughters of Philip (iii. 39, 39; comp. v. 17, 24), and in many other cases.

The History of Eusebius was early translated into the two languages which shared with the Greek by far the largest part of the whole area of Christendom. The Syriac version is preserved in great part in two MSS: one at St. Petersburg, dated A.D. 452, and containing books i–iv, viii–x, and xii, and the other in the British Museum (Add. 14,639 described in Wright's Catalogue, p. 1039), belonging to the 6th century and containing books i–v (with some mutilations in the beginning of the first book). As there were among the companions of Pamphilus persons who made it their business to translate the Greek into Syriac (see above, p. 310), and as other works of Eusebius were certainly translated into this latter language very soon after they were written (see pp. 320, 332), we may infer that this Syriac version of the Histor
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dates not many years after the original, and
perhaps during the lifetime of the author him-
self. Dr. Wright is preparing an edition of this
version, of which he has given a specimen
(i. 1-4) in Dindorf's præf. p. xviii sq. The old
Latin version was made by Rufinus, who, as
usual, deals very freely with his original. He
abridges and even inserts at pleasure. The
work is accompanied by a continuation from
his own pen, carrying the history down to the
death of Theodosius the Great. The exact date
of this translation is uncertain, but the possible
limits are narrow. In the preface Rufinus
mentions that Chronatius, to whom it is dedi-
cated, imposed the task upon him at a time
when Alaric was laying Italy waste. Alaric first
invaded Italy A.D. 402, and the version therefore
should probably be dated soon after. Chronatius
died A.D. 406. The best edition is that of
Cociari, Rome, 1740. The work is the subject
of an important monograph by Kimmel, de
Rufino Eusebi Interpretæ, Gerae, 1538. See also
Ebert, Christi Latini. Literatur. p. 310 sq.
(Leipzig, 1874).
The edicto princes of the Greek of Eusebius's
History is that of Stephana, Paris, 1544. The
following are the principal editors after Stephens.
(1) Yalesius (Paris, 1655), who has contributed
more largely than any one else to the criticism and
elucidation of Eusebius. (2) Reading (Cambridge,
1720); together with the Ecclesiastical Histories
of Socrates, Sozomen, etc. Reprinted reprinted Va-
lei's translation and commentary with additions
and corrections from this editor's manuscript
notes, and supplemented it with materials from
other writers. (3) Heinichen (Leipzig, 1827); a
very important contribution, but superseded
by his later edition, of which an account is given
below. (4) Strauh (Halae ad Salam. 1779).
The first volume only appeared, containing books
1-11. (5) Burton (Oxford, 1838); the text, the
translation of Valerius, and apparatus criticus, to
which was prefixed, some new and important contrib-
tutions. This was followed in A.D. 1842 by two
volumes of various notes and excursuses, issued
by the Oxford press, containing the labours of
Valerius, Heinichen, and others. Burton died before
the edition was completed (1838), and it
was brought out by anonymous friends. (6)
Schaff (New York, 1866). This is a very local
apparatus, but no explanatory notes; a con-
nvenient edition with useful indices. (7) Laemmer
(Scaphsia, 1862). This is the most important
edition for the criticism of the text, the editor
having made large additions to the existing
materials; but it has no explanatory notes. (8)
The edition of Heinichen in his Eusebius Pam-
philus Scripta Historica (Lipsiae, 3 vols., 1868,
1869, 1870), which includes also the Vita
Constantini, the Panegyricus (de Laudibus Con-
stantinis), and the Constantin ad Sanctorum
Coronam Oratio. This is the most complete and
useful edition, comprising prolegomena, text,
apparatus criticus, explanatory notes, excursuses,
and indices. The editor has revised and sup-
plemented his former work, making use of the
materials which have accumulated since the
appearance of his first edition. To these editions
should be added, as the most recent text and
convenient for use, that of W. Dindorf in
Tragia Series, 3 vols., 240 pp., (Leipzig, 1871).
Monographs on the Ecclesiastical History are
very numerous. The following may be men-
tioned: Müller, de Fide Eusebi in Archi Chris-
tiani episcopi. Havn. 1813; Darm, de Eusebi
Caesarensi Historiae Ecclesiasticae Scriptore,
etc., Jenae, 1815; Keuster, de Eusebi Historiae
Ecclesiasticae Compendio Auctoriali, etc., Got-
tingae, 1816; Ruterdale, de Fontibus Hist.
Ecclest. Eusebii, Lond. Goth. 1826; Holy, Eusebe de
The writer of the present article has also had the advantage of consulting some
manuscript notes of Dr. Westcott, from which
extacts have been given above with the initial
[W.]. Particular points are more fully treated
in special works; e.g. the list of Roman bishops
by Lipsius, Die Papstzeitgeschichte des Eusebius,
Kiel, 1866, and Chronologie der Römischen Bis-
schöfe, Kiel, 1869.

(6) Life of Constantine [Op. ii. 905 sq.], in
four books. The date of this work is fixed
within narrow limits. It was written after the
death of the great emperor who is its subject
(May 337) and by his three sons of which
declared Augusti (Sept. 337); see iv. 68.
On the other hand, the death of the author himself
was not later than A.D. 340 (see above, p. 318).
Gothofred (Philostorg. Eccl. Hist. vii. 3, and
elsewhere) denied its genuineness; but this
opinion does not deserve serious refutation.
The work is not named indeed by Jerome, but then
he himself implies that his catalogue is far from
complete (Vit. Ill. 81). On the other hand, it is
directly mentioned by Socrates (H. E. i. 1, v.
22) and largely used by writers of the 5th cen-
tury, and it bears manifest traces of Eusebius's
own. Photius also gives an account of it (Bibl.
127), styling it eis Konstantinon tou megan
basileia ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη
ekklesiastikeuparhion. Eusebius
does not profess to give a complete or general
biography of Constantine. He distinctly states
that he intended to pass over his military exploits
and his legislative enactments, and to confine
himself to the religious life (μην επελθη

quence of language befitting a panegyric, as if he were pronouncing an encomium, than to the accurate narrative of the events which took place." But with all this there is no ground for suspecting him of misrepresenting the facts. Suppression rather than invention is the fault of the work. He has given us no shadow in his portrait, and Constantine's character was marked with some very dark lines. With this important qualification, his biography has the highest value. It is a vivid picture of certain aspects of a great personality, painted by one who was familiarly acquainted with him and had access to important documents. It may be fulsome and maudlin in its fulsome ness; but flattery is a word quite out of place. Flattery cannot pierce the sealed grave; and the language which he uses of the reigning sovereign does not overstep the bounds of the conventional homage expected in those ages from a loyal subject. It may even be set down to the credit of Eusebius that his praises of Constantine are much louder after his death, than they ever were during his lifetime. In this respect he contrasts favourably with the meanness of Seneca in blackening the memory of the very sovereign whom a short time before he had extolled to the skies. Nor shall we do justice to Eusebius if we endeavor to find in his lavish praises which even heathen panegyrist lavished on the great Christian emperor before his face, as an indication of the spirit of the age. But after all excuses made, this indiscriminate praise of Constantine is a reproach from which we should gladly have held Eusebius free.

In his work on the council (he seems to be referring to his other writings, Eusebius has had no scruple in repeating himself. Some chapters are taken from the Ecclesiastical History; others from the Tricon- nial Oration; others again from the Theophania; but by far the greatest part of the work is new. Its most valuable portions are the letters and speeches of Constantine, and the author's personal reminiscences of Marcius. The headings of the chapters occasionally contain information which is not in the chapters themselves (e.g. iv. 44, where the name of Marcius is given). They must therefore have been added by some one acquainted with the facts, and presumably a contemporary. If the reasons given for Valois's doctrine of the inerrancy of Eusebius' tradition (xxxvi. 28) hold, we may naturally attribute them to his successor Acacius, who inherited his papers and may possibly have published the Life of Constantine as a posthumous work.

This work was first printed by Stephens with the Ecclesiastical History (A.D. 1548). It was also published with the same by Valois, and by Reading after Valois. Heinichen's first edition (Lipsiae, 1850) was independent of the Ecclesiastical History; but in his later revision of his work (A.D. 1869) it is included with the latter in the Scripta Historica of Eusebius (see above, p. 327). Various opinions respecting the date of the work exist. Engels (Hist. eccl., xiii. p. 746) attached to his notes (iii. p. 754). Phiotus (Lc.) criticizes it as too florid (ἀφθορίας) and forced (μεθάρμασθα) in style.

B. APOLLOGETIC.

(7) Against Hierocles [Op. iv. 795]. This work is not named by Jerome, but was read by Photius, EBZ 39. Hierocles was governor in Bithynia, and used his power ruthlessly to embitter the persecution which he is thought to have instigated (Lactant. Div. Inst. v. 2; Mort. Pers. 16; see Mason, Persecution of Diocletian, pp. 58, 108). If he was the same Hierocles who in the later years of the persecution ruled in Egypt, Eusebius had himself been an eye-witness of his cruelties (Mort. Pal. p. 18, ed. Cureton; comp. H. E. viii. 9). At all events he alludes in this work to the judicial functions of his adversary (c. Hieroc. 20, p. 524, τὰ δικαίωμα καὶ καθάλων δικαιώματα περιηγούμενος). But Hierocles, not satisfied with assailing the Christians from the tribunal, attacked them also with his pen. The title of his work, which consisted of two books, seems not to have been Ἔλλαθαι ἄριστος, as it is most commonly given after Pearson (p. 584), but Ἔλλαθαι simply, 'The Lover of Truth,' for Eusebius so styles it again and again (§ 1 twice, 4 several times, 14, 17, 25, 34, 36). It is not against his diocletianus [Div. Inst. v. 2, not contra Christiainos [καὶ Ἡρωδεαν], as if he were attacking enemies, but ad Christianos [πρὸς Χριστιανοὺς], as if he were reasoning with friends. Nevertheless it was a ruthless assault on Christianity, written in a biting style. Its main object was to expose the errors of the Christians, through an exaggerated account of the results of standing records. With this main part of the work however Eusebius does not concern himself. He says (§ 1) that it is shamelessly plundered, sometimes even verbatim, from previous assailants of Christianity like Celcus; that when the time comes it may perhaps be met by a special refe-

ence of the work (he means to say that he is too busy to treatise against Porphyry, which he had either begun or projected at this time); and that meanwhile it had been virtually refuted by anticipation in Origens work. He therefore confines himself to one point—the comparison of Apollonius, as described in his Life by Philo-
stratus, with our Saviour, to the disparagement of the latter. There is much diversity of opinion whether Philostratus himself intended to set up Apollonius as a rival to the Christ of the Gospels (APOLLONIUS OF TYANA), but Hiero-

cles at all events turned his romance to this use. On this point alone (which, by the way, is brought forward also by the philosopher Porphyry, whom Marcius refutes), does Eusebius credit Hierocles with originality.

Eusebius refutes his opponent with great moderation, and generally with good effect. He allows that Apollonius was a wise and virtuous man, but he refuses to concede the higher claims advanced on his behalf. He shows that the work of Philostratus was not based on satis-
factory evidence; that the narrative is full of absurdities and contradictions; and that the moral character of Apollonius as therein portrayed is far from perfect. For this purpose he takes the eight books in succession, fastening on such points as serve his purpose. He maintains that the supernatural incidents, if they actually occurred, might have happened, might have been invented, or invented by men of meaner minds. At the conclusion (§ 46—48) he refutes and denounces the fatalism of Apollonius, as alone sufficient to discredit his character for wisdom. The book begins, "Well then, dear friend, is it not right?" as if it had been attached to something which went before. But this mode of ex-

pression is perhaps assumed to give it an air of
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case. The work is correctly described by Photius as "a short treatise in refutation of the arguments of Hierocles in favour of Apollonius of Tyana" (ἀποκαταστάσεως βιβλίαδι πρὸς τὸν ὑπὸ Ἀπολλονίου τοῦ Τύανη Ἱεροκλῆς λόγον), and the titles in the MSS are to the same effect. It was probably one of the earliest works of Eusebius.

This treatise was first published by Alstus (Venet. 1592) with Philostratus's Vida Apollonii. It has been several times printed together with the work of Philostratus. The most convenient of recent editions are those of Gaisford, Eusebii Pamphili contra Hieroclem et Marcilium Libri (Oxon. 1852), and Kayser, Flavii Philostrati Opera, i. p. 369 sq. (Lipsiae, 1870, Teubner). An important aid is Pearson's Prolegomena in Hieroclem, reprinted in his Minor Works, ii. p. 575 sq.

(8) Against Porphyry (κατὰ Πορφύριον), an elaborate work in twenty-five books: Hieron. Epist. 70 ad Magn. 3 (i. p. 427, Vallarsi), Vir. Ill. 61. In the latter passage indeed the printed text is required much by the alteration of η ἀμακενοντικὴν τουτεστάτων πεπερατωμένην," but all Vallarsi's MSS "mio consensu" read "libri viginti quinque," omitting the other words. This accords with the notice in Epist. 70. The vulgar text therefore must be regarded as a later alteration, perhaps due to some confusion with another refutation of Porphyry by Apollinaris, which did contain thirty books and is mentioned elsewhere by Jerome in connexion with Eusebius. The alteration however is earlier than the Greek version of Sophronius, which agrees with the vulgar text. The work of Porphyry, which the treatise undertakes to refute, comprised fifteen books, and was the most formidable of the heathen attacks on the Biblical records: see Eldad, de Vit. et Script. Porph. c. xi. p. 273 sq. (reprinted in Fabric. Bibl. Græcæ. iv. p. 207 sq. c. 1); Tillemont, Empereurs. iv. p. 74 sq.; Fabric. Bibl. Græcæ. v. p. 746 sq. (ed. Harles); Neander, Gesch. der Kirche. (5. ed. p. 530 sq. (Bohn); Kellner in Theod. Quartalschr. xxvii. p. 60 sq. (1865). The ablust part of the work seems to have been the assault on the authenticity of Daniel in the 12th and 13th books, and to this Eusebius replied in the 18th, 19th, and 20th books of his refutation: Hieron. Comm. in Dan. passim. "In the same book," says Eusebius, "he treats of the use of the New Testament." For the correspondence of position in the attack and reply seems to show that Eusebius took the arguments of Porphyry in order from beginning to end.

It is strange that, though Eusebius again and again quotes from this very work against Christianity (H. E. vi. 19; Proph. Ev. i. 9. 20 sq.; v. 2 9 sq.; x. 9. 12), and elsewhere, when referring to other works by Porphyry, describes him as the author of this attack on the Christians (Proph. Ev. iv. 6. 2; v. 5. 4; vi. 36. 5; Den. Ev. iii. 7. 1), yet he never once (so far as I remember) mentions his own refutation. His silence may be explained with Valois by supposing that this refutation was written after these works in which Porphyry is mentioned, i.e. after A. D. 325. On the other hand, we have seen that he was already contemplating some such work at a much earlier date when he wrote his tract against Hierocles. The project would have been long delayed, and meanwhile he may have come to regard Porphyry as a foeman worthier of his steel than Hierocles. At all events there were personal circumstances, irrespective of the importance of Porphyry's work, which would lead Eusebius to notice it. He constantly speaks of Porphyry as a contemporary (δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν, H. E. vi. 19; Proph. Ev. i. 9. 20; iv. 6. 2; v. 2. 9), though he appears to have died in the very earliest years of the century. Porphyry was an Eastern, a native of Batanes, and had studied at Caesarea itself. If Socrates may be believed (H. E. iii. 23), he was at one time a Christian, but having received blows from some Christians, he apostatized in vexation at this treatment. This however is a typical story, which is reproduced in various forms of others, so that no weight attaches to it. On the other hand we have it on Porphyry's own authority (quoted in Euseb. H. E. vi. 19) that when young he had known Origen, and, as we may infer, had been his pupil. His disparagement and misrepresentation of this father, whom Eusebius regarded as the greatest of the ancient philosophers, is a reflection upon an admirer of Origen to refute the work in which the depreciation and misrepresentations occurred (see Euseb. H. E. i. c.).

It is strange that no part of this elaborate refutation has survived. Yet we may form some notion of its contents from the Propratio and Demonstratio Evangelica, in considerable portions of which Eusebius obviously has Porphyry in view, even where he does not mention him by name. To Jerome and Socrates the refutation of Eusebius seemed satisfactory. Philostorgius (H. E. viii. 14) preferred the similar work of Apollinaris to it, as also to the earlier refutation of Methodius. He himself however was induced to add another to these writings against Porphyry (H. E. x. 10). All the four refutations alike have perished, with the work which gave rise to them.

(9) Propratio Evangelica (Προπρατησις Ἐφηκτικας) [Op. iv. 9]. These two treatises in fact are parts of one great work. They are both dedicated to Theodotus, bishop of Lodoleis in Syria (Proph. Ev. i. 1. 1 below εὐαγγελιαν χρησα, an adherent of the Arian party, who held this see for some thirty years.

Various opinions have been held as to the time when these works were written. These have sometimes been based on erroneous data. Thus in Den. Ev. xii. 13. 17, Eusebius has been supposed to refer to his History, but S. Augustin, l. c., there means "my personal investigations." Thus again in two passages in the H. E. i. 3. 6, he has been understood as referring to the Demonstratio; but the first reference is certainly to the Elogia Propheticae, and the second would be satisfied as well by H. E. vii. 7. 34. 45 (p. 149 sq.) as by Den. Ev. viii. 2. Thus it is indeed a direct reference to the Quaestiones ad
Stephanus in Dem. Ev. vii. 3. 18; but the difficulties which beset the date of that work and the existence of a cross reference in it to the Demonstratio (see below, p. 338) deprive this notice of any value. All these notices falling us, we have recourse to the allusions to contemporary events. In Dem. Ev. iii. 5. 76 he says that "the confusion of the name of Jesus is wont to inflame the wrath of the rulers," so that they inflict the severest punishments on the Christians though innocent (comp. iv. 16. 22). This passage seems to have been written before the cessation of the persecution (A.D. 312). On the other hand, in v. 3. 11 he speaks of "churches flourishing (ἀρεσκαλουσι) throughout the world" in language which implies that the Christians then enjoyed peace; and in vi. 20. 17 he describes the enemies of the Gospel in Egypt as plotting to extinguish it, but "being scattered (ἀκαίρως καίρως) by God," language which implies that the tyranny of Hierocles was over, and that the cause of the Church had received a most favorable turn. See Tillemont, vii. p. 23 sq. Again, Praxip. xii. 10. 5 alludes to the persecution in language which seems to show that it had not long ceased (εἰσελθεῖν δὲ τὴν σειρά). On the other hand, Praxip. x. 9. 11 contains a direct reference to the Chronicle and this may perhaps be regarded as a reference inserted after the MSS. were published. See the two editions of the Chronicle (see above, p. 322). In the absence of more direct testimony therefore, we may infer that these works were begun during the persecution, but not concluded till some time after.

The Preparation is extant entire and comprises fifteen books. It is introduced by Jerome (l. c.), and by Photius (l. c.), who both give the number of the books. The Demonstratio on the other hand is incomplete. It consisted originally of twenty books (Hieron. l. c., Photius Bobb. 10). Of these, only the first ten are extant in the MSS., but an extract from the fifteenth was discovered and published by Mai (Script. Vet. Nov. Cl. i. 2, p. 173) from a commentary on Daniel; and Jerome, Comm. in Hos. praef. (Op. vi. p. xxiii), refers to the eighteenth. In the older editions the beginning of the first book and the end of the tenth are mutilated. The missing portions of these two books were first supplied by J. A. Fabricius (Delt. Argum. etc. Hamburgi, 1739) from a MS. in the possession of Mourovratoci, prince of Wallachia. Nicephorus Callistus (H. E. vi. 37) gives ten as the number of books, so that it was already mutilated in his time. There is, so far as I am aware, no evidence that these works were translated into Syriac. They are not mentioned in Eusebius, and may be regarded as the most complete version of all the Greek books of the Theophanes, where the apologetic of Eusebius is given in a shorter form, satisfied the demands of the Syrian Church.

The Preparation begins with a preface, which serves as an introduction to the whole work. It sketches briefly what the Gospel is, and then advances to the main subject, that the Christians accept their religion by faith without investigation. The whole work is an answer to this taunt. Taken in conjunction with the opening chapters of the Demonstratio, this introduction conveys an adequate idea of the design of Eusebius. The object of the Preparation is to justify the Christians in transferring their allegiance from the religion and philosophy of the Greeks to the sacred books of the Hebrews. The object of the Demonstratio is to show from those sacred books themselves that they did right in not stopping short at the religious practices and beliefs of the Jews, but adopting a different mode of life. Thus the Preparation is an apology for Christianity as against the Gentiles, while the Demonstratio defends it as against the Jews, and "yet not" he adds, "against the Jews, nay, far from it, but rather for the Jews, if they would learn wisdom" (ὁ ... κατὰ Ἰουδαίους, κατὰ, κατα, τὸ αυτοῦ τούτου νοέως, τὸ νοέως τούτου). Thus the two treatises form one comprehensive work. It is a justification of the anomalous position of the Christians, so unintelligible to the ancient world, with which religion was essentially a matter of nationality and patriotism, and appearing to them as "a novel route through a trackless waste, descrying the paths of Jewish and Greek alike" (Praxip. i. 2. 9). At κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπάγων ἐντὸς τοῦ Ἱουδαίου πολέμου. Accordingly the writer on his part "invokes the aid of the God of all alike, whether Jews or Greeks," in the Saviour's name to assist him in his task (Dem. Ev. i. 1. 19). He claims originality for his comprehensive plan, as contrasted with the partial labors of his predecessors and exegetes (Praxip. Ev. i. 3. 4). It is a challenge thrown down to the whole non-Christian world.

Of the contents of the Preparation a summary is given at the beginning of the last book (v. i. 1–7). In the first, second, and third books he attacks the mythology of the heathen, refutes the absurdity, and refutes the physiological interpretations put upon the myths; in the fourth, fifth, and sixth, he discusses the oracles, and connects therewith the sacrifices to demons and the doctrine of fate; in the seventh, eighth, and ninth, he passes on to "the Hebrew Oracles," explaining their bearing, and reduces the testimony of heathen writers in their favour; in the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth, he remarks on the plagiarisms of the Greek philosophers from the Hebrews, dwelling on the priority of the Hebrew Scriptures, and shews how all that is best in Greek teaching and speculation agrees with them; in the fourteenth he directs attention to the contradictions among Greek philosophers, pointing out how those systems which are opposed to Christian belief have been condemned by the wisest Gentile philosophers themselves; and lastly, in the fifteenth, he exposes the falsehoods and errors of the Greek systems of philosophy, more especially the Peripatetics, the Cynics, and the Stoics, and makes the version of all the schools. He thus considers that he has given a complete answer to those who charge the Christians with transferring their allegiance from Hellenism to Hebraism blindly and without knowledge.

In the Demonstratio, the first and second books are against the Jews (Dem. Ev. i. 1. 1. 14–15. In the first a sketch is given of the Gospel teaching, and reasons are alleged why the Christians, while adopting the Hebrew Oracles, should depart from the Jewish mode of life; a distinction being drawn between Hebraism, the religion of all godly men from the beginning, and Judaism, the temporary and
special system of the Jews, so that Christianity is a continuation of the former, but a departure from the latter. In the second, testimonies are adduced from the prophets to show that the two great phenomena of the Christian Church had been foretold long ago—the general gathering of the Gentiles and the general falling away of the Jews—so that the Christians "were only laying claim to their own" (Ecclesiasticus 1:1). With the third book begins the main subject of the treatise (σύνοψις τῶν βιβλίων). In this third book he promises to speak of the humanity (φιλικά τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) of Christ, as corresponding to the predictions of the prophets; but the topics are introduced in a desultory way (e.g., that Christ was not a sorcerer, that the apostles were not deceivers, etc.) without any very obvious connexion with the main theme, though otherwise this is one of the most important books in the treatise. In the fourth and fifth books he passes on to the divinity of Christ, but time of the crucifixion. What topics were comprised in the remaining ten books has no data for determining, but we may conjecture with Stein (p. 102) that they dealt with the burial, resurrection, and ascension, and perhaps also with the foundation of the Christian Church and the Second Advent. The extinct fragment of the eighth book relates to the four kingdoms of Daniel ii. The reference in Jerome (c. c.) to the eighteenth book speaks of the author as there "discussing some matters respecting the prophet Hosea."

This great apologetic work exhibits the same merits and defects which we find elsewhere in Eusebius. There is the same greatness of conception marred by the same inadequacy of execution, the same profusion of learning combined with the same inability to control his materials, which we have seen in his History. The divisions are not kept distinct; the topics start up unexpectedly and out of season. But with all its faults, this is probably the most important apologetic work of the early church. It necessarily lacks the historical interest of the apologetic writings of the 2nd century; it falls far short of the thoughtfulness and penetration which give a permanent value to Origen's treatise against Celsus as a defence of the faith; it lags behind the Latin apologists in rhetorical vigour and expression. But the forcible and true conceptions which it exhibits from time to time, more especially bearing on the theme which may be briefly designated "God in history," arrest our attention now, and must have impressed his contemporaries still more strongly; while in learning and comprehensiveness it is without a rival. The Preparation exhibits the same wide range of acquaintance with the classical writers of Greece which the History exhibits in the domain of Christian literature. The list of writers quoted or referred to is astonishing for its length (see Fabric. Bibl. Gracc. vii. p. 340). Some of these are only known to us even by name through Eusebius, and of several others he has preserved large portions which are not otherwise extant. The range of his quotations from extant writers may be inferred from the fact that he quotes not less than twenty-one works of Plato, and that there are between fifty and sixty quotations from the Laws alone. It was chiefly the impression produced by this mass of learning which led Scaliger to describe it as "divini commentarii," and Cave to call it "opus profecto nobilissimum" (H. L. i. p. 178).

The first editions of the Greek of the Proparapato and Demonstratio were those of Stephens, A.D. 1544 and A.D. 1545 respectively. The Proparapato afterwards edited by Bengas (Viguier), Paris, 1628, who revised the text, translated the work afresh into Latin, and added notes. The most important edition is that of Gaisford (4 vols., Oxon. 1843), who revised the text and gave a full critical apparatus, reprinting the translation and notes of Viguer. In 1846, Seguier published a new translation with notes. These notes are reprinted in Migne (iii. p. 1457 sq.). The Demonstratio also was edited by Gaisford (2 vols., Oxon. 1852), with critical apparatus and translation. The Latin translation was made by Bernardino Donato, 1498. The most recent text of both the Proparapato and Demonstratio is that of W. Diendorf in Teubner's series, 1887. The Proparapato and Demonstratio are the main subject of a monograph of Haenell de Eusebio Caesariensis Religionis Christianae Defensore (Gottingen, 1843).

(11) Proparapato Ecclesiasticus (Ἐξηγησιακὴν Ἀρθραῖον), mentioned by Photius (Bibl. 11), and—

(12) Demonstratio Ecclesiasticus (Ἐξηγησιακὴν Ἀρθραῖον Ἀνθείου), also mentioned by Photius (Bibl. 12).

The first of these works does not appear to be mentioned elsewhere. The second is named in the Jus Gentium-Romanum (i. iv. p. 586, ed. Leunclav.), but the reference conveys no information as to its contents. Photius merely gives, or rather gave, the number of books in each (the numbers have been obliterated), and adds in the case of the Proparapato Ecclesiasticus, that it contained extracts. Thus we are left to conjecture. The names however, combined with the one fact which Photius does mention, suggest that these two works aimed at doing for the society what the Proparapato and Demonstratio Evangelica do for the doctrines of which the society is the depository. If so, there seems to be an allusion to the Demonstratio Ecclesiasticus in the Proparapato Evangelica (i. 3. 11), where Eusebius speaks of having gathered together in a special work (ἐν ὕσσω Συλλογῇ) the sayings of Christ relative to the foundation of His Church and compared them with the events. In this case we may suppose that those portions of the Theophania (book iv) which relate to this subject were adapted from the Demonstratio Ecclesiasticus just as other portions (book v) are
adapted from the Demonstratio Evangelica (see below, p. 333).

(13) Two Books of Objection and Defence (Ἐλάγχων καὶ Ἀπολογίας λόγως δύο), mentioned likewise by Photius (Bibl. 13). He adds that he also read "two others which, while they varied from the two former in some passages, were the same in all other respects both in the language and in the sentiments." In other words, they were two different editions of the same work, just as we have two editions of the Martyrion of Palestine. This book again is only known from Photius. He tells us that Eusebius in this work "introduces certain difficulties as alleged by the Greeks against our blameless religion (ἡθωρήματι), and solves them well, though not so in all respects" (καλῶς, εἰ καὶ μη ψυχόμενον, ἐκλεκτῶς). Cæs. (Hist. Lit. i. p. 182) strangely supposes that the purport of this work was a defense of himself against the charge of Arianism. This view is quite inconsistent with the language of Photius, which implies that it was an apology for the Christians against attacks of the heathen. The form is illustrated by a similar apologetic work, the recently discovered Apocritica of Macarius Magnes, where the Gentile philosopher alleges his objections and the Christian apologist answers them. The same is true of Eusebius, which mention here is justified. There is no special reference to the book in question. Having spoken of several works in succession by the same author, he adds at the close some general remarks on the style and opinions of the writer himself. There seems to be no discussion of this work in Exe. Theol. ii. 22 (p. 269, Gaissard).

(14) Divine Manifestation (Θεοφάνεια), in five books (Op. vi. 607 sq.). This work is mentioned in the lists of Jerome (Vet. eccl. ii. 81) and Eusebius (Assem. Bibl. Orient. iii. p. 18). It is quoted sometimes in the Catena as Ἐλάγχων θεοφανεία (πρ. p. 609, 618, 643, 655), but elsewhere as Θεοφάνεια simply. The simpler title accords with Jerome and with the heading of the Syriac version. This work was long supposed to be lost, except by Labbe, who believed that the five books of the Theophania mentioned by Jerome were the five extant books against Marcellus, imagining Θεοφάνεια to be a synonym for Ἐλάγχων. Meanwhile it was noticed that certain Catena in the Vienna and other libraries contained extracts purporting to be taken from the Theophania of Eusebius (Fabric. Bibl. Graec. v. p. 408, ed. Harle). At length fragments of the Greek original were published by Mai from Vatican MSS in his Script. Vet. Non. Cat. xvii. 24 (1836). A year later (A.D. 1842) the work was printed entire in a Syriac version by Dr. S. Lee, who in the following year also published an English translation with introduction and notes (Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, on the Theophania, etc., Cambridge, 1845). By the aid of this version, Mai (A.D. 1847) in his Script. Vet. Non. Cat. xvii. 24 (1848) published anew his Greek fragments collected and rearranged, including among them some extracts which he had before erroneously assigned to the commentary on St. Luke. This collection of Greek fragments is reprinted in Migne.

The Syriac MS which has preserved this work is the same which also contains the Martyrion of Palestine, and has been mentioned already (p. 320). As it is dated A.D. 411, and as the Syriac text already contains very many corruptions which point to several stages of transcription (see Lee, p. xiv sq., note, and passim), the version itself was probably contemporaneous, or nearly so, with the original work. The Greek text however had already undergone some few corruptions, as the rendering 'of stone' (= Akrotites) is Theoph. v. 2 (corresponding to ἡλίθος in the parallel passage of the Dem. Ec. iii. 7. 20) shows. The difficulty of rendering the involved and florid sentences of Eusebius into Syriac must have been enormous, and the translator has necessarily used much freedom in unravelling the constructions and reproducing the imagery; but on the whole he has expressed the meaning fairly well. He was not however a complete master of Greek idiom, as e.g. when he renders σαρκα καθαρσαν, said of St. Peter's crucifixion, "after he had died the flesh of Christ, instead of "heads downwards" (v. 31).

The subject of the Theophania is, as its name suggests, the manifestation of God in the incarnation of the Divine Word. The contents of the five books are as follows. (1) An account of the subject and the recipients of the revelation. As against the Nestorians the doctrine of the Incarnation is pressed on the other, the doctrine of the Word of God is insisted upon. His person and working are set forth. The polytheist and the pantheist are alike at fault. The Word is essentially one. His relation to the different grades of creation, and especially to man. The pre-eminence, character, destiny, and work of the Word. Simultaneous with, and necessary to the necessity of the revelation. The human race was degraded by gross idolatry with its accompanying immoralities. The philosophers could not rescue it. Plato had the clearest sense of the truth, and yet even he was greatly at fault. Meanwhile the demons of polytheism had maddened mankind, as we see from the human sacrifices and from the prevalence of wars. The demons too had shown their powerlessness; they could not defend their temples, and they did not force their overthrow. (3) The proof of the revelation. The evidence of its excellency and power as seen in its effects. For this end it was necessary that the Word should be incarnate, and that the earth should again be put to death, and should rise again. The change which has come over mankind in consequence. (4) The proof of the revelation continued. The evidence from the fulfillment of Christ's words—His prophecies respecting the extension of His kingdom, the trials of His Church, the destinies of His servants, and the fate of the Jews. The comparison of the several events of human history; that Christ was a sorcerer and a deceiver, and that He achieved all these results by magic, is discussed and answered.

Eusebius had no hesitation about repeating himself; and the Theophania is a notable example of this freedom from scruple. Large portions of it are treated over again in another work (p. 131, p. 132), and even verbatim in his other works. The coincidences with the Oration on the Triencania of Constantine are perhaps the most striking. Very considerable portions of the first and second books, and some three-fourths of the third book, will be found in this passage. (Comp. Thuc. 1. 2—34 with Lc. 11. § 8—12.)
§ 16; Theoph. ii. 1 sq. with L. C. 13, § 1 sq.; Theoph. ii. 79—81 with L. C. 9, § 2—7; Theoph. iii. 2—9 with L. C. 16, § 1—17, § 15, § 16—14, § 12; Theoph. iii. 45—60 with L. C. 15, § 1—8; besides other coincidences.) The plagiarisms from the Demonstratio are hardly less. The whole of the fifth book, with the exception of the opening chapter and an occasional paragraph here and there, will be found in Dem. Ev. iii. 3—11—iii. 7, 38, though the order is sometimes changed, and the coincidences are not always verbatim. Nor are these the only parallels between the two works. The Procoparatio also contributes its quota (comp. e.g. Theoph. ii. 53—64 with Prosp. Ev. iv. 15, 8—iv. 16, 15), though here the debt is not so large. It has been conjectured above (p. 331) that great parts of the fourth book were taken in like manner from a lost work, the Demonstratio Ecclesiastica.

The date of the Theophania is a matter of some interest. The place of writing is Caesarea (iv. 18), but it was only written after the triumph of Constantine and the restoration of peace to the Church. The persecution is over, and the persecutors have met with their punishment (iii. 20, v. 52). Polytheism is fast waning, and Christianiit is spreading everywhere (ii. 76, iii. 79). Lee however would place it soon after the restoration of peace, mainly on the ground that "whatever portions of this work are found either in the Procoparatio, the Demonstratio Evangelica, or the Oration of Landibus Constantinii, they there occur in no regular sequence of argument as they do in this work, especially in the latter, into which they have been carried evidently for the purpose of lengthening out a speech" (p. xxi sq.). On the relation of our treatise to these other works of Eusebius with which it has matter in common, the settlement of the date must mainly depend; but Lee appears to have misconceived these relations altogether. (1) As regards the Procoparatio and Demonstratio, the phenomena are occasionally such as can hardly be explained otherwise than by their priority to the Theophania. Thus in Prosp. Ev. iv. 16, 9, 10, we have two quotations from different parts of Porphyry (de Abst. ii. 56, followed by vi. ii. 27) in succession. The words at the joining run thus: "But even at the present hour the Loaves and Fishes are offered in the great city at the feast of Jupiter Latialis? And again he (Porphyry) says: From whence even at the present time not only in Arcadia at the Lycana, but in Carthage they all publicly offer human sacrifices to Cronus."

In the Theophania however (ii. 84), though Porphyry's language is repeated word for word, no indication is given that Eusebius is quoting from any one, and the two quotations are run into each other thus; "... of Jupiter Latialis. For even to the present time not only in Arcadia at the Lycanae, etc. The effect of this is so confusing that Lee has entirely misapprehended the meaning. By "the great city" is meant Rome, as the mention of Jupiter Latialis shews, that the two passages of Porphyry refer to two different human sacrifices in localities far apart. But Lee supposes that "the great city" is Megalopolis in Arcadia, and he boldly translates "et in Carthago," i.e. toux Anavulion) "to Jupiter," thus making one sacrifice of the two...
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(15) On the Numerous Progeny of the Ancients (καὶ τῶν καλών ἀδῶνον πολυγυμνιᾶς). The title of this lost treatise is taken from Prav. Ec. vii. 8. 29, where Eusebius mentions it. It is doubtless the same work to which St. Basil refers (de Spir. Sanct. 29, Op. iii. p. 61) as De progeni in antiquis. The place of this work is (καὶ τῶν ἄρχων πολυγυμνιᾶς). The right place for this treatise would seem to be among the apologetic works, since it appears to have aimed at accounting for the normal type of life among the patriarchs and the Jews generally, as seen in polygamy, purely on the basis of the ancient type, which in his own time was regarded as the true ideal of Christian teaching. This practical contradiction starts up again and again in his extant apologetic writings, as a difficulty to be explained. In the reference in the Praeparatio he speaks of having discussed in this work the question of the patriarchs and "their philosophic endurance and self-discipline" (τῶν φιλοσόφων καρπιάς τε αὐτῶν καὶ αυτοκηθείς), whether by way of direct narrative or of allegorical suggestion. The quotation in Basil does not aid us.

C. CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL.

Use will be made of all works directed primarily to the criticism and elucidation of the Scriptures. (16) Biblical Texts. We have seen already (p. 310) how in his earlier years Eusebius was occupied in conjunction with his friend Pamphilus in the production of correct texts of Old Testament Scriptures. A notice connected with this is exhibited in a manuscript of a similar work (V. C. iv. 36, 37). The emperor writes to Eusebius, asking him to provide fifty copies of the Scriptures for use in the churches of his new capital Constantinople, where the Christian population had largely multiplied. The manuscripts must be easily legible and handy for use, they must be written on carefully prepared parchment; and they must be transcribed by skilful calligraphers. He has already written, he adds, to the procurator-general (καθολικός) of the district (τῆς διοικήσεως), charging him to furnish Eusebius with the necessary appliances, and has placed at his disposal two public wagons in order to convey the manuscripts, when complete, to the new metropolis. Eusebius executes the commission. The manuscripts were arranged, he tells us, in ternions and quaternions (τριακόντα καὶ τετρακόντα), and were carefully prepared at great cost. The emperor wrote again, expressing his satisfaction at the manner in which the commission had been executed.

It has been a question whether we have not among our extant MSS some of these very copies which Eusebius supplied to the churches of Constantinople. The only two which can possibly fall within the age of Eusebius are the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. The former however does not answer to the description, for it is clear that they must be written on quaternions or quires of five sheets (see Scrivener’s Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, p. 96, ed. 2). The latter does indeed satisfy this condition (see l.c. p. 88), and Dr. Scrivener (Colation of Codex Sinaiticus, p. xxxiv) thinks it "very credible" that we have here one of the copies prepared by Eusebius for Constantinople, but the locality in which it was found is at all events not favourable to the supposition, and the text in many respects differs too widely from the readings found in Eusebius to encourage this opinion (see Burgus, Last Text Verses of St. Mark p. 238). The library of Caesarea however was an especial resort of transcribers and correctors who were anxious to secure accurate texts of the Scriptures; see e.g. a later hand in a copy of the LXX, instanced by Scrivener (Introduction, p. 53); the original corrector of H of St. Paul’s Epistles (2. p. 158); and the Greek text from which the Harleian use of the corrector, was compiled, St. Clement of Rome p. 234, Appendix.

(17) Sections and Canons, with the Letter to Carpinus prefixed [Opera iv. 1273]. Eusebius explains the origin and method of these sections and canons in the preface to the letter. Ammonius of Alexandria (about A.D. 220) had constructed a Harmony or Diatheke of the Gospels. He took St. Matthew as his standard, and placed side by side with the paragraphs in this evangelist the parallel passages in the other three gospels. The work of Ammonius suggested to Eusebius the plan which he adopted. It was however somewhat different in principle. The great innovation of Ammonius was that St. Matthew alone could be read conti-

This shows him that the 141st section of St. Matthew corresponds to the 50th of St. Mark, to the 19th of St. Luke, and to the 50th of St. John; and the number of verses in the gospels, and finds the parallel passages, Mark vi. 1 sq., Luke iv. 22, John vi. 41, 42.

It will be seen from this account that the numbering of the sections was entirely dependent on the arrangement in canons. A section did not necessarily comprise a single subject complete in itself, as a chapter or a paragraph.
might do. Its length was regulated altogether by the matter which it had in common with one or more of the other gospels. Thus the 1st section of St. Luke extends over eighty-five verses (Luke i. 1–ii. 5), comprising the preface at one end and the account of the taxing with the journey to Bethlehem at the other, because the whole of this part has no parallel in the other evangelists. On the other hand, elsewhere a single verse will frequently be bisectioned, because its different parts stand in different relations to the other gospels.

This fact decides a critical question of some importance. It is common to speak of the arrangement which has been described as Ammonius Sections and Eusebian Canons, as though Eusebius had derived the former from Ammonius and had himself only added the latter. This however is not the natural inference from his own language. He does not say that he borrowed anything from Ammonius, but that his general scheme was suggested by the work of that critic of the common gospels to whom Eusebius owed his own __ερωτήσεις, though he himself adopted a different method (καθ' ευρέαν μεθόδον). The foregoing account shows that the canons and sections were intimately connected, and that the latter were determined altogether by the form. The principle of Ammonius was different, and the numbering of the sections, even so far as regards St. Matthew's Gospel, would not be suggested by his plan, or indeed have been compatible with it. The other gospels he would not be required to divide into sections at all. Mill however (Proleg. p. 123 sq.) falls into the error of ascribing the sections to Ammonius, and he is followed by not a few more recent critics.

The case is correctly stated by Wetstein (Proleg. pp. 68, 69 sq.), by Lloyd (Nov. Test. p. viii sq., Oxon. 1829), and by Westcott (Dict. of the Bible, s. v. N.-w Testament, p. 512); and the reasons for this view are more fully given by Burgon, Life of St. Mark, p. 188 sq.

The primary object of this scheme was to lay the basis of a harmony of the Gospels, or at least to furnish materials for the investigation of questions bearing on the mutual relations of the several evangelical narratives. The fact that it was suggested by the Diatessaron of Ammonius shows how that event which such investigations had for Eusebius is evidently moreover from his own __questiones ad Stephanum et ad Marianum. But Eusebius would find, as later harmonists have found, that it is not easy to draw the line between divergent narratives of the same event or discourse, and narratives of similar events or discourses. Hence, the only safe principle which he could lay down for himself was sufficiently close resemblance (τὰ παραπλησία). Any narrower rule would have obliged him to prejudge numberless doubtful cases, and this apparently he had no desire of doing. This principle however, once adopted, obliged him to admit as parallels references to similar incidents or sayings which no one could regard as different representations of the same thing; e.g. corresponding to the mention of the last passover in Matt. xxvi. 1, 2 (§ 274), we have references not only to Mark xiv. 1 (§ 156), Luke xxii. 1 (§ 290), John xi. 55 (§ 98), which are strictly parallel, but to the previous passovers mentioned by St. John, ii. 13 (§ 20) and vi. 4 (§ 48). In such cases the parallels serve very much the same purpose as our marginal references, and good service has been done by calling attention to these phenomena (Burgon, l. c. p. 298 sq.). But it seems to be an entire misconception to suppose that the sections "are only rightly understood when they are regarded as marginal references," and that the system "is nothing else but a clumsy substitute for what is achieved by an ordinary reference Bible." The main object of Eusebius was to exhibit the mutual relations of the four evangelical narratives; the main object of a reference Bible is to furnish illustrations to individual passages from other sources. The arrangement of the several canons was quite superfluous for this latter purpose; and a far less intelligent man than Eusebius might have seen that, by precluding any references to other parts of the same gospel, his system was very ill conceived for the attainment of such an aim. For the purpose which he had in view, it is very fairly adequate, though not perfect, and it has never yet been superseded by anything (§ 48).

Dean Burgon has pointed out (p. 308 sq.) that in the Syriac MSS generally, even in those of ancient date (e.g. the Medicean MS, written A.D. 586), though the principle of the Eusebian sections and canons is preserved, yet the sub-divisions themselves are not the same (e.g. in St. John there are two hundred and seventy-one sections instead of two hundred and thirty-two); and he even raises the question whether this larger number of sections found in the Syriac MSS may not represent the original arrangement of Eusebius (p. 310). For this latter suspicion there is no ground. The Syriac subdivision was doubtless some later, but comparatively early, readjustment of the Eusebian sections. The Latin sections, which must be as old as Jerome's time, and therefore may be traced further back than the Syriac, are the same as the Greek.

In the Coptic MSS also, so far as I have noticed, the sections correspond to those of the Greek.

The letter to Carpianus was translated into most, if not all, languages in which versions of the gospels were anciently made. For the history of the sections and canons in the MSS see Scrivener's _Intro. to the Criticism of the N. T._ p. 54 sq. and passim. The sections and canons there marked as unauthentic may be of the same family as those of Tischendorf and Tregelles.

(18) Under the head of Biblical exegesis may be ranged several topographical works which were undertaken at the instance of Paulinus, bishop of Tyre.

(a) _Interpretation of the ELamonic Terms in the Hebrew Scriptures (τὰ γενεια ἡ εἰσογγορία ἐνη ἐν τὴν Ἐλλάδα φωνή μεταβαλλόν τὰ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφή κυματίζει ἑβραίοις ὑπόμνημα προφητείας)._ This work, on the departure to Rome of the sick, who with the property of Bishop_...
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(d) On the Names of Places in Holy Scripture

(19) On the Nomenclature of the Book of the Prophets (τοῦ τῶν προφητῶν νόμων χρήσεως) entitling the head of Jerome's version of the Septuagint, entitled in the heading of his version of the Septuagint (Σημείωσις τῶν ονομασιών τῶν Σήμεων τῶν εἰς τῇ διαθήκῃ γραμματίσεως) in his catalogue, where he mentions among the writings of Eusebius a book de Figura Mundi, the Greek being mistranslated.

The treatise, On the Names of Places, like the three which preceded it, is written at the instance of Paulinus, to whom it is dedicated. It professes to give alphabetically the "designations of the cities and villages mentioned in Holy Scripture in their original language" (ἑωρᾷς γένεσθαι τοὺς λόγους τῶν μνημείων πόλεως καὶ χωρίων), together with a description of the locality and the modern names in each case. Its arrangement is based on its relation to Paulinus, as well as for other reasons, we may conjecture that it was a somewhat early work. Jerome indeed in his preface says otherwise; he describes it as written "post decem ecclesiasticos historical libros . . . post temporum canones etc."; but his statement is not absurd. The preface contains no statement of any value. Eusebius himself names other works (the topographical treatises already mentioned) which he had written elsewhere, but not the History and the Chronicle. Jerome interpolates these in his manipulation of Eusebius's preface.

The names of the places are not taken from the LXX, but transliterated with various success from the Hebrew. The letters are given in order, A, B, G, etc.; but in each several letter the words are arranged under the successive books in which they occur, so that the order is not strictly alphabetical. The great value of the treatise consists in the acquaintance which Eusebius had with the geography of Palestine in his own day.

This work had already been translated into Latini by some unskilful hand before Jerome's time, "quidam vir imbutus literis . . . ausus est in Latinam linguam non Latine vertere." The result was so unsatisfactory that he himself undertook a new version. Jerome's however was not a mere translation; he omitted some important notices, and he made several changes. His personal knowledge of Palestine enabled him to do this with effect.

The Topica was first edited by Bonnfrère (Paris, 1851), then by Martianay in his edition of Jerome's works (Paris, 1869), among which it is generally included along with his translation (e.g. by Vallarsi, Op. iii. p. 122 sq.). The two most recent and most critical editions are those of Lassow and Parthey (Euseb. Pamph. Episc. Caes. Onomasticon, etc., Berlin, 1892) and of Lagarde (Onomastica Sacra, Berlin, 1892)."
of the site of the Sepulchre may have been made then, and the buildings, which occupied some years in the erection, may have been begun soon after; but the basilica was not dedicated till A.D. 355 (see above, p. 318). The date of this commentary therefore can hardly be placed much earlier than A.D. 330, and may have been some years later.

This work stands in the first rank of patristic commentaries in point of importance, owing to its superior antiquity and its intrinsic merits. The historical bearing of the several psalms is generally treated sensibly; the theological and mystical interpretations betray the extravagance common to patristic exegesis. The value of the work to ourselves is largely increased by the frequent extracts from the Hexaplaric versions and by other occasional notices respecting the text and history of the Psalter. The author had this advantage over most patristic commentators, that he possessed some acquaintance with Hebrew, though not sufficient to prevent him from falling into mistakes. It is not certain however (as Montfaucon assumes) that he is guilty of a gross blunder when on Ps. cx. (ex. 3, ἐκ γυμνᾶς, his present text has ἐκ ἱματίας) he is compared with the name of the Virgin. There is obviously some clerical error in the context, and it is not at all clear that he himself adopts the view here mentioned. Even if he does, we must not hastily assume that he misunderstood the meaning of the Hebrew הַמָּלֶא from the word "womb." In the whole, the work more implies that there was a prophetic suggestion of the Virgin’s name (שֵׁם) in these Hebrew words. It is in accordance with the completed work of a great mind, the style of which is a blend of the Hebrew and the Greek, with a poetic grace that is almost beyond description. Eusebius was a man of wide and varied interests. This commentary has a great reputation. It was translated into Latin within a very few years of its publication by his namesake Eusebius of Vercellae, who however omitted the parts which he considered heretical (Hieron. l. c.; Euseb. Epist. 112, Op. i. p. 754, "Psalmonum quos apud Græcos interpretari sunt multis voluminibus, primum Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis"). To him doubtless he was greatly indebted in this work.

This commentary had a great reputation. It was translated into Latin within a very few years of its publication by his namesake Eusebius of Vercellae, who however omitted the parts which he considered heretical (Hieron. l. c.; Euseb. Epist. 112, Op. i. p. 754, "Psalmonum quos apud Græcos interpretari sunt multis voluminibus, primum Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis"). To him doubtless he was greatly indebted in this work.

This commentary had a great reputation. It was translated into Latin within a very few years of its publication by his namesake Eusebius of Vercellae, who however omitted the parts which he considered heretical (Hieron. l. c.; Euseb. Epist. 112, Op. i. p. 754, "Psalmonum quos apud Græcos interpretari sunt multis voluminibus, primum Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis"). To him doubtless he was greatly indebted in this work.

This commentary had a great reputation. It was translated into Latin within a very few years of its publication by his namesake Eusebius of Vercellae, who however omitted the parts which he considered heretical (Hieron. l. c.; Euseb. Epist. 112, Op. i. p. 754, "Psalmonum quos apud Græcos interpretari sunt multis voluminibus, primum Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis"). To him doubtless he was greatly indebted in this work.

This commentary had a great reputation. It was translated into Latin within a very few years of its publication by his namesake Eusebius of Vercellae, who however omitted the parts which he considered heretical (Hieron. l. c.; Euseb. Epist. 112, Op. i. p. 754, "Psalmonum quos apud Græcos interpretari sunt multis voluminibus, primum Origenes, secundus Eusebius Cæsariensis"). To him doubtless he was greatly indebted in this work.
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(22) Commentary on St. Luke’s Gospel (εἰς τὸ κεφ. Λουκᾶν εὐαγγ.Λουκᾶ) [Op. vi. 527 sq.].

(23) Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. At least such a work seems to be implied by Jerome’s language, Ep. xlix (Op. i. p. 235 “Origines, Dionysius, Hieremi, Eusebius Caesariensis, Didymus, Apollinaris, last series have epistolary interpretation sunt”), though he does not mention it in his Catalogue. One extract alone, on 1 Cor. iv. 5, appears in Cramer’s Catena p. 75 (repeated p. 477).

(24) Commentaries on other Books of Scripture. Extracts are given from, or mention is made of, commentaries on Matthew (Mai, Bibl. Nov. Patr. iv. p. 10 sqq. 75 316, reprinted by Migne, vi. p. 525; Hebrews (Mai, iv. p. 207, reprinted by Migne, vi. p. 605); and several other books of the Old and New Testaments (see Fabric. l. c. p. 389). It is obvious, however, in such cases the extracts (even when genuine) were taken from continuous commentaries or from other exegetical or dogmatical works of Eusebius. In some instances this is certainly so; e.g. in the case of notes on the gospels, which are extracted in many instances from the Quaestiones ad Stephumon and ad Martinum.

(25) On the Discrepancies of the Gospels (εἰς τὸν Διδωκέων Εὐαγγέλων). Jerome, in his Catalogue (c. 81), mentions among the works of Eusebius a book de Evangeliorum Diaphonias, and elsewhere (Comm. in Matth. l. c. 3, Op. vii. p. 11) he refers to Eusebius as discussing a certain question in libris Διαφωνίων Ἐυαγγελίων. Edebeju also in his list mentions “ libros Solutionis Contradictionum quae sunt in Evangelio” (Assem. Bibl. Orient. iii. p. 18). In the 16th century Latino Latinus wrote that there had been found in Sicily “libri tres Eusebei Caesariensis de Evangeliorum diaphonias,” and it is probable that these were published shortly. But from that time to this nothing has been heard of the Sicilian MS. Mai however discovered in a Vatican MS an epitome of the whole work, which he published in Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. i. 1, p. 1 sq. (1825), and again in Bibl. Nov. Patr. iv. p. 217 sq. (1847). He also added large portions of the unabridged work, which was not again published till the time of Strache on St. Luke (Vat. 1611), together with other fragments from other places, including two in Syriac (from the Vatican MS Syr. 104). These last doubtless belonged to the translation with which Edebeju was acquainted. Some criticisms on Mai’s editing of this work will be found in Burgon, Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark, p. 42 sq.

The work consists of two parts, which form separate works, and are quoted as such:

(i) Questions and Solutions on the Genealogy of the Saviour, addressed to Stephano; in two books [Op. iv. 879 sqq. 933 sqq.]. This work is mentioned by Eusebius in the Demonstratio (vii. 3. 18, 40 τῆς εὐαγγελίων τῶν εἰς τὴν γενεαλογίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἠκολουθήσεως καὶ λήης, where he refers his readers to it for further information. Its title may be inferred from this reference, combined with the heading in the Epitome (p. 879), where it is described as “addressed to Stephen concerning the Questions and Solutions in the Gospel.” It is mentioned also by Nicephorus Callistus (H. E. vi. 37).

(ii) Questions and Solutions concerning the Passion and Resurrection of the Saviour, addressed to Marinius; in one book [Op. iv. 937 sqq. 986 sqq.]. This is the title in Corder, Catena in Joann. p. 456, where it is quoted (see col. 1005, Migne). More commonly it is cited simply τα εἰς τοὺς Ναπερ (col. 1000, 1009, 1012, 1813).

At the beginning of this second work (col. 957), Eusebius says that, having already written two books (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τα τρίαν τὰν εἰς τὴν γενεαλογίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἠκολουθήσεως καὶ λήης, where he refers his readers to it for further information. Its title may be inferred from this reference, combined with the heading in the Epitome (p. 879), where it is described as “addressed to Stephen concerning the Questions and Solutions in the Gospel.” It is mentioned also by Nicephorus Callistus (H. E. vi. 37).

At the beginning of this second work (col. 957), Eusebius says that, having already written two books (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τα τρίαν τὰν εἰς τὴν γενεαλογίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἠκολουθήσεως καὶ λήης, where he refers his readers to it for further information. Its title may be inferred from this reference, combined with the heading in the Epitome (p. 879), where it is described as “addressed to Stephen concerning the Questions and Solutions in the Gospel.” It is mentioned also by Nicephorus Callistus (H. E. vi. 37).
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not a mere abridgment; but sentences are occasionally inserted to make the meaning more clear. There is however some difficulty in ascertaining the relation of the two works, owing to the fact that a writer quoting from the larger work will himself sometimes omit sentences which seem alien to his purpose. The *Questions ad Stephanum* contained two books in its original form, but there is no trace of a division into books in the epitome. It comprises sixteen questions. In the *Questions ad Marium* there are only four questions in the epitome. Mai believes that he has recovered nearly the whole of this latter work (col. 983); but we may reasonably doubt this. The epitome is entitled "A Selection in Brief" (ἐκάλυψις ἐν ὄρθορρυπί); and it may not only have abridged the solutions but omitted some of the questions. In one quotation we are referred to the thirteenth chapter (col. 1009), and a chapter would naturally correspond to a question.

The work professes to be written in answer to questions asked or in the course of the five fragments by Stephanus and Marinus respectively (e.g. col. 882, 892, 893, 925, 937). Where a question is stated anonymously (e.g. col. 1005 ὑποθέσεις μετῆρας), this may perhaps be a change made by the authority who cites the passage of Eusebius. One writer quotes the second part as "the Epistle to Marinos" (col. 1013), but there is no trace of the epistolary form. Who Stephanus and Marinos were, we have no information. Eusebius addresses the former as "his son Stephanus, the most holy [ἐπετράπατον] and studious [γελοιομακάτον] of men" (col. 936); the latter as "his son Marinos, most pruned by him, and most studious" (col. 937). A certain Stephanus held the see of Antioch for a short time after the expulsion of Eustathius (see above, p. 315), being put forward by the Arián party (Soc. H. E. ii. 20; Socr. H. E. ii. 26; Hieron. Chron. i. 192, Schöne). One Marinos appeas St. Ambrose, and another as bishop of Scæba in Palestine, in the lists of the Nicene council.

This work exhibits the characteristic hesitatio of Eusebius in a somewhat aggravated form. Alternative solutions are frequently offered, and he does not decide between them. But it is supported by full quotations, and, often without acknowledgment. Jerome's letters on certain difficulties in the Gospels (Epist. 59, 120) are largely drawn from it. The unacknowledged obligations of Ambrose on St. Luke and of Jerome on St. Matthew are pointed out in an appendix by Mai (Script. Vet. Nov. Col. i. 1, p. 101 sq.). Hierarchy of Pelusium (Epist. ii. 212, p. 220) plagiarizes whole sentences verbatim (col. 957). And so in like manner later writers.

D. DOCTINAL


This work forms the general part of the *Proph. iii. i.* (p. 97, Graec, column 95) (p. 236). The *Prophecetical Extracts* themselves formed the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth books of it, and Eusebius promises to deal in the tenth with the errors of "the godless heresiarchs" (iv. 35). The purport of this lost tenth book may be gathered from certain passages in the extant *Extracts*, especially iii. 9 (restored by Selwyn, Journ. of Philol. iv. p. 277), where he speaks of the Marcionites on the one hand, and the Artemonites, Samosatenes, Ebionites, etc., on the other, as being refuted by the prophet's language (comp. iv. 23). It would form a sequel to the *Extracts* themselves, and in it our author would discuss the false Christology of these heretics, and perhaps also their views of the relation between the Old and New Testaments. Five fragments of this work have been published by Mai (Script. Vet. viii. pp. 95, 100; Bibl. Non. Patr. iv. p. 316), being included in the *Res Sacrae of Leontius* and Joannes, a collection of extracts. These fragments all profess to be taken from different parts (ἐκ τοῦ α', ἐκ τοῦ β', ἐκ τοῦ γ') τῆς α' εἰσαγωγῆς (ἐκ τοῦ δ' is doubly a scriber's error), and are valuable as showing the form of the *Prophecetical Extracts*. Mai explains this to mean the first *Introduction*, and hence concludes that there were two works at least bearing the name. But this is improbable. All the fragments deal with analogous topics, having reference to general principles of ethics, etc., and it is therefore more probable that the "first book of the introduction" is intended, so that ἐκ τοῦ α', etc. will denote the chapters in the book. This work seems to have been a general introduction to the study of the Bible, and, if so, the *Vita Prophetae* would find a fit place in it.

(27) *Prophecetical Extracts* (Προφητικά Ἐκλαμβάνα, or more fully, ἀπερι τοῦ Χριστοῦ προφητικά ἐκλαμβάναι). [Op. iv. 1017 sq.]

The date of this work is fixed approximately by the fact that the persecution is mentioned as still raging (i. 8, p. 26). It must therefore have been written before A.D. 313. On the other hand, it contains a distinct reference to the *Chronicle* (proef. p. 2), but this difficulty may be met by the hypothesis that this valuable extract was taken from a book earlier than the *Chronicle* (see above, p. 322). Our treatise itself is referred to in the *History* (i. 2 ὠικεῖος ἀνατόμημα τὰς περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ προφητικὰς ἑλαμαχάς συναγωγεῖν). It contains extracts of prophetic passages from the Old Testament relating to our Lord's person and work, with explanatory comments, and comprises four books, of which the first is devoted to the historical books of the Old Testament, the second to the Psalms, the third to the remaining poetical books and the other prophets, the fourth to Isaiah. The author's main object, as he explains, is to show that the prophets spoke of Jesus Christ as the pre-existent Word, who is a second cause of the universe and God and Lord," and that they predicted His two advents (pp. 4, 5). Thus the personality of the Logos is the leading idea in his treatment of the prophecies in this work. The prophetic word is actually buttressed until it had been perfected; we probably have known more of his design in undertaking it, and of his
view of its relations to his other works. It was incorporated in his Elementary Introduction, as we have seen (p. 339).

This work was first published by Gaisford (Oxon. 1842) from a Vienna MS; but before this Lambec had given an account of it in his Com. de Bibl. Cascar. Vindob. III. iii. p. 201 (ed. Kollar; see also Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vii. p. 314 sq.), and had identified the authorship from the reference to the Chronicon in the preface, though the MS is mutilated at the beginning, so that the title is wanting. The MS is mutilated in other parts besides, and there are many obvious misreadings. Several emendations are given by the late Prof. Selwyn, who had some thoughts of preparing a new edition, in the Journal of Philology, iv. p. 275 sq. (1872).

Migne's text is merely a reprint from Gaisford.

(28) Defence of Origen (Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ὄρι-γένους). This was the joint work of Pamphilus and Eusebius. The joint authorship is distinctly attested by Eusebius himself (H. E. vi. 33) and by Eusebius as an anonymous writer of the 6th century who collected the Synodical Epistles (Epist. 198), and by Photius (Bibl. 118; comp. 117). This last writer is explicit as regards the portions executed by the two friends. The work, he tells us, comprised six books, of which the first five were written by Pamphilus and the sixth by Eusebius. The sixth was added by Eusebius to complete the work after the death of Pamphilus. The first five books therefore were written a.d. 307-309, and the sixth probably soon afterwards.

Of the authorship then there can be no doubt. But the matter was overclouded by an ignoble controversy which raged at the close of the 4th century. In the year 397 Rufinus, at the request of Macarius, translated the first book of this Apology (Rufin. adv. Hieron. i. 582). In his translation he entitled it a work of Pamphilus, suppressing the name of Eusebius. It is very possible that he was not acting arbitrarily in this, for the name may have been largely due to the work of Pamphilus that the name of Eusebius was not put forward in it. Perhaps the part of Eusebius in this book was confined to the collection and arrangement of the extracts from Origen. At all events, in the version of Rufinus the name of Pamphilus is prefixed to all the explanations which introduce and connect the passages of Origen, and in the prefatory dedication the writer uses the first person singular, "mihi," "habeo," and so also in the body of the work. When Rufinus quarrelled with Jerome he broke out, this was a main charge brought against him by the latter. Jerome maintained that Rufinus was the real author of the work; and that Rufinus had deliberately substituted the name of the honoured martyr for that of the tainted Arius, so as to conciliate his readers and thus recommend the heresies of Origen; and that he had altered the book in parts and introduced more orthodox expressions; c. Rufin. i. 8 sq. (Op. ii. p. 484 sq., Vallarsi), ii. 15 sq. (Op. i. p. 505 sq., ii. 3), iii. 3 (Op. i. p. 511 sq.), iii. 37 (Op. i. p. 563), Epist. 84 (Op. i. p. 531 sq.), Epist. 133 (ib. p. 1031). In his Catalogus (written a.d. 392) Jerome had supposed that Pamphilus and Eusebius had written two separate works in defence of Origen. Of Pamphilus (§ 75) he there says, "scriptavit, antequam Eusebius Casarensis scriberet, Apologicum pro Origeni," while to Eusebius (§ 81) he attributes "Ἀπολογίας pro Ori- gene libri sex." In his controversy with Rufi- nus he excuses himself for this error, pleading that he was misled by the title of Rufinus's translation, and asserting that he had afterwards made diligent search and found the library at Caesarea a copy of this work, which bore the name of Eusebius (c. Rufin. iii. 12). Jerome's treatment of this matter is a painful exhibition of disingenuousness, self-contradiction, ill-humour, and spite. Indeed he can only be acquitted at direct and conscious dishonesty on the suppo- sition of carelessness so gross as to be criminal under the circumstances. His main points are—

(1) That Rufinus tampered with his author to make him appear more orthodox. Here indeed he has a prima facie case. Rufinus elsewhere shews himself anything but an accurate and conscientious translator, being far more careful about the elegance of the version than the meaning of the original, and having no scruple to alter expressions if the fit was upon him. But we have the negative testimony of Photius, who has a keen scent for heresy and yet makes no complaint of this Apology, that it was in the main orthodox in the original Greek, as it is in Rufinus's translation. (2) That Pamphilus cannot have written the book, because in his Life of Pamphilus says that the martyr "ipse quidem propitius operis nihil omnino scrip- sit, excepta epistolae," etc. (c. Rufin. i. 9). But the existence of a work which consisted mainly of extracts from Origen with comments, and of which even thus he was only joint author, is quite reconcilable with this statement. Indeed the very form of the expression in the original, corresponding to "ipse quidem," "propitius," was probably chosen so as to exclude the work of compilation and partnership. (3) That the copy in the Caesarean library bore the name of Euse- bius. What foundation in fact there has been for this statement, we cannot say; but occurring in the midst of so large a body of disingenuous sophistry, it deserves no credit against the distinct statement of Eusebius him- self (H. E. vi. 33), not to mention other well-informed and careful writers. This avowal of Eusebius, by the way, is entirely ignored by Jerome, though he must have known of it. Nor indeed are Jerome's chronological statements easy to explain. The Catalogus was written a.d. 392; the translation of the Apology for Origen by Rufinus appeared not before a.d. 397. Yet Jerome implies (c. Rufin. ii. 23) that he was misled by Rufinus into ascribing the work to Pamphilus, "Euxæbus, ut sit, et ergo discepter fuerat divulgatum." His memory was very short indeed, for he wrote these words about a.d. 402.

The original of this work has perished, but the first book survives in the translation of Rufinus (printed in Origen, Op. iv. App. p. 17 sq. Delarue). Eusebius (H. E. vi. 3) says that the work was undertaken to refute "ępigraphias et iteramasserit," and that no mention is made of certain "imperitiissimi crini- num obtracatores ejus." The person especially meant was probably Methodius, who had written two works against Origen (Hieron. Vit. Ill. 85; Socr. H. E. vi. 13), and was attacked by name.
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in the sixth book of this Apology (Hieron. c. Rufus. i. 11). It was dedicated, as we have seen (p. 312), to the confessors of Palestine, more especially to Patermuthius (Phot. Bibl. 118) who himself suffered martyrdom the year after Pamphilus (Euseb. Mart. Pol. 13). The first book contains an exposition of Origen's principles generally, and then more especially of his doctrines respecting the Trinity and the Incarnation; after which several charges against him are refuted, relating to the nature of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the metempsychosis, etc. In one of the later books the doctrine of fatalism was discussed (Rufin. Apol. i. 11, in Hieron. Op. ii. p. 582). Elsewhere also it was shown that Origen in his mystical explanation of Adam and Eve, as referring to Christ and the Church, only followed the traditional interpretation (Socrat. H. E. iii. 3). In the same spirit precedents were quoted from earlier writers for his doctrines of the pre-existence of the soul and the restoration of all things (Apol. cont. Apol. I.c.). This Apology also contained a full account of the life of Origen from first to last (Phot. Bibl. 118). Eusebius himself refers to the second book for accounts of the controversy which arose about his ordination to the priesthood and of his contributions to sacred letters (H. E. vi. 23), and to the sixth book for the letters which Origen wrote to Fabianus and others in defence of his orthodoxy (H. E. 36), besides elsewhere referring to the work generally for the part taken by Origen in the theological controversies of the time (H. E. vi. 35). Socrates (H. E. iv. 27) also states to sacred letters (H. E. vi. 23), and to the sixth book for the letters which Origen wrote to Fabianus and others in defence of his orthodoxy (H. E. 36), besides elsewhere referring to the work generally for the part taken by Origen in the theological controversies of the time (H. E. vi. 35). Socrates (H. E. iv. 27) also states to sacred letters (H. E. vi. 23), and to the sixth book for the letters which Origen wrote to Fabianus and others in defence of his orthodoxy (H. E. 36), besides elsewhere referring to the work generally for the part taken by Origen in the theological controversies of the time (H. E. vi. 35).

The statement of Praedestinatus (Haruc. i. 43; comp. 42), that Pamphilus in his Apology defended Origen on the ground that the errors laid to his charge were not pronounced by him, but by two heretical namensakes, is unworthy of credit. Moreover, as Pamphilus also represents Origen as asserting that Origen's works were interpolated by the heretics (Haruc. i. 22), but here it is probably confusing Pamphilus with Rufinus. Antipater of Bostra wrote a Refutation of this Apology (Αντίφασις της Εὐσεβίου . . . ἐν τῷ Πρεσβύτῳ ἀπολογίας); see Fabric. Bibl. Græc. ed. Labbe, Conc. viii. p. 706 sqq. A passage of this refutation was read at the Second Council of Nicea A.D. 787 (Labbe, Conc. viii. p. 1017, ed. Collet). It treats Eusebius as the author and does not mention Pamphilus; but for this there was a strong motive. The Apology for Origen is mentioned among the works of Eusebius by Eusebius himself and by the Church (Assem. Bibl. Orient. iii. 19). On this work see Delarue, Orig. Op. iv. 2, p. 3 sqq.; Fabric. Bibl. Graec. vii. p. 301 sqq. (29) Against Marcellus, Bishop of Anycra (καρχαί Μαρκέλλον τοῦ Ὀγγέρας Αὐγάρου), in two books (Op. vi. p. 705 sqq.). The occasion of writing is explained by Eusebius himself (c. Marci. ii. 4, p. 55 sqq.). Marcellus had been condemned of Sabellianism, and deposed by the synod of Constantinople (A.D. 336), which was composed chiefly of the Ariana friends of Eusebius (see above, p. 317). This work was undertaken at the instance of the bishops and people of Anycra, who for this reason justify the decision of the council. Certain persons con-

sidered that Marcellus had been unfairly treated, and as he himself was partly responsible for the decision, he felt bound to uphold his justice. This work aims simply at exposing the views of Marcellus. He describes Marcellus as being moved by envy and hatred to write the book against Asterius, which had drawn upon him the condemnation of the synod (i. 1, p. 1; i. 4, p. 56). "Malicious" he writes (i. 4, p. 59), and hence the errors of Marcellus. He accuses him of seasoning his work with fulsome flatteries of Constantine, and thus attempting, though in vain, to poison the imperial ear (ii. 4, p. 115). The indignation of Eusebius is especially aroused by the attacks which Marcellus had made upon the names of the honoured dead, upon his dear friend "the thrice blessed" Paulinus bishop of Tyre, and upon his great hero, the saintly scholar Origen (i. 4, pp. 38 sqq., 43 sqq., 56). He felt bound in honour also to repel the assaults made upon his namesake Nicomedia, the great Eusebius (i. 4, p. 38 sqq.). This treatment of revered names was aggravated by a personal attack upon himself (i. 4, pp. 52, 57). Accordingly he gives instances of the blunders of Marcellus. He adduces examples of false readings and misquotations (i. 2, p. 24 sqq.). He accuses him of miscalling books, as when he speaks of the Proverbs as "prophecies" (ii. p. 27). He is especially and justly severe upon his exegetical blunders; e.g. when in Zech. iii. 1 he confuses Joshua the son of Josedek with Joshua the son of Nun (i. 2, p. 18 sqq.) or when he interprets the expressions of Col. i. 16 as referring to the Incarnation and human life of Christ (ii. 3, p. 88 sqq.) or when he explains Prov. viii. 22 sqq. in the same way, supposing the "abysses" to be the "hearts of the saints," and the "mountains and hills" to be "the apostles and the successors of the apostles" (ii. 3, p. 91 sqq.) or when, with the same motive, in Ps. cix (cix. 3) he interprets "before the morning star" (LXX) as referring to the star which appeared to the magi. These instances show that the exaggeration of Marcellus was hopelessly bad; and yet Eusebius himself is not from faultless in this respect, e.g. when he understands Gal. iii. 19, 20, to refer to Christ as the mediator at the giving of the law, and thus to the Haran, where however it is entitled without any authority, Contra Pamphilii Apologetam. A passage of this refutation was read at the Second Council of Nicaea A.D. 787 (Labbe, Conc. viii. p. 1017, ed. Collet). It treats Eusebius as the author and does not mention Pamphilus; but for this there was a strong motive. The Apology for Origen is mentioned among the works of Eusebius by Eusebius himself and by the Church (Assem. Bibl. Orient. iii. 19). On this work see Delarue, Orig. Op. iv. 2, p. 3 sqq.; Fabric. Bibl. Graec. vii. p. 301 sqq. (29) Against Marcellus, Bishop of Anycra (καρχαί Μαρκέλλον τοῦ Ὀγγέρας Αὐγάρου), in two books (Op. vi. p. 705 sqq.). The occasion of writing is explained by Eusebius himself (c. Marci. ii. 4, p. 55 sqq.). Marcellus had been condemned of Sabellianism, and deposed by the synod of Constantinople (A.D. 336), which was composed chiefly of the Ariana friends of Eusebius (see above, p. 317). This work was undertaken at the instance of the bishops and people of Anycra, who for this reason justify the decision of the council. Certain persons con-

1) Tillemont however (II. E. vii. p. 48) seems to be in error when he represents Marcellus (c. Marci. i. 4, p. 54 sqq.) as complaining that our Eusebius, when passing through Galatia, had preached heretical doctrine at Anycra. The person intended is Eusebius of Nicomedia, as Zahn (Monumenta Graec. p. 42, note 4) rightly understands the passage.
induced him to write this additional work are explained in a letter to Flaccus, bishop of Antioch, prefixed to it, and in the opening sentences of the work itself. He had thought it sufficient in the first instance merely to expose the opinions of Marcellus, without directly refuting them (Ep. xii. ad Ephesius), thus leaving them to condemn themselves. But on further reflection, fearing lest some might be drawn away "from the theology of the church" by their very length and pretentiousness, he had undertaken to refute them. Just as Marcellus had comprised his prolix work in a single book, as he himself alleged, that it might be a testimony to the unity of God which the Arians impugned, so Eusebius divides his reply into three books, that its very form may be a protest on behalf of the distinct personalities in the Blessed Trinity which Marcellus had confused. He undertakes therefore to shew that not a single Scripture favours the view of Marcellus, but that, according to the approved interpretations, they all are dead against him. Having done this, he will expound the true theology respecting our Saviour, as it has been handed down in the Church from the beginning. Thus, as explained by its author, the aim of this second treatise is refutation with as much facility as possible.

While the first was mainly personal, the second is chiefly dogmatical.

Whatever may be thought of the opinions of Eusebius himself, it can hardly be questioned that he makes good his case against Marcellus. "He shews himself," writes Eusebius (Eccl. Theol. iv. 34), "Jew, "either in the Jew or a Sabellian"; i.e. he is either Ebionite or Monarchian. Accordingly he calls him at one time "a downright Jew" (ib. ii. 2, p. 201), at another "a new Sabellian" (ib. ii. 20, p. 165); and these charges, especially the latter, are flung at him again and again. Though Marcellus himself perhaps did not intend it, his recklessness of language could only be interpreted as maintaining opinions which had a dangerous approximation to these extreme forms of heresy.

The quotations given by Eusebius speak for themselves. At the council of Sardica indeed (about A.D. 344), he was reinstated after making explanations. He had been led into his heretical statements by the arguments of Amphilochius, and the Athenian bishops who were dominant at Sardica would be predisposed to take the most lenient view of one who had suffered in the cause. The synod denounced "the base artifice (κακοτεχνία) of the party of Eusebius"; the statements which Marcellus had made "as an enquirer (A de Γρηγορίου... ὑπακοήν) they had been "accused as if they were "propositions (ἀποκρίσεως) or "teachments (δαβδακληθήσατο)." Athan. Ap. c. Arian. 47 (Op. i. p. 130). Though no direct mention is made of Eusebius of Caesarea (for the person named is, as usual, the bishop of Nicomedia), yet we must suppose that this language was directed, at least in part, against the polemical treatises of the former against Marcellus. But the language of refutation does not meet the facts as they stand out in the extracts of Eusebius; but the bishops of Sardica doubtless read the written treatise by the light of the subsequent personal explanation. When moreover we remember that Basil and Hilary and Chrysostom all condemned Marcellus as heretical, and that Athanasius himself in after years, when questioned on the point by Ephiphanus (Hist. Arm. iv. 4), smiled a significant smile, but said nothing, and is even stated by one authority to have excommunicated him before the more pronounced heresy of his pupil Photinus cast back its light on the teaching of the master (Hilar. Op. ii. p. 639), we shall be the less disposed to allow that Eusebius misread or misinterpreted the extracts which he gives.

Neither of the two works against Marcellus is mentioned by Jerome or by Photius. Socrates (H. E. i. 36, ii. 20, 21) is acquainted with the de Ecclesiastica Theologia, though he does not give it this title, but refers to it as a work in three books "Against Marcellus." Byzant. (H. E. ii. 21) passesages from the first and third books, so that there is no doubt about the identity of the work. Of the previous work Against Marcellus, in two books, he betrays no knowledge; and from his language respecting the other it must be inferred that he was not acquainted with the first two books.

The two treatises were first edited by Bishop R. Montague (Montacutius) with a translation and notes (Paris, 1628) at the end of the Demonstratio, and this edition was reprinted (Lips. 1688). The best edition is that of Gaisford (Oxon. 1852), where they are in the same volume with his "against Photinus." He revised the text and reprinted the translation and notes of Montague. The fragments of Marcellus are collected by Retzbuch (Marcellianus, Götting. 1794). The monographs on Marcellus, especially Zahn's Marcellus von Ancyra (Goths, 1867), are useful aids to the study of these treatises.

(51) On the Paschal Festival [Op. vi. 681]

Eusebius (Vit. Const. iv. 35, 36) states that he addressed to Constantine "a mystical explanation of the significance of the festival" (μεταξύ διάκων τοῦ τῆς λειτουργίας), upon which the emperor wrote in reply, expressing himself greatly delighted, and saying that it was a difficult undertaking, and that it was impossible for him to give a version of the origin of the Paschal festival, as well as its profitable and painful consumption (τῆς τε τῶν πάσχαλ εἰσοδήμως τοῦ ταύτα θεολογίας, where εἰσοδήμως is doubtful correct, though Heinichen prefers εἰσοδήμως,"the controversy"). He added that Eusebius had found no incontestant tradition, nor did he himself, it was impossible for a version to do justice to the original. The work therefore had been already translated into Latin, if we are right in so interpreting the very obscure language of Constantine. This letter was written about A.D. 335. A long fragment of this treatise was discovered by Mai in the Vatican Codex of Hippolytus on St. Luke, containing in a Vatican MS, and published by him not take up this position. He accuses Marcellus of denying the pre-existence, not of the Word of God, but of the Son of God, before the Incarnation; and this distinction between the Word and the Son is the very point of the controversy.
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(see Lib. Nov. Patr. iv. p. 208). From a comparison it appears that some portions of this fragment had been already published by Cordelius in a Latin version of his own in his Catena on this evangelist. There can be no doubt about the identity of this with the work mentioned above, as it corresponds to the description given by Eusebius and Constantine. The recovered fragment contains—(1) A declaration of the figurative character of the Jewish Passover. (2) An account of its institution and of the ceremonial itself. (3) An explanation of the typical significance of the different parts of the ceremonial, with reference to their Christian counterparts. (4) A brief statement of the settlement of the question at Nicaea. (5) An argument showing that Christians are not bound to observe the time of the Jewish festival, mainly on the ground that it was not the Jewish Passover which our Lord Himself kept.

Of this treatise Jerome makes no mention in his list of the works of Eusebius (Vit. Ill. 61); but in another occasion, when speaking of Hippolytus, he states that Eusebius "composed a canon for the Paschal festival, a cycle of nineteen years, that is, an eunachadakia." The bearing of this notice on the transactions of the council of Nicaea has been already discussed (p. 315). Here it is sufficient to say that, though it cannot be claimed that the council of Constantinople itself contained anything of the kind, this cycle is very likely to have found a place in it, either as an appendix or as the body of the work.

E. ORATIONS AND SERMONS.

(32) At the Dedication of the Church of Tyre. This oration is inserted by Eusebius in his History (i. 4). In this way it has been preserved. The oration which it bears in the MSS (whether due to Eusebius himself or not, we cannot say) is, "Panegyric on the Building of the Churches, addressed to Paulinus, Bishop of the Tyrians." The circumstances under which it was delivered has been already mentioned (p. 317). The new basilica of Tyre was one of the most important and splendid buildings which arose after peace was restored to the Church; and Eusebius seizes the occasion to emphasize the greatness of the epoch. He addresses Paulinus as a Bezaleel, a Solomon, a Zerubbabel, as a new Aaron or Melchizedek, the forerunner of the predictions of the Jewish prophets foretelling the rebuilding of the temple and the restoration of the polity. He pours out his thanksgiving for the triumph of Christ, the Word of God, who has proved mightier than the mightiest of kings. This magnificent temple, which has arisen from the ruins of its predecessor, is a token of His power. Then follows an elaborate description of the building itself. This material building, constitutes the orator, is a symbol of the spiritual church of Tyre, of the spiritual Church throughout the world, in its history, its overthrow, its desolation, its re-erection on a more splendid scale, as well as in the arrangement of its several parts. But the spiritual Church on earth is itself only a faint image of the heavenly Zion, where the adoring hosts sing the praises of their King without ceasing.

(33) At the Vicennalia of Constantine (Αβγος τεκαυνανφευδος), A.D. 325. This oration, which is preserved, is mentioned Vit. Const. prom. iii. 11. It seems to have been the opening address at the Council of Nicaea, as stated above, p. 313.

(34) On the Sepulchre of the Saviour, A.D. 335. It is mentioned, Vit. Const. iv. 33, 46 sq. The circumstances under which this oration was delivered are already described, p. 318. Eusebius (V. C. iv. 47) promises to append it to his Life of Constantine; but if he ever fulfilled his promise, it has been discovered and is lost.

(35) At the Tricennalia of Constantine (Αβγος τεκαυνανφευδος), A.D. 335 or 336 [Op. ii. 1315]. This is the work commonly called de Laudibus Constantini. Eusebius promises to append it (with the oration last mentioned) to his Life of Constantine (V. C. iv. 46); and accordingly it is found at the end of the MSS of this work, where it bears the title εις Κωνσταντινον του βασιλεος τεκαυνανφευδος. It is mentioned also in the preface to the same work. The circumstances under which it was delivered have been already given, p. 317 sq. As on other similar occasions, when the orations of the orator were used for the communication of theological teaching, more especially from the apologetic side. Referring to this speech, he describes himself in one passage as "weaving triennial wreaths of words" and "crowning the sacred head" of the emperor therewith (V. C. proem.), in another as "an authenticon of the universal King" (V. C. iv. 46). The two passages combined justly describe the purport and contents of the oration. It falls into two parts, of which the first (§§ 1–10) has a more special reference to the emperor and the festival, while the second (§§ 11–18) is a theological exposition on the person and work of the Logos. There is this difference also, that, whereas in the first part Constantine is spoken of throughout in the third person, in the latter part he is directly addressed. In a MS in the library of Trinity College Cambridge (f. 9, 6), where this oration appears by itself (without the Life of Constantine), the two parts are separated; and the heading is repeated before the second. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the two parts were delivered at separate times. Though the second part forms no unifor sequel to the first, and was doubtless written with this view, yet each part is complete in itself.

The oration, taking account of the festival, begins to speak of the Almighty Sovereign, and the Divine Word through whom He administers the universe (§ 1). The emperor is a sort of reflection of the Supreme Word. The monarchy on earth is the counterpart of the monarchy in heaven (§§ 2, 3). The Word is the interpreter of the invisible God in all things (§ 4). An emperor who is sensible of his dependence on God, like Constantine, is alone fit to rule (§ 5). Periods and divisions of time are from God, as is all order throughout the universe. The number thirty (3 × 10) has a special significance in the language of symbolism. It reminds us of the kingdom of glory (§ 6). The powers of wickedness, and the sufferings of the saints, were ended by Constantine, the champion and representative of God (§ 7). He waged war against idolatry, prodigality, and superstition (§ 8). What a change has been suddenly wrought! The false gods did not foresee their fate. The emperor, armed with piety, advanced against them, and overthrew them: Churches rise from the ground
everywhere (§ 8). The truth is proclaimed far and wide (§ 9).

"Come now (ἕτος ἀλήθεια), most mighty victor Constantine," says the orator, "let me lay before thee the mysteries of sacred doctrines in this royal discourse concerning the Supreme King of the Universe." Accordingly he proceeds to speak of the person and working of the Divine Word, as the mediator in the creation and government of the universe. The error of polytheism is condemned. As God is one, so His Word is one (§§ 11, 12). Humanity, led astray by demons and steeped in ignorance and sin, needed the advent of the Word (§ 13). It was necessary that He should come clothed in a body (§ 14). His death and resurrection also were indispensable, that He might accomplish the redemption of men (§ 15). The power of the Divine Word was evinced by the establishment of the Church and the spread of the gospel (§ 16). It was manifested in our own time by the faith of the martyrs, which triumphed over the opposition, and by the punishment of the persecutors themselves (§ 17). We have evidence of the divine origin of our faith in the prophetic announcements of Christ's coming, and in the fulfillment of His own predictions; more especially in the coincidence in time between the establishment of the Roman empire and the publication of the Gospel (§ 18).

Nearly the whole of the 8th chapter, describing Constantine's suppression of the prodigies of pagan worship, appears word for word in Vit. Const. iii. 54, 55. Eusebius may have been already engaged on his Life of Constantine, where he draws from this source to which this oration was delivered. Again, the theological portion of the speech reappears almost verbatim, though with great differences in the arrangement, in the Theophania. The inference from this fact has been already stated, p. 392 sq.

(36) In Praise of the Martyrs. The catalogue of the Assyrians. (Assem. ii. p. 184) attempted to show that this work was an account of the Eastern (i.e. Persian) martyrs, as the other was of the Western (i.e. Palestinian); but the language of Ebedjesus ("also a History of Constantine; but a speech of their praises") will not admit this interpretation. The question however is set at rest by the discovery of the discourse itself in a Syriac version. It is preserved in the same MS (dated A.D. 411), which contains also the Theophania and Martyrs of Palestine (Wright's Cat. Syr. MSS Brit. Mus. p. 639), where it is inserted in the 5th book. The reference to the martyrdom of Antiochianus (Fabianus), Cyrilus, and Babylas, so that it would seem to have been delivered at Antioch.

(57) On the Failure of Rain, mentioned by Ebedjesus (l.c.), but apparently not elsewhere.

Its theme may have been the incident of 1 Kings xvii, xviii, or perhaps some contemporary event.

F. LETTERS.

(38) To Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, &c. (39) To Theophania (correctly written improve the orthography), bishop of Balanse in Syria, a strong opponent of the Arians (Athana. de Fug. p. 324, Hist. ar. ad Mon. 3, p. 424), who was present at the Council of Nicaea. Theophania refers to this letter as considering it to be true that Christ is not true God (Iren. Synod. 17, p. 483). An extract containing the passage read at the Council of Nicaea is quoted at the Second Council of Nicaea (l.c.). It insists strongly upon the subordination of the Son.

(40) To Constantia Augustae (Op. 23, 1543), the sister of Constantine and the wife of Licinius, who was closely allied with the Arians (Constantia). Two fragments of this letter are preserved in the proceedings of the Second Council of Nicaea, act. viii (Labbe, Conc. viii. p. 324 sq.), and many more in the Anti-Rhetorics of Nicephorus the Patriarch (iv. 3 sq. in Spicil. Solesm. p. 233 sq.), who took an active part against the Iconoclasts. From the quotations in this latter writer we learn of a letter to Constantia which was written together by Boivin in his notes to Niceph. Gregor. Hist. Byz. xii. 3 (see i. p. 1301 sq., ed. Bonn), from which it is reprinted in Spicil. Scolae. i. c., and by Migne, Op. ii. p. 1544. It seems to be nearly complete, wanting little besides the beginning and end. There is no ground for questioning its genuineness, though this is done by Petavius, Theol. Dogm. de hier. xv. 14. 9, and by Lee (Theophania p. 110), who attributes it to Eusebius of Nicomedia. Constantia had asked Eusebius to send her a certain likeness of Christ, of which she had heard. He refused her for making the request, saying that such presence and image are intrinsic to themselves, and tend to idolatry. He states that a foolish woman (μετάληθη) had brought him two likenesses, which might be philosophers, but were alleged by her to represent St. Paul and the Saviour. He did not know how she had come by them; but he had detained them lest they should prove a stumbling-block to her or others. He tells Constantia that the letter declares his intention of "knowing Christ as long as the flesh." This noble letter has done more than any of his writings to injure his reputation. It was adduced by the Iconoclasts in their favour, and their opponents were thus provoked to rake up all the questionable expressions in his writings, and they might blacken his character for orthodoxy.

(41) To the Council of Caesarea (Op. ii. 1535), written from Nicaea (A.D. 325) during or immediately after the council to vindicate his conduct. This letter is preserved by Athanasius as an appendix to the de Deorit. Syn. X. (Op. i. p. 187; comp. § 3, ib. p. 190); in Socrates, H. P.
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18; in Theodoret, H. E. i. 11; in Gelusius Cyz. Hist. Conc. Nic. ii. 34 sq. (Labbe, Conc. ii. 264 sq. ed. Collet); in the Historia Tripartita, ii. 11; and in Nicemonus, H. E. viii. 22. On the question, whether it was appended to his work by Athanasius himself, see Cave, Hist. Lit. i. p. 179. The occasion and contents of this letter have been discussed already (p. 313). Gelusius (H. C. N. ii. 34 col. 3) says "the original letter". On the other hand Theodoret (l. c.) speaks of it as addressed "to certain persons holding the opinions of Arius." Athanasius (l. c.) however describes it as addressed "to his own church," and so too Socrates, "to the people under him." To the Caesareans doubtless it was written. A passage towards the end of the letter (§9, 10), which savours strongly of Arianism, is wanting in Socrates and in the Historia Tripartita, but appears in the other authorities, and seems certainly to be referred to by Athanasius in two places (De Decr. Syn. Nic. 3, l. c.; de Synod. 13, Op. i. p. 561). It is condemned however by Bull (De Hist. Nic. iii. 9, 3), and by Cave (Dict. Eccl. in Joh. Cleric. p. 58, printed at the end of his Hist. Lit. vol. ii.), as a spurious addition, probably inserted by some Arian. The letter is translated and annotated by Dr. J. H. Newman in Select Treatises of St. Athanasius p. 59 sq. (Oxford, 1853).

In the proceedings of the Second Nicene Council act. vi (Labbe, Conc. viii. 1145), mention is made of "all the letters" of Eusebius, as though a considerable number were then extant. Gelusius of Cyzicus (H. C. N. ii. 1) speaks of a letter which he addressed to the assembly of orthodox bishops in defence of his views; but he is doubtful in error, as no such document is mentioned elsewhere.

In addition to those works of which an account has been given, several other writings are extant, either whole or in part, which claim Eusebius of Caesarea as their author. In 1643 Sirmoul published in Latin fourteen Opuscula ascribed to Eusebius, and they have been many times reprinted (op. vi. 1047, Migne). They are discussed by Tillemon, vii. p. 61 sq.; comp. also Fabric. Bibli. Grav. vii. p. 406 sq. The most important of these are two books, or rather hemiclises, Against Sabellius. Cave (H. L. i. p. 183) prefers assigning them to Eusebius of Caesarea, or rather to Eusebius von Evessa (etc., p. 64 sq.) maintains this position with much force. Tillemon would assign the first to Eusebius of Caesarea and the second to Acacius. The remaining twelve works are sermons on the Resurrection, the Ascension, etc. In the Syriac MS Brt. Mus. Add. 17, 142, belonging to the 8th century (see Wright's Catalogue, p. 1042), is a treatise On the Star which appeared to the Magi, ascribed to our Eusebius. It was published by Wright, Journal of Sacred Literature (1866) ix. p. 117, x. p. 150. The authorship is disputed by Ceriani, Nöldeke, von Gutschmid, and others. From the closer resemblance of the Biblical quotations to the Peshito, than to the LXX, Nöldeke conjectures that it was written originally in Syriac. Epiphanias (Haec. lxi. 21) mentions among other refutations (Harmophies) of the Manicheans one by Eusebius of Caesarea; but no such work is mentioned elsewhere (e.g. in Theod. H. F. i. 26); and it must therefore be supposed that Epiphanias was mistaken or that this refuta-

tion was not a separate treatise, but occurred incidentally in some other work. Other writings, attributed to Eusebius, are enumerated as extant, wholly or in part, in manuscript in various libraries by Fabric. Bibli. Grav. vii. pp. 407, 408, Cave, H. L. i. p. 183; and probably several others, not mentioned in these writers, are lying hidden elsewhere. Thus a MS of H. 9. 6 in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, contains in Latin Sermones Quinque Eusebi Caesareiensis Episcopi de Sancto Stephano.

In reviewing the literary history of Eusebius, we are struck first of all with the range and extent of his labours. His extant works, voluminous as they are, must have formed somewhat less than half of his actual writings. No field of theological learning is untouched. He is historian, apologist, topographer, exegete, critic, preacher, dogmatic writer, in turn. And, if the permanent utility of an author's labours may be taken as a test of literary excellence, Eusebius will hold a very high place indeed. The Ecclesiastical History is absolutely indispensable. The Chronicle is the vast storehouse of information relating to the ancient monachies of the world. The Preparation and Demonstration are the most important contributions to theology in their own province. Even the minor works, such as the Martyrs of Palestine, the Life of Constantine, the Questions addressed to Stephanus and to Marinus, and others, would leave an irreparable blank, if they were obliterated. And the same permanent value attaches also to his more technical treatises. The Canons and Sections have never yet been superseded for their particular purpose. The Topography of Palestine is the most important contribution to our knowledge in its own department. In short, no ancient ecclesiastical writer has laid posterity under heavier obligations.

The explanation of this fact must be sought in some degree in his great erudition. In the field of History, in the choice of his materials, he has preserved for us a vast amount of early literature in three or more spheres, which would otherwise have been irrecoverably lost. But beyond his learning he deserves the highest credit for the intelligent selection of his subjects. No writer has ever shewn a keener insight in the choice of his themes, who would not have had the permanent interest for future generations. He lived on the confines of two epochs, separated from each other by one of those broad lines of demarcation which occur only at intervals of many centuries. He saw the greatness of the crisis; he seized the opportunity; he, and he only, preserved the past in all its phases, in history, in doctrine, in criticism, even in topography, for the instruction of the future.

This is his real title to greatness. As an expositor of facts, or as an abstract thinker, or as a master of style, it would be absurd to compare him with the great names of classical antiquity. His merits and his fruits have been already indicated in the criticisms on his several works (pp. 324 sqq., 331). His gigantic learning was his master rather than his slave. He had great conceptions, which he was unable adequately to carry out. He had valuable detached thoughts, but he failed to continue the line of thought which was most labourable and yet most desultory. He accumulated
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materials with great diligence; he was loose and perfunctory and uncritical in the use of them when accumulated. His style is especially vicious. At times indeed, when he forgets himself in his subject, as, for instance, in his attack on Marcellus, his language is plain and direct enough; but, when his theme seems to him to demand a loftier flight of rhetoric, as in his Life of Constantine, his language becomes hopelessly turgid and unnatural. These two works are especially instructive as examples, because they were written about the same time. Theodorus Metochita (Miscell. 17) propounds the theory that all writers who were brought up in Egypt, contracted a harsh style (φραγμένον τῷ λέγῳ χρώματι), and he instances Eusebius, who himself states that he had made a long sojourn in that country (τοῦ ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ πάντων ἁπλῶς συνεφόρητον). But we need not go so far for an explanation. Athanasius, though an Egyptian, can write with point and clarity, perhaps because he handled the connection of Eusebius with Egypt was very slight after all (H. E. viii. 7); and his violent style, so far as it was not inherent in himself, may be ascribed with much greater probability to Syrian and Oriental influences.

One other point deserves notice. While his writings are so large an area and are so various in character, he is before all things an apologist. His great services in this respect are emphasized by Evagrius (H. E. i. 1 περὶ ὅλου ὅλον τοῦ ἄνυψημάντου πραεσυνεῖ τῷ ἡμέρας); and doubtless his directly apologetic writings were much more effective than at this distance of time they appear. But his position as an apologist does not end with his apologetic works. Whatever subject he touches, his thoughts seem to pour instinctively into this same channel. If he takes up the subject of chronology, a main purpose is to shew the superior antiquity of the Hebrew oracles to the wisdom of the Greeks. If he sets himself to write a history of the Church, he does so because he sees the course of events a vindication of the Divine Word, in whom the faith of the Christian centres. If he selects a theme so purely mundane as the encomium of a sovereign, he soars aloft at once into the region of theology, for he sees in the subject of his panegyric an instrument used by a higher power for the fulfilment of a Divine economy. If he employs himself on a task so essentially technical as the division of the Gospels into sections, his underlying motive is the desire to supply materials for a harmony, and thus to vindicate the essential unity of the evangelical narratives against gain-sayers. This characteristic task was due partly to the epoch in which he lived, and partly to his individual temper and circumstances. To the epoch in which he lived: for his lot was cast in the great crisis of transition; he stood, as it were, on the frontier line between two ages, with one foot in the Hellenism of the past and the other in the sanctity of the future. And by his very position he was constrained to view them face to face, and to discuss their mutual relations. To his individual qualifications: for he was equally learned in the wisdom of the Greeks and in the teaching of the Scriptures, while his breadth of sympathy and moderation of temper fitted him beyond most of his contemporaries for the task of tracing their conflicts and coincidences.

"The grave accusation under which he lies," writes Dr. Newman (Arians, p. 262 sq.), "is that of Arianizing, but of corrupting the simplicity of the Gospel with an eclectic spirit. While he held out the ambiguous language of the schools as a refuge, and the Alexandrian imitation of it as an argument against the pursuit of the orthodox, his conduct gave countenance to the secular maxims that difference in creeds is a matter of inferior moment, and that, provided we confess as far as the very terms of Scripture, we may speculate as philosophers and live as the world." This grave charge of indifference to truth will be dealt with presently. It is sufficient to say here that the characteristic which is thus made the head and front of his offending, was his strong point as a champion of the faith. Like St. Paul on Mars' Hill, he sought out the elements of truth in pre-existing philosophy and theological systems and religion, and his object in obtaining a foothold, he worked onward in his assault upon paganism. The Greek apologists of the 2nd and 3rd centuries all, without exception, took up this position. It was the signal merit of the great Alexandrian fathers that they did not treat as a mere dead letter the precepts of St. John's Gospel, in which the eternal Son identifies the Word, who in the fullness of time became incarnate, with 'the light that lighteth every man.' Eusebius, through his illustrious spiritual ancestors, Origen and Pampilius, had inherited this tradition from Alexandria. It was the only method which could achieve success among the Jews in an age when rationalism as an apostle was a living reality. But his way was to face to face with still powerful forms of heathen worship. It is the only method which can hope for victory now, when once again the Gospel is confronted with the dominant and widespread religions of India and the farther East.

X. Character. If we may judge from the silence of his contemporaries—and silence in this case is an important witness—Eusebius commanded general respect by his personal character. With the single exception of the taunt of Potammon, which has been considered already, not a word of accusation is levelled against him in an age when theological controversy was peculiarly reckless and acrimonious. It is difficult to draw with any confidence the portrait of one of whose private acts so little is known. But we seem to see that his character was marked by amiability and moderation. His relations to Pampilius, more especially, shew a strongly affectionate disposition; and it is more than probable that he was drawn into these public acts from a sense of duty to the demands of the Age. He is considered, by the emperor Constantine, and his speculative opinions, as well as his personal 68 Dr. Newman adds in a note (p. 283). "In this association of the Eusebian with the eclectic temper, it must not be forgotten that Julian the Apostate was the pupil of Eusebius of Nicomedia, his kinsman," etc. It will be ill with us all, if we are held responsible for the opinions of the pupils of our brothers and cousins; but there is no reason for believing that Eusebius of Nicomedia was any relation of Eusebius of Caesarea (see above, p. 289).
EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA acts, bear out this commendation. "He seems," writes Dr. Newman (Arians, p. 262, 4to. ed.) "to have had the faults and the virtues of the mere man of letters; strongly excelled neither to good nor to evil, and careless at once of the cause of truth and the prizes of secular greatness, in comparison of the comforts and decencies of literary ease." If this description had stopped short at the first sentence, it might have been accepted as substantially just; but we may well challenge the fairness of the explanatory clauses. What ground is there for saying that the friend of Pamphilus was not strongly excited to good? How can it be maintained that the laborious apologist of the Gospel, the adversary of Marcellus, was indifferent to the cause of truth? Still less can we accept "the comforts and decencies of literary ease" as the description of a life which was before all things laborious and self-denying. He was not only the most learned and prolific writer of his age; but he administered the affairs of an important diocese, and he took an active part in all the great questions which agitated the Church. Not Athanasius himself was a harder worker in the cause of Christ. From youth to advanced age he laboured with unremitting vigour. The self-sacrifices of the man of letters, if he is true to his calling, are not less in extent than those of the man of action, though they may be different in kind.

The excessive admiration of Eusebius for Constantine will be felt to need some apology. Yet it is not difficult to understand how he was led to this exaggerated estimate. Constantine was unquestionably one of the very greatest of the great emperors of Rome. His commanding personality must have been irresistible; and the impression thence derived would be enhanced by his deference towards the leading Christian bishops. The external circumstances of his reign moreover seemed to stamp it with a peculiar grandeur. He had ruled longer than any other emperor since Augustus, the founder of the Empire, and carried the eminence in the relations between the Church and the State incomparably greater than any which had preceded, or than any which would follow. Eusebius delighted to place these two great sovereigns in juxtaposition. During the one reign the Word had appeared in the flesh; during the other He had triumphed over the world. The one reign was the counterpart and complement of the other.

XI. Theological Opinions. A discussion of the theological opinions of Eusebius is impossible within the limits of an article like the present. Leaders who desire to see what may be said on either side, are referred to Barrowi (ad ann. 340, c. 38 sq.), Petaurius (Dogm. Theol. de Trin. lib. i. cap. xi sq.), Montfaucon (Praelim. in Comm. ad Psalm. c. vi), and Tillemont (H. E. vii. p. 67 sq.), among those who have assailed, and Bull (Def. Fid. Nic. ii. 8, 20, iii. 9, 3, 11), Cave (Hist. Ed. ii. app. p. 42 sq.), and Lee (Theo- plact. p. 212 sq.), among those who have defended, his opinions, from the orthodox point of view. A convenient summary of the controversy will be found in Stein, p. 117 sq. It is clear from the latter list of names (which might be considerably enlarged) that his orthodoxy cannot be hastily denied. Dr. Newman himself, speaking on this point, says that "in his own writings, numerous as they are, there is very little which fixes on Eusebius any charge, beyond that of attachment to the Platonic philosophy. He has strongly convicted himself with the Arian party, it would have been unjust to have suspected him of herey" (Arians, p. 282). If we except the works written before the Council of Nicaea, in which there is occasionally much looseness of expression, his language is for the most part strictly orthodox, or at least capable of an orthodox exposition. Against the two main theses of Arius, (1) that the Word was a creature (kata given like other creationes, and (2) that there was a time when He was not, Eusebius is explicit on the orthodox side (e.g. c. Marc. i. 4, p. 22, de Eccl. Theol. i. 2, 3, p. 61 sq., x. i. 8, 9, 10, p. 66 sq.). He states in direct language that the Word had no beginning (Theoph. ii. 3, comp. de Laud. Const. 2). If elsewhere he represents the Father as prior to the Son (e.g. Dem. Ev. iv. 3, δ νεκροθαρια του νιου και της γενεσις αυτου προφυλεστηκε, this priority is not necessarily intended to be temporal, and in such a case the meaning of the writer must be interpreted by his language in other passages. Nor again do such expressions as "second existence," "second cause," necessarily bear an Arian sense; for they may be taken to imply that the word in which has ever been recognised by the most thoughtful writers on the orthodox side. But though his language may not be "his act is nothing;" his "act is nothing;" he is his confession. This is the strongest point in the indictment. His alliance with the Arian party is indisputable; but he inference drawn from it may be questioned. His friendship lay much among Arians, and he may have made too many concessions to friendship. His natural temper suggested tolerance, and the cause of the Arians was, or seemed to be, the cause of comprehension. He had a profound and rooted aversion to the Subilliamism of Marcellus and others, who were acting with Athanasines; and as it was necessary to take one side or the other, he may have ranged himself with Eusebius of Nicomedia and his allies. The best means of averting this danger which seemed to threaten the truth. Where we have no certain information as to the motives which guided him in his conduct, it seems only fair to accept his own statements as final with respect to his opinions.*

* "The remark has been made," writes Dr. Newman (Arians, p. 263), "that throughout his Ecclesiastical History, no instance occurs of his expressing abhorrence of the superstitions of Paganism," and that his custom is either to praise, or not to blame, such heretical writers as fall under his notice; and in his note he refers to Kestner, de Eccl. Auctoritat. p. 17.

If the reader will refer to Kestner, he will find that the passage assumes a different complexion when read in its own context; but this by the way. Nothing could be more erroneous as a statement of facts, than Dr. Newman's language here. Even if it had been true, that there is no abhorrence of paganism expressed in the History, great parts of the Propreratio and Theophania, not to mention the Triennial Oration and the Life of Constantine, are one beside another, abhorrent, and eternally abhorrent, of the superstitions and horrors of heathendom; so that the comparative silence in the History must be explained by the fact that the mention was not suggested, except incidentally, by his theme. On the other points—the attitude
XII. Posthumous Fame. While the Arian controversy was still fresh, the part taken by Eusebius was remembered against him in the Greek Church, and the mention of him in orthodox fathers is generally depreciatory. But as the direct interest of the dispute wore out, the tide turned and set in his favour. Hence in the fifth century we find a disposition to clear him of any complicity in Arian doctrine. Thus Socrates (H. E. ii. 21) is at some pains to prove him orthodox, alleging passages out of his works as evidence of catholicity. So again Gelasius of Cyzicus stoutly defends this "most noble tiler of ecclesiastical husbandry, and lover of truth" (φιλωτηστικά), as he calls him (H. S. N. ii. 1). He assures his readers that if there be any suggestion, however faint, of Arian heresy (μεταφυςεις Αριστοκρατίας), and that Eusebius himself "scorned the Arian panegyric" (τούτον εδοθαν γερά τον αριστοκρατικόν), assures them that he represents him, as we have seen (p. 314), as the leading champion of orthodoxy against Arian opponents. But at a later date the tide turned once again. The turning-point was the Second Council of Nicaea. The occasion was the Iconoclastic controversy. The Iconoclasts deplored his "fondness for his views" (see above, p. 344). The opposite party sought to disparage him. If they could only brand him deeply enough with the mark of heresy, the ground was cut from under their antagonists. The opinions of these later ages respecting Eusebius find expression in Photius. "His own books," says this writer, "can only be understood that he is called an "Arian" (τον Αριστοκρατικόν). In his very repentance," he continues, "he shews himself more plainly to be impenitent." A permanent injury was inflicted on his reputation by dragging him into the Iconoclast disputation. In the Latin Church he fared somewhat better. Jerome indeed did his best to damage his reputation, accusing him of "being a standard-bearer of the Arian faction," "the most flagrant champion of the impiety of Arius"—so he stigmatizes the teacher to whom he was more largely indebted than perhaps to any one else. But, notwithstanding this virulence of language, the eminent services of Eusebius to Christian literature carried the day in the Western Church. Two popes successively threw the shield of their authority over his reputation. Gelasius declined to place his History and Chronicle on the list of proscribed works (Decret. de Libr. Apoc. 4). Pelagius II gives expression to a truly noble sentiment while defending him: "Holy Church," he says, "weigheth the hearts of her faithful ones with kindness rather than their words with rigor" (Ep. 5. 921). It is worthy of notice that neither Gelasius nor Pelagius refers directly to the charge of Arianism. The offence of Eusebius, which seemed to them to require apology, was his defence of the heretic Origen. As an unknown Latin writer of a later age, quoted by Valois, doubtless expressing the feeling of his own time, calls Eusebius "the key of the Scriptures and the guardian of the New Testament." But a more remarkable fact still is the canonization of Eusebius, notwithstanding his real or supposed Arian opinions. In an ancient Syrian Martyrology (quoted above, p. 319 sq.), which is translated from the Greek and which can hardly date more than half a century after his death, May 30 is assigned to "the commemoration of Eusebius, bishop of Palestine," where he takes his rank among the honored martyrs and confessors of the church. Nor was it only in the East that this honour awaited him. In the Martyrologium Hieronymianum we find the entry "In Caesarea Cappadociae depositio sancti Eusebii" (Hieron. Op. ii. 578). The person intended was doubtless Eusebius the predecessor of St. Basil [Eusebius (2)] p. 355 sq.; as the addition "Cappadociae" shews (see Lassner, de Martyrologio Romano, p. 71 sq.; Plat. in the Biblioth. 1876). But the indissoluble fame of the other Eusebius of the other Caesarea eclipsed this comparatively obscure person and finally obliterated his name from the Latin calendars. The word "Cappadociae" altogether disappeared. In Usuard the notice becomes "In Caesarea Palestinae sancti Eusebii historiographi (with an i. t. n. l.) and in the Hieronymian Martyrologies, where he is not distinctly specified, the historian Eusebius is doubtless understood. Accordingly, in several Gallican service-books the historian is commemorated as a saint (see Valois, Testimonia pro Eusebio); and in the Martyrologium Romanum itself he held his place for many centuries. In the revision of this Martyrologium under Gregory XIII his name at length struck out, and Eusebius of Samosata substituted in his place, under the mistaken idea that the latter had been originally commemorated, and that Caesarea had been substituted for Samosata by a mistake. The Martyrologium Hieronymianum, which contained the true key to the error, had not yet been discovered. [L]

EUSEBIUS, CHRONICLE OF. This work may be described in words suggested by the author's own account of it at the beginning of his Eclogae Propheticae, as "chronological tables, to which is prefixed an epitome of universal history drawn from various sources." The ECLOGAE PROPHETICAЕ constitutes the first book of the Chronicle, the tables the second. As tables, as will more clearly be seen from the specimen we give farther on, exhibit in parallel columns the successions of the rulers of different nations, in such a way that the reader can see at a glance with whom any given monarch was contemporary. And they are accompanied by notes marking the year of some of the more remarkable historical events, these notes also constituting an epitome of history. The context of a second passage, where Eusebius refers to his Chronicle (Prap. Ec. i. 9), accounts very clearly for the interest which Christians felt in the study of comparative
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chronology. If their heathen opponents con-
trasted the antiquity of their rites with the
novelty of the Christian religion, the Christian
apologists retorted by proving that the most
celebrated Grecian legislators and philosophers
were very much junior to the Hebrew legislator,
and to the prophets who had beforehand testified
of Christ, and who had taught a religion of
which the Christian was the legitimate contin-
uation. This argument is the subject of the
section of the Praeparatio Evangelica to which
we have referred; and Eusebius there quotes
largely from preceding writers who had proved
the antiquity of the Jews; from Josephus, from
Tatian, from Clement of Alexandria, and in par-
cular from Africanus. This last writer (see
the article on him, Vol. I. p. 56) had made the
synchronisms between sacred and profane history
his special study, and he published the results in
a chronological work which gave Eusebius the
model and, to a great extent, the materials for
that which is the subject of this article.

A chronicle whose chronicle has a vitality which is not affected by the efforts of
subsequent imitators; but one the merits of
which are scientific is inevitably superseded by
the works of later writers, who, having learned
from it all that it is able to teach, combine there-
with the fruits of more advanced knowledge.
Thus the chronology of Africanus has perished,
the first cause of its falling into neglect probably
being the superior popularity of the work which
Eusebius had founded on it. In like manner, the
Greek of Eusebius's own work has been lost, and
until comparatively recent times it was only
known through the labours of successors who
had made use of it, in particular of Jerome, who
translated it into Latin, enlarging the notice
which related to Roman history, and continuing
the chronology to his own time. In 1806,
Scaliger published an edition of the Chronicle, in
which he attempted to restore the Greek of
Eusebius, collecting from Syncellus, Cedrenus,
and the chronoi of which he believed himself able,
mainly by the help of Jerome's translation, to identify as copied from
Eusebius. In this work he shewed great learning and industry, but over-confidence in his critical
sagacity sometimes led him to claim for Eusebius
more than really belonged to him; and his re-
stitution of the first book, where he had but little
guidance from Jerome, did not inspire confidence
at the time, and has since proved to be untrust-
worthy. It seems over-bold also to pronounce
concerning two lost works that the one was
little but a transcript from the other; yet this
was the judgment which Scaliger confidently
expressed concerning the obligations of Eusebius to
Africanus. It is very certain that Eusebius owed
much to Africanus, but we are not entitled to
assume, as Scaliger did, that Eusebius copied
Africanus without alteration in every place where
he does not expressly state his dissent from him.
In closely going over the work of Jerome, Scal-
gier was strongly impressed by the haste and
carelessness with which the Latin translator did
his work, trusting too much to the attendants
who read to him or wrote for him. The most
striking instance is Jerome's creation of a his-
torian, Paradisus, out of the two Greek words,
wap and Sur. He translates Minor Kypros as wap
Dak, "Minoi Cretes."

ut Paradisus memorat." Scaliger was in conse-
quence led to impute mistranslation to Jerome
every time that he found a difference between
Jerome's Latin and the Greek; and there are no
ceases in the later Greek chronologers. And though
of his great edition of Jerome's works, contains
much able criticism of Scaliger's work, urges
that we have no right to assume that the Greek
chronologers simply copied Eusebius without
introducing any changes of their own, or that in
any difference between them and Jerome they
must be pronounced right and he wrong, there
remain, after every allowance made, several cases
where Jerome cannot be cleared from the charge
of having blundered. The objections made by
Vallarsi to Scaliger's restoration of the first
book, and his opinion that the Chronicle never
had contained anything which could properly be
described as a first book, need not be considered,
the question having been set at rest by the
discovery of an Armenian translation of the
Chronicle, which was published in 1818, when it enables
us now to state what the contents of the first
book really were

The author, at the commencement of his work,
deprecates the expectation of too minute accu-
ricy in the investigations on which he enters, and
thinks that our Lord's words, "It is not for you
to know the times and the seasons," are applicable
not only to the end of the world, but also
to the knowledge of all times and seasons. He
pleads the difficulties, in the case of the Greeks,
 arising from the comparatively recent beginning
of civilization in that nation, concerning which
he quotes the saying of the oft quoted story told
in the Zumaecus of Plato, that the Greeks were
but children; in the case of the Egyptians and
the Chaldeans, arising from the fables of which
their early history is full. Even Hebrew chronol-
ology is not free from difficulties of its own. He
then, in the first section, gives a sketch of Chalde-
and Assyrian history, subjoining a table of the
succession and lengths of reigns of Assyrian,
Median, Lydian, and Persian kings, ending with
the Darius conquered by Alexander. The authors
whom he employs are Alexander Polybius, and,
as known through him, Berosus; Abydenus,
Josephus, Castor, Diodorus, and Cephalion. He
notes the coincidences of these writers with
Hebrew history, and he suggests that the inre-
dible lengths assigned to reigns in the early
Chaldean history may be reduced by the supposi-
tion that the "sari," said to be periods of 3000
years, in reality were far shorter periods. In
like manner, the Egyptian chronology may be
shortened by supposing that the years of their
periods were in reality but months. Africanus
had previously mentioned this solution. Another
is mentioned farther on in this first book, viz.
that some of the Egyptian dynasties may have
been, not consecutive, but synchronous. The
second section treats of Hebrew chronology, the
authorities used in addition to the sacred volume
in being Josephus and Africanus. He notices the
chronological difference between the Hebrew,
Septuagint, and Samaritan text, and conjectures
that the Hebrews, desirous to justify by patri-
archal example their love of early marriages,
systematically shortened the intervals between
the birth of each patriarch and that of his first
son. He gives other arguments which decide
him in favour of the LXX, especially as their version was the only one in use in the Christian church which had received it from our Lord and the apostles. A trifling difference here shows that Scaliger was wrong in supposing that Eusebius slavishly copied Africanus, for he reckons the years from the Creation to the Flood as 2242, instead of 2282, which we learn from Syncellus were counted by Africanus, the difference no doubt arising from a difference of reading as to the years of Methuseelah; for in this case there is a well known variation of reading, probably in the first instance arising out of a conjectural emendation made in order to get rid of a chronology which would have made Methusealah survive the Deluge. In the next division of time, from the Deluge to the birth of Abraham, which Eusebius makes the initial point of his own tables, he follows the Septuagint, except that he omits the second Cainian, making the number of years 945; and thus placing the birth of Abraham, according to the Creation, 31184. He notes in his tables that the Hebrew chronology made this interval 1949 years, which agrees within a year with that derived from our copies. Eusebius places the Exodus in the year from the birth of Abraham 505, in which he appears to agree with Africanus, but differs with him in respect to the next interval, that to the building of Solomon’s temple. Josephus counted that interval 592 years, which agrees closely enough with the 450 years assigned to the period of the Judges in the received text of Acts xiii. 20. Clement of Alexandria (Strom. i. 21), as Eusebius notes, does not substantially disagree from Josephus. After Josephus Africanus had extended this interval to 744 years. He may have been, as Scaliger supposes, desirous to maintain the then received computation of 5500 years from the Creation to the birth of our Lord, notwithstanding his throwing out of the chronology the 130 years of the second Cainian. For he gained as many years elsewhere, enlarging, for instance, the period of the Judges by counting 30 years for the elders that outlived Joshua, 40 years of anarchy after Samson, and 30 years of peace, arbitrary insertions for which he is censured by Eusebius. The great crex of Scripture chronologers has been how to reconcile the interval of about 600 years between the Exodus and Solomon’s temple, which is what most naturally comes out from adding up the years assigned to the Judges, with the statement (1 Kings vi. 1) that the interval was only 480 years. A reconciliation could be effected, and the times of the Judges shortened, by throwing out of the computation the years when the land is said to have sinned so much as to require a return to the wilderness, which he counted in the years of some contemporary judge; if it were not that the authority of the apostle Paul, as already quoted, seems to favour the longer computation. Eusebius is moved to decide in favour of the shorter mainly by the consideration that between Naasson and David there intervened but Salmom, Boaz, Obad, and Jesse. These are genera, and within a period of, according to Africanus, over 700 years, or, according to Josephus, 600, would give on the lowest computation the inadmissible length of 120 years to a generation. Eusebius therefore counts the interval 480 years, as in 1 Kings. If in Acts xiii. he adopted the reading of the oldest MSS now extant, he does not found on it any attempt to maintain Paul’s chronological accuracy, his line of defence being that the apostle’s object was not to teach scientific chronology, but that he merely had occasion, while preaching the saving doctrine of Christ, to make incidental mention of the times of the Judges, in doing which he conformed to the received chronology of the time. The consequence of the shortening of the Hebrew chronology by Eusebius in the period now under consideration was to bring down the place of Moses as compared with the line of Greek chronology. In the preface to his second book Eusebius states that his predecessor had made Moses contemporary with Inachus, and 700 years earlier than the Trojan War. His own computation made Inachus contemporary with Jacob, and Moses with Cercopes, but he contends that this leaves Moses still nearly 400 years older than the capture of Troy, older than Dacilus’s Deluge or Phaethon’s Conflagration, older than Racotus’s, Cadmus’s, Jason’s, Castor and Pollux, or Hercules; older than Homer and the Seven Wise Men of Greece, and Pythagoras the first philosopher. In the next period, Eusebius counts 442 years from the foundation of the temple by Solomon to its destruction under Zedekiah. How the 70 years’ captivity are to be reckoned, and his conclusion is that there are two prophetic periods of this length. The one begins with the destruction of the temple, and ends with the second year of Darius, son of Hystaspes, and the rebuilding of the temple under Zerubbabel. In so counting, Eusebius claims that he follows Clement of Alexandria (Strom. i. 21), who remarks that this is only true as respects the end of the period. Clement had made his 70 years begin with the captivity under Jeconiah, as the prophecy of Jeremiah xxix. seems to demand. The other prophetic period of 70 years he makes end in the first year of Cyrus (who was an altar was set up at Jerusalem, and the foundations of the temple laid), and begin with the first prophesying of Jeremiah in the fifteenth year of Josiah. In the tables, Eusebius gives another way of counting this period, viz. from the third year of Jehoiakim to the nineteenth of Cyrus. From the second year of Darius, which he counts as the first year of the 65th Olympiad, Eusebius counts 548 years to the preaching of our Lord and the fifteenth year of Tiberius, which he reckons as the fourth year of the 201st Olympiad; and as the year from the creation of the world 5228. He gives as elements of this part of the calculation the lengths of the years of the Persian kings, of Alexander, of his successors, and then a period of 14 years from Antiochus Epiphanes, carrying the calculation from this point through the Maccabees (with respect to whom he refers again to Africanus) and the Jewish princes who succeeded them. Both in this and in the first part of this book, Eusebius sums up his calculations by giving the total of years derived from the Vicennalia of Constantine (325), which is made the closing point of the Chronicle. The third part of the first book contains a sketch of Egyptian history commencing with an extract from Diodorus, but mainly taken from Manetho, from whom large extracts had also been made by Africanus and Josephus. For the history
after the time of Alexander the Great, Porphyry is employed. The fourth part treats of Grecian history. The first authority employed is Cassius, who seems to have drawn up his results in chronological tables, and from them Eusebius takes his history of the kings of Sicily, of Argos and of Athens. Eusebius next gives a notice of the foundation of the Olympic contests, contrasting that with the first olympiad authentic Greek history begins. He gives a list of Olympic victors, which according to the title professes to end with the 2474th, but which actually is continued to the 249th. This is the latest that could have appeared in the work of Africanus, so that the breaking off the list here is evidence of the source whence it is derived. Next follows from Diodorus a list of kings of Corinth and Lacedaemon, with a table of the nations who successively held dominion of the sea, with the number of years for which each held it. After this come Macedonian, Thessalian, and Syrian history, the authority of Porphyry being followed in the later history. The tables, must have found this method unsuitable on account of the length of time covered by his tables, which go back more than 1200 years before the first olympiad. And the same objection applied to the use of other celebrated eras which Eusebius does not mention, such as that of Nabonassar or of the Seleucidae. On the other hand, the differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint chronology would have made it inconvenient to date years from the Creation; for when Eusebius has occasion to make such a computation, he gives the result according to both systems of chronology. The important differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint all lie in the period prior to the birth of Abraham; that, accordingly, Eusebius records as the first event in his Chronicle, and makes it the beginning of his era, in respect of their distances from which all subsequent events are dated. The next columns give the successions of the rulers of different nations. Eusebius only counts the chronology of three nations as going back so far as the commencement of his Chronicle, the Assyrians, the Sicyonians, and the Egyptians; and he places the first year of Abraham as corresponding to the forty-third year of Ninus, king of Assyria, to the twenty-second of Europa, king of Sicily, and to the first year of the sixteenth or Theban Egyptian dynasty. With the foundation of new monarchies the number of columns increases, rising to as many as eight; diminishing again as kingdoms disappear, until, towards the close of the Chronicle there remains but the single line of Roman emperors. The remaining space in the tables, called by Scaliger the Spatium Historicum, contains entries of different historical events. These entries have been liable to much dislocation in the process of transcription, copyists altering their position as the space at their disposal made it convenient. Thus, while the Armenian and Jerome's translation, as a general rule, agree as to the dates of the accession of the kings, they differ perpetually as to the entries in the historical space. We give an example to illustrate the difficulty of recovering with any certainty the chronological system of Eusebius from these entries. Eusebius, as we have already mentioned, had before him a list of the nations who successively held dominion over the sea with the number of years of the rule of each. This list he worked into his tables, no doubt counting the years back from the crossing of the Hellespont by Xerxes.
which is its final point. But it is now, to all appearance, a hopeless task to recover the arrangement of Eusebius. Thus, the first name on the list is the Lydians, ninety-two years; and these years are given in the Armenian 848–928, by Jerome 842–960. There is but one entry out of seventeen in which the Armenian and Jerome agree. In this case there is no room for doubt that the notes were originally intended by Eusebius to be connected with definite years. But many of the others might from the first have been as well affixed to one year as another, and probably were not at first intended to be connected so much with particular years as with particular decades of years, indicating vaguely as they do the times about which certain events happened or when certain men flourished. It appears to us that these historical notes, incorporated with the tables of reigns, are what Eusebius had in view when, at the beginning of his <i>Eclogae Prospexiticas</i>, he refers to certain places with that he had written with them an epitome of history. The word he uses is <i>ἐντοπισαμένης</i>; if that contained in the first book had been intended, a different word would have been used. There is every reason for thinking that more editions of the Chronicle than one were published by Eusebius in his lifetime, and that later times added to the Vicennalia of Constantine; but the <i>Prospuratatio Evangelica</i>, in which the Chronicle is referred to, had been published several years previously. It is possible that the hypothesis that Eusebius himself published different editions of his Chronicle may give the true explanation of the difference between Jerome's and the Armenian. These are more than can be ascribed to the fault of transcribers. The Armenian version and Jerome's can readily be compared in Scheen's edition, where both are to be found on the same opening of the page, and the comparison is helped by a valuable memoir of Mommsen's on the subject (Abkomm. der philologisch-histor. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, i. 669). The account which Jerome gives in his preface of his claims to originality is that as far as the taking of Troy his work was a mere translation of that of Eusebius; that from that date on to the point at which the work of Eusebius closes, his work was still but translation, only enlarged by notices, taken from Suetonius and others, relating to Roman history, concerning which Eusebius, as a Greek writing for Greeks, had not been full; and that the conclusion continuing the Chronicle from the point where Eusebius breaks off to his own time was entirely his own. Mommsen is both wise and strict in the part of the Chronicle written before the time of our Lord the Armenian must have mutilated the work of Eusebius by capricious omissions, there being a multitude of notices absent from it, which are found in Jerome, and which are proved really to belong to Eusebius by being quoted as his by subsequent Greek authors. In the history after Christ, the Armenian appears to have faithfully reported Eusebius, almost everything additional that is found in Jerome being capable of being traced to non-Eusebian sources. Mommsen has expended some pains in tracing the sources of Jerome, and finds that, as indeed he had previously remarked, he is even more indebted to the history of Eutropius, which he does not mention, than to the work of Suetonius, which he does. Mommsen gives several illustrations of the haste and carelessness with which Jerome used his authorities. For instance, Jerome describes the emperor Claudius as "<i>patrius Drusi qui apud Magnutisacum monumentum habitet</i>," a strange statement, which is accounted for by a reference to Eutropius, where we find, "<i>patrius Caligulae, Drusi qui apud M. m. habet filius</i>.

Some lengths of the reigns of Roman emperors, which are merely entered in the Armenian by the round numbers of the years are given in Jerome, with the more minute accuracy of months and sometimes of days; and one of Jerome's statements, viz. that Pertinax reigned six months, instead of a year as in the Armenian, is proved, by a Greek quotation, really to have been made by Eusebius. Jerome also gives notices, not found in the Armenian canon, of emperors, who are mentioned in Eusebius, but the source of these is found in a list of the places and manner of deaths of the emperors, still found in the Armenian, which Eusebius had prefixed to his tables. He had also prefixed a table of the lengths of their reigns, but that has been lost from the Armenian by mutilation, so that we do not now possess the original discrepancies which Jerome removed between the list and the entries in the tables, or whether Jerome's version represents a later edition of the work of Eusebius. The succession of the Roman bishops will form the subject of a separate article [Rome, Bishops of]. Suffice it here to say that Jerome and the Armenian versions of the bishops differ from the Armenian in such a way as to suggest that Jerome had exchanged the work of a translator for that of a chronologer, reforming the system of his original by means of an independent list. Jerome's chronology of the Roman bishops approaches much more nearly than the Armenian to that of the later work of Eusebius, his Church History. Appended to Scheen's edition of the Chronicle is a translation, by Roediger, of a Syriac chronicle which goes down to the year a.d. 638, and which epitomises the work of Eusebius, though possibly, as von Gutheschmid conjectures, known to the Syriac writer through the intervention of Anianus. In this there are few cases where the Syriac agrees, as to the lengths of episcopates with Jerome, where he differs from the Armenian, and in three of them from the Church History of Eusebius as well. As it is improbable that Jerome's work could have been known to the Syriac writer, we are led to believe that Jerome mutilated the work, at least for what has been said as to Jerome's rough and ready method of working, it seems to us improbable that he took more pains in correcting the chronology of Eusebius by the help of other authorities than he himself lays claim to have done. And it seems to us that the simplest account of the plan which has been described is the hypothesis that Jerome worked on a later edition of the Chronicle than that represented by the Armenian translation. We have referred [Evodius] to Harnack's theory as to the principle on which the Chronicle dates the ascensions of bishops of Antioch. The difficulties in the way of accepting that theory are
EUSEBIUS, CHRONICLE OF

stated in the prologomena to Lightfoot's 
Eusebius, the Armenian two years before that emperor's accession. Now, in addition to Roediger's Syriac epitome already mentioned, there have been published by Bruns, in Eich- 
horns Repertorium für bli. und morgenl. Lit- 
teratur, xl. 273, extracts from another Syriac chronicle. These two witnesses are independent, for the Armenian has discovered a text of the Syriac chronicle. It may be noted here that in the later MSS. of 
Jerome's Chronicle the historical notices are all collected into the right-hand margin, the Syriac 
Historicum of Scaliger; and Jerome's preface as printed in the given MS. of Scaliger the directions for distinguishing the use of differently 
coloured inks to what nation each notice belonged. The older MSS. insert the historical notices in two places, between the columns of 
kingdoms. The Armenian also gives the notices in two places, the inner and outer margins. Scaliger 
considered that the directions in the preface which are not found in the older MSS. had been 
emitted by scribes, who found the use of differ- 
ent inks too troublesome, and he drew the 
paradoxical inference that the later MSS. con- 
tained the oldest text. But Schoene points out that it would be far more laborious for any 
scribe to separate into two, according to nations, 
notices which he had found all together than to 
join them; and he has found as many instances in the 
MSS. for what he calls the summer solstice B.C. 774, 
and that it begins at the autumnal equinox B.C. 2018; and from Julius Caesar to Pertinax, 
that it begins at the autumnal equinox B.C. 2019. He gives an explanation, which need not 
be here repeated, how the different calculation of the middle period is to be accounted for by 
the use of different scribes by the chronicles. Setting this aside, the other two reckonings, 
which differ by nine months, are best harmonized 
by the assumption that Eusebius's first year of 
Eusebius makes his olympiads begin with the 
year of Abraham 1240, that is to say, with 
Jan. 1, B.C. 777, the true date being the summer 
solstice B.C. 776. The olympiads of Eusebius 
therefore are only bisextile Julian years, 
differing by a year and a half from the true 
olympiads. Jerome makes his olympiads begin 
year later than Eusebius, and so brings them 
into closer harmony with the true 
olympiads. 
After the reign of Pertinax there ensues a confu-
sion in the chronology, and the agreement 
with the Armenian and Jerome as to the dates 
of the accession of the emperors ceases. In fact,
Eusebius, who in this part of the history appears to have worked on an Alexandrian table of regna, in which years are counted from the beginning of the month Thoth, i.e. Aug. 29, assigns a whole year to the reign of Pertinax, which lasted only three months, or five if we take in the reign of Julianus; he gives seven years to Caracalla, who really reigned only six years two months, and he gives seven years to Philip instead of five and a half years. In this way the time between the deaths of Commodus and of Philip is made three years too long. One of these redundant years is afterwards cut out by the omission of the year 223 between the resignation of Diocletian and the acceptance of the title of Augustus by Constantine. Jerome, partially, but only partially, corrects these errors. It has been thought surprising that Eusebius should have gone wrong in the part of the chronology which lay near his own time; of this von Gutschmid offers the following ingenious explanation. Among others he states that year 39 on March 25 to Jan. 1 occasionally leads to a mistake of a year in the dates of events which occurred in the first three months of years before the change of style. Chronological confusion to a much greater extent arose when the genuine olympiads came in different places to different periods, to some, to two, to three, to four years indeed, but not commencing at the same time as the true. A change in the way of counting the dates could not be made in any history from one period to the other without a breach of continuity at the point of transition. It has been explained (Vol. I. p. 598) what use was made of the help of eight (or four) years in counting the Easter full moons. Von Gutschmid tries to show there was in use in Alexandria such a cycle, in which the summer solstice of the year 284 commenced a period, and a different one at Rome commencing with Jan. 1, 293. His hypothesis is, that with Pertinax the sources from which Eusebius had previously been drawing were exhausted, that he then employed materials in which Alexandrian pseudo-olymiads were used, and later himself employed the Roman way of reckoning. This explanation is too complicated to carry with it complete conviction; and it does not seem to us incredible that Eusebius should have simply blundered in making out his chronology by the help of lists of emperors' reigns. Modern chronology is kept straight by the habitual use of the reckoning A.D., but if we dated events by the years of the reigning sovereign, we should be liable to error every time there was inaccuracy in our information how much each monarch lived, or by how much the letters of public documents showed him to have entered. The part of history which persons in general know worst is that which immediately precedes their own time. It was much easier for Eusebius to preserve historical accuracy in the early history, where he had the guidance of trustworthy histories; but for the periods for which the histories he had been following came to an end, and where he had to make, as best he could, a way for himself. Whatever may be thought of the correctness of von Gutschmid's explanation, it does not affect the value of his rule for turning Eusebian years of Abraham into years B.C. and A.D.; viz. in the period from the first olympiad to the beginning of the vulpus era, that is to say from the year of Abraha 1140-1160, subtract the year of Abraham from 2017, and the remainder gives the year A.D.; thenceforward to Pertinax, viz. from the year of Abraham 1720-2008 subtract 1690, and the remainder is the year A.D.; from 223 the last year in the Armenian subtraction 2018 in order to obtain the year A.D. Von Gutschmid has also compared the Eusebian with the true date of a number of events entered in the Spatius historiwm, as to the position of which the Armenian and Jerome agree. He finds that in putting these dates into his classes, in one of which the dates fairly correspond to those obtained by the preceding rule; in the others the dates as given by olympiads in the table will be right if we consider these as true olympiads. Cases of this kind would arise whenever Eusebius copied the dates given in olympiads by older authorities without any attempt to assign them to the years chosen.

We do not occupy space with an enumeration of editions of the chronicle, because, for the student's practical purposes, previous editions are superseded by that of Schoene, Berlin, 1873, 1886. Full explanation is given as to the mode of using the tables, p. xii. In his preface, men will be found the labours of previous editors, as also in Fabricius, Biblior. Gr. Basel, vii. 340, and in the preface to Aucher's edition of the Armenian. This version was made from a MS. brought from Jerusalem to Constantinople, of which transcripts were sent to Aucher in Venice in 1793 and 1795; but various hindrances delayed publication till 1816. We have not room to speak of the anticipation of this work by Zohrab and Mai in 1815. Petermann, for Schoene's edition, failed in his attempt to make a new collation of the Jerusalem MS., but he was able to compare the transcript of 1793 with a later one made by Aucher himself; and also another MS. of his akin to the Jerusalem MS., but in Petermann's opinion not derived from it, but rather both from a common original. The Armenian version speaks to be as early as the 5th century. Some errors in it are obviously to be accounted for as originating in a misunderstanding of Greek words; other features indicate a Syriac original; and though it is possible that the errors just mentioned may have been introduced by the Syriac translator, yet Petermann's opinion is that there were in Armenia in the 5th century two versions, one made directly from the Greek, the other through the medium of Syriac, and that two or three centuries afterwards these were combined into the published text. It is the languages through which the words of Eusebius passed, some of them certainly have become much disguised in the process. It would require a sagacious critic from the words "Hedrus primus virtutem ostendit, superabat eum iracundiam," to restore the original text of the passage after the text of the Syriac. Scaller's edition contained in addition to the chronicle of Eusebius, besides the Latin continuation of St. Jerome an εντοχή κρήνων taken from the Paschal chronicle at that time unpublished, the Chronographia of the Patriarch Nicæmones, and what he called ισπανικών αυγομετρία which is not an ancient work, but a collection of
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historical notices made by Scaliger himself, in some cases even translated by him from Latin into Greek. Subjoined to his Latin chronicles are what Scaliger calls most useful extracts from Eusebius, Africanus, and others turned into Latin, "ab homine barbaro inepto, Hellenismi et Latinitatis imperitissimo." [CHRYSOST. SCALIGERAN.] The substance in it is of such a character that this description is not too severe; for instance: τὸ ἔμαθεν ἢ τὴν τῶν Ἀρχαίων is rendered "Ille solis confixus est ab Acheim," but the historical matter contained in the notices promises to repay more careful investigation than it has yet received. These excerpts have been newly edited in Schöne's edition from a careful collation with the original MS. at Paris. Schöne's edition also contains the χρονογράφων στομονος, a work of the year 853, which had been published by Mai (Script. Vit. Soc. Coll. vol. i.), the first part of which professes to be drawn from the labors of Eusebius. The list of Alexandrian patriarchs has traces, in a number of curious alterations, of having been derived from a list in which the Monophysites are treated as the orthodox and the adherents of Chalcedon as heretics. [G. S.]

EUSEBIUS (24), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, by whom Basil the Great was ordained to the presbyterate. Eusebius was a layman and unbaptized at the time of his elevation to the episcopate A.D. 362. On the death of Dianius, the church of Caesarea was divided into rival factions, nearly equally balanced, and, as in the case of Ambrose of Milan, the choice of a layman universally known and respected and of high character for orthodoxy, was the readiest way out of the dilemma, as involving no acknowledgment of weakness on either side. Eusebius was by no means cowed by the honour thus forced upon him. Military force had to be employed to overcome his reluctance, and to compel the consecrating prelates to fulfill their functions. No sooner were they free than the bishops endeavored to annul their act and declare the consecration of Eusebius void. But the counsels of the elder Gregory of Nazianzus prevailed. He represented to them that it would have been the more honourable course to have risked their lives by refusing to ordain Eusebius, rather than to have yielded to the dictation of the populace through fear, and then annul their own act. There were discussions enough in the church, without their adding to them (Greg. Naz. Orat. xix. 36, pp. 308-9). The election of Eusebius was ratified, to the indignation of the emperor Julian, who grudged the loss of so valuable a servant to the state, and he held the see for a period of eight years till 370. Eusebius proved a very respectable prelate, who would have filled his office with credit to himself and advantage to the church in ordinary times; he shewed himself, however, quite unequal to the circumstances of severe trial in which he soon found himself. He was, writes Dr. Newman (Biographical Sketches, p. 4), "a bishop of orthodox profession, but had little of the theological knowledge or force of character necessary for coping with the formidable heresy with which the church was assailed." One of the earliest acts of his episcopate was to ordain Basil to the presbyterate. The coldness which grew up between Eusebius and Basil, probably arising from jealousy of the superior knowledge and greater influence of the latter, his insulting conduct towards Basil, leading to Basil's three years' retirement to Pontus, his desire to retain Basil's aid in combating the attack of the Arians under Valens on the church of Caesarea, and the ultimately successful mediation of Gregory Nazianzus and his old friend, are fully narrated in another article. [BASILII OF CAESAREA.] (Greg. Naz. Orat. xx. §§ 51-53; Epist. 19, 20, 189, 197.)

In 366 Eusebius saw Basil return to Caesarea. Each had learnt wisdom from the past. Basil was content to guide the counsels of Eusebius without publicly trenching on his prerogatives, while Eusebius was satisfied with official power and dignity, flattering himself, in Gregory's words, that he himself was ruling while Basil was actually the ruler. (Greg. Naz. Orat. xx. § 57-59.) The harmony continued unbroken to the death of Eusebius, A.D. 396. Freyta states that Eusebius is reckoned by some among the martyrs, but why, it would be hard to say (Freyta, xv. 13, 14; xvi. 9, 14, 17). Florintinns thinks that Usuard confounds Eusebius of Cappadocia with Eusebius the historian, whom he notes on June 21. Upon this point see annotations of Papebrochius in A.D. 584, Boll. Jun. iv. 75; and on the other side, Till. Mem. vii. 39. See also EUSEBIUS (23), supr. p. 348 b. [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (25), fourth bishop of Cahors, succeeding St. Ursinus and followed by Rusticus. He is mentioned in this order in one of the Vita of St. Desiderius, a later bishop of the same see. (Vit. Desid. cap. 4 in Patr. Lat. iv. 223 c; Gall. Christ. i. 120.) [S. A. B.]

EUSEBIUS (26), bishop of Chalea in Cœle Syria, a zealous man and a staunch Catholic, ordained by Eusebius bishop of Samosata, though in another province, after his return from exile, c. A.D. 375 (Theod. H. E. v. 4). He attended the council of Constantineople, A.D. 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). Theodore narrates a visit paid by him to Marcian the military (Hist. Rel. c. 3, p. 789). [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (27), St., bishop of Cibaliss, a town and district in Pannonia between the Drave and the Save, subject to the metropolitan authority of Scythian (Dict. G. & R. Geog.). He suffered martyrdom during either the Valerian or the Diocletian persecution. He is the only bishop of this see whose name is known. (Farlati, Myriarch Sacr. vii. 574; A.A. SS. Boll. 28 April, iii. 356; Mart. Guardi, Ap. 28.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (28), bishop of Clazomenae near Smyrna, present the council of Epiphan A.D. 431 and Chalcedon A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 729; Mansi, iv. 1216, vi. 1085.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (29), bishop of Como, 512. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 313; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 260.) [A. H. D. A.]

EUSEBIUS (30), bishop of Constantinople; vid. of Nicomedia. [EUSEBIUS (60).]

EUSEBIUS (31), bishop of Cremona, 637, a native of Piacenza; said to have erected the church of St. Antonius, martyr. For an exami-
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nation of the inscription in the church, see Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xi. 129. [A. H. D. A.]

EUSEBIUS (32), bishop of Cyzicus, present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 970.) He is described by Procopius (Bell. Pers. i. 25) as a man of overbearing character, and was ultimately murdered by the people of Cyzicus, as Malalas relates, in a conspiracy headed by John of Cappadocia, who was then an exile at Cyzicus. (Jo. Malalas, Chron. lib. xviii. p. 480, ed. Dindorf; Le Quien, Orient. Christ. i. 754.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (33), bishop of Dorylaem in Phrygia Salutaris, the constant supporter of orthodoxy against Nestorius and Eutyches alike. About Christmas A.D. 428, when Nestorius was asserting his heresy in a sermon at Constantinople, there stood up in full church a man of excellent character (ἀρχηγὸς τῶν ἑων ἔνθεεν), still a simple layman, but distinguished for “not incon- sillable (οὐκ ἡμισυμφόρος)” and orthodox zeal, and asserted in opposition to Nestorius, that the “eternal Word begotten before the ages had submitted also to be born a second time” (i.e. according to the flesh of the Virgin). This bold assertion of the faith caused great excitement and division in the church. Cyr. Hist. i. 20 in Migne, vol. i. 41 D; Marius Mercator, pars ii. lib. i.; Patr. Lat. cxviii. p. 769 n.) The “vir robus, adhue laicus” of this narrative is certainly, as Theophanes (Chron. p. 76) expressly says he was, our Eusebius, who has the credit of being the first to oppose the Nestorian heresy. (Evang. Hist. i. 9 in Patr. Gr. ixvi. 2448.) He was also the first to follow the utterances of Anastasius, the synod of Nestorius (Theophan. Chron. p. 76.) He was at this time a “rhetor” (Evgr. l. c.) distinguished in legal practice. (Leont. Byzant. Cont. Nestor. et Eutych. lib. iii. in Patr. Gr. ixvi. 1389) and an “agens in rebus” to the court, (Gesta de Num. Auct.; cap. i. in Galland, Bibl. x; n. 604; cf. Tillemont, xiv. note xi. on Cyril of Alexandria.) Theophanes (l. c.) calls him a σχολαστής τῆς βασιλείας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.

After the sermon of St. Proclus against Nestorius, and before the orthodox had separated from the communion of Nestorius, in consequence of the council of Ephesus, there appeared, fixed in a public place, an inscription which gives the identity of Nestorius’s doctrine with that of Paul of Samosata. This document common opinion attributed to Eusebius (Leontios, Cont. Nestor. et Eutych. lib. iii. cap. 43 in Patr. Gr. lxvi. 1389 προτεθέσθη, ἐν φανε, πάρα Ευσεβίου). In the Greek text of the document (Har- dium, p. 285), it is said to be “παρὰ τῶν κληρικῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως,” which is clearly wrong, as it is written in the first person singular (we should perhaps read ἐκάθεν τῶν, &c.). This public protestation begins by conjuring any one into whose hands it may fall to make its contents known or give a copy of it to all the bishops, clergy and laity in Constantinople. It draws out the parallel between the doctrine of Nestorius and that of Paul of Samosata, who both deny that the child born of Mary was the Eternal Word; it asserts the true faith out of the creed in use at Antioch (whence Nestorius and Anastasius came), and addresses the testimony of Eustathius bishop of Antioch, one of the bishops present at Nicea, and ends with an anathema on him who denies the identity of the Only Begotten of the Father and the child of Mary. Eusebius must have been a priest at the time when St. Cyril wrote his five books against Nestorius (Cyril. Opera, iv. 41, 42, 43, 45, 48). So much is implied in the reference of Jo. Malalas, Chron. to Λαταχοί, i.e. about A.D. 430. He was certainly bishop of Dorylaem in A.D. 448. We learn from his own statement that he was poor. (Labe, Concil. iv. 221.) At this date he bestowed himself against the heretical teaching of Eutyches. Common hostility to Nestorius had united Eusebius and Eutyches; but about this time Eusebius, perceiving the heretical tendencies of his friend, frequently, as he afterwards told the council of Constantinople, visited him, and exhorted him to reconsider his ways. (Labe, Concil. iv. 154 D.) Finding him however immoveable and obstinate, Eusebius took the opportunity of making known his views under Flavian, Nov. 8, 448, apparently for some other purpose (cf. Tillem. xv. 490) to present a “libellus” against Eutyches. In this “libellus” he describes himself as unsuspected of heresy, always fighting against heretics, and defending to the utmost of his power the orthodox faith. (Labe, in loc.) Eusebius, iv. 231, 231D mentions the losses of Eutyches in error, and demands that he should be summoned before the council to answer the charges of heretical teaching which he made against him. Flavian, who was very unwilling to admit the petition, urged Eusebius more than once to visit and speak to Eutyches in private. Eusebius replied that it was impossible for him to talk with such a man. His position was finally granted by the council, though with unwillingness, and a feeling about the propriety of Eusebius’s conduct. At the second session of the council (Nov. 12), Eusebius requested that the second letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius and his letter to John of Antioch should be read in the council and presented as an argument against orthodoxy. This led to a profession of the orthodox faith from Flavian, which was assented to by the other bishops. At the third session of the council (Nov. 15) Eusebius asked that what reply Eutyches had made when summoned to attend. It was found that he had refused to come, alleging a determination never to quit his monastery, and saying that Eusebius had been his enemy’s (σώλας) his enemy. (Eutyches [q.v.]) He was again summoned, with the same result. Only at the third summons was he with difficulty induced to submit to the demand. Meanwhile Eusebius was pressing his point with the council persistently and even harshly; he behaved with such warmth that Flavian said, “I am heartily wear- ed with him, in his zeal for orthodoxy” as the discovery of the attempt which Eutyches had made to secure the adhesion of the other archimandrites to his views (Faustinus [q.v.]) Eusebius urged that he should be immediately treated with the rigour he deserved. (Labe, iv. 231.) Flavian still urged patience and moderation.
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At last, on Nov. 22, Eutyches appeared with a large monastic and imperial escort, and was examined on the subject of his orthodoxy, heavily pressed by this time to have become a little afraid of the power of Eutyches: "I am poor," he said, "he threatens me with exile; he has wealth, he is already depicting (άνεγκλητικός) the oasis for me." Eusebius feared also lest Eutyches should turn round and assert to the orthodox faith—which causing him to be suspected of making calculated charges with an evil intention. (Labbé, iv. 221, c, d, 6.) The question with which he tried Eutyches was this: "My lord archimandrite, do you confess two natures after the Incarnation, and do you say that Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh or not?" To the first part of this question Eutyches could not but be got to give assent; he was condemned by all the bishops, and sentence of deposition was passed on him. He at once wrote to pope Leo I. in his own defence (Leo Mag. Ep. xxi. 739), complaining of the "machinations" of Eusebius. We are told that Eusebius sent Eutyches a recital of the Acts of the council of Constantinople, which Eutyches had declared to have been falsified. With him were fourteen others from among the bishops who had condemned Eutyches, out of the whole number of thirty-four. This examination was held at Constantinople in April 449. (Labbé, iv. 235.) Eutyches was represented by three delegates; Eusebius and others remonstrated against his not being present in person, but the emperor's orders overruled their remonstrances. During this examination Eusebius made it a special point that all examination into the case of Eutyches, and into any question other than the authenticity of the acts, should be referred to a general council. (Labbé, iv. 208.) The examination of the acts does not seem to have brought to light any inaccuracy of importance.

When Eusebius arrived in Ephesus at the beginning of August, A.D. 449, to attend the council, he was permitted to lodge with Stephen, metropolitan, for he was not permitted to attend the meetings of the council. (Labbé, iv. 111 D, 4.) He was not permitted to attend the meetings of the council. It was urged as a reason for this that the emperor had forbidden it. (Labbé, iv. 145 A, b.) Certainly when Flavian urged that he should be admitted and heard, Epilidas, one of the imperial commission, opposed the proposal (Hefele, Concilien-

Eusebius's remonstrance took this shape: et διά 

Eusebius put in prison (Liberat. cap. xii.; Galland, xii. p. 140), and immediately sent into exile (JOSEPH. A. 155. Galland, x. 508). Eusebius escaped and his refuge at Rome, where Leo welcomed him and granted him communion. He was there till April 481 (Leo Mag. Ep. lxxx. lxxx. lxxx. 1037, 1041), for Leo mentions his presence in a letter to Pulcheria at this date and commends to her care his diocese, "which some one who has been insinuously thrust into his place is said to be laying waste." Liberati, however (Brenzner, cap. xii. in Galland, xii. 140) says that no bishop was put into the place of Eusebius. Perhaps Leo, whose words are "qui injuste assessor inter subrogatus," represents no more than a rumour at Rome. Leo also commends him to the care of Antolinus of Constantinople, the successor of Flavian, as one who for the sake of the faith has undergone many dangers and troubles. Eusebius of course, left Rome to attend the council of Chalcedon. He had addressed a formal petition to the emperor Marcian against Dioscorus, and he appears in the council as his accuser. His petition to the emperor was first read in the first session of the bishops at his own request (Labbé, iv. 95); he complains more than once of the conduct of Dioscorus in excluding him from the council of Ephesus (145, 156). His innocence, with that of St. Flavian, was fully recognized at the close of the first session of the council of Chalcedon (Labbé, iv. 322, 323); but he was not yet satisfied; at the third session, on Oct. 13, he presented a further petition against Dioscorus, addressed to the council, in which he represents himself as speaking on behalf of himself, of Flavian (τοῖς ἐχθρίσισι) and of the orthodox faith. He urges the iniquities of Dioscorus at Ephesus, and begs for complete excommunication for himself, and condemnation for Dioscorus. (For the conduct of the latter and his condemnation, cf. s. v. p. 861; Labbé, iv. 381.) We find Eusebius again in the fourth session of the council, taking a part in the case of certain Egyptian bishops who declined to condemn the heresy of Apollinaris, allying in excuse of their refusal to follow to bound to follow their patriarch (i.e. Dioscorus), and that in so doing they were acting in accordance with the council of Nicaea. Eusebius has but one word to say, "ψυχομετά" (Labbé, iv. 513 A). We find him a little later (fifth session, Oct. 22) siding at first against the imperial officers, and the wishes of the Roman legates for making no addition to the council's definition of faith. (Labbé, iv. 558 D; cf. Bright, Hist. of the Church, p. 409.) Afterwards, however, he assisted at the revision which made that definition a complete expression of the doctrine of Leo's tome. In the eleventh session we find him (599 A) voting for the deposition of both claimants, Bassian and Stephen, to the see of Ephesus, on the ground that both alike had been irregularly consecrated. He appears in the fifteenth session (Oct. 23), as signing the much-contested twenty-eighth canon of the council on the subject of the portion to be held by the see of Constantinople. (Labbé, 172.) Just at this time, if Eusebius's name is in the rescript of the emperor Marcian, June 452. This rescript has for its special object to rehabilitate the memory of Flavian, but it secures also that the condemnation of the robber council should in no way injure the reputation of Eusebius and Theodoret. (Labbé, iv. 886.) Nothing more is known
of Eusebius. His name indeed appears in the list of bishops signing the decrees of the council at Rome in A.D. 503, but this list certainly belongs to some earlier council. (Cf. Baron. ann. 503, i.x.) Comparing him with Flavian we cannot help feeling that there was a want of generosity in his treatment of Eutyches, whose superior in logical power and theological perception he undoubtedly was. But none can deny him the credit of having been a watchful guardian of the doctrine of the incarnation all through his life, and a keen-sighted and persistent antagonist of error, whether on the one side or the other, who by his sufferings for the orthodox faith may be said to have merited the title of Confessor. [C. G.]

EUSEBIUS (28) EMESENUS, bishop of Emesa, now Hems, in Syria, c. A.D. 341-359. He was born at Edessa, of a noble family. As from his earliest years he was taught the Holy Scriptures, his parents must have been Christians. Eusebius enjoyed all the advantages of a liberal education which, begun in his native city under teachers who resorted thither, was carried on in Palestine, and subsequently at Alexandria. In Palestine he studied theology under the celeb- rated Eusebius of Caesarea and Patriarch of Scythopolis, from whom he imbibed the Arian leanings which distinguished him to the end of his life. Some terms of his standard-bearer of the Arian party, "signifer Arianorum factionis" (Chron. sub ann. x. Constantii), and his Arian tenets are spoken of by Theodoret as too well known to admit question. (Theod. Erasm. Dial. iii. p. 257, ed. Schultze.) About A.D. 331 Eusebius visited Antioch. Eustathius has been recently deposed and banished, and the see was occupied by one of the short-lived Arian intruders, Euphranius, with whom he lived on terms of intimacy. His heterodox leanings would thus receive additional strength. Eusebius's high personal character and reputation for learning marked him out for the episcopate. He had, however, no desire to become a bishop, and to secure the newsee by force to the office upon him, according to the strange custom of the time, he left Syria and repaired to Alex- andria. Here he devoted himself to the study of philosophy in the celebrated schools of that city. When he had made himself fully acquainted with their systems, he returned to Antioch, of which Flaccillus (otherwise called Flacillus) was the Arian bishop. Eusebius was received with the honour due to his learning and reputation for piety. Flaccillus received him into his episcopal residence, and admitted him to his friendship and confidence. When the Arian synod met at Antioch A.D. 340, under the predominant influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, to nominate a successor to the newly deposed Athanasius, the sustained life, attractive eloquence, and popular manners of Eusebius, together with his personal acquaintance with Alexandria and its leading inhabitants, marked him out for the vacant throne. Eusebius, however, was by no means disposed to yield to his namesake's wishes. He well knew how deservedly beloved Athanasius was with the Alexandrians, and he shrank from facing the storm of unpopularity a bishop intruded into his seat would have to meet. He resolvedly declined the proffered dignity, and Gregory was chosen in his stead. Eusebius's scruples, however, to the episcopate were by this time overcome, and he allowed himself to be created bishop of the see of Emesa. This city, situated on the river Orontes to the north-east of the Libanus range, some distance to the north of Laodicea, was famous for its magnificent temple of Elagabalus, the Syro-Mithraic sun-god, from which the young priest Bassianus, himself a native of Edessa, had been chosen by the army as their emperor, assuming the title of the deity whose minister he had been. A report, based on Eusebius's astronomical studies, had reached the excitable inhabitants that their newly chosen bishop was a sorcerer, addicted to judicial astrology. His approach was the signal for a violent popular commotion, before which he fled, taking refuge with his friend and future pase- gyst, George, bishop of Laodicea. By his exertions, and the influence of Flaccillus of Antioch, and Narcissus of Neronias, the people of Emesa were convinced of the groundlessness of their suspicions, and he obtained quiet possession of his episcopal see. He was a favourite with the emperor Constantius, who took him with him as a counsellor and friend on several of his military expeditions, especially those directed against Sapor II, king of Persia. It is singular that, as we learn from Sozomen, the charge of Sabellianism was brought against him. The anabaptistic Arian leanings were so pronounced. The his- torian attributes the charge to mere malevolence, excited by jealousy of his exalted qualities. His death occurred before the end of A.D. 359. He was buried at Antioch (Hieron. de Vir. Ill. 101). His funeral oration was pronounced by George of Laodicea, who ascribed miraculous powers to him. Eusebius of Emesa was a very copious writer, and his works enjoyed much popularity. Jerome (u. a.) speaks somewhat contemptuously of his productions as merely elegant and rhetorical compositions, written with a view to applause, chiefly studied by those who delight in having themselves clapt (vulg. Superbose) in the phrase of some by a sort of praise. Eusebius, however, as he praises, as he glorifies the Great, a truth for which he says Eusebius endured many and severe struggles, which he quotes with high commendation in his Eramistes (Dial. iii. p. 258, ed. Schultze). Theodoret also speaks of works of his against Apelles (Haer. fab. 135), and Manes (ib. 265). He also wrote a commentary on Genesis, of which Jerome speaks depreciatively (Comm. in Gen. tom. iii. p. 113), and a commentary on the New Testament, fragments of which, as well as of his commentaries on the Old Testament, are published in the Codex. Three homilies are accepted by some authorities as genuine, and are printed by Migne: (1) on the descent of John the Baptist to Hades and his preaching there; (2) on the treachery of Judas; (3) on the evil and Hell. Fifty homilies were published in Latin by Ganne, Paris, 1547, among which is a catechism made up from various Latin fathers. All the extant remains of Eusebius are printed by Migne, Patrolog. tom. ixxvi. p. 461 ff. and by Mai, Bibl. Gracc. tom. ii. p. 528 ff. See also Fabricius, Bibl. Gracc. tom. vii. p. 412 ff.
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Harles. (Socr. H. E. ii. 9; Soz. H. E. iii. 6; Nicop. H. E. ix. 5; Tillemont, Mémo. EcoI. tom. vi. p. 313; Cave, Hist. Lat. vol. i. p. 207; Oudin, tom. i. p. 365.)

EUSEBIUS (38), bishop of Epiphania in Syria Secunda, south-east of Apamea. He was present at the second general council at Constantinople, A.D. 381, as representative of the Syrian church. (Mansi, iii. 559; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 917.)

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (37), bishop at the Roman synod of 501, described as “Fanestrensis” (Mansi, vii. 299 c). He is believed to have been the third bishop of Fano, between Vitalis and Leo (Boll. Acta SS. 18 Apr. ii. 542; Ughelli, Rot. Sacr. i. 658), in which case he may be the same as the following:

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (38), bishop of Fano, accompanied pope John I. when Theodoric compelled him to go on a mission to the emperor Justin in 526. See Anonymous Valentinianus, i.e. the chronicle of Maximian archbishop of Ravenna, according to Waetz and Holder Egger, Monum. Eccl. ital. et Langob. 1878, p. 278 (ed. Gartdhausen, 1873, p. 303).

[A. H. D. A.]

EUSEBIUS (39), bishop of Foligno, c. 740 to c. 790 (Cappellotti, Le Chiesa d’Italia, iv. 404).

[A. H. D. A.]

EUSEBIUS (40), bishop of Gabala, in Syria, south of Laodicea. He was present at the second general council held at Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 558; Le Quien, Orient. Christ. ii. 797.)

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (41), bishop of Gadarra; the only known bishop of Palestine who subscribed the council of Antioch, A.D. 341. (Mansi, ii. 1307; Le Quien, Or. Chr. iii. 587.)

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (42), bishop of Gaza, previously Antioch; vil. of Antioch, Nos. 9, 10.

EUSEBIUS (43), bishop of Hieraclea Pontica, in the province of Honoria, present at the ecumenical council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Orient. Christ. i. 573; Mansi, iv. 1213.)

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (44), bishop of Huesca, signs acts of the eighth council of Toledo, A.D. 653 (Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 449).

[M. A. W.]

EUSEBIUS (45), bishop of Iubrada, in Phoenicia Secunda, north-east of Damascus; mentioned in the Acts of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, by his Metropolitan Theodorus of Damascus, who signed in the name of certain absent bishops. (Mansi, vii. 169; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 845.)

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (46), supposed patriarch of Jerusalem; mentioned only in Hugo’s Life of Magdalvess (cap. 2, § 28, in Boll. Acta SS. 4 Oct. ii. 539), where it is related that this saint, on making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, is honourably received there by the patriarch Eusebius. Le Quien, who discusses the subject fully (Or. Chr. iii. 299), places him between Theodorus I. and Elias II. cir. A.D. 772. See also Pastoral on the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, in Boll. Acta SS. Ma. 2. Introd. p. xxxvii.

[3. H.]

EUSEBIUS (47), bishop of Jubaiteia, in the Byzacena province of Africa. One of the catholic bishops summoned to a conference with the Arians at Carthage, and subsequently sent into exile, where he died, by Hunneric the Vandal king of Africa, A.D. 484 (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 192; Notitia in Victor. Vit. 58, Migne, Patrol. Lat. iviii.).

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (48), bishop of Laodicea, in Syria Prima. He was a native of Alexandria, where he became a deacon. In the persecution under Valerian, A.D. 257, when the venerable bishop Dionysius had been banished from Alexandria, Eusebius remained behind in the city, ministering to the confessors in prison, and burying the dead bodies of the martyrs. The faithfulness of his services is gratefully commemorated in a letter of Dionysius (apud Euseb. H. E. vii. 11). During the civil strife which followed the death of Valerian, when Alexandria was in revolt, A.D. 262, Amphilianus, who had assumed the purple, was driven into the strong quarter of the city called Bucoche, where he was besieged by the Ἰωνιας, the general of Gallienus, and was hard pressed by famine. Eusebius without the entrenchments, and his friend Anatolius within the besieged quarter, strenuously exerted themselves to lessen the horrors of the siege. Eusebius having obtained promise of quarter from Theodotus for all who would surrender themselves, informed Anatolius, who induced the senate, cooped up in Bruchium, to accept the terms for all useless hands. Nearly the whole of the besieged availed themselves of this opportunity of escape, including a large number of Christians, many disguising themselves as women and making their way out by night. The fugitives were kindly received by Eusebius, who supplied them with food and medicine, and carefully tended the sick and suffering. On the summoning of the synod at Antioch, A.D. 264, to consider the charges against Paul of Samosata, Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, being unable to be present through age, commissioned Eusebius as his representative. The see of Laodicea was then vacant. The Laodicenes resolved that Eusebius should be their bishop, and when he was refused to receive he was seized and forcibly consecrated. As bishop of Laodicea he sat at the synod when Paul of Samosata was deposed, A.D. 270. He was succeeded by his old friend Anatolius διδοῦχος δανέως δανεῖον. (Euseb. H. E. vii. 11; vid. 32; Tilletem. Mémo. EcoI. iv. 304; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 792; Neale, Patriarchate of Alexandria, i. 77; Patri. of Antioch, 54.)

[3. E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (49), bishop of Larissa, in Syria Secunda, south of Apamea. He signed the synodical epistle of the province of Syria Secunda addressed to Joannes, A.D. 518. (Mansi, viii. 1049; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 920.)

[3. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (50), fifth bishop of Le Puy, succeeding Roricus I. and succeeded by St. Paulinus. (Gaul. Christ. ii. 688; Gams, Series Episc. 605.)

[S. A. B.]

EUSEBIUS (51), one of the bishops of Macedonia addressed by Innocent I. (Ep. 17, P. L. xx. 527), and doubtless the one of the same name among the Macedonian bishops whom Chrysostom
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thanks for their firm adherence, A.D. 406. (Chrysost. Ep. 163; Pat. Gr. lii. 705.) [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (89), ST., sixth bishop of Macon, succeeding St. Justus, and followed by Florentius, succeeded, following pastors, Macon, A.D. 588, Lyons in the same year, and Valentinia in the year 584 or 585. He was buried in the church of St. Clement at Macon. (Gall. Christ. iv. 1041; Mansi, ix. 936, 943, 946.)

S. A. B.

EUSEBIUS (58), bishop of Magnesia on the Meander in the province of Asia, one of the Arian seeckers to Philoppoeus from the council of Sardica, A.D. 347. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 697; Mansi, iii. 139.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (54), bishop of Magnesia, near Mount Sipylos, in the province of Asia, present at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 735; Mansi, iv. 1215.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (56), bishop of Maranopolis, an unknown town in Mesopotamia, subscribing to the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, through his metropolitan, Simeon bishop of Amida. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1007; Mansi, vii. 165.)

EUSEBIUS (56), twenty-second bishop of Milan, between Lazarus and Gerunius, succeeding the former in 449. He was one of the bishops of Milan to whom Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, in the succeeding generation dedicated epigrams in verse. This author calls Eusebius a man of extraordinary value, from the East out of regard to a people that were strangers to him. At the time of his election to the see he was a deacon at Milan, and Ughelli states, upon what authority does not appear, that he was consecrated by pope Leo the Great. At the period of his accession the controversy was on foot that led to the assembling of the fourth general council, which commenced at Chalcedon on Oct. 8, 451. In anticipation of it Eusebius, at Leo's request, held a synod of his province, in which was considered the important letter which Leo had recently addressed to Flavian patriarch of Constantinople, giving his view of the doctrine in dispute. The letter was considered at length in the synod of Milan, the particulars of which are known from an extant synodical epistle of Eusebius addressed to Leo, and now printed among the epistles of Leo (ep. 97 in Pat. Lat. liv. 945), and in Mansi (vi. 141). Its editorial date is August or September, 451, and it was signed by or on behalf of eighteen suffragans. According to the traditions of the church, Mirolas was the compiler of the Ughelli and Cappelletti, Eusebius showed much zeal in restoring the churches which had been ruined by the Gothic invasion of north Italy, and in renewing the service books which had been burnt. An ancient metrical inscription in the church of St. Thecla given in the note at Ennodius as cited by Ughelli, and a brass plate to him as the restorer of that church in particular, after its destruction by fire. Ughelli states that Eusebius was present at pope Hilary's synod at Rome, Nov. 17, 466, and that, returning to Milan, he died Aug. 12, 466, and was buried in the basilica of St. Stephen. But in the list of bishops attending the Roman synod his name is not included, nor is Milan represented at all (Mansi, vii. 965), a circumstance which suggests either that he was then vacant, or that Eusebius was in his last illness. Cappelletti does not accept Ughelli's statement, but believes Eusebius to have died in 465. (Ughelli, It. Sacr. iv. 50; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 110, 301; Ennodus, Clem.; ii. carm. 88 in Pat. Lat. lxii. 350.) [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (87), bishop of Milebntus; his name is found in the list of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 919; Mansi, ii. 695.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (55), bishop of Nantes, present at the first council of Tours, 461. (Sirmion, Concilia Galliae, i. 126; Gall. Christ. xiv. 757.) [R. T. S.]

EUSEBIUS (59), bishop of Naples, c. 644-650. (Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum, part i. 28, in Scriptores Rerum Italicarum et Longobardorum, 1378, p. 416.) [A. H. D. A.]

EUSEBIUS (90), bishop of Nicomedia. Our knowledge of the character of this prelate is derived almost exclusively from the embittered language of his theological antagonists, and from the hints given by them concerning the extraordinary influence he wielded over the fortunes of some of the great party leaders of the 4th century. The fascination Eusebius exercised over the minds of Constantine and Constantius, the dexterity with which he utilized both secular and ecclesiastical law, in order to punish his theological enemies, the ingenuity with which he blinded the judgment of those who were not alive to the magnitude of the problem they were addressing, the power he had over the thinking world, the unprincipled way in which he brought men to a belief in the practical identity of his personal views with those of the Catholic church, together with the political and personal ascendancy he achieved, reveal mental capacity and diplomatic skill worthy of a better cause. During twenty years his shadow haunts the pages of the ecclesiastical historians of the period, though they seldom bring us face to face with the man, or preserve either his spoken words or his correspondence. Some of the most noteworthy expressions of his thought which have survived have been latterly brought into discredit. The chronology of his life is singularly perplexed, and while studying it we must steer through our way by the statements of the only authorities to which we can appeal. It is difficult to understand the pertinacity and even ferocity with which Eusebius and his party pursued the Homousian leaders, and to reconcile their sleepless and dogged antagonism to the great Catholic bishops with their well-accustomed compromises, their shifting of fronts, and their theological evasions. Denys (The Arians of the Fourth Century, p. 272) admits their consistency in one thing, "their hatred of the sacred mystery." He thinks that this mystery, "like a spectre, was haunting the field and disturbing the complacency of their intellectual investigations." Their consciences did not scruple to "find enemies of a tenacious statement..." Not only did they compromise themselves by signature, and if they were as unscrupulous as their enemies supposed, might therefore have dismissed the controversy from their minds. Yet, as a matter of fact, they did not treat as either insignificant or unimportant that which they were in the habit of declaring to be such; but they set all
The controversy between the Arian and the orthodox turns on problems and inquiries of which the full solution lies beyond the range of the human intellect. They agreed as to the unique and exalted dignity of the Son of God, they both alike described the relation between the first and second hypostasis in the Godhead, as the Son is dependent upon us in the paternal and filial relation. They even agreed that the Son was "begotten of His Father before all worlds"—before the commencement of time, in an ineffable manner—that the Son was the originator of the categories of time and place, that "by His own will and counsel He has subsisted before time and before ages, as perfect God, only begotten and unchangeable." (Letter of Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia preserved by Theodoret, i. 5.) They agreed that He was "God of God," "Light of Light," and worthy of all honour and worship. Orthodox went further, and in order to affirm that the Deity of the Son of God is absolute and not relative, infinite and not finite, asserted that He was of the same  

\textit{σωφρονίς} with the Father. There Arius and Eusebius stopped, and pressing the significance of the image of Father and Son by materialistic analogies into logical conclusions, they argued that "generation" implied that "there was a period, rather than a time" when He was not, that "He was not before He was begotten." The one element, said they, which the Son did not possess by his generation was the eternal, absolute  

\textit{σωφρονίς} of the Father. Arius wrote that to say the contrary was an "impious to which we could not listen, even though the heretics (meaning the party of Alexander) should threaten us with a thousand deaths" (Theod. i. 5). "We affirm," said Eusebius, in his one extant authentic letter, addressed to Paulinus of Tyre (Theod. i. 6), that "there is one who is unbegotten, and that there also exists and is such a creature, proceeding from Him, yet who was not made out of His substance, and who does not at all participate in the nature or substance of Him who is unbegotten." The mind grows dizzy in this exalted region of speculation, and thought trembles as it dogmatizes on the eternal nature of the internal "relations" in the nature of the "absolute" and Infinite God; but if we follow out the logical conclusions that are involved in the denial of the orthodox statement on this transcendental theme, it is more easy to understand the abhorrence with which the dogmatic negations of the Arians were regarded by the Catholic church. The position taken by Arius and Eusebius involved a virtual Dithesism, and re-opened the door to a novel Polytheism. After Christianity had triumphed over the gods of heathendom, Arius seemed to be re-introducing them under other names. The numerical unity of God was at stake in these speculations; and a schism, or at least a divarication of interests in the Godhead, seemed to be possible. Moreover the "Divinity" of the Incarnate Word was on this hypothesis less than God; and so behind the Deity which He claimed there loomed another Godhead, between whom and Himself antagonism might easily be predicated. The Gnosticism of Marcion had already drawn such antagonism into sharp outline, and the entire view of the person of the Lord, thus suggested, rapidly degenerated into a cold and unchristian humanitarianism.

The exigencies of historic criticism and of the exegesis of the New Testament compelled the Arian party to discriminate between the Word, the divine nature of God, the Son, and the Logos. They could not escape the conclusion, since God could never have been without His "logos," that the logos was in some sense eternal. They could not honestly apply their negative formulæ to the logos, and so took advantage of the distinction drawn in the Greek schools between  

\textit{λόγος} and  

\textit{φωνή}, identifiable with the wisdom, reason, and self-consciousness of God, and  

\textit{λόγος} as the "instrument of God’s purposes towards His creation." (Newman, f. c. 199; cf. Athan. Hist. Conc. Aris. et Selc. cap. ii. § 18.) The orthodox party admitted the double use of the word  

\textit{λόγος}, allowed that it answered to the eternal wisdom and also to the eternal manifestation of God, and discarding the trammels of the figurative expression by which the internal relations of the Godhead can alone be represented to us, they declared that they could not carry the materialistic or temporal accompaniments of our idea of Father and Son into this "generation," and boldly accepted the sublime paradox with which Origen had refuted Sabellianism, viz. the "eternal generation of the Son." To suppose the relation between the Father and Son other than eternal was to be involved in the argument of materialization and Gnostic speculation. As they were compelled to formulate expressions about the infinite and eternal God, they concluded that any formula which divided the essence of God left infinity on the one side, and the finite on the other, i.e. that there would be, on this hypothesis, an infinite difference even in majesty and glory between the Father and the Son. This was blasphemy to those who held the Divinity of the Son of God.

The controversy was embittered by the method in which Arius and Eusebius appealed to Holy Scripture. They argued that Godhead and participation in the divine nature were attributed to the Lord Jesus Christ in the same terms in which similar distinctions are yielded by God’s will and appointment to other creatures, angelic, human, or physical (Theod. H. E. i. 6, 8), and thus the rank in the universe of the Redeemer of the world might be indefinitely reduced, and all the confidence placed in Him ultimately proved to be an illusion. The method of argument had a tone of gross irreverence, even if the leaders can be quite acquitted of blasphemous levity or intentional abuse. It is difficult adequately to appreciate the wrath shown by Athanasius (\textit{Contra Arias}, Sermon. i. 1; \textit{De Conc. Anti. cap. ii}) against the mire chosen by Arius for
the composition of his Thalia. He and Eusebius doubtless calculated the effect which would be produced by the elephantes joke which roused the ire of the church Fathers. At any rate, we can see that if the angle of the original controversy be almost microscopic to modern eyes, yet the arc subtending the angle may itself become infinite if we follow out to the full its legitimate consequences. Two nearly parallel lines may apparently correspond with two lines which intersect at a great distance, yet a measureless difference between them will manifest itself if we follow our two pairs of lines out into infinity.

One of the tactics adopted by the Arian or Eusebian party was to accuse of Sabellianism those who did not accept their interpretation of the relation between the Father and the Son. We can easily believe that many Arians, and many Catholics, who were not versed in philosophical discussion, were incapable of discriminating between the views of Sabellius and an orthodoxy which vehemently or unguardedly censured that the Son was coeternal with the Father. Sabellius repudiated violently the Pantheistic tenacity of the Sabellian doctrine. They dreaded a merely modal Trinity. It was perilous in their opinion to regard Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as merely subjective aspects of the Divine Being. They repudiated an "inversion of the Logos (which) became little more than a figurative personality of divine power in the life and conduct of a mere man." (Newman.) It was politic of them to charge Athanasius, Eustathius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and others, with Sabellianism, and endeavour to make the world, if not the church, believe that they alone held the Catholic faith, and that those who refused to tolerate their negative definitions were "impious heretics."

Eusebius of Nicomedia is the most prominent and most distinguished man of the entire movement. He has been confidently and plausibly accepted as the teacher rather than the disciple of Arius. Athanasius himself made the suggestion. At all events, we learn on good authority, that of Arius himself, that they were fellow disciples of Lucian of Antioch (Theodoret, H. E. i. 5). It is true that Lucian afterwards modified his views, and Eusebius is not infixed for the truth, but his rationalizing spirit produced a great effect on the schools of Antioch. Antioch was singularly prepared by Jewish prejudices, and by the remains of the Ebonitic and Essenic spirit which lingered in certain parts of Syria, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia (Pauzéz of Samaria) to receive a rational of the person of Christ, which was deprived of its mystery and of its authoritative claims. Aristotelian logic was quickening an incipient nominalism, and broad eclecticism was growing rank in the schools of Antioch. Lucian imbibed and consecrated the tendency. Eusebius submitted to his influence before he came into a relation with the Arians. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, Eusebius was a distant relative of the emperor Julian, and therefore possibly a relative of Constantine.

We know nothing further of his early life, nor how he came to enter or serve the church. Constantine implies that at one time he was the friend and supporter of Licius. It may have been through the wife of Licius and sister of Constantine that he received his first ecclesiastical appointment. This was the bishopric of Beirut (Beirut) in Syria, the port which was much used by all travellers from Antioch or Damascus to the West. We cannot say under what pretext he was translated to the episcopal see of Nicomedia, a city which since the accession of Diocletian was still the principal seat of the imperial court. The Eclectic Letter of the Egyptian Council comments severely on the step: "He left the one see contrary to the law, and contrary to the law invaded the other; he deserted his own see, for he failed in affection, and took possession of another's, though he failed in a plea." In Nicomedia the ambitious spirit of Eusebius, and personal relations with the imperial family, gave him much influence. "He was," says Sozomen, "a man of considerable learning, and held in high repute at the palace." The palace and cathedral of Nicomedia were memorable in the history of Christianity (Diocletian), and her were spun the webs by which the Arian conspiracy for a while prevailed over the faith and discipline of the church. One of the most authoritative documents of Arius is a letter sent by Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia, when stung by what he describes as his persecution and afflictions, following the first suspension of his presbyterical functions at Baulacis, Alexandria, and in which [Aureus] he reminds Eusebius of their ancient friendship, and briefly states his own views. He boasts that Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodotus of Laodicea, Paulinus of Tyre, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Gregory of Berytus, Athius of Lydda, and all the bishops of the East, if he is condemned, must be condemned with him (Theod. H. E. i. 5). It is true that Lucian afterwards modified his views, and Eusebius is not infixed for the truth, but his rationalizing spirit produced a great effect on the schools of Antioch. Antioch was singularly prepared by Jewish prejudices, and by the remains of the Ebonitic and Essenic spirit which lingered in certain parts of Syria, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia (Pauzéz of Samaria) to receive a rational of the person of Christ, which was deprived of its mystery and of its authoritative claims. Aristotelian logic was quickening an incipient nominalism, and broad eclecticism was growing rank in the schools of Antioch. Lucian imbibed and consecrated the tendency. Eusebius submitted to his influence before he came into a relation with the Arians. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, Eusebius was a distant relative of the emperor Julian, and therefore possibly a relative of Constantine.

8 Hist zii. c. 2: "Nicomeda ab Eusebo educatus [Paulinusx] episcopo, quem genere longius contingebat."
9 The Benedicites make conjectures as to this relationship between Julian and Eusebius; Thiifmont, however, can see no good ground for them (Min. vi. 741).
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trivial error, but not so far gone but that Paulinius, if he were to try, might put him right. He made the tacit assumption that the party of Alexandria asserted "too unbegotten beings," a position utterly denied by themselves. He repudiated strongly the idea that the Son was made in any sense out of the substance of God. In fact, he declares the Son "to be entirely distinct in nature and power," that the method of His origin is known only to God, not even to the Son Himself. Stress is laid by Eusebius on the use of the verb "created," in Prov. viii. 22-26. The term, he said, could not have been used if the "wisdom" of which the prophet was speaking was ἐκ ἀφωγόρως τῆς ἀθάνατης. "For that which proceeds from Him who is unbegotten cannot be said to have been created or founded either by Him or by another." The effect of the word "begotten" is reduced to its minimum by saying that the term is used of "things," and of persons entirely different in nature from God. "Men," "Israel," and "drops of dew" are in different scriptures said to be "begotten" of God. The meaning of ἀθάνατης, "the term cannot and does not carry similarity, still less identity of nature.

On the first exhibition of the divergent opinions of Alexander and Arius, the emperor Constantine treated the conflict as if it were one capable of easy adjustment by a wise exercise of Christian temper. In the year 324 he wrote them a joint letter, which he entrusted to Hosius of Cordova (Sozomen, H. E. i. 16), in which he called upon the disputants for his sake, and for the sake of peace, to terminate their controversy. The dispute was a "trifling and foolish verbal dispute," and he called on the disputants to regard the problem as secondary, and to urge that any difference of judgment was compatible with union and communion on their part. It is highly probable that the mind of Constantine had been led to this step by the Bishop of Nicomedia, while the strong pressure put upon Alexander to receive Arius into communion of the Nicene Church, and the persistent demand of the Eusebians. The effort at mediation failed, although it was conducted by the skilful diplomacy and tact of the venerable Hosius. As the dispute was no mere verbal quibble, but did in reality touch the very object of Divine worship, the ground of religious hope, and the unity of the Godhead, such words of remonstrance poured fresh oil on the flame. Arius was again condemned by a council at Alexandria, the entire East was disturbed, and the well-meaning interference of the emperor augmented the acrimony of the disputants. The angry letter of Constantine to Arius, which must have been written after his condemnation by the Alexandrian council and before the council of Nicæa, shows that the influence of Eusebius must now have been in abeyance. Though Constantine was not a theologian, he hated a recalcitrant subordinate in church or state, and hence the undoubted vacillation of his mind towards Alexander, Arius, Eusebius, and Athanasius. The next appearance of Eusebius is at the ocumenical council of Nicæa in 325, where he does not hesitate to play the part of the defender of the excommunicated presbyter, and to be the advocate and interpreter of his opinions before the council. We must concede to him some credit for moral courage in risking his position, not only as a bishop, but as a court favourite, for the sake of his theological views, and in opposing himself almost single-handed to the nearly unanimous judgment of the first representative assembly of the Christian episcopate—a judgment now fanned into enthusiasm by the breath of martyrs and monks from the African monasteries, and accepted hurriedly but passionately by the emperor of the world. The courage was of short duration, and made way for disinclined wiles. He soon displayed an inconsistent and temporizing spirit. Whether he continued to hold that the discussion covered a merely verbal difference, we know not, but it is certain that when the Arian bishops in the council found that the Godhead of the Redeemer was declared by the vast majority to be of the very essence of Christ, they made every effort to accept the terms in which that Godhead was being expressed by the council, making signs to each other that term after term, such as "Power of God," "Wisdom of God," "Image of God," "Very God of very God," might be accepted because they could use them of such divinity as was "made" or "subtended" as such by the Divine appointment. Thus they were becoming parties to a test, which they were at the same moment intending to evade. The term ἡμοουσια, as applied to the Son of God, rallied for a while their conscience, and Eusebius declared it to be untenable. According to Theodoret (i. 9), the "formulary pronounced by Eusebius contained undiscerned evidence of his blasphemy; the reading of it occasioned great grief to the audience on account of the depravity of the doctrines; the writer was covered with shame, and the impious writing was torn to pieces." This absurdity and inconsistency of the Arian party is exaggerated by Theodoret, for he adds, "the Arians unanimously signed the confession of faith adopted by the council." This is not precisely the case. There were seventeen bishops (Soz. i. 20), who in the first instance refused their signatures, among them both the Eusebius, Theognis of Nicæa, Menophantus of Ephesus, Secundus of Potamia, Theonas, Patrophilus, Narcissus, Maris, and others. Eusebius of Caesarea, after long discussion, signed the symbol, which was in fact an enlargement of a formal creed that he had himself presented to the council in its entirety, on the ground that the negative dogmas of the Arian party, which were antagonized by the council, could not be found in Scripture. Others of his party followed. According to Theodoret (i. 9), they all, with the exception of Secundus and Theonas, joined in the condemnation of Arius, and Sozomen (i. 21) declares explicitly that Eusebius of Nicomedia, with others, "sanctioned" the decision of the synd to the consubstantiality of the Son, and the excommunication of those who held the Arian formulae; but Sozomen goes on

* Tillemont, Les Arien, note 5. The letter is preserved by Gelasian of Cyzicus (ii. 1) in Greek, and given by Barrow in Latin from a Ms. in the Vatican. Bar. Ant. 319, vi.

† Philostorius mentions twenty-two names, but Hefele, on the authority of Socrates and Sozomen, limits them to seventeen.
to say that "it ought to be known that Eusebius and Theognis, although they agreed to the exposition of faith set forth by the council, neither agreed nor subscribed to the deposition of Arius." He may have drawn a distinction between anathematizing his supposed views, and consenting to the ecclesiastical and civil degradation of the man. Otherwise these two statements are somewhat inconsistent. Sozomen, apparently, makes this refusal to sign, on the part of Eusebius and Theognis, to have been the reason or occasion of their own exile, and of the filling up by Constantine of their respective sees with Amphion and Chrestus. Philostorgius seems, in the fragments of his worthless history which remain, to have put another colour upon the transaction. He admitted that the whole rank and file of the Arian party, with the exception of Secundus and Theonas, signed the symbol, and adds that they did it deceitfully (δε δεα), and with the mental reservation of substituting in their case ὑστερον (of similar substance), for ἀναθηματος (of the same substance). He adds, according to his editor, that they did this under the direction of Constantine, the sister of Constantine; and further he relates that "Secundus, when sent into exile, reproached Eusebius for having signed, saying that he did so in order to avoid going into exile, and that Secundus expressed a confident hope that Eusebius would shortly be exiled, an event which took place three months after the council." Moreover Athenasius (de Decretis Syn. Nic. cc. 3, 18) expressly says that Eusebius signed the formulary, and made no reference to any reservation of either kind.

Notwithstanding their signature, for a reason which is not cleared up perfectly, Eusebius and Theognis were banished for nearly three years from their respective sees. Theodoret (H. E. i. 20) preserves a portion of a letter written by the emperor Constantine against Eusebius and Theognis, and addressed to Nicea. The document displays bitter animosity, and, for so actute a prince, a curious simplicity. Considerable confusion accompanies it, and Baronius has seen fit to assign its composition to a much later period. As it refers to the period of the Nicene council and the feeling then existing between Constantine towards Eusebius, it is important. Constantine reveals a private grudge against Eusebius for his conduct when Licinius was contending with him, and he professes to have seized the accomplices of Eusebius, and to have possessed himself of damaging papers and trustworthy evidence against him. He reproaches Eusebius with having been the first defender of Arius, and with having deceived him in hope of retaining his benefits. This is coupled with angry reference to the conduct of Eusebius in urging on Alexandrians and others the duty of communion with the Arians. And this pertinacity is suggested by Constantine as the actuating cause and occasion of his exile.

Now Epiphanius (Haer. lviii.) 1 details the circumstances of the union of the Melitian schismatics with the Arians, and the disinterested part taken by Eusebius in promoting his good offices with the emperor, if they are their turn would promote the return of Arius to Alexandria, and would promise intercommunication with him and his party. "I was myself deluded and deceived by Eusebius," said Constantine. "In everything he acted according to the desire of him whose mind is full of evil. . . . I sent orders for the apprehension of certain individuals in Alexandria who oppose our faith (i.e. Arians), but those good and excellent bishops who by the clemency of the council had been admitted to penitence (i.e. Melitians), not only received them under their protection, but also participated in their evil deeds. Hence I came to the determination of banishing those ungrateful persons to some far distant region." This, doubtless from its connexion, refers to Eusebius and Theognis.

The terms of hatred and disgust with which Constantine speaks of Eusebius in this letter, render his early return to Nicæa very puzzling. Sozomen (ii. 16) and Socrates (i. 14) both record a letter which in the year A.D. 328. Eusebius and Theognis wrote, not to Constantine, but to "the Bishops," explanatory of their views, in which they endeavoured to prove that they had the same faith that you do, and that after a diligent examination of the word ὑστερον, we are wholly intent upon preserving peace, and that we are seduced by no heresy. Having proposed for the safety of the church such suggestions as occurred to us, and having certified what we deemed requisite, we signed the confession of faith. We did not certainly sign the ordinance, but this was not because we impugned the confession of faith, but because we did not believe the accused to be what he was represented to us, the letters we had received from him and the discourses he had delivered in our presence compelled us to entertain a contrary opinion of him. So far from opposing any of the decrees enacted in your holy synod, we asent to all of them—not because we are wearied of exile, but because we wish to avert all suspicion of heresy. . . . The accused having justified himself and having been recalled from exile, &c. &c. we beseech you to make our supplication known to our most holy emperor, and that you immediately direct us to act according to your will. If this letter is a genuine utterance of the mind of Eusebius, it demonstrates the fact of his partial and incomplete signature of the symbol of Nicaea, and that the incompleteness turned on personal and not on doctrinal grounds. It vindicates somewhat the character of Eusebius, as it assigns the cause of the exile to that inchoate signature, it implies the return of Arius from exile, independently of his personal influence, and reveals what must be granted to be a certain chivalrous regard to the character and safety of Arius. Other statements of Sozomen (ii. 27) are in harmony with it, for he relates that an Arian priest was on terms of intimacy with Constantina (sister of Constantine and widow of Licinius), who represented to her that Arius was the victim of Alexander's personal enmity. Sozomen further

1 Letter of Constantine (Thed. i. 29).
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states that she, as a dying request, besought Constantine not to leave good men in perpetual banishment, and that this induced Constantine to permit Arius to draw up an artfully devised document expressive of his faith, which satisfied a synod of bishops at Jerusalem, and was enough to placate the vacillating mind of the emperor.

There are reasons for hesitating to receive these statements. The part said to be taken by Constantine in the return of Arius is hampered by serious chronological difficulties;² but the letter itself is in obvious contradiction with the evidence already offered that Eusebius and Theognis signed the symbol, anathemas and all. If they had not signed, they would have been banished then and there, and not as Philostorgius says, "three months after the council," in Nov. 325. Even Socrates implies it was after the council. The banishment could not have taken place in the midst of the trials of Athanasius, or he would have in his numerous references to Eusebius have mentioned it. De Broglie³ urges that it would be much more probable that some other influence brought to bear on Constantine should have first secured the return of the bishops, and then that they should have secured the recall of Arius from exile. The circumstance that it would have been addressed to the bishops rather than to Constantine is treated as suspicious, because Eusebius had not been condemned by them, seeing he had signed the formulaires. The alleged spuriousness of the letter, on the other hand, rests upon the assertions of Philostorgius (i. 54) and Epiphanius (vi. 5) that Eusebius did join in the anathemas and sign in toto. Are we to believe them against the conjoint testimony of Sozomen and Socrates, who expressly give a consistent representation of another kind, and one undoubtedly more favourable to Eusebius? The difficulty about the recall of Arius was solved by a statement of Sozomen (i. 22) that Eusebius and Theognis secured the return of Arius to Alexandria, whereas the letter given by Sozomen and Socrates merely refers to his recall from exile.

The most powerful argument of De Broglie and others against the genuineness of the letter, as being written after the exile of Eusebius, is the silence of Athanasius, who never once makes use of the argument it would have put into his hands, as to the identity of the position and sentiments of Arius and Eusebius.

Philostorgius⁴ tells us another rumour that after the council Eusebius desired to have his name expunged from the list of signatories, and a similar statement is repeated by Sozomen (i. 21) as the possible cause of the banishment of Eusebius. The fact may, notwithstanding the adverse judgment of many historians, have been that Eusebius signed the formululary, expressing at the time the view he took of its meaning, and how he discriminated between an anathema of certain positions and the persecution of an individual. It is probable that

a signature, thus qualified, may have saved him from immediate banishment, that in the course of three months his sympathy with Arius as a deposed and banished man provoked old sores in the mind of Constantine, and his underhand proceeding with the Meletians roused the emperor's indignation and led to his banishment. The probability that Arius was recalled first, as positively stated in what purports to be a contemporary document, is certainly greater than that merely a priori probability on which De Broglie insists. Moreover, if Arius had been restored to favour, the vacillating mind of Constantine may have been moved to recall the two bishops. At all events, about 329 we find Eusebius once more in high favour with Constantine (Socrates, H. E. i. 23), discharging his episcopal functions, persuading Constantine that he and Arius held substantially the creed of Nicea.

The course thenceforward pursued by Eusebius was to use his great power at the court, and the ascendancy he had already acquired over the mind of Constantine to blast the character and quench the influence of the most distinguished advocates of the anti-Arian views. He put all the machinery of church and state into operation to unseat Athanasius, Eustathius, Marcellus, and others; and by means which are open to the severest reprehension, he steadily and unscrupulously strove to enforce his latitudinarian compromise on the Catholic church. In the first place, it is not difficult to trace his hand in the letter Constantine addressed to Athanasius, now archbishop of Alexandria,⁵ in which Constantine threatened Athanasius with depositional if he did not admit to the church those who were anxious for such communion. Moreover, Athanasius assures us that Eusebius wrote to him personally with the same object in view.

The answers rendered by Athanasius both to Eusebius and to the emperor made it clear that the project could never succeed so long as Athanasius remained at Alexandria. This was the occasion on which the Meletians were encouraged to concoct the earliest of those charges against the honour, sobriety, and loyalty of Athanasius, which for a quarter of a century were almost lifted into artificiis stantis vel cadentis evincendae.

While the charges against Athanasius were in process of incubation, considerable controversy had prevailed between Eusebius of Caesarea and Eustathius of Antioch on the true meaning of the important term Homousios, and while Eustathius [Eusebius (Gusar)] in his great zeal for the Nicene faith, had unscrupulously refused to admit Arians into communion, he laid himself open, in the opinion of Eusebius of Caesarea, to the charge of Sabellianism (Soz. ii. 18). This provided the opportunity for Eusebius of Nicomedia to strike a blow at one of the pillars of the Nicene formululary. Nothing can exceed the treachery shown by Eusebius on this occasion. His apparently friendly visit to Eustathius, on his way to Jerusalem (Soz. ii. 19; Theod. i. 21), the gathering of his supporters and rallying of the Arian notables, on his return to Antioch, shew the scheme to have been deeply laid. Here, A.D. 330

---

¹ R. L. 11. Tillemon, Notes sur le Concile de Nice, note vili. Sur les Ariens, art. xii.
² L'Église et l'Empire romain, i. 132, note.
³ In his statement preserved in Lib. v. cap. 8 of the Historia Ecclesiastica Fidelis, by Nicetas Choniatis.
⁴ "Eusebius," says Athanasius, "caused the emperor to write to me." (Apol. contr. Aris., 59; Soz. ii. 22; Soz. l. 27.)
or beginning of 331, the council of his friends was held at which the charge of Sabellianism was, according to Theodoret (i. 21) and Philostorgius (ii. 7), gravitated by the accusation brought by a woman, that Eustathius was the father of her child.

Socrates makes no distinct mention of the latter charge, and it must be remembered that this was not an uncommon device of the enemies of ecclesiastics. We may charitably hope that Eusebius was not a party to the odious incrimination, but it is obvious that some such charge was brought, for Sozomen speaks of the accusation of "unholy deeds," and Eusebius, the historian, appears to confirm it. The upshot was that, through this and other vexed-up charges of disrespect to the emperor's mother, the bishop of Antioch was deposed and exiled by the Eusebians.

The letter of Constantine upon the affair, and against heretics generally, brought the controversy to a close, until the death of Athanasius. The career of Eusebius of Nicomedia during the remaining ten years of his life is so closely intertwined with the romantic sufferings of Athanasius that it is difficult to indicate the part he took in the persecution of Athanasius without reproducing the story of this great hero of the Catholic faith.

The first charge which Eusebius encouraged the Meletians to bring against Athanasius concerned his taxing the people of Egypt for linen vestments, and it turned upon the supposed violence of Macarius, the representative of Athanasius, in the act of reproving (for uncanonical proceedings) Ischyros, a priest of the Cuthian sect, upon the overthrow on that occasion of the altar and the chalice. These charges were all absolutely disproved by Athanasius before Constantine at Nicomedia. On the return of Athanasius to Alexandria he had to encounter fresh opposition. The well-known but probably unhistorical story of the murder of Arsenius, with its grotesque accompaniments, was gravely laid at his door. [Arsenius; Athanasius.] To this, at first, he disdained to reply. Eusebius declared even this to be a serious charge, and made much capital out of the refusal of Athanasius to attend the council at Csesarea, which was investigated, and Constantine was already on the eve of his public reception. A.D. 335, at the council of Tyre, Athanasius was compelled to attend, and meet a complicated series of accusations of the most varied character. Though these charges were refuted in the most convincing manner, Athanasius had no chance with his infuriated colleagues, who sat as his judges, and who refused even the evidence of their own senses in favour of the accused prelate, and he fled to Constantinople, to lay his case once more before the emperor. In his absence, the council of Tyre passed a sentence of deposition, which Arsenius, who was said to have been murdered by him, and who had confessed his sin and shame in extant letters to Athanasius, actually signed. Constantine summoned the whole synod of Tyre before him, Eusebius and a few of his party, Theognis, Patrophilus, Valens, and Ursicius, obeyed the summons, and confronted Athanasius. Instead of standing on the veracity of the disputed charges, upon which nevertheless the sentence of deposition rested, Eusebius and his friends met him with new accusations, likely to damage him in the view of the emperor. When Athanasius protested that he was utterly unable to do that which was alleged, viz., prevent the importation of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople, Eusebius thundered him down with the declaration that he was a rich man, and could do what he pleased. Constantine yielded to the apparently malicious invectives of Eusebius, and banished Athanasius to Tyries, in Feb. 335. The cause of banishment is given as that, as Sozomen says nothing about the delay of the corn-ships, while Athanasius himself (Apol. c. Ar.) says that this charge had been raised in Constantine's own letters. The statements of the Apology (§ 8, § 87) are slightly divergent, and twice over (Ap. § 87, Hist. Ar. § 53) Athanasius declares that Constantine sent him to Tyre that in order to deliver him from the fury of his enemies. While Athanasius was in exile, Eusebius and his party aimed a second blow, by impeaching Marcellus of Ancyra for refusing to appear at the Council of Dedication at Jerusalem, A.D. 335, and also for the sale of souls, an implication of heresy to which he exposed himself while zealously vindicating his refusal to hold communion with Arians. [Artemius; Marcillecta.] Marcellus was deposed by the Eusebians, and not restored to this see till the council of Sardica reinstated him.

Arius was present at the Council of Debra, at Jerusalem, and having propounded a view of his faith, which was satisfactory to the council, he was received into the communion of the church, and sent by Eusebius to Alexandria, whence, as his presence created great disturbance, he was summoned to Constantinople. There Eusebius had planned his public reception into the church. The tragic end of Arius on the eve of his public reception, A.D. 336, is described by Sozomen (ii. 29, 30) in words quoted from Athanasius. (De morte Arios, Ep. ad Episc.) The death of Alexander of Constantinople followed very shortly, in 336, when the effort to elect Cyril in his place (without the consent of the bishop of Nicomedia) roused the ire of Eusebius, who intrigued to secure his first deposition. Eusebius must still have retained the favour of Constantine, as he appears to have administered baptism to the dying emperor, May 337. Jerome says that by this act Constantine avowed himself an Arian. "But all history protests against the severity of this sentence." (De Brogle.) Hefele supposes that Constantine regarded Eusebius as the great advocate of Christian unity, and as one who felt it to be right to expel from positions of
EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA

importance and influence in the church those who were stumbling-blocks in the way of his comprehensive charity. Moreover, in this year of Constantine, Eusebius was one who had signed the Nicene symbol, and had renounced the secessions of Arius. Philostorgius (ii. 1) believed that Eusebius was the Arian priest to whom Constantine entrusted his "will," for presentation to his son; it is far more probable that this functionary was the Arian priest called by later writers Eustathius, who at sundry important epochs exercised much influence over him. There is reason to think that Constantinian before his death had determined to recall Athanasius, and this is the ostensible ground on which Constantine II (Emperor of the West) took the steps necessary to secure that result. The ecclesiastical historians of the period often differ in their chronology, and perplex us by their divergent statements as to the time when Eusebius was raised to the episcopate of Constantinople. Those who state that Eusebius was unlawfully translated from Nicomedia to Constantinople, in direct violation of that canon which prohibits bishops and presbyters from going from one city to another, and he asserts that this took place on the death of Alexander. There is, however, proof of another kind that Paul, who was twice banished through the influence of Eusebius, was the immediate successor of Alexander.

Paul was nominated by Alexander, but the Eusebian party put forward Macedonius (Soz. iii. 4), and were defeated. The dispute thus occasioned was turned against Constantine, and through the machinations of the enemies of Paul a synod was convened, and he was expelled from the church, and Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was installed in the bishopric of Constantinople, and with this statement Socrates (ii. 7) agrees. Paul's first occupancy of the see must have been brief and troubled. Differences have been raised as to the time when Paul was first banished, and whether he suffered from the Eusebian charges before or after his elevation to the bishopric. It would seem that he was bishop when Athanasius visited Constantinople, and this visit is supposed by Pagi to have been made to his own instance, from the preoccupation desire he had to advance the interests of the Catholic party in the Constantinopolitan church. According to him Athanasius must have been witness of the discomfiture of Paul and the steps which led to the election of Eusebius. For a while the education of Julian was entrusted to the courtly bishop, who had unbounded influence over Constantine. Gibbon says that Julian never expressed any gratitude to Eusebius for his instruction. Baronius suggests, with unscrupulous bitterness, that Julian's apostasy may be attributed, in part, to the time-serving spirit of compromise conspicuous in the career of Eusebius. However that may be, the course taken by Constantine was in the main due to Eusebius.

In 340 the Eusebius held a synod at Antioch, at which Athanasius was once more condemned. In 341 (May) the council developed into the celebrated council in Eusebius, held also at Antioch, which, under the presidency of Eusebius or Placitus of Antioch, and with the assent and presence of Constantius, diverse canons were passed, which are esteemed of authority by later ecclesiastical councils. These two councils are confused and identified by Socrates (ii. 2), and by Sozomen, and strange complications have arisen from the supposition that what was treated as a true synod by Julius, and was termed by Hilary a Synodus Sanctorum, could possibly have passed resolutions condemnatory of Athanasius.

The history of this controversy does not belong to the life of Eusebius. The cruel injustice to which Athanasius was subjected by long exile is freely attributed to Eusebius, as its mainspring and constant instigator. Nevertheless the last thing we are told about Eusebius by Socrates (ii. 13) is that he appealed from the council of Antioch to Julius, bishop of Rome, to give the definitive sentence as to the faults and sins of Athanasius, but that before the sentence of Julius reached him, he immediately after the council broke up, breathed his last, and went out of his body, and so he died," A.D. 342. He is compared by his theological opponents to Ahab.

The courts of many successive emperors are supposed to have suffered from the virus of his influence, and the world to have been permanently damaged by his errors and his spite.

In addition to the authors already cited the following modern works may be consulted. The Orations of St. Athanasius against the Arians, according to the Benedictine Text, with an Account of his Life, by William Bright, D.D.; Hefele, History of the Christian Councils, translated by Prebendary Clark and Mr. Oxenham, vol. i. and ii.; Möhler, Athanasius der Große und die Kirche seiner Zeit, 1844; William Bright, D.D., History of the Church from 313-451, 1869; Albert de Broglie, L'Église et l'Empire, 1856, tom. ii. The Arians of the Fourth Century, by J. H. Newman, 4th ed. 1876. [H. II. R.]

EUSEBIUS (61), bishop of Nilopolis (Melchis) in Egypt. He was present at the third general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1127; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 580.) [J. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (62), bishop of Ohba, in the province of Maurétania Tingitana; banished by the Vandal king Hunneric in the year 484 (Morelli, Africa Christ. i. 248; Notitia, 59, in Victor. Vit. Migne, Patrol. Lat. viii.). [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (63), bishop of Olba in Iasoria, on the river Lamus. Present at the second general council held at Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 570; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 1031.) [J. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (64), twelfth bishop of Orleans, following Dago, and succeeded by Leontius. In his episcopate was founded the abbey of Mickey, or St. Meinin, where the Loire flows into the Loire, in the diocese of Orleans. His signature is appended to Clovis's charter. (D'Archéy, Episcopologium, iii. 307; Migne, Pat. Lat. ixxi. 158.) In A.D. 511 he was present at the first council of Orleans, and in 518 we hear of him as burying the body of St. Laurian bishop of Seville at Antioch, which, under the presidency of Eusebius or Placitus of Antioch, and with the assent and presence of Constantius, diverse canons were passed, which are esteemed of authority by later ecclesiastical councils. These two councils are confused and identified by Socrates (ii. 2), and by Sozomen, and strange complications have arisen from the supposition that what was treated as a true synod by Julius, and was termed by Hilary a Synodus Sanctorum, could possibly have passed resolutions condemnatory of Athanasius.

The history of this controversy does not belong to the life of Eusebius. The cruel injustice to which Athanasius was subjected by long exile is freely attributed to Eusebius, as its mainspring and constant instigator. Nevertheless the last thing we are told about Eusebius by Socrates (ii. 13) is that he appealed from the council of Antioch to Julius, bishop of Rome, to give the definitive sentence as to the faults and sins of Athanasius, but that before the sentence of Julius reached him, he immediately after the council broke up, breathed his last, and went out of his body, and so he died," A.D. 342. He is compared by his theological opponents to Ahab.

The courts of many successive emperors are supposed to have suffered from the virus of his influence, and the world to have been permanently damaged by his errors and his spite.

In addition to the authors already cited the following modern works may be consulted. The Orations of St. Athanasius against the Arians, according to the Benedictine Text, with an Account of his Life, by William Bright, D.D.; Hefele, History of the Christian Councils, translated by Prebendary Clark and Mr. Oxenham, vol. i. and ii.; Möhler, Athanasius der Große und die Kirche seiner Zeit, 1844; William Bright, D.D., History of the Church from 313-451, 1869; Albert de Broglie, L'Église et l'Empire, 1856, tom. ii. The Arians of the Fourth Century, by J. H. Newman, 4th ed. 1876. [H. II. R.]

EUSEBIUS (61), bishop of Nilopolis (Melchis) in Egypt. He was present at the third general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1127; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 580.) [J. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (62), bishop of Ohba, in the province of Maurétania Tingitana; banished by the Vandal king Hunneric in the year 484 (Morelli, Africa Christ. i. 248; Notitia, 59, in Victor. Vit. Migne, Patrol. Lat. viii.). [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (63), bishop of Olba in Iasoria, on the river Lamus. Present at the second general council held at Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 570; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 1031.) [J. de S.]

EUSEBIUS (64), twelfth bishop of Orleans, following Dago, and succeeded by Leontius. In his episcopate was founded the abbey of Mickey, or St. Meinin, where the Loire flows into the Loire, in the diocese of Orleans. His signature is appended to Clovis's charter. (D'Archéy, Episcopologium, iii. 307; Migne, Pat. Lat. ixxi. 158.) In A.D. 511 he was present at the first council of Orleans, and in 518 we hear of him as burying the body of St. Laurian bishop of Seville at

8 Baronius, Valerius, and Pagi have discussed it at length. (Baronius, Pagi de Notitia, ann. 340, x. s. xi. alii.)
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Vatan in the diocese of Bourges, and he lived long enough to celebrate in 520 the funeral of St. Maximin himself. (Vita S. Maximini, Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. sec. i. 584; Labbe, Bibl. Nov. ii. 414; Gall. Christ. viii. 1413, 1527; Mansi, Conc. viii. 356.) [S. A. B.]

EUSEBIUS (65), bishop of Osca, i.e. Huesca, No. 44.

EUSEBIUS (66), bishop of Palaepolis, a town of uncertain position in the province of Asia; present at the synod held at Constanti- nople under Marcianus, a.d. 538. (Le Quien, Oriens Chri- st. i. 731; Mansi, viii. 1146; Gams, Series Episc. 444.) [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (67), an orthodox bishop of Palestine, who signed the Sardican confession of faith, A.D. 343-4. (Athanas. Apol. contr. Ariam. c. iii. § 50.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (68), a bishop in Palestine, one of those to whom the synodical of Theophilus bishop of Alexandria in the year 400, in condemnation of Origenism, is addressed. (Jerome, Ep. xcii.) [W. H. F.]

EUSEBIUS (69) I., bishop of Paris, c.r. 555, between Saffaracus and Germanus. But there is much dispute among French writers as to his existence (Gall. Christ. vii. 17). [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (70) II., 22nd occupant of the see of Paris, succeeding Ragnemodus, a.d. 591. Gregory of Tours gives the following account of him: "A Parisian bishop died: his brother Faramodus, a priest, was a candidate for the office, but one Eusebius, a merchant of Syrian birth, by dint of many presents obtained the see. Made bishop he dismissed the whole schola (according to Ruinart, the readers, singers, and others who were under the direction of the archdeacon) of his predecessor, and appointed his fellow- countrmen to the offices of the church. Eus- ebius, however, did not enjoy his honours long, and on his death he was succeeded by the Faramodus or Faramundus, whom he had dis- appointed. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. x. 26 in Mign. Patr. Lat. Lxxi. 558; Gall. Christ. vii. 22.) [S. A. B.]

EUSEBIUS (71), bishop of Pelusium, between Ammonius and Georgius. He was present at the council of Ephesus in 431 (Mansi, iv. 1127 A, 1129 B, 1366 D, v. 615 c). His contempor- ary lairdore, abbot of Pelusium, depicts him in the darkest colours. Eusebius, according to this account—which we have no means of checking—was a man of some taste and some ability, an "agreeable" preacher (Ep. i. 112; ep. v. 301), but at once hot-tempered (v. 196; ep. iii. 44) and easily swayed by men yet worse than himself (Ep. ii. 127; v. 451); his hands were not clear of simoniacal gain, which he employed in the building of a splendid church (i. 37; ii. 133); he "entrusted the flock to dogs, wolves, foxes" (v. 147), "the monasteries to herdsmen and runaway slaves" (i. 262); he was forgetful of the poor, and inaccessible to re- monstrance (iii. 282). His confidants were Lucius, the archdeacon, who was said to take money for ordinations (i. 29); Zosimus, a priest, who disgraced his grey hairs by vices which exceeded those of his youth (i. 140; ii. 75, 205, &c.), and took to himself contributions meant for the poor (Ep. v. 210); and three deans, Eustathius, Anatolius, and Maron (Ep. i. 228; ii. 28, 29, &c.), with whom Gotthius (Ep. ii. 10), Simon, and Chaeremon (Ep. v. 48, 373) are associated. The greediness of those who ad- ministered the church property was insatiable (Ep. v. 79). The offences of these men, or some of them, were so great that men cried out against them as effective advocates of Epi- curanism (Ep. ii. 153, 230), and Isidore, bishop, had to tell his correspondents that he had done his best (as, indeed, many of his letters show, e.g. i. 140, 435; ii. 28, 39, &c.) to reclaim the offenders, but that the physician could not compel the patient to follow his advice, that "God the Word Him- self" could not save Judas (Ep. iv. 205), that a good man should not soil his lips by denouncing their conduct (Ep. iii. 229; v. 116), and that nothing remained but to pray for their conver- sion (Ep. v. 2, 105, &c.), and in the meantime to distinguish between the man and the mistake (Ep. ii. 59), and to remember that the un- worthiness of the minister hindered not the effect of the sacraments (Ep. ii. 32). But the fullest account of the misgovernment of the church of Pelusium is given in the story of Justinianus (Ep. ii. 127), whom Eusebius had ordained, and made "accusans" or charge- steward. He played the knave and the tyrant, treated the bishops as his tool, was more than once in peril of his life from the indignation of the citizens, went to Alexandria, was menaced by Cyril the archbishop with excommunication, but returned and was united to Cyril himself in participation in simony. These things, and such as these, induced many to leave Pelusium in disgust; the "altar lacked ministers" (Ep. i. 38); a pious deacon, such as Eutonius, was oppressed by Zosimus (Ep. ii. 131), and attacked by the whole clergy, to some extent out of subserviency to the bishop (v. 564).

Eusebius is not mentioned among the fathers of the council of Chalcedon in 451. In 457 he was assisted, along with Peter bishop of Majuma, at the ordination of Timotheus Aecurus for the see of Alexandria (Evag. H. E. ii. 8), and those who were parties to that proceeding are stated by Theodorus Lector (H. E. i. 9) to have been deposed bishops. The epistle of the four bishops to Anatolius (Cod. Encyc. in Mansi, vii. 533 A) represents the two bishops (here unnamed) who ordained Timotheus as having no commis- sion with the Catholic church. (Le Quien, Ori- chr. ii. 533; Tillem. Mem. xv. 747, 748, 788-788.) [W. B. and C. B.]

EUSEBIUS (72), bishop of Pergamon, one of the Arian seceders to Philippopolis from the council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (Mansi, iii. 159); Le Quien (Oriens Chri. i. 715) supposes him to be the same as Eusebius, one of the fifteen bishops who met in synod at Gougna in Paphlagonia, and condemned the heretical asceticism of Eustathius. The date of this synod is disputed. [L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (73), fifth archbishop of Basa, succeeding Severus and followed by Marcellus. He subscribed two councils, the doubtful one of Cologne in 346, and that of Sardica in 347. (Gall. Christ. xi. 7; Mansi, ii. 1379, 1377.) [S. A. B.]
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EUSEBIUS (74), seventh bishop of Sabratha, succeeding St. Trophimus, and followed by Eusebius, he was present at the second council of Orleans in 533 and the fifth in 549, and according to the life of St. Radeugundis by the nun Baudonivia (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxii. 672) he summoned another council in conjunction with Leontius bishop of Bordeaux; but nothing further seems to be known of it. We learn from some verses of Venantius Fortunatus (lib. i. cap. xii, Patr. Lat. ixxviii. 74) that he founded a church in honour of St. Bibilnus, which Leontius completed. (Gall. Christ. ii. 1057; Mansi, Conc. viii. 838, ix. 138.)

EUSEBIUS (75) I, ST., fourth bishop of St. Paul de Trois Châteaux in Dauphine, between St. Sulpicius and St. Torquatus, lived perhaps about the beginning of the 3rd century. His day of commemoration is March 23. (Gall. Christ. i. 705; Gams, Series Episc. 615.)

EUSEBIUS (76) II, fourteenth bishop of St. Paul de Trois Châteaux, between Victor and Bette. He represented his predecessor at the council of Lyons in A.D. 567. His bishop, he was one of the subscribers of the second council of Valence, in 584 or 585, and, through a delegate, of the second council of Mâcon, A.D. 585. He is said to have died on March 23, and was honoured on that day in his own diocese. (Gall. Christ. i. 708; Mansi, Conc. ix. 788, 946, 978.)

EUSEBIUS (77), bishop of SAMOSATA. Samosata, the capital of Commagene on the Euphrates, distant from Cæsarea in Cappadocia about three hundred miles of difficult travelling, is interesting to the student of ecclesiastical history as being the early home of Paul, bishop of Antioch, between the years 260-270, whose monachism took a purely Unitarian form, denying the divine element in the person of Christ. Samosata is interesting between the years 360-375, as being the seat of the bishopric of Eusebius, the friend alike of Basil the Great, of Meletius, and of Gregory Nazianzen. All that is definitely known of Eusebius is gathered from the epitaphs of Basil and of Gregory, from some apocryphal texts, and from the fragments of a treatise on the History of Theodoret. The fervent and laudatory phrases in which these divines address their friend might suggest hyperbole if it were not so repeated and constant. We are compelled to admit that his personal character must have been lofty and pure, that he was treated with almost unique reverence, that his singular piety and extra-ordinary zeal commanded the respect of his enemies. Gregory assures Eusebius that the severe and almost fatal illness which prevented his paying him the respect of a visit when passing through Cappadocia, gave him less pain than the disappointment of not seeing his friend, with much more to the same effect. (Ep. xxvii. Greg. Naz. Opp. ed. Pruneus, Colon. vol. i. 792.) And in another letter (Ep. xxix.) he styles him a “pillar and ground of the truth,” a “light-bearer to the world,” a “gift of God to man,” “a rule of faith,” “all these things at once and more than these, together.” Gregory knew how to utter a panegyric, but this was in a private letter, and it corresponds with the equally exuberant way in which St. Basil of CHRIST. BIOGR.—Vol. II.

Cæsarea rejoices in his presence, deprecates his absence, and extols the effect of his teaching and the enthusiasm inspired by his virtues. He was probably much older than Basil, who speaks of him in 369 in most reverential terms. (Eph. xxiv. Basiliæ operæ, ed. Par. tom. iii. The quotations from Basil are made according to the Paris enumeration of the letters.) We find him bishop of Samosata in the year 361, when he took part in the consecration of Meletius as bishop of Antioch. At this time Meletius was in communion with the Arians, and a coalition of bishops of both parties placed the document affirming the consecration in the hands of Eusebius. Even Tillemont admits that at this time he must himself have been in communion with the Arians. Theodoret (ii. 31, 32), however, represents the election of Meletius as partly due to the ignorance of the Arians who, unaware of the real sentiments of Meletius, imagined that he was an adherent of their party and petitioned Constantius for his appointment. Moreover Theodoret says that Eusebius was a “noble defender and champion of the truth.”

Meletius very soon proclaimed in an explicit way his Nicene Trinitarianism, and opened himself to the usual charge of Sabellianism, and was banished by Constantius. Meanwhile Eusebius had “returned to his own city,” having in possession the written pledge of the appointment of Meletius to the see of Antioch. The Arians were anxious to destroy this proof of their complicity with the appointment of Meletius, and persuaded Constantius to demand, by a public functionary, the recovery of the document. Eusebius replied, “I cannot consent to restore the public deposit, except at the command of the whole assembly of bishops by whom it was committed to my care.” This reply incensed the emperor, who then wrote to Eusebius commanding him to deliver up the decree, threatening him with amputation of his right hand unless he complied with the injunction. Theodoret says that the threat was only meant to intimidate the bishop, if so, it failed of its effect, for Eusebius stretched out both his hands, exclaiming, “I am willing to suffer the loss of both my limbs rather than resign a document which witnesses the condemnation of the impiety of the Arians.” It is said that the bravery of Eusebius extorted the admiration of Constantius, who, however, shortly afterwards died.

On the accession of Julian many exiled bishops, orthodox and Arian, Donatist and Catholic, were restored to their sees. Among them Athanasius returned to Alexandria, and Meletius to Antioch. But in the interim, the orthodox, who had separated themselves from Eusebius, the Arian interloper, had favoured a separate community in Antioch, and they were unwilling to return to the mother church on the reappearance of the orthodox Meletius.

Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari undertook to reconcile the parties and establish concord. But Lucifer was baffled by the pertinacity of the disputants, and made matters worse by ordaining Paulinus over the orthodox episcopate, for giving a schismatical communion, which retained its separated church life for eighty-five years.

Tillemont hesitates to claim for Eusebius, as 2 B
many writers have done, the honour of being the Christian confessor in the persecutions under Julian, who, according to Gregor. Naz. (Orat. c. Julianum, i. p. 133 n.c.), when suffering on the rack and finding one part of his body not as yet bruised and tortured, complained to the execu-
tors for not conferring equal honour on his entire frame. The persecution under Julian, not-
withstanding the details recorded by Theodoret and Gregory (Orat. c. Julianum, iii. 7), was not of the
character to render this treatment of a Christian bishop very probable. The death of Julian and
the accession of Jovian gave liberty to the church, and facilitated the holding of synods at Alexan-
dria and at Antioch in 363. Accius of Caesarea, who had hitherto been a zealous Arian and
anxious to find himself on the winning side, in-
duced his party to declare their adherence to the
Nicene formula, with express acceptance of the
great term Homousia, as one “very well inter-
laced of the fathers, interpreted and explained
with commodious phrases and fit epithets,” and
as incompatible with the “blasphemous doctrine of the last word not, according to him, “that the Son is born of the substance of the Father, and is in respect of substance
similar to him.” (Socrates, iii. 25.) The synod
held at Antioch adopted, with this explanation,
the Nicene formulæ, and the document was signed by Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of
Samosata, Accius of Caesarea, and twenty-two
other bishops. This circumstance seems to
suggest that Eusebius up to this time, as well
as Meletius, had not sufficiently cleared them-
selves from Arian proclivities, and were even
then somewhat compromised by semi-Arian
equivocations.

During and after the temporary lull in the
imperial patronage of the Arian party, it is
probable that the great exertions of Eusebius
took place. He is represented as travelling in
the guise of a soldier (Theod. iv. 13) through
Phoenicia and Palestine, ordaining presbyters
and covering a large tract that has since become
known to Basil, who on the occasion of the
death of Eusebius of Caesarea wrote to Gregory,
(Bas. Ep. xlvii. Paris ed.) the father of Gregory of
Nazianzus, advising the selection of Eusebius
of Samosata to the vacant bishopric. The Paris
editors of Basil plausibly suggest that the
letter thus numbered was written by Gregory to
Eusebius concerning Basil, rather than by Basil
concerning Eusebius. The part which Eusebius
did take in the election of Basil is well known,
and though the strict interpretation of canonical
rules might render such interference in the
affairs of Cappadocia unsuitable, yet numerous
instances occur of the like eagerness. The
efforts made by Gregory the younger and
Eusebius were crowned with success. Basil
became bishop of Caesarea. The appointment
gave Gregory extreme satisfaction, and in a letter
(Greg. Naz. Ep. xxix.) charged eulogies he
dilates on the intense satisfaction with which
the visit of Eusebius to Caesarea had diffused
through the community. The bedridden had
sprung from their couches, and all kinds of
moral miracles had been wrought by his presence.

From this time forward the correspondence
between Basil and Eusebius reveals the prestige
of their joint lives, and throws some light upon
the history of the church. Two ecclesiastics
are passionately eager for another one's society,
and appear to have formed numerous designs for
mutual interchange of visits, which fell through.

In 372 Eusebius signed, with Meletius, Basil,
and twenty-nine others, a letter addressed to the
Western bishops, in view of their common
troubles from the presence of Arian opponents.
The letter is given (Basil. Ep. xxii. Paris ed.)
at length, and commences with the names of
Meletius, Eusebius, Basilius, &c., in an order due
to the dignity, character and age of the respective
bishops, and a melancholy Jeremias it is, recount-
ing disaster and disorder, uncanonical proceed-
ings, and Arian heresy. The Eastern bishops
feel it some solace to pour out their hearts to
their brethren in Italy and Gaul, and trust to
receive from them sympathy and advice. Great
honour is paid to the unadulterated pristine purity, which the Western churches have
preserved intact, while the Eastern must have
been lacerated and undermined, and divided by
heretical ideas and unconstitutial acts. Later in
the same year Basil treats Eusebius to meet
him at Phragmon in Armenia, where an as-
sembly of bishops was to take place (Ep. xxcvii).
If Eusebius will or cannot attend the conference,
neither will Basil; and in another letter (Ep.
xxvii.) he passionately urges him to visit him at
Caesarea. Letters from Eusebius appear to have
been received by Basil, who (Ep. c.) once more
improves a visit at the time of the festival of the
martyr Eusebius (Eusebius), since many things,
said he, demand mutual consideration.

At the end of the year Basil (Ep. cv.) managed
to accomplish the laborious journey to Samosata,
and to secure from his friend the promise of a
return visit. This promise, said he, had ravished
the church with joy. In the following year, 373,
Basil urged Eusebius to fulfill his promise, and
(Ep. cv.) assured him that Jovinus had
answered his expectations as bishop of Nicopolis.
Jovinus was a worthy pupil of Eusebius, and
gratified Basil by his canonical proprieties.
Everywhere the edriver apatm of Eusebius exhibit
the express image of his sanctity, γρηγορια ἄρες
τοις χριστιανοῖς. It appears from other
authorities (Tillemont, Art. iii.) that the said
Jovinus relapsed afterwards into Arianism. The
good offices of Eusebius were solicited by
Eustathius of Sebasto, who had quarrelled with
Basil, in order to bring about a reconciliation.
Basil's principle of "purity before reconciliation"
convinced Eusebius of his wisdom and
moderation.

The date of the council of Gangra is a great
puzzle, but it was probably held in the year 372
or 373. At this council Eustathius of Sebasto,
in Armenia, was condemned for Arian tendencies,
and for hyperacetic practices, which amounted
to something like the Manichean condemnation
of matter. There has always been a
difficulty in deciding who was the Eusebius
mentioned prima loco in the heading of the
synodal letter, as the see is not mentioned. It
is perfectly conceivable that it should have

---

* If this were so, and this were all that was intended
by the term, the conflict need never have raged over it.

* Hefele, History of the Councils, ii. 236.
EUSEBIUS OF SAMOSATA

been the bishop of Samosata, and that as Basil estreated his advice with reference to Eustathius, he may have joined him, Hypatius, Gregory, and other of his friends, whose names also occur in this pronunciamiento. His age and moral eminence, and the enthusiasm of his friends about him, may have given him this prominent position. The canons of Gangra, twenty in number, are detailed with interesting comment by Hefele and others, who accepts the view of the Penny Cellier that it was held in 376, nor that of the Ballerini that it was held between 362 and 370, as this turns on the bare supposition that the Eusebius was no other than Eusebius of Nicomedia Constantinople. Hefele thinks the chronology entirely uncertain, and mainly on the grounds of the difficulty of this identification. I venture to make the above suggestion, which would throw considerable light on the practical character of the bishop of Samosata.

In the year a.D. 373 by a letter of Basil (Ep. xxixvi.) we learn that Eusebius had successfully interceded in his behalf with the emperor in the interests of his father and his tutor, who had been confined in a monastery at Ephesos under the protection of the pope. The diagram which Eusebius sent to his tutor in his own words is here given, and the possessors of the copybook, in much the same character, as that which the emperor received. From this, however, is only a supposition. Eusebius must be credited at this time with eager desires after personal and mutual recognition of church privileges between the East and West. Even Basil (Ep. xxixvi.) appears to suggest caution in the matter. As a result of which Eusebius was induced to visit Rome in the year 374. The Paris editors put at an earlier date, viz. a.D. 368 or 369, the letters (Ep. xvii. xxvii.) descriptive of Basil’s illness, and the fact that he was in the habit of being called the bishop of Basil to his friends, but whensoever written, they reveal the extraordinary, almost magical, confidence put by Basil in his brother bishop. He had been in fact personally healed by the intercessions of Eusebius, and now, since all medical aid has failed in the case of Hypatius his brother, he recommends him to Saint Pancras, to the care and prayers of Eusebius and his brethren. It is remarkable that Eusebius was allowed to remain undisturbed during the bitter persecutions of the orthodox at the hand of the emperor Valens. At length his hour came, and few pages in the history of the time are more vivid than those which portray the circumstances of his exile. Valens made a promise to the Arian bishop Eudoxius, who had baptized him, that he would banish all who held contrary opinions. Thus in the year 375 Meletius was expelled from Antiocch. (a second time), Pelagius from Laodicea, and Eusebius from Samosata.” (Thed. iv. 13.) The imperial summons demanded Eusebius’s instant departure to Thrace. (Thed. iv. 14.) Cellier (v. 3) places this event in 374. The officer who served the summons was hidden by Eusebius to conceal the cause of his journey. “For if the multitude (and Eusebius), who are all imbued with divine zeal, should learn your design they would drown you, and I should have to answer for your death.” After the conduct of worship, he took one domestic servant, a “pillow, and a book,” and started in the dead of night. “When he arrived at the banks of Euphrates, which washes the walls of the city, he leaped into a ferry-boat and desired the rowers to convey him to Zeugma, which he reached at break of day.” The effect of his departure upon his flock is graphically described by Theodoret. The clemency of the emperor, the entreaties to return to Samosata, and to brave the wrath of the emperor, the humble submission of the bishop to the will of the prince, are all told with a few striking sentences. Eusebius left a deep impression behind him. He had excited a persistent and intense antagonism to the views of the Arians, which assumed a very practical form in the church, and Eusebius was excommunicated. The emperor exiled Eusebius to a complete isolation. He was avoided as if smitten with deadly and contagious pest. The very water he used in the public bath was wasted by the population of the city as contaminated by his use of it. The repugnance being invincible, the poor man, inoffensive and gentle in spirit, retired from the unequal contest. His successor, Lucius, “who was a wolf and a receiver of the flock,” was received with scant courtesy. The children of the city spontaneously burned a ball which the ass on which the Arian bishop was mounted had accidentally trodden upon. Lucius was not conquered by such manifestations of dislike, and took counsel with the Roman magistracy to banish all the Catholic clergy. Meanwhile Eusebius by slow stages reached the banks of the Danube at a time when “the Goths were ravaging Thrace and besieging many cities.” On his way through Cappadocia he failed to see Gregory, who had been hanged by his master and regarded as a punishment for his own sins.1 The most vigorous eulogium is passed upon Eusebius for his power to console others. There was scarcely a strip of blue sky in the heavens at the time, but the faithfulness of Eusebius was a joy to the bishops of the East. The Arian bishop of Thrace received a noble letter from Eusebius, on the privilege of having seen and conversed with such a man (Ep. clxviii.), and Gregory thought his prayers for their welfare must be as efficacious as those of a martyr. Cellier seems to think that Basil enjoyed a passing interview with his friend. We see no sign of it. While Eusebius was concealed in his place of exile, Basil contrived to institute means of communication between him and his old flock. From one of Gregory’s letters (Ep. xxx.) it would seem difficult whether the vacant bishopric was filled, but, as we have seen, Theodoret was explicit on this head, and Basil (Ep. xcv.) while approving of the resistance made by the church to the pastoral offices of Eunomius, warned the clergy, with moving words, against internal commotion and dissension. Numerous
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letters passed between Basil and Eusebius more in the tone of young lovers than that of old bishops, and some interesting hints are given as to difficulty of communication. Eusebius was eagerly longing for letters, while Basil protested that he had written no fewer than four, which never reached their destination. The bad roads, the carelessness of the "runners," the illness of Basil himself, were regarded as some explanation of apparent neglect. Grave anxieties had arisen in his mind as to the ἀνεστάλης, and this he does not venture to commit to paper, but entrusts to a namesake of Eusebius, a reader. Basil (Ep. cxxvii. dated 376–380) was intending to have sent a letter to Eusebius to the vicar of Thrace, and also by a certain Ἱερομοιον of Philippiopolis, who was visiting his neighbourhood, but the vicar came late in the evening when he was busy at his work and left early in the morning, and so never received the letter. A like calamity occurred on the occasion of the visit of the "Praepotus," and thus, though his heart was bursting with news and anxiety, he had been compelled to keep them all to himself. The letter went on to speak of the vicar as a favourer of heretics, though he questions whether he was able, from the stress of his occupations and the character of his mind, to understand Christian doctrine. Still, he entered upon the active part of summoning an heretical synod in mid-winter in Galatia, and there had deposed Hypsinus on a worthless and unsustained charge, and appointed one Ecdicius in his place, and he had moreover endeavoured to force Eustathius of Sebaste on Nicopolis. In another letter to Eusebius (cxcxii.) he deplores the appointment of Ecdicius, complains bitterly of the treatment he received, and lack of fair dealing on the part of the Western church, Antiochus, who had been to see Eusebius in his exile and carry the news of his suffering to the church at Samosata, was among those whom Lucius the Arian bishop exiled, and had to retire to an exile in Armenia. But it is not least of the doom of the dawn of Basil, notwithstanding his intense orthodoxy, was far from happy in his estimate of the sympathy accorded to him by the Western church, and mysterious hints are not unfrequently dropped as to the sentiment entertained at Rome with reference to himself, Eusebius, and Meletius. In the year 377 Dorotheus found that the two latter were, to the horror of Basil, reckoned at Rome among the Arians. Basil (Ep. cclxvi.), addressing Peter of Alexandria, condemns the implicit charge with great bitterness, and justly asks whether their present suffering and banishment for their anti-Arian position was not a sufficient proof of the injustice of the accusation. The charge itself appears to have fallen through, and it appears that Eusebius suffered less fear from the barbarian ravages of the Goths than from this momentary assault on his honour.

In the year 378 the persecuting policy of the emperor Valens was brought to a close by his death. The emperor Gratian recalled the banished prelates, and gave peace to the Eastern church. Theodoret (H. E. v. 4, 5) expressly mentions the permission to Eusebius to return.

Notwithstanding the apparently non-canonical character of the proceeding, Eusebius ordained numerous bishops on his way from Thracae to the Epiphates. Acacius at Heraclea, Theodoret at Hierapolis, Isidore at Cyrus, Eulogius at Edeus, were among the number. All these names were appended to the creed of Constantinople. Barlaam conjectures that he was empowered by the council of Antioch to take this step. The council of 146 orthodox bishops was held in October of the year 379, at which Eusebius was present, and in the records of which his name follows that of Meletius. But a more plausible explanation is, that his virtue and the reverence he universally inspired, proved mightier than the letter of the canons.

It was when he was engaged in the like work, taking part in the ordination of Marist at the little town of Dolica (Theod. H. E. v. 4), that a woman charged with Arian passions hurled a brick, which fell upon his head, and wounded him fatally.

It was not improbable that he had other enemies, who were delighted at his tragic fall, at this moment of his triumph. A beautiful incident is recorded by Theodoret, to the effect, that the aged bishop in the bliss of having secured the crown of martyrdom and in the spirit of the proto-martyr, as well as of his Divine Lord, extorted promises from his attendants that they would make no search for his murderer. When the magistrates were ready to prosecute those who had clearly plotted the death of Eusebius, the Catholics earnestly besought pardon for them. The 21st June is the day on which the Eastern churches commemorate his so-called martyrdom. In the Roman calendar the 21st June is the day chosen for the same purpose. His nephew Antiochus probably succeeded him in the bishopric of Samosata. (Tillem. viii. 326; Celliner, v. 5.)

EUSEBIUS (78) II., bishop of Samosata is the latter part of the 5th century, deposed by the emperor Zeno at the instigation of Peter the Fuller, bishop of Antioch, on the plea that he was favouring the tyrants, but really because he rejected the Henoticon. (Theophan. ann. 482; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 956.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (79), bishop of Sebastae (Samaria), who signed the semi-Arian formula at Seleucia, A.D. 358. (Epiph. Hær. ixii. No. 28; p. 874, &c.; Mansi, iii. 324; Le Quen, Or. Christ. iii. 651.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (80), bishop of Seleucia Pieria, who signed the Acacian formula at Seleucia, 359. (Epiph. Hær. ixiii. No. 96; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 777; Mansi, iii. 324.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (81), bishop of Seleucopolis, in Syria, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 449 c, 494 c; Le Quen, Or. Chr. ii. 922.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (85), bishop of Siena, at the council of Rome in 465 (Ugb. Ital. Soc. iii. 528; Cappell. Le Ch. d'Ital. xvii. 373, 557; Mansi, vii. 959.) [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (83), bishop of Sunicza, in the province of Numidia, who was amongst those
banished by Huneric, A.D. 484. (Morcelli, *Africa Christ. i. 291*; *Notitia in Victor. Vit. 56, Nigre, Patr. Lat. livit.* [L. D.])

**EUSEBIUS** (84), ST., first bishop of Sutrium in Etruria, present at the synod of Rome in 465; in 487 the see was held by Constantius. (Cansani, vii. 759 e; Ugellii, *Ital. Sac. i. 1274*; *Cap. Le Ch. d' Itai.* xxiv. 267.) [C. H.]

**EUSEBIUS** (85), bishop of Tarragona, from before 610 (? to about 632; signs among the metropolitan the (disputed) *Decretum Gunde- marii* in 610 [GUNCTHANAR]. In the letter in which Braulio asks St. Isidore for his *Etymology* (can. 631 or 632, apud *Esp. Sgr. s. xrv. 322, 329*) he speaks of Eusebius as just dead, and prays St. Isidore to use his influence with the king for the appointment of a suitable successor. Isidore replies (l. c.) that he will do his best, but that the king is not favourably inclined to the candidate mentioned by Braulio, and in 632 Guida signs the letter of Co. Toliv as metropolitan of Tarragona. To this Eusebius was addressed a curious and much discussed letter from the king Siebert (612–621), first published by Florez (*Esp. Sgr. vii. 326*) but well known to Spanish antiquaries before his day. The king's opening sentences speak in the most violent language of a letter just received from Eusebius, which, "omai contagione pollutam extremis vix attigimus mani- bus." Eusebius and his friends are accused of being the adherents of worthless causes, "inaniun —sectoreca causarum," and of having been led away, "miseric hominibus et infatul." The re- proach against Eusebius of having taken part in certain theatrical games and performances "ludis theatris tauroorum (or phanorum)," is universally believed. Who does not see what is so evident? The bishop has ventured to accuse publicly men devoted to divine things. Let him, however, not expect any further indulgence from the king, but a severe condemnation of the rule of the church of Barcelona "hic visu qui leo magis quam miserum placit hominibus." The matter is to be settled before the forth- coming Easter, so that "de ejus gaudeamus Pontifex optabili, et de vestra tandem vel eras concessions." This obscure and barbarously written letter was, however, not taken seriously, as was the case of the deposition of a Eusebius bishop of Barcelona, for participation in the games and spectacles which still in the 7th century maintained themselves all over Spain, and were essentially heathen in form and matter. (On the survival and gradual transformation of the ancient theatre in Spain, see Gaus, *K. G. i.* pt. i. 38–55, 126. Schack, *Gesch. der dram. Lit. und Kunst in Spanien*, Berlin, 1854, L. Amador de los Rios, *Hist. de la Lit. Espaol*, l. 441.) It is now, however, plain from Braulio's letter and the signature quoted above that Euse- bius was metropolitan of Tarragona, and that the king's letter refers to some opposition of his to the election of a certain candidate for the see of Barcelona (probably SEVERIUS, q. v.), whom the king was determined to see appointed. The mention of the games is apparently used as a threat to extort submission, and does not of necessity imply anything of the charge. The letter throws valuable light upon the state of episcopal elections at the time, and together with Isidore's letter to Braulio, and other cases, shews that when in the closely follow- ing fourth council of Toledo, special care was taken to define and re-affirm the canonical pro- cedure of election by clergy and people; conse- cration by metropolitan and comprovinciales, and confirmation by the crown (which is not men- tioned, but apparently taken for granted—C. Tol. iv. 10), the Spanish church, led by the great Isidore, was defending itself against certain very real, but at least in these cases at least, great abuses of the royal power. (Esp. Sgr. s. xrv. 82; Gams, *K.-G. ii.* pt. 2, 79; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 324.) [M. A. W.]

**EUSEBIUS** (86), about the year A.D. 600, bishop of Thessalonica; author of a Letter to Andrew the Monk and *Ten Books against the Errors of Andrew the Monk*, which works are both lost. An account is given of them by Photius.

In 593 pope Gregory the Great addressed a letter to him, and the bishops of Dyrrhacium, Milan, Nicopolis, Corinth, Prima Justiniana, Crete, Larissa, Sardinia, and Sicily, on the subject of the decree of the emperor Maurice, which had declared all ecclesiastics subject to the rulers of their country, and had given certain instructions about admission to monasteries which Gregory altered.

In 598 the pope again wrote to Eusebius, on the subject of a presbyter named Luke, who with a certain Peter boasted that he did not receive the council of Chalcedon. There was also a letter on the subject of the title of uni- versal bishop, arrogated by the patriarch of Constantinople. In 600 Theodore, reader of the church of Thessalonica, was sent to Rome by Eusebius. For some reason Theodore entrusted the letters he was carrying to a monk named Andrew, with whom he had long been acquainted. The monk, actuated by an excess either of folly or of rage, publicly read the letter of Eusebius to the pope, that anybody reading it must have thought the writer a heretic or a fool; besides this he composed several discourses under the name of Gregory highly discreditable to that acute theologian; and committing the blunder of making him speak in Greek. The pope wrote an account of these forgeries to Eusebius, and begged him to suppress the discourses if they fell into his hands; confessing that he did not understand Greek and had never composed any work in that language.

Photius says that the monk Andrew, who belonged to the sect of the Aphthartodecas, wrote a letter also to Eusebius, begging him for God's sake to read it. Eusebius wrote him a very candid answer, saying that he did not know how to write, had made many blunders, and should never have broken the repose of his monastic life to undertake a duty for which he was so unift. He then confuted Andrew's chief errors, and exhorried him to retract. Andrew, however, composed a treatise in defence of his propositions, which produced from Eusebius the *Ten Books*. His style is said to have been plain and clear, sufficiently pure, and not without judgment. (Jugis, *De synth. Graec. citi.* p. 451; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gracc.* Harles. vii. 417; Dupin, *Escl. Hist.* tom. v.;
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Baronius, ad ann. 598, xx., 598, xii.; Celsilier, xi. 537; Greg. Mag. Epist. viii. 5, ix. 68, x., 42 in Patr. Lat. xixvii. 898, 898, 1072.3

EUSEBIUS (87), 40th occupant of the see of Tours, succeeding Albertus and followed by Ostalbis, subscribed the council of Attignay in A.D. 765. He set, according to some sixteen, according to others, twenty years. (Mansi, xii. 675; Gall. Christ. xiv. 32.)

EUSEBIUS (88), bishop of Trois Châteaux; vid. of Saint-Paul de Trois Châteaux, No. 76.

EUSEBIUS (89), bishop of Tyre, attended the second council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, and signed the acts. His name appears among those who invited pope Vigilius to the council. (Lalbe, v. 416, 429, 514, 581; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 809.)

EUSEBIUS (90), bishop of Valentinianopolis, in Proconsular Asia, by whom Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus, was accused in the spring of 400, before Chrysostom and the conclave of bishops sitting at Constantinople, of simony and other scandalous acts of avarice. Chrysostom perceiving that the moving cause of the delation was a personal quarrel between Eusebius and the accused party, endeavoured to induce him to withdraw the written charges, on the promise that he would investigate the case, and if proved, correct it. Eusebius, however, with much vehemence persisting in his accusation and refusing the cancellatory office of Paul, bishop of Hierapolis, presented the libel a second time to Chrysostom within the choir of the cathedral as he was about to commence the eucharistic office, calling on him, by the life of the emperor and other fearful adjurations, to attend to the charges it contained. Chrysostom was too much disturbed by Eusebius' violence to continue the service, and requesting Pansophius, a bishop of Pisidia, to take his place as celebrant, he retired with the rest of the bishops. Service over, he took his seat in the baptistery, and having summoned Eusebius before the conclave and warned him of the responsibility of bringing forward charges of so much importance, the bishop was bound to prosecute, the indictment was admitted and formally read to Antoninus, who met the several counts by a flat denial of their truth. The importance of the charges led Chrysostom to determine to investigate them on the spot. The intrigues of Antoninus' powerful friends, and the alarm caused by Gainas having prevented Chrysostom from leaving Constantinople, a commission of three bishops was appointed to hold a court at Hypeaepae, a town near Ephesus, to examine the charges in conjunction with the bishops of the province. If either accuser or accused failed to appear within two mouths, he was to be excommunicated. Both obeyed the summons, but only to frustrate the ends of justice. The hollowness of Eusebius' character, and the unreality of the righteous horror he had assumed were revealed when it was discovered that the accused and his accuser had come to terms, and that Eusebius had accepted a bribe from Antoninus to annul the prosecution by feigned delays. At first no witnesses were forth-coming, and when forty days had been granted for their production, instead of employing the time in looking them up, Eusebius went off to Constantinople and kept himself close, that no one might know where he was. The time allotted having expired, and neither Eusebius nor his witnesses appearing, the commissioners sent circular letters to the bishops of Asia pronouncing sentence of excommunication on him as a slanderer and a runaway. In spite of the summer heats, on which Eusebius had relied to drive the commissioners away before the expiration of the time they lingered on at Hypeaepae for another month, at the end of which they returned in despair to Constantinople. There they happened to fall in with Eusebius, who, ever ready with an excuse, when upbraided with his conduct, pleaded sickness as the cause of his delay, and promised that he would still produce his witnesses. Meanwhile Antoninus was removed by death from a human to a divine tribunal. The case of the six bishops who were involved in the accusations of simony and the partner in crime, however, was still prosecuted, and the death of Gainas in January, A.D. 401, having set Chrysostom at liberty, he crossed over to Asia, and arriving at Ephesus conducted the trial in person. The shameless Eusebius again appeared on the scene, declaring that he had been unjustly excommunicated, and claiming to be readmitted to communion. The bishops refusing to allow his claim on the ground of his having failed to substantiate his charges against his brethren, he reasserted their truth, and engaged to bring forward abundant evidence in support of his accusations. The evidence proved overwhelming; the accused, who at first denied their guilt, were driven to a humiliating confession of having obtained the episcopal rank by purchase, and were condemned to be deprived of their see. They were not, however, excommunicated, and the heirs of Antoninus were required to repay the purchase-money in each case. The latter history of this base and shameless man is unknown. (Pallad. Dial. pp. 128-140; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 711.)

EUSEBIUS (91), bishop of Valerina (Valera de Arriba, near Cuencas) in 633, when he subscribed the acts of the council of Toledo he was also signed the fifth council of Toledo in 636. He precedes thirty-eight bishops in the first case out of sixty-two, and signs fifteenth or fourteenth (? ) of twenty-four in the second (Mansi, x. 642. 855; Exp. úigur. viii. 203; Aguistle-Catalan, iii. 385).

EUSEBIUS (92), bishop of Vienne, placed by the Sammarthani in 374; he subscribed the acts of the synod of Nismes in 394. These acts are not to be found in the older collections, but are given by Hefele (Conc. Grec. b. 8, § 110) from a MS. lately discovered at Darmstadt (Gall. Christ. iii. 1213.)

EUSEBIUS (93), St., bishop of Vercelli (Vercelli), known for his zeal and sufferings in the cause of orthodoxy in the 4th century. He was born in Sardinia, but there appears no record of his life, except his death in Rome, and was there ordained a "reader," and in the year 340 was consecrated bishop of
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Vercellae. St. Ambrose, in a letter addressed to the church of Vercellae (Ep. 63), gives Eusebius great praise for his devotion, and especially commends him as having been the first bishop in the West who joined the monastic discipline with the discharge of episcopal duties. He took several of his clergy to live with him, and adopted something of a monastic rule for their daily life. In 354 (Jaffé, Reg. Pontif., p. 10) he was asked by Libernus the bishop of Rome to go with Lucifer of Cagliari and others to the emperor Constantius, to suggest the summoning of a council, which might pronounce on matters of dispute between the Arians and the orthodox. The council was held in the next year at Milan. At first Eusebius absented himself from it. But he ultimately yielded to the united solicitations of the Arian party which led in the council, of Lucifer and Pancratius, the orthodox delegates of Libernus, and of the emperor Constantius, and took part in its deliberations. The proceedings of the council were committed to speech and the action of the bishop of Milan [DIONYSIUS (14)] was undecided. The practical question was whether the bishops present should sign a condemnation of Athanasius. Eusebius was so peremptory in refusing to do this as to excite the anger of the Ariantizing emperor, who banished him, together with some priests and deacons to Scythopolis in Syria. Patrophilus, a leading Arian, was bishop in Scythopolis, and Eusebius calls him his "jailer." In the course of his confinement here, two messengers arrived bringing a sum of money and assurances of good will from the churches of Vercellae and other neighbouring places to the exiled bishop. In a reply which he sent back by the hands of the messengers, and which has been preserved, Eusebius gives full particulars of the annoying treatment to which he was subjected at Scythopolis. He was a troublesome prisoner, having twice all been sentenced to death because he would not accept provisions from Arian hands. After a while he was removed to Cappadocia, and then to Egypt. From the Thebaid in Egypt he wrote a letter, which is extant, to Gregory, bishop of Elvira in Spain, praising his anti-Arian constancy.

Someem Julian, who succeeded Constantius in 361, permitted all banished bishops to return to their churches. Eusebius, being one to whom the interests of orthodoxy were paramount, did not hasten home at once, but went to Alexandria to consult with Athanasius. The two bishops agreed to convok a council, which was held in the year 362 at Alexandria. [ATHANASIUS, Vol. I. p. 197.] One of the objects of the council was to put an end to a schism at Antioch, and when its meetings were over Eusebius went thither as the bearer of a synodal letter or "tomé," addressed by the council to the Antiochenes. He found, however, on his arrival that he was too late. Lucifer of Cagliari had preceded him, and had aggravated the schism by the hasty consecration of Paulinus as a rival bishop; and Eusebius immediately withdrew from Antioch. [MELITIUS, PAULINUS.] Lucifer proceeded to renew communion with Eusebius and with the synod of Alexandria, the former of which, and the bishop of the Arian council, were willing to receive back bishops who repented of their connexion with Arian heresy.

Leaving Antioch, Eusebius made a tour amongst the Eastern churches, using his influence to confirm them in the orthodox faith. From the East he passed into Illyria, and so to Italy, which, in the words of Jerome, "put off its mourning on Eusebius's return."

He now joined with the zealous Hilary of Poitiers in endeavours to re-establish orthodoxy in the Western churches. With this view they stirred up opposition to the Ariantizing Auxentius bishop of Milan, but they were foiled by a profession of orthodoxy on the part of Auxentius. This was in 364. After this nothing is recorded of Eusebius until his death, which is placed by Jerome in the year 371.

The extant writings of Eusebius are three letters; one a brief answer to Constantius, announcing that he would attend the council at Milan, but would do there whatever should seem to him right and according to the will of God; the second to the men of the church at Vercellae and to Gregory of Elvira. They are to be found in Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, and in Migne, Patro. Lat. t. xii. Jerome mentions Eusebius as having translated, with the omission of what was heterodox, the commentaries on the Psalms of his namesake of Caesarea; and he also names him, with Hilary of Poitiers, as a translator of Origen and the same Eusebius; but nothing further is known of these translations. A famous "Codex Vercellensis" is thus described by Tregelles:—"A MS. of the 4th century, said to have been written by the hand of Eusebius bishop of Vercellae, where the codex is now preserved. The text is defective in several places, as might be supposed from its very great age. It was transcribed and published by Irici, at Milan, in 1748... This MS. is probably the most valuable exemplar of the old Latin in its unaltered state."

The chief authority for the life of Eusebius is St. Jerome, who gives him a place amongst his Viri Illustres, and makes allusions to him in his letters and elsewhere. There are several letters addressed to him by Libernus, and there are allusions to him in the works of Athanasius. Mention of him may be also found in the works of Hesychius, of Theodore, of Sozomen. The Sermoquae relating to him preserved in the works of Ambrose are admittedly spurious.

[J. LL. D.]

EUSEBIUS (94) II. bishop of Vercelli, 520. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xiv. 365; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 762.)

Priests.

EUSEBIUS (98), priests who were martyrs (Nos. 109, 112)

EUSEBIUS (96). Aug. 14, presbyter, confessor, at Rome, a.d. 358, and by some styled martyr. From the earliest times his name has been everywhere celebrated. A church dedicated to him is mentioned in the first council held at Rome under pope Synnachus, a.d. 498 (Mansi, viii. 236, 247). It was rebuilt by pope Zacharias, cir. 749 (Anastas. Lib. Pontif. art. Zacharias, p. 32). The facts of his history are very obscure. His Acts tell the following story...
EUSEBIUS—PRIESTS

(Baluz. Miscell. t. ii. p. 141.) Upon the recall of pope Liberius by the emperor Constantius, Eusebius preached against them both as Arians; and since the orthodox party, who now supported Felix, were excluded from all the churches, he continued to hold divine service in his own house. For this act of nonconformity he was arrested and brought before Constantius and Liberius, when he boldly reproved the pope for falling away from Catholic truth. Constantius thereupon consigned him to a dungeon four feet wide, where he continued to languish for seven months and then died. He was buried by his friends and co-presbyters Orosius and Gregory, in the monastery of Calistus, where they placed over him the simple inscription "Eusebio Hominem Dei." Constantius then arrested Gregory for his kindness to the body of his friend, and consigned him to the same dungeon, where he also died, and was in turn buried by Orosius, by whom the Acts of Eusebius profess to have been written. The Bollandist and Tillmont point out some grave historical difficulties in this narration, especially the fact that Constantius, Liberius, and Eusebius never could have been in the city together. Petrus de Natalibus gives us the story of a bishop Equilinus, which may throw some light on this difficulty. He speaks on the zeal of Eusebius, which shines forth against those heretics Constantius and Liberius, and which so annoyed Liberius that at the request of the pope the civil power intervened, and imprisoned the recalcitrant priest. This narrative does not require the presence of the emperor at all. The whole matter is a source of great trouble to Roman Catholic writers, because the saintly character of St. Eusebius, guaranteed by the Roman martyrology as revised by pope Gregory XIII., seems necessary to involve the fall of Liberius. The Bollandists at great length vindicate the catholicity of Felix II., and of course are equally zealous champions of St. Eusebius and Tilenmont, and in the present day Hefele, in his History of the Councils, vol. ii. sec. 81 ("Pope Liberius and the Third Sirmian Formula"), are equally decided opponents of Felix. But what then becomes of St. Eusebius, whose orthodoxy and faithfulness are proved by the oldest monuments of the church? Tilenmont maintains that he has not been separated from the Church by Felix, and concludes in the following words, which are a plain instance of begging the question: "But notwithstanding the facts told by Ado, the sainthood of St. Eusebius appears sufficiently attested by the records of the church to assure us that he could not have been a perjured person, nor a schismatic, nor, consequently, a partisan of Felix," conveniently forgetting that the sainthood of Felix himself is equally well attested. (Mart. Rom. Vet. Hieron., Baedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Wandalberti, Ferrarius, Cat. SS.; Kal. Front.; Sacrament. S. Gregor.; Baronius, 357, 57; Tilenmont, Mem. t. vi. 438, 776-778.) The party of Eusebius and Felix must have been very numerous among the populace, as they carried the day at the election of the next pope, eight years later, A.D. 366. Ursicinus was the candidate of the friends of Liberius, Damasus of those of Felix. On one day there were four candidates: Eusebius, Ursicinus, which was stained by the party of Damasus, the dead bodies of one hundred and thirty-seven men. Damascus at last conquered, and Ursicinus was banished. This triumph may help to account for the early insertion of the names of Eusebius and Felix in the list of saints and martyrs. (Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xxvii. c. 3; see also editions of Marcellinus and Faustinus, belonging to the party of Ursicinus, addressed to the emperors and to Martial, in Sirmond. Opp. t. i. p. 127; Neander, E. H. vol. iii. 313, Bohn's ed.; Milman's Lat. Christ. i. 85-89.)

EUSEBIUS (97), a deposed presbyter, who, in violation of the decrees of the council of Melitene, was reinstated by Eulpinus bishop of Satala. (Soz. H. E. iv. 24.)

EUSEBIUS (88), presbyter, a correspondent of Sulpicius Severus, among whose remains a letter addressed to him has been preserved. The letter unfortunately fails to throw light upon the position or character of Eusebius, unless we are entitled to infer, from his being so eagerly addressed, that he shared the reproach repented in the letter. It would seem that Severus, who had written a short treatise on the life of St. Martin, and had recorded many of his miracles, had failed to notice that he who had often extinguished fires, by which the lives of others were endangered, had once been in the greatest danger from fire himself. Why it should have been so was the question. Severus reminds Eusebius that of the Lord himself it was said, "He saved others, Himself he cannot save," he shews that the danger in which the saint had been, as in the case of the viper on the hand of St. Paul at Melita, illustrated his glory. Surrounded by fire he came out unharmed.

The letter is that marked i in the edition of the works of Severus by Clericus, Leipzig, 1709, i. 356.

EUSEBIUS (89), of Cremona, presbyter, a friend of St. Jerome, and known through the writings of that father. He was with him at Bethlehem in the year 393, and became the unconscious means of extending into Italy the strife concerning Origenism which had been begun at Jerusalem. Epiphanius had written a letter to John bishop of Jerusalem, in vindication of his conduct on his recent visit to Palestine, A.D. 394. [EPHESIUS I], p. 150.; JEROBOAM.] This letter was widely circulated and much praised; and Eusebius, not knowing Greek, begged Jerome to translate it for him. This he did in a rapid and cursory manner (Jerome ad Pammachium, Ep. 57, 22, ed. Vallingal.) The translation is given among Jerome's letters (Ep. ii. ed. Vallingal.) This document was stolen from the cell of Eusebius by one whom Jerome calls a Pseudo-monachus, and whom he believed to be in the service of Rufinus, together with another letter in which Rufinus was spoken of with praise (Jer. cont. Ruf. iii. 4). Rufinus appears to have sent the translation of Epiphanius's letter to Rome, with accusations against Jerome of having falsified the original in translating it. This accusation Jerome answered in his letter to Pammachium, "On the best method of interpretation" (Ep. 57), written two years later. Eusebius remained at Bethlehem till the Easter of the year 396, when he left Palestine and returned hastily to Italy (perhaps with Par-
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EUSEBIUS (101), presbyter and archimandrite of the monastery of St. Eulogius in Constantinople. This archimandrite Eusebius, contemporary with the foregoing, appears in the Greek (not in the Latin) heading of the address of the archimandrites to Marcellus (Lebbe, Concil. iv. 131; Mansi, vii. 75), and as subscribing by his deacon Theodulus the deposition of Eutyches in the council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vi. 754).

G.

EUSEBIUS (102), priest of Jerusalem, who was at Constantinople in the year 536, with the patriarch Mennas, in whose company he was fond of dilating on the reformatians that were going forward at Jerusalem under Peter the bishop of that city. Mennas, in his letter to Peter, styles Eusebius "communia frater, imo communia benefactor Deo amantisissimus presbyter." (Mansi, Concil. viii. 1165; Baron. Annal. ann. 536, 34v.)

H.

EUSEBIUS (103), cardinal-priest at Rome, who signs a diploma of pope Paul I, A.D. 761, given by Baronius from the original in the convent of St. Silvester at Rome. He occupied the church of St. Laurentius in Lucina. (Baron. A. E. ann. 761, vii.)

H.

Descons and Reader.

EUSEBIUS (104), a deacon of the church of Constantinople, who, happening to be at Rome on ecclesiastical business in A.D. 404, when Theophilus's report of the proceedings connected with the deposition of Chrysostom reached pope Innocent, prevailed upon the latter to wait for fuller information on the other side before he took any decisive step. (Pallad. Diai. cap. 1, p. 9, ed. Bigot.)

V.

EUSEBIUS (105), deacon, who, with his companion, the deacon Lamprotus, had shared the persecutions endured by the aged presbyter Hypatius in behalf of the sufferers at Constantinople after Chrysostom's deposition. Chrysostom, in his letter to Hypatius from Cucusus in 405, praises the two deacons for their zeal and constancy (Chrysost. Epist. 189). He may be the deacon Eusebius addressed by Niltus on the subject of Divine Providence in afflictions (Nil. ep. 235 in Pat. Gr. ixxiv. 169).

E.

EUSEBIUS (106), a reader, who accompanied the bearer of a letter from Basil to Eusebius of Samosata A.D. 375. He had been for a long time eager to visit Eusebius of Samosata, but Basil had restrained him till the weather was milder, on account of the delicacy of his health (Basil, Ep. 198 [263].

E.

Martyrs.

EUSEBIUS (107), martyrs who were bishops. (Nos. 24, 27, 77.)


G. T. S.
EUSEBIUS—Monks


EUSEBIUS (110)—April 24, martyr under Diocletian. Basil’s Menology represents him as converted by witnessing the miracles of the mega-martyr St. George, and as suffering soon after him. [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (111)—March 5, a martyr at Caesarea in Palestine under Diocletian. He suffered apparently at the same time as Pamphilus and others as narrated in Eusebius (Mart. Pal. cap. xi.). In the Roman Martyr, he is connected with Hadrian and Eulabius, mentioned at the end of that chapter. (Marty. Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

EUSEBIUS (112)—Aug. 14, priest, martyr in Palestine towards the close of 311 or beginning of 312, when Maximinus made a tour through the provinces subject to him, and in conjunction with Theoctesius devised measures for the persecution of Christianity and the establishment of paganism. Eusebius was brought before the president of the province, Maximus, and tortured to compel him to sacrifice. He appealed to the sovereign, who was then present, by whom he was beheaded on the next day. (Eusebius, H. E. lib. ix. cap. 2-9; Celiier, ii. 483.) [G. T. S.]

EUSEBIUS (113), a Christian of Gaza, who, with his brothers Nestabis and Zeno, was martyred by the pagan inhabitants of that city in the reign of Julian. (Soz. H. E. vi. 9.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (114)—Oct. 22, martyr at Adrianople under Julian, a.d. 362. He was tortured and burned with Philip a bishop, Severus a presbyter, and Hermes. (Martyr. Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

EUSEBIUS (115)—May 30, martyr with Christianus, Romanus, and many others by fire at Nicomedia (Bas. Monal.). His memory was specially commemorated in a chapel dedicated to St. Euphemia in Petrum, in the northern quarter of Constantinople. (Acta SS. Boll. Mai. vii. 237.) [G. T. S.]

Monks.

EUSEBIUS (116), a Scotish monk, said by Dempster to have flourished a.d. 369, and to have written Translationes Andreae, and In Sacros Scripturas aliquod. (Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 255-6; Tanner, Bibl. 271.) [J. G.]

EUSEBIUS (117), the third in age of the four Origenian Nitrian solitaries known as the “Tall Brethren.” (Chrysostom, Vol. I. p. 525; Dioscorus (4)). (Soz. H. E. vi. 7; Baron. Annal. ann. 399.) [E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (118), abbot of Mount Coryphe, in the 5th century. He was brought up by his uncle Marianus, a solitary, and, like him, at first lived a secluded life near Antioch. At the earnest entreaty of St. Ammonius, he quitted his solitude to become abbot of Mount Coryphe, a lofty hill in the same neighbourhood. His life is given by Theodoret. It is recorded of him, among many other austerities, that he chained his neck to his girdle to prevent his eyes seeing the beauties of nature, and that for forty years he looked upon nothing out of doors but the path which led from the monastery to the chapel. He was followed by a multitude of disciples, and appointed heads to many monasteries which he founded. He is mentioned as having taught philosophy to St. Sidonius (Sedf. Apoll. Epis. iv. 1.). He was commemorated as Jan. 23. (Theodoret, Hist. Relig. iv. in Patr. Gr. lxxxi. 1339; Acta SS. Jan. ii. 486; Celiier, Hist. des Autres ecclés. x. 53; Bailleul, Ver des Saints, Jan. 23.) [I. G. S.]

EUSEBIUS (119), an anchoret of Asicha in Syria. His austerities are mentioned by Theodoret, who for a long time was the only visitor he would receive. He clothed himself in skins, lived upon peas and beans soaked in water, and is said to have passed seven weeks fasting, having eaten nothing but fifteen figs. He died some time after the year 400. (Theodoret. Philos. cap. 18; Acta SS. 15 Feb. ii. 824; Celiier, Hist. des Autres ecclés. x. 58.) [I. G. S.]

EUSEBIUS (120), solitary, in the 5th century, a disciple of St. Marcusius, whom, according to the saint’s desire, he buried in a secluded and unknown spot. Celiier suggests that he is identical with the abbot whose Life was written by Theodoret (No. 118), but no connection of the latter with St. Marcusius is mentioned by either the Bollandists or the Bailleul (Celiier, Hist. des Autres ecclés. x. 53). [I. G. S.]

EUSEBIUS (121), Syrian monk, one of a large sect nicknamed Boraus, or “Grazer,” from their habits. They lived in the open air, ate no bread nor meat, nor drank wine. At feeding-time each took a sickle and wandered over the hills like cattle grazing, cutting and eating herbs. In the intervals they passed their time in praying and singing hymns. (Sozomen. H. E. vi. 53.) [I. G. S.]

EUSEBIUS (122), a solitary at Carisba, the ancient Haran, briefly mentioned by Sozomen. (Soz. H. E. vi. 33.) [I. G. S.]

EUSEBIUS (123), an abbot of age and piety, suddenly excommunicated by Maximinus bishop of Syracuse. For this the bishop was reproved by Gregory the Great in 592, but when he wished again to enter into communion with the abbot, Eusebius refused, upon which Gregory wrote to him, reproving him for his pride. (Greg. Mag. Epist. lib. ii. indict. x. ep. 34, 35, in Migne, lxxvii. 572-574; Ceilier, Ant. Soc. ii. 487.) [A. H. D.A.]

Lay Dignitaries.

EUSEBIUS (124), consul with Rufinus the year of the council of Sardica, a.d. 343. He may have been the same as the colleague of Hypatius in 355. (Socr. Eccl. Hist. ii. 20; Baron, el ann. 347.) [W. M. S.]

EUSEBIUS (125), FLAVIUS, May 22, a.d. 359, consul with Flavius Hypatius at the date of the formula of Sirmium and Ariminum (Athenins. Op. par. i. p. 576; Soc. Hist. III. 39.) He was brother of the empress Eusebia, wife of...
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of Constantius II. (Amm. xxi. 6, § 4), and brother of his colleague Hypatius (Amm. xviii. 1, § 1). Both were banished by Valens (probably about a.d. 374) on the charge of aspiring to the empire but were immediately recalled, the emperor still continuing to treat them with the greatest indignity (Amm. xxix. 2, § 9–15).

[M. F. A.]

EUSEBIUS (126), eunuch, and grand chamberlain under Constantius II. Socrates (i. 2, 16) relates that after the death of Constantius in 337, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea, bestirring themselves on behalf of the Arians, made use of a certain presbyter who had been instrumental in recalling Arius from exile. This presbyter, having been entrusted by Constantine with his will, was in high favour with Constantius. He persuaded Eusebius the head chamberlain to adoptarian opinions, and the rest of the chamberlains followed. The united force prevailed on the emperor also.

In 354 Eusebius was successful in checking a revolt among some troops at Chalon-sur-Soane (Amm. xiv. 10, § 5). Julian promotes the arrest of Gallus as a concession of Constantius to the malice of Eusebius (Ad. Ath. 272 d), and this quite agrees with the account of Philostorgius, who tells us that it was owing to the entreaties of the eunuch and his companions that the sentence of exile was afterwards changed for that of death, and also that Eusebius intercepted the messengers whom Constantius, in a moment of compunction, had sent to reverse the sentence (Hist. iv. 1; cf. Amm. xiv. 11, § 3).

After the death of Gallus in 354, Eusebius was appointed with Arboreus to inquire into the charges against the party of Gallus, and according to Ammianus put them indiscriminately to death (xv. 3, § 2). The same authority informs us that the appointment of the incompetent Subianinus as prefect is the sequel, and the consequent revolt of the Persians, was due to his influence (xviii. 5, §§ 4, 5; xix. 2, § 3). Eusebius was the bitter enemy of Julian, and did all in his power to alienate Constantius from him (Jul. Ad. Ath. 274 a; cf. Epist. 17, 384 d).

In 359 Eusebius was the mainspring of the plan of Eudoxus and others for dividing the council to be held on the subject of Ariusism, making the Western bishops sit at Rimini, the Eastern at Seleucia; part of those in the secret were to sit at each council, and try to gain over their opponents in different ways to Arian views. Eusebius the chamberlain was a dear friend of Eudoxus, and all the other laymen of influence favoured the plan in order to please the chamberlain. (Sozom. Eccl. Hist. iv. 15.)

On the death of Constantius in 361 nothing remained for Eusebius but to submit to Julian, since no one else could be made emperor; and accordingly Eusebius tried to curry favour with Julian by assuring him of the loyalty of the court (Amm. xxii. 15, § 4). He was unable, however, to avert what Ammianus and Philostorgius represent as the just reward of his deeds. One of the first acts of Julian was to condemn him to death (Amm. xxii. 3, § 12). Ammianus describes him as the prime mover of all the court intrigues of his day, and sarcastically calls the emperor one of his favourites (Amm. xviii. 4, § 35).

[W. M. S. and M. F. A.]

EUSEBIUS (127), vicar of Pontus, uncle of the empress Dominica, who menaced St. Basil with torture and death if he refused to surrender a lady who had fled to his church to escape a hateful marriage. [Basil. of Caesarea, V. i. p. 290 a.]

[E. V.]

Miscellaneous.

EUSEBIUS (186), father of St. Jerome. [Hieronymus.]

[E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (189), a magician, born at Myndus in Caria, a disciple of Eusebius of Pergamus. [Eusebius (4).] On the visit of the emperor Julian to the latter, Eusebius seeing his inclination towards the art of magic, persuaded him to go to Ephesus and consult Maximus, who subsequently acquired so great an influence over him. (Eunap. Vit. Maximini. in Vit. Soph.)

[F. M. A.]

EUSEBIUS (190), a young man whom Basil calls his son, in whose behalf he wrote to Sophronius prefect of Constantinople, and to Abagius a.d. 374. Eusebius was implicated in a charge under which a large number of persons had been convicted. Basil requests that he may not be condemned unheard, and that a thorough investigation of his character should be instituted. (Basil. Ep. 177, 178 [334, 360].)

[E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (191), a college friend and chamber-companion of Basil at Athens. He came to Caesarea during Basil’s temporary absence from home shortly before his death. Basil wrote to express his deep regret at missing the sight of his old friend, and to introduce a presbyter, Cyricus, to him. (Basil. Ep. 371 [11].)

[E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (322), a pagan of advanced years, styled by Gregory Nyssaeus “a mountain of unbelief,” converted by that father during his stay at Constantinople for the council, a.d. 381. (Greg. Nysae. de Zuta, ii. p. 62.)

[E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (183), a friend of Ambrose, wrongly identified with the bishop of Bologna (No. 22), addressed by Ambrose in two letters, 54 and 55. He had a son Faustinus, to whom Ambrose’s letter 39 is written; and he had sent some of his grandchildren to Milan to be educated under the care of Ambrose, including an Ambrosius and Ambrosia, as well as a Faustinus the younger. Ambrose’s treatise, de Institutione Virginis, is addressed to him, the occasion of it being the dedication of Ambrosia as a virgin.

[J. L. D.]

EUSEBIUS (184) Scholasticus, an author who, about a.d. 400, wrote a poem in heroic verse in four books, entitled Faustus, describing the rebellion of Gaianus the Gothic commander against Arcadius, a.d. 399. Of this rebellion Eusebius had been a spectator. (Socr. H. E. vi. 6 ; Niceph. H. E. xiii. 6.)

[E. V.]

EUSEBIUS (185), a gentleman of Hippo, apparently of the Donatist party, to whom St. Augustine wrote a letter (Ep. 34) complaining of the behaviour of the Donatists in respect of a youth who in the midst of violent conduct towards his mother had sought and received baptism from them. He asks whether this had been done with the sanction of the bishop, Pro-
culeianus, and if it be so, as he disliked the notion of a conference of delegates from each party to discuss the matter, he proposes that he should himself discuss it quietly with him either alone or in conjunction with a colleague, or if he objected to him as an opponent, that his own place should be taken by Sausmucius bishop of Tunis. In a second letter (35), written apparently in reply to an answer from Eusebius, Augustin mentions cases of which he says Pro-

EUSEBIUS—MISC.

EUSENBundle, bishop of Lerida. [EUREMB.]

EUSCHICHIUS. [EUSENDB.]

EUSIGNIUS, Aug. 5, martyr at Antioch under Julian, in the autumn of A.D. 362. He was originally a distinguished soldier under Constantius, father of Constantine the Great, and was reputed to be 110 years old when Julian arrived at Antioch. Arrested among the very first, he refused to offer sacrifice, and reprieved the emperor for his apostasy, after which he was beheaded (Bas. Mem.; Bar. Annal. 362). Con-

EUSIUSCHIUS, [EUSSCHIUS.]

EUSITIUS (EUSIUSCHIUS, EUSIUS, EUSIUSCHIUS, EUSIUSCHIUS, EUSIUSCHIUS, abbot, born at Par-

EUSIUSCHIUS, EUSIUS, EUSIUSCHIUS, EUSIUSCHIUS, EUSIUSCHIUS, abbot, born at Pergueux about A.D. 465. His parents being des-

EUSPHICITUS, abbot, of Verluin who that city revolted against king Clovis. After a siege, it was on the point of being taken on the night of the death of its bishop, Firminus, A.D. 498. Euspicitus was deputed to implore pardon, and prevailed by reason of his venerable age and reputation for sanctity. The king also offered him the vacant bishopric, and on his refusal made him a grant of land, upon which he built the monastery of St. Mesmin de Nère near Orleans, and became its first abbot. (Acta SS. 20 Jul. v. 72.)


EUSTACHIIUS (2) (EUSTACHIUS, named Placidus before his conversion), a military martyr, commemorated by the Latin Martyr. 3, by the Greeks Sept. 20, with his wife Theophatis, and two sons, Agapius and Theophatus, at Rome under the emperor Hadrian, A.D. 118. Their Acts are evidently spurious, and rejected by Tillemain (Mén. t. ii. 226, 685) as unworthy even of discussion. The fact of their martyrdom has strong and early evidence. The feast of St. Eustachius is marked in the Kir. Allatiai and the

EUSEBIUS (136), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118). Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.

EUSEB., bishop of the Donatists, to receive them not as heathens, to be baptized for the first time, but as returning penitents, and he inveighs in strong terms against the conduct of these apostates who, he says, being intolerant of discipline, affect a sacrilegious contempt for the church under the pre-

EUSEBIUS (137), an advocate of Constanti-

Eus. v. 33, 36; Socrates, iii. 15; Sozomen, v. 7; Theodoret, iii. 11. [BARYLAR.] [G. T. S.]

EUSEBIUS (138), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118), Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (136), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118), Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.]

EUSEBIUS (138), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118), Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.

EUSEBIUS (137), an advocate of Constanti-

EUSEBIUS (138), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118), Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.

EUSEBIUS (137), an advocate of Constanti-

EUSEBIUS (138), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118), Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.

EUSEBIUS (137), an advocate of Constanti-

EUSEBIUS (138), brother of Basilissa. On both of them Theodoret composed an epitaph, in which he called them nurseries of the most holy Xoli (Σαλών γαθαίων). Hesychius (Lex. a. v.) is of opinion that the Xoli were some unknown foreign tribe. They are apostrophized in another of Theodoret’s epistles (num. 118), Σαλών γαθαίων λαον τεθέον! The language seems to suggest a sort of Christian education, perhaps a monastic settlement or episcopal town. In his next epitaph Theodoret commemorates Georgius, a brother of Eusebius and Basilissa. (Theod. Curt. iv. sec. 2, num. 121, 122.) [C. H.
EUSTACHIUS (3), or EUSTASUS. According to "Præsidianus" (i. 10), a bishop of Lycia, who opposed the heresy of HERACLEON. [G. S.]

EUSTACHIUS (4), bishop of Cremona, present at the third and sixth Roman synods under pope Synesius, A.D. 501, according to the recipe of Daha (Die Könige der Germanen), who accepts, in this disputed matter, with a slight alteration, the arrangement of Hefele, § 220 (Mansi, viii. 252 and 315). [A. H. D. A.]

EUSTACHIUS (5), bishop of Safea. [Eustathius (4)].

EUSTACHIUS (6), abbat of Atalanta, near Ancra, in Galatia. On the Persian invasion in 619 he and his monks were obliged to evacuate their monastery. As they could not take many books with them, Antichus, a monk of St. Sabas near Jerusalem, wrote, at the request of Eustachius, an abridgement of the Scriptures, containing in one volume all that was necessary for salvation, to supply the loss of his library. (Antichus Monach. Epist. ad Eustath. in Pat. Gr. ixxxvi. 1422; Ceillier, Hist. des Antiqu. cox. xi. 607.) [I. G. S.]

EUSTACHIUS. [Eustathius, Eustathius, Euthamius.]

EUSTADIUS, abbess. She was the daughter of noble parents, at whose desire she married. After having given birth to a son whom she named Tetradius she was left a widow. She then devoted herself to a monastic life, and founded the "ecclesia mediæ Monasterii" (Moyen-Montier) at Bourges, of which she became abbess. Many miracles are recorded of her, and she was commemorated on June 8. She lived in the 7th century, and died at the age of more than ninety years. (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. ii. 133.) [I. G. S.]

EUSTADIUS (1), St., reputed 7th or 8th bishop of Naples, cir. 1899, between Agrippinus and St. Espedius, on the authority of Johannes Pasconus of Naples. (Ugh. Ital. Sac. vi. 27; Boll. Acta SS. 29 Mart. iii. 768.) [C. H.]

EUSTADIUS (2) (Ambros. ep. 42, p. 970 in Pat. Lat. xvi. 1129 A; Epist. Decretal. tom. i. 675), bishop [EUSTADIUS (18)]. [F. A.]

EUSTADIUS (3) (Gall. Chr. xii. 808), bishop. [Euthamius].

EUSTADIUS (4) (Eustathius, Eustachius), fifth bishop of Marseilles, succeeding Venerius, and followed by Graecus, in the latter half of the 5th century. He ordained St. Exuphron, who afterwards became the sixth bishop of Orange. Gennadius, who lived towards the close of this century, in his de Vitis illustr. (cap. 79 in Migne, Patr. Lat. ivi. 1103), says that Mnasus, a priest of Marseilles, composed and dedicated to Eustachius a hymn upon the sacrament of the Eucharist. (Gall. Christ. i. 634.) [S. A. B.]

EUSTADIUS (5) (Eustachius), 26th occupant of the see of Bourges. Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. x. 26) states that he was a deacon of Autun, who succeeded Sulpicius I. in the see. He died in 607, or according to Le Cointe (Ann. Eccl. Franc. a. 602, n. xxvii., tom. ii. 555) in 602, and was commemorated as a saint in his own diocese Dec. 31. His successor was St. Apollinaris. (Gall. Christ. ii. 15.) [S. A. B.]

EUSTADIUS (6), born in Burgundy about the year A.D. 560. He belonged to a family of illustrious ecclesiastics and was nephew to and was consecrated by St. Mecitius. When grown up, he embraced a monastic life, and entered the monastery of Luxovium (Luxeuil, in Franche-Comté), under the rule of St. Columbanus. He was appointed head of the school attached to the monastery, and soon made it one of the most celebrated of the age. In 610, St. Columbanus retired from Luxeuil, and Eustadius was chosen to succeed him. As abbot he gained the confidence of Cotaire II., who sent him to Italy to try and induce Columbanus to return. This Columbanus refused to do, but confirmed Eustadius in his appointment as abbot. In 616 and 617 Eustadius was employed in missionary labours, at first in his own neighbourhood among the Varasci inhabiting the basin of the Doubs, of whom some were idolaters and others were infected with the errors of the Photinus or Donus; and afterwards among the Boii or Bavarians, where he remained about a short time and then returned to Luxeuil to continue the work. While he was absent, one of his monks, Agrestinus, wishing him to discard the authority of Rome, made a schism in the monastery of Luxovium. Eustadius, returning, expelled Agrestinus, who then inveighed fiercely against the rule of St. Columbanus, and so persistent were his accusations that at length a council on the subject was convened at Mâcon in 623 (Buillet, Vies des Saints, March 29). Eustadius, in his speech at this council, cited Agrestinus to appear within the year before the judgment seat of God, there to plead his cause against St. Columbanus, and his opponent was murdered a few months later (Baron. 817, 11). Eustadius died in the fifteenth year of his rule, A.D. 625. Martyrologies vary as to the day on which he was commemorated, some saying March 29, others Oct. 11. Eustadius wrote a life of Columbanus [COLUMBANUS]; his own life was written by his contemporary Jonas of Bobbio, and has been printed by the Bollandists (Acta SS. Mart. iii. 785) and by Mabillon (Acta SS. O. S. B. sac. ii. p. 108). See also Baronius, Annales Eccles. A.D. 615, 10, &c.; Ceillier, xi. 617; Cave, Historia Liter. i. 575. [I. G. S.]

EUSTADIUS. See also EUSTACIUS and EUSTHADIUS.
EUSTATHIA, sister of Ambrosia, at Jerusalem, whose acquaintance Gregory Nyssen made during his visit to the holy city, and to whom, together with Basilia, perhaps the daughter of one of them, Gregory Nyssen addressed a letter after his return home, A.D. 379, indicating the disappointment he felt at the unholy lives of so many who dwelt among the holy places. (Greg. Nyss. Opp. vol. iii. p. 659; ed. Morel, 1636; Pat. Gr., cit. 1015.) The authenticity of the letter is vindicated by Isaac Cavaubon, by whom it was first printed, with a Latin version and notes, in 1606. [E. V.]

EUSTATHIANI, given by Timotheus, presbyter (Coteler, Mon. Eccl. Gr. iii. 400), as an alternative name for Euchitis. See Eustathius (54) of Edessa, also Eustathius (4) of Serapit, and Eustathius (5) of Antioch (Soc. Hist. vii. 21). [G. S.]

EUSTATHIUS (1), bishop of Parium, on the Hellespont; he is mentioned among the bishops who attended the funeral of St. Parthenius, bishop of Byzantium, who lived during the reign of Constantine the Great, A.D. 306–337. (A.A. SS. Holland. Feb. ii. 42; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 787.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (2), bishop of Arethusa, in Syria Secunda, north of Emesa. He was present at the first general council held at Nicaea, A.D. 325. (Manu. ii. 693; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 915.) [J. de S.]

EUSTATHIUS (3), bishop first of Berrhoea in Syria, and then of Antioch, c. A.D. 324–331, designated by Theodoret (II. E. i. 7) "the Great," θέρας, one of the earliest and most vigorous opponents of Arianism, venerated for his learning and his virtues, and admired for his eloquence (Soc. Hist. E. i. 2; ii. 19; Thed. Hist. E. i. 8). He was recognized by Athanasius as a subject of Athanasius and his learned fellow-labourer and fellow-sufferer in the cause of the orthodox faith (Athen. Hist. Arian. § 5). Eustathius was a native of Sidon in Pamphylia (Hieron. de Vir. Illus. c. 85). Nothing is known of his early life, but the title of "confessor," given him by Athanasius more than once (tom. i. pp. 702, 812) indicates that he witnessed to, and suffered for, the faith, in the persecution of Diocletian. He became bishop of Berrhoea, and while he occupied that see, the esteem in which he was held is shewn by his being selected as one of the orthodox prelates to whom Alexander of Alexandria sent a copy of his letter, addressed to Alexander of Constantinople, as a subject of Arius and his errors (Thed. Hist. E. i. 4). The date of his translation from Beroea to Antioch is uncertain. Sozomen, however, is decidedly in error in placing it after the Council of Nicaea, and making it the act of the assembled fathers of that synod (Soz. Hist. E. i. 2). Thedoret states more correctly that he sat at that council as bishop of Antioch, and that his election to that see was the unanimous act of the bishops, presbyters, and faithful laity of the city and province (Theodoret, Hist. E. i. 7). According to Thedoret he was the immediate successor of Philogonus; but according to the Chronicle of Jerome, which is supported by Theodorus and others, a certain Paulinus, to be distinguished from Paulinus of Tyre, intervened for a short time (Tillemont, vol. vii. p. 22, note i. p. 646). Eustathius accepted the weighty charges very reluctantly, as if foreseeing the troubles it would bring upon him. At the Council of Nicaea Eustathius occupied one of the first, if not the very first place among the assembled prelates (Facund. viii. 4). Whether he occupied the seat of honour at the emperor's right, as Thedoret announced the papistical address to Constantine is doubtful. The Allocutio ad Imperatorem given by Labbe (Concil. ii. 633) is certainly supposititious. This fact is asserted by Theodoret (H. E. i. 7), but contradicted by Sozomen (H. E. i. 19), who assigns the dignity to Eusebius. Eusebius himself maintains a discreet silence, but he evidently wishes it to be inferred that the anonymous occupant of the place of honour mentioned by him was himself (Euseb. de Vit. Const. iii. 11). This is accepted by Valesius (not ad loc.) On his return to Antioch Eustathius used his authority with great decision to check the rising heresy. He banished from his clergy as were suspected of holding Arian tenets, and resolutely rejected all ambiguous submissions. Among those whom he refused to receive among his clergy were Stephen, Leonius, and Eudoxius (who successively occupied his episcopal seat after his deposition), George of Laodicea, Theodorus of Tripolis, and Eustathius of Sebasto (Athanas. Hist. Arian. § 5). As well in his published writings as in his sermons, he lost no opportunity of declaring the Nicene faith, and shewing its agreement with Holy Scripture. Theodoret (H. E. i. 8) makes special mention of one of his sermons on Prov. viii. 22, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way," &c., from which he gives a long extract. The troubled relations of Eustathius with the two Eusebii may be dated from the Council of Nicaea. At this synod Eusebius of Caesarea and Eustathius of Antioch were to be made bishops of their respective sees, but on theological views as in favour of the emperor. The elevation of one meant the depression of the other. To one of Eustathius's uncompromising and somewhat old-fashioned orthodoxy, Eusebius appeared a foe to the truth, the more dangerous on account of his ability and the weight of his authority; hence his heretical proclivities. Eustathius did not shrink from denouncing his departure from the Nicene faith. Eusebius retorted with the charge of Sabellianism, accusing Eustathius of holding one only personality in the Deity (Soz. H. E. i. 23; Soc. Hist. E. ii. 18; Theod. H. E. i. 21). Their position became more and more one of mutual suspicion and hardly concealed enmity. Eusebius, endowed with far more subtlety and worldly wisdom than Eustathius, was watching his opportunity to overthrow the rival by whose personal and official superiority he was overshadowed. He could reckon on the support of the majority of the neighbouring bishops, especially with his namesake of Nicomedia, impatient like himself of the power and influence of Eustathius. The changed feeling of the emperor and the court favour now shewn towards the Arianizing party deprived their enterprise of any risk of compromising themselves with the imperial power. The two Eusebii had not to bide their time, concetr their mea-
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sured skillfully, and seize the first favourable opportunity, and success was certain. The occasion was not slow to present itself. Eusebius of Nyssa, writing to the emperor's variance by a request to be permitted to visit the magnificent sacred buildings erected by him at Jerusalem. Constantine not only acceded to his petition, but assigned him vehicles and every other convenience for the journey, at the public expense. Thegna of Neces accompanied him. Their progress was much opposed by the emperor's valets. On their passage through Antioch the two prelates had a fraternal reception from Eustathius, and they parted with every appearance of friendship. Their next meeting was of a very different character. His inspection of the sacred buildings over, Eusebius returned to Antioch with a large cortege of partisan bishops—Aetius of Lydda, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Theodotus of Laodicea, and the prime mover of the whole conspiracy, Eusebius of Caesarea. The cebal entered Antioch with the air of masters. The plot had been maturing in their absence. With men, and charged against the bishop of inconsistency and other gross crimes. Eustathius was summoned before this self-constituted tribunal, and in defiance of the opposition of the better-minded bishops, and in the absence of any trustworthy evidence, he was condemned on the ground of heresy, profanery, and tyrannical conduct, and deposed from his episcopate. The deposition of a bishop when they loved and revered aroused the indignation of the excitable people of Antioch, who took up arms in his defence. Some of the magistrates and other officials headed the movement, and encouraged Eustathius to refuse to obey so unjust a sentence. An artfully coloured and exaggerated account of these disturbances and Eustathius's complicity in them was transmitted to Constantine. His enemies had already poisoned the emperor's mind by reporting that he had given currency to some scandalous tales derogatory to the character of the emperor's mother, Helen. ("Stabulamuriam fruam ferunt." Ambros. de hist. Theod. 42.) His fate was sealed. A count, believed to have been Strategus Macedonianus, was despatched to quell the sedition and to put the sentence of the council into execution. Eustathius gave an example of submission to constituted authority. Accompanied by a large body of his clergy, resolved to share his fate, he left Antioch without resistance, or manifesting any resentment against the authors of so foul a wrong. (Socr. H. E. i. 24; Soc. H. E. ii. 18; Theod. H. E. i. 21; Philost. H. E. ii. 7; Euseb. Hist. Const. iii. 59.) Jerome states that the place of his banishment was Trajanopolis in Thrace, but he appears to have spent the larger part of his exile at Philippi, where he died, c. 337. The date of his deposition is much controverted. It may be probably placed at the end of 339 or the beginning of 341 A.D. It can hardly be questioned that there is an error in the text of Jerome (de Vir. Illust. c. 65) and Athanasius (Hist. Arian. § 5), which refers the event to the reign of Constantius instead of Constantine. (See Tillemont, Mem. Eccl. vol. vii. note 3; sur Saint Eustathe; Wetzer, Restituto vers chronolog. rerum contra Arican. greg.; De Brosses, L'Eglise et l'Empire, ch. vii.) His body, which in Jerome's time was still buried in the place of his banishment—"ubi usque hodie conditus est" (Hieron. de Vir. Illust. c. 85)—was brought back to Antioch by Cal多, then bishop of that city, in the presence of the emperor Zenos, and received with the utmost honour by the citizens, c. 482 (Theod. Lec. ii. p. 557; Theophan. p. 114). The deposition of Eustathius was the origin of a lamentable schism in the church of Antioch, which had the effect of dividing the Catholic church into two parties, and creating much dissension and discord in the ranks of the orthodox. This schism lasted nearly a century, not being completely healed till the episcopate of Alexander, A.D. 413-420.

Eustathius was a copious writer, and is much praised by early authorities for the eloquence of his language, which, according to Sozomen (H. E. ii. 19), had somewhat of an archaic cast, and the grave dignity of his style, as well as for his knowledge of Scripture and power of orthodox interpretation (Hieron. Epist. 70 [84], ad Magnum.). Of his numerous writings, we possess only one entire work, called De Energatriyothe odoeious Origenem, printed by Galland. In this work he attacks Origen with great vehemence, ridicules him as a υφυντορμις, and controverts his idea that the prophet Samuel was actually called up by the witch of Endor (Galland, V.E. Patr. Bibl. vol. iv.) and Migne (Patrol. vol. xlviii. p. 614, ff.). Of his other works, we only have a few scattered fragments. Excerpts from his eight books against the Arians, gathered from Photius, Facundus, Gelasia, &c., are given by Galland (A. E.), Fabricius (Biblioth. Grac. ii. 131 ff. ed. Harles), and Migne (A. s. p. 691 ff.). Some passages from his sermon on Prov. vii. 32 and from his exposition of Ps. xcv. and xcii. are to be found in the Ezechias of Theodoret (Dias. ii. p. 90; dial. iii. p. 156, &c.). His discourse on Prov. ix. 5 is quoted in the acts of the second Nicene council (Labbe, Concil. vii. pp. 1099, 1475). His expositions of Holy Scripture are frequently quoted in the Catena. On his innumerable letters, "infinitis epistolae" extant in Jerome's time, not one remains. A liturgy bearing his name, but probably spurious, appears in Renaudot (i. 254) and Migne (A. s. p. 698 ff.). A spurious commentary on the Hecateron bearing his name is also printed by Migne (p. 707 ff.). (Fabricius, Biblioth. Grac. vol. ix. p. 131, ff. ed. Harles; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 187; Galland. Vet. Patr. Bibl. tom. iv.; Migne, Patrolog. tom. i. p. 131 ff.; Tillemont, Mem. Eccl. tom. vii. p. 21 ff.; De Brosses, L'Eglise et l'Empire, tom. ii. p. 294 ff.). [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (4), bishop of Sebastia, or Sebaste (the modern Sioue), a town of Pontus, on the northern bank of the Halys, the capital of Armenia Minor (c. A.D. 357-380). Eustathius occupies a more conspicuous than honourable place in the unhappy dissensions between the adherents of the orthodox faith and the various shades of Arian, semi-Arian, and Anomoecian heresy which destroyed the peace and retarded the growth of the church during the middle of the 4th century. Originally a disciple of Arius he retained to the last the taint of his early heretical training, proving in Basil's words that the Ethiopian could not change his skin, and after repeated approaches more or less nearly
to the Nicene faith, and with occasional professor of accepting it, he probably ended his days as a heretic. The frequent and rapid transformations his creed experienced are a proof that Eustathius's religious convictions did not rest on any well-grounded dogmatic basis, but that with an underlying tendency in favour of his early Arian teaching, he had no fixed principle to save him, to use Basil's image, from being "carried hither and thither, like the clouds, with every changing wind." (Basil. Epist. 244 [82], § 9). Few in that epoch of conflicting creeds and formularies of faith ever signed more and more various documents. Basil enumerates his signature of the formularies of Ancyra, Scylencia, Constantinople, Lambaecaus, Nice in Thrace, and Cyprus, which, if all not directly at variance with one another, were sufficiently diverse to indicate the vagueness of his theology (Basil. l. c.). By his frequent changes of opinion Eustathius naturally forfeited the confidence of the rival schools of theology, and was subjected to repeated sentences of censure and deposition. He was deposed by Eulalius, the bishop who ordained him, and by Eusebius of Constantinople, excommunicated by a synod at Neocaesarea, convicted of perjury at a council at Antioch, condemned by the bishop of Melitene, deposed and excommunicated at Constantinople, and at Consantine, "while his hyper-asetic extravagances were the cause of the summoning of the council at Gangra, where he and his followers were synodically condemned. Lamentable as were Eustathius's vacillations of faith and dogmatic inconsistence, the general character appears to have been not only free from reproach, but of so high a standard as to account for the powerful influence he exercised over others. There must have been something more than common in a man who could secure the affection and respect for many years of Basil the Great, "as bearing about him, all the marks of a zealous and honest theocratic erring man" (J. H. Newman, Hist. Sketches, iii. 20), and in Basil's own strong language, "exhibiting something more than man," μετίκο η η και δημος τον (Basil. Epist. 212 [370], § 2), and of whom, after the painful dissensions which embittered Basil's later years, that great saint could say that from childhood to extreme old age he had watched over himself with the greatest care, the result of his self-discipline being seen in his life and character (Basil. Epist. 244 [82], § 4). His life was one of unspiring austerity. As bishop, he manifested a loving care for the sick and needy, and was unwearied in his exertions in the fulfilment of his episcopal duties. The force or Eustathius's character is evidenced by the rapid success of the system of coenobitic monasticism which was introduced by him into Asia, and which Basil took as his model. This Sozomen attributes to personal influence alone, inasmuch as he was devoid of eloquence. (Soz. H. E. iii. 14; Basil. Epist. 223 [79], § 3.)

Eustathius was born in the Cappadocian Cæsarea towards the beginning of the 4th century. According to Socrates and Sozomen (Socr. H. E. ii. 43; Soz. H. E. iv. 24), he was the son of Eulalus, bishop of Cæsarea. No bishop of that name, however, appears to have held the see at that time, and the statement is probably erroneous. As he was ordained at Antioch about the time that Eulalus was bishop of that city, it is possible that there has been some confusion between a natural and a spiritual father. He studied at Alexandria under the heresiarch Arius (c. A.D. 320) and, according to Basil, was regarded as one of his most genuine disciples (Basil. Epist. 223 [79], § 3; 244 [82], § 9; 263 [74], § 3). On leaving Alexandria he repaired to Antioch, where he was refused ordination on account of his Arian tenets by his orthodox namesake, the bishop of that city (Athanas. Suid. p. 812). He was afterwards ordained by the Eulalians of whom we have just spoken (c. 331), but was very speedily degraded by him as account of his refusal to wear the clerical dress (Socr. H. E. ii. 45; Soz. H. E. iv. 24). As the twelfth canon of Gangra (convened, as we have said, at a later period, to correct the extravagances of Eustathius) condemns the wearing of the περιβόλας (the rough pallium adopted by philosophers and monks to shew their contempt for luxury and the man of the world) "the covering, which he reasonably concludes that this, and not the use of the secular garb, was the offence which was thus punished. From Antioch Eustathius returned to his native city of Cæsarea, where he obtained ordination from Hermogenes, the orthodox bishop of that city, on declaring his unqualified admission to the Nicene faith (Basil. Epist. 244 [82], § 9; 263 [74], § 3). On the death of Hermogenes, Eustathius repaired to Constantinople and attached himself to Eusebius, the bishop of the Imperial city, "the Coryphasus of the Arian party" (Basil. H. E. c.). By him he was a second time deposed (c. A.D. 335) on the ground of some unspecified act of unfilialness in the discharge of duty (Soz. H. E. iv. 24). He retired more to Cæsarea, where, by a careful concealment of his Arian proclivities, he sought to commend himself to the then bishop, Dianius, a man whose love of peace was stronger than his zeal for orthodoxy, of which, moreover, his sincerity was not very keen. The subsequent period, till he became bishop of Sabeate, is almost a blank in Eustathius's history. We must, however, assign to it the theological argument held by him and his friend Basil of Ancyra with the Cæsarean Anomoæus. Actius, who is regarded by Basil the Great in some sense as Eustathius's pupil (Phil. Epist. 125, § 5), in which, according to Philostorius (H. E. iii. 16), they were shamefully worsted, but according to Gregory Nyssen (in Eunom. lib. 1. pp. 289, 296) obtained a decided victory. However this may have been, Eustathius zealously seconded Basil's endeavours to blacken Actius's character with Gallus, which were nearly ending in his execution (Philos. H. E. iii. 27). It was certainly during this period that together with his early friend and fellow disciple, the presbyter Aërius [Ækrius] Eustathius undertook an ascetic life, and became the founder of coenobitic monasticism in Armenia and the adjacent provinces (Epiph. Hell. 75, § 2). The rule laid down by him for the government of his religious communities of both sexes formed the model of the system subsequently established by Basil the Great, whose good sense cleared it of the extravagances alluded to by Socrates and Sozomen, which are not unlikely to have been the cause, otherwise unknown, of his excommunication by the council of Neo-Cæsarea.
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mentioned by those historians (Socr. H. E. ii. 43; Soc. H. E. iv. 24). It was while Eustathius was regulating his cœnobitic foundations (c. a.D. 358) that he was visited by Basil, who, emasculated of the ascetic system, had been travelling far in search of the most perfect example of that life, and found it eventually very near his own home. Basil records the delight with which he saw the coarse garments, the girdle, the sandals of undressed hide, and witnessed the self-denying and laborious lives of Eustathius and his followers. His admiration for such a victory over the world and the flesh dispelled all suspicions of Ariano sentiments, and the desire to spread them secretly, which had been rumoured (Basil. Epist. 223 [79], § 3). After Basil had retired to the banks of the Iris and commenced his own monastic life, he and his brother Gregory received frequent visits from Eustathius, who would sometimes accompany them across the river to Ancyra, the residence of their father, the sainted Macrina, where they would spend whole days and nights in friendly theological discussion (ibid. § 5).

We are ignorant of the exact date of Eustathius' elevation to the episcopate, but it must have been before a.d. 357, when Athanasius speaks of him as bishop (Orat. in Arim. i. p. 290; Solit. p. 812). He was made bishop of Sebasteia, according to the same authority, by the influence of the Arian party, which hoped to have him in an able and facile instrument. His early companion Aelius was a candidate for the bishopric, and felt the mortification of his failure very severely. Eustathius showed the utmost consideration for his friend, whom he ordained presbyter, and appointed manager of a house of refuge for the poor, the foundation of which was one of the first acts of his episcopate. The failure of Eustathius' attempts to conciliate Aelius' wounded pride, the grave but groundless charges brought against him, and the final rupture between them, are detailed in another article [AELIUS]. Somewhere about this time we may place his conviction of perjury in the council of Antioch mentioned by Sozomen (H. E. iv. 24), and his condemnation and deposition by his council at Armenia c. a.d. 357 (Basil. Epist. 263 [74]). Neither of these untoward events appear to have entailed any lasting consequences.

Eustathius was one of the prelates assembling at the semi-Arian synod summoned at Ancyra by George of Ladizas before Easter a.d. 358, to check the alarming spread of Anomoean doctrines, and accompanied Basil of Ancyra and Eleusius of Cyzicus when conveying the synodal letter, equally repudiating the Anomoean and Homoean doctrines, and declaring for the Homoeousian to the emperor Constantius at Sirmium (Soz. H. E. iv. 13, 14; Basil. Epist. 263 [74], § 3). When the council met at Seceleucia the next year, Sept. 27, 359, Eustathius occupied a prominent place in its tumultuous and indecisive proceedings, and was the head of the ten episcopal deputies, Basil of Ancyra, Silvanus of Tarsus and Eleusius of Cyzicus being other chief members, sent to Constantineople to lay their report before Constantine. The closing days of the year were spent in stormy discussions, in which Eustathius took the lead on the semi-Arian side as against the pure Arians. He vehemently denounced the blasphemies of the bold Anomoean, Eudoxius, bishop of Antioch, and produced a formulary of faith declaring the dissimilarity of the Father and the Son, which he asserted to be his composition. Eudoxius denied the authorship of the paper, which he said had been drawn up by Aetius. Aetius was summoned by the emperor, and acknowledged the parentage of the document. Eustathius, however, insisted that though Eudoxius might not be the author of this paper, he held all the doctrines contained in it. Constantius declaring that he must pronounce it a proved fact, and order its condemnation, we are on conjecture, Eustathius adroitly suggested that Eudoxius might clear himself from all suspicion if he would pronounce an anathema on the propositions of Aetius. This pleased the emperor, and Eudoxius, as cowardly as he was profane, after various subtile shifts, was driven, by Constantius' threats of deposition and banishment, to anathematize the views he inwardly held and afterwards openly promoted. To revenge himself on his accusers, Eudoxius, in his turn, demanded that Eustathius and his fellow-deputies should be required to condemn the Homoeousian a formulary, and comply with the requirements of Scripture. Silvanus of Tarsus succeeded in persuading Constantius that if not actually expressed, it might be established from Holy Writ, and, following up his success, induced Constantius to require of Eudoxius to subscribe a repudiation of the leading Arian propositions. Constantius then proceeded to the personal examination of Aetius, who was successfully encountered by his old opponents, Eustathius and Basil (Theod. H. E. ii. 27; Soz. H. E. iv. 23). All seemed to augur the triumph of orthodoxy, when the arrival of Vales and Ursacius, from Armenia, again challenged the authority of the Western bishops and the general proclamation of the Homoeousian suddenly changed the scene. Constantius was overjoyed at the attainment of his object, and after a protracted discussion, extending through the last day and night of the year, compelled Eustathius and the other Semelican deputies to sign the fatal formulary. It was then, in Jerome's words, "inge-nuit totus orbis et se esse Arianum miratur est" (Hieron. in Lucif. 19). This base concession, however, profited the recrants but little, and when the synod, called by the emperor, of which Acacius was the ruling spirit, met at Constantineople in January a.d. 360, Eustathius was deposed in a violent and tyrannical manner by those who were at the same time accusers and judges, together with Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Ancyra, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and other prelates of high consideration. The grounds of deposition were in no case professedly dogmatic. Party spirit and personal hatred were the real causes; but in each instance some old charge of a frivolous nature was reproduced, and made the ostensible plea. Eustathius was not even
allowed to defend himself. His former deposition by Eusilus was regarded sufficient (Socr. H. E. ii. 41-43; Soz. H. E. iv. 24). Constantius confirmed the sentence, sent the deposed bishops into exile, and bestowed their sees on others. The death of Constantius in A.D. 361, and the accession of Julian witnessed the recall of Eustathius to his see with the other banished bishops. He immediately repudiated his signature of the creed of Ariminum, and did all he could to shew his horror of pure Arianism. Sozomen informs us that, together with Eusebius, Sophronius, and others of the same sentiments, he held several synods, in which the partisans of Acacius were condemned, the creed of Ariminum denounced, and the Homoeousian asserted as the true mean between the Homoeousian of the West and the Anomoousian of Aetius and his followers (Soz. H. E. v. 14). With the accession of Valens in A.D. 364, Arianism once more assumed the ascendancy in the East. The see of Ancyra was assigned to Macedonius, and he now began to be called, seeing the emergency, by imperial permission, met in council at Lampactus a.d. 365, under the presidency of Eusebius. Here they repudiated the proceedings of the Acacian council of Constantinople in A.D. 360, and the creed of Ariminum, renewed the confession of Aetius (in Eusebius), and pronounced a sentence of deposition on Eudosios and Acacius (Soz. H. E. iv. 2-4; Soz. H. E. vi. 7). These proceedings irritated Valens, who refused to confirm their decrees, and required them to hold communion with Eudosios. On their refusal he sentenced them to fine and banishment, and the heads of his former synods, To escape complete annihilation, the Macedonians determined to send deputies to the Western emperor Valentinian and Liberus, bishop of Rome, who had now recovered from his unhappy lapse in A.D. 357, offering to unite with them in faith. Those chosen to go were Eustathius, Silvanus, and Liberus, who was the friend of Hilarion, for before they arrived Valentinian had left Gaul, and Liberus at first looked coldly on them, and refused to receive them, as Arians. On their declaration that they had long since returned to the right path, and had condemned the doctrine of the Anomoousian, Liberus required them to give him the Nicene creed, and their acceptance of the Homoeousian. On their doing this, Liberus consented to receive Eustathius and his companions into communion, and gave them letters in his name and that of the Western church to the prelates of the Eastern church, expressing his satisfaction at the proof he had received from their representatives of the identity of doctrine between the East and the West (Socr. H. E. iv. 12; Soz. H. E. vi. 11). No mention was made of the new Macedonian heresy concerning the Holy Spirit, which was infecting the Eastern church, and of which Eustathius and the other deputies were among the chief promoters. On the receipt of the papal letters, Eustathius and his companions at once repaired to Sicily, where a synod of bishops was summoned by them, which, on the profession of their orthodoxy, gave them letters of communion, with which they returned to their own country. On their return a synod of orthodox bishops was assembled in A.D. 367 at Tyana, to receive the letters of communion from the West and other documents (Soz. l. c.; basil. Epist. 244 [82] § 5). Eustathius and his fellow deputies were recognised as true Catholics, and they were acknowledged as the rightful bishops of their sees. The council appointed by their synod to meet at Tarsus, to consolidate the union so happily inaugurated, was prohibited by Valens, who, yielding to his wife's urgency, had committed himself to the Arian party by receiving baptism from Eudosios, and who now put forth an edict ordering the expulsion of all the bishops, who, having been deposed by Constantius, had been restored by Julian. Eustathius, to save himself, had the contemptible weakness to sign a formula at Cyzicus of Homoeousian character, which also denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Basil says tersely of Eustathius and his party, "they saw Cyzicus and returned with a different creed" (Basil. Epist. 244 [82], § 5; § 9; 226 [73]). On Basil's elevation to the episcopate in A.D. 370, Eustathius excommunicated him as his greatest and most holy of men, professed an earnest desire to be of service to his friend in his new and responsible office. On the plea that Basil would be in want of fellow helpers and counsellors, he recommended persons to his notice, who, as Basil bitterly complained, turned out to be spies of his actions and watchers of his words, interpreting all a malicious sense, and reporting his supposed heretical leanings to their chief (Basil. Epist. 223 [79], § 3). The subsequent relations of Eustathius and Basil, which so much embittered his episcopate, have been detailed in another article (Basilii of Cappadocia). Eustathius not only helped others of his former companions, openly charging him with Apollinarian and other heretical views and accusing him of haughty and overbearing conduct towards his suffragans and clergy, but also encouraged the clergy of his diocese and province to separate themselves from him, and form a rival communion. Demetrius, the Bishop of Philippi, who was the friend of Eusebius, openly charged him with Arianism in the ascendant, and orthodox everywhere punished, began openly to court communion with those whom he had repeatedly denounced. His deposition by the dominant party at Constantinople remained a fact which the Arians took care to remember, and up to this time they had declined to recognize him as a canonical bishop. As they were now the party in power, it was of the utmost importance to secure their goodwill. This he sought by the most humiliating concessions. He had overthrown the altars of Basilides, bishop of Gangra, as an Arian, and he now supplicated him to admit him to his communion. He had trebled the people of Aramea heretics, consecrated Eplidius for holding intercourse with them, and he earnestly sought their recognition. At Ancyra, the Arians refusing to recognize him publicly, Eustathius submitted to communicate with them in private houses. When the Arian bishops met in synod at Nyssa he sent a deposition of his clergy to invite them to Sebastia, and
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caused them to be conducted through the province with every mark of honour. On their arrival he gave them the best entertainment, and allowed them to preach and celebrate the Eucharist in his churches, and withheld no mark of the most intimate communion (Basil. Epist. 257 [72], § 3). These humiliations had but tardy and partial success in obtaining his public acknowledgment but this was not deemed to be eclecticism. The efforts made by Eustathius to secure the favour of the Ariotic party by repressing the Nicene faith, the effrontery with which he employed his former recognition by Liberius as a means of investing his words and actions with the authority of one in close communion with the great church of Rome, extorted from Basil a vehement letter of remonstrance, addressed to the bishop of Rome, and the other Western bishops, depicting the evils inflicted on the Eastern church by the wolves in sheep's clothing, and requesting Liberius to declare publicly the terms on which Eustathius had been admitted to communion (Basil. Epist. 263 [74], § 3). As will be read in the article already referred to (vol. i. p. 292 ff.) all Basil's efforts to obtain this mark of sympathy and brotherly recognition from the West were fruitless. He continued to be harassed by the casuistical attacks of Eustathius till his death A.D. 379. If the see was vacated by his death, and not, as Hefele holds, with much probability, by his deposition at Gangra, Eustathius soon followed him to his great account. In the following year, A.D. 380, Peter became bishop of Sebaste, and thus, in the words of Tillemont, by a remarkable disposition of providence St. Basil's brother was seated on the throne of Eustathius, Basil's most dangerous enemy” (Hæc. Eccl. ix. 574).

No little uncertainty hangs over the synod of Gangra, which is too intimately connected with the name of Eustathius to be passed over. The question of its date, and the identity of the Eustathius there condemned with the bishop of Sebaste, which, though affirmed by every ancient authority, has been denied by Blondel (De la Primauté, p. 138), Baroziani (Annal. iii. ann. 381, n. 53), Du Pin (Novaæ Biblioth. ii. 382), and called in question by Tillemont (Hist. des Perf. x. note 28, S. Baüle), has been carefully investigated by Hefele (Hist. of the Church Concils, ii. 325 ff. Engl. trans.). He pronounces himself unable to arrive at any certain conclusions as to its date (Gangra, Council of, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, i. 709), but regards the notion that another Eustathius is intended as undeserving of any serious consideration. The self-righteousness and heretical form of asceticism, professing a higher degree of spirituality and despising church ordinances, condemned in the twenty-one canons or anathemas of this council, is in complete accordance with the account of Eustathius as the founder of the ascetic and coenobitic life in Armenia given by Socrates (H. E. ii. 43), and Sozomen (H. E. iv. 54), Labbe (Concil. ii. 413). Ecclesiastical history is entirely silent as to the after fortunes of this hyperascetic sect. Hefele states that “in accordance with the decisions of Constantinople, Eustathius is said to have repudiated his peculiarities, and again dressed himself like other ecclesiastics, not as a monk” (a. p. 337).
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Lat. x. 527), and no doubt the one of the same name among the Macedonian bishops whom Chrysostom thanks for their firm adherence, A.D. 406. (Chrys. Ep. 189, Pat. Gr. ii. 706.)

EUSTATHIUS (14), bishop of Attalia, in Pamphylia, A.D. 431. His story is noticeable as a case of resignation of a see. Part of the last day of the council of Ephesus (July 17) was taken up with a consideration of his affairs. He was an old man, and was far from home and friends. He had been canonically elected and consecrated to Attalia, but various hostile parties made numerous accusations against him. It seems that he could easily have acquitted himself, but being timid and confused he wrote a renunciation of his see. The provincial council of Pamphylia thereupon placed Theodorus on his throne. Eustathius, for whose character little respect can be felt, had always intended to keep the name and honours of the episcopate. He therefore presented himself before the council of Ephesus, with tears and lamentations, to demand them, asuring the fathers at the same time that he had no thought of resigning his diocese. The canons did not allow the resignation of a see, so he had been deprived of communion. The council inquired into the charges brought against him, and restored him communion and rank on his promise not to do any episcopal act on his own authority. They permitted the provincial synod of Pamphylia to deal with him still more kindly if they pleased. (Concilia Generalia, i. 500, ed. 1828; Cellier, viii. 59.)

W. M. S.

EUSTATHIUS (15) I., bishop of Pararaus in Cappadocia, of the party of John of Antioch and the Orientals at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and consequently cut off from the communion of the orthodox (Baluze, Concil. p. 507); subsequently he joined the synod held at Constantinople by archbishop Flavien, which condemned Eutyches, A.D. 448 (Mansi, vi. 760). Ten years later, A.D. 458, he subscribed the synodal letter of the second Cappadocia to the emperor Leo (Mansi, vii. 399; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 410; Ganis, Series Episc. 440).

L. D.

EUSTATHIUS (16), bishop of Docimium in Phrygia Salutaris, present at the general council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Mansi, iv. 1294), and also at the synod held by Flavian at Constantinople, 448, which condemned Eutyches (Mansi, vi. 760), where his name is written in the acts Eustochius, a corruption found also in some MSS. of the transactions of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, at which also he was present. (Mansi, vii. 157; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 585.)

L. D.

EUSTATHIUS (17), bishop of Aegae, on the seashore of Cilicia, to whom Theodoret addressed a letter relating to a Catharimian lady named Maria, who having been taken captive at the sack of Carthage by Generici, A.D. 439, had been sold as a slave, together with her waiting-maid, to an inhabitant of Theodoret's diocese of Cyrrhus. Some Christian soldiers quartered there hearing of her misfortunes had purchased her freedom, and she was disposed of returning to her native country, where she heard that her father was still alive and holding a magistracy. Theodoret requests Eustathius to put Maria under the care of some of the Western merchants who resorted to the fair at Aegae whose fidelity might be relied on to convey the unfortunate lady safe to her destination. (Theod. Epist. 70.)

EUSTATHIUS (18), bishop of Temnus in the province of Asia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 168; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 707.)

EUSTATHIUS (19), bishop of Sabatha or Savatra, in Lycaonia; in the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon his name was subscribed in his absence by Onesiphorus of Iconium, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1084; Mansi, vii. 165.)

EUSTATHIUS (20), bishop of Sarancorum Tribus in Phoenicia Secunda. He was present at the fourth general council at Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and also signed the synodal letter to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 127, 183, 559; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 883.)

EUSTATHIUS (21), bishop of Colonias, in the lesser Armenia, signed the synodal letter which the bishops of that province sent to the emperor Leo concerning the murder of St. Proterius of Alexandria and the fanatic of Chalcedon, A.D. 458. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 430; Mansi, vii. 583.)

EUSTATHIUS (22), bishop of Berytus (Beyrouth) in the 5th century. He was one of the time-serving, cowardly prelates attached to the court, who regarded their rank as a position to be secured at all costs, changing their faith with change of circumstances, and bowing the knee to the dominant party. The object he kept steadily in view was the aggrandizement and independence of his see of Berytus, then suffering to Tyre. For this he curried court favour, and lent himself to the arbitrary power of the "Papal Synod." He was a bishop of some consideration for theological knowledge, and was appointed one of the three commissioners, with Photius of Tyre and Urania of Himera, by Theodosius II, A.D. 448, to examine the tenets of Ibas of Edessa, against whom serious complaints had been made by the Nestorian party as being falling under the Nestorian heresy, and who had been acquitted at a council at Antioch in consequence of two of his accusers failing to appear. This commission was dated Oct. 26, A.D. 448, and was addressed to Damasus, the secretary of state (Labbe, Concil. iv. 638). The commission was opened at Berytus, Feb. 1, A.D. 449, in the residence of Eustathius, recently erected by him in the vicinity of the magnificent new church he had built as part of his scheme for the exaltation of his see. The examination was continued for some time. Ibas indignantly disclaimed the blasphemies attributed to him, and produced a document signed by a large number of his clergy to prove that they had never heard him utter words contrary to the faith (ibid. p. 637). The accusation broke down. But the investigation was revived a week or two afterwards at Tyre. Urania was absent (ibid. 635). Eustathius and his brother commissioners succeeded in arranging matters between the retaining parties. They then signed a concordat, which was signed, Feb. 25, by
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At a later session of the council, Oct. 20, the point at issue between him and Photius of Tyre was discussed (ibid. 530). As a reward for the real service he had shown in support of the church party at the "Lactrocinium," Eustathius had obtained from Theodosius a decree giving metropolitical rank to the see of Beryton (Lupus, in Canon. 950). Flavian's successor Anatolius, together with Maximus of Antioc and some of the court bishops, had conspired to take upon themselves, at the close of 449, to dismember the diocese of Tyre, and had assigned five churches to the newly suffragan see of Beryton (Labbe, iv. 542-546). Photius disregarded this partition, and continued to consecrate bishops for these churches. For this he was in a high-handed spirit excommunicated by Anatolius, and the prelates he had consecrated were deposed and degraded by Eustathius (ibid. 530). Photius got frightened, and submitted to this interference on the threat of deposition, protesting at the same time that he did so by constraint. He now required of the council to return the power to the episcopal see of Tyre, and pronounce the acts of Eustathius null and void. The council on hearing the case decided against Eustathius, and refused to allow the gathering of bishops at Constantinople which had presumed to dismember the bishopric, any right to the title of a church council (ibid. 542-550). When at a still later session, Oct. 26, Ibas appeared and demanded restoration, Eustathius and Photius attested the fact of his acquittal at Tyre (ibid. 631).

When in 457 the emperor Leo, anxious to give peace to the sorely divided church of Alexandria, and yet wishing to avoid the summoning of a synod, directed letters to the chief metropolitans on the question of the intrusion of Timothy Aelurus, Eustathius was one of those consulted, and joined in the condemnation of the intruding patriarch (ibid. 890). A fragment of a defence of the letter of pope Leo against Timothy Aelurus is preserved by Cononius (Lec. in Antioc. ii. 257), and is printed by Migne (Pat. Gr. lxxxv. 1803). The church built by him at Beryton is described by Zacharias Scholasticus de mundi opificio. (Tillemont, Mon. Eccl. x.; Le Quien, Oriens Chris. ii. 818; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 440.)

EUSTATHIUS (23), bishop of Philoelaethia, in the province of Sparta; his name is appended to the letter of the synod of Constantinople to the patriarch John, condemning Severus of Antioch, A.D. 518, which was read in the fifth session of the synod also held at Constantinople under Menas, A.D. 558, which condemned Anthimus and Severus. In his subscription Eustathius calls Philoelaethia the metropolis of the province of Lydia, as if it set up rival claims to Sardis. (Le Quien, Oriens Chris. i. 870; Mansi, viii. 1047.)

EUSTATHIUS (24), bishop of Peræa, in Mesopotamia, driven out of his bishopric by the emperor Justin I. on account of his adherence to the heresy of Severus, A.D. 516. (Le Quien, Oriens Chris. ii. 946; Assemani, Bih. ii. Diæ. de Monophys. § 2.)

EUSTATHIUS (25), bishop of Antioch (Agrippias), on the seaboard of Palestine, who was one of the signatories of the synodal letter.
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of John of Jerusalem to John of Constantinople against Severus, A.D. 518. (Labbe, v. 191; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. iii. 632.) [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (36), bishop of Compli in Thrace, mentioned in the petition of Stephen of Larissa to the Roman synod under pope Boniface II., wherein he complains that they and other Thessalian bishops had been summoned to appear before Epiphanius of Constantinople, who had no jurisdiction over them, on an accusation of irregularly ordaining Stephen, A.D. 531. Through mutilation of the records, the decision of the synod is lost. (Le Quien, Oriens Christi. ii. 115; Mansi, viii. 743.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (27), bishop of Tiberiopolis, in Phrygia Pacatiana, present at the synod held at Constantinople under Meennas, A.D. 536. (Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 799; Mansi, viii. 1146.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (28), bishop of Tholona (Tlos) in Lycia, at the synod of Constantinople, A.D. 536 (Mansi, viii. 974). When an appeal was made concerning a suit between him and Pistus, a deacon of the church of Telmessus, and the judges were in doubt whether it should be decided according to the law as it stood, or as it was at the time of the suit, the emperor Justinian ordered, by his Norella cvx., Theoderus, praetor throughout the East, that it should be decided by the law as it was at the time of the original pleadings (Kriigel, Corpus Juris Civilis. pt. iii. p. 490), and that this should form a rule for all future cases. Le Quien (Oriens Christi. i. 979) says that the emperor ordered the praetors not to heurate in correcting the decisions of the bishops. Baronius adduces this case as an instance of Justinian asserting an ecclesiastical jurisdiction disallowed by the canons (A. E. ann. 541, xvi.). [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (39), bishop of Damascus; present at the fifth general council held at Constantinople, A.D. 553. (Mansi, x. 174; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. ii. 836.) [J. de S.]

EUSTATHIUS (30), bishop of Maximianopolis (formerly Imara), in Thracia, near Rhodope; was present as a metropolitan at the fifth general council at Constantinople, A.D. 553. (Mansi, ix. 391; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 1200.) [J. de S.]

EUSTATHIUS (31), II., bishop of Parnasus in Cappadocia, present at the synod called Trullana, or Quinisexta, held at Constantinople, A.D. 692. (Mansi, xi. 1005; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 418.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (32), bishop of Amblada, in Lyconia, subscribed the canons of the synod called Quinisexta or Trullana, held at Constantinople, A.D. 692. (Mansi, x. 1004; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 1078.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (33), bishop of Celenderis (Chelendrech) in Isauria, on the western coast of Cilicia. He was present at the seventh general council held at Nicea, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xii. 1000; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. ii. 1016.) [J. de S.]

EUSTATHIUS (34), bishop of Lamus in Isauria, at the mouth of the river of the same name; present at the seventh general council held at Nicea, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xii. 150; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. ii. 1018.) [J. de S.]

EUSTATHIUS (35), bishop of Hyrcania is the province of Lydia, present at the second Nicean council, A.D. 787. (Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 888; Mansi, xii. 1102.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (36), bishop of Laodicea, the metropolis of Phrygia Pacatiana, present at the seventh general or second Nicean council, A.D. 787. (Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 795; Mansi, xi. 994.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (37), bishop of Soli in Cyprus, present at the seventh general council (Nicea), A.D. 787. (Le Quien, Oriens Christi. ii. 1073; Mansi, xii. 1099.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (38), bishop of Erithrea is the province of Asia, opposite Chios, present at the seventh general council (Nicea), A.D. 787. (Mansi, xii. 997; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 728.) [L. D.]

EUSTATHIUS (39), March 29, bishop of Cyrus, an ancient town of Bithynia, and martry amid the Iconoclastic controversies. (Bas. Hs.; Boll. Acta SS. Mart. iii. 790.) [G. T. S.]

EUSTATHIUS (40), succeeded Politian as orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, in 801, during the caliphate of Al-Rashid. He was patriarch of Mark over the Jacobite communion. He had been a linen manufacturer, but his life was changed by the discovery of a treasure, hidden in the place where he exercised his trade. He resolved to dedicate himself, with his unexpected wealth, to God, and entering the monastery of Al-Kosairi, was presently raised to its chief office in that office he built a church, dedicated to the two apostles, within the walls of Al-Kosairi, and also a room for the use of the bishop.

At the moment of his call to the chair of Alexandria, the recent cessation of the Iconoclastic controversy, and the position of the caliph for the service rendered him by Politian, might well have raised the hopes of the orthodox, but the short and uneventful patriarchate of Eustathius brought no change in the slow decline of their power. The Jacobites, on the other hand, were strengthened at this time by their reconciliation with the Barasannahians, a subdivision of the Apechali, who, at the close of the 5th century, had seceded from the main body in order to uphold the episcopal consecration of Barasannahius. Eustathius died in 805, and was succeeded by Christopher. (Estychi Annals, Oxon. 1658, tom. ii. 411; Le Quien, Oriens Christianissimi, Paris, 1740, ii. 464; Nestle, Patriarchate of Alexandria, ii. 195, 197; L'Art de dérover les Dotes, Paris, 1818, iii. 482.) [F. P.]

EUSTATHIUS (41), dean, by whose hands the elder Gregory of Nazianzus sent a letter to Eusebius of Samosata, cir. A.D. 370, begging him to come to Caesarea and aid in securing the election of Basil to the vacant see. (Basil, Epist. 47 [4].) [L. V.]
EUSTATHIUS (42), deacon, who enjoyed the confidence of Basil, and by whom Basil sent a letter to Eustathius of Samosata, A.D. 372 (Basil, Ep. 47 [4]). Later in the year Basil had to nurse Eustathius for two months in an illness, which afterwards attacked the rest of his household and finally himself (id. Ep. 136 [297]).

EUSTATHIUS (43), monk, who was a member of the family of Gregory Nazianzen at the time of his death, and appointed by him one of the guardians of his poorhouse. He was joint legate with Gregory, the deacon of a farm at Arianzene. (Greg. Naz. Testam.)

EUSTATHIUS (44), deacon of Macedonia, for whose deposition twenty-three Macedonian bishops, in the course of their synodal letter, petitioned Innocent I. the bishop of Rome, A.D. 414. In his reply, Dec. 13, 414, Innocent declines, on the ground that Eustathius, who had been frequently approved by him, had never been accused of any offence against the faith or of any mortal sin. (Innoc. Ep. 17, c. 7, § 13. Pat. Lat. xx. 539; Cellarius, Audaces Sac. vii. 515.)

EUSTATHIUS (45), an aurifex of Philadelphi in Lydia, A.D. 431, induced by Jacobus, a Nestorian, to abjure Quarto-decimanism and petition Theophanes, bishop of Philadelphia, to be restored to communion. He had also subscribed the "symbolum" of Jacobus. (Labbe, Concill. iii. 675, 678, 683.) [CHARISIUS (5)] [T. W. D.]

EUSTATHIUS MONACHUS (46), a solitary known only from his letter De Dubius Nicolæ ad Timotheum Scholasticius against the errors of Severus. It would seem to belong to the age of Justinian in the 6th century. The Greek text was printed by Mai, Vet. Script. Noc. vii. 277, and with a Latin translation by Migne, Patrolog. Gr. ixxvi. 1, p. 901 sq. [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (47), (EUSTRATIUS), presbyter of Constantinople, biographer of the patriarch Calixtus I. (533-569), and his chaplain. He was a faithful adherent to his superior in misfortune and prosperity, and regarded him as the greatest and holiest of men. His life, written in a tart and prolix style, was printed by Scuris (de Prov. Hist. SS. April 6, p. 83); by Mennchen, with annotations and introductory observations (Boll. Acta SS. 6. Ap. i. 559); by Papebroch in Greek, the name here being Eustathius (Boll. Acta SS. Ap. i. Append. p. lix.; and elsewhere). [EUSTACHYUS (18), sub fn.] He is identified with his contemporary Eustathius of Constantinople by Cave (c. 536), Fabry (Bibl. Gr. ed. Harles, x. 725, xi. 629), and some others. [EUSTATHIUS (53)]. [W. M. S.]

EUSTATHIUS (48), a reader in the church of Caesarea in Palestine, deposed by the bishop Eulogius (No. 5), on the false charge of having corrupted the virgin daughter of a presbyter. Having obtained the bishop's permission to marry the girl, he persuaded her to enter a monastery, where, at the birth of the child, according to Palladius, the innocence of Eustathius was miraculously proved. He devoted himself to an ascetic life, was endowed with extraordinary gifts, and was popularly regarded as a martyr. (Pallad. Hist. Lusiac. c. 141, pp. 1041-1045; Tillemont, Mem. Eccl. xi. 518.) [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (49), July 28, a military martyr at Anycra, in Galatia, under a prefect named Cornelius. (Bus. Men.) [G. T. S.]

EUSTATHIUS (50), March 14, otherwise called Eutychius, martyr with many others at the hands of the Arabs, at Carnæa, in Mesopotamia, in the 22nd year of Leo the Isaurian, A.D. 740. (Acta SS. Boll. Mart. iii. 355.) [G. T. S.]

EUSTATHIUS (51), a famous philosopher of Cappadocia, whom Basil travelled far in search of shortly after his return from Athens, A.D. 355, and to whom he addressed a letter from Alexandria (Basil, Ep. 1 [126]). [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (52), physician, ἐργατικός, to whom Basil addressed the doctrinal treatise which stands among his epistles (Ep. 189 [80]), maintaining the unity of the Divine nature in all three Persons of the Trinity, and ascribing the proper divinity of the Holy Spirit. This treatise is also found in a somewhat enlarged form among the writings of Gregory Nyssen (Opp. i. 5), but is ascribed by the best authorities to Basil (Tillem. Mém. Eccl. ix. 678, "S. Basilii," Note 77). [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (53), a domestic in the family of Theodora, a disciple and correspondent of Chrysostom. Theodora had expelled him from her house for some real or alleged misconduct. Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus very earnestly in behalf of Eustathius, saying that if he had been accused wrongfully simply justice required his restoration to favour, and that if he were really guilty Theodora should forgive him as she hoped to be forgiven. (Chrysost. Epist. 117.) [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (54) of Elessa, a Messenian condemned at Antioch. (Photius, Cod. 52.) The common reading was Ἠὐσταθίου ἄλλος, and the person intended was supposed to be Eustathius of Seleucea; but according to Bekker this puzzle of a complimentary title given to a condemned heretic originated in a corruption of Ἑλληνικῶς written ἄλλως. [Kuchler.] [G. S.]

EUSTATHIUS (55), a quaeator at Constantinople, witness to the inventory presented by Germanus and Cassianus in refutation of the charge against Chrysostom of having made away with the church goods. (Pallad. Dial. p. 27.) [E. V.]

EUSTATHIUS (56), translator of Basil's Homilies on the Hexameron into Latin, cir. A.D. 440. The translation was much praised by Cassiodorus. It was first printed by Nicholas Faber at Paris in his edition of the works of Basil, 1603. (Cassiod. Divin. Lect. cap. 2 in Patr. Lat. ix. 1110; Siegbert, Gmbl. de Gr. Eccl. cap. 21 in Patr. Lat. cl. 552; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 429.) [C. H.]

EUSTATHIUS (57), of Epiphaneia in Syria, wrote a history from the earliest times to
the twelfth year of the emperor Anastasius. The work itself has perished, but we have citations from it or allusions to it several times in Evagrius, especially for the reign of Zeno (e.g. H. E. i. 9, ii. 15, iii. 29, 37, v. 24; Suidas, s. v.; Cave, Lit. Hist. i. 466). Nicephorus (H. E. iv. 57) speaks of his work as elegant.

[IFIED]

EUSTATHIUS. [EUSTASIUS, EUTHARIUS.]


[C. H.]

EUSTOCHIUM, third daughter of Paula (q.v.), the friend of Jerome, from whose writings all that is known of her is gathered. [The references given in this article are to the volumes and pages in Vallarsi's edition.]

Her original name, apparently, was Julia (i. 69), her father, Totius, was her ancestor through the Julian family. The Greek name Εὐστοχία (implying justness of aim) seems to have been added as a term of endearment. She was still of tender age (l. 184) when her sister Blerilla died, a.d. 384. We may suppose, therefore, that she was born about 370. She had shown from childhood a readiness to fall in with the ascetic views imbibed by her mother, and was confirmed in these by frequenting the house of Marcella (l. 952). Her uncle Hymettius, with his wife Praetextata (see Thierry's St. Jerome, i. 161), endeavoured to turn her from her purpose by inviting her to their house, changing her room, and bending over the mirror. The flattery of a patrician reception-room (l. 394, 683); but she resisted their seductions. Jerome relates that on the night after this attempt, an angel of threatening countenance appeared to Praetextata, warning her that, if she persevered in her wicked design, she would be bereaved of her husband and children, and that all this came to pass. By this and similar occurrences Eustochium became confirmed in her resolution, and she took the vow of perpetual virginity, being the first Roman lady of noble birth who had taken this step (l. 394). To confirm her in this course, Jerome addressed her in his celebrated treatise De Virginitate Servandae (l. 88), in which his experience as a hermit in the desert, the description of the monks of Nitria, the vision which had caused him to abandon classical studies, and a series of vivid pictures of the condition of Roman society, are made to enforce the superior sanctity of the state of virginity. This treatise, by exciting great anxiety against Jerome, was one of the causes of his leaving Rome and returning to Palestine. Paula and Eustochium resolved to go there also, and in the year 385 they embarked at Portus for the East. Eustochium accompanied her mother and Jerome in their journeys through Palestine and Egypt, and in their settlement at Bethlehem. There she was received with her mother in the building and management of the hospice and convent, and, on her mother's death in 404, became head of the establishment till her own death in 418, two years before that of Jerome. Jerome was himself at that time too weak to write her life, as he had written that of his other friends; but many passages in his writings give a picture of her character, and of her manner of life. She was small in stature; but, Jerome says, "in parvo corpuscula incertae animos cernebatis" (l. 290). She had great courage and decision of character (l. 394). She followed the ascetic teaching of Jerome and her mother with unwavering confidence and enthusiasm (l. 402, 403). She had considerable inquisitive energy; she spoke Greek and Latin with equal facility, and she learnt Hebrew also so as to sing the Psalms in the original (l. 720). Thierry considers that the incident relative to Sabinius (l. 1084) shows that she was deficient in the power of influence, and that the convent degenerated under her. Jerome, however, gives no hint of this. He praises her skill in the training of virgins, whom she led in all acts of devotion (l. 290), and to whom she set an example by undertaking all menial offices (l. 403). She was eager in her wish for the knowledge of the Scriptures, so that to her importance Jerome ascribes the writing of many of his Commentaries, which were sent to her in conjunction first with her mother and afterwards with her niece the younger Paula. The letters which Jerome wrote for her instruction were innumerable (ii. 956, Epistolaram ad Paulam et Eustochium, quia quotidie scribatur, incertus est numero). She attended her mother with devoted care during her last long illness (l. 721, 723), and, though left after her death in poverty (l. 671), she continued in her vocation to the end. She had as her coadjutress the younger Paula and the younger Melania, and continued with them her convent work and her study of Scripture, so that to the same Jerome the latest commentaries are dedicated. She is reckoned as a saint in the Roman church, her festival being on Sept. 28.

[W. H. F.]

EUSTOCHIUS (1), June 23, provost and martyr at Anicrya, in Galatia, under Maximin, a.d. 311. (Bos. Men.)

[E. V.]

EUSTOCHIUS (2), a layman who had given serious cause of offence to Cassian, whose younger Basil deprecates in his letter (Ep. 72, 73 [351, 388]). [CALLISTHENES.]

EUSTOCHIUS (3), a citizen of Constantinople, an early friend of Gregory Nazianzus, with whom he appears to have studied at Athens (Greg. Naz. Ep. 61), and to whom he subsequently sent a pupil named Proenus (Ep. 111). Nicobulus, the husband of Gregory's niece, having sent his son to study under another soothsayer named Stagirius, Eustathius was so much offended that he wrote to Gregory complaining of this breach of friendship, and bringing serious charges against his rival. Gregory replied, remonstrating faithfully but affectionately on his unworthy jealousy, which brought reproach on philosophy, and injured his own pupils (Ep. 61). Eustathius took these remonstrances in bad part, and began attacking Gregory himself, who wrote to him that he cared nothing for his insults, but that he had better hold his tongue if he could (Ep. 92).

[E. V.]

EUSTOCHIUS (4), St., fifth archbishop of Tours, between St. Bricius and St. Perpetus. He was of senatorial rank, and, according to Gregory of Tours, "magnificæ sanctitatis vir"
EUSTOCHIUS

EUSTOCHIUS (6), eighth bishop of Angers, between Emerinius and Adelphius. He subscribed the first council of Orleans in 511. (Mansi, viii. 357; Gall. Christ. xiv. 547.)

EUSTOCHIUS (6), patriarch of Jerusalem, in succession to Peter, and according to Papebroch from a.d. 544 to 556. On the death of Peter, Eustochius, excommunicated of the church of Alexandria but residing at Constantinople, was favored by the emperor Justianin in preference to Macarius, an Originist, who had been first elected. At the synod of Constantinople a.d. 553, Eustochius was represented by three legates, Stephanus bishop of Raphis, Georgius bishop of Tiberias, Damasus bishop of Sozusa or Sosytsana (Mansi, ix. 173 c); and when the acts in condemnation of Originism were sent by the emperor to Jerusalem, all the bishops of Palestine except Alexander of Abila confirmed them. But in the monasteries of that province, and especially in that named the New Laura, the partisans of the proscribed opinions grew daily more powerful, notwithstanding the resolute efforts of the patriarch against them. In 555, after eight months of persistent admonition, Eustochius went in person, accompanied by the deacon Athanasius, the bishop of the opposition, and forcibly expelled the whole body of the Monophysites, replacing them by sixty monks from the principal haurra and sixty from other orthodox monasteries of the desert, under the prior Joanus. By these proceedings Originism was rooted out of Palestine. According to Victor Tunnensii Eustochius was removed from the patriarchate, and Macarius restored. (Cyrillus Scythopol. in Cotel. Monum. Eccles. Graec. iii. 373; Evagrius, H. E. iv. 37, 38; Victor Tunun. in Pat. L. xuiii. 982 a; Theoph. Chronog. A. M. 6689; Papebroch, Patriarch. Hierosol. in Boll. Acta SS. Intro. to vol. iii. of May, p. xxvii; le Quien, Or. Chr. iii. 210.) Pagé (Ann. 561 iii.) discusses the chronology. See also Clinton, F. R. 537, 557.

EUSTOCHIUS (7), bishop of Avila, signs the seventh Council of Toledo, a.d. 646. (Esp. Sopr. xiv. 22; Aguirre-Catalan, iii. 429.) [JUSTINIANUS]

[M. A. W.]

EUSTOCHIUS (8), of St. Praxedes, cardinal-archbishop, present at the canonization of St. Swithbert by pope Leo III. In the presence of Charlemagne in the church of St. Swithbert at Werda (Kaiserswerth on the Rhine below Düsseldorf), on Sept. 4, 804. (Epicile of St. Ludgerus, cap. 8, in Surius, de Prob. Hist. SS. tom. ii. Mart. 1, p. 20, and in Baron. Annal. ann. 804, iv.)

EUSTOLIUS, a consecrated virgin of Antioch, whose intimate relations with Leucius, afterwards bishop of that see, having caused scandal, he mutinied himself in order that he might continue to enjoy her society without reproach. (Athanas. Apolog. pro fuja, c. 26, p. 718; Soccr. H. E. ii. 26.)

EUSTOLIUS, bishop of Nicomedia at the council of Anncy, a.d. 314. (Mansi, ii. 584 d; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 584.)

EUSTORGIUS (1), April 11, presbyter and martyr at Nicomedia (Mart. Hieron., Usuardi.)

EUSTORGIUS (3), named by Ambrose, with the title of confessor, as one of his predecessors in the see of Milan (Op. iii. p. 920). According to Ulpianus' Italia Sacra, he was the tenth bishop of Milan.

EUSTORGIUS (3), bishop of Dios-hieron (Christopolis) near Ephesus; his name was subscribed in his absence to the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, by the order of Stephen bishop of Ephesus, through Hesperor bishop of Pitane, a.d. 451. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 723; Mansi, viii. 168.)

EUSTORGIUS (4), bishop of Milan, a.d. 512-518. There is a letter to him from Avitus archbishop of Vienne (Avit. Epist. in Patr. Lat. iixi. 227), addressed to him as a bishop. Avitus thanks him for the liberal contribution which he had sent him for the use of the church in Gaul. He is identified as bishop of Milan in a letter of Theodoric to count Adilla, enjoining that due care should be taken of the possessions of his see in the island of Sicily (Eustoricius, Var. ii. 29). He is supposed to have been the Eustorgius mentioned in the poems of Fanodius (Garon. ii. 50). In the epistles of the church to those among those attributed to Theodoric, but most probably written by himself, there is a remarkable one (Var. i. 9) addressed to Eustorgius, respecting the bishop of Augusta (Aosta), unjustly accused by his clergy of treasonable intentions. Theodoric would not punish them himself, but he remitted the case to the bishop of Milan, who he knew would deal with the case according to ecclesiastical usage. (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. i. 643; Ugh. Ital. Sac. iv. 55; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 113.)

EUSTOSIUS, Nov. 10, martyr at Antioch, with Demetrius a bishop, and Anianus a deacon. (Mart. Hieron., Usuardi.)

EUSTRATIUS (1), Dec. 13, martyr at Sebaste in Armenia, under the prefect Agricola in the Diocletian persecution (Bac. ier.; Col. Ryment.; Bar. Annal. 311, 20); Dec. 12 (Col. Armen.).

EUSTRATIUS (2), a kinsman of Gregory Nazianzen. In his behove Gregory wrote to Olympius, governor of Cappadocia (Turkey), begging that he would pardon some unspecified offence (Ep. 177).
EUSTRATIUS (3), count, addressed by Firmus bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who commends to his patronage an instrumental performer unsurpassed in skill by ancients or moderns, whose sacred music the count had often enjoyed. For the sake of Firmus and of the church itself this musician should be warmly encouraged. Firm. ep. 39, Pat. Gr. i. 1505. [C. H.]

EUSTRATIUS (4), EUSTACHIUS bishop of Sufes, near the river Bagrada, in the Byzasene province of Africa, one of the bishops banished by Genseric on the accusation that he had referred to him in his sermons, as Victor Vitensis narrates, in his book De Persecutione Vandal., b. i. c. 7 (Patrol. Lat. xviii. 190). He seems, however, to have returned, as he was summoned to the conference at Carthage, A.D. 484, and subsequently banished by Hunneric. He is mentioned in Bede's Martyrology, on 28th Nov. (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 268; Patrol. Lat. xcv. 1117). [L. D.]

EUSTRATIUS (5), presbyter of the Greek church at Constantinople, contemporary with the patriarch Eutychius, author of a work variously cited as De Vita functorum Statu, De Vita functorum Animis, On the State of the Dead. Photius (cod. 171) mentions the work describing its scope, but citing no formal title. Leo Allatius discovered the actual work and printed it with a Latin translation in his Agreement of the Churches of West and East about Purgatory, Rome, 1655, pp. 336 sq. The Latin version alone appeared afterwards in the Max. Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. xxviii. 362; Cave, i. 538; Cellier, xi. 347. This author has been identified with Eustathius, the biographer of Eutychius. [EUSTATHIUS (47).] The treatise argues (1) that the souls of the dead, blessed or accursed, think and act after separation from the body; (2) that the souls which have appeared to men have their characteristic qualities; (3) that prayers for the dead are efficacious. His arguments are a strange medley. [W. M. S.]


EUSTRATIUS (7), bishop of Apamaea or Myrcia, in Bisitius, present at the seventh general council, A.D. 787. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 657; Mansi, xii. 1096.) [L. D.]

EUSTRATIUS (8), bishop of Methymna, in the island of Lesbos, present at the seventh general council, A.D. 787. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 961; Mansi, xii. 1096.) [L. D.]

EUSTRATIUS (9), bishop of Cotraia (otherwise Cordatus or Coradus) in Iasoria. Its situation is doubtful. Eustathius was present at the seventh general council at Nicaea, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xii. 142; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 1032.) [J. de S.]

EUSTRATIUS (10), bishop of Debeltum in north-eastern Thracia. Was present at the seventh general council held at Nicaea, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xiii. 150; and Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1184.) [J. de S.]

EUSYCHIUS, hermit. [EUSYNIUS.]

EUTACTIUS. [ARCHONTIUS.]

EUTALIUS, bishop of Edessa. [EUTALIUS (2).]

EUTALIUS, a bishop in Cyprus, one of those to whom the synodal of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria in the year 400, in condemnation of Origen, is addressed. (Jerome, Ep. xxii.) [W. H. F.]

EUTERIUS (1), Feb. 22, martyr with thirty-one others at Nicomedia, under Diocletian, A.D. 304. He was a member of the imperial guard. The exaggerations with respect to the martyrdoms at Nicomedia are very great. In the modern Roman Martyrology, on March 13, 10,000 martyrs at Nicomedia are noted. In Greek Menology, at Sept. 4, there are 3628 commemorated, while at Dec. 25 we are told that many thousands of martyrs were there buried in a church. (Acts SS. Boll. Feb. iii. 288.) [G. T. S.]

EUTERIUS (2), first abbot of Monza, in Avvernse, mentioned in a charter of Pope Sixtus, citing that Euterius obtained authority for the erection of the monastery from king Thedoric and his son king Clovis, i.e. Thierry III. and Clovis III. The tenor of the charter is given by Mabillon (Annal. t. ii. p. 204), but the text does not occur in the collections of Pertz and Baluze. See also Gall. Chi. ii. 392. [C. H.]

EUTHALIA (1), Aug. 27, virgin and martyr at Leontini, in Sicily, about the year 257. She is said to have been killed by her brother Sermilianus, on becoming a Christian. Her name was inserted in the Roman calendar by pope Paul V. Her acts, which are fabulous, were published by Octav. Cajetanus in his Fab. SS. Scol. t. i. p. 76. (Acta SS. Bell. Aug. vi. p. 12; Mem. Gregori. Serlet. in Canisius Antiq. Lect.) [G. T. S.]

EUTHALIA (2), a lady, a correspondent of Chrysostom, to whom he wrote from Cæsarea in A.D. 404 and 405, thanking her for her kindness in writing to him, and begging her to continue to do so frequently. He praises her for despising the things of this world, and directing her chief care to her spiritual state. (Chrysost. Epist. xxxii. 178.) [E. V.]

EUTHALIA (1), bishop of Byblus in Phoenicia, north of Beyrut. He is mentioned in the Basilian Menologion (June 13, Patrol. Gr. cxxxvi. 496), as having administered baptism to the martyr Aquillina during the persecution of Diocletian. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 821.) [J. de S.]

EUTHALIA (2), bishop of Edessa, present at the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325 (Mansi, ii. 694, where the name occurs under the form Ethalios, Athalios, Atholus. The Chronicle of Edessa, cap. 14 (Assem. Bibl. Or. i. 394), says he was made bishop in 324, and built the cemetery and the south side of his church. Assenian transliterates the name Astiallos, which means (Stanley, East. Church, p. 104, 4th ed.) the
brought of God," like the Greek Theophares. The Syrian writer Amrus (Assem. iii. 589) calls him Rabulas. Moses of Choren (ib. ii. cap. 89) in the French translation of Le Vaillant (p. 373) calls him Euthalius, and in the Italian version of Cappelletti (p. 193) Eutilio. This writer speaks of Euthalius journeying to the council in company with Jacobus of Nisibis and John of Persia.

[C. H.]

EUTHALIUS (3), a fellow deacon with Gregory Nazianzen. The civil authorities having endeavoured to compel him to military service after he had attained the presbyterate, Gregory wrote to Amphiliacus, then a leading advocate, to use his influence to get him off (Ep. 159). If he was the same person, he was accused by one Philadelpheus, a kinman and brother presbyter, of having imprisoned and beaten him. Gregory wrote desiring a deacon named George, to whom from some authority in the church, to bring Euthalius before him to answer to the charge (Ep. 182).

[E. V.]

EUTHALIUS (4), bishop of Colophon in the province of Asia, present at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1217; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 726.)

[L. D.]

EUTHALIUS (5), a deacon of Alexandria, afterwards bishop of Sylae, for there is no doubt that both designations belong to the same person.

The time at which he has flourished has been erroneously stated by Cave as A.D. 396 (Hist. Lit. sac. iv.). But this date, mentioned in a short statement on the martyrdom of St. Paul at the close of the twenty-third Epistle of that Apostle, does not apply to himself, but to one whom, in the course of the Prologue, he had described as "a certain father most wise and most beloved of Christ." Immediately afterwards, however, he gives the date of his own day as sixty-three years later, thus bringing the date in this Prologue to the close. Such an indication, bringing the date of this Prologue, was confirmed by the fact that the works of Euthalius are dedicated to Athanasius the Younger, who was bishop of Alexandria about the middle of the fifth century. At that time Euthalius appears to have been a deacon of the Alexandrian church, and to have turned his attention to the study of the Holy Scriptures. Since he has generally been known as the author of the Euthalian Sections, we shall speak of him first.

It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the different books of the New Testament were originally written without divisions of any kind, whether of chapters, verses, or words, from their beginning to their close, while at least is the appearance presented by them in our most ancient MSS.; and, as it can be shewn that these MSS. were copied in their form from old papyrus rolls, there is not the slightest reason to doubt that the characteristic of their structure, of which we are now speaking, belonged to them in their earliest condition, when they issued from the hands of the sacred writers. The inconveniences arising from this must have been manifold and great, but the first steps towards improvement seem to have proceeded less from any desire to remedy these, than from the wish to supply an easy means of reference to the parallel passages of the gospels. This was done by what are known as the Ammonian Sections, together with the Eusebian Canons, any detailed account of which would lead us too far away from our present purpose. It is enough to say that to Ammonius of Alexandria, in the 3rd century, is generally ascribed the merit of having been the first to divide all the four gospels into sections, regulated by the substance of the narratives contained in them. As yet, however, no similar principle of division had been carried into any of the other books of the New Testament. It was Euthalius who introduced a system of division into all the books of the New Testament not yet divided, except the Apocalypse, which proved as acceptable that it spread rapidly over the whole Greek church and has become, by its presence or absence, a valuable test of the antiquity of a MS.

Euthalius was not indeed really the first to suggest the whole of that scheme of division associated with his name. As far as the Epistles of St. Paul are concerned, he himself tells us that he only adopted the scheme of the "father" already alluded to. The name of this father is nowhere given, and Mill's conjecture (Prolegomena N. T. p. 78) that it was Theodochus of Monestria, whose name was concealed, because he was at that time under censure of the church, has hardly sufficient positive ground to rest on. But, whoever he may have been and however Euthalius may have been stirred up by his example to independent exertion, there seems to be no doubt that the latter, by means, in all probability, of his other labours, and of the more critical apparatus, by which we have here to speak, procured for them the acceptance which they soon obtained. It will give some idea of the length of these glossa if we observe that in the Epistle to the Romans there were 19; in that to the Galatians 12; in that to the Ephesians 10; in First Thessalonians 7; in Second Thessalonians 8; in Hebrews 22; in the Epistle to Philemon 2; and so with the other Epistles.

In themselves these sections possess no value. The whole value arises from the fact that they were very widely adopted throughout the church, and that transcribers of manuscripts were in the habit of using them, and marking them on their own part. Since not a single copy is known in the Ammonian Sections, with their numbers in the Eusebian Canons, are marked, the evidence is almost irresistible that the manuscript falls between the time of Eusebius and the early part of the 5th century. Where our evidence as to antiquity is often at the best defective, every consideration that can render the least help is to be valued; and thus this simple arrangement has preserved the name of Euthalius when all his other labours might have failed to do so. Of these labours we have now to speak.

They relate mainly to three points in connexion with the text: the Larger Sections or Lessons, which Euthalius was the chief instru-
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tement of leading the Greek church to adopt
upon a uniform plan; the smaller divisions, or
\( \sigma'\varepsilon\varphi\alpha\varsigma \) as they were called, to which, if he did not introduce them, he at least gave a greater
currency than they previously possessed; and
his plan of collecting and noting the quotations
from the Old Testament in the New. We will
remark upon each of these:

(1) The Lessons. Fixed lessons to be read in
public worship had been known even in the syna-
gogue, and there can be little doubt that they
passed into the Christian church, at least as soon
as the canon was settled. But up to the time of
Euthalius there seems to have been little or no
uniformity in them. Individual churches,
for the most part, had divisions of their own.
The scheme proposed by Euthalius, however, so
commended itself that it speedily became
general wherever the Greek tongue was spoken.
The whole of the New Testament, except the
Gospels and the Apocalypse, was divided by it
into fifty-seven portions, some certainly very
difficult to divide, from the others. In Acts there
were 16; in the Pauline Epistles 31; 5
in Romans; 5 in First Corinthians; 4 in Second
Corinthians, &c.; in the Catholic Epistles, 10;
2 in James; 2 in First Peter; 1 in Second
Peter, &c.; in all 57. Of these, 53 were for
the Sundays of the year, which seem alone to
have been composed by the Alexandrian
Synaxarists, and it is supposed by Mill that the
other four were for Christmas, Good Friday,
Easter, and Epiphany. (Proleg. in N. T. p. 96.)

(2) The smaller divisions. These are the
well-known \( \sigma'\varepsilon\varphi\alpha\varsigma \) \( \tau \) that is, lines, in Latin versus,
each containing either a few words complete in
themselves, or so as much as it was possible to read
without effort at one breath. Like that of the
sections or capitula formerly spoken of, the plan
of these \"verses\" was not introduced by
Euthalius. It had already been adopted in the
case of some of the poetical books, and even in
some of the poetical parts of the prose books of
the Old Testament. The Testament had occa-
sionally employed it. It had been sanctioned by
Origen. The Vulgate had used it, and it is
found in the psalms of the Vatican and Sinaitic
manuscripts, both as old as the time of which we
speak, if not even older. Nay, the idea had
also been partially applied to the New Testa-
ment, for Scripture refers to Origen as speaking
of the 100 \( \sigma'\varepsilon\varphi\alpha\varsigma \) of the second, and
third epistles of St. John, of the few of St. Paul's
Epistles, of the \"very few\" of I John; while
Eustathius of Antioch, in the 4th century, is
said to reckon 135 from John viii. 59 to x. 31
(Introduction to Codex D, p. 17). It is clear,
however, from the figures thus quoted, that
many of these divisions cannot have been \( \sigma'\varepsilon\varphi\alpha\varsigma \)
in the strict sense of the term. They must
have been of very unequal length, and for the
most part considerably larger than those divi-
sions to which the term properly belongs.
The credit due to Euthalius lay in this, that what
was before partially and imperfectly done, was
united under one head, and comprehended with
greater care. His work thus forms an im-
portant step in the process by which punctua-
tion, so invaluable to the ordinary reader of the
Bible, was at last reached.

But it was hardly as a system of punctuation,
however imperfect, that the divisions to which
we refer were at first designed. Euthalius, in
describing his labours on the Acts of the
Apostles and the Catholic Epistles, makes no
mention of this. He speaks only of increased
facility of reading, and more especially of the
meet expression which his labours afforded to
that love and admiration of scripture which
ought to lead to its being adorned in every-
creasing measure by successive students. (p. 400)
In the Epistle to the Romans he made 920 such
\( \sigma'\varepsilon\varphi\alpha\varsigma \); in Galatians, 293; in Ephesians, 312;
in First Thessalonians, 193; in Second Tes-
ssonians, 106; in Hebrews, 703; in Philem.,
37; and so on.

(3) Still a third part of the labours of our
author was expended upon enumerating all the
quotations from the Old Testament, and even
from profane writers, to be found in those books
of the New Testament to which his attention
was turned. These he numbered in one cata-
logue; assigned to the various books wherein
they were taken in a second; and quoted at length in a third.

The points of which we have hitherto spoken
refer to the outward arrangements of the sacred
text; but, if we may look upon the Arguments
which are published as a part of the works of
Euthalius as his own, and not as the production
of a later hand, we went also into the substance
and meaning of the books edited by him. These
Arguments contain short summaries of the
books to which they are prefixed, and convey
a simple and excellent idea of their contents. It
has indeed been contended by Zacagnius, their
editor, that they must belong to a later time
than that of Euthalius, inasmuch as they
present discrepancies from statements in other
parts of his works as to the places where the
Epistles were written (Praef. p. 60). Thus the
Argumentum to First Corinthians states that it
was written from Ephesus (p. 589); but in the
collected statement as to the cities whence all
the epistles were written, Philippus is said to
have been the place (p. 584). The argument is by
no means conclusive. It may be urged with
equal, if not more probability, that the general
statement is the interpolation, and that it is
extremely unlikely that at a date later than
that of Euthalius, any one could have been
found to depart from the long-standing tra-
dition of the church.

However this may be, it is not without inter-
est to observe that both Euthalius himself and
his patron Athanasius had wonderfully correct
ideas of the manner in which such a work as
one on the text of the New Testament should be
set about; for when the patriarch, interested
by his deacon's success with the Pauline Epistles,
urged him to undertake a similar treatment of
the Acts and Catholic Epistles, we are told that he
immediately set out to Caesarea in order that he
might there have the best opportunity of com-
paring the famous MSS. of Origen and of Pam-
philus the martyr, which had been collected by
Eusebius, bishop of that city. At the close of
his work, he is said to have sent drafts of
the states that he had done this. (Works, p. 512.)

Beyond the critical labours of which we have
spoken, it does not appear that Euthalius at-
ttempted much. He wrote indeed a short life of
St. Paul, which forms the first part of his work
on the fourteen epistles of that apostle. But is
is so bold and meagre that it is altogether undeserving of notice. Besides this, it has been said that the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of St. Luke; and that in an ancient catena on the epistle to the Romans fragments of his writings were to be found. None of these statements seem to be correct. Zacagni, at all events, tells us that he had searched everywhere for the commentaries spoken of, but in vain. (Proef. p. 71.)

We have seen that Euthalius began his labours as a deacon of the church, and it was in this capacity that he earned the distinction which has hinged his name down to posterity. In later life he was appointed to a bishopric, and he is known as Episcopus Sullensis. Socratees observes that Sulci in Sardinia is the only see of that name that he can find (Intr. p. 58, n. 1). Possibly that may be the place; yet it is unlikely that one who had belonged to the church at Alexandria, and who had earned his promotion at the hands of his bishop, would be sent all the way to Sardinia, and to the See of Sulci. It is possible that the See of Sulci may have been the same name as Salsa, a city of the Thebaid near Syene, and that there, in recognition of his labours, Euthalius was honoured with the episcopate; but Galland throws doubt on the conjecture. It is unnecessary to inquire further into a point of this kind, on which it is almost impossible to throw any light.

The works of Euthalius remained long unknown. Cave had spoken of them as hidden away somewhere, but obviously without any notion where they might be. At last, however, in A.D. 1639, they were edited and published at Rome by Laurentius Alexander Zacagni, prefect of the Vatican Library, in the first volume of his Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum Ecclesiae Graecae ac Latinae. The edition has prefixed to it a long preface by the editor, in which different questions relating to Euthalius are discussed with much care. It has been printed in Galland (Biblioth. Pat. x. 197) and in Migne (Pat. Gr. lxxxv. 621). Notices of Euthalius will also be found in the Prolegomena of the New Testament of Wetstein and Mill, and in Scrivener's Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.

EUTHARIC, an Ostrogoth, belonged to the stock of the Amali. He was an indirect descendant of Ermanaric, and grandson of Berthmund, who had wandered from the Ostrogoths to the Visigoths (Dahn, Die König der Germanen, ii. 115, 116). He married Amalasuntha, the only daughter of Theodoric. Their son Athalaric was born anno 518. Theodoric allowed his son-in-law to be adopted by Justinian ("actus est per arma filius Cassiod. Var. Epist. lxxxv. 11 Migne, lxxxv. 723"). Athalaric was consul in 518, and though he was hostile to and severs upon the Catholics, by the magnificence of his games and his genial bearing he condescended the people of Rome. He died a few years before Theodoric. (Jordanes, ed. Clovis 168; Excerpta Valesiani, i.e. the chronicle of Maximian, a bishop of Ravenna, ed. Thomsen, 1875, p. 301; Dahn, Die König der Germanen, ii. 176.)

EUTHIASIUS (EUSTASIUS), bishop of Augusta Praetoria (Aosta), represented by a pre-bis
tactor, Gratus, at the council held under Eusebius of Milan, in A.D. 431. (Leo. Mag. Ep. 97, 1085, in Pat. Lat. iv. 846 n.) He is identified in Gallus Christianus, xii. 806, with a bishop Eustatius or Eustachius, who was present at a council in A.D. 381 at Aquileia (S. Ambros. Opera, 780, 1), whom Gall. Christ. and Gama (Series Episc. p. 828) call "Saint," and who is identified, without much ground, with a Eustachius mentioned in the "de laudibus municipii" published among his works (Acta S. Victoric (see Gheqoëri, A.D. SS. Belgio, i. 420, § 11). [EUTSTATIUS (12).] [C. G.]

EUTHERIUS (1) (ERHERIUS), subscribed the council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (Athanas. i. 132. Patr. Grsec. xxv. 337). [W. M. S.]

EUTHERIUS (2), bishop of Tyana, an earnest Nestorian, and an acknowledged leader of that party both in the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and for some time afterwards. Before the assembling of that council he was in active correspondence with John of Antioch, on the subject of the allegiance of the church of Alexandria and his adherents (Cyril (?), vol. i. 764 a. ; Theodoret. Ep. 112. ; Migne, Patrologia Gr. lxxxiii. 1310). He was one of the 68 who demanded that the council should not be opened until John's arrival (Synodicon ad. Traged. Irenan. ; Migne, Patrol. Gr. lxxiv. 566). The appeal of Nestorius after his deposition to the emperor is signed by Euthérius, as are also the sentences of deposition pronounced in the synod convened by John of Antioch at his lodging (Acta Concilior. u. s. 598). On July 1 Cyril and his party wrote to the emperor to complain of the proceedings of John and his friends, among whom they name Euthérius (Act. Co. Ep. Labbe and Cossart, u. s. 740-751). On July 18, John of Antioch and his adherents were deposed and excommunicated, and Euthérius among them (Act. Co. Ep. acta v. u. s. 654). Both parties now issued circulars to the churches relating what they had done, and what had been done by others, and both were signed by Euthérius. Towards the end of the month a letter arrived from the emperor, commanding all to return to their homes in peace. This was addressed to fifty-one bishops by name, and among them Euthérius. Euthe
terius would seem to have at once obeyed the imperial injunction, and shortly after we find him in friendly correspondence with his neighbour, Firmus of Caesarea, notwithstanding that Firmus had taken part in his excommunication, on the subject of a lawsuit which was pending between two members of their several flocks. (Firm. ep. 23. ; Patrol. Gr. lxxi. 1498.) But before the end of the year, deposition of Euthérius at Ephesus had been confirmed at Constantinople.

Soon after this Firmus was sent to Tyana, to ordain a successor to Euthérius, and met with great opposition on the part of the citizens, who were evidently much attached to their bishop. Long ago also, the imperial officer who was in command of the Isaurian troops stationed in the city, interfered; and both Firmus, and the person whom he had ordained in spite of the opposition with which he met, were compelled to flee. The newly ordained bishop soon renounced his orders, and seems to have returned to lay life. (Theodoret, Ep. Hypomnem. Alex. Hierap. Synodicon. c. 45, u. s.)
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When negotiations were opened for reconciliation between the rival patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, one of the conditions upon which John and his adherents at first most strenuously insisted was the restoration of, among others, the deposed bishop of Tyana (Theodore, ad Hesiod. ep. Mar. Mercator.); Migne, Patr. xlviii. 1081). In the meanwhile, Eutharius and his fellow sufferers had written to Cyril, to Maximian, the newly appointed successor of Nestorius, and also to Xystus bishop of Rome, to protest against the extreme measures of which they were the victims. (Cyril, ad Donatum. ep. 45, ol. 42; Migne, Patr. Gr. lxviii. 250, and Act. Co. Epk. pt. ii. c. 38.) In their letter to Xystus they not only complain of Cyril, but they also charge him with having introduced “novelties.” At the same time they express their painful astonishment that John should have so far yielded to Cyril as he had done, and pray the intercession of Xystus with the emperor in their behalf. (Synodicon, c. 117, u. s. 727; and Migne, Patr. i. 594."

After the reconciliation had been effected, Eutharius wrote to John to renounce with him on his inconsistency and want of loyalty to what he once contended for, but says nothing of his having abandoned his friends, and left them to their fate. (Synodicon, c. 73, u. s. 681.) Eutharius wrote to Alexander II. Hierapolitanus, who was equally opposed to the reconciliation, a long letter in which he ably defends the position which they and others were still determined to maintain (Synodicon, c. 201, u. s. 815); and to Helladius bishop of Tarsus, who had also written to Alexander, to enforce his position, if he had any. (Synodicon, c. 74, u. s. 684.) Eutharius was ultimately banished to Scythopolis, and from thence to Tyre, where he died. (Synodicon, c. 190, u. s.)

Eutharius is the author of a treatise in seven chapters, with a preface, letter addressed to Eutharius, bishop of Parmisia, in which Photius ascribed to Theodoret (Phot. Biblioth. c. xiv, Migne, Patr. Gr. ciii. 79), which has since been attributed by some to Maximus the Martyr, and by others to Athanasius (Garner’s notes on Marius Mercator in Patr. l. xviii. 759, 1098, 1097; Fabricius, Biblioth. Gr. ed. Harles, viii. 304), in which he subjects the “Scholia” of Cyril of Alexandria, “de Incarnazione Unigeniti” (Mar. Mercat. u. s. 1066) to elaborate and searching criticism. This treatise is still published with the works of Athanasius, but among the “Dubia,” under the title of “Confutationes quarumdam Propositionum” (Athanas. Op. Patr. Gr. x. 337, in Praef. to the Dubia, p. 1287, and cf. the titles of chapters 8–24, inclusive of the “Libri” read by Photius with those of the seventeen chapters of the “Confutationes”). Gams infers from the preface letter that Eutharius published this treatise before his banishment.

[T. W. D.]

EUTHERIUS (3), bishop of Stratonicia, in the province of Lydia. His name is appended to the protest signed by several bishops against the opening of the Council of Ephesus before the arrival of John of Antioch; nevertheless, he attended the first session, which was held on the day of the protest, A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Oriens

Christ. i. 893; Mansi, iv. 1224; Baluz. Synod. c. 7, Concil. 698.)

EUTHERIUS (4), (Aethereius), bishop of Sardis, the metropolis of the province of Lydia, received a letter from the emperor Leo, ordering him to collect his province, and to inquire about the murder of St. Proterius of Alexandria, and about the faith of Chalcedon, A.D. 458. The synodal letter sent in answer to Leo is extant. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 862; Mansi, iv. 523, 571.)

EUTHERIUS (5), a person whom pope Gregory the Great styles “magnificis memoris,” and for whose death he writes to console Clementius, Patricius. From some misapprehended allusion to episcopal duties in the letter Eutharius has been conjectured to have been a bishop. (Greg. Mag. Epp. lib. i. ind. ix. ep. 11; Patr. Lat. xlviii. 458.)

EUTHERIUS (6), bishop of Chartres. [Eutharios (2).]

EUTHMIUS or Euthymius, deacon and martyr at Alexandria. He died in prison. (Mar. Vit. Rom., Adon., Usuard.)

EUTHONUS, an Italian bishop who suffered martyrdom in Bithynia, A.D. 311. (Baronius, Annal. 311, 18.)

EUTHORIO, king of the Visigoths. [Eutric.]

EUTHMIUS (1), a convert at Milan, cir. A.D. 390. During the struggle between the emperor Justinus and Ambrose at Milan, Justinus offered high dignities and rewards to catch a would withdraw Ambrose from the church and conduct him into banishment. Euthymius purposely took a residence near the church, and kept a carriage in readiness. At the end of a year, however, and on the very day in which he had hoped to take Ambrose by surprise, he was himself surprised and was taken into banishment in the very carriage which he himself had provided. Euthymius, reflecting upon the workings of Providence, was himself converted. (Paulin. in Vit. Ambros. sec. 12.)

EUTHMIUS (2), a presbyter of Constantinople, who with Philip presided over the church in that city, from which office they were deposed on account of their adherence to the cause of Chrysostom, and the freedom with which they had condemned the proceedings of his persecution. Chrysostom wrote to Euthymius from Caucasus in A.D. 404 to console him under his trials, and to encourage him to persevere. (Chrysost. Epist. 318.)

EUTHMIUS (3), the youngest of the four Nitrian solitaries known as “the Tall Brothers.” [Chrysostom; Diodoros.] [E. Y.]

EUTHMIUS (4), abbot in Palestine. He was born in 377, at Melitene in Armenia. His parents’ names were Paulus and Diospias, and his birth was considered an answer to prayer made at the shrine of the martyr Polyaeuctes. His tutor was Aacius, afterwards bishop of Melitene. He was placed at an early age under the direction of Ortes, bishop of that town. After his ordination to
the presbyterate he was placed in charge of all the monasteries in and near the place.

Finding this care too great an interruption to his meditations, in his twenty-ninth year he escaped to Jerusalem, to visit the holy places, and settled at the dwelling of a community of separate monks called Pharan, six miles from Jerusalem.

Having made a particular friendship with another hermit, named Theoctistus, he used to take long walks with him into the desert of Cetila at sacred seasons. On one of these occasions, in the fifth year of his stay at Pharan, they came to a tremendous torrent, with a cavern on one of its banks. Here they determined to live lost to the world. They were, however, after a time discovered by some shepherds, who were at first terrified by their appearance, but afterwards sent them gifts from their village. The fathers of Pharan also found them out, and came at times to see them. About 411 Euthymius began to take to monastic life. They turned the cavern into a church, and built a monastery on the side of the ravine where it was situated. Theoctistus had charge of it.

In 420 he erected a laura, like that of Pharan, on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. The fathers of this place and his own disciples were allowed to come to consult him on Saturdays and Sundays, and his advice was always given with captivating sweetness and humility. In A.D. 428 the church of his laura was consecrated by Juvenal the first patriarch of Jerusalem, accompanied by the presbyter Hesychius and the celebrated Passarion, governor of a monastery in Jerusalem.

A new turn was given to the life of Euthymius by a cure which he effected for Terebon, son of Aspebutes, prince of the Saracens. The biographer Cyril had obtained the details from many of the Fathers, but the most authentic edition of the story was given to him personally by another Terebon, grandson of the subject of the cure. Prince Aspebutes, the Saracens, was tributary to the Persians, but came under the supremacy of Rome in the following manner. Towards the end of the reign of Isedeger, king of Persia, a persecution was aroused against the Christians. Orphans were appointed on all the monasteries as prefect of the East; he received him kindly, and made him prefect of all the subjects of the Empire then living in Arabia. The son Terebon, who was not yet grown up, had for some time suffered from some kind of paralysis, which had withered his right side from head to foot. The boy is said to have had a dream indicating the abode of Euthymius and Theoctistus. At any rate, the sheikh Aspebutes brought him to that gloomy retreat. When they arrived with a large train of followers, they were refused admittance to Euthymius because it was neither Saturday nor Sunday. The sheikh challenged Theoctistus by the hand, and silently pointed to his affected leg. Terebon, too, himself made an eloquent appeal. Theoctistus reported the scene to his superior; Euthymius did not care to disobey what was said to be a heavenly vision, and came down to the party below. His prayers are narrated to have restored health to the patient, and the whole company believed on the Lord Jesus. Euthymius ordered a little recess for water to be hollowed out in the side of the cave, and baptized them on the spot. The sheikh took the name of Peter. His brother-in-law Maris refused to leave the place, and joined the community of anchorites, bestowing all his wealth for the enlargement of the buildings. The report spread over Palestine and the neighbouring countries, and Euthymius was besieged with applications for medical assistance and prayer.

Mindful of his former untroubled tranquillity, he meditated a flight to a still more secluded place, which is called Ruba in the narrative. Theoctistus, however, divined his intention, and collecting all the brethren, made them fall on their knees and beseech him to remain. But in spite of this, some few days later he set out with a disciple named Domitian, and took up various stations on the barest peaks of the awful solitude near the Dead Sea, in some cases founding small settlements of monks amongst the ruins left by Amorites or Moabites.

The next event of importance is the visit of Peter, bishop of the Saracens, on his way to the council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. Euthymius exhorted him to unite with Cyril of Alexandria, and with Acacius of Melitene, and to do in regard to the creed whatever seemed right to those two prelates.

When the council of Chalcedon issued its decrees (451) two of his disciples, Stephen and John, who had been present, carefully brought them to their master, to see whether he approved of them. The report of his sanction spread through the desert, and all the recluses would have followed his example but for the influence of the monk Theodosius, whose life and doctrine appear to have been equally unsatisfactory, who even did his utmost to persuade Euthymius himself to reject Chalcedon, but without success.

The empress Eudoxia, an energetic Eutychian, next crosses the path of Euthymius. After the death of her husband in 456, Eudoxia went to Jerusalem, alleging a vow as the cause of her journey. She does not seem to have been satisfied with her religious position, and being urged by her brother Varianus to become reconciled to the Catholic church, she determined to have the opinion of the celebrated anchorite of Palestine. Knowing that he would never set foot in a town, she built a tower about four miles south of his laura, on the highest part of the great waste. She sent to him Cosmas, guardian of the so-called True Cross at Constantinople, and Anastasius a bishop. He came; and after giving his blessing to the empress, advised her that the violent death of her son and of Valentinian, the irruption of the Vandals, the captivity of her daughter Eudoxia, and of her grandchildren, might all be viewed in connexion with her Eutychian opinions. She should abjure her schism, and embrace the communion of Jrenual, patriarch of Jerusalem. The empress obeyed Euthymius and took the vows of a nun, and her example was followed by a multitude of monks and laymen. A celebrated anchorite, also,
named Gensinius, owed his separation from Eutychianism to Eutychius.

Eutychius died in A.D. 473; his obsequies were celebrated by the patriarch Anastasius and a large number of clergy, among whom are mentioned Chrysippus, Guardian of the Cross, and a deacon named Fidus.


**EUTYCHIMIUS, patriarch. [EUPHRIUS (4).]**

**EUTHYMius (9), bishop of Sardis.** He was a strong opponent of the iconoclastic emperors. He was present at the Nicene council, A.D. 787, in which he took an active part, and read the confession of faith in the name of the council at the fourth session. He was banished by the emperor Nicephorus, and, according to the Bollandists, ultimately suffered martyrdom under the emperor Theophilus. He is commemorated Dec. 29 (*Cant. Byzant.*), and on March 11. (Mansi, xii. 904, 1016, 1038, 1148, xiii. 135, 171, 366, 382; *AA. SS. Bol. 11 Mart.* ii. 73, 3 April, i. 283 in the Life of Nicetas; *Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 862*).

**EUTYCHIMIUS (9), bishop of Sardis in Thrace, present at the council held at Nicea, A.D. 325.** (Mansi, xii. 149, 372; *Le Quien, Or. Christ. i. 1182*).

**EUGINIUS (9), or Euthychius, Nov. 13, martyr, with his brother Paschalius and two others, in the Arian persecution, raised by the Vandals against the Catholics in the 5th century.** Ado notes them on Nov. 12, and records how faithfully they maintained their faith against Sigeric king of Vandals. He tortured and killed them. (Prosper, *Chron. a.d. 437*; Reinart in *Hist. Persuict. Vandai.* p. 431, a.d. 441; *Tillemont, Mem. xvi. 500; Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuard.)*

**EUTICHIUS (1)—May 21.** A deacon and martyr, with Polius and Timotheus, at Caesarea in Mauritania. (Marti. Vet. Rom., Mart. Hieron., Adon., Usuard.)*

**EUTICHIUS (2), hermit. [EUSITIUS.]**

**EUTICHIUS (1), Oct. 5, martyr in Sicily, with Placidus and thirty others.** (Marti. Hieron., Adon., Usuard, Raban.)*

**EUTICHIUS (2), Dec. 11, martyr in Spain.** (Marti. Hieron., Adon., Usuard.)*

**EUTICHIUS (1), Sept. 19, martyr, with St. Januarious, bishop of Beneventum. [JANUARIUS]**

**EUTICHIUS (2), Sept. 29, martyr, with Plautus, at Heraclea in Thrace.** (Marti. Hieron., Usuardi, Rabani.)*

**EUTICHIUS (3), Dec. 28, presbyter and martyr at Ancysa, in Galatia.** He suffered with a deacon, Demetianus. (Marti. Hieron., Usuardi.)*

**EUTROPIA (EUTRHO).** In the Irish annals reference is made to a sacrificial act of special enormity, which took place at Kildare, the true year probably being A.D. 762 (*Ann. T. G.*). The entry in the *Four Masters* (by Donovan, i. 588–589, A.D. 753) is:—"Euthegn (Eutychins, Ann. Uit., and Leteguins, Ann. Tigernach), a bishop, was killed by a priest at the altar of St. Bright, at Kildare (as he was celebrating mass, Ann. Clon.), between the crocaginel and the altar: from whence it arose that ever since a priest does not celebrate mass in the presence of a bishop at Kildare." In the *Ann. Uit.* and Tigernach, this is said to have taken place in a derethae or duirtheach, 48 *mēid mēid* a *Cairt* which, in the former, O'Conor interprets as "in hispicio pauperum Eudarins," and in the latter as "in dono pontificio monasterii Cildarensis," but evidently the "derethae" was the oratorium or church (Pethis, *Round Towers of Ireland,* 343–58; O'Conor, *Er. Bib. Scrip.* ii. 255, iv. 99).

**EUTO, bishop. [ETRHO.]**

**EUTONIOUS, one of the fourteen bishops who met at Disopolis (Lydda) to condemn Pelagianism.** (Aug. Contra Julian. Lib. i. cap. 5, § 19, in Pat. l. xlv. 622). [EUTHROIUS (3)]

**EUTRECHIUS, prefect of the East, A.D. 447.** Theodoret addressed a letter of congratulation to him on his appointment, containing expressions of affection for him, and his assurance that it was reciprocal (*Theod. Epist. 57*). Theodoret wrote to him again in 448, after the machinations of Dioscorus had prevailed with the feuds Theodosius II. to issue an imperial edict forbidding him to leave his diocese of Cyrrhus, as a disturber of the public peace. Theodoret expresses his surprise that Eutrehius refrains from having him no intimation of the plots laid against him, and his regret at the failure of his hopes that Eutrehius's appointment would have calmed the tempest in the church. He was worse treated than murderer and adulterer, in not having any opportunity of answering the charges. (*Epil. 80*). He describes how Eutrehius seems to have replied to the assurances of friendship. Theodoret answers that he does not question his affectionate feeling, and begs that he will endeavour to find out who are the real movers of this persecution, and represent to the emperor how unjust it is to condemn him unheard. (*Epist. 91*).

**EUTROPIA (1), martyr. [EUPERPHIA (I).]**

**EUTROPIA (2), wife of the emperor Maximus (Hercules).** Her full name, Guleia Valeria Eutropia, is preserved on an ancient medal (Goltz). She was a native of Syria (Victor. Chron. sub voc.). By a former marriage she had a daughter Flavia, whom Hercules espoused to the emperor Constantius. By Hercules she was mother of Maxentius, the usurper, and of Fausta, the wife of Constantius. A letter of Constantine seems to show that she embraced Christianity, for he tells the bishops of Palestine that his pious mother-in-law (ἡ διοικετήσις κυριοτρία) had reported to him the desecration of Mamre. (*Euseb. Prol. Const. iii. 52; cf. Sozomen, H. E. ii. 4, § 6*). [M. F. A.]
EUTROPIA

EUTROPIA (3), third daughter of the emperor Constantius I. by his wife Eudoxia, and therefore half-sister to Constantine the Great. She was the mother of Nepotianus, the usurper (Zosim. ii. 43), with whom, according to St. Athanasius, she was put to death in 350 (Apol. Ad. Imp. Const. cap. 6). Her husband was probably the Popilius Nepotianus who conspired in 301. (Cf. Du Cange, sub voc., and Tillemont, Hist. Emp. Constantin., art. iii. ad fin.)

[M. F. A.]

EUTROPIA (4), Dec. 14, virgin, martyr at the hands of the Vandals, A.D. 407. She was sister to Nicasius bishop of Rheims, who suffered in the same invasion. St. Jerome (Epist. ii. ad Agermonium) describes the ravages of the Vandals on this occasion. [Nicasius.]

[G. T. S.]

EUTROPIUS (1), the first bishop of Saintes. According to Gregory of Tours, he was said to have been sent to Gaul by Clement, bishop of Rome, at first consecrated bishop by Eutropius’s name. Here he preached the gospel until after a time the heathen rose against him, and by a blow upon the skull he met with a martyr’s death. The continuance of the persecution prevented his body receiving honourable or Christian burial, but most of the legend affects to trace the ultimate destination of his remains. Gregory tells us that at the close of the 6th century they were solemnly interred by St. Palladius in a church dedicated in their honour, the foul being still visible upon the skull. And from another source we learn that there was a church at Saintes called by Eutropius’s name, which Leontius restored when almost in ruins. He is commemorated on April 30. His successor is the see of St. Blaize. His Acta are to be found in the Bollandists, but they are admittedly not genuine. (Greg. Tur. de Glor. Mart. i. 56; Vener. R. Mer. i. 18; Migne, Patr. Lat. ixi. viii. 70; Bobb. Acta SS. April. iii. 733; Gall. Chr. ii. 1054; Baron. Annal. ann. 95, vii.)

[S. A. B.]

EUTROPIUS (2), bishop of Adrianopolis. [Eutropius (3).] [T. de S.]

EUTROPIUS (3), one of the orthodox bishops in Macedonia thanked by Chrysostom, A.D. 406, for their adherence. (Chrys. Ep. 165; Pat. Gr. iii. 705.)

[C. H.]

EUTROPIUS (4), bishop of Evaza, a town of uncertain position in Asia Minor, one of the spearsmen who pronounced in favour of the letter of St. Cyril, and subscribed the deposition of Nestorius at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1151, 1217; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 731.)

[L. D.]

EUTROPIUS (5), bishop of Ettene (Trisenna) is the first Pamphilian; spoke in favour of the two letters of Cyril to Nestorius at the eccumenical council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1003; Mansi, iv. 1149.) [L. D.]

EUTROPIUS (6), bishop of Adada, in Pusidria, present at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. He signed too the letter of the synod of Pusidria to the emperor Leo, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 575, 571; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1063.) [L. D.]

EUTROPIUS (7), bishop of Pergamos, voted for the decrees of Dioscorus at the Latrocinium CHIST. EORLOG.—VOL. II.

Epheсинum, A.D. 449 (Mansi, vi. 853, 932); his name was subscribed to his absence to those of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, by Hesperius bishop of Ptane, at the instance of Stephen bishop of Ephesus. (Mansi, vii. 168; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 715.)

[L. D.]

EUTROPIUS (8), bishop of Aureliopolis in Lydian, signed the synodal decree of Gennadius of Constantinople against the Simoniaci, A.D. 452. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 896; Mansi, vii. 917.)

[L. D.]

EUTROPIUS (9), twenty-sixth bishop of Mainz, between St. Aureus and Adalbertus. He is said to have sat twenty-three years, and to have died in 477 (Gall. Chr. v. 435), or according to Le Coante, 474 (Ann. Ecol. Franc. an. 474, tom. 1. p. 105).

[S. A. B.]

EUTROPIUS (10), bishop of Orange (Arausio), which was at that time in the realm of Burgundy. Authorities.—A letter of Sidonius Apollinaris (vi. 6) assigned by Ceiller (Ant. Sacr.) to the close of the year 473 or 474, after the retreat of the Visigoths from Avignon, to a Latin to Verus, a later bishop of Orange (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. vi. 699); Audo and Usuard, under May 27. He enjoyed a high reputation for spirituality, and the best effects of awakening it in others. Sidonius begs that he may be permitted to experience the influence of the great gifts possessed by Eutropius, insomuch as for his own part he is deeply conscious of a state of spiritual famine and ignorance. The above date gives us the time when this honoured prelate flourished; but we do not know anything further concerning him.

[J. G. C.]

EUTROPIUS (11), eleventh bishop of Angers, between St. Albinus and Domitianus. He lived about the middle of the 6th century, and is said to have consecrated the monastery and churches of Glenfriul on the Loire. He also transferred the body of his predecessor to the church of St. Germanus, which thenceforth was called after him. (Gall. Chr. xiv. 548; Vita S. Albini, 21, Vita S. Mauri, 48, in Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. saec. i. p. 112, 292, Paris, 1668-1701.]

[S. A. B.]

EUTROPIUS (12), a monk, irregularly consecrated bishop of Ephesus by the imposition of the hand of the dead bishop, Procopius, c. A.D. 560. Like Procopius, he adhered to the heresy of the Julianistæ or Incorrupticœ, and ordained ten bishops to various sees, including those of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, for the dissemination of his heretical views. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 682; J. S. Assemanus, Biblioth. Orient. ii. 86-8.) [L. D.]

EUTROPIUS (13), bishop of Valencia in Spain, towards the end of the 6th century, originally abbat of the monastery of Servitiana, the site of which is now doubtfull. Most writers, including Florez (Esp. Segr. viii. 57) place it near the ancient Sastabas (Xativa), while Gams (K. G. von Spanien, ii. 2, 57) inclines to a more southerly position near Olleria. It was founded by St. Donatus, an African monk, who fled to Spain at the time of an inquisition, “barbarorum genium” (Hilflos. de l'An. Ill, cap. 4).
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A.D. 590, and was according to Ildephonsus the founder of Spanish monasticism. Eutropius was the successor of Donatus. Joannes Bclarenensis mentions him first under the year 584. In 589 Eutropius, already with Joannes Bclarenensis the most famous of Spanish abbots, assisted St. Leander in drawing up the acts and directing the proceedings of the third council of Toledo—the conversion council under Recared (Joan. Bcl. Chron. in Pat. L. lxxii. 867, 869; Exp. Sagra. vi. 387). Ximeno in his Noticios Preliminares de los mas antiguos Escritores de Valencia, p. ix. rightly dwells on the great position he must have attained to have been thus associated with the most distinguished of Spanish ecclesiastics, in such an important piece of work, in preference to any bishop. Games thinks that he was one of the abbots sent by Recared to Gregory the Great with letters requesting the pallium for Leander (K. G. ii. 2, 31, 59), and points to the superscription of one of his two extant letters to Peter bishop of Arcavits, Ad Petrum popam, de die monasterio et unam monasteriorum directa Romae. The first letter to bishop Peter is concerned with the eight vices, gastrimargia, forniciatio, philargyria, ira, tristitia, acedia, cænonodia, superbia. The second is in answer to one from Peter, who seems to have reminded Eutropius of the too harsh rule of Servititanus. Eutropius replies in words of fiery vindication of his own views, which, if they were penned at Rome, seem to show the immediate influence of Gregory and Benedict. We know from St. Isidore alone (de Vir. Ill. cap. 45) that he was bishop of Valencia and that he still abided at Servititanus another letter, now lost, to Licianus of Cartagena on the subject of the administration of the chrisma to children in baptism. His episcopal career must have been very short, as in 589 Celsinus was bishop of Valencia, and in 610 Marinus, on the faith at least of the Decretum Gudemarsi [GUTHRIE]. Between these dates we have strong indications of his journey to Rome, if the journey itself is to be accepted.

St. Martin of Braga, Donatus, Eutropius, Joannes Bclarenensis, St. Emilian and St. Fructuosus were the heads of Spanish monachism in the sixth and seventh centuries. Under the head St. Martin of Braga is discussed the much vexed question of the rule or rules observed in the Gothic monasteries. (Exp. Sagra. viii. 166-169; Castro R. de Bbe. Español, ii. sac. vi. p. 279; the two letters, apud Migne Patr. Lat. lxxx.)

M. A. W.

EUTROPIUS (14), the heathen umpire in the disputations of ADAMANTUS. [G. S.]

EUTROPIUS (15, March 3, a Cappodician by birth, and martyr at Cyzicus, on the Hellespont, under Maximin, either A.D. 307 or 311. He was tortured and crucified by the president Asclepius, together with Cleonicus and Basiliscus. (Bas. Men.; Barb. Annot. 311, 19.) [G. T. S.]

EUTROPIUS (16), author of the Chronicle Historiae Romanae from the founding of the city to the death of Julian, dedicated to the emperor Valens. He is said to have been secretary to the emperor Constantine, and to have accompanied Julian in his Parthian expedition. (Brev. x. 16.) He was not a Christian, but a fair-minded heathen like Ammianus. Cf. l.c. at Julian "gloriae audixit as per eam animi perenneque immodici, religiosique Christianse inceptor, prontae tamen ut cruoere abstinent." For further details, see the Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Biography.

J. W.

EUTROPIUS (17), a man of high character and literary attainments, proconsul of Asia, 334, a correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. That he was the same person with Eutropius the historian, though maintained by Valensius, is a pure conjecture, embarrassed with chronological difficulties. Gregory Nazianzen having occasion to visit the province of Asia during his proconsulate, Eutropius received him with much distinction as a man of letters and begged him to write to him. Eutropius fell into trouble through suspicion of complicity in the supposed plot of Theodorus against Valens, A.D. 374, but escaped, no evidence having been found against him. Having ceased to be proconsul, he visited the neighbourhood of Nazianzen, and wrote to request a visit from Gregory, who replied, expressing his deep regret at being prevented from going to him by illness. If he is the same person who became prefect of the East in A.D. 381, the anticipations of his future elevation expressed by Gregory were fulfilled. (Greg. Nn. Epist. 131, 138; Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 29.) [E. V.]

EUTROPIUS (18), a young reader and scribe of the church of Constantinople, of great personal beauty and of the most spotless purity of life, who was tortured to death after the expulsions of Chrysostom, in the vain hope of extracting from him the names of authors of the mystagogical confabulations which immediately followed his departure. Eutropius was examined before the prefect Optatus, who treated him with the most merciless barbarity. He was severely wounded, the flesh of his sides and his face was lacerated with iron combs until his bones were laid bare, and his eyebrows were torn off; lighted torches were applied to his journey parts of his body, and he was cruelly racked. But young and delicate as he was, his tortures elicited no confession. He was therefore taken to prison, and his feet set in the stocks, where he died. Some presbyters of Arcacius's party, fearing lest he mangled body should be seen by others, gave him a hasty interment by night. The pious imagination of his fellow-sufferers conceived that heavenly mourners accompanied the young martyr to the grave, and that the funeral chant was sung by celestial voices. Sossen records the story of a vision of St. Stephen the protomartyr, seen by Sisinius, the bishop of the Novatians, declaring that after long search he had found but one good man in Constantinople, and that one was Eutropius. Sisinius, on waking, sent one of his presbyters to discover this one righteous person, whom after a search through all the prisons, he found at last at the point of death, and having made the bishop's dream besought him to pray for him. (Pallad. Dial. cap. 20, p. 198, ed. Bp., etc. St. H. E. vii. 24; Baron. Annot. ann. 404, lxxii.)

EUTROPIUS (19), a presbyter who headed a division among the Macedonians on account of a difference of opinion between him and Catherine (Socr. H. E. v. 24.) [E. V.]
EUTHROPIUS (20), eunuch and chief adviser of the emperor Arcadius. He may be the eunuch of the same name whom we read about in Zosimus I. 163, that he was the slave of a soldier named Ptolemi, who gave him to the general Arintheous (I. 61), who in turn gave him to his daughter on her marriage (I. 104). When too old for further service he came to court (I. 145), where by the influence of Abundantius he was raised to high positions (I. 154). These he abused by peculation and avarice (I. 191), but in spite of this he became successively judge (I. 231), general (I. 235 foll.), and consul (I. 287).

One of his first acts under Arcadius (A.D. 395) was to persuade the emperor to marry Eudoxia, the daughter of the chieftain of Rufinus, who had intended his daughter to enjoy that honour (Zosim. v. 3). After the murder of Rufinus by the soldiers at the instigation of Gainas, Eutropius set himself to supplant Timasius, who had now become his most dangerous rival. He persuaded a certain Bzargus to act as his accuser, and having used him successfully for the purpose, and procured the banishment of Timasius, afterwards had him put to death (Zosim. v. 8, 9, 10). He was now practically master of the Eastern empire, as Stilicho was of the Western. Arcadius being simply a tool in his hands (emporios' prokouménos, Zosim.). His next act was to get his former benefactor Abundantius banished to Sidon. He then proceeded to procure a decree of the senate procuring Stilicho a public enemy (Zos. ch. xi.). By securing the adherence of Gibio he transferred the province of Africa from the Western to the Eastern empire, but this Stilicho soon recovered. The account of the avarice of Eutropius given by Claudian is fully borne out by Zosimus. The last of the great men in the state found life under such rule intolerable. Accordingly Gainas formed a plot with Tribogildus to invade the empire. Eutropius was entrapped by the emperor with the promise of support. He was designated as general Leo, a favourite of his own and utterly incompetent, and Gainas, who secretly favoured the rebellion. Had it not been for the exertions of a volunteer named Valentinus, the plot must have been successful (Zos. v. 13–10). In 398 he was raised to the rank of patrician, and was appointed consul for 399. He comes before the notice of the church historians as an active supporter of the election of Chrysostom to the see of Constantinople, A.D. 397 (Soc. H. E. vi. 2, 11; Soc. H. E. vii. 2, 20). For a time they were opposed on terms of great intimacy (Soc. vi. 5, 2), and the discourses of the bishop after his fall also imply this. He represents himself as having been originally a friend of the cause, but estranged by his pride and avarice. His fall was as rapid as his elevation was unprecedented. The same year, 399, which saw him pronounced a despot, was able to bring about his downfall had it not been for the co-operation of the empress. She was a bold and ambitious woman, and had probably been long jealous of Eutropius. The emperor sent for him and deprived him of all his honours. Thereupon he fled for refuge to the altar of the Christians, although he had himself just helped in passing a law which took away the right of sanctuary. Himself the first victim of his own impiety, his case afforded a striking instance of the working of retributive justice (Soc. H. E. vii. 7, 6; Soc. H. E. vi. 5, 4, Chrysost. in Eutrop. 5; cf. Eunap. apud Suid. sub voc.). The emperor sent to arrest him, but the bishop refused to give him up, and on the following day delivered the homily which is still extant, pointing the moral of the instability of human fortune by the spectacle of the late favourite crowning beneath the holy table. Zosimus tells us that the emperor violated the right of sanctuary, dragged him from the church, and banished him to Cyprus. St. Chrysostom, however, plainly tells us that he had remained in the church he would have been safe ("οὐχ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀνήκεν ἢ ἀνήκεν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ἄνηκεν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁμαρτών ἄμειναν," de Captro Eutrop. 1). The banishment, at all events, is certain. Gainas was not satisfied with this, and fresh charges were laid against him. He was accused of aspiring to the pomp of the emperor at the time of his entering upon the consulsiphip (Philost. xi. 6), was tried, convicted, and finally beheaded at Chalcodon (Soc. H. E. vii. 7, 5; Soc. H. E. vi. 5, 7). St. Chrysostom made his conviction the occasion of a second discourse, which is still extant, under the title De Captro Eutropius. After his death his name was erased from the list of consuls, and the law which he had passed as to the right of asylum was annulled. He was the first eunuch who ever attained consular rank. (Soc. H. E. vi. 5, 3.) All the historians agree in their estimate of his character, and single out his avarice as his distinguishing feature. Nothing can more strikingly prove the weakness of Arcadius than that such a man should have been able to gain so great an influence over him.

A marble slab has recently been found in the neighbourhood of the ancient Chalcodon, not far from the little church of St. John Chrysostom, bearing the following inscription:

Εὐτροπίου τάφος εἰς κεραυνόν ἦ γιὰ κλαθεὶς σώματα τῆς ἁμαρτέων ἐγένετο ἅμα ναυτών.
Ἀγεραμοί καὶ τῇ τῆς στίγμης ἀργοὶ ἄρα τρία, ἡ ἀριστερά, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῷ ἅγιῳ τεύχεον.
Πέτροι ἐκ γῆς εὐρέοι πλακαὶ τόνῳ κραδάς στεφανὸν ἀναβαθμίζουσιν τούτο γέρας περίχων.

The place is still called the harbour of Eutropius, and the letters are said to be of the character of those of the 4th century A.D. The inscription may therefore be a memorial of the subject of this article. (Eötvös. Zeitung, April 26, 1878.)

[M. F. L.]

EUTROPIUS (21), a Gallic priest, of the 5th century, who, according to Gennadius (de Viris Illustrib. xlix.; Migne, Patr. Lat. ivii. 1087), wrote two letters or consolatory treatises to two sisters, handmaids of Christ, who had been dis-
inherited by their parents for their devotion to celibacy and love of religion. The letters have not survived to us, but, according to the same author, they were elegant and clear in style, and reason and Scripture were alike employed to fortify the argument. It has been suggested, and is not impossible, that he was identical with the bishop of Orange (No. 10). [S. A. B.]

EUTROPIUS (22), layman addressed by Sidonius Apollinarius in the 5th century.

Name.—This name, though it has not descended to modern times, was a common and popular one during the period embraced in this work. It is one of the long list, coined after the fashion recommended by Cicero respecting new terms, which will be accepted, says the poet Ars Poetica, 52, 3), "si Graeco fonte candidum parvo detorta"; εὐτρωπός (eurotētikos, active, and thence secondarily well-disposed) being of course its base.

1. Authority.—Two letters of Sidonius Apollinarius (Lib. i. ep. 6; lib. iii. ep. 6 in Sirmiood, vol. i. and in Migne, Pat. Lat. Viii.), were addressed to Eutropius, being on a visit to Rome, where he believed that he had been supernaturally cured of a fever, while praying in the church of the Apostles (meaning St. Peter's), writes to his friend Eutropius, urging him that he should try to obtain some dignity worthy of his birth. If Eutropius acts on this advice, Sidonius is pared to help him to the very best of his ability. This Eutropius was evidently a layman. Sidonius appears to respect him, and to regard him as one unduly neglected by those in authority, though such neglect may partly arise from indolence or backwardness on his own part, as the following passage seems to indicate: "Munere Dei tibi congruit sevi, corporis, animi vigor integer: dein quod equis, armis, veste, sumptu famulici instructus, solum (nisi fallimus) incipere formidam." We do not know the date of the birth or death of this Eutropius, but he was probably somewhat younger, or at least not older (his distinguished correspondent). The duty specially suggested to him by Sidonius was that of militiam pia, on which Du Cange may be consulted (iv. 6). [J. G. C.]

EUTROPIUS (23), the father of St. Benedict of Nursia. (Pet. Diacon. Vitr. Ill. cap. 1, Pat. Lat. clxiiii. 1011 A, where the reading is Eutropius.) Another reading appears to be Eupropius. (Cellier, Histoire des Autres ecclés. xi. 158.) [T. G. S.]

EUTULANUS. [Endlus.]

EUTUUIUS, an Anglo-Saxon king mentioned in one of the hymns attributed to Alcuin (Hymn., ii. Alc. Cpp. ii. 549, ed. Prob.). The editor of those hymns may have been a West Saxon subregulus, or else identical with Escwine. But the poem, which says of him, "Qui primum imperum Saxonum rite regebat," and makes him to be succeeded by Caedwalla, negatives both these suppositions. The name is evidently a corruption of Centwine, which king is accurately described in the poem. [Centwine.] [G. H.]


EUTYCHES (2), a Christian of Cappadocia taken prisoner by the Goths, c. A.D. 286, and with some of his fellow captives suffered martyrdom for the faith after having sown the seeds of the gospel in the land of their captivity. (Thall. H. E. ii. 5.) The body of Eutyches was sent to Basil c. 372, at the instigation of Asclepius, bishop of Thessalonica, for which that saint set him a letter of warm thanks. (Basil. Epist. 165 (3597).) [E.]

EUTYCHES (3) (Eutyches), April 15, martyr with Maro and Victorinus in Italy. They were exiled at first to the island of Pontus, and afterwards executed in the persecution of Nerva. [Domitilla.] (Mart. Rom. Vet., Aedonis, Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

EUTYCHES (4) and EUTYCHIANISM. Eutyches was archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople. For seventy years (as he told Pope Leo) he had lived a monastic life, and during thirty out of those seventy he had presided over his 300 monks. This life-long education in a monastery helps to explain the character attributed to him. He was an honest and pious, but narrow-minded man; full of fiery zeal against Nestorianism, and ready to discern herey from a language different from the dogmatic phraseology he had accepted; an "im prudent and not very learned man," and led into the error called (after him) Eutychianism by his "want of learning rather than by subtlety of thought" (Leo). He was known among his contemporaries as a staunch upholder of the views and conduct of Cyril of Alexandria; the archbishop had even sent to him, as a special mark of favour, a copy of the Acts of the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. He enjoyed high favour at court through the influence of the eminence Chrysaphus, at that time minister, and his own god-child. But neither powerful ecclesiastical and political patronage nor his own passionate energy against Nestorianism enabled him when suspicion rested upon his own episcopate. By whom he was accused, whether by Theodoret in his Eunomites, or by his former friend Eusebius of Dorylaeum, or by Demosthenes of Antioch, it seems difficult to decide (cp. Hesiod. ii. 319; Martin, 75-78); but it is clear that to Eusebius is due the definite charges first brought against him at Constantinople in 448.

Flavian, who succeeded Proclus in 447 as archbishop, convened a synod in Constantinople on Nov. 6, 448, to consider some questions between the metropolitan of Sardis and two of his suffragan bishops. Eusebius was present, and, at its conclusion, handed in a complaint against Eutyches. Eusebius as a layman had twenty years before exposed and opposed Nestorianism; he was now the first to urge a West Saxon subregulus to oppose the extreme errors of an opposite kind. He complained that Eutyches "defamed the holy Fathers and himself, a man who had never been suspected of herey;" and alleged himself prepared to convict Eutyches of being undeserving of the name of orthodox, and of being inimical to the orthodox faith. He had listened to the document in astonishment, and suggested that Eusebius should first privately discuss with Eutyches the points in dispute. Eusebius retorted that he had already several times privately, and an old friend, retur-
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Eutyches struck in, "This is quite enough to enable us to take action against Eutyches; but that time is not come yet. The two priests (Mammus and Theophilus) were now sent. They were instructed to tell Eutyches that his replies to the deputies had given great offence, and that he must come and explain them, as well as meet the charges originally brought against him. They took with them a note to the effect that if he did not go before them, two might be necessary to deal with him according to canonical law, and that his determination not to leave his cell was simply an evasion. During their absence, Eusebius brought forward a further charge. Eutyches, he asserted, had written and circulated among the monks a little book on the faith, to which he had requested their signatures. The statement was evidently an exaggeration; but it was of sufficient importance to deserve verification. Priests and deacons were at once sent to the neighbouring monasteries to make inquiries. In the meantime Mammus and Theophilus returned. They reported that they had encountered many obstacles. The monks round the door of the monastery had affirmed the archimandrite to be ill; one Eleusinius had next appeared reporting himself the representative of Eutyches; and it was only on the assurance that the letter, of which they were the bearers, contained neither hard nor secret messages that they at last procured an audience. To the letter Eutyches had replied that nothing but death should make him leave his monastery, that the archbishop and the synod might do what they pleased, and that they had much better spare themselves the trouble of summoning him a third time. In his turn, he wished them to take a letter; and, on their refusal announced his intention of sending it to the synod. Eusebius at once broke out, "Guilty men have always some excuse ready; we must bring Eutyches here against his will." His condictions were more reasonable, and, at the desire of Flavian, two priests (Memnon and Epi-

Flavian and the bishops present accepted these propositions, and a resolution to the same effect was sent to the absentees for their approval and signature. The synod thus professed its belief in "Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God, perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and body subsisting, begotten before all ages, without beginning; of the Father according to the Godhead, but in these last days for our sake and for our salvation born of the Virgin Mary, according to the manhood; consubstantial with the Father, as touching His Godhead, and consubstantial with the mother, as touching His manhood." "We confess," they stated, "that Jesus Christ, after the Incarnation, was of two natures in one Hypostasis and in one Person; one Christ, one Son, one Lord. Whosever asserts otherwise, him we exclude from the clergy and the church" (Mani, vi. 679). The third session took place on Nov. 15, when the deputies announced the result of their interview with Eutyches. He refused to appear before the synod, on the ground that he had made a resolution, as early as the beginning of his monastic life, never to leave the cloister. Further, he wished to inform the synod that Eusebius had long been his enemy, and, in this instance, had greatly slandered him; for that he (Eutyches) was ready to assent to and subscribe the statements of the holy Fathers at Nicæa and Ephesus. On the synod was moved by the Synod of Nov. 15, it was attended with general satisfaction, and the session, information was brought to Flavian that certain monks and deacons, friends of Eutyches, and Abraham, archimandrite of a neighbouring monastery, requested an audience. They were at once admitted. Abraham informed the archbishop that Eutyches was ill, and had deputed him to wait upon the archbishop and speak for him. Flavian's reply was paternal and conciliatory. He regretted the illness of Eutyches, and, on behalf of those present, expressed their willingness to wait till he was restored to health. "Let him remember," he continued, "that he is not in the presence of strangers, but among men who would receive him with fatherly and brotherly affection, and many of whom have hitherto been his friends. He has pained many, and must defend himself. Surely if he could leave his retirement when the error of Nestorius imperilled the faith, he should do so much more when his own life is in question. He has but to acknowledge and anathematize his error, and the past shall be forgiven. As regards the future he must give
assurance to us that he will only teach conformably to the doctrines of the Fathers." The archbishop closed the audience with words replete with significance, "You (monks) know the seal of the accuser of Eutyches." Fire itself seems to him cold in comparison with his burning zeal for religion. God knows I have besought him to desist; but, as he persists, what could I do? Do you suppose that I have any wish to destroy you, and not rather gather you together? It is the act of an enemy to scatter, but the act of a father to gather."

The fifth session opened on Wednesday, Nov. 17, with Memnon's report on their mission to Eutyches. The archimandrite, he stated, received their letter with the remark that he had sent Abraham and the others to declare to the archbishop and the synod that he (Eutyches) assented to the definitions of Nicaea and Ephesus, and to all that Cyril had spoken. Eusebius started up with the interruption: "If Eutyches assents now and from compulsion, that does not put me in the same case as the man who must do it with the past and not with the future." The archbishop calmed him, and Memnon was allowed to proceed. Eutyches had assured him that he had sent Abraham on account of his own illness. "I pressed him, nevertheless," said Memnon, "to appear personally before you; but first he wrote a letter, or message, next—when we offered to remain with him till then—he begged us to request you not to command his attendance this week, and added that he would (God willing) attend on the following Monday."

Before any decision was pronounced upon this request, the deputies who had been sent by the synod to the various monasteries were asked to make their report. They stated that they had been to several monasteries. Martin, archimandrite of the first, told them that he had received a document from Eutyches on Nov. 12, which he had been requested to sign; that on his objecting that the definitions of the faith should emanate from bishops and not monks, Eutyches had answered, "If you do not support me, the archbishop, after he has destroyed me, will destroy you." Martin had not sent the document, but Eutyches had informed him that it contained what he had told the council of Ephesus and Cyril had taught. A second archimandrite had told them that the monks who had brought him the paper for his signature, had assured him that it contained the definitions of the fathers at Nicaea and Ephesus; but that his request to be allowed to compare it, previous to signing it, with the acts of those councils, had not been accepted, and the monks had departed, seemingly displeased. Other abbots disclaimed all knowledge of paper on the subject. Eusebius, however, declared that it was a false statement. The synod maintained that it was the honest opinion of Eutyches. "The charge is proved," he cried, "and we can proceed against him. Moreover, the man is a liar; at one moment he tells us that it is his determination not to come out. At another he promises to come." More rational counsels prevailed. Eutyches was interrogated on Nov. 17, and that in the event of his failing to appear, he would be deprived of his clerical functions and monastic dignity.

The bishops met for a sixth session on Saturday, Nov. 20, and agreed that Eutyches might be accompanied on the Monday following by four of his friends. The indefatigable Eusebius then rose. He had been given to understand that when Mamas and Theophilus had visited Eutyches, the archimandrite had made use of expressions which had not been reported to the synod, but which threw great light on his opinions. At the request of the bishops, Theophilus narrated what had occurred. Eutyches, he said, wished to argue with them; and in the presence of several of his monks he put these questions:—"What, in Holy Scripture, is there any mention of two natures? Which of the Fathers has declared that God the Word has two natures?" Mamas had replied to the effect that the argument from the silence of Scripture was insufficient. "The word ἀποδείκνυς does not occur in Holy Scripture; we owe it to the definitions of the Fathers. And similarly we owe to them the affirmation of the two natures." I (Theophilus) then asked Eutyches if he believed that God the Word was "perfect (τελεας) in Christ." "Yes," he answered; and he gave the same answer to my next question:—"Do you believe that he has one mind to do with the past and not with the future?" Whereupon I urged, "If in Christ be perfect God and perfect man, do these perfect (natures) form the one Son? Why will you not allow that the one Son consists of two natures?" Eutyches replied:—"God forbid that I should say that Christ consists of two natures or disputable natures. Let the synod depose me, or do what they please. I will hold fast by the faith which I have received." Mamas substantiated the truth of what Theophilus had stated, adding that what led to the discussion was the remark made by Eutyches:—"If God the Word became flesh to restore fallen human nature," and the question which he (Mamas) had at once put:—"by what nature, then, is this human nature taken up and restored?" It was a natural question on the part of Flavian to ask, why this conversation had not been reported before: it was a base, but thoroughly Oriental answer to reply:—"Because we had been sent with Eutyches about his faith, but to summon him to the synod. We gave you his answer to the latter point. No one asked us about the former, and therefore we held our peace."

The synod met in its seventh, last, and weightiest session on Monday, Nov. 22. Eutyches' letter eventually presented himself, accompanied by a multitude of soldiers, monks, and others, who refused to allow him to enter till assurance had been given that he should depart as fast as he entered. A letter from the emperor (Theodosius) was presented. "I wish," it said, "for the peace of the Church, and steadfast adherence to the orthodox doctrines of the fathers at Nicaea and Ephesus. And because I know that Flor- entius the patriarch is a man approved in the faith, I desire that he should be present at the session of a synod, which has to deal with matters of faith." The synod received the letter with shouts, "Long live the emperor! His faith is great! Long live our pious, orthodox, high-priest and Auguste, on Nov 24th, 381!" When Florentius was conducted to his seat, the accuser (Eusebius) and the accused (Eutyches) took their places in the midst of the assembly, and the session began by the recital of all the papers bearing on the point between them. Cyril's letter to John of Antioch was again read; but,
after the words—"We confess our Lord Jesus Christ... Consubstantial with the Father, according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with the Son... the union of the two natures was made; wherefore, we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. And in accordance with the perception of the unconfused union (ἡ τοῦ ἐνεργοῦ ἐνεργοῦ ἐνεργεῖα), we confess the Holy Virgin theotokos, because she was made the man and became man and united to Himself by conception the temple taken from her." Eusebius exclaimed, "Certainly, Eutyches does not acknowledge this, he has never believed it, but taught the very opposite to every one who came to him." Florentius declared that Eutyches himself should be asked if he assented to these documents or not; but again Eusebius broke in, "If he does so now; then, Eusebius, shall appear to be a calumniator, and I shall lose my office." Eutyches, he asserted, had already threatened him with banishment; Eutyches was a rich man, and possessed plenty of influence; and he (Eusebius) was one and possessed nothing. Flavian and Florentius succeeded in calming Eusebius, and the former turned to Eutyches with the question: "Do you confess union out of two natures?" "I do," he answered; but when Eusebius put the question in a more precise form: "Do you confess the existence of the two natures after the Incarnation, and that Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh?" Eutyches replied, "I have not come here to dispute, but to testify what I think. My opinion is contained in this paper. 1 pray you command that it be read."be continued: "This is my belief. I worship the Father with the Son, and the Holy Ghost with the Father and the Son. I acknowledge that the only person of the Son is from the body of the Holy Virgin, and that He became perfect man for the sake of our salvation. This is my confession before the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and before your holiness." Further questions followed. The archbishop put the plain question: "Do you confess that Christ is of two natures?" Eutyches answered, "I have never yet presumed to dispute about the nature of my God; that He is consubstantial with us, have I never said. I readily admit that the Holy Virgin is consubstantial with us, and that our God was born of her flesh." Flavian, Florentius, Basil of Seleucia, and others, pressed upon him: "If you admit that Mary is consubstantial with us, and that Christ took His manhood from her, it naturally follows that He, according to His manhood, is consubstantial with us." Eutyches answered: "I do not say that the body of man has become the body of God; but in speaking of a human body of God I say that the Lord became flesh of the Virgin. If you wish me to add that His body is consubstantial with ours, I will do so; but I cannot use the word consubstantial in such a manner as to deny that He is the Son of God." Flavian's retort was justified by the result of this other controversy, and not because it is your belief." Florentius again appealed to Eutyches: "Do you believe or not that our Lord who was born of the Virgin is consubstantial with us, and after the Incarnation—has two natures?" and the answer came: "I acknowledge that our Lord before the union of the Godhead and the human nature had two natures; but after the union, I confess but one." Finally the synod desired Eutyches to make a full explanation, and to pronounce an anathema on opinions opposed to the documents which had been recited. Eutyches replied that he would, if the synod desired it, make use of language (viz. consubstantial with us, and of two natures) which, in his opinion, was very much open to question; "but," he added, "inasmuch as I do not find such language either in Holy Scripture or in the writings of the Fathers, I must decline to pronounce an anathema on those who do not accept it, lest—in so doing—I should be anathematizing the Fathers." Once more Florentius interposed: "Do you acknowledge two natures in Christ, and His consubstantiality with us?" "Cyril and Athanasius," answered Eutyches, "speak of two natures before the union; the Eusebius is one nature after the union." "If you do not acknowledge two natures after the union," persisted Florentius, "you will be condemned. Whosoever refuses the formula 'of two natures' and the expression 'two natures' is unorthodox; to which the synod responded with the cry, "and to receive this under compulsion (as would Eutyches) is not to believe in it. Long live the emperor!" The sentence was pronounced: "Eutyches, formerly priest and archimandrite, hath proved himself affected by the heresy of Valentinus and Apollinaris, and hath refused—in spite of our admonition—to accept the true faith. Therefore we, lamenting his perverseness, have decreed, through our Lord Jesus Christ, blasphemed by him, that he be excluded from all priestly functions, from our communion, and from his primacy in his monastery." Excommunication was pronounced upon all who should consort with and abet him, and the sentence was signed by thirty-two (two hundred and twenty-three archimandrites. Eutyches left the council-chamber muttering an appeal to Rome. Action was at once taken by both parties. The monks rallied round Eutyches, and the influence of Cyprian was exerted in his behalf. Eutyches himself wrote to the emperor and to the bishops, and placarded notices about Constantinople, protesting against his sentence, and justifying his teaching. Of these letters the most important is that to pope Leo. In it he accuses Eusebius of acting at Satan's bidding, not in the interests of orthodoxy, but with the intention of destroying him. He repeats that he could not accede to the demands of the synod, acknowledge two natures in Christ, and anathematize all who opposed this doctrine, because Athanasius, Gregory, Julius, and Felix had rejected the expression "two natures," he himself having no wish to add to the creed of the see of Ephesus, nor to define too particularly the nature of God the Word. He adds that he had desired the synod to lay the matter in dispute before the pope, promising to abide by his decision; but that this favour not having been granted, he obeyed the synod in great discontent, and implored the pope to give an unprejudiced judgment upon the points in dispute, and to extend protection to him.
Flavian, on his part, circulated the decree of excommunication. He charged the monks to obey it, he communicated it to the emperor, to the pope, and the bishops in the provinces; but his interviews with the emperor were painful to himself, and marked by great suspicion on the part of the emperor; and his letter to Leo was forestalled by that of Eutyches, and required a second, more explanatory of the synodal acts, and refuting the mis-statements of Eutyches, before the pope was satisfied. Leo eventually gave Eutyches his answer in the celebrated "epi-
stola dogmatica ad Flavianum."

It was soon evident that court favour inclined to Eutyches; and early in 449 a commission was appointed by the emperor to examine a charge of falsification of the acts of the late synod of Constantinople, proffered by Eutyches against Flavian. The revision of the proceedings brought to light no such material differences as Eutyches alleged, and the commission had no choice but to confirm the synod's pronouncement. Eutyches, however, was not satisfied; but an agitation was thereby advanced, which was productive of the greatest misery.

A council had already been summoned by the emperor Theodosius to meet at Ephesus. Eutyches and Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, had demanded it; and their position had been supported by Chrysaphius. This conjunction was, in itself, ominous; it more than justified Flavian's openly expressed conviction that a council convened under such patronage could do no good. Chrysaphius was notoriously opposed to Flavian; the eunuch could bear no rival at court; and (if the story be true) he had never forgiven Flavian's eloquence in pronouncing the archbishop's rebuke of his culpity. Dioscorus retained the traditional jealousy of the see of Constantinople, and—in defiance of all canonical law—had admitted Eutyches to communion, and declared him reinstated in his functions as priest and archimandrite.

The imperial summons was couch in the names of Theodosius II and Valentinian III, and was dated May 30, 449. It stated the cause of the summons to be due to the doubts and disputes which had arisen concerning the faith; it invited Dioscorus to present himself with ten metropolitans and ten bishops at Ephesus on August 16; and extended the invitation to other bishops, Theodoret of Cyrus (Kars) being exempted unless specially summoned by the council. A second letter to Dioscorus appointed the Syrian abbot, Barsamas, representative of the Eastern priests and archimandrites, evidently with the intention of considering and composing certain Nestorian disputes. The imperial instruc-
tions to the commissioners, Epiphanius and Eudocius, charged them to repress all unruliness at the sessions, to preserve order, and carry through the business carefully and quickly. One sentence was especially significant: "The bishops who, at Constantinople, had passed judgment upon Eutyches were to attend the proceedings at Ephesus, but were not to be allowed to take part in them, because their own already ex-
pressed opinions were to be examined anew." Proclus, the proconsul of Asia, was ordered to support the commissioners. Two further imper-
ial decrees remain to be noticed. The first appointed Dioscorus president of the synod, with Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Thalassium of Ccesarea, as special assessors, in order to check the mon-
ument made by certain Nestorian bishops to Jesus Theodoret; and the wish was expressed that no consideration should be shown for any who added to or diminished from the Nicene Creed; the second was addressed to the council itself, and, directly blaming Flavian for his actions towards Eutyches and his (alleged) unwillings to let drop the matters in dispute between them, desired the council to go into the subject thoroughly, to root out the errors, to expel the followers of Nestorius from the church, and fix the true faith on a firm and irreproachable basis.

The synod—the "Lactantianum" or "Rober-
synod," as posterity was taught to call it by Leo—met for the first time on August 8, 449. It was synod at which "Flavian was presented as an oppressor, and Eutyches as a victim, and terrible was the day on which it opened. The true faith received in the East a shock from which it had never completely recovered since. The Church was witnessed departing from the symbol of faith which have never returned to her, and perhaps never will." (Martin.)

Leo was not present: Julius, a bishop, Re-
natus, a priest, and Hilary, a deacon, accompanied by a notary, appeared as his legates. They brought with them the famous tome, or dox-
ical letter, to Flavian and Dioscorus, and left it. In his letter to Theodosius (June 13, 449) Leo expresses his regret that "the foolish old man" (Eutyches) had not given up opinions condemned by the synod of Constantinople, and intimates his wish that the archimandrite or the archbishop should, if he would keep his promise to the pope, and amend what was erroneous in his views. In the letter to Pulcheria (same date), the pope consi-
siders Eutyches to have fallen into his error "through want of knowledge, rather than through wickedness" in his letter to the arch-
mandrites of Constantinople, he states his con-

tiction that they do not share the views of Eutyches, and exhorts them to deal tenderly with him should he renounce his error; and in his letter to the synod he quotes the confession of St. Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." (St. Matt. xvi. 16), as embodying belief in the two natures, and argues that all Eutyches had really understood these words, he would not have swerved from the path of truth. In most of these letters Leo refers to the tests as containing the true teaching of the Church.

That tome was indeed presented at the synod; but a synod "bought with gold and packed with brutal men." (Ennemius of Dorylaeum) described by the express Eutyches as "tedious, and disastrous," and stigmatized by Leo himself, as "no court of justice, but a gang of robbers," was not likely to permit the recital of a document condemnatory of the man (Eutyches) they were pledged to acquit. It was presented, but shelved.
EUTYCHES

The history of the synod, in its relation to Eutyches, is discussed elsewhere [Diocletianus].
The Christian world was rent in pieces by its proceedings. Egypt, Thrace, and Palae-
tine, ranged themselves with Dioscorus and the emperor; Syria, Pontus, Asia, Rome, protested against the treatment of Flavian, and the schism of Eutyches. Dioscorus excom-
municated Leo, Leo excommunicated Dios-
coros. Theodosius applied the formula confirmed by the decisions of the synod in a decree which de-
nounced Flavian, Eusebius, and others, as Nesto-
rians, forbade the elevation of their followers to episcopal rank, deposed them if already bishops, and expelled them from the country. Leo wrote letters to the emperor Theodosius, to the church at Constantinople, and to the anti-Eutychian archimandrites. He asked for a general council; he is interested in the emperor Valentinian III, who with his wife (Eudoxia) and his mother (Galla Placidia), happened to be at Rome on the feast of St. Peter's chair (Feb. 22, 450); and he appealed to Pulcheria, whom he believed upon her erroneous idea of the views of Eutyches—
especially gladdened him. The letters of Valen-
tinian and Leo were answered by Theodosius, in a strain which left no doubt as to his intentions; "the synod at Ephesus has been perfectly un-
biased; they had come to conclusions entirely
consonant with orthodoxy; Flavian had been
justly deposed on account of his innovation on the faith." He desired Leo to recognise Anastasius, as Alexandrian whom Dioscorus had consecrated to Constantinople, and (at that time) a partisan of Eutyches; a request which Leo met by the stipulation that Anastasius must first prove his orthodoxy, by formulating a confession of faith on the lines laid down by Cyril, the council of Ephesus, and his own letter to Flavian.
The wrangle was suddenly silenced by the death of Theodosius (July 450). Pulcheria raised her husband, Marcian, to the throne, and ortho-
day triumphed over any Eutychianism, as well as Nestorianism, was conquered (Leo). Marcian
accepted at once and cordially to the pope's re-
quest for a council; Anastasius convened a synod of
bishops, archimandrites, priests, and deacons
were at Constantinople, and in the presence of
the emperor legislated those monks, as
were in the whole assembly, anathematized
Eutyches, Nestorius, and their followers. Pul-
cheria wrote to confirm the news, and added that
Flavian's body was to be brought to Constantin-
ople and buried in the Basilica of the Apostles,
and that the exiled bishops were to be recalled.
Leo's joy was sincere, but his wish for a council
was now so urgent. The danger which ex-
isted when Theodosius was emperor had passed
away. Eutychianism and Nestorianism had been
anathematized; his own tome had been every-
where accepted; of more immediate importance,
in his opinion, than discussions upon matters of
doctrine, was the practical question, how best and most speedily to reconcile the penitent and
to punish the obstinate. The war in the West,
the invasion of Gaul by Attila, would prevent
the bishops of the West from attending a council in Italy, where he wished it to be. Nestorianism was as successful among the bishops of Syria, and would unquestionably have his
should a council be called in the East, as the
emperor desired. He feared that the men who
would unite for the condemnation of Eutychi-
elianism, would, out of that very condemnation, find means for a triumph of Nestorianism over
orthodoxy.
Leo pressed his views respectfully and firmly;
but, in deference to the emperor's convictions, he
did not insist upon them. He consented to send
representatives to the future council, while he
urged that no fresh discussion should be allowed whether Eutyches was heretical or not, or
whether Dioscorus had judged rightly or not,
but that debate should turn upon the best means
of reconciling and dealing mercifully with those
who had gone wrong. For a similar reason he
urged Pulcheria to cause the removal of Eut-
yches from the neighbourhood of Constantinople,
and to place an orthodox abbot at the head of
his monastery; the one step would check the
existing means of intercourse, the other would
free the community from false teaching. That
the last piece of advice was needful seems clear
from the appeal made about this time to Mar-
cian by one Anastasius and other archimandrites.
Eutyches, they urged, had many followers, and
especially among his own monks. These persons
had paid no attention to the summons to obe-
dience addressed to them by Anatolius and his
council. Therefore, urged the petitioners, let
them be proceeded against according to monastic
rule, and let fresh archimandrites be appointed to
see that the imperial enactments be enforced.
The fourth great council of the church, or-
iginally summoned to meet at Nicea on Sept. 1,
451, met—after various inevitable delays and
change of locality—at Chalcedon, on Oct. 8. Its
general history is given under Dioscorus; here
one or two points only need be considered which
have special reference to the subject of this
article.
During the first session the secretaries read
the documents descriptive of the introduction of
Eutyches at the synod of Ephesus (the Lateri-
cinium) and the conclusions of his paper. Eutyches
of Dorylaeum interrupted them when they came
to words which attributed to Eutyches the
statement, "The third general council (that of
Ephesus, 431) hath directly forbidden any addi-
tion to the Nicene creed. "That is untrue,"
Eutyches exclaimed. "If you find the later copies," retorted Dioscorus. Diogenes of Cyrillicus
urged that Eutyches had not repeated the Nicene
Creed as it then stood; for the second general
council (that of Constantinople, 381) had certain-
y appended (against Apollinaris and Macedonius) to
the words, "He was incarnate," the words "by
the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary," though he
considered the appended words an explanation
rather than an addition; but the Egyptian
bishops present disclaimed (as Cyril had pre-
viously done) any such revised version of the
Nicene confession, and greeted the words of
Diogenes with loud exclamations of disapproval.
Angry words were again exchanged, when the
reader continued: "[Eutyches] anathematize all who say that the flesh of Our Lord Jesus Christ
came down from heaven. "True," interrupted Eusebius, "but Eutyches has never told us
whence Christ did take His manhood;" and
Diogenes and Basil of Seleucia also pressed Eutyches, though pressure upon this point at Con-
stantinople, had refused to speak out. Dioscorus
now, and to his honour, protested: "Let Eutyches
be not only punished, but burnt, if he holds heterodox opinions. I only care to preserve the Catholic faith, not that of any individual man;” and then he turned upon Basil for having said one thing at Constantinople and another at Ephesus. “I did so,” pleaded Basil, “out of fear of the majority. Before a tribunal of magistrates I would have remained firm even to martyrdom; but I did not dare oppose (a tribunal of) the Fathers (or bishops).” And his appeal for pardon on that ground was caught up by the others. “Yes, we all sinned (at Ephesus); we all implore forgiveness.”

At the fourth session (Oct. 17), eighteen priests and archimandrites, headed by Faustus, were admitted to the presence of the Council. They were questioned about a petition (perhaps a counter-petition to their own) addressed to Marcin previous to the opening of the council, by Carusus and other Eutychians, who styled themselves archimandrites. Faustus replied, “We do not believe (Carusus and Dorotheus) were archimandrites, the rest were men who lived in martyries (chapels dedicated to martyrs), or were unknown to them, and he demanded their punishment for the assumption of a title which was not theirs.

The commissioners commanded that Carusus and the rest be summoned. They came to the number of twenty. The quick eye of Anatolius discovered among them two men who had been already condemned for heresy; and all present shrank with horror from one man in the company—Barsamas. The petition was read. It was an impassioned appeal to the emperor to preserve the orthodoxy of the church, to summon a council, and in the meantime forbid the expulsion of any man from his church, monastery, or martyr. The hearing had hardly finished when Diogenes denounced Barsamas as the man who had killed Flavian; and cries of “Out with the murderer!” prevented for some moments the recital of another paper which the Eutychians had prepared to be read to the council. This second document the Eutychians excused themselves for not having previously attended the council, on the ground that the emperor had forbidden it; and they now professed the request that “his holiness the archbishop Dioscorus and his bishops should be invited to attend. Angry exclamations burst forth on all sides; “Anathema to Dioscorus! Christ hath denoted him. Turn out these men, and blot out the insult they have offered us. We will not listen to a petition which calls the deceased Dioscorus a bishop.”

The commissioners had the courage to insist that the paper should be read through. “The emperor,” it proceeded, “had assumed to himself that at the council the creed of Nicæa only should be established, and that nothing should be undertaken previous to this.” It urged that the condemnation of Dioscorus was inconsistent with the imperial promise; and he and his bishops should therefore be again called to the council, and the presented schism would be removed. Should, however, the council declare to act thus, they (the Eutychians) declared that they would hold no communion with men who opposed the creed of the 318 fathers at Nicæa. At the same time, to prove their own orthodoxy, they appended their own signatures to that creed and to the Ephesian canon which confirmed it.

Aetius, archbishop of Constantinople, now reminded these petitioners that church discipline required monks to accept from the bishops instructions in matters of faith; he pointed out to them that all those present held the confession of faith approved at Nicæa and Ephesus as firmly as themselves, that the writings of Cyril and Leo were not to be taken as superseding, but as explaining the faith; and he called upon them to say out boldly whether they would assent to the present council or not. The commissioners joined in the explanation and appeal. Carusus fenced with it: “I have no need to anathematize Nestorius. I have spoken as much against him over and over again.” “The anathematize Eutyches,” cried Aetius. “It is written,” said Carusus, “judge not, and ye shall not be judged;” and then he turned upon Aetius, “Why are you talking, and the bishops sitting still?” Aetius persisted, “In the name of the council, I ask you, Do you assent to their decision?” “I have not,” answered Carusus; “condemn me and send me into exile. Paul hath taught me, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be anathema’ (A.V. accursed) (Gal. i. 8). If Eutyches doth not believe what the Catholic church believes, hold him anathema.”

The appeal of Faustus and other anti-Eutychian archimandrites to the emperor already mentioned, was now ordered to be read. The Eutychian archimandrite, Dorotheus, immediately asserted the orthodoxy of Eutyches. The commissioners retorted, “Eutyches teaches that the body of Christ is not united to the flesh of the bystanders.” What say you to that?” Dorotheus avoided a direct answer by quoting the language of the Constantinopolitan creed in this form, “Incarcerate of the Virgin and made man,” as interpreting it in an anti-Nestorian sense; but he declined to attest the language used on the point by Leo in his tome. The commissioners were now on the point of passing judgment, when the Eutychians, who had refused a space for consideration of two days, asserted that the emperor had promised them an opportunity of fair debate with their opponents in his presence. It was necessary to ascertain the truth of this, and the Council of Oct. 17 ended.

On Oct. 20 the bishops and commissioners met again. Alexander, the priest and periodist ("visitor," see Suiser, Theana, i. n.), who had been deputed to see the emperor, informed the council that he and the decurion John had been sent by the emperor to the monks, with a message to the effect that, had he (the emperor) considered himself able to decide the dispute, he would not have convened a council. “I now charge you,” continued the emperor, “to attend the Council and learn from them what you do not yet know. For what the holy general council determines, that I follow, that I rest in, and that I believe.” The imperial language was interpreted. More impetuous spirits present wished to enforce at once against Carusus and the Eutychians, the fourth and fifth canons of the Council of Antioch (341) which deposed bishop, priest, and deacon found guilty of persistent disobedience or of schismatic worship. This the commissioners rightly refused. The Eutychians were granted
thirty days’ consideration, at the end of which time, should they still remain contumacious, they would be deprived of ecclesiastical rank and office. The matter does not appear to have been brought before the council again, but from Leo’s correspondence (Ep. 136, 141, 142) it would seem that Cæsarius and Dorotheus persisted in their views and were ejected by Marcian from the see of Ierousalēm.

On Oct. 22, in the fifth session, the memorable “Definition of faith agreed upon at the council of Chalcedon” was recited and received with the unanimous cry, “This is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of the Apostles. We all assent to it. We all think thus.” It was signed by the metropolitan and by the imperial commissioners, and instructions were given that it should be laid before the emperor. The hearing of this “definition” upon Eutychianism may be briefly noticed. After declaring “the sufficiency of the wise and saving creed” of Nicaea and Constantinople, inasmuch as that creed taught “completely the perfect doctrine concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and fully explained the Incarnation of the Lord to those who received it faithfully,” it goes on to admit that some “dare to corrupt the mystery of the Lord’s Incarnation, others (i.e. the Eutychians) bring in a confusion and mixture (εἰρήκουσιν καὶ σφάλματα) and absurdly imagine the nature of the flesh and of the Godhead to be one, and teach the monstrous doctrine that the Divine nature of the Only-Begotten was a commixture capable of suffering;” “Therefore the present holy, great, and ecclesiastical Council... has added for the confirmation of the orthodox doctrines, the letter of Leo written to Flavian for the removal of the evil opinions (κακαολογία) of Eutyches. For it is directed against those who attempt to rend the mystery of the Incarnation into a dual of Son and Father it repels from the sacred congregation those who dare to say that the Divinity of the Only-Begotten is capable of suffering; it is opposed to those who imagine a mixture or confusion of the two natures of Christ: it drives away those who fancy that the form of a servant which was taken by Him of us, is of an heavenly nature, and to an end and at an end forever those who speak of two natures of the Lord before the union, and feign one after the union.”

“We then,” was the conclusion, “following the holy Fathers, all with one consent teach men to confess one and the same Son, one Lord Jesus Christ; the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood: truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; is all things like unto us without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, according to the Manhood; and one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, infallibly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably (ὑπὸ δύο φύσεων δυνατώς, ἀδερφώς, διαμέριστος, ἐκ τούτου γενόμενος), the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one hypostasis, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-Begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself taught us, and the creed of the holy Fathers has delivered to us.”

“Writing, composing, devising, or teaching any other creed” was declared unlawful, with the following penalties: “bishops and clergy were to be deposed, monks and laymen anathematized.”

On Oct. 25, Marcian, accompanied by Pulcheria and the court, opened and closed the sixth session. In his address he explained that he appeared in person, as Constantine had done before him, not to overawe and coerce any, but to strengthen and confirm the faith: his efforts and his prayers were alike directed to one end, that all might be one in true doctrine, hold the same religion, and honour the true Catholic faith. The archdeacon Actius recited in his presence the confession of faith approved at the previous session, and the question then put by the emperor: “Is the opinion of all expressed in the formula just read?” was answered by a shout from all sides, “This is the belief of us all! We are unanimous and have signed it unanimously! We are all orthodox! This is the belief of the Fathers; this is the belief of the Apostles; this is the belief of the orthodox; this belief hath saved the world! Long live Marcian, the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David! Long live Pulcheria, the new Helena!”

Three ordinances brought by the emperor, and referring to the conduct and treatment of refractory monks (such as the Eutychians), were afterwards incorporated in the canons of the council (II. iv. 11x.); and they, together with canons viii. and xxxii. were probably found sufficient to repress for a time monks who went “to the royal city of Constantinople, and remaining there for a long time, raised seditions and disturbed the ecclesiastical state (xxiii.).

Imperial edicts followed speedily after the close of the council (Nov. 1). One dated March 13, 452, was especially directed against the Eutychians. They had persisted in disseminating their “foolishness,” in spite of the council and the emperor. Marcian now warned them that their contumacy would be sharply punished, and this warning was presently carried into effect. On July 28, Eutychians and Apollinarians were deprived of their priests, they were forbidden to hold meetings, or to live together in monasteries; they were to be considered incapable of either inheriting property under a will or deviseing such property to their co-sympathizers; they were to be reckoned unfit for military service. Eutychian priests who had seduced from their post in the church and the monks from Eutyches’ own monastery were banished from Roman territory. Their writings were to be burnt, and the composer and circulator of such works was to be punished with confiscation of goods, and with exile. Dioscorus and Eutyches were exiled, but the latter died probably before the sentence was carried into effect.

“With none of these who have been the authors of heresies among Christians, was blas-
EUTCHEANUS (3), bishop of Rome from January A.D. 275 to December A.D. 283, during a period of 8 years 11 months and 3 days, and buried in the cemetery of Callistus, was one of the facts about him given in the Liber Pontificalis, that he is said to have been martyred, and as a saint and martyr he is honoured on Dec. 1 in the Roman Calendar. But his claim to the latter title is disproved by the silence on the subject of the earliest known recension of the Lib. Pont., the Felician catalogue, and by his name occurring in the Liberian Depositio Episcoporum, not in the Depositio Martyrum. The Felician catalogue speaks of him as "sanctus tuscus, ex patre marino," and says that he appointed the blessing of fruits upon the altar, and that he buried 462 martyrs. The later editions of the Pontifical record add that it was beans and grapes he said that he ordered to be blessed upon the altar, that it was his own hand that he buried so many martyrs, and that he ordered that no martyr should be buried without a dalmatic or a purple ciborium. Two spurious decretals are attributed to him. One is to the Bishops of Buxteh, directing the offering at the altar, and benediction there, of grapes and beans, and blessing of fruits at the tomb of the priest, and containing a long disquisition about the two natures in Christ. The other is to the Church of Sicily, regulating and controlling accusations and proceedings against the clergy, with a view to their protection and immunity. Ten decreta also appear as his in the collections of Gratian, Ivo, and others. [T. B.]

EUTCHEANUS (4), the first bishop of Bazzi (Hazara) of whom any record remains, gives the acts of the Council of Elberri, a.D. 360. The see of Bazzi, one of the ancient suffragans of Toledo, may probably claim an existence of some antiquity with that of Acci. The two towns are only twenty-six miles apart, and were in 1489 made one bishopric by Ferdinand and Isabella. The last bishop of Bazzi under the old order whose name remains is Serra-redondo, in the 14th century. (Ebs. Sagr. vii. 84; Aginem. Catalañi, ii. 30.) [W. A. W.]

EUTCHEANUS (5), bishop of Amaus (Eutchianus i6.)

EUTCHEANUS (6), a monk who had his abode in the mountain range of Olympus separating Phrygia from Bithynia, and who gained there a great reputation, owing to the many miracles he was said to perform. He lived in the time of Constantine, and, though an adherent of the Novatian party, he appears to have enjoyed the confidence and respect of that emperor. Socrates, in his Eccles. History (i. 13), has preserved some of his famous deeds, which illustrate the growth of that influence by which the clergy came at last to assert their superiority to the civil power. One of the imperial bodyguard was
EUTYCHIANUS (7), bishop of Patara in Lycia, celebrated for its temple of Apollo; one of the forty bishops who at the synod of Seleucia, 385, signed the heretical form of faith drawn up by Acacius of Caesarea and George of Alexandria. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 977; Mansi, iii. 321.)

EUTYCHIANUS (8), prefect of the praetorian guards at Constantinople and prefect of the last, in which capacity an edict was addressed to him by Arcadius, July 13, 399, commanding him to take measures for the destruction of any pagan temples still remaining in Phoenicia. (Cod. Theod. xvi. c. 10, p. 285.) This edict was not enforceable by the influence of the emperor. (Theod. Hist. c. 29, p. 29.)

The name of Eutychianus appears among the witnesses authenticating the correctness of the inventory of the church goods presented after the confiscation by Germanus and Cassianus. (Pallad. Dia. p. 27.) An edict was addressed to Eutychianus, dated Nov. 18, A.D. 404, commanding him to expel from the churches all those who refused to communicate with Aracius, Theophilus, and Porphyry, and to prevent their meeting for worship elsewhere. (Cod. Theod. xvi. c. 4, c. 5, p. 103.)

EUTYCHIANUS (9), bishop of Epiphania in Syria Secunda. He was present at the fourth general council at Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vi. 570; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 917.)

EUTYCHIANUS (10), bishop of Baris, a town of uncertain position in the ecclesiastical province of the Hellespont. In the sixth session of the Council of Chalcedon, 451, Diogenes of Cyzicus, his metropolitan, subscribed his name in his absence to the definition of the faith. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 769; Mansi, vii. 164.)

EUTYCHIANUS (11), first bishop of Tharsus or Anastasopolis; also called Justiniana Nova, in Mesopotamia, near the confines of Persia. In

506 Thomas bishop of Amida having been employed by the emperor Anastasius in fortifying Daras, set some of his clergy to superintend the works, and among them the presbyter Eutychianus, who became the first bishop of the city. He was succeeded by Thomas of Rhenaia. (Asseman, Bibl. Or. ii. 58, from the Syriac Eccles. Hist. of Zacharias of Melitene in Armenia; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 988.)

EUTYCHIANUS (12), a cleric of the episcopal church of Adana in Cilicia, one of the household, and a constant companion of St. Theophilus, the ecconomus or vice-domus of that church A.D. 538. There is attributed to him a History of the Episcopate and Conversion of St. Theophilus, the Greek MS. of which is described by Labeceius among those in the imperial library of Vienna (Lambec. Comment. de Biblioth. Curs. Vindob. ed. Col. lib. viii. cod. 11, num. 9, p. 156). Labeceius bestows much pains in sustaining the genuineness of the work, which has been doubted. A Latin translation by Paulus Diaconus of Naples is given by Surius and the Bollandists (Surr. de Prof. Hist. SS. tom. i. Feb. 4, p. 39; Boll. Acta SS. 4 Feb. i. 483; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 519.)

EUTYCHIUS (1), bishop of Melitene (535-547).

EUTYCHIUS (2).

EUTYCHIUS (3), sixth bishop of Syracuse in the third century, between Abraham and Anthemius. He died, and was buried at Palermo (Pirri, Sicilia Sacra, i. 600.)

EUTYCHIUS (4), bishop of Syracuse, between Julianus and Januarius. He died, and was buried at Palermo (Pirri, Sicilia Sacra, i. 605.)

EUTYCHIUS (5), bishop of Seleucia Pirra in Pissidia, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Mansi, ii. 695; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1053.)

EUTYCHIUS (6), bishop of Amasea, in the district of Hellenopolis, in the province of Pontus Polemonianus, A.D. 329; present at the council of Nicea. (Mansi, ii. 694 d; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 525.) He is especially connected with the martyr-bishop of Amasea, his predecessor, Basilius or Basilus (Basiliius, Vol. i. p. 295), who in his last letter to the church of Amasea (Baronius, 316, axil) had expressed a hope that Eutychius the son of Callistratus should be named his successor.

EUTYCHIUS (7), bishop of Smyrna, one of the fathers of Nicea, A.D. 325. (Mansi, ii. 694 a; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 741.)

EUTYCHIUS (8), bishop of Satara. [Eve-}

EUTYCHIUS (9), bishop of Philippopolis in Thrace. Signed the epistle of the Eusebian bishops to the African church, A.D. 344. (Mansi, iii. 139, and Le Quien, Or. Christ. i. 1158.)
EUTYCHIUS (10), a bishop of an unnamed see who signed the acts of the council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (Athenasius. Apol. adv. Ariam. c. III. § 50.). [E. V.]

EUTYCHIUS (11), occurs in the Chronicon of Jerome, sub anno 349, as the first of the bishops intruded by the Arians into the see of Jerusalem after the deposition of Cyril by Acacius. He is mentioned by no other authority. Tilmont (Mém. Écol. vi. 425) suggests that he may have been the same with Eutychius, bishop of Eleutheropolis [EUTYCHIUS (13)]. See Tilmont's note on the intruded bishops of Jerusalem, viii. 782. [E. V.]

EUTYCHIUS (12), a bishop deposed at the same time as Acacius, by the semi-Arian faction at Seleucia, A.D. 559 (Socr. H. E. ii. 40). [E. V.]

EUTYCHIUS (13), bishop of Eleutheropolis (Hebron), in Palaestina Prima. He succeeded Theophilus on his translation to Castabali in Cilicia. Eutychius had been brought up in the orthodox faith under Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem. The community he conceived of Maximus's successor, Cyril, led him to attach himself to Cyril's bitter enemy, Acacius of Caesarea, and to profess his theological views. At the synod of Seleucia, 359, he signed Acacius's semi-Arian formula (Mansi, iii. 322). After the condemnation of Athanasius by the Eusebian synod at Milan, 353, Eusebius of Vercelli, one of the three bishops who nobly refused to sign the sentence, was banished to Eleutheropolis, where he was subsequently joined by his fellow confessor to the truth, Lucifer of Cagliari, whose original place of exile had been Germanicia. Eutychius is charged with having treated both the bishops with violence and contumely. It is asserted that when Lucifer was celebrating the holy communion with a handful of orthodox believers, the doors being closed, Eutychius forcibly broke the door down, and interrupted the sacred rite, carrying off the sacred vessels and books, and dispersing the communicants. (Marcelli, et Faustini. Liber Precon. ad Theodorum, p. 89.) Eutychius, in turn, charges him with being a Catholic at heart, but concealing his belief for the sake of retaining his bishopric. This he seems to have done till his death, although he was excommunicated and deposed by the party opposed to him at Seleucia. In A.D. 363 he signed the synodal letter of the bishops assembled at Antioch, including Meletius, Acacius, and Eusebius of Samosata to the emperor Julian, on the consubstantiality of the Divine Word. (Socr. H. E. iii. 25; Labbe, ii. 828.) Jerome speaks of Eutychius having been one of Epiphanius's hearers "in monasterio," while the latter was still a presbyter, i.e. before A.D. 358 (Hieron. Epist. ad Pamphil. 61; i. 690; Epiphan. Haer. ixxii. No. 23-27). [EUTYCHIUS (11)]. [E. V.]

EUTYCHIUS (14) (TYCHIUS), bishop of Erythrae in the province of Asia, present at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 727; Mansi, iv. 1156, 1215.) [L. D.]

EUTYCHIUS (15), bishop of Hadrianopolis in Vetus Epirus, present both at the second council of Ephesus, "the Latrocinium," A.D. 449 (Mansi, vi. 929), and at the ecumenical council of Chalcedon, 451. (Mansi, vii. 124; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 141.) [L. D.]

EUTYCHIUS (16), bishop of Trani, present at the fifth and sixth Roman synods under pope Symmachus in 503 and Oct. 504, according to the reckoning of Dahn (De Roli de Germania, who accepts, with a slight variation, the arrangement of Hefele, § 220). See Mansi, viii. 299 and 315. All subscriptions to the fifth synod must be received with caution. [A. H. D. A.]


EUTYCHIUS (18), ST., patriarch of Constantinople. His biography, composed by his chaplain Eustathius, has been preserved entire. [EUSTATHIUS (4)].

Eutychius was born at Theum in Phrygia cir. A.D. 512. His father Alexander was a general under Belisarius; his mother's name was Synesia. It is not clear whether it was to Constantinople or to Augustopolis, an episcopal see in Phrygia, that he went at the age of twelve to study under the care of his great- father Hesychius, a presbyter and the treasurer of the cathedral. After his education was finished, he thought of becoming a monk; but the bishop of Amasea, in Iberia,, hearing of it entered him among his clergy, and made him pass through all the degrees of the ministry, intending him even for the episcopate. The bishop afterwards changed his mind, and Eutychius assumed the monastic habit at Amasea, at the age of thirty, cir. A.D. 542.

At some council that was being held at Constantinople, towards the end of the patriarchate of Menenas, Eutychius, then archimandrite, attended as apocrisiarius for the bishop of Amasea, who was ill. Eustathius calls this council the fifth of Constantinople; but this did not commence until 553, when Menenas was dead. Perhaps we are to understand some preliminary gathering held in preparation for it. The archimandrite had the honour of being lodged at the palace of the patriarch, and won his esteem that Menenas begged him never to leave him, and pointed him out to his clergy by the words, "That man will be my successor." Eutychius earned the admiration of the emperor also. One day, in a conference before Justinian, the question was discussed whether the living could pass sentence on the dead. Eutychius supported the affirmative by quoting the example of Josiah, who dug up the bones of the worshippers of the golden calf and buried them. This opinion suited the emperor and clergy, Eutychius was loaded with honor, and became an intimate of the imperial court. Mennas died in 552, probably on August 25, and while his body lay in state Justinian nominated Eutychius to an assembly of the senate and clergy for the patriarchate.

At the beginning of 553 Eutychius wrote to pope Vigilius who was then at Rome, making his profession of the catholic faith, declaring his acceptance of the four councils and the letters of St. Leo, and requesting Vigilius to preside over the council that was to be held on the question of the Three Chapters. Vigilius refused,
EUTYCHIUS—Patriarch

and Eutychius shared the first place in the assembly with the patriarchs Apollinarius of Alexandria and Dominicus of Antioch. In conjunction with these he even went so far as to invite Vigilius again to the second session, but the pope excused himself on the ground of ill-health. The subscription of Eutychius to the Acts of this synod, which sat from May 5 to June 2, 553, is a summary of the decrees against the Three Chapters.

The next important event in the patriarchate of Eutychius was his violent collision in 564 with Justinian, when this emperor adopted the theses of the Aghathodocetae. Eutychius, in a long address, demonstrated the incompatibility of that theory with Scripture; but Justinian insisted on his subscribing to it, and finding him uncompromising, ordered his arrest.

On Jan. 22, 565, Eutychius was celebrating the feast-day of St. Timotheus in the church adjoining the Hormidias palace (cf. Du Cange, Cyp. lib. ii, p. 96, lib. iv. p. 93, ed. 1729) and was at the time engaging in conversation with a monk, when an officer with a band of soldiers broke into the patriarchal residence, and at length entered the church, and carried the patriarch away. Eutychius was first taken to a monastery called Choraceus, and on the following day to that of St. Olias near Chalcedon.

The eighth day after this outrage, Justinian called an assembly of princes and prelates, to which he summoned Eutychius. The charges against him were trifling and absurd: that he used ointments, that he ate delicate meats, that he prayed long. Cited thrice, Eutychius replied that he would only come if he were to be judged canonically, in his own dignity, and in command of his clergy. Condemned by default, he was sent to an island in the Propontis named Principis. He landed at night in a storm, and was comforted in the morning by the circumstance that the first thing on which his eyes rested was a cross painted on the wall with the inscription, "Christ is with you: stand firm," a charm against earthquakes. He was next sent to his old monastery at Amasea, where he spent twelve years and five months.

Eutychius relates many wonderful works performed by the Lord in his lifetime, all acts of healing, and possibly both the diseases and the cures are true but exaggerated.

On the death of Joannes Scholasticus, whom Justinian had put in the patriarchal chair, the people of Constantinople loudly demanded the return of Eutychius. Justinian was deaf, Justin II. had succeeded, and had associated with himself the young Tiberius. The emperors immediately sent an honorable deputation to Amasea to bring back Eutychius, even if he were unwilling; but his joy was great, and, having blessed the monastery and people, he returned to Constantinople. There an immense concourse met him, shouting aloud, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," and "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace." In questionable imitation of our Lord he entered the city on an ass's colt, over garlands spread on the ground, the crowd carrying palms, palm branches in his hand, and his head illuminated, public banquets were held, new buildings inaugurated. Next day he was met by the two emperors with conspicuous honour at the church of the Virgin in Blachernae. He then proceeded to the Great Church, which was filled from end to end, mounted the pulpit, and blessed the multitude. He afterwards distributed the communion during the space of six hours, as all wished to receive the elements from his own hands. The date of his restoration was October, 577.

On Sept. 26, 578, in the lifetime of Justin, Tiberius was crowned by Eutychius (Zonar. Annal. lib. xiv. § 11; Du Cange, Fam. August. p. 85), and on Oct. 5 Justin died. Theophanes makes the mistake of describing Eutychius as offering prayer on the occasion of the association of Tiberius in the empire, whereas he was not recalled till afterwards.

Towards the end of his life Eutychius maintained in a book on the resurrection, now lost, that after the resurrection the body will be more subtle than air, and no longer palpable. Gregory the Great, then residing at Constantinople as delegate of the Roman church, felt himself bound to oppose this opinion and Gregory sent to Luke xxiv. 39, "Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Eutychius said this was a sign granted to prove the Resurrection to the Apostles. Gregory replied that it would be a curious sign if it was to give us a doubt. Eutychius answered that though the Body might be palpable then, it grew more subtle after. Christ being raised dieth not more, rejoined Gregory (Rom. vi. 9). Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God, answered Eutychius (1 Cor. xv. 50). Flesh, responded Gregory, has two meanings in Scripture, human nature, and sin's corruption. The result of the discussion was that each adhered to his own opinion. The emperor Tiberius talked to the disputants separately, and tried to reconcile them; but the breach was persistent. Finally, the emperor ordered the book to be burnt. It happened immediately afterwards that both Eutychius and Gregory fell ill. Gregory recovered, but Eutychius died. He was visited by the emperor on his deathbed, and gave him his blessing. He breathed his last quietly on Sunday after Easter Day, April 5, 582, at the age of seventy. Some of his friends told Gregories in his ear, a few moments before his end, he touched the skin of his hand, saying, "I confess that in this flesh we shall rise again." This was probably compatible with his previous view, but at any rate Gregory availed himself of this excuse to leave the matter alone (Paul. Diacon. Vit. Greg. Mag. lib. 1, cap. 23; 27-30; Vit. Greg. ex ejus Script. lib. 1, cap. 5, §§ 6-8; Greg. Mag. Mornal. xiv. §§ 72-74).

The chronology of his life here followed is that fixed by Heschen in his introductory argument to the life by Eutathius (Boll. Ada SS. 6 Ap. i. 550).

The literary remains of Eutychius are his Letter to pope Vigilius already mentioned, printed in Greek and Latin by Mansi (ix. 186), and by Mingre (Pat. Lat. lxxix. 63; Pat. Gr. lxxvii. 2401), and some fragments of a Discourse on Easter and the Holy Eucharist. One portion of this, in Greek, was first published by Mai in his edition of Euthy. The whole city was illuminated, public banquets were held, new buildings inaugurated. Next day he was met by the two emperors with conspicuous honour.
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Luke by Nicetas, he collected under the above title, adding a Latin translation, in his Biblioth. Nov. (t. iv. p. 54), and this was reprinted by Migne, Patr. Grac. lxxvi. 2391). In this treatise Eutychius argues against the Quarto- decimans, against the Hydroperastatae who used water only instead of wine at communion (he says that the only apostolic tradition is the mixture of both), against certain schismatic Armenians who used only wine, and against some Greeks and Armenians who adored the elements as soon as they were offered and before consecration. The last work of Eutychius was a discourse on the manner of existence of reasonable natures in space, a sort of physical theory of the future life. It is mentioned in a treatise of Eustratius of Constantinople (De Vita Functorum Status, cap. 14), who says the object of the work was to prove that the soul is not liable to corruption. The title, which is all that survives, runs: περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ καθ ἐκείνους ὁμοίων χάριν ἐκείνων καὶ χαρών, which Allatius translates De ipsis qui secundum modo naturalis sua finit in loco, notione videlicet et sola mente praedictis. The Greek and Latin are to be found in Allatius (De Utriusque Ecclesiæ de Purgat. Consens. p. 433), and the Latin alone in La Bigne, Mag. Bibli. Patr. xxvii. 438.

The life of Eutychius was in the Venetian Library, and was edited by Lipomannus, Surius, and Petrus Franciscus Zinus. Another copy was in the possession of Queen Christina of Sweden, and had belonged to Paulus Rhamnusius.

Eutychius was celebrated as a saint by the Greeks, on April 6. His name is found in the Metrical Ephemeris and in the Muscovite Tables. The emperor Basil's Menology has a short biography of him. Molanus mentions him in his Actarium Usuardi.


EUTYCHIUS (19), bishop of Tyndarion (on the north coast of Sicily), is encouraged by Gregory the Great (Lib. iii. indici. xl. Epist. 53; Migne, lxxvii. 659), to persevere in the conversion of "quosdam idolorum cultores atque Angeliliorum dogmatum." [A. H. D. A.]

EUTYCHIUS (20), bishop of Melos in the Aegean, present at the sixth general council, A.D. 680. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 945; Mansi, xi. 616.) [L. D.]

EUTYCHIUS (21), Aug. 24, legendary disciple of St. John the Apostle. He was born at Sebastopolis. Basil's Menology strangely represents Eutychius as joining St. Paul and suffering with him after the death of St. John. According to the same, he was flung into a furnace, from which he escaped unhurt, and after visiting St. John's flock at Ephesus, returned to his own city, where he died, according to Molanus, by a martyr's death. [G. T. S.]

EUTYCHIUS (22), presbyter and martyr, by some commemorated on April 15, by others on May 15, and by them named Eutitus. He lived at Ferentinum, an ancient episcopal city of Eturia, where he suffered, either slain A.D. 289 or else during the Diocletian persecution, in company with the bishop Donusia. His memory has been celebrated by Gregory the Great in his Dialog. lib. iii. c. 38, where it is related how the martyr appeared to Redemptus, bishop of Ferentinum and foretold the horrors of the Lombard invasion. St. Gregory severity states that he had this story from St. Redemptus himself, who lived in his own time. The vision appeared in 560. The Lombard invasion took place in 566. Gregory wrote his Dialogus in 585. (Rom. Mart. Apr. 15; Boll. Acta SS. ii. 378.) J. S. Assemani in his De Sanctorum Ferentinæ (1745) has an exhaustive dissertation on this saint, his name, church, and festival, distinguishing him from other saints of the same name. [G. T. S.]

EUTYCHIUS (23), Feb. 4, martyr at Rome under Maximian, A.D. 304. He was buried is the cemetery of Callistus, where his tomb was afterwards ornamented by pope Damasus, c. 364. [DAMASUS.] In Acta SS. Boll. Feb. i. 438, will be found a copy of an inscription on a marble tablet, erected to the memory of the martyr in the church of St. Sebastian, wherein Damasus laid down a marble pavement. (Ferrarius, Cod. SS.) [G. T. S.]

EUTYCHIUS (24), son of Polycentus of Melitene, an Armenian martyr under the pres- ident Antiochus, A.D. 311, Maximian being emperor. (Baron. Annal. 311, xxi.) [G. T. S.]

EUTYCHIUS (25), Jan. 20, martyr with Bassus, Eusebius, and Basilides, in the Diocletian persecution. They held a high position in one of the imperial households, where they were so impressed by the courage and steadfastness of a martyr, Theopemptus, that they too embr speed the faith, for which they suffered in various ways. Eutychius was bound to four stakes, which being allowed to rebound, tore him into pieces. (Bas. Men.) [G. T. S.]

EUTYCHIUS (26), A.D. 358, subdeacon of Alexandria, martyred by the Arian in the persecu- tion of the Alexandrian church. This account is given of him by Athanasius: "imitating the Scythians, the Arians seized Eutychius, a subdeacon, who honourably served the church, and when they had got him beaten on the back with bulls' hides almost to the point of death, demanded that he should be sent to the mines; not any mere chance mines, but in particular those that are called Phaeno, where a condemned homicide would be unable to live more than a few days. And, what is still more extraordinary, they would not allow him even a few hours to be healed of his wounds, but got him sent out on the road forthwith, saying, that if that were done all would tremble and join them. But he had not gone far when, prevented by the pain of his wounds from reaching the mines, he died in the way. He died rejoicing, for he had gained the glory of martyrdom; but the impious persecutors not even then were touched with shame, but as it is written, 'having cruel bowls,' she accomplishing this crime, again devised a deed of Satanic darkness. For when there came supplicants from the people to beg pity for Eutychius they ordered four excellent men of free birth to be arrested, one of whom was Hermias, who said..."
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to wash the feet of beggars; these the general order to be hairy, scourged thence, and trampled down by the priscians. But the Arians, more heartless even than Scythians, seeing that they did not die of the pain of the beating, began to extol state and threaten. We shall write, cry them, to the emperors, and tell them that you did not fling them to our taste. Frightened at these words, he was obliged to scourge them again. During the punishment, knowing why they were beaten, and of whom they had been slandered, 'It is for the truth,' they said, 'that we are beaten; we do not communicate with heretics; flog on as you will, you will be judged by God for this.' That was all they said. The persecutors wished them to be imprisoned till death released them; but the people of God, watching their opportunity, begged mercy for them; and after seven days or more they were dismissed." (Athanas. Opp. pars. i, p. 300 in Patr. Grec. xxv. 765; A.D. SS. Bolland. 26 Mart. iii. p. 620, 713.) [W. M. S.]

EUTHYCHIUS (27), a Spaniard by birth, and a martyr a.D. 437 with three others, Arcadius, Probus, and Paschasius, during the Vandal persecution in Africa. Refusing to join in communion with the Arians, they were put to death. (Prosper. Aq. Chron. p. 745; Patr. Lat. lib. 597; Baronie Annoy. A.D. 437.) [G. T. S.]

EUTHYCHIUS (28), a leading person among the Quattredecimans of Philadelphia in Lydia, prevailed upon in 431, by the Nestorian Jacobus, to seek from bishop Theophanes a restoration to church communion. He also signed the symbols of Jacobus. (Labbe, Conc. iii. 675, 678, 686.) [CHARMIUS (1).] [T. W. D.]

EUTHYCHIUS (29), one of the archicham- ridae Euthychnus, as they called themselves, who, being exiled, cast an appeal to the emperor Marcian in the Euthychian interest in a.D. 451, asking for a general council (Labbe, iv. 524). The orthodox archichamnites, sitting in the council of Chalcedon before their Euthychian brethren were summoned, would not recognize him as archichamnite, but described him as belonging to the Basilica of Celsus or Celestius. (Labbe, iv. 518.) [C. G.]

EUTHYCHIUS (30), of Constantinople, founder of a sect. [EUNOMIUS EUTHYCHIAN.]

EUTHYCHIUS (31), a holy man in the district of Narsia, who was called to be abbot of a monastery in his neighbourhood. For a quaint and amusing story of him and his friend Florentius see Greg. Magn. Dist. lib. iii. cap. 15; Migne, 1xvii. 249. (Mabillon, Acta SS. O. B. R. i. 120.) [A. H. D. A.]

EUTHYCHIUS (32), a prefect, bearer of a letter of pope Gregory the Great, who calls him "vir magnificus," to Cridianus, May 602. (Greg. Mag. Epp. lib. xii. ind. v. ep. 54; Patr. Lat. Irxvii. 1244.) [C. H.]

EUTHYCHIUS (33), the last known exarch of Ravenna. His predecessor Paul, who had been directed by the emperor to take or kill the pope excommunicated by the Iconoclastic decree, had been killed, A.D. 727, in an engagement at Ravenna between his own followers and the supporters of image worship. The emperor CHRIST. BISCH.—VOL. II.

then sent the patrician and exarch Euthychius (who had been formerly exarch according to Anestas. Liber Pontif. Greg. ii. § 185, but it does not appear when) to Naples to carry out his designs against pope Gregory II. Euthychius sent a subordinate to Rome to take the pope's life, who was discovered, and whom the Romans desired to kill, but the pope restrained them. They then anathematized the exarch, and told him that if they would willingly die for their pope, Euthychius tried to bribe the Lombard king Liutprand and the dukes to combine with him against the pope, but in vain. After this he probably went to Ravenna. The chronology of the events is here uncertain, but probably, before 792, Ravenna was attacked by Liutprand, Charles destroyed, and the town ultimately taken by his nephew Hildebrand and Peredue duke of Vicenza. The exarch fled to Venice, and Gregory II. wrote to the doge Ursus, and to Antonius patriarch of Grado, in the following remarkable words, "ut ad primum statum sanctorum Regini aliciae in Imperialis servitio dominorum filiorumque nostrorum Leonis et Constantini magnorum imperatorum ipsa revocetur Ravanum civitatem." A Venetian fleet under the doge at once went to Ravenna. Hildebrand was captured, Peredue killed, and Euthychius reinstated. At the time we are told the army of Ravenna and the Venetians, in the fervour of their faith as image-worshippers, would have elected another emperor if the pope had not forbidden them. (Andreas Dandali Chronicon, iii. 2-5 in Muratori, SS. xii. 153; Johannis Chron. Venetum in Pertz, Monum. vii. 13; Pasch. Dial. Constan. 54.)

In 729 Euthychius entered into friendly relations with Liutprand, and they combined for an expedition to the south, Euthychius to take Rome, Liutprand to subdue the dukedoms of Benevento and Spoleto. The dukes submitted, and the combined forces appeared before Rome. At this critical moment Gregory appeared in Liutprand's camp, and induced him to submit to the church. At the king's request the pone consented to be reconciled to the exarch, and when Tiberius Petianus, an usurper, rebelled against the empire in Tuscany, the pope sent assistance with the forces of Euthychius against him. Tiberius was defeated, and his head sent to Constantinople. (Pseudo-Philippus, II. in Liber Pontifficis, Migne, cxviii. 981-983.)

With Gregory III. (731-741) the next pope, Euthychius was on friendly terms, and sent him six columns of onyx. These were placed in St. Peter's, and adorned with figures of Christ, the Apostles, and other saints; doubtless as a protest against the Iconoclasts. In 743 Liutprand began pressing upon the exarchate, and when he was preparing to besiege Ravenna, Euthychius and John the archbishop sent to ask help from pope Zacharias. The pope sent an embassy to Liutprand in vain, went to Ravenna where he was warmly received by the exarch and the people, and then went on to the court of Pavia. The king submitted, and agreed to restore to the empire the conquests he had made. After this we have no further certain knowledge of Euthychius. In 749 king Ratchis is pressing upon the Pentapolis, and in 751 king Astolphus dates a diploma at the place of Sella. 764 is the probable date for the approximate date of the fall of the exarchate, and it is generally assumed, though without any special evidence, that Euthychius was
EUTCHYRIUS, bishop of Thessalonica, addressed on September 1, A.D. 437, by pope Leo the Great, in his 150th letter (formerly 119th). He urges him and three other bishops to be courageous against the Eutychians, assuring them that such conduct will confirm the good will of the emperor Patricius. (Leo Mag. Epist. cl. Patr. Lat. liv. 1119; Le Quien, Oriens christ. ii. 34; Ceillier, x. 233.) [W. M. S.]

EUNOIS, Arius, bishop of Antioch, appointed by the influence of Constantius after the deposition of Meletius, A.D. 361. Eunaisos was the companion and intimate friend of Arius from an early age. He was one of the eleven presbyters and deacons of that church, deposed together with Arius by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, c. A.D. 320 (Socr. H. E. i. 6; Soz. H. E. i. 15; Theod. H. E. i. 4; ii. 311; Athanas. de Syn. p. 907). He was again condemned and banished, together with Arius, by the council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. When Arius was recalled from banishment, and summoned to the emperor's side in A.D. 330, he was accompanied by Eunaisos, who by this time had been advanced to the presbytery. The Eunaisos restored both regius to the emperor's confidence by an evasive declaration of their faith and a professed acceptance of the creed of Nicaea (Socr. H. E. i. 25, 26; Soz. H. E. ii. 27). He accompanied Arius to Jerusalem at the great gathering of Eusebian bishops for the dedication of the church of the Anastasis, Sept. 15, A.D. 335, and with him was received in communion by the council then held (Soz. H. E. ii. 27; Athan. de Synod. p. 891). In A.D. 361 Constantius, having banished Meletius bishop of Antioch, summoned Eunosios from Alexandria, and commanded the bishops of the province to consecrate him. Athanasius, who calls him by the epithet "the Catholic" (Athanas. Hist. Arian. p. 850), states that he was subsequently deposed. If so, the deposition took no effect (Socr. H. E. ii. 44; Theod. H. E. ii. 27; Philost. H. E. v. 5; Athan. de Synod. p. 907). A few months later Constantius, having while in the east been seized with the fever which put an end to his life, on Nov. 3, A.D. 361, summoned the newly-appointed bishop Eunaisos to his bedside, and received from his hands the sacrament of baptism. Whether this took place at Antioch or at Mopsucrene, in Cilicia, is uncertain (Athan. de Synod. 907; Philost. H. E. vi. 5). On the accession of Valens Eunosios was urged by Eudosios to convene a synod of bishops at Antioch to take off Aetius's sentence. Eunosios replied that it was the part of Eudosios himself to take the initiative. He, however, ultimately yielded to Eudosios's importunity, c. A.D. 364 (Philost. H. E. vii. 5). On the death of Athanasius in A.D. 373, Eunosios was, at his own petition, despatched by Valens with Magnus the imperial treasurer, and a force of troops to install the imperial nominee, the Arius I. of Samosata, in the room of Peter the deacon elected and enthroned bishop. This commission was carried out with shameless brutality and persecution of the orthodox (Socr. H. E. iii. 21; Thad. iv. 21, 22). Eunosios's death is placed by Socrates in A.D. 376, and is said to have taken place at Constantinople (Socr. H. E. iv. 33). Jerome (in Loc. cit. c. vii. p. 144) seems to assert that he lived into the reign of Theodosius. This is improbable, and the passage is probably corrupt. (Le Quien, Or. chr. ii. 713; Baron. de l'ann. 325, lxxix.; 335, xlix.) [E. V.]

EUROIS, bishop of Caesarea in the latter half of the 4th century. On the death of Aetius, A.D. 356, Cyril of Jerusalem had influence enough to secure the appointment of his nominee, Philipmenus, to the vacant see. A rival bishop, however, was speedily appointed by Cyril's bitter enemy, Eutychianus of Scythopolis, called by Epiphanius (whose historical statements must be received with caution) Cyril "the Edder." Philipmenus having disappeared from the stage, Cyril nominated his sister's son, Gelasius, to the bishopric, who in his turn was forced to make room for Eunosios, appointed by some influential (Epiph. Haeres. lxxix. 15). Eunosios held his see against his rivals during the reign of Valens, but was deposed on the accession of Theodosius, A.D. 379, and Gelasius was restored. We are informed by Jerome (ib. viii. 119) that Eunosios had been originally educated in the city of which he afterwards became bishop under Theopnecus, the rhetorician, having Gregory Nyssen as a fellow student. While bishop of Caesarea, he exercised himself to restore the library collected by Origen and Pamphilus. (Hieron. Epist. 141 ad Marcell.) According to Jerome, Eunosios was a copious and popular writer, "serafort ejus variar et multis locupletar trautascus quos nemo pensante scit," the whole of which have perished. [E. V.]

EUROIS. In the Latin list of the fathers of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, occurs the name IUNUS bishop of Cema in Lycaonia, which is most probably a corruption for Eunosios. (Le Quien, Oriens christ. i. 106; Mansi, iii. 570.) [L. D.]

EVA (1), martyr. [DATIVUS]

EVA (2), the fourth abbot of Gloucester. So like her predecessor, Eadburga, is said to have been a widow of Wulfhere king of Mercia. According to the Historia Glouce. (ed. Hart, i. 7) she was blessed by Wilfrid of Worcester in 735 and died in 767, after which time the rule of abesses was discontinued. She is called in the same work, in another place, Gaffe. She seems to be a creature of legend. (Th. p. 4.) [S]

EVAGORAS (1), an Egyptian bishop, who signed at the council of Sardica, A.D. 347. (Athan. Opp. pars. i. 135.) [J. W. S.]

EVAGORAS (2), bishop of Illusa (Gaza) Phrygia Pachastiana; his name was subscribed to his absence by his metropolitan, Nunechus of Laodicis, to the definition of the faith that was read before the emperor Marcian at the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 453. (Mansi, vii. 165; Le Quien, Oriens christ. i. 81.) [L. D.]

EUTCHYRIUS (34), martyr. [EUTCHYTHUS (59)]
EVAGRIUS (3), bishop of Heraclea, near M. Lycaon in Macedonia, present at the council of Sardica, A.D. 347. (Mansi, iii. 38; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 81.) [L. IV.]

EVAGRIUS (2), bishop of Mytilene in Lesbos, one of the succeeding bishops at the council of Sardica. He signed the Arian creed of Acacius of Caesarea and George of Alexandria, and was consequently ejected from his episcopate by a decree of the council, A.D. 359. (Socr. Hist. Eccl. ii. 40; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 953; Mansi, iii. 321.) [L. IV.]

EVAGRIUS (5), one of the bishops who subscribed the synodal letter at Antioch to the emperor Jovian, A.D. 363 (Socr. H. E. iii. 25). His designation is Evagrius Nicollorum (ZueLsb). Sceili remarks Valesius on this passage, was an oriental town of site unknown. (Patr. Graec. Irivii. 454 E.) [C. H.]

EVAGRIUS (4), orthodox bishop of Constantinople for about two months during 370, between Paul and Gregory of Nazianzus, chronologically, his episcopate occurs during that of the heterodox Demophilus. In the year 370 died Eusebius, the heterodox bishop of Constantinople, after holding the see nineteen years. Valesius happened a short time previously to have left Constantinople for Antioch, so that the election was sure, in such excited times, to take place without consultation with him. Arianism was in great force at the capital of the East; the Arians at once chose Demophilus. The Catholic or, as Socrates calls them, the Homoeans, thinking it a favourable opportunity to get a bishop of their own (they had not had one at Constantinople since the death of Paulus, twenty years before), chose Evagrius, a person otherwise unknown. Socrates states that he was consecrated by Eustathius bishop of Antioch, supposed to have been at Constantinople, but Valesius (note 55 on Soc. iv. 14) shows that this private act must have been done before the end of the reign of Constantius, for Julian, and after him Jovian, recalled all the exiled bishops to their sees. The age of Eustathius would now have been between 90 and 110, and therefore remarkable enough to be mentioned. Both Victor Tununensis and Theodorus Lector state that Eustathius died at Philippi, evidently in exile. However that may be, Evagrius, by whomsoever consecrated, had a short term of office. His appointment was the signal for an outburst of persecution from the Arians. The news of the ecclesiastical turmoil quickly reached the emperor Valens on his travels. He feared that a tumult might be raised such as would endanger the safety of the empire. He ordered troops to be despatched from Nicomedia to the metropolis, and banished both Nicomedia and the consecrating bishop. The latter, who may have been some other Eustathius, was exiled either to Bizya or to Cyrus, Evagrius to some other place.

The authority for the duration of his episcopate is Eutychius of Alexandrius, in his Annals, translated into Latin by Pococke.


Evagrius is believed to have been the author of some comments on St. Luke, which Nicetas, descan of Constantineople, afterwards bishop of Serres, included in his Catena Patrum on that evangelist, and which Mai printed in the 9th volume of his Scriptores Vetern. See also Cellller, vi. 333. [W. M. S.]

EVAGRIUS (6), commonly known as Evagrius of Antioch (his birthplace and the chief sphere of his work) to distinguish him from others of the same name, and more especially from Evagrius the historian. The dates of his birth and his death are uncertain; but he is known to have been consecrated bishop over one of the parties in Antioch in A.D. 388 or 389, and he must have lived until at least A.D. 392.


Life.—Evagrius was the son of a citizen of Antioch named Pompeianus. He appears to have been of full age by A.D. 362, and was probably already ordained presbyter when we find him about that date travelling to Italy with Eusebius, bishop of Verulam (347). On the death of Eusebius in A.D. 370, Evagrius returned to Antioch in company with Jerome. He was certainly at that time a presbyter. Some identify him (e.g. Stephen in his Life of Chrysostom, but see Fabricius ubi supra, tom. viii. p. 455) with the presbyter who trained Chrysostom in monastic discipline. This identification is probably correct, though it is remarkable that Chrysostom received ordination, first as a deacon from St. Meletius, and then as priest from Flavian, the bishops of that party in Antioch which stood opposed to the one subsequently headed by Jerome.

For the history of the dispute in Antioch the reader must be referred to the authorities given above, more particularly Theodoret, and to the articles, Flavianus, Meletius, Paulinus. In this place it must suffice to comment upon two points, one involving a general question, the other having special reference to Evagrius. The first point relates to the contest at Antioch. This, though originally springing out of the Arian controversy, soon became a question partly personal and in part connected with the influence, if not the actual jurisdiction, of the Roman see. Indeed St. Jerome (among whose high and noble gifts judicial fairness cannot be reckoned) wrote a letter (No. 15, ed. Ben.) of impassioned partisanship to his friend Damascus [Damascius], which seems to imply that the bishop of Antioch who is accepted at Rome must of necessity be the right one, and that Meletius, with all others not so accepted, must be counted profane. This history has not in any way been tioned the view taken by Jerome in this affair. Meletius, as has been already observed, ordained St. Chrysostom; and, though he may have died
out of communion with Rome, has been always allowed, both in the West and in the East, to have been orthodox in doctrine, most blameless in life, and in short one whose name is fully entitled to the honourable prefix of saint. It would be needless to mention this, had not the passage from St. Jerome been cited in controversy (e.g. in Dr. Newman's Essay on Development, p. 279) as if it expressed the general sentiment of the church of his age.

The second point concerns Evagrius. Our information concerning him is not sufficiently ample to enable us to use very positive language concerning his conduct and character. His consecration to the episcopate by Paulinus was, as Theodoret (I.c.) and St. Ambrose (I.c.) both assert, in many ways uncanonical. Paulinus, even if his own position had been wholly unimpeachable, had no right to make another man bishop without consultation of the other bishops of the province, nor to give solitary consecration in the teeth of the famous fourth canon of the Nicene council, which required the co-operation of at least two assisting bishops.

There is a primum facie case against anyone who accepts advancement, as Evagrius did, under such circumstances. It is, however, reasonable to bear in mind the strong influence exerted in all ages, even on good men, by the violence of party spirit, when a contest is still at its height. The circumstances may have disposed the combaters no longer any doctrinal point at issue (καταργείται ἡπείρα τοῦ δογματικοῦ ἐξερεύνησι), as Theodoret has it), in all probability rather increased than diminished the bitterness of the rivalry. One who is described even by Jerome (I.c.), as Evagrius is, a man acris ac ferventia ingenii, may easily have been persuaded by Paulinus that he was doing good service to the church of Christ by accepting the post of successor. The Nicene canon was understood to be indeed a matter of order, but not such a rule as actually to invalidate a consecration once effected (on the principle fieri non dubit, factum valet), and the rival bishop Flavian had broken a solemn promise made by himself that he would never aspire to the see. St. Ambrose (I.c.) takes a western view of the matter, and recommends an appeal to our holy brother, the bishop of the Roman church, but he finds even more fault with the conduct of Flavian than with that of Evagrius, and describes each of the rivals as stronger in the attack than in the defence—vitae seu vitae consortiae magis ordinatio sua quia suum (bonum) et fretus. If excuses can be made for Flavian by charitable critics (e.g. Stephen in his Life of Chrysostom), it seems undeniable that the course pursued by Flavian must also have created in the minds of the large party which accepted Evagrius the impression that he had no colourable case, and that the primal irregularity of his consecration might be condemned. On the death of Evagrius, which appears to have been sudden, no successor was appointed, and Flavian, mainly through the influence of Chrysostom (who highly eulogized him as a worthy successor of St. Meletius), succeeded in healing the division.

Writings.—Evagrius of Antioch, while still a presbyter, read to his friend St. Jerome (Jerome, I.c.) treatises on various topics (discorsae, hypostaseum tractatus). These were not published when Jerome wrote, and if they were subsequently made public, they have not come down to us. Jerome's tone concerning them implies some admiration. He adds that Evagrius translated into Latin (as notorius sermonem) the life of St. Antony from the Greek of Athanasius. Whether we do or do not possess this translation is a matter of considerable controversy, it depends in some degree upon the decision of the previous question, whether we have or have not got the actual biography of St. Antony which St. Athanasius composed. The point has already been discussed in this dictionary. [ANTONY, ATHANASIIUS.] If we accept the position therein (which is that of Du Pin, Newman and others) that the biography ascribed to Athanasius is substantially his, we are then to discuss whether the translation gives us as that of Evagrius of Antioch by the Benedictine editors of Athanasius (tom. i. p. 284, p. 785 et seq.) and by the Bollandists (St. Sanctor, for Jan. tom. ii. p. 107) is genuine and authentic.

Cave (Historia Literaria, vol. i. p. 239, ed. Osong, 1740) rejects it; and Osdin (de Sept. Eccles. antich. tom. i. pp. 358 seqq. 392 seqq.) defends it, and supports Cave. To the present writer the arguments of these distinguished critics appear to resolve themselves into one only; namely, that the Life of Antony by Athanasius is spurious, and that consequently the translation ascribed to Evagrius is also spurious. To dogmatize when such considerable authorities are at variance would be rash. But we believe that most modern critics would consider it all but certain that the author of the Latin biography ascribed to Evagrius had before him a copy of the Greek essentially identical with that which we now possess. It is true that his version is often a very lax one. This is fully admitted by the Benedictine editors, who indeed perhaps overstate the laxity in the following words—"Evagrii versionem quod spectat, usque ad librum illam est, ut apud numerorum verborum Athanasii nihil pensi habeas videtur, immo ad eum ac scopo frequentissime abservat, soleique benedicti Athanasianae exprimere quam in Graecis eam rentur." But the notion of preserving precise strictness in the translation of a biography of some length is a comparatively modern one. What strikes us is the amount of agreement between the Greek and the Latin in the texts cited from Holy Scripture. This is surely a crucial test, as the passages in question are for the most part merely illustrative; and it would be most improbable that two independent authors should select the same. Jerome assures us that Evagrius did translate this work of Athanasius: and we incline to the belief that the translation before us is that to which he referred.

The late Professor Ramsey (Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, art. EVAGRIUS OF ANTIOCH) mentions the existence of a MS. in the library of Worcester Cathedral, described in the Catal. MSS. Angliae et Hiberniae (vol. ii. p. 17) as containing a life of St. Antony written by Evagrius and translated by St. Jerome. He justly re-
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marks that there probably is some error in the MS itself or in the description of it.

[1. G. C.]

Pompeianus, the father of Evagrius, was, according to Jerome (Chron. anno 2, Aurelian), a descendant of the general officer of the same name who commanded in the campaign of Aurelian against Zenobia, circ. 275. Evagrius belonged to the Eustathian division of the orthodox church at Antioch, of which he became a presbyter. After the unhappy schism at Antioch had been perpetrated by the rash act of the headstrong Lucifer in consecrating Paulinus, Evagrius left Antioch, and accompanied Eusebius of Vercellae to Italy, A.D. 363 or 364. Here he zealously co-operated with Eusebius in restoring peace to the churches disturbed by the results of the disastrous council of Ariminum, and re-establishing orthodoxy on the terms laid down by the synod of Alexandria of A.D. 362. He also afforded pope Damasus important aid in getting the better of his rival Ursicius and his faction, A.D. 385. Bishops of this Eustathian communion 

The bishop of the church of Antioch was, according to Jerome (Epist. 52. [52.] He restated his return to Antioch, Evagrius wrote in harsh terms to Basil, accusing him of a love of strife and controversy, and of being unduly swayed by personal partialities. If he really desired peace let him come himself to Antioch and endeavour to re-unite the Catholics under one head. If he could not come he should at least write to them, and use his influence with Meletius to put an end to the discussions that were rending the church. The letter Basil sent in reply is a model of courteous sarcasm. If Evagrius was so great a lover of peace, why had he not fulfilled his promise of communicating with Dorotheus, the head of the Meletian party? Deeply seared evils could not be cured by light measures. A single letter would effect nothing. Much mutual conference and discussion was required. Even if the season had not rendered the mountains impassable, he was too feeble a state of health to travel to Antioch. But some one else, the patriarch of Alexandria, desired it. As regarded the deputation to the West, he had no one qualified to undertake the duty. It would be far better for Evagrius to depute some one from Antioch, who would know the parties to be approached, and the form the letters should assume. A.D. 389. On the death of Paulinus, A.D. 388, Evagrius manifested the hollowness of his professed desire for peace by becoming himself the instrument of prolonging the schism. He was ordained by the dying bishop Paulinus, in his sick chamber, without the presence of witnesses or any assisting bishops, in direct violation of the canons of the church. Flavian, it will be remembered, had been consecrated by the other party on the death of Meletius, A.D. 381. Thus the hope of healing the schism which had long been so great a scandal to the Christian world, and had caused division between holy men agreed on all else, was again frustrated. (Socr. H. E. v. 15; Theod. H. E. v. 23.) The Christian world being still divided, a council was summoned at Capua, A.D. 390, to determine whether Flavian or Evagrius was the lawful bishop of Antioch. At this council Evagrius appeared, but hesitated to attend, telling the emperor that he would rather resign the bishopric into his hands than engage in any public controversy. The bishops assembled at Capua found the question too knotty for them to solve, and after declaring their readiness to admit all orthodox bishops to communion, relegated the decision to the bishops of Alexandria and the Egyptian bishops. In fact, the case of each was so bad that it was almost impossible to distinguish between them. Each, in the words of Ambrose, depended more on the defects of his competitor's ordination than on the validity of his own, so that if Flavian had reason to fear the trial of his cause, Evagrius had no reason to press it. (Ambr. Ep. 8, p. 150.) It was not long, however, before the death of Evagrius deprived Flavian of his rival. It is not certain when this happened; but it was not before A.D. 392, in which year Jerome speaks of him as still alive. (De Vet. illustr. c. 125.) Jerome records the acute, winsome and fervid character of his intellect, and speaks with praise of treatises on various subjects, which he heard him read while still a presbyter, but which he had not yet published. (Ibid.) Evagrius was the owner of the village of Maronis, twelve leagues from Antioch, renowned for its fame as the dwelling place of St. Malchus. (Hieron. Vit. Malchi, p. 255.) Palladius, although a partisan of the Meletian side, praised Evagrius for the many contests he endured in his labours for the church. (Pallad. Dialog. p. 51.) Notwithstanding the doubts as to the validity of his consecration, the church of Antioch enrolled the name of Evagrius in her diptychs as one of her bishops, and he stands in the list of the orthodox bishops of Antioch given by Theodoret at the end of his Ecclesiastical History. [E. V.]


[H. W. P.]

EVAGRIUS (7), bishop of Soli, in Cyprus; present at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, at the seventh session of which he supported Augustinians, the archbishop of Cyprus, and Evagrius declared it. As regards the deputation to the West, he had no one qualified to undertake the
Antioch; this claim was allowed and confirmed by the council. (Mansi, iv. 1465; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 1072.)

EVAURIUS (8), bishop of Valentia in Phrygia Pacatiana, or of Neva Valentia in Orbisina, a town to be identified in the latter case with Bala, near Nicophorion or Callinicum, on the Euphrates. In the subscriptions he is called bishop of Balanta. He was a supporter of Nestorius at the council of Ephesus, a.d. 431, signed the protest against the operation of the council before the arrival of John of Antioch, as also the synodal decrees and letters of the Orientals, and was consequently cut off from communion by the orthodox (Baluz. Concil.; Synodicon, c. 7 and 13, pp. 699, 706). Some suppose two bishops of this name, but are not supported by the subscriptions. (Gams, Series Episc. 437, 440; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 817, ii. 895.)

EVAURIUS (9), a monk to whom is addressed an epistle, found among the works of Gregory Nazianzen, as his "Oratio xiv." p6p oie6/Tosx. This ascription has been generally regarded as erroneous by the best critics, on the ground of the inferiority of its style. It is attributed by Galland and others to Gregory of Nyssa on the authority of the Panoplia of Euthymius, and several MSS. (Tillemont, ix. p. 709, S. Græg. de Nazianzœ, note 28; Cellier, v. 241; vi. 125.)

EVAURIUS (10), FLAVIUS, consul, together with Flavius Eucherius, when Gregory Nazianzen made his will. (Greg. Naz. Test.)

EVAURIUS (11), a deacon of Nazianzen, mentioned by Gregory Nazianzen in his will in grateful terms as the partner of his labours and his cares. In testimony of his affectionate gratitude, Gregory bequeathed some articles of apparel and thirty gold pieces. (Greg. Naz. Test.)

EVAURIUS (12), PONTICIUS, anchoret and writer, born at Ibona in Pontus Galaticus, according to Tillemont, in 345. Jerome (Epist. ad Hisidion) styles him Hyperboræus. Valensius thinks this is an error of the copyst for Ephesius. But it is more probably a contemptuous play on the word Hærodia, such as Jerome was fond of employing when dealing with his theological adversaries. The father of Evagrius was a presbyter. If, as Tillemont thinks not impossible, Gregory Nazianzen's 153rd epistle has reference to Evagrius of Pontus, his father bore the same name as himself, and he himself received instruction in rhetoric, and the first principles of religion from Basil's friend. However this may be, it is certain that he was ordained reader by Basil, and deacon by Gregory Nyssen, who took him with him to the council of Constantinople, a.d. 381. For that we have the authority of Palladius (Hist. Lausiac. c. 86, p. 1010), who was his pupil. Both Socrates (H. E. iv. 23) and Sozomen (H. E. vi. 30) state that it was Gregory Nazianzen by whom he was ordained, and whom he accompanied to Constantinople, and that he became his archdeacon. But this is an error. (Tillemont, A. R. Eccl. 741, x. 761; Valensius ad Sozomen, vi. 30.) Gregory Nyssen had so high an opinion of the powers of Evagrius as a theologian and dialectician that he left him behind in Constantinople to aid the newly appointed bishop, Nectarius (who it will be remembered before his consecration was a layman of theological training), in dealing with heretics. The imperial city proved a dangerous home for the young deacon. The eloquence of his sermons, commended by the graces of a very handsome person and a scrupulous care in dress, attracted crowds of listeners, including many ladies of rank. One of these, the wife of an ex-prefect, conceived a guilty passion for him, which he returned. The husband's jealousy was awakened, and Evagrius only escaped assassination by a timely flight. It was said that he was warned of his peril by a dream (Soz. H. E. vi. 30). Jerusalem was the place of his retreat. Here he was hospitably received by Melania the elder, by whom he was nursed during a severe attack of fever, and who, perceiving the weakness of his disposition, availed herself of his sickness to lead him to give up the world altogether and embrace an ascetic life as the only safeguard against the temptations to sensual pleasure to which he had more than once almost been a prey. On his recovering Evagrius went to Egypt, the home of the ascetics, where, after two years spent in great austerities in the Nitrian desert, he plunged still deeper into the solitude, and practised severer mortifications in the cells of Scetis. Here he had the two Macari as his instructors and models in the ascetic life. After enduring many terrible temptations, recorded by Palladius, and having obtained mastery over his bodily passions, he became qualified to be the instructor of others in asceticism. Palladius became his companion and disciple in 381. Among his other disciples were Rufinus, and Heracleides of Cyprus, afterwards bishop of Ephesus (Soz. H. E. vii. 18). Palladius gives several anecdotal illustrative of the height of ascetic virtue attained by Evagrius and his fellow hermits. On one occasion he threw into the fire a packet of letters from his masters and other near friends, as the purer of them should entangle him in worldly thoughts once more (Cassian, v. 32; Tillemont, x. 376). His reputation for wisdom and piety led Theophilus, the metropolitan of Alexandria, to desire to make him a bishop, and Evagrius was forced to flee to resist his importunities (Soz. H. E. iv. 23).

Evagrius passed the remainder of his life in the cells of Scetis, where he died worn out with austerities in the seventeenth year of his recluse life, a.d. 598, at the age of fifty-four, "signis et prodigiosis pollinis" (Gennad. Iliast. Vir. c. xi). Evagrius was a serious champion of the doctrines of Origen, for which he fell under the lash of Jerome, whose enmity towards him had been excited not only on theological grounds, but as having been the instructor of Rufinus during his sojourn in Egypt, and having enjoyed the patronage of Melania. Jerome speaks in contemptuous terms of his writings (Ad Epist.); especially of his book πελάτος ἀμαθείας, when combating the tenet ascribed to the Origenists that a man could raise himself to a superiority to temptation (i.e. as Jerome says, "becoming either a stone or god"), and live without sin. He also charges him with being a precursor of Pelagius (in Petiov. p. 260). Jerome excuses Evagrius of
including in his book "de monachia" many who never were monks at all; and those who were were Origenists, and had been condemned by their bishops. Evagrius was a very copious writer, and Jerome himself (u. s.) bears witness to the celebrity of his works, which, he tells us, were widely read not only in the East in the original, but also in the West, having been translated into Latin by his pupil Rufinus, as after-wards happened by Socinus. Socinus (u. s.) speaks in high terms of his learning, and eloquence, and the persuasive power of his writings. The existing remains of his writings are printed by Galland, Bibl. Patr. vii. 551—581, and Migne, Patrolog. vol. 86.

We obtain the following list of the writings of Evagrius from Socrates, Gennadius, Palladius, and Sidaros, sub voc. "Macarius."

(1) "Monachus," πειρατία εν "αὐτῇ πρακτορείᾳ," on "active virtues," in 100 chapters. Of this work Socrates gives two fragments (H. E. iii. 7, iv. 23), and the whole treatise is printed by Cotelerius (Mon. Ecol. Græc. tom. ii. p. 70). (2) "Gnosticus," "as eu qui cognitionis maneri donata sunt," in 50 chapters. A fragment is given by Socrates (H. E. iv. 25). It was translated into Latin by Gennadius. (3) "Antirhetica," a collection of passages from Scripture, with comments, distributed under eight heads, against the eight divisions of evil thoughts. This was also translated by Gennadius. It was published in Greek and Latin by Liege, together with Palladius's Life of Chrysostom, Pat. 1690, 4to, and in Latin only, Bibl. Patr. Lugd. 1677, tom. 27. (4) "A Century of Propers." (5) "966 Greek Problems." (6) A Letter to Melania. (7) A book, πειρατίας. (8) 100 Sentences for the use of Anchorites living alone. (9) Short Sentences, translated by Gennadius, who describes them as being of great obscurity, only intelligible to the hearts of monks. (10) "Evagrius," in two books, one of them addressed to monks, and the other to a virgin dedicated to God (printed without the author's name), Bibl. Patr. u. s., and among the works of Mena (ed. Suares, pp. 613—626). (11) "Liber de verbo omnipotentis rationibus" (Coteler. u. s. lxxvii). (12) "Scholiæ de tetragrammatō Dei nominā" (ed. p. 110). To these may be added the "Compendium," found in a manuscript in the name Evagrius, on Job, Proverbs, and other books of the Old and New Testament. Combebys, in his Bibliotheca Concōntinentiva, gives two such passages, one in the Catena on "the good Samaritan" (vol. t. p. 553), the other on the Parable of the Founds (vol. viii. p. 812), which he ascribes to our author (vol. i. p. 11). (Oudin, l. 883; Tillemont, Men. Eccl. p. 369 fr.; Fabr. Bibl. Græc. ix. 284, ed. Harles; Dupin, Hist. Eccl. iii. i.; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 275.)

EVAGRIUS (14) (Evstithius), prefect of Egypt in the reign of Theodosius I. We hear of him in connection with the disturbances at Alexandria, arising from the desecration of the heathen temples by the bishop Theophilus (Soz. H. E. vii. 15; Soz. H. E. v. 15, 16, 17). This event is placed by Socrates and Sozomen during the time of the emperor's visit to Rome, which was in 383. The pagans made the occasion of resistance, taking up a position in the temple of Serapis, but were finally dissolved. There was a law of Theodosius against the pagans dating June 17, 391, addressed to Evagrius, so that he seems to have been prefect for three years. He is mentioned by Eunapius (Dial. 15) as present at the time of the disturbances at Alexandria, where, however, the common reading is Eustathius.

[M. F. A.]

EVAGRIUS (14), presbyter and monk under St. Martin of Tours, after whose death he betook himself to Sulpicius Severus, with whom he was living in 405. (Guliph. Ecol. iii. 1, 2.) He is proved by Ceiller to have been the author of a dissertation between Theophilus, a Christian, and Simon, a Jew (mentioned by Gennadius, de Viris Ills. cap. i. and printed by Martens in 1717), and of Deliberations between Zaccheus, a Christian, and Apollonius, a philosopher, which in an ancient MS. of the abbey of Vendome precedes the former work, and is plainly by the same author. Both works are to be found in Patr. Lat. vol. xx. (See Ceiller, viii. 424.)

[E. T. S.]

EVAGRIUS (15), philosopher, the friend and fellow-student of Sosiphoenax, by whom he was converted and induced to accept the doctrines of the resurrection of the dead and eternal retribution. (Tillemont, xii. 527.)

[É. V.]

EVAGRIUS (16) (Baron. Amm. u. a. 555. lxxvii.), a Trithête heretic. [EUSDIUS (14).]

[T. W. D.]

EVAGRIUS (17), an ecclesiastical historian of the 6th century, who wrote a church history in six books, embracing a period of 163 years, from the council of Ephesus A.D. 431, to the twelfth year of the emperor Mauricius Tiberius, a D. 594. He was born at Epiphaniae in Coele Syria, A.D. 536 or 537. His parents seem to have been Christians, for he tells us himself that they were among the multitudes who, at a time when they were expecting destruction at the hands of Chorozes, hastened to Apamea, a city not far distant from Epiphania, that they might there embrace the wood of the true cross, and thus if possible escape the fate with which they were threatened, or at all events be strengthened for their departure to a better world (iv. 25). Evagrius was a child at school at the time, but was taken with his parents to Apamea for this purpose. The infant in Christ was said to shine with any particular light upon his training; but it illustrates the feelings of the age, and enables us better to understand how one who gives in his works many tokens of sobriety and judgment should have been the eulogial gatherer of legends that he was. From Apamea Evagrius would seem to have gone to Antioch, the capital of Syria, and there to have entered the profession of the law. He must have prosecuted the profession with success, for he received the surname of Scholasticus, a term often applied to lawyers (Du Cange, Glossarium, s. v.), gained great favour with Gregory bishop of Antioch, and was chosen by him to assist him in his judgments. At the same time he seems to have won the esteem and goodwill of all classes, for on the occasion of his marriage, a second one, the city was filled with rejoicing, and great honours were paid him by the citizens.

The relations of Evagrius with Gregory appear, as far as this world goes, to have been among the most fortunate circumstances of his life. He accompanied that bishop to Constantinople,
and advocated his cause when he was summoned to answer for them for heinous crimes. The defence was successful. He also wrote for him a book containing aurratus, disputations, with sundry other matters," which must have been highly thought of, for he tells us that, in consequence of it, he was preferred by Tiberius Constantinus to the honour of quaestor, and by Mauricius Tiberius to that of magister militum, "where the lieutenants, and magistrates with their monuments are registered" (vi. 23). This, his own account of his promotion, is more to be trusted than the insinuation contained in Gibbon's sneer that, in his praise of Maurice, he had been "so wisely indi-crate that the emperor knew and rewarded his favourable opinion" (Decline and Fall, ch. 45).

The year of his death is not known. It must have been subsequent to A.D. 594, at which date, the twelfth year of Maurice's reign, he wrote his history at the age of 58 (iv. 28).

It is the history of Evagrius that chiefly inter-est us, for his other works have perished. That history was intended to be a continuation of the histories of Eusebius, Sozomen, Zosimus, Priscus, Joannes Rhetor, Prosopius of Caesarea, Agathius, and other good authors. He saw that the information to be found in them was too scattered to permit of its full value being felt; and he resolved to gather it together, as previous historians had done, to the end "that the famous deeds which shimmered in the dust of forgetful-ness must be stirred with his pen, and presented for immortal memory; that not only every man might know what had happened until that age, when, where, in what sort, against whom, by what men, but also that worthy act, by reckless security and languishing slothfulness the sister of ob-li-vion, might be put clean out of remembrance" (Preface to his Hist.).

These words of his own preface indicate well not only his object but the spirit in which he pursued it, while at the same time they illustrate the unnecessarily inflated style in which perhaps the very sense of the importance of his work not unfrequently led him to indulge. It is fair, however, to allow that he largely attained his end. He is a warm, often an enthusiastic writer, orthodox in his sentiments, and eager in his denunciations of prevailing heresies, yet nothing was demanded by the feel-ings of the time. Jortin indeed has condemned him as "in points of theological controversy an unjustly prejudiced zealot" (Jortin, Remarks on Eccl. Hist. ii. p. 120); but we cannot forget that Evagrius was a lawyer, not a theo-

logian, and that we must look from him for the popular rather than the learned estimate of the theological controversies urged with such keen-ness in his time. It is not so much in this respect that his judgment fails him as in the credulous enthusiasm which led him to ac-
cept too easily the legends of the saints then con-
stituting the spiritual nutriment of Christians. Evagrius in other respects shows many of the best qualities of a historian. He has learned from Eusebius the importance of quoting original documents; and not a few such, decrees of councils, supplications to emperors, letters of emperors, and bishops, &c., are preserved in his pages, forming most important authorities for the events to which they relate. He took great pains in collecting his materials, and sometimes made happy use of them. Goss (in Herzog) especially praises his defence of the Emperor Con-
stantine against the slanders of Zosimus.

In his general arrangement he follows the reigns of the emperors of the East from Theo-

dossius the Younger to Maurice: but the arrange-
ment of details is faulty, and in the loose heaping together of his materials, as well as in the failure to place much that he refers to in the light of any general aim, we see the want of the artistic skill of a historian. There is often, however, great spirit in the narrative, of which we have an excellent specimen in his account of the council of Chalcedon (ii. 18). The work is chiefly valuable in relation to the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, and the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The style, as may be gathered from the extract already given from the preface, is frequently turgid, but upon the whole it is good.

The History of Evagrius was first published by R. Stephens (Par. 1544); but the best edition is that of Valesius, with notes (Par. 1673). Still later, in 1720, it was reprinted at Cam-
bridge in the 4 Hist. Eccl. Scriptores eum seda Valesii et Reading. There is a fair English translation by Meredith Hammer, London, 1819, along with a translation of Eusebius and Sozomen.

[W. N.]

EVAL. ST. (ULDES), the patron saint of St. Ival in Cornwall. The parish church is on the Sunday nearest Nov. 20. The Celtic names are planted thickly on this part of the coast, and the dates of the parish feasts have been mostly preserved, while on the eastern side of Cornwall the dates have been in many cases lost (see Cressy's Church History of Brittany, ix. 19, 1).

[C. W. B.]

EVALDUS, bishop of Vienna. [EOALDE]

EVAUCIUS. [EVAUNCH]

EVAUNDER (1), a bishop of Nicomedia, in-vented by "Praedestinatus" (i. 17) as an opponent of the Ophites.

[G. S.]

EVAUNDER (2), bishop of Ursinum (Ajaccio), in Corsica, one of the nineteen bishops appointed by Constantine to bear the case submitted to him by the Donatists, A.D. 313. (Optatus, de Scism. Dom. i. 23; Aug. Opp. vol. iii. 773; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xvi. 507; Ugh. Ital. Soc. iii. 493.)

[H. W. F.]

EVAUNDER (3), one of the solitaries of the diocese of Nazianzus, highly extolled by Gregory
EVANDER

Eyasvaras as rich in the gifts of God, exceeding in purity of soul the whiteness of his grey hair. (Greg. Naz. Caron. 47, p. 108.) [E. V.]

EVANDER (4), bishop of Dicia in Phrygia Pacatiana, a town known only from the records of the councils; present at the council of Chalcedon, a.d. 451 (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 824; Mansi, vii. 157). Gama (Series Episc. 368, 440), following Fairlatt, supposes another Evander at this council, bishop of Diciae on the coast of Epirus, the modern Antivari, in Albania (Farlatt, Hagiocal Sacir. vii. 1). [L. D.]

EVANDER (5), bishop of Cnidius or Stadus, the well-known town on the peninsula of Caria; present at the fifth general council, a.d. 553. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 917; Mansi, ix. 385.) [L. D.]

EYANDRIUS, an Eastern bishop of the 5th century, addressed by Firmus archbishop of Caesarea, in his 15th letter. Firmus invites him to attend a commemoration of certain saints in Argeni. In the council of Chalcedon, a.d. 451, occurs an Evander bishop of Dicia in Phrygia (Evander (4)); but it has been thought that Dicia would be too far from Caesarea for such an invitation. (Firm. Cas. Episc. Epist. xv. Paris. Grac. lxvii. 1492.) [W. M. S.]

EVANGELIUS, bishop of the Scythians, named as "pontifex et praepositus" of the churches among those people (Vid. Patrum, cap. 16 in Pat. Lat. lxxvii. 404 c). Le Quien makes him first bishop of Timi in the time of Dioslethus, Philius being his successor (Or. Chr. i. 121). [C. H.]

EVANGELIUS (1), a presbyter, known through two letters of Jerome to him (73 and 165, ut. Vall.). Vallarini thinks he was of Africa, and was the Evangelus bishop of Assurae mentioned in the Gesta Colationum Carthaginensium (Evangelus (3)), and also the Evangelus to whom Amianus Clemens dedicated his translation of Chrysostom's Homilies (see Migues's Patr. Lat. xi. 1176). The first letter was. reduced by questions relating to Melchizedek. The second by an assertion, which Evangelus rejected, that deacons and presbyters were originally equal. This leads Jerome to develop well-known views on the three orders of the ministry. [W. H. F.]


EVANGELIUS (3) the only known bishop of paulia (Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, i. 528), also called Paulia (Vasula, Procop. de Aedif. iv. 1), in Dacia Medi-

Cenana (Wiltsch, Handbuch, i. § 88). He was set at for the emperor Anastasius, who was a zealus Eutychian, a.d. 516, in the hope that he might prevail upon him to renounce the communion of the Catholics. But, notwithstanding that Evangelus readily refused to consent to the emperor's wish, he was allowed to return to his see in peace, Anastasius, it is said, being afraid of the Illyrian soldiers who were quartered at Paulia and seem to have been greatly attached to their bishop. (Marcellin. Com. Chron. o. a. 516; Farlatt, Hagiog Sacir. vii. 77; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 307.) [T. W. D.]

EVANGELIUS (4), deacon of Sipontum, who in 593 complained to Gregory the Great that his daughter had been seduced by his bishop's nephew (Patxi. 1548); and that, having been a captive of war, he was in debt for his ransom money. Gregory directed that the bishop should discharge this debt from the property of the church if the means of Evangelus were insufficient, and that the seducer should either marry the girl or be confined in a monastery. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. iii. ind. xi. epp. 41, 43.) [C. H.]

EVANTHIUS (1), one of the judges appointed by the emperor Constantius to hear the defence of Photinius (Epiphan. Haer. lxxi. 1. Patr. Gr. xlii. 375 b). [C. H.]

EVANTHIUS (2), St., seventh bishop of Mende, succeeding St. Hilarius. He was present at the fourth council of Orleans in a.d. 541. His successor was Partenious. (Greg. Tur. Vit. Patron. de S. Gallo. c. iv. Migues, Patr. Lat. lxxxi. 1032; Gall. Christ. i. 87; Labbe, Conc. v. 1071.) [S. A. B.]

EVANUS (1), St., seventh bishop of Autun, in the first half of the 5th century. He appears in the Ascovaria of Grevenus and Molanus to Usuard on Sept. 13, on which day he is commemorated. (Gall. Christ. iv. 337; Boll. Acta SS. Sept. iv. 21.) [S. A. B.]

EVANUS (2), St., 27th occupant of the see of Vienne, succeeding Philipus and followed by St. Verus III. He was present at the first council of Macon (a.d. 581), the third of Lyons in 583, the second of Valentinia in 584, and the second of Macon in 585. There is extant a letter on the subject of abstinance from the blood of animals which was long attributed to this Evangelus, but was probably written by an archdeacon of Toledo of the same name (see the following article). He died in 586, and is commemorated by some Jan. 13, by others, including the Bollandists, Feb. 3. (Mansi, ix. 936, 943, 945, 957; Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. viii. 39; Ada, Chronicum, actus sexta (575) in Migues, Patr. Lat. cxxi. 111; Gall. Christ. xvi. 27.) [S. A. B.]

EVANUS (3), mentioned as archdeacon of Toledo about the year 720 by Isidorus Pcenasia (§ 49), who speaks in high praise of him and of his contemporaries, Froladorius bishop of Gundix and Urban preconcer (probably) of the cathedral of Toledo, three men who by their learning, wisdom, and sanctity were a great support of the church. The "doctrina" and "sapientia," of which Isidorus speaks, were displayed in a letter to the Judaising Christians of Saragossa, who refused to eat the blood of animals (conf. Adrian's letter to Egilla, ed. Etila). The letter is printed by Aquirre (Col. Max. Conc. Hisp. iii. 587), by Migues (Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 719), Caninius (Theor. Monum. tom. i. p. 522), La Bigne (Max. Affl. Patr. tom. x. 1092). (Caninius, Col. Hist. i. 540, cf. Ceiller xi. 852) and Fabricius call the author of this letter a Spanish abbot, and he is so called in the title of the letter,
EVANTIIUS

but there is no ground for "abbas" in the letter itself, and Aguirre proves that it belongs to the archdeacon. It may possibly be to this letter, or at any rate to the followers of Evantius that Egils refers, when he complains to pope Adrian that certain persons in Spain stigmatize those who refuse to eat blood or things strangled as "rudes aut ineruditi.

Evantius and Urban are also mentioned by Cilicia in his life of St. Isidore (Exp. Sup. v. p. 507) as his authorities for the miracles there described. Cilicia implies that he heard from them all that he narrates, but he does not expressly say that they were eye-witnesses as Bayer reports (l. c.). Indeed, as St. Isidore died in 636, and Isidorus Facensis places the deaths of Urban and Evantius under the era 775 (A.D. 737) this, although possible, is not very probable. Isidore speaks of them as "viri doctores et sanctimoniae studio satis pollentres," an indirect testimony to the tolerance and mildness of the early Mohammedan rule.

[M. A. W.]

EVANTIIUS (4), son of Dynamius Patricius, slain at Carthage, A.D. 589, while prosecuting an embassy to the court of Constantinople (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. x. 2).

[CH.]

EVARESTUS—Dec. 23. An inhabitant of Heraclea in Crete, martyred with several others under Decius. (Basil. Menol.)

[G. T. S.]

EVARIUS (1), king of the Visigoths. (Evario (1.).)

EVARIUS (2), one of the tribe of the Rugini who had accompanied Theodoric into Italy and always kept themselves distinct from the Ostrogoths. He was elected king by his own people after the murder of Ildibald, whom the Ostrogoths had chosen as king when Vitiges was carried prisoner to Constantinople. The Ostrogoths, however, were thoroughly discontented with the inefficiency of Evario, and called Totila, nephew of Ildibald, to be their king, Ann. 541. But Evario entered into secret negotiations with the emperor Justinian to betray Italy to him, and receive the title of prince of the Ostrogoths. During the absence of his messengers Evario was murdered by the Goths after a five months' reign, and Totila became sole king. His life illustrates one of several phases of disunion which existed among the followers of Theodoric after his death. (Procopius, de Bell. Goth. ii. 2, ed. Bonn. ii. pp. 287-290. Dahm, Die Könige der Germanen, ii. 227.)

[CH.]

EVARIUS. [Evaricius.]

EVARIUS (called Aristus in the Liberian catalogue), bishop of Rome at the beginning of the 5th century. With respect to the exact date of the inception of his episcopate, as well as the names and order of succession of his predecessors [LIMUS, ANASCLEPTUS, CLEMENT], ancient accounts are greatly at variance. Eusebius (H. E. iii. 34, iv. 1) gives Clemens as his immediate predecessor, the third year of Tranjan (101) as the date of his accession, and nine years as the duration of his episcopate: but in his Chronicle he makes the latter seven years. (Cron. iv. 1.) Ireneus, an older authority, who probably got his information when at Rome in the time of Eusebius towards the end of the century, also makes Clemens his predecessor, but gives no dates. (Adv. Haeres. iii. 3, 4.) The Liberian (A.D. 354) and subsequent Roman catalogues, as well as Augustin and Optatus, represent him as succeeding Anacleptus, and the former authorities give A.D. 96 as the commencement of his episcopate (thus beginning, according to them, in the reign of Domitian), and between thirteen and fourteen years as its duration. These discrepancies, and the absence of dates from the earliest notice by Ireneus, suggest the conclusion that Evantius is to be ranked in the group of early heals of the Roman church, of whom no authentic tradition was preserved. The conflicting accounts that have come down to us of his three predecessors seem certainly to imply a hazy tradition of their period: and that of Evantius may be taken as partaking of the same dimes, it not having been till later in the 2nd century that, along with the more complete organization of episcopal government, official records of the bishops began to be preserved. Lippus (Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe) takes this view, and adds the fact that Ireneus, in his letter to Victor about the observance of Easter, refers to the practice of Telesphorus and Xystus only, as evidence of the absence of any distinct tradition before the earlier of these two bishops, who succeeded the successor of Evantius. In the Felician catalogue (530) Evantius is described as a Greek of Antioch (his father being a Jew of Bethlehem), is said to have assigned titles (or parishes) to the presbyters of the city, to have appointed seven deacons to attend the bishop when preaching, and to have been buried near the body of St. Peter in the Vatican. Later accounts, unsupported by Ireneus, who assigns the crown of martyrdom to Telesphorus alone among the Roman bishops before his own day, make him a martyr; and as such he is venerated now on Oct. 26.

Two decretal epistles are assigned to this bishop by the Pseudo-Bisdo, both addressed to the bishops of Africa; one containing the direction about seven deacons attending the bishop when preaching, and also regulations about marriage; the other comparing the bond between bishop and pope with that between husband and wife, preserving against undue accusations of bishops, and reserving to the see of Rome the power of terminating all cases arising from such accusations.

[CH.]

EVARIX (Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. ii. 25), king of the Visigoths. (Evario (1.).)

EVASINUS, bishop of Asti, c. 775. (Cappellelleti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xiv. 87.)

EVASIUS (1) L. ST., first bishop of Asti c. A.D. 265, martyr under the praeses Statulinus, with Projectus a "levite" and Mallanus deacon. They suffered under either Gallienus or Diocletian, near the town of Sedulum, the modern Casal di S. Vaso in Liguria near the Po, and were commemorated on Dec. 1. Only two bishops of Asti of this name are recognized by Ughelli, but Cappellelleti reckons three additional ones between them, belonging respectively to the years 364, 389, 419. (Ug. Int. Soc. iv. 396;
EUVASUS


EUVASUS (2), II., bishop of Asti, c. 740. Tyros (Cod. Dipl. iv. 119) gives a record of a donation by king Liutprand to St. Euvasus (ann. 743). There is some doubt as to the donation and as to its date. It seems possible that it was made to this bishop in memory of the earlier Euvasus, bishop and martyr. (Cappellati, Le Chiesa d' Italia, xiv. 87; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 336.) [A. H. D. A.]

EUVASUS (3), one of the apparatus of the imperial authorities at the conference at Carthage, a.d. 411. (Mon. Vet. de Don. Oberthür, ii. p. 344, x. p. 466; Doraillius, 693.) [H. W. P.]

EUVASUS (4), donatist bishop of Gibrill in opposition to Quodvulteius the Catholic, at the conference at Carthage, 411. (Mon. Vet. de Don. p. 448; Morelli, Afr. Chr. i. 171.) [H. W. P.]

EVE, GOSPEL OF. A book called the Gospel of Ewe is said by Epiphanius (Haer. xxvi. p. 84) to have been current among some Gnostic sects; and from it apparently are taken two extracts which he proceeds to give. We are probably to take as mere sarcasm of Epiphanius his statement that this gospel was called after her from her having found the fruit of "knowledge" through the revelation of the serpent who spoke with her. It is more likely that we are to look for illustration to the Pericastic use of the name of Eve "the mother of all living" (Hezipp. v. 16, p. 141), and to the Ophite doctrine concerning the "first woman" (Iren. i. 39, p. 106). [G. S.]

EVELLIUS—May 11. He was a member of St. Peter's College. Converted by the sufferings of St. Torquatus, he was baptized, and therefore beheaded by the tyrant. This martyrdom is so early and genuine authorities. (Mart. Rom. Notker; Ferrarius, Catal. SS.; Bar. Andal. a.d. 69, num. 44.) [G. T. S.]

EVEMERUS (Euekerius), said to be the sixteenth archbishop of Troyes, succeeding Jumblinus and followed by St. Marcus about a.d. 480. (Hid. Obs. xii. 372.) [S. A. B.]

EVEMERUS. [Eucumertus.]

EVEUTIUS. See also Euvius.


EVEUTIUS (2), bishop of Ticinum (Pavia); who joined with Ambrose in condemning Palladius and Secundianus at the council of Aquileia, a.d. 381. (Ambrose, Opp. iii. pp. 836, 843.) He also added his signature to a letter addressed by Ambrose and a synod of Milan to Syricus, applauding his condemnation of Jovinianus and others. (Ibid. p. 1044.) [J. L. D.]

EVEUTIUS (3), bishop of Vienne. [Evan- tius (3).]


EVEUTIUS (5), a presbyter. [C. H.]

EVEUTIUS (6), bishop of Cyzicus, who held the see of the Hellespontic province, received letters, along with the other metropolitan from the emperor Leo I., ordering him to assemble his
province in synod, and to take its opinion about
the murder of St. Proterius, bishop of Alexandria, and
about the faith of the council of Chalcedon.
Evetius narrated a similar letter he received
from the emperor, which is extant, A.D. 458. (Le
Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 753; Mansi, viii. 523,
584.)

Evetius, prefect. [Evagrius (13).]

Evilasius—Sept. 20. A palace official in-
trusted with the execution of the virgin martyr
Fausta, converted by her patience, and executed
with her. (Bar. 311. xvii. s. xii.) [Fausta (20).]

[G. T. S.]

Evilla, invoked among the holy virgins
and widows in the Dunkeld Litany (Bp. Forbes,

[J. G.]

Evippus, bishop of Neocæsarea (Le Quien,
Or. Chr. i. 594). In the synodal of the pro-
vince of Pontus Polemoniacus to the emperor
Leo I in 458 Evippus signs as metropolitan
(Mansi, vii. 605). His name however does not
occur in the extant lists of the metropolitans
whose communications Leo had invited (Mansi,
vi. 523, 788). As far as now known, the sub-
fragans sees of Evippus’s province were Comana,
Polemonacum, Cœnus, all three represented in
the synodal, and Terasins, which had a bishop
at the council of Chalcedon, 451. The sees of
Irizium and Pitussa are found later. [C. H.]

Evodius. See also Evodius.

Evodius (L), according to early tradition,
first bishop of Antioc. (Euseb., Chron. arm. Abr.
2058; II. E. iii. 22.) The episcopate of Evodius
has indirectly the older testimony of Origen,
who speaks of Ignatius as the second bishop after
Peter (in Luc. Hom. 6, vol. iii. p. 938; see also
p. 2). This tradition has all the appearance of
being historical. Ignatius early acquired such
celebrity that it is not likely the name of an
unquestioned person would have been placed
before his, if the facts did not require this arrange-
ment. The language used about episcopacy in
the Ignatian epistles agrees with the conclusion
that Ignatius was not the first at Antioch to hold
such an office. As time went on, the fitness of
things seemed more and more to demand that
Ignatius should not be separated from the
Apostles. Athanasius (Epist. de SYNODIS, i. 607)
speaks of Ignatius as coming after the Apostles
without mention of any one intervening; Chrys-
sotom makes him contemporary with the
Apostles (Hom. in Ignat. vol. ii. p. 593; the
Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 46) have recourse to
the expedient adopted in the parallel case of
Clement of Rome, the hypothesis of a double
ordination, Evodius being said to have been
ordained by Peter, Ignatius by Paul. Theodoret
(Dial. l. Immuth., iv. 82, Migne) and others
represent Ignatius as ordained by Peter. The
authorities on the subject are given at length
by Zahn (Patres Apostol. ii. 327). Malalas,
252 (325), has a circumstantial story how
Peter, happening to pass through Antioch at the
time of the death of Evodius, ordained Ignatius
in his room, and how about the same time Mark
was succeeded in the episcopate of Alexandria by
his disciple Anianus, as the learned chronologist
Theophrilus related. He further ascribes to
Evodius the giving to the disciples the name of
Christians. The Theophrilus here mentioned is
doubtless he who was bishop of Antioch, a.d. 170.
We are not warranted in ascribing to him the
testimony of Malalas than that Theophrilus men-
tioned the episcopate of Anianus; an interesting
fact, from which we may probably infer that he
gave account of the succession of bishops, not
only at Alexandria but also at his own see, Antioc.

There is reason to believe that the earliest
tradition did not include an ordination even of
Evodius by Peter; for the chronicle of Eusebius places
the departure of Peter from Antioch three years,
or according to St. Jerome’s version, two years
before the ordination of Evodius. The chronology
of the early bishops of Antioch has lately been
investigated by Harnack (Die Zeit des Ignatius).
He notices that the chronicle of Eusebius does not, as in the case of the bishops of Rome
and Alexandria, accompany the name of each
bishop of Antioch with a note of the length of
his episcopate; but on the other hand it that it
does not abstain from assigning a date for the
accession of each, as in the case of the bishops
of Jerusalem, where Eusebius owns to having no
chronological information. He infers that the
earliest list must have contained only names of
bishops of Antioch without any note of length of
episcopates, but still that Eusebius must have
had the work of some preceding chronologer
to guide him. He tries to prove that this work
was the chronicle of Africanus, and also that
Africanus had without any real chronological
information put down dates for the accession of
each bishop on the old traditional list, according
to an arbitrary scheme of his own. Harnack’s
supposed discovery of the principle of this scheme
may be rejected as a mere ingenious fancy (see
Hilgenfeld’s review, Zeitschrift, 1878, p. 403);
but we may well believe that Eusebius got his
chronology of early bishops of Antioch from
Africanus, to whom he acknowledges his obli-
gation, and whose chronicle has generally been
believed to be the basis of that of Eusebius. If
the belief had been entertained at the beginning
of the 3rd century that Evodius had been ordained
by Peter it is unlikely that Africanus would have
omitted to mention the name of any
ordainer, and incredible that he would have
assigned a date to the event which absolutely
excludes an ordination by Peter. It deserves
to be remarked that the Clementine Recognitions
do not mention Evodius, though his ordination
by Peter would have been the natural termina-
tion of the work if the author had heard of any
such tradition; and also that Tertullian (de
Præscip. 32) is silent about it in a place where
we might have expected him to mention it. The
explanation of the date assigned by the chronicle
of Eusebius to the succession of Evodius is revealed,
on inspecting it in the form given by Jerome,
where we find three consecutive entries in three
consecutive years, giving the assumption by
Peter of the episcopate of Rome, and the appoint-
ment of Mark and Evodius respectively to the
bishops of Alexandria and of Antioch. It is
apparent that the chronology has no historical
basis, and that their order merely expresses the order
in dignity of the three sees in the time of the
chronologer. Thus, while we accept the episco-
pate of Evodius as a historic fact, we have
EVDIUS (3), bishop of Uasalis in prosconsular Africa, not far from Utica. (Aug. Civ. B. xiii. 21.) Born, as well as St. Augustine, at Tagaste, he became intimate with him at Milan, a.d. 385 or 386, and the friendship thus begun lasted through life. He was at first a soldier, but left the army on becoming a Christian, in which all-important change he preceded his friend. Having determined to return to Africa the two friends proceeded together as far as Ostia, where Monicas, the mother of Augustine, died. Augustine relates how, after her death, Eudius took the lead among the assembled company in chanting Ps. Prior. (Aug. Conf. iv. 8, 12.)

In the course of their subsequent lives, Augustine and Eudius frequently exchanged letters, and in two treatises written in the form of dialogues, the latter is represented by Augustine as the interlocutor with himself. One of these dialogues, De Consulate Animal, written a.d. 391, the other, De Libero Arbitrio, begun about the same time, was not finished till 395. Four letters of Eudius to Augustine are extant, numbered in the list 158, 160, 161, 163, all written about 414, and one is mentioned as having failed to reach its destination. No. 158 gives an account of the dying death in the monastery in which Eudius was then living, of a youth, his secretary, the son of Armeunas, a presbyter of Melitenes, and of an apparition of him after death to a widow named Urbea. Upon this last he proceeds to Augustine various speculative questions concerning the condition of the departed in his reply to this (Ep. 159). Augustine declares his inability to solve all his friend's questions, and refers him to his twelfth book, De Gen., which he was intending to republish. He appeals, however, to the experience of many persons as to the reality of apparitions, especially mentioning one which occurred to a young physician named Genecius, whose doubt concerning the future life had been removed thereby. In No. 160, Eudius proposes to Augustine an abstract metaphysical question as to the time in life or after the death. We cannot understand about God, he says, without the aid of reason. Therefore reason seems to be anterior in time to God, and as reason helps to demonstrate the being of God, so the Son's existence demonstrates the being of the Father. In No. 161 he proceeds further questions concerning the incarnation, and finds fault with certain expressions used by Augustine in a letter to Volusianus, which he had read in a remonstrance to the Pelagians addressed to Innocent, bishop of Rome (Aug. Ep. 177, 185). In 425 he is mentioned by Augustine as a trust-
EWA, ST.

EWOULUS, bishop of Avignon. [EULUS]

EWOULUS (Gall. Chr. ii. 500), bishop of Limoges. [EULUS]

EWOULIS (Evoortius), bishop of Zeugma in the Syrian province of Euphrates. His name appears also as Evocius, and in Greek as Eulpios. The name of his see appears also on coins as Zevgarov (Smith’s Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geogr. s. v.). Present at the council of Antioch in A.D. 448 (Harduin, Concil. ii. 515 ii), and at Chalcedon in 451. He signs the synodal letter of the latter council to Leo I. (Leo Mag. Ep. 96, 1105, Migne), but here his name appears as Evodus, bishop of Sauna, q. v. [C. G.]

EVOPTIIUS, a native of Cyrene, succeeded his elder brother Symius, as bishop of Ptolemais, the chief city of the Libyan Pentapolis, c. A.D. 430. He was one of the leading prelates at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Labbe, Concil. iv. 285), and was one of the seven bishops deputed by the Cyrillian party to lay their case before the emperor (Labbe, Concil. iii. 784). He set Cyril Theodoret’s condemnation of hisautopietas, for which courtesy Cyril thanked him in a gracious letter. (Rud. iv. 887, 480; Liberat. c. ix. 41.) [E. V.]

EVORIC, king of the Visigoths. [EURI]

EVOBTIIUS (Euvoríus), often in the English Calendar Encomius, bishop of Orleans, appearing in one Martyrology as a martyr, but in all other records as a confessor. The question of his date depends on his identification with Eortius, whose name is subscribed to the acts of the council of Valence A.D. 374. The Hollandist biographer argues at great length against this identification, and places Evoritius under Constantine; but the other opinion is maintained by Tillemont. The acts of this bishop, assigned by the Hollandist to the 6th, by Tillemont to the 8th century, are so filled with fables that nothing trustworthy can be extracted from them. (Acta SS. Sept. 7; Tillemont, Mémo. viii. 555; Gams, Spir. Ep. 592.) [R. T. S.]

EVOTUS. [SARAGOSA, MARTYRS OF.]

EVREMUND. [ESREMUND]

EVRESIUS, bishop of Termessus in the second Pamphylia, one of the Nicene fathers, a.d. 325. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1019; Mansi, ii. 695.) [L. D.]

EVRICHERIUS, bishop of Lagonia. [ERICHORES.]

EVROU, ST. [EUKULUS]

EVRITIIUS. [Euvoríus]

EWA, ST., gave name to the Cornish parish of St. Ewe, west of Mevagissey. John of Tintern, Capgrave’s predecessor in collecting the lives of the saints, spells the name “Iwy” (see appendix to Ritson’s Arthur, p. 168). The church sometimes has the prefix “La” (Flynn’s Records, iii. 202, “Laungev in Poudershires”), which seems to be prefixed in Domestay to meet of the Cornish churches of British origin that are mentioned there. [C. W. B.]
EWAIN, EWEEN. In the short prose chronicle which precedes the metrical in the Chronicle Elegiacum (Skene, Chron. Picta and Scot., 177), the following obits are given of kings of the Scots in direct lineal succession, viz., Ewan, A.D. 741; Murezau, A.D. 744; Ewen, A.D. 747; Hed (Abbub), A.D. 777; Fergus, A.D. 804. From this chronicon they appear to have been inserted in the Chronicle of Mabion (Gale, Hist. Angl. Script., t. i. pp. 136-7). But with the same or less alteration, they appear in the other Scots Chronicles (Skene, i. 130, 140, 171, 287, 305). Allowing for the uncertainty of dates and nominal forms, these are evidently Echactus (Achy, Eichold, Eugenius) III. c. A.D. 708-733; Murdock, c. A.D. 733-736; Eoghan (Achy, Eugenius), c. A.D. 736-739; Aodh Flu of Edina (Kilnianz Efinnus, by translation Hed Albus, erroneously Abbub), c. A.D. 739-769; and Fergus, c. A.D. 769-772. [J. G.]

EWALD (Creery, Ca. Hist. Brit. ix. 19, 1), Cornish saint. [EVAL] [C. H.]

EWALD. [HEWALD].

EWEM, in the anonymous fragment which forms the earliest extant life of St. Ketigern, and is acknowledged to have been the basis of Jocelin's fuller narrative, is the name of the sceler of St. Ketigern's mother, and the father of St. Ketigern. He is there called "Ewem Wergend nobilesissima Brittonum prope orus"; and again, "In gestis historiarum [historian?', vocatur Ewem filius regis Uli" (op. Forbes, S. Nin. and S. Kent. 245). Jocelin gives no name. Provo, Aberdeen, has "patre Lupio Leurthe." This Ewem or Eugenius is evidently Owein, son of Uliien Rhiwedd, whose name is so familiar in the Welsh poetry of Tales-in and other bardic works (Skene, Four Anc. Books of Wales, passim); he is the Ywaine, Ewen, Owein, Owain, of the Romances and Welsh Trials, in both of which he is represented as a bold warrior, with his father Uriance, and at last slain in battle by Frawddoc, i.e., Theudric, king of Berica (A.D. 580-587). Geoffrey of Monmouth (Hist. i. c. 1) calls him Ewancus, and represents him as the honoured friend of king Arthur, as the nephew of Angusel, king of Alba, and of Lot, the ruler of Lothian; and as himself the ruler of Moray by special gift from Arthur. It is probably from this bardic and legendary source that the anonymous writer is the time of Herbert, bishop of Glasgow, venerated to name Ewem as the father of his saintly patron and literary hero. (See Ritson, Met. Rom. iii. 225 sq.; Williams, Eumin, Welsh, 386; Rees, Welsh Saints, 261.) [J. G.]

EWINUS, ST., or Uni, brother of St. Ia, and St. Ercus, and patron saint of Uny-Lelay, in the Hayle estuary, where St. Ia landed. His festival was Feb. 1. (On the derivation of the name, see.) and the parish feast of Lelant is still on the Sunday nearest to Feb. 1, the tendency having been to move the feasts on to the next Sunday. Lelant (a corruption of Lanant) is the mother church to St. Ives (In) and Towadneck, and St. Caen, and to a small extent, to Pen-y-bont, the Episcopal seat of the neighbourhood (see Leland, Itin. iii. p. 19; Oliver's Itin. Doces. Exon. p. 75, 440, 442; Whittaker's Cathedral of Cornwall, ii. p. 4 and 99).

William of Worcester says "Sanctus Vuy (misprint for Uny), fratex sancti Herych, jacet in ecclesia parochialii Sancti Vuyi propo villam Lelant super mare borbale per tria milliaria de Mont-Meygill; ejus dies agitatur diebus Februr.ii." [C. W. B.]

EXACONITAE. [EXCOnITAE.]

EXARNS, bishop of Osnobola, who signed the acts of the council of Merida, 666, in the eighteenth year of Rekewinth. (Mansi, xi. 89; Loaiza, Concil. Hisp. ii. 533; Esp. Sfor. xiv. 215; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 267.) [M. A. W.]

EXCALCETI, superstitious people classed as heretics by Philaster (61), followed by Augustine (68). They counted it a duty to walk barefoot in obedience to God's command to Moses (Ex. iii. 5), and in imitation of Isaiah (xx. 3). [G. S.]

EXCOMMUNICATION (excommunicatio) strictly construed = the judicial act excluding individuals or churches from communion, or participation in the sacrament of the Eucharist. It is thus stronger than διωγμή, which, in fact, its effect; and more specific than ἐφορέωμεν or ἀνάθημα, though it is implied in both. For nobody was ever cast out of the church or placed under anathema who was admissible to communion; yet people were constantly refused communion without being anathematized or cast out of the church as well. Higher privileges might be suspended without involving the loss of the lower; but forfeiture of the lower presupposed that of the highest. The highest privilege to which the church could admit was the sacrament in which Christ was given and received. None with the best dispositions could be admitted to it who had not been baptized: nor any that had been baptized, but were living in unreptent sin. Probably there is no recorded instance of excommunication, as such, in the New Testament unless the command of τιμωρήσετε μηδέ συνανθρώποι (1 Cor. v. 11), interpreted by x. 29, may be supposed one; and probably the first recorded it of it in ecclesiastical history was supplied by Pope Victor in his dispute with the churches of Asia Minor about Easter—διωγμούσης ἑγορό πάνω τε οὐκ οὖν δικαιοποιήσεται ἐκκλησία. (Euseb. E.H. v. 24). This is the more curious, as the Latin word for it has really no Greek equivalent. Hence St. Athanasius, in affirming the same thing of the bishops who met at Seleucia, has to use the same phrase—διωγμούσης παντός ἐκκλησίας οὖν ἐπισκόπους. (De Syn. § 12), there being no such word in use as διωγμός. The Greeks had a delicacy, no doubt, in associating ecclesiastical censure so directly with a subject of so much awe. This is, however, the point of view to which our attention should be confined here; viz. exclusion from the sacrament, and its effects, so far as they are spiritual, and connected with the soul, according to the teaching of the Fathers. For explanations of the term in church-law, where it is commonly taken in a much wider sense, as Albaspineus has shown (Observ. Ecc. 1. i. comp. Marili. Alter. de Cons. Ecles. lib. 1. disp. ii. c. 3); and for the spiritual consequences of different times connected with it in either sense, see the Dictionary of Antiquities and of the Bible, s. v.
EXCOMMUNICATION

Remur: Ipsi praedicate et monente: "Ego sum panis vitae, Qui de coco decedisti. Si quis uberit de Meo pane, vivet in aeternum. Panis satem, quem ego dedero, caro mea est pro seculi vitii." Quandod ego dederim, neque in vitium, neque in libidinem eriderit de Eius pane, ut manifestum est eos vivere, qui corpus Eius attigant, et Eucharistiam jure communicationis accipient: ita contra temporalem est et orandum, ne dum quis abstusit separatus a Christo corpore, primo remanent a salute: communicari vel dictum est: "Nisi oeditis carmen Filii Hominalis, et bibite Ejus, non habebitis vitam in vitis." Et ideo Paschae nostrae, id est, Christum dari nobiscum quotidianis petimus, ut qui in Christo manemus et vivimus, a sanctificatione Eius et corpore non recedamus" (de Ovart. Dom. ad Verba). Such was the general view taken of this petition in primitive times, and irrespectively of the explanations given to the word τινοςεύριον. This, according to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, is τινοςεύριον, τος ουκ ηδήν της ψυχης καινακαισμούς (Cathech. xxiii. 15). It was rendered by the Latins in general "quotidianum," whence St. Isidore seeks to re-establish it (Ep. ix. 136). It is hardly possible to translate vel carna tributur, hic exposcitur... (Excl. Off. i. 15); and St. Augustine, "non miserum, si nominato pane et cetera necessaria intelligantur" (Serm. liii. § 5, ed. Ben.); but the he adds: " Ergo, panem nostrum, &c. quid est? Sic vivamus, ut ab altari tuo non separemus." And in another sermon (lxx. § 6), he asks, in reference to the next petition: "Quid est quo eramus, nisi ne malum aliquid admissamus, unde a tali pane separemus."... Thus excluding a mass from the Eucharist was thought in those times equivalent to depriving him of the daily bread of his soul; and this St. Cyril tells Pope Cornelius should never be lightly done, showing from two subjoined cases what his own practice was. The first was that of the lapsed. "Si tuerasumam jam priores, frater carissime, parti-pato iudiciem nobiscum consilio, ut qui in per-sectionibus infestatione supposito ab adversario, et lapset, ab altari tuo non separemus..." "Servi ducendum fideli agnoscunt fideles," says St. Augustine (Serm. cxxi. § 1, ed. Ben.). And as they know what they get in it, so they know, likewise, what they lose, when they are refused it on just grounds, or absent themselves from it with deliberate purpose. It was this universal instinct, doubtless, that influenced the authors of the primitive liturgies everywhere to order the recital of the Lord's Prayer by all, before communion was given; and gave rise to the tradition mentioned by pope Gregory I. (Ep. lib. ix. 12) that the apostles employed no prayer in the breaking of bread but that one: the daily bread for which they asked in that prayer being, pre-eminently, "the bread from heaven," which they received then. It was intended to be the daily food of the soul, in their opinion, as what they ate and drank was of the body. Thus St. Cyri-con: "Panem vitae Christum est... et quo modo dicimus Pater nostro, quia intelligendum et credendum Pater est, sic et panem nostrum vocamus, quia Christus eorum, qui corpus Eius contingunt, panis est. Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et Eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis et vitis vocemus, cultum vobis, insignes, delecto, dum abstent et non communicantes a celesti pane probemur, a Christi corpore separ-
rabilia ecclesiara in verbo veritatis institutor, liberum arbitrium negat esse in hominibus, quia Deo totum tribuit quodd recta vivimus? Nam quid legem Dei culpatis, quia non ex ipsa justificari hominem significat: quandoquidem quod illa iubet, a Domino Deo precibus impetrandum esse declarat? . . . (C. Ep. Past. v. 9). The baptized had only to ask for grace to be kept from sin. They were, therefore, considered to be doubly responsible before God, whenever they sinned by choice; and to be barred from the Eucharist by every such sin till it had been forgiven. How then, was forgiveness of such sins to be had? By "the ministry of that reconciliation," as the apostle calls it (2 Cor. v. 18-19), wherewith "God had reconciled the world to Himself in Christ," committed by Christ to his church. As Theodoret has paraphrased his meaning: "Εδόθησαν τοις διαμαρτυρηματι της ἁμαρτίας, ημεῖς δέ, ἐπουραγησάμενοι της ἐνεργείας ἐξοριστώμενοι. One of St. Cyril's paraphrases of the Lord's (John xx. 21-3): "Summing up the institution of the apostleship in a few words, He tells them, that He sends them as the Father had sent Him; that they might thus feel it to be their duty to call sinners to repentance, and heal those that were sick in mind, spirit, soul, and body, and ever seek in their ministry, not their own will, but the will of Him who sent them, and do their utmost to keep the world in His teaching." . . .

It was in the spirit of this injunction that a system of canonical discipline was gradually framed for those who had fallen into such sins as should exclude them from the Eucharist: for those to whom there could be no doubt those words of the apostle would apply: "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Such spying the church would have to itself, as well as to her members, to prevent. "Quod non statim Domini corpus iniquitatis manibus acceptum, aut ore polluto Domini sanguinem bibat, sacerdotibus sacrilegus frustratur," says St. Cyprian of the lapsed of his day. And again, more fully: "Quocunque occurrit scriptura Divina, si in imperio spirituale manducavit carnem et anima quacunque manducaverit ex carne sacrificii salutaris, quod est Domini, et immuniqvia ipsius super ipsum est, peribit anima illa de populo suo" (Lev. xii. 19, 20). Apostolus item testetur et dicit: "Non potestis calicem Domini bibere, et calicem de moderatorum: non potestis mettere Domini communicare, et mensa demoniorum" (1 Cor. x. 21).

Idem contumacijs et pervicacibus comminutus et deidentur, dicebant: "Quicunque ederit panem aut biberit calicem Domini indignus, reus est corporis et sanguinis Domini" (ib. xii. 27): spondet his omnius et contemptis, ante expiata delicta, ante exonomologesim factam criminis, ante purgatis sanctiam sacrificio et manu sacerdotis, ante offensam placatam indignantis Domini et minantis, vis infirmitur corpi Ejus et sanguini: et plus modis in Dioymum manibus atque ore deliquans, quam cum Domini negaverant. . . . (De iustitiis cap. iii. 21).

The public opinion finally was unanimous with the church in putting a bar between all such offenders and the church's holiest rite: and was content that the church should decide what that bar should be. Public opinion went with the priest in all ages, though . . .
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An inhibition, in the words of St. Ambrose: "Apostolus docet ut separemus nos ab omni fraude iniqui. Agentem. Perciaciamus eum gladio spirituali, qui est Verbum Dei. Non fratri, non prope frater, qui est Verbum Dei: sed eum non immundum a Christo secernamus altari, ut emendet et corrigat lapsus suos, quid ac sacramento Christi redire mereatur" (De Ep. et Ex. § 82). As he told the emperor Theodosius to his face: "I dare not offer the sacrifice, should you elect to be present: for how can what is unlawful for the slayer of one innocent person be conceded to the slayer of many?" ... (Ep. 51, ed. Ben.). "Or how will you extend hands reeking with blood unjustly spilt to receive the Lord's body: or approach the mouth, that illegally sanctioned the slaughter of so many persons in wrath, to His precious blood? Withdraw, then: and far from endeavouring to aggravate one crime by another, accept the sentence which God, the Master of all things, confirms: its whole design being to promote your cure" ... (Theodor. H. H. v. 18). Even when soldiers were sent by Valentinein, in the Arian interest, to occupy his church, his orders were: "ut abstinenter a communionis consortio" (Ep. I. § 20). For, as he says elsewhere: "Sequestrari, oportet graviter lapsum, ne medicum fermentum totam massa curruptum... Et benedicat 'expurgandum,' non proficiendum: quod autem ministrum, non totum jussit. Ideo enim purgatum, ut utile et inutilis separaretur. Quod autem projiciatur, nihil in se utile habere creditur" ... (De Poen. i. 15). And there was yet a further limitation which was always implied: viz. that nobody should be so debased for offences that were not either proved or owned. The acts of Theodosius, and of the soldiers of Valentinein, were public acts that proved themselves. Bishops might use too much precipitation in cases that were less obvious. "Et ita fit," as Origen says (In Lev. xiv. 3), "ut interdum ille qui feritas minitatur, intus sit: et ille foris qui intus retinet se: ... atque epidem in Data. Most of our brethren were of that age, when St. Augustine was most explicit on this point. "Nos a communione prohibere quenquam non possimus," he says (Serm. ccxi. § 10), "quamvis haec prohibito nonudum sit mortalis, sed medicinalis, nisi aut sponte confessamus, aut in aliquo, sive secaculii sive ecclesiasticorum, iudicio nosse. Sibi remanerit quidem in utrumque sudeb assumere, ut cuiquum ipsa sit et ascensus et iudex." One effect of this caution on the part of the church would of course be, that three parts of the crimes committed would escape punishment, if not observation, unless voluntarily confessed; and thus every person would be left to shift as it suited his own fitness to communicate — in most cases: in all cases, that is, where the sin committed was not one of those prescribed in the canons, and for which consequently no canonical penalty was incurred. Offenders of this sort naturally formed a large and important body, that all believed in some degree understood themselves to be debarred, ipso facto, not merely from communicating, but from worshipping with the faithful in any way, till they had performed their penance to the satisfaction of their bishop, which, of course, could not be done without making known their sin, and during the whole period under consideration this was a public act, and there was a set time for performing it. As St. Eligius, bishop of Noyon (A.D. 640) has it in the first of his homilies at Maudry Thursday: "Ut igitur audire vestra dictio, haec omnis pedem lotus nostrorum conciliorum est magnum inconstantiam ipse die, sicut ecclesiae tenet consuetudo, pesientiam fit reconciliatio. Ut enim autam nos dis- tum est a Patribus, cum tanta est plaga pecati atque impetus morbi, ut medicamenta corpore eae sanguinis Domini differenda sint, auctoritate antistitis debet se quiesque ab altario renoveris, quod ad legam penitentiam, et eodem auctoritate reconcile- liari. Lectum quippe modo est: 'Quis man- ducet et bibit indignum,' &c. Hoc enim est indicia illud accipere qui accipiet te tempo, quod debeat penitentiam agere. Ut mihi ad vos, 0 fratres, nunc habebundis est sermo, quos sancte pres- ses ecclesia nostre officio hodiern reconcilest Deus... In reconciliatione autem vestra, nobis estis episcopos attendere ut auctores, sed ut ministri: nam quis sit auctor manifestatur sedregnum. doctor... 'Omnia autem ex Deo, Qui reconciliavit nos sibi per Christum... Exercet omnes... Servus Christi... (ap. Migne, Patrolog., lxxxvii. 610.) However, even such offenders might at times honestly doubt whether they had actually sinned to the extent contemplated in the canons: as, for instance, where their sin had been committed under compulsion or without full purpose or knowledge of its gravity, or had been but half executed. And for the greater number of sins by far, there would be no external standard of any sort to gauge their precise gravity. In all such cases the church was content to insist on the general duties of self-examination and repentance, leaving, or rather committing, the execution of both to the individual conscience, where consciences were willing and strong enough to act for themselves, but always giving everybody the option of having recourse to her minis- ters for the exercise of those powers with which they had been entrusted by Christ. For sometimes it was held that a man might be severely wronged with themselves in particular cases that was required, or were possessed by a morbid feeling of their general unworthiness and need to be reassured; of such St. Ambrose says, "Severeiores in se judices sunt qui posse praescribunt sibi, declinant remedium" (De Poen. i. 9). Quoddam enim sit in antiquo, si manus, iniuriae, ut, De Est.}
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iv. 6). Besides, the invitation was to all, as Theodoret says: "He calls the Lord's sacrifice the Lord's Supper, as being partaken by all equally, whether rich or poor, slaves or masters, rulers or subjects... open to all alike is the Lord's table." (I Cor. xi. 20); and St. Chrysostom: "The Lord's Supper," that is, "the Master's, ought to be common to all. For what belongs to the master is not the property of one servant more than another, but is shared by all alike (I. v. 21). Again, why should he remind us of that time, of that evening, when Christ was betrothed to his bride? You might wonder if any rapacious plunderer, or ungodly luxury, or unrighteousness might be excited in us from such remembrance? For let a person be a very stone, yet he could not think of Him on that night, first sorrowful with His disciples, then betrayed, bound, led away, condemned, and tormented to the extent He was, without feeling himself mired inwardly like wax, and becoming dead to the things of this world. To you I would apply, as to the Eucharist, this saying that you do not give way to excess, but perhaps to less. You do not allow yourself to be disturbed by the mercy you have received; live then accordingly, and be at one with your neighbour... (Ib. v. 24). Consider how the apostles employed themselves, whenever they partook of that holy feast; what time they devoted to prayer and psalm-singing; how they kept holy vigil... and do you consider yourself fasting to communion merely that you may appear in some sort fit to receive; but when you have received, instead of continuing your moderation, let it all go. Whereas, it is not of equal moment to be sober after and before, for you should be sober both; but, of the two, most after having received the Bridegroom. You should be sober before receiving, in order to become worthy to receive; and after, in order not to appear unworthy of what you have received. What then? Should you fast after you have received? I don't see that. I would not force; I would simply show that I have a good conscience. I would be merely to say that you do not give way to excess... (Ib. v. 27). But "let a man prove himself." As he says in his 2nd Epistle: "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove yourselves" (2 Cor. xiii. 5): not as we do now; instructed rather by the time of year, than by zeal of heart. For our thought is not to prepare ourselves so that we may be come filled with composure and purged from all our sins, but so that we may come on great festivals, and when everybody else comes. Such, however, was not the teaching of the apostle, whose one concern for coming to communion was a pure conscience. For a festival, according to his teaching, was a manifestation of good works, uprightness of mind, and irreproachable conduct; possessed of these, you will be able to keep festival at all times, and to come to communion at all times too. It is for this reason he says: "I pray for myself, and for them that hear me," in other words, he bids each man not to have recourse to another, but to prove himself, directing the tribunal to be without publicity and the proof without witnesses... (Ib. v. 28).

As Theodoret has it: "Be your own judge, and take accurate account of all the acts of your life; examine your conscience, and so receive the gift." (Ib.). One possible result of this teaching, of course, would be that the bad might frequently communicate side by side with the good. So they might, replies the Fathers, but it would be no more than Judas had done at the outset. Oi μόνοι οι θεωκα ἀπόστολοι, ἢλλα καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, τῶν μικρῶν μετεώρον ἁματος τα καὶ ἀματος, as Theodoret says of our Lord on that occasion (Ib. v. 23-25), and St. Augustine was at no loss to discriminate between what each got by communicating. "Namquid Judas," he asks, "Magistri vobis et traditor impius, primum ipsum manibus ejus consuetudinem carnis et sanguinem Eius cum ceteris discipulis, sicut aportius Lucas evangelista declarat, manducaret et biberet, manus in Christo aut Christus in eo? Tam multe denique quia vel corde ficto carce illam manducaret et san- guinem bibit, vel cum manducaverint et biberint, apostatae sint, namquid manent in Christo aut Christus in iis?... (Sermon. lxii. § 17). For the Fathers, as they recognised two distinct parts in this sacrament, the outward and the inward, and made the Holy Ghost exclusively the source of the inward grace, this difficulty whatever in reconciling a real objective presence, as it is called, after His descent on the elements, with the reception of the outward part alone by every receiver, whose heart He found closed to the inward, that is, to Christ (art. EUCHARIST, near the end). Hence they denounced coming to communion for false purposes or in unrepeated sin, as tridling with God in its worst form. "Not only," says Theodoret, "will you get no salvation from it by receiving unlawfully, but you will have penalties to pay for coming to it as a drunkard" (Ib. v. 29); and again, "if we took account of our acts, and delivered a just verdict against ourselves, we should not receive chasiment from God; still even for the greatest offences He corrects us with mercy, to the end that we may not be given over to the destruction of the wicked" (Ib. v. 31). St. Ambrose adopts a sterner tone: "It is not your judgment whether virtue or sin is hidden, unless he has a wedding garment on, or faith combined with love. He, therefore, who brings not peace and charity with him to Christ's altar will be bound hand and foot, and thrust into outer darkness" (in Luc. vii. § 204). In the same spirit he says in another place (De Poen. l. 15): "Be not deceitful, neighbour, and separate a Christi corpore;" and in another: "Etideo nempe in peccato positus arrogare sibi debet auctoritatem aut usurpationem sacramen- torum... (Ib. ii. 11), in other words, if a priest, let him not administer; if a layman, let him not receive for communion..." There were thus, according to the Fathers, three descriptions of excommunicate persons in the sacramental, or strict, sense of the word:—

1. Persons excluded from the Eucharist by their bishop, or his superiors. 2. Persons excommunicating themselves virtually, by staying away when they were not invited, or by persons receiving in sin, whose mouths therefore received the sacrament, and yet the "res sacramenti" was never conveyed to their souls. Of these, the first might, as has been said, be debarred from the sacrament ever so long, without losing Christ, while the lust could never, by...
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receiving the sacrament ever so often, attend to Christ. Of the first, on the other hand, all who were justly debarred and of the second all who wilfully debarred themselves from it, became spiritually diseased; and unless they repented in time, they would die at last. At first it was merely that their spiritual growth was arrested: but, in process of time, decay set in; the living bond that held them to Christ was detached fibre by fibre, till at length the branch and the vine parted company. "Unum de duobus palmiti congruit," as St. Augustine says: "aut vitis, aut vires; si in disciplina, nec vires, ut erige in igne non sit, in vite sit."

(In Joham. c. xiv.; Tract. 81, § 3.)

In this the Fathers argued on principles of analogy from nature to grace, or from one channel of grace to another, as on kindred points. For if by a real participation of Adam's nature, we were truly liable to death; we needed a real participation of His nature, who is the second Adam, to be able truly to live again. The supernatural life sown in us at our baptism, moreover, needed supernatural alimentation to expand and grow; and the more so, the more generous, proportionably to the constant and copious, or the scant and stint supply that it received. Food likewise, they said, was only profitable to the body, when it was assimilated and taken up by the system: the purest and best food was powerless to impart vigour, and might be death, to a diseased frame. Water was the sacramental element under which new life was conveyed to man: bread and wine the sacramental elements under which its choicest aliment was assured to it: the Holy Ghost, finally, the agent and dispenser of both. In His hands, whatever might be the acts of His fallible ministers, neither could ever be stolen on false pretences: nor any defrauded of either, whose dispositions entitled them to their full benefit. Such were the principles by which the Fathers were guided in dispensing or withholding the Eucharist: and as long as principle and practice went hand in hand, it is the Church's right to require the other. In our days, truth is veritas, exommeunicatur. Romanii similiter communicant qui volunt: qui autem solutur, nos excommunicantur..." (Capit. collect. ex Frog. in Migne, Patro. xci. 955.) And Amalarius, presbyter of Metz, as late as the 9th century, writes to his friend Guatrad: "It is ordered in the canons that all who come to church should communicate; or failing to do so, should state their reason: which being found satisfactory should excuse them, otherwise they should be excommunicated. Now I learn that you have cast your anchor at sea, and not in port. For you have fixed it in Gennadius, bishop of Hareselles. Let me beg of you to fix it in the safe harbour of St. Augustine, as is confessed by all the churches. Gennadius counselled your communicating on Sundays chiefly, because, perhaps, it was not his custom to celebrate the Eucharist every day... Justa Augustinum, quasque fidibus tibi susurras, et in te sempiternam communionem less frequent. Auricular confession produced similar effects later in the West. St. Isidore shews his sense of this, by repeating and supplementing St. Augustine (Ep. liv. § 4), in what follows: "Ceterum si non sunt tanae pec- cata, ut excommunicandus quisque judicetur, non se debet a medicina Domincorum corporis separare, ne dum forté diu abstinentus prohibetur, a Christi corpete separetur; manifestum est enim eoe vivere, qui corpus Ejus attingat. Unde etiam timendum est, ne dum diu quiescet separatus a Christi corpore, aliusque remanet a salute, igitur dicente, 'Nec omnem, nec carnem Filii hominum,' etc. Qui enim jam peccare quierit, communicare non desinit..." (De Ecol. Of. I. 18). A later writer of the same school (append. ad op. St. Isid. ed. Migna, de Ecol. Dogm. c. 53), says: "Quotidie Eucharistiae communemone perceipere nec laude, nec reprehendo. Si in omnibus diebus non communis, et ignes est, Ut ergo in igne non sit, in vite sit."
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mon lived in an age when excommunication had been degraded almost to the level of impounding cattle: and when people were refused the Exhilarat for personal disputes about the goods of this world, often or for anything else; or for a thousand things, at any rate, besides sin. The president of the 4th Lateran council takes credit for the "salutary statute" as he terms it, which he there promulgated, and ordered to be published in all churches, lest any should excuse themselves through ignorance from conforming to it; his behest being, that all the faithful of either sex should make their Easter communion at least in every year: still even so, they must all have previously confessed in private to their priest: who might, at his discretion, bid them abstain from communicating even then: and nobody could pronounce on their fitness, but one licensed by him (can. 21). The broadest way, and the widest gate, as the other canons testify, for gaining or regaining admission to the highest privileges of the church militant was then to take part in the incessantly bawled jubilee war.


[2. S. P.]

EXERESIS, bishop of Gerasa, in Arabia, one of the Acacian party at the synod of Seleucia, A.D. 359, and at the council of Constantinople, 360. (Epiph. Haeres. ixxii. 20; Nazian, iii. 324; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 861.)

[2. E. V.]

EXHILARATUS (1), episcopus Metaurensis, according to Cappelleti (Le Chiese d'Italia, iii. 189), bishop of Urbino, signing the second letter of pope Agatho, sent in 890 after a synod is Rome to the third council of Constantinople. (Nazian, xi. 314.)

[2. H. D. A.]

EXHILARATUS (2), a Sicilian bishop, concerning whom pope Gregory the Great writes to Basilus, the defender at Panormus in 603. The proceedings of Exilaratus had been frequently reported to Gregory; bishop Leo, who had been judge in his cause, had twice tightened his punishment; Gregory had summoned him to Rome, and dealt severely with him. On sending him back to his church Gregory directs Basilus to keep an eye upon him, and admonish him to behave with charity towards his clergy while correcting their faults; the clergy on their part were to be warned against insolent and uncommissive behaviour towards their bishop. Exilaratus had evidently been a tyrannical disciplinarian. (Greg. Mag. Epp. lib. xiv. ind. vii. ep. 4. Patr. Lat. ixxvii. 1306.)

[2. C. H.]

EXHILARATUS (3), duke of Naples, which is his time was almost the only place in Italy continuously under the power of the Byzantine emperors. In A.D. 726 or 727, during the time when Italy generally was in a state of revolt against the emperor Leo, on account of his decree against image worship, Exilaratus, with his son Hadrian, led an attack on Campania, and tried to persuade the inhabitants to join him in an attempt upon the pope Gregory II.'s life. A body of Romans came out against him and took him and killed him with his son. (Vita Gregori II. in Liber Pontificiorum, Migne, ccxviii. 581.)

[A. H. D. A.]

EXHILARATUS (4), an officer whom Gregori the Great in 594 was going to employ in the affair of Maximos the invading bishop of Salona (Greg. Mag. Epp. lib. iv. ind. xii. ep. 47). He appears to be the person whom in another letter (lib. vii. ind. xii. ep. 32) Gregory, 597, terms a "secundicerius" (vid. Du Cange, Glossar, sub voc.), through whom the presbyter Anastasius sends Gregory his benediction (Patr. Lat. ixxvii. 772, 890 c).

[C. H.]

EXITIOSUS, a secretary at the conference at Carthage, A.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. de Don. Oberhaut, pp. 344, 466.)

[H. W. P.]

EXITZIOSUS, bishop of Veri, in the province of proconsular Africa. One of the catholic bishops summoned to a conference at Carthage with the Arians by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 484, and was there burnt to death.

(Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 351; Victor. Vit. Notitia, 55, Patrol. Lat. xviii. 772.)

[L. D.]

EXOCHIUS. [EXOTUS.]

EXOCIONITARUS, EXOCIONITARUS in Theod. Haer. Fab. iv. v. 3), an Arian sect, so called from the district of Constantinople where they had churches outside (Eoia) the pillar (closer) of Constantine, and hence called "Exocionites" or "Eoicuminum" (Codinus, de Signis Constantin. p. 46, ed. Bonn; Du Cange, Constantinop. Christ. lib. ii. p. 153; Suicer, Theol. s. v. "Exocionites"). They seem to have been Eunomians. A.D. 379 Theodocius expelled them from the churches which they had hitherto occupied, and bestowed them upon the Catholics (Socrates, H. E. v. 20; Chron. Pasch. a. s. c. Cod. Just. i. v. 20). Justianus, however, made an exception in their favour when he suppressed the assemblies of all other heretics (Ceiling, Hist. Compend. p. 645 ed. Bonn). Alaric, the son and successor of Theodoric, is called an Exoconite as being an Arian (Chron. Pasch. a. s. 468.)

[T. W. D.]

EXOTUS (EXOCHIUS, EXOTUS), thirteenth bishop of Limoges, following Rubicius II. and succeeded by St. Ferreolus, or, according to some, tenth. He is only known as the subject of a most laudatory epistle by Venantius Fortunatus, from which we learn that he sat fifteen years. (Venant. Fort. Miscell. iv. 6; Migne, Patrol. Lat. ixxvii. 157; Gall. Christ. ii. 503.)

[S. A. B.]

EXPECTATUS, ninth bishop of Fréjus, succeeding Desiderius, and followed by Asterius, or, according to a conjecture of Le Coite, by Epiphanius. (Cf. Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. vi. 24.) At the fifth council of Orleans (A.D. 549) he was represented by this Epiphanius, a priest, and was present in person at the fifth of Aries (A.D. 554) and the second of Paris (civ. A.D. 555). Nothing further is known of him. (Le Coite, Hist. Franc. an. 582, a. xii. tom. ii. p. 233; Nazian, iii. 137, 703, 740; Gall. Christ. i. 424.)

[S. A. U.]

EXODUS, in the Bible, is the 13th book of the Old Testament. It contains the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, their journey through the wilderness, and the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. It is divided into five parts: the wilderness, the book of Numbers, the book of Deuteronomy, and the book of Joshua. The book of Exodus begins with the story of Joseph, who was sold into slavery by his brother Benjamin, and later became the viceroy of Egypt. When Egypt was threatened by a famine, Joseph recommended his brother Benjamin to his father, Jacob. Jacob and his family then went to Egypt, where Joseph welcomed them. The Israelites soon became a large and powerful group, and Joseph's brother Benjamin, called Pharaoh, gave them land and resources. Eventually, Pharaoh's son, Pharaoh, became unhappy with the growing power of the Israelites and planned to destroy them. However, his prime minister, Moses, warned him of the danger, and Pharaoh was convinced to release the Israelites. Moses then led the Israelites out of Egypt, and to the Red Sea, where they crossed over to the land of Canaan. During this period, Moses received the Ten Commandments and other religious laws. The book of Exodus is an important source of information about the Israelites and their religious beliefs. It is also a key text in Jewish and Christian tradition.
EXUPERIUS (8), a bishop of Derbea, present at the council of Aquileia, A.D. 381 (Mansi, iii. 600). He was thirteenth bishop, and succeeded Joannes. His first known successor was Martinianus II. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 627; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, iii. 692.) [C. H.]

EXUPERIUS (9), a Roman soldier, to whom Jerome wrote (Ep. 145), exhorting him to give up his calling and to come with his brother Quintilian and follow the more perfect life of monachism at Bethlehem. Palladius says that Exuperantius came to Bethlehem, but was, after a time, driven away by the violence and envy of Jerome. (Palladius, Hist. Lausi. c. 80.) [W. H. F.]

EXUPERIUS (10), a certain bishop who had the rashness to erect and dedicate an oratory in the diocese of another bishop, Joannes. On this subject pope Gregory the Great writes to Joannes the subdeacon of Ravenna. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. xiii. ind. vi. ep. 17. Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 1272.) Cappelletti (Le Chiese d'Italia, xv. 94) places him among the bishops of Parma. [C. H.]

EXUPERIA, martyr at Rome under Valerian in 258, with Sempronius, Olympius, and others; commemorated July 26 and October 31. (Rom. Murt.; Baronius, Annuall. ann. 259, xxx. ed. Theiner.) [C. H.]

EXUPERIUS (2), the standard-bearer and companion in martyrdom of St. Maurice, the leader of the Theban legion, A.D. 286, commemorated Sept. 29. *Ursus; Rom. Martyr.* [MAURICIUS.]

His body was translated in the 10th century to the monastery of Gembloux, by Guilbertus the founder, by whom it was dedicated in honour of St. Peter and St. Exuparius (Molain. Nat. SS. Sept. 29).

[G. T. S.]

EXUPERIUS (3), first bishop of Bayeux, is reported to have been sent by St. Clement. But this is only an instance of the tendency of the Gallic churches to claim an apostolic or sub-apostolic origin. Exuperius really belongs to the latter part of the 4th century, when the sees of Erceux, Lisieux, and Coutances were formed, with Rouen for metropolitan. In the disturbed times of the invasions of the Northmen the body of this bishop was removed to a quiet resting-place, and finally deposited at Corboliun (Corbeil), where, as well as at Bayeux and other places, it is invoked under the names of Suspirius, Spiritus, or Spire. Many miraculous details are given in biographies of later centuries. He appears in the title of the Bollandist life (and there in Potthase) as bishop of Corboliun. *Acta SS. Aug. 1; Gall. Christ. xi. 347.*

[R. T. S.]

EXUPERIUS (4), a rhetor at Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Narbonne. He was made prelate of Spain by the Dalmatian Caesars, whom he had instructed. Baronius (A. E. ann. 406, xxxv.) maintains that he was the bishop of Toulouse mentioned by St. Jerome. Others, however, maintain that he was made bishop of Cahors, where according to Ausonius (Profess. Bardig. 11, Pat. L. xix. 558) he died. But the words of Ausonius do not imply that he was bishop in Cahors, and the Sammaranthi believe that the bishop was a different person from the rhetorician, who made a fortune in Spain, and simply retired to Cahors for tranquillity. *Gall. Christ. l. 116; Tilletmon, Mon. x. 823.*

[R. T. S.]

EXUPERIUS (5), bishop of Toulouse in the beginning of the 5th century. He was known to Jerome, who dedicated to him his Commentary on Zechariah, and who urged his friend Faustinus (Ep. lvi. 11), A.D. 394, to profit by his instructions, in order to "behave sedately et fideliter." We infer from this that he lived at Rome before his episcopate. He was a man of great simplicity of life, and carried this simplicity also into the appliances of Christian worship, so that Jerome praises him (Ep. cxxv. 20) as the custos out of avarice from the temple. Jerome also (Bibl.) sets him forth as an example to Rusticus, afterwards bishop of Narbonne, who was leading an ascetic life in his diocese. He applied to pope Innocent for advice on various points of discipline, and on the question what books should be held to be canonical. Three replies were sent, in a letter dated Feb. 405 (Inn. Ep. vi.), answering his questions clearly, and giving the scriptural books as they are now received, excluding the Apocrypha. Exuperius appears to have suffered great losses, but to have made them the means of a noble Christian independence (Jerome, Ep. cxxv. 20). He was held in high esteem, and is reckoned as a saint by the Roman church. (Ceillier, vii. 511.)

W. H. F.]

EXUPERIUS (6), eighth bishop of Limoges, following Dativus and succeeded by Astidius, or according to Gams (Ser. Episc. 694), tenth, succeeding Adeleus. The authors of the Gallia Christiana (1891) give a catalogue to show the effect that he suffered much from the Arians during the thirty-five years of his episcopate in the reign of Constantius. *S. A. B.*

EXUPERIUS (7), follows Eutropius in the list of bishops of Coutances, c. A.D. 475. *Gall. Christ. xi. 864.*

[R. T. S.]

EYNARDUS. [Einhard.]

EZEKIEL, a Jewish writer, the author of a dramatic work in Greek iambics, called the Ἐγκρυπτή, the subject being the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. All that can be asserted with certainty as to his date is that he was anterior to Clement of Alexandria, who quotes some fragments (Simplic. l. 25, p. 414). Eusebius (Praep. Ev. lxi. 28, 29) also gives these fragments, together with several others. The last, which contains an account of the appearance of a wonderful bird (apparently suggested by the ambiguity of the word φωτις, Ex. xv. 27), is copied also by Eustathius (ad Hezician. p. 25). It has been conjectured that an anonymous fragment in iambics, given by Epiphanius (Hemer. 64, p. 544), may have formed part of the prologue to the same work. The fragments have been well restored by Gaisford in his edition of the Praep. Ev. For earlier editions see Fabricius's Bibl. Gr. ii. 305, ed. Harles, and Heinichen's note ad loc. The fragments are given also in Didot's Antiques Classici, forming part of the appendix to Euripides.

[G. S.]

EZIUS (IZIUS, EZZIUS), abbot of St. Peter's at Juwavia (Salzburg). According to Hund he was consecrated in 696 as fifth bishop of Salzburg, ruled twenty-five years, and was buried in the church of his monastery. (Hund, Metrop. Salzburg. l. 2.) Potthast and Hansi follow Mabillon in excluding him from the list of bishops (Hansin, Genn. Socr. ii. 68, 70; Potth. Bibl. suppl. p. 398).

[C. H.]

EZNIK (EZIA, ENID), in the name of an Armenian doctor of the church in the 5th century. His native place was Koghb or Kolp (whence he was called the Kolpensian), and he himself a disciple of the patriarch Sahak (Isaac) and Mgecrops, the preceptor Armenie. Besides his mother tongue he understood Persian, Greek, and Syriac. In the course of long journeys through Syria, Mesopotamia, and Greece, he added to his stores of theological learning, and made himself thoroughly acquainted with ecclesiastical literature. We find him later raised to the rank of bishop. In this capacity he took part in the synod of Artaohast, A.D. 450, which expelled the demands of the Persian viceroy, and to which he added, that the Armenians should adopt the Zoroastrian religion, in an epistle marked with dignity, courage, and faith.

He died an aged man, as bishop of Ragwrand.
in his answer to a letter from the Roman clergy informing him of their bishop's martyrdom, speaks of the "glorious departure of the good man, his way, the arrival that his honourable consummation had corresponded to the integrity of his administration" (Ep. 39). The Roman clergy also, writing to Cyprian, deprecate their want of a bishop "for controlling all things in those times of difficulty, and for treating the lapsed with authority and judgment, and the departure of Fabian of most noble memory" (Ep. 30).

In the Liberian Catalogue (A.D. 354) he is said to have divided the regions (of the city of Rome) among the deacons, to have caused many fabrics to be made through the cemeteries, and to have suffered martyrdom on the 20th January, 250. In the Felician Catalogue (A.D. 530), and in later editions of the Liber Pontificalis, it is added that he made also seven subdecanies to superintend the seven notaries who are previously mentioned as having been appointed by the earlier bishop Cyprian. The conflict between Armenian Christianity and Parism. The sources whence he derived his knowledge of the latter appear to have been not the sacred literature of the Parsees themselves, but the popular form which the Zoroastrian faith had at that time assumed in Persia. The fourth book is moreover of interest and value for the history of heresy. The representation here given of the Marcionite doctrine of Principia, and the various myths regarding the origin of the human race, its corruption by matter, the mission of Christ, His crucifixion, descent into hell, and victory over the Demiurg, contain much that is peculiar and characteristic, but much also that belongs not to the original forms of Marcionism but to some of its later developments. Of Eznik's Homilies nothing has been preserved, while on the other hand a whole series of Exhortations or Moral Sentences exist as a kind of appendix to his Devision of Faits and Doctrines. These are by others attributed to Nilus.

[R. A. L.]

FABIANUS (I), (called by the Greeks and in the Liberian Catalogue FABIUS, by Eutychius and in the Alexandrian Chronicle FLAVIAN) bishop of Rome early in February, A.D. 236 to January 20, A.D. 250, and contemporary with the emperors Maximin, Gordian, Philip the Arabian, and Decius, under the last of whom he suffered martyrdom. Eusebius relates that all, the brethren being assembled in the church to choose a successor to Anterus, Fabianus, then a layman lately come to Rome from the country, was pointed out as the chosen of Heaven by a dove settling on his head, wherupon all the people, moved with one divine inspiration, declared him worthy by acclamation, and at once placed him on the episcopal throne (H. E. vi. 29). A similar story was told also in connexion with the consecration of the successors of the deceased (21).

That the choice proved a good one may be concluded from the testimony of Cyprian, who,
tion of the title (Roma Soterrorum, by Northcote and Browne).

In connection with the buildings (fabricæ) assigned by the good authority of the Liberian Catalogue to Fabianus may be quoted the statement contained in the Philosophumenon, attributed to Hippolytus, to the effect that Zephyrinus (his own contemporary, and Bishop of Rome, some 20 years before Fabianus) "had entrusted Callicius with the government of the clergy, and set him over the cemetery." (Philosoph. ix. 11.) This is a further evidence of the careful provisions made by the bishops of the 3rd century for the decent burial of Christians. The cemetery entrusted to Callicius is supposed by De Rossi to have been one common to all the Christians of Rome, at that time given to the church by some noble family, and to be clearly identified with the catacomb called the Coemeterium Callici, already alluded to, on the Appian Way. Over this newly acquired burial-place De Rossi concludes the pope to have placed Callicius (who as stated above was also the president of the clergy), so as to satisfy the law which required recognized burial confessions to be represented by a deacon and subdeacon. This view is confirmed by the fact of Victor, the predecessor of Zephyrinus, being the last pope said to have been buried on the Vatican, thirteen out of his eighteen successors having been deposited in this new cemetery. The cemeteries which Fabianus provided with buildings may have been others given afterwards by wealthy individuals after the example thus set, the buildings being oratories, or structures in provision for the guardianship of the tombs. The further statement, above mentioned, about the seven deacons, subdeacons, and deacons, though but partially supported by the early authority of the Liberian Catalogue, may still be regarded as expressing a true tradition of the early provision made for preserving records of martyrs.

Fabianus is specially named by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 36) as one among many other bishops to whom Origen wrote in defence of his own orthodoxy. Cyprian mentions him (Ep. 59) as having, with Donatus bishop of Cartagin, written a letter severely censuring one Frumentius, a heretical bishop of Lambessa in Numidia, who had been condemned by a synod of ninety bishops at Lambessa for "many and grievous faults."

What has been so far mentioned comprises all that is known about Fabianus with certainty. Doubt, and more than doubt, rests on the story (accepted by Andrea da Chesne, in Vol. Pontif., and in the main by the Bollandists) of his having been the founder of the seven Gallic churches of Toulouse, Arles, Tours, Paris, Narbonne, Clermont, Limoges; to which he is said to have sent respectively, Saturninus, Trophimus, Gratus, Donatus, Paulus, Astresimus, and Martianus, as missionary bishops. Tillemont regards the story with suspicion, as being absent from early records. It is disputable also on other grounds. The following are the ancient testimonies. In the Passio St. Saturnini Episc. Tolosani (c. 2, and Auctori) it is stated that Saturninus went to Toulouse "Decio et Grato consilium," i.e. A.D. 258. In the Passio St. Trophimi (about 590) refers to this statement, and adds that the other missionary bishops above referred to were sent at the same time (Hist. Franc. I. 28); and elsewhere (x. 30), that one of these, Gratus of Tours, was sent in the first year of Decius by Sixtus the Pope of Rome. Now, since Fabianus was martyred in the January of the year assigned to the mission, it seems improbable that he was its organizer; and who was Sixtus, named by the historian as the then existing pope? The Bollandists meet these difficulties by supposing the mission to have been designed by Fabianus before his martyrdom, and carried out after it by Sixtus, a leading prebyster at Rome, erroneously described as pope. But, further, there is an evident error in the statement about Trophimus having been then sent to Arles. We have the testimony of Pope Zosimus (Ep. 1. ad Episc. Gall.), that the church of Arles had been founded by Trophimus sent from Rome; but this must have been before 250, since it appears from Cyprian (Ep. vi. 7) that in 254 Marcellinus had long been bishop of that see. It would seem then that at any rate the additions made by Gregory of Tours to his extract from the 'Passion of Saturninus,' rested only on vague and uncertain traditions, and that there are no valid grounds for attributing the foundation of those Gallic churches to Fabianus.

Still more improbable is the story, accepted by the Bollandists and Barinnus, and resting mainly on the authority of the Acts of St. Pontius, that the Emperor Philip and his son became Christians, and were baptized by Fabianus. [PHILIPPUS.]

Three spurious decrealts are attributed to Fabianus. One forbids all communication with excommunicated persons, quoting the apostolic precept. Another, addressed to all the bishops of the East, orders the annual consecration of new chriat, tracing the order from the Apostles, and contains stringent rules, having for their object the protection of the clergy from accusations by persons of bad character or suspected of heresy, and especially the faithful of their own flocks, except on the ground of heresy. A third has the same drift as the last mentioned, with further provision for appeals exclusively to the see of Rome. There are also ten Decretals assigned to him by Gratus and others, on matters of discipline; which, being other things, fasting, confirmation three times a year, and obligations of bread and wine every Sunday at the altar, are enjoined; perjury, marriage within the prohibited degrees, and of insane persons, are forbidden; the age of thirty is fixed for ordination, and illiterate priests are prohibited from saying Mass.

His festival is kept on the 20th January, the day of his martyrdom. The Greeks commemorate him by the name of Fabius on the 6th of August. [J. B.—Y.]

FABIANUS (5), bishop of Antioch. [FABIUS (5).]
possibility that Fabian was the magistrate of another prefecture. Tillemont (H. E. iv. p. 744, 2nd ed. notes sur St. Sebastien IV.) conjectures that Fabius was prefect of the city from July 286 to August 287, and that he was preceded in the first year and followed in the second by Junius Maximus. Corsini (Series Prot. 284–288) adopts this ingenious supposition, for which a precedent exists. Tiburtius the martyr, when scourged between the legs by Fabianus, challenged the prefect to thrust his hand into boiling water in the name of Jupiter and see if the water would scald. "I," he added, "shall tread upon these burning cinders as upon roses, in the name of Jesus Christ their creator." Fabianus replied, "Everyone knows that your Christ taught you the art of magic." (Acta S. Sebastiani, xxii. 81, 82 in Bull. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 377.) [L. D.]

FABIUS (4), bishop of Elberi. [Flavius (1).]

FABIUS (5), an Arian who lived at the commencement of the 6th century, in the north of Africa, probably Carthage, and who not only caused great annoyance to Fulgentius of Ruspe, but elicited from him a great work, the fragments of which alone are now extant. This work is entitled, Festi Catholicii instrumenta excerpta de libris S. Fulgentii contra gesta quae adversus eum Fabianus haereticus falsa continuiit. It was originally divided into ten books. The Père Chifflet discovered and preserved in his Requisit des Œuvres de saint Fulgence thirty-nine fragments of these books, which may still be read (Migne, Patrol. Lat. xxv. pp. 750–834, Ben. ed. p. 377 ff.). Cave refers, among the lost works of Fulgentius, to nineteen books, de Veritate Praedestinationis et gratiae contra Fabianum, and says that seven fragments from this work were included by Theodulphe Aurelianus, "in collectaneis suis de processione Spiritus Sancti," and that J. Simond published, among the works of Alcimus Avitus other fragments of this work, Paris, 1643; and says that Chifflet published thirty-nine fragments from a very ancient MS. of the same books (Hist. Literaria, p. 386). The confusing statement of Cave arises from his mistakes in the bibliographies, who, however, had studied Fulgentius, "Jam reversus ex exilio noem et decem libros Fabiani mentionis falsa gesta convincens, de veritate praedestinationis et gratiae libros confecit tres." Deprez has corrected the text, reading noem for noem. Baronius therefore stated the number of books as ten, and also referred to the well-known three books on predestination, which had nothing to do with Fabian. Cave omitted the closing words, confecit tres, and therefore misunderstood the sentence. The fragments preserved by Chifflet are entirely occupied by the most subtle disquisitions on the idea of election of the Godhead, e.g. on "The one Highest Paraclete, Messenger, Teacher, and Judge," "The Functions of praying, groaning, interceding in Christ and the Holy Spirit?" "On the One Infinite," in three personalities; on "The Worship of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," and the like. The fragments contain no personal reference to the bishop of Carthage, but are after the return of Fulgentius from exile, Fabianus, an Arian of reputation, secured an interview with the bishop of Ruspe, and then, with a view to undermine his influence, published numerous discourses under the name of his rival. Fulgentius, to free himself from these false representations of his views, produced a work in which he author of the Vida Fulgentii supposes that Fabianus was the anonymous slanderer to whom Fulgentius refers in his preface to the work Ad Monimentum, de duplicit Praedestinatione Del. If so, Fabianus must have endeavoured to show the contrariety between the thoughts of Augustine and Jerome on the one hand and Fulgentius on the other. The fragments that remain are exclusively occupied with the Arian controversy, and are remarkably free from personal bitterness or local colouring (cf. Baronius, ann. 523, xxvii). [Fulgentius (5).] [H. R. H.]

FABIOLA (1), a noble Roman lady, a friend of St. Jerome, who wrote for her two dissertations (Ep. ixvii. and ixviii. ed. Vall.) on the dress of the high priest, and on the stations of the Jerusalemites in their march through the desert. Jerome also wrote a memoir of her in his touching letter to Oceanus (Ep. ixvii. ed. Vall.) in the year of her death, 399. Thierry (St. Jerome, ii. 11) has worked up the intimations about her into an interesting and dramatic story.

She was descended from Julius Maximus and was extremely wealthy. She was a woman of a lively and passionate nature, the subjugation and direction of which was a triumph to the church. She had married a man whose views were such that she was forced to divorce him. She then, to escape the temptations of an unprotected state, accepted a second husband, the first being still alive. It is probable that this separated her from Paula and the other friends of Jerome, and from church communion. (On this point Thierry, who inverts the order of the facts as given by Jerome, is at issue with Jerome's statement that she received the communion again immediately after her penitence.) This may account for the fact that we hear nothing of her during Jerome's stay at Rome. But, after the death of her second husband, she voluntarily went through a public penance. At the church of the Lateran, on Easter eve, in the presence of the bishop, she took the hands of people, who were deeply affected by the scene, she appeared in the porch amongst the penitents, with tears and cries, with rent garments and bare feet and head, casting away her jewels and disfiguring her face. After this, having publicly renewed her communion with the church, she sold all her possessions, and determined to administer the vast sums thus acquired for the good of the poor. She supported monasteries in various parts of Italy and the adjacent islands; and she joined Pammacchius in the institution of an hospital (evosomassio), where she gathered in the sick and the outcasts and tended them with her own hands.

In the year 395 she suddenly appeared at Bethlehem, and seemed to wish to remain there. She made the journey with her kinsman Oceanus, who also returned with her to Rome the following year. But several causes conpired to prevent Bethleem of Carthage meeting in Rome. The Originenstical strife had lately broken out which divided Jerome and his friends from Rufinus and Melanion, and the new-comers did
not escape the discord. Oceanus warmly opposed the side of Jerome; Fabiola seems to have taken the side of Jerome. But efforts were made, if we may believe Jerome (Cont. Ref. iii. 8), to draw them into the camp of his adversary. Letters which had been fraudulently taken from the cell of Jerome's friend Eusebius, and in which the former was praised, were found in the rooms of Fabiola and Oceanus. If this proceeding was intended to rouse the empress between Fabiola and Jerome it entirely failed. Jerome bears witness to the earnestness with which she attached herself to his teaching, her eagerness and instability in asking questions, her unwillingness to believe in his confessions of ignorance of many things which she put before him. The two treatises above mentioned are the results of her importunity. He describes how on one occasion she recited from memory the letter which he had written to Heliodorus from the desert twenty years before (Ep. 14, ed. Vall.).

It is not likely that Fabiola would have stayed long at Bethlehem. Jerome represents her as liking to be surrounded by a crowd. Her idea of the solitude of Bethlehem, he says, was that she should not be cut off from Mary's inn. But little time was given for the experiment. Jerome was still seeking a suitable dwelling-place for her, and was at the same time engaged in writing for her his treatise on the mystical meaning of the high priest's garments, when the inroads of the Huns into the Roman empire, the consequence of the treachery of the praetorian prefect Rufinus, caused a panic in Palestine. The Huns had taken Antich, and were threatening to burst upon Jerusalem. Jerome and his friends hurried to the sea-coast at Joppa, and had hired vessels for Egypt, when, as they were on the point of sailing, the situation suddenly changed. The Huns abandoned their purpose, and turned back without crossing the Lebanon. Jerome, with Paula and Eustochium, returned to Bethlehem; but Fabiola, less in love with Palestine, continued her journey to Rome. Jerome records how he advised the treatise on which he was engaged, and the cables were being loosed and the sails hoisting for the voyage.

If possible, that, as Thierry supposes, the episode to which Jerome's letter to Amandus (Ep. 55, ed. Vall.) relates has to do with Fabiola, and is to be placed here. Amandus, a Roman presbyter, afterwards bishop of Burdigala, wrote to Jerome for an answer to three questions on difficulties in the New Testament, and Jerome found added to this letter a little paper containing these words, which purported to be from a "sister" of Amandus. "Ask whether a woman who has left a husband of the vilest character and has accepted a second through violence (per vim) can, without such penitence, communicate with the church, while the first husband is living." Thierry supposes that this question was really put on behalf of Fabiola, and that, not liking to speak to Jerome directly on the subject, she took care that he should find the letter at Bethlehem after her departure. If so, and if it implied that she had some third marriage, and wished not to renew her public penitence, she tried no comfort from Jerome. His answer was cautious but decided. He suspected that the "vis" under which she had taken the second husband was simply that of passion, and he declared that no woman during her husband's life could maintain a claim to do this. If indeed it related to her, Fabiola seems to have been satisfied, and worldly desires stirred in her no more.

The last three years of her life were occupied with incessant activity in good works. She considered all her properties as given to Christ, and herself as merely a stipendiary and an administrator of what was His. In conjunction with Pammachius, she instituted at Portus a hospice (xenodochium) perhaps taking her model from that established by Jerome at Bethlehem; and it was so successful that, as Jerome says, in one year it became known from Parthia to Britain. But to the last her disposition was restless. She found Rome and Italy too small for her charities; and she was preparing some long journey or change of habitation when death overtook her in the year 399. Her funeral was celebrated as a Christian triumph. The whole city came forth to see it, the streets were crowded, the hallelujahs reached the golden roofs of the temples. Jerome's book on the forty-two stations (mansioes) of the Israelites in the desert, which he had been composing for her, but had been unable to complete till after her death, was dedicated to her memory, and became to its author a counterpart of the memoir of her life which he sent with it to Oceanus, an image of her progress to the heavenly rest.

[W. H. F.]

FABIOLLA (2), a lady who wrote to St. Augustine, regretting the separation from heaven and from personal intercourse with the saints, which the conditions of the present life necessitate. In his reply Augustine points out that absence and separation are corporal only and not real, for that real intercourse is carried on through the mind and spirit. As every one is more nearly present to himself than to anyone else, so also two persons at a distance from each other can converse more effectively in this way than if in the presence of each other they both remained silent. Fabiola appears to be the same person as the whom St. Jerome sent two volumes of his commentary of Ezekiel, a.d. 411. Aug. Ep. 267; Hieron. Ep. 129; Tillemont. (102, vol. xiii. p. 265.)

[H. W. P.]

FABIUSt bishop of Rome. [FABIANUS (1).]

FABIUS (1), bishop of Antioch, succeeding on the martrydom of Babylas in the Decian persecution a.d. 250. (Euseb. H. E. vi. 39; Chron. sub ann.). There is uncertainty as to the correct form of his name. He is called FABIUS by Eusebius, FLAVIUS by Nicephorus, FABIANUS by Rufinus, and FLAVIUS by Syncellus and Jerome. FABIUS was disposed to look favourably upon the Novatians, which had extended to Antioch, and Novatian having sent him notice of his consecration as bishop of Rome, it seemed not improbable that FABIUS would acknowledge him as a canonical bishop. (Euseb. H. E. vi. 44.) Cornelius bishop of Rome, fearing the consequences of a such a step, and the portion of the bishop of one of the chief sees of Christendom, entered into a long correspondence with FABIUS on the subject. (Hieron. de Vit. Ill. Cornelius,
c. 66.) Eusebius mentions this correspondence (Euseb. H. E. vi. 43). Dionysius of Alexandria likewise wrote to Fabius on the case of the Chaldaeans. The example of Scarpion, that it was not right to exclude penitents from communion (6 c. 44). Eusebius preserves another letter of the same prelate to Fabius, narrating the sufferings of the martyrs during the Decian persecution at Alexandria (6 c. 41). Fabius still continuing favourably inclined towards Nestorius, it was proposed to hold a council at Antioch, which was prevented by the death of Fabius after an episcopate of only two years. He was succeeded by Demetrius (6 c. 46). [L. V.]

FABIUS, prefect of Rome. [FABIANUS (3).]

FABIIUS (2) VICTOR, a soldier and martyr at Marseilles. The authorities vary as to the date of his passion. Cellier fixes A.D. 290; Ruinart, A.D. 290 or 303. The former date is the more probable, as there were several martyrs in the army in the early portion of Maximian's reign, and long before the persecution became general upon Diocletian's first edict. All these martyrs took place in the western portion of the empire and under the operation of military law. [CASSIANUS (3).] (Euseb., Hist. Eccl. viii. 4.) Fabius made himself notorious by his activity, and was therefore called upon to sacrifice. Upon his refusal, which he accompanied with acts of insolence very common at that time, going so far even as to set up the altar in the emperor's presence, he was tortured, and condemned to be ground to death in a hand-mill. The machinery having broken down, however, he was decapitated, when a celestial voice was heard crying, "Viicti, beate Victor, viictisti." During the tortures, which lasted several days, his steadfastness converted his guards Alexander, Longinus, and Felicianus, who brought him by night from his prison to the seaside, where they received baptism at his hands. This action being reported to the emperor, he at once beheaded them. All the bodies were cast into the sea, but recovered by the Christians and buried in a crypt. The acts of Fabius Victor are not original; they are attributed to Cassian, or some other author of the 5th century. (Cellier, iii. 366; Ruinart, 292-97.) [G. T. S.]

FABIIUS (3), martyr at Carisana in Mauritania; commemorated July 31. He refused to bear the standard, and was beheaded, probably under Maximian and about the year 295, when there were several military martyrs in North Africa. We possess in Ruinart the genuine acts of St. Cassian, St. Maximilian, and St. Maresillus of that date, and all from the same district. (AA. SS. Boll. vii. 179; Mart. Vet. Rom., Adonis, Usuardi; Rom. Martyr.) [G. T. S.]


FABIIUS (5), martyr at Faesulae in Umbria, period uncertain; commemorated May 17 (Acta SS. Maii iv. 132.) The Bollandist suspects he is the same Fabius who is commemorated in Roma. Martyr. with Anthimus on May 11. They were martyred in the Diocletian persecution at the 22nd milestone on the Via Salaria. The Martyr. Hieron. and Mort. Usurrii commemorate Anthimus without any mention of Fabius. [G. T. S.]

FABIIUS (6), a shorthand writer under the vicar of Africa at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411. (M. Vet. Don. p. 344, ed. Othen.iii.) [H. W. P.]


FABIIUS (8), bishop of Fermo, predecessor of Passivus, the latter a contemporary of Gregory the Great mentioned in Epist. lib. ir. Indict. i. ep. 19. (Migne, lxixvii. 960.) [A. B. D. A.]

FABRICIANUS, bishop of Epidaurus (Ragusia) in Dalmatia, A.D. 530. (Fabius, Hygin. Sacra. vi. 410.) [J. de S.]

FACHTNA, apparently the same as FACHMAN, latinized FACCUNDUS, and used interchangeably with it, yet not so freely but that it clings more closely to some individuals. (1) The best known Fachtas was bishop of R., Aug. 14, surmounted Mongach. He was first abbot of Molana, a small island near the mouth of the Blackwater. His chief dedication, however, is that of Ross in the county of Cork. He was not only bishop there, but he gathered round him a large school, one of the most famous of that age, for studying the liberal arts (Usher, Ext. Ant. vi. 471-72). Fachtans probably died towards the end of the 6th century. (Laisca, Ext. Hist. ir. ii. 192-8, 317-8; Colgan, Acta SS. 585, cc. 3, 4, 579, n. 1; Kelly, Cal. Irish Saints, 131-2; Ware, Tr. Ant. c. 26, 29, and Irish Bp. by Harris, 583-4.)

(2) Son of Polachtan (Tolechtagh, Ann. Tu.) was abbot of Clonfert, co. Longford, and died 729 (Ann. Tu.; Four Mart. A.D. 723). [H. G.]


FACUNDUS, bishop of Ermiana or Hermia, in the province of Byzaecena. In 464 he was at Constantinople, and apparently at the council which Mennas convened in the autumn of that year on the subject of the "Three Chapters." He, however, refused to subscribe, and withdrew from communion with those who did (Contr. Mocian. Migne, u. s. 859). After the dismissal of the council, and at the request of the unwilling signatories, he set himself to the preparation of a defence of the condemned "Chapters," but before he had completed the task he was interrupted by the arrival of Vigilius the bishop of Rome, who required all further proceedings on the subject to be suspended (Pro Defens. Tr. Capitul. præfet. u. s. 927, xii. 1, 853). This was in January, A.D. 547 (viii. Kal. Feb. Marcellin. Com. Cor. u. s. 547. Migne, Patro. li. 946). The next year, A.D. 548, Vigilius also convened a council on the subject at Constanti- nople, consisting of about seventy bishops, in which Facundus took an active part (Pro Defens
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s.a.prof.; Lib. cond. Mocian.]. After that council Facundus resumed his "Defence," but was compelled to complete it hurriedly at the command of the emperor who had called him to account for refusing to subscribe his edict (Contr. Mocian. s.a. 890; Proc. Def. Prof. s.a. 897). The work was then presented to Justinian. In that, its original form, it seems to have consisted of only two books, which were afterwards expanded into seven, and then again into the twelve in which it now appears. ("Facundus... super Justinian principalis scripta, de duabus naturis Dom. Christ. duos libellos." Cassiodorus, Exp. in Paul. Ps. cxxxviii. in Migne, Patrol. LXX. 994, "Et tempore vic. libri Facundii refusule," Victor. Tausenn. Chrov. s.a. 550 in Migne, Patrol. LXXVIII. 938.)

Soon after this Facundus returned to Africa, and was present at a council of the bishops of the prefecture, A.D. 550, when Vigilius was excommunicated for having condemned the "Three Chapters" (Victor. Tun. u.s.). These proceedings gave great offence to Justinian, and numbers of the African bishops were deprived and imprisoned or sent into exile, while others were compelled to seek refuge in flight. Among these last was Facundus (Victor. Tunusins. u.s. s.a. 551, 552, 553, 554; Fac. Contr. Mocian. u.s. 853, 855). He remained in concealment for several years, and nothing more is heard of him until A.D. 571, when Mocianus, a "scholasticus," having written in severe reproachment of those who still withheld themselves from communion with the signatories to the condemnation of the "Three Chapters," his brethren again requested him to take up his pen in their defence. Though very ill at the time he readily complied, and prepared a treatise mainly for their use, which is of great value for the history of the whole controversy (u.s. a. 853-859), "nunc in praedictum magnum Synodum. Chaled. resuscitavit questio "aeternum et clementi annos finitas" (u.s. 886). At the same time he also published a Letter to the subject, apparently designed for more general use (Ep. Fid. Cath. in Defens. Tr. Opp. Migne, u.s. 867). After this he heard no more of him. [T. W. D.]

FAEBHARDAITH (FEHORDAITH), abbot of Tighen, now Dalna, in the barony of Upper Bally, co. Meath. He seems to have been put to death in A.D. 789, during a raid from Osseory. (For Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 387-9, A.D. 781; Ann. Ult. a. 785.)

FAGADUIN, bishop. [FAGADUINJ.

FAELAN (FAELAN, FÉILLAN, FÓILLAN, FÚLLAN, PHÜLLAN). Faolan, the diminutive of Fael, a wolf, has assumed a great variety of forms. In Ireland the favourite form seems to be Fáelán, and in Scotland Fülân. It gave the family name O'Félán, and is now Phelan and Phelan (Joyce, Jr. Names of Places, 2 ser. 153). Colgan adopts Fóllanu, and gives a list of twelve entries bearing the name (Acta SS. 614, c. i.; see Bishop Forbes' "Notice of the Bell of St. Félain" in Proc. Soc. Antiqu. Scotl. viii. 267 seq.).

(1) Amhlobar (the Stammerer, or rather the Lepor) of Rath Eran and Kill-féélán, commemorated June 20. He is said to have been son of king Aenghus by his second wife Eithne, who died with her husband in battle, A.D. 489. He is also said to have been a disciple of St. Ailbe, and when St. Ailbe wished to go to Tyle (Thule), but sent out instead twenty-two disciples, one of these was Fáelán of Rátharann. This place is now called Dùndurn, and is in the parish of Comrie, Perthshire, in the immediate vicinity of the present village of St. Fillian's, which lies at the east end of Loch Earn. (Scott. Hist. 188.) Regarding his Irish dedication, Dr. Reeves says, "His Irish church is situate in the Queen's County, in that part of the parish which is in the barony of Cullenagh (Ord. Surv. Sheet. 18). In 1623 it was called Killyhelan [i.e. Cilli-Fhethlann] (Leinster Inquis. Com. Regnat. Nos. 24, 25, Jac. 1.), which name is now disguised in Ballyheiland." The church of Averdour in Fife was dedicated to him, and so probably was that of Forgach or St. Fillian's, Fifeburgh, it is hardly possible to distribute the dedications fairly between the two Fillian, so near in the name and locality. (Bishop Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 341; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 83.)

(9) Brother of St. Farey. [FÓILLANUS (2).]

(3) Son of Aedh, commemorated Mar. 31 (Mart. Doneg.; Mart. Tall.). Colgan (Acta SS. 799) thinks that Fáelán was son of Aedh Danmanus or Benjamin, and not of the royal stock of Munster. [FAITHLENN.]

(4) Son of Ceallach, abbot of Kildare, perished in an attack of the Hy-Néill upon the Leinstermen in the year 804. (For Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 407-9, A.D. 799; Ann. Ult. a.d. 803.)


[J. G.]

FAELCHU. (1) Of Finglas, commemorated Sept. 24. In the Life of St. Abban in Colgan (Acta SS. 615, c. 20, 623, u. n.) an account is given of St. Abban founding churches and monasteries in the south of Ireland, and southward from Connaught as far as Muskerry in Cork, then turning east and north, proceeded through Tipperary till he reached Killculen, on the banks of the Lifey, where he built a most regular monastery at Cluain-find-glasse, probably Finglas beside Dublin, and there Faelchu died A.D. 763 (Ann. Tg.). Colgan would place it in Munster.

(2) Abbot of Iona, A.D. 716-724, having his feast on April 3. He was son of Dorbene and at the race of Conall Gulban. At seventy-four he was appointed to Iona, A.D. 716 (Ann. Tg.), the only year which would meet the condition "in iv. Kal. Sept., die Sabbathi suscipit." He succeeded Duncach, and appears to have been chosen, perhaps as coadjutor, or actual abbot, the year before Duncach died. In A.D. 724, at a ripe old age, he died, and was succeeded by Cillane Fada. Skene thinks it probable that he had been at the head of a Columban monastery in the territory of the northern Picts before his elevation to the abbacy, and that he is the same as Velocins, the patron saint of Dunmull and Logy, in Mar, both in Aberdeenshire. Skene is also of opinion that he represented the
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conservative party at Iona. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 313, 319; O'Conor, Rev. Hib. Script. ii. 228 n. 20, 234 n. 48, iv. 72 n. 2; Colgan, Acta SS. 745, col. 2, n. 2, and Tr. Thum. 481 n. 13, iv. 284 n. 12; Calcutt, Calendar of Irish Chartularies. iii. 157-9; Reeves, Adamnan, 381; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 177-8, 278 sqq.; Grub, Eccl. Hist. Scot. i. 114, 119; Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. pt. 1, 288.)

The two chief events of his primacy were, as related in the Annals of Tigernach, (a) the driving of the family of Ely by king Ninian across the Grampian range in A.D. 717, on account, probably, of their not obeying the orders of that Pictish king regarding the newly adopted usages; and (b) the adoption of the coronal tonsure in A.D. 718. (O'Conor, Rev. Hib. Script. ii. 229.)

[J. G.]

FAELDOBAIR (1) Of Clochar, bishop, June 29 (Mart. Doneg.; Mart. Tall.). He died A.D. 702 (Ann. Ror.), but has been confounded by Ware, Colgan, and Lanigan with Faeldobair of Kildare, who regarded his date.

(2) Beg, called also The Wise, died at Fohbar, or Fore, in Westmeath, in the year 731. (Four Mast. A.D. 725; Ann. Ult. A.D. 730.)

[J. G.]

FAELGHUS.

(1) Abbot of Killeigh, in King's County, died A.D. 898. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 186 n. 2, 413, A.D. 803; Ann. Ult. A.D. 807, calling him "princeps").

(2) Son of Tuathcháil or Touthgaille, a wise man of Clonard, in Meath, died A.D. 784. (Four Mast. A.D. 777; Ann. Ult. A.D. 783.)

[J. G.]

FAENDELAICH (FAENDELAICH).

Commemorated on Sept. 18. There was a Faendalech, son of Mnaech, who was abbot and bishop of Armagh, and whose sudden death is entered in the Ann. Ult. A.D. 794 (O'Conor, Rev. Hib. in Scriptor. iv. 117). He seems to have succeeded Ferdorcrich in A.D. 768, but there appear to have been many claimants to the episcopal dignity and a consequent confusion in the succession. Faendalech probably resigned his abbacy in 771, and the vacancy continued till 778, when Dubdaltere was appointed. During his rule the city of Armagh in A.D. 770 was twice burned. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 463 n. 4; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. iii. 194, 295, 294; Stuart, Armagh, 94-5.)

[J. G.]

FAFILA (1) (FAVILA), the father of the famous Felayo, according to certain chroniclers. (Felagius.)

[M. A. W.]

FAFILA (2), son of Pelayo, and king of the Asturias after his father's death. He reigned two years (737-739), and built the church of the Holy Cross at Canasa. In 739 he was killed by a bear (Seb. Sal. c. 12), and was buried in the church he had built. For the famous inscription still existing in the church of the Santa Cruz at Canasa, which professes to date from Fafila's lifetime, and contains the names of himself and his queen Froiluba, see Hubner's Inscrip. Hist. Esp. i. 149. An amended text of it, as transcribed by the Spanish scholar Fernandez Guerra y Orbe, will be found among the Additaments to the Inscrip. Brit. Christ. (M. A. W.)

FAGAN (FAGAN), usually represented in the legend of king Lucius as sent with Dyfan by pope Eleutherus to Britain, where they instructed and baptized at the end of the second century. Geoffrey of Monmouth (Hist. iv. c. 20) boldly affirms that they "almost extinguished the pagans of Britain," demonstrating their work in the churches and temples that had been founded in honour of many gods to the one only God and his saints, and filled them with congregations of Christians." There is a parish in Glamorganshire still bearing the name of St. Fagan, four miles from Caerdis. In Leland's survey (Lal. vol. iv. 284 n.) the parish church had been rebuilt and was dedicated to St. Mary, but the older parish church bearing the name of St. Fagan survived. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 82-7, 338; Hadad and Stubbs, i. 28; Sp. Forbes, SS. Nin. and Aenl, 53, 354-55; Girald. Camb. Descrip. Camb. i. c. 16, wks. vi. 202; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. cc. 4-5, wks. v. 53-77, 126-27.) He is placed among the chiroepiscopi of Llandaff prior to the time of St. Dubricius (Lib. Landan, 623), and is reputed as the founder, with Daman, of the ancient see of Congersbury (Stubbs, Reg. Sac. Angl. i. 153, 154). See also W. J. Rees, Cambro-Briton Saints, 61.)

His day is, perhaps, Feb. 10, but a "Faganus confessor" occurs in some English books under Aug. 8. (Deruvianus.) (J. G. and C. W. B.)

FAILA (FAILENNA, FAOILEANN, FOILEN-
NA.). (1) Virgin, March 3. She was descended from the illustrious house of the Hy-Finachrach; her mother was Cuillean or Cuillicanda, and her three brothers, Colgan, Aedh, and Sorac. Her church was at Kil-faile, now Killicott, noted for its pilgrim raids. St. Faila must have spoken about A.D. 580. (Colgan, Acta SS. 248, c. 238, c. 3, and n. 4, 456; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 326-9; Kelly, Cat. Ir. Saints, 82.)

(2) Virgin, Nov. 13. She was daughter of Eoghan (Mart. Doneg., by Todd and Reeves, 304) and, like the preceding Faila, belonged to the house of the Hy Finachrach, but through a different son of Dathi, and thence to a different sept, which was named from her father, Hy Finachrach Aideine (Reeves, Adamnan, 45). (J. G.)

FAILBE (FAVILUS).

(1) Son of Pzan, abbot of Iona, March 22 (Mart. Doneg.) He was of the noble race of Conall Gulain, a Tyrconnel, and, like so many of his family, sought voluntary exile in the arch-monastery of Iona. There he spent many years, till at the death of Cuimine Alibhe in A.D. 669 he was himself called on to rule, which he did for ten years, when St. Adamnan succeeded him. In the Selecta de Aenusa it is said that during his primacy he twice revisited Ireland, and Colgan imagines that the most probable occasion for these journeys was the Pascchal controversy, but Skene thinks it is as likely to have been in connexion with missionary enterprise, St. Maelrubha about that time having carried the Gospel to the north-western shores of Scotland. The journeys were evidently considered very important, as all the annals record a visit to Ireland in the year 673, and his return in 676 (Ann. Thg.). He died A.D. 679. He is referred to by St. Adamnan (Vit. S. Columb. i. c. 1) as "meus successor; noster abbas Failbeus." (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. 97 sqq.; Grub, Eccl. Hist. Scot. ii. 202; Reeves, Adamnan, 16, 28, 275; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. vi. 245, and Ind. Chron. A.D. 679; O'Conor, Rev. Hib. Script. ii. 209 n. 4.)
(3) Beg, abbot of Iona, also called Fedhlhímidh, March 10. His obit appears in the Four Mast. a.d. 734. "Fedhlhímidh or Faibhe, abbot of Iona, died after the 87th year of his age." Reeves (Adomnán, 385) does not count this Faibhe among the abbots of Iona, but only coadjutor-abbot, or set up as a rival abbot in the confusion caused by the paschal controversies. He held this office from the primacy of Faecu, as the Ann. Tigernach, a.d. 725, have the entry "Fiedhinnus Principatum Hionae tenet." He thus held an abbacy there while Cillene Foda (A.D. 724-729), Cillene Droicreach (A.D. 726-729), and Sliabhine (A.D. 732-767), were more generally accepted as the abbots of the Columban brotherhood. Faibhe may have headed the conservative or traditional party, which was then certainly on the decline (O'Conor, Rer. Hdb. Scot. ii. 231 n. 20; BP. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 335-3; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 281-88).

(3) Of Erdagh or Erdaimh, commemorated Feb. 8, April 8. There is entered on these two days in the Irish Kalendars "Faibhe of Erdagh," referring probably to the same individual (Mart. Doug. by Todd and Reeves, 43, 98 n. 1; 99; Mart. Taltagh, in Kelly, Gal. Ir. SS. x. x.) in the Four Mast. (by O'Donovan, i. 729) is the name "Aed Theobaldus, Faibhe, son of Guaire, successor of Maelrubhais, was drowned, and the crew of his ship along with him; they were twenty-two in number." The true date is probably 737 (Ann. Ttg.). (Reeves, Adomnán, 385; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 285 sq.; 000, Rer. Hdb. Scot. ii. 241, 242; Geog. pap., Acta SS. 576; Grub, Eccl. Hist. Scot. i. 120; BP. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 335.) Applecross is a parish on the west coast of Ross-shire, and lies between Loch Torridon and Loch Carron (see Cosmo Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. pt. ii. 402).

(5) Beg (medicus, Ann. Ult.) is said in the Four Mast. a.d. 711, and Ann. Ult. a.d. 712, to have been abbot of Clonmacnois, in King's County, and the former adds that he "was of the Gallenga of Corann," that is, as interpreted by O'Donovan (Four Mast. i. 311 n. b), of a sept of the race of Ollill Olum, king of Munster, seated in the diocese of Achonry, in the province of Connacht, Corann being the name of a barony, a townland of the county of Sligo. The Ann. Ttg. place his death at probably its true date, a.d. 713, and say he is of the Gallenga in Corann (CO Sánaigearch in Corannach to which O'Conor has erroneously prefixed "bishop" (O'Conor, Rer. Hist. Scot. ii. 228).
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enim Apostolus: 'Conde creditur ad justitiam, et autem confesso fit ad salutem.' (Serm. ad Caten. de Symb. § 1.) Of these the latter words, threatening but not showing how it affected, and still affects, the first. It is the virtue that stands for special treatment here.

I. "Whatever be the particular faculty or frame of mind denoted by the word," says Dr. Newman, "certainly faith is regarded in Scripture as the chosen instrument of meeting heaven and earth, as a novel principle of action, most powerful in the influence which it exerts both on the heart and on the Divine view of us, and yet in itself of a nature to excite the contempt or ridicule of the world." (Univ. Sermons, Serm. ix. p. 189). These characteristics, here so well summarized, "its apparent weakness, its novelty, its special adoption, and its efficacy," were precisely the points on which the fathers had to enlarge in meeting objections urged against it in pagan times. Credo stands first of all in the creed," says Rufinus, "agreed with what the apostle Paul, writing to the Hebrews, says: 'He that cometh to God must first of all believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him.' The prophet, too, says: 'If ye will not believe, neither shall ye understand' (Is. vii. 9, LXX). This he proves in detail so far from being peculiar to religion that it is an accepted principle in every walk of life, to start from faith. All we cannot see for ourselves, but must learn from others, whether past, present, or future, is an object of faith. Many truths we cannot understand we accept on faith. What wonder then if, in approaching God, we are required to accord to Him what ordinary routine exacts from all? "Hae autem idicrvo in principiis praemissimis," he continues, "quia pagni nobis objicere solent, quod religio nostra, quia rationibus deficit, in solis credendi persuatione consistat" (In Symb. Apost. § 3). How Rufinus have we learned from the recent Homily of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose fifth catechetical lecture formally treats of faith: "the eye of the whole conscience that creates in it understanding," as it is there called: and St. Cyril in turn, drawing from Origen, who quotes Celsus, saying, "Some there are who will not give not adequate account of those things they believe, but always meet you with, 'Don't inquire, only believe: and, thy faith will save thee': who maintain, further, that worldly wisdom is an evil, and folly a good." (c. Cels. i. 9-11); and even Origen in this passage, repeating much of what his master, St. Clement of Alexandria, had said before him in his fifth book of Stromatae or Miscellaneous, where there is much also worth remembering that is didactic. As, for instance, the following: "Remove every ground for inquiring, and faith is made firm and sure. Our position accordingly, which cannot be gainsaid, is, that it is God who speaks, and has declared Himself in His word on every point that we had selected for inquiry. Who, then, is so absurd and so godless as not to believe God when He speaks, or to require proof from God as from men?" (v. p. 548). This brings us back to Rufinus again. He draws attention to a distinction of form in the creed, for he defines the Creed as "Hominis," on his side, though bishop Pearson seems sceptical of its intrinsic worth (On the Creed, vol. i. p. 22; Burton's ed. with the notes). Of the concluding articles of the creed, then, Rufinus observes: "Non dixit in sanctam ecclesiam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, sed in sanctorum, si enim addidisset in praeseptionem, unum superioresibus eademque vis fieret, nunc autem illius quidem vocabulis ubi de Divinitate ordinatur fides, in ... dicitur ... in caeteris verbo, ubi non de divinitate, sed de creaturis ac mysteriorum sacrorum capendi litterarum itaque praeseptionis syllabæ Creator a creaturis secernitur, et Divina separantur ab humanis." (§ 36). Nothing can be more certain than this. Faith in the Infinite is the only faith that can be without reserve. A Being of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness is the only being who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Faith in Him is the only faith that can be called "divine." To place the same faith in any being short of the Infinite is creature-worship. We may believe man: it is our duty. We may not believe in man: that is idolatry. Verax Christus, mendax Petrus," according to St. Augustine (Serm. de Veró. Ev. cxxvi. § 1). And again, "Quod non potest in Paulum, nemo in Petro, nemo in aliis apostolorum, hoc potest in Domino" (Serm. ixvi. § 5, 20). And again, "Credimus Apostolos, non credimus in Apostolum; non enim Apostolus justificat impiam ... " (Tract. in Joam. xiii.).

Here we must remark, in passing, on the Latin and Greek form of the Nicene creed as now used. It is the Latin form, "Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam," which has, in all probability, preserved the reading of primitive times. The Greek, "εἰς τὸ μὲν εὐαγγέλιον," was either meant to be construed with the preceding clause—viz. "The Holy Ghost . . . who spake by the prophets to one holy Catholic" etc., as was all but demonstrated by professor Baletta some few years back: or else the word εἰς is a corrupt—perhaps an Aramaic—substitution for εἰς. The English, "And I believe in one Catholic etc." is made very orthodox in the Latin. All the articles of the creed agree so far, indeed, that we believe them on the authority of God Himself. We should be justified in disbelieving them, we should err in believing them, if they came to us vouched for only by man. Who knows God for-instance, not granted to us in the remission of sins or eternal life? As St. Irenæus says of the Incarnation itself, "Propositum hoc, generationem ejus quis enarrabit? Quoniam homo est, et quis agnoscet Deum? Cognoscit autem Illum illum, cui Pater Qui est in coelo revelavit, quoniam Is, Qui non ex voluntate carni, nec ex voluntate viri, natus est Filius hominis, Hic est Christus, Filii Dei vivi." (Hær. iii. 19). But again, believing even an eternal truth, is intrinsically different from believing in God. "Quid est credere in Deum?" asks St. Augustine. "Credeendo amore, credendo diligere, credeendo in Deum ire, et Eius membris incorporari" (Tract. in Joam., xxi. 6). In other words, believing in God includes loving Him to the same extent.

Hence, to resume the teaching of the fathers up to this point, we find two characteristics of divine faith, radically distinguishing it from human, to be: first, that it has God alone for its object; and secondly, truth authentically taught by God not for its own sake per se. It is, therefore, illimitable and beyond argument, in both respects. Its foundations, from whichever side
ability to act is in exact proportion to our believing." Finally, St. Isidore of Seville—to quote from a writer as long after St. Augustine, as the rest were before him—in the second book of his Sentences: "It is impossible to arrive at true blessedness, except through faith; and he is blessed, who, by believing rightly, leads a virtuous life: and that he is virtuously cleaves to the right faith. . . . Faith is in no case exerted by force, but instilled by persuasive arguments and examples . . ." (c. 2.) The sternness of the last remark is enhanced doubly by coming from Spain. "Yet neither St. Ambrose nor St. Martin, in their day," says Butler, "would communicate with Ithacius, bishop of Ossebona, or those bishops who held communion with him, because they sought to put heretics to death" (Lives of the Saints, Sept. 11).

Faith, then, according to the teaching of the fathers, is a new graft on an old stock; a supernatural virtue developed out of a natural instinct; belief in God evoked from the ready-made habit that exists in all men of believing each other. Furthermore, being a gift of the Holy Ghost, it carries with it its own evidence, which is love—all-powerful, if accepted, to inspire confidence where reason and experience are wholly wanting, or of the slenderest kind, or even point the other way.

What Aristotle calls the moral proof, depending on the character of the speaker, needs no confirming, when that person is God. For the same reason, though divine faith, equally with human, is an act of the whole man, assent must always be dictated in the former by trust; and understanding a thing, never be made a condition of believing it. Faith in the Infinite, rightly requires us to believe many things we cannot fathom, or only fathom after believing them. "Through faith" says the apostle, "we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. xi. 3). Whence St. Augustine: "Frisus crediti, postes intelligenti; cui autem Dominus Deus, ut cum crediderit, cito intelligat, Dei donum est, non humanae fragilitatis." (De Trin., § 6, 1.)

One more specificity which the Fathers attribute to divine faith is its expansive character; deepening and widening in harmonious sympathy with the revelation of His benign purpose, which it has pleased God to unfold gradually to man. Thus, what used in primitive times to be simple belief in God—and in heathen lands is no more still—has been long heightened and expanded under the Gospel into full-blown belief in Three Divine Persons, now known to constitute the Godhead; of the redemption of man by the second Person, Who became flesh for His sake, and of the sanctification of man by the third, shed abroad in his heart. As St. Augustine puts it: "Superiorius temporibus omnium modo latuit sacramentum justificationis ex fide. Eadem tamen fides mediatoris salvos justos faciebat antiquos—puisillos cum magnis. . . . (De Conc. ap. Nupt. ii. 24) "slave in its justus quos sacra Scriptura in justos quos quidem illa non commemorat, sed tamen tuis credenti sunt: vel ante diluvium, vel inde usque ad legem datum, vel ipsius legis tempore, non solum in filiis Israel, sicut fuerunt Prophetae, sed etiam extra eundem populum, sicut
Each bishop, on his consecration, sent "communication letters," containing a profession of faith, round to his brother bishops, of which there are at least 100. (St. Irenaeus, vii. 8, in his orthodoxy.

All such professions, orthodox or heretical, public or private, purported to be compositions of Scripture; either drawn up in its very words or embodying its substance, intact and complete. But the Holy Father, St. Augustine, tells his catechumens: "quod recessus estis, et redituri, ista verba quae auditis, per divinas Scripturam sparsa sunt: sed inde collecta et unum reducta, ne tardoribus hominum memoria laboraret, ut omnis homo positus dicere, positum teneres, quod credit..." (De Synth. Serm. ad Catech. § 1). In other words, the subject matter of divine faith was held by the Fathers to be contained in Holy Scripture, and thence drawn out into creeds; and as long as creeds aspired to be more than a collection of Scriptural truths expressed in Scriptural language, they were so completely the outpourings of divine faith all through, that they might well be called by the same name. Subsequently, when human inferences from Scripture came to be placed on the same footing as Scriptural statements themselves, and the conclusions of theologians elevated into matters of faith by the living authorities of the church, belief in the church militant obtained as a practical principle, to the obscuration of belief in God; and divine faith waned in the individual, while ecclesiastical formulae, enlarged and multiplied, were forced on his acceptance.

The beginning of this change dates, indeed, from the 9th century. To dwell further on it, therewith would be to exceed our limits. It has been glanced at, however, because the contrast brings out how exclusively the subject-matter of divine faith was maintained by the Fathers to be the written Word; and its object, as well as its author, to be God, has been at least in part saved.

Besides the minor treatises of St. Augustine, De fide et operibus; De Fide comum quam non videntur; De fide et symbolo; Serm. ad Catechum.; Enchiridion; his more important works against Pelagianism (vol. x. of the Ben. ed.) should be consulted; also, treatises De Fide, by St. Ambrose, St. Pius the Great, St. Bernard, St. Bernardus; De ecclesiis; Beccaria, De Iudicio; et omnibus. Mareschel, Concord. Potrum, generally, contained in Schrumpf's Analysis; Feseller, Int. Patr. Estius and the older schoolmen on Book iii. Dist. 22-25 of the Sentences; Suarez, de Trip. Vitr. Theol. Fidei, Spec. et Cordatis; Pearson, in the Cred. Art. L.; Waterland, Faber, and Newman On Justification; bishop Harold Brown, in Art. XL., and Art. JUSTIFICATION. [L. S. F.]
FAITH, RULE OF

rule in his observance of Easter. Irenaeus, in a
passage quoted under CREEDS (Vol. 1. p. 698, § 10), employs the words “Rule of Faith” to the
traditional belief of the church. To this tradi-
tional belief he refers in numerous passages.
So does Tertullian, using the title Regula Fidei
as his tracts de Virgin, melanox, c. 1; de Mono-
gaminia, c. 2; de Praescript. c. 13. The last pas-
sage refers to several points not mentioned
explicitly in the baptismal creed. There are
passages in the work of Novatian de Trinitate
which run thus: “The Rule of Truth requires
that we should believe. . . . The same Rule of
Truth teaches us to believe . . . .” where the
Rule of Truth must be equivalent to the church’s
order, requiring a belief in the church’s teach-
ing, this teaching furnishing the standard by
which every statement was to be measured.
Once more, Victorinus of Petavium (Hahn, § 12)
speaks of the arundo et mensura fidei, the measur-
ing rod of the faith. So far the statement of
Bingham (Antiq. x. iii. 20) that the word καθολου
(rule) was one of the many titles given to the
symbolon or creed requires enlargement.
This distinction was fully recognised in later
years. At present, we may refer to the large mass
of teaching put forward confidently by Irenaeus,
not only in the passages quoted in the article
of CREEDS, but throughout his great work.
Thus he says, i. 22. 1: “If we hold the rule of
truth we can detect and confute” such and
such assertions of the Valentinians; in i. 27. 4,
he speaks of people adulterating the truth and
teaching of the church; in ii. 30. 9, of the
advantage we possess in standing by Him “whom
the law announces, whom the prophets proclaim,
whom Christ reveals, whom the apostles hand
down, whom the church believes.” In iii. (In-
troduction) we read of the duty of contending
for the true and life-giving faith which the
church received from the Apostles and delivered
to her children. On this faith he enlarges much,
especially in chap. 3, in which he appeals to
the churches of Christendom, and especially to
the churches of Rome, Smyrna, and Ephesus.
He claims that what was contrary to the
teaching of these churches must be false, for
“the apostles have poured into the church, as
into a sea, the whole thing, the whole thing, the
truth, so that every one that will may drink out of it the water of life.” Compare
chap. 5. 1. In book v. he confirms all his teach-
ing out of the discourses of our Saviour. Such
was the faith which the Apostles handed down,
and which was sufficient “to measure” the early
heretics.

Passing from Irenaeus to Origen we have, in
the latter’s work, ἕκαστος ἠμαρτάνων, indications of other
points which were considered to be part of the faith
handed down by the Apostles. He enumerates
these among others: that every rational soul pos-
sesses freewill and choice, and that we have to
pass through a struggle with the devil and his
agents; again, that this world was made at a
certain time, and is hereafter to be dissolved;
that the Scriptures were written per Spiritum
Dei et sensum habentem, non eum solum qui in mani-
facto est, sed et aliwm quaedam latens pharisieon.
Of course, these years were already those spent
into the Baptismal Creed. Further illustration
of the same distinction is given by St. Cyril of
Jerusalem. His fourth lecture is devoted to a
brief summary (ἀναπαραλαῖτοι στόχοιο) of the
doctrines which are necessary to be believed,
and he introduces such that is deeply interest-
ing on the following subjects:—God, Christ, the
Birth from the Virgin, the Cross, the Burial,
Resurrection, Ascension, the Future Judgment,
and the Holy Spirit. But these lessons are
followed by others on the condition of man, his
soil, his body, on his food, his clothing, his
resurrection; the latter, the Holy Scripture,
including a list of the books “which we read
confidently in the church.” In Saint Augustine’s
Enchiridion (15, vol. vi. col. 375) the Regula
Fidei is the creed. But in his Letters this
phrase (as well as the corresponding Regula
Veritatis) is used of the general or traditional
teaching of the church. Thus (Ep. xcvii. § 40)
in discussing the conduct of Cyprian as to the
rebaptizing of heretics, Augustine says that “if
Cyprian’s opinions were wrong at one time, he
afterwards corrected them by the rule of truth.”
In another letter (Ep. cxxv.) he says that “they
who deny the baptism of persons after
baptism, are utterly alien from the rule of the
Catholic faith, and from the teaching of Christ
and His Apostles.” (See, too, Ep. cxlvii. § 34.
In Epp. cxlvii. § 39, and cxxii. § 11, regula
fidei stands for the baptismal creed.)

As time passed along, the rule of the faith was
considered to include the decisions of the councils
which were generally received. Thus the council
of Chalcedon did not only confirm the creeds of
Nicaea and Constantinople, but it also adopted
the synodal letters of Cyril of Alexandria, and
the letter of Leo to Flavian, and, by way of
addition or explanation, it put out its own con-
fession. This confession was substantially incor-
porated with the document which Quesnel
conceived to be the letter on the faith which used
to be addressed by the popes of Rome on
their election to the bishops of the East. Again,
the collections of councils give, under the first
council of Toledo, “the rule of faith which the
bishops of Tarraconica and others transmitted
to Balconius, bishop of Gallician, against all
heresies, and especially against the Priscillanists.” (Labbe, ii. 1227; Mansi, iii. 1008.)
In the preface to the canons of the second council of Orange (C.
Arausiacus, antiqu. ii. 1200, Labbe, v. 1927;
Mansi, viii. 711) we read that some persons had
wandered from the rule of the faith in regard to
grace and free-will. The language quoted above
as from the first council of Toledo was repeated
at Braga in 563 (Labbe, v. 856; Mansi, iv. 774).
The well-known councils of Toledo (No. III. anno
589; No. IV. anno 633; No. VI. anno 638; No.
XI. anno 675) put forth representations of “the
Catholic faith” in ever-increasing volume, but
it is only in the last (apparently) that the bishops
used the phrase “Rule of Faith.” They said
that for three days they consulted together in order
that they might lay down these expanded rules of
faith, of which simplicity. (The result of their
deliberations occupies four columns in Labbe’s
folio, vi. 541—545.) A similar desire to expand
the rule according as necessity seemed to arise,
may be observed in other councils, as in Milan
A.D. 680, and in Rome the same year. About
these years, too, the pontifical wrot~ to the
popes on the offices of the church (Migne, lxxxii.),
in which we find (p. 817) a long chapter entitled
De Regula Fidei. The articles enumerated in it
FAITHLEC (FAITHLEI) founded the abbey of Contoutskert, in the barony of South Ballintober, co. Roscommon (Ware, Jr. Ant. c. 20; Mon. Hb. 90). [G. J.]

FAITHLENN, "son of Aedh Diarmhan, of the race of Corc, son of Lugaidh, &c., traced up to Oilill Olum, is commemorated in Mart. Doneg. at June 8. His name is the same as Faelain, son of Aedus Damanian or Bennanus, of the royal house of Munster, of whom, along with Colman and Fethadius, Colgan gives a short account at March 31. [FAELAIN (4)]. If they are not the same, they are brothers, and flourished in the first half of the 7th century, Aedh Bennan, king of West Munster, having died in A.D. 619, at which year the Ann. Tigernach have the death of Aedh Bennan, king of Munster (O'Conor, Rev. Hb. Script. ii. 184). At Sept. 5 there is a Faithleen, whom Mart. Tallaght calls "Faithleinn Deochoin," and O'Clery (in Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 297) suggests that he may be this Faithleinn. [G. J.]

FALCIDUS, a person, apparently a deacon of Rome, who endeavoured to shew (1) that in the pontificate Levites were in an equality with priests; (2) that under the New Testament deacons were to be so regarded in reference to presbyters. This presumptuous claim a writer, formerly supposed to have been St. Augustine, confutes in a treatise entitled De Sacratud Romanorum Levitarum. It is contained in a work entitled Questiones ex urbeque maritim. i.e. gathered both from the Old Testament and the New Testament, and is now placed in the appendix to vol. iii. of the works of Augustine, but it is no longer ascribed to him as its author. The writer shews conclusively enough that as the greater contains the less, so the presbyterate contains the diaconate, but that this does not imply that the two orders are identical. (Aug. Opp. vol. iii. App. p. 2301, qu. 101.) [H. W. P. J.]

FALCO (FOULQUS), 19th bishop of Maestricht (aft. Liége), succeeding his brother Encherius I. about A.D. 488, and followed by Enchorius II. upon his death, about A.D. 512. Upon his consecration he appears to have usurped episcopal rights over the church of Mouzon, which belonged to the see of Rheims, ordaining priests and deacons to it, and appointing an archdeacon and a precentor (primicerius scholae clarissimae), and appropriating the church revenues. These pretensions drew down from St. Remigius, the archbishop of Rheims, a letter of remonstrance, to be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxv. 968. (Geoff Pontificum Lcodiniun. i. 54, Liége, 1612, ed. Chapeaule; Gall. Christ. iii. 817; cf. Cellier, Hist. des Artistes sacrés, xi. 81.) [S. A. B.]

FALCONIA (FALTONIA) PROBA, of much esteem in the middle ages as a Christian poet, but of uncertain name, place, and family. Of her works there is but one extant, Contesces Virginiens (Bibl. Nat. Paris. 708-716, Paris, 1824; Virgil. Cant. exc. Hebr. Steph. an. 1578; Migne, Patr. Lat. t. xix. 802-818). She uses Virgil's words, after a short original preface, to tell the events of the Bible from the creation to the ascension of Christ, but her hexameters have little point in Christian teaching, and, from the very exigencies of the case, breathe little of Virgil. Her own identity is much disputed, and she is wholly unknown if she be not (and this identification appears to be generally assumed for want of information to the contrary) Ascia (or Valeria) Faltonia Proba, the pious wife of Sextus Anicius Petronius Probus (called by lictor, "Aedus Amicus proconsul"), whose wealth, wealth, and liberty made him one of the most honoured Romans in the end of the 4th century. [FALCONIA PROBA, in Dict. Greek and Roman Biography.] Her husband was consul with Gratian, and a Christian, though late in life; and her three sons, Olybrius, Probinus, and Probus, were also consuls. She had great influence at Rome, and used it in favour of the Christians: her daughter-in-law, Julianus, was the friend of St. Augustine, and her grand-daughter, Demetrius, the friend of St. Jerome. [DUMITRAS] From Cucusus in Armenia the exiled St. Cyprian, in A.D. 406, wrote a letter (Ep. 165 al. 188) to her in reference to the persecutions and disorders at Rome, recommending the confessors to her charity; and when Alaric had taken Rome (A.D. 410), and the widow Proba had found refuge in Africa, she came more immediately under the influence of St. Augustine of Hippo, and received from him (Ep. 130 al. 121) a letter in which, recognising her widowhood and wealth, he especially recommends to her the great duty of prayer. The time and place of Proba Falconia's death are unknown, and the above attempt at identification, though common, is very doubtful. (Baronius, Ann. Ecc. a. 385, i. ii. and 410, ir.; Cave, Script. Eccl. Lat. i. 255; Lindemannus, Corp. Gram. Lat. vol. ii. 65; Montfaucon, Dair. Ital. 38.) [J. G.]

FALDUS, bishop of Lyons. [FALOALDA]

FALLE, ST. [FIDOLUS]

FALLAMHAIN (FOLLOMAN), bishop, is commemorated on July 31, along with his brothers Colman, Jarnog, Natal or Naib, and Papan, who are said to have been the sons of Nadfraech, or rather the sons of that Aegeus, son of Nadfraech, king of Cashel or Munster, whom St. Patrick converted and baptized, and who was slain at Cillossedach, now Kells, co. Carlow, in A.D. 489. Fallamhain was bishop of Santry, now a village in the barony of Coolecon, co. Dublin. (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 207; Rogers, Antiq. Ulster, i. 168, c. 2, 176; Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. 4 ser. iii. 185.) [NAILL.] [J. G.]
FALTONIUS PINIANUS

FALTONIUS PINIANUS. [PINIANUS.]

FALVAX. The standard catalogue of the archbishops of Tarracina contains the death of Falvax, a.d. 578; but in most lists the name is marked as doubtful, and even placed at the end of the catalogue from uncertainty where it ought to stand. Domencia, in his life of Cyprian, archbishop of Carthage, places him before that bishop, and says that he died "cum insigni nomine et pietate." (Fluxus, Epist. Aegypt., v. 77; Annales, Series Episc. 76.) [L. D.]

FANTINUS (1), confessor. [FANTUS.]

FANTINUS (2), defender, who in 599 received letters from Gregory the Great in behalf of the Jews turned out of their synagogue, and on many other subjects. He is called defender of Palestines in one place, in another of Naples. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. ix. indicii. ii. ep. 53; lib. x. indicii. iii. ep. 14, etc.; Migne, lxxxv. 993-1078.) [FANTUS (68).] [A. H. D. A.]

FANTINUS, martyr, July 31, with Deodata his wife, under Diocletian. They were rich and of noble birth, living at Syracuse. While still bachelors they were charitable and devout, earnestly supplicating the gods to send them a child. In due time the child was born and named Fantinus, and they continued pangs till he reached the age of twelve. One day, when hunting, the boy pursued a deer into a cave where dwelt a hermit, by whom he was converted and baptized. Returning home he led his parents to embrace the faith. On making a public profession they were arrested, severely scourged, and cast with their child into prison. There in the middle of the night an angel appeared with a light, who encouraged the parents to endure, and allowed the boy to escape. A short time after, the parents suffered martyrdom. (Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vii. 177; Calendar, Vitae SS. Storia i. 149.) [G. T. S.]

FAOLEANN. [FAILA.]

FAOLEENN, FAOLAN. [FAOLAN.]

FABA, ST. (Burgundofaran), daughter of Chasarius, a high official at the court of Theodenbert king of Austria. Her mother was Leonegunda. She was at an early age consecrated to a conventual life by St. Columbanus, but being opposed by her father she fell ill. Her father intimated to the earnest representations of Columbanus and Eustathius. She then recovered, and took the veil at Meaux in 614. She was afterwards elected abbess of a convent called after her, Fara-medior, near Meaux. Here she established the rule of St. Columbanus, and died in 655. Her festival was kept on Dec. 7. An account of her will be found in Mabillon (Acta SS. O. S. B. t. ii. p. 400), based on the earlier mention of her by Jonas of Bobbio in his lives of Columbanus (sec. 50) and Eustathius (sec. 13) which are also given by Mabillon (ibid. pp. 22, 113.) [L. G. S.]

FARAMUNDUS (1) (Faramude), twelfth bishop of Paris, succeeding Eusebius II. and succeeding Simplicius. He was a son of Eugenius, the twenty-first bishop, on whose death he sought the bishopric, but was postponed in favour of the Syrian Eusebius II. (circa a.d. 591). On the latter's death, however, which was not long delayed, he succeeded him according to the catalogue. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. t. ii. 26; Gall. Chr. vii. 22; Gams, Series Episc. 598.) [S. A. S.]

FARAMUNDUS (2), usurping bishop of Liege, or, as the see was then called, Maastricht. Upon the death of Childeric II. in 673, St. Lambert was driven from the city and Faramundus put in his place. But after an exile of seven years, St. Lambert was restored by Pippin, and Faramundus ejected from the province. (Vita S. Landecberti, auct. Godescalco, in Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict. sec. iii. pt. i. pp. 71-2; Paris, 1668-1701.) [S. A. B.]

FARAMUNDUS (3), seventeenth bishop of Cologne, succeeding Anno I. and followed by Ruginfredus. His exact date is uncertain, but he sat early in the 8th century. Some have identified him with the preceding, but without authority. (Gall. Chr. iii. 629.) [S. A. B.]

FARRANN was one of the three brothers, called O'Burchan, viz., Farann, Boithgal, and Maolstoe, in the time of Cathal, son of Finghin, king of Munster, who died a.d. 742 (Ann. Tig.). These three are said to have been respectively bishop, judge, and poet, and to have made a digest of laws under the title Judicia Coelestia. (O'Reilly, Irish Writers, p. 81; O'Flaherty, Ogygia, ii. pt. iii. 78; Tanner, Bibl. 273; O'Conor, Proleg. ii. 67.) [J. G.]

FARANNAN. [FORANNAN.]

FARDULFUS, a native of Lombardy, whom Charles the Great carried into France along with king Didier, after the capture of Pavii. While in exile he became the fortunate discoverer of a plot formed against the life of Charles by his eldest son, Pepin, and upon the death of Magniarius, a.d. 790, was preferred, in consequence of this service, to the abbacy of St. Denys. Gratitude for his promotion led him to enlarge the monastery by the addition of a magnificent hall in which to entertain his patron. In a short poem, ascribed to Alcuin (Migne, Patrolog. vol. ci. p. 552), he is eulogized on account of his munificence in this and other respects. An ancient MS. belonging to the abbey records that he accompanied the king in his expedition against the Saxons in 795, and was likewise one of the delegates whom Charles appointed to visit and report upon the various provinces of his realm, with a view to the better enforcement of law. He died in 806, and was buried within the walls of the abbey of St. Denys. His only extant writings are three short elegiac poems, (1) An inscription written for the façade of the hall above mentioned. (2) An inscription for a chapel dedicated to St. John the Baptist, which he built in performance of a vow made in the first year of his exile. (3) A fragment addressed in all probability to his royal patron. (Migne, Patrolog. xii. p. 825.) [E. M. F.]

FARMUS, bishop of Viseo. [FIRMINUS.]

FARNAN. [FORANNAN.]

FARO (Burgundofara), St., nineteenth bishop of Meaux. There are three lives of him.
Faro

Extant, the chief and oldest of which, written by Hildegard, bishop of the same diocese, in the 9th century, in a diffuse and wearisome style, and by no means free from errors, is to be found in the Annals of Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti, ii. 606–625, Paris, 1688–1701. He was born in the district of Brie (Pagus Brigiensis), in Burgundy. Agnericuis, his father, was a noble of the court of theobert of Austrasia, who entertained St. Columba, and received the saint's blessing on his sons and daughters (Visa S. Columbani, Mabillon, ii. 255). His mother's name was Landegundis. Changaudois, bishop of Laon was his brother, and the famous St. Fara and Agnerudis were his sisters. His biographer quaintly derives his name from famen and ros, quod caelestis doctrina fando alius manabat eis ab ore, but it appears to have been the equivalent for a noble in the Burgundian language. The first part of his life was spent in courts. Theobert, Theodoris, Coltae II. and Dagobert II. were successively his patrons. His biographer asserts, though incorrectly (see Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. 2, 26), that the founder of Cluny, his relation of the elder II. Influenced, probably, in part by his sister St. Fara, he became a priest, after persuading his wife to take the veil. With his wealth he enriched the church of St. Stephen at Meaux, and was remarkable for his hospitality to the English and Irish missionaries. To St. Placitus, or Fergus, he gave land of his own for a monastery in the forest of Breuil, and St. Chelles, or Kilian, another Irishman, he received into his monastery and sent on a mission to the Atrebates (Artois). Under Dagobert I., son of Clotaire, he held the office of chancellor, or referendaris, in which capacity his signature is appended to a charter of the year 628 (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxi. 507). About this last date he became bishop of Meaux, succeeding Gundulf, and not Waldbert, as his biographer supposes (see Mabillon ut supr. n. and Le Coite, Annu. Eccl. Franc. an. 642, n. xiv. tom. iii. p. 647). His career as bishop is outlined by the dates of the charters he signed, but beyond them we have few details. In A.D. 635 or 636, he consecrated, in company with Audoenus, an altar at the monastery of Rebaiz, which Audoenus had built by Dagobert's command (Le Coite, Ann. Eccl. Franc. an. 636, n. ii. tom. iii. p. 30). In 644 he was present at the translation of the bodies of St. Crispin and St. Crispinian (Le Coite, an. 648, n. xii. tom. iii. 240). In 652 he subscribed a charter of Landericus, bishop of Paris, for the monastery of St. Dionysius (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 289). In 657 he was at the second council of Sens (Le Coite, an. 657 n. 16, tom. iii. 450). In 658 he subscribed the charter of Eunus, bishop of Sens, for the monastery of St. Pierre le Vif (Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 1171); and in 662 he was one of the bishops to whom Berthefridus of Amiens addressed his concession for the monastery of Corbie (Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 1178). In 696 he signed that of Drauinus, bishop of Soissons, for the convent of the Blessed Virgin in that city (Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 1183). He was himself the builder of a monastery on his own land, which he dedicated to the Holy Cross, John the Baptist, and all the Apostles, according to Le Coite (an. 642, n. lixii. tom. iii. 102) in A.D. 642, and in which he entertained Adria, the companion of Theodore, on his way to England, in 698 (Beza, Hist. Ecol. iv. 1). In his biography are found several miracles. He died, according to Mabillon, in 672, and was buried in the church of the monastery he had built. His successor in the see was St. Hildegardus. His day of commemorations is the 28th of Oct. (Usuard, Mart. Migne, Patr. Lat. xxiv. 629; Boll. Acta SS. Oct. ii. 593; Gall. Christ. viii. 1599.)

[4. S. A. B.]

FAROALDUS I., the first Lombard duke of Spoleto, c. 580. According to Paulus Diaconus (iii. 13) he attacked and devastated Clasis, the port of Ravenna. This is improbable. (Note by Wits, Monum. Rerum Langob. 1878, p. 100. Catalogus Imperatorum Ducum, etc. in Mon. Lang. p. 521.)

[5. A. D. A.]

FAROALDUS II., duke of Spoleto, c. 703, son of Thrasamund. He invaded Clasis, the port of Ravenna, but at the command of king Liutprand restored it to the Greeks. His son Thrasamund rebelled against him, c. 724, deposed him and made himself duke. (Paulus Diacon. vi. 30–44. Catalogus Imperatorum Ducum, etc. in Monum. Rerum Langob. 1878, p. 522.) Pope John VII. confirmed the privileges and property of the abbey of Farfa at the request of Farold (Jaffe, Regesta Pont. p. 173; Troya, Ecles. Dipl. ad 374, ii. 61.) He is also mentioned in Historia Ffarianum (Pertz, Monum. Scriptores, xii. 524.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FASCIUS (Fascius), a Christian of Hippo Regius, who, having incurred a debt of fifteen soli, and called him to an account, and for a period of three years. In order to avoid the disgrace of a public appeal to the congregation to meet this difficulty, Augustine was obliged to borrow the money from Macedonius (Maciodonius), under promise that he should make up the deficiency, if any, should be made up from the property of the church, assuring them at the same time that whatever was given in this way was really offered to God. (Aug. Ep. 248; Bingham, Orig. viii. 11, 4; Tillemont, th. 93, vol. viii. p. 338.)

[6. W. P.]

FASIR, one of the leaders of the Circumcellions, whom their followers dignified with the title of "leaders of the saints." (Opt. iii. 4.) (Donatini, Vol. i. p. 863; Ambrosii.)

[A. W. P.]

FASI SICULI [CHRISTIAN PIUS].

FASCIUS [FASCIUS].

FASSTOSUS. A monk and presbyter is the north African church at the commencement of the 6th century, at the time when the persecuting zeal of the Arians under their Vandal princes had desolated the church and exiled her bishops. Fasstosus, according to the strongly-worded accusations of Valgentius of Ruspe, deser-
FASTIDIUS, of whom Genadius of Marsella, in his book De Illustrissimis Viris (written about A.D. 480, see Ebert's Geschichte der Christlich-Lateinischen Literatur, i. 427), c. 56, says—"Fastidius Britanniarum episcopos scriptis ad Fastatum [que dam] de Vita Christiana librum usum, et alium de Viduata servanda, sana et bea digna doctrina." The Corby MS. of Genadius has merely "Fastidios Britto," but the other MSS. read as above, and Fastidius may have been one of the numerous Celtic bishops without fixed sees. He only wrote one work, addressed to a widow, Fatilia, whom he calls "deilectissima soror," but the last chapter is headed "Viduarum tripexus genus;" the book itself he compares to country bread, which is better for the hungry than that made of very fine flour. It is printed in Galland, ix. p. 481-483, as a separate work, after Holstenius's example, having been previously assigned to St. Augustine. In literary tradition the great name swallows up all the little names, and some semi-Pelagian works have thus been assigned to the very father who combated Pelagianism. Fastidius actually quotes his fellow-countryman Pelagius twice, though without naming him, and Genadius himself a semi-Pelagian, prays him for his sound doctrine. In one place Fastidius speaks of those who sin "after Adam's example," the very phrase of Pelagius; in another he copies Pelagius's advice as to how the saints should pray, words similarly addressed to a widow, Iulia, the mother of Demetrius. (See Galland, ix. pref. p. xix.; H. Wharton's Historia de Episcopis et Decanis Londinensibus, p. 6; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 10.)

FATHERS, THE. This term has been applied variously, both in classical and Christian times (see DICT. OF CHRISTIAN ANT. I. 665). It is here considered with reference to those primeval writers of the Christian church whose remains constitute what is called Patristic literature—a literature commencing with the 1st but ending practically with the 7th century, there having been few representatives of it acknowledged in the West and East alike subsequently to the sixth council, A.D. 680, when the last of the great heroes relating to the Incarnation—viz., Monothelitism—was condemned. And, in truth, when we come to inquire when and where the application of the term in this sense commenced, we shall find that when isolated instances might be cited of its earlier application, it dates as a phrase from the time when the bishops who met in eccumenical synods at Nicæa for the first time began to be so designated by their supporters and admirers in the struggle that ensued between the Nicæans and those who made rather to men than books; to lives and deaths in defence of the faith rather than logic or rhetoric. Those who had lived for it were called brethren; those who had suffered for it, athletes or confessors; and those who had died for it, martyrs; even in referring to their works for what was held and taught in primitive times. (Comp. Euseb. E. H. v. 28. 2.) tertullian himself founds his rule, not on the consent of fathers, but of churches (De Praes. c. 32–6). It is St. Athanasius who first quotes "fathers" as witnesses to the faith: "If the faith," he says, "commenced with the present consolatip;"—"as the Ecstasy emanating from his opponents was being dated—"how will the fathers and the blessed martyrs fare?" (cap. Soc. E. H. ii. 37). And again, "It is not only now that the canons and formularies of the church were placed in our hands; but they were handed down to us securely and faithfully by the fathers." (Ep. Enucle. § 1.) It was in a measure of the council of Nicæa that per-rogative which it retains to this day. The first
fathers to be quoted as a distinct authority were "the ἤχον" (318) fathers." All earlier or later writers upholding the doctrine set forth in their creeds, or by the help of Augustine, were not considered as having any distinct and style by succeeding councils and of controversy, in quoting from their works. "We pronounce," say the bishops of the fourth council in their first canon, "it to be befitting and just that the canons of the holy fathers made in every synod to this time remain in full force and authority, but that no one is confirmed, nor their framers classed with fathers in this pronouncement. Subsequently the fathers were distinguished according to the age in which they lived by the epithets apostolic, ante-Nicene, post-Nicene, &c.; or, with reference to their writings, apologists, doctors, commentators, &c.; or, with reference to their country, Greek, Latin, African, Gallican, Anglican, &c. Of African fathers, St. Fulgentius in the 6th century was the latest; of Greek, St. John Damascene in the 8th; of Latin, St. Gregory the Great in the 6th, Venerable Bede in the 9th, St. Peter Damian in the 11th, and St. Bernard in the 12th. Another distinction ought also to be pointed out and remarked upon: viz., into saints and unsaints. For as there are numerous saints in the calendar who were never styled fathers, so there are several of the fathers who were never styled saints. Origen and Tertullian, in particular, have been placed in this latter class, all the world over, as being unsound on some points, though, for general purposes, their authority ranks high even among the fathers. Further, as it was no pope, but common consent, which qualified the honour in which their names should be held, so neither was it any pope, but common consent, that dictated which of the fathers should also be styled saints. Canonization, in the modern sense of the word, was a process unknown in their day. The epithets ante-Nicene and post-Nicene explain themselves; but the chronological division of fathers who lived ante-nicene or posterior to the first council of Nicea, a.d. 325. Apostolical, viz., such as were personally known to the apostles, or anyhow flourished in the same age, form a subdivision of group I., with St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, and St. Polycarp of Smyrna, for its chief heads. All that can be said about them personally, or their extant letters—the only species of composition remaining to us certainly belonging to this period—will be found in this work under their respective names. Under "Barbaras," similarly, will be found all that can be said of the epistle ascribed to him; and under 'Hermas,' of the allegorical work bearing his name, called 'The Shepherd.' The authorship and character of the 'Epistle to Diognetus' is discussed under that title. At first the writings of the fathers were for the most part "apologetic," that is, of a defensive character. Even the epistles of St. Ignatius, and of St. Clement of Rome, so far as they are depreciatory, though addressed to believers, might be so classed. For St. Clement depreciates deicides as being against Christian brotherhood; St. Ignatius as being against church-order. Indeed, it should be pointed out that though, popularly, by Apologists are meant such as opposed Christianity from the time assigned to them already, very little could be said about their works here that would not involve repetition. Thus much it may, however, be well to add: 1. These treatises have, generally speaking, a two-fold value for us, which is more than can be said of half the mere controversial works of the next period. For they are valuable, both as shewing the objections urged against Christianity by contemporaries with the living facts in full view; and as answering by anticipation objections of the same kind recast and repeated in modern times. Greeks, Romans and Jews of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries were judges of the intrinsic merits of the cause they defended by the Apologists than the accust thinkers and subtlest reasoners in lands permeated by Christian influences can be now; and the wholesale conversion of the vastest, most civilized, most heterogeneous empire that the world has yet seen by Christianity, is a homage to the weight of argument in its favour at its commencement, and antecedently to its achievement, such as we may fairly say no other cause can be shewn to have received before or since. Further, in estimating their collective value, we must never forget that the greater portion of these treatises has not come down to us. 2. It must be remembered that, from the nature of the case, Christian Apologists, when they had pangs for their opponents, could only base their arguments on such grounds as pugnacium would admit. Pagan subterfuges and pagan mythology supplied them, of course, with topics in abundance for retorting on their opponents; but the principles of morality and natural theology were the sole topics to which they could appeal of a positive kind. In reasoning with the Jews, again, the Scriptures of the Old Testament form the bonds to the argument from the Revelation. It was first in controversy with heretics, that the New, as well as the Old Testament, formed the stand-point on both sides. Heretics attacked the interpretation put on the whole Bible by the Church, and the fathers defended it. As, therefore, St. Justin Martyr was the earliest of the extant Apologists proper, so the great work of St. Irenæus may be called the earliest of the Apologies special. And these two classes of works may be compared with profit. For this distinction is of the utmost importance to ourselves, in estimating their respective references to Scripture. Tertullian supplies us with some treatises of each kind, for example: Nov. throughout his Apology, and his work addressed To the Nations, though desecrating on Jewish history and Christian customs in both, he never once quotes Scripture as Scripture. In a single passage of his work Against the Jews, he is surprised into saying: "Et merito evangelium—whom, however, he will not name—et prophetae usque ad Joannem." (c. 8). In the
very next chapter, as though conscious of having gone too far, he quotes sayings of the Jews and of Christ recorded in the Gospels, but without quoting, where they are to be found. "Sic et Babylon apud Joannem nostrum Romae urbis figur at est" (25) is his sole remaining explicit reference to the New Testament; but, again, the work to which he refers is not named. In his treatise, De Praescriptione Haereticarum, on the one hand, he accepts the testimony of all the Gospels, but he quotes professedly more than one hundred times, with the books as often as not, named, from which he quotes. St. Irenæus was contemporary with Tertullian, and St. Justin Martyr, about a quarter of a century prior to both. The Refutation of all Heresies contains quotations from heresies about as much earlier than St. Justin, as St. Hippolytus, his reputed author, was later than St. Irenæus.

These quotations from heresies we class for convenience with the Apologies and work against Tertullian by St. Justin: their Refutation, whether by St. Irenæus or not, is the well-known work of St. Irenæus on the same subject. On comparing them, we get a repetition of the same phenomena noticed in the treatises corresponding to them by Tertullian, for which a cause must be sought.

That is to say: (1) St. Justin, in his first Apology, produces a number of the sayings of Christ as the sayings of Christ, but omits points of detail, where they are to be found. In quoting from the books of the Old Testament, on the contrary, he names their authors without any reserve. First in one passage, speaking of the institution of the Eucharist, he ventures on referring to what the apostles had handed down, εις τον βλεπον ανωμαλουσαν—using a word familiarized already to his hearers in the "Memoriae of Socrates" by Xenophon, as Grabe points out—κατεναν ουκ ουκεται, as if apologizing for having named them. And in the next chapter, he refers to the "Memoriae of Hermas," and the "Apocalypse of Peter" with the "Writings of the Prophets," as though covering his reference to the first by the last. In his second Apology there is no reference to them whatever. In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Moses, Isaiah, Hosen, David, Ezekiel, Amos, Malachi, Zacharias, Daniel, are being quoted, but nowhere, when he speaks of the Gospels and twenty passages where the sayings of Christ are quoted as His, there is but one where the alleged saying is said to be found written in the Gospel generally. (2) The sayings of Christ are not, but four, where they are said to be written in the "Memoriae of the Apostles," and some of these, the last, where the writer admits having learnt it from thence (§§ 101, 102, 104, 105). (2) Of all the citations from the works of heretics in their Refutation, but one, ηδη, from Basilides, refers to 'the Gospels' by name (vii. 10), though there are numbers where the sayings of Christ are quoted as His.

Reserve so studiously cannot have been accidental, whether we be justified in affirming it proceeded from ignorance of the Gospels in the shape they now bear, for Tertullian, who maintains equal reserve throughout his works against heathen and Jews, in his single work on Prescription, could have scarce shown more intimate familiarity with them than he whom the New Testament had he now been alive. Christian had been authoritatively warned against "cutting their pearls before swine," and this, and not lack of materials to refer to, prompted their reserve, when quoting professedly from books with which even heretics shared more or less. If Origen, writing against Celsus, is more explicit at times, it is due to the fact that he was really writing for Christians whose minds had been shaken by the vigorous onslaught upon their sacred books of one concomitant with their contents. Nevertheless, compare this work of Origen with that of St. Irenæus against heresies, and the contrast is plain. The Gospels were no authority for Celsus, nor did he raise questions, or expend criticism, about their authors. He disputed their facts, reviled their doctrines, imputed their miracles to occult arts. Origen, accordingly, referred to them from the standpoint of his opponent, and no further. The heretics, refuted by St. Irenæus, appealed to them, and to works which they placed on the same footing, in confirmation of their own peculiar views. St. Irenæus was, therefore, called upon not merely to quote Scripture, but to show distinctly what interpretations had been put upon it by the church, and what books received into the canon. Such was the diligence, and such the prophetic instinct, with which he performed his task; that, as if purposely to meet an exception to their genuineness, made 1700 years after his time, he quotes not only the opening but the concluding words of the Gospel of St. Mark, as they stand now (c. Haer. iii. 10).

(3) It has been often observed, as of the fathers in general, so of the apologists in particular, that they repeat each other. This is true, but it is not peculiar to either by any means. All it proves is: 1, that they were literary men—readers, as well as writers, that is, And, 2, that they had a literature of their own. Tertullian and St. Irenæus lived in the same age so completely that each may well have read and pondered over the other. Yet there is little or no ground for saying that Tertullian was indebted to St. Irenæus for his masterly treatise, De Præscript., though considerably more than the germ of it is contained in the second and third chapters of the third book of the latter against Heresies. St. Vincentius of Lerins in the 5th century, could scarce be supposed unacquainted with the writings of both, but his Commentaries could not, with any justice, be stigmatized as the work of a plagiarist. A literature circumscribed in its range by the same facts, and inspired to overflowing by the same principles and aspirations, must necessarily repeat itself again and again in varying degrees, as occasion may require. Men who think alike, and put pen to paper on the same subjects, must inevitably write alike, whether professing to quote from each other or not. Floating ideas are inseparable from every such literature. Now, that there was such a thing as patriotic literature, from the earliest times downward, is a fact which cannot be denied, though probably nine-tenths of it have been lost. Of the great work of St. Irenæus against heresics, and of the commentaries of Origen on the Old and New Testament for instance, what have we now remaining but fragments or translations? How many more works by them and by others have totally disappeared, that Eusebius names as
entertaining confused notions of what they professed to believe, or with believing some things which their successors pronounced heretical. Now, first, as regards their personal orthodoxy, it has been too solidly vindicated by bishop Bell against Petavius, ever to be called in question again. Next, as regards definite thought and formulated expression, it is a charge which would apply with as much force to the post-Nicene fathers as to ante-Nicene, to the present as to past ages alike. It is a simple fact, that all truth gains by discussion amongst men. And if the ante-Nicene fathers merely permitted themselves language that was subsequently refined, and expressed views that were subsequently qualified, after careful analysis by all of what they taught or believed, and authoritative declaration by the church of the boundaries between truth and error; they could not, without manifest unfairness, be contrasted unfavourably with any that followed them on that ground alone.

When St. Athanasius, for instance, in his certain exposition and development in the Diognæus against the Arians; and St. Augustine certain passages in St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and Rufinus, against the Pelagians; are not reminded of words like "hypothesis," and phrases like "Dominicus homo," requiring or less, exactness in St. Athanasius himself and of the two books of Retractions, let us face to the voluminous works of St. Augustine by his own request? "Quid igitur opus est," as he nobly says of his predecessors, "ut error accurmur epuscula, qui prius quam haeresibus oritetur, non habuerunt necessitatem in difficulter solvendum quaecumque: quod procul dubio equum, si respondere tabibus cogentur". "(De Præd. c. 14.) Or, again, in apologizing for his own shortcomings: "Pulchimus enim singulis quamque haeresibus intahale ecclesiae proprias quaestionum, contra quas dilegentius defenderetur Scriptura Divina, quam sitnulla necessitates cogat." "(De Ius Div. c. 25.) Or, in another subject: "Et de Patre quindecim libris dissertavert docti et spiritualissimi viri... de Spiritu Sancto autem noundum tam copioso nec diligerent disputatum est a doctis et magnis Divinarum SCRIPTURARUM tractatores, ut intelligi facile posse et Eius proprium, quod propter ut Eum neque Filium neque Patrem dicere possimus, sed tantum Spiritum Sanctum". "(De Fide et Syn., § 18, 19.) Yet this treatise was delivered as a discourse, "in the presence of the whole African episcopate, just twenty years after the publication of the well-known treatise, De Spiritu Sancto, by St. Beili. The fact is, the fathers in all ages had their attention concentrated on the controversies of their own day, and seldom either raked up exploded errors, or refuted new by anticipation. Truth was drawn out by them in logical sequence, but without any design on their part, by being asserted against one error after another in succession. From the 1st to the end of the 4th century, all heresies, beginning with Gnosticism and ending with Macedonianism, were directed against the fact of the Incarnation of the Trinity, and embodied a denial either of the reality of the Human and Divine Natures in the Incarnate Word, or of the existence of that Person of one substance, power, and eternity
met also decisively by the doctrine of the descent of Christ into hell, which was acknowledged on all hands, and understood to mean the descent of His human soul. As Tertullian says of
Prætos, "Ipse dicit Patrem descendentem in virginem, ipsum ex tā natum, ipsum passum, desire ipsum esse Jesum Christum" (c. 1). No other contemporary works against it have been preserved entire. Arius distinguished between the "Patris". As he who became the man and refused to follow Artemon and Paul of Samosata, who had pronounced Him to be no more than man, yet denied Him to be very God. Thence, then, was the thesis which the first council of Nicaea resolved on maintaining under anathema, and which all the earlier post-Nicene fathers defended with their pens and lives, beginning with St. Athanasius. It is to his works, indeed almost exclusively, that we must go for a refutation of Arianism proper. St. Hilary supplies historical facts: in some cases of great value. St. Gregory Nazianzen, servid oralatio; St. Cyril of Alexandria, or three tracts; and the five books of St. Basil against Eunomius expose the impious tenets of the party called Anomoeans. But of other then renowned controversyists and champions of orthodoxy, Hosius of Cordova, Alexander of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, Eusebius of Vercelli, Meletius, and Paulinus, only fragments or letters remain. Eusebius the historian left a work against Marcellus, bishop of Ancyræa, who was thought, in opposing Arianism, to have fallen into Sabellianism. Of his own orthodoxy the truest account seems to be, that he was no follower of Arius any more than of St. Athanasius. Failing in their attacks on the Second Person in the Trinity, but unable to recover their equilibrium, a portion of the semi-Arians, headed by Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople, called in question the Godhead of the Third. This caused a further addition to the creed on that head, which, though put into form, and accepted at Constantinople, was first promulgated at Chalcedon. I didymus of Alexandria, St. Basil, and St. Ambrose, left treatises on the subject, but they went no deeper than to the point which had been assailed, leaving a wide field open to St. Augustine, and the theologians of Charlemagne.

The manner of the Incarnation—in other words, how God became man—was the latest point controverted. Apollinarius, father and son, started the idea that the Word had been made flesh without assuming a human soul. Nestorius, that He had assumed not merely soul and body, but a human person. Eutyches, that He had united both natures in His own Person, but that after their union they were no longer two. Monothelism, that there were no longer two wills. It was easy to see that all these positions were met by the simple words of the creed "was made man," in their full, obvious, and ascribing acceptance. As St. Augustine puts it: "Qui temporali dispensationi multis modis haec dictavit haeretici. Sed si quis tenerius catholico fideum, ut toto hominem credat a Verbo Dei esse suceptum: id est, corpus, animam, spiritum—satis contra illos munitus est" . . . (De Fide et Smyth, § 8). Nevertheless each point was contested and had to be made good in succession. St. Athanasius himself wrote two books against the Apollinarians. They were
himself. He began life with the Manicheans, whose errors he espoused subsequently with much force. He was a semi-Pelagian on some points himself, till he commenced refuting Pelagius; and had he lived on till the schism of the Eastern and Western churches had become fact, he would have found his famous argument against the Donatists—Securus judicat orbit terrarum—crumble away under his feet.

Dogmatism was not the creation of St. Augus-
tine: yet neither is his dogmatic tone different from his with whom it originated, as we shall see. In the work of the renowned Origen, de Principiis, we have the earliest specimen of a dogmatic work on revealed truth in the Chris-
tian church; and these are the lines on which it was constructed, unless Rufinus misrepresents them: \textit{Sicut enim multis apud Graecos et bar-
baros pollicitibus virtutem, desivimus apud omnes eas quasere, qui eam falsis opinionibus asserantem, postestquam credidimus Filium Dei esse Christianum, et ab ipso nobis hanc descendam esse nec ullam quasen qui cum multis sint, qui putant sentire quse Christi sunt, et nonnulli eorum diversa a prioribus sentiant: servetur vero ecclesiastica praedicatio per successionis ordinem ab apostolis tradita, et usque ad praeceps in ecclesia permanens: illa sola credenda est veritas, quae in nuce ab ecclesiastica apostolica tradita.}\ (§ 2). Within these limits, and no further, he conceived himself at liberty to speculate, or form conclusions of his own. Whether he never exceeded these limits is another question. But the ground was untrod, and he was a pioneer of such amazing insight and energy, that, right or wrong, he has been a luminous beacon in each case for all who followed. But it was only by degrees that any fresh advance was made. Credos had to be got into shape before they could be systematically expanded. This, in reality, was the earliest shape which dogmatism assumed in the church; and of this, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his fourth and fifth letters to the bishops of Egypt, was the first, but one of the best specimens we possess. The commentary now given to Rufinus is another of the same kind. Many such tracts or sermons occur among the works of St. Augustine; and after his time it became a literature. Exposi-
tions of faith were published by St. Athanasius and St. Cyril, and there are letters of each highly prized for their dogmatic character, particularly the third letter of the latter to Nesi-
torius, which, with the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, were received in the definition of the fourth council as authoritative exponents of the Incarnation. Two longer treatises by St. Cyril,—\textit{On the Holy and Essential Trinity}, the second entitled \textit{The Treasury}—should not be passed over here; nor, again, the twelve books, \textit{On the Trinity}, by St. Hilary, nor, again, the \textit{Anacrasis} of St. Epiphanius, with the seven books, \textit{On the Incarnation}, by St. John Cassian, written at the request of St. Leo.

But the master-piece by far of this period in dogmatism was the great work of St. Augustine on the Trinity, and never perhaps was a deep subject handled more delicately or expounded more luminously, or each conclusion of the author respecting it expressed with more mo-
desty and reserve. This is his temper at start-
\textit{Zeus quisque habe legiti; ubi pariter certus est, perget mecum: ubi pariter habe, quaeruntur: ubi pariter suum credit, redeat ad me.}\ Its ingenuity simul cancia-
viam, tendentes ad Eum de quo dictum est: \textit{Quasiere faciem Eius semper.}\ Quisquis ergo, cum legiti, dicti, \textit{hoc non bene dictum est, quoniam non intelligi} : locutionem non intelligi, non fide, et forte vere potui dicere, verei plurium veritatem non lucem, sed in omnibus ab omnibus intelligeretur. Vide ergo qui hoc in sermoni meo disputet, utrum alios in talibus rebus questionibus versate intelligat, cum me non intelligi; et si est, ponat librum meum: vel etiam, si hoc visi-
tur, abjicit: et si potius, quaestum intelligi, operam et tempus impleat. . . . Qui vero legens dicit, \textit{Intello quidem quod dictum est, sed non vere dictum est;} asserat, si placet, sen-
tentiam suam et redarguat meam, si poterit: Quod si cum caritate et veritate fecerit, milite etiam (si in hae vitâ maneo) cognoescat facere cumverbatim, alium veritatem liber, hujus mei celerem. (\textit{De Trin. i. 3}). Strange words indeed to have proceeded from the founder of theological dogma for the West! The treatises of Gennadius, \textit{de Dogm. Eccl.} in the 5th century; of St. Fulgentius, \textit{de Fide ad Pet.} in the 5th; and of Alcuin, \textit{de Trin.}\ (which is, in other respects, mere plagiarisms throughout), in the 8th; show how widely professed admirers and disciples had wandered from their spirit even by then. How-
ever, the four books of St. John Damascene, \textit{Fide Orth.}, in the 8th century, form the true point of departure from the patristic to the scholastic method. "In laudem sedet Joannis Damasceni," says Le Metayer of them, "quod in se habet volumen Doctorum Doctorum primus confusionis sancti-
ti structum digerisset." (Op. i. 118).

Commentators are the next class of writers that patristic literature supplies; and they are readily distinguished from other classes, and yield in importance to none, having, of course, the Scriptural literature, scripture nor the first, but one of the best specimens we possess. The commentary now given to Rufinus is another of the same kind. Many such tracts or sermons occur among the works of St. Augustine; and after his time it became a literature. Exposi-
tions of faith were published by St. Athanasius and St. Cyril, and there are letters of each highly prized for their dogmatic character, particularly the third letter of the latter to Nesi-
torius, which, with the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, were received in the definition of the fourth council as authoritative exponents of the Incarnation. Two longer treatises by St. Cyril,—\textit{On the Holy and Essential Trinity}, the second entitled \textit{The Treasury}—should not be passed over here; nor, again, the twelve books, \textit{On the Trinity}, by St. Hilary, nor, again, the \textit{Anacrasis} of St. Epiphanius, with the seven books, \textit{On the Incarnation}, by St. John Cassian, written at the request of St. Leo.

But the master-piece by far of this period in dogmatism was the great work of St. Augustine on the Trinity, and never perhaps was a deep subject handled more delicately or expounded more luminously, or each conclusion of the author respecting it expressed with more mo-
desty and reserve. This is his temper at start-
\textit{Zeus quisque habe legiti; ubi pariter certus est, perget mecum: ubi pariter habe, quaeruntur: ubi pariter suum credit, redeat ad me.}\ Its ingenuity simul cancia-
viam, tendentes ad Eum de quo dictum est: \textit{Quasiere faciem Eius semper.}\ Quisquis ergo, cum legiti, dicti, \textit{hoc non bene dictum est, quoniam non intelligi} : locutionem non intelligi, non fide, et forte vere potui dicere, verei plurium veritatem non lucem, sed in omnibus ab omnibus intelligeretur. Vide ergo qui hoc in sermoni meo disputet, utrum alios in talibus rebus questionibus versate intelligat, cum me non intelligi; et si est, ponat librum meum: vel etiam, si hoc visi-
tur, abjicit: et si potius, quaestum intelligi, operam et tempus impleat. . . . Qui vero legens dicit, \textit{Intello quidem quod dictum est, sed non vere dictum est;} asserat, si placet, sen-
tentiam suam et redarguat meam, si poterit: Quod si cum caritate et veritate fecerit, milite etiam (si in hae vitâ maneo) cognoescat facere cumverbatim, alium veritatem liber, hujus mei celerem. (\textit{De Trin. i. 3}). Strange words indeed to have proceeded from the founder of theological dogma for the West! The treatises of Gennadius, \textit{de Dogm. Eccl.} in the 5th century; of St. Fulgentius, \textit{de Fide ad Pet.} in the 5th; and of Alcuin, \textit{de Trin.}\ (which is, in other respects, mere plagiarisms throughout), in the 8th; show how widely professed admirers and disciples had wandered from their spirit even by then. How-
ever, the four books of St. John Damascene, \textit{Fide Orth.}, in the 8th century, form the true point of departure from the patristic to the scholastic method. "In laudem sedet Joannis Damasceni," says Le Metayer of them, "quod in se habet volumen Doctorum Doctorum primus confusionis sancti structum digerisset." (Op. i. 118).

Commentators are the next class of writers that patristic literature supplies; and they are readily distinguished from other classes, and yield in importance to none, having, of course, the Scriptural literature, scripture nor the first, but one of the best specimens we possess. The commentary now given to Rufinus is another of the same kind. Many such tracts or sermons occur among the works of St. Augustine; and after his time it became a literature. Exposi-
tions of faith were published by St. Athanasius and St. Cyril, and there are letters of each highly prized for their dogmatic character, particularly the third letter of the latter to Nesi-
torius, which, with the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, were received in the definition of the fourth council as authoritative exponents of the Incarnation. Two longer treatises by St. Cyril,—\textit{On the Holy and Essential Trinity}, the second entitled \textit{The Treasury}—should not be passed over here; nor, again, the twelve books, \textit{On the Trinity}, by St. Hilary, nor, again, the \textit{Anacrasis} of St. Epiphanius, with the seven books, \textit{On the Incarnation}, by St. John Cassian, written at the request of St. Leo.

But the master-piece by far of this period in dogmatism was the great work of St. Augustine on the Trinity, and never perhaps was a deep subject handled more delicately or expounded more luminously, or each conclusion of the author respecting it expressed with more mo-
desty and reserve. This is his temper at start-
\textit{Zeus quisque habe legiti; ubi pariter certus est, perget mecum: ubi pariter habe, quaeruntur: ubi pariter suum credit, redeat ad me.}\ Its ingenuity simul cancia-
viam, tendentes ad Eum de quo dictum est: \textit{Quasiere faciem Eius semper.}\ Quisquis ergo, cum legiti, dicti, \textit{hoc non bene dictum est, quoniam non intelligi} : locutionem non intelligi, non fide, et forte vere potui dicere, verei plurium veritatem non lucem, sed in omnibus ab omnibus intelligeretur. Vide ergo qui hoc in sermoni meo disputet, utrum alios in talibus rebus questionibus versate intelligat, cum me non intelig
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inspired by his. St. Augustine moreover, in his third book *Upon Christian Doctrine*, gives his own rules for interpreting Scripture, which he comes to that point; and in mentioning the rules of Tiberiusus the Donatist afterwards with approbation, shows that he was unacquainted with any biblical authority to whom he could refer with more confidence. No doubt in their sermons, and devotional works generally, the Fathers expatiate with a freedom that has provoked criticism, on the mystical sense; but this is just the case where the appeal to it is seldom otherwise than edifying, and arguing from it cannot mislead. So far as their specifications are concerned there is certainly no disproportionate prominence given to the mystical sense, nor any neglect shown for the literal, by SS. Jerome, Chrysostom, and Cyril; Theodoret and Theophylyact, who pass for the best patristic commentators on the Old and New Testaments. St. Augustine cannot be called a commentator in the ordinary sense of the word; nor his noble, and for all devotional purposing, that work upon the Psalms, a commentary. The *Morala* of St. Gregory the Great on the book of Job is another of the same kind. But, as interpreters of Scripture, we should in all fairness judge the Fathers from their commentaries rather than from their sermons, or works written for spiritual instruction. Again, to estimate their commentaries aright, we must compare them, not with the accumulated wealth of ages in modern times, but with Ammonius upon Aristotle, Servius upon Virgil, the expositors in general upon the classics, their contemporaries. It must be conceded, indeed, at stressing their subject-matter matters to their advantage; still it would have covered them with confusion, had they proved unequal to it. Taking them as they stand, it will hardly be denied that the commentaries of the Fathers on the Scriptures in general are better reading than ordinary scholia, and St. Chrysostom on the Psalms Exposition than Servius on the Aeneid. Several complications from the Fathers, however, must not be considered their equivalents in this comparison.

Letters, again, form another important branch of patristic literature, and here likewise, though we have the letters of Cicerio and others of the Augustinian charge that the Fathers may fairly be said to hold their own. The papal neglects, to begin with alone, comprising a multitudinous as well as continuous correspondence without a break, spread over at least fifteen centuries, have no parallel either in ancient or modern times, among royal, scientific, or ordinary correspondence; nor in the archives of any kingdom whatsoever. Of mere Fathers, we have: 270 genuine letters from or to St. Augustine, 428 of St. Basil, 242 of St. Gregory Nazianzen, 150 of St. Jerome, 50 of St. Paulinus of Nola, 147 of Apollinaris Sidonius, 225 of St. Chrysostom, 146 of Theodoret, to name no more, all teeming with information on questions, and feelings, and customs of the day; edifying alike for the high sentiment and aspiration they breathe, and for the spiritual instruction, no less than the theological and ecclesiastical lore with which they abound. It is of this branch that the author says: "I might perhaps have made another, and a very interesting branch of the prose Christian literature, the epistolary." Those desiring some choice specimens of it ready to hand may find them in the exquisitely rendered extracts from letters of St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Basil, for the most part in the *Church of the Fathers*, by Dr. Newman. But the letters that passed between St. Jerome and St. Augustine (Ep. xxviii, xli, lxiii—lxiv, lxv—lxvi.ii) may well be read for the noble passage of controversy they exhibit between two great men; the letters of St. Jerome to Sunnia and Fretela (Ep. civ.) for its biblical criticism; to Evagrius (Ep. cxiv.) for remarks on ecclesiastical orders; of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, preserved among his letters (Ep. xlv.) for its notices of the Holy Land at that date. Several of the letters of St. Paulinus of Nola possess interest, as being written in the joint names of husband and wife—Paulinus et Thesaria—and that husband a bishop or priest at least, and addressed in three cases to St. Augustine (Ep. iv, vi, xiv); another (Ep. I.) asks his help in interpreting Scripture.

Several of the letters of Apollinaris Sidonius are addressed 'domino papae Lupo salutem'; viz. to St. Lupus, bishop of Troyes, who accompanied St. Germanus from France to aid the bishops of Britain in their struggle with Pelagianism. Other letters from him to other bishops are couched in the same style, proving its application to bishops in general to have been in constant use then. Of the twelve books called *Variae* by Cassiodorus, consisting for the most part of letters, edicts, and rescripts, it has already been observed in this work (art. Cassiodorus) that "apart from the study of those pages, it is hardly possible to obtain a true knowledge of the Italy of the 6th century."

In sermons, we have none to compare with the Fathers, but those who followed in their wake. It is a species of literature that begun with Christianity, and is peculiar to it; and therefore cannot be criticized by comparison with other styles, though for mere eloquence it is surpassed by none. Neither Ciceron nor Demosthenes ever produced greater, or more elevated, or more lasting effects on their hearers than St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, for instance. Suidas, says that St. John Chrysostom had a longest jest, or edict, was of more force than the longest jest or edict of the Nile. Photius credits him with the purest language, splendid imagery, varied matter, and graceful anecdotades without end. His twenty-two sermons, delivered when he was a priest at Antioch, on the occasion of a sedition in which the people threw down and trampled upon the statues of Theodotius and the empress Flacilla, in the absence of his bishop, who went to intercede for the people, while he preached repentance to them, are models of the noblest cast. As the last of them was preached, the bishop returned with full pardon for all. Of St. Augustine, Possidius, his biographer and disciple, says that he was no sooner ordained priest than he was permitted to preach by his bishop, Valerian, even when he was present himself, a thing wholly without precedent in Africa till then. His sermons were so popular, that many practiced committing them to memory while they were preached; others emulated the work in them. They are divided by his Benedictine editors into four classes:—1. On the
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Sciences of the Old and New Testaments; 2. On the seasons; 3. On the saints; 4. On miscellaneous subjects. Nothing is more wonderful in them than his handling of types and his power of developing and applying them. Last this was for edification, solely, not argument; nor can he be charged with unmindfulness of the letter in expounding Scripture. Speaking of his own success in preaching down the brutal fights that had long been a national custom in Mauritiania, he says, "Non tamen egiisse aliquid me ostendente, sed unum etiam acclamationes, sed cum flentes viderem" (De Doct. Christiana) with a touch of true genius. Some of his sermons must have occupied nearly two hours in delivery; but to judge from other extant specimens, these must have been exceptional. All the 154 sermons of St. Peter Chrysologus, whose surname bespeaks his eloquence, were of a much shorter type, and besides them, 21 of St. Gaudentius, 21 of St. Celarius of Arles, and 96 of St. Leo. But of this shorter type, the homilies of St. Gregory the Great on Ezekiel and on the Gospels are perhaps the most striking.

Of much value were the works among the Fathers, and hynmology may be properly called their creation. Of these St. Gregory Nazianzen wrote verse with facility, and St. Paulinus with elegance. Prudentius "was especially the poet of dogs," says Osnabrum: but the attempts of Juvenal and Dacitus, Sedulius and Victorinus to turn the homilies into literary verses into drivel must be pronounced failures: though they cleared the ground for Milton and Klopstock. St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, and Venantius Fortunatus composed many beautiful hymns. Boethius, author of the Consolatio Philosophiae, was a true philosopher; Cassiodorus, author of the twelve books of Variae, a man of letters and cultivated taste. To Dionysius Exiguus we owe the study of canon law in the West, and the custom of dating from the Christian era. The work of St. Isidore of Seville On Etymology, in twenty books, is replete with curious facts and ancient lore. The six books on music by St. Augustine, the only remaining specimen of a series brought out by him on the arts then taught, produced a number of kindred treatises by later writers of less note.

Two more classes of works remain to be noticed: historical and spiritual.

1. Ecclesiastical history commenced in the 2nd century with Hegesippus, of whose work in five books, now unfortunately lost, Eusebius speaks in terms of high praise (E. H. iv. 8); the same praise being unquestionably due to his own in ten. Putting its style on one side, which is turgid at times, it must, for the information it contains, and the truthfulness with which it has been composed, be pronounced of the same value to us, as the nine books of Eusebius are to the ancient world. But for his opposition to St. Athanasius, nobody would have thought of disputing his orthodoxy; of his devotion to the Christian religion there can be no question, as long as his Praeparatio and Demonstratio remain to speak for themselves. His Chronicon opened a new era in historical writing, and succeeding ages. But of ecclesiastical historians it is impossible to speak, without noticing the fact, that a reputation for orthodoxy has seldom figured among their strong points. So great, the success of Eusebius, was a profound Nazianzen; Theodoret took fierce part against St. Cyril; Philostorgius was at least a semi-Arian; neither Sozomen nor Evagrius rank high on other grounds; Sulpicius Severus has alone never been discredited as a writer or as a Christian, and though his is but an abridgment, it contains some facts of importance, which, according to V. Guizot, "are not found elsewhere. History, less than science, predisposes men to regard views in matters of faith, both shaping their estimate of the unseen world by the facts of the seen.

Of works of narrow compass St. Optatus has given us a fair account of the Donatists; Liberatus, of the Nestorians and Eutychians; St. Epiphanius and Philostorgus, of heretics in general, down to their own times. Later, the history of kings and of empires, of wars and of peoples, came to be written by Christians exclusively, and in most cases, down to the 16th century, by persons in holy orders. Nor is it out of place to observe, before quitting the branch, that the entire literature of pre-Christian times must have been irrecoverably lost; if, indeed, kind in succeeding ages, had it not been for Christian scribes, among whom Pamphilus, the friend of Eusebius the historian, was perhaps the earliest and most indefatigable; so early MS. of any portion of it being now extant, but what has been the work of their hands. (Comp. Del. Chr. Antil. L. xxvii, i. 15.)

2. Of spiritual treatises, if so few have come down to us from those times, one reason is because they were, to begin with, oral. All instruction was oral at first. Numbers had delivered catechetical lectures before St. Cyril; but these were the first to be taken down. And must have been deeply devotional, to judge from his. We have fragmentary speciments elsewhere in the ancient service-books. But the Confession of St. Augustine created a new flood of spiritual works, with material for meditation and self-examination in the closet. Witness the collection of kindred pieces that formerly claimed him as their author, in the appendix to the sixth vol. of the Benedictional of his works (p. 74 et seq.). The six books of St. Chrysostom On the Precepts; the four books of Dialogues by St. Gregory the Great, and his work On the Pastoral Care, were soon in the hands of all who could read. Each of the two last were translated into Greek and Angl-Saxon, and the former of them into Arabic as well. Martyrologies and lives of the saints formed another class of works expressly written for edification, but meant as little to be measured by their historical exactness, as sermons by their conformity with biblical criticism or with logical rule. It is a characteristic of all biographies that they abound with anecdotes, whose value rests on no better evidence than hearsay. Such, then, is a compressed outline of a literature, which has no doubt its faults as well as its shortcomings, but, in addition, recommendations which it would not be easy to parallel. First, it is a literature on which character is impressed conspicuously throughout, whose whole tone is spiritual and holy, and whose object is to promote the civilization of man through religion. Imperfections of style it may have; imperfect knowledge it may betray; defects of temper it may at times be led into; still, their
FAUSTINA (1) (FLAVIA MAXIMINA FAUSTA)
daughter of the emperor Maximian Heracleius by
Eutropia, and second wife of Constantine the
Great. She was born at Byzantium, married
in 307, and soon after her marriage she and
her husband a great service in revealing her father's
plot against his life. She was the mother of six
children, three sons, afterwards emperors:
Constantius, b. 312, Constantius, b. 317, and
Constantine, b. 320; and three daughters:
Constantia, named Augusta by her father, and married first
to Hanzahil, king of Pontus, and then to Gallus
Caesar; Constantia, said to have been the foundress
of St. Agnes at Rome, and to have professed virginity;
and Helena, wife of the emperor Julian.
(Ducange, Fam. Byzant. p. 47.)

She was put to death by her husband, probably
in 326, under very doubtful circumstances:
see the article on CONSTANTINE, Vol. I, p. 630.

FAUSTA (3), a virgin and martyr with
Evilasius at Cyzicus, under Galerius, A.D. 305.
She was the daughter of rich parents, who,
having carefully instructed her in the Christian
faith, left her name at thirteen. Becoming famous for
her religious activity she was reported
to the emperor, who sent his Primus
Falastii, Evilasius, to torture her.
Converted by her constancy and arguments she was in turn
tortured by the propraetor Maximinus.
Some of the Martyrologists, as Rabanus and Symeon
Metaphrastes, hold this last as a third martyr,
converted by the sufferings of the other two.
Bede, Usuardus, Rabanus, Notkerus, and Mart. H. E.
commemorate them on Sept. 20. Rabanus
and Notkerus commemorate them at Jan. 7 as well.
(Men. Basil. at Fob. 6.) The acts are extant
in Greek and Latin. (Surius, vita SS. I. 863;
Acta SS. Bull. Sep. vi. 144.) They are so full
of legend that Tillemont's sentence, "nullus infest
illius veri species," does not seem too severe.
(Tillemont, Men. tom. v. p. 61.)

FAUSTIANUS (FAUSTINIANUS), sixth
bishop of Dax, succeeding Liberius A.D. 584.
He was nominated to the episcopate by the
pretender Gundobald. Bertram, of Bordeaux, at
that time the metropolis of Dax, excused himself,
mistrusting the consequences, and ordered Pallad-
ius of Saints to consecrate him. Orestes, bishop
of Bazas, was also present, though he afterwards
denied it before the king. But Gundobald being
soon afterwards killed, Guntram assembled the
second council of Macon, A.D. 585, at which
Faustianus was deposed, but Bertram, Orestes,
and Palladius, who were responsible for his con-
secration, were ordered to support him by turns
and pay him a hundred pieces of gold a year.
In spite of his deposition he appears to have
subscribed the synod. He was succeeded by
Nicetius, whom Chilperic had nominated for the
bishopric at the time of the usurpation.
Mansi, ix. 95; Gall. Christian. i. 1045; Rom. ann. 588, xxi.)

FAUSTINA (1) (full name FLAVIA MAXIMA
FAUSTINA, Goltz), third wife of Constantius II.
Constantius married her at Antioch in
the winter of 360. (Ann. xxi. 6, § 4. She was
FAUSTINA

pregnant at the time of his death, and the child afterwards born, Flavia Maxima Constantia, became the wife of the emperor Gratian. (Amn. xxi. 15, § 6.) [M. F. A.]

FAUSTINA (2), wife of Julianus, a wealthy man living in Dalmatia at the beginning of the 5th century, and friend of St. Jerome, whose letter to him (118, ed. Vall.) was written after his wife's death. [W. H. F.]

FAUSTIANUS (3), legendary father of CLEMENS ROMANUS (Clem. Recog. ix. 33). In the Clementine Homilies (xiv. 8) the name of the father is given as Faustus, and Faustianus is that of one of Clement's brothers. [G. S.]

FAUSTIANUS (3) (FAUSTINUS), bishop of Bononia (Bologna), c. A.D. 312, and successor of St. Zama. It seems uncertain whether he immediately succeeded St. Zama, or whether the see had remained vacant during the persecution of Diocletian. He died probably c. A.D. 330, and was succeeded by St. Basilius. (Boll. Acta SS. 26 Feb. iii. 639; Ugghelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 8; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. iii. 446.) [B. S. G.]


FAUSTIANUS (6), one of the sixty-one bishops of Numidia, who met in council at Mileum, Milevis, or Mereum ("Milah," Shaw, p. 633), A.D. 416, and joined in an address to pope Innocent I. against the errors of Celestius and Pelagius. (Aug. Ep. 176.) [H. W. P.]

FAUSTIANUS (7), one of the bishops who met in council at Carthage, A.D. 416, and joined in an address to pope Innocent I. concerning Pelagius and Celestius. Probably the same as the preceding. (Aug. Ep. 175.) [H. W. P.]

FAUSTIANUS (8), bishop of Utica; present at the council held at Carthage by bishop Boniface, A.D. 525. (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 363; Mansi, viii. 647.) [L. D.]

FAUSTIANUS (9), bishop of Dax. [FAUSTIANUS.]

FAUSTINUS, a name sometimes interchanged with Faustus. [FAUSTIANUS.]

FAUSTINUS (1), legendary brother of CLEMENS ROMANUS (Clem. Recog. ix. 35; Clem. Hom. xiv. 9). [G. S.]

FAUSTINUS (2) (Cyp. Ep. 57, A.D. 252), African bishop, present at the second synod of Carthage under Cyprian, De Pace. He does not appear in any subsequent council. [E. W. B.]


FAUSTINUS (4), bishop of Tuburbo, or Tuburbo, a small, and as St. Augustine remarks, insignificant town of proconsular Africa; condemned as a traditor by the Donatists without inquiry, A.D. 312, but not further proceeded. (Aug. ad Don. post. coll. 22, 38, vol. ix. p. 518; Tillemont, 8, vol. vi. p. 18.) A Faustus bishop of Tuburbo was present at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314 (Routh, R. S. iv. 513, 2nd ed.; Mansi. ii. 477 n.), and is perhaps the same person. [H. W. P.]

FAUSTINUS (5), bishop of Bononia (Bologna). [FAUSTIANUS (2).]

FAUSTINUS (6), the seventh known bishop of Iconium, and metropolitan (Le Quien, Reg. Chrest. i. 1068), coming between Eusilius (FRAU- LIUS I) and Joannes I. St. Basil, writing in 373 (ep. 138, al. 8) mentions his having been invited to Iconium to ordain a successor to Faustinus, who was dead. In 374 Boil (ep. 161, al. 393) complimented John's successor Amphiloctius with an allusion to I Sam. i. 3, "the asses are lost (πῶνα ἀπόλαυσαν) that Israel may have a king," insinuating that Faustinus and John were men of dull parts. The reading of ἐξηγητός for πῶνα (which would imply that they belonged to the Aram party) is not accepted. [E. H.]

FAUSTINUS (7), seventh, or perhaps ninth, bishop of Brixia (Brescia), succeeding Ursus c. A.D. 350. He is believed to have written the Acts of St. Apollinarius, and of SS. Faustus and Jovita the martyrs (Feb. 15). He died c. 375, and was succeeded by St. Philastrius. (Ammm. 16 Feb. ii. 886; Ugghelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 729; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xi. 556.) [K. S. G.]

FAUSTINUS (8), Donatist bishop of Hippo Regius, about A.D. 380; mentioned by St. Augustin as having recommended that because there were few Catholics in Hippo no one should bake bread for them. In one case a baker vowed that the tenant of a Catholic desecrated, threw away unbaked the bread intended for his landlord, and refused all communication with him. (Aug. c. Petil. ii. 84, 184; Tillemont, 37, vol. vi. p. 140.) [H. W. P.]


FAUSTINUS (10), one of the bishops, probably of proconsular Asia, who presented a complaint against Chrysostom at the council of the Oak, for having unjustly deposed them (Chrys. Cod. 59, p. 60). [L. T.]


FAUSTINUS (12), Donatist bishop of Tamabaja, in Byzacena; present at the preceding. (M. V. D. 447.) [H. W. P.]
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FAUSTINUS (13), Donatist bishop of Naxos, in Byzacene; present as the preceding. (M. V. D. p. 467.)

FAUSTINUS (14), bishop of Silla, in Numidia; present as the preceding. (M. V. D. p. 466.)

FAUSTINUS (15), the name of two bishops present at the council of Milevis, or Mileum, A.D. 416. But the name of one of them is also given as SAINUS. (Aug. Ep. 176.)

FAUSTINUS (16), perhaps a bishop, to whom are ascribed (l.) a homily On the Passion, wherein the sufferings of Abel, Isaac, and Jonah are put forth as types of the passion of Jesus Christ (Patrol. Lat. lxx. 407); (ii.) a fragment of a sermon justifying the addition of a week to the Lent fast, preserved in the book of Aeneas bishop of Paris, Against the Greeks, cap. 176. (Migne, Patrol. Lat. cxxi. 742); (iii.) an exhortation to use this present world in such a manner as to gain a better one, printed among the sermons of Eusebius Emessin. under the title, Sermo V. exhortatorius, Sancti Faustinii Episcopi (La Bigne, Bibl. Patr. vi. 679). These compositions have been generally attributed to Faustinus bishop of Riez, but as Ceillier states (Ant. Sacr. x. 435-8) they differ in style, and are probably to be attributed to a bishop of the 5th century otherwise unknown. As to the Sermo in Kalendia Januaris, which has been ascribed to the same writer, see No. 19.

FAUSTINUS (17), twelfth bishop of Le Puy, deposing St. Armentarius or Hermentarius, and followed by Fortius or Fortius in the latter half of the 5th century. Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of a bishop Faustinus in friendly terms, who may perhaps be identical with him. (Sid. Apoll. lib. iv. Epist. 6. Migne, Patr. Lat. viii. 509; Gall. Christ. ii. 689.)

FAUSTINUS (18), bishop of Girba, a town situated on an island near the lesser Syrtis, included in the Tripoli- zone of the African province, and by which it was distinguished from Girba in the proconsular province; one of the Catholic bishops banished by Hunneric after the conference with the Arians at Carthage, A.D. 484. (Norcelli, Africa Christ. i. 171; Notitia in Victor. Vit. 60, Migne, Patr. Lat. viii.)

FAUSTINUS (19), fifteenth bishop of Noyon and Tourai, succeeding St. Medardus and followed by Gundulfus, about the middle of the 6th century. The Bollandists printed a sermon entitled Episcopi Faustinii Sermo in Kalendia Januaris, drawn from the archives of the monastery of Aquiscuitum, and Le Cointe ascribes it to this bishop. It is directed against some Satamalian rites which apparently had survived from pagan times, and which were joined in by Christians as well as heathens; and it reminds the people that the first day of the year is a long standing custom a fast-day. (Gall. Christ. ii. 581; Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franco, an. 345, vii. tom. i. 685-690; Boll. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 2.)

[FAUSTINUS (19)]

[S. A. B.]

FAUSTINUS (20), bishop of Seville, appointed metropolitan of Seville by the sixteenth
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council of Toledo, which ratified the translation of Felix, formerly of Seville, to the see of Toledo [Felix (153)]. At the time of this translation of Felix, Faustinus was metropolitan of Braga, and was thence transferred to Seville by Egica. He signis the Acts of the sixteenth council of Toledo, and according to Roderic of Toledo (lib. iii. cap. 13, apud Schott, Hisp. Ill. iv. 144) was present at the seventeenth council, A.D. 694 (Exp. Sagr. ix. 228; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 333). (M. A. W.)

FAUSTINUS (21), a presbyter and martyr, with his brother Jovita a deacon, Feb. 15, at Brixia in Italy, under the emperor Hadrian, about the year 120. (Martyr. Vet. Rom. Usuardi, Notker; Euseb. H. E. iv. c. 9.) Their acts, which are full of legendary stories, are said to have been written by Faustinus bishop of Brixia, A.D. 350 (cf. Acta SS. Boll. Feb. ii. 307).

[G. T. B.]

FAUSTINUS (22), Aug. 7; martyr at Milan under Commodus, about A.D. 182 (FAUSTVS, Vet. Rom. Mart.). He was son of a Milanesan Christian, named Philip. Together with his father he was baptized by Cyprian, bishop of Milan, and going in military service he seems to have been called on to discharge some idolatrous ceremony. Upon his refusal he suffered the penalty of military law and obtained the crown of martyrdom. The Bollandists are astonished at Baronius placing his martyrdom under Commodus, while in his Annales he tells us that there was no persecution under this emperor. But many suffered for Christ under the operation of military law even when no general persecution took place. For a Roman soldier there was no freedom of conscience. [F. FUNDANUS.] (Vet. Rom. Mart. Mart. Hieron., Usuardi, Adonis, Notker; Ferrarius, Catalogus SS.)

[G. T. S.]

FAUSTINUS (23), martyr at Foro in the Decian persecution, according to the tabulae ecclesiasticæ quoted by Baronius. (Baron. A. E. ann. 254, 255.)

[G. H.]

FAUSTINUS (24), commemorated Feb. 17, suffered with forty-four others. Baronius conjectures that they suffered at Rome, but their date is not fixed. Ferrarius (Catalogus SS.) tells us that before the correction of the present Roman calendar no mention of them existed therein (cf. Martyr. Hieron., Bede.). [G. T. S.]

FAUSTINUS (25), July 29, martyr at Rome in the Diocletian persecution with Simplicius and Beatriz or Vinator, their sister. He suffered at the seventh milestone on the Via Portuensis. One of the most valuable illustrations of Christian antiquity in De Russi's La Roma Sottoravvis Cristiana, tom. iii., is his account of the cemetery of Generosa, wherein they were buried. Beatriz, having rescued the bodies of the martyrs which had been flung into the Tiber, hastily buried them in the sandpit of one Generosa, a Christian woman, whence the origin of the cemetery; a catacomb, which had long been looked for elsewhere, was accidentally discovered a few years ago. It is approached from a small ruined basilica, dedicated to Faustinus, Simplicius, and Beatriz, and built (it would seem) by pope Damasus in 382. This
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FAUSTINUS—MISCELL.


FAUSTINUS (26), a presbyter (Cyp. Ep. i. 1, 3). [G. T. S.]

FAUSTINUS (27), a presbyter of Orange at the council of Arles, 314 (Mansi, ii. 476; Routh, Rel. Sac. iv. 303, 312, 2nd ed.). [C. H.]

FAUSTINUS (28), a son of Ambrose's friend Eusebius. It is probable that he is the person to whom Ambrose's letter 39 was written. He had a son of the same name. [EUSEBIUS (133).]

FAUSTINUS (29), catholics, mentioned by Athanasius as inciting the populace to molest Catholic congregations. (Ath. Hist. Aran., ad Monach. § 55 in Opp. par. i. 298.) [C. H.]

FAUSTINUS (30), a Roman, perhaps a presbyter, at the end of the 4th century. He was one of the many who took a strong part in resistance to the Origenistic doctrines then agitating the church. Tranquillus, his brother (either by nature or spiritual relationship), finding him pronounce a very strong judgment on Origen as ‘penitus respuedum,’ wrote to St. Jerome then at Bethlehem, to know the truth. Jerome's answer, which is discriminative and moderate, is written to Faustinus, and forms the sixty-second letter in Vallarsi's edition.

FAUSTINUS (31), a gentleman of Caesarea, whose acquaintance Chrysostom made during his sojourn in that city, on his way to Cæcumen A.D. 404, and from whom he received many kindnesses, to which he refers with warm expressions of gratitude in a letter, announcing his safe arrival at his place of exile (Chrysost., Epist. 84). [K. V.]

FAUSTINUS (32), a layman of Philadelphia, one of those who adjured Quartodecimans opinions and signed the symbolum of Jacobus in 431 (Mansi, iii. 1353 d). [EUTYCHIUS (28).]

T. W. D.]

FAUSTINUS (33), a Roman presbyter who on the death of Liberius bishop of Rome in September, 369, sided with Ursinus, and soon afterwards was one of the many who suffered exile on his account (e. the edicta in Baronius, Ann. a. a. 369, iii. iv. v.; 371, i. ii. iii.; DAMASK., Vol. i. 783). In the preface to a petition which he and a fellow exile, Marcellinus, presented to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, c. A.D. 383, there is an account given both of the schism and of that which led to it, which is so damaging to Damasus personally, as well as to his party and their proceedings, that such writers as Damasus do not scruple to violently impugn its veracity (Libellus Precum, Migne, Patrolog. xiiii. 82; Baron. Ann. a. a. 367, xiv.). But it is fully sustained by the evidence of Ammianus Marcellinus (xviii. 3), and even by that of Socrates (H. E. iv. 29), who in his narrative of what took place transcribes Rufinus (Valesius, note in Socr. u. s.), a contemporary who had ample means of direct information as to the facts.

Both Faustinus and Marcellinus were Lib- erians. Their petition contains, perhaps, the most trustworthy account we possess of that party and of the personal career of Liberius, bishop of Cagliari, with whom it had its origin. It was written at Eleutheropolis in Palestine. The bishop of that see was Turbo, a deacon of his predecessor Eutychius the semi-Arian (Epiphan. Haer. lxiii.; Baronius, u. s. a. 351, xxvii. xcviii.; Gams, Ser. Episc. 453). The exiles bitterly complain of his cruelty both to Liberius, when he was in his power some years previously, and of late to themselves (c. Ep. Conc. Rom. ad Gratian. et Valentin. a.d. 381 (?); Labbe et Cossart, i. 1000; Renouard. Gratian. ib. 1003) and earnestly implore the interposition of the emperors in their behalf. The reply was a rescript addressed by Theodosius to Cynegius, prefect of the East (A.D. 384, Gothofred. Prosopogr. Cod. Theod. a.n.), commanding him to see that they had full liberty, and that the civil authorities protected them from further molestation (Migne, u. s. 106, 107).

About the same time that he and Marcellinus thus appealed to the emperors, Faustinus wrote a work on the Trinity, addressed to Flancus the wife of Theodosius, which was prepared at her request. This work has been strangely ascribed to Gregory the Theoretic bishop of Eliberis (e.g. Baronius, A. E. a. s. 371, civ.; Gams, u. s. 34), and is, no less strangely, still printed as having been addressed to Gallus Placidus (Migne, u. s. 29), notwithstanding that the latter expressly states that it was addressed to Flancus, and that its author was Faustinus (de Str. Eccl. Migne, liviii. 1069). He has also left a confession of faith addressed to Theodosius in reply to some persons who had charged him with Sabellianism (Migne, xiiii. 70).

FAUSTINUS (34), a priest of the monastery of Anastasia Barba, a letter to whom is extant, preserved from Eusebius (Labbe, Bibl. i. 665). But no other testimony is available to shew that the monastery then existed, and the letter is doubtless spurious. (Celliler, Ant. Eccl. viii. 453.)

[FAUSTINUS (35), a penitent who had publicly confessed his sin with tokens of great humility, when St. Nilus wrote to the priest Charde, who was treating him with too severe a discipline, urging gentleness and mercy towards repentant sinners. (Nil. ep. 243, p. 212, Pat. Gr. ixix. 498; a.; Celliler, viii. 222.)

[FAUSTINUS (36), defender of Sicily; according to another reading of Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. ii. ind. i. ep. 23, Migne, note, FASTIS.]

[FAUSTINUS, bishop of Taburba. [FAUSTINUS (4.)]]

FAUSTUS (1), the father of Clemens Romanus. [FAUSTINIANUS (1.)]

FAUSTUS—BISHOPS

FAUSTUS (3), bishop of Panemotichus in the second Pamphylia (coins of Julia Domna are extant bearing the name of this town), one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quien, Orienta Christ. i. 1051; Mansi, ii. 700.) [L. D.]

FAUSTUS (4), bishop of Limenes in Pisidia; present at the first Constantinopolitan council, A.D. 381. (Le Quien, Orienta Christ. i. 1051; Mansi, iii. 570.) [L. D.]


FAUSTUS (6), bishop of Sassana (Sarsina). He succeeded Valerianus a.d. 437, and died c. 459. His successor was Probus. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. ii. 485.) [R. S. G.]

FAUSTUS (7), bishop of Apollonia, probably the town of that name in Bithynia, 484. He wrote a letter to Peter the Fuller, of Antioch, concerning the clause that bishop had added to the Trisagion, "Qui crucifixus est propter nos," which Faustus condemns as heretical and blasphemous (Cave, Script. Eccles. I. 457; Mansi, vii. 1127, gives the letter in full). This bishop of Apollonia is not mentioned either in Le Quien's Orienta Christiana, or in Gams's Series Episcoporum. [L. D.]

FAUSTUS (8), bishop of Buriona, a town of uncertain position, mentioned only in connexion with this bishop. Victor Vitensis (de Persecutione Vandali, l. c. xli) cites him as a witness to the miracles wrought at the place where certain martyrs perished during the persecution under Hunneric; "a blind woman received her sight in the bishop's presence." Faustus appears to have died before the persecution under Hunneric, as there is no further mention of him. (Morelli, Africa Christ. i. 110; Migne, Patrol. Lat. lvii. 196.) [L. D.]

FAUSTUS (9), bishop of Castra Severianum, in the province of Mauretania Caesariensis; one of the Catholic bishops who, after the conference at Carthage with the Arians, was banished by king Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Morelli, Africa Christ. i. 130; Notitia in Victor. Vit. 50; Migne, Patrol. Lat. lviii.) [L. D.]

FAUSTUS (10), an orthodox African bishop, banished from his see of Telepte in 484, by Hunneric. Faustus founded a small monastery in this district which became celebrated, from the circumstance that the young procurator, Fabius Fulgentius, had recourse to its founder, when he was first smitten by the desire to enter upon the "religious" life. This was in the year 480. Fulgentius was well known to Faustus (Vita Fulgentii, in Acta SS. et Migne, Patr. Lat. cc. 4-8), who strongly disapproved the motive from a method of life so contrary to all his previous habits. His resolution and courage induced Faustus to grant a brief noviciate to Fulgentius, during which he was put to severe tests. The mother of Fulgentius betook herself to Faustus in a state of frenzy (furibunda), and besought upon him violent reproaches. She loudly bewailed her lot, and clamoured at the gates of the monastery. Faustus did not allow her to see her son, although the latter overheard her bitter ejaculations. Faustus argued that as Fulgentius was born to this severe strain upon his integrity, it was safe to admit him to the brotherhood. It appears that Faustus made no demand upon Fulgentius for his paternal property, which the latter handed over to his mother for the education and advantage of his brother Claudius. Under pressure of persecution, Fulgentius sought separation from Faustus (Fulgentius of Ruspe), who nevertheless exercised a certain authority over him. As Fulgentius for many years manifested intense reluctance to occupy any position of trust and importance, and was tempted to make numerous romantic escapes from the dignities that were thrust upon him, Faustus was appealed to, and he suddenly ordained Fulgentius as presbyter, and commanded him to undertake the duties of both presbyter and abbot (c. 15). His influence over Fulgentius is his principal title to remembrance. [H. R. R.]

FAUSTUS (11), sometimes called Faustus the Breton, from his having been born in Brittany, or (as Tillemont thinks) in Britain, but more generally known as Faustus of Riez (Faustus Riensis, al. Regiensis seu Breganconis) from the name of his see in Provence. He was born towards the close of the 4th century, and died in A.D. 492, or possibly somewhat later.

Authorities. — 1, his own writings, for which see below; 2, the letters of his friend and contemporary, Sidonius Apollinaris (Epist. Lib. ix. Ep. 3, 9); 3, Gennadius 1 (Theor. Verorum Catalogus, cap. 65); 4, St. Avitus (Epist. iv.); 5, acts of the third Council of Arles (Concilium Arlesanum, about A.D. 455, and of another council at the same place which may be termed the fourth), held in A.D. 475; also of a Council of Lyons (Lugdunense) said to have been held shortly after that of Arles; 6, a letter of pope Hormisdas, written in A.D. 520, to an African bishop named Possessor, who had consulted him concerning the writings of Faustus. For Nos. 5 and 6 see Labbe's Concilia, tom. ii. pp. 806, 1038 (ed. Parisiis, 1714). For editions of the other authorities cited the reader is referred to their respective names in this Dictionary.

Life. — We are ignorant of the condition of the parents of Faustus, and even of their names. He may have lost his father while he was young, for we only hear of his mother, whose servile piety and striving demeanour made a great impression on all who saw her, insomuch that to be allowed to kiss her was esteemed a favour. She lived to a great age, and saw her son become a bishop. Faustus studied Greek philosophy, but in a Christian spirit. He also mastered the principles of rhetoric, and may possibly have pleased for a time at the bar as an advocate. A brother, named Memorius, appears to have been ordained prior to this period, and to have lived with Faustus during his later career at Riez.

While still youthful (probably about A.D. 426 or a little later), Faustus retired from the world and entered the famous monastery of Lerins (Lerianum), at that time presided over by St. Maximus. Here he became a thorough ascetic, and a great student of Holy Scripture, without, 2 H 2
however, giving up his philosophic pursuits. It was probably at Lerins that he acquired the reputation assigned to him by Gennadius of being an illustrious extempore preacher. He became a presbyter, and about 492 or 493 succeeded Maximus as abbot of Lerins.

His tenure of this office was marked by a keen dispute with his diocesan Theodore, bishop of Frejus, concerning their respective rights. So much scandal was caused by this controversy, that the third council of Arles was convened by Ravennius, bishop of Arles, for the sole purpose of settling it. The decision, which seems to be a kind of compromise, leaves considerable ecclesiastical power in the hands of the abbot. This may be an early instance of encroachment on episcopal authority by a corporate body. But, considering how strongly even the best men may be influenced by the spirit of concord, we are not unjustified, without further evidence, in blaming either side. In such cases men think of the rights of their successors, and consequently a difference between a bishop and the ruling body of a monastery, a college, or a cathedral, is an event which may happen in any age of the church. Of Faustus’ death we have no definite account, a successor named Gratus (cf. Gratius or Gregorius), who was heretical on the union of the two natures in the Person of Christ, belongs also to this period of his life.

The next event of importance in the career of Faustus is his succession in the episcopate of Gaul from St. Maximus, whom he had already succeeded in the abbacy of Lerins. Of the fact there is no question, but its date is extremely uncertain. Baronius (followed by Ramsay in Smith’s Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography) places it as late as A.D. 472; but Tillemont (Met. Eccles. tome vi. p. 775) makes an ingenious case against so late a date as this, and is inclined to place it at least, as early as 462, or even in 456. Happily the vagueness of the chronology does not in this case seriously affect the history. There is no question but that Faustus continued as bishop the stern self-discipline which he had practised as monk and abbot. He often retired to Lerins with a view of inspecting the observance of his monastic regimen, and became known throughout his diocese, and beyond its bounds, not only as a striking preacher, but also as one who gave both temporal and spiritual succour to the sick, both in body and mind. He seems, however, to have taken a somewhat stern view on the subject of late repentence, like that so prevalent, at an earlier period in the church of North Africa. In the councils of Arles and of Lyons above-named a presbyter named Lucidus, accused of having taught falsity through misunderstanding the writings of Augustine (ex libris Sancti Augustini male intellectus), was censured, and induced to make a retraction. The signatures of eleven bishops were admitted, according to the report given us by Faustus, to his letter against Lucidus; and Leontius, bishop of Arles, invited Faustus to compose a treatise on the subject of grace and free choice. (The case of Lucidus is thought of sufficient importance to be noticed by Bähr in his Dogm. der kath. dogmatik, tom. i. lib. ix. cap. 2, § 2; and also by Diblenger, in his Church History, vol. ii. chap. 4, § 2.)

We next find Faustus mixed up in secular affairs, inasmuch as he appears from Sidonius to have had some share in bringing about that treaty, concluded in A.D. 475 between the emperor Næpus and Euric, king of the Visigords, which Tillemont and Gibbon agree in regarding as discreditable to the Roman empire. It certainly wrested Auvergne and subsequently Provence from the hands of an orthodox sovereign, and threw them into those of an Arian one. This result was an unfortunate one for Faustus. About A.D. 491 he was banished from his see, in all probability in consequence of his writings against Arianism. Kind and powerful friends supported him during his exile, which he bore, though suffering from illness, with fortitude and dignity. His banishment is naturally attributed to king Euric, on whose death, in A.D. 483, Faustus was enabled to return to Riez. His life, as has been remarked, was prolonged until at least A.D. 495, possibly until some years later. Of his character it is impossible to speak without first considering his publications.

Writings.—These have not come down to us in a complete and satisfactory condition. The ill-repute of the Arians and their association with the pagans probably much lessened their chance of being carefully edited. If, for reasons to be mentioned presently, they have in some quarters been rather over-censured, it must be owned that there is nothing extant from the pen of Faustus of Riez to justify the extravagant encomiums lavished on their style and matter by his friend Sidonius Apollinaris. The following are still accessible:

1. Professio Fidei, contra eos, qui per idem Dei Voluntatem alios dicitur ad Vitam autri alios in Mortem deprimunt: hinc Solum con Gentibus asservant, inde Liberum arbitrium cum Manichesum negant. (Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum Lugduni, A.D. 1677, p. 523.)

This treatise is addressed to the then bishop of Arles, bestissimi ac reverendissimi Leontii Papae. (Leontius.) Faustus opens it with a severe attack on the teaching of Pelagius as heretical, but proceeds to express a fear of the opposite extreme, of such a denial of man’s power as a new augury, as would virtually amount to fatalism.

2. Epistulae Fausti Episcopi ad Lucum Presbyterum (ibid.). This letter, to which reference has already been made, is similar in tone to the preceding, but rather fiercer in its language. Faustus here, too, anathematizes the error of the Pelagians; but he also says a few words to any one who shall have declared that the vessel of wrath cannot arise so as to become a vessel for honour; or that Christ did not die for all men, or willeth not that all should be saved, or to any one (it seems desirable here to give the author’s own wording) “qui dixit illam qui perit, non esse suam pro se posset, et de baptizato, vel de illius sUltis pagos, quos credere putavit et noluit.”

3. De Gratia Dei et Humanae Meritum libri Arbitrio Libri II. (ibid. p. 525.) The first book of this treatise is like an expansion of No. 1. After again censuring Pelagius, the writer argues strongly on behalf of the need of supernatural co-operation with the Divine aid. Towards the close of the first book, and still more emphatically in the second, he gives his
FAUSTUS OF RIEZ

interpretation of some of those passages of Holy Scripture (as e.g. Exodus iv. 21, vii. 13; Romans ii. 11-20), which make most strongly for Arianism. This is the part where Faustus is most extreme and least successful. The idea of an antinomy, of the acceptance of two apparent contradictions, which in this life must remain unharmonized, is a comparatively recent one, though we find it in the writings of Bossuet. But it had not dawned upon the mind of the 5th century, that of the 16th, and many passages in this book resemble the writings of a much later age, and might almost be supposed to have come from the pen of some Armenian controversialist in the age of the synod of Dort. In cap. x. of this second book, which has for its title "Gentes Deum Naturaliter Sumus," Faustus calls attention to the language of Daniel towards Nebuchadnezzar, and his censure of Belshazzar, as assuming heathen recognition of God (Dan. iv. and v.). He also appeals for the same purpose to the first chapter of Isaiah, to the repetitiveness of the Ninevites (Isa. xiv.); and he even cites Jeremiah (viii. 7-10). In this chapter the writer anticipates a sermon by bishop Horsley to the same effect. Perhaps the famous expression in the apology of Tertullian, O testimonia animae salutaris Christianae, and the language of St. Justin Martyr, St. Clement of Alexandria, and some other fathers, might be considered to favour the view of heathendom here taken by Faustus.

4. Fausti Rheginiae Episcopi ad Monochos Sermo.—The title seems privata facie to indicate a publication subsequent to the author's elevation to the episcopate. But it may, of course, have been written at an earlier date, as just as it is e.g. common among ourselves to speak of the works of archbishop Leighton, although most of that prelate's writings are prior, in point of date, to his consecration as bishop.

The tone of this short letter resembles that of the author's other writings. He refers to excommunicating a terrible weapon, only to be used in the last resort. It is said and to monks go back to the world, especially if, after doing so, they retain their monastic dress. The lower creation sets a better example. "Aves ipsae diligent nidos suos. Amant ferae locum quibus extranea sunt." As usual, he is energetic in his appeals to the human element in religion. "Ut jejun. Resit the devil. Cherish all graces, especially obedience and humility." "Quanto nos anserim in studio, tante illo apnont adjuvatum se quo nos appenderimus ad dilectissime tante addam ad gloriam. Qui iubet, abere illud." With this admonition may be classed Sermones secund Monachos, which certainly seem to have been addressed to the community of Lerins, while Faustus presided over it. (These are all given in the Patr. Bibl. Max. ubi supra pp. 545-7; also by Martene and Durandus in their Scriptor. et Monument. ampliss. Collect. tom. ix. p. 145, Paris, 1733; by Brockel, Codex Regum, append. p. 469. Ang. Vind. 1759; and by Bunsen, Thevetius Monumentorum, tom. i. p. 330. Amst. 1725.)

5. Responsum ad objecta quasdam de Ratione Fidei Catholicae.—This is an epistle consisting of two portions so distinct from each other, that several critics have, with Grauwitz, regarded them as separate treaties. The former part is a brief statement of the case against Arianism. It explains the distinction between Persona and Nature in reference to our Lord's Incarnation, and appears to be addressed to an orthodox, but perplexed friend, whom the author treats as a superior. The second portion is metaphysical, and discusses the nature of the soul, which Faustus seems to pronounce material. Claudius Mamertus, in his De Statu Animae, wrote against Faustus on this point. It is, however, possible that Faustus may not have meant more than to draw a marked distinction between the Creator and the creature; arguing, as he does, nihil credendum incorporum praeceptor Divinum. (This is given in the Patr. Bibl. Max. and has also been published in the collection of ancient French ecclesiastical writers edited by P. Pittho, Paris, 1556.)

6. Homilia de S. Maximino Laudibus.—This eulogy of the person, whom Faustus twice succeeded, has been, by a singular mistake, ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa. [EUSEBIUS EMESIENS.] But this Eusebius died about A.D. 360, a century before the date of Faustus, and before the existence of the famous monastery of Lerins. (It is given in another patristic collection, the Bibl. Magn. Patr. published at Cologne in 1618, tom. v. pt. 1.)

7. Epistles. (These, to the number of nineteen, are also given in the collection just named [ibid. xx. part v.], and a selection is also to be found in the Lyons Patr. Bibl. Max. cited throughout this notice.) That to Lucidus has already been described. The one addressed to Gratianus given by H. Canisius (in his Antiquae Lectiones, tom. v. and reproduced by Bunsen ubi supra) has been already mentioned. Cunniades describes Gratianus as a Nestorian, but his errors, apparently resulting rather from ignorance than willfulness, seem more akin to those of Eutyches. The other epistles of Faustus touch upon problems of metaphysics and theology, but do not make any important additions to our knowledge of their author.

Taking Faustus of Riez as an ecclesiastic and as a writer, we have before us this phenomenon. Here is a man of unimpeachably good character; of an earnest, active, ascetic life; orthodox on the central doctrine of the Christian faith, and even suffering exile for it as a confessor; but stigmatized as a semi-Pelagian, and consequently by many authorities, both ancient and modern, denied the title of saint. But his own flock at Riez, deeply moved by his life and preaching, and warmly attached to his memory, insisted on giving him at least a local canonization. To them he was Sanctus Faustus Rienensis; they erected a basilica, dedicated in his name, and kept Jan. 18 as the anniversary of his festival.

The decision of this question will depend upon the verdict passed by the student on the school to which Faustus belonged. [v. SEMI-PELAGIANISM.] In the case of Arianism it is possible to answer with an emphatic affirmative or negative to the really essential question put by Arius, viz. is the Redeemer, or is he not, only a creature? But Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism involve questions of degree, and cannot be thus trenchantly stated. The excellent life of Faustus does not prove (no more than that of Pelagius himself) that he may not have written some dangerous, if not absolutely heretical, statements.
concerning man's free agency. But the following considerations also seem to deserve attention.

If St. Augustine was—as so many now believe—betrayed by his opposition to Pelagius into some extravagances, the reaction in Southern Gaul must be in part ascribed to the influence of this extreme tendency. In the Italy of the 5th and 6th centuries the weight of Augustine's name and that of his followers, St. Hilary and St. Prosper, was so great, that those who refused entire acquiescence in their views were unfavourably regarded at Rome. In a later day much of the learning of the French fell into the hands of decided Jansenists, such as the editors of the Lyons Bibliotheca Patrum, Natalis Alexander, and Tilllemont. The Jansenist school has so many claims upon our admiration and respect that in some quarters it seems to be assumed that its decisions on all such questions are final. This, however, can hardly prove to be the ultimate verdict of impartial history. The apologies made by learned Jesuits, such as Sirmond, on behalf of Faustus, may be somewhat viewed with suspicion, as coming from a partial source; but it is hardly possible to deny that the account given by Tilllemont is much more strongly imbued with partisanship and a disposition in pejus interpretari. Baronius reminds his readers that Faustus wrote before the date of the second Council of Orange, presided over by St. Caesarius [CAESARIUS], (which did so much to lull the disputes on predestination), and rather lean towards allowing the citizens of Riez to have their way, and continue their homage to his memory. "Maneat igitur Fausto integra ura sua, nec ex nostris scriptis sentiat praecedulum." The cardinal does not seem to pay regard to the letter of pope Hormisdas to Possessor, which tends, to say the least, in the opposite direction. But, if confronted by it, Baronius might perhaps have taken refuge in the convenient resource, that the bishop of Rome was here writing only as a private doctor, and not pronouncing a decision ex cathedra.*

[J. G. C.]

FAUSTUS (12), II., fifth bishop of Riez, succeeding Constantius, and followed by Emerius. He was represented at the fifth council of Orleans, A.D. 549, by Claudianus, a deacon. (Mansi, ix. 137; Gall. Chris. i. 393.)

[8. A. B.]

FAUSTUS (13), twenty-fourth bishop of Auch, succeeding Paulinus and followed by Fabius. He was present at the second council of Macon (585), and died the same year. There is a Faustus, whose praises as the builder of a church of St. Martin, are sung by Venantius Fortunatus (Misc. lib. i. cap. 4 in Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxviii. 67), who may possibly be this bishop. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. viii. 22; Mansi, ix. 957; Gall. Chris. i. 975.)

[8. A. B.]

FAUSTUS (14), ST., fifth bishop of Tarbes

succeeding Amelius, perhaps about the close of the 6th century. All we know of him is derived from the legendary life of St. Licerius his disciple, whom he taught, and who after his return from exile to Vicus-Julius (Aire) remained with him till his death. This life, which is ascribed to Bernardus Guido, was first published by Labbe, and is also to be found in Boll. Acta SS. Aug. vii. 46. Nothing trustworthy is known of Faustus, and his successors are unknown even by name till Sarsotius, towards the close of the 9th century. (Gall. Christ. i. 1256.)

[8. A. B.]

FAUSTUS (15), comm. Oct. 4, a deacon and martyr, with his fellow deacons, Gissus, Eusebius, and Chaeremen and many other disciples, probably, of Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, when head of the celebrated catechetical school in that city, A.D. 232-247 [DIONYSIUS I (6)]. They suffered, some in the Decian persecution, A.D. 250 (Menolog. Graec. Mon. Sahianus, s. v. Valerian and Gallienus, A.D. 258, and Faustus is an advanced old age under Diocletian. (Eusebius, E. H. vii. c. 11. (8. T. E.

FAUSTUS (16), commemorated Sept. 6, martyr at Alexandria, with Macarius and others under Decius, Valerius being prefect of the city. (Menolog. Graec. Sirilla.)

[8. T. E.]


[8. T. E.]

FAUSTUS (18), commemorated Aug. 1, martyr at Rome with Bonus and others at the same time as pope Stephen, under Valerian. (Mart. Bedae, Usuardi; Euseb. H. E. vii. 10.]

[8. T. E.]

FAUSTUS (19), martyr at Cervera, in January and Martin, their feast is placed by the Bellandists on Oct. 13, but the Gothic and the most ancient Spanish breviaries Sept. 28. The date of their martyrdom is uncertain. Two points, however, throw light on it. (1) a verse of Prudentius, which probably refers to it, "Corduba. Asturiae, Zoelum. Tragica coronas;" cf. Prudent. Frag. Hymn. 4, 10; (2) the mention of "sarmatissimae imperatrices" in some MSS. of the Acta, which would seem to fit the Diocletian persecution. Tamayo de Salazar (Martyr. Hosp. Oct. 19) gives the date as 298, but with equal confidence he makes them brothers to Diocletian of St. Marcellus and St. Nona. The first position seems disposed of by the word "societas" in the Acta applied to the bond between them, and the connexion with St. Marcellus probably arises from the confused notices of them in the Martyrologies, where three other martyrs of Chalcedon share the same day, one of whom is named Marcellus, and they appear to be confused with one another and with the Cordesian martyrs. There was a church in their honour at Cordova in the 9th century (Memorias Sacramentariae of St. Eulogius, cap. 9, lib. 2, and Merida in the 7th, if the document known as De Vitis et Mort. Paer. Emerit. (Esp. Bap. iii. p. 355) is to be trusted. On the contrary, Cordova by St. Ferdinand their church was re-dedicated to St. Peter, and the supposed relics of the three saints, together with others, were
discovered in it Nov. 21, 1575. (Florez, Ep. Negros, vol. x, 321, 508; Boll. A.A. SS. Oct. vii. 1.) the Acta are given at P. 2450 of the fine 18th-century Sacrorum, which in Florence's time was still in the monastery of Cardenas, but is now in the Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 25,800. See also Mart., Adon., Usuard.)

FAUSTUS (20), one of a company of martyrs at Albinum in proconsular Africa in the Diocletian persecution, according to the Acta Martyrum professing to be drawn from the proconsular records, and quoted by Baronius. (Baron. A. E. ann., 303, 311.)

C. H.]

FAUSTUS (21), martyr, April 16. [SARACOSA, MARTYRS OF.]

FAUSTUS (22), commemorated Nov. 26, perhaps identical with the Faustus of Oct. 4 (No. 15), a presbyter and martyr at Alexandria, with Dios and Ammonius, who suffered under Maximinus, A.D. 308, at the time when Peter, bishop of that city, was also put to death by his command. (Martyr., Adonis, Usuard.; Euseb. H. E. viii. 13.)

[G. T. S.]

FAUSTUS (23), commemorated Sept. 8, martyr at Antioch with Timothy (Martyr. Usuardi), called Faustinus (Martyr. Bedae), and Faustianus (Martyr. Hieron.).

[G. T. S.]

FAUSTUS (24), commemorated Nov. 19, an aged deacon and martyr. (Martyr. Usuardi.)

[G. T. S.]

FAUSTUS (25), probably a monk, the bearer of a letter from St. Augustine to his friend Bonifatius, the tribune, from whom he had brought a letter to Augustine requesting his advice, c. A.D. 413. (Aug. Ep. 189.) [H. W. P.]

FAUSTUS (26), monk of Constantinople, son of Julianus. The father, who had been a soldier in the time of the emperor Theodosius, was prevailed to embrace a monastic life by St. Basil of Constantinople. Faustus followed the example, and was shorn by his own father. Both lived in the greatest credit with the emperor and the senate, and miracles are recorded of the Faustus was commemorated on Aug. 3. (Basil. Menon.)

[C. H.]

FAUSTUS (27), a deacon mentioned by Syrius, bishop of Poloena in Cyreneaca, who praises the clergy for heading their flocks against their enemies when the soldiers would not come forward, and commends above all the valour of the many (μακρινοὶ) Faustus, who was the foremost combatant. (Syrius, Ep. 122, in Migne, Patrol. Græc. ivii. 259; Cæliari, Aut. Sacr. viii. 31.)

[L. D.]

FAUSTUS (28), a presbyter and archimandrite of Constantinople, ranking first among the contemporary holders of that office. In the year A.D. 448 Eutyches, the heretic, endeavoured to secure his support, in common with that of the other archimandrites of Constantinople, for his views. With this object he sent round a tome to which he tried to induce the archimandrites to subscribe. When Eutyches' agents, Constantius and Eleusius, came to Faustus to request his signature as **Exposition of the faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers of Nicaea** and of the Fathers of Ephesus? *"Let me have it," said Faustus, "to compare with the copies which I have of the decrees of those councils." This however, they would not allow, and retired. When narrating this incident to messengers from the archbishop Flavian, Faustus added, *"As to us, we are the children of the church, and have, after God, but one father, our archbishop."* (Labbæus, Concil. iv. 211; Tillemont, xv. 501.) This Faustus, with Martin, a brother archimandrite, enjoyed the especial confidence of Leo I. He wrote to him, Martin and the other archimandrites, in June A.D. 449, against the heresy of Eutyches (Leo Mag. Ep. 32, 358, Migne). He addresses them again in October, after the "Robber Council," exhorting them to constancy (Ep. 51, 837). He writes again to Faustus and Martin in March, 450 (Ep. 61, 983), in answer to a letter from them, in the same strain. Again in July he writes to all the archimandrites complaining of the silence of Anastasius and the bishops who conspired him to the see of Constantinople, as to his having given adequate evidence of orthodoxy (Ep. 71, 1012). In the same year he wrote an undated letter to Faustus alone (Ep. 72, 1016), praising his faith and constancy, and in November he wrote to Faustus and Martin (Ep. 75, 1022), saying how intolerable to the Western bishops was the action of the "Robber Council" at Ephesus. In A.D. 451 Faustus, with eighteen other orthodox archimandrites of Constantinople, addressed a letter to the emperor Marcian against the Eutychians, asking him, with a view to preventing the spread of that heresy, to allow them to subject its monastic supporters to the rules of monastic discipline (τινι ουκεται των μοναχων δικαιον), and if they obstinately continued to punish them as they deserved, they asked also that a certain cave to which the Eutychians seem to have retired (Πηθανετος την ουρανιον και καινους) might be handed over to them. (Labbæus, iv. 511.) After the meeting of the council of Chalcedon in 451, the bishops there assembled summoned Faustus, among other orthodox archimandrites, to take their seats in the council when Carosus and the other Eutychian archimandrites were summoned before it. Their names appear as subscribing to the deposition of Eutyches, in Act i. of the council. [C. G.]

FAUSTUS (29) (FAUSTIUS), the Latin form of the Irish CONOlALL.

FAUSTUS (30), monk of Agunnium (St. Maurice) in the Vales, accompanied his abbots, St. Severinus, on a journey to Paris to visit king Clovis I, who was sick of a fever. Severinus died on the return journey at Château-Landon, where Faustus appears to have established himself instead of returning to Agunnium. At the age of sixty he wrote a life of Severinus, c. A.D. 523-4, at the command of Childerich, who had built a church over the tomb of the saint. This work was corrected and adorned by some one whose name is unknown, at the suggestion of Magnus bishop of Sens, at the beginning of the 9th century, and in this new form is published by the Bollandists (A.A. SS. Feb. ii. 547). The original work in its imperfect state has been edited by Mahillon (Acta SS. O. S. B. p. 568), but
doubts have been thrown on its genuineness (Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 111). Cave (Script. Eccl. i 574) wrongly identifies this Faustus with Faustus Cassinensis, who lived half a century later.

[...]

FAUSTUS (31), CASSINENSIS, an Italian confided in childhood by his parent to St. Bene- dict to be brought up in the monastery of Monte Cassino; A.D. 543 he was sent by the saint to take part in the foundation of Glaneuil in Anjou, the first Benedictine establishment in France, of which St. Maur was the abbot. After a sojourn there of forty-six years, Faustus returned to Italy, and took up his residence in the Lateran monastery, whither the monks of Monte Cassino had retired after their monastery had been destroyed, and there he died. He is revered as a saint (A.A. SS. Bell. Feb. ii. 839-841). He wrote a life of St. Maur after his return to Italy, which is printed by the Bolzaniana (Acta SS. Jan. 1, 399 to 1051), and contains as a prologue a short autobiography. Some doubts have been cast on the genuineness of this work, but without good reason; Odo (Eudes) abbot of Glaneuil rewrote the work, altering only the style and not the facts, A.D. 863; there is no cause for supposing that he is the actual author of the work; the work of Faustus is only a creature of his imagination. The work is dedicated to all monks of the East and West, and mentions the approval of pope Boniface, either the third or fourth of that name. Cave wrongly identifies this Faustus with Faustus of Aquanus, who was over sixty years of age A.D. 528. (Cellier, Act. Sacr. xi. 310-12; Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 496; Cave, Script. Eccl. i. 574.)...
FAVENTIUS, bishop of Regium Lepidii (Seggio, in the Duchy of Modena), present at the council held under Eusebius of Milan, A.D. 451 (Leo. Mag. Ep. 97, 1082, Migne). [C. G.]

FAVILA. [FAPILA.]


FEACHNACH (Feachtach, Ann. Uit.) abbot of Fobar, now Foró, co. Westmeath, died A.D. 781 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 776, i. 381). [J. G.]

FEADHACH (Feadach, Ann. Uit. Feachtach, Feadhach), son of Conchae, and abbot of Louth, now Louth, died A.D. 780 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 784, i. 381; Lanigan, Ch. Hist. Ir. iii. 302). [J. G.]

FEAMMOR, virgin. [BLATH.]

FEAR—[FER—]

FEABUS, bishop of Orleans in the 5th century, between St. Magnus and Gratianus (Gall. Chr. viii. 1419). [C. H.]

FEBEDIOLUS (Fидiulus), fourth bishop of Benea, succeeding St. Melanius and followed by Victorus, subscribed the 5th council of Orleans, A.D. 546. (Manli, i. 156; Gall. Chrift. i. 740.) [S. A. B.]

FEBRONIA, commemorated June 25th, martyr under Diocletian, A.D. 304. She is said to have lived at Nisibis in Mesopotamia, where she was a member of a religious house and celebrated for her beauty, piety, and charity. Diocletian suspecting a young man of noble family named Lyeinachus, of a secret inclination to Christianity, sent him to the distant East to prove his fidelity to heathenism by uprooting the Christian faith. To secure his obedience he entrusted the chief power to the matters in the hands of the young man's uncle and guardian, Selenus, an ambitious, determined, and cruel man. Having arrived at Nisibis he was taken by江苏, worked while Lyeinachus in secret endeavoured to tempt the fate of the persecution. Selenus, having arrested

Febronia, was so struck with her beauty that he offered her the hand of Lysimachus in marriage, and, upon her refusal to accept it or to sacrifice, put her to death with the most cruel torments. Stung with remorse, Selenus committed suicide, while Lysimachus sought baptism and became a monk. Her Acts professed to be the work of an eyewitness, and member of the same monastery, named Thamas. They were originally written in Syriac or Greek. (Boll. AA. SS. Jun. v. 17—24; Synmone Metaphrastes; Menolog. Conc. ii. 5.)

FECHIN, bishop of Lerida, signs the acts of the council held at Lerida in A.D. 546 (not 534 as Dahn and others have it, see Tychon y Samiro, Colec. de Can. ii. 146), attended by eight bishops and one proxy, and presided over by Sergius, metropolitan of Tarragona. (Florez, Esp. Sagra. xlv. 99, 170; Hefele, Conciliumschrifte, ii. 683; Aguirre-Catalani, i. 171.) [M. A. W.]

FECHIN, FECHIN, FECHIN, ST. Beside the following there are other Fechins or Fechins commemorated in the Irish Calendars, at Feb. 22, Aug. 2, and Dec. 28.

(1) Fechin, abbot of Fobhar or Fore, was a zealous labourer for Christ in the west of Connaught in the seventh century, and his name is still remembered in connexion with his religious foundations. Only two ancient Livs seem to be extant. (Colgan, Acta SS. 130—139.) Bp. Challoner (Brit. Sacrif. pt. ii. 68—70) and Bp. Forbes (Kal. Scott. Saints, 458—58) have given memoirs of the saint, but the latest and fullest is by O'Hanlon (Irish Saints, i. 356—82). His name is attached to wells and churches in many localities in Ireland. In none of the Livs is there any record of his visiting Scotland, yet there is Échadseachan or Échadseachan in Dumfriesshire, and under the intituled form of Vigeanus his dedication is found at St. Vigean beside Arbrath. His being called Mo-ocern or Ecorus by St. Aengus and in the Col. Gene tol seems to be based on a mistake, though Colgan (Acta SS. 140 n.) accepts it as a fact.

(2) St. Fechin, one of the priests of the third class of Irish saints, belonged to the same noble race as St. Brigida. He is said to have been born at Billy, in the barony of Leyan and county of Sligo. So soon as he was of age for education, he was placed under the charge of St. Nathi (Aug. 9) of Achonry in the same barony of Leyan, but whether he entered the priesthood under him or not is uncertain. After a time he left his own country for greater retirement, and built his monastery at Fobhar, or Fore, now St. Feighin's, in the barony of Fore and county of Westmeath. (For the remains at Fore, see Petrie, Round Towers of Ireland, 174—5, 453; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 365 sq.) But besides the monastery of Fobhar, where three hundred monks were under him "secedum regulam a sancti patris institutium," other places are associated with his name, as the islands of Omeay and Ardollen in Galway, Cong near Lough Corrib, Ballysadare and Drumrat in Sligo. (On the localities see specially Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. iii. 46—50, and O'Hanlon, Lives of the Irish Saints, i. 360 sq.)

He died in the yellow plague, which proved fatal to so many saints in Ireland in A.D. 665.

FECHNO (Fethchu, Fethchu, Fethro, Flicina, Fichna, Fichno), one of St. Columba’s companions in the first voyage to Iona, and the planting of the faith in the Hebridies of Scotland. He was son of Rodan, and brother of Rus. He devoted himself to preach the gospel among the Picts, bringing them back to the piety of the days of St. Ninian. Miracles were said to be wrought at his tomb. By the early Scotch historians his feast is Aug. 12, and the year of his death 580. Colgan evidently prefers July 23, A.D. 588, for the date of his death (Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, 356; Colgan, Acta SS. 588; Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. vii. 372; Usher, Eccl. Antiq. xviii. 237–38). He is invoked in the Litanies of Dunblane (Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scott. Saints, p. 1.).

FEDHILIM (Fedella, Fedelmai, Fedhelm, Fedelmair, Fethelma), virgin, daughter of Ailill, king of Leinster (ob. 544). She was baptized, with her sister Mughain, by St. Patrick at a fountain near Naas. Both of them took the veil, became famous for virtue, and (it is said) for miraculous signs, and were commemorated on Dec. 9. (Mart. Donegal, by Todd and Reeves, 331; Tripart. Life of St. Patrick.)

FEDHILIMIDH (Fedhlimidh, Felix), a common name in the ecclesiastical annals of Ireland.

(1) Fedhlimidh, of Cill-mor Dithrubh, who is commemorated on Aug. 9, is said to have been brother of Diamid (Jan. 10) of Inis-colman and others, and to have belonged to the race of the Hy-Fianrac (Diamid 4). (Colgan, Acta SS. In his Locality of Patriciana, the Rev. J. F. Shearmur shews his father to have been Cuirrin, son of Laisre luird, descended from Niall of the Nine Hostages, and his mother to have been Deigha or Deidi, the daughter of Trian, son of Dubhthac mac Ua Lugair; he attributes the feasts of both Aug. 3 and 9 to him (Journ. Roy. Hist. and Archd. Assoc. 4, ser. iii. p. 24 Gen. Table, and p. 56). To Fedhilimidh is usually ascribed the foundation of the see of Kilmore, co. Cavan, yet there are no particulars of his life connecting him with either the place or its episcopate, and there is no account of any bishop being there prior to the fifteenth century. But as in the calendar he is placed at Cill-mor Dithrubh (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 215), it is suggested by O’Donovan, and accepted by Reeves, that he in no sense belonged to Cavan, but lived at Kilmore, a parish in the barony of North Ballinabo, co. Roscommon, which lies close to the Shannon, and is the “Cill-mor Dithrubh” where St. Columcille (Lux. Bp. founded his monastery of Kilmore. This St. Fedhlimidh must have flourished about the middle of the sixth century.

FELICIANA, one of the band of noble Roman ladies who gathered round St. Jerome when he was at Rome, A.D. 383–5. She is saluted by him in a letter to Paula (xxx. 14, ed. Vall.) as “rect
FELICIANUS—BISHOPS

carnis et spiritus virginitatem felicem." She is possibly the same as Felicitas (4). [W. H. F.]  

FELICIANUS (2) I, fourth in the list of the bishops of Foligno, his native town. His predecessor is anonymous, following Britius; his successor, also anonymous, is followed by Felicianus II. According to the Roman Martyrology he was consecrated to the see of Foligno by Victor, bishop of Rome, and in extreme old age was martyred in the Decian persecution. The period assigned to his episcopate is from A.D. 203 to 254, and his commemoration day is Jan. 24. In the time of Otho the Great numerous relics of the saints were brought out of Italy, and Theodoric bishop of Metz, attending that emperor in his expedition beyond the Alps, was one of the most zealous collectors of such treasures, for the enrichment of his monastery of St. Vincentius at Metz. Siebert names Felicianus among those whose remains were thus transported. The Bollandists give the Acta in three sections. (Siebert. An. 506; Porr. Lat. cix. 192; Barlaeus, Hist. sanct. ann. 293, ii. 254, 254; Bull. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 581; Ughel. Ital. Sacr. i. 684.)  

FELICIANUS (2) II, 6th in the list of bishops of Foligno, following the anonymous successor of Felix I, and preceding Paulus. His election is stated to have been confirmed by Marcellinus, bishop of Rome, A.D. 296. He is thought to be the Felicianus mentioned without a see among the 308 bishops of the council of Sirmium, A.D. 303. (Mansi. L. 1253; Ughel. Ital. Sacr. i. 685.)  


FELICIANUS (4), Donatist bishop of Musti, Nubita, or Mustita, a town of which there is some doubt whether it was in Numidia, or in proconsular Africa. The Notitia Africae places it in the former, but the latter view is the more probably correct. The Donatist party was strongest (Aug. Enarr. in Ps. 21, 22; de Unit. Ecc. 19, 51); but (1) Musti of the Provincia (Abd-er-Rabbi) was a well-known place, at which Roman remains still exist (Shaw, p. 93). (2) Bishops from other towns in the Provincia are mentioned as well as Felicianus, as being present at the council of Bagaun, e.g. from Membresa and Assuris. (3) The civil proceedings arising out of that council were carried on before the proconsul, and not, as it seems, in Numidia. In order to reconcile the difficulty, several writers, as Noris, Tillemont, Morelli, and Gams, have supposed another Musti to have existed in Numidia, but of this there is no authentic trace. (Ant. Itin. 48, 49; Aug. c. Cresc. iv. 5; c. Gaudenc. ii. 7, 7; Enarr. in Ps. 57, vol. iv. p. 685.)  

However this may be, there is no doubt that the name of Felicianus of Musti is one of the most prominent in the history of Donatism, and that it almost always occurs in connexion with that of Prætextatus of Assuris, the place mentioned above. Probably, but the expression of St. Augustine is not quite definite, he assisted at the consecration of Prætextatus, A.D. 391. Two years later he was accused of heresy by his colleague Cahunus who condemned him, and of the twelve who joined in ordaining Maximian in his place, A.D. 393 (Aug. c. Parm. 1, 4, 8; c. Cresc. iii. 13, 16; c. Petil. 1, 12; Ex. in Ps. 36, 20; Doctr. i. 887). At the council of Bagaun, April 24, A.D. 398, Prætextatus presided, and was succeeded in his position by the 310 bishops there assembled. None of the Maximianists attended, but they were all condemned by the council, especially those who assisted at the ordination of Maximian, of whom Felicianus was undoubtedly one. The sin of all who took any part in this act was denounced in the strongest terms possible, but to all, excepting the twelve ordainers, a respite was granted until Dec. 25 of the same year (Aug. c. Cresc. iii. 19, 22; 54, 60; 56, 62; iv. 4, 5; c. Gaudenc. ii. 7, 7; Ep. 51; de Gest. cum Emerc. 9). In March of the year following (A.D. 399) the Priminastian party commenced proceedings in the civil courts for the purpose of ejecting the Maximianist bishops from their sees, on ground supplied, as it would appear, by the imperial edicts issued to protect orthodox bishops and churches, such as the Priminastian representatives themselves were exclusively the object of (Theodos. iii. 24 and 26). They were carried on first before the proconsul Herodes, at the suit ostensibly of Peregirus, a presbyter, and the elders of the people of Musti, represented by an advocate named Titius; and they lasted during three or four proconsulates until that of Theodorus, but in what year he filled the office is uncertain. One of the proconsuls during the time was Serenus, who pronounced a decree against Salvius of Membresa (see above), but similar doubt exists as to his date (Aug. c. Cresc. iii. 55, 59; 56, 62; iv. 3; 48; 48, 59; de Gest. cum Emerc. 9). Certain it is that the proceedings were carried on more or less continuously till A.D. 398, but without producing the desired effect, though Felicianus was attacked, not only before the proconsul, but before the municipal authority of Musti (Aug. c. Cresc. iv. 4; Ep. 57). During this time the condemned Maximianist bishops suffered annoyance, and even persecution, in which Salvius of Membrase was cruelly put to death. This persecution was chiefly instigated by Optatus, bishop of Thamugadi, surnamed the Gildonian, from the support which he received from Gild the tyrant, as he may be called, of Africa at that time. These severities succeeded, at length, in terrifying the people of Musti and Assuris into inviting, or rather demanding, that their bishops, of whom Prætextatus had died, and been succeeded by Rogatus, should return to the communion of Priminastus (Aug. c. Cresc. ii. 10, 60; iv. 35, 32; Mon. Vet. Doc. p. 405, ed. Oberthür). They returned unconditionally, without any act of humiliation, and all their acts during the time of separation were accepted without question by the Donastitian communion. It is on this point that Augustine is never weary of insisting in his arguments against the Donastitans: "If," says he, "Felicianus and Prætextatus were rightly exiled, how could they be restored rightly on these terms? If wrongly, how could the acts of the Donastitans towards them be justified? They baptized many persons during their time of separation, yet none of these underwent re-baptism. The baptisms performed by Maximianists were not condemned; yet if the council of Bagaun was right, Felicianus and the rest condemned by its 310 bishops, were little less than murderers, and in returning,
FE LICIANUS

ought to have been treated as penitents, not re-admitted on equal terms."

(Aug. c. Parm. i. 4, § ii. 3, 7, 15, 34; de Bap. l. i. 2; c. Petil. ii. 7, 16; 52, 120; c. Cresc. iii. 59, 43; iv. 10, 13; Post. Coll. 4, 4; Epp. 76, 108).

After this restoration, Felicianus appears as the Donatist bishop of Musit at the great Enquiry, A.D. 411, but took no prominent part in its proceedings (Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 401, ed. Oberthür).

[W. H. P.]

FE LICIANUS (5), the name of five bishops present at the Carthaginian conference of A.D. 411, namely, the bishop of—


Cufrauti, in Byzaene; a former bishop had been condemned by the Donatists, and not received by the Catholics, and no Donatist appointed. (M. V. D. p. 409; Tillemont, 77, vol. vi. p. 189.)

Ferada Minor, in Byzaene. (M. V. D. p. 418.)


Utina, in proconsular Africa. Donatist. (M. V. D. p. 440.)

[H. W. P.]

FE LICIANUS (6), the name of three Catholic bishops banished by Hunicus after the convention at Carthage in 484 (Victor. Vit. Notit. 56-58 in Migne, Pat. Lat. liviii), namely of—

Girutarae, in the province of Numidia. (Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 170.)

Ida, in the province of Mauretania Caesariensis; along with Subitians, who was bishop of the same see, he went to the convention; as he is placed lower in the list than Subitius, he is supposed to have been a Donatist who joined the Catholics, and would have retained his rank and see according to the rule of the African church. (A. C. i. 190.)

Meta, in the province of Numidia. (A. C. i. 225.)

[F. L. D.]

FE LICIANUS (7), the name of a person either real or imaginary, but of whom, if real, nothing is known, though he is called by Alcuin an Arian bishop. He is represented as one of the interlocutors in a dialogue carried on with St. Augustine on the nature of the Trinity. The treatise which contains this is entitled Contra Felici-

anum Arrianum de Unitate Trinitatis, and was former-

mly ascribed to Augustine. It is quoted under his name by Alcuin, Bede, and Peter Lombard. The first who doubted its genuineness was Erasmus, and it was afterwards assigned, chiefly on internal grounds, by the Jesuit father, P. P. Chillet, to Vigilius bishop of Tapsa or Tapsis in Byzacene, c. 484, and this judgment has been followed by the later editors of St. Augustine's works. The arguments of the dialogue are confessedly founded less on scriptural grounds than on such as belong to the nature of the case, and the work terminates somewhat abruptly. (Aug. Opp. vol. viii. app. pp. 1158-1172; Cave, Hist. Lat. i. p. 458; Tillemont, 342, vol. xiii. p. 914.)

[H. W. P.]

FE LICIANUS (8), bishop of Ruspe, in North Africa, elected on the day of the death of Fulgentius, A.D. 533 (Vit. Fulg. cap. 69), and consecrated in the following year, A.D. 534.

While a presbyter he shared the exile of Fulgentius in Sardinia (Vit. Fulg. proc. sec. 2). As bishop he took part in the council of Carthage under Reparatus in 534. (Mansi, viii. 841.) To him was addressed the Vita Fulgenti, prefixed to the works of Fulgentius. (Vit. Fulg. in Pat. Lat. Irv. 117; also in Bolt. Acta SS. Jan. i. 32; Morcelli, Afr. Chr. i. 266.)

[H. R. K.]

FE LICIANUS (9), bishop of Vicenza, c.A.D. 809. (Cappellotti, Le Chiese d'Ital. x. 822.)

[R. S. G.]

FE LICIANUS (10), commemorated Nov. 18, martyr at Vienne, A.D. 163, with Severian and Eupereus. Their relics were translated to the church of St. Romanus in Vienne some time about the year 800. (Martyr. Ussauri, Abn., Chronic. Adonis.)

[G. T. S.]

FE LICIANUS (11), commemorated Jan. 29, martyr in Africa with Pelianus and others (Martyr. Romana, Hieron.); probably at Alexandria or Carthage in the beginning of the Decian persecution, when the entire population was summoned man by man to sacrifice, and hundreds were put to death. See letter of Donatus bishop of Alexandria, describing this process in Eusebius (H. E. vi. 41).

[G. T. S.]

FE LICIANUS (12), commemorated June 9, martyr with Primus at Nomentum, now Menton, an ancient city of Latium, four miles and a half from Rome. Their acts are given in three different versions in Surius. Cellier, however, does not regard them as authentic. The story, which is surrounded with many difficulties, is briefly thus:—The emperors Diocletian and Maximian being at Rome, the martyrs, who were Roman citizens, were brought before them, at the instigation of the heathen priests, who declared that the gods would neither give oracles nor blessings till they were compelled to sacrifice. The emperor ordered them to be led to the altar, and to sacrifice to Jupiter and Hercules. Upon their refusal, they were committed to the charge of Promotus, governor of Nomentum, with strict orders to compel them to obedience, or else to punish them with the severest tortures, which he forthwith executed. Weared out with their obstinacy, Promotus made a final effort, calling them before his tribunal, and endeavoured to persuade them to obedience. Whereupon Felicianus refused, saying: “I am now eighty years old, but have known the truth for thirty years, during which I have chosen the service of my master the eternal God, thinking nothing of the pleasures of the world.” Upon this they were beheaded, and their bodies cast to the dogs; but neither birds nor beasts would touch them. The Christians recovered the bodies, and built a church in a sand-pit at the arch on the Via Nomentana, where a church was afterwards built. (Martyr. Ussauri, Bede, Hieron., Adonis; Surius, Hid. SS. June 9.)

[G. T. S.]

FE LICIANUS (13), commemorated July 21. A soldier and martyr under Maximiian at Marsi-

elles. (Francois Victor.) (Martyr. Adonis, Ussauri, Hieron.)

[G. T. S.]

FE LICIANUS (14), commemorated Oct. 29; martyr in Lucania with Hyaclitus, Quintus, and Lucius (Martyr. Ussauri).

[G. T. S.]
FELICIANUS


FELICIANUS (18) (Cyp. Ep. 59. xi. xii.), an apostle of Rome sent from Cornelius to Cyprian, a.d. 232 and the bearer of intelligence from the latter to Cornelius of the movements of the party of Felicissimus; whose death prevented Cornelius from being forewarned, and disconcerted him much. [E. W. B.]

FELICIANUS (17), to whom Dionysius Exiguus dedicated his translation of the epitate of St. Proclus of Constantinople to the Armenians. Dionysius addresses him as "pastor," and then styles him "venerable," adding that it is at his instance and for his ears that he translates this epitate into Latin. We must infer him, therefore, to have been a Latin ecclesiast of some distinction, but whether bishop or priest is uncertain, as Dionysius styles the "presbyter Eugubius," to whom he dedicates another of his translations, also "venerable." We meet with no subscriber of this name to the various councils contemporary with Dionysius. [E. S. F.]

FELICISSIMUS (1), deacon of Carthage, whom Novatus associated with himself in the management of a district called Mons. (Cyp. Ep. 41.) He was the chief agent (signifer sedis) in the anti-Cyprianic party, which combined the five presbyters originally opposed to Cyprian's election, with the later-formed party for the easy redemption of the lapsed. (Ep. 43, 45.) The charge of peculation and debauchery (Cyp. Ep. 41, 59) is weakened by its reapparence in the case of every deacon in opposition. (E.g. Novatian.) But Cyprian (Ep. 82) more shortly states that he had been, when the persecution arose, on the point of being tried before the presbytery on charges of homicidal cruelty to his father and wife. Like other African and Spanish deacons (Neander, vol. i. p. 324, ed. Bohn) he acquired influence through his adoration of church property, and was able to threaten with excommunication any one who accepted relief of office from Cyprian's commissioners (Calvinus), who doubtless seemed to interfere with his functions. He was then excommunicated by them (Ep. 42) with Cyprian's consent, but any future adherents were warned that their excommunication would be perpetual. (Ep. 43.) Still they were heard again by the first Council, a.d. 251 (Ep. 45. v.), and condemned. The mild resolution of the Council of a.d. 252, easeing the redemption of the lapsed on their earnest repentance (Cyprianus, p. 744 a), destined his locus standi. The party then associated with that of Privatus, who consecrated Fortunatus anti-bishop; and Felicissimus called from Rome to concatenate or to intimidate Cornelius into a recognition of him. (Ep. 59.) Failing here, the party melted quietly away into the cities.

68.1. On the Mons, see Cyprianus, Vol. i. p. 743. Obs. 2. The expression that Novatus "discourseth constit Felicissimus" cannot fairly be pressed into "Novatus ordained him," although it might mean that he procured hisordination, as we read similarly that he "fict Epicopum Novatianum." But as Cyprian (Ep. 41) is already familiar with him, and speaks of his "vetera fraudem, de quibus jam multa cognoveram," it more probably means that Novatus appointed him deacon of his own presbyteral district. Obs. 3. Reitberg (in accordance with his general theories), treats the faction of Felicissimus as anti-episcopal, i.e. presbyterian in principle; but there is no foundation for the idea, [see Cyprianus, p. 743.]

FELICISSIMUS (3), a layman, "quietus semper et sorbuis," one of the earliest confessors at Carthage in the Decian persecution. (Cyp. Ep. vi.) See Pearson (Anm. Cyp. A.D. 250, vii) as to his being made into a martyr by Bede and other Roman martyrologists. [E. W. B.]

FELICISSIMUS (3), presbyter, described at condemnation of Priscillian, 386, at Treves, as a recent convert. He was beheaded (Sulp. Serv. li. 51). [M. B. C.]


FELICISSIMUS (5), bishop of the two sees of Sedelia and Utina, in the province of proconsular Africa; present at the synod of Carthage held under bishop Boniface, A.D. 525. (Morelli, Africa Christiana, i. 272; Manzi, viii. 648.) [L. D.]


FELICISSIMUS (7), commemorated Aug. 6; martyr at Rome with Agapetus, both of whom were deacons in attendance upon pope Sixtus, who suffered under Valerian in virtue of an edict which adorned A.D. 238. This edict is extant in Cyprian, Ep. 82, ad Successum. After various tortures they were all beheaded. The deacons were buried in the cemetery of Praetextatus. (Martyr. Usuard, Adonis, Hieron., Bede, Suri Vitae SS, Acta S. Lawendii, Aug. 10; Neander, Hist., i. 193, ed. Bohn; Baron. A. E. ann. 261. iv.) [G. T. S.]

FELICISSIMUS (8), commemorated July 2; martyr in Campania under Diocletian, with Aristo and others. In the list of St. Sebastian (Surius, vol. i. Jan. 20) there is an account of their conversion by the efforts of St. Sebastian and St. Polycarp. These Acts are evidently corrupt, as they give the title of Episcopus episcoporum to the bishop of Rome. Ceillier, however, considers them to have been written before the end of the 4th century, as they are the work of gladiatorial shows as still existing, which were abolished in or about A.D. 403. (Martyr. Usuard, Adonis; Till. Mem. iv. 515.) [G. T. S.]

FELICISSIMUS (9), commemorated May 20; martyr, a.d. 303, under Diocletian, with Hera-
FELICISSIMUS

clius and Paulinus at Tudertum (Martyr. Usuard.,

FELICISSIMUS (10), Nov. 24, martyr at
Perugia, according to Usuardus at Rome ac-
cording to Jerome (Martyr. Hieron., Usuard.).

[G. T. S.]

FELICISSIMUS (11), commemorated March
14; martyr at Nicomedia with Dativus, Fronti-
sinus, Joquinus (Martyr. Hieron., Nötf.).

[G. T. S.]

FELICITAS (1), commemorated on Nov. 25;
martyr at Rome with her seven sons, under
Antonius Pius, Publius being prefect of the
City, about A.D. 150. The story of the martyr-
doom of Felicitas and her sons is fixed by their
Acts under Antonius Pius, and at his personal
command. Now it is almost certain that there
was no authorized persecution in his reign
(Antonius Pius). Public calamities, a famine,
an inundation of the Tiber, earthquakes in Asia
Minor and in Rhodes, ravaging fires at Rome,
Antioch, and Carthage, stirred up the mob to
seek for the favour of the gods by the shedding
of Christian blood (Julii Capitolini Vita Antonii
Pii). While they were thus doing, Felici-
tas and her children suffered without any par-
ticipation on the emperor's part. In her Acts
Publius the prefect is represented as commanded
by Antonius to compel her to sacrifice, in
which he fails, though he appeals to her maternal
affection as well as to her fears. He then calls
upon her seven sons, Januarius, Felix, Philippus,
Sylvanus, Alexander, Vitalis, Martialis, and with a
similar want of success, the mother, exhorting them thus,
"Behold, my sons, heaven, and look upwards, whence you
expect Christ with His saints." The prefect,
having tortured some of them, reported the
whole matter to the emperor, at whose com-
mand they were beheaded. Their martyrdom is
commemorated by Gregory the Great, in Rom.
3 super Evang., where, preaching in a church
dedicated to her, he lauds Felicitas as "plus
quam martyris quae septem pignoribus ad regnum
praemissis, toties ante se mortua est. An poena
primum est sed perennit octavam" (Martyr. Vet.
Rom., Hieron., Bede, Adonis, Usuard.).

[G. T. S.]

FELICITAS (2), March 7; martyr at Car-
thage with Perpetua, Revocatus, Saturninus,
and Secundinus. They were all catechumens,
and baptized after their arrest. Felicitas and her
companions having been interrogated by Hila-
rius, the proconsul, and remaining steadfast
in their profession, were condemned to be thrown
to the beasts on the anniversary of the young
Geta's accession. Felicitas, being in the eighth
month of her pregnancy, and the law not per-
mitting women in her condition to be executed,
was greatly distressed at the delay of her martyr-
dom. Prayer was therefore made that God might
give her a speedy delivery, and this accordingly
took place a few days after. While the pangs
of labour were upon her the jailer, hearing her
utter some natural exclamations of pain, said,
"If thy present sufferings are so great, what
wilt thou do when thou art thrown to the
wild beasts? This thou didst not consider when
they put thee into prison." She answered,
"What I now suffer I suffer myself,
but then there will be another who will suffer

for me because I also shall suffer for Him." They
were all put to death together in A.D. 202
or 203, during the reign of Severus, whose later
years were marked by a very rigorous perse-
27 in Hist. August. Script.). Few martyrs are
better attested than this one. The ancient
Roman calendar, published by Bucherius, ad
dating from about the year 360, mentions
only three African martyrs, viz. Felicitas,
Perpetua, and Cyprian, and fixes the day of
their death as March 7. Their name is em-
bodyed in the canon of the Roman Mass, which
mentions none but really primitive martyrs.
Their martyrdom is mentioned by Tertullian in
his book, De Anima, 1v., and is treated at length
in three sermons, 280, 281, and 282, by St.
Augustine, while their burial at Carthage, in the
Basilica Major, is asserted by Victor Vitensis,
Lib. i. de Percut. Vandal. Their acts were
for a long time missing, and after a long search
were found by Lucas Holstenius among the
 MSS. in the convent library at Monte Cassino.
They profess in part to have been written by
Perpetua. Some think from their style that
they were edited by some one after he adopted
Montanist views. (Martyr. Vet. Rom., Hieron.,
Beda, Adonis, Usuard; Ruinart, Acta Sincera;
Prosper in Chron. Labbeano; Beda, de Sex Actat.;
Neander, vol. i. 170; vol. ii. 209-212, ed. Bohn.)

[G. T. S.]

FELICITAS (3), martyr with Augustine
Capua; according to some, during the persecu-
tion which raged during the brief reign of
Decius, about A.D. 250. Valerian, afterwards
emperor, and a persecutor as well, occupied at
that time the post of public censor, restored by
vote of the senate, Oct. 27, A.D. 251. He may
have been the immediate agent in the persecu-
tion. According to others (Tilmum. iv. 174) the
martyrdom happened in Valerian's persecu-
tion, A.D. 257. St. Cyprian is said to have en-
couraged them to persevere in an epistle which is
now lost. (Lactantius, de Mort. Percut. cap. 4; 5;
Ceillier, li. 341.)

[G. T. S.]

FELICITAS (4), a Roman lady, eminently
for her sanctity, a friend of St. Jerome, who
saw him again through Asia in the letter (45, ed.
Vall.) written from Portus, when he was leaving
Italy for the last time for Palestine, a.d. 38.

[FELICIANA.]

[W. H. F.]

FELICITAS (5), a lady, probably the head of
a religious house, to whom St. Augustine woule
compose some differences which had arisen in
the society, and to exhort the inmates to main-
tain peace, rather than encourage a spirit of con-

[H. W. P.]

FELICULA

(commem. June 5; martyr at Rome, on the Via Ardeatina, with Felicius,
and twenty-one others. There seems a confusion
between this martyr and the following in the
Martyrologies (Martyr. Hieron., Nötkeri).

[G. T. S.]

FELICULA (2), commem. June 15; virgin
and martyr at Rome, under Donatian. A prefect
accused her of some such charge as the
death of his first wife Petronilla. He gave her
a choice either to marry him or to sacrifice to
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the gods. Upon her refusal to comply with his wishes he delivered her to his deputy, who ranched and starved her, and flung her body into the public sewer, whence it was rescued by a priest named Eusebius. On the seventh milestone on the Via Ardestina (Martyr. Bede, Adenis, Usuardi, Wandalberti). [G. T. S.]


FELIM. [Fedelimidh.]

FELIMUSD. martyr at Perusia in the Decian persecution, according to the tabulae ecclesiasticae referred to by Baronius. (Baron. A. E. ann. 354, xii.) [C. H.]
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FELIX (I) I., bishop of Rome, probably from January 5, A.D. 292, to Dec. 30, A.D. 274, in the reigns of the emperors Claudius and Aurelian. These are the dates according to our oldest and most trustworthy authority. For the Liberian Catalogue (354) names the consuls of the years above mentioned as those contemporary with his accession and death, and gives 5 years, 11 months, and 25 days as the duration of his episcopate, while the Liberian Depositio Episcoporum gives the 30th of December as the date of his death. Later authorities, including the Liber Pontificalis, differ as to the date and duration of his episcopate. But there seems to be no good reason for doubting the correctness of the earliest record. He appears in the Roman Calendar as a saint and martyr, his day being the 30th of May. His martyrdom is asserted, not only in the later editions of the Liber Pontificalis, but also in the early recension of 550, known as the Felician Catalogue, where we read, "Martyrio coronatus fuit temporibus Claudii et Aureliani." It is attested also in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (431), and by Cyril of Alexandria and Vincentius of Lerins, in the same century. But, notwithstanding this testimony, the fact of his martyrdom seems inconsistent with the silence on the subject of the Liberian Catalogue in the previous century, and with his name appearing in the Depositio Episcoporum, not the Depositio Martyrum, of the same date. There is also this further argument against his martyrdom, that, if Eusebius is to be believed, the intended persecution under Aurelian, to which he is said to have fallen victims, never in fact took place. For Eusebius states (E. E. vii. 30, Chron. ad ann. 2292, Ab.) that the emperor died when on the point of signing the edict of persecution, and that consequently it never took effect. It is true that Lacantius (de Morte Perscr. c. 6) gives a somewhat different account, representing the edict as having been signed, but its effects stopped by the flight of the emperor. But it reached the distant provinces. This account leaves room for the operation of the edict for a time in Rome, at least for the martyrdom of Felix under it. Still, the apocryphal character of other legends about martyrs under the supposed Aurelian persecution (appearing in the Acts of Synods and elsewhere) would throw suspicion on the story of the martyrdom of Felix, even if the absence of all mention of it in the Liberian Catalogue did not invalidate its probability.

It has been supposed that the story may have arisen from a substitution of the name of Felix I. for that of Felix II., the antipope to Liberius in the following century, for whom his followers claimed the honour of martyrdom. This supposition is supported by the fact that the pontifical annals which make Felix I. a martyr assign to him also the same place of burial as is assigned to Felix II., viz. his own cemetery at the second milestone on the Aurelian Way; whereas it is distinctly stated in the Liberian Catalogue that he was buried, like other popes of the period, in the cemetery of Callistus. (See Lepius, Chron. d. röm. Bischöfe, p. 251 et seq.) Another probable supposition is that the stories of the martyrdom of both these popes arose from a confusion of them with an African martyr of the same name, the translation of whose remains to Rome was celebrated on the same day as is devoted to Felix II. in the Roman Calendar (Dolinger, Fables of Popes of the Middle Ages).

Nothing is known with any certainty of the acts of Felix I., except the part he took in the deposition of Paul of Samosata from the see of Antioch. A synod at Antioch (A.D. 290) having deposed this heretical bishop, and appointed Domnus in his place, announced these facts in letters addressed to Maximus and Dionysius, bishops of Alexandria and Rome, and to other Catholic bishops. Felix, who had in the meantime succeeded Dionysius, addressed a letter on the subject to Maximus and to the clergy of Antioch, fragments of which are preserved in the Apologia of Cyril of Alexandria, and in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, and which is also alluded to by Marius Mercator, and by Vincent of Lerins in his Commonitorium. Paul refusing to cede his place to Domnus, the case was laid before the Emperor Aurelian, present at Antioch in 272 or 273, after his victory over Zenobia. He decided in favour of whichever claimant to the see should be recognised by the bishops of Italy and of Rome. The consequence was the expulsion of Paul (Euseb. H. E. vii. 30).

It is stated in the Liber Pontificalis that Felix I. ordered the sacred mysteries to be celebrated over the graves of martyrs.

Three decrees, undoubtedly spurious, are assigned to him (Harduin, Concil.). One, to a bishop Paterius, has for its object the protection of the clergy from accusations for crimes, the controlling of the process in case of accusations being made, and the reserving of appeals to Rome. Another, purporting to be in reply to complaints received from a synod of Gallican bishops, relates to the accusation and trial of bishops before provincial synods, disallowing the entertainment of any charges against them by persons of suspected character, and protecting the accused from spoliations during the progress of any trial. It also orders masses in remembrance of martyrs. A third, to a bishop Benignus, is doctrinal, condemning the assertions that,
because no one has seen the Father at any time, the Son sees Him not, and that, because the Father is invisible and the Son visible, the Son is less than the Father.

FELIX II.—Pope

FELIX (3) II., made bishop of Rome after the exile of Pope Liberius (A.D. 355). This Felix has obtained a place in the Roman Calendar as a saint and martyr, and in the Pontifical and in the Acts of St. Felix and St. Eusebius is represented as a legitimately elected and orthodox pope, persecuted by the emperor and the Arian faction. Contemporary and other ancient writers (Faustus and Marcellinus, Hilary, Athanasius, Jerome, Rufinus, Sozomen, and Theodoret) unanimously represent him, on the contrary, as an interloper into the see, placed there violently and irregularly by the emperor and the Arian party, and make no allusion to his martyrdom.

The following is drawn by Marcellinus and Faustus, two contemporary Luciferian presbyters of Rome, who must have had good opportunity of knowing the truth. It occurs in the preface to their Libellus Pecamin addressed to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius during the pontificate of Damasus, who separates and publicly censures the writers. We have occasion to complain of being persecuted. Immediately on the banishment of Liberius all the clergy, including the archdeacon Felix, swore before the people that they would accept no other bishop during the life of the exiled pope. Notwithstanding this, the clergy afterwards ordained that Felix, though the people were displeased and abstained from taking part. Damasus, pope after Liberius, was among his persecuted supporters. After two years the emperor visited Rome, and, being solicited by the people for the return of Liberius, at length consented on condition of his complying with the imperial requirements, but with the intention of his ruling the church jointly with Felix. In the third year Liberius returned to Rome, when the people met him with joy. Felix was driven from the city, but after a little time, at the instigation of the clergy who had perjured themselves in his election, burst into it again, taking his possession of Julius beyond the Tiber. The whole multitude of the faithful, and the nobles, again expelled him with great ignominy. After eight years, during the consulsipate of Valentinianus and Valens (i.e. A.D. 365) on the 10th of the Calends of December (Nov. 22) Felix died, leaving Liberius without a rival as bishop of Rome till his own death on the 8th of the Calends of October (Sept. 24), A.D. 366. The other ancient writers of repute mentioned above confirm this account, supplying further details, and with no discrepancies such as to affect the main drift of the narrative. From their combined relations we learn that the election and consecration of Felix took place in the imperial palace, and that Felix and Liberius were consecrated from their churches: that three of the emperor's eunuchs represented the people on the occasion, the consecrators being three heretical bishops, Epictetus of Centumellae, Aecarius of Caesarea, and Basil of Ancyra; and that it was only the Arian section of the clergy, though appearing as the free clergy at Epictetus' bidding, "in viribus (Caere?) "ad latum formam (fori?) Trajanit," on the 3rd of the Ides of November, when
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his body was taken in the night by certain clergy, including the presbyter Damasus, and buried in the 12th of the Calendae of December in a basilica on the Via Aurelia at the second milestone from the city, which he had himself founded, and endowed with a field on the spot which he had bought. The Acts of St. Felix agree with his life in the pontifical, though with some differences as to dates. In the Acts of St. Eusebius it is stated that, when Liberius had been seized by the tyrant, he was described in his life in the Pontifical, Eusebius, a Roman presbyter, began to denounce him as a heretic and a friend of Constantius. On many, in consequence of this denunciation, avoiding the communion of Liberius, the churches were seized by him, Felix was ejected, and Liberius restored. Then follows a detailed account of the seizure of Eusebius, his examination by the emperor, assisted by Liberius, his imprisonment and martyrdom.

The two accounts of these transactions given on the one hand by Marcellinus and Faustus, supported by such a number of reputable authorities as the Acts of Martyrs, the former is undoubtedly to be preferred. The latter authorities are in no case altogether trustworthy, and in this instance are inconsistent with each other, showing signs also of their compilation at a later time than those of the events referred to by evident historical inaccuracies, viz., the incorrect designations of Ursacius, and Valens, and the confusion between Constantius and Constantine. They may be considered due to a desire to clear the reputation of Felix, his party having become dominant on the elevation of Damasus, his support to the papacy after the contest which ensued on the death of Liberius. [See DAMASUS.] It may be, however, as is maintained by Lipsius in his Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe, that they contain elements of truth, as representing the genuine traditions of the party of Felix, though coloured and distorted. This writer endeavours to reconcile the two accounts, and to reduce the conflicting accounts. He even supposes that the alleged martyrdom of Felix may have had a foundation in fact; that, strengthened through the action of Eusebius, and supported by the majority of the clergy, who were now alienated from Liberius, he took his account of his compliance with heresy, he held his position as a rival bishop in the basilica on his own property alluded to, that conflict had ensued between the two parties, in one of which Felix might have been killed, and hence come to be regarded as a martyr. (See the same writer, as above cited, for the probable chronology of the events.) Dr. Dehlerer (Popelhofen des Mittelalters) regards the whole of the stories in the pontifical and the Acts (so far as they contradict the historical narrations) as fabulous, and considers that the martyrdom of Felix to be sufficiently disproved by the expression "requievit in pace" applied to him in the earliest and least fabulous of these accounts, the life of Liberius in the pontifical. He considers the tradition of his martyrdom to have arisen from a confusion of his name with that of an African martyr Felix, the translation of whose remains to Rome was celebrated on the same day, July 28, as is devoted to Felix II. in the mass and the orthodoxy of Felix himself, even the writers who are most adverse to him do not distinctly impugn it; though all agree that he owed his elevation to the heretics Athanasius, who speaks violently against Constantius and the ordination of Felix, says of him that he was worthy of them. Rufinus says of him, "Non tam sectae diversitatis quam communiunionis et ordinatiois connivit via Eustachia maculatur." Socrates, having just said that he then embraced the Arian heresy, adds that some affirmed that he by no means embraced the Arian opinion, but had undergone their baptism compelled by force and necessity. Sozomen similarly asserts the report of some that he perpetually adhered to the Nicene faith, and that on the ground of religion he was entirely without reproach, the only ground of reproach against him being that even before his ordination he had been associated with heretics. If against these testimonies in his favour be urged the improbability that the emperor could allow his ordination without the same compliance with heresy as he undoubtedly required and at last obtained from Liberius, it may be replied that after the banishment of the latter the attitude of the Emperor was such as to deter the emperor and his advisers from the dangerous step of elevating an avowed heretic to St. Peter's chair. Still, from the charge of association with Arians and toleration of their communion, and also apparently of perjury, Felix cannot with any probability be regarded as free. Probably, like Liberius, he was all the time orthodox at heart, and avowed his orthodoxy boldly, as Liberius did, when pressure was removed.

Though Felix, as well as Liberius, has obtained a place in the list of lawful popes, and has even been canonized, it is evident from what has been shown that his claim to such a place is more than doubtful. And, accordingly, Augustin, Optatus, and Eutychius, regarding him (as did Athanasius, Jerome, and Rufinus) as a mere interloper, exclude him entirely from their lists of popes. In the Roman church, however, his claim to the position given him appears to have remained unquestioned till the 14th century, when, an emendation of the Roman Martyrology having been undertaken in 1582, under Pope Gregory XIII., the question was raised and discussed. Baronius, who was an actor in what took place, relates the circumstances. He himself was at first adverse to the claims of Felix, and wrote a long treatise against them; a cardinal, Sanctorius, defended them. The question was finally decided by the accidental discovery, in the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian in the forum, of a coffin bearing the inscription, "Corpus S. Felix, papae et martyr, qui damnavit Constantium." In the face of this, which seemed like a personal reappearance of the calumniated saint to vindicate his own claims, Baronius was convinced in spite of his own arguments, and retracted all that he had written. (Baron. ad Liberium, c. xii.) Accordingly Felix retained his place in the martyrology, though the title of pope was afterwards expunged from the oratio for his day in the breviary. What became of the inscribed slab is not known. Of course in the absence of any knowledge of its date, its testimony is valueless.

An expedient for justifying the position of Felix as well as that of Liberius among the
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lawful popes is that of supposing, that the see having become vacant on the banishment, or fall into vacancy, as the latter, the former was legally elected in his place, and continued lawful pope till his death, when Liberius again became so by virtue of a second election (Bellarmine, de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 17). But of any such second election there is no intimation, whether in any existing record. Barouius dispenses with its necessity, supposing Liberius to have resumed his old position, on the next vacancy of the see, after breaking with the Arians (Baron. ad Liber. Irvii.).

The festival of Felix is kept on July 29.

Two spurious decreals are assigned to him by the Pseudo-Isidore. One, addressed to Athanasius and the African bishops, relates to charges against bishops, its object being to protect them, and to reserve appeals to Rome: the other, addressed to the clergy generally, is directed against Arianism, and exhorts to patience under persecution and other trials. [J. B.—y.]

FELIX (3) III. (otherwise II.); see preceding article; bishop of Rome after Simplicius, from March A.D. 483 to February A.D. 492, during nearly nine years. The circumstances attending his election are in the first place noteworthy. They are known to us from the acts of a council held at Rome under Pope Symmachus (498–514). In the synod which was held, it was stated that the clergy having met in St. Peter’s Church for the election of a successor to Simplicius, Basilius (Praefectus Praetorio, and Patrician) interposed in the name of his master Odacce the Herulian, who since the year 476 had ruled the West as king of Italy. This Basilius alleged, as a fact known to his hearers, that Simplicius before his death had conjured the king to allow no election of a successor to take place without his consent; and this for the avoidance of the tumult and detriment to the church that was otherwise likely to ensue. He expressed surprise that the clergy, knowing this, had taken independent action; and proceeded in the name of the synod, to propose a law, prohibiting both the pope to be then elected, and all future popes, from alienating any farms or other possessions belonging to the church; declaring invalid the titles of any who might thus come into possession of ecclesiastical property; requiring the restitution to the church of alienated farms with their proceeds, or the sale for the benefit of religious uses of gold, silver, jewels, and clothes, unfit for church purposes; and further subjecting all donors and recipients of church property to anathema. The assembled clergy seem to have assented to this law, and to have been then allowed to proceed with their election, the choice falling on Caesar Felix, the son of a presbyter, as called Felix. The Roman synod under Symmachus, on the document being read which gave an account of these things, protested against the interference of laymen with the election of a pope which had been allowed on the occasion referred to, and to laymen being presumed to pronounce an anathema, and further requested Symmachus to declare void the law that had been promulgated, as having been enforced by merely lay authority, and, however assented to at the time by bishops, invalid for want of papal confirmation. Sym-

machus, while he assented to this request, at the same time caused the synod to re-enact the law against alienating farms, and to extend its prohibitions to all bishops and presbyters as well as future popes. (Syn. Rom. 3, sub Symmacho; Harduin, Concil. vol. ii. p. 977.)

The pontificate of this Felix was chiefly remarkable for the commencement of the memorable schism of thirty-five years, between Rome and the Eastern patriarchates. For a clear understanding of what led to it, a brief reference to certain previous events is in the first place needed. In the year 451 the Council of Chalcedon had condemned the Monophysite or Eutychian heresy, adopting the definition of the schism of thirty-five years, between Rome and the Eastern patriarchates. For a clear understanding of what led to it, a brief reference to certain previous events is in the first place needed. The same council had also enacted certain canons of discipline, of which, the fifth and the seventeen, gave to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople the final determination of canons against Metropolitans in the East and West, and, the twenty-eighth, assigned to the most holy throne of Constantinople or the East, Rome, equal privileges with the elder royal Rome in ecclesiastical matters, as being the second after her, with the definite right of retaining metropolitans in the Pontic, and Asia, and those in Asia, and those in the islands of Barbarians therein. This last canon the legates of Pope Leo, present at the council, had protested against at the time, and Leo himself had afterwards repudiated it, as contrary (as he expressed himself) to the Nicene cases, and an undue usurpation on the part of the see of Constantinople.

It was in connexion both with the heresy, condemned by the council of Chalcedon, and with the privileges assigned by its canons to the see of Constantinople, that the schism between the East and West ensued during the pontificate of Felix.

The condemnation of Monophysitism at Chalcedon by no means silenced its obloquy. In the church of Alexandria they were especially strong and resolute. There, A.D. 477, Peter Mousas (or the Stammerer) had by them been elected patriarch, but had been deposed by the Emperor Zeno in favour of Timotheos Solofacvus, who professed orthodoxy. The latter prelate dying in 492, Peter Mousas was again elected by supporters to the patriarchal throne in opposition to John Talmas, who was elected by the orthodox. At first the Emperor Zeno, and Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, opposed Peter’s appointment, the former ordering his expulsion, and the latter writing to Pope Simplicius against him. Soon, however, Acacius (offended, according to the account Liberat. de Constant. Talmas not having sent him the usual synodal letters announcing his election, and penned by the emissaries of Peter Mousas) induced the emperor to accept the latter on condition of his signing the Henoticon, a formula of faith, ambiguous, or pronounced. Which Zeno at this time put forth under the advice of Acacius in the hope that all parties might come to terms by signing it. John Talmas now fled to Rome to solicit the support of Pope Simplicius, who wrote to Zeno and Acacius, complaining of the expi-
sion of John, and insisting that Peter should either be required to accept the faith of Chalcedon, or be expelled from communion. After the death of Simplicius in 483, Felix at once took up the cause. In a synod at Rome he condemned the Heptasulon, renewed his predecessor's excommunication of Peter Mogus, and addressed also letters to Zeno and Acacius, which were despatched by the hands of two bishops, Misenus and Vitalis, to whom was joined Felix, Defender of the Roman church. In his letter to Acacius he urges him to comply at length with the injunction of Simplicius, by supporting the faith of Chalcedon, renouncing Peter Mogus, and inducing the emperor to do the same. With this letter he sent also a formal summons (citation libellum) requiring Acacius to appear at Rome and there answer before a synod to the charge of having disregarded the injunction of Simplicius, and to other charges brought against him by John Talaias. In his letter to Zeno, having said that he had waited in vain for a reply to the letter of his predecessor, he implores the emperor to refrain from rending the seamless garment of Christ, and, following the steps of Simon the Greco and of Felix, to remove all support of the one faith which had raised him to the imperial dignity, the faith of the Roman church, against which the Lord had said that the gates of hell should not prevail. He urges him also not to shrink from severe measures of coercion. To this letter also was added a more formal document (impersonation libellum), in which the usurpation of Peter Mogus is described, as requiring expiation, affecting the whole Eastern church, and implicating Acacius. Mention is also made of the charges brought against Acacius by John Talaias, and of the summons to submit himself to St. Peter that had been sent to him in accordance with both ecclesiastical and imperial law, and which it is hoped he will attend to without delay. Misenus and Vitalis, charged with these documents, set forth without Felix, who was detained by sickness. At Abydos they were seized, deprived of their papers, and required under threats to communicate with Peter Mogus. Under the same threat, they are said to have been won over by bribes, and, being so allowed to proceed to Constantinople, they complied with the imperial demands. In the meantime Felix was kept informed of what went on there by those steady champions of orthodoxy the "Acometae," or Sleepless Masks, whose abbot, Cyril, had written to him from Constantinople, before the arrival of the legates, to warn him against delay; on which Felix had written to his legates charging them to do nothing till they had consulted Cyril and taken instructions from him. After their compliance at Constantinople Cyril sent messages to Rome informing the pope that the name of Peter Mogus was at length openly, and no longer secretly as before, read from the diphythys in the presence of Misenus and Vitalis, that the latter openly communicated with him and Acacius, and that a man (who had been ordained by two heretics only) had, after the flight of John Talaias, presumed the orthodox, and had been supported in all his acts by Acacius. The account of things sent by letter to Felix by the emperor and Acacius was, that John Talaias was deposed for perjury, having accepted the see of Alexandria in defiance of his previous oath that he would never do so; and that Peter Mogus had proved his orthodoxy by signing the Nicene Creed, "belo the steps of the faith of which the Chalcedonian synod also rested." Zeno stated also, in his letter, that Peter Mogus as well as Acacius had actually accepted the faith of Chalcedon. With respect to this last assertion the historians Nicephorus and Evagrius speak of Peter as a Protes, who sometimes declared his acceptance of, and sometimes utterly condemned, the decrees of Chalcedon, obliging his clergy to join in the condemnation. They say that Acacius had manifested with him on this ground, and for having, as was alleged, caused the body of his orthodox predecessor, Timothy Solofacius, to be ignominiously disinterred, but that he had then denied the truth of the charges: also that Zeno had sent a legation to Alexandria to inquire into the matter, which proved without any good result. However, both the emperor and Acacius continued to support Peter, being probably moved thereto by the high tone of the pope quite as much as by their own satisfaction with Peter. After the release of Misenus and Vitalis from confinement at Abydos, Felix, the Defender, arrived at Constantinople, where he was denied access to Acacius, and is said to have been imprisoned and had his papers taken from him. The papal legates having at length returned to Rome, Felix convened a synod of sixty-seven Italian bishops, in which he deposed and excommunicated the two faithless legates, renewed the sentence of excommunication which had been already pronounced against Peter Mogus, and finally published a sentence of deposition and excommunication, which was signed by the sixty-seven bishops, against the patriarch Acacius himself, declaring him to be incapable of being ever loosed from the anathema then pronounced. The sentence alleged against Acacius as the ground of this irreparable sentence were, first, his invasion of the provinces of other bishops, contrary to the canons, in having ordained one John Cordonatus bishop of Tyre, within the province of Antioc, and raised to the priesthood one Hymeron, a deacon, whom the patriarchs had deposed; second, that he would have been unlawful even had the persons promoted been catholics, instead of heretics, as they were; secondly, his communicating with and promoting condemned heretics, especially Peter Mogus; thirdly, his having been a party to the imprisonment and corruption by bribes of the legates sent from Rome; and lastly, his disregard of the summons requiring him to clear himself at Rome of the charges against him, and his refusal to admit even to an interview the Defender Felix, who had been the bearer of this summons. With respect to the first of these charges it is to be observed that what Acacius had done was doubtless in virtue of the authority assigned to him by the canons of Chalcedon, above mentioned, which Pope Leo had repudiated; and with respect to the power assumed by Felix, alleged to be according to ecclesiastical and imperial law, of summoning a patriarch of Constaninople, the latter supreme, the latter proceeded, and was doubtless that of the canons referred to previously by Pope Leo as contravened by the objectionable canons of Chalcedon, and by him on that occasion called Nicene. In both instances the canons meant appear to have been those of
Sardica. A council held at this place in 343, being one of Western bishops only, had given appellate jurisdiction over metropolitans to Julius then bishop of Rome: and these canons had been erroneously referred to by subsequent popes (beginning with Zosimus, A.D. 415) as Nicean, and interpreted as giving not only appellate but also coercive jurisdiction to the bishops of Rome perpetually over the whole church. Felix also addressed letters to the emperor, to the clergy and monks of Constantinople, and to those of the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, acquainting them with the judgment. The conveyance of these documents to Constantinople, and their promulgation there, was a task of difficulty and danger. It was entrusted to one Tutus, an aged Roman ecclesiastic and Defender of the church, who, after arriving at his destination, was, like the legates sent before, won over by bribes, and himself communicated with Acacius. The sentence of excommunication was at last served on Acacius by one of those zealous champions of Felix, the sleepless monks, who had in some way obtained from Tutus the fateful parchment. He effected his purpose by fastening it on a window through which he could afterwards officiate in church. The patriarch discovered it, but proceeded with the service without regarding it, and then, in a calm, clear voice, ordered the name of Felix, bishop of Rome, to be erased from the diplomas of the church. This memorable occurrence was on August 1, A.D. 484. And another, on the 26th of November, Charles, nephew of the emperor, stood mutually excommunicated, and the first great schism between the East and West, which lasted thirty-five years, began. The emperor, and the great majority of the prelates of the East, supported Acacius; and thus the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as well as that of Constantinople, remained out of communion with Rome. Felix, having excommunicated his emissary Tutus, wrote to the monks of Constantinople and Bithynia, acquainting them with the fact, and warning them to hold no communion with the deposed Acacius. The latter, however, in spite of the pope, retained his see undisturbed till his death. As to John, he was deposed and excommunicated, and had been the immediate cause of the quarrel, Felix, unable to procure his elevation at Alexandria, made him bishop of Nola in Campania, where he ended his days (Libertatus, Breviset).

Another noted Monophysite who, as well as Peter Mongus, had excited the orthodox zeal of Felix was another Peter, called Fullo (i.e. the Fuller), who during the reign of the Emperor Leo had been raised by his party to the patriarchal throne of Antioch, and had been several times deposed and reinstated. Eutychianism was not the only heresy of which he was accused. He had added to the Sermanticus the clause, 'They are crucified for Thee,' thus attributing passibility to the Godhead. To him, therefore, from a Roman synod, Felix had addressed a letter of earnest remonstrance, which is extant, accusing him of a multitude of heresies, especially in respect to his addition to the Sermanticus, and imploring him to stop in his course. 'If he hearkened to this letter, and another addressed to him by Felix, being disregarded, the latter sent him a final synodal letter, which is also extant, in which, in the name of Peter, the chief of the apostles and the head of all sees, he pronounced a sentence of deposition and excommunication. He also wrote to the emperor announcing Peter's excommunication, and urging his expulsion from Antioch. Acacius also, as well as other bishops, had written to this Peter in strong reprobation of his addition to the Sermanticus, and in the final sentence pronounced by Felix they are alluded to as concurring, or being expected to concur, in the sentence. But after the rupture between Rome and Constantinople in 484, Acacius pro pre further proof of his defiance of the pope by reinstating the heretical patriarch in his see. This appears from the letter of a Roman synod, dated Oct. 5, 485, and signed by forty-three bishops, to the clergy and monks of the East. The immediate purpose of this letter is to apprise the orthodox Easterns of the excommunication of Acacius, the knowledge of which, they say, might possibly have been kept from them, and to induce them to concur in it. They therefore send a copy of the sentence, and detail the circumstances that had led to it, and they say in some pains to explain to the Orientals the immemorial custom of the church when absent, and the reasons for their deviation from it (they say) by the Council of Nice, that the pope, as St. Peter's successor, should determine and confirm all things done in synods, thus implying a little doubt as to the acquiescence of the Easterns in this view. They then go on to state how Acacius had proceeded to such a pitch of impudent presumption as to excommunicate the Bishop of Christ's deposition of the Bishop of Christ's deposition, and how lately (as they heard) deposed from the see of Antioch the holy bishop Calentinus and put Peter, whom he had himself often before condemned, in his place. They conclude with an anathema against Peter Mongus, Acacius, Peter Fullo, and all their followers.

In the year 489 Acacius died, and was succeeded by Flavitas, or Fravitas. Felix, having of the vacancy of the see, wrote to Thalson, an archimandrite of Constantinople, warning him and his monks (who appear throughout to have espoused the cause of Rome) to communicate with no successor to Acacius till the see of Rome had been fully apprised of all proceedings, and had declared his renunciation of communion. Thalson, thereupon, sent a letter to the pope, who declared to him that ecclesiastics had been deposed from communion. Flavitas, after his election, unwilling (as Nicephorus expresses it) to be deposed without the consent of the Roman pontiff, sent a legation to Rome charged with letters, in which he declared his renunciation of Peter Mongus, and craved intercommunion. The legation was accompanied by some of the Constantinopolitan monks, who seem to have given a good account of the orthodoxy of the new patriarch. But when Felix intimated to the messengers the necessity of the name of Acacius, as well as that of Peter Mongus, being erased from the diplomas, they replied that they had no instructions to that effect, and were contented with merely inserting a letter from the pope to Flavitas insuring compliance with the condition required. Nicephorus states that Flavitas had written also to Peter Mongus declaring his communion with him and his renunciation of Felix, and that it was the pope's having heard of this double dealing that caused the disaffection and contumely. But of this the extant letter of Felix to Flavitas makes no mention. Flavitas having died within four months after his election.
FELIX III.—Pope

The pope's letter to him, as well as a reply from Peter Mousos, was received by his successor Euphemius. The letter of Peter condemned the Council of Chalcedon, and Euphemius in consequence at once broke off communion with him, removing with his own hand his name from the diplomas. He also replaced the name of Felix, to whom he sent letters, as his predecessor had done, professing his own orthodoxy, and desiring intercommunion. Felix, though satisfied as to the faith of Euphemius, still insisted on the erasure of the name of Acacius, which condition being still demanded by the, breach was not continued.

In the April of the year 491 the Emperor Zeno died, and was succeeded by Anastasius, to whom Felix sent a congratulatory letter. The new emperor, whose policy at that time was one of toleration towards all religious dissentants, was not recorded to have replied; and on the 24th of February in the following year Felix himself was removed by death.

Between the date of his rupture with the East and that of his death Felix had been employed in helping to reconstitute the African church, which had lately suffered under persecution at the hands of Julianus. This, however, had so subsided that the bishop of Carthage had met to compose the breach with great cruelty under king Hunneric, who died in 484, had ceased under his nephew and successor Gundamund, when a number of apostates sought readmission to catholic communion. A synod of thirty-eight bishops was held at Rome under Felix in the year 488, the result of which was a synodical letter from him, dated the 15th of March in that year, laying down the following terms of readmission:—1. Bishops, priests, and deacons, who had allowed themselves to be rebaptized by the Arians, whether willingly or under pressure, were to do penance during life, and be admitted to lay communion only at the point of death. 2. Others, whether clerics, monks, virgins, or laity, who had been rebaptized voluntarily, were to be received on condition of repentance, after twelve years, of which three were to be passed among the ancients, seven among the novices, and two more of which were to be spent in the refutation of a book of the vatican, being still allowed them during any period of their penance if at the point of death. 3. Persons not being bishops, priests, or deacons, who had been rebaptized under pressure of persecutions, were to be admitted to communion after three years' penance, and imposition of hands. In all cases those who had been rebaptized were declared incapable of ordination. Children who had been rebaptized were, on the ground of the ignorance incident to their age, to be admitted to communion after a short period of penance.

Felix is honoured as a saint in the Roman calendar on the 25th of February. His extant works are fifteen letters, to most of which reference has been made. Of these seven were first published by Sirmonti in 1631. Gratian gives further a decretum as his, to the effect that the pope will yield to priests in ecclesiastical cases.

The ancient authorities for his life are his own letters and those of his successor Gelasius, the Breviarium of Liberatus Diaconus, and the Church Histories of Evagrius Scholasticus and Zosimus Callistus.

FELIX IV.—Pope

FELIX (4) IV., (otherwise III.; see FELIX II.), bishop of Rome from July 526 to October 530, during four years, two months, and fourteen or eighteen days (Anastas. Biblloth.). The same authority states further that he was a Samnite, the son of his father's name Castoridi, that he built the basilica of SS. Cosmas and Damian, restored that of the martyr St. Saturninus which had been burnt, and that he was buried on the 12th of October, in the basilica of St. Peter. There is little to be told of this pope, except the circumstances of his appointment. His predecessor, John I., had died in the prison of Ravenna, into which he had been thrown by Theodoric the Ostrogoth, who then ruled the West as king of Italy. On his death Theodoric took the unprecedented step of appointing his successor on his own sole authority, without waiting for the customary election by the clergy and people. His choice fell on Felix, to whom there seems to have been no objection on the ground of personal character or belief. This high-handed proceeding seems to have been resisted for some time, but at length acquiesced in, the see having been kept vacant for probably owing to the long delay. This appears from a letter from Athalaric, who succeeded Theodoric in the same year, to the Roman Senate, in which he commends that body for having at length acquiesced in Theodoric's nomination, accepting "a man probably instituted by divine grace, and commended by the royal examination." He also reminds them that there was no disgrace in having had to yield to a prince, and hopes that no one may ever be affected by the past contention (Casiodor. lib. 8, Ep. 15). No subsequent king or emperor laid claim to a like power of interference in the appointment of popes, freedom of election being henceforth allowed, as before, to the clergy and people, though the confirmation of elections by the civil power was insisted on, and continued till the election of Zachary in 752, when the confirmation of the arch of Ravenna, as representing the Eastern emperor, was first dispensied with by the Western emperor. The same continued to be the theory of papal elections till the appointment was given to the College of Cardinals during the pontificate of Nicholas II., A.D. 1059. (For previous interventions of the civil power see articles on Boniface, Exulianus, Felix III., Symmachus, Laurentius.) Theodoric died only ninety-eight days after the death of John I. (Anastas. Biblloth.), an awful account of his end being given by Procopius (de Bell. Goth. lib. i.), the horrors of which have been regarded as a judgment for his treatment of the deceased pope, and his general insurrection towards the church. (Baronius on Felix IV.)

The only further event known as marking the pontificate of Felix is the issue of an edict by Athalaric, the grandson and successor of Theodoric, requiring all civil suits against ecclesiastics to be preferred before the bishop and not the secular judge, on pain of the latter losing his suit, and forfeiting ten pounds of gold, to be distributed by the bishop to the poor. If, however, the bishop should fail to render justice, application was to be allowed to the secular judge. The edict was called forth by Felix, with the Roman clergy, having complained to
Bishops in Alphabetical Order of their Seats or Countries.

BISHOPS IN AFRICA, WITH NO SEES NAMED.

FELIX (5), African pseudo-bishop, temp. Cypri. [PRIVATUS.] [E. W. B.]

FELIX (6), African bishop. [Cypri. Ep. 56; AHNIMNIUS.] [E. W. B.]

FELIX (7), African bishop (in Syn. iv. Carth. de Basileide, A.D. 254; Cypri. Ep. 87). It is useless to try to settle which other Felix he is, or to identify with. [E. W. B.]

FELIX (8), African bishop. [Cypri. Ep. 57; Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 2 de Facce.] [E. W. B.]

FELIX (9), African bishop in Syn. Carth. 5, sub Cypri. de Bap. Haer. 1; Cypri. Ep. 70. [E. W. B.]

FELIX (10), a bishop mentioned in a letter of Constantine to the bishops of Numidia concerning the restoration to the Catholics of a church at Cirta, of which they had been deprived by the Donatists A.D. 330. [Mon. Vet. Don. p. 215, ed. Oberthür.] [H. W. P.]

FELIX (11), the name of one or more than one Donatist bishop, to whom St. Augustine wrote at the same time as to Eulinus. [ELUSINUS (1).] [H. W. P.]

FELIX (12), a bishop, to whom, as well as to Hilarinus, St. Augustine wrote concerning Bonifacius, a presbyter, whom he considered to have been unjustly accused, and therefore not deserving of removal from his office. [Aug. Ep. 77.] [H. W. P.]

FELIX (13), a bishop, present at the council of Milevis, or Mileum, in Numidia, held against the Pelagians, A.D. 416. [Aug. Ep. 176, 162.] [H. W. P.]

FELIX (14), a bishop, present at the council of Carthage against the Pelagians A.D. 416. He was, perhaps, the same as he on whose behalf St. Augustine wrote a letter of introduction to Valerius, count of Africa. [Ep. 175, 181, 186.] [H. W. F.]

FELIX (15), bishop of Abarca, in the province of proconsular Africa, only of the Catholic bishop banished by Hunneric, A.D. 484, after the convention at Carthage. Ruinart identifies him with the paralytic FELIX ABDINUSCAUS (No. 15). [Morn. Antiq.CHRIST. 1, 59; Notitiae in Vet. Vit. 55, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvi.] [L. D.]


FELIX (17), bishop of Abbir Major, banished by Hunneric in 484, after the convention at Carthage. He was aged and paralysed, having been a bishop forty-four years, and he had to be strapped upon the animal which carried him to his desert exile. [Victor Vit. Vandal. ii. in Patr. Lat. lxxvi. 209; Morcelli, Afr. Chr. i. 61.] [C. H.]

FELIX (18), bishop of Abors, in the province of proconsular Africa, subscribed the letter which the bishops of that province sent to Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, against the errors of the Monothelites, which letter is to be found in the acts of the Lateran council, 649. [Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 64; Mansi, x. 940.] [L. D.]

FELIX (19), bishop of Accl. [Id. Val. Gesch.]

FELIX (20), bishop of Adermatum (Heliogabalum), the metropolis of the Byzacena province of Africa; exiled by Genericius, A.D. 453, because he had entertained John, a foreign monk [Victor Vit. Persac. Vandal. i. 7.] The Notitia makes no mention of this see; or in the list of these exiled by Hunneric, so that Felix is thought to have lived in exile till A.D. 484. [Morcelli, Africa Christ. 1. 63.] [L. D.]

FELIX (21), bishop of Agrigentum (Girgentum), present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelites. [Hefele, § 307; Mansi, x. 866.] [A. H. D.]

FELIX (22), bishop of Ambi, in the African province of Mauretania Caesariensi, a town known only from the mention of this bishop; among the Catholic bishops exiled by the Vandal king, Hunneric, A.D. 484. [Notitiae in Vet. Vit. 59, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvi.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. 1. 75.] [L. D.]

FELIX (23), first recorded bishop of Aquania, or Anagni, present at the Roman council held 487 under Felix III. [Mansi, Concil. ii. 1171; Ugheb. Ital. Socr. i. 307.] [C. B.]

FELIX (24), bishop of Antium (Anzio), present at the council mentioned in the preceding article. [Mansi, vii. 1171 a; Ugheb. Ital. Socr. xiv.] [C. B.]

FELIX (25), bishop of Apollonia in Srv Epiro, present at the council of Ephesus in 431 [Mansi, iv. 1125 a, 1368]. His first signature
appears to describe him as likewise bishop of the neighbouring city of Bullis. (Farlati, Ital. Sacr. vii. 396.)

FELIX (28) I, bishop of Aptungus, a person around whom has raged a tempest of controversy, the centre of which may be said to have been the condemnation of Cassilianus to the see of Carthage (vol. i. p. 867). The place of which he was bishop is written variously, Aptungus, Abtungae, and Autumnae; but its situation is uncertain, except that it has been in some processual Africa, and probably not far from Zama, between it and Furius (Opt. i. 18). It must have been of a place of some importance, for it possessed a municipal government, of whose principal officers the names and titles of some are recorded (Mon. Vet. Rom. pp. 160–167, ed. Oebertur). His history begins at the death of Memurias, when Cassilianus having been chosen as his successor by the vote, as we are told, of the whole people, Felix of Autumnae was one of those who laid hands on him, if not the sole officiating bishop, A.D. 311 (Aug. Brecol. Coll. iii. 14, 26 · 10, 29). He was not only not distinctly condemned as a Christian, but was not even cast out by the church earlier than the council of Nice, A.D. 325 (Conc. Nic. c. 4; Bruns. i. p. 18).

When the storm began to rage against Cassilianus, an important element lay in the question, whether, previously to his own appointment to a Christian bishopric, Felix himself had not been guilty of the infamous crime of "tradition" (vol. i. p. 881). He was consequently denounced without scruple by the enemies of Cassilianus, as the "fountain head of all the subsequent evils" (Aug. Ep. 88, 3; c. Cresc. iii. 61). But though many indirect complaints were made, no formal examination appears to have taken place into the case of Felix, until the Donatist party had failed to establish their case against Cassilianus in the Court of Enquiry held at Rome, under Melchiades, October 2, A.D. 313. Fieled in this attempt, and also in the results of the enquiry as to the true position of the Catholic church, which ended in Africa under Konstantius and Olimpius, at the direction of the emperor, they turned their attack on Felix, and the emperor gave orders to Aelianus, the proc- soil of Africa, to hold an enquiry on the spot, which took place on February 15, A.D. 314, eleven years after the facts (Aug. Const. Coll. 28, 56; Ep. 43, 3–14; 88; c. Cresc. iii. 61). It was held at Carthage in the presence of many persons who had held municipal offices at the time of the persecution, A.D. 303, 304. The prosecutor was Maximus, a Donatist, the counsel on the Catholic side, Aprianus, but Felix himself was not present. The principal witness was Alibus Cassilianus, formerly chief magistratus at Aptungas ("dunmivir, sedilis, magistratus"), who deposed that when the imperial officials came to execute the edict at the house of Felix, he was reported to be absent, but that a man named Giosias went with them to the church, from which they had removed the episcopal chair and other certain documents ("epistolarum notaritiae") not belonging to holy Scripture, and all the doors, and then burnt all these publicly. And now came a piece of fraudulent testimony, which, if it had been proved true, would have substantiated the charge against Felix. At some time later than the events just now described, a man named Maurus purchased, it was said, the bishopric of Zama, for which he was publicly denounced by Felix. A man named Ingenuus, a friend to Maurus, formerly secretary to Augustus, a former colleague of Cassilianus in the sedition, was sent to arrange with his friend Felix with "tradition" at the time of the persecution. In order to prove this, he paid a visit to Cassilianus, bearing with him a letter which purported to have been sent by Felix to his friend Cassilianus, to the effect that he had in his possession, though not of his own property, certain papers, namely, a letter in number, which he was unwilling to surrender, and with this view wished his friend Cassilianus to say that, as inquisitor, he had burnt them at the time of the persecution, intending by this clumsy device to make him an accomplice, in suggesting that they had belonged to Felix, and that the latter had thus been guilty of "tradition." At first he came alone, but when Cassilianus endeavoured to drive him away, he brought with him on a second occasion Augustus, the friend of Cassilianus, to support his request. Cassilianus dictated to Augustus a letter, in which he said he had been present when Felix wrote it, at the time of the search. The letter is imperfect, but clearly contains no account of any act of "tradition" on the part of Felix, and it concludes with the usual salutation. To this last, however, Ingenuus made a fraudulent addition, to the effect that Felix had given direction to the officials about taking with them the key of the place in which the books were deposited, so that they might fulfil their purpose concerning them, but desiring them to spare the oil and flour used for sacred purposes. This forged postscript was of course intended to implicate both Felix and Cassilianus, but under threat of torture, he confessed the fraud, as well as the fact that he travelled about the country endeavouring to stir up opposition to the Catholic church. Thus self-convicted, the procurator sentenced him to be imprisoned at the pleasure of the emperor, and pronounced a judgment of complete exsultation in favour of Aquileia. In the name of the emperor in a letter to Probianus, the successor of Aelianus, in which he ordered Ingenuus to be sent to Rome. This decision was repeated in a letter to Verinus, or Valerius, the vicar of Africa, A.D. 321. The case of Cassilianus and Felix, though not named, is no doubt implied in the thirteenth canon of the council of Arles, which prescribes caution in removing from the clerical order persons accused of "tradition." The whole case was brought up again at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411, and the absence of Felix at the time of the enquiry was pressed hard by the Donatists as a fatal defect in the integrity of the acquittal, but Augustine argued that his absence was, in truth, an argument for its fairness, that all the documents were in existence, and that there was no doubt of the completeness of the imperial decision. (Aug. c. Cresc. iii. 81, iv. 79; de Unit. Bapt. 28; Brecol. Coll. 41, 42; Post. Coll. 56; Mon. Vet. Rom. pp. 160–167, 169, ed. Oebertur; Bruns. Conc. i. 108; Routh, Rel. Sacr. iv. 92.)


FELIX (28), schismatic bishop of Aquileia.
in opposition to Maximus. The latter signs the first at the Lateran council in 649 (Mansi, x. 866 a.; De Rubeis, Monum. Ecc. Aquil. 303; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. viii. 71, 555). Ughelli (Ital. Sacr. v. 33) believes there is authority for regarding both the bishops as one, under the name of Maximus Felix. [C. H.]

FELIX (39), bishop of Aquisira, in Mauretania Caesariensis, identified by Morcelli with Artigasia; exiled by Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Notitiae in Victor. Vit. 59, Migne, Patrol. Lat. iv.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 81.) [L. D.]

FELIX (30), twenty-ninth bishop of Arles, between John I. and Walbert; signs with the following. (G. C. i. 549; Mansi, xi. 506.) [C. H.]

FELIX (81), bishop of Ascoli, signed the second Epistle of pope Agatho, which was sent in 680, after a synod in Rome, to the third Council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 303; Hefele, § 314.) [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX, bishop of Asturica (Astorga) (No. 99.) [C. H.]

FELIX (38), bishop of Atino, said to have been consecrated by pope Pelagius in 592, and to have sat thirty years, preceding Gauldentinus. A chronicle quoted by Ughelli makes him a martyr. (Ugh. Ital. Sacr. vi. 498; x. 592.) [C. H.]

FELIX (33), bishop of Bagai (interesting place, see Morcelli), in Numidia; present at the seventh synod of Carthage under Cyprian, the third on Baptism, A.D. 256. (Sent. Epp. 12.) He was one of the nine martyr bishops of the mines of Sigus. [NEMESIAN.] (Cyp. Ep. 76, 77.) [E. W. B.]

FELIX (34), bishop of Baianae, in the province of Numidia; present at the council of Carthage, under Gratus, A.D. 349, where he seems to have held the position of primus of his province, since he is named first among the bishops present in the praesidio to the canons then enacted; the Numidian province was always reckoned next to the proconsular. (Mansi, iii. 144; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 94.) [L. D.]


FELIX (36), bishop to the Barbaricains (146). [C. H.]

FELIX (37) L., c. 520, bishop of Benevento. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, ii. 21; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. viii. 17.) [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (38) II., c. 585, bishop of Benevento. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, ii. 21; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. viii. 17.) [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (39), bishop of Bellanum (Bellon) c. A.D. 347. His successor was Joannes. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. x. 108, 214.) Ughelli (Ital. Sacr. v. 146) dates him 547. [R. S. G.]

FELIX (40), bishop of Berecina, in Numidia, a town not mentioned by geographers. He is the first of the list of the Numidian bishops exiled by king Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Notitiae in Victor.) [C. E.]
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Vit. 56, Migne, Patrol. Lat. iv.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 101.) [L. D.]

FELIX (41), thirteenth bishop of Besancon, succeeding St. Claudius II. and followed by Tetradius II. at the beginning of the 6th century. The authors of the Gallia Christiana (xv. 18) quote the work of an anonymous canon of St. Paul's at Besancon to the effect that Felix gave himself up to intemperance and plundered the goods of the church. The canon followed his example, and exceeded all bounds in their violence and debauchery, so that the citizens at last rose in indignation, and saying some, drove the others from the city. Felix, in alarm for his own life, fled into Upper Burgundy, where he died. [S. A. B.]


FELIX (43), seventh bishop of Bononia (Bologna), a native of Milan, and a pupil and deacon of Ambrose, at whose death he was present. He became bishop of Bologna, c. A.D. 400, succeeding St. Eusebius. He died A.D. 429, and was succeeded by St. Petronina. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. ii.; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacr. x. 161.) [R. S. G.]


FELIX (45), ST., twenty-fourth bishop of Bourges, following St. Probianus and succeeded by Remedia. He was consecrated by Germanus of Paris, A.D. 568 (Venant. Fort. Vit. S. Germani, liii.; Patr. Lat. iv. 477). In 573 he subscribed the fourth council of Paris and the letter of the same council to Sigebert. (Mansi, xi. 867, 869.) Venantius Fortunatus has some verses addressed to Felix in praise of a pyx (turris) which he had made of gold to contain the host (lib. iii. c. 25. Patr. Lat. iv. 477). There is a Felix mentioned in the will of Bertram bishop of Le Mans (to be found in Patr. Lat. iii. 402), whom Le Coët supposes to be Felix of Bourges (Ann. Ecc. Franc. an. 615, an. xiii. tom. ii. 688). The year of his death is unknown, but he was buried in the church of St. Austrepius de Castro in the suburbs. Gregory of Tours says that at his tomb, which was of Parian marble, many miracles were wrought, and that nearly twelve years after his death his body was found to be untouched by corruption (Greg. Tur. Li. de Glor. Confess. cap. 102). [S. A. B.]


FELIX (47), bishop of Brosca, 817. Certain inscriptions are quoted by Cappelletti (Le Chiese d'Italia, x. 565) to show that Theodelinda caused a baptistery to be erected in Como during his episcopate. [A. E. D. A.]

FELIX (48), bishop of Bulla, in proconsular Africa, exiled by Hunneric after the conference of 484. (Victor Vit. Notit. 55; Morcelli, Afr. Christ. i. 197.) [C. E.]
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FELIX (49), Donisat bishop of Bulla Regia, an important town on the confines of proconsular Africa, four days W. S. W. from Carthage (now probably Bul Bull. (Ant. Itin. 43, 4), present at Cath. Conf. a.d. 411. (Mon. Vet. Don. p. 420, ed. Oertber.)

[F. W. F.]

FELIX (60), bishop of Bullis in Illyria. V. of Apollonia.

FELIX (61), African bishop, "a Balsacensis," in Prov. Proc. From an unexpected inscription in Maffei, Morcelli concludes that this is a corruption of "Colonia Balsica Lucana" (v. l. Bastiacgenis, abustiacgeni, abusti lacinii). He was present at the council of Carthage, under Cyprian a.d. 253, and gave his opinion that questions of rebaptizing heretics ought each of them to be decided on their own merits, and not only by the general custom of the church. (Cypr. Squall. Lpp. 83; Ang. de Bapt. iii. 8, 11.) [E. W. B.]

FELIX (62) of Caesar Augustus (Saragossa), wrote to Cyprian and the African bishops on affair of Basilides. (Ep. 67, vi.) As to the question whether he was bishop of Saragossa, see Baluze & loc. (ap. Bouth, Ref. S. p. 158). But it seems likely that he is the "Felix prebymyster" of the title.

[E. W. B.]

FELIX (63), bishop of Calahorra, signs the acts of the sixteenth council of Toledo, a.d. 695, in the sixth year of Egica. For a discussion of the late tradition which connects this bishop with the St. Felix now venerated in the episcopal of Calahorra, see Risco, Exp. Squall. iiii. 162. (Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 335.) [M. A. W.]

FELIX (64), bishop of Camerino, signed the second epistle of pope Agatho, which was sent in 689, after a synod in Rome, to the third Council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 302; Hezela, § 314.) [A. H. D. A.]


[F. W. F.]

FELIX (66), bishop of Canessa, or else Canessa (No. 154).

FELIX (67), bishop of Caris, near Carthage, in the proconsular province of Africa; banished to the island of Corsica by the Vandal king Huneric, a.d. 484. (Notitia in Victor. Vit. 55, Migne, PatroL Lat. iv. ; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 122.) [L. D.]

FELIX (68), bishop of Casae Nigrae, in the province of Numidia; banished with the preceding. (Notitia, 56; Morcelli, i. 124.) [L. D.]

FELIX (69), bishop of Castellum, in Mauretania Stilensis, one of many towns of this name in Africa; banished with the preceding. (Notitia, 59; Morcelli, i. 128.) [L. D.]

FELIX (60), i. nineteenth bishop of Chalonsur-Marne, succeeding St. Leudomerius, and followed by Ragnobaudus. He was one of the bishops who in a.d. 589 signed the letter to

Gundegesius, archbishop of Bordeaux, on the disturbances in the monastery of St. Croix, at Poitiers [Chrodonlidian. He was also present at the council of Rheims in 625. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. ix. 41; Mansi, x. 594; Gall. Christ. ix. 863.) [S. A. B.]

FELIX (61), ii., 25th bishop of Chalonsur-Marne succeeding Chauflus, and followed by Bladadus, about the beginning of the 6th century. The name alone survives. (Gall. Christ. ix. 863; Gams, Series Episc. 534.) [S. A. B.]

FELIX (62), bishop of Cisterna (No. 168).

FELIX (68), 27th bishop of Clermont, succeeding Gyronius and followed by Garivaldus in the latter half of the 7th century. He was buried in the church of St. Stephen. (Gall. Christ. ii. 245.) [S. A. B.]

FELIX (64), Et., a bishop of Como, to whom Ambrose's third and fourth letters are addressed. Ambrose had ordained him bishop, and calls the day of his ordination his birthday. The letters show him to have been an intimate friend of Ambrose, and highly successful in his ministry at Como.

[J. L. D.]

FELIX (55), bishop of Compostella (99).

FELIX (66), bishop of Cremona, 537, a native of Cremona, died 562. (Cappelletti, La Chiesa d'Italia, xii. 128; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 561.) [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (67), bishop of Crepulius, in the Byzacene province of Africa, according to Morcelli on the coast; banished by the Vandal king Huneric after the conference of Carthage, a.d. 484. (Notitia in Victor. Vit. 57, Migne, PatroL Lat. ivii. Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 141.) [L. D.]

FELIX (68), bishop of Curnis or Curubes, a town in the proconsular province of Africa; banished to Corsica with the preceding. (Notitia, 55; Morcelli, i. 150.) [L. D.]

FELIX (69), bishop of Diabe. (Optart. de Schism. Don. i. 18, in Patr. Lat. xi. 105, var. lec.) Vit. of Zaba (No. 184.) [C. H.]

FELIX (70), bishop of Diamium (Diena), signs the acts of the 11th council of Toledo, a.d. 575, the last council of the reign of Wamba. At the twelfth and thirteenth councils he was represented by vicars. He died before 684. The first bishop of Diamium was probably Antonius (q. v.) (636), and the see disappears with the Moorish invasion. The bishop was a suffragan of Toledo. (Exp. Squall. vii. 212; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 247.) [M. A. W.]

FELIX (71), bishop of Dumium (129).

FELIX (72), the apostle of the East Angles and first bishop of Dunwich. He was born and ordained in Burgundy, and, having offered his services as a missionary to Huneric, archbishop of Canterbury, was sent to preach to the East Angles, among whom he settled in the see of Dunwich, ruled for seventeen years and died there. Bede gives the length of the episcopate of Felix and his successors, Thomas, who was bishop for five years, and Berhutgil or Boniface, who ruled for seventeen years, and whose suc-
censor was consecrated by Theodore about the
year 670. The date of the appointment of
Felix is thus thrown back to the year 631
at the latest, between which year and 627 he
probably was consecrated bishop by Honorius,
his ordination in his own country having, it
would seem, been to priest's orders and not to
the episcopate. Felix found the East Angles still
heathen, for although Redwald had become a
Christian in Kent, he had apostatized on his return
home; Eorpwald, his successor, had been con-
verted under the influence of Edwin of North-
umberland, but had been murdered almost imme-
diately afterwards; and, after three years of
disturbance, Sigebert mounted the throne at the
same time that Felix undertook the mission.
Bede describes the conversion of the East Angles
as very effectual; it was indeed the only mission
of the Kentish church of which so much could be
affirmed, as, even here, during the episcopate of
Boniface, the Mercian bishop Jaruman had a
great share in the establishment of the faith,
which, so long as Penda lived, must have been in
a very precarious state. Sigebert, after a short
reign, retired into a monastery, leaving his king-
dom to his kinsman Egovic, and shortly after both
Sigeberht and Egovic were killed in battle with
Penda. Anna, the next king, and father of a
family of saints, occupied the throne during the
remaining years of the life of Felix. Although
the state of East Anglia was anything but peace-
ful, Felix managed to found schools and to ob-
tain teachers from Kent, a fact recorded by Bede,
and his middle age pressed for an argument
for the antiquity of the university of Cambridge.
The death of Felix can scarcely be placed later
than 647: he was commemorated as a saint on
the 8th of March. The historians of Ely and
biographers of St. Etheldreda have added to these
details derived from Bede some particulars which
may be traditional and are more or less legendary.
According to the Ely history Felix had become
acquainted with Sigebert when the latter was in
exile in France, and had been a bishop before he
undertook the mission (c. 1. p. 13); after his
death his body was translated to Seaham or Soham,
near Ely, which he had founded; Redham (Reed-
ham) also was a church of his foundation. After
the Danish invasions his bones were removed
Romsey (c. 6, pp. 21, 22). Felix Stowe, on the
Suffolk coast, is said to be called from him; and
several churches are dedicated in the name of Felix,
which may probably be referred to him in
preference to the other saints of the name. The
church of Felling in Yorkshire is one of these.
Basingdon in Norfolk is no doubt dedicated to
him; and the church of Kirby Ravensworth in
Yorkshire to St. John the Evangelist and St.
Felix (Parker, Angliom Kalendar, p. 215).
The missionary career of St. Fursey in East
Anglia coincides with the early years of Felix,
but the two are never mentioned together,
although in his time, as in Sigeberht, they
must have acted in concert. Probably Felix
represented the clerical and energetic missionary
element, whilst Fursey was a monk and ascetic.

There is a life of Felix in Capgrave, f. 146, 
amainly an expansion of Bede's narrative, and
another still in manuscript among the lessons of
the monks of Dryby. See Hist. Cut. Mon. 234, 235; Bede, H. E. ii. 15, iii. 18, 20, 25;
Maldenbury, Gest. Pontif. lib. ii. 74, iv. 181;
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FELIX (85), African bishop, "a Gurgilitibus" (Suet. Ep. 74, Prov. Byz.), Morcelli conjectures this to have been on river Triton, if so near Cape.

[F. W. B.]

FELIX (86), bishop of Hadrumetum (20).

FELIX (87), bishop of Hierpina, in Byzacae; banished by Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Notitia in Victor. Vit. 57; Patrol. Lat. iviii; Morcelli, Africa Chr. i. 170.)

[L. D.]

FELIX (88), bishop of Hispelleum (Spello) in Umbria, martyr under Maximian; commemorated May 18. In Usuard the city is named "urbis Spellatensis," which some identify with Spoleto. In preference to this and other possible identifications Henichen, who discusses the question, decides for Hispelleum (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. iv. 167).

[C. H.]

FELIX (89), bishop of Hizirzada or Iziria in Numidia, present at the Carthaginian conference is 411. (Gesta Collat. Carth. cap. cxxxiii. p. 271, is Patr. Lat. xi. 1308 a; Morcelli, Afr. Chr. i. 183.)

[C. H.]

FELIX (90), Donatist bishop of Idicira, in Numidia (Oued Bousselah, Ant. Juns. 28, 4), guilty, in conjunction with Urbanus, of great excesses during the period of Donatist ascendancy under Julian, A.D. 361-362, especially at Tipasa (Tefesah), a town on the sea-coast of Mauritania Caesariensis. Unless the language of Origen be grossly exaggerated, the conduct of Felix and his fanatical partisans was brutal, unrelenting, and licentious in the extreme, resembling in all respects, as he describes it, the "wild and desperate wickedness" of soldiers let loose upon a city taken by storm. From Tipasa the party appears to have gone to Tyseeria, a place whose situation is indetermined ("Tididinianus," Gams, Scr. Episc. p. 489), and there to have laid violent hands on Donatus, its septuagenarian bishop, whom they forced by terror into a declaration favourable to their sect, and even, perhaps, to resign his see; but the words which seem to express this may perhaps be taken in a rhetorical description of the violent treatment received by him. (Opt. ii. 19; Tillemont, vol. iv. p. 139.)

[H. W. P.]

FELIX (91), bishop of Interamna (162).

FELIX (92), bishop of Iria Flavia (Compostela), signs the acts of the third council of Braga, 675; in the last place, as Idalpiana qui cognominor Felix, Iriani Ecclesiae Ephoruni. In the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth councils of Toledo (A.D. 681, 683, 688) he appears as Felix Iriensis, and is the last-mentioned council his name takes precedence of thirty-five bishops. The order of seniority in the various signatures is tolerably conclusive for the fact that the Idalpus Felix of the council of Braga is the same as the Felix of the subsequent councils of Toledo. For a notice of the untenable theory that this Felix of Iria afterwards became metropolitan of Seville, and is to be identified with Felix the successor of Julian, see Felix (No. 152). (Exp. Sgr. xii. 58; Aguirre-Catalaní, iv. 265, 270, 297, 312.)

[M. A. W.]

FELIX (93), bishop of Jactera (Zactarna) in Numidia; present as delegate of the Numidian province at the synod of Carthage under Boniface, A.D. 525, and again at the council likewise held at Carthage under Restitutus, A.D. 555, in which was discussed the liberty of monasteries, which he strongly upheld. (Mansi, viii. 647, 841; Morcelli, Africa Chr. i. 188.)

[L. D.]

FELIX (94), bishop of Jadera (Zara) in Dalmatia, present at the council of Aquileia, 381, and took part in the condemnation of Theodoricus and Secundianus (Ambrose, Opp. iii. 893). It is probably the same bishop who joins in the condemnation of Jovinianus and others (A. 1044).

[J. L. D.]

FELIX (95), bishop of Janua (Genoa), succeeded St. Valentinus c. A.D. 307. He is said to have been a man of remarkable learning and sanctity. He was succeeded by St. Syrus, who had been his pupil. (UgHELLi, Itali. Sorc. iv. 112; Capelletti, Le Chiese & Stel. xiii. 278.)

[R. S. G.]

FELIX (96), Donatist bishop of Lambia. Lambessa, or Lambese, an important town of Numidia (Lamba, Ant. Itin. 34, 2), alleged to be absent through illness from Carth. Conf. A.D. 411. His name was confounded by the Donatist party with that of Felix of Zuma. (Mon. Vet. Don. p. 449, ed. Oberthür.)

[H. W. P.]

FELIX (97), bishop of La Mentana (123).

FELIX (98), bishop of Lameorte in Africa, banished by Hunneric in 484. (Victor Vit. Notit. 56; Morcelli, Afr. Chr. i. 192.)

[C. H.]

FELIX (99), one of the two bishops raised to the see of Leon-Astorga and Merida, in the places of their deposed predecessors Basiliades and Martialis (q. v.). Our only information respecting him and his colleague, Sabinus, is derived from St. Cyprian's letter (Ep. 68, Migne, Patr. Lat. ii. 411); Felixus Premaglori et Pheidus consistensibus ad Lectionem et Aristacianum, ibem Lucilio Diciano et Pheidus suavitate consistenter, tertio in Domino. There is considerable difficulty in ascertaining these two sees rightly between the four bishops in question. Baronius, Routh, Dupin and Aguirre make Basiliades and Martialis bishops, not of Leon-Astorga and Merida, but of Leon and Astorga respectively. Tillemon rightly joins the churches of Leon and Astorga, but avoids assigning the bishops, while Ceillier (H. 265, 562-4) holds Basiliades to have been bishop of Leon-Astorga, and Martialis bishop of Merida. Flores does the same, on the ground that as Leon-Astorga is mentioned before Merida and Basiliades are Martialis, therefore the two names must be connected, as also those of Martialis and Merida. This argument is certainly not conclusive. We know from Cyprian's letter that Sabinus was made bishop in the room of Basiliades. His name, however, is mentioned after that of Felix, so that no such inference can really be drawn from the passage of names. Gams (Kirchenlex. von Spornice, i. 236), in contradiction of all previous writers, maintains that Sabinus was made bishop of Merida in the room of Basiliades, and Felix of Astorga and Leon in the room of Martialis, supporting his view by various ingenious arguments drawn from the name of Sabinus and the circumstances.
of his election, which are described in some detail by Cyprian [SCHR.15]. If this is accepted Felix would appear as the first bishop of Astorga or Leon, or of both together, known in history. Only one episcopus Legionensis appears in British or Gothic Spain—Decius of Leon, who signs the canons of Eliberti 305 (a signature probably to be understood in the same way as that of Postumius (q. v.) of Emerus, i.e. Porto, C. Tol. iii. 589). [M. A. W.]

FELIX (100), 18th bishop of Limoges, succeeding Simplicius and followed by Adelphius II. [GALL. CHR. ii. 505]. There is a story in the life of St. Eligius, of how St. Eligius, while a layman, obtained the see for Felix from the king. [Vita S. Eligii, ii. 29; Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. i. 558]. He was represented at the council of Chalons about A.D. 650, by Paterinus, an abbot (Mansi, x. 1194). In A.D. 650 he wrote a letter to St. Desiderius, Didier of Cahors, which is extant, but in no way remarkable. [Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 266]. [B. A. B.]

FELIX (101), reckoned the seventh bishop of Lucca, between Fullanus and Obequentius, identified by some with the Felix Lucensis (where other readings are Lunensis and Gumiensis) in the list of those present at the Roman council of Hilarius, A.D. 465 (Mansi, Concil. vii. 959; Ugh. Ital. Sacr. i. 794). The reading Lunensis, which makes Felix the first bishop of Luna, a see afterwards transferred to Sarzana, is adopted by Ughelli (Ital. Sacr. i. 844) and Cappelletti (Le Chiese d'Ital. xiii. 420). [H. C.]

FELIX (102), bishop of Lucca. A confirmation by him of goods granted to the monastery of St. Fredianus, in Lucca, c. 685, is given in Troya, Cod. Dipl. ii. 565. Also in Marutari, Antiq. Med. Aev. v. 367. King Cunibert, c. 686, confirmed the charter of Felix, given to the same monastery (Troya, Cod. Dipl. iii. 11). [A. H. D. A.]


FELIX (104), Donatist bishop of Magarmonza in Numidia, present at the preceding. [M. V. D. p. 402]. [H. W. P.]

FELIX (105), Donatist bishop of Manazena Regina, in Numidia, present at the preceding. [M. V. D. p. 451]. [H. W. P.]

FELIX (106), bishop of Manfredonia (159). [C. H.]

FELIX (107), bishop of Marazana in Numidia (Anton. Rin. Marazana, in Notitia, “Maraziana” Sentt. Ep. 46), is the “alter Felix,” who is a martyr bishop at Sigua in mines (Cyp. Ep. 76, 79), and the scribe or author of Ep. 79. [C. H.]

FELIX (108), bishop of Martana (Martula), cir. 306; commemorated on Oct. 30, according to Ferrarius (Cat. SS. qui non sunt in M. R.). Jacobillus reckons him the same as the martyr bishop of Bispellum (No. 88), May 18, and as preserving over both sees. [Ugh. Ital. Sacr. x. 129]. [C. H.]

FELIX (109), bishop of Mathur in Numidia; banished by the Vandal king Hunneric, after the conference between the Catholics and Arians at Carthage, A.D. 484. He died in exile. [Notitia in Victor. Vitt. 56, Migne, Patr. Lat. iv. vii.; MERC. Africa Chrish. i. 217]. [L. B.]

FELIX (110), bishop of Mazia in the province of Mauretania Caesariensia; exiled with the preceding. [Notitia; 59; MERC. i. 219]. [L. B.]

FELIX (111), Donatist bishop of Manza, a town of proconsular Africa, perhaps Hamuniel Enf, eighteen miles from Carthage; but, as there was more than one place of the same name, this is not certain. [Dict. Geog. ii. p. 239]. He was present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411. [Mon. Vit. Don. p. 442, ed. Oberthür]. [H. W. P.]


FELIX (113), bishop of Metz. Nothing is recorded of him save some incredible stories in the chronicles of the bishops of Metz. He is there said to have ruled for forty-two years, and died in the fourth year of Hadrian, a.d. 121. He was commemorated on Feb. 21. [Gall. Chr. xii. 860; Boll. A.A. SS. 21 Feb. iii. 256]. [R. T. S.]

FELIX (114), 35th bishop of Metz, succeeding Aptatus, and followed by St. Sigibedinus early in the 8th century. The authors of the Galli Christiani (xiii. 703) quote the Codex of St. Symphorian to the effect that he sat nine months, and died on Dec. 22. He is said to have been buried in the church of St. Symphorian. [S. A. R.]

FELIX (115), Donatist bishop of Mopix in Mauretania Sitiensis, in opposition to Leo the Catholic bishop; present at the Carthaginian conference of 411. [Gast. Colat. Carth. cap. 143, 180, in Patr. Lat. xi. 1319 a, 1323 a.]

FELIX (116), bishop of Mura, in the proconsular province of Africa; summoned to a conference with the Arians at Carthage, and subsequently banished by the Vandal king Hunneric, a.d. 484. [Notitia in Victor. Vitt. 56; in Patr. Lat. ivii.; MERC.; Africa Chrish. i. 239]. [L. B.]

FELIX (117), St., elected bishop of Natta in Britannia 550, died 8th January, 582. [Ada Sanctorum, 7th July, ii. 470-77]. He is repeatedly mentioned by Gregory of Tours (iv. 4, 51, v. 32, 50, vi. 15, ix. 39; Liber de Glorio Confessarum, c. 78; Vitae Patrum, c. vi. 4), who says that Felix once wrote him a letter full of reproaches, because Gregory would not yield up some property to him. Gregory says he was careless and boastful, and that he himself replied that if Felix had only been bishop of Marseilles the ships from Egypt would have brought no oil or spices hither, but only paper for the lamps of good men by his writings. [Hist. Fr. v. 4]. He was one of the few Western scholars who knew Greek. Fortunatus, who addressed several poems to Felix (iii. capm. 8), praises him for his...
discipline in his diocese after the rebuilding of the churches, which, it seems, had been destroyed by the Goths in the year 410 or 411. He consulted Innocent I., bishop of Rome, on certain difficult points which had arisen. Innocent, commending the deference he had displayed towards the Roman see, which he termed the chief bishopric, proceeds to mention some of the disqualifications for the clerical office. He is surprised that so well informed a man as Felix should have consulted him on points known to all in the world, and his serious labours must have made him forgetful of the canons which had decided all the points he had brought before him. Innocent's reply is placed by Jaffé (Regest. Pontif. p. 26) between the years 402 and 417. (Innocent, Ep. 37, ed. Migne, Patr. Lat. xx. 608; Mansi, Concil. iii. 1045, Ep. 4.) Ughelli says he was present at a council with Decentius bishop of Eugubium (Ital. Sacr. i. 1065; see also Gams, Sacr. Episc. 709).

FELIX, bishop of Padua (181).

FELIX, bishop of Palermo, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Heeke, § 307; Mansi, x. 867.) [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (129), bishop of Paris, mentioned in the Acta S. Genorefan, under the name of Villicus or Julicius. (A.A. SS. Jan. 1. 143 b; Gall. Christ. vii. 15.) Commemorated on Jan. 3. [R. T. S.]

FELIX, bishop of Parium, in the proconsular province of Africa; subscribed the letter against the errors of the Monothelites sent by the synod of his province to Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, a.d. 646. (Mansi, x. 939; Morcelli, Africa christ. i. 253.)

FELIX (131), bishop of Potawia (Pudus). He succeeded Evagrius c. A.D. 293. He is said to have introduced the practice of burying Christians in a ground apart from the pagans. He died c. A.D. 313, and was succeeded by Paulus, a Roman. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 308; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. x. 484.)

FELIX (132), IL, bishop of Patavium, c. A.D. 523. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. x. 487.)

FELIX (133), III, bishop of Patavium, succeeded Virgilius c. 591, and was succeeded, 609, by Audacius. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 309; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. x. 488.)

FELIX (134), ninth in the list of the bishops of Pavia (Ticinum), between Crispinus and Maximus, as given in Ughelli, who places his accession in 253 and his martyrdom on July 15, 255. In some accounts of the bishops of Pavia the place of Felix is occupied by a Crispinus II., a discrepancy discussed by the Bollandists. Gams omits Felix, and places Crispinus and Maximus in the 5th century, with Epiphanius between them. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 1078; Roll. Acta SS. Jul. iv. 25; Gams, Sacr. Episc. 800.) [R. S. G.]

FELIX, bishop of Pesaro (Pisurarn), receives a letter from Gregory the Great, blaming him for interfering with a monastery and allowing public men-sangare (lib. vi. indet. epist. 46; Migne, lxvii. 832). [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (137), bishop of Portus Romanus addressed by Gregory the Great (lib. ix. indict. ii. Ep. 29; in Migne, lxixvii. 830). Gregory (Dei. iv. 51, 53) states that Felix was born in the Sabine province, and that to him he owes some of his information. Felix was present at the synod of 595 about the service of the pope, the goods of the church, etc., and also at the synod of 601, which tended to free monasteries from episcopal control. These are two separate synods according to Hefele, §§ 288, 289; according to Jaffé, from a consideration of the signatures there was only one, and that in 595. (Regesta Pont. p. 114; Mansi, ix. 1228, and x. 488.) [H. D. A.]

FELIX (138), bishop of Oporto, A.D. 692, but made metropolitan of Braga by the same sixteenth council of Toledo, which, in consequence of the conspiracy of Sisbert, transferred Felix of Seville to Toledo and Faustinus of Braga to Porto. (Felix (150).) In the latter's edition he is made to sign the acts of the sixteenth council as bishop both of Braga and Porto; but according to four of the council MSS. it should be "Bragensis atque Dumiensis sedem Episcopos." The see of Duinum, which included the monastery of Duinum only, and which was founded in memory of St. Martin of Duinum, was often administered by the bishop of the neighbouring diocese and town of Braga. For the groundless legend of the martyrdom of Felix by the Arabs in 724, see Exp. Sagra. xv. 161, and Boll. A.A.SS. May 15. (Exp. Sagra. xv. 158; Aguirre-Catalán, iv. 333.) [M. A. W.]


FELIX (140), archbishop of Ravenna, 708–729. He was consecrated by pope Constantine. At the request of his consecrator he was unwilling in some way to submit to the papal supremacy. Hence his later fate, according to the author of the Life of Constantine, was not undeserved. (Vita Constantini I. in Liber Pontificalis, Migne, cxxxviii. 947.) The people of Ravenna had killed the exarch John Biczopoulos, and had rebelled against the emperor Justinian, who sent a force under Theodore, c. 709, against Ravenna. Felix was captured, and carried off to Constantinople, where he was blinded, and sent into exile in Pontus. Justinian's successor, Philipicus, took pity upon Felix, caused search to be made for his property which had been taken from him, and recovered all except one candlestick. He then gave him presents, and sent him back to Ravenna. Felix died in 724, Nov. 25, and was buried in the church of St. Apollinaris in Classe, where his sarcophagus and epitaph are still to be found. He had written many works, but he caused them to be burnt before his death, because on account of his blindness he could not revise them. One was saved by the priests, a commentary on St. Matt. xxiv. 15, which was extant in the 9th century when Agnellus wrote, but has perished. According to Agnellus, Felix had been head of the monastery of St. Bartholomew, in Raven. (The Life of Felix is given in the Liber Pontificalis Eccl. Rom. of Agnellus, Monum. henn. lat. 478, which is inaccurate in many details, and may be partly corrected from the Liber Pontificalis Vita Constantini I. Migne, cxxviii. 947.) [A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (141), Donatist bishop of Rome, sent thither from Africa by his party, present at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411. Objections were made to his appearance by the Catholic members, as not being an African bishop. Petullia, on the part of the Donatists, defended it as being simply the result of the general migration from Rome at the time of the Gothic invasion. The president pointed out that his duty was to deal with an African question, but admitted his signature on the understanding that this admission was not to prejudice the rights of Innocent, the Catholic bishop who was not present. (Aug. Ep. 53, 2; Mon. Vet. Don. pp. 430–432, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

FELIX (142), bishop of Rotaria, in Numidia, present at the council of Cirta, A.D. 305, who gave an opinion on the side of moderation. (Aug. c. Crescent. iii. 30; Opt. i. 14.) [H. W. P.]

FELIX (143), bishop of Rusubiria (Rusulchar), a port of the province of Mauretania Tingita, but assigned to M. Caesariensis by the Notitia; and the Catholic bishops summoned to Carthage by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 484, and subsequently banished by him. (Notitia in Vict. V. 58; Migne, Patr. Lat. lvi.; Mervél, Africa Christi. i. 287.) [L. D.]

FELIX (144) OF SARAGOSSA, probably bishop of Saragosse, described in the letter of Cyriacus and the African bishops on the case of Basilides and Martinus as "ille Felix de Caesaragogus fidel cultor atque defensor veritatis," who had written letters to the council assembled at Carthage, describing the fall of the two deposed bishops. There has been much dispute as to whether he is to be regarded as bishop of Saragosse. Spanish opinion, on the whole, opposed to the bishopric. (See Aguirre, Coll. Mem. Conc. Hisp. i. Diss. 14, Exc. i, and Risco in the Exp. Sagra. xxi. 99.) Nothing, however, can safely be inferred from the substance of the episcopal title, which is equally absent with regard to the catalogue of African bishops given in the supercription of Cyriacus' letter (Ep. 68, apud Migne, Patr. Lat.); and, on the whole, it seems most probable that Felix was bishop of Saragosse. If so, we should have no information, dating from the middle of the 3rd century, of the existence of three bishops in northern Spain—Tarragona (Ferrocruce), Astorga (FELIX), and Saragosse. To these the Spaniards would certainly add Braga, but all the proofs are doubtful. (Exp. Sagra. xxi. 290; Gams, Kirchengesch. von Spanien, i. 283.) [C. No. 52.] [M. A. W.]

FELIX (145), bishop of Sardinia in Occonia in Dacia. This see was subject to the metropolite of Prima Justiniana at the end of the 6th century, but Felix resisted the authority of Joannes, and elicited a severe letter of reproach from Gregory the Great, who threatened further
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ecclesiastical censures if he refused submission. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. v. 14 in Patrol. Lat. lax. 151. Witsch gives Lycinianus as the name of the minister, who had been transferred to Prima Justiniana, c. A.D. 530. See also Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 281–285.) It is not known whether Felix submitted, or how long he lived. [J. de S.]

FELIX (146), a bishop sent by Gregory the Great, c. 595, together with an abbot Cyriacus, to convert the Barbaricians, an idolatrous portion of the population of Sardinia. Their religious instruction had been neglected by the native bishops, whom Gregory accordingly reproves. (Greg. Mag. Epis. lib. iv. ind., Epist. 23–26.)

[R. S. G.]

FELIX (147), bishop of Sarina, a.D. 495–533, between Aedocatus and Sergius. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia, ii. 497, 518.) [C. H.]

FELIX, bishop of Sassari (179).


FELIX (149) II., bishop of Segermis; subscribed the letter which the bishops of his province wrote to Constantine, the son of Heracleius, against the novel doctrines of the Monothelites, A.D. 641; "et Gernissi" in the subscription has been emended into "Segernity ana." (Manni, x. 928; Morelli, Africa Christian. i. 773.) [L. D.]

FELIX (150), bishop of Scelmelay, a town either in the proconsular or Numidian province of Africa. He was present at the council convened at Carthage by bishop Geneiathius, A.D. 390, and was the author of three of the canons there enacted concerning the discipline of the clergy, two of which were afterwards embodied in Gratian’s decretal. (Manni, iii. 693; Moreelli, Africa Christian. i. 273.) [L. D.]


FELIX (152), metropolitan bishop of Seville shortly before C. Tol. xvi. in can. 12 of the council, Siebert of Toledo is deposed for conspiracy against Egica and his family; and Felix, then metropolitan of Toledo in his place, by election of the council, and consent of the clergy and people of Toledo. The council, however, in this only ratified the praedicto and autordis of Egica, "diicti Domini nostrii," who had commanded (justifiably) Felix to assume the charge of the see of Toledo. His election is spoken of as "in praetiriter," and we may probably see it in one of the first excerpts of C. Tol. xxi. 6, which had placed the election of bishops in the hands of the king and the metropolitan of Toledo. In this case, however, the council inserted both the delivery judgment upon Siebert and to confirm the election of Felix, probably because Felix could not confirm himself, and possibly because the strong hand of Julian (i. v.) having been withdrawn, it was felt desirable, at a critical moment for the government, to make some concession to the wishes and the interests of things. This Felix is not to be identified with the Felix bishop of Irin who signs C. Tol. xii. (Exp. Sigr. vi. 285), but rather with the Felix, archbishop of Toledo, who signs the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth councils, and disappears from the lists. Felix of Seville and Toledo is heard of. He was in all probability the friend and protégé of Julian, whose life he wrote, and whose ambitious policy with regard to the see of Toledo he seems to have attempted to carry out, though with inferior ability and vigour. Isidorus Facensias in the 8th century says of him, after some expressions of praise, "concilia satis praecellae etiam adhibec cum ambuscus Principibus agit" (Isid. Pac. Esp. Sigr. viii.). The princes were Egica (687–701) and his son Wittiza, associated with his father in the government from 688; and it has therefore been inferred from this passage that, besides the sixteenth council of Toledo already quoted, Felix presided also at the seventeenth and eighteenth. For his presidency at the seventeenth in 694 we have the authority of Roderic of Toledo (iii. 13), writing from Mss. in which the signatures of the council, not now extant, were contained; and it is of course possible that he survived the eighteenth, under Wittiza, the acts of which are lost, though the passage from Isidore of Beja, already quoted, is our only ground for supposing it. The life of Julian of Toledo, attributed to Felix, and which with Julian’s life of Idefon Mask appears as an addition in many Mss. to the De Viris Ill. of Isidore and Idefonsus, is accepted by Gams as genuine. (Kirchengev. von Spanien, ii. (2) 222; Exposit. Sigr. vi. 316; Aguirro-Catalan, iv. 333; Hefele, Conc. Gesetz. iii. 318, 323.) [M. A. W.]


FELIX (154) II., bishop of Spigno (Ugelli, Ital. Soc. vii. 810), addressed by Gregory the Great. In 591 he is requested to take charge of the vacant church of Canusium (Canosa in Apulia, a see afterwards united with Bari) and directed to ordain two porochial presbyters for it (lib. i. ind. i. ep. 53). Ugelli (Ital. Soc. vii. 790) on the authority of this letter places Felix as commendatarius among the bishops of Canusia, having evidently so read the name of the church. In 593 Felix is bidden to make, with two notaries of the Roman see, an inspection of the valuables of the Sipontine church and forward a summary account of them signed by him, without any delay or excuse, to Gregory. For the dissolute morals of his nephew Felix (Evangelus) he is severely blamed, and the debt owing by his deacon Evangelus for his ransom he is directed to discharge out of the church funds (lib. iii. ind. xi. ep. 42, 43). In this year also Felix is reproached as unfeeling for having withheld payment, from the same source, of twelve solidi incurred by Tribunus, charged both with the penalty of the bishop of Bari. [Felix (56).] [C. H.]
FELIX, bishop of Spello (88).

FELIX (155), bishop of Spoleti, signed the second Epistle of pope Agatho, which was sent in 680 after a synod in Rome to the third council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 302; Hefele, § 314.)

[F. H. D. A.]

FELIX (166), bishop of Suava (Sua), in the province of Numidia; banished by the Vandal king Hunneric, a.d. 484. (Notitia in Victor. Vit. 57, Migne, PatroL Lat. viii.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 284.)

[L. D.]

FELIX (157), Donatist bishop of Summa, or Zamma, a town in Numidia. He was not present at Carth. Conf. a.d. 411; but as the name of a bishop of that see appeared in the list of signatures, the error, being challenged by the Catholics, was after some discussion admitted by the Donatists. (Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 448, ed. Oberthür.)

[H. W. P.]

FELIX (188), Donatist bishop of Tacaepae, or Tacaep, a town of proconsular Africa, near some hot springs (Gabo, Cabes, or Qubes, Ant. Itin. 78, 3), said by his party to be prevented by illness from appearing at Carth. Conf. a.d. 411. (Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 419, ed. Oberthür.)

[H. W. P.]


[H. W. P.]

FELIX (160), bishop of Teveste (Theveste), in Numidia; banished by Hunneric, 484. (Notitia in Victor. Vit. 56, Migne, PatroL Lat. viii.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 308.)

[L. D.]


[H. W. P.]

FELIX (162), bishop of Terenii (Lateranum), present at the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Roman synods under pope Symmachus in Oct. 501, Nov. 502, in 503, and Oct. 504, according to the reckoning of Daha (Die Königre der Germanen, iii. 209), who accepts, with a slight alteration, the arrangement of Hefele, § 220. (Mansi, viii. 252, 258, 299, 314; Ugh. Ital. Sac. i. 750.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (183), third bishop of Terracina, c. a.d. 366, succeeding Sabinus. It is related in a Vatican manuscript quoted by Ughelli how the prayers of Felix in the church of St. Caesarius at Terracina obtained a cure for Placidia, daughter of Valentinian III., when possessed by a demon. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 1298.)

[R. S. G.]

FELIX (164) II., bishop of Terracina, present at the Lateran synod under Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Mansi, x. 887; Hefele, § 307.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FELIX (165), bishop of Thenea, in the Byzaenec province of Africa; subscribed the letter of the bishops of his province against the Monothelites, c. a.d. 641. (Mansi, x. 928; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 313.)

[L. D.]

FELIX (166), bishop of Tibiura Tibursica. Vol. of Tabzocae (No. 174).
his final refusal Felix and his companions were delivered for transportation into Italy. After four days' sail they arrived in Sicily, having partaken of no food during the journey, doubtless from sea sickness, wherein we find an incidental proof of the authenticity of these Acts. At the various points Agrigentum, Catana, Messana, Taurumimum, wherever they touched, they were received with the greatest honour by the Christians. Thence they were carried by the prefect—who perhaps called at so many towns to rouse the zeal of the officials—to Venetia, in Apulia, where, having again called upon him to surrender the sacred writings, he condemned him to death for disobedience. Doubtless the known sentiments, or perhaps the secret instructions of Maximian, encouraged the court officials in exceeding the limit fixed by the letter of the edict. Felix finally suffered by beheading, Aug. 30, on which day he is commemorated by Bede. At his execution he is reported to have said, "Thanks be to Thee, O God. Fifty-six years have I lived in the world. I have guarded my virginity, I have preserved the Gospels, I have preached the faith and truth. Oh, Jesus Christ, Lord God of heaven and earth, I offer my neck as a sacrifice to Thee, who abidest to eternity, to whom be glory for ever." The Acts and Martyrologies call the town where Felix was bishop, Tuzboca, with considerable variations in the spelling. Baronius, however, well suggests, though without any MSS. authority, Thibaris, a well-known episcopal city, of Numidia, whose bishop, Catholic and Donatist alike, appears at the Carthage conference, a.D. 411, while Tuzboca is utterly unknown. The companions of his martyrdom were Audacius and Januarius, presbyters, Fortunatus and Septimus, readers. There is considerable confusion as to various details in different versions of the Acts, which D'Acquista and Baluze have in vain endeavoured to remedy. (Martyr. Vet. Romae, Bede, Adonis, Usuardi; Baronius, Annal. a.D. 302, cxxi.-cxxii.; Ruinart, Acta Sancera; Surius; D'Achery, Spicileg. t. xii. 634; Baluz, Miscell. t. ii. p. 77; Tillemont, v. 202.)

FELIX (178), reckoned by Matthaeus the first of the undoubted bishops of Turres (de Turribus), or Torres, a see afterwards removed to Sassari, in Sardinia (Matth. Sard. Sac. 144). He was one of the bishops exiled by Hunneric in 484 (Victor Vit. Notit. 60 in Pat. L. viii. 276 b). Cappelletti recognises earlier bishops, and among them another Felix, a.D. 404. (Le Chiese d'Ital., xiii. 131.)

FELIX (179), bishop of Urgel, a city of Catalonia, near the Gallic border, at the roots of the Pyrenees, on the Segre and one of its affluents. As Urgel lay within the dominions of the Visigoths, and belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Narbona, that monarch watched the movement represented by Felix with the greatest concern. Felix was a native of Spain (Eginhard. Ann. s. a. 792, in Migne, Patrol. Lat. civ. 441), and early distinguished himself, both by his high character and the ability (Alcuin, Hist. Boni, a.D. 6 Felix, Episc. in Migne, c. 144 ; Elipand. Epp. ep. 3, ad Carol. Mag. sec. 2, in Migne, xcvii. 868 c). About a.D. 783 he was consulted by Elipandus bishop of Toledo on the adoptionist theory of
Paulinus patriarch of Aquileia was commissioned to draw up a libellus on the subject, to be sent with the decree of the council to the “Spanish provinces” (Paulinus. Libellus, Sacrificium, in Migne, ccxiii. 151–156). In 756, three years afterwards (A.D. 756) Paulinus held a council at Aquileia in which Adoptionism was again condemned. (Co. Forozul, in Migne, ccxiii. 285; Madrisius, Diss. de Conc. Forozul. lb. 54).

In the meanwhile Felix replied in a libellus of considerable length to the letter which he had recently received from Rhodinian, in which he says that he found “more heresies or rather blasphemies than he had previously read in his writings” (Ep. 83, ad Dom. Reg. in Migne, cc. 273 D). Charles, hearing of this, requested Alcuin to prepare an answer, and Alcuin consented. At the same time, on the plea that he felt himself unequal to the task alone, Alcuin prayed the king to forward copies of the libellus to Leo III, Paulinus of Aquileia, Bishop of Treves, and Teudulf bishop of Orleans, with a request that they would also answer it. Paulinus compiled in his Contra Felicem Urgellitanim, which he inscribed to Charles. (Migne, ccxiii. 390–467). As Felix is not known to have been at Rome more than once, it was probably at this date that he wrote the letter to Eulpandus which the latter received with extreme delight, and sent on to the brethren at Cordova who “thought rightly about God” (“Eulpandp. Ep. 5, u. z.). From this it appears that on his arrival in Southern Italy, he encouraged others to hope that his opinions would meet with a better reception than that accorded to them at Ratisbon. If so, he was more than disappointed, as at a council convened by Hadrian he was again prevailed upon to recant. At the same time he drew up a libellus of which Hadrian approved, and laid it first on the altar, and afterwards on the relics of St. Peter, taking an oath that the opinions there expressed were those that he would maintain thenceforth (Eginhard. u. z.; Mansi, xiii. 856; Leo III. ap. Co. Rom. A.D. 799, Mansi, xiii. 1031).

Notwithstanding his double recantation, however, Felix does not appear to have been restored to his see (Eulpandp. Ep. 5, ad Carolum Mag. inv. 1592). Felix apparently returned to Urgel, and was soon as active as ever in disseminating the opinions which he is said to have so solemnly recanted (Alc. Ade. Elip. u. z.; Leo III. u. z.). Alcuin, who had held him in the highest esteem, and still retained great respect for him, now seems to have written a letter of earnest remonstrance, addressing him as “vir venerandus et in Christi charitate desiderandus,” “episcopus,” “pater,” “pater amandus,” and reminding him of their former correspondence, he beseeches him to “arise and return to his Father, and to the bosom of the church,” adding, “Christ calls you, the sacred laws for still the saints desire you as a citizen.” In this letter Alcuin speaks very highly of the writings of Felix, though he takes strong exception to his Adoptionism. (Migne, cc. 119–126.) In 794 Charles convened a council at Frankfort, to which Felix was summoned, but where he does not seem to have been present. It was then decreed that an assembly condemns the “impious and wicked heresy of Eulpandus bishop of Toletum and Felix bishop of Orgellis” (Mansi, xiii. 909).
tion of a Disputatio cum Saraceno, which, how-
er, he had only heard of, and had never seen.
It had been inquired for by Charles, and Alcuin
referred him to Leidradus, with what result is
Migne, cl. 314.) The only work of Felix that
survives in the collection is the Concilio Fidelis
(Paci, Crit. s. a. 783 ix. 788 xi. 792 i. 794 ii. 798
Mairan, de Fel. et Elipand. haer. Disput. his-
tico-chronologico in Migne, xci. 557 et seq.;
Walch, Hist. Adoptionis. 1755; Ehrueber, Diss.
Disputatio-histor. contra Chr. Walch, in Migne, ci.
338 et seq.; Dornert, Person of Christ, ed. Clark,
ed. Clark, ii. 279-334; Villanueva, Viaje ite-
rario a las islas de España, x. 20; Florez,
Ep. Sagra, v. 335.)

[4. W. D.]

FELIX (177), bishop of Uthina (cf. Tert. de
Monag. 12), on Bagradas river in Prov. Proc.
(Saut. Ep. 186.)

[F. W. B.]

FELIX (178), Donatist bishop of Utina, a
place in Numidia, mentioned as being absent
405, ed. Oeberth.)

[H. W. P.]

FELIX (179), Donatist bishop of Uzalis, or
Uzala, near Utica, in proconsular Africa, present
ed. Oeberth.)

[H. W. P.]

FELIX (180), bishop of Valencia, signs the
acts of the eighth and ninth councils of Toledo
(a. 635, 655), the former, which was a national
council, in the thirty-seventh or thirty-eighth
place; in the latter, which was provincial only,
in the eighth. (Esp. Baptr. viii. 171; Aguirre-
Catalani, iii. 448.)

[M. A. W.]

FELIX (181) (Felicianus), a bishop of
Verona, who probably lived c. 470. (Acta SS.
19 Jul. v. 644; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 580; Cap-
elli, Le Chiese d'Ital. x. 747.)

[B. S. G.]

FELIX (182), bishop of Vicus Turris, in the
proconsular province of Africa; was present at
the synod of Carthage convened by Boniface,
bishop of that see, a.D. 435. (Mansi, viii. 648; Mor-
celli, Africa Christ, i. 353.)

[L. D.]

FELIX (183), bishop of Villa Regia, a place in
Numidia, present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411.

[H. W. P.]

FELIX (184), bishop of Visica, a place in
proconsular Africa, present at Carth. Conf. A.D.

[H. W. P.]

FELIX, bishop of Voeseta (44).

FELIX (185), Donatist bishop of Zaba, or
Zabi (M'lib), a town within the district of
Zabi, in Mauretania Sitifensis (Ant. Jtin. 30, 3;
Saw, p. 68), notorious for his violence during
the period of Donatist ascendency under Julian,
especially at a place called Lamella, between
Sidiid and Zabi. Where two Catholic deacons
were slain, Primus, son of Janusarius, and Donatus,
son of Ninus, A.D. 361 or 362 (Opt. ii. 18).

[H. W. P.]

FELIX, bishop of Zaceria (No. 99); of Zara
(No. 94); of Zurna (No. 157).

Clergy and Monks.

FELIX (186) of Nola in Campania, a priest,
called also by St. Augustine a confessor, whose
personal history is known chiefly through the
poems of Paulinus bishop of Nola A.D. 409-431,
on which Bede has founded a history in prose.
He was of Syrian extraction, but born at Nola,
where his father Hermis had settled. He de-
voed himself from a very early age (fifteen) to
the service of God and of the church, and,
having passed through the lower grades of the
ministry, was ordained priest by Maximus
bishop of Nola, c. A.D. 250 (a date as early as
A.D. 84 is sometimes given). During the perse-
cution under Decius, Maximus retired from his
see for refuge, and the persecutors laid hold on
Felix, and having imprisoned treated him with
excessive severity. But, says his encomiast
Paulinus, like St. Peter he was delivered by an
angel, and, having reached his bishop at a
moment when he was at the peak of death,
revived him by means of some grapes, of which
he found a bunch hanging on a thorn-bush.
He took him on his shoulders, and carried him
to a place of safety, where an old woman took
charge of him, whilst he himself returned
home and remained there until the time of
danger had passed away. The circumstances
just related took place, we are told, in a single
night. During the reign of Valerian persecution
was renewed, A.D. 257, and again Felix became
an object of attack. Having taken refuge in
some ruined buildings, the search of the
persecutors was diverted from his place of
concealment by their seeing a cobweb spread
across the opening, by which they were led to
suppose that it had not lately been entered by
any one. Meanwhile Felix escaped by another
way, and took refuge in an old war-trunk, in
which he was fed during six months by an old
woman who lived in a neighbouring house.
When persecution ceased he returned to the
town, and was received with joy by his fellow-
Christians. Maximus was now dead, and they
made a strong effort to place him in the vacant
seat, but Felix refused, and persuaded them to
elect Quintus, a priest of seven days' older
standing than himself. We are not informed of
the date of his death, but many miracles are
said to have been wrought around the place of
his interment, over which a church was built,
according to local tradition, by pope Damasus.
At the time of the Gothic invasion, A.D. 410, he
is said to have appeared to many persons. St.
Augustine, who was intimate with Paulinus,
declared his belief in the reality of these mani-
ifestations, for when a question of serious mis-
conduct had arisen between two members of a
monastery under his superintendence, named
Spes and Bonifacius, he recommended that they
should both of them repair to the tomb of St.
Felix, and there await a Divine revelation of
their respective guilt or innocence. He also
speaks of an apparition of Felix at the time of
the barbarian invasion, as attested by a trust-
worthy witness (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. vi. 219, 246;
Ep., 78; de Curtu mort. c. 16; vol. vi. p. 606; de Dolcitl. quest.
ii. 2; vol. vi. p. 157.) The legend became a
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popular one during the middle ages, and appears in the *Golden Legend* of Jac. de Voragine, c. 19.

[Faulinus.] [H. W. P.]

FELIX (187), a deacon of Carthage, who, having written a severe letter during the persecution of Maxentius, A.D. 311, was concealed, at some risk to himself, by Mensurius, who refused to give him up to the government. [Mensurius.] [Opt. l. 17.] [H. W. P.]

FELIX (188), a deacon of Milan, sent by Ambrose with a letter to the emperor Theodosius (Ambrose, Opp. iii. 1109). [J. L. D.]

FELIX (189), a young monk of Adrumetum, who went with Florus to Usalitis, and there dictated to him the letter of St. Augustine which caused so much disturbance among the brethren. In company with Cresconius and another Felix, who, from some unknown cause arrived later than his companions, he took a journey to Hippo to confer with Augustine on the matter. They were in a great hurry to return home before Easter, but Augustine prevailed on them to remain longer under the festival, perhaps because of the late arrival of the other Felix, and thus gained time to explain the questions to them more fully. (Aug. *Ep. 214, 215, 216; Tillemont, 318, vol. xiii. pp. 873-878; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl. xxiv. 45, 46.* [Cresconius (4), Evodus (3), Florus (12).] [H. W. P.]


FELIX (191), deacon of the church at Ruspe, who, by his desire to secure the appointment of an unsuitable person during the Vandal persecution, was the means of preventing for some years the election of a bishop. He endeavored to arrest the consecration of Fulgentius by very questionable and even violent means, A.D. 509. He failed in his attempt, and was subsequently subdued into obedience by the gentle spirit of Fulgentius, who shortly afterwards ordained him as presbyter. He died within the year 503. (Vita Fulgentii, c. xvii.; Migne, Patr. *Ep. 134; Ceillier, xi. 5.* [Fulgentius (29).] [H. R. R.]

FELIX (192), deacon, one of the five legates whom Hormisdas specially instructed and sent in A.D. 519 to treat with John, bishop of Constantinople, and the whole Eastern church on the question of reconciliation with the Western (Baronius, *Annum. ix. a. 519, 2.* The legates appear to have remained some time in the East, and to have kept Hormisdas acquainted with the course of events, especially as to the circumstances and motives of the riots that were occurring in Thessalonica and all through the East. The legates returned to Rome in A.D. 520. (Ch. a. 520, 28. See the whole proceedings in Mansi, *Concilia, viii. 441 sq.; Hormisdas Papae Epistola et Decreta, psp. 31 sq. Migne, Patr. Lat. *Ep. 80. 8, 9.* [J. G.]

FELIX (193), African monk, the head of the little monastery in Byzacena to which Fulgentius retired shortly after his entrance upon the monastic life. (Vita Fulgentii, cc. 8-11, 15, in *Boll. Acta SS., Jan. 1. 35-38; Patr. Lat. *Acta 124 sq.* Felix strove to induce Fulgentius to assume chief command. He consented to undertake the educational department only, while Felix retained that of the property. The friendship of these two men was ardent and protracted. They lived together, before an incoherence of barbarians, to Sicca Veneria or Siscia, and there endured great indignities from an Arian priest, who also bore the name of Felix. The monk Felix displayed a beautiful spirit of self-renunciation. Fulgentius, in his search for austerity and severity of rule, deserted Felix more than once, yet it was through Felix and his monks that Faustus ordained Fulgentius: and when that father was subsequently made bishop of Ruspe, and when he erected a monastery in close contiguity to his church, he persuaded Felix to come and preside over it; transferring to it the majority of his own monks, so that leaving the remnant of his family under the deputy control of one Vitalius, the two houses were brought under the same management. During the double exile of Fulgentius, Felix appears to have retained the position, and his life must have been prolonged for some years after the death of Thrasium in 533. On the return of Fulgentius, though a bishop, he resolved to conduct himself as monk, and to submit to the smallest matters to the authority of the abbot Felix (26. c. 29). [Fulgentius (59).] [H. R. R.]


FELIX (196), an abbot in Eumompharae, of the Ponza islands, off the coast of Campania. He was the bearer of a letter in 601 from Gregory the Great to the subdeacon Anthimus, the rector or defender of Campania, who is directed to supply Felix with 1500 pounds of lead. (Epist. *Lib. i. Indict. ep. 50. Migne, Lat. *Ep. 513.* [A. R. D. B.]

FELIX (197), mentioned by Alcinus in connexion with Elipandus and the Adoptionist controversy, different from Felix bishop of Urgel. Mabillon thinks he was abbot of Oba, a Benedictine monastery founded in 789 by Abdon, the son of king Silo in Asturias. (Alcinus, *Hy. 587, col. 2, n. ed. Froben.; Mabili *Anadel. ii.* 273, num. 53; Patr. *Lat. xcv. 889.* [C. B.]

**FELIX — CLERGY AND MONKS**
Felix—Martyrs

Exile, with Aemilius, Triarius, and Lucianus (Martyr. Rom., Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi.) [T. S.]

Felix (207), commemorated June 11; martyr with Fortunatus his brother, at Aquileia, under Maximian, a.d. 296. They seem to have been instances of the intermittent persecution, which went on here and there, especially among the military, under Maximian and Galerius, previous to the edict of Diocletian, which authorized a general persecution. (Marti. Rom., Vet., Adon., Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

Felix (206), commemorated June 23; presbyter and martyr at Satrium, in Tuscany, under a prefect named Turcius. (Martyr. Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

Felix (209)—July 2, martyr with Felicitus (9). [G. T. S.]

Felix (210), commemorated July 6, a hermit and martyr at Apollonia under the emperor Numerianus, a.d. 283. (Bas. Men.) [G. T. S.]

Felix (211)—July 15, bishop of Pavia (No. 194). [G. T. S.]

Felix (212), commemorated July 17; martyr at Carthage, with eleven other Christians from the town of Scilla. They suffered in the persecution of Severus, a.d. 200 or 202, when Perpetua and Felicitas also were martyrs. The names of his companions were Speratus, Martinez, Cythius, Veturius, Aquilius, Lactantius, Januarius, Generosus, Vesta, Donata, Secunda. Their Acta seem genuine, being strikingly confirmed in one particular by a contemporaneous document. The Acta call the presbyter under whom they suffered Saturninus, while Tertullian ad Scapulam, lib. iii, treating of persecutors, says, "Vigilius Saturninus, who first used the sword against us, lost his eyes." Saturninus, however, seems to have used the deliberation in his course of action which was characteristic of legal procedure of this kind at Carthage. He called on the men to subscribe on the same day. On another day he called on the women to do so, and offered all of them time for consideration. One of them, Donata, replied, "We render honour to Caesar as Caesar, but worship and prayer to God alone." Persisting in their refusal, they were condemned to be beheaded. On receiving their sentence they thanked God, and as they came to the place of execution they fell on their knees and again gave thanks. The ancient Calendar of the church of Carthage, discovered Mabillon and assigned by him to the 5th century, commemorates them on the same day. (Martyr. Rom., Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Notkeri, Wandelberti; Bainart, Acta Sacerd.) [G. T. S.]

Felix (213), commemorated July 27; martyr at Nola. In several of the martyrlogies he is noted with three women, Julia, Jucunda, Januaria, who suffered at Niconyma. They all died probably in the Diocletian persecution. (Martyr. Rom., Vet., Bedae, Notkeri; Fernandus, Catal. Generalis.) [G. T. S.]

Felix (214), commem. July 29, martyr in Africa with Niceta and Festinarius. Only found in Martyr. Hieron, which of course may have
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helped the confusion about pope Felix II. (No. 2).

[5. T. S.]

FELIX (215), commemorated Aug. 1; martyr under Diocletian and Maximian at Gerona in Spain. By his Christian energy in preaching God's word he rendered himself so remarkable that Dacian, the proconsul, notorious for his persecuting zeal, ordered him to be seized and then put to death with various torments, to which the imaginations of the monks have added numerous miracles and angelic appearances. [DA伽INUS (3).] (Martyr. Adon., Usuard.; Gregor. Turon. de Glor. Mart. cap. 92.) [G. T. S.]

FELIX (216), commemorated Aug. 22; martyr at Ostia with Martialis, Epictetus, Saturninus, Aprilis; apparently travellers or seamen who there suffered for Christ. (Martyr. Adon., Usuard.) [G. T. S.]

FELIX (217), commemorated Aug. 30; presbyter and martyr at the second milestone on the road to Ostia. There may possibly, or even probably, be a confusion between this and the previous uncanonical, both suffered in or about the same place. The Martyrologies, however, give more details about this man. He lived under Diocletian and Maximian, and suffered in the fresh persecution which ensued upon the publication of the fourth edict, April 30, 304. Having been racked and tortured by the prefect Draco, he was taken to several shrines and commanded to sacrifice. He steadfastly refused, and according to a monkish legend, worked so many miracles at each shrine as ought to have converted the most determined persecutor. A Christian encountering the martyr on his way to execution and stirred up with that mania for martyrdom which then seized men like an epidemic, cried out that he also was a Christian; whereupon he was seized, and executed in company with Felix. His name being unknown, the Christians denominated him Aduactus, because he was added to the crown of St. Felix. The confusion about this commemoration among the authorities is almost inextricable. Hieronymus notes him on Aug. 29, with four women, of whom one is Adana. Bede (ed. Colomb.), on Aug. 30, commemorates Felix the bishop of Tubzola in Africa, among whose fellow martyrs was Aduactus, a presbyter. In ed. Bull. of Bede both Felix of Rome and of Africa are noted on that day. All efforts to unravel the matter would now be hopeless. (Martyr. Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Notkerl. Wandalbert.) [G. T. S.]

FELIX (218), commemorated Sept. 24; martyr at Autun, with Andochius a presbyter and Thyrus a deacon, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 161-180, probably about the same time as the martyrs at Lyons, A.D. 177. (Martyr. Roman., Hieron., Bedae.) [G. T. S.]

FELIX (219), commemorated Oct. 12; martyr with 4976 others, bishops, priests, deacons, and laymen, in Africa, under Hunerici, A.D. 477. Cyprian and Felix were the most distinguished presbyters who suffered at that time. They were martyrs in behalf of the Catholic faith as against Arianism, which Hunerici and the Vandals supported. The numbers may seem large, but all the authorities represent the

arian persecution of North Africa, which lasted from A.D. 429 to 523, when the accession of Hilderici brought peace, to have been a very frightful one. (Martyr. Adonis, Usuardi; Victor Vitensis, de Persecut. Vandal. i. 2) Victor was himself a bishop of Vota in Numidia, expelled by Hunnerici. Other authorities for the Vandal persecution are the life of St. Fulgentius, who was distinguished in the persecution at Thrasimund, A.D. 496, contained in Biblioth. Mar. Patrum, tom. ix. pp. 4-16; Procopius, de Bello Vandal. c. 7, 8; Gibbon, cap. xxi. Rainart, the last editor of Victor Vitensis, illustrated the whole subject with a copious and learned apparatus of notes and supplement. [G. T. S.]

FELIX (220)—Oct. 24; martyr. (No. 114.)

FELIX (221)—Nov. 5. The Hieronymian Martyrology commemorates him in Italy on Nov. 1, and places a Felix in Africa on Nov. 3. Baroinus places him under Trajan, while the acts of Caesarius place him under Claudius Nero. Tillemon considers the whole story of this Felix and his fellow-martyrs, Eusebius, Caesarius, and Julianus at Taracina, to have been very much corrupted. [CAESARIUS (15).] It is pityfully that it is best to leave them in the number of those whose sainthood we are sure of, but of whom we know nothing else. (Martyr. Hiero., Bedae, Usuardi, Wandalberti; Tillemon, Mon. Eccles. ii. p. 574.) [G. T. S.]

FELIX (222), commemor. Nov. 6; martyr at Teniza in Africa. St. Augustine, when expounding the 127th Psalm, is said to refer to him where he says, "Felix martyris, verè fidelis et corōnē, cujus hodie dies est." (Martyr. Hiero., Adonis, Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

FELIX (223)—Nov. 15; martyr (122).

FELIX, martyrs. See also Nov. 32, 121.

Miscellaneous.

FELIX (224), addressed by Sidonius Apollinarius (ii. Ep. 3) in a letter of congratulations to his elevation to the dignity of patriarch. [G. T. S.]

FELIX (225), a notary to whom Fulgentius addressed a work entitled De Trinitate, in thirteen chapters. He is addressed in engaging terms, and reminded that he is surrounded by those who are infected with various errors. Fulgentius hurried him with a practical mode of counsels from the orthodox faith. The only authority to which he appeals, with the exception of the quotation from Augustine in his Scripture. [FULGENTIUS (35).] (Fulg. Opp. p. 498 in Migne, Patr. ixv.; Ceillier, xi. 50.) [H. B. R.]

FELIX (226) GALLIUS, friend of Cassiodorus. He was advanced to the consulsiply by Theodorici, in recognition of his public services (Cassiod. Var. lib. ii. Ep. i. and ii.); he probably the same person whom CassiodorusDesign i as having assisted him in the composition of the epistles contained in the first ten books of Varieties. [E. N. Y.]

FELIX (227), chartularius and "vicus consularis," remembered by Gregory I. to Maximinus
FELIX—MISC.
FEoca, St., an Irish devotee, who gave his name to the parish of St. Feock, on Falmouth harbour, in Cornwall, where the Celtic tongue was still spoken down to 1640. It is possible that the name is the same as that of St. Fieoe, bishop of Sletty, in Ireland, to whom is doubtfully attributed the famous hymn in praise of St. Patrick. (Todd, St. Patrick, 1864.)

[C. W. B.]

Feolcberht, presbyter in the diocese of Ely, in Normandy, calls the synod of Clovesho, 803.

[K. H.]

Feologeld, the sixteenth archbishop of Canterbury (M. H. B. 616). Before he was raised to the archiepiscopal see he had been an abbot in one of the Kentish monasteries, and his name in that capacity occurs in several charters.

Not to mention the spurious act of Bapchil, misdated 798 (Kemble, C. D. 1018; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 517), Feologeld, priest and abbot, is found among the Kentish abbots at the council of Clovesho in 803 (K. C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546); he attests an act of archbishop Ethelheard in 805 (K. C. D. 189), and of one of King Cuthred the same year (D. 190). He is mentioned along with archbishop Wulfred, and abbot Wernoth of St. Augustine's as one of the chief members of a council at Ache in 810 (K. C. D. 256; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 567); consents to a grant of Ceolwulf, king of Mercia, in 823 (K. C. D. 217), and to the reconciliation of Wulfred and Cenwrythryth at the council of Clovesho in 823 (K. C. D. 220; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 601). On the death of archbishop Wulfred he was elected to the archiepiscopal see. According to the Chronicle, in 829 (which must be corrected to 831, both because of the error of two years in the computation of the chronicle and because Wulfred survived until the latter year, K. C. D. 227, dying on the 34th of March, Ob. Cond. in Ang. Sax. i. 539), archbishop Wulfred died, and his abbot, Feologeld was chosen to the archiepiscopal on the 7th of the Kalends of May: "and he was consecrated on a Sunday, the 5th of the Ides of June, and he died on the 3rd of the Kalends of September."

(M. H. B. 344.) It must be observed that this notice occurs only in one MS. of the Chronicle, all the others containing 832 (Me. B. 832): "this year Ceolwulf was chosen bishop and ordained, and abbot Feologeld died." The day, however, given for Feologeld's consecration was a Sunday in 832, and as the name occurs in nearly all the lists of the archbishops, the authority of the single MS., which is a Canterbury MS., may be accepted as sufficient. Some few lists omit the name of Feologeld and substitute that of Swithred, of whom, however, nothing is known (M. H. B. 616). The pontificate of a few weeks was too short to contain any events of historical importance, and the name of Feologeld as archbishop is not found on coins or in charters. It would be interesting to know what abbey he had presided before his promotion; it was probably in or near Canterbury, but we know too little of the constitution of the cathedral at the time to favour the conjecture that he may have presided as abbot over the monastery of Christ Church itself. See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 609; Einemam, p. 14.

[Feradnach] (1) Abbot of Saighdr, now Serkjeran, in the barony of Ballybritt, King's County, died A.D. 914 (Four. Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 908, i. 421).

(2) Son of Sechnall, scribe and abbot of Achadhbo-Caighnagh, now Aghaboe, in the barony of Upper Osory, Queen's County, died A.D. 933 (Four. Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 908, i. 421).

(3) Son of Seighen, abbot of Reshrine, now Rathlin island, off Antrim, died A.D. 799 (Four. Mast. A.D. 794, i. 403; Ann. Ult. A.D. 794).

Ferdachrich (Ferdachrich, Ferdachricho, Fermachrich) is etymologically the man of two boundaries or countries.

(1) Abbot of Dairinis, died A.D. 744 (Ann. Tys.). He seems to have become mixed up in the Kalendaris with St. Maccartane of Clougher (Maccartanes). This Dairinis (Oak-island) is identified as Molan or Molana, where St. Masadfaid erected an abbey or monastery at the mouth of the Blackwater, near Youghal, co. Waterford. (Four. Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 742, i. 343; Ann. Ult. A.D. 748).


(4) Abbot and bishop of Armagh, succeeded Cearl-Peter at Armagh, A.D. 758, and died A.D. 768. In the Irish Annals, Ferdachrich is always called abbot, but, Ware, Lagenian, and other authors usually follow the Poisiter of Cabled in placing him among the bishops or archbishops of Armagh. (Four. Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 771, i. 376 n. 377; Ann. Ult. A.D. 770; Legian, Ecol. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 19, §§ 13, 14; Ware, Tr. Bps. by Harris, 41; Stuart, Armagh, 94.)

(Ferdhunach, latised Ferdhinnachus, and phonetically contracted into Ferdhinnach, literally “churchman.”)

(1) Abbot of Tuam, died A.D. 782, and commemorated on October 10 (Mart. Doneg.). He is included among the bishops of Tuam. (Four. Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 777, i. 383; Ann. Ult. A.D. 781; Legian, Ecol. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 19, § 16.)


Ferdulcus, Duke of Friuli, in the beginning of the 8th century. He bribed the Slaves to invade his duchy, and was ultimately killed in fighting against them. (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 24.)


[F. J.]
FERFUGILL

FERFUGILL (YEARFOUMAILL, FERFUGILL), of Clondalkin, bishop, commemorated on March 10, is not found in the Mart. Doneg., but in Mart. Tallaght there is on this day "Firnaghil Eps." (Kelly, Col. Ir. Saints, xviii.) In his short memoir, Colgan (Acta SS. 577) states that he flourished after the middle of the 7th century, when having risen to the episcopal dignity, he governed the church of Clondalkin (now a parish and village in the baronies of Uppercros and Newcastle, co. Dublin), and that after a rule of many years, and the acquisition of a fame for sanctity, he died A.D. 783. Lanigan (Ecc. Hist. Ir. iii. 202) places his death in A.D. 783, but the true date is A.D. 789 (Ann. Uit. a.d. 789; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 784, i. 391).

[J. G.]

FERGEOLEUS, Jan. 12, bishop of Grattanepolis (Grenoble), and martyr in the 7th century. (Acta SS. Boll. Jan. 1, 749.) [G. T. S.]

FERGHUS (FERGHEUS, FERGHEAS, FERGUSS, FERGUSA), from 'fear' a man and 'gus,' strength or valour (Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 2 ser. 132). In Mart. Doneg. there are eleven dedications to saints of this name, and in Mart. Tallaght thirteen, called Ferghus, Fergus, and Fergusus, but of most of these, as usual, we know merely the feast. [FERGUS.]

(1) Of Drumlethglas, commemorated Mar. 30. He was son of Aengus, and descended from Caelibhath king of Ireland, (Four Mast.). Ware (Irish Bishops, by Harris, 194) places him second in the list of bishops at Down, but Lanigan (Ecc. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 12, § 1) and Reeves (Ecc. Ant. 42-44) consider him the first. His death is placed at different years in the Irish Annals from a.d. 557 to 589, but the true date is probably a.d. 584 (Ann. Tyn.). He appears to have been a distinguished person, for the fact of his having founded Cill-M-bian (a place now unknown) is mentioned, along with his death, in all the Annals. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 211.)

(2) Son of Cathal, a bishop, died A.D. 765 (Four Mast.), but his place in Ireland is unknown.

[J. G.]

FERGIL (1), the Geometer. [VIRGINILUS.]

(2) Ferghil of Cill-mor-Elimbere, now probably the church of Kilmore-Equilland, co. Armagh, died A.D. 770. (Ann. Uit. a.d. 789; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 795, i. 387, 388 n. 4.)

(3) Us Thadgh, scribe of Lusca, now Lusk, co. Dublin, died A.D. 800. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 795, i. 405; Ann. Uit. a.d. 799.) [J. G.]

FERGNA (FEARONA, FERBNAUS, VIRNOCS). These are some of the forms of a name which is found among the Scotch and Irish saints, and is etymologically the diminutive from the Irish "ferg," anger.

(1) Brit, fourth abbot of Iona, and bishop, commemorated on March 2. Of this person, Colgan (Acta SS. 448-50) gives a life which gathers up under eight heads the most of what is known or imagined about him. He was of noble Irish extraction, being son of Faillice, who was descended from Conall Gulban through his son Enna Bophaghe. He followed his relation, St. Columba, to Iona, and, as his disciple, so progressed in learning and virtue as to merit participation in a heavenly vision, as related by St. Adamnan (Vit. S. Columb. iii. c. 19). He became abbot of Iona, A.D. 605, on the death of St. Laisren (Ann. Tyn). In that office he continued till his death A.D. 623. A gloss on Mar. O'Gorman calls him a bishop, and this is followed in the entry of his death and feast in the Four Mast. (A.D. 622) and Mart. Doneg. (March 2), but the Ann. Inisfallen. (A.D. 616), Ann. Uit. (A.D. 622), Ann. Tigern. (A.D. 623), Mart. Tull. and Kal. Drum. merely call him abbot. Such an exceptional appointment as a bishop-abbot at Iona at that period, and especially when taken in connexion with the testimony of Bede (Ecc. Hist. iii. 4) that the abbot was always a priest, cannot be entertained by Dr. Reeves as other than a later fabrication. (Colgan, Tr. Tráthn. 370 n. 14, 481 n. 22; Lanigan, Ecc. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 14, § 12; Ussher, Ecc. Ant. vi. 245, Ind. Chron. A.D. 598, 623; Reeves, Adamnan. 223-24, 373, 463; Bolandists, Acta SS. Mar. 2, t. i. 125, placing him among their pretermissi: O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, iii. 41-2; C. Innes, Orig. Par. Soc. ii. pt. i. 287; Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, sc. ii. pt. i. 135; Skene, Celt. Soc. ii. 151 sq.; Bp. Forbes, Celt. Scot. Saints. 6, 199, 398; Kelly, Col. Ir. Saints, 81.)

(2) In his Vit. S. Columbae (iii. c. 23), St. Adamnan tells of a Feargna who retired from the monastery in Iona, and spent twelve years as an anchorite at Muirbulemar, on the island of Hinda, one of the Garveloch islands on the west of Scotland. He was at Cluain-Finchill in Ire and with Logaidh, when the death of St. Columba was revealed to the latter by a vision. It seems evident from Adamnan's narrative that this Fergus or Virgous could not have been the abbot of Iona, but only a hermit in the solitary island Eilean na Naomh, where the bee-hive cells of the recluses are still to be seen (Skene, Celt. Soc. ii. 131, 249; Reeves, Adamnan, 322 sq., Edinb. 1874.). [J. G.]

FERGUS (FERGUSIANUS) (1), bishop and confessor, has his legend given in the Breviary of Aberdeen (Prop. SS., pars aestiv. i. 103-64), but in the other older calendars is usually called Tergus and Tergusius. The truth of the legend seems wonderfully confirmed by the church dedications which mark his route, and appear to stamp the story as a genuine tradition. Probably of Irish birth, and after being many years in Ireland as a bishop, he came with a few presbyters and clerics to the western parts of Scotland, and settled for a time in Strathern, where he founded three churches, Stroeghan, Blackford, and Dolpatrick, all dedicated to St. Patrick. Thence he went north to Caithness (Cathania), where for some time he occupied himself in converting the barbarous people by his doctrine and by his life; there we find Wick and Halkirk dedicated to him. Passing southward again, he visited Buchan in Aberdeenshire, and built a basilica at a place called Lungley, now the parish of St. Fergus; Dyce in the same county was dedicated to him. Still southward, on the same coast, and beside Montrose in Forfarshire, a church was situated at the entrance of St. Fergus' Creek, and dedicated to St. Fergus. And at Glamis in the southwest of the same county the legend gives the place of his rest; this, the church of Glamans,
FERGUSUS

is dedicated to St. Fergus, and there are St. Fergus's cave and his well. A pious abbot of Scone is said to have carried off St. Fergus's head long after to the monastery of Scone, where it must have remained till the year 1503, when King James IV. had a silver case provided for it, and made his "offrand to Saint Fergus heide in Scone." The carrying the head to Scone might suggest a reason for the curious fact of a close connexion existing between the church of Caithness and the abbey of Scone, and of the abbot of Scone holding a prebend in the cathedral church of Caithness; but on the other hand we find offerings made from that county to "God and St. Michael" and to the canons remaining at Scone, without any reference to St. Fergus (C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. i. pt. i. p. xxiii. n. ii. pt. ii. 621-22). His festival is variously given from Nov. 15 to 18, and his time is uncertain. (Book of Deer, pp. iii.; C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. i. pp. xxiii. and Scot. Eart. Scot. Hist. 5, 71-2, 126, and al.; Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 163, 219, 243, 350-38; Ogilvie, Christ. in Buchan, 14-5, 34, 43-5; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 232-33; Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, &c., ii. pt. i. 7, 116, 141; Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 199.)


(4) [FERGUSUS.] [J. G.]

FERGUSUS, a bishop, but of what place is unknown. Along with "Seclitus Britanniae Episcopus de generi Scotorum," he signed the canons passed at the council held in Rome, under pope Gregory II. A.D. 721, as "Fergusus Episcopus" (Mansi, viii. 109). There was sufficient intercourse at that period between Rome and Britain to account for the appearance of a Pict from Ireland being found at the threshold of the church, but we have hardly sufficient material for otherwise identifying him or fixing his see if he had one. Dempster ascribes to him Commentariorum in Evangelium S. Matthiae, lib. i., and says Bale calls him Fergusus. [FERGUSUS (1)]. (Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, &c., ii. pt. i. 7, 116, 141; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 232; Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 337-38; Ussher, Ecol. Ant. i. 16, wks. vi. 331.) [J. G.]

FERMIERUS (popularly Frainge), ST. and confessor in Angoulême, and the isle of Gosin, in the department of La Vendée, commemorated Aug. 30. The Bollandists identify him with St. Fremerius, martyr in the diocese of Bazas. (Bell. Acta SS. Aug. vi. 842, Oct. i. 32.) [S. A. B.]


FERRANDUS, deacon of Carthage, disciple of Fulgentius of Ruspe. [FULGENTIUS (3)].

FERRANUS, "Episcopus Culdaeus in Scotia," is mentioned by the Scotch annalists, and placed by Dempster in the middle of the 8th century, but by Lesky in the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 4th. The former says he wrote Hermones psal. lib. I., and Camerarius places his feast on May 24. (Boetius, Hist. vi. f. 99; Dempster, Hist. Ecol. G. Scot. i. 292; Lesneus, de Rech. Gest. Scot. lib. iii. 117; Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 150; Tanner, Bib. 278; Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 257, 338.) [J. G.]

FERREOLUS (1), June 16, presbyter and martyr at Besançon. He suffered with Ferretus, a deacon. They are said to have been sent there by Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons. [Martyr. Hieron. 2. 2; Wandelberti (which place the commemoration on Sept. 5), Adonis, Bedae, Usuardi; Greg. Tuno. de Gior. Mort. c. 71; Gall. Christ. xv. 4; Tillemont, Mm. iii. 98; Surius, Vitae SS. t. ii. and t. vii.) A street in Besançon is called Rue des Martyrs, as being the traditional place of their sufferings. [G. T. S.]

FERREOLUS (2), Sept. 18, martyr at Vienne in Gaul, under Maximian, about A.D. 304. He was a military tribune when the persecution broke out. For a time he exercised great influence to protect Christians like St. Julianus, who had taken shelter with him. At last, seeing the speedy advent of the persecution, he advised them to fly, and prepared himself to meet the coming storm. The prefect, Crispinus, shortly afterwards called on him to sacrifice. Upon his refusal, he was tortured and imprisoned. In his Acts we read of a miraculous deliverance from the prison-house, which, however, admits of perfectly natural explanation, in the secret presence of many Christians among the officials. Being recaptured, he was put to death by beheading. [Martyr. Hieron. 2, ed. Adam, Usuard.; Greg. Tuno. Lib. de Mirac. Juv. et al. ep. ii.; Sidon. Apoll. lib. viii. ep. 1, md Mavroec, Venantius Fortunatus, lib. viii. narr. 4; Renuari, Acta Sinocra.) [G. T. S.]

FERREOLUS (3), ST., fifth bishop of Urra, succeeding his uncle St. Firmius, and followed by Albinus. He is said to have been born in the province of Narbonne, of noble parents named Ambertus and Bilthild, or Biltilis, A.D. 521. Among his ancestors he numbered the emperor Avitus and two prefects of Gaul, while on the mother's side he was a grandson of king Lothaire I. At the age of seven he was sent in company with his uncle St. Firmius, who was then only twelve years old, to Roricus, bishop of Uzes, and his great uncle, for instruction in letters and religion. At the age of thirty-two, upon the death of his uncle, he was consecrated to the see, A.D. 553. He is said to have striven earnestly for the conversion of the Jews, who were numerous in the province, mixing freely with them and inviting them to his table, so freely indeed, that his enemies accused him to king Childerich of plotting with them against the throne and country. He was summoned to the palace and sent into exile at Paris, where he remained three years, until the king, being convinced of his innocence, remitted him to his diocese with presents. On his return he convened a diocesan synod to discuss the means of converting all the Jews of the district. Many, it is said, became Christians, and the stubborn were compelled to labor on the earth or emigrate elsewhere. He died A.D. 581 (Gall-
FERROELUS, ST.

Christ. vi. 613), and is commemorated Jan. 4. Gregory of Tours says, "At this time died Ferreolus, bishop of Uzes, a man of great sanctity and full of wisdom and understanding, who, in imitation of it, was composed several books of letters" (Hist. Franc. vi. 7). According to the Charterae Fontamellesinae (Spicilegium, ii. 263), he suffered martyrdom. There is still extant a rule composed by him for a monastery, which he built at Uzes, and which was called after him. Before instituting it, he submitted it to the criticism of Lucretius, bishop of Die. (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxvi. 959; cf. Cailleret, Hist. des Auteurs sacrés xi. 312, for a short statement of it.) [S. A. B.]

FERREOLUS (4), ST., fourteenth bishop of Limoges, succeeding Exotius and followed by Asclepius. In the eighteenth year of his reign (A.D. 579), Chilperic I. laid very heavy taxes on his kingdom, which caused great distress and riots. At Limoges Marcus the royal commissioner was saved from the popular fury by the intervention of Ferreolus. The bishop rebuilt the church of Brive-Curetta (Brive-la-Gaillarde). In A.D. 585 he was present at the second council of Mâcon. He is said to have died A.D. 595. He is commemorated Sept. 18. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.v. 29, v1. 10; Mansi, ix. 957; Vita S. Areol, ss. 16, 17 in Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Brev. sacri i. 352; Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxvi. 1157, 1138; Gall. Christ. ii. 503.) [S. A. B.]

FERREOLUS (5), twenty-fourth bishop of Autun, succeeding Ischoo, and followed by St. Leger. His name occurs in the Gesta Dagoberti I. Regis, cap. xxxvii. (Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxvi. 1411), and in a charter of the same king in favour of the matriculari of the monastery of St. Denis (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxx. 535). He was present at the council of Cléons (cirk. A.D. 659), and died in 637. The see remained vacant for two years. (Mansi, n. x. 1193; Gall. Christ. iv. 348.) [S. A. B.]

FERREOLUS (6), ST., thirteenth bishop of Grenoble, succeeding Clarus, and followed by Boe, is said to have been martyred A.D. 683, but accounts differ as to the manner of his death. According to the Breviary of Vienne (Jan. 16), he was killed by a blow from a staff while preaching to the people of Grenoble. But Saussetus (Jan. 12) makes him one of the victims of Droit, mayor of the palace, by whom he was first driven from his see and afterwards murdered. (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. 1, 749; Gall. Christ. vii. 226.) [S. A. B.]

FERREOLUS (7). [ERNAN.]

FERROLIO, bishop of Osca (Huesca), in the province of Aragon, between A.D. 803–809. He is also called bishop of Aragon, and again "Episcopus in sancto Petro et in Iacca." Huesca was the metropolis, but being in the hands of the Moors, the bishop resided at Jacca till such time as Huesca could be recovered, when Jacca was to take the position of a suffragan see. (Ansay, Fundaciones de Huesca, p. 351; Gams, Series Episc. 36.) [L. D.]

FERROCINCTUS, one of the bishops who subscribed the third council of Paris (A.D. 557) without appealing his see. Le Coite conjectures him to have been the fifth bishop of Evreux, succeeding Licinius and followed by Victor. (Mansi, ix. 747; Le Coite, Ann. Eccl. Franc. an. 557, n. xxxvii. tom. i. 629; Gall. Christ. xi. 567.) [S. A. B.]

FERRUTIUS, martyr. [FERREOLUS (4).]

FERRUTIUS, Oct. 28, a military martyr at Mainz, probably about the year A.D. 296, when a considerable number of soldiers suffered. In Gaul, as in Africa, an idea seems to have just then got abroad among many, that the Roman military service was utterly unlawful for Christians. [FAHUS (2) VICTUS, FABUS (6).] Ferrutius having resigned his post was seized, imprisoned, and starred to death by his commanding officer. His memory is preserved for us in a sermon preached by Moginhard, a monk of Fulda, upon the translation of his relics to the newly-founded monastery of Bleidenstadt, three miles from Mainz, A.D. 850. A church had been previously dedicated to him by Rieculfe, archbishop of Mainz, A.D. 812. (Martyr. Rom.; Ceiller, xii. 523.) [G. T. S.]

FESTUS (1), Sept. 19, deacon of Beneventum, who, when visiting St. Januarius his bishop at Puteoli, where he had been arrested for the sake of Christ, was also seized by a magistrate named Timothy, cast to the beasts, and beheaded. He suffered under Diocletian and Maximian, A.D. 304. [JANUARIUS.] (Martyr. Rom. Vot., Adonis, Usuardi; Basil. Menod.) [G. T. S.]

FESTUS (2), bishop of Strategus, a town of unknown position in the ecclesiastical province of Hellas, supposed to be Strategus in Acraniam. He was one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Mansi, ii. 696; Le Quiné, Orac. Christ. ii. 222.) [L. D.]

FESTUS (3), a pupil of St. Basil, who addressed to him and Magnus (probably Festus's brother) a letter of earnest affection, requesting the young men how he had planted the seeds of piety in their hearts, had watered them with his prayers, and entertained good hope of their bringing forth worthy fruit. Basil testifies to the delight of imparting knowledge to those who will open their minds to receive it; and rejoices in the thought that, though separated from them, he can still instruct them by his letters, if only they will attend to his words. (Basil, Epist. 294 [210].) [E. V.]

FESTUS (4), a Christian in the imperial service, possessing authority, perhaps as a landed proprietor, over many persons in the province of Hippo Regius. In pursuance of the edict of Honorius, A.D. 405, he appears to have written letters with the view of reclaiming these persons from Donatism, but without success. St. Augustine wrote a letter to him describing the excesses and inconsistencies of the Donatists, and justifying the imperial proceedings against them, but recommended that instead of communicating directly with these persons, Festus should send out trustworthy agents who should confer with him in the first instance, and arrange the plan of operations for endeavouring to reclaim them (Aug. Ep. 89). [H. W. F.]
FESTUS

FESTUS (6), a Roman senator, and father of Elpis, reputed to have been the wife of Boethius. He is probably the same person who is coupled with Symmachus by Eunéus (Puran. Didasc.).

[S. M. Y.]

FESTUS (6), bishop of Satatins, in the province of Mauretania Stifensis; summoned to a conference at Cartaghe, and subsequently banished by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Notiss in Vict. St. Migne, Patrol. Lat. iv. viii. viiiii. iv. vii. l. 37. Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 271.)

[L. D.]

FESTUS (7), patriarch of Rome, employed by king Theodoric on an embassy to the emperor Anastasius II. He was elected pope, A.D. 496. He was mixed up in the attempts to heal the breaches of the churches. He was addressed by the apostriarius of the church of Alexandria at Constantinople, requesting communion with the Roman see. When pope Anastasius died, A.D. 498, Festus returned to Rome, having made a secret arrangement with the emperor Anastasius that the bishop of Rome should subscribe the Henoticon. On his arrival he found that Symmachus was chosen to succeed Anastasius II, and in order to fulfil his engagement he procured the election and consecration of Laurentius, and got up an accusation against Symmachus. Theodoric, however, determined in the favour of Symmachus, and the schism was healed by Laurentius's acceptance of the bishopric of Nocera. (Mansi, viii. 194, 246;CELLIER, Ant. Sacr. x. 519, 521.)

[L. D.]

FESTUS (8) (Fuscus), bishop of Capua, who complained to Gregory the Great that he was despised by the clergy and citizens of Capua. He died before Gregory, who, after the death of Festus, ordered the restitution of a sum of money which he had unwisely taken from his archdeacon. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. iii. ind. xi. epist. 34 in Migne. lxxvii. 631; lib. v. ind. xii. epist. 13, 14 in Migne, 734; lib. v. ind. xii. epist. 33 in Migne, 759.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FESTUS (9), bishop of Merida, from about 672 to about 690. He is known to us only from the speech of Egica (687-701) annexed to the acts of the sixteenth Council of Toledo [EGIC]. From this we learn that at the beginning of Wamba's reign "Theudemund Spuriarius noster" [THEUDEMUND], was, at the instance of Festus, then bishop of Merida, degraded by Wamba from the noble class and obliged to fill the office and perform the duties of numerarius at Merida. What was the reason of Festus's appeal to the king and what part exactly the bishop played in the transaction is far from clear. It is a curious instance of the infraction of a purely secular punishment by ecclesiastical means. (Exp. Sacr. ii. 218; Tejada y Ramiro, Coll. de Can. de la Ig. Esp. ii. 594.)

[M. A. W.]

FESTUS (10), Dec. 21, martyr in Tuscany, with a companion named John. (Martyr. Rom. Vet. Hieron., Adonis, Ueuardor; Ferrarius, Cat. SS.)

[G. T. S.]

FETHAIH (Fethaidh) is commemorated on March 31 in the Irish Martyrologies and Colgan (Acta SS. 798) has a short notice of Fethaidh, whom he seeks to identify with Feadhach, son of Cormac, abbot of Louth, Slaine, and Duleek, who died in A.D. 789, but the identification is no more than conjecture.

[Colgan i. 190, 191.]

FETHCHU (Fedchun, Fedchicho, Fethnú) At July 6 and 23 in Mart. Doneg. there are commemorated Fedchhu, of Uamadh Fhui, and Fethchu; in Mart. Tallaght they are Fedchhui or Fedchhoinid and bishop Fethnu. Colgan at March 12 (Acta SS. 588) gives a remembrance of Fedchhu to whom the Feadhach of Feadhach Feadhach. Hence Fedchhu is identifies with Fechino or Fethan companion of St. Columba. [Fechno.]

[J. G.]

FFAGAN (Stubbis, Reg. Sac. 154), legendary British bishop. [Fagan.]

FFILIL, ST., a Welsh saint, to whom Rhos Filili or Rhos Sili in Gower is dedicated. He is placed by Rees among the saints who resided between A.D. 566 and 600. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 277.)

[C. W. B.]

FFFFINAN, ST., an Irish saint, to whom Llanfanin in Anglesey is dedicated. There is also an Irish saint called Ffinian, who is said to have visited St. David at Meneris, about 590, and to have built three churches. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 238; Haddon and Statham, 168.)

[C. W. B.]

FFLEWYN. [Flewyn.]

FFOMREU, abbot of St. Illtyd, or Llantwit Major, Glamorganshire, witness to the deed of restoration of Abermell to king Ithael to bishop Berthgwyn of Llandaff, in the latter part of the sixth or early in the seventh century. (Lb. Land. by Rees, 429.)

[J. G.]

FFRAID. [Fraid.]

FIACC (Fieich, Fieichun), bishop of Sleibhte (now Sletty), commemorated October 12. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Oct. vi. 96-106, and Suppl. tom. 119-121) have compiled a memoir, which contains almost everything known about him, and the date they assign is "sub sanctu. V., ut sup. ant.," i.e. "We are told in the Assisi. Ttrockan that St. Patrick conferred the orders of bishop upon him, so that he was the first bishop that was ordained among the Lagenesians, and St. Patrick gave a "Cunntach" or box to St. Fiacce, containing a bell, a "menster" or reliquary, a crozier, and a "poolle" or book satchel. He also left seven of his people with him (Fetrie, Round Towers of Ireland, 338; Wilson, Preflat. Annals, 657). But in teaching the faith, St. Fiacce is often styled not merely bishop, but archbishop of Leinster: thus the ancient Scholast upon The Hymn of St. Fiacce in Praise of St. Patrick (Colgan, Tr. Thaug. n. 11) states the fact of his consecration as bishop, and then adds "tandem Lageniae Archiepiscopus instituit; quo etiam munere ejus Comorombii sive successoribus abinde funguntur." (See also Colgan, Tr. Thaug. 8 n. 1, 285, col. 1, and Acta SS. 217 n. 29; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. 574, 278.) But this notion has arisen from a misinterpretation by Colgan of the title applied to St. Fiacce by the Scholast, and the adoption of a false local designation which was not used in Ireland till the 12th century. The word in the original Irish of the Scholast is Ape-Eprcoba, but
FIACCHINA, a diminutive of Fisch, a raven.

(1) It is a name which we find in the Irish Kalendars on March 30 and April 29, but without any distinct identification. The Scholia on the Feílire of Aenghus the Culdeis calls the latter "monk of Mochuda" (Marti. Doney. by Todd and Reeves, 114 n. 3, 115), and O'Corry (ib. 91) thinks it probable that either one or other of the two Fischnas may be the person of whom Cuimín of Condeir gave the character, that he never pronounced a bad word, but always a word pleasing to God, and of whom he further suggests that he was, perhaps, of the race of Englan, son of Niall.


(3) Companion of Columba. [Fechino.]

J. G.

FIACHRA (FIACHRUS, gen. from FIACHRACH), (1) abbot of Conaval and Clonard, was widely venerated throughout Ireland on Feb. 6. He had dedications in the county of Kilkenny. In The F一般是 of Aengus, he is praised as "Fischra—a manly man, the noble abbot of Iarad," and he gave the riticium to St. Comgall, of Bangor (Comgall (11)). He flourished in the beginning of the seventh century. (Colgan, Acts SS. 406 c. 5, Mart. Doney. by Todd and Reeves, 43; Kelly, Cat. Ir. Saints, ix.; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 412; O'Connor, Rev. Hibern. Scrip. iv. 184; Ust. Journ. Arch. ii. 214-15; Reeves, Adamnan, 317; Fleming, Coll. Sacr. 312-313.)

(2) Son of Fothadh, abbot of Baslick, near Ballinotober, county Roscommon, died A.D. 759. (Four Mast.)

FIACHRAIDH (FIACHRA), son of Fisch, is commemorated in the Irish Martyrology, and in the Scotto-Irish Kalendur of Drummond Missal on October 12, and specially called the son of St. Fisch. He was born probably before St. Fisch met with St. Patrick, and was presented to the episcopate; but beyond his being commemorated at Sletty, where it is likely that he lived with his father, we know nothing more of his history. [Fiac.] (Marti. Doney. by Todd and Reeves, 273; Kelly, Cat. Ir. Saints, xxxiv.; Colgan, Tr. Tham. 182 n. 264; Bp. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 26.)

FIACRIUS, sometimes FEPHUS, Fr. Fisch. (Probably Irish-Gaelic Fischara [gen. Fischraoch] from Fisch a raven, and -ru or -raidh, a collective suffix. Fisch also signifies value, worth, &c.)

Fiacrus, a saint of Gaul, was almost certainly by birth an Irish Celt. Hector Boece, indeed, (Hist. of Scotland, ix. 19), claims him as a fellow-countryman, saying that he was a younger son of Eugenius IV. king of Scotland, who withdrew from his father's court out of desire for an ascetic life; but it is far more probable that he was one of the great body of Irishmen who in the 6th and 7th centuries were driven by an impulse of missionary zeal to visit the continent of Europe [Missions, in Dictionary of Christian Antiquity, p. 1908]. Early in the 7th century
The authorities for the life of St. Fiacre are found in Surius, viii. 745, ed. Turin, 1877; in Mabillon, Acta SS. Renect. spec. ii. p. 596 ff.; and in the Bollandist Acta SS. Aug. 30, vol. vi. p. 604 ff. with the Comment. Provinc. of Stilling. There is a Histoire de Saint-Fiacre by J.J. Anser, Paris, 1782, which the writer has not seen. See also Hardy, Cat. Mat. i. 272–274.

FIANA, in an Irish Life of St. Barry of Cork, is represented as belonging to a female school which that saint had at Loch Inre, and as giving the last sacrament to him at Cloyn before his death (Caufield, Life of St. Fin Barre, v.)


FIANCHU, abbot of Lughmada, now Loch, died a.D. 770 (Four Mast.), or abbot of Lauges, now Luane, co. Meath, died a.D. 774 (Ann. Uit.); evidently both belong to the same individual.

FIANAGALCH, son of Annmadch, son of Macelmarach, abbot of Inisbofn in Loch Ree, co. Longford, died a.D. 750 (Four Mast.).

FIANGUS, abbot of Roscrea, in the barony of Ikerrin, co. Tipperary, died a.D. 805 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, a.D. 800, i. 411.) [J. G.]


FIARI, bishop of Agen. [FOEADARUS]

FIARMUS, bishop of Viscn. [PIRAS (12)]


FIDELIS (1), April 21, martyr in the Diocletian persecution, at Edessa with his mother Bassa and his brothers Theogonus and Agapius. Encouraged by the exhortations of Bassa her sons suffered first, and then she also was beheaded. (Martyr. Rom. ed. Baron.) [G. T. S.]


FIDELIS (3), wife of Pneumatis, and addressed with him in a consolatory poem of considerable length by Paulinus of Nola on the death of her son Celsus. The poem is chiefly on the resurrection of the dead. (Migne, P.L. lxi. 698.) [L. D.]

FIDELIS (4), companion of St. Teil from Armorica in the 6th century, and included among
FIDELIS

the clerical witnesses to grants of land to St. Teilo. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 253; Lib. Landav. by Res, 551-55, 365-67; Ussher, Brit. Eccl. Ant. vi. 80.)

FIDELIS (B), ST., priest, abbat. [FIDELIS.

FIDELIS (B), ST., commonly accepted as bishop of Merida before Masona (who presided at C. Tol. iii. in 589), and placed therefore by Florez between 560 and 571. His life rests entirely upon the testimony of the not very satisfactory pieces of writing known as the Opus. de Vita et Miraculis Patrum Eneri-
tesium, and attributed in the MSS. to a certain Paulus Diaconus (not to be confounded of course with his famous namesake of Lombard memory).

Fidelis, according to this life, was the successor and adopted son of Paulus bishop of Merida. A company of Greek merchants visiting Merida were entertained by the bishop, and in return sent him a present by the hands of a boy whom they had brought with them as a servant. The bishop was struck with the boy, asked him his name and history, and discovered that he was his own sister's son. He immediately claimed him from the merchants, sent a message through them to his sister, and thenceforth the boy was brought up at Merida. He was, of course, dedicated to the church, and made a deacon in due time. Paulus in his old age took a strange and unnatural step with regard to Fidelis. "Hume sibi successorem elegit, moxque etiam in loco suo se vivente ordinavit, et omnium honorum suorum haeredem instituit," coupling the legacy with the condition that, if after the death of Paul, the clergy of Merida confirmed the appoin-
tment of Fidelis, the money should pass at Fidelis's death to the see of Merida; if they did not confirm it, because of those "insidias facibus successus," the money was to remain at Fidelis's absolute disposal.

After Paul's death, what he had foreseen happened. "Quidam pestiferi homines" began to make objections to Fidelis's appointment. The legal, however, of the alienation of Paul's property from the church finally silenced all opposition, and the objectors, "plus invitii licet quam sponte se pedibus ejus prostraverunt." Thus it came about that the church of Merida became equal if not superior in riches to any in Spain. The principal events of Fidelis's pontificate—leaving the miracles out of account—appear to have been the rebuilding of the episcopal palace (atrium), and the restoration of the church of St. Eulalia. The old palace fell just after the bishop and all his clergy had quitted it on their way to Mass. The new house was made far more splendid than the old. Its pavement and walls were adorned with shining marbles. Afterwards the church of St. Eulalia (see Prudentius's famous description of its architecture in the 4th century, Peristeph. Hymn 3) was restored in a wonderful manner, and high towers were added to it. At last, after many marvellous appearances of saints and angels, Paul was warned by a vision, seen not by himself but by a certain religious man of the town, of his approaching death. Like St. Fructuosus and St. Isidore, he had himself carried into the church, and there distributed large sums to the poor, remitting, moreover, all debts owing to him, and returning the chirographa and cautions he had received on account of them. He died in the church, and was buried with his predecessor.

Seven churches are named as existing in or close to Merida in the life of Fidelis, and are vaguely mentioned under the general title of basilicae martyrum. In the early part of the document, of which this life forms a part, we read of more than one monastery in the immediate neighbourhood of Merida, so that the impression left on the mind is one of the great ecclesiastical importance of the city. No such impression remains to us as to the ecclesiastical state of any other Spanish town under the Goths. (Esp. Sylag. xii. 176, 350; Gams, Kirchenj. von Spanien, ii. i. 425; Bolland. A.A. SS. Feb. 1.)

FIDELIS (T), according to the list of Mue-
lin's Hetvica Sacra (l. viii.), eleventh bishop of Constance, elected a.D. 681 on the death of Ganguphus, and followed by Theobald. His name is omitted from the list of the Gallia Christiana (v. 893).

FIDELIS (S), an abbat living in Asturias, addressed by Elibandus in a letter, a.D. 785. Beatus, a monk of Asturias, together with Etherius, afterwards bishop of Oviedo, had exerted themselves with success in combating the Adoptionist views, whereupon Elibandus, archbishop of Toledo, wrote an angry letter to Fidelis, wherein he says "that those who do not confess that Jesus Christ is the adoptive Son according to His humanity, but not according to His divinity, are heretics," and, remarking on the youthfulness of Etherius, compares Beatus to Bonosus the Pho-
tinian, and Faustus the Manichee, and finally im-
plores Fidelis to root out the Beatian heresy. In the second book of his answer Beatus calls Fidelis "frater," so that though Elibandus wrote to him as if he was an Adoptionist, he really held the true faith; he is said to have shown the letter to no other persons besides Beatus and Etherius. (Prober, Acad. ii. 587, 601, 985; Collieri, Ant. Sacr. xii. 214.)


FIDENSIUS (1), Sept. 27, martyr under Dio-

cletian and Maximian, A.D. 304, at Tuderatum, in Umbria. They are said to have been born in Cappadocia, whence they came to Rome, where they were converted. Upon the outbreak of persecution the bishop was arrested, tried, and delivered to the commander of the first cohort for execution. The rest of their story is distorted with legendary miracles. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.; Ferrarius, Catal. Sanctorum; Bell. Acta SS. Sept. vii. 479-481.)

FIDENSIUS (2), bishop and martyr with twenty others, most probably in the Diocletian persecution. He is, perhaps, the same as Fiden-
tianus, commemorated Nov. 15, in the Rom. Martyr. Baronius would identify them with twenty martyrs who suffered at Tarsus, in

FIDENTIUS

511
FIDENTIUS (3), one of the Donatist bishops who petitioned Constantine that some Gallic bishops should be appointed as judges in the case of Cæcilianus. (Ulp. i. 22.)

FIDENTIUS (4), bishop of Cefaia, in the proconsular province of Africa; present at the conference between the Catholics and Arians, A.D. 411, where he declared that in his diocese there was no rival Donatist bishop; for, as Valentinian, the deacon of the Donatist archbishop Primianus, added, one of the same name as the Catholic bishop, had lately died in that see. (Mansi, iv. 110, 266; Morello, Africa Christ. i. 133; Mon. Vet. Dom. i. 413, ed. Oeberthür.)

FIDENTIUS (8), bishop of Diana (Zanah), a town in the interior of Numidia, north-west of Lambes in (Ant. Itin. 34, 3), at Carta in (Ant. Itin. 11, ed. Oeberthür.)

FIDENTIUS (9), Donatist bishop of Culfita, perhaps Chullu (id Quoll), on the sea-coast of Numidia, present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. Dom. i. 445, ed. Oeberthür.)

FIDENTIUS (7), bishop of Tucci (Martos), one of the suffragans of Seville, from about 610 to about 633. His signature appears among those of the second council of Seville (919), at which Isidore and Fulgentius were present, and in 633 his vicar, Centarius, signs for him at the fourth council of Toledo in the first place among the vicars, as representing the senior bishop of those unable to attend personally. (Exp. Sogir. xii. 389; Aguirre-Catalan, iii. 355-385.)

FIDENTIUS (8), with the consent of the duke of Friuli, founded an episcopal see for himself at Castrum Julianum (Julia Carnica, now destroyed), c. 725, and was followed in the see by Amator. (Paulus Diaconus, v. 51.)

FIDENTIUS (9). In the preface to the work of St. Agobard against the Adoptist opinions and writings of Felix of Urgel, which was composed A.D. 818, the author states that his own work is really a summary of the writings of others on the same point, amongst whom he mentions Fidentius, an ecclesiastical writer otherwise unknown. (Hist. Litt. de la France, iv. 572.)

FIDES (1), Ang. 1 (Usuardus et Rom. Mart.), June 23 (Nocerius), Sept. 16 (Bon. Hila. Symeon Metaphrastes); martyr with her mother, Sophia, and her sisters, Spe and Charitas. (Carit.)

FIDES (2) (St. Faith), Oct. 6; virgin and martyr at Agen in Aquitaine, in the Diocletian persecution, under the president Dacian, 304. Her example encouraged St. Caprasius to endure martyrdom. (Caphasius.) (Mart. Rom., Hieron., Adonis, Usuard, Notker, Rabani; Tillemont, iv. 543, 735; D. J. Solesmes, vii.) Her name of Faith was attached to seventeen churches in England besides the crypt of old St. Paul’s. In art she is represented with a bundle of rods or a brazen bed in her hands. (J. H. Parker, Cat. of Angl. Ch. 121.)

FIDHAIRLE Ua Suasnaigh, abbot of Rathain (now Rahin), commemorated Oct. 1. After the expulsion of St. Carthach Machuda (May 14) from Rathain or Rathin near Tullamore in the King's County, about A.D. 530, the place fell nearly out of sight till Fidhairle Ua Suasnaigh founds it anew, and becomes its patron. He was brother of Fidhmune Ua Suasnaigh and Fidhghus Ua Suasnaigh; also eterne brother of Dichitheas O'Triallagh, of Aedhain of Cloghoggill, and of Colman Ua Finnchach of Templeshannon (p. r.). He died A.D. 763 (Ann. Tigernach), and is said by Mac Fheargais to have had a church at Rinnale, co. Cork. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 758, l. 361) (Cromer, Iter Hibern. Scriptior. ii. 250, iv. 99; Butler, Lives of the Saints, Oct. 1; Mart. Doneg., by Todd and Reeves, 205.) [FIDHMUNAINE.]

FIDHBHADHACH (1), abbot of Bagen, died A.D. 767 (Four Mast. A.D. 762; Ann. Uí Mh. A.D. 768.)

FIDHBHADHACH (2), of Cill-Delge, son of Kildalkey, co. Meath, died A.D. 753. (Four Mast.)

FIDHMUNAINE (Fionngh, Fionnch). Ua Suasnaigh of Raithin (now Rahin), commemorated on May 16. With Fidhairle and Fidghus his brothers, he was son of Fidhbhanach, son of Codinillig, descended from Fiscura, son of Echaidh Mischmarthe, his mother being Fanamhla or Ferbla, daughter of Dinn Dubh, of the same house. Fidhmune died, according to the accurate entry in the Ann. Tigernach, in A.D. 757. The Ann. Clogomnae add slightly to our information: "A.D. 751, Luanaus alias Fionnch O'Suasnae of Rahin, died." He was interred at Rahin near Tullamore in the King's County, and is also designated by O'Clery (who lower
FIIDOLUS, a bishop of Rennes. [Februarius.]

FIIDOLUS (popularly FAUL of FAILELE), B.T., priest and abbot at or near Troyes in the 6th century, was born of noble parents in the city of Clermont. From his early years he seemed marked out for the service of God, and in due time entered the ranks of the clergy. In an expedition of king Theoderic against his native city he was taken prisoner with many others. As his captors were returning with him through the territory of Troyes, they were met by Aventinus, the abbot of a monastery at or near that city, who had been warned in a vision to ransom Fidolus, and adopt him into his community. Twelve pieces of gold was the sum demanded and paid. By his diligence and obedience in the monastery, Fidolus strove to repay the debt. At time went on he was chosen first to be prior, and then upon the death of Aventinus, abbot of the foundation. In this office he was remarkable for his meekness and austerity, and his preeminent sanctity was attested by numerous miracles. He is commemorated May 16. This account is from a meagre life, first published by Camusat, and afterwards more correctly by the Belgianists. The authors of the Histoire Litéraire de la France adjudge it from its style to the close of the 6th century, forty or fifty years after the saint's death. Another life is to be found in Mabillon's Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti evi
dently of a later date, which simplifies the former only to make it incorrect, as, for instance, where it treats as contemporary Theoderic, the brother of Theodebert, who was reigning in A.D. 596, and Camelius, the bishop of Troyes who was pre
t at the first council of Orleans in 511. Who the Theoderic of the earlier life may have been, is not clear, but probably he was the eldest son of Clotilda, in which case the expedition will be explained as having taken place in A.D. 507. [Cf. Gest. ii. 17, or iii. 14, 15. The site of Fidolus' monastery is also doubtful, some placing it at a little town called Insula on the Seine, about two leagues from Troyes, others within the walls of Troyes, and others again in the suburbs of that city, where afterwards a church in honour of St. Aventinus was built. (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. iii. 588; Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti. i. 196, Venice, 1733; Bouquet, Recueil des Historiens, iii. 406; Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 415, 416; Gall. Christ. xii. 531.) [S. A. B.]

FIIDUS (2), African bishop, applied to Cyprian and Council, (1) to complain of bishop Therapius having resented to lay communion a lapsed presbyter, Victor, before due and sufficient penance. (2) To state, and to ask for an affirmation of, his opinion that infants ought not to be baptized within two or three days of their birth, alleging both the law of circumcison, and stating that it was repugnant to the feelings to give the kiss of peace to a newborn child. Cyprian replies to Fidus for the council (3rd Carth. A.D. 250), (1) censuring, but declining to reverse the action of Therapius; (2) disagreeing with Fidus, both as
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to the law and the sentiment. (Cyp. Ep. 11v.) The Epistle very useful to Augustine in his controversy with Pelagians. [E. W. B.]

FIIDUS, bishop of Joppa, one of the fourteen bishops who took part in the synod summoned by Eugubius, metropolitan of Caesarea, at Diospolis, A.D. 416, stigmatized by Jerome as "a miserable little synod," in which Pelagius was acquitted of heresy (Labe, Concil. ii. 553; August. contr. Julian. c. 5). We find Fidus afterwards at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, at which he warmly espoused the cause of Cyril, whose letter against Nestorius he declared to be such as might have been written by the Holy Spirit Himself (Labe, Concil. iii. 468), while that of Nestorius was far removed from the truth, and approached very near the evil doctrine of Paul of Samosata (ibid. 477). He signed the sentence of deposition against Nestorius (ibid. 540), and the anathema against any who should compose another creed (ibid. 585). Fidus visited the celebrated solitary, St. Simeon Stylites, at his laura, in company with his nephew Fidus, afterwards bishop of Dor, and Anastasia, afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem. (Cyrill. Sce
thop. Vita S. Euthymii. c. 60.) [E. V.]

FIIDUS (3), bishop of Dor in Palaestina Prima, nephew of the preceding. He, while still a lector, accompanied his uncle, the bishop of Joppa, and Anastasia, on a visit to St. Euthymius (Cyrill. Sceythop. Vita S. Euthymii. c. 60). He was ordained deacon by Anastasius immedi
dately after he became bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 458, was despatched to Euthymius to request him to allow him to visit him, and shew the truth of his prophecies of his elevation to the episcopate (ibid. 96). [ANASTASIBUS.] On the death of Euthymius he accompanied An
tastia, as his deacon, and his obsequies, and was left by him at the laura to erect a suit
table tomb (ibid. 110, 111). Having been des
patched by Martyrius, bishop of Jerusalem, to Constantinople with letters to the emperor Zeno and the bishop Acacius relative to the Apoclis
tae, on his voyage out he was shipwrecked at midnight, and almost perishing himself of the cold, he saw a vision of Euthymius, who told him that the journey he proposed would bring no advan
tage to the church, and that he was to return home, and assure Martyrius that the schismatics would soon return to the unity of the church. He also commissioned Fidus to convert his laura into a cenobium, to be erected around his sepulchre (ibid. 113-115). In obedience to the vision, with the sanction and aid of the patriarch, he pulled down the scattered cells and erected a monastery, of which Cyril gives a lengthened description (ibid. 116-121), which was dedicated with great pomp by Martyrius, A.D. 494 (ibid. 122). In that or the following year, Fidus became bishop of Dor (ibid.). Nothing more is known of him. He died before A.D. 518. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 575.) [E. V.]

FIGULUS, an ecclesiastical writer, known only from the citations by Smaragdus abbot of Saint Mihel (9th century) in his sermons on the Epistles and Gospels for the year, which are abridgments of the writings of twenty fathers of the church. Between Isidore of Seville and Bede he places Figulus; perhaps the name is corrupted.
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FILACRIUS

(Hist. Litt. de la France, iv. 444; Cellier, Ant. Sacr. xii. 256.)

[F. D.]

FILACRIUS (Hilarus), bishop of Novara, 552. For his tombstone and epitaph, see Cappelletti. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xiv. 447; Ugheili, Itali. Sacr. iv. 683.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FIBLBTH, bishop of London. [Eadberht.]

FILEAS (Usuard. Mart. Feb. 4), bishop of Thmus. [Fileas.]

[F. H.]


[H. W. P.]

FILLANUS, fifth bishop of Soissons. (Gall. Christ. ix. 332.)

[R. T. S.]

FILLABRIUS, bishop, who subscribed the third council of Arles in 461. (Isid. Mer. in Pat. Lat. xxx. 382.)

[C. H.]

FILIBERTUS (Aelein, Carm. 76, Opp. ii. 213, ed. Froben), abbot and founder of the monastery of Jumièges. [Philibertus.]

[C. H.]

FILIMIRUS (Filimirus), bishop of Lamego in Lusitania, signing the acts of the eighth council of Toledo in 653, and of the tenth in 656. (Eos. Supr. xiv. 158; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 448, iv. 136.)

[M. A. W.]

FILLAN, with Felan, Filan, and Phillan, seems to be the Scotch form of the Irish Fælan, and the person so named at Strathfillan was no doubt an Irishman, yet as his legend is purely Scotch, and his name of St. Fillan is associated with a memorable epoch in Scotch history, it seems best to treat him under this designation. For the sake of clearness, however, it may be mentioned that two Irish saints of the same name had their churches in Perthshire, viz.: Fælan Amblachan of Ruthern (June 20), whose dedication is at St. Fillan's in the parish of Comrie, at the east end of Loch Earn, [Fælan, (1)], and Fælan Macogna or Moescena who is the present St. Fillan of St. Fillan's in the quondam sacra parish of Strathfillan, which was the site of the extensive parish of Kilfin. His legend is given in Breo. Aberdon. (Prop. SS. paras hyem. f. xxvi–vii., and quoted at length by Bishop Forbes (Kol. Scott. Saints, 342–43). The Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. 9, tom. i. 594–95) have a notice, "De S. Filiano sive Feliano Abbate in Scoti," mostly taken from Camerarius and Boethius, with the Chron. Pasch. and Breo. Aberd. Colgan (Acta SS. 49) has a memoir similarly compiled; so also Baring-Gould (Lives of the Saints, Jan. 9, i. 127–28); and O'Hanlon (Irish Saints, i. 134–44) devotes to his Life an article of three chapters, and treats it with great fulness and lucidity. Fillan was a son of Ferdalach, or Feristh, of the race of Fiantach Finn, by Kientgerma, daughter of Cellach Cualanna, king of Leinster. The date of Fillan is very doubtful, as his legend is evidently full of anachronisms, introduced in order to magnify the saint. The Bollandists follow Camerarius in placing him in the 7th century, and Colgan suggests the beginning of the 9th, but the middle of the 8th seems the most probable date for his death. His chief dedications were at Killin and Strathfillan, where his memory was cherished and miraculous gifts zealously resorted to, specially in mental diseases, till even a late date (Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot. new ser. i. 259 sq.). His cave is shewn at Pitenweem, Fifeshire; his name is found corrupted in Killinna, near Loch-alsh, in Ross-shire, and Killalian, an old parish in Renfrewshire; and his wells in other places may mark dedications. (For his dedications, see Bp. Forbes, Kol. Scott. Saints, 344–46; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 139.) There are three of St. Fillan's relics of special interest, viz. his arm, bells, and crozier. (a) The estimation in which St. Fillan was held in Scotland was greatly enhanced by the part he was supposed to take in procuring for the Scots the victory at Bannockburn, and he and his arm having been specially venerated before the battle, as related in Bellenden's Boece, ii. 380 sq., and as attested by the subsequent gifts to St. Fillan at the priory built and dedicated to St. Fillan at Strathfillan (Uelt. Journ. Arch. ii. 213–4; Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot. xii. 122 sq.). (b) The Cogygerach, Quigmach, Quirich, or Pastoral Staff of St. Fillan, which was carefully preserved till a recent date at Killin in the custody of the hereditary keepers named Dewar, who had it by regular descent, and who carried it with them to Canada, has been brought back to Scotland, and was presented to the National Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland on March 22, 1877, when the late Dr. John Stuart, secretary of the society, read a long, learned, and very interesting paper on St. Fillan's crozier and on his name and legend generally. (For the Cogygerach, see Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot. ii. 12–5, iii. pt. ii. 235–43, xii. 121, 122 sq.; Spald. T. Miscell. iii. pp. xxii. 237; Wilson, Proc. Antiq. Scot. 664–65; Reeves, Adsuman, 366–97; Archael. Scot. iii. 289; C. Innes, Scot. Antiq. Scot. Hist. 389–94; 623–24; Black Book of Foymond, xxxvii–vii.; Chambers, Encyclopaedia, iv. 324–25, and Book of Days, i. 72–3; Rev. Proc. Antiq. Scot. xvii. 377–78; Wilson, Proc. Antiq. Scot. 345–46, 662–63.)

[F. E.]

FILLEUL, bishop of Rouen. [Flavius (6)].

FILIMIRUS, bishop of Lamego. [Filimirus].

FILOCALUS, FURIOUS DIONYSUS, calligrapher to pope Damasus. The Damasian inscriptions in the catacombs are formed in letters of peculiar beauty, so that a fragment belonging to one of them can be easily recognized (see Vol. I. p. 784). What is known as the Liberian catalogue of the popes formed part of a collection made in the year 354, the ornamented title-page of which bore the inscription "Furio Dionysius Filocalus titularis." Mommese
(Über den Chronographen vom Jahre 354; Mund:undungen der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft, i. 585) identified the writer with the artist of a Danasine fragment preserved at the Vatican, "Scribit Furius Dion." All possibility of doubt was removed in 1856 by the discovery (De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, i. 116) of the epitaph of pope Eusebius, ending—

Scribit Furius Dionysius Filocalus,
Damasus [Damasi sul, De Rossi] pappos cultor atque amator.

De Rossi gives the name Filocalian to the collection just mentioned, objecting to Mommsen's designation by the year 354 on the ground that what was done in that year was in substance the reproduction of a work made twenty years previously. [See Chronicon Hibern.] [G. S.]


FILTERIUS, a Gallic bishop (see unknown), is one of those to whom the letter of pope Celestian on behalf of Prosper and Hilary, is addressed. (Collari, Act. Soc. x. 277.) [T. S.]

FILTIOSUS, bishop of Agger in the Byzacene province of Africa, one of the Catholic bishops summoned to Carthage for a conference with the heretics by the Vandals king Hunneric, and subsequently banished a.d. 484. He is identified by some with Fusculus, one of the bishops who were severely beaten by Hunneric before their banishment. (Victor Vit. de Pers. Vandal. ii. 21; Nat. ad. 57; Migne, Patrol. Lat. viii.; Novell, Afric. Christ. i. 72.) [L. D.]

FILUMENUS, a Donatist, perhaps a bishop, who, after the decision of the Roman Court of Inquiry in favour of Caecilius, requested the emperor that he should be detained, for peace' sake, at Brescia, while Eunomius and Olympos were despatched to Africa to ascertain the true position of the rival parties. (Vol. i. 368; Opt. i. 25.) [H. W. P.]

FIMOYNE. [FIDHMUN.] FINAN, FINNNAN. This name assumes a vast variety of forms, and, being radically the diminutive of Finau (white), is the Irish equivalent of the Latin albus. It is found as Finan, Fianan, Fidann, Finna, Finian, Finnian, Fidiane, either simply or with a Latin termination; there also is Finnao, Fianio, and Vinianus, to which the Scotch add Wynnain, the Italian Fidiana and Frigidian, and the Irish Findbarr or Findbairn. It was a favourite name in Irish Monasticism. [FINNAN, FRIDYAN, and WYNN.]

(1) Son of Ermann, is commemorated in the Irish Kalendars on Feb. 12, having died a.d. 676 (Ann. Tigi). O'Conor (Rec. Hdb. Scriptor. iv. 80 n. 9) seeks to identify him with that St. Finnan, the "soldier of Christ," who, after being present at the battle of Drum-ceatt, a.d. 563, "blameless in the life of an anchorite for many years," was near Dunker, and survived to tell St. Adamnan (St. Columb. i. c. 49) the events of the battle. But evidently the dates will not admit of this, and Dr. Reeves (Adamnan, 96) seems to prefer Colgan's suggestion (Tr. Thunm. 380 n. 103) that the anchorite was Finan Lobhar. (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 505; Mart. Doney. by Told and Reeves, 47; Kelly, Cat. Ir. Saints, etc.; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 284 n. 1.)

(2) Son of Ferga, Oct. 4, disciple of St. Finian of Clonengag. (Colgan, Acta SS. 352, c. 19; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 518, 588.)

(3) Son of Pipan, of Rath, commemorated Nov. 25. He was son of Pipan, son of Amadhaig, of the race of Coen Gulban; he thus was brother of St. Faibbe (Mar. 22), who died a.d. 679, the eighth abbot of Iona. His church was at Rath or Tempul-Ratha, in Cinel-Conaill, and is now known as Rannaynterdoney, in the county of Donegal (Colgan, Acta SS. 46, c. 1, and Tr. Thunm. 380 n. 104; 481 n. 21, 490 n. 44; Reeves, Adamnan, 376, who says he is locally called Peenan).

(4) Son of Rimhidh, bishop, commemorated on Jan. 8. Of this person no particulars are known, and yet he must have been one of much importance, as he is mentioned in all the Irish Annales and Martyrologies; he died a.d. 690 (Ann. Tigri.) At a.d. 693 (Collari, Act. Soc. x. 277), he is called him "Fynian mac Rivea Bushep." He may possibly be the bishop of Lissiasne, who is commemorated on the following day, and died in the year 661 [FINAN (7)]. (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 133, 144; Mart. Doney. by Todd and Reeves, 11; Skene, Chron. Picts and Scots, 71, 250, 347.)

(5) Cam of Cessan-Eithig, now Kinitty. There are three lives of this saint mentioned by Hardy (Descr. Cat. i. 127-28, 788). Born at Corca Dubhne, now Corkaginy, in Kerry, he was early associated with St. Brendan (May 6) of Confort, whose pupil he is said to have been, and with St. Senan (Mar. 1-8) of Iniscathay or Scattery Island, to whom he appears to have been related. He belongs to the 7th century, and his monastery is believed to have been destroyed by the northern pirates. But a beehive house of Cyclopean style preserves the memory of his sojourn in Kerry; it is situated on Church Island, in Lough Lee or Curann Lough, on the boundary of the baronies of Iveragh and Dunkerrin, in the county of Kerry, and four miles to the north of Derryneave abbey, in Irish Doine Fhionain, which derives its name from the saint." His name is also preserved in Rubhannane, Finan's thirtor fort, now a townland near Ventry. (Petrie, Round Towers, 130-1; Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. viii. 430; Colgan, Acta SS. 325, c. 20, 529 n. 11, 534, c. 27, 540 n. 21, and Tr. Thunm. 380 n. 102; Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 3rd ed. 148; Nicholson, Ir. Hist. Lit., 46.)

(6) Lobhar (The Loper), of Swords, Mar. 16. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Mar. 16, tom. ii. 439-42) give, after a learned commentary as preface, a life of St. Finan (communicated by Henry Fitzsimons, but belonging to the 11th century). He was a native of Ely O'Carrol, in King's County, and flourished after the middle of the 6th century. He is connected with four Irish dedications: (a) Swords, near Dublin. (b) Innisfallen, an island in Lough Lein or the lower Lake of Killarney, in Kerry. (c) Ardfinian, in the county of Tipperary; he has
probably given his name also to Kilfinane, in Limerick, where his well remains and his festival was celebrated. (d) Clonmore; probably the Clonmore in Carlow. (Colgan, A.D. 232, 215; 276-77, 637-28, and Tr. Thom. 349, 400, 404, 451 n. 40, 490 n. 50, 509, c. 7; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 11, § 10, iii. c. 18, § 3; Reeves, Adamnan, 279; Ware, Ir. Ant. c. 28; Mon. Hb. 60, 68; Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 3 ed. 147-49, 2 ser. 78. He had dedications at Egan Finnan or Sunart, Argyl shire; Mochnrum, Wigtownshire; Miggie, Aberdeen; Abernethie in Monymusk, Aberdeen; and perhaps Kilfinan, Argyllshire, but some count Finn of Lindisfarne, his patron. In the Dunkeld Litanies he is called Finnanach among the holy bishops, or Finnane in the list of holy abbots. (Bp. Forbes, Kat. Scot. Saints, pp. viii. 1x. 347; C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. 14-5, 49, 199.)

[J. G.]

FINAN (7) (FINANUS, FINNAN), a monk of Hii, or Iona, who succeeded Aidan, in A.D. 632, as bishop of Lindisfarne. He was ordained in Scott land, and was Rori, or rector of the church of which he was a member, and was sent to Lindisfarne when the vacancy took place. Finn rebuilt the church "more Scottorum," and made it worthy, as Bede says, to be the seat of a bishopric. The standard was not a high one. The church was constructed only of oak planks, that a wolf might not be able to enter it. This was afterwards dedicated by archbishop Theodore in honour of St. Peter. (Bd. iii. 25; Symeon, H. E. D. l. 4.) Aidan and Finn had under their charge the whole of Northumbria. The mission of arch bishop Paulinus came to an end in A.D. 633, and, after a brief interval, the monks of Hii stepped in, and worked the neglected diocese. Lindis farne was selected to be the seat of the bishopric instead of York, because it was nearer to Hii, and in its situation was the counterpart of that island. The missionaries had also a fuller scope there for their ascetic life than they could have found in the old Roman capital. The system carried on at Lindisfarne was that of Columba at Hii. The monastery was governed by an abbot, selected by the bishop, with the consent of the brethren, and all the clergy inside and outside the monastery, including the bishop, observed the monastic rule. (Bed. VITA Cath. c. 16; Skene's Celt. Scot. ii. 157-158.) The system was then at its best. Missionary exertion extended far and wide, and its fruits were visible in the numbers who were baptized and educated, in the churches that were built, in the monasteries which were founded and endowed. (Bed. H. E. iii. 5.)

Finn had two great missionary successes beyond the boundaries of Northumbria. Penda, son of Peada, king of Mercia, sought the hand of Alchfrida, a daughter of Ousiu of Northumbria. Ousiu made the adoption of Christianity by the suitor and his people the condition of his consent to the union. Peada asserted, being chiefly influenced by Alchfrid, Ousiu's son, who was also his brother-in-law. He was baptized therefore by Finn, with all his suite, in one of the royal vills near the Tyne. Bede calls it Ad Muruan, which is probably Benwell. Four priests, Cedd, Adda, Betti, and Diuna, went back with Peada as missionaries. Of these, Diuna was ordained afterwards by Finn, as the first bishop of the mid-English and Mercia. (H. E. li. 21.) The special connexion between Northumbria and Mercia, in addition to the over-lordship of Osuin, contributed largely to this religious victory. Another triumph followed. Sigebert, king of the East Saxons, was converted to Christianity by Osuin, and was also baptized by Finn at Ad Murum. Sigebert asked for missionaries, and Cedd was sent to him from Mercia. On one occasion, when Cedd, who had been a monk of Lindisfarne, returned home to confer with Finn his superior, his old master, pleased with his success, sent for two other prelates and ordained him bishop. (H. E. iii. 22.)

Finn was of course a rigorous observer of the Columban method of observing Easter. Whenever anyone came into Northumbria from France or Kent, Finn invariably heard that his practice was at variance with the Roman usage. There were some in Northumbria who upheld that use, such as James the Deacon, whom Paulinus had left behind him, queen Eanfled with her chaplain and suite, and, notably, an ecclesiastic of the name of Sicanus, who came from Columba's See. Finn, who had learned in France or Italy the incorrectness of the Northumbrian practice. With Finn Ronan had 'many an argument on the subject, but in vain. Bede says that Finn had a "ferox animus," which was impervious to reason. (H. E. iii. 25.)

Finn was buried on the 31st August, A.D. 651. There is a notice of him in the Acta SS. Feb. iii. 21, founded chiefly upon Bede. See also Col gan's Acta SS. Hiberniae, i. 357; Hardy's Cat alogue, i. pt. 1, 259; and Forbes's Lives of the Scottish Saints, 348-9. Finn's opposition to Rome deprived him of a place in the Roman calendar. He is to be found, however, in the old Scottish lists, and there is a notice of him in the Aberdeen Breviary.

[J. B.]

FINAN (8), abbot of Cloone, in the barony of Dartry, co. Meath, succeeded Nuad, A.D. 751, and died A.D. 778 (Four Mast. A.D. 773; Ann. Ultera. A.D. 777.)

FINBAR. [BARRY and FINNBAR.]

FINBIL, abbas of Cluan-Bronagh, now Clonbrony, in the barony of Clonard, co. Longford, succeeded Eillibhrig in 785 as the fifth abbe, and died in 809 (Four Mast. A.D. 804; Ann. Ultera. A.D. 808.)

FINCAN, FINCANA (FINCANE, FINTANA, FINSEGAD), Oct. 13, daughter of St. Donald of the Glen of Ogilvie, in Forfarshire; probably is the beginning of the 8th century. She is the patron saint of Echt, Aberdeenshire, and perhaps has given her name to Finlachan in Nairn, in Argyllshire (C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. pt. i. 314), but Dr. Reeves (Adamnan, 66) thinks St. Finchan has a preferable claim. (Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 278; Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 165; Boethius, Scot. Hist. i. c. 55; Vener. Dio. Aberd. 638; Bp. Forbes, Kat. Scot. Saints, 155, 165, 214, 239, 347.)

FINchan (FINDCHAN, FINCHAN), commemorated Mar. 11. In the Irish calendars there are five saints of this name, and the Mart. Dalhachius calls the one commemorated on Mar. 11, Finchan an pe 1 finneh, or
FINCHELL

"Finchell of long-continued sufferings." Finchell had come with St. Columba from Ireland, and so approved himself as to be made reverent of the monastery at Artaichin in Tirere. There he ruled prudently for some years, till returning to Ireland he met with Aedh Dubh, a notoriously cruel and bloody man. When Finchell came back to Artaichin he had Aedh with him, having, as is said by Colgan, induced Aedh to take up the royal monk's cowl. So high was his opinion of his penitent, that in the course of time he sent for a distant bishop to have him ordained, and laid his right hand upon the head of Aedh along with the ordaining bishop's. This sacrilegious ordination was severely denounced by St. Columba. Finchell wiped out the stain of his crime by suffering, but the date of his death is unknown. (Colgan, Tr. Thum, 346, c. 379 n. 49, 436, c. 97, 496 n. 42, 502, col. 1; Lamigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 11, § 14; Reeves, Eccl. Antig. 279, and Adamnan, 69-71, with the elaborate notes on the whole passage in Todd, Patrick, 7-10; Kelly, Col. Ir. Saints, 95; Bp. Forbes, Kil. Scott. Saints, 347-8; Skene, Celt. Scot. ii. 94, 130; Haddan and Stubbs, Concilia, 8; p. ii. p. 107.) His name is found in Kilfinichen or Killinchine, in the island of Mull, and his chair is pointed out above the church; his Scotch name is St. Fitzell, as is under the inscription Beandochy, Perthishire, is dedicated to him. (C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. p. i. 314; Old Stat. Acc. Scot. xix. 342, 359; New Stat. Acc. Argyle, 286-97; Reeves, Adamnan, 66, 145; Scott. Past. Eccl. Scot. iii. pt. i. 83; Bp. Forbes, Kil. Scott. Saints, 347-48.)

FINCHILL (FINCHELL, FINCHHALH, FINCHILL, FANDOCH, FANDIFF, or FANDуч), commemorated at Steall-Guarie, now Siver-Gorri, a mountainous district in the barony of Clunieck, co. Carvran, on Jan. 15th, but is otherwise unknown. He may also be the Finchell, virgin, of April 24. (Marti. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 27, 421; Marti. Tull. in Kelly, Col. Irish Saints, xiii.; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 437.)

FINCHIOU (FANCIHU, FANCIHO, FINCHHU), son of Finlich, of Brigown, commemorated Nov. 25. His life in Irish is preserved in the Book of MacCarthy Reagh, a MS., now better known as the Book of Lismore. Finchih was baptized by St. Albbe, was a pupil of St. Comgall (May 10), and was seven years in the abbacy of Bangor after St. Comgall, but there is no mention of him as such in the Irish Annals, and Silvanus or Silvanus is given (Colgan, Acta SS. 423; Marti. Doneg. Feb. 28) as St. Comgall's immediate successor. His name seems to have been originally Gaulio, with the surname Fin, and by transposition Finchih. His life was one of extreme austerity in accordance with the spirit of his age or the ideals of a later date (Marti. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 317-19; Reeves, Eccl. Ant., referring to Fleming, Coll. Sac. 314. In the Feilir of Armenus he is said to have settled at Croich, co. Monaghan, and his chief residence was at Bri-gobhan, now Brignew, near Fermoy, in the baronies of Condon and Clan-gibbon, co. Cork. (Book of Obitis, C. C. Dublin, pp. lxxiv-v. 182.)


FINGAR (GWNER, GWYNNE), ST., an Irish saint who gave his name to the parish of Gwinnar, close to the Hayle estuary in Cornwall. There is a "passio" of him and his sister Pila, falsely attributed to St. Anselm. (Migne, Anselm, ii. 325-334.) It was written at the request of some member of St. Fingar's church, perhaps in the 12th century, in the age of religious biographies and commemorative legends. It is quite unhistorical, except perhaps so far as the names are concerned. The name Gwinnar gives the Cymric form of the word meaning "white," which in Irish is Finn. The legend makes Fingar to be one of St. Patrick's converts in Ireland, a son of King Clito, who in anger drives him out, and he flies to Brittany. After returning, he again sets out with his sister Pila, and lands in the port of Hayle, where they suffer martyrdom at the hands of king Theodoric, and a sacred fountain still marks the spot. This may have taken place about 450. (See the Acta Sanctorum, 23 March, iii. 456-59, and supplem. 144; Hardy's Catalogue of Materials, i. 55, No. 167.) It is possible that a different life was seen by Leland. (Holin. ed. 1744, vol. iii. fol. 4.)


FINNAN. [FINAN and FINNHAN.] Finnann Scuatus, abbot Calduain, is said to be Dunpiste (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 286) to have flourished A.D. 402, and written De Vida S. Echabhi, lib. i. He is commemorated Feb. 22 (Tanner, Hist. 280), but he is probably a reflection, in Dunpiste's hands, of St. Finnian, bishop of Clonard, who had a commemoration on Feb. 23.

FINNAN, abbat of Swords. [FINAN (60).]

FINK. [FINCHAN.]

FINLAGAN, a saint having dedications in Argyshire. (Bp. Forbes, Kil. Scott. Saints, 348.) [FINNLOUGH.]

FINNBHAR is variously represented as BARRE, BARR, BARRINDUS, BARRY, FINBAR, and FINDVAR; it is also equivalent to FINNAN, FINNIA, &c., and literally means "light-haired." This variety of synonymous names is a cause of great confusion and difficulty. [FINNAN] (Reeves, Adamnan, 103; Caulfield, Life of St. Fin Barre, 11, n. x.) (1) Son of Archo, the (1) Son of Archo, of Inis-doomle, abbat, commemorated July 4. This saint, who is to be distinguished from Barry of Cork [BARRY], being of the race of Eochaidh Finn Fothart, and family of St. Brigida, was abbat of Inis-Doomle, now Little Island, near Waterford. St. Barfinn was his brother (Marti. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 187, 299). He was a companion of St. Mocheimocu, and with many others is said to have been trained under
FINNCHAN

St. Conmag of Bangor, so that he would belong to the beginning of the 7th century (Colgan, Acta SS. 590, c. 11, 597 n. 11). Luigan (Ecol. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 17, § 5) suggests that Inis-Dimbeal may really have been Inishlounaght, co. Tipperary, where St. Mochoemocos for some time lived.

(2) Mac Ua Bairdene does not find a place in the Irish Kalendar or in the Féitire of Aenghus, yet his death is given in the Four Mast. and Ann. Ult. in the year 437. If he was a son of Restitutus, the Lombard, who is said to have been brother-in-law of St. Patrick, he is yet never quoted among the nephews of the apostle of Ireland. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. p. 132 n. 1; Petrie, Round Towers, 163–67; Colgan, Tr. Thamn, 238 n. 3; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 17, wks. vi. 381 sq.) [J. G.]

FINNCHAN. [FINCHAN.]

FINNCHU, FINNCHU, FINNCHUO. [FINCHU.]

FINNE, priest of Druim-lisce, is commemorated on Feb. 9, and is, O'Hanlon thinks, of an early date. His dedication is probably now Drumlease, co. Leitrim. (See an interesting account of the place and its patrician foundation in O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 433–37.) [J. G.]

FINNIA, FINDIA. On Sept. 28 the Féitire of Aenghus commemorates ‘the two shining Finnia,’ and the second hand inserts the name in Mort. Doneg. (by Todd and Reeves, 261), but their history is unknown. One called Fine or Finnia died abbess of Kildare, A.D. 805 (Four Mast. A.D. 800; Ann. Ult. A.D. 804; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 152); and another was sister of St. Itsa or Mida, daughter of Connafield (Colgan, Acta SS. 73, c. 2). [J. G.]

FINNIA. FINDIA, FINIANN, FINNIN.

Among the Irish saints in the sixth century a foremost place is held by the two Finnias, who connected the period of St. Patrick and St. Brigid with that of St. Columba and St. Conmag. The word Finnian appears to be the diminutive of Finn, ‘white,’ and as a name has a great variety of forms. [See Finnian and Finian.]

(1) Of Clonard, bishop or abbot, commemorated Dec. 12. This early Irish saint, the master of so many Christian teachers, has a place in all the Irish Kalendar, and is commemorated in the Scotch Kat. Drummond, Kat. Celt., and Mort. Aberd. (Bp. Forbes, Kat. Scott. Saints, 36, 92, 137). Colgan (Acta SS. 383 sqq.) has published one life ‘ex codice Ms. Salamancae,’ and the special office of St. Finnian; Hardy (Descr. Cat. i. p. 128–29, pt. ii. 789) notices four Lives of St. Finnian, and Nicholson (Irish Hist. Lb. 46) refers to a Life in Trin. Coll. Dublin. A Life in Irish is in a thick quarto volume, among other Irish Lives, in the Burgundian Library at Brussels (Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. iii. 485). St. Finnian was descended from Ailill Teldub, from whom he had the designation Ul-Teldub; his mother was named Talsch; he was a native of Leinster. For deeper insight into spiritual truth he crossed the Irish Channel to the city of Kilmaine or Menevia, and placed himself under St. Merchan, that he might stay with that holy man, and some say he remained thirty years, but the time was probably much shorter. During that time he is said to have founded three churches, which are now entirely unknown, unless one of them be Llannfain subject to Llanshangel Ysgellig, Anglesey (Rees, Welsh Saints, 239–40; Williams, Ew. Welskem. 155–56). Returning to Ireland he is said to have founded several churches, his chief foundation being at Clonard, in the county of Meath, from which scholars came out in as great numbers, in the words of Ussher, as Greeks of old from the sides of the horse of Troy. The usual number ascribed is three thousand, and O'Clergy (Mort. Doneg.), following Mr. O'Gorman, calls him ‘a docteur of wisdom, and tutor of the saints of Ireland in his time.’

He is always known as ‘the preceptor of the twelve apostles of Ireland’ (Todd, St. Patrick, 99 n. 1; Mahillon, Annal. Bened. i. 208). It is now impossible to establish the date of his commencment of his work at Clonard, but considering the celebrity with which his name is everywhere known, and owing to the fame he had already obtained, he must have been there before A.D. 520. Even his ecclesiastical position there is undetermined; in the later accounts of him he is called, as by Ware, bishop of Clonard, but the probability is that he was never more than abbot, and it is noteworthy that neither in his Acts, nor in the Irish Kalendar, is he called a bishop. Ware says he wrote some Protectations and other things, but nothing is extant. He is reported to have preached before St. Brígida, visited St. Enna at Aras, and received the birth of St. Columba of Iona, and received the viaticum from St. Columba of Tirdaglas. He died in the year 550 (Ann. Fig.), or 552, when so many died of the contagious black jaundice, and was buried at Clonard. His chief feast is Dec. 12, but he is also commemorated on Feb. 23.

(2) Of Moville, bishop, Feb. 11 and Sept. 10. In the more purely Scotch Kalendar he is commemorated as Wynnin, also Vinim, Vinna, and Vinian. By the Welsh he is called Winius. There seems to be little doubt but Finnia of Moville and Wynnin of Kilwinning in Ayrshire are the same person. But the same cannot be said of Fridian bishop of Lucca. [Fin.]

Caspargre (Norm. Leg. Angl. sol. civisi b) gives an English or British Life of ‘St. Finn, bp. and cleruici,’ and there seems to be a little life or lives preserved in the Burgundian Library at Brussels (Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. iii. 480, 485). For the rest we are obliged to have recourse to the lives of St. Fridian and contemporary Irish churchmen.

St. Finnian of Moville, near Newtownards, co. Down, belongs to the second order of the Irish saints, and is venerated as the patron saint of Ulster, especially in the county of Down. His father was Cairpre, of the royal house of the Dal Fiatach, his mother was Lassara or Lasair (Colgan, Acta SS. 646, c. 5; Tod, Book of Hymns, Fasc. i. 88 n. 3). His education was first under Colman of Dromore, and then co. Down; by the latter he was next recommended to the school of St. Caolan or Mochaoi of Nendrum (now Mahee island, in Strangford Lough), who died A.D. 497. St. Mochoi sent him to the Magnum Monasterium in Britain, to be under bishop Neannio. The late Dr. Tod (Book of Hymns, Fasc. i. 104 n. 4) concludes that this conclusion is a mistake, and only a few names are added later, such as Futernia, Rosat, and Cupidula Casu, was the
(2) Virgin, commemorated on Nov. 9, and had her dedication at Craghagh, in Monawey, in the barony of Lower Ormond, co. Tipperary (Mart. Denv. Nov. 9; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, vii. 85.)

[ J. G.]

FINN TAN (FINDAN, FINNTAN, FINNEGAN), a common Irish name, which is the same as Finn and Finigan, being the diminutive of Finn, and signifying "little white-haired man."

(1) Son of Aedh, abbat, commemorated Sept. 19. Colgan (Tr. Thom. 337, c. 31, 384 n. 27, 480 n. 6) strives to identify him with the Finn, son of Aedh, who (Adamnan, Vit. St. Columb. ii. c. 31) accompanied St. Columba across Drumalban in Scotland, and founded the monastery of Kiallaun-inde; but where this was is unknown.

(2) Son of Gabhren, of Clonenagh, commemorated Feb. 17. Hardy (Descript. Cat. i. pt. i. 192, pt. ii. 789) notices the Lives given by Colgan and the Bollandists. O'Hanlon (Irish Saints, Feb. 17, ii. 574-98) goes fully into details. In most of the purely Scotch Kalendar he is confounded with St. Bish, bishop of Lindisfarne, whose feast was on the same day.

The father of St. Finnatan belonged to the house of Escohid Finn Fothair in Wexford (Colgan, Acta SS. 355, c. 2; Todd, St. Patrick, 252, 287). His mother's name was Findath. He was probably born about the year 525 or 530, as being slightly St. Columba's junior, and received his education under St. Columba of Tirdaglas, having for his fellow-pupils St. Caemhan of Enach-Traim, and St. Mucemun. While yet a young man (juvenia) he founded the monastery of Clonenagh near Maryborough, Queen's County. There he established about A.D. 548 one of the famous schools of Ireland, and pupils came to him from all the country, the most illustrious being St. Conall the abbot of Banogar.

Of the monastic rule of St. Finnatan we have no detailed account, and no trace of it is extant; but both for himself and his pupils he prescribed and observed strictly, so that he was called "chief head of the monks of Erin." Like hermits, they laboured with their own hands, and for a plough used a light hoe. They denied themselves all flesh-meat, and had not even a cow to supply them with milk. The discipline at Clonenagh was deemed unusually severe, and St. Cianenech is said to have been the means of having had the rule considerably softened. The Book of Cluain Eithneach, said by tradition to have been written by St. Finnatan, is one of the numerous class of lost books of Ireland. In Keating's time in the beginning of the seventeenth century, it was preserved and highly prized, but it has since disappeared (O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 380-2), and we have no distinct account of its contents.

The year of St. Finnatan's death is uncertain: Colgan and Ussher say he flourished A.D. 550-60; Ussher (Index Chron.) puts his death at A.D. 603, which is the date in the Ann. Tigernach, and Ware (Tr. Writ. c. 13) apparently accepts it; but Colgan (Acta SS. 355 n. 28), followed by Lanigan (Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 229), says he must have died long before St. Columba, whose death took place A.D. 597. Kelly (Cat. Ir. Saints, 74-5) says he was called Stationarius, because he prayed with his arms extended like a cross.
FINNTAN

At Kilfountain, near Dingle in Kerry, there is a pillar-stone, on which is engraved the name Finnten, to the saint from whom the place derives its name, but he may not have been the patron of Dunleise (Journ. Killearn. Arch. Coll. Soc. new ser. ii. 189; Arch. Combr. 3rd ser. i. 103). If he lived in the time of St. Comgall of Bangor, he flourished in the end of the 6th century (Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 13 § 2, 31, Hardy, Descrip. Cat. i. pt. ii. 729; Kelly, Col. Irish Saints, 50).

Tall-na-psalm, commemorated March 27. On this day the Martyrologies of Donegal and Tullaghgheen commemorate St. Finntan Tall-na-psalm, Os-psalmorum, or Mouth of the Psalms, and Colgan (Acta SS. 771) gives a short notice, "De S. Fintanu Psalmeano." In his Index Chren. Colgan says, "S. Fintanus, dictus Os Psalmerun," flourished A.D. 598. (Kelly, Col. Irish Saints, 106.)

Corach, bishop of Clonfert, commemorated Feb. 21. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Feb. 21, tom. iii. 233) place him among their preeminent saints, and O'Hanlon (Irish Saints, ii. 657-658) attempts to give a criticism of the foundation on Colgan's short account of the saint. In this Colgan (Acta SS. 385) states that he was both abbott and bishop, and as such ruled several churches for many years. (a) Lennachill, now probably Laughil, Queen's County. (b) Clonenagh, near Maryborough, Queen's County, where he either lived or was buried. (c) Clonfert in Connaught, where by an unusual arrangement he held both the abbacy and the episcopate at the same time. (d) Cluain sittench in Leix, Queen's County, which was either founded or ruled by him. Colgan suggests several reasons for his receiving the name Corach, "a wise," and the most likely one is that he had a musical voice and instructed the monks in some new mode of singing the hymns and services of the church. The year of his death is unknown; he probably flourished about the end of the 6th century, and was succeeded at Clonfert by St. Senach, who died A.D. 620, yet even in the order of succession he cannot be without doubt. (Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 14, § 3; Kelly, Col. Irish Saints, 77.)

Son of Eochaidh, and brother of Colman (4) and Conaillegh, both of Snaore, was descended from Niall of the Nine Hostages, and is said to have lived at Bealach, but where this "road" or "pass" lay is unknown. His mother was Ailfeann, daughter of Lencus of Killiney, co. Dublin, and his feast Jan. 1. His usual name is Finntan Mac Ecchech. He probably belongs to the first half of the 7th century. (Marty. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 5; Marty. Tullaghgheen in Kelly's Col. Ir. Saints, xi.; Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir. 4 ser. iii. 48; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 24, ii. 607; Colgan, Acta SS. 355, col. 1; Reeves, Adaman, 173.)

Inclusus. [FINNTAN.]

(11) Of Oenttrebha, abbate of Bangor, died A.D. 612 (Four Mast. and Ann. Ulter.). Oentrebha is the old name of Antrim (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 251). Finntan was the fourth abbate and held the abbacy for three years, between Silian and Mac Laisre.

(12) Of Roscoenuch, disciple of St. Barry, at
FIRMILIANUS, ST. 521

Loch Irec (Colgan, Acta SS. 697; Caulfield, Life of S. Fin Barre, v.) [J. G.]

FINTAN, FIDAN, patron of Augia Rheni, now Rheingaw or Rheinis, near Schaffhausen, whose life was published by Goldastus (Rev. Alaman. Scriptor. i. 318 sqq.), by Mabillon (Acta SS. 8. & 8. tom. v. sac. iv. pt. i. 359), and by Zapf (Rit. tom. i. 233 sqq.). Though an Irishman, he has no place in the Irish Kalendars. According to the Life, he was born in Leinster. His sister had been carried off in one of the earliest incursions of the Northmen, and Fintan being sent by his father in search of her, was himself taken captive by the same pirates; this must have been some years prior to A.D. 795. Slipping away from them as they rounded the north of Scotland, he commenced himself to the waves, and was carried apparently to the coast of Caithness, where he remained with a bishop for two years. Thence he proceeded to Rome, visiting St. Martin's at Tours by the way; from there he went to Switzerland, and lived with a nobleman for four years "in clericatu." Then he became a monk at Rheinis in the fifty-first year of his age; and in the monastery, and as a monk in an adjacent cell, he spent twenty-seven years, his monastic profession being dated in A.D. 800, and his death in A.D. 827. Though not the founder of Rheinis, he was adopted as the patron, and his feast is Nov. 15. (Lasian, Eccl. Hist. Fr. iii. c. 20, § 7; Reeves, Adamnan, pp. xxii. — Tanner, Bibl. 280; O'Connor, Ep. Num. c. 61, &c.; Proleg. ii. 186; Ware, H. A. L. c. 24, and Ir. Writ. i. c. 6; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 16, wks. vi. 277, Chron. Ind. A.D. 795.) This St. Fintan or Fidhan is to be distinguished from one of the same name at Augia Dives, now Reichenaun, whose feast is Nov. 16, and who is identified with St. Fintan of Lrmochili, or at least having his feast on the same day. [FINTAN (12).] [J. G.]

FINTAN, presbytery, confessor. (Usuard, Mart. Feb. 17.) [FINTAN (2).]

FIONCIUS, bishop of Lamego, signs the acts of the fifteenth and sixteenth councils of Toledo in 688 and 693 [FILICHIUS]. (Exp. Scriptor. xiv. 139; Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 333-338.)

FIRMATUS, deacon, commemorated, with his sister, Flavia or Flaviana, virgin, at Auverre, Oct. 5. (Usuard, Mart.; Hieron. Mart.; Boll. Acta SS. Oct. iii. 163.)

FIRMIANUS, bishop of Centuriones in Numidia, banished by Huneric, A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. Notitiae, 56 in Migne, Patrolog. Lat. iviii.; Nicocleti, Africa Christ. i. 196.) [L. D.]

FIRMILIANUS (1), ST., bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, one of the greatest prelates of his time; a friend of Origen, ranked with Dionysius the Great, appealed to by Cyprian, and a rebuker of St. Stephenus. In A.D. 232, tenth year of Alex. Severus, he already held the see in his see (Eus. vi. 26, 27), though Cave (Hist. i. p. 123) speaks of A.D. 233 as the year of his elevation. When Origen soon after left Egypt, Firmilian induced him to visit the "climate of Cappadocia, εἰς ἡγαγώνων ἰδίαν

χαίροντας τὴν ζωὴν, skilled alike in philosophy and theology.

Routh (vol. iii. p. 149) points to him as one of the oldest authorities who states with precision the Anti-Pelagian doctrine. Basil (de Spiritu Sancto. xxiv.) speaks of his Λέον as early testi-
monies to the exactness of his own doctrine, and quotes his agreement with Cyprian on baptism in the epistle to Amphilectus (Ep. 180). The fact that he is not mentioned by other ecclesiastical writers shows that he cannot have been voluminous. A book upon the persecutions is absurdly attributed to him by Moses Chor-

nensis. (Routh, R. S. vol. i. p. 103.)

FIRMILIANUS (3), successor of Urbanus as governor of Palestine in the reign of Maximin, whose chief agent he was in the persecution of the Christians in those parts. The horrible tortures which he employed are described at length by Eusebius. The best known of his victims is PAMPILLIUS. After the death of Maximin he was beheaded by order of Licinius, probably in A.D. 313. (Euseb. de Mart. Pal. chaps. viii. ix. xi.)

[F. W. B.]

FIRMILIANUS (1), bishop of Mimat (Mende); commemorated on Jan. 4. Some argue that he must have lived between St. Privatus, who was slain in the time of Gallus and Valerian, and Genialis, who subscribed the first council of Arles, 314. He may possibly have preceded the first bishop of Avignon. His body is said to have been found ipso reclinante at La Canourgue (Canonic). (A.A. SS. Jan. i. 93; Gall. Christ. i. 86.)

[M. F. A.]

FIRMILIANUS (2), bishop of Amiens, a native of Pampeluna. He was the son of Firmus, a senator of Pampeluna, and became the earliest convert of Honorius the apostle of Pampeluna. There he was subsequently ordained a bishop by Saturninus bishop of Toulouse, but apparently only as a missionary bishop for Gaul, though he has been reckoned (Gams, Ser. Ep. 62, 487) first bishop of Pampeluna. In Gaul he is said to have preached in the districts of Albi, Auvergne, Angers, Beauvais, and Amiens. Of the last he was reckoned the apostle and first bishop. He is said to have been martyred by order of the Roman governor, and was commemorated on Sept. 25. But his death is placed at various dates, from the apostolic age down to A.D. 303, and our knowledge of his history rests wholly on the equally authentic statements, given at great length by the Bollandists, who defend them (perhaps not very successfully) against the arguments of Tillemont, in his article on St. Saturninus. (Mém. vol. iii. 303; A.A. SS. Sept. vii. 51; Gall. Chr. x. 1150.)

[R. T. S.]

FIRMILIANUS (3), bishop of Amiens, cir. 370 or 380, said to have been baptized by Firmilanus L, and to have ruled the see for forty years. (Boll. A.A. SS. 1 Sept. i. 175.)

[R. T. S.]

FIRMILIANUS (4), driven from Italy under the Arian king Theodoric, and having found refuge at Metz was there chosen bishop on the death of Adelphus. But the duration of his episcopate is variously stated at eight and twenty-eight years. (Gall. Christ. xiii. 684.)

[R. T. S.]

FIRMILIANUS (5), a native of Toul, raised late in life to the bishopric of Verdun; died A.D. 502, when Clovis was besieging the town. [EXSCRIPTVS.] (Gall. Christ. xiii. 1165.)

[F. T. S.]

FIRMILIANUS (6), ST., fourth bishop of Uzes, born in the province of Narbonne, of noble parenthood, about A.D. 516. At twelve years he was sent to Uzes with Ferreolus his brother Augustus's son, and his successor in the bishopric, thus seven years old, to be instructed by his uncle Hiloricus. His progress was so rapid that in his twentieth year he was ordained a priest, though the canon was thereby infringed, and consecrated suffragan and successor of his uncle, upon whose death shortly afterwards he was appointed to the see in the 22nd year of his age (A.D. 538). In his episcopate the see of Uzes was separated from the archbishopric of Narbonne, and joined to that of Arles or Bourges. St. Firminus was present at the fourth council of Orleans in 541, the fifth in 549, and the second of Paris about 551. He is said to have been a joint author with Cyprian and Victorinus of the life of St. Cæcilius of Arles, and has been supposed by some to have been one of his disciples. Some verses of his contemporary, Arator (A.D. 490-556 or 560), sub-deacon of the church of Rome, prove that he was known beyond his country (quoted in the Gall. Christ. vi. 612). He died in 558, at the age of eighty-seven, and was commemorated Oct. 11. His tomb in the church of St. Basilium was celebrated for its miracles in the 9th century. (See the letter of Annnu, bishop of Lyons, to Theobald of Langres, s. 6, in Mige, Patr. Lat. exvii. 81.) He is said to have built two churches at Uzes, and there was long existing an abbey called after him in the city. He was succeeded by his nephew St. Ferreol. (Usuard. Mart. Oct. 11; Bull. Acta SS. Oct. v. 635; Mansi, ix. 120, 136, 740, Patr. Lat. lxvii. 1001, 1253, Gall. Christ. vi. 611.)

[S. A. B.]

FIRMILIANUS (7), sixth bishop of Vence, following Prosper and succeeded by Deuterius (circ. A.D. 550-540). (Gall. Christ. iii. 1214.)

[S. A. B.]

FIRMILIANUS (8), bishop of Triehe, who with other bishops of Istria and north Italy, maintained a separation from Rome, on the question of the Three Chapters. He afterwards was reconciled to the church of Rome, and troubled, in consequence, by Severian, patriarch of Carthage, head of the separatists. Gregory the Great in 602 writes to encourage him to be firm (lib. xii. 33, ind. v. in Migne, lxvii. 1243); also in 603 to Smaragdus the exarch, asking him to protect Firminus. (Lib. xii. 33, ind. vi. in Migne, lxvii. 1283.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FIRMILIANUS (9) (FIRMINUS), ninth bishop of Tarentaise, between St. Herasclius and Probian about the commencement of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. xii. 702.)

[S. A. B.]

FIRMILIANUS (10), bishop of Blda (Blora), south of Viterbo, present at the Lateran synod under Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Mansi, x. 867; Hefele, § 307.)

[A. H. D. A.]

FIRMILIANUS (11), said to have been 7th bishop of Lodève, succeeding Anatolius, and followed by Ansemundus (circ. A.D. 652), but the evidence of his existence is dubious. (Gall. Christ. vi. 528.)

[S. A. B.]

FIRMILIANUS (12), June 24; a military martyr with six others, in Armenia, under the emperor Maximin, A.D. 312. Some short time previously
FIRMINUS

Armenia, under the teaching of Gregory the Illuminator, had embraced the faith with enthusiasm. When, therefore, in May, 311, Maximian set a general persecution upon foot throughout the land, the Armenians took up arms in defence of their oppressed brethren, and defeated the emperor with great loss. During this campaign our martyr seems to have suffered. (Martyr. Rom.; Eusebius, H. E. lix. cap. 8–9; Mason, Diocletian Persecution, pp. 130, 325.) [G. T. S.]

FIRMINUS (13), a young man of high birth and godly parentage, to whom St. Basil wrote, c. A.D. 373, reproaching him for the paucity and brevity of his letters, and expressing the sorrow with which he had heard that he had deserted the ascetic life, and, following the example of his paternal grandfather, had adopted the military profession, and beseeching him to return to his home, and enter on the career of civil distinction open to him (Basil. Epist. 116 [174]). Firminus at once yielded to Basil's remonstrances, and wrote, stating that through the influence of persons he felt est in obtaining honorable discharge, and declaring his resolution to adopt a celibate life (ibid. 117 [234]). [E. V.]

FIRMINUS (14), a layman of Caesarea, whose friendship Chrysostom formed during his stay in that city on his way to Cucusus A.D. 404. Chrysostom wrote to him on his arrival there to announce the safe accomplishment of his journey, his satisfaction with Cucusus, and the kindness of its inhabitants (Chrysost. Epist. 80). [E. V.]


FIRMINUS (1), bishop of Verona, probably early in the 3rd century. (Ughelet, Ital. Sacr. v. 551; Cappelletti, Chiese d'Italia x. 740.) [R. S. G.]

FIRMINUS (2), martyr of Carthage, a.d. 250. [Armito.] [E. W. B.]

FIRMINUS (3), Aug. 9, martyr with Rusticus at Verona, 304. He was sprung from a noble family in Bergamo, which rendered his steadfast adherence to the faith the more meritorious to the emperor Maximian, who at the time was carrying on the persecution with great vigour in north Italy, being a resident at Milan. Firmus was arrested, and in company with a relative, Rusticus, led before the emperor, and by him delivered over to the prefect Anulinius, who took them to Verona, and there put them to death. A story prevailed of the bodies having been taken to Africa and subsequently brought from thence to Verona, which gave rise to a controversy for centuries between the two towns as to which of them possessed the remains, until the question was settled by St. Charles Borromeo in the year 1575 solemnly transferring the relics from a tomb in the suburbs to the cathedral. (Martyr. Rom. ed. Baron.; Petrus de Natali, Catal. SS. lib. 7, cap. 42; Boll. Acts SS. Aug. ii. 419–423.) [G. T. S.]

FIRMINUS (4), Feb. 4, martyr: whose name appears nowhere save in the local offices of the church at Genoa. He probably is the same as the Firminus commemorated on Feb. 2, as a martyr at Rome, A.D. 304, with Fortunatus, Pelicanus, Candidus, and twenty-four others. (Murt. Rom., Hieron., Usuardi; Boll. Acts SS. Feb. i. 960.) [G. T. S.]

FIRMINUS (5), June 24, one of the seven brothers; military martyrs, in Armenia, under Maximian. [Firmius (19)]. [G. T. S.]

FIRMINUS (6), June 1; martyr in Greece under Maximian, A.D. 312. (Murt. Rom.; Bas. Menol.) [G. T. S.]

FIRMINUS (7), a Moorish chief, who revolted against the Romans in the reign of Valentinian. Our chief authority is Ammianus Marcellinus (xix. 5). From him we learn that Firmus was the son of Nebel, the most powerful of the Moorish chieftains. The revolt soon assumed serious proportions, and Count Theodosius, father of the future emperor, was sent to quell it. He seemed for a moment to have gained his object, whereupon Firmus had recourse to a new expedient. He sent Christian envoys, thinking thereby to make up for obtaining honours, and not disappointed. This unnatural alliance appears from St. Augustine to have been permanent and well-known; since he reproaches the Donatists for having employed this "barbarous rex," whom he characterizes as "Hostis immansissimus Romanorum," to persecute their enemies the Rogatists, and for recognizing him as a legitimate king (Cont. Parminiunam, i. 10, 11), so much so, that the Rogatists gave them the nickname of Firmianus (Ep. 87, Migne). In the latter passage, he also mentions an atrocious act of a Donatist bishop of Riscicada, who formed a plot with Firmus to come into his city and exterminate the Catholics. The revolt appears to have begun in the middle of 372; since Romans, who was superseded by Theodosius, is mentioned as count in June of that year (Cod. Theol. ad loc.). It must in that case have lasted at least two years, since Ammianus (ch. 6, 1) makes it contemporary with the revolt of the Quadi, which occurred in 374. It is referred to briefly by Zosimus (iv. 16), Orosius (Hist. vii. 33), and Paulus Diaconus (Hist. Miscell. lib. xii.), who quotes Orosius. Symmachus (Ep. i. 64, al. 58) apparently alludes to it, when he says that the barbarians seized a large treasure when they took Caesarea.

There is a medal extant, of uncertain date, with the inscription, D. N. Firmus P. F. Aug., which Spanheim (de Praest. et Usu Numm. Antiq. Diss. xi. p. 364, ed. Amst. 1717) thinks to be our Firmus. This may certainly be supported by Zosimus (loc. cit.). Other authorities have supposed the name to be another form of Firmius, a tyrannus in the time of Aurelian. [M. F. A.]

FIRMINUS (8), ST., bishop of Tagaste in the African province of Numidia, mentioned by St. Augustine in his De Mendacio (xiii. 23), as protecting a fugitive, "for," said he, "I can neither tell a lie by saying that I have not concealed him, nor can I deliver him into your hands." So great was his constancy even when brought before the emperor that he preserved the man who had thrown himself on his protection. He is commemorated on July 31. (A.A. SS. Boll. Jul. viii. 180; Morelli, Africa Christ. t. 258.) [L. D.]
FIRMUS (9), a presbyter in the beginning of the 5th century; an active man and trusted with matters of importance. He visited St. Jerome at Bethlehem first in the year 405, and was charged by him with letters for St. Augustine (Ep. 115, 116, ed. Vail.). He was again with Jerome ten years later, and was repeatedly employed by the famous writer to keep him informed of the progress of the Nestorian controversy and the younger Paula at Ravenna on his return to Italy in the year 415. He afterwards proceeded to Africa, where he was in communication with St. Augustine (Jerome to Augustine, Ep. 134, ed. Vail.). We hear of him again as the bearer of a letter from Silvanus (afterwards pope) to Augustine and Alypius, and again returning with the answer in the year 318 (Aug. Ep. 191, 194). [W. H. F.]

FIRMUS (10), a bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea, who was present at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and took a rather conspicuous part in its proceedings. He protested against the decision delivering the opening of the council for the arrival of John of Antioch, and called upon Mennon, the bishop of Ephesus, to state how many days had elapsed since the sessions ought to have commenced (Labbe, Concil. iii. 450). On the arrival of the legates of the Roman see, and the reading of the letter of pope Celestinus, Firmus declared that the sentence against Nestorius contained in it should be regarded as final, and Nestorius pronounced canonically deposed (ibid. 618). He highly praised Cyril's exposition of the Nicene faith for its clearness, which left nothing doubtful, and for its perfect consistency with the Catholic faith (ibid. iv. 168). He was one of the delegates to Theodosius (ibid. 1313). He was deposed by the Oriental party at Tarsus (Trag. Iren. cc. 38, 66, 138, 141, 201), notwithstanding the high commendations lavished on him by John of Antioch (ibid. c. 4). Forty-five letters of Firmus were published by Muratori from a MS. in the Ambrosian Library (Script. Græc. Patav. 1709, also in Migne, Patrol. Ixxvii. p. 1477 sqq.). These are charming examples of a refined epistolary style, short, bright, playful, and very interesting from the light they throw on the manners of the age. They do not touch at all on theological questions. He died A.D. 459 (Socr. H. E. vii. 49). [E. V.]

FIRMUS (11), bishop of Tipasa in the African province of Numidia, one of the delegates of his province to the council assembled at Carthage by Boniface A.D. 525 (Mansi, viii. 647). His name is found amongst the five African bishops present at the first session of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 553; but it may have been a successor to his see of the same name. (Mansi, ix. 174; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 327.) [L. D.]

FIRMUS (12) (FARMUS, FARNUS), bishop of Viseo, one of the suffragan churches of Merida, in the years 638 and 646, the dates of the seventh and eighth councils of Toledo, the acts of which he signs. Before and after the Suevian occupation of Gallicia, Viseo was a suffragan church of Merida; but during the rule of the Suevi it was transferred to Braga. (Esp. Supr. xiv. 314; Aguirre-Calatani, iii. 423-448.) [M. A. W.]

FLACCUS, the name of two African bishops, one of Bulula in Byzaeena, the other of Vicus Pacis in Numidia, banished by Hunneric, A.D. 484, after the conference at Carthage between the Arians and Catholics. (Nobilis, Victor. Vit. 57 in Migne, Patrol. Lat. viii.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 137, 353.) [L. D.]

FLABIANUS. [FLAVIANUS.]

FLACCUS (1), a proconsul of Africa, though at what time is uncertain, mentioned by St. Augustine as a man of ability, education, and judgment. Licentius, one of the interlocutors in the dialogue contra Academicos, gives him as an instance of a man who, though unwillingly, could not help bearing witness to the correctness of the conjectures made by a notorious conjurer named Albicierus. One of these was that without previous information, as was said, he named correctly a property which Flaccianus was about to buy, and another that being asked of what region the conjurer was thinking, he answered, though an illiterate man, a line of Virgil which he had then in his mind. He is also mentioned by Augustine as having brought to his notice a prophecy concerning our Lord delivered by the Erythrean Sibyl. Augustine is also said to have written magical letters to him, which were lost. (Aug. c. Acad. i. 18, 21; GC. Dix. xvi. 23; Tillemont, vol. xiii. p. 35.) [H. W. P.]

FLACCUS (2) (FLAVIANUS), bishop of Rhodope. Baroinus quotes a Vatican manuscript purporting to be an epitome of Flaccianus, or perhaps Flavianus, a bishop of Rhodope, to Peter Fullo, patriarch of Antioch, charging him with Arianizing in his interpretation of the Triagion. The writer says he has been driven to find refuge at Rome from the spiritual tempers of the east. Baroinus, placing him in 483, conjectures he may have been among the bishops who came from Egypt with John of Alexandria to Rome. The epistle is probably spurious, but Le Quen thinks the person to whom it is attributed a real one, and puts him among the bishops of Trajanopolis, the metropolitan see of the province of Rhodope. (Baroin. ann. 483, 1xii.; Le Quen, Or. Chr. i. 1191.) [C. H.]

FLACCUS (3), bishop of Thessalonica. I. Name.—A medal, engraved by Du Cange and by Baroinus, has the inscription "Ael. Flaccialis Aug. By the Greek writers, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Nicephorus, etc., the name is given as Pusaflæa. Others, e.g. Philippinus (H. E. x. 7) call her Pauclisia. The treatise of Faustus of Iconium, which professes to be written at the request of the empress, who, from all internal evidence would seem to be Flaccia, is entitled in the ordinary editions, "Ad Galliam Pauclisiam." There seems, therefore, to have been a confusion, owing to the similarity of the names Pauclisia and Pauclisia, between the subject of this article and the well-known Gallia Pauclisia.

II. Origia, etc.—Clavius tells us that she was by birth a Spaniard (De Laud. Sac. 89), and Valesius (Not. ad Sus. H. E. vii. 6. 3) concludes that she must have been the daughter of Antoninus, prefect of Gaul, and consul in 632. This is founded upon Themistius (Or. xvi. p. 263 B,
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ed. Harduin, who says that Theodosius conferred the consulsip upon his κυρίας. This, says Valesius, can be no other than Antonius, his father-in-law. The words, however, seem hardly to warrant such an assumption of certainty. We gather from St. Jerome (Ep. 70, 2, Migne) that his wife was the mother of Arcadius and Honorius, who married Salina, daughter of the Moorish prince Gildo. [GILD.]

III. Life and Character.—Her marriage with Theodosius probably took place in 376, since her eldest child seems to have been born in 377. She was the mother of Arcadius and Honorius, afterwards emperors, and of a daughter Pulcheria, who died just before her mother, and who is commemorated in a funeral oration by St. Gregory Nyssae (vol. iii. p. 863, Migne's ed.). Some think that the Gratian mentioned by St. Ambrose (de Ob. Theod. § 40, Migne) was also her son, but St. Gregory Nyssae (de Plac. ad fin.) tells us plainly that she had only three children. The Chron. Pasch. (ad ann. 386) makes a mistake with regard to her, calling her the second wife of Theodosius, which is obviously incorrect (cf. esp. Soc. H. E. iv. 31, 18). Her masterpiece is the ode by St. Ambrose, St. Gregory Nyssae, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Nicephorus, among Christian writers, and equally by the heathen Themiutis.

Sozomen (H. E. vii. 6. 3) calls her ισαρτάτη φίλας τού δόγματος την εν Νικαια σωμάδου, and narrates how she deterred the emperor from having as a hostage, as he had intended, with the Arian Eunomius.

Theodoret (H. E. v. 19) tells us that so far from being elated by her high position, she made herself the servant of the lowest, and used to visit the hospitals and the homes of the sick and to minister to them with her own hands; also, that she continually reminded her husband of the gratitude which he owed to God for his many gifts, and by this means nourished the seeds of good within him. St. Ambrose (de Ob. Theod. § 40, ed. Migne) speaks of her as a "fideis unna Deae."

"Theodoret (p. xix. p. 231 a) tells us that it was by her advice that the emperor pardoned the conspirators in 385 [THEODOSIUS], and that in this, as in other cases, their sentiments were in perfect harmony—συμμόρφων της δικαιώματος αυτή και δει βοηθουσέναι εις μάς.

Nicephorus Callitius (H. E. xii. 42) repeats almost verbally the account given by Theodoret.

IV. Death, etc.—She died apparently in 385, on Sept. 14 (cf. Tillemont, Emp. vol. v. note 25 on Theodosius), at Scutumis, in Thrace, whither she had gone for the sake of the waters. St. Gregory, to whom we owe this last piece of information, prefers her funeral oration, which is still extant (vol. iii. p. 878, in Migne's edition of his works), in which he praises her throughout as a model of Christian virtues. (Vid. also Zonaras, xiii. 18.)

The Chron. Pasch. (1. c.) and Du Cange (Cyp. Christ. ii. 5, 3) mention a palace at Constantinople, on whose corners statues were erected to her at Antioch was destroyed shortly after her death in one of the tumults which arose on the subject of taxing, and the affection which the emperor entertained for her memory is strikingly shewn by the signal vengeance which he resolved to exact, and which he was afterwards persuaded to mitigate (Theod. H. E. v. 20; Niceph. H. E. xii. 41). Tillemont (Emp. vol. v. art. 26) says that the Greek church reckons her as a saint. This is founded upon the Menaion for Sept. 14, where the words are: "Και μονή της ευσεβεστάτας βασιλείας Παλαιάς, η άμαρτος των βασιλείων θεωσών," followed by the following lines: "Θαυμάντοι λεγομένοι στίγμα γι' ή Παλαιά, εν οὐρανοί οἴσαντον εύφρης στίγμα. Αὕρη πάντοτε της της χρόνος εν υπέρβαλη και τη των ροώντων ενυπελίε στρατος Άγιοι." The Bulliot writer on Sept. 14 contends that this commemoration is not sufficient to justify Tillemont's conclusion, since the bishops of the sixth general council are immediately afterwards commemorated in much the same way, and since she is not mentioned in the Menolog. Synaxar. Typica, etc. His conclusion is that Flacciellae mention est in Menaion impressa sed potius tanquam venerabilis quam ut sancta. In Ferrarius, however (Catal. Sanct. qui in Martyr. Rom. non sunt), she is mentioned as being commemorated at Constantinople, on Aug. 14, which seems hardly to bear out the statement of the Bulliot writer. "Apud Ferrarium memoria est Flacciellae, tanquam imperetriis beatae memoriae," meaning apparently not as a saint. The fact that she is not commemorated in the Roman calendar seems therefore to have prejudiced the Bulliot writer unduly against her claims, and Tillemon's conclusion is apparently the more correct of the two.

[M. F. A.]

FLACCILLA (2), elder daughter of the emperor Arcadius by Eudoxia, born in 397. (Marcellinus, Chron.) She apparently died young, as she is not mentioned by Sozomen or Philostorgius among the children of Arcadius. (Cl. Philost. xii. 6; Soz. H. E. ix. 1.)

[M. F. A.]

FLACCILLUS (FLACCILLUS), Arian bishop of Antioch, A.D. 353-342. There is a very remarkable discrepancy as to the true form of the name of this bishop. Jerome, in his Historia Ecclesiae, calls him Placciullus; Sozomen, Placcius or Placitus (H. E. iii. 5); Theodoret, Flaccitus (H. E. i. 21), while Athanasius (Apol. ii. pp. 797, 799) and Eusebius (in Marcell. lib. iii. pr. p. 57), followed by Theophanes, write the name Flacciellus. He appears in the modern catalogue of the patriarchs of Antioch as Placentius (Seale, Patriarchs of Ant. p. 156). After the deposition of Eustathius, A.D. 331, the episcopal succession was singularly rapid. Eulalius held the see but three months, Euphrontius, the immediate predecessor of Flaccillus, only fifteen. The episcopate of Flaccillus was a matter of lesser length, though the exact dates are uncertain, about nine years. Nothing is known of Flaccillus previous to his becoming bishop of Antioch on the death of Euphrontius, and little is recorded of him as bishop save his official acts. He presided at the council of Tyre, 335, held, by the emperor's desire, to investigate the charges against Athanasius, and joined in the sentence of deposition pronounced upon him. From Tyre he passed on with his episcopal brethren to Jerusalem to celebrate the dedication of the Church of the Resurrection, which took place Sept. 13 in that year. Tillemont thinks it probable that Flacci-
cillus resided at the council which succeeded the solemnities of the consecration by which Anian and Eusebius were ordained as orthodox believers, who had suffered from the calamities of jealous rivals. Six years later, we find him occupying the same position at the celebrated "Council of the Dedication" held at Antioch, 341 (Socr. ii. 8, 9; Soz. iii. 5). Flaccillus is associated by Theodoret with his two Arian successors, Stephen and Leontius, as men whose unjust and impious deeds it would require a volume to recount (Theod. H. E. ii. 24). No definite charge, however, is specified. Flaccillus must have had some reputation for erudition, since Eusebius dedicated to him his work against Marcellus of Ancyra, with the request that he would make any additions or corrections he might think desirable (Euseb. in Marcell. i. iii. pr. p. 57). He must have died about A.D. 345, and was succeeded by Stephen. [E. V.]

FLACCUS (1), bishop of Sanius or Sanaus, in Phrygia Pacatiana, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Le Quen, Origen Christ. i. 805; Mansi, ii. 695.) [L. D.]

FLACCUS (2), bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia Salutaris. One of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325 (Mansi, ii. 695); subsequently he joined the Eusebians, and was one of the Easterners whose "indecent and suspicious flight" provoked the anger of the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347. His name is appended to the letter to the churches, which the seeders published at their synod at Philippopolis. (Mansi, iii. 140; Le Quen, Origen Christ. i. 804.) [L. D.]

FLACCUS (3) ALBINUS. [ALCUIN.]

FLACHERTAC. [FLAITHBHERTACH.]

FLACILLUS, bishop of Jassus, on the coast of Caria, present at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quen, Origen Christ. i. 913; Mansi, vii. 156.) [L. D.]

FLAITHBHERTACH (1) Abbot of Cillmor-Emhir, now Killmore, situated three miles to the east of Armagh, died A.D. 812. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 807, i. 419.) [J. G.]

(2) Flaithearthach or Flachertach, son of Loingseach, became monarch of Ireland A.D. 722, and after reigning seven years, retired A.D. 729 to Armagh, where he died in monastic seclusion, A.D. 760 (Four Mast.) or more truly A.D. 765. (Ann. Ult. A.D. 764.) [J. G.]

FLAITHGHIAL (FLAIDHEIL), son of Taichleath, abbot of Drum-rath, said by Colgan (Acta SS. 876) to be a church in Léiny, Cunaught, died A.D. 793. (Four Mast. A.D. 788; Ann. Ult. A.D. 792.) [J. G.]

FLAITHNIA (FLAITNE) son of Congall, and called The Wise, died A.D. 715. (Four Mast. A.D. 713; Ann. Ult. A.D. 714.) [J. G.]

FLAITHNIAIDH, son of Congall, abbot of Cloond, co. Longford, died A.D. 781 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 381, A.D. 778); but in Ann. Ult. A.D. 782, there is the obit of Mac Flainnabhadh, abbot of Cloond. (O'Conor, Eri. Hist. Scrip. iv. 111.) [J. G.]

FLAMMS, abbot of Chimen. It is stated in the Life of St. Germanus of Paris by Fortunatus that a letter which Flammeris received from Germanus was the means of curing a sick monk, who was allowed to maintain the signatur with his tongue, and so receive the precious inkt into his system. (Vit. S. Germa. § 58, in Mabill. Acta SS. G. S. B. i. 230, and in Pat. Lat. lxxii. 72.) [C. H.]

FLAMINA, May 2, virgin and martyr is Gaul during the Diocletian persecution. She suffered under the president Basilus. She was particularly venerated for her influence on sorcery. The offices of the church of St. Hilarius, near Clermont, under whose altar she rests, is said to be the prayer to God that by her intercession the worshippers might be protected from all diseases of the eyes. (Ferrarius, Catal. SS.; Acta SS. Boll. Mai. i. 181-183.) [G. T. S.]

FLANN (FLAINN, FLANNUS) means "red" or "crimson," is used as a proper name, and the latinized form is Frenius or Florence: its original idea was probably a ruddy-faced man (Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 2 ser. 145).

(1) Febla, of Armagh, commemorated April 24. His name does not appear in the Irish Kalendars. He succeeded Segene at Armagh A.D. 688, where he is called abbot, bishop, and archbishop, and was there for twenty-nine years. The most celebrated event of his rule was the assembling of the synod at Tara in Meath, about A.D. 697 (Potrie, Tara Hill, 171-2). There were forty bishops or abbots presided over by Flann Febla; and the best known person present, and the person at whose suggestion the convention is said to have been held, was St. Adamnan (Sept. 23), abbot of Iona, Colgan (Acta SS. 454, col. 1) had a copy of the acts of the synod, and copies of the same are now preserved in the Burgundian Library at Brussels (Ns. 2324), and in bishop Marsh's library, Armagh, in a book entitled, Presidents of Sec of Armagh, Ns. (Trans. Roy. Irish Acad. xvii. 173, Annap); they have been printed by Martene (Thebenea in Nov. Anec. tom. iv. col. 18), and are probably the eight canons known as the "Cain Adamnan." [ADAMNAN (2).] (Reeves, Adamnan I., ii. 178, 179; Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 11, § 10; Colgan, Acta SS. 473, col. 2, 566, and Tr. Thomn. 218, i. 563,) He died A.D. 715. (Ann. Ty. ; Stuart, Armagh, 94.)


(3) Sinna Us Cola, abbot of Cleonaighe, one of the Ui-Creamhthainn, died A.D. 726. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 323.)

(4) Abbat of Banger. At Dec. 15, in Mart, Duneog, there is merely the commemoration of "Flann, abbot of Beanachor." In the Irish Annals he is entered as St. Flann of Aestebr (the ancient name of Antrim), abbot of Beanachor; he died A.D. 725. (Ann. Ty.; Four Mast. A.D. 725; Ann. Ult. A.D. 727; O'Conor, Eri. Hist. Scrip. ii. 236, iv. 80; Reeves, Exc. Antip. 277, 278, 381.)

(5) Son of Cinoing, abbat of Cill-mor-Rithairb (now probably Kilmore, co. Roscommon,
FLANNAN

founded by St. Columba), was murdered: the Four Mast. say in A.D. 730, the Ann. Ult. in A.D. 734 (Four Mast. by O'Donnay, i. 327; O'Conor, Rev. Her. Scrip. iv. 95).

(8) Beg, commemorated July 17. By Colgan (Tr. Thomann, 509, c. 8), and Lanigan (Eccles. Hist. Ir. iii. 171) he is identified with the "Flann, son of Ceillic, son of Crumad, bishop of Beachrann," who died A.D. 739 (Ann. Tgj.). Lanigan accepts this Beachrann as the small island Raithlin, Rathylin, or Raighares, off the coast of Antrim; but O'Donnay is unable to decide whether it is that or the island of Lambay, off Brega, near Dublin (Four Mast. by O'Donnay, i. 336 n. 4, 337; O'Conor, Rev. Hist. Scrip. ii. 243, iv. 88; Reeves, Eccl. Antiq. 249, 292).


(8) Aghile, bishop of Aughrim, a village in the county of Galway, died A.D. 741 (Four Mast. by O'Donnay, i. 338 n. 4, 339; Ann. Ult. a.d. 740).

(9) Ua Dorchua (Ua Dochrua, Ann. Ult.), abbot of Inishkeen, co. Monaghan, died A.D. 771 (Ann. Ult. a.d. 770; Four Mast. by O'Donnay, i. 385).

(10) Bishop, wise man, and abbot of Inishkeen, co. Monaghan, died A.D. 784 (Four Mast. by O'Donnay, i. 384 n. 385).

(11) Finn, commemorated Jan. 14. On this day the Irish Calendars commemorate Flann Finn, of Cuilinn, in the vicinity of Corgach (Mart. Domest. Mart. Tidalgot). As appearing in the "Recueil de Armagnac, he probably flourished not later than the eighth century. He is to be distinguished from Flann Finn, son of Macruhlae Ua Cruinnueill, chief of Gneil Keghain, who died A.D. 698 (Four Mast.), and from Flann Finn, who was known by this name in Ireland, but in England as Aelfred son of Owgy king of Northumbria.

(12) Son of Ceillic, abbot of Finneghla, scribe, archivist, and bishop, died suddenly A.D. 812 (Ann. Ult., a.d. 811; Four Mast., by O'Donnay, i. 867, i. 419). [J. G.]

FLANNAN, of Killaloe, commemorated Dec. 18. The name is etymologically the diminutive of Flann. Of this saint there appear to have been two lives, which are now lost. Hardy (Descript. Cat. i. 229) notices a Vita St. Flanniani Episc. Luminensis, in MS. Bodl. Rawl. i. 505.

Flannan was the son of Toirdhelbach, latarized Theodoricus, king of the Dalcasians in Munster, who became a monk at Lismore after he had endowed his son's church at Killaloe with ample revenues, and thus prepared his own final resting-place. Flannan had one of the famous schools of Ireland at Killaloe. Colgan calls him "Episcopus Luminensis," and Ware, the first bishop of Killaloe, having been consecrated at Rome by pope John in A.D. 639; but Lanigan (Eccles. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 19, § 2) wholly doubts the tale of his Roman visit, and even the date of his consecration. Dr. Petrie, however (Ardagh Tocain, 281) seems more inclined not to accept the legend. Besides his dedication at Killaloe, the island Inis-flannan in Lough Corrib and Ios-fhlanan Point, with the ruins of St. Flannan's church in Mainl Bay, preserve the memory of this saint. In Inisheen island there is Tobar Flannan (O'Flaherty, Tuar-Cnualaithe by Hardiman, 24, 109, 111, 115, 116); and he has probably also given their name to the Flannan islands, to the west of Lewis (Bp. Forbes, Cat. Scott. Saints, 350; Martin, West. Is. 15, 16, 2nd ed.). [J. G.]

FLAVIA DOMITILLA. [DOMITILLA.]


FLAVIANUS, bishop of Rome. [FABIANUS (I).]

FLAVIANUS, bishop of Antioch. [FA-RIANUS (I).]

FLAVIANUS (2) (FABIANUS), bishop of Elberi; signing 14th among the nineteen bishops present at the council of Elberi in 305. The see of Elberi (so spelt on Gothic coins, Tovelmy wrote Illeribis, Pliny Illeri), now represented by Granada, makes its first appearance in history with this bishop. (As to the site of Elberi see Dory's "Observations geographiques sur quelques anciennes Localités de l'Andalousie" in his Recerches, i. 328.) For a clever attempt to give historical form to the famous legend of the seven apostolic men, amongst whom St. Cecilins is made bishop of Elberi, see Gams, P.B. Kirchen-geschichte von Spanien, i. 79-178. (Bp. Segur. xii. 111; Aguure-Catalani, vol. ii.) [M. A. W.]

FLAVIANUS (2), said to have been bishop of Tente (Chietit), c. A.D. 320-340. (Gams, Novus Episcoporum, p. 875.) [H. S. G.]

FLAVIANUS (3), bishop, supposed to have belonged to the province of Cappadocia, yet not clearly referred to any see, though by Cellier (vi. 215) called bishop of Cappadocia, and regarded by the Bellandists (Acta SS. 9 Mart. ii. 9) as Flavian patriarch of Antioch at the same period. [FLAVIANUS (4).] (Tillemaen, Mon. Hist. Eccl. i. 580, 703.)

About the year 393, Gregory of Nyssa wrote to Flavian (ep. i.), as he did to other bishops, complaining of the treatment he had received at the hands of Helladius, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and demanding satisfaction; the letter to Flavian is long and interesting, giving an account of his hurried flight from Seleucia, his unwelcome interview with Helladius, and his delight at escaping from him safe and well. He then reviews his whole relation to Helladius as one of entire superiority. [J. G.]

FLAVIANUS (4) L., bishop of Antioch, 381-404. Flavian was born at Antioch, of a distinguished and wealthy family. He had several brothers and sisters. One of the latter, who had survived all the rest, was living with him in A.D. 387, in very feeble health, at the time of his journey to Constantinople to appease the wrath of Theodosius. He was very young when the death of his father left him heir of the family property, which was of considerable amount.
When bishop continued to occupy the family mansion at Antioch, which he devoted to the reception of the sick and distressed of his flock. We know nothing of Flavianus's early training, or of his instructors in the faith. Chrysostom, in his highly-coloured eulogium pronounced on receiving ordination to the priesthood at his hands, records that although reared in the midst of affluence, he was remarkable for his earliest years for his temperance and control over his bodily appetites and for his contempt of luxury and a rich table. Although the premature death of his father deprived him of parental control at an early age, and he was exposed to the temptations incident to youth, wealth, and good birth, he overcame them all. From his youth he devoted himself to a religious life, sparing no pains to obtain complete self-mastery, and to cultivate his spiritual faculties. He adopted the strictest asceticism, and according to Theodoret (H. E. ii. 24) at the time that a half-concealed Arianaism was carrying all before it and a-states to avoid a breach with Eugenianus. He was encouraged, he together with his friend and fellow-champion of the orthodox faith, Diodorus (a few years later the celebrated bishop of Tarsus), left his home and adopted the life of a solitary. The sad necessities of the times soon recalled the two friends to Antioch, where, while still laymen, they exerted a powerful influence in favour of the truth, and by their zeal in unceasing kept alive an orthodox remnant in the midst of the dominant Eusebians. The crafty Leontius (ὁ ἀρχιερατεὺς) was then the intruding bishop of Antioch, who while a Eusebian at heart sought by concealment of his real sentiments to avoid a breach with the orthodox. Diodorus, by a temporizing policy to preserve a hollow peace in his church. The adroitness with which the party to which Leontius belonged eluded any distinct declaration of their belief on the most critical questions, and veiled their heresy by dogmatical speech was as far as they went, felt short of the full Catholic belief, menaced the faith with formidable perils. From the time of the expulsion of Eusebius, c. A.D. 328, the orthodox party at Antioch had been destitute of a head, and as the counsel of Eustathius himself before he quitted Antioch was that his adherents held the faith of the church, and, in spite of his illegal deposition, continued in communion with his successors in the see, there was no small risk of their being gradually absorbed by the Eusebians, and losing their hold of the Catholic faith. This danger was strenuously met by Flavianus and his friend Diodorus. They rallied the faithful about them, and by their example and influence accustomed them to assemble round the tombs of the martyrs, where they held nocturnal meetings for worship, and exhorted them to adhere steadfastly to the faith. As a powerful instrument for kindling zeal, Flavianus and Diodorus are said by Theodoret to have revived the practice of the antiphonal chanting of the psalms, which tradition ascribed to Ignatius. (Theod. H. E. ii. 24; Socr. H. E. vi. 8.) The statement of the Arian historian Philostorgius that they altered the lesser Doxology from its older form, “Glory to the Father by” or “in the Son,” to “through the Son” (Philost. H. E. iii. 49), though, as St. Basil has shown, when charged with introducing a similar novelty, at variance with facts (De Spiritu Sancto, c. 29 [70]), probably contains so much of truth that until the rise of the Arian heresy had rendered cautious in theological phraseology necessary, the various traditional forms of the doxology had been used indifferently, and that Flavianus and Diodorus were among the first to enforce the exclusive use of the form which was least susceptible of any heterodox perversion. The measure adopted by Leontius to check the growing influence of these religious gatherings by causing them to be transferred from the martyrs without the walls to the churches of the city, had the effect of increasing their popularity and strengthening the cause of orthodoxy. Flavianus and Diodorus became all powerful at Antioch. Leontius was unable to resist their wishes. The threat of withdrawing from his communion and travelling to the west to lay their remonstrance before Constantius and the Oriental bishops compelled him to retract his steps, and inhibit the synod of Antioch in A.D. 360 on the exercise of the functions of the diaconate to which he had admitted him. (Theod. H. E. ii. 24.) [AETIUS] Leontius is reported to have said, pointing to his white hairs, "When this snow melts there will be plenty of mud," meaning that his death would be followed by great disturbances. (Soz. H. E. iii. 20.) The history of the next twenty years fully proves the truth of his words. His successor in the see of Antioch was Eudoxius, the profane and intriguing bishop of Gerniana, and the open patron of Aetius. On his promotion to the see of Constantinople in A.D. 365, and the deposition of his successor, the excellent Meletius, Eudoxius, the old comrade of Arius, was made bishop of Antioch A.D. 361, and Arianaian at once assumed the ascendency. Eudoxius was repudiated with horror by all the orthodox. Those who up to this time had remained in communion with the Emperor now separated themselves altogether and recognised Meletius alone as their bishop. The old Catholic body, however, who bore the name of Eustathians, could not bring themselves to submit to the authority of a bishop consecrated by Arians, however orthodox, and continued to worship apart from the company of leisures and Eudoxius as well as from Eusebius. They had as their head Paulinus, a presbyter so highly esteemed by all parties that even Eudoxius abstained from any interference with him, and permitted him to hold his religious assemblies in a small church in the new city, situated on an island of the Orontes. (Soz. H. E. iii. 9.) This schism between two orthodox bodies, who should have united in defence of the common faith, was the cause of much pain to Athanasius and the orthodox. A council was held at Alexandria, early in A.D. 382, one object of which was the healing of those unhappy dissensions. The wise decision that Paulinus and his flock should unite with the patriarch Meletius, who had now returned from exile, was unhappily rendered nugatory by the pre-eipitancy of Lucifer of Cagliari, who, instead of accompanying Eusebius of Vercellae to Alexandria, had gone straight to Antioch to accommodate matters, and now perpetuated the schism by retaining Paulinus as his coadjutor. Meletius, who followed him to Antioch, could do no more than
lament the irreparable mischief caused by Lucifer's rash act. The schism thus openly declared lasted till A.D. 415, and was productive of the greatest injury to the church. (Socr. H. E. iii. 6; Soz. H. E. v. 12; Theod. H. E. iii. 5.) Flavianus, however, still continued the ruling spirit at Antioch, and during the unhappy discussions and serious persecutions of the next twenty years proved the zealous champion of orthodoxy. He and his friend Diodorus having been raised to the presbyterate did much to supply the place of their beloved bishop Meletius during his lengthened banishments. Flavianus's zeal for the truth and courage in maintaining it in the face of fierce opposition was proved during the reign of Valens, when the Arians, secure of imperial favour, tyrannized over the orthodox at their will. Valens took up his residence at Antioch in June A.D. 370. This was the signal for a violent persecution of the orthodox. Meletius was banished for the third time, and the duty of administering to the faithful and supporting them under their prolonged trials devolved on Flavianus and Diodorus. The Catholics having been deprived of the use of their churches took refuge among the ravines and caves and mountains which overhang the city. Here they met for worship, exposed to all the inclemency of the elements, and liable to the assaults of a rude soldiery, by whom they were repeatedly dislodged, and compelled to find another place of assemblage. At one time the banks of the Orontes, at another the "Cathedra Maior" of the city, resounded with the psalms and hymns with which their insatiable leaders sought to kindle their courage. Theodoret tells us that Flavianus abstained from preaching in public, committing that office to his more eloquent companion Diodorus, whom he furnished with the subjects of his discourse, and scriptural arguments in support of his theses. (Theod. H. E. iv. 25.) The obliquity with which the orthodox, when driven from one place of assemblage, gathered in another, irritated Valens exceedingly. Many were seized and cruelly punished, and not a few were put to death. The favourite death was drowning. The presence of theercy stood on an island of the Orontes, and, by an anticipation of the "noyades," of a later age, the faithful were taken out in boats and thrown out to perish on its rapid waters. (Socr. H. E. iv. 17.) We have no evidence that Flavianus was a sufferer in this persecution, but it is difficult to see how so pronounced a leader of the orthodox could altogether escape. The persecution, which had already relaxed, ceased entirely with the death of Valens in A.D. 378. The exiles for the faith were everywhere recalled, and Meletius quickly resumed the charge of his Antiochene flock. His official recognition as the Catholic bishop of Antioch was more tardy. Gratián had commanded that the churches should be given up to those prelates who were in communion with Damasus, bishop of Rome, and that the Ariam instigators should be expelled. Easy as the execution of this enactment might be elsewhere, a small difficulty was experienced in Antioch. The presence of two bishops with equal claims to orthodoxy, Paulinus and Meletius, to whom a third was added, Vitalian, who held Apollinarian views, Sapor, a military officer high in command, to whom Gratian had committed the execution of the edict, was naturally no judge of theological niceties and was much perplexed how to decide. Flavianus came to the rescue and, by cleverly framed questions, involving the critical points, addressed to the other two bishops, convinced Sapor that the right lay with Meletius. The separation, however, still continued. Paulinus declined the proposal of the peace-loving Meletius, that they should unite their flocks, and that placing the volume of the Gospels on the vacant episcopal throne, each should recognize the other as of equal authority with himself, and that at the death of either the survivor should be the sole bishop. The unhappy Antiochene schism continued to divide the Christian world. The Oriental churches recognised Meletius, while the West and Egypt maintained the cause of Paulinus. (Theod. H. E. v. 1-3.) Three years later, A.D. 381, Flavianus accompanied Meletius to the council of Constantinople, where he signed, as a presbyter, with Euplides (Labbe, Concil. ii. 955). At the death of Meletius, which took place during the session of the council, Gregory of Nazianzus, who had reluctantly succeeded him as president, entreated his brother bishops to accept the episcopal charge over the lamentable schism, by recognizing Paulinus as the orthodox bishop of Antioch (Greg. Naz. de Vita Sac. v. 1572, sq. p. 757). But this, however right in itself, would have been to give a triumph to the Westerns. The council was composed of Oriental bishops only. Unworthy monuments of the interests of the church, and, in spite of the earnest remonstrances of the aged Gregory, Flavianus was elected as the successor of Meletius. We cannot altogether excuse Flavianus for thus allowing himself to be the instrument of perpetuating the schism. His act becomes less pardonable if it is true, as Socrates and Sozomen state (Socr. H. E. v. 5; Soc. H. E. vii. 2, 3), that he was one of the six leading clergy of Antioch, who had bound themselves by an oath at the death of either Meletius or Paulinus not to seek the bishopric themselves, but to acknowledge the survivor as the rightful bishop. This charge, however, rests upon the authority of Sozomen and Sozomen, whose accuracy is far from being unquestionable, and its truth is rendered very doubtful by the absence of any reference to it in the letters of Ambrose, or any of the contemporary documents published by the adherents of Paulinus during the progress of the controversy. The consecration of Flavianus was performed by his life-long friend, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Accius of Beroea, and received the ratification of the council. Paulinus monstrated in vain (Theod. H. E. v. 23), but his cause was sharply maintained by Damasus and the Western bishops, as well as by those of Egypt; while even at Antioch, though the majority of the Meletian party welcomed Flavianus with joy, as seeing their beloved bishop revive in him (Chrys. Hom. cum Presbytr. flat ordinatus, § 4), some, indignant at the breaking of an engagement, real or implied, separated from his communion, and connected themselves with Paulinus (Socr. H. E. vii. 11). The West refused all intercourse with Flavianus, and the council, meeting at Aquileia in the September of the same year, wrote to Theodosius in favour of his rival, Paulinus,
and requested him to summon a council at Alexandria, to decide that and other controverted questions. Theodosius thought it better that the council should be held at Rome. The Eastern prelates were invited, but declined to attend, and held a second synod of their own at Constantinople in 382. Perfect unanimity could not be secured even here, as the bishops of Egypt, Cyprus, and Arabia recognised Paulinus as the rightful bishop, and demanded the banishment of Flavianus, who was supported by the bishops of Palestine, Phoenicia, and Syria (Socr. H. E. v. 10). A synodal letter was, however, despatched to Damascus and the Western bishops which, among other subjects, recognised Flavianus' ordination as legitimate. (Theod. H. E. v. 9.) Paulinus himself attended the council at Rome, accompanied by Epiphanius and Jerome, the latter of whom espoused his cause very ardently. The result of this council was to confirm the West in its refusal to acknowledge Flavianus; it is a pity that such an election of bishop, as it was said they even went so far as to excommunicate him and his two consecrators. (Socr. H. E. vii. 11.) Meanwhile the two rival bishops continued to exercise the episcopal functions among their respective flocks. The consequences of thus setting up church against church were very disastrous. Church discipline became impossible, when the attempt to exercise it led to a desertion to the opposite camp. Such a transference of allegiance was rendered easier by the difference between them being simply one of church order, not of doctrine. Some time after his consecration, Flavianus, accompanied by Apollinaris, together with other bishops, priests, and leading laymen, paid a visit to the celebrated solitary, Marcellus, with the hope of inducing him to receive holy orders; but the aged ascetic maintained an obstinate silence, and the deputation had to depart baffled. (Theod. Vit. Patr. iii. 4.) Early in his episcopate, Flavianus was also engaged in a dispute with the Syrian sect of fanatic perfectionists known as Euchites or Messalians. To make himself acquainted with their doctrines, which it was their habit to conceal, he resorted to an act of deception which we cannot but condemn. Having summoned Adelphius, the head of the sect, and an old man of feeble body, he prevailed on his guard by professions of friendship and of a simple desire to become acquainted with his tenets, and thus led him to a full declaration. On this he threw off the mask, denounced his heretical views in the strongest terms, and expelled him and his adherents. (Theod. H. E. iv. 11.) Adelphius proceeded to Rome, and the result was to ordain him to the presbyterate. He was received by the bishops, and took his seat in the synod. These overtures were rejected at a synod held by Flavianus. He had previously received a synodal letter of a gathering of bishops held at Side, under Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, acquainting him with the principle held by the synod that the end sanctifies the means, and that falsehood for a good end was no sin; and warning him not to be too ready to credit their professions. Flavianus wrote to the bishops of Asia respecting the punishment and excommunication of the Messalians, for which he received a letter of thanks. Flavianus also wrote to an Armenian bishop, reprimanding him for patronizing these pestilent heretics. (Photius, Cod. iii. p. 37; Theod. Haer. Fab. iv. 11, p. 243.)

In A.D. 386 Flavianus ordained Chrysostom presbyter. Chrysostom, on the occasion of his ordination, or very soon after it, preached an inaugural discourse in the presence of his bishop, on whom he passed a very laboured eulogium, which, however well deserved, a modern standard of good taste would have reserved for another occasion. (Chrys. Hom. cum Presb. fut. ordinatus, § 3, 4.) The sedition at Antioch on the occasion of the destruction of the Imperial Statues, A.D. 387, showed the noble, self-sacrificing character of Flavianus in its graver colours. His absence from the episcopal palace during the first violence of the storm had prevented his doing anything to arrest its fury. But when the brief fit of popular madness was over, and the Antiochenes awoke to a sense of their danger, Flavianus at once yielded to their entreaties to become their advocate with the emperor, which with a firm heart and unwearied endeavours to appease his just wrath. Regardless of his advanced years, the dangerous sickness of his only surviving sister, the inclemency of the season, and the length and difficulty of the journey, the dauntless old man started immediately on his errand of mercy. In the words of Chrysostom—"Having learnt that the good shepherd layeth down his life for his sheep, he took his departure, venturing his own life for us all, notwithstanding there were many things to forbid his absence and enforce his stay. For this reason he would encounter every danger, and nothing would avail to detain him." (Chrysost. In hom. xxxii.) The success of Flavianus' mission has been stated in another article. (Chrysost. l. p. 521.) It was instant, and it was complete. His wrath having had time to cool, Theodosius was already disposed to mercy; and his favourable disposition towards the Antiochenes was confirmed by the boldness of the aged bishop, who had risked so much to offer his intercession in person. If Flavianus' bearing is more submissive—it might be almost called abject—than appears to us consistent with the dignity of a Christian bishop pleading for his flock, we must remember the difference between the old man of feeble body and those invested with sovereign authority, and rejoice that his intercession proved so effectual. Theodosius granted a free pardon to the city of Antioch, and urged Flavianus to lose no time in returning, that he might relieve the people of Antioch from the agony of suspense. After the severe strain and anxiety of the last few weeks, Flavianus was unequal to a rapid journey. An express courier was therefore dispatched to convey the joyous tidings. The bishop followed at a more leisurely pace, but reached Antioch in time to keep the Easter festival, and had the happiness of finding his aged sister still alive. (Chrysost. de Stat. xxii.) The next year, A.D. 388, witnessed the death of Paulinus. This event, however, had not at once, as might have been hoped, the effect of healing the schism; for on his death-bed, in direct violation of the nineteenth and twenty-third canons of the council of Antioch, Paulinus, without the authority of a synod or the assistance of any other bishop, had taken the
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ill-advised step of consecrating Evagrius, a presbyter of his church, his successor. (Socr. H. E. v. 15; Soz. H. E. vii. 15; Theod. H. E. v. 23.) The scandal of this long-continued schism was deeply felt in the West, and was a cause of trouble to Theodosius, in whose esteem Flavianus stood high. Accordingly, on his return to Constantinople from the West in A.D. 391, he proposed to Flavianus, whom he had summoned to appear in person at a synod to be assembled at Capua. Flavianus excused himself on the ground that the winter was just setting in, but promised to obey the emperor’s bidding in the spring, and returned to Antioch. (Theod. H. E. v. 23.) Though there is some discrepancy as to whether the Western bishops actually joined communion with Evagrius, there is no doubt that their feeling was strongly in his favour, and that they were indisposed to admit the claims of his rival. Flavianus had some reason to fear that the Western synod would not be altogether impartial in his favour, and even went so far as to send a secret report of the soundness of his own cause, he declined to attend. It is probable that Evagrius was there. Whether Ambrose or Siricius took part in it is uncertain. The feeling manifested was strongly against Flavianus, but no decision was come to his absence, and the final adjunction was entrusted to Theophilius of Alexandria, and his suffragans, who had remained neutral. (Ambros. Epist. lvi. (ix.).) Flavianus disregarded the summons addressed to him by Theophilius, and seems to have appealed to another synod which he urged Theodosius to summon in the East. Ambrose wrote to Theophilius, sharply condemning Flavianus for having recourse to state aid and imperial rescripts to support him in his disobedience to ecclesiastical authority, and for seeking to impose on the bishops—many of whom were old and poor—the trouble and expense of travelling to another synod. After much wrangle the Western prelates were urgent with Theodosius to compel Flavianus to come to Rome and submit to the judgment of the church. Flavianus replied to the emperor with much dignity, that, if the question was one of heresy or immorality, he would not shrink from the trial; but if his episcopate was only the object of attack, he would prefer to resign it altogether. The emperor might assign the see to whom he pleased. Such magnanimous sentiments were in harmony with Theodosius’s own generous heart. He admired his courage and his wisdom, and commanded him to resume the government of his church. (Theod. H. E. v. 23.) Flavianus’s refusal to submit to the arbitration of “the haughty and tyrannical Egyptian” received the high commendation of Nestorius. (Mercator, tom. ii. p. 86, 8.) The knot which seemed insoluble was, before long, cut by the death of Evagrius. Flavianus’s influence prevented the election of a successor. The Eustathians, however, still refused to acknowledge Flavianus as their bishop, and continued to hold their assemblies apart. (Soz. H. E. vii. 15; viii. 3; Socr. H. E. v. 15.) This separation continued till the episcopate of Alexander, A.D. 414 or 415. The bishops of the other Western churches and the West was finally healed by Chrysostom, who took the opportunity of the presence of Theophilus at Constantinople, for his consecration to that see in A.D. 396, to induce him to become reconciled with Flavianus, and to join him in despatching an embassy to Rome to supplicate Siricius to recognise Flavianus as the canonical bishop of Antioch. The deputies chosen for this mediation were Aecarius of Beroea, and Isidorus, presbyter and hospitaler of Alexandria, for whom Theophilus had striven to obtain the bishopric of Constantinople, to whom Flavianus added some leading presbyters of his church. Their mission was entirely successful. All were heartily weary of the schism which was a discredit to the church, and were glad to have a decent excuse for bringing it to an end; and Acacius, who was the chief of the mission, returned to Antioch bringing letters of communion from Rome and Egypt. (Socr. H. E. v. 15; Soz. H. E. viii. 3; Theod. H. E. v. 23.) As a proof of the cessation of all angry feeling, and of the means of conciliating his opponents, Flavianus put the names of Paulinus and Evagrius on the fourth list of the Synod of 396, p. 203.) Flavianus lived just long enough to see with sorrow the deposition and exile of his beloved and distinguished son in the faith, Chrysostom, against the injustice of which he protested with his last breath. His death probably was placed in A.D. 404. (Pallad. Dial. p. 144; Soz. H. E. viii. 24; Theophan., p. 68.) He governed the church of Antioch for twenty-three years; and Tillemont thinks it probable, from chronological considerations, that he lived to the age of ninety-five years. The Greek church has commemorated him on Sept. 26.

Flavianus was more famous as a bishop than as a writer. He left behind him certain remains, of which a few fragments are preserved to us by Theodoret and others. Theodoret in his Epanistia quotes one on Joh. i. 14 (Dial. l. p. 46), another on St. John the Baptist (ib. p. 68), on Esoster, and the treachery of Judas (Dial. ili. p. 230) or the Theophrastus, and a passage from his commentary on St. Luke. (Dial. ii. p. 160.) His homilies are also quoted in the proceedings of the council under John of Antioch, and that of Chalcedon (Funct. lib. viii. c. 4, p. 319; Labbe, iv. 830); and by Leontius, in Nest. et Eulych. (p. 979). (Tillemont, Mem. Eccl. vol. 5.)


FLAVIANUS (7), bishop of Philippoi in Macedonia. He acted as proxy for his metropolitan Rufus bishop of Thessalonica, and sat among the metropolitans at the Council of Florence A.D. 431. In the first session he suggested the second and third summons to Nestorius, that nothing required by ecclesiastical procedure should be omitted; he asked for quotations from the ancient fathers of the church on the points in which Nestorius was said to have erred from the teaching of the Church of Egypt, which had been inserted in the acts of the council, and took an active part in all its proceedings. (Mansi, iv. 2 M 2)
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1132, 1133, 1138; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 68; Baron. A. E. ann. 450, xxvii.) [L. D.]

FLAVIANUS (8), eighteenth bishop of Constantineople, between Proclus and Anatolius. The length of his episcopate is a little uncertain, but it was about two or three years. He is described by Nicephorus as being at his election guardian of the sacred vessels of the great church of Constantineople, with a reputation for a heavenly life.

At the time of Flavian's consecration Theodosius was staying at Chalcedon. Chrysaphius his minister appears to have immediately inaugurated his scheme against the new patriarch. He suggested that the emperor should ask Flavian to send him some kind of present or firstfruits in acknowledgment for his elevation. Flavian replied by returning what seems to have been a common compliment on such occasions, some fresh loaves or cakes. These were rudely rejected by the insolent enmarch, who wrote back the following letter, 'I desire something in the shape of gold. The prelate answered that unless he used some of the sacred vessels for the purpose, he had nothing of the kind. The ill-will of Chrysaphius achieved its object, for the courageous integrity of the churchman stirred up great bitterness against him; and by some means Pulcheria was kept ignorant of the discredituable proceeding.

Two methods of attack against Flavian now presented themselves to the scheming brain of the minister; the direct subversion of the authority of the emperor's sister Pulcheria and the support of Eutyches, one of the archimandrites of Constantineople, a theological opponent of the archbishop. Stirring up the jealousy of the emperor Eudocia, he persuaded her to warn her husband with entreaties that he would remove a person who seems to have been a kind of secretary of state to Pulcheria. Baffled unsuccessfully, the emperor then turned his attention to the faithful ally which had caused his death; but she could shew his dead body all the honours which affection and respect could dictate.

Among the letters which touch on the career of Flavian, may be mentioned the reply of Peter Chrysologus, archbishop of Ravenna, to a circular appeal by Eutyches against his condemnation by Flavian; the letter of Theodoret congratulating Flavian on his condemnation of Eutyches; another from Theodoret, when the bishops of Syria had taken up Theodoret's defence, which was one of twenty-two with which he entrusted the deputation which they sent to Theodosius. Leo, who was plunged in the profoundest grief, wrote him a beautiful letter before hearing that he was dead.

(Leo, Magn. Epist. 23, 26-27, 28, 44; Facund. Pro Tris. Capit. viii. 5; xii. 5; Evagrius, ii 2, &c.; Liberatus Disc. Breviar. xi. and xii.; Sol. H. E. i. 1; Theoph. Chronogr. pp. 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, &c.; Nic. Const. xiv. 47. [W. M. S.]

FLAVIANUS (9), bishop of Flavianus (Floriae), c. A.D. 449-451. He succeeded St. Maurus, and appears to have held his office
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FLAVIANUS (10), St., bishop of Adramyt- tium in the province of Asia, present in the Latrocinium Ephesinum, 449 (Mansi, vi. 992); his name was subscribed in his absence by Hesperorus of Pitane at the instance of Stephen of Ephesus to the definition of the faith that was read before the emperor Marcian at the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 168; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 701.)

FLAVIANUS (11), bishop of Gabala in Syria, south of Laodicea. He signed the synodal epistle of the province of Syria Secunda to the emperor Leo, in reference to the murder of Proterius, A.D. 455. (Mansi, vii. 551; Le Quien, Gr. Chr. ii. 793.)

FLAVIANUS (12), twelfth recorded bishop of Paris, between Felix and Ursicinus, about A.D. 486, judging from his position in the list, which is here undated. (Gall. Chr. vii. 15.)

FLAVIANUS (13), bishop of Casena (Cesena), c. A.D. 485-499. He was succeeded by Ignatius. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 441; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. ii. 527.)

FLAVIANUS (14), bishop of Vamalla in Mauretania Sitifensis, banished by Hunneric A.D. 484. (Victor. Vit. Notitia, 60 in Migne, Patrol. Lat. iviii.; Morelli, Af. Chr. i. 946.)

FLAVIANUS (15), patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 489. [PRAVITTA.]

FLAVIANUS (16) II., bishop of Antioch, 498-512.Vacillating in faith, and of little moral strength, he occupied a more prominent than honourable position in the unhappy dissensions which troubled the Eastern church at the close of the 5th century. In connexion with the Monophysite troubles at Alexandria, and the deposition of Acacius by pope Felix, A.D. 484. After much unworthy compliance with the demands of the emperor Anastasius, he was ultimately driven from his see, and ended his life in banishment A.D. 518. He had previously been a monk in the monastery of Tilmognon, in Coele-Syria (Evagr. H. E. iii. 329), and at the time of his elevation to the episcopate filled the office of "apocrisarius" or nuncio of the church of Antioch at the imperial court of Constantinople (Vit. Tun. Chron.; Theophan. Chronogr. p. 125). Before his consecration Flavian passed for an opponent of the decrees of Chalcedon, and on his appointment he sent Solomon, a presbyter of Antioch, to announce the fact to John Haemula, bishop of Alexandria, and to convey letters of communion with the request that he would grant the same to him (Evagr. H. E. ii. 23). He speedily, however, withdrew from intercourse with the patriarchs of Alexandria, and joined the opposite party, uniting his name with Elias of Jerusalem, and Macedonius of Constantinople (Liberat. c. 18, p. 128). Flavian soon found a bitter enemy in the turbulent Monophysite, Xenaias or Philoxenus, bishop of Hierapolis, originally a Persian slave, raised to the episcopate by Peter the Fuller, who pursued him with uncompromising hatred, never resting till he had succeeded in working his overthrow. On Flavian's declaring for the council of Chalcedon Xenaias denounced his patriarch as a concealed Nestorian. Flavian made no difficulty in anathematizing Nestorius and his doctrines. Not content with this concession, Xenaias demanded that he should anathematize Diodorus, Theodore, Theodoret, and a host of others, declaring that unless he publicly condemned them he was as much a Nestorian, even if he should anathematize Nestorius ten thousand times over (Evagr. H. E. iii. 31). On his refusing, Xenaias stirred up against him the party of Dioscorus, in Egypt, and uniting with himself Eusebius of Saisma, and Nicias, of the Syrian Laodicea, personal enemies of Flavian, he laid a complaint against Flavian as a Nestorian before Anastasius, A.D. 507 (Evagr. u. s.; Theophan. p. 128). Anastasius used a severe pressure, to which Flavian thought it most politic to yield partially, vainly trusting that his concessions would satisfy his enemies, and that they would allow him to live in peace. He conveyed a synod of the province of his patriarchate which drew up a letter to Anastasius confirming the three first councils, passing over that of Chalcedon in silence, and anathematizing Diodorus, Theodore, and the others. It was asserted that Flavian also added some clauses respecting the two natures, at variance with the decisions of Chalcedon (Evagr. u. s.; Theophan. p. 129; Labbe, Concil. iv. 1414). These concessions provoked fresh demands. Xenaias, whose object was Flavian's overthrow, pursued his advantage, and required of him a formal anathema of the council of Chalcedon, and all who admitted the two natures. On his refusal, Xenaias again denounced him to the emperor, who received with cold aversion the complaints and remonstrances addressed to him, as well as the formal profession of belief in which Flavian declared his acceptance of the decrees of Chalcedon, only so far as they condemned Nestorius and his proceedings. Disunited Xenaias having gathered the bishops of Isauria and others induced them to draw up a formula of faith anathematizing Chalcedon and the two natures, and as Flavian and Macedonius refused to sign this, they declared them excommunicate, A.D. 509 (Evagr. u. s.; Theophan. p. 131). The next year we find the vacillating Flavian receiving letters from Severus, the uncompromising antagonist of Macedonius, on the subject of anathematizing Chalcedon, and the reunion of the Aecphaloi with the church (Liberat. c. 19, p. 135). This intelligence so irritated Macedonius that he pronounced an anathema on his former friend, and drove with indignation from his presence the apocrisarius of Antioch (Theophan. p. 131). On the expulsion of Macedonius, A.D. 511, Flavian yielded to the emperor so far as to recognise his successor Timotheus, on being convinced of his orthodoxy, but without discouraging his display of the violent and hostile canonical measures by which he had been deposed. This exasperated Anastasius, who readily acceded to the request of Xenaias and Soterichus that a council should be convened, ostensibly for the more precise declaration of the faith on the points at issue, but really to bring about the deposition of Flavian and Elias of Jerusalem.
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The synod met at Sidon early in a.d. 512. About eighty bishops assembled, under the joint pres- dency of Xenais and Soterichus. Flavian and Elia were one accord to secure themselves from the menaced deposition. They sent adulatory letters to Anastasius, containing fresh concessions, which even went so far as to reject the decrees of Chalcedon, but diplomatically concealing their divergence of opinion on one critical point. The council was broken up by the emperor's mandate, to the extreme vexation of Soterichus and Xenais, without pro- nouncing any sentence on the two patriarchs (Labbé, Concil. iv. 1414; vii. 88; Theoph. p. 131; Coteler. Monum. Eccl. Græcor. iii. 399). Their re- priere, however, was but short. Anastasius was easily convinced that he had been made the dupe of disingenuous declarations, and that Flavian and Elia secretly held to the decrees of Chalce- don, which they had openly repudiated. These calumnious charges received the powerful sup- port of the Monophysite leader Severus, then at Constantinople, who became his successor in the see of Antioch. Elia managed to detain his see for a time through the intercession of St. Sabbas. As for Flavian his perplexities were increased by the inroad of a tumultuous body of monks from Syria Prima, clamouming for the anathematiza- tion of Nestorius and all supposed favourers of his heretical doctrines. Some of the rabble of Antioch, bribed, it was said, by Xenais, joined this turbulent body, but the citizens generally rose against them, slew many of them, and threw their bodies into the Orontes. The con- fusion and bloodshed was increased by the appearance of a rival body of monks pouring down from the mountain ranges of Coele-Syria, eager to do battle in defence of their metropol- ian and former associate. Flavian was com- pletely unversed, and as the only means of re- storing peace to the city, and maintaining his see, he yielded to the demands of the stronger party, and pronounced a public anathema in his own name on the decrees of Chalcedon, and the four so-called heretical doctors. This was a severe mortification to his enemies, who were determined to get rid of him in order that his patriarchate might be given to one of their own party. The old charges of disingenuousness were revived, and he was accused to the emperor of condemning with his lips what he still held in his heart. The guilt of the recent disturbances at Antioch was also attributed to him, which afforded the civil authorities a sufficient pretext for desiring him to leave Antioch for a time, as the only way of restoring quiet. His quitting Antioch was eagerly seized on by the emperor as an acknowledgment of guilt. He declared the see vacant, and sent Severus to occupy it, and at the same time banished Flavian to Petra, in Arabia. Here he spent the last six years of his life. His death is placed by Moschus close to that of his chief enemy, the emperor Anastasius, in July, 518. Flavian's restoration to his see was one of the points demanded by Vitalian in his rebellion, a.d. 513 or 514 (Kutych. Alex. Annal. Ecol. p. 140; Marcellin. Chron.; Theophan. p. 134; Evagri. H. E. iii. 32). Flavian is com- memorated as a confessor by the church of Rome, together with Elias of Jerusalem, on July 4. (Baron. Annal. 498-512; Tillemont, MEM. Eccl. xvi. 675-680, 703-708.)

E. V.
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FLAVIANUS (17), bishop of Cotrina in Pamphylia, present at the council held at Con- stantinople under Mannus, a.d. 536, which con- demned Anthiusus, G. Quien, Orient. Christ. i. 1010; Manni, viii. 1147.)

FLAVIANUS (18), bishop of Verselli, c. 536. (Cappelletti, L'Chiese d'Italia, xiv. 365; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 762.)

[See A. H. D. A.]

FLAVIANUS (19), bishop of Crotone, c. a.d. 557. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. ix. 528.)

[See R. S. G.]

FLAVIANUS (20), bishop of Como, c. 542. (Cappelletti, L'Chiese d'Italia, xi. 313; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 261.)

[See A. H. D. A.]

FLAVIANUS (21), 14th bishop of Le Puy, succeeding Foribus or Fortius, and followed by St. Aurelius, in the latter part of the 6th cen- tury. (Gall. Christ. ii. 690.)

[See S. A. R.]

FLAVIANUS (22) (FLAVIANIUS, FLAVIA- NICIUS), ST., a bishop of Autun, placed by the authors of the Gallia Christiana, following Le Cointe, twenty-first in the series, between Lefastus and Auspicius, about a.d. 610. He was commemorated Aug. 23. (Gall. Christ. iv. 347; Le Cointe, Ann. Ecol. Franc. an. 610 n. ii. 614. n. xiv., tom. ii. 598, 663.)

[See S. A. R.]

FLAVIANUS (23), bishop of Utica, the well- known town in proconsulare Africa, subscribed the letter of his province to Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, against the Monothelites a.d. 646. (Mansi, xz. 942; Morcelli, Africa, p. 363.)

[See L. D.]

FLAVIANUS (24) (FLAVINUS), bishop of Novaria (Novara), c. 660. He was succeeded by Vigilinus (or perhaps Virginilus), and followed by Pamphronius. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. iv. 948; Cappelletti, L'Chiese d'Italia, xiv. 448.)

[See R. S. G.]

FLAVIANUS (25) LL., bishop of Como, c. 692. (Cappelletti, L'Chiese d'Italia, xi. 318; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 202.)

[See A. H. D. A.]

FLAVIANUS (26), bishop of Tortona, 769 at earliest. (Ughelli gives 765.) One of a somewhat doubtful list of bishops. (Cappelletti, L'Chiese d'Italia, xii. 672; Ughelli, iv. 628.)

[See A. H. D. A.]

FLAVIANUS (27) (FARINAS), May 25, a deacon and martyr in Africa with SS. Mos- tanus, Lucius, Julianus, and four others. They were all disciples of St. Cyprian, and in holy orders. Arrested by the proconsul Maximus soon after the death of St. Cyprian, they were detained in prison for several months. In the spring of a.d. 259 they were brought up for examination. The friends of Flavianus endeavoured to secure his safety by denying that he was a deacon and therefore outside the scope of the emperor's edict, which ordained death against the clergy alone. (Cyprian's Epist. 82, ad Successor.) Flavianus, however, avowed that he was a deacon, and suffered three days after his companions. The acts of these martyrs are described by Ruinart as "worthy of all faith, and such as may be numbered among the most precious and truthful monuments of antiquity." They are divided into two parts—1, a letter which they wrote to the faithful from prison; 2, the narra-
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FLAVIANUS (28), governor of Syria in the time of Diocletian, and charged with carrying out the law against Christians, A.D. 303. (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl." vii. 25.)

FLAVIANUS (29), Jan. 30, martyr in the Diocletian persecution at Centumcellae (Givita Vecchia), where he appears to have discharged the office of deputy-prefect under the prefect of the city of Rome, whose jurisdiction extended 160 miles from the city. Baronius commemorates him on Jan. 30. ("Epist. Rom." 184.)

FLAVIANUS (30), vicarius of Africa, 377. In the October of that year, the emperor Gratian addressed an edict to him commanding him to see that all churches then occupied by the Donatists were given up to the Catholics, and ordering all private houses used by the Donatists as places of meeting to be confiscated (Cod. Theod. vi. 23). Flavian was himself a Donatist (Augustin. ep. 87, § 8 in Patr. Lat. xxxii. 296); he was also a friend and a correspondent of the Athenian sophist Himerius. (Photius, "Biblioth. celiiz.")

T. W. D.

FLAVIANUS (31), praetorian prefect at the time of the death of Valentine II. He had a reputation for skill in augury, and encouraged Eugenius to rebel against Theodosius, assuring him of victory. (Soz. H. E. vii. 22.)

Zosim. i. 11.) He was prefect of Italy and Ilyryia in 382, 383, and 391, and consul in 394. He was the brother of Symmachus, many of whose letters to him are extant, comprising the whole of the second book according to the present arrangement. He comes before the notice of students of church history in connexion with St. Ambrose. It was at the request of Flavianus that Eugenius restored the altar of St. Ambrose at Milan. (Paulin. "Vit. Amb. xxvi.") In consequence of this, St. Ambrose refused to accept his presents for the church, and so enraged Flavianus that, on his departure from Milan, he threatened as soon as he returned to make the church a stable for his horses, and to force the clerics to serve as soldiers. (Paulin. "Vit. Amb. xxxii.") However, he did not live to carry out his threat. He seems to have died soon afterwards in guarding the Alps against Theodosius I, A.D. 394. Theodosius, after his victory, restored much of the property of Flavianus to his son, who bore the same name, and was afterwards prefect of Rome in 399. (Symm. Ep. iv. 7.)

M. F. A.

FLAVIANUS (32), a presbyter and archimandrite of the monastery of Hermillus, or Hermasus, in Constantinople. He subscribed the deposition of Eugenius at the council of Constantinople in A.D. 448. (Labbe, iv. 232 B.)

C. G.

FLAVIUS COLOMBO, successor of Euphrinus as bishop of Autun. Cir. A.D. 500. ("Gall. Christ." iv. 240.)

R. T. S.

FLAVINUS, bishop of Novara. ("Flavia-

nus" 24.)

FLAVINUS, thirty-seventh bishop of Chartres, following Hado and succeeded by Godalhardus, perhaps late in the 8th century. ("Gall. Christ." viii. 1102.)

S. A. B.

FLAVITA, bishop of Constantinople. ("Fra-

Vitt.")

FLAVIUS (4) LATINUS, legendary bishop of Brixia (Brescia), c. A.D. 84 or 90, preceded by St. Clates a martyr, and followed by St. Apollonius. (Ugghelli, "Ital. Stat." v. 728; Cappelletti, "Le Chiese d'Ital." xi. 550.)

R. S. G.

FLAVIUS (5), bishop of Antioch. ("Fa-

bius" 3.)

FLAVIUS (6), addressed in a letter by Dionysius of Alexandria in A.D. 360 or 261 on the Paschal question. (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl." vii. c. 20.)

J. G.

FLAVIUS (7), Roman senator, belonging to the Anician family, and probably the sole consul in the year 457 (Clinton, "Hist. i. 700); he is probably, and is usually regarded as, the father of the celebrated statesman and politician Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (Migne, Patr. Lat. lixii. 555; Cellier, "Auteurs sacrés," x. 645) ("Boethius"), though Baronius (Ann. a. 457, 1) identifies the consul in A.D. 457 with the philosopher. He seems to have died while his son was yet young ("Boethius, Consol. Phil." ii. 3), but nothing is definitely known. (Gibbon, "Hist. c. 39; Robertson, "Ch. Hist." iii. c. 6.)

J. G.

FLAVIUS (8), bishop of Chartres. His date is approximately fixed by the fact that his successor was ruling in A.D. 490. ("Gall. Christ." viii. 1095.)

R. T. S.

FLAVIUS (9) FLIVUS, FILIUS, ST., sixteenth bishop of Rouen, following St. Gildardus, or Godardus, and succeeded by St. Præfectactus; was present at the second council of Orleans in A.D. 534, the third in 538, and the fourth in 541. He is commemorated in Aug. (Mansi, viii. 838, ix. 20, 120; "Gall. Christ." xi. 10; Acta SS. Aug. iv. 640.)

S. A. B.

FLAVIUS (10), seventeenth bishop of Rheims, succeeding Romanus and followed by Maiparius, was present at the council of Clermont, A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 863; "Gall. Christ." ix. 13.)

S. A. B.

FLAVIUS (11), ninth bishop of Châlon-sur-Saône (Cable), succeeding St. Agricola and followed by Lupus; secretary, or referendarius, to king Guntram. He subscribed the first council of Mâcon (581), that of Lyons in 583, the second of Valentinia, and the second of Mâcon (both in 585), and in 591 was present at Nanterre at the baptism of Clotaire. In the Epitomata of Fredegarius to the history of Gregory of Tours, he is said to have favoured the fiction of Gundulph, who came from Constantinople pretending himself to be the son of Clotaire. He is said to have founded or restored the monastery of St. Peter in the suburbs. The date of his death is unknown. (Greg. Tur. "Hist. Franc." v. 46, x. 28; Mansi, ii. 937, 944, 946, 958, x. 469; "Gall. Christ." iv. 867.)

S. A. B.
FLORENTIANUS


FLORA (3), lady of rank, mother of Cyriacus. [CYRIACUS (3)].

FLOREBERT (1) (FLOREBERT, FLOREBERT), thirty-first or thirty-second bishop of Liège, succeeding St. Hubert, whose son he was, and followed by Fulcarinus. He is said to have been abbot of Stavelo (Stabalus), a monastery in the diocese, before his elevation. His death is placed in A.D. 745, after an episcopate of about eighteen years, in which he enriched the church with many gifts. He was buried in the church of St. Lambert, in the same tomb with Peter and Andoletus, who suffered martyrdom with that saint. (Gesta Pontificum Leodienium, tom. i. 145, ed. Chapeauleville, Liège, 1612; Gall. Christ. iii. 830.)

FLOREBERT (2), first abbot of the monastery of Ghent. He received St. Livinus and his companions after their departure from Ireland. (S. Livini Vita, 22; Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxvii. 338.) It was at his request that St. Livinus wrote an epistle to St. Baro, the martyr of Ghent, which, with an accompanying letter, he sent to the abbot. Both are in elegiac verse, and are extant. (Patr. Lat. ixxvii. 345.)

FLORENIUS, a prebendary of Epernay. [EPIPERNAIUS (9)].

FLORENCIUS, bishop of Merida. [FLORENTIUS].

FLORENCIUS, bishop of Saetabis, signs the acts of the fourth and fifth councils of Toledo, 633 and 636. He is the second bishop of the see known. Saetabis (referred to by Silius Italicus, Punic. iii. 373) is the modern Xativa, and we have no mention of the see after the Moorish conquest. (Esp. Segr. viii. 47; Aguirre-Catalanii, iii. 385-405.)

FLORENDUS (FLORENDINUS), tenth bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne, following Amandus, and succeeded by PROVIDERUS, in the latter half of the 6th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 862.)

FLORENTIA—Nov. 10. Martyr with Modestus and Tiberius in the Dacian persecution at Agatha (Agde). (Mart. Adonis, Usuardi, Wandalberti; Petrus de Natal. lib. 10, c. 46.)

FLORENTIANUS (1), bishop of Midea in Numidia, banished by Hunneric A.D. 484. (Victor. Vit. Notit. 56 in Migne, Patr. Lat. liii.; Mercelli, Africa Christ. i. 227.)

FLORENTIANUS (2), bishop of Utica. [FLORENDINUS (5)].

FLORENTIANUS (3), bishop of Vieux Pacis in Numidia, present as the delegate of his province at the council held by Sosius at Carthage A.D. 395, where he made excuse for
the absence of his primate (Missor) on the ground of old age, and handed his letter to the archbishop. (Mansi, viii. 638, 647; Morelli, Africa Christ. i. 553.)

[ L. D.]

FLORENTINA (1), a young lady to whom St. Augustine wrote expressing his willingness to give her all the help in her studies that he could give. He enlarges on the great responsibility of all who profess to teach, and reminds her that after all God is the true impartor of all knowledge. (Aug. ep. 266.) [H. W. P.]

FLORENTINA (2), St., the sister of Leander, Isidore, and Fulgentius; younger than Leander, and older than Isidore, who was the youngest of the family. When the family exile took place she was young. "You have, therefore," says Leander in the last chapter of Lib. ad Florentiam, "no recollections which need stir your soul with longings (to return), and blessed art thou who knowest nothing of what I suffer." After their parents' death Leander, metropolitan of Seville before 575, assumed the position together with his sister, and at an unknown date, but in any case before Leander's death in 600, she became a nun. Tradition places her convent near Astigi (Ecija), of which her brother Fulgentius was bishop, and identifies its site with a little village on the banks of the Xenil, called Nuestra Señora del Valle, whither a procession goes every year from the Hospital of Santa Florentina in Ecija. According to various MS. breviaries (the evidence of the breviaries, however, in such points as these is seldom worth much), she was not only superior of her own convent, but of many others which voluntarily placed themselves under her guidance—a position of which there is no trace in any of the contemporary documents. To her, after her profession, Leander addressed the treatise which Isidore (de Vir. Ill. cap. xii.) calls de institutione virginum et contempnunt mundi Libelli, and which is commonly known as the rule of St. Leander, or the Libelli ad Florentiam. Thus far it is that Leander was at the time it was written the superior of her convent. On the contrary, the senior who, in cases where it was necessary to distinguish within the convent walls, between the high-born and wealthy and the poor and low-born, "is to be praised, if she bear herself discreetly towards individual persons, adjudging to each what is necessary"—and with regard to whom, Leander directs, when forbidding private property in the convent, "Whatever thy hand shall touch, seniori ostende, in commune repone," seems to be distinct from the Soror Florentinæ to whom the treatise is addressed. Floret gives the name of the superior as Turtura (Esp. Sapr. x. 120), supposing that the famous passage at the end of the rule—"Noli ab eo evolare nisi ubi turtura reposit lucubros suos. Simplicitatis filia es, quae Turtura nata es... Turturum pro matre responde. Turturum pro magistra attendo," etc.—from which the name of Turtura as the wife of Fulgentius and mother of Isidore and her brothers, was commonly obtained by older writers, really refers to the abbes of Florentina's convent, and that she, and not the wife of Severianus, was called Turtura. The passage, however, must always remain of doubtful meaning. The rule opens with a long introduction in the form of a letter devoted to the praises of virginity, and consists of twenty-one chapters. Intercourse with women still in the world must be avoided by the nuns; communication even with holy men is forbidden; they must be frugal in eating and drinking, and persevering in reading and prayer. The Old Testament is to be read in a spiritual sense; in fasting regard is to be paid to the weak and infirm; wine is only to be used as a medicine; they must remain within the convent (in monasterio), must avoid all appearance of vice private, and not imitate those virgin wives who remain in the world (cap. 17). Can. 13 of the council of Elbriberi, and Gams's remarks upon it (X. G. ii. (1) 64) may be compared with this last passage. These women vowed to celibacy, but remaining in their parents' or relations' houses, represented in Leander's time the older type of monachism which existed before the conventual type. Of this older type Emilia of Merida is commonly taken as the most famous Spanish representative (although neither in the Acta, nor in Prudentius's well-known hymn, is there any mention of voces in her case, whereas the council of Elbriberi speaks of her—Deo, and of the pactum virginitatis ") One sees from the Libelli ad Florentiam that in Leander's time the practice, though still continued, was discredited and passing away, and we remember no later notice of it in Spain. For certain modern instances of it elsewhere see Gams, l.c.

Leander, however, was not the only rule which Florentina possessed, if we are to take the words "Habes Regulam quam sequaris" (cap. 14) in the sense which Gams assigns to them (Ibid. de Vir. Ill. cap. v). Considering the familiarity which Isidore, Leander, and other lost works of Hosius, it is not improbable that Leander may have modelled his own treatise upon it. The last chapter of the Regula is full of interest for the light it throws upon the early history of the family to which the brother and sister belonged. We have already quoted part of it (see above, and under FULGENTIUS). Towards the end Leander asks for his sister's prayers: "Nor do thou forget our younger brother, Isidore, whom our common parents left under God's guardianship to the care of his surviving brothers and sister (tribus superstitesbus germanis), and thus joyfully, and without fear for his infancy, departed to God,... Love him the more dearly and pray the more to Jesus for him as thou knowest him to have been the more tenderly loved by our parents,... For I am well assured that thy virginal prayer for us will touch the Divine ear." It was at Florentina's request that this young virgin named Florentina and her brothers, was commonly obtained by older writers, really refers to the abbes of Florentina's convent, and that she, and not the wife of Severianus, was called Turtura. The passage, however, must always remain of doubtful meaning. The rule opens with a long introduction in the form of a letter devoted to the praises of virginity, and consists of twenty-one chapters. Intercourse with women still in the world must be avoided by the nuns; communication even with holy men is forbidden; they must be frugal in eating and drinking, and persevering in reading and prayer. The Old Testament is to be read in a spiritual sense; in fasting regard is to be paid to the weak and infirm; wine is only to be used as a medicine; they must remain within the convent (in monasterio), must avoid all appearance of vice private, and not imitate those virgin wives who remain in the world (cap. 17). Can. 13 of the council of Elbriberi, and Gams's remarks upon it (X. G. ii. (1) 64) may be compared with this last passage. These women vowed to celibacy, but remaining in their parents' or relations' houses, represented in Leander's time the older type of monachism which existed before the conventual type. Of this older type Emilia of Merida is commonly taken as the most famous Spanish representative (although neither in the Acta, nor in Prudentius's well-known hymn, is there any mention of voces in her case, whereas the council of Elbriberi speaks of her—Deo, and of the pactum virginitatis ") One sees from the Libelli ad Florentiam that in Leander's time the practice, though still continued, was discredited and passing away, and we remember no later notice of it in Spain. For certain modern instances of it elsewhere see Gams, l.c.

Leander, however, was not the only rule which Florentina possessed, if we are to take the words "Habes Regulam quam sequaris" (cap. 14) in the sense which Gams assigns to them (Ibid. de Vir. Ill. cap. v). Considering the familiarity which Isidore, Leander, and other lost works of Hosius, it is not improbable that Leander may have modelled his own treatise upon it. The last chapter of the Regula is full of interest for the light it throws upon the early history of the family to which the brother and sister belonged. We have already quoted part of it (see above, and under FULGENTIUS). Towards the end Leander asks for his sister's prayers: "Nor do thou forget our younger brother, Isidore, whom our common parents left under God's guardianship to the care of his surviving brothers and sister (tribus superstitesbus germanis), and thus joyfully, and without fear for his infancy, departed to God,... Love him the more dearly and pray the more to Jesus for him as thou knowest him to have been the more tenderly loved by our parents,... For I am well assured that thy virginal prayer for us will touch the Divine ear." It was at Florentina's request that this young virgin named Florentina and her brothers, was commonly obtained by older writers, really refers to the abbes of Florentina's convent, and that she, and not the wife of Severianus, was called Turtura. The passage, however, must always remain of doubtful meaning. The rule opens with a long introduction in
FLORENTINUS. See also Florentius.

FLORENTINUS (1) (Florentius), bishop of Treves, succeeded St. Severinus, and said to have been martyred. Our only information, however, with regard to him comes from the Roman Martyrology and the Treves breviary, in which he is related to have lived and suffered in the 4th century, before the conversion of Constantine. But the Bollandist Van Hecke swells these small materials by a long dissertation to prove that Christianity in Gaul, and at Treves in particular, had its origin in the apostolic age. Herein he differs from the Bollandist author of the life of St. Maternus. (AA. SS. 17 Oct. viii. 16.)

[ R. T. S.]

FLORENTINUS (2), bishop of Merida. [Florentius (8)].

FLORENTINUS (3) (Florentius), Donatist bishop of Adrumetum, in Byzacena, present at the Donatist council of Cabarussis, A.D. 393. (Ang. En. in Psal. 36, c. 20.) [H. W. P.]

FLORENTINUS (4), the name of three bishops at the Carthaginian conference of 411, viz. one (also called Florentius) of Hippo Diarrhytum; or rather, as he comes from Africa (Ben. Zurt.), assistant on the Catholic side (Mon. Vet. Dom. pp. 288, 345, 425, ed. Oberthür); (Donatist) of Farni in Byzacene (M. V. D. p. 447); (Donatist) of Tubusius or Thugusitus in Mauretanica Sitifensis (Boru Ticha, Ant. Ritu. 32, 2). (M. V. D. p. 440). [H. W. P.]

FLORENTINUS, bishop of Tenedos. [Florentius (19)].

FLORENTINUS (5), bishop of Utica, and another bishop of Tusculum in the Byzacene, banished by Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Victor. Vit. Notitia, 55, 57 in Migne, Patr. Lat. ivii. ; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 342, 362.) [L. D.]

FLORENTINUS (6), bishop of Tisili, in the proconsular province of Africa, present at the council of Carthage, A.D. 525. (Manai, viii. 648 ; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 328.) [L. D.]

FLORENTINUS (7) (Florentius), the first known bishop of Ciusium (Chiusi), c. A.D. 465. He was at the council held at Rome in that year. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. iii. 667 ; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xx. 576.) [R. S. G.]

FLORENTINUS (8), bishop of Passum (Capaccio), A.D. 499, attending the Roman synod of Symmachus (Manai, viii. 325 B. 289 A; Volti, Vescovi Pustani, p. 1). Ugelli (Ital. Sac. viii. 465) misreads the name Laurentius. [C. H.]

FLORENTINUS (9), bishop of Ancona c. 603. Florentius archdeacon of Ancona (No. 17), has been supposed identical with this bishop, but it seems more probable that our bishop had been previously a deacon at Ravenna (No. 18), and that he was chosen bishop of Ancona on the recommendation of Gregory the Great. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 378 ; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. vii. 27-29.) [R. S. G.]

FLORENTINUS (10), bishop of Cadiz. (Bagnullius) present at the Lateran synod concerning the election of popes and image worship under Stephen IV. in 769. (Manai, xii. 715; Hefele, § 343.) [A. H. D. A.]

FLORENTINUS (11), a Christian official to the court of Africa, who had carried of Faventius by force, and to whom St. Augustine wrote on the subject (Ep. 114). [Faventius (11)].

FLORENTINUS (12)—Sept. 27. Martyr with Hilarius at the village of Semonz, near Autun. He had been a soldier, but retiring therefrom he devoted himself to the religious life. In one of theruptions of the barbarians his tongue was torn out, after which, continuing to preach, he was beheaded. He died about A.D. 406. His relics were translated in A.D. 855 to the abbey of Ainay-de-Lyon. His acts are extant in a Wolfe format, shape, one longer, the other shorter. They were written by a monk of the abbey of Bonneval after the translation of the relics. They are of course very corrupt. There has been a long controversy between Malbon, Castellan, Ruinart, and others about the exact place of his martyrdom, some contending for the ancient town of Sion in the Rhone valley in Switzerland, others for Semonz and Autun in France, of which there is a full account in the Boll. Acta SS. Sept. viii. 404-427. (Mart. Rom. Hieron., Usuardi; Ruinart, Hist. Persec. Wandel. p. 409; Boll. Acta SS. Sept. viii. 420; Gall. Christ. xiiii. 734.) [G. T. N.]


FLORENTINUS (14), a correspondent and friend of Sidonius Apollinaris. Ambitious like many others of possessing a letter from Sidonius, he wrote to the bishop complaining of his delay in coming to see him and in writing to him. Sidonius, either not inclined to encourage his admirers in this way, or too modest to think his compositions of any consequence, disappointed Florentinus by this brief reply, "I come and write." (Sid. Apol. Ep. 19, in Migne, Pat. Lat. ivii.) [C. H.]

FLORENTINUS (15), first abbot of the monastery of the Apostles at Arles, established by St. Aurelian. He is said to have been born in 483, made abbot in 548, and to have died in 553. Januarius, a monk of the same foundation, composed on the occasion of the translation of his remains, in 588, from the monastery burial-ground to the church of the Sancta Cruz, an acrostic epitaph, which is given by the Acta SS. Mai. v. 39. He was commemorated on April 12, as the day of his death, and May 21, the day of his translation. (Gall. Christ. i. 599.) [S. A. B.]

FLORENTINUS (16), Irish missionary at Amboise, said by Vosscher (Eccles. And. c. xvi. wsk.
vi. 309-10, and Ind. Chron.) to have lived in A.D. 500, but the dates and facts of his life are confused. (Lanigan, Evoli. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 16, § 16; Boll. Acta SS. Oct. 24, tom. x. 850-58.)

[J. G.]

FLORENTINUS (17), archdeacon of Ancona. He was one of three candidates recommended to pope Gregory to succeed to the vacant see of Ancona, the others being Rusticus deacon of Ancona, and Florentinus deacon of Ravenna. Gregory hears this character of him, that he is well versed in the Scriptures, but too bowed down by age, and too parsimonious, and moreover has solemnly sworn never to be a bishop. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. iv. ind. vii. ep. 11 ed. Migne); Jaffé (Reg. Pontif. 153) dates this letter Dec. 603. The vacancy appears to have been filled by either this Florentinus or the following; see Cappelletti (Le Chiese d’Ital. vii. 28, 190).

[C. H.]

FLORENTINUS (18), deacon of Ravenna, one of three candidates, and the most popular, recommended to pope Gregory for the vacant see of Ancona. (See preceding article.) In the case of his being appointed it would be necessary, Gregory observes, to procure the free approval of his own bishop, whose consent ought not to appear constrained by any mandate of the pope. (Greg. Mag. Ep. lib. iv. ind. vii. ep. 11 ed. Migne.) [FLORENTINUS (9)]

[C. H.]

FLORENTINUS (1), sixth recorded bishop of Tongres, between St. Severinus and Martinus, belonging apparently to about the year 230, judging from his position in the list, which is here dateless and without further record. (Gall. Christ. iii. 809.)

[R. T. S.]

FLORENTINUS (2), the first known bishop of Fosaurum (Icera), c. A.D. 247. He is said to have built a cathedral at Pesaro, and to have placed in it the relics of the martyr St. Terentius. (UgHELLI, Ital. Sacr. ii. 948; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Ital. iii. 340.)

[R. S. G.]

FLORENTINUS (3) PUPPIANUS, a bishop and confessor in the Decian persecution, of whom nothing is known but what is contained in Cyp. Ep. 66. He had written a slanderous letter to Cyprian and receives a warm and singular reply. He appears apparently written to him as “Thascius Cypritanus,” omitting the sacerdotal Christian name Caeclitus [CYPRIAN], and the reply is headed, “Cypriano qui et Thascius Florentio qui et Puppiano, &c.” Through the epistle he calls him Puppianus carefully, as if to annoy, and quotes with precision the Caecilius Cyprianus Episcopus Christianorum of the edict. He sarcastically contrasts with his own exile “the dignity of charity and martyrdom,” “the highest sublimity of martyrdom,” which Florentius had attained, and asks to confirm him in the episcopate. Florentius had doubted the truth of his visions, and Cyprian promises to inquire in vision whether he may admit him to communion. Pearson (p. 47) takes Florentius to have been a Novatianist, but it may be doubted, considering this last threat, whether the “cum in ecclesia esses et mune communicares” is more than a sneer (like that of Firminus to Stephen), as if he had excommunicated himself.

[E. W. B.]

FLORENTINUS (4) I. (FLORENTINUS), bishop of Vienne, martyr, c. A.D. 253. Ado in his Chronicon (Act. Sacr. ann. 241) calls him Florentinus, and says he was eminent in life and learning in the reign of Gordian, and remained until the time of Gallienus and Volusianus, when he was exiled and martyred. In his Martyrology Ado records him as Florentius under Jan. 3, and calls him eighth bishop of Vienne. (See also Boll. Acta SS. 3 Jan. i. 127; Gall. Chr. vi. 10.)

[C. H.]

FLORENTINUS (5), bishop of Tresves.

[FLORENTINUS (1)].

FLORENTINUS (6), bishop of Ancysra in Phrygia Pacatiana; one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325 (Manasi, ii. 985), and afterwards one of the council sent to Philippi to enforce the Council of Sardica, 347. (Manasi, iii. 139; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 799.)

[L. D.]

FLORENTINUS (7), bishop of Puteoli (Poseu-
omi), c. A.D. 355. He appears to have been deposed for misconduct, but to have returned and taken reposition of his see (by force, as would appear from the expression “eam ecclesiæ invasit”) fifteen years after his condemnation. (UgHELLI, Ital. Sacr. vi. 318; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Ital. xvii. 881.)

[R. S. G.]

FLORENTINUS (8) (FLORENCUS, FLOREN-
tinus), bishop of Merida from about 321 to about 357. Our first notice of him is probably as the Florentius Dianus, who accompanied his bishop, Liberatus of Hebridea, to the first council of Arles (A.D. 314). Among the signatures to the council of Sardica, he appears as “Florentius ab Spania de Emerita”; and later on his name became well known from the strange story of his death given in the Libellus Precum of Marcianus and Faustinus, addressed to Valentinian and Theodosius (Sirmond., i. 136). According to these Luciferian prebendaries, Florentius, for the sin of having continued in communion with Hesius of Cordova after his signature of the Sirmium Formular, was stricken with a sudden and awful death in the church of Merida, before a great concourse of people. Twice he recovered, but in his senseless, and twice recovered sufficiently to remount the episcopal throne. The sect, however, again repelled him “ut quasi indignum,” and he fell for the third time and expired. The writers of the Libellus call the whole “great city of Emerita” to witness to the truth of their story. It may no doubt have a kernel of truth; various forms of sudden and fatal illness would present the appearances mentioned; but considering the accounts given in the same document of the deaths of Hesius and Potamius, and the animus of the whole, not much faith need be given to the story. Florentius was probably the first Metropolitan bishop of Merida. On the subject of the changes in the church organisation of Spain during the 4th century, see Gams, Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, ii. (1) 168. (Esp. Segr. xiii. 133; Harduin, i. 259.)

[M. A. W.]

FLORENTINUS (9), bishop of Cahors about the year 370. He may be the same whom Paulinus of Nola addresses (lib. iv. Ep. 30). He was succeeded by his brother Alethius, mentioned by Gregory of Tours. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. ii. 15; Gall. Christ. vii. 575.)

[B. T. S.]
FLORENTIUS (10), bishop of Ravenna, appears to have succeeded Probus in that see, c. A.D. 501, and to have been followed by Liberius, c. 374. He is said to have been a man of great learning and eloquence. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 330; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. ii. 26.) [R. S. G.]

FLORENTIUS (11) II, bishop of Vienne, assisted at the Council of Valence, A.D. 374, and may possibly have preceded the metropolitan of Apamæa. (Cellier, iv. 600; Tillemont, iii. 623; Labbe, Conc. ii. 904; Gall. Christ. xvi. 10.) [R. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (12) (Florentius), sixth in the list of bishops of Arretium (Arezzo), between Severianus and Maximus, succeeded A.D. 375, died A.D. 377. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 409.) [C. H.]

FLORENTIUS (13), bishop of Adrumetum. [Florentius (9).]

FLORENTIUS (14), bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus. [Florentius (11).]

FLORENTIUS (15), African bishop, whose name, as well as that of Secundianus, is associated with that of St. Augustine in a letter concerning Leporius, addressed to Proculus and Cyrilinus. (Ep. 219.) [Leporius] [H. W. P.]

FLORENTIUS (16) (Florentinus), bishop of Toul (Troy). His accession is variously stated as from A.D. 409 to 417. He appears to have died c. A.D. 449. Innocent I. once wrote to him, reproving him for having infringed on the diocesan rights of Ursus bishop of Nomentum. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 216; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. vi. 624; Cellier, Autour Sacr. vii. 525.) [R. S. G.]

FLORENTIUS (17), A.D. 448, bishop of Sardis and metropolitan of Lydia. He had a difference with two bishops of his province. This gave occasion to Flavian, bishop of Constantiopole, to assemble a council, probably of prelates who were at that city on various business. The best known present are Saturninus of Marcianopole, Basilius of Seleucia, Seleucus of Amasues, and Julian of Cos. The council assembled in the chapter-house of the cathedral. (Cellier, x. 689; Labbe, vi. p. 485.) [W. M. S.]

FLORENTIUS (18), a bishop of the Western church, whose name stands at the head of the 117th letter of Theodoret. This has, with reason, been thought to have been a circular letter addressed to the Occidental bishops generally. It was written at the same time with that to pope Leo (Epist. 113), A.D. 449, after Theodoret had been deposed by the Latrocinium of Ephesus, and when attempts were being made to drive him into exile, and was conveyed to the West by two episcopoi, Abramius and Hypatius, and Alypius, the exarch of the monks of the diocese of Cyrurus. Theodoret exerts his correspondent to come forward as the champion of the apostolic faith, and help in driving away the heretics then troubling the East, and not to look coldly on those who, like himself, were suffering for the truth's sake, but give them the benefit of his protection, and thus prove to his enemies that they could not have their own way in everything (Theod. Epist. 117). [E. V.]

FLORENTIUS (19), bishop of Lesbos, Tenedos, Proselenae, Agiali, according to signature affixed to the third and sixteenth acts of the council of Chalcedon. He appears also as "Episcopus, Lesbi, Tenedi, Helleponti" (in the acts of the "Robber Council"), "Episc. Lesbi, Tenedi" (Act. vi. Chalced.), and as "Episc. Lesbiteriae" (Les-bi Tenedi? synodal letter to Leo I, Leo Mag. Ep. 98, 1106, Migne; Oriens Christ. i. 949). Though he was present at the Robber Council at Ephesus in A.D. 449, and assented to the condemnation of Flavian and Eusebius, he appears to have recognised his error before the council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451, at which he was also present, and on the orthodox side. At this latter council his weakness prevented him from writing, and he employed a chorepiscopum, by name Chrysocles, to subscribe for him. (Manii, vi. 932, vi. 160, 408—here described as "of Mytilene," 456; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 955.) [G. C.]

FLORENTIUS (20), bishop of Hadrianopolis in Pisidia; present at the oecumenical Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; he also signed the synodal letter of Pisidia to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1049; Manii, vi. 106, 571.) [L. D.]

FLORENTIUS, bishop of Cladium. [Florentinus (7).]

FLORENTIUS (21), one of three bishops, Severus and Equitius being the others, to whom pope Simplicius wrote, Nov. 19, 475. (Manii, Concil. vii. 973; Jaé, Regest. Pontif. 49.) [C. H.]

FLORENTIUS (22), bishop of Centenaria, in Numidia, banished by Hanneric, 484. (Victor. Vit. Notitia, 56 in Migne, Patr. Lat. iii.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 130.) [L. D.]

FLORENTIUS (23), bishop of Nova Germania in Numidia, banished as the preceding. (Notitia, 56; Morcelli, i. 244.) [L. D.]

FLORENTIUS (24), bishop of Semina in proconsular Africa, banished to Corbica as the preceding. (Notitia, 56; Morcelli, i. 274.) He died in Corbica, and was venerated as a saint, though his remains were carried into Italy (AA. SS. Boll. ii. Jun. 179.) [L. D.]

FLORENTIUS (25), ST., eighth bishop of Orange, between Verus and Vinclanialis. According to the Pseudo-Epiphram of the consecration of Placeintia in Italy, where he is commemorated Oct. 17, he was a native of Tures. He subscribed the council of Epson, A.D. 517, and the fourth of Arles, A.D. 524. A bishop of his name too was present at the first of Lyons in 517, but it is doubtful whether the signature belongs to him. The bishop of St. Paul de Trois-Châteaux, who was contemporary with him. His death is placed about A.D. 526. He was honoured as the patron of the town of Florentia, in the diocese of Placeintia, which possessed his relics, the translation of which was commemorated March 19. (Audo and Usanard, Oct. 17; Migne, Patr. Lat. cxiii. 380, 381; Boll. Acta SS. i. 572; Boll. Theol. Rel. ii. 76; Labbe, Sacr. Conc. viii. 565, 570, 627; Flor. 1759-98; Gall. Christ. i. 676.) [S. A. B.]

FLORENTIUS (26), 11th bishop of St. Paul de Trois-Châteaux, succeeding St. Michael and
followed by Heraclius. He is known only by his
subcription of the council of Epona (A.D. 517).
He must be distinguished from the priest of this
diocece (45), who wrote the life of St. Rusticula.
(Mansi, viii. 565; Gall. Christ. i. 707.)

FLORENTIUS (27), bishop of Lampsota, in
Numidia; present at the council of Carthage
A.D. 525. (Mansi, viii. 647; Morcelli, Africa
Christ. i. 198.)

[ A. B. A. ]

FLORENTIUS (28), bishop of Campilia, in
the district of Massa Populonia in Etruria,
c. 540-546; possibly bishop of Populonia itself;
but he is of doubtful authenticity. 
(Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xiiii. 681, 724; Acta Sact. Boll. 15 Mai. iii. 470.)

[A. D. H. A.]

FLORENTIUS (29), bishop of Matelica. His
name is joined with that of pope Vigilius in the
Dunmesthe Theodori, i.e. the document issued
by Vigilius in Constantineople, August 551,
and containing sentence of deposition against Theodore
Askidas, bishop of Cesarea, and Mennas, patriarch
of Constantineople. (Mansi, x. 60; Hefele, § 264.)

[ A. D. H. A.]

FLORENTIUS (30), bishop of Epidauros
(Ragusa) in Dalmatia, c. A.D. 600. (Farlati, Hagiogr. Sacr. vi. 410.)

[J. de S.]

FLORENTIUS (31), the name of two bishops
in the proconsular province of Africa, viz.
of Eguges and of Zempta (Zenta), who signed the
letter of the synod of his province, which was
sent to Paul patriarch of Constantinople against
the errors of the Monothelites, A.D. 646. 
(Mansi, x. 911; Morcelli, Africa Chri.
d. 370.)

[L. D.]

FLORENTIUS (32), St., twelfth bishop of
Straburg, succeeding St. Arbogastus and fol-
lowed by Wiggeron, or Wiggerus (A.D. 679-687),
was born in Ireland. Together with his prede-
cessor, also an Irishman, and two others, he came
to Austria early in the reign of Dagobert II.,
possibly in company with that prince, whom upon
his father Sigebert's death (c. A.D. 655) had been
privily sent away to Ireland by Grimold, the mayor
of his palace, and did not return to his
knightly calling until the year 670. In Alsace
he settled himself in the forest of Hasel or Haselau,
where the Bruschn flows from the Vosges,
and built, probably with Dagobert's aid, the
monastery of Haselau at about six leagues from
Straburg. Elected to the bishopric upon the
death of Arbogastus, he founded at Straburg
the monastery of St. Thomas, mainly as a refuge
and house of entertainment for the Irish. He
retained the friendship of Dagobert, whose
doughter he was said to have freed from demo-
nical possession, or according to another account
restored to speech and sight. After an episco-
poal of eight years he died A.D. 687, on Nov. 7.
He was buried in the monastery church of St.
Thomas, but at the beginning of the 9th century
his remains were translated to Haselau by Rathi,
one of his successors in the see. 
(Gall. Christ. v. 783, 831; Lanigan, Ecclesiastical Hist. of Ireland,
xxv.; Flor. Vite, Sutius, de Vita Prot. Sanct.

[S. A. B.]

FLORENTIUS (33), June 1, martyr at
Perga with Marcellinus, Cyriacus, Faustinus,
and Julianus under Decius, A.D. 250. The Rom.
Mort. commemorates them on June 5. 

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (34), July 15, martyr at Car-
thage with the deacon Catullinus. (Catullinus
2.)

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (35), July 25, martyr with
Felix. They were natives of Sipontum, an ancient
town in Apulia. They belonged to a body of
eighty-three soldiers who suffered martyrdom at
one time under Maximian at Furconium, a town
of Central Italy. 
(Martyr. Rom. ed. Baron.;

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (36), Oct. 13, martyr at
Thessalonica in Maximin's persecution,
Menol.)

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (37), May 11, martyr at
Osmo (Auximut), not far from Ancona. He
suffered with Sisinus, a deacon, and Dioctetius
under Maximian. 
(Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.)

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (38), Oct. 10, martyr at
Cassius and with Cassius and many others. 
Probably they were soldiers, as Bonn was the headquarters of
a legion, and a fortress. (Mort. Rom. ed. Baron.;
Mart. Usuard.)

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (39), Oct. 27, martyr at
Trois-Châteaux. (Mort. Rom. ed. Baron,
Usuardi.)

[G. T. S.]

FLORENTIUS (40), presbyter and con-
fessor, commemorated on Sept. 22; placed by
Usuardi in "pago Pictavens," and by the Bell-
undistan at a mountain of Gaul called Glouna,
at the extremity of Aquitaine, near the Loire 

According to his very legendary Acts, which are said to belong to the 9th century, Florentius came to Lyons, thence proceeded to Tours and thence to Glouna, where he built an oratory. He paid a yearly visit to St. Martin at Tours, lived to the age of 123 years, of which 63 were
after the death of St. Florimus, and was buried at Glouna.

[J. G.]

FLORENTIUS (41), priest of a church near
Subiaco, where St. Benedict of Nursia had one
of his twelve monasteries. It was to avoid the
jealousy of Florentius at his growing fame that
St. Benedict removed from that spot to Monte

[C. H.]

FLORENTIUS (42), father of St. Nicetius
(Nicerius) of Lyons. The story is that the see of
Genova being vacant, Florentius, who was a
senator, was chosen for the office, the Pope con-
firming the election. Coming to his house he
announced the fact to Artemia his wife, who
exclaimed, "Cease, I pray you, to desire this
bishops. In my womb I carry a bishop of your
own flesh." Florentius thereupon declined the office in compliance with the text of Scripture which said, "In all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice." Gen. xxi. 12. 
(Greg. Tur. Viteae Patrum, viii.)

[S. A. B.]

FLORENTIUS (43), a recluse in the district of
Nursia. For the story of his friend Eutychius
and himself, see Greg. Mag. Dial. (lib. iii. cap. 15
in Migne, lxvii. 249), and Mabillon (Acta Sanc-
torum, O. S. B. i. 120). [A. H. D. A.]

FLORENTIUS (44), subdeacon of Rome. He
was elected by the Neapolitans as their bishop,
but not being able to make up his mind to ac-
cept the appointment, he took to flight. Gregory,
discovering the secret, wrote to Scholasticus, Bishop
of Cam-
pania, to assemble the people of Naples for a
15); Jaffé (Reg. Pont. p. 102) dates this letter
Dec. 592. The bishop who succeeded was For-
tunatus (No. 21).

[C. H.]

FLORENTIUS (48), a presbyter of Trois-
Châteaux, author of the life of St. Rusticula, an
abess of the monastery of St. Caesarius at Arles
(Mabillon, Acta SS. Benedicti, i. 189). It was
written soon after her death, A.D. 631, at the
instance of her successor, Cebula. Its literary
style is good. (Ceillier, xi. 695). [S. A. B.]

FLORENTIUS (49), magister officiorum
under the emperor Constantius II. He was son
of Nigrinianus, and acting for the magister officiorum
in A.D. 355 (Ammianus Marcellinus, Rec.
Gest. xvi. 5, 12); in his official capacity he
presented to the emperor Constantius the two books
which Lucifer of Cagliari wrote in behalf of
St. Athanasius. They were so bold and out-
spoken that the emperor directed Florentius to
return the codex to Lucifer, and ask definitely
if he acknowledged it to be his. Florentius's
letter accompanying the codex and Lucifer's
reply, acknowledging the authorship to the
fullest extent, are given in Migne (Patr. Lat.
xiii. 935-6). In the days of Julian (A.D. 361)
he was banished to the island of Boa or Baro,
on the coast of Dalmatia. (Amm. Marcell. lib.
xxii. 3, 6; Tillemont, Mon. Hist. Eccl. vii. 517;
Ceillier, Actores sacrés, iv. 242). [J. G.]

FLORENTIUS (47), a wealthy man of Italy
who retired to Jerusalem to pursue the monastic
life late in the 4th century. He was known
to Jerome, Evagrius, Heliodorus, and Rufinus;
but Jerome had not actually seen him when
their correspondence took place in the year 374.
Florentius had already at that time established
himself at Jerusalem, and was becoming known
throughout the world for his kindness and
magnanimity towards the strangers who went there.
Heliodorus (afterwards bishop of Altinum),
who had gone with Jerome to Antioch in 374,
appears to have gone on to Jerusalem, leaving his friend behind. At Jeru-
salem he was entertained by Florentius, and on
his return gave a glowing description of his
charities. Jerome begs Florentius to be the
intermediary of his correspondence with Rufinus,
and asks him to transmit several books to him,
and promises others in return. We hear nothing
of him after Jerome himself went to Jeru-
salem; perhaps he may have died early; per-
haps he may have taken the part of Rufinus in
the controversy between the two former friends.
But in the year 382, when Jerome wrote the
continuation of Eusebius' Chronicle, he thus
speaks of him (sub ann. A.D. 378): "Florentius,
Somoas et Rufinus insignes monachi habentur;
e quibus Florentius tam misericors in egenos
fuit ut vulgo pater pauperum nominatus sit."
admission of Florentius to the synod. Flavian replied that everybody knew the soundness of Florentius's faith, and that he might take his place in the council if Eutyches wished it. Eutyches replying that he would consent to anything God and his holiness the bishop thought right (ibid. 220). Florentius was sent for. He took his seat among the metropolitans, next to Seleucus, bishop of Amasea (ibid. 238; Liberat. c. xi. p. 60). Florentius disclaimed all desire to depute his ecclesiarch to forget his position as a layman; but it is evident that he took a very leading and authoritative part in the discussion, and manifested a strong leaning towards the acquittal of Eutyches. But his efforts to induce the archimandrite to acknowledge the two natures in Christ, or, at least, to adopt language which might satisfy the council, were fruitless, and he was compelled in the interests of orthodoxy to give the word for his condemnation (ibid. 507, 517). As Eutyches left the hall, which was resounding with the acclamations of the assembled bishops at the much-desired sentence, he lodged with Florentius an appeal against his condemnation to the churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, which he asserted he had just publicly made, but which in the uproar had been disregarded. Florentius ran to apprise Flavian of it in order that it might be entered on the minutes of the trial. But the bishop had already left the hall of judgment, and availed himself of the plea that the trial was closed to exclude the registration of the appeal (ibid. 244).

Eutyches having taxed Flavian with having falsified the records of the proceedings of the synod, an investigation was held in the following April to examine and verify them, at which Florentius virtually presented at the command of the emperor and the desire of Eutyches, who evidently expected greater impartiality from a layman, accustomed to judicial proceedings, than from a prejudiced clerical body (Liberat. Brevar. c. xi. p. 60; Libbo, iv. 250). On the denunciations of Eutyches requiring to be presented to worship before their master, he overrode the opposition of Flavian to their appearance (ibid. 239), and compelled the reluctant Aetius, who had acted as notary, to produce the minutes of the trial. No inaccuracy of importance was detected, though Eutyches complained that there were many omissions. The most important of these was the absence of any mention of the appeal he declared he had made to the leading Christian churches, which was consequently disallowed (ibid. 242-247). When the council of Chalcedon met for the consideration of the doctrines of Eutyches, Florentius was present, with other high civil dignitaries; but there is no record of the part he took.

We have a letter to Florentius from Theodor, written A.D. 449, defending himself from the charges of unsoundness in the faith, protesting that he holds and ever has held the truth as delivered by the apostles and prophets, and taught by Ignatius, Eusebius, Basil, and other chief doctors of the church, and declared by the Nicene fathers, and beseeching Florentius to close his ears against all calumnies against him (Theod. Epist. 89). Iodose of Pelusium also wrote to him to complain of a bad governor named Gigasithianus, whom he begs Florentius to treat as he deserves (Iod. Pelus. Epist. lib. i. 480). We have a letter to him from Firmus of Caesarea, begging his acceptance of some Easter gifts (epiBopa). (Firm. Epist. 29.) [E. V.]

FLORENTIUS (51), father of Gregory bishop of Tours. He was the son of Georgius, a member of one of the senatorial families of Auvergne. Gregory relates that he was cured of an attack of recurrent fever by the prayer of St. Martinus, abbot of Clermont. (Vitae Patrum, liv. 5.) [S. A. D. B.]

FLORESINDUS, metropolitan of Seville from about 682 to before 693, signing the acts of the thirteenth council of Toledo, summoned by Ervig in 683. He signs last among the metropolitan. At the fourteenth council of Toledo, 694, he is represented by the abbot Gaudencius. At the fifteenth council, 688, he signs in the third place among the metropolitans. (Eosp. Supr. ix. 224; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 270, 287, 304, 313; Gems, Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, ii. 2, 219; Mansi, xi. 1075, 1091, xil. 21.) [M. A. W.]

FLORIANI. Under this title, with the alternative names Carcopratiani and Milites, Philaster (57) describes a sect of heretics who denied the resurrection and judgment, who disbelieved Christ's birth from a virgin, and who taught and practised immorality. Philaster had given a separate article to the CARPOCRATIANS, and the name Milites would rather lead us to think of those Gnostics whom Epiphanius (xxvi. 5) calls Επιρροτομικοι and Philobites. The name Floriani does not elsewhere occur, and all that can be said about it is that there seems no reason for connecting it with FLORENRIUS. [G. S.]

FLORENIUS (1), bishop of Caesara, in Gallia Cispadana, a member of the Court of Inquiry held at Rome concerning Caesarianus, (Opt. i. 23.) [CAECILIUS (5)]. [H. W. F.]

FLORENIUS (2), Donatist bishop of Putiza, a place in Numidia, prevented by illness from attending the Carthaginian conference, but having given his advice as a member of that name, A.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. Dom. p.p. 430, 432, ed. Oberhür.) [H. W. F.]

FLORENIUS, bp. of Placentia (Piacenza). [FLAVIANUS (9)].

FLORENIUS (3), bp. of Olerzo (Opi§tergium) in Venetia. He was desirous of martyrdom, and is supposed to have been martyred c. 620, probably by the Lombards according to tradition. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, x. 322, 323.) [A. H. D. A.]

FLORENIUS (4), bishop of Piacenza, c. 648. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xv. 15; Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 198.) [A. H. D. A.]

FLORENIUS (5), said to have been 25th bishop of Aries, following St. Virgilius, and succeeded by Cyprianius, or Theodosius, in the early part of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. i. 541; Le Coite, Ann. Ecol. Franc. an. 604, n. viii. tom. ii. 563; Gems, Series Episc. 493.) [S. A. D.]

FLORENIUS (6), May 4, martyr in the Diocletian persecution at Lorch (Laurocun), the chief town of Noricum Ripense. The president
of Noricum, one Aquilinus, as soon as the edict of persecution arrived, called upon the officials to sacrifice. Florianus held the important post of "princeps officiorum." He refused to obey, and was sentenced to be flung into the Anius with a stone tied round his neck. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron., Usuardi, Rabani, Notkeri, Wandalberti; Surii, Vit. SS. t. iii.) [G. T. S.]

FLORIANUS (7), addressed in a letter which is attributed to St. Ambrose. He is represented as having asked direction from St. Ambrose on the subject of repentance and amendment. The letter is given among St. Ambrose's works as genuine in the Roman edition (tom. v. p. 202, Ep. 29, Rom. 1582), but is reckoned spurious by the Benedictines (Patr. Lat. xvii. 749 sq.) and by Ceillier (xi. 511). Florimius is otherwise unknown.

[J. G.]

FLORIANUS (8), abbot, addressed in a poetical epistle by Arator, who compliments him as being spiritually instructed in the grace of Christ, but he is not otherwise identified (Patr. Lat. xviii. 63 and note). He is said by Ceillier (xi. 197) to have been abbot of Romain Moutier in the present canton of Vaud.

[3. G.]

FLORIANUS (9), martyr with Calanicus and fifty-eight others at Beil Jibrin (Kleutheropolis), between Jerusalem and Gaza. According to the Roman martyrlogy he suffered at the hands of the Saracens, who invaded Palestine and took Jerusalem by an honourable capitulation in A.D. 637, Heraclius being still a boy. It has not been possible to explain the expression "royal court" by referring to any known soeuron of an emperor in Asia Minor within the limits which the chronology demands; and Lightfoot has plausibly suggested (Contemp. Rev. May 1875, p. 839) that the expression may have been loosely used of the court of T. Aurelius Fulvius, afterwards the emperor Antoninus Pius, and who was proconsul of Asia, A.D. 135 (Le Bas and Waddington, Fastes des Provinces asiatiques, p. 724). Florimus may possibly have come from Italy in the proconsul's retinue. The title of the letter to him was: On Monarchy, or that God is not the author of evil; and Eusebius remarks that Florimus seems to have maintained the opposite opinion concerning God. It would be rash in us, who have not seen the letter, to assert that this inference of Eusebius was erroneous, but since the characteristic of dualism is not to make God the author of evil, but to clear Him from the charge by ascribing evil to an independent origin, the title would lead us to think that the letter was directed not against one who had himself held God to be the author of evil, but against one who had charged the doctrine of a single first principle with necessarily leading to this conclusion. And we should have supposed that the object of Eusebius was to show that it was possible to assert God to be the sole origin and ruler of the universe without holding evil to be His work. However this may be, later writers have naturally followed the report of Eusebius.

Philaster (79) having described it as the heresy of Colletus that he denied things evil to be God's work, contrasts with this the doctrine of another named heretic, who taught that things which God made were in their own nature evil. Augustine (68), in other respects following Philaster, calls the anonymous heretic Florimus, and with little probability, as we shall presently see, makes him the founder of a sect of Florinians. He probably arrived at this result by considering the notice in Eusebius with Philaster's mention in another place of Florinius. The great work of Irenaeus does not mention Florinus, and has nothing which we can conjecture as likely to have been common with the letter of which we have been speaking. The tract of Tertullian against Hermogenes is on the same measure deals with the same subject, but freely as Tertullian used the church of Rome, which office he lost on account of his having fallen into heresy. He is known to us by two notices (v. 15, 20) in the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, who drew his information from works written by Irenaeus in opposition to Florinus. One was a letter to Florinus, of which Eusebius has preserved a most interesting fragment, in which Irenaeus records his youth, his recollections of Polycarp, representing how that bishop, whose good opinion he remembered Florinus had once been anxious to gain, would have been shocked at his present opinions. Scholten, in order to save a theory of his from destruction, has found it necessary to assail the genuineness of this letter (Der Apostel Johannes in Kleinzieben, p. 41), but his arguments are too weak to need refutation, and the fragment contains unmistakable internal evidence of genuineness. It states that Florinus at the time of his acquaintance with Polycarp was doing prosperously at the royal court in Lower Asia, Irenaeus being still a boy. It has not been found possible to explain the expression "royal court" by referring to any known soeuron of an emperor in Asia Minor within the limits which the chronology demands; and Lightfoot has plausibly suggested (Contemp. Rev. May 1875, p. 839) that the expression may have been loosely used of the court of T. Aurelius Fulvius, afterwards the emperor Antoninus Pius, and who was proconsul of Asia, A.D. 135 (Le Bas and Waddington, Fastes des Provinces asiatiques, p. 724). Florimus may possibly have come from Italy in the proconsul's retinue. The title of the letter to him was: On Monarchy, or that God is not the author of evil; and Eusebius remarks that Florimus seems to have maintained the opposite opinion concerning God. It would be rash in us, who have not seen the letter, to assert that this inference of Eusebius was erroneous, but since the characteristic of dualism is not to make God the author of evil, but to clear Him from the charge by ascribing evil to an independent origin, the title would lead us to think that the letter was directed not against one who had himself held God to be the author of evil, but against one who had charged the doctrine of a single first principle with necessarily leading to this conclusion. And we should have supposed that the object of Eusebius was to show that it was possible to assert God to be the sole origin and ruler of the universe without holding evil to be his work. However this may be, later writers have naturally followed the report of Eusebius. Philaster (79) having described it as the heresy of Colletus that he denied things evil to be God's work, contrasts with this the doctrine of another unnamed heretic, who taught that things which God made were in their own nature evil. Augustine (68), in other respects following Philaster, calls the anonymous heretic Florinus, and with little probability, as we shall presently see, makes him the founder of a sect of Florinians. He probably arrived at this result by considering the notice in Eusebius with Philaster's mention in another place of Florinius. The great work of Irenaeus does not mention Florinus, and has nothing which we can conjecture as likely to have been common with the letter of which we have been speaking. The tract of Tertullian against Hermogenes is on the same measure deals with the same subject, but freely as Tertullian used the
labours of others, and of Ireneaus in particular, there is nothing which entitles us to say that he employed the letter to Florinus. If Florinus ever in a heretical sense made God the author of evil, his errors afterwards took the opposite direction, and he became a Valentinian. It was in reply to him that Ireneaus composed his work On the Ogdoad, to which he must himself have attached considerable value; for he prefixed to it an adscription to ensure fidelity in its transcribers, which pleased Eusebius so much that he not only copied it into his ecclesiastical history, but prefixed it to his own work on Chronology. Concerning the time of the controversy of Ireneaus with Florinus, we have to balance the arguments that, if it had taken place before the publication of the treatise on heresies, we should expect to find some trace of it in that work; and, on the other hand, that, after the publication of a treatise which deals so fully with the whole subject of Valentinianism, a separate treatise on the Ogdoad would have been unnecessary. The scale seems to be turned in favour of the later date by the fact that there is a Syriac fragment (Harvey, ii. 457), which purports to be an extract from a letter of Ireneaus to Victor of Rome concerning Florinus, a presbyter, who was a partisan of the error of Valentinianism, and had published an abominable book. No such letter is mentioned by Eusebius, but otherwise the extract presents no ground for suspicion. The letter calls the attention of the bishop of Rome to writings which would seem to have been uncensured by him, and which were doing mischief, as bearing the authority of a presbyter of his church. It may be inferred that however the doctrines of Florinus may have verged on Valentinianism, he had not formally joined that sect, else he could not have retained his position. Whether the interference of Ireneaus was followed by the deposition or the retraction of Florinus, it does not appear that he was the founder of any heretical sect; probably he did not long survive, for he must have been a considerably older man than Ireneaus. He is not named by Epiphanius, by Philaster, or by Pseudo- Tertullian, who has so many notices of Roman heretics; and it is likely, therefore, that he was not named in the later work of Hippolytus, nor in the lectures of Ireneaus, on which that work was founded; he is not named in the later work of Hippolytus, nor by Tertullian. This silence is not easily explained if either Florinus or any school of Florinian were a source of danger to the church after his exposure by Ireneaus.

[FLORINUS (3), bishop of Cesena. [FLORINUS (1).]

FLORINUS (3), a Greek, sixth in the list of the bishops of Eugubium or Gubbio in Umbria, behind Decentius and Anastasius, a.d. 426. (Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 634.)

FLORINUS, bishop of Cesena. [FLORINUS (5).]

FLORIUS, bishop of Aemonia (Cittanova) in Istria, about ten miles north of Parenzo, c. 324. On a journey to Constantinople he died. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Itali, vii. 747; Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 223.)

[CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. II.]


FLORIUS (1), said to have been bishop of Calaris (Cagliari), in the 2nd century. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Itali, xxii. 48; Cosii, Città di Cagliari, &c., p. 56.) [R. S. G.]

FLORIUS (2), traditionally the first bishop of Lodève; but according to the Sammarchiani the ancient tradition rests on no evidence. (Tillemont, Mem. iv. 506; Gall. Christ. vi. 536.) [R. T. S.]

FLORIUS (3), one of twelve Gallic bishops congratulated by Leo the Great, Aug. 16, 498, on the consecration of Ravennatus by them to the see of Arles (Leo Mag. Ep. 40). He occurs again among about 40 Gallic bishops in the synodal letter of Ravennatus to Leo, and likewise in Leo's reply. (Leo Mag. Ep. 99, 102, ed. Migne, Patr. Lat. iv.; Mansi, Concil. vii. 151.)

[FLORIUS (4), bishop of Amiata or Pompeipolis, in Pontus, a.d. 598. He was born at Constantinople. His father's name was Florius, and his mother's Euphemia. He is stated to have attained to great knowledge and skill both in secular and sacred literature. He married, and had two sons, but in later life took monastic vows. He was later made bishop of Amiata, a town which being close to Eupatoria shared with it the common name of Pompeipolis. He held his see under the younger Justin, Tiberius, and Mauritius. In the Memoirs of the Greek church his name is found to be celebrated on Dec. 18. (Basil. Mem.) [F. A.]

FLORIUS (5), bishop of Cesena, c. 588. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Itali, ii. 530; Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 445.)

[FLORIUS (6), the name of three Italian bishops, viz. of Cesena, Forconium, and Feligno, who signed the second epistle of pope Agatho, which was sent in 680 after a synod in Rome to the third council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 303, 315; Hefele, § 314; Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 421.)

[FLORIUS (7), bishop of Mentesa, signs the acts of the thirteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth councils of Toledo, 683, 688, 693 (Mansi, xi. 222, 22, 84). The see of Mentesa disappears at the time of the Moorish invasion. Taric destroyed the town, and Florius is the last bishop. (Esp. Sagr. vii. 360; Roderic. Tolet. lib. iii. cap. 22, ap. Schott, Hispania Illustrata; Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 297, 313, 333.) [PARDUS.] [M. A. W.]

FLORIUS (8), a Roman officer, probably consular of Numidia, a.d. 303, by whom the persecution against the Christians was carried on with extreme severity. (Böcking, Not. dig. Occup. p. 17; Optatus, iii. 8; Ang. cont. Crez. iii. 29, 30.) [H. W. P.]

FLORIUS (9)—Aug. 18, Martyr with Laurus his brother in Iliumurco under Licinianus, between 312 and 316. They were towns, and natives apparently of Byzantium, where they were employed by two Christian sculptors, Procopius.
FLORUS

Ius and Maximus, who suffered martyrdom there. Upon this Florus and Laurus escaped into Ilyricum, where they obtained employment from the president of the province. Pleading him by their skill, they were sent to the emperor Licinius, who was then probably living at Sirmium, the capital of Ilyricum. He gave them orders to erect an idol temple, which they did, but ended by dedicating it to the true God and breaking the idols, for which the emperor cast them into a deep well. Their relics were translated to Constantinople in the time of Constantine the Great. (Martyr. Rom. ed. Baron. Ussward.; Bas. Memot.) [G. T. S.]

FLORUS (10), deacon of the church of Syracuse, accompanied his bishop, Chrestus, to the council of Arles (A.D. 314), and was his only companion, though the invitation of the emperor (Eusebius, i. 5) allowed two ecclesiastics to go. (Mansi, ii. 475; Ceilier, ii. 625.) [J. G.]

FLORUS (11), magister officiorum under Theodosius the Great in the Eastern empire in A.D. 391. At the end of that year he became presbyter. During A.D. 391-3 many of the imperial decrees are addressed by Theodosius to him for execution (Cod. Theodos. i. pp. 107-115, ed. Ritter), entrusting him, among other duties, with the putting down of the heathen sacrifices, and with the establishing an inquisition against the Manichean and Encratite heretics. [J. G.]

FLORUS (12), a.D. 436, a young monk of Adrumetum. He made a visit to a monastery at Usalas with his friend Felix, another young monk. Here he read Augustine's letter (No. 194) to the presbyter Sixtus. It struck him so much, that he asked permission of the monks of Usalas to make a copy, and transcribed it at the dictation of Felix. After their sojourn at Usalas, Florus went on to Carthage, Felix returned to Adrumetum. Here Felix read the letters of his brother brothers of that house. Some of them considered it fatal to the doctrine of free-will; and, when Florus returned, accused him of being the author. The monastery was in quite a turmoil of theological disputation, of which the abbott Valentine was kept in ignorance. Florus felt himself obliged to tell him the truth of the matter; whereupon Valentine read the letter, recognized the style of Augustine, and allowed one of the recalcitrant brothers, Cresconius, to make a pilgrimage with Felix to Hippo, which restored peace to the monastery. When they arrived, the bishop explained the letter to Sixtus, and wrote a letter on the subject to the abbots of Adrumetum and his confraternity. He had intended to give them other treatises on the subject of Pelagianism, but they were unwilling to wait until copies were made. He kept them, however, till after Easter, to give them more complete instruction on the theory of grace. Besides a second letter to Valentine, he composed for them the treatise De Gratiam et Libero Arbitrio. He subsequently received a letter from the abbat, and a visit from Florus. This gave rise to his chapter on the subject in the Liber Retractationum, where he explains that he had been under the impression that the disputants of Adrumetum had maintained that free-will was denied in defending grace. (Augustinus, Liber de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio; Liber Retractationum 11. 66; Epist. 154, &c.; Patrolog. Lat. xxiii. 516, &c.; Ceilier, ii. 513.) [W. M. S.]

FLORUS (13), a Gallic noble in the middle of the 6th century, said to have shewn St. Mauro the spot whereon to build his monastery and to have entrusted his son Bestolphus to the care for education, an example that was followed by many other nobles. (Wend. Flor. Hist. an. 553, ed. Coxe.) [C. H.]


FLORUS (15), martyrlogist, called by Cave (Script. Ecc. Hist. Lat. i. 692) monk of the Gallican congregation of St. Trudo in the diocese of Lyons, about the year 760, but more frequently identified with Florus Magister, deacon or priest of Lyons, who was commentator on Scripture and one of the chief opponents of Joannes Scottus in the Predestinarian controversy about the middle of the 9th century. His personal history is thus doubtful, but his work in the martyrlogy is very important from its close connexion with that of Bede. He is said to have materially enlarged the imperfect Martyrologium of Bede, and when Henschelius first discovered the complete Martyrologium in the library of H. Bouchier, the French senator at Dijes, and compared it with the fragment he had previously found in queen Christina's library at Rome, he imagined that in the different characters in which the former was written, he could detect the original Martyrologium of Bede and the later additions by Florus: and hence in the Bollandine edition (Acta SS. Jan. tom. i. 40 sq.) an attempt is made to distinguish the genuine work of Bede from the additions by Florus and others. But the original and additions are really indistinguishable, and there is no separate and entire Martyrologium of either; while the extent to which others may have extended the work of Florus is unknown. Avo's Vetus Romanus Martyrologium (Migne, Patr. Lat. xxiii. 143 sq.) professed to be merely a filling in of martyrs to the days omitted by Bede and Florus, while Usuardus's Martyrologium was a condensing of the other martyrlogies. The martyrlogist Wandalbert (Migne, Patr. Lat. xxii. 577) expresses his obligation to a subdeacon of Lyons named Florus, who excelled in Scriptural studies; but it is doubtful whether this is the martyrlogist. (Boll. Acta SS. Mart. ii. praef. p. 94 sq., giving Henschel's account of his finding the Martyrologium of Bede and the reasons for his distinguishing the parts belonging to Bede and Florus from others; see also St. Jan. i, praef. Gen. § vi. p. xlviii, for the sources whence the Martyrologium is taken; Giles's Bede, iv. praef. pp. lii, iv; Migne, Patr. Lat. xcv. 799 sq., giving both the Cologne and Bollandine editions, with Smith's preface and notes; Ceilier, Anteks sacrés, ii. 465.) [J. G.]


FLOSCLUS (FOSCLUS), thirteenth bishop of Orleans, succeeded St. Prosper, and died about the year 450. He is entitled martyr or confesser.
in some MSS., but not in the Roman Martyrology, nor by Sausayse in the Gallican. There is a strange legend that St. Evurtius, on occasion of a difficulty in selecting a bishop, caused Foculus when a mere baby to take a name from the altar; whereas the child cried three times "Anianus is bishop," and spoke no more for a year. His feast is kept on Feb. 2. (Hieron., Usuard, Mart.; Gall. Christ. viii. 1413.)

[8. T. S.]

FLUMINIUS, bishop of Tabudiun (Tutbuda) in Numidia, banished by Hunneric, 484. (Victor. Vit. Noticia, 56 in Migne, Patr. Lat. lviii.; Morselli, Africa Christ. i. 294.)

[8. D.]

FOLALDUS, bishop of Lyons. [FULCOALDUS.]

FOCALDUS, FOCOALDUS, bishop of Auxerre. [FULCOALDUS.]

FOEGADIUS (FAEGADIUS, PRAEGRADIUS, SEBATIUS, SARADIUS, or PHEDADUS, called in Gascony St. FIARE), bishop of Agen. His name, which suffers many corruptions, appears to be Greek, a tongue then common in Aquitania. His accession to the episcopate was probably later than 347, since he is not mentioned in the acts of the Sardican council. He rejected the second Sirmian formulary sent by Constantius into Gaul, and refused it in a work contra Ariano. He attended the council of Ariminum, and took an active part in the first proceedings, but refused to sign the Arian confession, even after nearly all his brethren had yielded. But, importuned by the prefect Taurus, he was at last deceived into subscribing by a trick of Valens, who to the statement Christ is "not a creature," had privily added the words "as other creatures." (Sulp. Serv. Chron. ii. 44.) Foeadius, on discovering the fraud, protested so vehemently as to clear himself in the eyes of all, and he attended the councils of Valence, 374, and probably that of Saragossa in 380 (Agen, belonging then to Spain), for the name Fidatus occurs among those subscribed, and his friend Delphius, of Bordeaux, was proscribed. In 392 when St. Jerome wrote his catalogue of illustrious men, he was in deprecitudo. St. Ambrose addressed a letter jointly to him (under the name Sebatius) and Delphius (Ep. 86, ii. 1106). The two books against the Arians were the only work of his which Jerome knew. It may be found in Pat. Lat. vol. xx. It is an able treatise, but contains nothing very remarkable, unless it be the definition (lib. i. cap. vii.) of substance in its ecclesiastical use. "Substantia dicitur id quod semper ex se esse est; hoc est, quod propriiter intra se virtute consistit, quae vis uni et soli Deo competit." In addition to the above work the treatise De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos, and the Libellus Fidei, which stood as Nos. 49 and 50 of the Orations of Gregory Nazianzen, really belong to Foeadius. They also are in Pat. Lat. vol. xx.

The former is written to explain some points which had been misunderstood in the treatise of Severus, and the latter is a formal confession of orthodox faith. (Cellier, Aut. Eccl. v. 372; Gall. Christ. ii. 895; Tillemont, Mem. vi. 427; Bull. AA. SS. Ap. 25.) [8. T. S.]

FOENDALACH (FOENDALACH, FOENNELACH), son of Meanach, bishop of Armaghs, succeeded Ferdachrich or Ferdachry A.D. 768, but sat with difficulty for only three years, when Dubadhiele obtained the primatecy, Gormghal being an unsuccessful claimant at the same time. Foendalach lived till A.D. 794. (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 18, § 14, c. 29, § 6; Vallet, Eccl. Bishops, "Armagh.") [8. G.]

[FULLANUS. (FULLANUS (2).]

FOLACHTACH (FOLACHTACH). (1) Son of Teach Tuse, abbot of Clonmacnois, died A.D. 770 (Four Mast. A.D. 765; Ann. Ulton. A.D. 769). Teach Tuse, the House of St. Tusa, now Taghadro or Tappo, is situated near Maynooth, co. Kildare, and Folachtach probably had been born there; the ancient church has disappeared, but the round tower remains to shew its ecclesiastical importance. (Four Mast. o' Donovan, i. 358, n. 7, 369.)


FOLCBERHT (1) An abbot who attests a grant of Offa to Archbishop Jaenberht in 774 (Kemble, C. D. 121, 122); his name is attached also to questionable charters of the same king, granted to Worcester a little later (Sud. nos. 145, 150).

(2) A priest of the diocese of Elhumah, who attended the council of Claves in 803 (K. C. D. 1024; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 547). [8.]

FOLCBERHT, a nun of Bath, to whom, in conjunction with the abbess Berngvidi, Ethelmod, with the consent of king Ethelred of Mercia, gave land on the Cherwell. (K. C. D. 21.) [8.]

FOLCRED, a Mercian abbot, who attests an act recorded in the council of Cahalhyth, probably belonging to the year 801 (Kemble, C. D. 118; Hadden and Stubbs, iii. 531). [8.]

FOLCUINIUS (FOLCUWICUS, WOLFWICUS), noticed in the Gallia Christiana (v. 742) among the abbots of Weissenburg on the Lauter in Alsace, and in the CH. v. 763 among the bishops of Worms; he appears first as successor to Vernharius in the abbacy of Weissenburg and in the see of Worms in the year 766. He was buried in the nunnery of Mons Sti. Andreae, beside his predecessor Vernharius. [8. G.]

FOLLIANUS, martyr. [FAELAN.]

FOLRADUS, abbat. [FULRADUS.]

FONTEIANUS, bishop of Sagalassus, in Pidisa, present at the council of Chalcedon A.D. 451, signs the synodal letter of the council to Leo I. (Harduin, Concil., ii. 369 e; Leo Mag. Ep. 98, 1106, Migne.) His name appears in the list of bishops signing the decree of the council held at Rome in 603. The list, however, belongs certainly to some earlier council. (Harduin. ii. 987 e; Baron. 503, ix.; Oriens Christ. i. 1041.) [8. G.]

FONTEUS (1), bishop of Vaison. He was bishop in 450, in which St. Leo wrote him a
FONTENIUS [Fontenius], bishop of Feltre, one of the ten bishops who signed a letter to the emperor Maurice in 591, which was sent by certain bishops of Venetia and Rhaetia II (after they had held a synod of which we have no record) to justify their refusal to condemn the Three Chapters (Mansi, x. 466; Hefele, § 281). His name is also in the list of those bishops who are supposed to have held a synod in 579 under Elias, archbishop of Aquileia, concerning the translation of his see to Grado (Hefele, § 280; Mansi, ix. 926). This synod is probably fictitious. (Mansi, ix. 929; Chronicon Patriarcharum Graecorum in Mon. Rerum Langob. 1878, p. 393, and note by Witz.) [A. H. D. A.]

FORRANNAN (Forannan, Farnan, Forandunus, Forannan), commemorated Feb. 15. Colgan (Acta SS. 336-38) calls his father Quintus or Contans, descended from Niall of the Nine Hostages. While St. Forannan was preaching in Ireland, St. Columba went to Hy. When he returned, about A.D. 575, to heal the divisions of the church, a numerous assembly met together to welcome him. At that time St. Forannan is said to have received from St. Columba the church called at first All na fairgliona, and afterwards All-Forannan, now Altarman, parish of Easkey, in the north-west of the county of Sligo. There he lived in a cave. Colgan (Acta SS. Ind. Chron.) says he flourished A.D. 565. He is probably the original of Ferranus in the Scotch annals (Reeves, Oddece, Evid. d.). He is not to be confounded with Forannan, son of Ronan, bishop of Water-on-the-Meuse in the end of the 10th century, commemorated on April 30 (Colgan, Tr. Taurum, 485, cc. 51-6, 490 n. 44; Todd, St. Patrick, 33-5).

(2) Abbot of Clonard, commemorated Feb. 12. Colgan (Acta SS. 336 n. 7) has made the curious mistake of identifying St. Forannan at A.D. 751, which is really (according to the Four Masters, whom Colgan usually follows) the year of the death of St. Forannan, bishop of Meath, a place not yet identified [Forannan (4)] (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 353). St. Forannan of Clonard died A.D. 748 (Ann. Tg.; Four Mast. A.D. 740; Ann. Ult. A.D. 744; O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 509).

(3) Abbot of Kildare, commemorated Jan. 15. In his list of the prelates of Kildare, Colgan (Tr. Taurum, 629, col. 1) attaches to this day the feast of St. Forannan, who was abbot of Kildare, and died in A.D. 697, according to the Annals of Ulster and of the Four Masters. He succeeded Lochene Meann, the Wise, in A.D. 697, but Colgan probably intends to identify him with the son of Aedh, whose feast is Feb. 15, as the Kaldanes have such a name on Jan. 6 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 297, 299; O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 219-20; Lanigan, Ch. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 19, § 4).

(4) Forandus, bishop of Meath (Taurum) (Four Mast.) or Meath tuirian (Ann. Ult.), died A.D. 756 (Ann. Tg.; Four Mast. A.D. 751; Ann. Ult. A.D. 753), but his place is unrecognised.


FOREBFLATT (Forebflat), daughter of Conna, abbot of Claonbroey, near Granard, co. Longford, died A.D. 780 (Ann. Ult. A.D. 779; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 776, i. 380, n. 4, 381).


(2) Forbhshasach or Forbosach, son of Maoltos, abbot of Roscommon, died A.D. 779 (Ann. Ult. A.D. 778; Four Mast. A.D. 774).


FORBBIUS (Fortius), thirteenth bishop of Le Fruy, succeeding Faustus, and followed by Flavianus, in the southern part of the 6th century. (Gall. Christ. ii. 690.) [S. A. B.]

FORCRON (Forconnus), abbot of Cleamacnoise, in the barony of Garrycastle, King's County, died A.D. 688 (Ann. Tg.; Four Mast. A.D. 686). [J. G.]

FORDRED. [Forthere, Forthred.]

FORMARIUS, a bishop of Cingulium (Cingoli) in the 6th century. It is uncertain whether he was the predecessor or the successor of Julianus, who held the see A.D. 544-558, and consequently whether he acceded c. A.D. 510 or 559. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, vii. 454, 465.) [R. S. G.]

FORMENIUS (Firmin, Firminus, Parminius), a legendary king of Thrasoe, who had dedicated his kingdom and retired as a hermit among the Alps, at the time that Dathi, son of Flachna or Erinn, led his army as far as the Alps, and perished there by lightning in the beginning of the 5th century. Dathi's death is represented as a divine vengeance upon him for destroying St. Formenius's cell, with its round tower of sand and stones. This legend is given in the Book of Lecan, f. 302 b, and in the Lebor na hUidhir, f. 55, p. b. col. a; it is also quoted at length in Mac Firbis's Genealogies, &c., of the Hy-Finnach (by O'Donovan, pp. 18-23), and referred to by O'Flaherty (Oggia, ii. pt. iii. c. 87, p. 301); Keating calls him Formenius. [J. G.]

FORMERIUS, martyr. [Fermerius.]

FORMINUS, bishop of Bleda (Bleda), c. A.D. 649. He sat in the Lateran council held by Martin I. in that year. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, vi. 180.) [R. S. G.]

FORTCHERN (1), son of Follimith, commemorated Feb. 17 and Oct. 11. Of this saint we have several ancient notices, though none of
them actually taking the form of a Life: Colgun (Acta SS. 364-65) has a memoir; the Bollandists (Acta SS. Feb. tom. iii. 13-15) give a Commentarius Criticus, quoting mostly from Ussher, Joceline, and Evynus. Ússher (Eccl. Ant. c. 17. Wks. vi. 418-14) and Todd (St. Patrick, 287-89) quote extracts from Tireschan from the Book of Armagh (fol. 16 a b). St. Fortchern was son of Fedelimhida, son of Laeghnaire king of Ireland, and his mother was Scatha, daughter of a British king. Under St. Patrick he laid aside all earthly pursuits, and gave over the care of his three sheep entrusted to him, and instead became a hermit, and lived in a recessed cave with a small stone bed for his sleep, and a rough stone table for his meal, and a stone seat for his worship of God. (Four Mast. A.D. 449). Michael, John, and other relics of St. Patrick's relics, along with other sacred vessels, were in a place called Rath-sin. At his master Loman's urgent desire before death, he accepted the episcopal charge of the church at Athtrium, now Trim, in Meath, but held it only three days, and then, retiring into entire privacy, built the monastery of Roscrea. St. Finian of Clonard is stated to have stayed with him thirty years before going over to Britain. He is venerated on different days at different places: at Killfortchern in Kildrane, in the present county of Carlow, on Oct. 11, and at Trim in Meath, along with other seventeen patrons, on Feb. 17, as a second dedication. (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 273; Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 137 n.; Todd, St. Patrick, 150-51, 258-62; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. ir. i. 427-29; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 556, 601-3.)

(3) Son of Deaga or Deague, is classed among the ancient Irish writers, in company with Fleechus or Fiacc, Cenflelaidh, and Maelmuir; some fragments of his writings remain in Bodl. Laud. f. 95, and Cod. Stow. iii. f. 7, vi. f. 4. Tigernach is said to have drawn his materials from him, and Cennflelaidh to have interpolated his poetry. Though some place him as far back as the days of Julius Caesar, he probably belonged to the 7th or 8th century. (O'Conor, Proleg. ii. 66 sq.; and Apul. Nescap. 63, 101.)

FORTHRE (1) (Forter), the second bishop of Sherborne (M. H. B. 620). He succeeded Alvin as bishop, whose death occurred in 709, and was alive at the time when Bede completed his history (Bede, H. E. v. 18, 23); the venerable historian describes him as a man very learned in Holy Scripture. He ruled his diocese from 709 to 737, in which year he went with queen Frithgith of Wessex to Rome (Chr. Z. H. B. 328), after which no more is heard of him. During this long time his name frequently appears in charters; in 712 as "famulus famularum Dei," he was a benefactor to Glastonbury (Kemble, C. D. 63; Mon. Angli. i. 47); in 716 he attested the act of the council of Clovesho by which Withrede's privilege was confirmed (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300); his name is attached to two doubtful grants of Iene to Glastonbury in 725 (K. C. D. 73, 74), and to a similar charter of Ethelheard dated in 729 (Rh. 76). Glastonbury was locally within his diocese, and the finity of his date was a great convenience to these writers of these documents. A grant to Abingdon (Rh. 81), which purports to have been signed by Forther "in Banesinga villa," is scarcely more trustworthy. There is also a charter of the date of archbishop Notherl, which is attested both by Forther and by his successor Herewald, a conjunction which, considering the circumstances of Forther's resignation, raises a presumption in favour of its genuineness (K. C. D. 82). More interesting and undoubtedly trustworthy are the notices of Forther which occur among the remains of St. Boniface; one of these is a letter of Britwald, archbishop of Canterbury, addressed to Forther, in which he beg him to insist that Beorwald, abbat of Glastonbury, should release a captive girl, for whom her brother Eppa was ready to pay a ransom of 300 solidi (Ep. Bonif. ed. Würthwein, No. 155; Mon. Moguntina, ed. Jaffé, pp. 48, 49). The other is a letter of bishop Daniel of Winchester, to Forther, referring to him a newly ordained deacon, named Merwala (ed. Würth. Ep. 148; Mon. Mog. p. 99).


FORTHRED (1) (Fordred, Forthebræc), a Northumbrian abbot, who is mentioned in a letter from pope Paul I. to Eadbert king of Northumbria, in A.D. 757 or 758. It appears from it that Eadbert had deprived Forthred of three monasteries, which had been given to him by a certain abbess, viz., Stanninggrave, Cucha-walda, and Domenasthu, and bestowed them on a person of the name of Moll, Forthred's brother. Forthred went to Rome to complain, and Paul writes to Eadbert (archbishop Egbert's name being also inserted in the letter) desiring him to make restitution. The places referred to are probably Stonegrave in Ryedale, co. York, where there are some very early remains, the neighbouring church of Coxwold, and Jarrow on the Tyne, which is situated at the mouth of a rivulet called the Don (cf. Symeon, Chron. 33, and n.). The letter is printed in Wilkins, i. 144, and in Haddan and Stubbs, i. 394-4.

It is improbable, from the difference in dates, that this Forthred is identical with a Mercian abbot of the same name, who died A.D. 803 or 805 (cf. Haddan and Stubbs, ut supra, or with Forthred, a priest, to whom Alcuin, about the same time, gave a general letter of recommendation where he was setting out for Rome (Ep. Alcuin. ed. Jaffé, p. 894). [J. R.]

FORTHRED (2), Mercian abbot, whose death is noted in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the year 903 (M. H. E. 341), to be corrected to 805. In the list of signatures to the act of Clovesho in 803 Forthred appears as a priest and abbat of the diocese of Leicester (Kemble, C. D. 1024). There is among Alcuin's letters (Mon. Alcuin, ed. Jaffé, p. 894) an epistle of commendation written in favour of a priest named Fordred, who was going on pilgrimage; this possibly refers to the abbat. The earlier notice of an abbat, Forthred in Northumbria, can scarcely be referred to him. (See No. 2.) Forthred's name is attached to charters from 790 to 803 (K. C. D. 159, 161, 166, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 185, 1810, and 1820.)

FORTIS (1) (St.), martyr, and, according to a vague tradition, an early bishop of Bordeaux. Venantius Fortunatus, in a poem on Leontius, archbishop of the same diocese, tells him "tertius a decimo huic urbi antites haberes" (Lib. i. cap. 15, Migne, Patr. Lat. i. 125, 78). As we have only eight names before that of Leontius,
FORTIS (3), a Donatist bishop mentioned in the history of the inquiry before Zenophilus. He endeavoured to reconcile Silvanus, Donatist bishop of Cirta, to Nundinarus, a desecram of the same church, who accused him of "tradition" and other crimes. He wrote letters to this effect to Silvanus, and to the clergy and elders of the church, and received one to the same effect from another bishop, Sabinus, imploring him, as a personal friend of Silvanus, to lose no time in effecting the reconciliation before the festival of Easter. (Mon. Vet. Dom. iv. pp. 174-176, ed. Oberthür.) [NUNDINARUS, SILVANUS.] [H. W. F.]

FORTIS (3), Donatist bishop of Cedia, in Numidias, who joined with others in an address to Primianus and other Donatist bishops, requesting them to undertake the management on their side of the controversy to be held at Carthage, A.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. Dom. pp. 429-432, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. F.]

FORTIS (4), bishop of Caputcella in Maurétania Caesariensis; banished by Hunneric, A.D. 484. (Victor. Vit. Notitia, 58 in Migne, Patr. Lat. ivii.; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 120.) [L. D.]

FORTIS (5), archbishop of Milan, 641 to 643, lived at Genoa, and probably died there, as did several of his predecessors, after the invasion of the Lombards. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 132; Ughelli, Itali. Sacr. Inv. iv. 137.) [A. H. D. A.]

FORTIS (6), bishop of Agga (Aggya) in the proconsular province of Africa, signed the letter of his patriarch to Paulinus of Constantine, nople, to warn him against the errors of the Monothelites, which he was favouring, A.D. 646. (Mansi, x. 942; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 71.) [L. D.]

FORTIUS, bishop of Le Puy. [FORNIUS.]

FORTUNA, martyr, Carth. A.D. 250. [ARISTO.]

FORTUNATA, Oct. 14, virgin and martyr at Caesarea in Palestine, under the pontificate Urbanus, in the Diocletian persecution. She suffered with Carponius Evaristus and Prisciansus, her brothers. Her body is said to have been translated to Naples, out of the records of which church Baronius transferred her name to the Roman martyrology. He tells us that her relics were found at Naples, a.d. 1561, in the church of St. Gaudioso. (Mart. Hieron.) Ussuarus writes the name Fortunatus, and commemorates him as bishop of Tudertum. He also notes another of the same name on Oct. 15. [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATIANUS (1), bishop of Assurac in Mr. Procons. Lapsed (as a sacrificator; arm.) in Decian persecution; endeavoured to resume office without penance, though admissible even with penance only to lay communion. Pamphlets, copied by Fell, calls him a Novatianist; plainly wrong. Cyprian (Ep. 65) insists on his being repelled, and counsels other lapse against forming a sect round him. [EPACTUS (3)]. [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATIANUS (2), bishop of Aquileia in the middle of the 4th century; known to us chiefly through St. Jerome, who includes him in his catalogue of Viri Illustres (c. 97). He was born in Africa, but became bishop of Aquileia in the reign of Constantius. In 343 he was present at Sardica (Mansi, iii. 39). He was a man of considerable influence, and judged less hardly of the semi-Arian opinions than most of the Catholics. He persuaded Liberius, the bishop of Rome, who was ready to go into exile for his faith, that he might properly subscribe the formula of the council of Sirmium; and he even went so far as to consent to the condemnation passed upon Ananias in the Council of Milan (A.D. 355. See Ceiller, iii. 592). He wrote a commentary on the Gospels, divided into sections or chapters, in an abrupt, unpolished style. Jerome condemns him vehemently ("detestabilis habetur") for the advice given to Liberius; but in his earlier work, in the desert, Jerome highly valued his commentary, which he begged Paulus of Concordia to send him in the year 374 (Ep. 10, ed. Vall.), calling it "a pearl from the Gospels, the word of the Lord which is tried as silver." [F. H. F.]

FORTUNATIANUS (3), bishop of Capua in the Byzacena, a town to be distinguished from the one of the same name in Numidias; present at the council held at Carthage by Gratian, A.D. 349: as his name occurs first among the Byzacene bishops he is supposed to have been primate of his province. (Mansi, i. 153; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 119.) [L. D.]

FORTUNATIANUS (4), bishop of Sicca Veneria, an important town of Numidia, on a branch of the river Bagradas (Reff, Shaw, p. 95), perhaps the same person as the bearer of the letter to Paulinus (see No. 12). St. Augustine wrote a letter to him requesting him on his behalf to ask pardon of a bishop, not named, whom he thought that he had offended by some expressions in a letter concerning the seeing God in a merely human or physical sense. This Augustine declared to be impossible, for God is a spirit, and therefore not limited to time or space, but if his language had seemed to be in any way scornful or derisive, he desired to apologize. He proceeds to explain his meaning, viz., "that God can only be seen on earth in a spiritual, or, to use his own expression, an invisible manner. He quotes on his own side Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius, and Gregory Nazianzen, and shews that any other view of the question must savour of anthropomorphism. After the resurrection the human body will cease to be animal and become spiritual, but into any minute explanation of the matter he professes himself incompetent to enter, or to quote any authority on the point. "We know," he says, "that we shall see God "as he is" (1 John iil. 2), and that He will be "all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 28), and that without holiness no man can see Him (Heb
FORTUNATUS

Fortunatus is a presbyter of Tagaste, by whom St. Augustine sent a letter to Paulinus and Thrasibius, sometime between A.D. 394 and 410. (Aug. Ep. 80.) [H. W. P.]

FORTUNATUS (18), a heathen, yet advocate for his sister St. Victoria in the Diocletian persecution in Numidia. He tried to gain his sister off from death by suggesting that she was merely misled for a time, but she repudiated the evasive suggestion, and disavowed even his fraternal relationship except as he should keep the commandments of God. There is no notice of his conversion. (Baronius, Ann. Eccl. a. 303, ivii.; Bell. Acta SS. Feb. ii. 518-529; Ruinart, Act. S. Mart. 389. All authorities follow the Acta S. Saturnini et Soc. Mart. in Numidica. See also Ceillier, Antverp. sacrés, iii. 21.) [J. G.]

FORTUNATUS (1), bishop of Thucuboris in Proc. Prov. of Africa, near Carthage. He attended all Cyprian’s synods of which we have lists (his seniority identifying him), viz., Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. de Pace, A.D. 252. (Ep. 57.) Syn. 4 de Basilide, A.D. 254. (Ep. 67.) Syn. 5 de Bap. I, A.D. 255 (Ep. 70), and spoke seventeenth among the eighty-seven bishops of Syn. vii. de Bap. iii., possibly the same as (2) and (3). [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATUS (2), to whom Cyprian’s De Exhortatione Martyrii is addressed, is possibly the preceding. [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATUS (3), the colleague of Codonius in the embassy to Rome (Cyp. Ep. 44 and 45). From the neighbourhood of the bishop of Thucuboris (No. 1) to Carthage, and his frequent presence there, one may conjecture that he was his colleague. [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATUS (4), the African bishop mentioned in Cyp. Ep. 50, is more likely to have come from the neighbourhood of Carthage. [A. H.]

FORTUNATUS (5), though he is named in some lists as an early bishop of Aquileia, it appears doubtful whether there was any bishop of that or similar name before Fortunatus, who was present, 343, at the synod of Sardica. [FORTUNATUS (3).] (Ugelli, It. Sacr. v. 31; Cappellatti, Le Chiese d’Ital. viii. 34-27.) [R. S. G.]

FORTUNATUS (6), bishop of Caesarea, the metropolis of Mauretania Caesariensis, present at the council of Arles A.D. 314. His name is inserted among the Gallic bishops. (Mansi, ii. 477; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 114.) [L. D.]

FORTUNATUS (7), bishop of Dionysiana in the Byzacene province of Africa, present at the council held at Cartharussum in the same province, which is mentioned several times by Augustine, where the Maximianists condemned Primian, the rival Donatist bishop of Carthage A.D. 393. (Mansi, iii. 847; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 151.) [L. D.]
FORTUNATUS (8), probably ninth bishop of Naples, c. A.D. 344. He is recognized as bishop of Naples in a circular addressed to him and many others by the Arian bishops assembled in the "pseudo-synod" of Philippopolis in 343. He seems to have died before A.D. 359. (Mansi, iii. 129; Ughelli, Itat. Sac. vi. 42.) [R. S. G.]

FORTUNATUS (9), the name of six bishops present at the Carthaginian conference of 411, viz. the bishop of Capoe (Gafsa, Ant. Itin. 71, 7), an important town south of Numidia; of Undesita, or Bajesita in Numidia; of Abenass in proconsular Africa; of Casa Caralense in Numidia; (Donatist) of Vescorri, a town of Mauretanian Sitifensis; of Rusucurris, Rusucurro, or Rusucurium (Dellis, Ant. Itin. 16, 4), a seaport town of Mauretania Caesariensis. (Mon. Vet. Don. pp. 399, 404, 405, 419, 421, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

FORTUNATUS (10), bishop of Cirta or Constantinae, chief town of Numidia, associated with St. Augustine, for whom he was present together with Alpius (orr. loc. Absentius) and Augustine, when some of the clergy of Cirta put into their hands a letter, written no doubt by Pelitian, Donatist bishop of Cirta, to his own clergy concerning the claims of Donatists to the same letters which a Donatist presbyter, at the command, he said, of an angel, placed in the hands of Generousus, a Christian gentleman, of whom we hear elsewhere as consular of Numidia. To this letter Augustine replied in his own name and in those of Alpius and Fortunatus. (Ep. 53; 1 Petil. l. i. p. 459; Eutrop. xiv. p. 326–329; Cellarius, i. p. 390.) He also appears to have joined in a letter concerning Pelagianism, sent to pope Innocent by the council of Milevis, A.D. 416. (Aug. Epp. 53, 176.) [Favennius (1).] [H. W. P.]

FORTUNATUS (11), bishop, to whom Primaus appears to have written three books (not extant) upon heresies. (Primaus, Opp. Prolog. ap. Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxiv. 407; Tilmont, Mem. Hist. Eccl. xxiii. 54.) [J. G.]


FORTUNATUS (13), the name of four bishops, viz. of Anagni, of Foligno, of Value near Solmona in Abruzzo, and of Sessa (Susian) in Campania, present at the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th synods under pope Symmachus, from 493 to 504, according to the reckoning of Dahn (Die Könige der Germanen) who accepts, with a slight alteration, the arrangement of Hefele, § 220. (Mansi, viii. 234, 253, 268, 299, 315.) [A. H. D. A.]

FORTUNATUS (14), bishop of Catania (Catana), c. A.D. 514. He was sent with Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, and others by pope Hormisdas on an embassy to the emperor Anastasius in the year 515. (Mansi, Concilia, viii. 389; Jaffé, Regesta Pontific. 65.) [R. S. G.]

FORTUNATUS (15), bishop of Petput (Pupitii), in proconsular Africa, present at the council of Carthage, A.D. 595. (Morelli, Africa Christian. i. 258; Mansi, viii. 645.) [L. D.]

FORTUNATUS (16), bishop of Todi ("Te

FORTUNATUS (17), VENANTius HON-
ORIUS Clementianus, bishop of Poitiers, and the last representative of Latin poetry in Gaul, was born about the year 530 at Cenéa, the modern Ceneda, in the neighborhood of Tar-
visium (Trevixo). (Vit. Sanct. Martin. lib. iv. 698.) Nothing is certain about his family, but he seems to have resided at an early age at Aquileia, where he came under the influence of one Paulus, who was instrumental in his conversion. Paulus Diaconus (Hist. Langob. lib. ii. 25) relates that he studied grammar, rhetoric, and poetry at Ravenna. Here he came almost blind, but was restored to sight by the oil of a lamp which burned at the altar of St. Martin of Tours in the church of St. Peter and St. John. In fulfillment of a vow made in gratitude for his recovery, he set out on a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Martin of Tours about 565. He himself relates in his famous moral poem, the Life of St. Martin. Quitting Italy, he crossed the Alps, and, passing into Austrasia, visited the court of king Siegfried, by whom he was hospitably entertained, and for whom he composed an epithalamium, on the occasion of his marriage with Brunehault, couched in terms of extravagant flattery, which reproduce the expressions of disgust leveled at the Northern barbarians in the dedication of his poems to Pope Gregory. Siegfried helped him on his way to Tours, and assigned him Sigvaldus as a guide (Moselet. ii. 20). Euphrondus was at this time bishop of Tours, with whom, on arriving at his destination, Fortunatus entered into close friendship (Moselet. iii. 1–3). After fulfilling his vow he continued to travel in Gaul, receiving everywhere the admiration and sympathy of the best Gallo-Roman society, and employing his time in correspondence with his former hosts, or in the composition of those fugitive poems which form the staple of his works. The disturbed state of his native country, owing to the incursions of the Lombards, seems to have been the prime cause of his prolonged sojourn in Gaul, but an additional inducement was the society of Rhegond of Poitiers, for whom he conceived a Platonic attachment, which the imaginative genius of Aug. Thierry (Écrits mérovingiens, tom. ii. rec. vi.) has invested with a romantic air, but hardly warranted by the generally heartless and sensual tone of the poet's writings. Rhegund was the daughter of Bertarius, king of the Thuringians, who, having been espoused against her will to Lothair I., king of Neustria, had separated from him, and retired in 550 to Poitiers, where she founded the convent of St. Grol,
more for purposes of literary than of religious seclusion, appointing her own domestic Agnes the first abbess. At what date Fortunatus visited Poitiers is uncertain, but it was no more than natural that a visitor of his literary eminence should find welcome in the cultivated society of St. Croix, or have been induced to take up his residence as chaplain and almoner to the convenant. Here he had abundant opportunity for indulging his literary and social tastes. Rhadegund, being in close relation with the most distinguished men of the time, may have served him in turn as poet-chaplain in correspondence with them, but despatched him from time to time on delicate missions, for which his courtly manners qualified him in no ordinary degree. In this way he became intimate with Gregory of Tours, Syagrius of Antan, Felix of Nantes, Germanus of Paris, Arrius of Clermont, and many others, to whom his poems are addressed. His leisure hours were employed in composing Lives of the Saints, Theological Treatises, and Hymns, among which latter are to be found the famous "Vexilla Regis," composed for a religious ceremony at Poitiers, and the "Pange Lingua," which, though generally ascribed to his pen, was more probably composed, as Sidonius has shewn (Sidon. in Not. ad Epist. Sidon. Apoll. lib. iii. ep. 4), by Claudianus Mamertus. After residing for some time at the convenant of St. Croix, he was ordained priest, and, subsequently to the death of Rhadegund in 597, succeeded Plato in the bishopric of Poitiers; but this dignity he only attained shortly before his own death, at the commencement of the seventh century.

The works of Fortunatus Venantius comprise:

(1) Eleven Books of Miscellanies, chiefly in elegiac verse, being a collection of fugitive pieces upon a great variety of subjects, interesting for the light they occasionally throw upon the manners of the time, or upon the history of art (Miscell. lib. 12; lib. iii. 13), but from a literary point of view all but worthless. Among his works are to be found two prose treatises of doubtful authenticity on the Lord's Prayer, and an epitomized version of the Aquitanian creed of Rufinus.

(2) The Life of St. Martin of Tours in four Books, consisting of 2245 hexameter lines. This was hastily composed in the space of two months, and is little more than a metrical version of Severus Sulpicius's incomparably better prose. In the fourth book the saint is represented as prescribing to the poet a pilgrimage to his own relics at Tours, to which fiction we owe the latter's description of his travels.

(3) An elegiac poem in three cantos, unless they are three distinct poems, written in the character, and evidently under the inspiration of Rhadegund. The first, entitled "De Excilio Thuringiae," is dedicated to her cousin, Amalfred (or Hermafrod); the second is a panegyric of the emperor Justin II. and the empress Sophin, who had presented Rhadegund with a piece of the true cross. The third is addressed to Arbeus, the young son of Amalfred, upon the death of his father.

(4) To these have been added in recent times — (i) a collection of 150 elegiac verses addressed to Rhadegund and Agnes, which was discovered by M. Guérard in the Royal Library at St. German, and published by him in the twelfth volume of his "Notices des Manuscrits." (ii) A short epigram "Ad Theuclildem," brought to light by Mal in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and first published in his Epistolae.

(5) The Lives of Eleven Saints—St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. German of Paris, St. Aulin of Angers, St. Peter of Avranches, St. Rhadegund of Poitiers, St. Amant of Rodes, St. Médard of Noyon, St. Remy of Rheims, St. Lubin of Chartres, St. Mauril of Angers, and St. Marcel of Paris—but the first book of the Life of St. Hilary and the lives of the three last named saints are to be attributed in all probability to another name (see next article). To these must be added an account of the martyrdom at Paris (A.D. viii. ed. Octob.) of St. Denys, St. Rusticus, and St. Eleutherius.

The following works of Fortunatus are lost:—

(1) The Life of St. Severinus (Greg. Turon. de Glor. Confess. c. 45).


He is also said to have composed an itinerary of his Travels, and a treatise upon the Art of Reigning addressed to the Empress St. Empress.

The poetry of Venantius Fortunatus represents the expiring effort of the Latin Muse in Gaul. Even the poet himself felt the decadence not merely of language, but of thought, which characterizes his verse:—

"Aet ego sensus inopis . . .
Faeco graviss. sermo leviss. ratione pigrissens,
Mente hebes, arte carens, usus rudi, ore nee exper."

Vit. S. Martin. v. 29-30.

and it is difficult to dissent from the severe judgment he has passed upon himself. His style is pedantic, his taste bad, his grammar and pro- sody seldom correct for many lines together. Two of his longer poems, however, display a simplicity and pathos which are foreign to his usual style. One of these treats of the marriage of Galesuintha, sister of Bruneauht, with Chilpere; the other is the Elegy upon the Fall of Thuringia. For what is of real merit in these two pieces are in all probability in the genius of Rhadegund rather than to any sudden access of inspiration in the poet himself.

The first edition of the works of Fortunatus was published at Cagliari in 1573, but this contained only the hymns. The earliest edition which can lay claim to any completeness is that of the Jesuit Christopher Brower, published in 4to at Mainz in 1634. The best is that of Michael Angelo Luchi, 2 vols. 4to, Rome, 1786, which is reprinted in Migne's Patrologia, vol. Lxxxvi., together with an appendix containing the discoveries of Guérard and Mazière.


FORTUNATUS (18), a bishop, see unknown, who has been confounded with Venantius Fortunatus bishop of Poitiers. He was born at Vercellae, migrated from Lombardy into Gaul, and became intimate with St. Germanus, who induced him to write the Life of St. Martinus. He was in all probability the author of the first
book of the Life of St. Hilary of Poitiers, and of three other lives of saints ascribed to his more distinguished namesake. He died at Celles, in the diocese of Sens, curs. A.D. 569. (Rivet, Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iii. p. 298.) [E. M. Y.]

FORTUNATUS (28), bishop of Pola, c. A.D. 806, succeeding Peter. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, viii. 805.) [R. S. G.]

FORTUNATUS (27), bishop of Trieste in 788; translated to the patriarchate of Grado in 802, succeeding John (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, viii. 682). In 803 he received the pallium from pope Leo III. His life was an eventful one. The murderers of his predecessor suspected him, probably correctly, of intending to avenge his death, and forced him to fly from his see. He went to France to Charles the Great, to whom he accused his enemies of partisanship for the emperor Constantine. Charles sent him back with a charter of confirmation given in the third year of his empire. Meanwhile his office had been usurped by a deacon named John, and he appears to have fled again into France. However, in 818 he obtained from Louis the Pious a charter confirming him in the patriarchate. In 821 he was accused of favouring the designs of Ludwig, king of Pamphylia, against the monarch of Constantinople. There he remained three years, till 824, when he presented himself before Louis with other ambassadors from the emperor Michael. The king sent him to Rome to clear himself of the charge of treason before the pope, but he died soon after while still in France. He is described as a man of unassuming and distinguished virtue, and he is said to have conferred many benefits on his church, partly of his own munificence, partly by his influence with Charles the Great. His successor in the patriarchate was Venerius. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. v. 1180; Einhard, Annal. an. 805, 821, 824 in Pertz, i. p. 231, 208, 212; Bar. xii. 805, x.; Pag. xiv. an. 821, xviii. an. 824, xiv.)

Mabillon identifies him with the Fortunatus who, as abbot of Moyen Moutier (Mon. Media nense), disputed with his monks as to the distribution of the revenues of the monastery, to the administration of the whole of which he laid claim. Scharndus, abbot of the monastery of St. Michael in the same house, was deposed, having failed to arrange the quarrel, which he did on the terms of the monks receiving a portion of the revenues for their due sustenance and the abbot taking the rest. The quarrel broke out afresh in the time of Hiamundus, his successor. (Protharri Epist. iii. in Migne, Pat. Lat. ci. 865; Mabillon, Annales, xxvi. n. 83; xcvii. n. 827; xxix. n. 64; tom. ii. pp. 340, 414, 491.) [S. A. B.]

FORTUNATUS (28), July 12, deacon of the church at Aquileia, and martyr there under Nero, with his bishop Hermagoras. (Hermagoras.) (Mart. Usuardi, Adonis.) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (29), April 33, deacon and martyr at Valence. (Felix (203).) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (30)—Aug. 8. Martyr at Salerno in Italy with Caesius and Anthes. They suffered under Maximin, A.D. 304, or thereabout, Leontius being proconsul. Their acts are extant, but in a very corrupt shape. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.; AA. SS. Bull. Aug. p. 163-189.) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (28), bishop of Sarzina [now united to Bertinoro], 702-730. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, ii. 488.) [A. H. D. A.]

FORTUNATUS (26), bishop of Pola, c. A.D. 806, succeeding Peter. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, viii. 805.) [R. S. G.]

FORTUNATUS (27), bishop of Trieste in 788; translated to the patriarchate of Grado in 802, succeeding John (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, viii. 682). In 803 he received the pallium from pope Leo III. His life was an eventful one. The murderers of his predecessor suspected him, probably correctly, of intending to avenge his death, and forced him to fly from his see. He went to France to Charles the Great, to whom he accused his enemies of partisanship for the emperor Constantine. Charles sent him back with a charter of confirmation given in the third year of his empire. Meanwhile his office had been usurped by a deacon named John, and he appears to have fled again into France. However, in 818 he obtained from Louis the Pious a charter confirming him in the patriarchate. In 821 he was accused of favouring the designs of Ludwig, king of Pamphylia, against the monarch of Constantinople. There he remained three years, till 824, when he presented himself before Louis with other ambassadors from the emperor Michael. The king sent him to Rome to clear himself of the charge of treason before the pope, but he died soon after while still in France. He is described as a man of unassuming and distinguished virtue, and he is said to have conferred many benefits on his church, partly of his own munificence, partly by his influence with Charles the Great. His successor in the patriarchate was Venerius. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. v. 1180; Einhard, Annal. an. 805, 821, 824 in Pertz, i. p. 231, 208, 212; Bar. xii. 805, x.; Pag. xiv. an. 821, xviii. an. 824, xiv.)

Mabillon identifies him with the Fortunatus who, as abbot of Moyen Moutier (Mon. Media nense), disputed with his monks as to the distribution of the revenues of the monastery, to the administration of the whole of which he laid claim. Scharndus, abbot of the monastery of St. Michael in the same house, was deposed, having failed to arrange the quarrel, which he did on the terms of the monks receiving a portion of the revenues for their due sustenance and the abbot taking the rest. The quarrel broke out afresh in the time of Hiamundus, his successor. (Protharri Epist. iii. in Migne, Pat. Lat. ci. 865; Mabillon, Annales, xxvi. n. 83; xcvii. n. 827; xxix. n. 64; tom. ii. pp. 340, 414, 491.) [S. A. B.]

FORTUNATUS (28), July 12, deacon of the church at Aquileia, and martyr there under Nero, with his bishop Hermagoras. (Hermagoras.) (Mart. Usuardi, Adonis.) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (29), April 33, deacon and martyr at Valence. (Felix (203).) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (30)—Aug. 8. Martyr at Salerno in Italy with Caesius and Anthes. They suffered under Maximin, A.D. 304, or thereabout, Leontius being proconsul. Their acts are extant, but in a very corrupt shape. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.; AA. SS. Bull. Aug. p. 163-189.) [G. T. S.]
FORTUNATUS (31), Aug. 23, deacon of the church at Belgrade, and martyr there with another deacon, Donatus, and several others of the clergy in the Diocletian persecution under Victorinus, president of Mysia. (Ferrarius, Cat. SS. [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (32), martyred with cruel tortures with his brother Felix (FELIX (207)), at Aquileia, in the reign of Diocletian; commemorated June 11. (Usuard. Mart.) [C. H.]

FORTUNATUS (33), martyred with Septimius, both of them readers, at Venusia, in the reign of Diocletian; commemorated Oct. 24. (Usuard. Mart.) [C. H.]

FORTUNATUS (34), Oct. 15, martyr at Rome, on the Aurelian Way (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron., Usuard.) at Capua with Luplius (Ferrarii Cat. SS.) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (35), Jan. 9, martyr at Smyrna with Vitalis and Revocatus (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron., Usuard., Wandalbert); in Africa (Mart. Hieron.) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (36), Feb. 2, martyr at Rome with several others. A curious instance of the way in which the number of martyrs was increased by the mistake of transcribers occurs in connexion with this name. Canisius, in his edition of the Martyrologium Germanicum, reads: "Eodem die diep ipse in urbe, triginta milium martyrum qui in persecutione Diocletiani coronati sunt." Canisius copied from Galesinus who used a coder which read thus: "et xxxiii. alienum," and which he took as "xxx." Mart. Hieron. seems to place their martyrdom on the Flaminian Way, at the 17th milestone from the city, a place now called Possambrote. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron., Hieron., Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

FORTUNATUS (37), subdeacon of Carthage (Cyp. Ep. 84.) [Philumenus.] [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATUS (38), subdeacon of Carthage, bearer of Ep. 35 to Rome. (Cyp. Ep. 86.) [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATUS (39), presbyter of Carthage [Donatus], one of the five who opposed the election of Cyprian (Cyp. Ep. 59), who subsequently became the pseudo-bishop of the lax party about Felicissimus, on the question of the lapsed (Ep. 14); consecrated by the excommunicated heretic bishop Privatus of Lambæae. [Cyprian.] [E. W. B.]

FORTUNATUS (40), deacon of the church of Nazianzus, and bearer of a letter from Gregory his bishop, to Alypius governor of Cappadocia; in an accompanying letter St. Gregory very highly recommends his deacon's probity, and recommends him to the government's good offices. (Greg. Naz. Ep. 84, in Migne, Patr. Gr. xxxvii. 155-7; Caillier, Auteurs sacrés, v. 254.) [J. G.]

FORTUNATUS (41), a Donatist presbyter, of whom it was alleged at the council of Carthage, a.d. 394, that Primianus had cast him into a sewer because he had baptized sick persons. (Primianus.) (Aug. S. in Ps. 36, 20; Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 256, ed. Oebertiir.) [H. W. P.]

FORTUNATUS (42), subdeacon, by whom pope Celestine wrote to Patroclus bishop of Arles, a.d. 428. (Jaffé, Regest. Pontif.; Ceillier, Aut. sacr. viii. 130.) [C. H.]

FORTUNUS (43), abbot of the monastery of St. Laurentius and St. Zeno, at Cesena in Romagna. Gregory the Great writes to Marinius, abbot of Raveonna, desiring that he shall be restored to his monastery, if it be found that he has been unjustly deposed. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. xiv. indicii. vii. epist. 6. Migne, lxvii. 1308.) [A. H. D. A.]

FORTUNATUS (44), abbot of a monastery called "Balneum Ciceronis" ("at Puteoliis, aut in agro Tusculano"), gave to Gregory the Great some of the materials for his Dialogues. (Dialog. lib. i. 4, 10; Migne, lxvii. 165, 208.) [A. H. D. A.]

FORTUNATUS, deacons who were martyrs. See Nos. 28, 29, 81.

FORTUNATUS (45), one of the bearers of the letter of Clemens Romanus. [Clemens Romanus, i. 556, col. 2.] [G. S.]

FORTUNATUS (46), Anastasius, prefect of the legion of Trajan, at the martyrdom of Marcellus the centurion, a.d. 298. (Ruiniart, Acta Sinc. Mart. p. 303, 2nd ed.) [C. H.]

FORTUNATUS (47), a member of the Donatist congregation at Taca, a town of Numidia, of which Verisimus was the bishop. (Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 401, ed. Oebertiir.) [H. W. P.]

FORTUNATUS (48), a Manichean presbyter with whom Augustine held a public disputation, at the request of his fellow-citizens, Donatists, and others, in the baths of Socinus at Hippo, August 28, a.d. 392. (Vasidianus, Vit. Aug. in Aug. Op. i. 38, ed. Migne, Patr.; Aug. Retract. ii. 611; Disp. contr. Fortunat. lib. viii. 111.) Fortunatus had a numerous following at Hippo, but being worsted by his great antagonist, he was compelled to fly from the city. He was soon succeeded, however, by another presbyter who seems to have been Felix. (Aug. Ep. 79. w.s. ii. 272.) [Faustus (34), Felix (233)] [T. W. D.]

FORTUNIO, martyr, Carthage, a.d. 250. [Aristo.] [E. W. B.]

FORTUNUS (1), Donatist bishop of Tubur-sicus or Tuburiscia, a town of Numidia, with whom St. Augustine held a controversy c. a.d. 397, of which he gives an account in a letter to the Donatists, Eulogius, Glorius and Felix (Ep. 44). Partly in consequence of the tumult, partly because of the unwillingness of the reporters to do their duty, no proper report was made of the controversy. Augustine therefore transcribed from memory as much as he was able to report, and laid it before his correspondents. The arguments used by Fortunius to support the principle of his sect appear to have been—(1) its universality; (2) the divine command to eschew false prophets, and the false charge so often made and refuted of the "tradition" on the part of Felix of Aptungus; (3) the complicity of foreign churches in the cruelties of Macarius; (4) a letter said to have been addressed by the council of
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Sardicas, A.D. 347, to the African bishops of the Donatist communion. To this Augustine replied by showing the absence of authority to support this document, which was in truth of Arian origin. He also showed that the Donatists were not the only persons who had suffered persecution, and that their having been exposed to it was no proof of their superior holiness. After proving that evil persons are frequently tolerated by God, as for example the Traitor himself Judas Iscariot, Augustine enforced his favourite argument that on earth there must be toleration of evil until the time of final separation. When Fortunius excommunicated Genethius, a former bishop of Hippo, for his forbearance towards Donatism, Augustine remarked that on Donatist principles even he ought to have been rechaptised. After some further discussion, Augustine proposed that a conference should be held of ten persons on each side in some quiet place, and he undertook that all necessary documents should be forthcoming. (Aug. Ep. 44.)

The name of Fortunius is mentioned as one of the bishops present at the council of Bagais, A.D. 394, and it is very probable that this was the same person as the one mentioned above. (Aug. cont. Cresc. iii. 53, iv. 10.) [H. W. P.]

Fortunianus (2), a person unknown, who had married a woman, Ursus, probably before the wars of Avaric. She was carried off into captivity, and afterwards returned to find Fortunianus married to another woman named Restituta. The question referred to pope Innocent was, which of the two was his wife. In his letter to Probus (Ep. 38, Migne, Patr. Lat. xx. 609), dated by Jaffé (Regesta, 23) between the years 402 and 417, Innocent decided, "fide Catholica suffragante," that Ursus, still alive and undisposed, was his only wife. (Cellarius, Acta martyrum, vii. 324.) [J. G.]


Fortunianus (4), bishop of Eugubium (Gubbio), A.D. 603. He succeeded St. Gaudenius or, according to Uggelli, Gaudioso. Cappellotti doubts whether there was a bishop of Gubbio of that name. (Uggelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 677; Cappellotti, Le Chiese d'Ital. v. 586.) [R. S. G.]

Fortunianus (5), bishop of Cellae in the Byzacena province, a name common to several African towns, subscribed the letter of his province to Constantine the son of Heraclius, against the errors of the Monothelites A.D. 641, which was read at the first Lateran council. (Mansi, x. 927; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 154.) [L. D.]

Fortunianus (6), bishop of Optina in the proconsular province of Africa, signed the letter of the synod of his province to Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, against the errors of the Monotheletes, which he favoured, A.D. 646. This letter was read at and the first Lateran council, 649. (Mansi, x. 940; Morcelli, Africa Christ. i. 250.) [L. D.]

Fortunianus (7), bishop of Carthage. There are no data for a precise chronology of his episcopate. Morcelli (Afr. Chr. iii. 363) makes his succession to Dominicus, after an interval, in 630, somewhat confused. In 666, he is believed to have imbibed Monothelite opinions under the influence of Pyrrhus, who had then recently come as an exile into Africa and was a zealous proselytizer (Morcelli, 375). In the council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, a number of Fortunianus were recognized as bishop of the Church of St. Sophia during the patriarchate of Paulus (Mansi, xi. 594 c). This visit must have occurred before 648, when Paulus was deposed for Monothelitism. Morcelli (377) puts it in 646. His fraternizing with Paulus at Constantinople was regarded by his brethren in Africa as an open profession of heresy, and they seem to have construed his absence as a desertion of his church. A council was held without him in 646 at Carthage, the senior bishop, Galusus of Pups, presiding, and Monothelite doctrine was condemned. From that time Fortunianus disappears, and Morcelli commences the episcopate of his successor. [T. W. D.]

Fortunianus (also called Fortunatus). April 21, a martyr at Alexandria with Aratus, a presbyter, Felix and Vitalis. According to Mercurio Hieron., Felix was son of Arator. In later martyrlogies the ascetic views prevalent about clerical celibacy converted the word "filli" into "silvii," and another martyr was thus added to the list. (Marti. Hieron., Usuardi, Adonis.) [G. T. S.]

Forty Martyrs, the. The following groups occur under this title:—

(1) Forty soldiers, March 9, who suffered under Licinius, 320, at Sebast in Armenia. A list of their names is given in the martyrlogy of Adu under March 11. For their various festivals see art. Sebastian, Forty Martyrs of, in the Dict. Chr. Antiq. They were young, brave, and noted for their services. The Emperor, having ordained that the military police of the cities should offer sacrifices, the governor called upon these forty to comply with the law. They refused, and withstood every attempt by bribe or threat to influence their resolve. Thereupon a new punishment was devised. They were immersed for a whole night in a frozen pond in the midst of the city, and, to render their sufferings the more acute, a hot bath was placed within their sight ready for any who might choose to avail themselves of it, their doing so however being the sign of apostasy. The trial was too great for one. He left the pond and flung himself into the bath, gaining, however, nothing thereby, for as soon as he touched the hot water he died. The number of forty was not however broken. The sentinel who watched the bath had a vision. He saw angels descend and distribute rewards to all who were in the pond save to the one unhappy apostate. The guard at once stripped off his clothing and took the vacant place in the pond. The next morning they were all taken in vehicles and flung into fires. There was one Melitio, younger and more vigorous than the rest, whose resolution they thought they might possibly yet shake. His mother, however, who was present, with her own hands placed him in the executioner's cart,
exhorting him thus: "Go, my son, finish this happy voyage with thy comrades, that thou mayst not be the last presented to God." Their relics were carefully preserved and carried to various cities, where many churches were built in their honour. The mother Emelma, and the sister Matrina, of St. Aedh, are said to have been buried for their monastery near the village of Annas in Pontus, where already a church had been built in their honour (Greg. Nys. Vit. S. Macrin.). Sozomen (H. E. ii. 2) tells a strange story about the adventures of another set of their relics in addition to the authorities above quoted, of the Frisii, Ablact. Sacr. t. i. p. 599, in Sicily, Scolamense. Their popularity throughout the entire East has ever been very great (cf. Dr. Zireck, Geschichte der Bulgaren). In Burton's Unexplored Syria, App. ii., a church in their honour is noted at Huns, near Damascus; cf. also Melchior de Vogüé, Les Églises de la Terre Sainte, p. 367.

(2) Another set of Forty Martyrs in Persia, 375, is commemorated on May 20 (Assemani, Mart. Orient. i. 141). Among them were the bishops Abdas and Ebed-Jesu. (Ebed-Jesu) (Ceiller, iii. 82, 336; Bas. Mon.)

(3) Under Dec. 24 Forty Virgins Martyrs under the emperor Decius at Antioch in Syria are noted in Mart. Hieron., Adon, Usuard. [G. T. S.]

FOSSONIUS (Fossonius, Corotius), fifth bishop of Vermandois, between Maximus and Asternus, or Fraternus. The first eleven bishops of this see are mere names undated; the twelfth was living in A.D. 511. [Gall. Chr. i. 975.]

FOTAIDE is the name given in the Four Masts, A.D. 432, to the father of Culfhran, father of St. Patrick, but he is usually called Fothius in the Lives. [J. G.]

FOTHAD, the canonist, receives special honour from the Irish annalists for his efforts on behalf of the clergy. He was a teacher at Aranaigh and abbot of Farman Mura, now Fobban (Upper), in the barony of Inisheenow West, co. Donegal; he had been tutor of Aedh Oirdnide, monarch of Erin A.D. 793–817, to whom on his accession he dedicated a Royal Precept or Rule of Government, a vigorous poem of seventy-two stanzas, still preserved in the Book of Lismore. He appears to have been, or some time after, been taken by Aedh into the number of his counsellors. When Aedh assembled his forces consisting of clergy and laity, and led them into Leinster as far as Dun-Cuair (now Rathcore, a small village in the barony of Lower Moyensrath, co. Meath.—Four Mast. i. 408 n. 2), a controversy arose between the king and northern clergy whom he had compelled to accompany him to the war, the case was referred by king and people to the decision of St. Fothad. The clergy objected to being called to the field at the will of the king, and when the dispute was submitted to Fothad and the bishop of Armagh, he decided in the metrical sentence or "canon" from which his name "na canois" is said to have been derived, exempting the clergy from all compulsory military service. And this sentence, being acquiesced in by king Aedh, continued ever after to be the rule throughout Ireland. It was as follows (from the Four Masts, by O'Donovan, l. 409):

"The Church of the living God, let her alone, waste her not, Let her light be apart, as best it ever was. Every true monk, who is of a pure conscience, For the Church to which is due let him labour like every servant. Every soldier from that out, who is without [religious] rule or obedience, Is permitted to aid the great Aedh, son of Niall. This is the true rule, neither more nor less: Let every one serve in his vocation without murmur or complaint."

(O'Curry, Man. Cust. Anc. Irish, ii. 61, 95, 175–76; O'Conor, Rev. Hibern. Scriptor. iv. 132, 202, and Epist. Nuncup. 55; Reeves, Adamnan, 255; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. iv. c. 20, § 8.) This took place, according to the Four Masts, in A.D. 799, but more correctly in A.D. 804. Its name, however, may have been based upon his acquaintance with canon law. In Colgan's Breve Chronicon (Tr. Thom. 292) there is at A.D. 799 "S. Fothadus cognomento De Canonibus, Doctor et Scriptor Ardinachanus, Scriptis et Sanctissimis deservit." At A.D. 805 the Ann. Inisfallin have, as rendered by O'Conor (Rev. Hibern. Scriptor. vol. ii. pt. ii. 26), "Fothad Othna, i.e. Fothad Canoine [Fothadus Monasterii Othnae, i.e. Fothadus Canoonum Scriptor] quiuebit," but according to the calculation (ib. ib. i. § 7) this date should be A.D. 810, which agrees with the corrected date of the Ann. Ulm. "An. 818. Fothad monasterii Othnae mortuit." [J. G.]

FOTINIANI. (Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 6, 65, v.) [Phuotiniani.] [T. W. D.]

FOTINUS seems to be the Scotch ecclesiastical name of Pothinus, bishop and martyr at Lyons, A.D. 177. (Miller, Arboath and its Abbey, 163, 187; View Disc. Aberd. 255; Bp. Forbes, Kol. Scotts. Saints, 851.) [J. G.]

FOTINUS (Ambros. de Fid. l. 1), heretic. [Phuotin.] [T. W. D.]

FOUR CROWNED MARTYRS. Severus, Severianus, Carphophorus, Victorinus, who suffered at Rome in the Diocletian persecution, and were commemorated on Nov. 8 (Mart. Adon., Us.). A martyrium in their honour existed at Canterbury from the earliest times of the Augustinian mission (Bed. ii. 7). For an account of their festival and other particulars, see Dict. Chr. Ant. art. Coronati Quattuor. [C. H.]

FRAECH (Freach, Freach, Freigus, Freoch, Frongoid). Cruinuthar Fraech, i.e. priest Fraech, is commemorated, in the Irish Kalendares, at Dec. 20, as "of Clusain Collaing, in Muintir Molain," now Clonen, a parish in the baronies of Carrigallen and Mohill, the diocese of Ardagh, and the county of Leitrim. He was son of Cathachus, and of the race of Conmac, son of Forsus, son of Ros, son of Righache (Colgan, Se respecting, SS. 598, c. 3). Mart. Ir., ed. Tod and Reeves, 343; Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. vii. 142). He was maternal uncle of St. Berach (Feb. 15), of Clusain-cairthe, and gave him baptism and the rudiments of education. [Berach (2)]. His exact date is not known, but he appears to have flourished about A.D. 570.
and thus been contemporary with many well-known saints and founders of schools and monasteries, such as St. Columba, St. Kevin, St. Brigid, St. Dennis, the Brendan, and St. Daigh (Colgan, Acta SS. 340, cc. 2-4, 345, c. 2, 346, nn. 2, 753, c. 17, 756 n. 18, and Tr. Thauon, 410, c. 8; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 14, § 6). Etymologically, Fraech is the Irish for heath. (Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 2nd series, 99.)

[J. G.]

FRAGITANUS, a priest of Cordova, unjustly deposed by the bishop of Cordova (probably Agapitus) on his own authority only. The second synod of Seville, held A.D. 619 under the presidency of St. Isidore, ordered his restoration, and laid down the principle that no priest or deacon could be expelled from his office without the consent of a council. (Eps. Sagra. x. 233; Aquigre-Catalani, ill. 355.)

[M. A. W.]

FRAID, FFRAID, the Welsh form of St. Bride. [Brigid．] (Mv. Arch. ii. 42, 51; Welsh Saints, 189-90; Williams, Emin. Welsh, 156-57.)

[J. G.]

FRAMBAUDUS, FRAMBALDUS (FRAMBAUDUS), abbot of Senlis (Silvanectum) and confessor, perhaps belonging to the first half of the 6th century, is fully treated of by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 16 Aug. iii. 300-302) in a commentary prefixed to Labbe's Etiquum S. Frambalbi Abb. ex vet. Brev. Sibon. According to the Etiquum he was born in Aquitaine, of noble parents; when a priest, he went to Le Mans (Cenommannus) and retired with some brethren to a neighbouring wood. But regarding his life and acts there is the utmost uncertainty; to Ado, Usuardus, and even later martyrologists he was unknown. He was probably venerated at both Le Mans and Senlis, on Aug. 16 or 23. His relics are specially mentioned as having been preserved in the church of St. Frambaudus in Senlis.

[J. G.]

FRAMBOLDUS, ST., fourteenth bishop of Bayeux, succeeding St. Gerebhaldus and followed by St. Hugo I. early in the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. xi. 350.)

[S. A. B.]

FRAMECHLIDUS, FRAMECHEW, mother of St. Austreberta, and wife of the count Palatine Fidefridus (A.D. 479). The following is given in the Vita S. Austrebertae (Bolland. Acta SS. 10 Feb. ii. 419-23), and again critically presented by the Bollandists (15, 17 Maii, vii. 800-2). She flourished under king Dagobert I. (A.D. 628-638), and is venerated at Montreuil in Picardy on May 17, or, as some less probably say, 27.

[J. G.]

FRAMENGERUS, twenty-sixth bishop of Noyon, between Guaranfius and Hunnuanus, said to have sat two years, and died A.D. 723. (Gall. Christ. ix. 995.)

[S. A. B.]

FRANCILIO (GANZICLIO, VINCILICLIO), fourteenth bishop of Tours, following Leo, and succeeded by Injurious. He was a native of Poictiers, where his family was of senatorian rank. He had a wife, who was named Clara, but no family, and both were possessed of landed estates, the bulk of which they bestowed upon the church of St. Martin at Tours, the rest upon their relations. He held the see for two years and a half, dying A.D. 929. Gregory of Tours, who is the authority for all that is known of him, relates that on the night of the Feast of the Nativity ere he descended to observe the vigils, he bade his servant fetch him a draught, after swallowing which he immediately expired. Gregory infers that he was poisoned. He was buried in the church of St. Martin at Tours.

(Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iii. 17, x. 31, 14; Gall. Christ. xiv. 19.)

[C. H.]

FRANCIO, metropolitan bishop of Philippopolis in Thrace, present at the council of Chalcedon 451, and appears among the bishops who subscribed the synodal letter of the council to Leo I. (Harduin, Concilia, ii. 367 6; Leo Mag. Ep. 98, 1104, Migne; Oriens Christ. i. 1157.)

[C. G.]

FRANCLA (FRACLA, FRANDA), one of the three sisters of SS. Tressan, Gibrian, &c.; she went from Ireland to Gaul in perhaps the 5th century, but her acts are unknown. (Boll. Acta SS. 8 Maii. ii. 299-9; O'Halloran, Irish Saints, ii. 377.)

[J. G.]

FRANCO, seventh bishop of Aix, succeeding Avolus, and followed by Pentius (5th circ. A.D. 566). The story of Tours has the following story of him. Childeric, chief of the household of king Sigebert, claimed some of the church lands of Aix. The bishop appealed to the king, who decided against him, and fined him 300 pieces of gold for wrongfully withholding lands from the payment of taxes. Returning to his see, the bishop threw himself upon the tomb of St. Metries, the confessor of Aix, and exclaimed with tears, "No lamp shall be kindled here, nor psalm chanted, most glorious saint, until thou hast revenged thy servants upon their enemies and restored to holy church the lands taken from her. So saying, he threw thorns upon the sepulchre and went out fast and at doors and placed more thorns against them. Childeric was forthwith stricken with a fever, but his pride was not broken till his sickness had lasted a whole year, when he sent messengers to restore the lands, and to offer by way of restitution 600 pieces of gold. This done, he expired where he lay, and the church was revenged upon her foes. (Lib. de Glor. Confess. lixii.; Gall. Hist. i. 301.)

[S. A. B.]

FRANCO I., 233rd bishop of Le Mans, between Josephus and Franco II., born at Baisin, and noble Frank parents. In his youth he repaired to Charlemagne's court at Aix, and in 792 was appointed by him bishop of Le Mans. The influence he had won at court he employed for the aggrandisement of his see. In 796 he obtained a grant of privileges from the king in favour of his diocese (Bouquet, v. 766). In 802 he extended his jurisdiction over the monastery of St. Calais (Carliefus) by means of forged records, as it was said, which deceived the king's chancellor (Bouquet, v. 766). In the same year he obtained decree for the payment of certain church dues. And finally in 814 he received a confirmatory charter for the privileges of the church of Le Man from Louis the Pious (Bouquet, vi. 459). He died in 818 at a place then called Balian, one
of the possessions of the see, but was buried in the church of St. Vincent at Le Mans, where an epitaph fixed the duration of his episcopate at twenty-two years. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 356.)

FRANCOLINUS, sixth bishop of Conceranos, following St. Licerius. He subscribed the council of Naborne, A.D. 788 or 791. His successors in the diocese are not known for nearly a hundred years. (Mansi, xiii. 923; Gall. Christ. l. 1127.)

FRANTA, one of the obscure Suevian kings of Spain after the defeat of Reikiar in 456 by Theodoric II. of Toulouse. He appears to have been the head of certain Suevian districts, while Maldras was king in the north and west of Gallicia. "Suevi in partibus sæculi Gallaeciarum, e quibus parvae Francianæm, pars Maldrum Regem appellet," says Idatius. Franta belongs, therefore, to a time of confusion between the death of Reikiar and the accession of Remismund to the undivided monarchy at Frumarii's death, when the Suevi split up into various parties, were making the best head they could against the allied Goths and Provincials. The period was ended in 460 by the death of Frumarii and by the renewal of the alliance between the Suevi and Goths, which alone enabled the Suevi to keep down the provincials of Gallicia. (Idatius, apud Zep. Socr. iv.; Inscr. Hist. Sacrum, ed. vi.; Dahn, v. 956.)

FRATER, bishop of Geneva, said to have attended the council of Milan, A.D. 347, and died 361. (Gall. Christ. xvi. 368.)

FRATERNUS. The name occurs among the signatures to the epistle of the bishops of Gaul to Leo the Great, A.D. 451; and the lists of the see of Glanum identify him as bishop of that place (Gall. Christ. iii. 1230).

FRATERNUS, bishop of Auxeerne. Gama (Srex. Episc. 501) says he was consecrated Sept. 26, A.D. 448, and slain in the Hans in Sept. A.D. 451. This supposes him to have immediately succeeded St. Germanus, but Theod. (Mem. xvi. 26, 836, 839) while shewing that the chronology of the period is very difficult, thinks that Alodia succeeded St. Germanus, and that, after Alodia died in 482, there was a vacancy for ten years; then Fraternus was appointed, and his death took place at the hands of the barbarians on the day of his consecration. The Gallia Christiana (xii. 206) and many martyrologies say he was martyred, but the Bollandists do not state this. (Acta SS. 22 Sept. viii. 135-138; see also Sel. ii. 670, vii. 280.)

FRATERNUS I. and II., bishops of Langres in the 4th or 5th century. (Gall. Christ. iv. 516.)

FRAVITTA (Flavita, Flavianus, Phra- vittas, or Phreittas), 33rd bishop of Constantinople A.D. 485, between Acacius and Euphemius. Fratius, Theophanes, and Liberatus Dionysius are very short in their account of him; the principal authority is Nicephorus Callistus. He relates that on the death of Acacius, the emperor Zeno placed on the altar of the great church of Constantinople two sheets of paper. One was blank; the other contained a written supplication to Almighty God that He would deign to send an angel to inscribe on the blank sheet the name of him whom He wished to be raised to the patriarchal throne. A feast of forty days was proclaimed, and all were exhorted to pray earnestly for a favourable issue. The church was given into the custody of a confidential eunuch, the imperial chamberlain, and the imperial seal was set on the casket in which the papers lay. There was a presbyter named Fravitta in charge of the church of St. Thecla, in one of the suburbs of the city. He appears to have been a Goth; at any rate, at the beginning of the century, a Goth of that name was consul and commander-in-chief of the forces of the East. Fired with the ambition of leaping into so magnificent a position at one bound, he sounded the integrity of the eunuch. Finding him accessible to gold, he paid him large sums, and made him large promises on the understanding that he would write his name on the blank sheet, and seal up the casket afresh with the imperial signet. At the end of the forty days the casket was opened; the name of the presbyter of St. Thecla was found; and the eunuch, in the religious world of Constantinople rejoiced at the Divine interposition; and amid universal acclamations Fravitta mounted the chair of Gregory Nazianzen and of Chrysostom. But his abominable wickedness was not to remain hid. Death spelt his calculations; within four months he had breathed his last, and the powerful eunuch was pressing his executors for the promised gold. Unable and unwilling to discharge so scandalous a debt, they fled to the emperor, and revealed the odious tale. Zeno was at first dumb with amazement; but though Fravitta was dead, the fraudulent forger remained to expiate his crime: he was turned out of all his employments and driven from the city. Zeno, ashamed of his failure, entrusted the election of the new patriarch to the clergy. Such is the account of Nicephorus Callistus. In the correspondence between Zeno, Fravitta, and pope Felix on the subject of the appointment no trace can be found of such a story. The fact that the replies of the bishop of Rome extol the piety of his most glorious son the emperor, and exhibit delight that so holy a person Fravitta had been from his childhood chosen by God to fill the see, cannot be construed into an allusion to so remarkable a mode of episcopal election. It is true that Fravitta shewed peculiar anxiety to secure the acquiescence of the Western patriarch in his elevation, and refused to ascend the vacant throne without his acquiescence; but there would be reason enough for that in the uncertain character of the times, the former banishment of his patron Zeno, and his own recent obscurity. To strict theologians Fravitta must have been a strange enigma; for at one and the same time he wrote letters to Peter Mognus asking for his communion, and the synodal to pope Felix begging his sanction and co-operation. To shew an earnest of good intentions, this document was carried to Rome with another from the emperor, by the catholic monks of Constantinople, who had always kept distinctly separate from Acacius the late patriarch, and his friend Mognus. The accompanying letter of Zeno demonstrated great affection for Fravitta; he had only laboured for his appointment, because
be thought him worthy of the dignity; and to restore peace to the churches and unity to the faith.

Pope Felix was delighted with the letters, and had that of the emperor read aloud in presence of the deputation and of all the clergy of Rome, who repeatedly expressed loud approval. When the pope however wished the monks from Constantinople to engage for the rejection of the names of Ancius and Mongus from the dipityches, they replied that they had no instructions on the point. Felix therefore hastened to write to Zeno and Fravitta, dismissing authority, but beseeching them as a matter of conscience. Before his letter reached Constantinople, Fravitta was no more.

Felix wrote also to Thalassius and other abbots of Constantinople forbidding them from communicating with their bishop until they should be authorized by the see of Rome. This was hardly in keeping with the disclaimers of the letters to Zeno and Fravitta. The joy of the pope, moderate as it must have been by this time, was altogether destroyed by the arrival at Rome of a copy of the letter which Fravitta had sent to Mongus. Directly contrary in tenor to that which Felix had received, this document actually denied all communion with Rome. The deputation of monks had not yet left for Constantinople, but the pope would not hear a word more from them. Whether Fravitta obtained his chair by the dishonourable means recorded by Nicephorus Callistus or not, he stands disgraced by this duplicity. (Niceph. Callist. xvi. 19. Pat. Grac. cxvii. s. 684, p. 152; Joann. Zonar. Annal. xiv. iii. Patr. Græc. cxxxiv. § 53, p. 1214; Liberat. Disc. Brac. xviii. Patr. Lat. levii. 34; Felicis Pap. Epist. xii. and xiii. Patr. Lat. lviii. p. 971; Evagri. iii. 23. Patr. Græc. lxxxi. part 2; Theoph. Chronogr. 114. Patr. Græc. cxvii. p. 324.)

FREARDUS, recluse, near Nantes. (Usuardus, Mart. Aug. 1.)

[J. G.]

FREDERBERTUS, twelfth bishop of Angoulême, succeeding Damasius or Tornianus, and followed by Launus I., in the middle of the 8th century. He is said to have obtained the concession of a charter from king Pipin. (Gall. Christ. ii. 982; Gams, Series Episc. 460.)

[S. A. B.]

FREDENGAND (FRIDEGANDUS), commemorated July 17. He was one of the Irish missionaries who followed St. Fursey into Gaul, and he built his monastery upon the Sambre; it is now the monastery of St. Peter, and stands two miles from Namur. He was also held in special honour at Turvain or Dorne, near Antwerp, as he is said by Mirandus to have died and been first buried there. (Colgan, Acts SS. 51 n. 1, 96, c. 6, 292, c. 13, 299 n. 2;) Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. 462.) Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 281-2) has compiled a short notice of St. Fridengandus, mostly from continental sources, attributes to his pen Homiliae de Sanctis, lib. 1. and says he flourished about A.D. 600 or 650. (Tanner, Bibl. 296.)

[FREDEREGIUS]

The name assigned to a chronicler, whose chief claim to attention arises from his taking up the history of France and Burgundy at the point where it is left by St. Gregory of Tours (Gregorius Turonensis) and continuing it to A.D. 641, with some incidental notice of events of his own time occurring as late as A.D. 656-658. The chronicler is distinguished from others of his name by the surname Scholasticus.

 Authorities.—(1) His own work, for which see below; (2) Adrien de Valois, Gesta Francorum, lib. xv. Paris, 1646; (3) Fabricius, Bibl. monach. medie. et infima Antiqua. Discussions on this writer may also be found in the preface by Dom. Ruinart to his edition of Gregory of Tours and Frédégaire (Paris, 1699); in the notice prefixed by M. Guizot to his translation of Frédégaire, and in the article “Frédégaire,” seemingly from the pen of M. Guzat, in the Nouvelle Biographie générale (Paris, Didot, 1856).

Life.—Of the career of this annalist we are wholly ignorant. Inasmuch as the only original portion of his writings is all but exclusively occupied with Burgundy, the very chronology being marked by the reigns of Burgundian kings, it is naturally inferred that he was the inhabitant of that realm. Adrien de Valois (better known by his Latinized title of A. Valuesius) fixed upon Avenches as his birth-place, and maintained that he had found the name Frédégaire assigned to the chronicler in an ancient manuscript. The evidence for these statements seems but slight, and Ruinart vainly sought the name, but as it had already been given to our author by Marquard Frerher and Joseph Scaliger, it will probably be considered as his title for all time. As Frédégaire writes in the tone of a contemporary concerning events which occurred in the middle of the 7th century, we must assume that he flourished at that period.

Writings.—The editio princeps, published in 1850, at Basle, in 1568, was printed as an appendix to the works of St. Gregory of Tours under the following title: Frédégaire scholasticus Chronicon, quod ille, iubente Childerando comite, Pipinis patris patriae, scripsit. The first three are a mere compilation from the works of Julius Africanus, St. Jerome, and the early Spanish chronicler, Idautus. The fourth book is an abridgment of the first six books of the history of St. Gregory of Tours; while the fifth is an independent continuation of the work of Gregory. This fifth book is naturally the one which has attracted attention. Besides the Basle edition, that of Ruinart, and the translation by Guizot already named, may be mentioned the transcript in the Lyons Bibliotheca Patrum Maximus (tom. xi. pp. 815 et seq.).

Frédégaire is strictly the chronicler as distinguished from the historian. He gives a dry summary of the invasions of Burgundy by barbarians, of inundations, of the death of a count by order of the king, without one word of regret at the national calamities, or any hint whether he regarded the death of the chieftain as a murder or a just punishment. He was probably a monk. Certainly his point of view, in the few passages where it is made manifest, is ecclesiastical. He naturally rejoices over the conversion of the Goths from Arianism; and relates with evident appreciation the boldness of St. Columbanus (Columbanus) in bearing the wrath of Brunehild by his refusal to bless the illegitimate children of her son, king Thierry.
The above estimate will be found confirmed by Guizot (L.c.), who remarks on the downward course of the French of this period, and also by Sismondi in his Histoire des Français (three i. chap. 2). And yet, however, to St. Gregory of Tours, speaks feelingly of the descent experienced on turning from his works to those of this mere chronicler of events; but in turn evinces some gratitude, when he comes to a later generation, which had not even a Fredegarius to hand down its history. [J. G. C.]

FREDEGUNDIS, FREDEGUND, originally a slave of Chilperic I. (Gesta Reg. Fr. 31), became his wife by supplanting Audovera. Whilst Chilperic was absent on an expedition against the Saxons, Audovera brought forth a daughter. At Fredegund’s instigation the daughter was baptized before the return of Chilperic, and Audovera was induced by Fredegund to hold the child at the font, thereby becoming godmother to her own daughter. Chilperic on his return accorded Audovera, compelling her to take the vows of a nun, and abandon to his bed. (On the authenticity of this story v. Löbell, Gregor von Tours, p. 23, note.)

The position of Fredegund was little more than that of a concubine, one wife of many (cp. Löbell, pp. 21 sqq.); and in 567 Chilperic, in order to have a wife of equal station and rank to that of his brother Sigebert, married Brunchilde’s elder sister, Galiswinda, daughter of the Visigothic king Athanagild. Chilperic promised his father-in-law to discard his other wives. But before the year was out Fredegund recovered her influence. Quarrels arose between Fredegund and Galiswinda; the unhappy Galiswinda thought to be allowed to return home if she left her treasure behind. Chilperic dissimulated, and Fredegund had her rival fully murdered, and a few days afterwards was openly married to Chilperic (Fredegundin recept in matrimonio, Greg. Turon. iv. 20).

The duty of bringing Galiswinda’s death devolved upon Sigebert, her sister’s husband, and it would appear that he and his brother proceeded to take steps to depose Chilperic, but that an arrangement was arrived at by the intervention of Guntram, by which the wrath of Brunchilde and Sigebert was bought off by the presentation to Brunchilde of Galiswinda’s “morning-gift” of five Aquitanian cities. (Greg. ix. 20; see G. Richter, Annalen d. Deutschen Reichs, note, s. a. 567.)

Bloodthirsty though her contemporaries were (such as Giswinda of Spain, Greg. v. 33, Austrichildis, Guntram’s wife, v. 36), Fredegund far exceeded them all. Her biography is simply a history of the murders she committed. She studied the art of assassination, and was no mean adept at it. See her address to the two clerks whom she employed in one of her attempts to murder Childerbert. (Greg. vii. 29.) Having once begun the policy of getting rid of her enemies by assassination, she did not scruple to continue it to the end. She brought about the deaths of her stepsons Meroveus (v. 14, 19 s.), and Cloris (v. 40), she made more than one attempt on the lives of Brunchilde and Brunchilde’s son Childerbert (v. 20, x. 18, also against Guntram. Gregory vii. 43, 18), and an exceptionally horrible attempt with her own hand on her own daughter Rigunth (ix. 34). According to the Gesta (c. 35) she caused her husband Chilperic to be murdered because inadvertently she had discovered to him her adulterous intercourse with Landeric, and Landeric (Greg. vii. 29) doubts the truth of this charge. Gregory has not alluded to it, nor does he ever mention Landeric. Compare, however, bk. vii. 7, where Childerbert, in demanding the surrender of Fredegund, accuses her of this murder amongst others.

She crowned her wickedness in the eyes of her contemporaries by having Pretexhtatus, bishop of Rouen, who had given her mortal offence by blessing the marriage of Meroveus and Brunchilde, murdered before the altar, and by openly poisoning a Frank noble who protested against her wickedness (viii. 31, 41).

But her political assassinations were almost the least horrible that she committed. Her personal revenge was absolutely implacable. Once offended, she never rested satisfied with anything short of the blood of her victim. And her revenge was prompted by various motives, inspired with a passion that was above all caution, as in the case of Leudastes, towards whom she shewed the most calculating cold-blooded cruelty (v. 50, vi. 32); superstition, as in the case of Mummolos (vi. 35); and lastly, the frantic rage of disappointed passion or bulked vengeance (vii. 20, vi. 19). No wonder that Guntram, her brother-in-law, calls her “an enemy of God and man” (ix. 20); and Gregory adds “that she had no fear of God before her eyes” (vii. 15). Devoid of natural affection as she generally appeared to be (v. 23, cp. vii. 7), even she felt remorse for her wicked deeds when she saw her children dying before her face. Seized, Gregory says, with a tardy repentance, she addressed her husband thus: “Long has the divine mercy suffered our evil deeds; we have been warned by fevers and by other ills, but we have not repented. And now we are to lose our children, now they die, shin the tears of the poor, the weeping of the widow, the sighs of the orphan. We are bereft, and without hope, none remains to us for whom to hoard. Do not our collars overflow with wine, our granaries with corn, our chests with gold, silver, and precious stones? And yet the dearest treasure we possess, that we lose. Come, let us burn these unjust taxation rolls, let us be content with the revenue that satisfied our father Clotaire.” The king hesitated. “What!” she cried, “you shrink? Follow me. Even though we lose our beloved children we shall at least escape eternal punishment.” Chilperic yielded, the rolls were burned, and the tax remitted (v. 35, cp. also 11).

That she really ruled rather than Chilperic, or that at any rate she was the moving spirit in much political action that was taken, is evident from what has already been narrated or referred to, especially from the stories of Pretexhtatus and Leudastes. Nor was she without vigour and resources in adversity as well as in prosperity. On the murder of her husband she was left with her infant son Clotaire, apparently defenceless and surrounded by implacable and unscrupulous enemies. She took refuge and sanctuary at St. Claz, and was not content enough to place herself for the moment under the protection of Guntram, the least dangerous of her
enemies, escaping but only just escaping the vengeance of Childebert. "Let my lord come," she wrote, "and take the kingdom he had from his brother. I have a little child that I desire to place in his arms. For myself I submit to his rule" (vii. 4–5, 7). Subsequently she had to retire to Rueil (vii. 19), but even when her fortune was at its lowest ebb she still hoped to find an escape for herself by the murder of her foes (vii. 20). Later on her capital was at Tournai, and it was there that in order to maintain internal peace within her realm she caused three turbulent Frankish chiefs to be murdered at her table (x. 27). Apparently a rising took place, Fredegund was seized, and was to be delivered over to Childebert. She contrived, however, to raise a counter revolution within Childebert's kingdom in Champagne, and was herself rescued. Again she appealed to Guntram, and got him solemnly to preside at the baptism of Clotaire (x. 28). In 593 Guntram died, and Childebert became sole king of the Franks. Clotaire's kingdom and Fredegund's rule at this time appear to have embraced little more than the Frisian, Flemish, and Norman coast lands, the extreme north-west of Neustria (Donnell, Anfänge d. karol. Hauser, p. 218). On Childebert's death, however, in 596, Fredegund seized Paris, Soissons, and other cities (Fred. 17) without warning or declaration of war (Stella barbarum), and ravaged the country around Soissons, defeating the forces of Theobert and Theoderic at Lafaux (Fred. 17). A few months afterwards she died, in 597, and was buried in St. Germain-des-Prés, at Paris.

Even though she may not have been guilty of the murder of her husband, it is preposterous to attempt to exalt her in any way into a heroine. The eulogy upon her by Fortunatus (Carm. iv. 1) may have been prompted by flattery or fear. But apologies such as were made in the last century by M. Dreux du Raliel (Mémoires historiques etc. des Reines et Régentes de France, vol. i. 670, and in this century by Luden, onl only be maintained, as Löbell (pp. 342–4) has pointed out, at the expense of the authenticity of Gregory or of the character of the Frankish nation. Much relating to the history of Fredegund is to be found in Thierry's Histoires des Temps mérovingiens. [T. R. B.]

FREDERICUS. [FREDEGUS.

FREDERICUS (FREDIENUS), the first bishop of Braga after the Moorish invasion, according to a document said to have been discovered in the Braga archives in 1589 by Fray Geronymo de Roman, who left a MS. history of the church of Braga, from which Flores extracts. The document, from Roman's account of it (Flores does not seem to have seen it himself or even a copy of it), purported to be a donation by Alfonso the Chaste of certain parts of the diocese of Braga together with Braga itself to the bishopric of Lugo in exchange for territory taken from Lugo and given to the new church of Oviedo. (The bishopric of Oviedo was founded 802–812, Gams, K. G. ii. 2, 349.) The deed, however, describes an unsuccessful attempt made by Alfonso I. the Catholic (737–757) to restore the see of Braga in the person of Fridesindus in the seventh year of his reign, about 744 there-fore. The attempt failed, says the document, because of the wars and uncertainties of the time, and Braga is now handed over to Lugo. As far as Alfonso I. and Fridesindus are concerned, the fact is a priori possible. Braga was one of the first towns deserted by the invaders at the time of the Berber insurrection [Alfonso I.], and Alfonso may well have cherished the thought of incorporating part of Galicia with the ancient metropolis and strong town of Braga, and may then have found his resources not equal to the task of re-population and defence against such struggling bands of Berbers as became the ancestors of the modern Maragatos, near Astorga and Leon [Maragatos]. But the ecclesiastical history of northern Spain in the 8th and 9th centuries, and indeed for a good deal later, is a chaos, through which, in the present state of information, it is almost impossible to see one's way, and these Oviedo and Lugo documents are specially suspicious. [Exp. Sagr. xv. 168.]

FREDIANUS, bishop of Lucena. [FRUDIAN]

FREDARIOUS, bishop of Aci (Gadiz) after the Moorish invasion, about A.D. 720, according to Isidore Faciens, who praises him for learning and piety, together with Umay and Evantius. [Ibid. Faciopap Exp. Sagr. viii. 297.]

FREGUS, a man of holy life, whom St. Kentigern found on his death-bed in old age at a place called Kernach, now Carnock, in the parish of St. Ninian's, Stirlingshire. After his pious death on the following day, his body was placed on a wain drawn by two untamed bulls, brought by them to Cathures, now Glasgow, to a cemetery which had been consecrated by St. Ninian, and there buried by St. Kentigern, who thus seems to have had Glasgow pointed out as his dwelling-place. (See the legend in Vita S. Kentgerii, c. 9; Bp. Forbes, Lives of SS. Nin. and Knl. xxxiii. 50–5, 178–9, 329; Skene, Celt. Soc. ii. 184.)

FREHELM, an abbot whose death is noted by Simeon of Durham (M. H. B. 653), under the year 764. His name occurs as a priest abbet in the Liber Vitae Dunelmensis, p. 6.

FREETHOMOND, an abbot in the diocese of Worcester, who attested the act of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.) His name, under the form of Fromond, is likewise appended to a charter of 824. (C. D. 218.) His monastery was probably Westbury.

FREETHORED, a priest of the diocese of London, who attested the act of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.)

FREETHUBERT, a priest of the diocese of Elumham who attested the act of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547.)

FRETULA, a learned man, living in Getica at the beginning of the 3rd century. He is known to us by the reply made by St. Jerome to a letter from him and his colleague Susian (Jerome, Ep. 106, ed. Vall.). It is not certain from Jerome's expressions what the condition of
his correspondents was. It might appear that they were, or had been, military men. Vallarsi in his note gives reason to think that they became bishops. [Fratiller.] They were diligent students of Scripture, perhaps engaged in translating parts of it for the use of the northern tribes. Finding that in the psalter, of which they had Jerome's version made at Rome in 383, there were many things disagreeing with the LXX, they wrote to Jerome in the year 403, he living then at Bethelhem, to obtain an explanation of these differences. He replies at full length, going through the whole list of passages which they had sent him. He points out that the edition of the LXX called Kephe, which they and most persons used, was faulty, and differed in many ways from the other versions given by Origen in the Hexapla; and that, when Greek versions of the Old Testament differed, recourse must be had to the Hebrew. Jerome dwells also with delight on the evidence given by the letter of Fretela and Sunnias that even among the Getae were now found students of Scripture, while Greek was preferred to live on in ignorance, the hands of men of the north, which had grown callous by handling the bow, now turned the pages of the Scriptures. It is from these expressions that Ceillier and others have assumed that Fretela and Sunnias were soldiers. [W. H. F.]

FREYDO (Fratido, Fraiddo), ninth or tenth bishop of Spires, succeeding Basarius or Otho, at the end of the 8th or beginning of the 9th century. [Dall. Christ. v. 717.]

FRIARUS, recluses, has his history given as a moral tale by St. Gregory of Tours (Vita Patrum, c. 10, Patr. Lat. illxi. 300, 1054 sq.). He was especially pious as a youth. In manhood he retired with an abbot Subauilius (or Baudus) and a deacon Secludus, to an island called Vindaniunum near Nantes, where he died and was buried. His death is said (65) to have taken place on Aug. 1, A.D. 570 or 577, but his feast was on Aug. 2. [Uerard. Mort. Aug. 1; Bull. Acta SS. 1 Aug. l. 56 sq.; Le Coiteau, Ann. Ecol. Franc. ii. 188, Paris, 1666.]

FRIECEFUSUS (Fricorauus, Frichor, Fricchius, Fricorius), also called Hadrianus on the continent on account of the harshness of the Irish name to the foreign ear, was a close companion of St. Caedoc, the apostle of the Norini, and their work is undistinguished. [Caedocius.] He is mentioned with Caedocius in Alemin's Vita B. Richardi, c. 1, according to one reading (Alcuin, Opp. ii. 176, ed. Froben). Friecesus became an inmate of the monastery of Centula, and was buried there about the middle of the 7th century. In the 10th his tomb was prepared by abbat Angilbert, and an inscription placed on it, like that on St. Caedocius. [Hartlaub, Cent. Lat. 1. c. 5, iv. c. 33; Bull. Acta SS. 31 Mai. 262; Mabillon, Ann. Ben. A.D. 615, 627; D'Achery, Spic. t. v. p. 176, t. vi. p. 429; O'Connor, Epist. Nuncup. 149, 228-9.]

FRIDEGANDIS. [Fredeand.] FRIDEGILS, priest. [Frithegils.]

FREDERICUS (Frédericus, Frédis, Frédéricus, Frédarius, Freddricus), brother of Theodoric II, king of the Visigoths, assisted Theodoric in the murder of their brother, Thorismund, in A.D. 452 or 453 (Iatius, Chron. A.D. 453; Dubos, Hist. Crit. i. l. ii. c. 19; Baronius, Ann. a. 451, l. ii.). He complained to Hilary bishop of Rome, through a deacon named Helius, of the irregular appointment of Hermes, A.D. 462, to the see of Narbonne, as related by St. Hilary in Ep. vii. to Leontius (Mansi, Cons. conc. 933-4; Migne, Pat. Lat. ivi. 24; Cellarius, Anteuros sacros, p. 387). He fell in battle against Aegidius, the Roman commander, about A.D. 469. (Bouquet, Script. des Hist. ii. 701, 704.) [J. G.]

FRIDERICUS, son of Flecteus, Fava, or Phæba, king of the Rugi, a Norician tribe. Flecteous (see Vita S. Germani Noricorum Apostoli) by Eugippius (Migne, Pat. Lat. isi. 1167 sq.) was a friend to St. Severinus, but his wife Gisla was a bitter enemy, and Fridericus their son, though anxiously warned by the saint before his death, became a violent oppressor, and a sacrilegious robber. He is said to have been murdered by another Frederic, his nephew. (Baronius, Ann. Ecol. 482, 487, 488.) [J. G.]

FRIDESINDUS, bishop of Braga. [Fridesindus.]

FREDISWIDA, ST. (Frideswitha, Frideswitha, Frisewitha, Friswy, Frideswida, Frideswithina), of Oxford. Her reputed period makes her just contemporary with Bede, her birth being placed c.r. 650, and her death c.r. 735; but she is not mentioned in Bede, nor does her name occur in the Monuments Historica Britanniae. Gosceline, who collected his early English memoirs just after the conquest, has none of Frisidwy. Yet at the conquest neither her name nor her foundation had perished. She is named as having been buried at Oxford in the Anglo-Saxon catalogue of Saints printed in Hicken's Theasurn (pt. iii. p. 120), and in the Oxfordshire Domesday the canons of St. Frideswyde are mentioned. The biographical sketch of the biography begins to be written in the twelfth century, to which period belongs a Bodleian manuscript life, noticed by Hardy (Dena. Cat. i. 462). William of Malmsbury too in that century gives an account of her in his Gesta Pontificum. (315, ed. Hamilton), and in his Gesta Regum (i. 327, ed. Hardy) he speaks of her monastery. His story of the saint has every appearance of a genuine tradition, being as vague as undecisymphantal as might be expected under the circumstances. She was a king's daughter; she refused her hand to a king, and to escape his importunity fled to Oxford, the suitor being smitten with blindness in attempting to gain the town. There she founded a monastery, ruled it, died, and was buried, and when Malmesbury wrote her house was still existing, occupied by regular canons. Malmsbury died about 1142, and wrote therefore a little before the date of the earliest recorded Oxford professor, Vacarius. This legend therefore would have been written just when Oxford University was commencing its historic life; but the legend gives no hint of St. Frideswyde being as yet connected with Oxford in any tutelary sense. In 1180 occurred St. Frideswyde's translation; afterwards commemorated on Feb. 12. This is briefly recorded as an event in the chronicle of Wykes 2 0 2
(Gale, ii. 22), but somewhat circumstantially described, though without a date, by prior Philip of St. Frideswide's, whose manuscript is placed by Hardy (i. 460) at about 1200. The translation was in this instance a survival of the relics from the obscure spot of their original interment in the church (on the site of the present Christ Church), to a conspicuous shrine in the same, and prior Philip's statement must be accepted as authentic, from his proximity to the event. The ceremony was evidently regarded as important by William, and understood from the prior's language that king Henry II. was present. The Bollandist questions this interpretation, and the language perhaps admits some room for question; but it is certain that Henry was at Oxford in Jan. 1180. At all events the king expressly sanctioned the proceeding, which were witnessed by the archbishop and several of the bishops and nobility. Wood states that it was from this date that St. Frideswide began to be regarded as the tutelary saint of the town and university, that her church became the mother church of both, and that a ceremonial procession of the clergy and laity in common was made to it on certain stated occasions (see Wood, Annals of Oxford, ann. 1268). The significance of the event of 1180 will be appreciated when it is recollected that in 1187 or thereabouts is the first express mention, by Gildas Cambrensis, of students coming to Oxford. The assembling of prelates and nobles to create the festival of Feb. 12 would indicate that an effort was being made to promote the academic reputation of the place. It is, moreover, at this period, the reign of Henry II., that historians have seen the first revival of the English race and its commencing amalgamation with the Norman. It may have been a sign of this tendency, and a stimulant of it, that the English youth found a saint of their own ancient blood distinguished as their patron when they flocked in to study under the shadow of the Norman castle. Henceforth, accordingly, St. Frideswide's tradition grows more definite. A fourteenth-century Harleian manuscript (Harl. i. 462) names her father Didan, her mother Safrida; the suitor king is Algar, a Mercian; she dies and is buried at Thornbury, now Binsey, near Oxford, and her translation thence to Oxford takes place 400 years afterwards. In the fourteenth century again her story was told by John of Tim- mouth, in whose roll of Anglo-Saxon saints she stands No. 122 (Smith, Catalogue of Cotton MSS. p. 29), and this memoir was adopted by Capgrave. Here likewise appear the names Didan, Safrida, Algar; but the burial and translation are placed at Oxford, as they also are in the traditions collected by Leland (Collect. vol. i. p. 342), who adds to our information, above all other sources after the event, that the pious woman who taught Frideswide to be a saint was named Algiva.

On the whole, the defect of early mention in contrast with posterior and late celebrity need not create any suspicion against St. Frideswide. Higher and more continuous, but without her exist without her existence, is one of the salient features of her life. It is in her favour that her principal commemoration day, Oct. 19, was that of her death, not that of her translation. It is also in her favour that through all the Danish period, when monastic history was blotted out of so many localities, Oxford was probably one of the safer parts of England, and Frideswide's foundation seems to have been nearly continuous as a religious house of some kind, so preserving a continuous and authentic memory of her. Malmesbury Abbey too, where William of Malmesbury wrote, was not a great distance off, and its history was nearly continuous from the heptarchy downwards, a circumstance which adds to the trustworthiness of its records; and this again is in her favour.

St. Frideswide had an office in the Sarum Breviary, and she occurs in our present calendar (Oct. 19), but only one church in England out of Oxford is known to have been dedicated in her name, that of Frilsham in Berkshire. In France she was the tutelary saint, as St. Frewine, of Bomy in Artois. She also had her special offices in the Norman abbey of Fontenelle, out of the manuscript legendary of which one Mabillon has contributed to her published biographical literature. (Mab. Acta SS. G. S. B. iii. part i. p. 534.) Mr. J. H. Parker in his Calendar of the Anglican Church, gives an engraving of St. Frideswide, by Emmanuel Leutaurdess of the chapel of Cardinal Wolsey. It represents her carrying an abbatial staff, with an ox crouching at her feet.

The Acta SS. Boll. (Oct. viii. 560 sqq.) are very full on St. Frideswide, and print some of the MSS. noticed by Hardy. See also Mon. Angl. ii. 143.

[O. H.]

FRIDIAN (FRIDIAN, FRIDIGIAN, FRIDIANA), of Lucca, commemorated Mar. 18. He is mentioned by Gregory the Great (Dial. iii. 9). For his Lucca episcopate see Ughelli, Ital. Sac. i. 794; Cappelleli, La Chiese d'Italia, xv. 497, 498. Regarding this person we have a difficulty in obtaining a clear representation. Colgan (Acta SS. 633 sqq.), O'Conor (Rec. It. Script. iv. 124, 125) and Ware (Hist. Ant. c. 26), wholly identify him with St. Finnian (Sept. 10) of Moville. [FINNIAN (2).] But Lanigan (Ecc. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 10, § 6), Todd (St. Patrick, 102, n., and Book of Hymns, Fasc. i. 37 sq.), and Reeves (Annal. Antiq. Nat. iv. 157 sqq.), identify him with St. Finnian and Frigidian or Frigidiana or Frigidian are entirely different persons, whose histories are mixed up together in medieval legend. The bishop of Lucca may probably have been an Irishman, and born like St. Finnian in the province of Ulster, but no account or explanation can be given of the confusion in the Acts. Colgan (supra) gives two lives of St. Fridan, which are allowed by him to be of late compilation and are of nearly the same contents. According to Colgan's First Life of St. Fridan, bishop of Lucca, taken from the office of the saint that was celebrated at Lucca, the blessed Fridan, "at prime cardinal brevita sua," belonged to "Hibernia, an island of Scotia," and was educated from infancy in the love of Christ, and how to please Him. He was put under Mogenius, who was a bishop and taught him the liberal arts in a city called Candida. There Mogenius plotted against him, and fell in his own snare. After Giesen his enemy forsook his kindred and country (dimissis gavis et patria suis), went into Hibernia, and took the religious habit at a place called Machile. After performing many miracles on the quick and the dead, he left all and went to Italy. In Tuscany
FRIDOLIN
he led an eremitic life, aiming always at perfection, and proving himself a truly faithful servant to Christ. At the urgent request of the clergy, and with the consent of the citizens, he became bishop of Lucca, where he laboured with great care and watchfulness for twenty-eight years, and built as many churches. But this First Life gives no account of his death or of leaving Lucca. Colgan's Second Life of St. Fridolin, bishop of Lucca, and of the Order of the Caunes, Bishop of St. Augustine, taken from a MS. in the Chartreuse of Cologne, goes over almost the same ground as the first, but gives additional particulars at the beginning and the end. He was the son of the great king of Ulter, whose name was Ulitach (but Coegrave thinks this a mistake, and would regard Ulitach as not a proper name, but an appellative equivalent to "of Ulster;" Colgan, _Supra_, pp. 641, n. 1, 649, c. 5, Append.). Refusing his father's proposals of marriage, and despising earthly honours, he set out for Rome, and was honourably received by pope Pelagius (up to his death of that name, A.D. 555-60). He afterwards returned with many gifts and relics, put himself under Megenius at Candida, left that place for the reason given above, and, forsaking his nation and country, took up his abode at Mische in Hibernia. But he went again to Italy, and died bishop of Lucca, in Tuscany. His body lay buried in the basilica of St. Vincentius, till the time of Charles and Pepin, the most serene kings, when John, bishop of Lucca, had the remains removed and placed in a splendid shrine, with all pomp and ceremony. It is plain that in these two Lives we are in the main upon a purely Scottic track, and can easily follow the saint as he attends the famous schools at Candida Casa and Moville, and perhaps pays a visit to the Continent. But the difficulty is, at the same time, to identify Fridolin with the founder of the school at Moville, and to give any reasonable account of St. Finnin's being made bishop of Lucca, or of St. Fridolin's coming to have such a purely Irish history. Butler (Lives of the Saints, iii. pp. 252-53) gives in a short account of St. Fridolin, says he was the eleventh bishop from St. Paulinus founder of the church, and that he died A.D. 378, which is the year in which the name, Ulta, place the month of St. Finian. But Ussher and Reeves say he flourished A.D. 570, and Colgan places his death about the year 595. Tanner (Irish, 299) refers to _Liber de Canonebus_ and _Canones B. Fridigian_ as works still extant, but erroneously attributed to St. Fridigian. (Bp. Forbes, _Kath. Scott. Saints_, 463-466 on "Wynnara," and SS. _Nn._ and _Knt._, xiii.; Ussher, _Eccl. Ant._ c. 17, Wks. vi. 412, and Ind. Chron. A.D. 570; Lanigan, _Eccl. Hist. Ir._ ii. c. 10, § 3; Todd, _St. Patrick_, 102-5, and _Book of Hymns_, fasc. i. 89-100.) [J. G.]

FRIDOLIN (Winfred), abbot of Seckingen, commemorated March 6. Of St. Fridolin, the Traveller, and abbot of Seckingen on the Rhine, we have a full account, from the Bollandists (Acta SS. Mart. 6 tom. 429-44), and Colgan (Acta SS. 478-93). Baring-Gould (Lives of the Saints, March 6, iii. 91 sq.) has a memoir, with references to the continental authorities. Fridolin was Irish by birth, and of noble descent, but we know neither his family nor native place; some would represent him as the son of a Scoito-Irish king. In Ireland he was ordained and taught: he sought for a wider field in France, and became, he become Bishop of Lucca, where he laboured with great care and watchfulness for twenty-eight years, and built as many churches. But this First Life gives no account of his death or of leaving Lucca. Colgan's Second Life of St. Fridolin, bishop of Lucca, and of the Order of the Caunes, Bishop of St. Augustine, taken from a MS. in the Chartreuse of Cologne, goes over almost the same ground as the first, but gives additional particulars at the beginning and the end. He was the son of the great king of Ulter, whose name was Ulitach (but Coegrave thinks this a mistake, and would regard Ulitach as not a proper name, but an appellative equivalent to "of Ulster;") Colgan, _Supra_, pp. 641, n. 1, 649, c. 5, Append.). Refusing his father's proposals of marriage, and despising earthly honours, he set out for Rome, and was honourably received by pope Pelagius (up to his death of that name, A.D. 555-60). He afterwards returned with many gifts and relics, put himself under Megenius at Candida, left that place for the reason given above, and, forsaking his nation and country, took up his abode at Mische in Hibernia. But he went again to Italy, and died bishop of Lucca, in Tuscany. His body lay buried in the basilica of St. Vincentius, till the time of Charles and Pepin, the most serene kings, when John, bishop of Lucca, had the remains removed and placed in a splendid shrine, with all pomp and ceremony. It is plain that in these two Lives we are in the main upon a purely Scottic track, and can easily follow the saint as he attends the famous schools at Candida Casa and Moville, and perhaps pays a visit to the Continent. But the difficulty is, at the same time, to identify Fridolin with the founder of the school at Moville, and to give any reasonable account of St. Finnin's being made bishop of Lucca, or of St. Fridolin's coming to have such a purely Irish history. Butler (Lives of the Saints, iii. pp. 252-53) gives in a short account of St. Fridolin, says he was the eleventh bishop from St. Paulinus founder of the church, and that he died A.D. 378, which is the year in which the name, Ulta, place the month of St. Finian. But Ussher and Reeves say he flourished A.D. 570, and Colgan places his death about the year 595. Tanner (Irish, 299) refers to _Liber de Canonebus_ and _Canones B. Fridigian_ as works still extant, but erroneously attributed to St. Fridigian. (Bp. Forbes, _Kath. Scott. Saints_, 463-466 on "Wynnara," and SS. _Nn._ and _Knt._, xiii.; Ussher, _Eccl. Ant._ c. 17, Wks. vi. 412, and Ind. Chron. A.D. 570; Lanigan, _Eccl. Hist. Ir._ ii. c. 10, § 3; Todd, _St. Patrick_, 102-5, and _Book of Hymns_, fasc. i. 89-100.) [J. G.]

FRIDOLIN, [FRIDIAN.]

FRIDOLIN (Winfred), abbot of Seckingen, commemorated March 6. Of St. Fridolin, the Traveller, and abbot of Seckingen on the Rhine, we have a full account, from the Bollandists (Acta SS. Mart. 6 tom. 429-44), and Colgan (Acta SS. 478-93). Baring-Gould (Lives of the Saints, March 6, iii. 91 sq.) has a memoir, with references to the continental authorities. Fridolin was Irish by birth, and of noble descent, but we know neither his family nor native place; some would represent him as the son of a Scoito-Irish king. In Ireland he was ordained and taught: he sought for a wider field in France, and became, he become Bishop of Lucca, where he laboured with great care and watchfulness for twenty-eight years, and built as many churches. But this First Life gives no account of his death or of leaving Lucca. Colgan's Second Life of St. Fridolin, bishop of Lucca, and of the Order of the Caunes, Bishop of St. Augustine, taken from a MS. in the Chartreuse of Cologne, goes over almost the same ground as the first, but gives additional particulars at the beginning and the end. He was the son of the great king of Ulter, whose name was Ulitach (but Coegrave thinks this a mistake, and would regard Ulitach as not a proper name, but an appellative equivalent to "of Ulster;") Colgan, _Supra_, pp. 641, n. 1, 649, c. 5, Append.). Refusing his father's proposals of marriage, and despising earthly honours, he set out for Rome, and was honourably received by pope Pelagius (up to his death of that name, A.D. 555-60). He afterwards returned with many gifts and relics, put himself under Megenius at Candida, left that place for the reason given above, and, forsaking his nation and country, took up his abode at Mische in Hibernia. But he went again to Italy, and died bishop of Lucca, in Tuscany. His body lay buried in the basilica of St. Vincentius, till the time of Charles and Pepin, the most serene kings, when John, bishop of Lucca, had the remains removed and placed in a splendid shrine, with all pomp and ceremony. It is plain that in these two Lives we are in the main upon a purely Scottic track, and can easily follow the saint as he attends the famous schools at Candida Casa and Moville, and perhaps pays a visit to the Continent. But the difficulty is, at the same time, to identify Fridolin with the founder of the school at Moville, and to give any reasonable account of St. Finnin's being made bishop of Lucca, or of St. Fridolin's coming to have such a purely Irish history. Butler (Lives of the Saints, iii. pp. 252-53) gives in a short account of St. Fridolin, says he was the eleventh bishop from St. Paulinus founder of the church, and that he died A.D. 378, which is the year in which the name, Ulta, place the month of St. Finian. But Ussher and Reeves say he flourished A.D. 570, and Colgan places his death about the year 595. Tanner (Irish, 299) refers to _Liber de Canonebus_ and _Canones B. Fridigian_ as works still extant, but erroneously attributed to St. Fridigian. (Bp. Forbes, _Kath. Scott. Saints_, 463-466 on "Wynnara," and SS. _Nn._ and _Knt._, xi; Ussher, _Eccl. Ant._ c. 17, Wks. vi. 412, and Ind. Chron. A.D. 570; Lanigan, _Eccl. Hist. Ir._ ii. c. 10, § 3; Todd, _St. Patrick_, 102-5, and _Book of Hymns_, fasc. i. 89-100.) [J. G.]

FRIDOLIN (Winfred), abbot of Seckingen, commemorated March 6. Of St. Fridolin, the Traveller, and abbot of Seckingen on the Rhine, we have a full account, from the Bollandists (Acta SS. Mart. 6 tom. 429-44), and Colgan (Acta SS. 478-93). Baring-Gould (Lives of the Saints, March 6, iii. 91 sq.) has a memoir, with references to the continental authorities. Fridolin was Irish by birth, and of noble descent, but we know neither his family nor
FRITHBERT, bishop. [FRITHBERT.]

FRITHGILS (Fridilda), a priest of that northern monastery of which Ethelwulf wrote the metrical history. [ETHELMULF (2).] (Acta SS. S. B. sac. iv. pt. 2, p. 324; compare Liber Vitae Dunelm. p. 34.) [S]

FRITHGITHA (Fridighitha), the wife of Ethelheard, king of the West Saxons, 728-739. In the year 736 or 737, probably the latter, she denounced the world, and, accompanied by Forthhere, bishop of Sherborne, went to Rome, where she probably died. (Chr. S. M. H. B. 329; Flor. Wig. 542; H. H. 727.) Her name is associated with her husband's in a grant to Glastonbury, dated 729 (Kemble, C. D. 76; Mon. Angl. i. 59), and she is mentioned in the grant of Taunton to Winchester as especially urging Ethelheard to make the gift. (K. C. D. 1002.) [S]

FRITHWALD (Fredwold), an ealdorman of Surrey, who assisted St. Eorcanwald in the foundation of the abbey of Chertsey. He is described as a dependent of Wulflhere, king of Mercia (Kemble, C. D. 986, 987), and is said to have married Wilburga, a daughter of Penda, son of Wulhere, by whom he became father of St. Oswald. V. S. Osith, ap. Surius, Oct. 7, f. 222; R. de Disticii i. 111, 115. The Chertsey Cartulary contains a charter of Frithwald, bestowing on Chertsey which he describes as found in first under king Egbert of Kent, 500 manentes on the banks of the Thames near the port of London. The charter is a fabrication of no authority, as it is another granted by Frithewold and Eorcanwald together, to the same monastery (K. C. D. 986, 987), but the tradition which connects him with Chertsey is ancient and not inconsistent with probability. See Will. Malmesb. G. P. (ed. Hamilton), p. 142; Flor. Wig. M. H. B. 535; Mon. Angl. i. 422, 423. [S]

FRITHOBERT (Fridbert, Fridenbertus, Frithuwulph, Frithebryht) was consecrated bishop of Hexham, in the place of Acus, the friend of Wilfrid, on Sept. 8, A.D. 734 (Symeon, Chron. p. 12; Ric. of Hexham, p. 1). In A.D. 740, during the disgrace of Cynewulf of Lindseyfame, he had the charge of that see for a year (Symeon, H. E. D. ii. 2). There is little more known about him. He died on Dec. 23, A.D. 766 (Symeon, Chron. p. 22; Ric. of Hexham, p. 37; A. S. C.). At the translation of the remains of the saints of Hexham in A.D. 1154, Frithbert's bones were discovered, with an inscription on the coffin which contained them. (Memoriales of Hexham, ed. Surtees Soc., pp. 199-200.) One of his teeth was among the relics at Durham. (Hist. Dun. Scr. Tres. app. p. 427.) [J. R.]

FRITHWALD, a Mercian monk to whom, under the designation of "Monacho Winfridi Episcopi," a grant is made by Osbera, ealdorman of the Hwicians, by the leave of Ethelred, king of Mercia. (Kemble, C. D. 17.) The charter is either corrupt or spurious. Bishop Winfrith had been deprived in 675, and might have been still alive, but the indiction given in the date does not agree with the year 680. [S]

FRITHWALD (Fredwold, Fredweold, Fredewaldus), succeeded Pechtelm as bishop of Candida Casa or Whitburn in A.D. 735 (Flor. Wigorn. i. 54). He died in A.D. 764 (Symeon, Chron. 22). [J. R.]

FRITILAS, a queen of the Marchamundi, in the end of the 4th century. She was so much impressed by what she heard of the Christian character of St. Ambrose, that she begged him to send her instruction in the Christian faith, and became a zealous believer. She travelled to Milan to see Ambrose, but arrived after his death. (Paulinus, Vita Ambrosii, § 37.) [J. L. D.]

FRITILAS, bishop of Xeres and metropolitan of Tinghir. His name is of Gothic derivation and he may have been possibly the Fritila or Fretelas to whom Jerome wrote his 106th epistle. [FRETELA.] He attended the third general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431, but secluded and signed the protest against the condemnation of Nestorius. (Mansi, iv. 1209; Le Quien, Or. Christ. i. 1107.) [J. de S.]

FROARICUS, bishop of Porto (Portus) from about A.D. 675 to 690, signs the acts of the third council of Braga, and of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth councils of Toledo. His absence from the fourteenth, which was somewhat hastily convened, immediately after the termination of the thirteenth, to meet the demands of some envoys from Rome [ENNIO, JULIAN], is easily explained by the distance of his see from Toledo. (Expo. Sepr. xi. 38; Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 262, 272, 283, 284.) [M. A. W.]

FRODA, an abbot who attests the grant of Ini to Malmesbury dated May 26, 704. (Kemble, C. D. 50.) [S]

FRODOBERT, abbate of the Monasterium Cellense, near Troyes. His life, written by a monk of his own monastery, or perhaps by Adso abbate of Montdidier, was published by Camuza (Camus, Prompt. Sacr. Ant. Tres. Dioec. 1 sqq. Trec. 1613); by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 8 Jan. i. 505); and by Mabillon (Acta SS. S. B. ii. 598). He was born at Troyes and educated under Ragnegundis the bishop (c. 650). After becoming a cleric he went to Luxeuil, and was there under abbot Walbert. After some years he returned to Troyes, and remained under bishop Bertold (c. 656). But burning to be free from the world and all human conversation, he chose out a fitting place for his purpose, and procured a grant of it from King Clovis, in a marsh which lay in a suburb of the city of Troyes. There building this monastery, frequently called Insula Germanica (also Insula Trescaisia and LItt), he formed a school which became famous, and died in the time of bishop Abbé (666-673). He was consecrated on Jan. 8. In the Life, he is said to have been a contemporary of the French kings Clovis son of Dagobert, and Clovis his son, i.e. Clovis II. and Clovis III. [J. G.]

FRODOMUNDUS (Rotmundus), twelfth bishop of Coutances, succeeding Hughrius or Hilderic, and followed by Willebertus. He was
the founder of a nunnery, dedicated to St. Mary, in his diocese, as appears from an inscription discovered in the 17th century, and given by Nabilon in his Annales ad ann. 675, c. 535. (Gaff. Christ. xii. 686.) [S. A. B.]

FROILA (1), bishop of Mentesa. He signed the acts of the eighth council of Toledo, A.D. 653. (Florea, Exp. Sagr. vii. 260; Aguirez-Catalan, iii. 448; Maasi, x. 122.) [Pardus.]

FROILA (2), brother of Alfonso I. (the Catholic) king of Asturias. He is mentioned by Sebastian of Salamanca (Exp. Sagr. xiii. 481) as having shared in his brother's successful forays against the Moors, that is to say, according to Professor Dozy's most interesting explanation of this period from Arabic sources (Recherches, etc. i. 126), in his expeditions over that tract of desert country lying between the mountainous districts of northern Galicia, Asturias, and Cantabria, and the frontier line of Galicia-Cornia, Tavera, Toledo, Guadalajara, Tindela and Portos, upon which the Berber insurrection (c. p. 128) followed immediately by the great famine of 750-755, had obliged the invaders to fall back towards the middle of the 8th century. Alfonso's and Froila's expeditions, therefore, were not exactly victorious campaigns, as the Christian chroniclers represent them. Rather the two brothers seem to have explored the abandoned districts, to have put to death what Muslims remained, and to have carried back with them the Christians of the deserted towns, most of whom had embraced Mohammedanism under the rule of the conquerors (Doxy, l. c. from the Alcor Madijnous, fol. 75 r.), but who now gladly returned to their old faith. (Una quoque Arabes occupatores supralitterarum civitatum interficere, Christianos secum ad patriam duxit (Alfonso).) (Sob. Sal. cap. 13.) Froila was the father of Aurelius and Veremundus (Lemundo I.), both of whom were among the successors of Alfonso I. (Sob. Sal. cap. 17, 20.) [M. A. W.]

FROILA (3), Fruela, king of Asturias from 759 to 768, son of Alfonso the Catholic and of Pelayo's daughter Ermesinda. He reigned eleven years with considerable success, both at home and abroad. Sebastian of Salamanca (circa 880) speaks of his many victories over "the Cordovan enemy, hostem Cordobensem," and especially mentions a battle at Pontonivia, in Galicia (to the north-east of Tuy), where 54,000 infidels perished—"qui quinquecenta quattuor milia Chaldaeorum"—a number only to be outdone by the slaughter at Cordona I. The Musulman general Haunmar, son of Ademranham Ibn Hisean was taken prisoner, and put to death. On this defeat, the Mohammedan annalists, so far as Prof. Dozy's Recherches, vol. i., enable us to consult them, are silent, although Ibn Khalidoum (Dozy, l. c. p. 101) speaks of Froila's constantly increasing power, and of the recovery by him of certain important towns, in which last particular, however, he appears to confuse him with his father, Alfonso I. Later on a rebellion of the Basques, who had never acknowledged the authority of the Gothic kingdom for long together (Dahn, v. 199.), and who were now a horn in the side of the new state, was put down and punished. A certain young girl, named Numis (q. v.), among the captives, attracted Froila's attention. He made her his wife, and she became the mother of his famous son, Alfonso the Chaste (Sob. Sal. cap. 16). Disturbances arising in Galicia, where the Suevi had never been wholly amalgamated (Wittiza was probably sent by Ercigis to Tuy in 658 for the purpose of keeping down this disaffected country), Froila deviated from the whole district, not so effectually, however, as to prevent another rising some years later under his successor Silo (Sob. Sal. cap. 16, 18). Apparently in the last year of his reign he murdered (proprius mans, says Sebastian) his brother Vimaranaus, "ob invidiae Reguli," according to the Chron. Albred., while Sebastian is altogether silent as to the cause. The murder, if political, was not successful. In vain did Froila, according to the 13th-century chronicles, adopt his brother's son Veremundus (Rod. Tol. iv. 6). The party of the murdered man was not to be conciliated, and Froila speedily paid the penalty of his act, "non post multis temporis taliem justa acediae suis interfector est" (Sob. Sal. i. c.). He was buried with his wife, Numis, at Ovetum.

Froila appears to have lost an impression of harshness and cruelty upon his generation, which has descended into all subsequent accounts of his reign. "Victorius egit," says the unknown author of the Chron. Albred., "sed asper moribus fuit....ob fraterem merely in Canicas interfector est." The monk of Silos (about 1100) repeats the charge of harshness, without however mentioning the murder of Vimaranaus. He is bent upon adding to most of the particulars already chronicled the fact or tradition that Froila checked the marriage of the clergy which had prevailed under Wittiza. "Iste imposuit finem illi nequissimo scribi quod Wittiza rex inter Christum et vasum sanctitatis alterius missum est...misere immenventur, saliet ne Christi sacrosanctas canamam confugia ulceris sortinentur." (For an account of the growth and intentions of the clerical tradition respecting Wittiza, see art. under his name.) Rod. of Toledo, d. 1249, incorporates all previous accounts and adds a wholly new detail about Froila, which, if trustworthy, is the most important fact in the internal history of his reign. "He peopled Ovetum," says the archbishop, "and built there the cathedral church,...i.e. the church of San Salvador."

As far as chronicles are concerned, we have here the first appearance of this statement, in this form, at least, Lucas of Tuday's earlier statement, "iste episcopatum in Ovetum transulit a Luconii civitate," based upon the acts of the so-called council of Oviedo in the Cod. Ovet., must not, however, be overlooked. (His. Ill. iv. 73.) Roderic of Toledo, whose historical work is of a high order for his time, spoke on the authority of the Oviedo archives, which, in the first half of the 12th century, had been overhauled, compiled, and to a large extent falsified by Pelayo, bishop of Oviedo, from 1101-1129. 3

3 One of the documents included in the Chron. Albred., makes him the brother of Alfonso I. This is a confusion, however, with the real brother Froila (vo. 2).
It appears, indeed, upon examination that Froila's connexion with Oviedo (beyond the mention of his burial there by Sebastian of Salamanca) rests upon a privilege granted by Alfonse the Chaste to the church of St. Salvador at Avilés, in confirmation of his father's will, in which Froila is spoken of as having built and endowed the churches of the Saviour and of SS. Julian and Basílisa (Esp. Sgov. xxviii. Mariana, ed. Valência, 1787, iii. 511), and upon an inscription in the church of the Saviour not now existing, but which was copied and described by Pelayo of Oviedo in the Cod. Oest. before 1129. (Hubner, Inscr. Hsp. Christ. No. *93.) Both document and inscription speak of a destruction and rebuilding of Froila's churches. "Noscito," says the first stone of the inscription, "hic ante istum fuisset alterum, hoc eodem ordine situm quod princeps condidit salvatori domino suppex per omnia Froila," &c. The second stone speaks of the destruction of the older church by the pagans, a gentilis decretum sordibusque contubernal, et restitutum by Alfonso. The inscription is thus in complete agreement with the donation in which Alfonso, on the occasion of the "recuperationem domus tuae" (the donation is addressed to Christ in the curious rhymed prose of the time, see art. IDEMUS), confirms all that had been granted by his father. Very much might be written on the subject of these two sources, which, if genuine, are the earliest certain records of the second kingdom. Hubner has placed the inscription among the falsae et suspectae, no doubt on account of its connection with the too-well-known Pelayo of Oviedo. Professor Dozy, however, has been able to bring forward from the Arabic side what appears a very strong confirmation of the genuineness of both these sources. For his description of the campaign of Hicham I. against the Asturian kingdom, in 794, during the reign of Alfonso the Chaste, of the capture of the capital (which can be no other than Oviedo) and of the destruction of the churches of the royal residence, which is expressly mentioned by the Arabic annalist Naurawi, see his Recherches, i. c. vol. i. p. 145. Both the capture of the capital and the destruction of the churches are passed over in complete silence by the Christian chroniclers, who otherwise describe the campaign. The Oviedo inscription, if genuine, would thus furnish our only knowledge of the fact, from the Christian side. In all probability, then, Froila built two churches at Oviedo, and occasionally lived there (in the privilege above quoted Alfonso speaks of having been born and baptized at Oviedo, "quo solo natus, loco quod umbris exiit"), though it was not made the capital of the new state, until the reign of his son. At his death he was buried in the church he himself had built, as his uncle Fafila had been before him, in the church of Santa Cruz. Then in 794 and 795 came the storm of the Moorish invasion, and Froila's churches were either partially or wholly destroyed. (The foundation of what is still existing of Alfonso's buildings in the cathedral may very well be Froila's work.) If this is so, Froila's reign marks an important stage in the history of the infant kingdom. The first period, when the refugees as mere mountain guerrilleros maintained a precarious independence under a warlike chief, is past. The reign of Alfonso the Catholic, and the backward rush of the wave of invasion which marked it, had changed all this. When Froila succeeds his father a belt of uninhabited country divides the Christian kingdom from the Moors, and the Mohammedan frontier line, which under Pelayo touched Leon, runs now between Pamplona and Coimbra. Sheltered behind the deserted plateaux of Castille as well as by their own mountains, the refugees of Pelayo's time begin to develop a settled policy; threatened, however, on the one side by the Suevic pirates of Galicia, and on the other by the turbulent Basques. The move inland from Pravia and Cangas to the site of Oviedo, with its splendid natural capabilities both for defence and cultivation, made by Froila, opens a new time and prepares the way for the more definite steps taken by his son, under whom the kings of Asturias become kings of Oviedo, to remain such till the next forward move is made to Leon, and by whom "all things were ordered at Oviedo as they had been ordered at Toledo, both in the church and in the palace." (Chron. Almod. ap. Exp. Senv. xiii. 452.) For the supposed first foundation of Oviedo itself in the fourth year of Froila by the priest Maximus and his uncle, the abbot Fromisran, see FROMISLAN. [M. A. W.]

FROILUBA, the queen of Fafila, Pelayo's son and successor in the kingdom of Asturias. She was buried with him in the church of Santa Cruz, near Cangas de Onis (Sch. Sul. cap. 12), and her name appears in the well-known inscription still existing there. [FAFILA (2.)] At various places in the Asturias, stones are found roughly engraved with the story of Fafila's fatal encounter with the bear, and in these Froiluba appears as holding back, or saying farewell to her husband. Sandoval (Historias de Los Cinco Obispos, p. 91) and Flores, Reyes de España, i. 35, describe the most famous of these stones, inscribed in the doorway of the church of San Pedro de Villanuera, and which tradition supposes to have been placed there by Alfonso I. the Catholic, and Ermesinda, Fafila's sister, in memory of his tragic death. The Rev. H. F. Tozer describes one of the ancient stones of the same subject of Fafila and his wife at Santa Maria de Villamayor. (Gent. Mag. August, 1865.) [M. A. W.]

FROISCLUS (FROISCLUS), an Arian, was made bishop of Tortosa in the room of his Catholic
FROMISTAN

predecessor Julian [JULIANUS] by the Arian king
Leovigild. In 589, however, under Leovigild's
converted successor, Recared, Froisclus, with the
other Arian bishops, attended the famous third
council of Toledo and renounced his heresy in the
following form: "Froisclus in Christi nomine
civitatis Dertosanae episcopus anthamattianus
haeresis Arrisiare dogmata superius damnata,
salem hanc sanctam catholicam quam in Ecclesiam
Catholicam veniens credidi manu mea de toto
corpus subscribisse." 

After the reunification of the Arian bishops the
council proceeded to its work, and among the
signatures to its decrees are found those of the
two bishops of Huesca, Julian, and Froisclus
(five other pairs of bishops appear among the
subscriptions). Julian signs first, as bishop of
Tortosa; "Froisclus Hemon ibi episcopus," follows.
In the year 599 Julian and Froisclus appeared
at the council of Barcelona, and both signed as
bishops of Tortosa, the signatures of Calahorra
and Ampurias intervening. It is not known
which survived the other. (Esp. Sagr. xlli. 81;
Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 293.) [UNAM]

FROMISTAN, first abbott of the monastery
of St. Vincent at Oriedo, and first discoverer of
the site of Oriedo itself, according to a certain
document, which in Morales' time (Viaje Santo,
1793, p. 120), was shown in the library of
the monastery. (For the text see Esp. Sagr.,
xxxvii. Append.) It is an agreement between twenty-five
persons whose names are given, headed by Mon-
tañosus presbyter, and the abbots Fromistian
and his nephew Maximus, presbyters, upon the subject
of the foundation of a monastery in connexion
with the church of St. Vincent, founded twenty
years before the agreement by Fromistian and
Maximus. "It is known to all," say the twenty-five, "that this place which they call
Oreto, thou, Maximus, didst first establish, and,
I together with thy serfs, didst first level and
clear it (planasti illum), when it was but a
mean, unexpected and uninhabited mountain,
and afterwards in company with thy uncle, 'Dominico Fromstiano Abb.' didst first
and the aforesaid place the church of St. Vincent, Levite and
 Martyr of Christ." Later on, the twenty-five signa-
tories renounce the world, and, "as is the
custom of the churches, et eruditio regula,
transferring themselves and their property to the
use and possession of the church of St. Vincent,
under the rule of Fromistian "abbati nostro"
and of Maximus. Then follows, "And I, 'From-
ista Abbas, who now twenty years ago,
with my nephew Maximus, priest, dis-
covered this mean and uninhabited spot, and
found the church of St. Vincent, and foot
upon us the rule of the Blessed Abbot Benedict'
(to which place also we gave all our possessions)
so receive you to the service of God, and so
make confirmation and testament with you all
and with my nephew Maximus, as that, etc." Then
follow threats of excommunication against
those who shall at any future time transgress
the rule of St. Benedict, or tamper with the
possessions and the church of St. Vincent, and the agreement is
signed by Fromistian and Maximus on the one
side, and Montanus on behalf of the twenty-five
monks on the other, in the era 819 (A.D. 781).

If this document is genuine, it is the earliest
historical mention of the Benedictine rule in
Spain (leaving out the more than doubtful
foundation charter of the monastery of Obena,
supposed to have been granted by Adalgaster,
which is a mere copy of the charter of St.
Victor of Oriedo with the name changed from
St. Vincent of Oriedo (Esp. Sagr. i. c.
Append. v.) It is far from universally accepted,
however, by modern Spanish critics, and it will
be impossible to assign it its proper place in the
religious history of Spain until a more thorough
critical investigation has been made of the
earlier charters and monastic records of northern Spain.

[Ma. A. W.]

FRONIMIANUS, brother of Braulio of
Saragoza, to whom that bishop sent his life of
San Millan. [EMILIANUS (8).] [Ma. A. W.]

FRONIMIUS (1), bishop of Besarnum, related in
an anonymous life to have compiled the
church of St. Stephen in that town, and estab-
lished there a coenobium, obtaining privileges for
it from popes Damasus and Siricius. If this
statement could be relied upon, the period of
Fronimius would be the latter end of the 4th
century (Gall. Chr. xvi. 17). [R. T. S.]

FRONIMIUS (2), 5th bishop of Agde, suc-
cceeding Leo, and followed by Tigridius, and 8th
of Vence, succeeding Deutherius and followed
by Aurelianus. He was a native of Barges, but
migrated into Septimania, where he found great
favour with the count Sigevass, the successor of Athanagild,
king of the Visigoths, and was consecrated to
the see of Agde. But after his patron's death
be was accused by the Arian Leovigild, whose
son Hermengild was betrothed to Ingudis,
the daughter of Sigebert, of attempting to poison
her mind against him as a heretic, and was com-
pelled to flee from his diocese to escape
assassination. He repaired to king Childe-
bert, who made him bishop of Vence upon
the death of Deutherius. He subscribed the
second council of Mâcon in A.D. 585, though
his see is not appended, and died in 588. Gre-
gory of Tours, who is the author for the fore-
going narrative, also recounts how a servant of
this bishop was cured of epilepsy at the tomb
Vitae Patrum, cap. viii, a. 8; Labbe, Sacr. Cons.
ix. 959, Flor. 1759-98; Gall. Christ. iii. 1214,
v. 668.) [S. A. B.]

FRONITASUS, Jan. 2, martyr in Gaul with
Severinus, Severianus, and Silanus, his companions.
They were disciples of St. Fronto, reputed to
have been appointed bishop of Vesunna (after-
wards Pettoricium, now Perigueux) by St. Peter
himself. They were sent by Fronto to preach
the gospel among the Gauls. They were seized
by the president Squindo and put to death by
him in the first persecution under Nero. The
Bollandists say Claudius was emperor, but then
Claudius was one of Nero's names after he was
adopted by the emperor Claudius, A.D. 50. [Dal-
well, in *Disert. Cypriani*, xi. 13, shows how doubtful are the stories of all martyrs under Nero, except those which happened in Rome. "Aliam itaque persecutionem comminiscantur necesse est, quam illam cujus menmit Tacitus, sive alios praeterque Romam Christianos in ea passos comminiscantur." ([Acta SS. Boll. Jan. i. 73.]

[Fonteinus, bishop of Peltre. [Fonteinus (2).]

**Froninianus (1)**, bishop of Salona (Spalato) in Dalmatia, c. A.D. 300; supposed to have suffered martyrdom A.D. 303. ([Farlati, *Hsr. Sacr. i. 707.*]

**Froninianus (2)**, bishop of Gerona in the early part of the 6th century. In the 5th century, owing to the political troubles of the country, the lack of councils leaves us almost without information as to the succession of bishops over Spain. From the year 404, in which the bishopric of Gerona is mentioned by Innocent I. in his letter to the synod of Toledo (Innoc. ep. 3, cap. 2 in Patr. Lat. xx. 489 c), to the signature of Froninianus, at the council of Tarragona in 516 (Mansi, viii. 544), we have no record of the see, which must have been fought over during all that time again and again by Goths, Suevi, and Provinciales. In 517, on the prayer of Froninianus, a council was assembled at Gerona, which drew up ten canons concerning liturgical and disciplinary matters, for which see Aguirre-Catalani, i. 129; Mansi, xi. 547; *Hom. Sacr. xii. ii. 44, 220, 475; Hefele, *Cosm. Gesch.* ii. 655.[M. A. W.]

**Froninianus (3)**, bishop of Ancyræ towards the close of the 6th century. He had previously been bishop of Salona, but had been deposed for refusing to subscribe the condemnation of the "Three Chapters," and banished to Antioch in the Thebaid. In 562 he was recalled from exile, and translated to Ancyræ (Victor, *Tununens. Chron. s. n.* 532, Migne, Patr. Lat. ivii. 961; Le Quien, *Orbes Chrétiens* i. 455, 456). The next known bishop of Ancyræ was Paulius, c. A.D. 590. ([T. W. D.]

**Froninianus (4)**, bishop of Salona, A.D. 630-638. ([Farlati, *Hsr. Sacr. ii. 265.*]

[de S.]

**Froninianus (5)** was one of the series of bishops who held the see of Huesca or Osca during its occupation by the Moors, and did not therefore assume that title, but styled themselves bishops of Aragon, or bishops of Jacca after that town was recovered from the Moors. They resided at the monastery of St. Pedro de Ciresa or that of St. Juan de la Peña. The only information we have about Froninian is derived from the Life of St. Urbez or Urbichius, who was a hermit, and lived near Huesca. Froninian is said to have been devoted to St. Urbez, to have frequently visited him, and to have been miraculously cured by him of a fever. He appears to have been a bishop about A.D. 802. ([D. Ayora, *Fundacion de Huesca*, 278, 351.]

[F. D.]

**Froninianus (1)**, reckoned the first bishop of Florence, c. A.D. 56, and probably its first instructor in the Christian faith. ([Ugheini, *Ital. Sacr. iii. 14*; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Ital.* xvi. 432.]

**Froninianus (2)**, Jovianist, condemned by pope Sisirdus. In Cellarius (iv. 652) he is called Felix Fronint, but the more common form is Plotinus and Froninianus. Baronius (Ann. vi. ann. 390, xliii. ed. Thunier) has Prinotinus, with alternative readings Pontinus and Froninianus. (See also Patr. Lat. xxiii. 1171 n.)

[de S.]

**Froninianus (3)** (Froninianus), bishop of Avignon, 306-324. He was born of an opulent family at Alba in Italy, became a presbyter at Rome, died from the persecution of Galerius into Gaul and settled at Avignon. Here he led a retired life for two or three years, and so gained the affections of the people that he was unanimously chosen to succeed Primus as bishop. This account is stated by the Sammarthians to rest on the authority of the manuscript registers of the see of Avignon and Savaro's catalogue of the bishops. ([Gall. Chr. i. 856.]

[de C.]

**Froninianus (4)** (Victor, *Tununens. Chron. ann. 502,* bishop of Salona. ([Froninianus (4).]

[de T. W. D.]

**Frono (1)**. That the first bishop of Perigueux was St. Frono all the authorities agree. But all else, age, country, and particulars of his life, are uncertain. There is, as the Sammarthians pitifully observe, profound silence concerning him in all the ancient writers, long and minute accounts of him in the more recent. ([Gall. Christ. ii. 1446; Tillemont, *Mém.* iv. 502; Gams, *Srh. Episc.* 597.) Usuard's account of him is that he was ordained a bishop at Rome by St. Peter, along with Georgius, a presbyter, who was raised from the dead by the apostle's staff, and became Frono's companion in travel. St. Frono was the apostle of Périgueux, died in peace, and was commemorated Oct. 25. (Usuard, *Mart.* Oct. 25.)

[de T. S.]

**Frono (2)**, a member of the Ephesian church, sent by that church to meet Ignatius at Smyrna on his way to Rome. ([Ign. Ep. ad Eph. 3.]

[de G.]

**Frono (3)**, M. CORNELIUS. We learn from Minucius Felix (ix. xxxi) that an oration against the Christians was published by Frono, in which the charge was dwelt on that presumptuous and incestuous intercourse took place at the Christian meetings. This Frono is described as a native of Cirta, and therefore may be safely identified with the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, concerning whom, see *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*; Teuffel, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* 730. No reference to the Christians is found in Frono's extant remains. ([de G.]

**Frono (4)**, FRONTONUS, FRONTONIUS, abbot, is commemorated by Usuard (Apr. 14, sp. Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiii. 384, and note) also by Ado (ob. cxxiii. 247), and Notker (ob. cxxiii. 1065). The Bollandists (*Acta SS. 14 Apr.* ii. 201-3) treat De S. Fronkone obitate in Eremita Nigriensi in Aegypto, giving prefatory notes and a Vita, autore coepto, ex MS. et Rosendo in Vitis Patrorn. The same life is given from Rosweyde by Surius (de Prob.
FRANTO

Sact. ii. 158-9, and is said to have been written by one who received the information from one of St. Fronto's monks; by some it is attributed to St. Jerome, yet probably only as a collector of lives. According to the Life, Fronto, there called Frontoani, abhorring the common life and seeking for solitude, gathered to him some brethren (called seventy), and led them into the Nitrian desert, where they cultivated the ground and lived in pious austerity; the special trials of the abbot were probably only as the brethren becoming resting under the monastic severity. The last clause of the life says he flourished in the thirteenth year of Antoninus the emperor, which would be A.D. 151 or 152.  

J. G. [FRONTO (6), priest of Malum, is said in the Passio S. Theodoti Ancyr. (Boll. Acta SS. 18 May, iv. 163-5; Ruinart, Acta Mart. Siccor. 350-5) to have carried away the body of the martyr Theodotus. He had come to Ancyrna on the evening of the day on which St. Theodotus suffered, and by giving the soldiers, who were watching the body, to drink freely of the wine with which his ass was laden, he snatched the corpse while they slept, and laying it on the ass sent it by a safe messenger to Malum. This was in A.D. 303. Fronto raised his own wine: “agriculturam enim exercet egregius iste vir.”  

J. G. [FRONTO (6), martyr, April 16. [SARAGO., MARTYRS OF.]

FRONTO (7), Arian bishop of Nicopolis, a town in the mountain district of Lesser Armenia. He seems to have originally belonged to the orthodox party, and was one of the clergy at Nicopolis; but he was won over by the Arians, and by their assistance was consecrated bishop of Nicopolis. Basil (Ep. 238, 239, 240) consoles the clergy of Nicopolis for the defection of one of their number, he declares Fronto to be an object of execration throughout the whole of Armenia, and refuses to acknowledge him as a bishop or to accept his ordinations; (Ep. 246, 247) he exhorts the people of Nicopolis to endurance under the trials and persecutions arising from their bishop's conduct and opinions. It appears that Fronto held the see only for a brief period (A.D. 372-375) (Patr. Græc. xxii. 306; Cellier, Ant. socr. iv. 481; Le Quien, O. C. i. 427.)  

L. D. [FRONTO (8), bishop of Phaselis in Lyca, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 985; Manni, v. 1086.)  

L. D. [FRONTO (9), bishop of Milan, c. 555-566, said to have been ejected as a schismatic. There appears, however, a doubt whether any bishop of Milan so named lived at that date. If he did, he must have been the successor of Vitalis and the predecessor of Auxianus, which last seems clearly to have been elected A.D. 566. (UgHELLI, It. Sacr. iv. 82; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xi. 117.)  

R. S. G. [FRONTO (10) appears in the Series Episcoporum of Gams as an archbishop of Bordeaux in the early part of the 8th century, between Antonius and Verebulphus, but a doubt is suggested whether he and his predecessor should not be attributed to the see of Angoulême. He is omitted by the authors of the Gallia Christiana (ii. 795). [S. A. B.]

FRONTIUS, seventh bishop of Angoulême, succeeding Mererius and followed by Heraclius. Before his elevation he was sent by Abbonius, the predecessor of Mererius, on a mission to Sabaudes bishop of Pottiers, or Saintes, to ask that the holy monk. St. Eparchius, might be at liberty to make his abode in the diocese of Angoulême. Frontius obtained the see of Angoulême by murdering the occupant, Mererius, but enjoyed the fruits of his crime for one year only (A.D. 758-79). (S. Eparchii Vita, s. 4, Boll. Acta SS. Jul. I. 118; Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 37; Gall. Christ. ii. 980, 1452.) [S. A. B.]


FRUCTUOSA, Aug. 23, martyr at Antioch with fifteen others. (Mart. Adonis, Usuardi.) [G. T. S.]

FRUCTUOSUS (1), martyr, bishop of Tarragona in the 3rd century. The Acta of his martyrdom, and of that of his two deacons, Eulogius and Angurius, who suffered with him, are the most ancient of Spanish Acta, and are marked by a realistic simplicity which contrasts very favourably with the style of many of the Acts of the Diocletian persecution, with those of the two Eulalii for instance. Prudentius made use of them in his hymn to the martyrs (Felix Tarracii Fructuosi vestris, etc., Peristephi, vi.), and they are largely quoted by St. Augustine in one of his sermons (No. 275, Migne, Patr. Lat. xxviii.). The Hieronymian Martyrologies confuse both names and place, but in Bede, Usuard, and Ado, they are correctly given, as in the mass general of later martyrologies. In the fine 10th century Sanctorale, from the monastery of Cardeña, mentioned under St. Eulalia of Barcelona (q.v.), the Acta of Fructuosus and his companions are grouped at fol. 131-138 (Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 25, 609). Acta. Under Valerianus and Gallienus, in the consolatium of Aemilianus and Præses (ann. 259), Aemilianus Præses of Tarragona, "aut feritas impulsa aut imperitis ampla," issued an edict directed against the Christians, compelling all to sacrifice to the gods. Hearing this, the bishop Fructuosus, together with the whole church of Tarragona, gave themselves to unceasing prayer. One night, after Fructuosus had retired to rest, four apparitores appeared at his gate and summoned him and his deacons before the Praeses. He roused his companions, they dressed hastily and were led to prison. This was Sunday, and they remained in prison till Friday, enjoying, however, a certain amount of intercourse with the brethren outside. Fructuosus even baptized a catechumen within the prison. On their appearance before the Praeses, a short dialogue ensued between themselves and the judge, in which all thrice simply and steadfastly avowed their faith. Finally the Praeses asked Fructuosus "Art thou the bishop of the Christians?" He answered. "I am." To whom the Praeses, "Thou wast," and he gave orders for them to be scourged and burnt alive. On their way to the amphitheatre a crowd both of Christians and
Liturgies, though Gams thinks it not likely (Kirchenrecht, von Spanien, i. 270). The Acta quoted by Augustine seem to have contained a statement about the age of Fructuosus, which is not found in any of the printed copies. Comparing the relative power of the martyrs and the gods, and referring, of course, to the mythical founder of Tarragona, he says, "Contra uam infirnum et tremetnum omnibus membris senem, quid valet Hercules?" This would throw the birth of Fructuosus into the 2nd century, and is interesting as bearing upon the date of the introduction of Christianity into Tarraconensis. Fructuosus is the first bishop of Tarraco whose name remains. In Hübner's Inscriptiones Hisp. Christ. nos. 57, 85, are two inscriptions from Movera in Estremadura, and Medina Sidonia, of the 6th and 7th centuries respectively, containing the names of Fructuosus and his successors. Their festival was on Jan. 21. (Exp. Syl. xvi. 9; Gams, K.-G. i. 265.)

FRUCTUOUSUS (2), a person present at the search for sacred books and utensils in the case of Silvanus, during the persecution, A.D. 303-304. (Ang. c. Cresci. iii. 29; Mon. Vet. Don. p. 170, ed. Oberthür.)


FRUCTUOUSUS (4), a bishop present at the council of Carthage, against the Pelagians, A.D. 416. (Ang. Ep. 175.)

FRUCTUOUSUS (5), bishop of Giru Marcelli (Marcelliana) in Numidica, banished by Humeric, A.D. 484. (Victor. Vit. Notitia. 56, in Migne, Patr. Lat. iviii.; Morcelli, Africa Chrisl. i. 172.)

FRUCTUOUSUS (6), bishop of Emporias (Ampurias), appears at the third council of Toledo, A.D. 589, represented by his archpriest Galanus. (Exp. Syl. xiii. 269; Aguirre-Catalana. iii. 325.)

FRUCTUOUSUS (7), bishop of Eugubium (Gubbio), said to have been consecrated by Benedict I. A.D. 577, and if so was probably the immediate predecessor of Gaulus. Doubts, however, of his existence, have been expressed. (Ugellii, Itali. Soc. i. 877; Cappelletti, Chiese d'Ital. v. 380.)

FRUCTUOUSUS (8), bishop of Lerida in 633, when his signature is found among those given to the acts of the fourth council of Toledo. He may possibly be identified with the Fructuosus diaconus who signs the acts of the council of Egara in 614 as the representative "Domine mei Gomarellis episcopi." (Exp. Syl. xlii. 105, 106; Aguirre-Catalana. iii. 363, 542.)

FRUCTUOUSUS (9), bishop of Beja (Vila Franca) in the proconsular province of Africa, subscribed the letter of his province against the errors of the Monothelites to Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, who favoured their views, A.D. 646. This letter was read at the first Lateran council. (Mansi, x. 939; Morecelli, Africa Chrisl. i. 185.)

Lesley supposes (Prof. in Missale Mixtum, &c. no. 210) that Fructuosus had in his mind certain words of the Missa omnia offerentium as they appear in the Mozarabic Liturgy (p. 229, i. 35, and at p. 5, i. 91), and brings forward the speech, as one proof among others, of the antiquity of the Liturgy. ("Eclesiam sanctam catholicam in orationibus in mente habeamus, ut eam Dominus et fide et spe et chritiate propitius ampliare dignetur," &c.) But it is of course quite possible, if we are to suppose any connexion between the two passages, that the words of the Acta were absorbed into the
FRUCTUOUS (10), ST., bishop of Dumium, and afterwards of Braga, a famous Spanish saint of the 7th century, whose life was written shortly after his death by St. Valerianus, abbot of the Monasterium 'Rubinense' (San Pedro de Montes), near Astorga, one of the houses founded by St. Fructuosus. The father of Fructuosus was a Gothic noble who had led the country's forces in war, and who possessed lands and flocks in the Vierzo. (A mountainous district between Astorga and Lugo—the Asturica Augusta and Lucus Augusti of the Romans—watered by the Sil and its tributaries, and bounded to the north by the Asturian mountains, and to the south by the plateaux of central Spain. It owes its name to the Roman town of Bergidum, once the centre of the district.) Once when going upon a round of inspection of his estates the father took the boy Fructuosus with him, and the child, struck with the loneliness and beauty of the mountain valley, inwardly resolved to found a monastery there which should have grounds to make his father happy, and in which he himself might be buried. On his father's death he placed himself under the teaching of the neighbouring bishop, Conatius (q. v.) of Palencia, as a preparation for a hermit's life. Here marvels already began to surround him, and to point him out as a future saint. As soon as he was old enough he sent his son to the monastery of San Isidro in Madrid, near Avila, where he left Palencia for the innermost recesses of the Vierzo, founding his first monastery, the Monasterium Complutense (so called from its dedication to the martyrs of Complutum, SS. Justus and Pastor), in the "narrow plain of emerald green, nearly half a mile long, and about 100 ft. wide, deeply sunk in the heart of the wild mountains," where stands the modern village of Compludo. Without reserving anything for himself, St. Fructuosus gave up his property to the use of the brotherhood, and presently the solitary valley was full of monks flocking thither from all parts of Spain. One person only saw the rising house with envy and dissatisfaction; that was his father-in-law, who had hoped apparently for the inheritance of the saint's property, and now saw all given to strangers. He accordingly went to the king, and petitioned that some of the property of the new monastery might be assigned to him on the pretence of using it in some state service. Fructuosus no sooner heard of it than he stripped the altar, covered them with ashes, and wrote a letter of rebuke and warning to the delinquent, who, indeed, speedily died without any heirs to enjoy the property he had wished to plunder. Meanwhile the fame of the saint grew day by day, and soon the numbers of his adherents grew so large that leaving others in charge of the convent, he withdrew farther into the wilderness in search of more undisturbed solitude.

Near the source of the Oza, a river rising among the heights of the Montes Aguinaus (or Aquinas, the Eagle's Crag), and running thence into the Sil below Ponferrada, he founded his second monastery, the Monasterium Vianaense, afterwards the famous San Pedro de Montes, of which his biographer Valerius was abbot, which was restored in the 10th century by San Gennadio, and existed as a monastery until the general dissolution of the religious houses in the present century. Later on he founded the Visusine, north of the Sil, among the Aguiar mountains, which passed long afterwards into the possession of the Cistercian house of Garcinaco, the Ponsense, on the coast of Galicia, and many others, whose names are not given. Thus the saint, "giving the last remains of his great fortune to churches, to the poor, and to the freedmen of his house, penetrated every day into great deserts, peopling them with monks by means of the convents which he built, giving them the wherewithal of living holily, and instructing them for a time by his example. Then he himself would fly deeper into the rocks and woods to avoid the commerce of men, and to be known and seen of God only." Once some jackdaws, which had been tamed in the convent, found out his retreat, and proclaimed it by their cries of joy. Again a doe, which was pursued by the hounds, fled to him for shelter. The saint protected her, and the animal followed him home, and thenceforward never left him. When the saint slept she slept at his feet, when he went far away from him. At last, to the grief of the saint, an ill-disposed youth killed her. The youth was seized with fever, and nothing but the prayers of Fructuosus saved him from death.

After this half legendary time in the Vierzo we come to the more public portion of the saint's life. He seems to have lived in the shrine of St. Eulalia of Merida, and thence to Seville and Cadiz. Near Cadiz Fructuosus founded a monastery nine miles from the sea, to which monks flocked so abundantly that the Dux exercitus of that province complained to the king that there would soon be no men left for the army. His fame also was a noble lady, Benedicta by name, who lived first in a hermitage built for her by the saint, and became afterwards the abbess of a convent of eighty nuns. Here also Fructuosus determined to end his life in the Holy Land, and he accordingly chartered a vessel for the voyage. But the king (Rechwenith), warned of this intention, and fearing lest such a light of sanctity should be lost to Spain, ordered that the saint should be brought before him. When he appeared at Toledo the king compelled him to accept the see and abbacy of Dumium, founded by St. Martin. Thence, in 656, at the tenth council of Toledo, he was transferred by the unanimous voice of the bishops to the metropolitan see of Braga, in the place of the deposed Potamius. A question arose in the same council concerning the will of the deceased bishop of Dumium, Rechmir, which was found to contain provisions contrary to the canons. For the amending of these clauses the council deputed the management of the whole matter to Fructuosus (Canc. 43 p.).

After his elevation to the see of Braga Fructuosus, still leading the hermit's life of austerity and almsgiving, founded one more monastery on the road from Braga to Dumium (which, under the name of San Fructuoso, and under Franciscan rule, was still existing in the 18th century), and began also the building of the Visusine church. When they were building he was inwardly warned of his approaching death, and, being eager to leave his work perfected and complete, he carried on the work of building, not only by day but by night also, the masons working by torchlight under the saint's direction. At last the final
touch was given, and the work stood completed. Then Fructuosus knew that his last day was come. He told his disciples, who wept bitterly, while he alone was joyful. One of them asked him whether he feared death. "No, indeed," he answered; "for though a sinner, I am going to the presence of my Lord." They bore him to the church, and there, after he had received the penitential habit, he remained prostrate before the altar through the day and night. "As the day dawned he lifted his arms in prayer, and yielded his stainless and holy soul into the hands of God."

The preceding account is taken from the life by Valerius, with the exception of the connexion of the saint with the bishopric of Diumum, and of the proceedings with regard to Reciniger. Valerius, whose life was in many points similar to that of Fructuosus, was, as we have said, abbot of San Pedro de Montes towards the end of the 7th century, and from the opuscula of his remaining (Epsy. Sapr. xvi.) as well as from his biography, we see that he gathered up many of the local memories and stories of Fructuosus remaining in the Vierz. He speaks of intercourse with old pupils and servants of Fructuosus, and for the general story of the saint's life he says that he was indebted to Cassian, abbot of San Fructuoso, and the saint's first disciple, and to the priests, Benezatus and Julianus, who had accompanied him in his journeys. Our only other sources of information respecting Fructuosus are—(1) the acts of the tenth council of Toledo, or rather the decreum appended to the acts, on the subject of the crime, penitence, and deposition of Potamius (q. v.), and the succession of his see, and the gathering of several of his letters as to the youth of Fructuosus at the time, and the comparative immaturity of his work on the one hand, and as to the possible influence on him of the example of the life of San Millan on the other. There is no indication of date in the letters, but they must have been written before the year 631, in which Benezatus died, and are probably a good deal earlier, as there is no trace of complaint in them of that decay of intellectual power of which Braulio speaks sorrowfully elsewhere. The dates of San Fructuosus's life are quite unknown. That of his appearance at the tenth council of Toledo, in 631, is the only fixed point. Gams (Kirchengesch. ii. 153–157) thinks he did not long survive the year 660, which would throw the period of his principal monastic activity back to the first third of the century. He was buried in the convent of San Fructuoso, near Braga, where his remains were removed to Compostella in the 12th century, by the well-known archbishop Diego de Gelmirez. The cult of the saint began immediately after his death (see conclusion of Acta), and in the 10th century San Genesio appears as the restorer or second founder of the monastic system inaugurated by Fructuosus in the "holy Vierz."

The first letter, Fructuosi presbyteri ad Braulionem, speaks of the fame of Braulio, and how the news of his life and deeds "pleases our humble ear amid the hoarse sounding waves of the foaming brine, of the eddying ocean, and the unquiet seas," which looks as if the letter were written from that monastery on the Gallician coast, of which we hear in the life. Braulio is asked to solve certain biblical questions (of a curiously trifling kind), and finally Fructuosus winds up with a request for the loan of certain books, for seventeen of the Collations of Cassian, for the lives of the holy men, Honoratus and Germanus, "vestrique beatissimi novi Aemiliiani" [Emilianus (8)], and with a prayer for his kindy remembrance of those "far off and sunk in the dark district of the west," who thus address him. The bishop's letter, of much greater length and pretensions, answers his questions, which, however, Braulio thinks Fructuosus might have answered for himself, and contains a pæan of gratitude to the saint. As to the books, the bishop is not able to give a satisfactory answer. Of some of them he has no duplicates, others have been taken out of his cupboard, and cannot be found (see preface to the Vita Sancti Aemiliiani, for an interesting correspondence between this passage and what he there says of the loss of life MS.). But when found they shall be sent to Fructuosus.

Finally, Fructuosus is not to talk despondently of the province in which he lives, but is to remember its Greek origin ("Graecam originem sibi defendit," conf. Isid. Etym. ix. 2, Hi (Gallanci) graecas sibi origines asserens), and the illustrious men it has brought forth, such as Orosius, Turribius, Iatius, and Caritiers. Only let him beware of the venom of the Priscillians, peculiar to that country, and which has in bygone times infected even such men as the holy Orosius.

Various inferences may be drawn from these letters as to the youth of Fructuosus at the time, and the comparative immaturity of his work on the one hand, and as to the possible influence on him of the example of the life of San Millan on the other. There is no indication of date in the letters, but they must have been written before the year 631, in which Benezatus died, and are probably a good deal earlier, as there is no trace of complaint in them of that decay of intellectual power of which Braulio speaks sorrowfully elsewhere. The dates of San Fructuosus's life are quite unknown. That of his appearance at the tenth council of Toledo, in 631, is the only fixed point. Gams (Kirchengesch. ii. 153–157) thinks he did not long survive the year 660, which would throw the period of his principal monastic activity back to the first third of the century. He was buried in the convent of San Fructuoso, near Braga, where his remains were removed to Compostella in the 12th century, by the well-known archbishop Diego de Gelmirez. The cult of the saint began immediately after his death (see conclusion of Acta), and in the 10th century San Genesio appears as the restorer or second founder of the monastic system inaugurated by Fructuosus in the "holy Vierz."

The first letter, Fructuosi presbyteri ad Brauli...
FRUDBERT
FRUDBERT (Bed. v. 24, append.), bishop of Hexham. [FRITHDBERT.] [C. H.]
FRUDBYALD (Bed. v. 24, append.), bishop of Whithern. [FRITHWALD.] [C. H.]
FRUSCOBUS, bishop of Mentosa. [FRUSCUBUS.]
FRUMARIUS, Suevian king of Spain from cir. 460 to cir. 463. He belongs to the period from 456 to 463, when the Suevi were struggling against the allied Gothic and Roman armies. Theodoric II., who had been the ally of the Suevian king Reikar (448-456) up to 456, fell back in that year upon the foedus with Rome, which his successor Euric was soon to set aside altogether. The Suevi, attacked by the allied Goths and Provincials, were hard pressed. In the course of the campaign Reikar was taken and executed, and Theodoric appointed Aliulf governor of the Suevian territory. In the extreme north-west of Gallicia, however, a band of Suevi made Maldrada king. (Idat. ann. 460.) A time of great confusion follows. Maldrada, Aliulf, and Franta all appear as Suevian kings between 456 and 460. In 459 (? Maldrada made his son Remsubm district-king (Besirks-König, regulus, Jord. c. 44), and in 460, after Maldrada's murder, we have the first appearance of Frumari (Idat. ann. 460). Who Frumari was is far from clear. He may have been a son of the brother murdered by Maldrada in 460 (Dahn, vi. 566), and if so, a cousin of Remsubm. At any rate, he seems to represent a time of anarchy and confusion, when the West Suevi, who after Reikar's defeat and death, made Maldrada king, appears as distinct from, and at one time even in discord with the East Suevi under Remsubm. Under the year 460 Idatus speaks of the descent of Frumari upon Aquae Flavinae, of the capture of himself, "capit Idatio Episcopo, septimo Kalendas Augusti in Aquae Flavieni Ecclesia," as the determinant of the district. [Idatus.] Meanwhile Remsubm, who appears so far to have acted in concert with Frumari, was ravaging the country of the Auregenes on the Minho and the coast about Lugo. Immediately afterwards dissensions arose between the two chiefs, followed by a short truce between the Suevi and Provincials, and negotiations between the Suevi and the Goths, at that time occupying the position of Roman foederati in various towns of the peninsula, possibly set on foot by Remsubm with the object of obtaining help against Frumari. (Dahn, i. c.) The Gothic and Suevian legates meet in Lugo, and Remsubm goes twice to Theodoric at Tolouse. During his absence, in spite of the presence of certain Gothic troops commanded by Cyril in Gallicia, collisions occurred between the Provincials and Frumari's Suevi. (Idat. ann. 462.) In 463 (according to Dahn; Florez gives 464) Frumari died, and Remsubm thereupon united all the Suevian districts in one kingdom, strengthening his position moreover, by close alliance with Theodoric II.

The supposition that after Maldrada's death Frumari at first ruled the West Suevi as district-king (Besirks-König) in dependence on Remsubm, and that he subsequently broke loose and assumed an independent position, Dahn thinks "not likely"—though it remains quite possible. (Idatus, Chron. apud Exp. Sagr. iv., Migne, Patr. Lat. ii. 387; Iisdor, Hist. Suevorum, idem, v. i. p. 124, "Könige der Germanen, v. 386."

M. A. W.]

FRUMENTIUS (2), March 23. Two African martyrs of the same name are commemorated on this day. They were merchants who suffered for the Catholic faith, at the hands of the Arians, in the Vandal persecution under Hunneric, A.D. 471. (Marty. Rom. Vet.; Adonis, Usuardi; Victor. Vitas, de Persecut. Vandal. lib. 3.) [G. T. S.]

FRUMENTIUS (3), the name of two African bishops, viz. of Tibursica near Tagaste, in Numidia, and of Telepte in the inland part of the Byzacene, banished by Hunneric A.D. 484. (Victor. Vit. Noticia, 56, 58; Patr. Lat. vIIIi.; Morelli, Africa Christ. i. 311, 315.) [L. D.]

FRYGES. (Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 40, 50, 65, v.) [Pryges.] [T. W. D.]

FUGATIUS, a form of FaGAD (Cressy, Ch. Hist. Brit. iv. cc. 5-7); also used by Baronius (Ann. Eccl. A.D. 183, i. 227). [J. G.]

FUGITIVUS, metropolitan of Seville in Dec. 465, when the tenth council of Toledo was held. Florez identifies him with the abbot Fugitus, whose signature, together with that of the abbot Ildefonsus, afterwards the famous Ildefonsus of Toledo, occurs among those of the ninth council of Toledo (provincial not national), which met Dec. 2, 458. (F. G. I. Supr. ix. 219; Aurrere-Catalani, iv. 145, 154.) [Margar.]

FULARTACH (FALERTUS, Felbertus, FoLARATAIO, Fularaciius). (1) Son of Brecc, commemorated Mar. 29, Dec. 21. Colgan (Acta SS. 787) gives a brief notice of this hermit, whose sanctity is more carefully recorded in kalendars and festalities than in other histories. He was descended from the most illustrious family of Rudhraige, and of the race of Conal Cearrauth, in Ulster. He had a hermit-cell at Offaly, on the borders of Kildare and King's County: this was named Disert-Fulartagh. Some say the hermit afterwards became bishop at Clonard, but the Annals, like the Four Masters, place the death of "Fulartach, son of Brecc, an anchorite," at A.D. 755, and that of the bishop of Clonard at A.D. 774 (O'Connor, Rev. Hib. Script. ii. 251, iv. 108). Evidently the Annals contemplate different persons, but O'Gorman and later writers regard them as one.

(2) Of Donagbheatrick, bishop. In the Tripe Life of St. Patrick there is mention made of Felartus, whom Colgan (Acta SS. 788) calls Fulartus, giving at the same time a memoir of St. Fulartus, bishop. In the middle of the fifth century he was a steady and active disciple of St. Patrick, and for many years was his constant companion and assistant. It is said in the Vita
FULCARIUS

S. Benigni that when St. Patrick came into the west of Connaught, he refused the hospitality he sought at the house of Echinnus, son of Brian, son of Ethoglao, king of Connaught, and that, retracing his steps, he came to a place afterwards known as Donaghpatrick, near Lough Corrib, where he built a church and gave it to bishop Fulartus. Fulartus had two virgin sisters, who were dedicated to the Lord, namely, Crot, who had been twice married, and Croche, who was on an island of the name of Cui-chomacine on the coast of Connemara. (Colgan, Tr. Thum. 134, c. 39, 136, c. 52, 178 n. 110, 111; Ussher, Eccl. Ant. c. 17, wks. vi. 518; Laugien, Eccl. Hist. Ir. i. c. 5, § 10, c. 7, § 8; Kelly, Cat. Ir. Saints, 108, 109.)

FULCARIUS (Fulcher, Fularcizus), 32nd or 33rd bishop of Limerick, succeeded Florbertus and followed by Agilfridus, is said by Aegidius to have sat for fifteen years. He is one of the bishops addressed in the twelfth letter of pope Zachary, written probably a.D. 748. (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxxix. 948.) In 757 he signed a charter for the monastery of Gorze, confirming the privileges granted by St. Chrodegangus. (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxxix. 1121–6.) His signature is also found appended to two charters given in a.D. 762 by king Pipin for the foundation of the monastery of Prum. The Plocatum Attinacense was subscribed by a "Fulericus Episcopus civit. Tungiri." This can hardly be other than Fulcarius, especially as variations in the spelling of the name from that of Baronia above given, are found in other accounts. This, however, involves the rejection of Aegidius's fifteen years for the duration of the bishopric, unless with Pagius we believe the plenitude to be properly dated three years earlier than the date above given. (Gall. Chro. pag. 1830; Bar. Patrolog. Reg. 762 n. iv.; Labbe, Sacr. Conc. xi. 675, Flor. 1759–98; Aegidius, Gest. Pontif. Loc. i. 147, ed. Chapenuville, Liége, 1812.)

FULCILIUS, eighth bishop of Nevers, succeeding Agrilo and followed by Rannacus, or according to Coquelle's list, ninth, succeeding St. Agrilo and followed by St. Arigius, about the close of the 8th century. (Coquelle, Hist. du Néerwis, sub fin. Paris, 1612; Gall. Christ. xi. 627.)

FULCAOLDUS (1) (Coaldus, Baloldus, Fraldus, Fouldus, Fouldus) forty-third bishop of Lyons, succeeding Godwinus, and followed by Madalbertus, or Mautbert. All we know of him is derived from the life of St. Bonitus (St. Bon or St. Bonis), bishop of Clermont, who died and was buried at Lyons, and whose remains his successor, Nordobert, had vainly sought to obtain from Godwin, the predecessor of Fulcaoldus. Proculus was more successful with Fulcaoldus, and installed the relics at Clermont (Vita S. Boniti, § 31 et seq., Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict. sec. iii. pars 1, p. 59, Paris, 1868–1910). It was during his episcopate that Lyons, in common with a great part of France, fell under the domination of the Saracens. In that calamitous period, and, if we may believe the ecclesiastical historians, the yet more peaceful time of Charles Martel's ascendency, which followed the battle of Tours (732), the archbishopric of Lyons, like the see of Vienne, was long vacant, while no less than ten years elapsed between the death of Fulcaoldus in A.D. 744 and the consecration of his successor. (Gall. Christ. iv. 31; cf. Ada, Chron. Migne, Pat. Lat. cxiii. 122.)

FULCALDUS (2), abbot of Faris (between Rome and Rieti), from A.D. 740 to 758. He came originally from Aquitaine. In 746 he received a gift of land from Lupus duke of Spoleto. His name is found in connexion with various exchanges of land and other transactions in diplomas of various dates from 744 to 756. (Troyes, Cod. Dipl. Nos. 567, 574, 586, etc.; iv. 148, etc.; Catal. Abb. Forf. p. 585, and Contrauctio Farfori, p. 526, in Ferris. Monum. vol. xi.)

FULGENTIAUS (1), legendary bishop of Arina in Campania, cir. A.D. 100. (Boll. Acta SS. Sept. 22; Ugelli, Ital. Sacr. vi. 129.)

FULGENTIIUS (2), bishop of Otiracio in Umbria (Utriculensis), mentioned in Greg. Magn. Dial. (lib. iii. cap. 12; Migne, Lxvii. 240) as having been ill-treated by Tetilia and the Gaths. His date is 545 according to Cappellati. (Le Chiese d'Italia, iv. 573, 579.)

FULGENTIUS (3), Fabius Claudius Gordanianus, bishop of Ruspe, was born in the year a.D. 468 and died a.D. 553. His life was spent for the most part in those provinces of northwestern Africa which were brought under the cruel tyranny of the Vandal kings, Genseric, Hunneric, and Theodoric, and he witnessed and suffered from the persecutions inflicted by those enemies of the Catholic faith. The writings of Fulgentius himself, a biographical memoir of the saint prefixed to his works, and addressed to Felicianus his successor in the bishopric of Ruspe, supposed to be written by Ferrandus, a deacon of the church at Carthage (Felicianus (14), Ferrandus), and a treatise De Percussione Vincens, written by Victor Vitensis in 487 (viz. Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum, tom. vii. and Migne, Patr. Lat. tom. livii.), are the principal sources of information concerning this outbreak of barbaric malice. Every refinement of cruelty seems to have been visited upon the presbyters, bishops, and virgins, of the north African church during the reign of Genseric and Hunneric. At the first incursion of the Vandals the whole country was desolated, the houses of prayer and basilicas were often razed to the ground; neither age nor sex was any shield from these cruelties, and the tombs of the martyrs were rifled for treasure. The bishops were banished from their sees, the clergy were harshly used, and every effort was made to alienate the masses of the people from the Catholic faith. At the commencement of the reign of Hunneric (Victor, lib. ii.), a gleam of sunshine cheered the church, during which the vacant see of Carthage was filled by Eugenius (Eugenius (21)), whose extraordinary virtues are daily recorded by his biographers. His
popularity with the people excited the rage and
animosity of the conquerors, who forbade their
own people to enter the church where he
ministered. Those who disobeyed these orders
were submitted to torture, were blinded, and
died many of the inhuman treatment. Women
were scalp and stripped and paraded through
the streets. Victor says, "We knew many of
these." Hunneric must have hated Christianity
in any form, as Jocundus, the Arian patriarch
was burned alive, and Manicheans were hunted
down like wild beasts. At the end of the second
year of his reign, the king refused all position in
the court or executive to any but Arians, and
banished to Sardes all who refused to conform;
heavy pecuniary fines were imposed whenever a
bishop was ordained; peculiar and malicious in-
humanity was visited upon Christian women, from
the consequences of which many died and many
were crippled for life. In 486, the bishops and
priests were exiled into the desert [FELIX OF AN-
DRADE], and in the eighth year of the reign of Hun-
neric, a bishop was exiled, and an edict was promulgated
(Victor, b. lib. iii.), in which the Homonoians
were summoned to renounce their faith, a date
being fixed for their submission, their churches
were doomed to be destroyed, their books burned,
their pastors banished. The consequences of this
bloody edict are detailed with horrorous circum-
stances by Victor, and even Gibbon allows
that they must have been inhuman in their
severity. The cruelties of the Diocletian persec-
tion were equalled if not surpassed by the
measures thus taken to extirpate the homousian
faith. Gordian, the grandfather of Fulgentius, a
senator of Carthage, was exiled by Genseric.
His sons were reduced to their home during an
interval of grace, to find their property in the
hands of Arian priests. They were not allowed
to remain at Carthage, and settled themselves at
Telepte, in the province of Byzacene. One of
them, Claudius by name, married Maria Anna,
a Christian lady, and she gave birth in 486 to
Fulgentius.

The mother of Fulgentius was particularly
careful to secure the best education for her
son. She compelled his study of the Greek
language, and would not allow him to indulge
in the perusal of Roman literature, until he
should have committed to memory the greater
part of the poems of Homer, and of the plays of
Menander. He was then allowed to pursue a
more varied course of study. He displayed great
talent for business and much versatility. His
fine character recommended him to the court,
and he was appointed fiscal procurator of the
province, and learned his first lessons in the art
of ruling men. But in the midst of these pur-
SUITS he became enamoured of heavenly things,
and after persuing Augustine's comment on Ps. xxxvi.
(xxvii. Heb.), he was attracted by the "pleasures
of a mind at peace with God, which fears nothing
but sin." At the time when Hunneric had
exiled bishops to the neighbouring deserts,
with the hope of weakening their confidence in
the Catholic faith, young Fulgentius began to
retreat from society, deprived himself of ordinary
recreation, and devoted himself to fasting, prayer,
and various austerities. One of these exiled
bishops, Faustus, had formed a little monastery
not far from Telepte, to which Fulgentius
betook himself. The old bishop was induced by
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plot of ground for the erection of a spacious monastery, which was at once crowded by inhabitants. The fertility of the soil, and the other advantages it possessed, seemed a positive defect in the pursuit of the divine life. Restless under physical comfort he fled once more to a lonely island, which was more satisfactory to him, seeing that neither wood nor drinkable water could be found upon it, and that access to the mainland was almost interdicted. Here he occupied himself with manual toil and spiritual exercises. Felix having discovered the retreat of Fulgentius persuaded Faustus to ordain him as a presbyter, and under pain of excommunication to compel his return to his monastery. Faustus hoped by these means to keep him under jurisdiction, to intercept these romantic escapades, and curb the restlessness of his nature. This ordination occurred shortly after the death of Hunneric, and accession of Thrasimund. The latter monarch, though a bigoted Arian, was more liberal and refined than his predecessors. (Gibbon, iii. iv.) Several charges were brought against him, for he had forbidden the churches which had been deprived of their bishops during the reign of Hunneric to fill up the vacant sees, yet many of these churches dared to disobey the order. No sooner was a bishop appointed than he was at once banished to Saridania or elsewhere. (Victor, Exc. lib. iii.) Several obits were contended for the privilege of having Fulgentius as their bishop, but with his marvellous faculty in concealing himself, he was able for a while to baffle their importunity, and he returned with a genuine Noto Episcopari upon his lips to his monastery. It was not, however, for long. The little town of Ruspe (or Ruspe), a small sea-port on a projecting spur of the coast, not far from the Syrtis Parva—int. 35° 1', long. 11° 1'—had remained without a bishop. This had been the case, not from obedience to the royal mandate, but from the machinations of another Felix, a deacon who had prevented a suitable man from accepting the episcopal title from Fulgentius, and when he was actually taken by force from his cell to Victor the primate of Byzacene and consecrated bishop of Ruspe. This was in the year 508, when he was forty years of age. He made no change in his costume or daily regimen, he declined to wear the orarion, the ornamental chasuble, or any coloured garment. He walked barefoot, or at least shod with nothing more luxurious than a monk's sandal; he wore a little white or black cloak, a linen sari round his neck, a leathern girdle round his loins, and must have looked more like a Hebrew prophet than a Christian bishop of the 6th century. It is expressly stated that he wore no different costume in the celebration of the mysteries, saying that the heart and not the clothes needed changing. He never allowed himself meat or wine. Eggs, herbs, and seed-corn, unground and undressed, were his food. His prayers, vigils, and fastings were incessant as before. His first demand from the people of Ruspe was a plot of ground on which to build a monastery. This was soon granted, and the building erected, and his old friend Felix summoned to preside over it. This blending of episcopal and monastic rule was soon brought to an abrupt end by Thrasimund, who dismissed him and other newly elected bishops to Saridania. He accepted his fate with joy, at the privilege of suffering for his Master. As he passed through Carthage presents were heaped upon him, which he sent to the new monastery at Ruspe. Though the last of the exiled bishops he was soon recognised as the greatest of them, and was entrusted with delicate and difficult duties. In the name of the sixty exiles he wrote important letters on various questions of theological and ecclesiastical importance. His literary faculty, his great knowledge of Scripture, and his reputation as a theologian, probably induced Thrasimund to summon him from Saridina to Carthage, and to enter into personal dispute with him. It is possible that the king, supposing by his threats and promises, his banishment of the bishops, his cajolery and other devices, that he had gained a victory, and, moreover, being thoroughly convinced of the truth of his own profession, wished to discuss the Catholic doctrine and crush it by fair argument. Ten objections to the Catholic faith were thus presented to Fulgentius. To these he was requested to give satisfactory replies. The result was that he wrote his One book against the Arians, Ten Answers to Ten Objections. The third of these objections resembles a common argument of the earlier Arians, viz. that the passages of Scripture, Prov. viii. 22, John xvi. 29, Psalm 11, 7, and others imply that the Son is created; "generated in time," and therefore not of the same essence with the Father, to which Fulgentius replied that they all refer to the Incarnation, and not to the essence of the Son of God. He used the argument of Athanasius, which makes the customary worship of the Son of God verge either on Polytheism or Sabellianism if we do not at the same time recognise the consubstantiality of the Son. To say, said Fulgentius, the Catholic position, compels the objector to adopt the alternative of saying that the Son of God was either from something or from nothing. The supposition that He was made "out of nothing" reduces Him to the rank of a creature; the other supposition that He was made "from something" involves a co-eternal Being, and some form of Manichean dualism. Throughout this ingenuous polemic, Fulgentius laid the greatest emphasis on the unity of God's essence, and assumed, as a point not disputed between himself and his opponents, that Christ was the object of Divine worship. This argument throws some light upon the later Arianism. The reply was not considered satisfactory by Thrasimund, who could not but have perceived that logically and rhetorically Fulgentius had the best of the argument. He, therefore, in order to cover him with reproach in the eyes of his Arian supporters, sent another group of objections, which were to be read to Fulgentius. No copy was to be left with him, which might enable him by mere logical agility to gain a superficial victory, but yet he was expected to return categorical answers. The statement of this Nebuchadnezzar-like policy might appear to be a biographical exaggeration, if it were not sufficiently vouched for by the opening chapters of the Ad Trismiumdom Regem Vandalorum Libri tres (cf. Schroech, Christliche Kirchengeschichte, xviii. 108). The first book treats "of the Mystery of the Mediator, Christ, having two natures in one person." The second book "of the Immaculaty of the Divinity of the Son of God." The third book, "of the Sacrament of the Lord's Passion," In the
FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE

first of these books he displays great familiarity with Scripture, and endeavours to establish the eternal creation of the Logos, and the birth in time of the Christ, when the Logos took flesh, and by “flesh” he endeavours to shew is meant the whole of humanity, body and reasonable soul, just as occasionally by “soul” is denoted not only reasonable soul but body as well. In bk. i. the author shews that the whole of humanity needed redemption, and was taken up into union with the Eternal Word; in bk. ii. he shews that nothing less than Deity in His supreme wisdom and power could effect the redemption. As the assurance that Christ is “the First and the Last,” does not mean that Christ will have an end, so the ἐκάκος of John i. 1, cannot mean that the Godhead of the Logos had a beginning. He cannot be localis by whom locis is made, nor temporalis by whom tempus is originated. The Godhead of Christ may be “everywhere” in His “power,” but not “everywhere” in His “grace.” He ingeniously endeavours to shew that he was not addressed to Mary, as a refusal to admit her affectionate treatment of his body, until she had appreciated His Divinity. The church is now His body, and they who do not appreciate His unity of essence with the Father must not have the privileges of His church. In many other ways he argues the immensity of the Son and also of the Spirit of God, and here again the common ground held by the Arius and himself, as to the worship of Christ, is worthy of special note. In bk. iii. he opposes strongly not only Patrissiasmus, but all theopatrisi, theopatriotism and the supposition that the Deity of Christ felt substantialiter the sorrows of the Cross. The dryphysis position is urged with remarkable earnestness, and held to be completely compatible with the unity of the person of Christ. The personality of the Christ the Son of God is distinguished from the personality of the Father, with an almost semi-Arian force, while he holds that the Son and Father are, as the Fathers and the Son are one and the same. Sicut inseparabiles est unipate naturae sic incostitubiles permaneat proprie persone (lib. iii. c. 3). (Cf. here unus deumino; non confusione substantiâ; sed unipate persone, of the Athenian Creed.) Yet though Christ emptied Himself of His glory, He was full of grace and truth. The two natures were united, not confused, in Christ. Totus in patre et totus in utero matris. He suffered in the flesh. His Deity, although it took on Him possible flesh, yet remained impassible, because immutable. The “unction” of the Holy Spirit was received by Christ as man and not as God. Inasmuch as He was the Eternal Son, there was no inequality to be redressed, no imperfection to be imparted. But seeing that there was taken up into His one personality the reasonable soul and flesh of man, not a human personality, but human nature, He could weep at the grave of Lazarus and die upon the Cross. Chapter 20 shews conclusively that Fulgentius must have read as the text of Heb. ii. 9, χαιρετος Θεος rather than χαιρετε Θεος, as he lays repeated emphasis on the ραν Θεος. He bore in His cross the sins of others. He had none of His own. No corruption befell His body in the grave; nor did any punishment overtake His soul in Hades. Schroech (xvii. 112) speaks slightly of the argument, as simply proving that Fulgentius knew his own position. The author of the Vides assures us that Thrasmuhid in his vision, before the birth of the Logos, had a vision of the Logos as a child and a man, and sent messages from the Logos to India to the people of India; also that Fulgentius rejoined. The existing work entitled pro Fide Catholica, etc. Fintam Episcoporum Arianum, liber unus (Opp. Migne’s ed. pp. 708-720) cannot be the work of Fulgentius; it possesses nothing of his style of address, makes no reference to Thrasmuhid or to India, and consists of little more than rough invective, followed by a cento of passages of Scripture, which, however, are not taken from the Vides as generally used by Fulgentius, but from the old Latin (cf. Schroech). The actual reply of Fulgentius, which no longer exists, and his great personal popularity seem to have roused the indignation of the Arius party at Carthage, and to have led to what is called his second exile. This measure was adopted by the king, who directed his forcible seizure. In the dead of night Fulgentius was hurried on board a vessel bound for Sardinia. The Contrary is said to have been overthrown, and a Syllage, where he received a sorrowing ovation on the part of the persecuted church. He is said on this occasion to have predicted the speedy close of the persecution. His biographer adds that he did not boast of any predictive powers, nor would he as a miracle-worker pray for the healing of the infirm, always urging that our prayer should be that the will of the Lord might be done. He disconcerted the idea of miracles, saying that without righteousness they were valueless, and might lead to everlasting condemnation. On reaching Calarissi (Cagliari) in Sardinia, he was received by the exiles with great enthusiasm and reverence. Here he remained until the death of the king in 523, and displayed extraordinary energy in his literary, polemical, and monastic work. In conjunction, and with the assistance of Brumanius, the ‘antistes of the city, he built another monastery, where more than forty monks assembled, and carried out the rule of community and observant life with the possession or maintenance of any personal interests. The equity, benevolence, and self-abnegation of these coenobites are extolled in high terms, but the most interesting feature of his character is said to have been his sweetness and gentleness to the youngest and weakest. His cheerfulness, tenderness, and urbanity, were never disturbed until bound by his office and his vows to act with severity towards insubordination or sin. Symmachus, bishop of Rome, wrote a letter of congratulation to these valiant champions of Christ. (Anast. in Symmacho, Baron. ann. 504.) It was during this period that the majority of his extant letters were penned, for the most part in answer to difficult theological questions that were proposed to him, and it was then also that he revealed his strong sympathy with the opinions of Augustine on the doctrines of predestination, of grace, and of remission of sin, at a time when these were being called in question by the semi-Pelagians of Southern Gaul and North Africa. (Cf. Neander, General Church History, Clark’s tr. vol. iv. 417 ff.; Shed. History of Christian Doctrine, vol. ii. p. 104, ff.; Wiggers, Augustinianism and Pelagianism, II. Theil. 369-393; Schroech, xviii.)

The most extended of these dissertations is Ad Omnium, hœri tres. 1. De claio præcessio.
FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE

Fulgentius is known for his eloquent and polemical writings, particularly against the Manichaean heresy. He was a member of the clergy and a prominent figure in the Church during the late 4th and early 5th centuries. His works are characterized by their forceful language and their attempt to defend the orthodox faith against its enemies.

In the passage you have provided, Fulgentius is discussing the concept of predestination and its implications. He argues that sin is a prerequisite for salvation, a view that was controversial in his time. This is evident in his statement: "Sin," he said, "is not in Him, so sin is not from Him. That which is not His work cannot be His predestination."

Fulgentius also addresses the question of why God permits evil, a common theme in Christian theology. He suggests that God permits evil to reveal His goodness and to bring about eventual salvation. This is reflected in his words: "He may punish another, gives grace to one who is unworthy of it, even if He finds another worthy of His anger. Here He insists on the point, which has repeatedly been debated. In the two books he had written on grace, viz., that the good will, the new heart, the right spirit, are God's gift (Ezek. xxxvi. 26). God begins, conducts, completes, the whole activity of the good-will, prepares us in every good work to do His will. The beginning of our calling, the augments from the Spirit who are in God's predestinatio (Rom. viii. 29). Those who are predestinated to glory are first predestinated to righteousness. He crowns in the saints which He has gratuitously given, but He will condemn in the wicked that which He has given. Do not say then that God does not predestinate the beginning of all sin. Predestination is always of the good. All evil is from the perseverance of the human will. God foreknows those who are about to sin, but does not predestinate them to it."

Fulgentius' arguments are a reflection of the complex and dynamic nature of Christian thought during this period, where the concepts of predestination, free will, and the nature of sin were all under intense scrutiny.

As a historical figure, Fulgentius' writings continue to be studied and debated, providing insights into the theological debates of the early Church.
the difference between Esau and Jacob depended on the fact that Esau was condemned before his birth, because of his future evil deeds. Fulgentius, with more logical consistency, maintains that Esau perished in his original sin; Jacob was saved by gratuitous favour. Divine grace and human will co-operate, but Divine grace always precedes the human aspiration after it. God works in us to will and do; free-willnulliter efficitur nisi divinitus adjutetur.

The question of creationism versus traducianism is left aside, because it was by Augustine, but Fulgentius maintains that if "creationism" be true, still every child at the creation of its soul receives the taint of original sin by its contact with the body. In the three books, De Veritate Predestinationis, the purely gratuitous doctrine of absolute predestination is argued from the assumed fact that some infants are baptized, and therefore saved, while a child of heathen or even Christian parents, not being baptized, is condemned to eternal fire! Aeternis et ignibus deputatus. In the Epistola to Peter the deacon he goes even further, and asserts that unborn children are not supplieo mappae (see, e.g., Wiggers, l.c. 378). The case of unbaptized adults differs only by their punishment being not only of their original but actual sin. Book ii. is a repetition and enforcement of his doctrine of free-will existent, but not capable of good. The question then arises, but is never answered, whether the poor are to be excepted on the idea that the mere dignity or office of emperor or bishop, or the like, can be all that is meant by "a vessel of mercy," he says it may be the reverse, and in a wonderful passage shews the greatness of their responsibilities. (Book iii.) Since predestination is not righteousness, it is no excuse for carelessness. If predestinated, we do undoubtedly and necessarily pray, watch, and practice good works, and bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. While Fulgentius was in Saragossa, he conducted an extensive private correspondence. In his letter ad Gallam, he assured the widow Gallula that virginity was a higher grace than the glory of marriage, but he also encouraged her to hope that by maintaining her widowhood she might rise almost as high in the kingdom of God as a virgin can. In two letters, ad Probas, virginity for the body and humility for the soul were set forth as the two great graces, and fasting and prayer commended. He introduces the Augustinian doctrine that holy servitude is the true freedom. In a letter ad Theodorum, he appeared very much alive to the advantage of the conversion of the great and influential. In a letter ad Venantium he urged that conversion consisted of "the hope of pardon and the acts of penitence, and such a hope of pardon as leads to penitence." Julius failed from being destitute of hope, while many perish now from being too confident of Divine mercy, and thus fail from never performing a true penitence. There was an extensive correspondence on matters relating to charity, the conjugal debt and the like, which simply accord with the current matters of the monastery. These efforts of his pen have been preserved.

In the year 523 Thrasimund died, having before his death called on his successor, Hilderic, to swear that on his accession he would carry out to the full the policy already inaugurated against the professors of the Homousian (Catholic) Faith. Hilderic, with his more orthodox sympathies, had not acquired an adequate sense of the prime virtue of truth, for he considered that his oath would not be violated, if, before his accession, and before Thrasimund's breath was out of his body, he should prepare the way for the return of the Catholic bishops, and the election of new ones in the churches still vacant. On the death of Thrasimund, the bishops were received at Carthage with transport. They were received with greater enthusiasm than was Fulgentius, who was honoured with extraordinary demonstrations of welcome. Triumphal arches, lamps, torches, banners, accompanied his entire journey to his humble bishopric. On arriving at Ruspe, he yielded in the monastic entire deference to Felix, took the position of the humble neophyte, and made no suggestion except that of more vigorous work for the cleric, more frequent fasting for the monks. In the year 524 a council was held at Juncensis (Cellier, Vie de S. F. xi. 9, and Hist. des Conciles, xi. 925, where it is especially characterized by the formula, "Ci." The object of which would seem to have been the enforcement of a more rigid attention to the canons. At this council, Fulgentius was called to preside. His precedence was disputed by a bishop who was called Quodvultdeus, on the ground that he was not even a presbyter. After the council, Fulgentius besought out of charity that his brethren would transfer this nominal precedence to his rival, thus heaping coals of fire on the head of an antagonist. The power of Fulgentius over the heart and conscience must have been very great. Even the primate of Carthage, Boniface, at his approach, put his hand to the establishment of a new church, and wept tears of joy under his powerful discourse. It was during this period of his life that Fulgentius wrote his great work against Fabianus, fragments only of which remain. Even the fragments are more abundant than many of his finished writings. The manuscripts containing them were deposited in the monastery, and by them resting problems bearing on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit and on other elements of Trinitarian doctrine. The Sermones, which remain to attest the power of Fulgentius, are of very different character, and, from his flowing eloquence and biting style and tender sensibility, may easily be credited with the power of securing. The most noteworthy libri which remain to be noticed are those which were addressed to Scarcilas and to Ferrandus the deacon; and one which discussed the Sermo Fastidiosi—the work of an Arius who seems to have roused the plauda spirit of Fulgentius into unusual storm; and there may be added the Libellus de Triudate ad Felicem Notariatum. The first of these was occasioned by a letter from Scarcilas to Fulgentius (preserved in Migne, Epist. x. p. 577), which brought from Fulgentius a reply—a libri: De Incarnazione Fili Divi de mutatione animation Aurem. Scarcilas had been troubled by the question whether the whole Trinity had not been incarnate in Christ, and whether God could have been the author of carnivorous, predatory, and venomous beasts. Fulgentius powerfully discriminates between the Son and the Trinity, and
Fulgentius of Ruspe

clearly involves himself in the double procession of the Holy Spirit. He claims the Father to have created by the Son everything, every fly and scorpion and tiger. Men are only wounded by the poison and malice of these creatures by reason of their sins. The mightiest beings are submitted to man. There is no evil in nature. In addition, he draws weighty distinctions between the sins of the just and the wicked.

Ferrandus [Fulgentius Ferrandus] the des- con wrote a most abject and obsequious letter to Fulgentius, asking for advice (Ep. xi. Migne) on the puzzling question whether he might count upon the salvation of an Ethiopian, who had come up to the church, as a catechumen eagerly desiring baptism. He had been instructed and prepared for the ordinance, but was taken too ill to respond to the questions put to him at the moment of baptism. He passed into a state of unconsciousness and died. Since he received the sacrament in this unconscious state, is he saved? If the question be answered in the affirmative, Fulgentius was forced to submit this question to the holy bishop's judgment. The baptism of a catechumen, known to be dead at the time of the ceremonial, and would he do so with a similar hope? Ferrandus argued his first case with great ingenuity, basing it on the practice of infant baptism, and he concluded his inquiry by seeking from Fulgentius advice as to the admission of converts to communion in the Eucharist after baptism, supposing death to have intervened. The answers of Fulgentius to Ferrandus reveal, with much vividness, the character of the man, his sacramental doctrine, and the blending with his ecclesiastical theo- bles some powerful elements of common sense. His reply starts with the thesis that faith is the indispensable condition of salvation, baptism or no baptism. Unbaptized heretics will be condemned, and heretics and enemies of the church will not be saved by their baptism. The Ethiopian gave credible evidence of faith, and was baptized, both conditions being indi- pendent. He is the same sinner as before. But he repartes baptism of the really dead, on the ground that baptism removes the stain and curse of original sin. The seat of this sin is the soul. If the soul is severed from the body, baptism is worthless. He decided that the benefits of the Eucharist are contained in baptism, and hence, he says, for many centuries past, infants are not fed with the Eucharist after their baptism. Ferrandus also beset Fulgentius with five other questions, to which he replied in Ep. xiii. with much ingenuity.

An interesting correspondence appears to have passed between Fastidius, an Arian priest, and several of the friends of Fulgentius and himself, on some of the principal questions at issue in the Arian controversy. The Sermon of Fastidiousus is given in Migne, p. 375. The main point of it is that the Son is fœcundus, creatus, fundatus, that the Homousians, who assert that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are inseparable, cannot hold this opinion, and that the unity of the Son is to be found in the flesh, etc. He argued his points with some acuteness and bombast, and when Victor asked for Fulgentius's judgment on the Sermon, Fulgentius replied with unusual acrimony of language and personal denunciation of the character of

the apostate priest. His great point is that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are meant wherever the word "God" is used. The One God fills all space and time, and the elements of the Trinity cannot be divided. The Wisdom, Love, and Power of God cannot be separated. As born of God, the Christ is equal to the Father, as sharing in humanity and born of a human mother, he is less than the Father is, naturæ et factum. He maintained the eternal generation of the Son, but also the co-operation of the undivided Trinity in the creation of the humanity of the Christ. He declared that the charge of Ferrandus against the Homousians is only compatible with the Sabellian hypothesis, which probably Ferrandus would at once have endorsed, but Fulgentius argued that the personality of the Son is that around which humanity, not transfigured or changed, is taken up. The sufferings and all the other incidents of the Incarnation were not endured substantialiter, but personaliter. The Divine nature of the Only-begotten God remained impassible while the flesh was crucified and buried. The这事 is the suffering of a person, but quæ naturæ, it was the experience of his flesh only. His soul and body were separated at death. His soul went into Hades, his body to the grave, but His Divine nature at that very moment filled all space and time, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Many of the same statements are repeated by Fulgentius in the Letter Addressed to the Monks of Skyhia, who accepted all the decisions of Chalcedon, who anathematized Pelagius, Julian, and even Faustus, and asked for further light. These four monks were, Peter the deacon, John, a monk, Leonius, a monk, and another John, a reader. The reply of Fulgentius and fifteen other bishops consists of sixty-seven chapters. The points of chief interest are that Fulgentius denied that the Virgin was conceived immacu- late, and also that when speaking of the eternal generation of the Son, he used the naturalis expression, ex utero Patris. In this work he laid the strongest emphasis on the Neoplatonic hypothesis of regeneration, and he weakened the universalism of numerous expressions of God's love by declaring that "all" does not mean "all men," but "all kinds of men." The reconciliation of all things to Himself, necessitates a limitation of the all, or else lands one in the admission of the ultimate reconciliation of the devil and his angels. Fulgentius made a belief in predestination to be necessary to salvation. Unless a man believes it, he cannot belong to the elect.

In the work addressed to Felix, a notary, he reiterated his view of the doctrine of the Trinity, and added a dissertation on angels and men, antedating a later speculation found in Athanasius, that the human race was created to fill up the places of the fallen angels. While Fulgentius was thus pursuing his literary work with such remarkable industry, he retired from his monastery at Ruspe to another on the neighbouring island of Circeo, and redoubled his labours and meditations, until health gave way. When told that it was absolutely necessary, to prolong his life, for him to have the comfort of a bath, he obstinately refused it, preferring not to break his rule. He died in January, 538, in the sixty-fifth year of
Fulgensius Ferrandus, a disciple and companion of Fulgentius of Ruspe (3); sharing his exile to Saragossa when the Catholic bishops were removed from their sees during the persecution by the Arian kings of the Vandals. Ferrandus received the hospitality and spiritual care of Sts. Agapitus and Epiphanius and was near to the death of Thrasimund, A.D. 553, returned to Carthage, where he became deacon of the church. In all probability, he was the author of the Vita Fulgentii prefixed to the works of the latter, and dedicated to Felicianus. (Hofmann, Lex. s. a.; Herzog, Encycl. art. by Wagemann; Petrus Pithaeus, in preface Lec-
tori, prefixed to Breviscio Canonum Ferrandi, Col. Canonum, p. 303. Wiggers, Augustinismus und Paganismus, ii. Theil, p. 370.)

Two letters of Ferrandus to Fulgentius are extant (Migne, Patro. lxxvi. pp. 578-455), with the lengthy and careful replies of the latter. [FULGENTIUS (3.)] The form of these letters asked for advice on the question, whether the baptism of a dying, unconscious catechumen was lawful; and if so, whether the baptism of a corpse was also justified. The second letter concerned the most intricate questions:—1. Of the Separability of the Persons of the Trinity, since the Trinity itself is inseparable in will, nature, and work. (Wiggers, 1. c. p. 373.)

2. Whether the Divinity of the Christ suffered on the Cross, or whether the Divine Person suffered only in the flesh. The fifth question concerned the double gift of the cup to the Apostles, as mentioned in St. Luke's gospel. Ferrandus was not only an interrogator, but was often appealed to for his own theological judgment. Among his extant letters may be enumerated those to Antonius, deacon of the church in Rome; to the Comes Regnus, and to Severus Scholasticus. (Baronius, ann. 559, 9.) In his collected writings (Bibliotheca Patrum, Chillett, 1649) some other treatises are preserved, such as one entitled, De Duabus in Christo naturis, and an Epistola Anicita de quaeions an aleptic ex Trinitate pascua est. Baronius (ann. 553, 18) refers this letter to an early period in his career. He charges it with prolixity. It is interesting to see how closely Ferrandus here follows the lead of Fulgentius, by declaring that though one person of the Trinity suffered, it was only in curse. The Comes Regnus, in the first place, asked Fulgentius, and after his death he asked Ferrandus for special instruction on the legitimacy or otherwise of military service, which led to the completion of the fragment of Fulgentius, and to the composition of an ethical discourse, De septem regulis innocentiae, charged with practical rules, rules of life, seven rules:—I. Gratia Dei adutorium tibi necessarium per singulos actus crede. II. Vita tua spectum sit ubi multibus tuis vecund quid agere debent. III. Non praeeete appatens, sed psodoes. IV. Dilige rempublicam sicut te ipsum. V. Humanis divina praeponi. VI. Noli esse multis judegyt invenisse, sed in uno. Memento te esse Christianum. Ferrandus also edited and completed another work which Fulgentius at his death left incomplete. One on the later Eutychian doctrine of the incorruptibility of the Body of Christ from and after His birth (aphtharto-
docism). Ferrandus was impelled to both these efforts by the Comes Regnus, who had previously asked Fulgentius himself to solve these philosophical and ethical problems for him. Ferrandus is also the author of a Breviscio canomum ccelestiaeorum. (Codex Canummen, V. Pithaeus, and Miscellanea Eclecticis, Petrus Pithaeus, p. 369) A collection and digest of 232 canons arranged by quarry and according to Laodicen, Sariscia, Constantinople, Carthage, &c. chiefly appertaining to the election, ordination, and character of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, as well as a variety of details concerning the feasts of the church, the duties of clerics, virgins, catechumens, &c. From the mention of certain canons and councils by Fer-
randus, it is argued that it must have been compiled during the reign of Anastasius, who died in 518. He appears to have had access to a knowledge of the Greek councils through a translation and digest of such canons as had been previously in use in Spain. The mention of later synods and writings has led others to believe that the Breviscio was compiled at or about A.D. 547. (CANNON-LAW, DICT. CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.) Ferrandus took a not unim-
portant part in the violent discussions produced by the edict of Justinian I., which goes by the name of Constitutio Trias (περὶ τριῶν καθηματῶν), in which that emperor who was ambitious of securing for himself a place among great ortho-
dox and successful theologians, had endeavoured to conciliate and win the Monophysite leaders over to the orthodox and Catholic church by pronouncing a condemnation on certain passages from the writings of Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Isaac of Edessa, which the venu-
FULGENTIUS, bishop of Astigi (Ecija) in the first quarter of the 7th century. He was the brother of Leander, Florentius, and Isidore, and is mentioned in connexion with all three. His name occurs five times in contemporary or quasi-contemporary documents, i.e.—

(1) In the last chapter of Leander's Libellus ad Florentinam (Holstenius, ed. Brockie, Cod. Reg. i. 405), where his name is mentioned in a passage which has perplexed many critics. In the first part of the chapter Leander exhorts Florentine to hold fast her profession, and not to think of going back to her native country ad "genital solum.... ubi si te Deus habitare voluisset non te indutur ejiceret." Their mother, Leander declares, had often said to him that even if she could go back she would not, "ut etiam diu viventer patriam illam non reviseret." Thou therefore, says Florentina, beware of what thy mother feared, and the evil from which she had experienced it fed, do thou prudently avoid." "Alas!" he continues, "unhappy me! I grieve because I have sent thither our common brother Fulgentius, and I dread the dangers he may encounter there with a never-ceasing fear. He will be safer, however, if thou, in absence and security will pray for him." This passage, which Floroz professes himself unable to understand (Esp. Sagr. x. 88), and which puzzled the clear head of Nicholas Antonii (Bibl. Vet. lib. 3, cap. 1, 3), is connected with the general question of the native place, parentage, and early history of this famous family, a question we propose to touch upon under the head of its most illustrious member, Isidore of Seville. It will be sufficient to remark in this place that the danger incurred by Fulgentius in returning to his native place at the bidding of Leander — possibly on some family business — is a warning to us against the explanation of older writers, a spiritual danger to his faith from contact with Arianism, but is to be explained in all probability by the very plausible hypothesis that the family came originally from territory which after A.D. 554 fell into the hands of the Byzantine troops, rashly summoned into the country by the pretender Aethagund, and the last remnants of which were not recovered by the Goths till about the year 624 (Isidore, Hist. Goth. ann. 554; Dahn, König der Germanen, v. 124). Leander, therefore, is speaking of the physical risks run by one who ventures into an enemy's country, though no doubt the elder brother, Baccarecch's all-powerful minister and adviser (Leandri), would have known how, in some measure at least, to protect the younger in the fulfillment of his task whatever it may have been. At any rate, Fulgentius returned safely, was made bishop of Astigi (Ecija) in the province of Seville, probably by the influence of Leander, and if so before the year 600 (in which Leander died), and is next met with—

(2) In connexion with the doubtful Decretum Gundemerari, 610 (Gunthamar), when his signature as Episcopus Asiligitanus Sedis appears, together with that of his brother and metropolitan Isidore, Leander's successor.
FULIBURS

(3) Among the bishops of the second council of Seville, held in 619, which was a synod of the province of Baetica, and at which Isidore presided, as metropolitan, Fulfidus was almost certainly one of his bishops. In two letters addressed to Isidore, which are preserved to us, Fulfidus speaks of his respectful submission to the authority of his prelate, and of the care he took in the instruction of his clergy.

(4) In Æneas's life of Isidore, where among the list of Isidore's works we find Ad Germanum et servum Fulgentium Episcopum epistolam Officiorum libris duo, and lastly—

(5) In Isidore's own preface to the De Exst. Off. addressed to "domino meo et Dei servo Fulgentio episcopo." Fulgentius had asked him, says Isidore, for a short account of the origin and authors of the church offices. "Haeque ut voluisti libellum de origine officiorum misi."

For an account of the supposed translation of the bodies of Fulgentius and Florentina to a safe place in the mountains of Guadalupe, near Berzocana in the 8th century, of the invention of the bones under Alfonso XI. (circa a.d. 1330) and of a transference of a part of the relics to Carthagena in 1592 by order of Philip II., see Exp. Sagr. x. 105. In the same year (p. 90) Floreze exposes the confusion with Fulgentius, which began with the name of a false Lucas of Tolentino, in the 13th century, and led later to the elevation of Fulgentius to the honour of doctor of the church on the strength of works written by his namesake. The pseudo-chroni-
clers have been very busy with Fulgentius. For an example of their work see the Acta de Ros, given in Xamay de Salazar, Martyr. Ripa. p. 155. The Bollandists, adapted from that by Quin-
tandueñas, shews many traces of their influence. (A.A. SS. Jan. i. 971; Exp. Sagr. x. 89; Aguirre-
Catalán, ii. 324, 355.) [M. A. W.]

FULIBURS, the name given to the third abbot of Bath. (Mon. Angl. i. 206.) [S.]

FULLANUS (1) (FULLARIUS), bishop of Lavae, perhaps c. 400. There is a tradition that he suffered martyrdom in Germany with St. Ursula and her nuns, but his very existence is doubtful. (Ugolioli, Not. Sac. i. 344; Cap-
pelle, Chiese d'Ital. xv. 497.) [R. S. G.]

FULLANUS (2) (FAELAN, FOILANUS), a brother of St. Fursey, to whom he committed his monastery at Cuoharebes in East Anglia, when he determined to become an anchorite. (Bede, H. E. iii. 19.) After the death of Fursey he is said to have gone with his brother Uldan into Brabant, and to have founded the monastery of Foise, in the diocese of Cambrey, leaving this monastery in the care of Fursey. After the death of Uldan he went to Nilelles, where he lived for some time under the rule of St. Gertrude. Whilst on his way to visit his brother at Foise, he was killed in the forest of Stognies by an assassin, about the year 656, and buried at Foise, where under the name of Fullanus he was commemorated on Oct. 31. (Mabillon, Acta SS. O. S. E. sac. ii. p. 295.) Capgrave (vol. 149) gives a life of Foilanus, in which this story is preserved with additions and corrections. Foilanus is there called Eulfan, and his story is desig-
ned as having pontifical honors, but no explanation of the term is given. It is also said that before setting out on his last journey he gave exact directions for his burial; his speech before his death is given at length, and we are told that his body, and those of his companions, were hidden in the wood. Gertrude, wondering at his long absence, sent to Ulanus to inquire about him; Ulanus replied that he had had a vision of a snow-white dove ascending to heaven. After three days' fast Gertrude set out to seek the bodies, which she discovered by a miraculous sign seventy-eight days after the murder, Jan. 16. Grimold, the mayor of the palace, and Dido, bishop of Poitiers, were at the funeral. Other lives of Fullanus are mentioned by Sir T. D. Hardy in the Cat. Mat. i. 254. [S.]

FULRADUS (1) (FULRADUS, FULREDUS), 14th abbot of St. Denys at Paris, principal chaplain to Pippin and Charles the Great, and archbishop of France. He was the son of wealthy parents in Alsace, named Ricolius and Ermengarde. He was already abbot in A.D. 750, and for many years afterwards was entrusted by kings and popes with missions of the highest confidence and importance. In A.D. 751 he and Burchard, bishop of Würzburg, went on that embassy from the Franks to the pope Zaccharias, which began with a mission to the well-known message, "That it were better that he who had the power should have the name," and which resulted in the deposition of the shadowy Merovingian kings by papal authority, and the election and coronation of Pippin at Soissons. A little later, St. Boniface of Mainz sought his aid. The letter still remains in which Boniface, appealing to his proved friendship, begs him to use his influence with Pippin for his scattered missionaries on the frontiers of paganism, and the little monastery school he has founded, that when his own super-
vision shall be withdrawn by the death which he feels approaching, they may not be scattered and abandoned to destruction (Patr. Lat. lxxix. 779). In 754 another mission took Fulradus to Italy. Pippin in a victorious campaign had imposed terms of submission upon Astulfus king of the Lombards, and Fulradus was now deputed to escort pope Stephen back to the holy see with a retinue of Franks. But scarcely had the king crossed the Alps on his return, when Astulfus repudiated his engagements and marched on Rome. Fulradus was the messenger whom Stephen selected to bear the letter sum-
moning Pippin and his Franks to the rescue in the name of St. Peter; and at the prosperous close of the second campaign it was he who was com-
misioned to restore the usurped cities to their allegiance to Rome, which he accomplished by offering the keys of twenty-two towns with Pippin's deed of gift at the shrine of St. Peter. The pope was, not unnaturally, well disposed to the abbey and its monastery, more especially as much of his exile had been spent there. It was there in fact that he saw, in his illness, the vision in which, as he relates, St. Peter, accompanied by St. Denys himself, had promised him a happy restoration to the holy see (Patr. Lat. lxxix. 1022). Accordingly in 737 Stephen granted to Fulradus's abbey the almost unique privilege of having daily mass celebrated by bishops, abbots, and monks and consecrated by the bishops of the country, to govern their monastery and the dependent foundations of Fulradus, which were under the protection of the holy see (Patr. Lat. lxxix. 1015). This concession was confirmed by pope Adrian in 786, after Fulradus's death.
FULRADUS (xvi. 1211; cf. Fleury, Hist. Eccles. lib. xlix. tom. ix. pp. 504-5, for the functions of these benefices and the absence of the abbots of St. Denis from the list for 1024, a fact which has led historians to suppose that the charter of Imperial privilege of 1013 was a forgery). By the time of his death he had given a hospital and house at Rome (Patr. lxxix. 1013). By the emperor he permitted him the privilege of wearing a certain shoe made by Italian abbots in the 10th century. [Ibid. lxxix. 1017]; and by another he conferred the right to use six decans of St. Denis and wearing the dalmatic, the use of which seems to have been a privilege of the Roman clergy (ibid. lxxx. 1018). Nor were the kings more backward, as is testified by the great number of charters of Pippin, Carloman and Charles the Great, alluded to in the Gallia Christiana (vii. 343) many of which are to be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. tom. lxxx. and xcvii. Among the Fœcere Justiciables in Félibien's Histoire de l'Abbaye royale de St. Denis, Fulradus's name is also introduced into the fabulous vision of Eucherius of Orleans respecting Charles Martel in hell. He and Boniface were the supposed witnesses to whom Eucherius showed the empty tomb of Christ, the risen dragon and the marks of fire (see the epistle to Louis, grandson of Charles the Great, from the bishops at the council of Kloery in Bouquet, iii. 659, and Enhardi Fuld, Annales, Persz. i. 345). In 777 Fulradus published his will (Acta SS. Ord. S. Benet. sec. iii. pt. ii. p. 341, Paris, 1688-1701), in which he disposed of his property, declaring that he was buried at St. Denis, but was afterwards translated to the monastery of Leberaw, in Alsace, his own gift to St. Denis. But he wrote an epitaph on him, which still remains (ibid. p. 339).


FULRADUS (2), abbot of the monastery of Altahense in Bavaria (St. Maurice at Nieder Altaich on the Bogen Bach, an affluent of the Danube). The emperor Charles the Great addressed him a letter published by Bernard Perz, and also by Migne, Patr. Lat. xxviii. 935. The abbot is directed to appear by the 20th of June at Starnsburg with a band, armed and equipped, to join in a campaign against the Saxons. The letter contains minute directions as to the weapons and tools to be provided and his conduct on the march. [S. A. B.]

FUNDANUS (Fundanus), rhetorician of Carthage, shortly before the time of St. Augustine of Hippo. He accidentally became blind in one eye, and the fact of his having had two sons after this occurrence, one seeing with only one eye, and the other with two, is used by St. Augustine as an illustration against the Pelagian Julian; but the son who had by nature what the father had by accident, and the other had more than the father himself at the time had to transmit. (S. Augustin. contra Jul. Pel. c. 6, ap. Migne, Patr. Lat. xlvii. 832; Ceillier, Auteurs sacrés, ix. 508.) [J. G.]

FURIA (Fundanus (1)) MINUCIUS, proseal of Asia in the reign of Hadrian. He received the Imperial investiture of the provinces of his favour as being extend. By the pope he came to be at Rome (Patr. lxxx. 1013). By another he permitted him the privilege of wearing a certain shoe used by Italian abbots when he officiated at the mass (ibid. lxxx. 1017); and by another he conferred the right upon six decans of St. Denis of wearing the dalmatic, the use of which seems to have been a privilege of the Roman clergy (ibid. lxxx. 1018). Nor were the kings more backward, as is testified by the great number of charters of Pippin, Carloman and Charles the Great, alluded to in the Gallia Christiana (vii. 343) many of which are to be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. tom. lxxx. and xcvii. Among the Fœcere Justiciables in Félibien's Histoire de l'Abbaye royale de St. Denis, Fulradus's name is also introduced into the fabulous vision of Eucherius of Orleans respecting Charles Martel in hell. He and Boniface were the supposed witnesses to whom Eucherius showed the empty tomb of Christ, the risen dragon and the marks of fire (see the epistle to Louis, grandson of Charles the Great, from the bishops at the council of Kloery in Bouquet, iii. 659, and Enhardi Fuld, Annales, Persz. i. 345). In 777 Fulradus published his will (Acta SS. Ord. S. Benet. sec. iii. pt. ii. p. 341, Paris, 1688-1701), in which he disposed of his property, declaring that he was buried at St. Denis, but was afterwards translated to the monastery of Leberaw, in Alsace, his own gift to St. Denis. But he wrote an epitaph on him, which still remains (ibid. p. 339).


FURIA, a Roman lady, friend of St. Jerome, and known to us through his works, especially through a letter (Ep. 54, ed. Vall.) which he wrote to her (De Vindicatum saevo). She was of the race of Camillus. Her father was of patrician and consular rank, and she was possessed of a large fortune. Her mother, Tatiana, imbued her in early life with ascetic views, but she seems to have hesitated between these and the ordinary life of the world. She married a son of Probus, who had held the consulate, and her brother was the husband of Bessilia, the daughter of Paula and sister of Eustochium. Her husband died early, leaving her with a family of young sons; her mother also was dead, and her father old and infirm, at the time that Jerome wrote to her (A.D. 394). The year before she had projected a splendid but undesirable second marriage, and her friends at Bethlehem were cast down at hearing of her luxurious life and of the worldly society which she frequented. But she determined to put an end to all this aside and to live as a widow, and wrote to Jerome, with whom she had probably been acquainted ten years before at Rome, for counsel as to the regulation of her life. His reply is a pendant to his famous letter to Eustochium (Ep. xxiii. ed. Vall. De Virginitate). His description of the evil to which she was about to be exposed, the jealousy of young widows who were known to be likely to marry again, of the flattery of nurses and slaves, of the subserviency of the clergy, are amongst his most vivid pictures of Roman society. He gives Furia a scheme of an ascetic and charitable life.
and commends her to the pastoral care of Exsnu-
perius, who was then living at Rome, but was
afterwards bishop of Toulouse. [W. H. F.]

FURSEUS (1), abbot of Lagny and patron of
Peronne, Jan. 16. Belonging to the next
generation after Columbanus, and following in
the same track of missionary enterprise from the
shores of Britain, St. Fursey has left an indelible
mark upon the church of France, and upon the
speculative conceptions of popular religion of
later ages. His visions gave a distinct impulse to
the developing and fixing of the mediæval
belief with regard to the condition of the departed,
and have afforded, at least in part, the basis of
probably the most sublime and best-known poeti-
cal production of the later middle age, Dante's
La Divina Commedia. With those of Drychestel
(Bede, Eccl. Hist. v. 12) they form a well-defined
landmark in the evolution of Christian teaching,
as showing how theological speculation was
taking shape in the seventh century, from the
few and mysterious unveilings of inspiration to
the more systematic and theological systematiza-
tion at the time of the Reformation. They are
important as indicating the current of theo-
logical and dogmatic thought, which was shaping
the doctrine and discipline of the church in the
following centuries, and thus have a value and
significance far beyond their own individual
value.

For the life of St. Fursey there is abundant
material, showing the hold he has taken upon
the Christian imagination. The primary
authority is Bede (Eccl. Hist. iii. 19), who pro-
iously quoted from a "libellus vitae ejus," probably
written about A.D. 670 or 675, or at
least soon after the death of St. Fursey.
This is supposed to be the tract edited by
Surius (De Prob. Sanct. Vit. i. 259-263), and
given, with the addition of miracles, by the
Bollandists, Colgan, and Mabillon, but collated
with other MSS. Many foreign writers have
treated of St. Fursey, of whom O'Mahlon (Irish
Soc. Hist. 1911, p 48) is the most note-
able of the Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. 16, tom. ii. 35) give two lives.
Hardy (Desc. Cat. i. pt. i. 239-246, pt. ii. 794,
795) presents all the MS. authorities, with
notices of the several lives. The Benedictines
(in Hist. Lit. de la France, t. iii. 616-615) have
given a very useful résumé of his life and the
foreign authorities.

St. Fursey was of noble birth, his father being
Fintan, son of Finlog, a regulus in South
Munster, and his mother Gelges, daughter of
Aedh Finn, a prince in Connaught. The year
and place of his birth are uncertain, but his
education seems to have been at the monastery
of Inchaquin, on Lough Corrith, under Meldan.
His first foundation was at Rathmoy, now
probably Killursa, on the east side of the lough,
and there he formed a school or religious retreat,
and it may be his church which now stands in
ruins at Killursa. He then went to Munster
to deepen religion among his own relations, and
it is then, according to his Vita, that his visions
or ecstatic dreams are said to have been given
him during a period of extreme sickness. They
evidently are the workings of a mind of peculiar
spiritual sensitiveness, the imagination dwelling
upon the current form of theological thought and
moulding it into the clear outline of a divine
inspiration. They, no doubt, owe something to
the methodizing of the scribe and the spiritual
application of the homilist; yet, after all, they
present a wonderful picture of early Christian
teaching. Bede seems to give a brief summary,
or rather only one scene. Desmuy, in his Life of Fursey (Paris, 1607), devotes three
chapters to describing the falling into the
ecstatic state, the visions of heaven and of the
torments in Gehenna, while the old life carries him
first through Gehenna with all its torments and
Satanic blasphemies, to the bright abodes of the
blessed, where he meets St. Beocan or Beodan
and his old master, St. Meldan. Unlike the vision of
Drychestel, the fires do not seem to be in any sense
purgatorial, but, like it, the whole tale was used
for a homiletic purpose, warning against and
suggesting remedies for special sins, and proposing
charity as the surest path to eternal blessedness.

After preaching in Ireland for some time (ten
or twelve years seem too long), St. Fursey left
Ireland, and was kindly received by king Sige-
bert of the East Angles, with whose consent he built
his cell in the castle of the bishop of Beccles
in the county of Suffolk. Smith assigns this to
the year 633 (Mon. Hist. Brit. i. 190, n. 1). At
Cobhernessburg he lived as an anchorite, his
monastery being assigned to the charge of the
two priests Gobban and Dicul. But when Penda
king of the Mercians, the scourge of the
country and church, brought calamity and
ruin, the retreat of the saint, he sought refuge
with Gaul with his brothers Faeland [FULLANUS]
and Utaan, and receiving land from Erchinoald,
mayor under Clovis II., built the monastery of
Lagny, " Latinicum coenobium," near the
Marne, six leagues from Paris. The date of this
is much disputed; Smith accepts Mabillon's,
Baronius's and Fleury's date of A.D. 644, but
others think this too early, and Colgan prefers
A.D. 648 or 649. In Desmuy's life there is a
long account of Fursey's progress to Rome, his
reception there by pope Martin I. (A.D. 649-55)
and his return through the kingdom of Aus-
tリア, his marvelous experience by king Inchaquin,
and his miracles, but this part is very doubtful,
and may be traced to his connexion with Sige-
bert of the East Angles. At the court of Clovis
he was very favourably received through the
influence of Erchinoald. The fame of Lagny
spread over the sea to Ireland, attracting others
from its shores. Erchinoald continued to be St.
Fursey's liberal patron to the last, and near his
residence at Peronne two religious houses were
built; Baldechildis or Balside the queen was
also very favourable to him. But before his
death St. Fursey wished to revisit some of the
churches he had founded, and leaving Emilian or
Eloquius in charge of Lagny, got as far north
as Macerius or Masarellis, where on his first
arrival in France he had secured the friendship
of duke Haimo. Here he was taken ill and died.
His body was brought to Peronne and buried in
the new church upon Mont Cigues; four years
after it was translated by Eligius bishop of
Noyon and Gutherus his abbot in the church of
Camerliso, and a chapel built for it on the east side of the altar
of the same church, and the place became a
favourite resort of pilgrims from all parts of
Gaul and Britain. The date of his death is un-
certain, authorities varying from A.D. 630 to A.D.
660; he died probably about the year 650. His
chief feast is Jan. 16, but he is also commemorated on Feb. 6, 9, 25, March 4, July 14, Sept. 17, 28, Dec. 26. At the first-named day he has a place in all the kalendars, and shews a wide extent of popular favour, but Dempster's ascription to him of De Vita Monastica, lib. i., is not to be accepted; Harris (W. Fr. Writ. i. c. 4) attributes to him a prophecy, and in Trim. Coll. Library, Dublin (MS. H. 11, Nos. 6–7), some poems and a litany, said to have been composed by him, are preserved.

(2) (FUSCA, FUSAEUS, FUSSEY) Of Assylia, near Boyle, co. Roscommon, died A.D. 753. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 351, A.D. 748; Ann. Ult. 752.)


[F. G.

FUSCANA, Feb. 13, virgin and martyr at Ravenna under the emperor Decius, A.D. 250. She suffered with her nurse Maura, and by command of the president Quintianus. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.; Petrus de Nat. Cattal. SS. lib. iii. c. 119.)

[G. T. S.

FUSCIANUS (1), the praefectus urbi who condemned Callistus to be scourged and sent to the mines of Sardinia (Hippol. Ref. Haer. ix. 15, p. 287). Tertullian (Ad Nat. i. 16) tells a story of a remarkable case tried before the same prefect. Capitolinus (Per. 4) contrasts the severity of Fuscianus as a magistrate with the mildness of Pertinax, his successor. It is possible that the same influence which obtained the release of the Christian prisoners in Sardinia obtained also the disgrace of the magistrate who had condemned them; and if Marcia had any share in the appointment of Pertinax it is the more intelligible why she and her advisers should have turned to him on the death of Commodus. The date of the trial of Callistus is limited in one direction by the consideration that in the interval of seven years between the death of Perennis and that of Commodus, Pertinax filled successively the offices of consular legate of Britain, superintendent of the imperial charitable foundations, proconsul of Africa and city prefect, so that it seems improbable that his tenure of the last office could have been longer than a couple of years. Hence we conclude that Fuscianus did not go out of office earlier than A.D. 190 or 191. Bunsen inferred from his having had his second consulship in 188 that his appointment to the office of city prefect must have been later; but the opposite inference is more probable. A first consulship no doubt must have preceded the appointment, but a second consulship was a special honour, rather more likely to have followed it; for there seems reason to think that it was then usual to give it to the city prefect on the earliest opportunity, if he had not had it already. For many years before and after Fuscianus every one whom we have been to have been city prefect, appears also as having a second consulship at what may well have been the same time. Victorinus was prefect (perhaps immediately) before Fuscianus had his second consulship in 183, Pertinax, his successor, in 192. The next prefect, Sulpicius, entering on office immediately after Jan. 1, could not be one of the ordinary consuls for 193, but he was one of the consules spectro.

We are not aware of the entrance of Fuscianus on office A.D. 187; and if we date the trial of Callistus 189, and his return 191, it will agree well enough with the statement of Hippolytus that Callistus was not long enough away to permit the delinquencies ascribed to him to be forgotten. Fuscianus appears to have held office again under Severus, A.D. 197. (Cod. Just. v. 54, 1.)

Clinton, following Pauvinius, describes this prefect as C. Allius Fuscianus, and these names, in fact, are found in three inscriptions (Gruter, 126; 786, 10; 1077), though not with any identification that the bearer held office. Two of these inscriptions belong to the years 149 and 186 respectively; the last would correspond to the date of the present Fuscianus; the other might be supposed to refer to his father, also a Caius. But we think that there is better reason for supposing the prefect to have been the Seius Fuscianus whom Capitolinus names together with Victorinus as having been friends and fellow students of Marcus Aurelius. Victorinus died as prefect some time after 185; therefore the chronology offers no difficulty to his having been succeeded by Fuscianus, who may have been a younger man. And Dion Cassius states (Ixxix. 4) that Fuscianus the prefect had a grandson named Seius Carus, who was put to death in the reign of Elagabalus. It must be owned however that historians do not give so favourable a view of the administration of Commodus, as would be indicated by his bestowing the most important magistracies successively on men of high character—his father's trusted friends; and that Dion in particular might have been expected (Ixxii. 4) to have named Fuscianus as an exception when he speaks of Commodus having put to death his father's friends.

FUSCIANUS (2), Dec. 11, martyr with Victorinus and Gentianus at Amiens in the Diocletian persecution. Rictorvarus the president, after inflicting various tortures, beheaded them, A.D. 304. (Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.; Petrus de Nat. catt. SS. lib. i. c. 57.)

[F. G.

FUSCINA, the sister of Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, a nun, to whom her brother's poem, "De consolatoria castitatis laude," is addressed.

[E. M. Y.


[H. W. P.


[T. E. H.]

FUSCULUS, Sept. 6, a bishop and confessor in Africa in the Vandal persecution. He was tortured by command of Huneric with four other bishops, Donatianus, Praesidius, Manseutus, and Germanus. These were all finally exiled, while another bishop named Laetus, a learned and brave man, was burned to death. (Mart. Rom. Vet., Antonius, Usuradi; Victor. Vet. lib. ii. sub finem.)

[G. T. S.

FUSCULUS, (Usuard. Mart., Hieran. Mart.,
FUSCUS, bishop and martyr at Orleans. [FLOSCULAS.] [C. H.]


FUSCUS, bishop of Thyatira in the province of Lydia, one of the sixty-eight bishops who signed the protest against opening the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, before the arrival of John of Antioch, in which subscription he is called probably by an error of the transcribers, bishop of Lydia (Baluz. Concil. p. 688; Synodicon. cap. 7.) Like many others, he joined the council when it was actually opened. (Mansi, iv. 1224; Le Quien, Oriens Christi. i. 878.) [L. D.]

FUTURUS (?) [PRIVATUS LAMBAMBIANTUS.] [E. W. B.]

FYLACRIUS (HILARIOUS), bishop of Novaria (Novara) c. A.D. 552-568. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia, iv. 447.) [R. S. G.]

FYNCANA, Irish saint. [FINCAN.] [J. G.]

FYNDOCHA (FYNDOCHA, FRUDOCHA), virgin, commemorated Oct. 13 in company with Fintana, is usually believed to have been one of the nine daughters of Donald, in the Glen of Ogrie, belonging to the 8th century. But Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 276), who ascribes to her pen de Vita Contemplativa Conventualibus, lib. i., places her in the sixth. Instead of our finding Fintana or Fintan associated with Fndochea, the latter is often found with Sitha, and hence Fndochea is identified with Oria, called also Manoita. She is also called by some Frudochea. Echt, Aberdeen, has Fndochea for patron (Brev. Aberd. Prop. SS. p. est. f. 129); a chapel of St. Fndochea was on the island of Inchaidh, and Inishail, in Lorne, was dedicated to her. (C. Innes, Orig. Par. Scot. ii. 129; Dp. Forbes, Kal. Scot. Saints, 352 et al.; Bollandists: Acta SS. Aug. 24, tom. iv. 399, giving her among their pretermissi, and Oct. 13, tom. vi. 223-3, treating of her in a long note.) [J. G.]

FYNTANUS. [FINTAN.] [J. G.]

GABHRAN, son of Dubhthach. [EUEHEL.]

GABERIN, GABRIN. [GAIBHEREN.]


GABRINUS (1) (GAVINUS)—May 30. Martyr, with Crispulus, under Hadrian, at Turres (Torres) in Sardinia. His relics were transferred to the Vatican by pope Gregory III. (Mart. Rom. Let., Hieron., Adon., Usuard., Notk.; Ferrarri Cat. SS.; Till. Mein. ii. 230, 587, v. 143.) [G. T. S.]

GABRINUS (2) (GAVINUS)—Oct. 25. Martyr at Torres in Sardinia in the Diocletian persecution. A priest Protus and a deacon Januarius, having been arrested and placed under his care, succeeded in converting him; whereupon he was baptized. He then allowed his prisoners to escape, for which he was executed. Hearing of his death, they gave themselves up, and were also put to death. The cathedral of Torre was dedicated under the name of St. Gabunius, May 4, 517. Tillemon considers the Gabunius of May 30 and that of Oct. 25 the same person. (Mart. Hieron.; Till. Mein. ii. 230, v. 145; Ferrarri, Cat. SS.) [G. T. S.]

GABRINUS (3)—Feb. 19. A presbyter, who was brother of Caius bishop of Rome, and father of a virgin and martyr named Susanna, about whom a number of romantic fables will be found in the Bollandist upon this day (Acta SS. Feb. iii. 61). Tillemon fixes upon 290 as date of her death and 293 as that of her birth. (Mart. Rom. Vet., Adon., Usuard., Notk.; Boll. Acta SS. Feb. iii. 128; Till. Mein. iv. 571, 572.) [G. T. S.]

GABRINUS (4) (GAVINUS) of Huesca (Ossa) signs the acts of the conversion council of 588. Antedius a deacon subscribes for him at the second council of Saragossa, 592 (Mansi, x. 472; Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 253, 690). [M. A. W.]

GABRINUS (5) (GAVINUS), bishop of Arcavi- ca from about A.D. 868 to about 893, signing the acts of the fifteenth and sixteenth councils of Toledo (Mansi, xii. 21, 84). He is the last bishop of Arcavica under the Gothic rule. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 315, 333; Esp. Negre, vii. 7.) [M. A. W.]

GABRINUS, a Donatist who returned to the communion of the church, but without undergoing re-baptism, an omission which Gau- dentius professed to blame greatly, but which was defended by St. Augustine, who also denied the insinuation of Gaudentius, that the change had been brought about by compulsion. (Aug. c. Gaud. i. 11, 12; 12, 13; 32, 43.) [GAU- DENTIUS (7).] [H. W. P.]

GABRIL, (1), in the Gnostic systems. In the system of JUSTINUS the name of one of the paternal angels (Hippol. v. 26, p. 151). In an Ophite system the name of one of the seven demons (Orig. Adv. Cels. vi. 30). St. Luke's account of Gabriel's connexion with the Annunciation is recognised by MARCUS (Iren. i. 15, p. 77). In Pistis Sophia (p. 12) it is Jesus Himself who takes the form of Gabriel (described as ἐν οἴδανω αἰώνω), and is supposed by the Archons of the Aeons to be Gabriel. In this form He introduces into the womb of Mary certain heavenly powers, which are to constitute the Saviour's body and soul. In like manner Elizabeth had received an inferior heavenly power as well as the soul of Elias to animate John the Baptist; and the mothers of the twelve apostles each receive a still lower heavenly power which takes the place of the soul, that otherwise would have
come from the peace of the Archons; so that when the apostles are born no such soul is found in them. This is what is meant by our Lord's words, "Ye are not of this world, even as I am not of this world."

G. S.

GABRIEL (2), presbyter, abbot of St. Stephen's, near Jerusalem. His memoir by the Hollander (Acta SS. 26 Jan. ii. 731–2), is extracted from their Vita S. Euthymii by Cyril of Scythopolis (20 Jan. i. 302–328). He was a eunuch, and with his elder brothers, Cosmas and Chrysippus, men of Syria, but educated in Cappadocia, presented themselves to Euthymius, and continued with him in his laura till called from it by the empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II., about a.D. 458, who had them made priests and presented them with monasteries. Gabriel became abbot of St. Stephen's in the beginning of 460, and died there about 490, in the 86th year of his age.

J. G.

GABRIEL (3), bishop of Seville, in the episcopal catalogue of Seville preserved in the Codex Emilianensis. (Esp. Sagra. iii. App. xxxii.) His place in the catalogues suits the end of the 7th century, and he seems to have succeeded Faustinus who was transferred from Braga to Seville in 693. (Esp. Sagra. i. 228.)

M. A. W.

GACHISOINDA, queen. [GAULISIINDA.]

GADINUS, bishop of Lyons. [GODWINUS.]

GADISCALDUS, bishop of Huesca. The abbat Andebertus represents him at the 13th council of Toledo a.d. 683. (Aquilea-Catalani, iv. 28.)

M. A. W.

GAIDHEAL (GOHID, ANN. ULT. A.D. 775.), abbot of Clonard, co. Meath, died a.d. 776. (Four Murr. A.D. 771.)

J. G.

GAFFÉ, abbess of Gloucester. [GAFFA (2)].

GAFFO, Welsh saint. [CAFFO.]

GAIANAS, GAIANTAE. [GAIANUS (6)].

GAIANUS, bishop of Jerusalem. [CAIUS (8)].

GAIANUS (1)—June 23. Martyr under Maximin at Ancyr, with his uncle Eustochius, who had converted him. [EUSTOCHIUS (1)]. Others of the same name are commemorated on April 10, June 15, and Aug. 31 (this last at Ancyr also), in Acta SS. Boll, about whom, however, nothing of importance is on record.

G. T. S.

GAIANUS (2), Donatist bishop of Tiguala, or Tuncalta, in Byzacena, present at the council of Cabarsus, A.D. 393. (Aug. En. in Ps. 36, 20.)

H. W. P.

GAIANUS (3) (CAIANS), bishop of Medaba in Palestina Tertia; he, together with his two brothers, Andrew and Stephen, natives of Melitene, were among the earliest members of the laura of Euthymius (Cyrill. Scythop. Vid. S. Euthym. § 41). They were relatives of Synodius, who had been the tutor of Euthymius when a boy (ibid. § 54). Having been sent by Euthymius with letters to Antipater, bishop of Bostra, to obtain the release of Terebon, who was unjustly detained by another Arab sheik, Antipater was so much delighted with him that he refused to allow him to return, and ordained him bishop of Medeba (Coll. § 97). He subscribed to the council of Chalcedon, 451, by his metropolitan Constantinus. (Mansi, vii. 167; Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 771.)

K. V.

GAIANUS (4), bishop of Nicaea, on the Morava, mentioned by Marcellinus in year 516. He died in exile at Constantinople. (Marcell. Comit. Chron. in Patr. Lat. ii. 939; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 514.)

J. de S.

GAIANUS (5), a presbyter of Ancyr, who was legate of his metropolitan Euplius at the council of Constantinople A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 937; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 466.)

T. W. D.

GAIANUS (6) (GAIANAS, GAINAS), monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, chosen by the party of the Incoercibilists, or Phanomnaste, whilst the party of the Corruptibilists, or Phthatorolatru, put forward Theodosius (a.d. 537). It was the custom at Alexandria that the patriarch elect should keep vigil by the body of his predecessor, placing the right hand of the corpse upon his head, and after the funeral, in which he himself took part, receive the pall of St. Mark from his neck. Whilst Theodosius, who had been consecrated, was performing this rite, the rabble of the opposing faction broke in and drove him from the city. But Gaianus having held the see for only three hundred days was banished by order of the empress Theodora, first to Carthage and afterwards to Sardinia. The rest of his life is unknown. From this Gaianus the sect of Incoercibilists at Alexandria received the name of "Gaianites." (See Liberius, Breviar., xx.; L'Art de vérifier les Dates, iii. 473.)

J. W. S.

GAIBALDUS, GAIBALT, bishop of Natisbon. [GAIBALDUS (3)].

GAIBHREN, GAIBHREIN (GAIRN, GAIRHRIN), commemorated June 24, identified by O'Corry (Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Revett, 179) with Gabhrin or Gabrenus, a fellow-student of Mochua of Bally (Life of Mochua, cap. in Boll. Acta SS. Jan. i. 48).

J. G.

GAIDOALDUS succeeded Eunin as duke of Trent c. 595. After some discord with the Lombard king Agilulf, the cause of which is unknown, he was peaceably received by him, c. 602. Paulus Diaconus calls him "vir bonus ac fide catholicus" (iv. 10, 37).

A. H. D. A.

GAIDUALDUS, duke of Brescia, father of Rangunda the second wife of Rinaldus duke of Benevento (707–733). (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 189.)

A. H. D. A.

GAIDULFUS, Lombard duke of Bergamo. He rebelled, c. 592, against the Lombard king Agilulf, who made peace with him and received hostages. He rebelled again, and took refuge on an island in the lake of Como. Agilulf pursued him, seized his treasures, and carried them to Pavia. On rebelling a third time he was killed. (Origo Gentis Langob. 6; Paulus Diaconus, iv. 13.)

A. H. D. A.

GAIDUS, duke of Vicenza, who according to Andreas Bergomus, together with Botonus duke
GAILA


[A. H. D. A.]

GAILA (1), daughter of Giulf duke of Friuli, and sister of Grimoald afterwards king of the Lombards. (Paulus Diaconus, iv. 37.)  

[A. H. D. A.]

GAILA (2) (Geila), brother of Suinthila Gothic king of Spain (621–631). At the time of the insurrection which deprived Suinthila of the throne Gaila deserted his cause for that of Sisinnath. Within the next two years, however, he seems to have added intrigue against the new king to his desecration of the old, and in 633 the fourth council of Toledo pronounced sentences of confiscation and exclusion from communion against both Suinthila and Gaila. The wives and children of the brothers are with them excluded “a societate gentis atque consortio nostro.” (Tejada y Ramiro, Coll. de Can. de la Ig. Esp. ii. 314; Dahn, Königre der Germanen, v. 188.)  

[M. A. W.]

GAILBALDUS. [Garialbus (7).]

GAILESUINDA, queen. [Gailesintha.]

GAINDBAIL. [Ganibball.]

GAINDIBAIL (Gaindibail), abbat of Aran, in Galway Bay, died a.D. 760. (Four Mast. a.d. 755; Colgan, Acta SS. 715, c. 7, calling him Gomindibale.)  

[J. G.]

GAIMAS, a Goth who had taken service in the Roman armies, first mentioned as being appointed one of the commanders of the barbarian allies by Theodosius at the commencement of his campaign against Eugenius, a.d. 394. He was sent the following year by Stilicho in command of the reinforcements dispatched by him to Arcadius. The latter, stung by the court, wrote to the suggestion of Gaiamas, to meet them before the gates of Constantinople. After the army had saluted the emperor, the soldiers, at a signal given by Gaiamas, flung themselves upon the obnoxious minister Rufinus, the enemy of Stilicho, and murdered him before the emperor’s eyes. Gaiamas was judged that most of the fruits of this conspiracy should be reaped by the envious Eutropius, and plotted his downfall. (Eutropius.) Meanwhile Gaiamas threw off the mask, joined his countryman Tribigild at Thyatira, and marched on Chalcedon. For his demands for the surrender of the ministers of Arcadius, their preservation by the entreaties of Chrysostom, and the firmness with which the latter compelled the demand of Gaiamas that a church should be granted to the Arians within the walls of Constantinople, see Chrysostom, p. 524, and the authorities there cited. A peace was patched up between Arcadius and Gaiamas; the latter was appointed master-general of the armies, both horse and foot, and entered Constantinople with his Gothic followers. The inhabitants, especially the money-changers, were alarmed by the crowds of barbarian warriors who filled the streets, feared every moment that a general pillage might begin. Gaiamas himself, who had left the city after directing the barbarians who remained behind to wait the signal of his return, was repulsed in a premature attack on the walls. He was declared a public enemy, and the Goths in the town, who had taken refuge in the church granted for their use (Chrysostom, p. 523) were attacked and massacred, and the church was burnt. Gaiamas retreated to the Chersonese and endeavoured to cross the Hellespont; but his rafts were sunk by the Roman fleet, and Gaiamas, after losing a great part of his troops, was obliged to relinquish the attempt, Dec. 23, a.d. 400. (Chronicon Paschale, i. 567, ed. Dindorf.) He then marched into the interior of Thrace, but the passage was barred by Ulde king of the Huns at the head of his forces. Gaiamas made a gallant attempt to cut his way through, but was defeated and slain. His head was brought to Constantinople, Jan. 3, a.d. 401. (Chronicon Paschale, above cited.) For a further account of Gaiamas, see Arcadius, in Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, and Gibbon, c. 32. (Zosimus, iv. 57, 58, v. 17–22.)  

[F. D.]

GAINAS, patriarch of Alexandria. [Gaiunas (9).]

GAINDBAIL, abbat. [Gaindiball.]

GAIRINUS (Gérin, Guérin), ST., martyr, brother of Leodegarius (St. Léger). He took part with his brother in his contest with Ébrin, and with him was accused of having been concerned in the murder of Chilperic II. Though the charge was not proved, he was fastened to a stake and stoned to death, 678. There is extant a consolatory letter to their mother Sigrida at Soissons by St. Léger. (Migne, Patr. Lat. xcvii. 373.) He was commemorated Aug. 25 and Oct. 2. (Bull. Acta SS. Oct. i. 355; Mabille. Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict. ii. 600.)  

[S. A. B.]

GAIO (Gaiuonux, Gaynouonux), abbat of Flavigny in Burgundy, and 31st bishop of Autun, between Modenrnxus and Hiddo. In the Chronicon of Hugo abbat of Flavigny, Gaynouonux episcopus is said to have succeeded Walinus in the abbacy in 603. Later, against the year 755, is placed the death of Gaynouonux episcopus, and the ordination of Manasses as abbat in his place, and this statement is repeated in the series of the abbats of Flavigny at the end of the Chronicon (Migne, Patr. Lat. cliv. 136, 150, 309). The first of these dates is plainly a mistake, and Le Coiteul conjectures in its place the year 747 (Ann. Eccl. Franc. an. 747, n. xxxii. tom. v. p. 180). The identity of the bishop and abbat rests only upon conjecture. (Gall. Christ. iv. 588, 456.)  

[S. A. B.]

GAIROVALDUS. [Gariaus.]  

GAIUS (Basil. Mon. i. 166, Nov. 4), one of the 70. [Caius (4).]  

[G. H.]

GAIUS, bishop of Rome. [Caius (3).]  

GAIUS (L’Art de rééif. iii. 36), bishop of Jerusalem. [Caius (8).]  

[C. H.]

GAIUS (1) of Dida (an otherwise unknown place, probably near Carthage), a presbyter who, with his deacon, communicated some lapsed persons without ecclesiastical sanction, and was ex-
GAIUS

communicated by the Carthaginian clergy with advice of bishops then in Carthage, and with Cyprian's consent. (Cyp. Ep. 34.) [E. W. B.]


GAIUS (2)—Oct. 21. Martyr at Nicomedia with Darius and Zoticus. Having publicly overthrown the offerings presented on the altars to the gods, they were martyred by drowning, probably in the Diocletian persecution, which raged with special violence at Nicomedia. (Bas. Menol.) [G. T. S.]

GAIUS (Augustin. Ep. 19, al. 84, al. 82. [CAIUS (22).] [C. H.]

GAIUS (3), the name of two bishops, viz. of Adenavada in Maurertania Caesariensis, and of Uci in procornasian Africa, banished by Humericus, A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. Notit. 55; Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 70, 348.) [R. S. G.]

GAIUS (4), bishop of Tseapo in Byzacena, delegate of his province to the council of Carthage A.D. 525. (Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 293.) [R. S. G.]


GALACTON (GALATIUS), bishop of Melos, present at the second Nicene council, A.D. 787. (Manii, xiii. 372; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 945.) [L. D.]

GALACTORIUS, bishop of Benebarum or Benarnum, now probably Lescar in Bear. His signature is found to the canons of the council of Agathas or Agde in A.D. 506 (Manii, Concilia, viii. 337). He is said to have fought at the head of the Bearnese against the Arian Visigoths, by whom he was defeated and made prisoner. On his refusing to abjure the Catholic faith he was cruelly put to death. This cannot have happened later than A.D. 507, as Clovis passed the winter of that year at Bordeaux, after defeating and slaying Abaric king of the Visigoths. He was commemorated on July 27. (Boll. AA. SS. July vi. 434; De Synodus, Mart. Gall. 1151; Gall. Christ. i. 1265.) [F. D.]

GALANUS, bishop of Emporius (Ampurias) from 392 onwards. He appears first as archdeacon representing bishop Fructuosus at the third council of Toledo in 589 (Manii, ix. 1002 c). He was present as bishop of Emporius at the second council of Saragossa, 592, and at the council of Barcelona, 599. (Manii, x. 472 b, 484 a; Aguirre-Catalani, ii. 238, 342; Esp. Brev. xi. 270.) [M. A. W.]


GALADIUS, a man who was said to have been desired by Felix of Aptunga to deliver up the sacred books to the agents of persecution. [FELIX (26).] [H. W. P.]

GALBALDUS. [GARIBALDUS (3).]

GALERIUS, 27th bishop of Sebaste, between Macarius and Gobalbus or Carobalus, probably in the first half of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 339.) [S. A. B.]

GALDUS, bishop ofries. [GAUDO (9).]

GALENUS, CLAUDIUS, physician, born A.D. 130 at Pergamus, flourished chiefly at Rome under the Antonines, and died in 200 or 201. For a full account of him see Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography. He belongs to church history only as the author of a few incidental words referring to Christianity that occur in his voluminous writings. Thus in his De Pulsusman Differentiis (lib. iii. cap. 3, sub fin. in Opp. tom. viii. p. 657, ed. Kühn) he writes: "It is easier to convince the disciples of Moses and Christ than physicians and philosophers who are addicted to particular sects." In the same treatise (lib. ii. cap. 4, p. 579) he condemn the method of Archigenes, who requires his dicta to be received absolutely and without demonstration, as "though we were come to the school of Moses and of Christ." In the De Remus Affectuosis Dignatione (Kühn, t. xix.) there are still more references to Christianity, but that treatise is spurious. An Arabic writer has preserved a fragment of Galen's lost work, De Republica Platonis, which is to the following effect:—"We know that the people called Christians have founded a religion in parables and miracles. In moral teaching we see them in newise teaching them to philosophers; they practise celibacy, as do many of their women; in diet they are abstemious, in fastings and prayers assiduous; they injure no one. In the practice of virtue they surpass philosophers; in probity, in continence, in the genuine performance of miracles (vera miraculorum patrimonia—does he mean the Scripture miracles, on which their religion was based?) they infinitely exceed them." (Cusari, Biblth. Arabico-Hispiana, vol. i. p. 253). For apologetic remarks on Galen's testimony see Bardner's Credibility (Works, vol. vii. p. 306, ed. 1838). [C. H.]

GALERIUS, emperor. (GAIUS GALERIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS is the full name on his coinage; he is called MAXIMIAN in some Acts of Martyrs, that having apparently been his name until Diocletian changed it; see Lact. Mort. 18; the appellation of ARMENTARIUS is but a nickname taken from his original occupation.) He was a native of New Dacia, on the south side of the Danube. His mother Romula had fled thither for refuge from the predatory Carpi, who pillaged her own country on the other side of the stream. In later times he asserted that his father was none other than the god Mars, who seduced his mother under the form of a dragon (Lact. Mort. 9; Aur. Vict. Epit. xI. 17). As a youth he was employed as a beastherd on his native plains, but soon joined the army, and learned war under the stern tuition of Aurelian and Probus. Without education, and without virtues, he raised himself by his undoubtedly military gifts, until he was actually selected (in conjunction with Constantius), by Diocletian, to fill the office of Caesar of the East in Diocletian's famous scheme for the reorganization of the empire, A.D. 292. His connexion with Diocletian war
strengthened by a marriage with Valeria, the Christian daughter of Diocletian. There were no children of the marriage, which was anything but happy, but the gentle Valeria adopted for her own husband's bastard son Candidian.

[DIOCLETIAN.] Galerius had indeed none of the gifts of a ruler, nor any appreciation of his father-in-law's policy, but his authority with the army made him a useful coadjutor. Five years after his call to the Caesarship (A.D. 297), he was sent to conduct the chief war of the reign of Diocletian, the last which ever gave the empire a triumph, against Narses king of Persia. The first campaign proved unsuccessful through the deficiency of numbers, and Diocletian was so exasperated that he forced the haughty Galerius to walk a mile on foot behind his chariot in the sight of the army (Amm. Marc. XIV. xi. 10). This humiliation Goaled Galerius to fresh exertions, and in a second campaign he utterly routed Narses, and forced him to purchase peace at the cost of five provinces near the source of the Tigris.

Little more is recorded of Galerius until the year 303, which brings him prominently in contact with the church. He had conceived a hatred for the Christians, not based, like that of Diocletian, on political suspicion, nor, like that of Marcus or Julian, on philosophical disapproval, but originating (so far as we can see) almost wholly in his fanatical superstition and his aversion from Christian morality. His mother, who appears to have exercised great influence over him, was a noted votress of the Phrygian oracles, and continued to hold the entreaties to demolish Christianity. Her authority was supported by that of the magician and so-called Platonist, Theonexus (Cedr. vol. 1. p. 47, ed. Bonn), who had also acquired an ascendency over Galerius. The winter of 302–3 was spent by Galerius at Nicomedia, where he used every effort to compel the reluctant Diocletian to annul the legislation of Gallienus, to break the forty years' amnesty between the empire and the church, and to crush the religion which Diocletian had so conspicuously favoured. His urgency was so great and so formidable (Diocletian being depressed with the approach of his great malady, and Julian not yet dead), that step by step he gained his point, until Diocletian consented to prescribe the open profession of Christianity and to take all measures to suppress it short of bloodshed (Lact. Mort. 11, "rem sine sangue transigii"). The first edict of Diocletian, however, was not strong enough to content Galerius. The demolition of buildings which proclaimed the power of the church, the prohibition of synaxis, the burning of the books used in the Christian ritual, the civic, social, and military degradation of Christians, were slow ways of abolishing the obnoxious religion. Galerius longed for more summary action to be taken, and that an assault should once more be tried. His one desire was to effect the removal of Diocletian's expressive clause, that "no blood was to be shed in the transaction."

Shortly after the promulgation of the First Edict, a fire broke out in the part of the palace where Diocletian lived. Lactantius, who was the historian of the event, without fear of contradiction that it was set alight by Galerius. His object was to persuade the Augustus that his trusty Christian chamberlains were conspiring against him; but on application of torture to the whole household, they were acquitted. A fortnight later the same act or accident was repeated, and this time Galerius (who, ostensibly to escape assassination, perhaps really to avoid discovery, took immediate departure) convinced Diocletian of the existence of a Christian plot. Thus convinced, the emperor signed his second edict, ordering the incarceration of the entire clergy, though even now there was to be no bloodshed, against which Diocletian set his face from first to last.

In Galerius' favour it must be said, that in his mode of putting these edicts into execution he shews occasional signs of an intention to adhere, though very loth, to the principles of Diocletian's legislation. It is true that his return into his own province in 304 is marked by a sudden crowd of martyrs where the edicts had before not even been published: but his conduct, in the case of St. Romanus shows that, when directly appealed to, he felt bound to forbid the capital punishment of even obstreperous Christians (Eus. Mart. Pal. ii.).

The time was coming, however, when Galerius was to have more liberty of action. In 304, he probably desired a total collapse of Diocletian's health, the so-called Fourth Edict was issued by Maximin, no doubt in conjunction with Galerius, making death the penalty of Christianity. Diocletian began to recover in March 305. For years past he had intended to abdicate on the 1st of May in that year. But now, for some reason, he hesitated to dispense with an account of the commotion which he found had been caused in the empire by the Fourth Edict. Galerius, who had long looked constantly upon the diadem promised him against that date, would brook no more delay, and with much violence compelled the embittered Augustus to retire, leaving himself nominally second to Constantius in the government. The death of that prince in July, 306, left Galerius supreme.

It was the beginning of the downfall of Diocletian's system. Galerius was driving the empire wild with his taxation, which were imposed upon the city of Rome itself. Usurpation followed without intermission, that step by step was to put down Maximiatus, was taken prisoner, and Galerius, who followed with a large army to rescue him, learned that Severus was dead, and at the same time found himself deserted by his troops, and compelled to best a hasty retreat. In 307, Nov. 11, he effected a meeting at Carnuntum (near Freiburg) between Diocletian, Maximin, and himself, at which (probably in spite of his father-in-law's advice) Galerius appointed Licinius to be Augustus, though he had never been a Caesar.

These troubles had not diverted the attention of Galerius from persecution, which was going on at too great a pace to last. In the year 308, March 31, the emperor issued, in conjunction with his nephew Maximin, a bloody edict against the Manichaeans (Cod. Greg. ed. Hanel, lib. xiv. p. 44*). The question cannot be discussed here, but the writer of this notice believes that he has proved this to be the true date of the Manichaean edict in his essay on "The Persecution," pp. 278. The same year did indeed see an order to substitute mutilation for death in cases of Christianity; as Eusebius 2 Q
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says (Mort. Pol. iv.), "The confagration subdued, as if quenched with the streams of sacred blood." But the relaxation was only for a few months. In the autumn of 308 a new edict of persecution was issued, which began a perfect reign of terror, not to be concluded till two full years had elapsed. These two years were the most prolific of bloodshed of any in the whole history of Roman persecutions; and the vast majority of persons who in the East (for the persecution in the West had ceased with the accession of Constantine, and usurpation of Maxentius) are celebrated as "martyrs under Diocletian" really suffered between 308 and 311. This part of the persecution bears marks, however, rather of the genius of Maximian Daza than of Galerius.

Towards the close of the year 310 Galerius was seized with an incurable malady, which seems to have been partially caused by his vicious life. This gradually developed into the frightfully malignant disease vulgarly known as being "eaten of worms." The fact rests not only on the authority of the church historians (Eus. H. E. viii. xvi. 3 foll.; Lact. Mort. 33), but also upon that of the pagan Aurelius Victor (Epit. xl. 4) and the precious fragment known as Anonymus Valesii. Galerius had all his life been a slave of superstition; and now, face to face with death, and so awfully a death, he thought (apparently) that a compromise might be effected with the God of the Christians, whom he undoubtedly regarded as an active and hostile power. From his dying bed was issued his famous edict of toleration, bearing the signatures also of Constantine and of Licinius, which finally put an end to the "persecution of Diocletian." This most extraordinary document (which may be read in full in Eus. H. E. viii. 17, and also in Lact. Mort. 34) begins with an assertion that the emperors in their desire for conservative reform, had taken steps to reduce "to a good disposition the Christians who had abandoned the persuasion (seeded in their own fathers)." The fact is that the persecution is ascribed to the fact that the Christians had wilfully departed from the "institutions of the ancients which had pervadventure been first set on foot by their own forefathers," and had formed schismatical assemblies on their own private judgment. Primitive Christianity is here meant by the phrase "institutis referens," and the edicts had had no object but to bring the Christians back to it. But the only effect of the edicts, Galerius continued, was to bring many into trouble; in spite of them, the Christians would "neither display due reverence to the gods nor pray heed to the God of the Christians;" and seeing this, Galerius was determined, mercifully under certain unspecified conditions, which were conveyed privately to the magistrates, to allow Christianity once more and to permit the building of churches. Finally, in return for this indulgence, the Christians are told to pray to their God for the recovery of Galerius.

Thus did the dying persecutor the sacrilegiously to duple the church into believing him a kind reformer, and the church's God into remitting his temporal punishment. But it was of no avail. "The Unknown God to whom he had at last betaken himself, gave no answer to his insolent and tardy invocation" (De Bрогlie, i. 207). The edict was posted at Nicomedia on April 30, and on the 5th or 13th of May 311, it was announced that Galerius was dead. [A. J. M.]

GALESUINTHA, queen. [Galesuinta]

GALINDO, supposed to be the original Spanish name of Prudentius bishop of Troyes, before he changed it on coming to live for his education in France. It is given to him in the Annales Bertiniani, a.D. 861, which seems to be the only authority. (Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxv. 965; Ceillier, xii. 493.) [J. G.]

GALINUS (Salvinus), 42nd bishop of Auch, succeeding Revelius and followed by Elisaesus about the close of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. i. 977.) [S. A. B.]

GALLA (1), St., May 8, one of many martyrs commemorated with St. Ancius or Agatius, a Roman soldier at Byzantium about 303. (Mort. Hieron.; Bull. Acta SS. 8 Maii ii. 291, 762.) [A. B. C. D.]

GALLA (2), first wife of Flavius Julius Constantius, half-brother of Constantine. (Hist. xiv. 11, § 27) tells us that she was the sister of the consuls Rufinus and Cerealis. She had two sons and one daughter by Julius Constantius. The name of the eldest son is unknown, but Julian tells us that he was put to death by the emperor Constantius II. (ad Ath. 370 D.) The second son, born in 323, was Flavius Julius Gallus Caesar. The daughter, whose name is not recorded, was the first wife of the emperor Constantius II. (Julian, ad Ath. 272 D.; cf. Euseb. de Vit. Const. iv. 49; Du Cange, Fam. Aug. 37.) [M. F. A.]

GALLA (3), a lady in Spain in the later part of the 4th century, connected with Adrian in the diffusion of the Zoroastrian idea of which Priscillian was the champion. Jerome speaks of her as the type of those women who in the next generation busied themselves in the spread of Pelagianism. (Jerome, Ep. cxxiii. 4, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

GALLA (4), the daughter of Valentinian I. by his second wife Justina. In 383 according to the Chron. Pasch., 386 according to Marcellinus, she became the second wife of the emperor Theodosius I. and by him she was the mother of Gallus Placidus (Zosim. Hist. iv. 43; Chr. Pasch.). She died in child-birth, a.D. 394 (Zosim. iv. 57). Galla, like her mother, was an Ariam (Philostorg, H. E. x. 7.) [T. W. D.]

GALLA (5) PLACIDIA, daughter of Theodosius I. by his second wife Gallus. On the death of her father, a.D. 395, she and her half-brother Honorius were left under the care of Stilicho and his wife Serena, the latter being the daughter of Gallus's paternal uncle Honorius (Olympiod. op. Phot. Biblioth. ixx.). In 408 Serena was unjustly accused of being in correspondence with Alaric, who was then besieging Rome, and Placidia is said to have been a party to the cruel sentence which was passed upon her (Zosim., Hist. v. 38). Two years afterwards the city was captured and Placidia taken prisoner. Notwithstanding that great exertions were made to procure her release, especially by Constantin,
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Her future second husband [CONSTANTIUS III, Dict. G. and H. E.], who was ready high in the imperial service, she was still detained in captivity, though treated by her captors with great respect (Olympiod. u. s.; Zosim. vi. 12). In January, A.D. 414, she was married to Ataulfus, who had in the meanwhile succeeded his uncle Aicarius. The marriage, which was celebrated with great splendour, took place, according to Olympiodorus (u. s.) and Iatadius (Chron. s. a.), at Narbona in Gaul. By Ataulfus she had a son, who was named Theodosius after his grandfather. He died in his infancy, and was buried near Barcelona. Soon after this Ataulfus was fatally wounded by one of his domestic, and on his death-bed charged his brother to send Placidia to Honorius. She did not return to Italy, however, until A.D. 416, when she was brought to Ravenna by Eupathius, an imperial officer, who had been sent to Gaul to receive her. She now took up her abode with Honorius and influence over Ravenna, and in January A.D. 417 she was married to Constantius, but greatly against her will. By him she had two children, Valentinian and Honoria (Olympiodor. u. s.).

Her influence over her second husband was soon betrayed in his active persecution of the Pelagians (Prosp. Chron. s. a. 419). In February, A.D. 421, Honorius admitted Constantius to a share of the empire. The persecution of the Pelagians was then renewed with great vigour. On Sept. 11, 421, Constantius died. Placidia again took up her abode with Honorius at Ravenna; but great scandal arising from the rascipuous relations of the latter, and their mutual affection being replaced by bitter hate, which occasioned serious disturbances in the city, she and her children were sent to Theodosius II. at Constantinople (Olympiod. u. s.). During her disgrace she was greatly befriended by Boniface, who was already count of Africa (Placidia, ii. 4). On the death of Honorius in August, 423, Boniface refused to acknowledge Joannes in Africa, which he held for Placidia and her son (Prosp. Chron. s. a. 424). Theodosius at once declared himself in favour of Valentinian and sent him and his mother with an army to depose Joannes. Having been deposed, Placidia entered into a correspondence with Aquileia, and immediately put to death (Olympiod. u. s.; Marcell. Chron. s. a. 425; Philostorg. H. E. xii. 11). Valentinian being but a child, the authority of Placidia was now supreme, and among her first acts was the issue of three edicts in rapid succession for the banishment of all "Mauchaeans, heires, and schismatics, and every sect opposed to the Catholic faith" (Cod. Theod. XI. v. 62, July 17; c. 63, Aug. 4; c. 64, Aug. 6, A.D. 425, all dated from Aquileia), and another restoring to the clergy all the privileges of which they had been deprived by Joannes (Cod. Theod. XI. ii. 4, Oct. 8, A.D. 425). The schismatics whom she especially had in view were the adherents of the antipope Eulalius, who were still numerous in Rome. These edicts were soon followed by another of great severity, directed against apostates (Cod. Theod. XI. viii. 8, April 7, A.D. 429).

In 427 Aetius, whom she had long forgiven for supporting Joannes, and who was now greatly in her favour, persuaded Placidia that her tried friend Boniface, to whom she was under such heavy obligations, was meditating revolt. He at the same time, by letter, persuaded Boniface that Placidia was resolved upon his ruin. His double treachery was but too successful. Boniface, in despair, appealed for help to the Vandals, who gladly responded to his appeal, and Africa was overrun by their forces. Some of his many friends at Rome, who refused to believe that one who had hitherto borne so high a character could be guilty of the treason with which he had been charged, procured Darius [DARIUS, Vol. I. 789 a] to be sent to Africa to inquire into the facts. On his arrival Boniface shewed him the letters which he had received from Aetius, and Darius reported accordingly to Placidia. She at once explained the whole matter to her friend, and urged him to do his best to repair the injury which the empire had sustained. But it was too late, the Vandals were masters of the country, and Africa was lost (Prosp. u. s.; Augustin. Ep. 220; Gibbon, c. xixii.). In 435 Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, visited Ravenna, where he was taken ill and died. Placidia was lavish in her attentions to him on his death-bed, and afterwards caused his body to be carried into Gaul with great honour (Constant. Vib. Germ. ii. 21, 24).

In the education of her children Honorio and Valentinian she was most unhappy (Prosp. u. s.). Both of them disgraced themselves by the grossest misconduct. Her administration of the empire was equally unfortunate. On this account especially Cassiodorus institutes a contrast between her and Amalasuntha, the mother of Aetharic, and greatly to her disadvantage. (Pros. lib. xi. ep. i in Migne, l. xi. 503). In 449 Placidia was at Rome with Valentinian. The legates of Leo had just returned from the robber council of Ephesus. Leo was greatly distressed at what had taken place in that assembly, and bitterly bewailed its proceedings to Placidia, who immediately wrote to Theodosius and his sister Eudoxia (Pedriani, i. 4), expressing the fervent hope of the empire, of the faith of their ancestors, and their influence to procure the restoration of Flavian, the deposed bishop of Constantinople. The reply of Theodosius was by no means complimentary. He briefly refers his suit to what he had written to Leo, simply saying that "Flavian, who is said to be the chief cause of this mischief," had been canonically deposed, and concludes with telling her that "he had never thought of anything contrary to the faith," as "some said he had" (Conc. Chalced. pt. i. Ep. 26, 28, 30; Labe, iv, 53, 55, 58). Placidia died at Rome soon afterwards, and was buried at Ravenna (Iatadius, Chr. s. a.; Gibbon, u. s.). She is said to have erected the palace which bore her name at Constantinople, and to have done so during the lifetime of her father (Chron. Pasch. s. a. 385). [T. W. D.]

GALLA (6), St., wife of Eucherius bishop of Lyons (434–450). The legend is that Eucherius, on being converted to a religious life, had himself walled up in a cave on his own estate on the banks of the Durance and spent his time in prayer, that he was taken thence by force and made bishop of Lyons, and that his wife Gallus installed herself in the cave, her daughters Tullia and Consordia ministering to her there as she had done to Eucherius. The story of Gallus, Tullia, and Consordia, has been supposed to belong to

2 Q 2
GALLANUS, Irish saint. [GRELLANIC.]  

GALLBRAN UA LINGAIN, scribe of Clonmacnoise, King's County, died A.D. 768. [Four Mss.]  

GALLENIA, martyr. [GALONICA.]  

GALGO or GALLGOV, ST., a saint to whom Linnaligo in Anglesey is dedicated, and who may have lived in the 6th century; the festival day is Nov. 27. [R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 230.]  

GALLIANUS, bishop, subscribed the third council of Arles, A.D. 461. [Isid. Mercat. in Patr. Lat. cxxx. 382.]  

GALLIANUS (1), Roman duke and consul, martyr in Egypt, A.D. 302. The Bollandists (Acta SS. 25 June. v. 30-39) have a notice of De

---

GALLIANUS (2), ST., seventh bishop of Embrun, succeeding Catullinus and followed by St. Palladius (c. A.D. 524-555). He was represented at the fourth council of Arles by Emeterius (A.D. 524), was present at that of Carpentras in 527, perhaps at the second of Orange in 528, though his name is not found in the subscriptions, at the third of Vaison in the same year, and at the fourth of Orleans in 541, and was represented by Probus at the fifth of Orleans in 549 (Manst. viii. 627, 708, 718, 728; ix. 120, 137). He is said to have consecrated the church of the Spanish martyrs, Vincent, Orentius, and Victor, built by Palladius at Embrun. In the life of St. Palladius (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. iv. 96) he is spoken of as preceding St. Palladius, while in the Breviary of Embrun he appears as his successor. This discrepancy has been eluded in the lists of the Embrun bishops by the supposition of two bishops of the name, the preceding and the other following St. Palladius, and this arrangement has been followed in the Gallia Christiana (iii. 1060-1) but with an expression of doubt. Following Le Coite (Ann. Ecl. Franc. an. 536, n. xvii. tom. i. 457) we have recognised only one. Those who believe in two assign the first four of the above-mentioned councils to Gallianus I. and the other two to Gallianus II. [S. A. B.]  

GALLICINUS, ST. (GALLITANUS), sixth bishop of Bordeaux, between St. Amantius and Cyprianus in the latter half of the 5th century. He is mentioned in an ode contained in a letter of Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. viii. epist. 11, Migne, Patr. Lat. ivii. 605). From a letter of the same author, in which he laments the ravages of the Goths in Aquitania, who had slain, amongst others, the bishop of Bordeaux, it has been inferred that he suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Eutic king of the Visigoths, about A.D. 475 (lib. vii. Epist. 6, Migne, Patr. Lat. ivii. 571; Gall. Christ. ii. 790). [S. A. B.]  

GALLIENUS, P. LICINIVS, emperor. He was the son of the emperor Valerian, and was appointed by the senate conductor to his father very shortly after Valerian’s accession, in August 253. In 260, his father’s miserable captivity in Persia freed him from an irksome moral restraint and left him politically irresponsible. No notion of his character may be formed from the words with which he received the melancholy news. Parodying the philosopher who said “I was aware that I had begotten a mortal,” he replied, “I was aware that my father was mortal.” (Poll. Gall. 17.) Gallienus was a man of marked ability, accomplished and versatile, an orator and a pretty poet, drawn to the mystic Platonism...
of Plotinus, to whom he was disposed to offer a territory in Italy to be governed on Utopian principles. (Porphyry. Vit. Plot. c. 12.) Yet his character was entirely without moral earnestness. In his clearness and folly he more nearly resembled Nero than any other prince between the two. He made no attempt to govern. Certainly no man ever had more excuse for neglecting duty on the plea of difficulty. The number of generals who claimed and exercised independent power has been stretched to thirty, fancifully called "the Thirty Tyrants." Gallienus made but feeble and desultory attempts to put any of them down, turning into wretched jests each new humiliation, and taking refuge in sensuality from the hopeless task of state reorganization.

Such a view of his character and of the political situation is necessary to the understanding of the one great act which brings him into church history. On his father's fall, he found himself confronted by the church against which Valerian had declared deadly warfare. He was legally bound to put every clergyman to death he could find, and to deal in almost as summary a fashion with all other Christians. [Valerian.] Gallienus had had three years' experience of the difficulty and wearisomeness of this task. There was no prospect of its coming to an end. The object, too, was not very apparently useful. The "Thirty Tyrants" were foes formidable enough to attract what little attention could be spared from pleasure. Accordingly, in 261, he issued an edict (προφήτης, etc., a document publicly displayed and proclaimed, not an ἀναγραφή or private instruction to the magistrates) by which Christianity was for the first time put on a clearly legal footing as a regular religio licita. This edict of Gallienus is the most marked epoch in the history of the church's relation to the state, since the rescript of Trajan to Pliny which had made Christianity distinctly a religio licita. The words in which Eusebius describes the edict (the text of which is lost) imply no more than that actual persecution was stopped (ἀπείρωσε τῶν λαχειαν, Eus. Hist. Eccl. vii. 13), which might have been the case without a legal recognition of Christianity; it might merely have implied the cessation of bloodshed; but Eusebius has preserved a copy of the encyclical rescript which the emperor addressed to the Christian bishops of the Egyptian province, which bears a most remarkable testimony to the position which the church had won. "The emperor Caesar P. Licinius Gallienus . . . to Dionysius, Pinnas, Demetrius, and the other bishops." The words "the bishops" have a perfectly recognised meaning for the pagan government; it needs no more paraphrase than "the pro-consuls" would have needed. The purport of the rescript is to inform the bishops that orders had been issued to the pagan officials to evacuate the consecrated places (εἰ τὸν θεὸν οἱ προσταινούσαι;); the bishops have but to produce their copies of the rescript, which will serve them as a warrant against any interference in reoccupying (Σαραμαίνει τῶν ἁγίων). Thus formally, universally, and deliberately was done, what Alexander Severus had but done in an isolated case and in a freak of generosity, i.e. the right of the Corpus Christianorum to hold property was fully recognised. If Christianity had not been explicitly made a religio licita, this would have been impossible. The great proof, however, of the footing gained by the church through Gallienus's edict lies in the elevation of his successor Aurelian in the matter of Paul of Samosata. Though Aurelian's bigoted sun-worship and hatred of the church were well known, and his death alone prevented a great rupture, the Catholics were so secure of their legal position as actually to appeal to the emperor in person to decide their dispute; both and Aurelian, as the law then stood, not only recognised the right of the church to hold property, but also to decide internal disputes (though they concerned property) according to her own methods.

The most elaborate account of the secular history of Gallienus will be found in Bernhardt's Geschichte Roms von Valerian bis zu Diocletianus Toto, part I. (Berlin, 1867). [A. J. M.]

GALLIENUS, a Roman dunyvir of Aptunga, at the time of the inquiry about Felix, bishop of that place. (Mon. Vet. Don. p. 180, ed. Oertzth.); [Felix (26).] [H. W. P., GALLIENUS, a friend of St. Jerome, who was with him at Constantinople in the year 382. He probably died early, as we do not hear of him afterwards. He was, however, at the time in close intimacy with Jerome, who made him with Vincentius (q. c.) the confidant of his views as to the text of Scripture, and dedicated to these two friends his first great work, the translation and continuation of the Chronicle of Eusebius. Jerome speaks of Gallienus as "pars animae meae." (Jerome, Pref. to bk. ii. of Chron. vol. viii. 224, ed. Vall. Migne, Pat. Lat. xxvii. 33.) [W. H. F.]

GALLINICUS, patriarch of Constantinople, [Gallinicus (2).]

GALLINICUS (Gallinicius) appears among the Eutychians, who, claiming to be archimandrites, appealed to the emperor Marcian for a general council in A.D. 451 (Labbe, iv. 524); but the orthodox archimandrites in the council of Chalcedon would not recognise his claim to the title (Labbe, iv. 521 A). His name appears only in the Latin text, where he is described as "inhabiting a memoria" with ten persons under him." [Cf. Epipdus (31).] [C. G.]

GALLIONUS, a Maxianist bishop mentioned as being absent from the council of Cabarsus, A.D. 393. (Aug. En. in Ps. 38, 20; Mon. Vet. Don. p. 238, ed. Oertzh.) [H. W. P.]

GALLITIANUS of Bordeaux. [Gallicianus.]

GALLIUS (Gallus), thirteenth bishop of Arezzo (Arezzo), c. A.D. 447. He succeeded Eusebius II., and was succeeded by Benedictus. He is said, even while bishop, to have led the life of a hermit in the neighbouring marshes and mountains, only shewing himself to his people when absolutely necessary. (Ughelli, Ital. Soc. l. 456; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xvii. 71.) [R. S. G.]

GALLOMAGNUS, twelfth bishop of Troyes, succeeding Ambrosius and followed by Agrippus, was present at the fourth council of Paris (A.D. 507).
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573), and signed the letter addressed by it to king Sigebert. He also subscribed the first council of Magon (A.D. 581 or 582). He is said to have obtained the relics of St. Nicetius of Lyons, which were placed in the church called after him, formerly dedicated to St. Maurus. (Mansi, ix. 387, 389, 936; Gall. Christ. xii. 457.)

GALLONIANUS, bishop of Utica, in prosconsular Africa, present at the two synods at Carthage, A.D. 419. (Mansi, iv. 433, 438; Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 382.) [R. S. G.]

GALLONISTUS (GALLONISTUS, GALLONISTUS, GALLONISTUS), bishop of Adria, present at the Lateran synod on Monothelism under pope Martin in 649. (Hefele, S. 307; Mansi, x. 867.) For the connexion of the see with Ravigo, vdf. Ugh. Ital. Soc. ii. 297; Spieresius de Alvaratis, Adriens. Episc. 32. [A. H. D. A.]

GALLUS (1) CAESAR, son of Julius Constantius (younger brother of Constantine the Great) and his mother Eudocia, A.D. 325 appointed Caesar by Constantius 330, executed by his orders 354.

1. Authorities. 2. Life. 3. Character and Relation to the Church.

1. The authorities for his life are generally those referred to for that of his half-brother Julian. The most important is Amnianus Marcellinus (q. e.) whose fourteenth book (the first now extant) is chiefly concerned with Gallus. The Arian church historian Philostorgius also records a good many facts about him which are not found in other Christian writers. The facts of his life are given as length in Tillemont, Comp. vol. iv. under Constantius, arts. 22, 30-34, and Julian, 1, 2.

2. The life of Gallus may be divided into two periods: (1) as a young man; (2) as Caesar.

(1) As a young man, A.D. 325-350.—Julius Constantius, the patrician, the youngest and most remarkable of the sons of Constantius Chlorus and St. Helena, married as his first wife Gallia, a sister of Rufinus and Cerealis, two men of rank, who had filled the offices of consul and praetorian prefect with reputation (Amn. xiv. 11, 27). She bore him two sons, the eldest of whose name is unknown to us (Jul. ad S. P. Q. Athan. p. 270 B, ed. Spanheim), and the subject of this article, who presumably received his name from his mother. He was born at Massa Veternensis near Siena in Tuscany (Amn. xiv. 11, 27). Gallia could not have survived the birth of her younger son, since we find Julius married a second time to Basilia (q. e.) five or six years later. At the death of Constantine the Great in 337, Gallus was twelve and Julian about seven years old.

In the general massacre of the younger branches of the imperial family which then took place, the two young brothers were alone preserved—Gallus being ill of a sickness which seemed likely to be mortal, and Julian being an infant (Soson or Constantine, p. 851). The preservation of Gallus is described by Gregory of Nazianzus to the exertions of Mark bishop of Arles, amongst others (Or. 4, 91), and that of both brothers to the clemency of Constantius, who shielded them from the revolting soldiery (bk. 21). Yet neither of them could feel much gratitude to their protector, who permitted, if he did not command, the slaughter of their father and elder brother, their uncle and six cousins (Jul. Ep. ad S. P. Q. Athan. p. 270 D). Gallus was at first banished from Constantinople (perhaps to Tralles; see Hertlein's note, p. 271 B), and attended the professors of the schools of Ephesus (Socrates, H. E. iii. 13, cf. Erod. Gesch. der Röth. Julians, p. 27, note 32, Jena, 1877), and was thus separated from his brother, who seems to have remained in the capital. It was not until several years had passed that they were reunited, being then sent to a place called "Macell. Fundus" in Cappadocia by the command of Constantius. Their six years' residence in this retirement was adorned with the state and luxury becoming their rank, but was felt, by Julian at least, to be little better than an imprisonment, inasmuch as they were encircled by sires, and were debauched from intercourse with the outside world. (Jul. ad Athan. p. 271; Amn. xv. 2, 7, gives the name. His words in xiv. 1, "et 40 orantes misericordiam concedat," in actual fact, the primitia ad principale culmen incesso salus protectus," seem a mere exaggeration; cf. Greg. Naz. Or. 4, 22; Sozomen, H. E. v. 2.) Both of them were brought up as Christians, and entered with apparent zeal into the externals of the Christian life. They were even enrolled as readers in the ranks of the clergy, and rivalled one another in building chapels over the relics of martyrs. In one case, that of the martyr Mamas, it was noticed that the work of Gallus succeeded, while that of Julian was continually falling down (Gregory and Sozomen, ad supr.). It is not improbable that this circumstance was regarded as ominous, even at this moment, by some of those whose business it was to keep a close watch upon the young princes. It was probably from this retirement that Gallus was called directly to the court to receive the unexpected dignity of Caesar which the childless Constantius determined to appoint (Jul. ad Athan. p. 271 B). 

... eis tén deôn kathêkyn, kai elôs, p. 272 A. Sozomen, I. c., introduces a sojourn of Gallus in Ionia at this point, but apparently from misunderstanding Socrates, i. I.) Gallus was now twenty-five years of age, of a tall, handsome, well-knit person, with soft, light hair, and a small beard. He had, however, a brusque and harsh temper, which contrasted unfavourably with the gentle manners of his brother, and which was destined to display itself to his disadvantage in his later years (Amn. xiv. 11, 23; Jul. ad Athan. p. 271 D).

(2) Gallus as Caesar, 350-354.—The reason which led Constantius to appoint a colleague was no doubt the difficulty of the sovereign moment of the empire to which he succeeded on the death of his brother Constans in 350. In the West he was distracted by the very formidable usurpation of Magnentius in Gaul and the less dangerous rising of Vetranio in Illyria, while in the East the Persians were a perpetual source of anxiety. He determined that he should give the command of the Eastern empire to his cousin, in order to turn all his energies against Magnentius. Vetranio had not been a determined antagonist, professing himself throughout friendly to Constantius, and acting, as is said by
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some writers, under the authorization of his sister Constantia, widow of the king Hinni-
was after the abduction of Vetranio that the appointment of Gallus took place. Various
precautions were taken to ensure his fidelity. He had to make a solemn oath upon the Gospels not
to undertake anything against the rights of his cousin, who similarly pledged himself to Gallus.
He received at the same time the strong-minded and unfeminine Constantia as his wife, and
Luciliana, the count of the East, as his general. (Zosimus, 2, 45. Philostorgius, iv. 1, refers to
the oath between Constantius and Gallus; cp. Chron. Pasch. p. 540; Zonaras, xiii. 8.)

Gallus perhaps used his new power to obtain a relaxation of his brother's seclusion—at any
rate, Julian was released and permitted to pursue the studies which attracted him at Constant-
inople. Gallus then set out for the East, and in passing through Bithynia saw Julian pro-
longing the labour which had cost him so dear. (Julian, Epist. 149: Philip. 147; Gallus
did not deny them but, in the bluntness of his style, he shared the blame upon his wife. This excuse was not
favourably received, and Constantius issued an order for his execution, which took place towards
the close of the year 354. (Ibid. 11. 11–23. For the malign influence of Eusebius. cp. Jul. ad Ath.
p. 272 b.) Some say that Constantius repeated and recalled his order; but Eusebius prevented
the messengers from arriving in time to save him, and was afterwards in consequence put to
death by Julian (Philostorg. iv. 1).

3. Character and Relation to the Church.—All authorities (including Julian) agree that Gallus
was harsh and truculent in temper. Yet he had some popular qualities, and with a little
more prudence might have easily made himself a formidable rival to Constantius. He loved the
games of the circus, which were the delight of the people of Antioch, and reviled the bloody
spectacles of gladiators, which had been forbid-
den since the days of Constantine (virtus et

In another direction, too, Gallus appears to have been supported by a considerable popular
feeling, viz. in his translation of the body of the martyr Babylas, bishop of Antioch, to
Daphne, the delicious sanctuary of Apollo in
the suburb of the city. Here he built a chapel
to the saint opposite the heathen temple, and
did something to purge the place of its incon-
tinence and superstition. (Sozomen. H. E. v. 19.
Lihanius, ἀπεκ τῶν γραμματέων, t. ii. p. 556 ed.
Beiske, in an oration addressed to Theodosius
the Great, seems to refer to the suppression of
the Maiana by Gallus.)

His instruction had been Arian under the direction of Constantius, and he seems to have
been influenced not a little by the Anomoean Aetius. This notorious man had been sent to him
with a request that he should be put to death as a heretic. Gallus spared him on the interces-
sion of Leontius, bishop of Antioch, and became very friendly with him. According to Philo-
storgius, who reports these facts, he made him his religious instructor, and attempted by his
means to recall Julian to the faith, when he heard that he was wavering (Philost. H. E. iii.
27). It was doubtless this Arian connexion
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that made the Arian historian favourable to Gallus.

There is no reason indeed to doubt that the young Caesar was a zealous Christian after a sort, and that he was distressed by his brother's danger of apostasy. A letter expressing this anxiety, and the relief he felt at the report brought by Aetius, is extant, and is generally printed at the end of Julian's Epistles. Petavius and others consider it spurious, inasmuch as the writer says, "the report has reached me that you are deserting your first religion, which you received from your forefathers." (In ep. vii. 4) As their grandfather Constantius Chlorus was not a Christian, this phrase has been thought to indicate a forger's hand (see the note in Heyler, Jul. Epistolae, p. 545). Tillemont, however, does not see sufficient reason to reject the letter (Emp. 4, p. 492); and Julian's maternal ancestors had perhaps long been Christians. On the other hand, such a letter, if written, would hardly have been preserved by Julian, while it is in the kind of writing which a forger to invent would incline, therefore, on the whole, to think it spurious. Whatever may have been the case with this letter, Julian tells us that they corresponded rarely and about few things (ad Athen. p. 273 ἀλ.), and they do not seem to have seen each other after the meeting at Nicomedia, which followed Gallus's enthronement (Socr. H. E. iii. 1, p. 169). Julian (we are told by Libanius) sent his brother good advice; and if he had followed it, he might have retained both his life and the throne (Libanius ad Julianum Consulam, t. i. p. 376, Reiske).

On the relations of Gallus with Libanius, see Sievers, Leben des Libanius, pp. 62 foll. Liban. θέλητα φιλοδοξοί τυχόν, tom. 1, p. 65 foll. Tillemont (Julic. art. 30) seems to represent Gallus as more favourable to Libanius than was really the case (cf. Liban. Epist. 394 α.). [J. W.]

GALLUS (2), the name under which Salpicius Severus relates in his dialogues the portion of the life of St. Martin omitted in the biography. (Sulp. Serv. Dial. i. init. Opp. Vindob. 1866, p. 132 in Pat. Lat. xx. 189.) [R. T. S.]

GALLUS (3), bishop of Tica, in Byzaene, present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411, though this was denied by Petilianus. (Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 121.) [H. W. P.]

GALLUS, bishop of Arretium. ([GALLIUS.]"

GALLUS (4), a priest of the diocese of Troyes, who having left his wife and fled to Auvergne, was induced by a letter of St. Lupus to come back. (Sid. Apoll. vi. Ep. 3.) [R. T. S.]

GALLUS (5)—Feb. 22. Consul and martyr at Antioch. He cannot be identified, the name occurring very frequently in the consular fasti of the first three centuries. Syria was a consular province. (Mart. Hier.; Acta SS. Boll. Feb. iii. 288.) [G. T. S.]

GALLUS (6), an early bishop of Aosta, succeeding St. Jocundus. According to an epitaph in the monastery of St. Ursus, given in the Gallia Christiana, he was consecrated Oct. 15, 528, and died Oct. 5, 546. He was followed by Litifredus. Although included by some in the number of saints, he has no appointed day (Gall. Christ. xii. 808; Gams, Syriac Episc. 820). [S. A. B.]

GALLUS L. ST.


GALLUS (8), fourth bishop of Valence, between St. Apollinaris and Maximus II. He was present at the Fifth council of Orange, 543. (Gall. Christ. xvi. 394; Majn. i. 136.) [S. A. B.]

GALLUS (9), L. ST., sixteenth bishop of Clermont, succeeding St. Quintianus. His father Georgius was a senator, his mother Leocadia is said to have been descended from Vetius Epagathus the martyr of Lyons, A.D. 177. He was uncle to Gregory of Tours, who has left a short account of his life. From his earliest years he evinced piety and devotion, and when his father would have married him to a senator's daughter he fled to the monastery of Courron, about two leagues from Clermont, and begged for the tonsure. The abbot refused to receive him without his father's consent, to inveigle what was obtained, though not without difficulty, as he was the first-born of the house. He especially excelled in the wonderful sweetness of his voice, which led the bishop, St. Quintian, when he heard it, to take him away from the monastery to Clermont. His fame coming to king Theoderic, who had collected at Treves many clergymen of that diocese, he was instantly summoned to the court, where he soon rose high in favour with both king and queen.

St. Quintian of Clermont and Aprunculus of Treves died about the same time (circa A.D. 527). The latter diocese desired Gallus for its bishop, but he had begged that of Clermont from the king, who gave it to him, in spite of a deputation from the clergy, who had elected another, and sought the royal sanction with rich presents. Gregory observes here that now was beginning the evil custom of kings selling bishopship and clergy buying them. St. Gallus used to say that he could make a bishop out of the ricas who carried the food to the cook who prepared the meal made by Theoderic in honour of his elevation. As bishop he subscribed the council of Orleans (533) by the hand of Laurentius a priest; he was present at that of Clermont (535); he was represented by Optenardus at the third of Orleans (538), and was present in person at the fourth (541) and fifth (549). Gregory relates several anecdotes and miracles of him. To his intercession was ascribed the comparative immunity of Clermont from a plague (lues inguinaria), which seems to have devastated a great part of France, and is several times alluded to by Gregory. By way of thanking, for the deliverance of his diocese, he instituted Rogations in the middle of Lent, in which there was a procession with singing of psalms to the tomb of St. Julian the martyr.

On his death-bed he summoned his flock around him, and partook of the sacrament with them, and after receiving parts of the Scripture and blessing the bystanders, he died in the fifty-fifth year of his age. His episcopate lasted twenty-seven years, though Venantius Fortunatus, in his epitaph on him, "forte metri legibus coarctatus," as a commentator suggests, gives the number as twenty-six. Amid lamentations, in which even the Jews took part, he was buried in
GALLUS, II, ST.

Though appropriated by Dempster and Came- 
rarius as an Albanic Scot, he undoubtedly was of 
Irish birth, and his original name was Cellbach, 
Calech, or Caillech. He is said to have belonged 
to the sept of the Hy-Ceannsealach, and been 
related to St. Brigid of Kildare. He was 
ute and probably a younger brother of St. 
Deiclius (Jan. 18), abbot of Luere, but beyond 
his having been of noble descent, and son of 
Cethernach, son of Oescu, his mother being a 
queen of Hungary (Ussher, Brit. Ecol. iv. 431), 
we have no further particulars of his 
lineage. Trained at Bangor, in the famous 
school of St. Comgall, and carefully instructed 
in grammar, poetry, and the sacred 
rites, he accompanied Columbanus into Gaul, 
A.D. 585, followed him in his exile from 
Luzeul, went with him along the Rhine into 
Switzerland, and, apparently from his aptness at 
learning the languages, proved a most useful 
assistant in preaching the Gospel to the Suevi, 
Helvetii, and neighbouring tribes. [COLUMBANUS 
(1).]
When Columbanus in the year 612 left 
Switzerland to escape the persecution of the 
Burgundian court, and crossed the Rhetian 
Alps to Bobbio, Gallus was detained at Bregenz 
by a fever, and we need not imagine, with 
Walafrid, that any unworthy reason could 
be imputed by Columbanus to his companion for 
remaining behind. So soon as he could, after 
the departure of his master, Gallus returned to 
his friend the priest Willmar, at Arbona on 
the south shore of the Lake of Constance, and 
seems soon to have made up his mind to devote 
his remaining years to the conversion of the wild 
tribes who inhabited this eastern frontier of 
Austria. Finding a suitable place on the 
banks of the Steinah or Steinsach, he built his 
cell and oratory in the midst of a thick forest. 
Twelve others accompanied him. His collection 
of rude huts determined the site of the famous 
town and monastery of St. Gall. Three 
years after, Columbanus died at Bobbio, and bequested 
to his old associate his abbatial staff as the last 
token of property. With this and other gifts, 
which had urged him to destroy the heathen 
images at Bregenz, and made him, according to 
the legend, an invincible foe to the demons of 
the lake and of the mountain (Pertz, ii. 5), who 
retired in silence before him, Gallus laboured 
for the conversion of the heathen, and soon 
acquired such a fame for wisdom and holiness 
that, when the see of Constance became vacant 
in A.D. 616, the episcopate was urgently pressed 
upon him; and again, in A.D. 625, when his old 
companion abbot Eustace died at Luzeul, 
he was earnestly invited to return and take the 
oversight of his former home. But with 
firmness and courtesy he declined both the prefixed 
dignities, and for the bishopric of Constance was 
allowed to nominate his own deacon John, as 
the more suitable person, being a native of the 
place. The sermon he preached at John’s con- 
secration is still extant in the Latin in which 
it was probably pronounced; it is given by 
Canisius (Cant. iv. 569); see also 
for illustration, Geir, Der H. Gallus; Rettberg, 
Observationes ad Vitam S. Galli; Hefele, Die 
Einführung des Christenthums in Südwest- 
Deutschland; Raud, Eich d. Ecclec. Jesu Christi 
und durch Gallus, Apost. d. Schwäb.; Wart- 
mann, Urgeschichte der Abtei St. Gallen.)
GALNUTIUS

calling of the Gentiles, and ending with a powerful appeal to Christian faith and life, which gives us a pretty distinct idea of the state of the corrupt and barbarous society he was seeking to leaven. But beyond these few incidents we know little of his abbacy and work among the Alemani and Swabians. In extreme old age he was induced at the pressing request of the priest or bishop of Arbona to revisit Arbona, but catching a fever there, under which he suffered fourteen days, he died Oct. 16, 645 or 646, at the age of 95, but some would propose an earlier date. He was buried at Arbona.

The sermon—which has received a variety of titles, as An Abrifment of the Holy Scriptures, An Abrifment of Christian Doctrine, A Discourse as to the Way of Governing the Church—seems to be the only really genuine literary remains of St. Gall, but Dempster (Hist. Ecc. Gent. Scot. i. 299-301) attributes him to many other works. Tanner (Bibl. 307) adds Epistola ad Duxiciam from Ussher (Synogog, Wks. iv. 430) and to others. Bangastu’s Epistle in Hist. Lit. de la France in thinking the Epistles given by Canisius and Ussher were the work of Gallus the Younger, bishop of Clermont. (Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 180, and Kelt. Oct. 15; Lescaud, de Rech. Gent. Scot. i. 146, 147; Care, Script. Eccl. Hist. Lit. 452.)

The story of St. Gall gives rise to one of the most celebrated monasteries of the middle ages, and its library to this day stands unrivalled in the wealth and variety of its ancient manuscripts. (For an account of the school of St. Gall and its cultivation of the fine arts, see Hist. Lit. de la France, iv. 245-246.)

GALNUTIUS, saint. [WINWALLUS.]

GALONICA, ST. (GALONICA, GALENIA), the companion of St. Aquilina. They were at first employed to draw St. Christopher from the faith, but being converted suffered martyrdom. There is some obscurity as to whether the so-called Mozarabic breviary hymn does not represent them as solitars (Liturg. Mon. Mag. ii. 1167, congratulates with l. 795 n., 799 n.) instead of women, as in the later Western authorities. The name of Aquilina’s companion has other variations, ‘Niceta’ (Baronius, Suris, 12th-cent. Passionale), and ‘Nicera,’ or ‘Nicea’ (Walter of Spires, Legenda Aurea, etc.). They are commemorated in the Roman martyrlogy July 24. Mr. Baring-Gould mentions also Calnice as an alias for Aquilina.

[CHR. W.]

GALSUNThA (GACHILESONDA, GALSONTA, GALSUNTHA, GALESWINTHA, GALSUNDA, CHILPREADI), wife of Chilperic I, king of the Franks; daughter of Athanagild king of the Visigoths of Spain and Galsuntha. In 587 Siegbert, one of Chilpéric’s brothers, married Brunichilde the younger sister of Galsuntha. Chilpéric was stirred to emulation, and the same year sent an embassy to ask for the elder. His envoys were instructed to give assurances that, if his request were granted, he would put away the women with whom he had been living. Athanagild consented, and the bride elect was escorted in a triumphal progress through France, and received by Chilpéric with great honour at Rouen. Before her marriage she abjured the Arian heresy in which she had been brought up, and was baptised into the Catholic communion. For a short time the king loved her much, for, as Gregory explains, she had brought much treasure. But very soon he forgot the promise which he had made to her father, to relinquish his other women, and Fredegund resumed her influence. Slighted by her husband and insulted by his mistress, Galsuntha, weary of vain remonstrances, offered to give up her dowry if only she were sent back to Spain. Chilpéric assembled, and sought to soothe her with reassuring words, but, at Fredegund’s instigation, secretly instructed a slave to strangle her in her bed. After a few days’ signed mourning, the king married Fredegund. Galsuntha’s sanctity was said to have been attested by a miracle at her tomb. Chilpéric could not conceal his guilt from his brothers, who, urged on by Sigebert, undertook to avenge her death by depriving him of his kingdom. The quarrel was not finally composed till, by the treaty of Andelot, twenty years later, the five towns of Aquitanie on the Garonne, Bayonne and Bigorre, which formed Galsuntha’s Wedding-gage, were made over to Brunichilde (Greg. Tur. ix. 20). The chief authorities for Galsuntha’s life are Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. 28; Epist., i. 1; Alinon, iii. 5, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 625; and the poem written in her honour by Venantius Fortunatus (vii. 7, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 215-220). As to the last, however, though graphic in its details, it is not quite apparent how far the author has drawn on his own imagination. For modern accounts of this marriage see Lébèl, Greg. von Tours, p. 314, Doreau, D. du Ratin, Mém. fr. eccl. de France, i. 223-9 and the somewhat highly-coloured story of Augustus Thierry (Récits du Temps Mérovingiens, i.).

GAMALIEL I., also called GAMALIEL THE ELDER, RABBAN GAMALIEL, or simply GAMALIEL, son of the priest Simon, grandson of Hillel I., of the royal family of David. He succeeded to the presidency of the Sanhedrin, a.D. 30, in the reign of Agrippa I., and was one of the most distinguished doctors of the law at the beginning of the apostolic age. The fact that Gamaliel succeeded to the patriarchate about the same time that was written in his forward as the Messiah, that he propounded the law when Jesus preached the gospel, that he was the teacher of the apostle Paul, whose character he greatly moulded, and that it was before him in council that the apostle Peter was brought, makes any information which we may obtain about the teachings of this remarkable rabbi of the utmost importance to the student of ecclesiastical history and antiquity. His great maxim was to search the Scriptures to ascertain their true import, and faithfully to pay to the Lord’s sanctuary what belongs to the Lord. Hence he urged on his disciples to put themselves under approved teachers of the word of God, so as to learn to prize the saving of truth, to shun every species of doubt which leads to transgression, and not to pay the dues prescribed in the divine law according to conjecture. “Secure for thyself a teacher, keep thyself from doubting, and do not pay thy tithes conjecturally too often” (Abot, i. 10). How this maxim operated on the Great Apostle of the
Gentiles may be seen from a comparison of Rom. xiv. 23; 1 Tim. ii. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 15. What distinguishes him most are the benign statutes which he promulgated to protect the helpless, to ameliorate the condition of the oppressed, and to impart relief to all needy irrespective of creed or nationality, thus seeking to exalt the Mosaic law by setting forth the humane lessons which it teaches, as will be seen from the following extracts.

I. The Mosaic laws about the sabbath, which enjoin that “no man must go out of his place on the seventh day,” and “that no manner of work shall be done in it” (Exod. xvi. 29, xx. 10 with Jerem. xvii. 21, 22; Neh. x. 32, xiii. 15–19), were understood to involve abstention from the use of arms on this sacred day. Hence the faithful Jewish soldiers allowed themselves to be massacred by the enemy rather than violate the sabbath (1 Maccab. i. 32, &c.; 2 Maccab. vi. 11; Josephus, Antiq. XII. vi. 2; War. II. xvi. 4). Though the law was afterwards interpreted more leniently, viz. that it was only offensive war that was forbidden and that it did not forbid defensive action (1 Maccab. xii. 34, 43, &c.; Josephus, Antiq. XIII. i. 3, XIV. vi. 2; War. II. xvi. 4), it still was held that it forbids the soldiers to return home and carry their weapons when the sabbath is at the termination of a war they are more than a sabbath day’s journey from their homes. It was Gamaliel who interpreted the law still more liberally, and enacted that all persons called out to resist hostile invasions or to render help at inunctions, or at fires, or at the falling down of houses, or at child-birth, might walk 2000 yards, that is 6 stadia 750 Roman paces, or sabbath-day’s journey, as it is called in the New Testament (Acts i. 12), in any direction (Flavius Josephus, Antiq. 23). It was this canon which gave rise to the beautiful maxim that the Sabbath is delivered into your hands, not into its hands (Yoma, 85 b), alluded to by our Saviour (Mark ii. 27).

II. The rather uncertain grounds on which the Mosaic law permits divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1–4) exposed women in the time of Christ to great injustice on the part of unprincipled husbands and gave rise to social disorders. A husband who had sent a bill of divorce to his wife by a messenger could revoke it in any court of justice, thus causing the greatest inconvenience to the woman and her children, inasmuch as she could not be sure whether she was free or not. Gamaliel ordained that the husband could only recall it in the presence of the same messenger who carried it (Gittin, 22).

III. At the time of Christ and in the apostolic age many of the Jews had duplicate names, Hebrew and Greek. The practice of only signing one name in legal documents exposed the woman to the mercy of an unprincipled husband, inasmuch as he could insist on the instrument being invalid. Gamaliel, by decreeing that the clause “and every other name which describes the person” should be added to the signature (Gittin, 34), protected the helpless woman.

IV. According to the ancient law it required two witnesses to attest the death of a person and to declare a married woman legally a widow. This caused the greatest inconvenience, inasmuch as it was not always possible to produce two witnesses. Gamaliel ordained that upon the mouth of one witness shall the thing be established (Yevamoth, 110).

V. According to a custom already alluded to in the Book of Tobit (vii. 5), every Jew had to make a settlement on his wife on day of marriage (ראביה). Usurpacious children not infrequently deprived their widowed mother of this settlement by declaring that she had compounded for it in the lifetime of their father. Gamaliel enacted that her declaration to the effect that she had not relinquished the portion due to her is to be taken as binding (Gittin, 34). It is this special legislation for the protection of widows, which throws light on his disciple’s advice on the same subject (1 Tim. v. 1–16).

VI. He ordained that the poor heathen should have the same right as the poor Jews to gather the gleanings after the harvest, that equal provision should be made for both, that the sick heathen should be attended to, that the last honours should be paid to the dead. It was non-Israelite mourners should be comforted in towns which are inhabited by both Jews and Gentiles (Gittin, 59–81, &c.; Jerusalem Gittin, v. 2). This lesson to care for the poor of all nations, without distinction of creed, which Gamaliel inculcated on his disciples, illustrates the remark of the Apostle to the Galatians, vi. 10.

VII. The authority which he, as president of the Sanhedrin, exercised over the Jewish communities out of Palestine, and which may be seen from his edicts still extant, not only shews the ecclesiastical organization at the time of Christ and the apostles, but throws light upon an incident in the life of St. Paul recorded in the New Testament. On one occasion when he was on a journey in Syria, the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem had to declare the year intercalary, but they did it subject to his approval, and when Gamaliel returned he said, “I am satisfied therewith, and will also give my assent intercalary” (Mishnah Eduth, vii. 7; Sanhedrin, ii. 6). As both the form and the language of these decrees are of the utmost importance to the student of Christian antiquities, and the history of the apostolic age, we give a translation of one of them, subjoining the original in the foot-note. To our brethren the exiles in Babylon, the exiles in Media, the exiles in Greece, and to all other exiles of Israel, peace be multiplied to you. We make known to you that the lambs of this year are still tender, the pigeons are not yet fledged, and the spring is altogether late. It hath therefore pleased me and my colleagues to lengthen the present year by thirty days.” (Comp. Jerusalem Sanhedrin, i. 2.) This document explains the fact mentioned in Acts i. 1, 2; xiii. 5, that letters from the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem authorising a certain thing were binding upon
the Jewish communities far and wide, and that which was therein set forth was strictly obeyed. It moreover shows that the language of the Jews at that time, both in Palestine and elsewhere, was Aramaic.

VIII. An incident in the life of R. Gamaliel, related in different parts of the Talmud, is an important contribution to the history of the Septuagint. We are told that when he was once sitting on the Temple mount, the Greek version of Job was for the first time shown to him. He, however, so strongly disapproved of the book being popularised that he ordered the builders who were working at the temple to immure the copy in the wall (Jerusalem Sabbath, xvii. 1; Toschepta Sabbath, xiv. p. 128, ed. Zuckermandel; Babylon Sabbath, 115 a; Sopherim, v. 15). It will thus be seen that at the time of Agrippa I. the Greek translation of Job was unknown in Palestine, and that when a single copy was brought either from Egypt or Syria to R. Gamaliel, he at once had it concealed (Tosephta). R. Gamaliel had other copies, and it being in circulation at that time, the concealing of this single copy would have been useless (comp. Graetz, Montatschrift, xxvi. 83–91; Ginsburg, Commentary on Sopherim, v. 15).

IX. So great was the esteem in which he was held by the nation at large, that he was the first rabban of president of the Sanhedrinh, who was honoured with the title rabban (ר巴נן), the master, the teacher, which is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew rab (רבי), used in Babylon, and with suffix Rabbi (רבי), used in Palestine, (Toschepta Eduyoth). Rabban (ר巴נן) = PaBbαv however, is the highest title of the three forms, and is rendered still more venerable by the pronominal suffix, first person, viz. rabbanı (ר巴נן) = PaBbαv! my master, or rabbanı, as it is pronounced in Aramaic. It was the desire of blind Bartimeus and of Mary Magdalene to shew the greatest veneration for Christ, which made them call Him the most distinguished title recently bestowed upon the highest and most honoured person of the whole Jewish nation (Mark x. 51; John xx. 16). Though it is difficult adequately to render this title in English; yet it will be seen that of the two passages in which it occurs in the New Testament, the first (Mark x. 51) fails to give the force in the authorised version, whilst the second (John xx. 16) conveys a feebler idea of the original, since it makes it equivalent to Rabbi (רבי) PaBbαv, which occurs fifteen times in the New Testament (Matt. xxiii. 7, 8; xxvi. 25, 49; Mark ix. 5; x. 21; xiv. 45; John i. 33, 39; iii. 2, 26; iv. 31; vi. 25; ix. 2; xi. 8), and is translated by the same expression master eight times (Matt. xxvi. 25, 49; Mark ix. 5; x. 21; xiv. 45; John iv. 31; ix. 2; x. 8), though it is lower in degree than rabbonı.

X. His absolute faith in the ultimate victory of Divine truth, his great liberality of sentiments, and his prudence and humane conduct in the most difficult and cruel circumstances, who unceasingly strove to differ from him in matters of religion are attested by the record in the New Testament of the wise counsel which he gave about the treatment of the Apostles (Acts v. 34–40). That he composed or sanctioned the well-known prayer against Christian heretics, as is asserted by Cony-
of the nation, whilst some, losing all faith in the
love of the God of Abraham for his people, made
common cause with the Romans. These rene-
guades were appointed as judges and preservers
in order to try the sons brethren for treason.
They became the tools in the hands of the
oppressors and mainly aided by treachery the
self-imposed destruction of the nobler and more
heroic portion of the nation. In the midst of these
disintegrating and destructive forces, R.
Gamaliel commenced his patriarchate. His
faith in the promise that "the seed of Israel
shall never cease as a nation," never wavered.
He rallied the remnant of believers around him
at Zabne, and with never-failing zeal endeavoured
to rouse in the people a consciousness of their
divine mission. But the very remnant who were
willing to receive from the mouth of the
patriarch and his colleagues words of comfort
derived from the promises declared by God's
holy prophets were exposed to a far more power-
ful agency, which shook them to the very
foundation. Infant Christianity had put forth
its apostolic efforts to gain the suffering Jews
for Jesus, pointing out to the weary and heavy-laden
the only source of peace and rest, and won over to its ranks many of the
most pious and most learned children of Abraham.
Gamaliel had, therefore, to devise means so as to
guard his brethren against this threefold agency,
which, though antagonistic in its nature, com-
bined to break up the Jewish community.
To effect this the patriarch had the aid of some of
the most distinguished doctors of the law, who
were members of the Sanhedrin at Zabne in the
days of the apostles. Of these colleagues may be
mentioned R. Abba, his brother, R. Eliezer,
b. Hyrcanos, his brother-in-law [Eliacer],
R. Joha, b. Chananya, R. Zadok with his son R.
Eliezer, b. Torphon, R. Samuel the less, who is
sometimes erroneously identified with the
Arach, R. Akiba, R. Simon Hupekulhi, R. Akiba
b. Mahelalai, &c.
His first aim was to re-examine and harmonize
all the canonical decisions and traditional expedi-
tions of the Scriptures which had developed
themselves in the different schools of Shammai
and Hillel, and which had hitherto been trans-
mitted orally. The destruction of Jerusalem,
the execution by the Romans of some of the
most distinguished doctors, the dispersion
of others into different countries, and the conver-
sion of others again to Christianity, threatened
with bringing the loss of important traditions,
and to produce diversity of opinion and practice.
He therefore had all these decisions brought
before the Sanhedrin at Zabne by their different
disciples. These were discussed publicly,
and Gamaliel ruled that the decision of the
majority must be final, and henceforth become unable
the uniform practice, and that
insubordination on the part of the minority is to be
visited with the penalty of excommunication.
So rigorously did he carry out his rule that he
excommunicated his own brother-in-law, the
celebrated R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos, refusing to yield to the majority. [Eliacer b. Hyr-
canos.]
Another important point undertaken by
Gamaliel II. was to determine the time and
order of the daily prayer. As the Temple
which was the central place of national worship,
was now destroyed, and as the sacrifices ceased,
he ordered that every Israelite is bound to pray
three times a day, morning, afternoon and
evening; the morning prayer to take the place
of the morning sacrifice, the afternoon or
Mincha prayer to take the place of the evening
sacrifice, and the evening prayer to represent
the steaming of the fat of the evening sacri-
fice. He appointed R. Simon Hupekulhi, one of
the members of the Sanhedrin to arrange the
eighteen benedictions to include a prayer for the
rebuilding of Jerusalem, and asked R. Samuel the less, another
member of the Sanhedrin, to adapt the old
collect against heretics, entitled Birchath Ha-
Mininim (ביכרת הミיניים), to the present circum-
stances so as to include therein the new sect of
Christians which had recently sprung up in the
Jewish community (Deraochote, 28 b). It will
thus be seen that with the exception of the
collect for the speedy restoration of the holy
city, and the verbal alteration in the collect
against the heretics, these eighteen benedictions
are of pre-Christian form. It was then a part
of the Temple and synagogue service prior to and
at the advent of Christ. As there can therefore
be no doubt that our Saviour and the apostles
joined in these prayers when they resorted to
the temple and the synagogue, we subjoin them
in their re-arranged form according to the order
of Gamaliel II. 1. (דבירתי) Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers Abraham,
Isaac, and Jacob, great, omnipotent, fearful, and
most high God, who bountifully shewest mercy,
who art the possessor of all things, who rememberest the pious deeds of our fathers, and sendest the redeemer to their children's children, for
his mercy's sake in love. O our king, defender,
saviour and shield! 2. (דבירתי) Blessed art thou,
O Lord, the shield of Abraham. 3. (דבירתי) Thou
art powerful, O Lord, world without end; thou
bringest the dead to life in great compassion,
thou holdest up the falling, healest the sick,
loosest the chained, and shewest thy faithfulness
to those that sleep in the dust. Who is like unto thee, Lord of might, and who resembles thee?—a saving of the falling and bringing again, and causing salvation to flourish—and
thou art sure to raise the dead. Blessed art thou,
O Lord, who raisest the dead! 4. (דהיון)
Thou art holy, and thy name is holy, and
the holy ones praise thee every day con-
tinually. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the holy
God! 5. (דהיון) Thou mercifully bestowest
knowledge upon men and teachest the mortal
prudence. Mercifully bestow upon us, from
thyself, knowledge, wisdom, and understanding.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who mercifully
bestowest knowledge! 6. (דהיון) Our Father,
lead us back to thy law; bring us very near,
O our king, to thy service, and cause us
to return in sincere penitence into thy presence!
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who delightest in
repentance! 7. (דהיון) Our father, forgive us,
for we have sinned; our King, pardon us, for
we have transgressed; for thou art forgiving
and pardoning. Blessed art thou, O Lord, merciful
and plenteous in forgiveness! 8. (דהיון)
Look at our misery, contend our cause, and deliver us speedily, for thy name's sake, for thou art a
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magnificent deliverer. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the deliverer of Israel! 8. (םהינפ). Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed, save us and we shall be saved, for thou art our boast; grant us a perfect cure for all our wounds, for thou O Lord, O Lord, our king, art a faithful and merciful physician: Blessed art thou, O Lord, who healest the sick of thy people Israel! 9. (דוד). Bless to us, O Lord our God, for this year and all its kinds of produce; send thy blessing upon the face of the earth, satisfy us with thy goodness, and bless this year as the years gone by. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessest the seasons! 10. (udad).

Cause the great trumpet to proclaim our liberty, raise the standard for the gathering of our captives, and bring us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gathrest together the dispersed of Israel! 11. (דרש). Reinvest our judges as of old, and our councillors as of yore, remove from us sorrow and sighing and do thou alone, O Lord, reign over us in mercy and love, and judge us in righteousness and justice. Blessed art thou, O Lord the King, who loveth righteousness and justice! 12. (לע). Let the apostates have no hope, and let those who perish wickedness speedily perish; let them all be suddenly cut off, let the proud speedily be uprooted, broken, crushed, and humbled speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who breakest down the enemy and humblest the proud! 13. (עק). On the righteous, on the pious, on the elders of thy people, the house of Israel, on the remnant of the scribes, on the pious proselytes, and on us bestow, O Lord our God, thy mercy; give ample reward to all who trust in thy name in sincerity, make our portion with them for ever, and let us not be ashamed, for we trust in thee! Blessed art thou, O Lord, the support and refuge of the righteous! 14 a. (לע). To Jerusalem, thy city, in mercy return, and dwell in it according to thy promise; make it speedily in our day an everlasting building, and soon establish therein the throne of David. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest the prayers of thy people Israel in mercy! Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer! 14 b. (לע). The branch of David thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and exalt his horn with thy help, for we look to thy help all day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who causeth to flourish the horn of David! 15. (לע). Hear our voice, O Lord our God, have pity and compassion on us, and receive with mercy and acceptance our prayers, for thou art a God hearing prayer and supplications. Our king do not send us empty away from thy presence, for thou hearest the prayers of thy people Israel in mercy! Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest the prayers of thy people Israel in mercy! Blessed art thou, O Lord, who restor eth thy Shechinah to Zion in love. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who restor eth thy Shechinah to Zion! 17. (לע). We thankfully confess before thee that thou art the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, world without end, and that thou art the shepherd of our life and the rock of our salvation from generation to generation; we render thanks unto thee and celebrate thy praises. Blessed art thou, O Lord, whose name is goodness and whom it becomes to praise! 18. (לע). Bestow peace, happiness, blessing, grace, mercy, and compassion upon us and upon the whole of Israel thy people. Our father, bless us all unitedly with the light of thy countenance, for in the light of thy countenance didst thou give to us, O Lord our God, the law of life, loving kindness, justice, blessing, compassion, life, and peace. May it please thee to bless thy people Israel at all times and in every moment with peace. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessest thy people Israel with peace!

As scruples were entertained whether the ancient number of eighteen should be increased, the new prayer for the restoration of peace (14a) ordered by R. Gamaliel was combined with the old prayer for the kingdom of David (14b). This, however, gave rise to another question whether it was right to merge the two benedictions. Hence they were separated, and the present number of nineteen, which is justified by an appeal to Ps. xxi., where the number nineteen occurs nineteen times (Bereishoth, 28 b). The dates of Benedictions 1–3 and 16–18 are lost in remote antiquity; Benedictions 4–13, 14 b, 15, 16, were compiled during the Maccabean struggles and the Roman ascendency in Palestine, whilst 14 a was the new addition. Three of these benedictions were pronounced by the priests on the people every morning in the hall of the square in the Temple court; the high priest recited Benedictions 16 and 17 in the Temple on the great day of Atonement (Yoma, 68 b), whilst the four-and-twenty representatives of the people recited all of them in the Temple every day (Sabbath, 24 b). Hence the great importance which Gamaliel attached to the making of these benedictions, which constituted an essential part of the sacerdotal Temple service, the central point of the daily prayer. For the same reason he fixed the service for the Passover eve in the place of the Paschal sacrifice, and himself composed several phrases on it. On the 17th of Nisan, on that evening (Bereishoth, 37; Tosaphoth Bereishoth, iv.). He exerted himself to the utmost to do away with pernicious customs which weighed heavily upon the people, but which they had not the courage to discard. Thus it was an ancient custom among the Jews to bury their dead with great pomp. The heavy expense which this entailed upon families with small means often crippled their resources for life. Fear of this heavy burden not unfrequently led many to leave their dead unburied. Gamaliel forbade this extravagance, and ordered his family to bury him in simple white linen (Mod Nedarim, 27; Ketuboth, 8 a; Tosaphoth Nedarim, iv.), and this mode of burial is followed by the Jews to this day. He also sacrificed the length and breadth of Syria to become personally acquainted with the condition of the people in the different towns and villages. He investigated their institutions, visited their synagogues and schools, delivering public addresses, giving decisions, and organizing places for education. It was on these journeys that he came in frequent
contact with the apostolic fathers and the early Christians. Like many other indefatigable spiritual heads, he could brook no contradiction. Difference of opinion on the part of his decisions, and arbitrarily excluded the public from attending the discussions at the Sanhedrin, though it was contrary to ancient custom to carry on the debates with closed doors. This fomented secret discontent with his conduct, which so manifestly assisted itself openly, and led to his temporary deposition from the patriarchate. The immediate occasion of the open rupture between him and the Sanhedrin was as follows. A disciple came before R. Joshua, the vice-president (גְּנֵרְבָּן) with the question, "Whether the recital of evening prayer was a duty or a voluntary act?" to which he replied that it is voluntary. It so happened that with his concurrence and to respect the decisions of his opponents. He now endeavoured to seek reconciliation with those whom he had offended. To this end he visited R. Joshua, whom he had mostly sinned against. When he entered R. Joshua's house, he found to his utter amazement that this distinguished and greatly beloved doctor of the law was engaged in his accustomed needlework. "Have you to get your livelihood in this way?" exclaimed the wealthy ex-president. This gave R. Joshua the desired opportunity for expostulating with him about his indifference to the manner in which some of the members of the Sanhedrin had got a living. "It is bad, indeed, that you have only now got to know this. Woo to the age whose guide you are, you know not the cares of the sages and what trouble they have to earn a subsistence" (B. H. 29) Ḥ. Gamaliel meekly listened to the merited reproof, and then sincerely asked R. Joshua's pardon. He not only willingly but eagerly endeavoured to have him reinstated as patriarch. About this there was no difficulty, for as soon as R. Eleazar heard that a reconciliation had taken place between them he, accompanied by the members of the Sanhedrin, went to R. Gamaliel's house the following morning to pay him the homage due to the president. R. Eleazar's voluntary resignation, however, was not accepted; it was so arranged that they should both have the dignity, R. Gamaliel alternately presiding over the Sanhedrin a fortnight, and R. Eleazar a week. The lesson which Gamaliel thus learned he never forgot. Henceforth he was most affable and forbearing. He cultivated friendship with all classes of people, with the learned of all nations, with Christians and the different religious orders which sprang up at the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd century of the Christian era. Of his intercourse with heathen philosophers we have an interesting account in the following anecdote, which shows how much the Gentiles of that period read the Septuagint, and with what weapons they attacked its contents. A Gentle sage remarked to him, "Your law says, 'God is a jealous God.' Why, then, does he manifest his jealousy against idolaters and not against the idols?" To this
GAMALIEL

R. Gamaliel replied in a parable. "A king hath a son that delighteth to call his dog by the name of his own royal father. Now with whom will the king be angry, with the dog or with his son?" Then saith the heathen philosopher, "Why doth not God destroy these idols if they are such worthless things?" Saith R. Gamaliel, "If the heathen only worshipped useless things God might do it, but they worship the sun, the moon, the water, &c., and shall God destroy the world because of fools?" (Aboda Zara, 54 a-55 a). Of his intercourse with Christians we may adduce the following account. A Christian believing that "life and immortality are brought to light in the Gospel" (2 Tim. i. 10), extolled the doctrines of the New Testament by asking R. Gamaliel, "How do you know (without the New Testament) that the dead will rise again?" To this Gamaliel replied, "From the words, 'the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give them' (Deut. xi. 21), but as the fathers were dead it havepassed a resurrection when alone the land could be given to these fathers" (Sanhedrin, 90 b). This shews the force of the interpretation given by Christ of Matt. xxii. 32, and the inference he deduced therefrom. This liberal intercourse made him one of the most popular presidents of the Sanhedrin. R. Gamaliel was in years, full of honours, and beloved by all, Gamaliel died about A.D. 117. At his funeral Onkelos, the celebrated translator of the Pentateuch into Chaldee, who was one of his disciples, paid him royal honours by burning costly garments and furniture to the value of seventy Tyrian minas = 21,4, declaring that "R. Gamaliel spake words more than a hundred kings from whom the world hath nothing" (Twofold Sabbath, viii. p. 119, ed. Zuckermandel; Aboda Zara, 11 a). R. Eleazar, his co-president, and R. Joshua, his former antagonist, ordered general mourning, to which the whole nation readily responded. R. Gamaliel left two sons, named Simon and Abbà, and a daughter he married to his brother, R. Aboa. At the marriage he gave her the significant paternal blessing, which strikingly illustrates the patriarch's character, "May you never be compelled to seek your parental root again" (Yebamoth, 15 a). His son Simon succeeded him in the presidency under the title of Simon the Ill. (comp. Sappapar, Kerem Cleqem).

[C. D. G.]

GAMALIEL (3), patriarch of the Jews in the reign of Theodosius II, from whom he received the title of honorary prefect. He seems to have abused his power by arbitrary and illegal conduct, and we have extant a law of Theodosius of the year 415, by which he is deposed. (Cod. Theod. vi. 22.) Three of the charges against him are that he had ventured to act as judge in cases where Christians were concerned, that he had tried to force circumcision upon Christians, and that he had kept Christian slaves. It is probable that this is the same Gamaliel whom St. Jerome mentions (Ep. L7, § 3) as an enemy of the consular Hesychius. He appears to have been the last of the Jewish patriarchs, since in 429 the office is represented as extinct (Cod. Theod. vi. 29), and it is reasonable to connect this with the fact of his flagrant abuse of power.

[M. F. A.]

GAMALINUS, bishop of Perrha, in the province of Comagune, during the reign of the emperor Anastasius, whilst Severus was patriarch of Antioch, whose heretical opinions Gamalinus adopted, c. A.D. 512. Assemani (Bibl. Orient. i. 409 n.) narrates from Syriac authorities his uniting with Paul bishop of Edea in the expulsion of certain pseudo-monks who pretended to partake neither of bread nor wine, nor water, yet made frequent use of the consecrated elements. (Le Quien, O. C. ii. 944.) [L. D.]


GAMELBERTUS (GAMELBERTUS, GAMELBERTUS, AMELBERTUS, AMELBERRTUS), parish priest in the village of Feagum or Michelbsuch in Lower Bavaria. The Bollandists (Acta SS. 27 Jan. ii. 783 sq.) represent him as flourishing at the time of Charlemagne's final repression of Tassilo duke of Bavaria, a.d. 788. According to an anonymous Vita which they give, he was born one of noble parents at Michelbsuch, at the command of the Isar and the Danube. He preferred study and retirement, to which, after promotion to the priesthood and a visit to Rome, he devoted himself. He was a man of only moderate learning, but devoted to his pastoral duties. Forsaking the family mansion, he built himself a cell adjoining the parish church, where he might practise his nightly devotions without restraint. In the Lenten fast he secluded himself absolutely, allowing no one to visit him, and never going out except to celebrate mass, which he did daily, concealed however from the laity by a veil suspended before the sanctuary, while a deacon delivered the sacrament to the communicants. During the same season he heard confessions and gave absolution through a window in his cell, but was never seen. [J. G.]

GANDERICUS (CANDERECUS, GAUDERICUS, GAUDERICUS), thirty-fifth bishop of Lyons, succeeding Theodoricus, or Tetricus, and presiding over the church, under the rule of Vitalianus (comp. Mappart, Kerem Cleqem).

[C. D. G.]

GANDO, 15th bishop of Strasbourg, between Aldus and Uto I., according to Gall. Chr. i. 780. Winpheling (Cat. Episc. Argent. p. 16) places him 19th between Gundoaldus and Uto I., and finds him described as a man "clari ingenii." From his position in the list he may have lived early in the 7th century. [C. H.]

GANGULPHUS, martyr. [GANGULPHUS]

GANRICUS of Treves. [GANRICUS (2)]

GANGULPHUS. After Bosco, who was bishop of Constance about A.D. 942, the history of
the see of Constance is lost in obscurity till the time of Audoinus, who lived about A.D. 736. A catalogue of the 14th century gives as the bishops of Constance during this interval, Oph- 
tanus, Picturinus, Severus, Joannes, and Buffo, or Boso. This list is adopted in Gallia Christiana, v. 894, and by Mansius (in Pistorius, Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores, iii. 702). Another list, however, in Mangel's Chronicle, written in A.D. 1548, fills up the interval with Gargulis, Fidelis, and Theobaldus. This is followed by Dami, Series Ep. 271, who spells the name Garg-
ulphus, and von Müller, Helvetia Sacra, ii. 8. Gelpke (Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz, ii. 282) prefers the former list.

[F. D.]

GARALT, abbat. [GERALDUS.]

GARBAN (GARBAN, GARDAN, GERVAN), (1) In the Life of St. Barry Garban son of Finabarr is named among his pupils at Lough Ine. Colgan (Acta SS. 750, 751) places his feast on March 26, and thus identifies him with Garban abbat of Achadhu. Harris and Archdall follow Colgan and attach Garban to Dun gargavan, on Dunargavan Bay, as its founder, though Lanigan seems to have made the mark in copying a title. The "fort of Garvan" in all likelihood "swears its name not to a monk but to a chief slain." He flourished in the middle of the 7th century, if he was a pupil of St. Barry. [BARRY.] (Lanigan, Ecol. Hist. Ir. ii. 318, 319; Mart. Donagh. by Todd and Reeves, 87.)

(3) Garban, priest of Kinsale, a parish near Sweers, co. Dublin, commemorated on July 9. His father was Langath, and his mother Cainer, who was mother also of St. Mocha or Cronan (Aug. 9) of Clondalkin, and other saints. He was a disciple of St. Coemgen (June 3) of Glen-
dalch, and seems to have had considerable influence with that holy man. (Mart. Donagh. by Todd and Reeves, 191, 213; Lanigan, Ecol. Hist. Ir. ii. 44, 45; Forbes, Kat. Scotti. Sainct, 15.)

(4) Garvanus, son of Aengus, was one of the bishops of Tuath, of which he is said to have been present at a council called in Ireland in the time of St. Forannus and St. Columba for meeting the public necessities and allaying quarrels. He was a descendant of Coall Crimthain, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, and, if a contemporary of these holy men, he flourished about the middle of the 6th century. (Colgan, Acta SS. 396, c. 5, and Tr. Thom. 463, c. 55.)

[3. O.]

GAR, son of Cewydd ab Caw, a Welsh saint of the 6th century, said to have had a church in Glamorganshire dedicated to him. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 263.)

[3. G.]

GARDINGUS, bishop of Tuy, one of the Arian bishops who embraced Catholicism at the famous third council of Toledo, A.D. 589. The signature of the Catholic bishop of Tuy, Nephila, appears in the same council. Gardingus was probably made bishop of Tuy by Leovigild, to the exclusion of the Catholic bishop, after the final annexation of the kingdom of the Suevi, A.D. 585. (Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 298; Esp. Esp. xxii. 30.) [ANILA.] [M. A. W.]

GARIGLISI (1), Numidian bishop, addressed Cyp. 70. (Ep. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. de Bap. Haur. 1.) [Compare with the name "Gargilisus."
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[2. W. B.]


[2. W. B.]

GARIABUS (GARIALBUS), about twenty-second bishop of Angers, between Godoberus and Boso, perhaps about the middle of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. iv. 551.)

[3. A. B.]

GARIALBUS (1), son of Grimosde king of the Lombards, by the sister of king Goderbet, whom he had ejected. Garibalde, while a boy, was left at his father's death, A.D. 672, as king of the Lombards, but in three months he was turned out by Perthai, brother, and formerly joint ruler with Goderbet. (Paulus Diaconus, v. 38, and Catalogus Archon Langob., in Monumenta German. Historiarum, pp. 155, 508.)

[4. A. H. D. A.]

GARIALBUS (2) (GAREBALDUS), twenty-second bishop of Touli, succeeding Dofo and followed by Godo, is said to have been the son of Wulfoaldus, a count. In 708 he was witness to a charter of Pippin and Piecrutius in favour of the monastery of Epternach, in the diocese of Treves (Migne, Pat. Lat. ixxxii. 540). In 709 he subscribed a charter of his father, for the foundation of the monastery of St. Michael, near Verdun (Migne, Pat. Lat. Ixxxivii. 1258). He added many new possessions to his church, and is said to have died about A.D. 735 (Gall. Christ. xii. 905.)

[5. S. A. B.]

GARIALBUS (3), GARIOBALDUS, GARIOYALBUS (GARIBALDUS, GARIADANUS, GATHIALDUS, GAIHALT, GAUHALDUS, GHEHALDUS), bishop of Ratisbon, St. Boniface, on his return from his third journey to Rome, A.D. 739, was invited by Odilo duke of Bavaria to visit that country. There he made many converts, and finding that Vivlio, who had been consecrated by the pope, was the only bishop in Bavaria, he, with the duke's approval, divided Bavaria into four sees, Salzburg, Frising, Ratibud, and Passau. The last was assigned to Vivlio, and to the others St. Boniface appointed Joannes, Erembercht, and Garivaldus. The authority for this account is a letter of pope Gregory III. to St. Boniface, dated Oct. 29, in the twenty-third year of the emperor Leo (A.D. 740), in Migne, Pat. Lat. Ixxix. 584, in which he approves of St. Boniface's arrangements, mentioning that the latter had informed him "dum episcopos non habebant in provincia, nisi unum nomine Vivilio." Pagi, however, in his notes on Baronius, xii. 739 IL, 756 VIII., on the authority of certain verses of an anonymous writer, who lived in the next century, argues that one Wicpertus was bishop of Ratibod, and that till his death in A.D. 756 Garibaldus was only his coadjutor. However, the authority of the above quoted passage seems preferable. There was also a Wicpertus, bishop of Augsburg, whose life is given in the Boll. Acta SS. Aprili. li. 547, who

2 R
GARIPALD, duke of Turin, sent by Godbert (Joint king of the Lombards with his brother, losing, in 661) to obtain help against his brother from Grimoald duke of Benevento. Garipald intrigued with Grimoald, who killed Godbert with his own hand. The story is so told as to throw all the blame of treachery on Garipald. (Paulus Diacon. iv. 51; Pauchet, Forschungen z. d. G. ii. 458.) Garipald was shortly afterwards murdered by a hand of the house of Godbert.

[ A. H. D. A.]

GARISIGIUS (CHARRISIGIUS, CARRISIGIUS), twenty-eighth bishop of Tours, succeeding Latuinus, and followed by Chrotermus (i. c. a.D. 650). The catalogue assigns two years for the duration of his episcopate. (Gall. Christ. iv. 28.)

[S. A. B.]

GARIVALDUS (GAROFAELUS), twenty-eighth bishop of Clermont in the latter half of the 7th century, succeeding Felix. According to one of the lives of St. Fauguecutes (Prix), upon the death of Felix the greater part of the clergy or people desired to have St. Prix for their bishop, but Garivaldus, who was archdeacon of the city, usurped the see. He survived his intrusion only forty days, and was succeeded by St. Prix (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 634; Gall. Christ. ii. 245).

[S. A. B.]

GARMON, Welsh form of GERMANY, or Germanus of Auxerre (Rees, Welsh Saints, 121).

[G.]

GARNIMIA Irish saint. (Boll. Acta SS. 23 Feb. iii. 280.) [GARNIN.]

[G.]


GARTNAI DH, GARNAIT, GARTNAICH, GARTNAITH, GARTNART, GARTNAY (GARTNAICH), son of Domelich or Domnach, succeeded Brude, the friend of St. Columba, on the Pictish throne, in the year 584, and seems to have belonged to the southern Picts in Scotland, as his residence was not at Inverness but at Abernethy on the Tay, where he built a monastic church dedicated to St. Bridget, and thus aided in the revival of the Christianity founded among the southern Picts by St. Ninian. According to Tigernach he died a.D. 599. (Skene, Celt. Scotl. i. 233, 235, ii. 136, 137; Robertson, Scot. under her Early Kings, i. 185, App. ii, Reeves, St. Adamnan, 372. For this king and the many forms of his name, see Skene, Chron. Picts and Scots, 462, "Gartnart."

[J. G.]

GARUAN, G. RIAN. [GARSHAN.] GATIANUS, said by Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. 25 and 522) to have been sent by the see of Rome in the first year of Decius to Gaul, where he became first bishop of Tours. Persecution arising he hid himself in the caves of a few Cistercian monks, and celebrated in secret the "mysterium solemnissimis diei dominici." His death is placed in the Roman Martyrology at Dec. 20, 301. (Gall. Chr. xvi. 4.)

[R. T. S.]

GATIANUS, martyr. [GATIANUS (G.)] GATSA KELEK, the name of a monster. Half a man and half a dog, who is said to have assisted SS. Andrew and Bartholomew in their preaching the gospel in Parthia. [ARENAS. The Conflicts of the Holy Apostles, p. 51, translated from the Ethiopic by S. C. Malan.]

[G. T. S.]

GAUBALDUS of Ratisbon. [GAURALDI]

GAUCHIOBERTUS, bishop. [GAUCHIOBERTUS]

GAUDELENUS (GAUDOLANUS), bishop of Lerida, a.d. 653. The deacon Sauturinus represents him at the eighth Council of Toledo (653). (Mansi, x. 1293; Aguirre-Catalan, iii. 448; Ep. Sagra. xlii. 107.)

[M. A. W.]

GAUDENCIUS, bishop of Astigi. All our information about him is derived from a letter addressed by the bishops who attended the first council of Seville, a.d. 590, to his successor Pegasius. This letter was in reply to one the latter had sent them by his deacon, containing a list of the slaves belonging to the church of Astigi, of whom some had been manumitted by his predecessor Gaudenci-us, and others given by him to his relations. The letter of the bishop states that they had consulted the canons to see if such a manumission or gift was valid, and had found that if a bishop had given his private property to anyone but the church (his sons and descendants only excepted), the gift was void. (Compare canons 7 and 33 of the Council of Agatho, in Mansi, viii. 325-330.) Therefore, if the church of Astigi was not in possession of the property of Gaudencilus, the slaves he had manumitted were not legally free. However, if his property was sufficient to manumit the church for the value of the slaves, they were to remain free. If, on the contrary, he had not made compensation to the church, the bishops, being more inclined to humanity than severity, decided that those who had been so manumitted should remain free in other respects, but should be so far subject to the rights of the church that they could not leave their property to any but their sons, who in turn were to be subject to the like condition, and if any of the class died without leaving issue qualified to succeed him, the church was to become entitled to his property. As to the other slaves, whom the said bishop had transferred to his relations, they were to be restored to the church, unless he had paid
the full price out of his own means. Though the address of this letter does not mention the see of Pegasisus, we know that it was Astigio, as in the second part of the letter the words occur, “Hanc formam non solum vestra, hoc est Asti- gitana, servavit ecclesia.” Servandus too, as descom of Pegasisus, bishop of Astigio, subscribes the acts of the third council of Toledo, A.D. 589. (Esp. Sur. x. 85; Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 693; Gans, Kirchengeschichte, ii. part ii. 19.)

[FD.]

GAUDENTIUS—Aug. 30. A virgin martyr at Rome with three others. (Mart. Hieron., Usuard.)

[G. T. S.]

GAUDENTIANUS, bishop of Volterra, probably in the time of Cunibert, 688-700. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia, xviii. 215.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GAUDENTIUS (1), bishop of Pisa, one of the judicial committee appointed to examine the case of Caecilianus at Rome, A.D. 313. (Opt. i. 23; Ugelli, Ital. Sac. iii. 351.) [H. W. P.]

GAUDENTIUS (2), bishop of Niassus (Nissa) in Moesia Superior, deposed by the Arians. He was present at the council of Sardica in A.D. 347. (Mansi, iii. 39, 42; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 514.) [J. de S.]

GAUDENTIUS (3), bishop of Turris Tam- allaiaea, or Trettamalia, a town of Byzacena, between Tescapae and Leptis Magna (Telemin), Ant. R. 74, 3. Another reading gives Tydinae as the place of his see. He was present at the council of Carthage concerning Donatism, A.D. 348 or 349. (Morocelli, Africa Christ. i. 339, Bruna, Concil. i. 111.) [H. W. P.]

GAUDENTIUS (4), bishop of Armenia (Rimini), c. A.D. 346-360. When the Arians, under the patronage of Constantius, held a council at Rimini, A.D. 359, Gaudentius appears to have retired from his diocese for a time, but to have speedily returned, and opposed the Arians so vigorously, declaring the decrees of the council null, that his enemies in their anger stoned and best him to death. (Acta SS. Oct. 14; Ugelli, Ital. Sac. ii. 410; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia. ii. 372.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS (5), ninth bishop of Arretium (Arezzo). He succeeded Eusebius c. A.D. 381. He was put to death as a martyr in the following year by the prefect Marcellinus, a bitter persecutor of Christianity, and was succeeded by Decius. Ugelli accounts for the martyrdom taking place under a Christian emperor by the circumstance that Valentinian at the commencement of his reign appointed pagan prefects. (Rom. Mart. Jun. 19; Boll. Acta SS. Jun. iii. 848; Ugelli, Ital. Sac. i. 456; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia. xviii. 69.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS (6), the name of three Numidian Donatist bishops, viz. of Nigzirbuz or Nibizirbuz, Zerta, and Tigiss; the first two present at the Carthaginian conference A.D. 411, the third prevented by illness. (Mon. Vet. Don. pp. 167, 202, 209.) [H. W. P.]

GAUDENTIUS (7), Donatist bishop of Tamugada, Tamogada, or Tamugadi, a town of Numidia, about fourteen Roman miles north-east of Lambessa (Tennagadi) (Ant. R. 34, 2), one of the seven managers on the Donatist side in Carth. Conf. A.D. 411, but appearing to have taken no very active part in the proceedings. (Mon. Vet. Don. pp. 288, 408, ed. Oberthür.)

The principal occasion on which his name has become notorious is his controversy with St. Augustine, A.D. c. 420. When Dulcius [Dul- cius] had sent him a letter of a pacific nature respecting the course to be pursued by the imperial government towards the Donatists, Gaudentius replied in two successive letters, one shorter, the other more at length. These letters Dulcius placed in the hands of Augustine, who replied to them in the two books entitled contra Gaudentium (Aug. Opp. vol. ix. 707-751, ed. Migne), and which may be regarded virtually as representing the closing struggle of the Donatist controversy (Vol. i. p. 895).

In the first book Augustine criticizes the complimentary form of address used by Gaudentius towards Dulcius, as inconsistent with the severe principles of his sect, and defends the language of Dulcius, but disclaims any responsibility on the part of the church for language used by a layman and a soldier. Gaudentius had said that he studiously discouraged any hindrance being offered to those who wished to quit the Donatist communion and return to the church, for, says he, “we who have learned that no one ought to be forced into religious belief, cannot retain against their will those who wish to leave us.” To this Augustine replies that if Gaudentius thinks it right to promote return, he should do so openly, but if wrougthing, it is dishonourable and cruel in him and his party to sanction it.

The second letter of Gaudentius is longer, and so also, consequently, the reply of Augustine to it. Its arguments may be exhibited briefly, though not in their precise order, as follows:—

I. Holy Scripture forbids equally the punishment to be inflicted, or the guilty to be spared (Ex. xxiii. 7). Gabinus [Gabinus], and those turncoats who have renounced Donatism, ought either before their departure not to have been treated as guilty persons, or after it not to be received by the Catholics as innocent.

II. God gave man free will, but persecution abolishes this; how can then the conduct of the persecutor be thought to agree with the will of God?

III. The church is founded, not on the laws of sovereigns, but on the preaching of prophets.

IV. Scripture in general, our Lord and His apostles, foretell persecution as the lot of the righteous; therefore righteousness is on the side not of the persecutors, but of the persecuted. (Matt. v. 11, 12; John xv. 2, 3; 2 Tim. iii. 12; Rev. vi. 9, 11; Wisdom v. 1-6.)

V. The good shepherd dies for his flock, and ought, therefore, not to avoid persecution, but to perish at his post. On this ground to follow the example of Nazis in committing suicide, who is praised in his deed by Scripture, is justifiable and praiseworthy. (2 Macc. xiv. 27-46.)

VI. The case of Emeritus, who was falsely reported to have become a Catholic, was grossly misrepresented. [Emeritus.]

To these arguments St. Augustine replies:

I. The imperial government does not wish to kill, but to correct, and only in extreme cases to banish those who hinder others from exercising...
their free choice in returning to the church. In matters of cruelty the Donatists go beyond the government, for they threaten to commit suicide, while Dulcitius and the government wish to save them from their own violence. In this respect they are really wishing to suffer not for Christ’s sake but for their own, and thus they are not martyrs, but only deceitful heretics. The example of Raisis is related only, not commended by the author of the Book of Maccabeus, and after all, the authority of this book is not to be placed on a level with that of the other books of Scripture. Moreover, even our Lord commanded His apostles to take flight during persecution, as St. Paul in fact did when he was in danger at Damascus (Matt. x. 23; Acts ix. 23, 25). If our Lord’s promise concerning the limits of flight in such cases (Matt. x. 23) cannot fail, but the Donatists exclude themselves from its operation, how can they be truly said to belong to Christ? It is not all who suffer, but those who suffer “for the sake of righteousness.”

But, in truth, what right have the Donatists to complain of persecution (a) whose forefathers persecuted Caucasians with the utmost bitterness; (b) whose partisans, especially the Circumcellionists, have used all manner of violence towards Catholics; (c) whose preachers had no scruple in enjoying immunity during the time of Julian, while the Catholics were suffering persecution, a contrast which destroys the assumption on the part of the Donatists of persecution as a mark of exclusive goodness; (d) again, what becomes of their consistency when the story is told of Scardus, bishop of Tigicis, who fled to avoid the violence of Purpurius at theDonatist council of Cirta, A.D. 305, and who must himself have been guilty of “tradition,” for otherwise how could he have escaped in the persecution under Diocletian? (e) Lastly, let Gaudentius remember the flagrant instances of violent conduct on the part of his own predecessors. Is this the Church? (f) But it is almost equivalent to persecution to behold, as Catholics and well-disposed persons are obliged to do, the perversity and obstinacy of men who are bent on destroying both themselves and others.

IV. As to compulsion, (a) our Lord in His Parable of the sower (Matt. xiii. 12) desired His servants to “compel” men to enter His kingdom. (b) It was by state authority that the people of Nineveh were brought to repentance.

V. As to state interference, (a) kings have been guardians of the church, and God gives in charge to them to correct disobedience. (b) If error is not to be corrected, how can human punishment be justified? The primeval law of punishment was one of death, but in truth the emperor wishes to spare life.

VI. What can be more inconsistent than the conduct of the Donatists towards the Maximianist Felicianus, whom they first denounced and persecuted, and afterwards received without impugning, sanctifying all his acts done during secession?

VII. The case of Emeritus was no doubt misrepresented, but the Donatist cause gains no advantage from the true statement of it. When he appeared, as he did of his own accord, he neither offered argument on behalf of himself and his party, nor replied to any urged against them by Augustine, but simply remained silent. He can thus claim no credit for being a faithful confessor assailed by persecution.

VIII. Gaudentius regards Gabinius, and those who have returned to the church, as idolaters, for they have, he says, adopted its worship under compulsion. Is the church of God a mere human creation, or have not these people acted as they have done deliberately, because they have recognised its divine mission, and like sensible men have become weary of a system destitute of divine foundation?

IX. Gaudentius takes credit for not hindering such persons from returning, but on his own principles, is he not sanctioning idolatry by doing so?

Finally, Augustine invites Gaudentius to a friendly conference on the disputed points.

The second Book, c. Gaudenius, is a reply by Augustine to another letter, in which Gaudenius quotes the authority of St. Cyprian to show the inadmissibility of the new sect. Augustine replies that his authority does not shelter them, why did they leave the church? Because they could not endure the presence of “tares” among the “wheat.” But in order to set themselves on the right ground in this point, it is necessary for them to apply the meaning of the parable as the world outside of the church, in which alone they said that “tares” were to be found. Further, that the “bad fish” of another parable were in their view supposed to be unknown to the fisherman, and therefore not to be included in the church. On this principle, says Augustine, many of the parishioners of sins committed by persons unknown to them. Does Gaudentius remember the mistake made by Emeritus at the conference, when he denied the reading of Matt. iii. 12, “floor,” “stream,” i.e. that by the “floor” was meant the church, but, being corrected by his colleagues, maintained that by “shovel” was meant offenders who could not injure the good (Mon. Vet. Don. p. 564, ed. Oberth.). But this opinion does not agree with that of Gaudentius, who holds that the good are injured by the neighbourhood of the evil. If this last opinion be the true one, what hope can there be for the Donatists themselves, who separated themselves from known evils, but who must have perished through existence of unknown? But, in truth, the doctrine of Cyprian is against both Emeritus and Gaudentius. He taught that Christians ought not to withdraw from the church on account of the existence in it of “tares.” But, say the Donatists, “tares” are only to be found in the world, not in the church. The contrary says that tares and wheat are to grow together till the harvest, and that He will not come till the gospel has been preached to all nations. There must, therefore, be many nations among whom no wheat has been sown, and from whom therefore it cannot have perished. As to baptism, the Donatists blame the Catholics for not recognizing heretics, but on their principles how could Felicianus baptise duly, who was condemned by the council of Bagaria, even more severely than Caucasians had been at an earlier period, yet he was permitted to return to the Donatist community without question. But besides this, when Cyprian wished to re-baptize heretics, Stephen, bishop of Rome, refused to do
GAUDENTIUS, the bearer, together with Quadrulteus, of a letter from Severus to St. Augustine. (Aug. Ep. 110.) [H. W. P.]

GAUDENTIUS, a Roman to whom St. Jerome wrote in the year 413 on the education of his daughter Pacatula. The child had been born at the time of the sack of Rome by Alaric (410), and the father had consecrated her to the state of virginity. He wrote to Jerome, then at Bethlehem, begging him to write a letter of precepts of piety and asceticism for his child. Jerome replied in a letter to the father, which he hoped Pacatula might read in after years. The letter shows how piety and asceticism were in those days impressed on the minds of the young, and also proves how the miseries consequent on the inroads of the barbarians made Christians abandon the world. (Jerome, Ep. 128, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

GAUDENTIUS appears among the Eustychians, who, claiming to be archimandrites, appealed to the emperor Marcian, in A.D. 451, for a general council (Labbe, iv. 524). The orthodox archimandrites at the council of Chalcidon refused to recognise his claim to be an archimandrite, and described him as a pseudo-priest (cf. Epistulae) with five others under him (Labbe, iv. 523 a.). [C. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, bishop of Antium, present at the council held at Rome by Hilarius, A.D. 465. (Mansi, vii. 907; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. i. 684.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, bishop of Albenga (Albenga), present at the council at Rome under Hilarius, A.D. 465. (Mansi, vii. 905; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, iii. 592.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, supposed to be the first bishop of Scylacium (Scullvare). He was present at the council at Rome under Hilarius, 465. (Mansi, vii. 906; Ugolli, Ital. Socr. iv. 488; Fenelius, Antiquitates Scylacenses, Scyl. 14.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, bishop of Verona, probably c. 465, in which year he is said to have been present at the council at Rome, but his date is uncertain. (Acta SS. 12 Feb. i. 602; Ugolli, Ital. Socr. v. 576; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia. x. 747; Biancolini, Vescovi di Verona, pt. ii. p. 2; Mansi, viii. 908.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, bishop of Auffinium in the Abruzzi, complained of to Simplicius bishop of Rome, A.D. 475, by some of the neighbouring bishops, as having conferred orders improperly, and misappropriated the property of his church. He was consequently deprived of the power of ordaining, condemned to make good his wrong doings, and allowed for the future but a very slight control over the revenues of his diocese. (Jaffe, Reysta Pont. Romana. p. 49; Ceillier, Autecrae sacr. x. 402.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, bishop of Putea in Numidia, banished by Hunneric, 484. (Victor Vit. Notit. 58; Morcelli, Afr. Christ. i. 200.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS, the name of two bishops, viz. of Salerno and of Tadinum (Gua-
GAUDENTIUS

Tadino in Umbria), present at the first synod under pope Symmachus, March 499. (Hefele, § 209; Mansi, viii. 253.) [A. H. D. A.]

GAUDENTIUS (19), bishop of Nola, who received letters from Gregory the Great, providing for and giving directions about the church at Canus (Lib. v. ind. xii. Ep. 13 and 33 in Migne, lxxxvii. 731, 759.) [A. H. D. A.]

GAUDENTIUS (20), 9th bishop of Constans, succeeding Martin, and followed, after an interval of three years, by Joannes I. His death is mentioned in the life of St. Gall of Walafrid (cap. xiv. Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiv. 990). It took place probably in 616 or the following year. (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, cap. xvi. s. ii. n.: Gall. Chr. v. 893.) [S. A. B.]

GAUDENTIUS (21), bishop of Atina (Atino), said to have been appointed by Honorius of Rome subsequently to A.D. 625, and to have held his see for fifteen years. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. vi. 540.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDENTIUS (22), bishop of Tergeste (Trieste), signing the second epistle of pope Agatho which was sent in 680 to the third council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 311.) [A. H. D. A.]

GAUDENTIUS (23), bishop of Valeria from a little before 675 till after 693, during, that is to say, part of Wamba's reign, the whole of Ervig's and the greater part of Egica's. He appears as junior bishop at C. Tol. xi. (675) and subscribes the acts of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth councils (A.D. 684, 688, and 693), being represented at the thirteenth by his vicar Vincent. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 247, 287, 304, 313, 333; Exp. Sopr. viii. 205.) [M. A. W.]


GAUDENTIUS (25), bishop of Perugia, at the Roman synod under Zacharias in 743 concerning monastic discipline, etc. (Mansi, xi. 367; Hefele, § 364.) [A. H. D. A.]

GAUDENTIUS (26), vicar of the prefect of the seven provinces of Gaul, from one of Sidonius Apollinaris. From two letters of the latter, one addressed to Gaudentius himself, we learn that he had risen to his position without the advantage of high birth. (Sidon. Apoll. Epistolae, lib. i. ep. 3 and 4. Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 450, 451.) [S. A. B.]

GAUDENTIUS (27), an abbot to whom Dionysius Exiguus addressed his history of the finding of the head of John the Baptist, about 550. (Patr. Lat. lxxxv. 417.) [S. A. B.]

GAUDERICUS of Lyons. [GANDERICUS.]

GAUDERICUS of Treves. [GUNDERIC (2).]

GUADESTEUS (GODESTEUS, GODESTHEUS), bishop of Orense from before A.D. 646, till about 656, present at the seventh council of Toledo, A.D. 646. (Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 423; Exp. Sopr. viii. 44.) [M. A. W.]

GAUDINUS, ST., twenty-fifth bishop of Soissons, followed St. Adolbertus, and succeeded by Macharius. In the Gallican martyrology (Feb. 11) it is stated that having publicly rebuked some citizens for their nunnery, he was secretly seized, dragged to the Viae Herlius, and there cast into an open well, where he perished. (Boll. Acta SS. Feb. ii. 553.) In 693 a Gaudinus is said to have subscribed the pisciculum of king Clovis at Valence, but whether of Soissons or Lyons is not certain. (Gall. Chr. ix. 339.) [S. A. B.]

GAUDILONUS. [GAUDELENTUS.]

GAUDIOSA, the queen of the famous Pelayo, the first king of Asturias (Seb. Sal. cap. 11; ep. 1. 15), was married to her husband in the church of St. Eulalia of Valamero, between Cangas and Covadonga, but the remains of both, according to Morales (Coronos, lib. 13, cap. 6), were transferred by Alfonso X. to the church of our Lady of Covadonga, where the tomb of Pelayo is still shown. (Flores, Regnas de España, i. 83.) [M. A. W.]

GAUDIOSUS (1), bishop of Abitina, in proconsular Africa, said to have been banished by Genseric c. A.D. 440, and to have died in exile at Naples A.D. 452. (Morcelli, Afr. Chr. i. 64.) Barennes mentions some legendary circumstances collected at Naples by his father. (Barennes, Mart. Oct. 28, notes: A. E. am. 416, x.) See also Ruinart, Comment. on Victor VII. cap. ii. sec. 5, p. 255, in Pat. Lat. lxxvii. 405.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDIOSUS (2), bishop of Pippianum, in proconsular Africa, was at the council of Carthage, A.D. 525. (Hardouin, Concil. ii. 1082; Morcelli, Afr. Chr. i. 583.) [R. S. G.]

GAUDIOSUS (3), ST., a saint of Tarassos, in Aragon, the city of which he was bishop. According to Acta given by J. T. Salazar (Mart. Hisp. vi. 59) he was the son of Guntha, a man of high rank at the court of Theodoric, while the latter governed Spain during the minority of Amalasuntha, afterwards the wife of Theodoric's death, and was a pupil of St. Victorian. The Acta then relate that he went to Constantinople, where he married a Syrian lady, and that he was appointed by the emperor Maurice, who reigned from A.D. 582 to A.D. 602, præfector in Africa and they identify him with the Gaudiosus, the magister militum, to whom St. Gregory the Great wrote in A.D. 590 (S. Gregorii Epist. i. 76 in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 530). Gaudiosus afterwards returned to Spain, and was appointed by king Gondemar, who reigned from A.D. 610 to A.D. 612, bishop of Tarazona, as successor to Stephanus, who signs the canons of the third council of Toledo (A.D. 589). The Acta represent that the Arians were then so powerful in Spain that no one, however brave, ventured to acknowledge himself a Catholic; but that Gaudiosus was not deterred thereby, nor by the contemporary executions by the Arians of Boethius and Symmachus (which really happened about A.D. 529-532), from preaching the orthodox faith, and that he wrote many letters to St. Isidore of Seville, and to Maximus and Braulio of Saragossa, to encourage them to resist Arianism. Finally, these Acta place his death in A.D. 530. From the above account of the Acta it will be seen how
untrustworthy they are, and it may be added that the statement that Gundemar appointed Gaudiosus as successor to Stephanus is erroneous, as Florivius. in A.D. 610, subscribes the decree of Gundemar as bishop of Tarazona (Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 483); and further, that Ariаниsm in Spain was never formidable after the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589. From the mention of St. Victor, who died in A.D. 561 in his eightieth year, Gaudiosus apparently flourished in the first half of the 6th century, and this agrees with the Chronicle of Maximus (in Migne, Patr. Lat. ixxx. 625), which places him about A.D. 533. Gans (Ser. Episc. 76) also places him about A.D. 530. He gave many gifts of lands and farms to the monastery of St. Martin, of which St. Victorian was abbot. He died on Nov. 3, on which day he is commemorated. His body is preserved in the monastery of St. Victorian, in the diocese of Lerida. (Boll. AA. SS. Jan. i. 741; Esp. Sgr. xlvii. 230.) [F. D.]

Gaudiosus (4), bishop of Eugubium (Gubbio), who received a letter from Gregory the Great, ordering him to provide for the destitute church of Tadumum (Gualdo-Tadino in Umbria), and to send a priest to be consecrated as its bishop. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. ix. indict. ii. ep. 87; Migne, lxxviii. 1016.) [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudiosus (5), a poor man of Rome, who complained to pope Gregory the Great soon after his accession (9th indict. i.e. A.D. 590) that the agents of the church claimed his sons as bondmen, and were violently enforcing the demand. Gaudiosus had proved to Gregory by satisfactory evidence that his wife Sirconia, once a slave, had been bestowed as a gift by a lady Leza on a lady Morena, and that this last had emancipated her by letter. Gregory writes to the subdeacon Anthemius to see justice done. If there were no documents with the church to invalidate those of Gaudiosus, the man was not to be molested; for it was intolerable that, when people bestowed liberties at their own cost, the church was the natural guardian of those liberties, should revoke them. (Greg. Mag. Epp. i. ep. 55, in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 516.) [C. H.]

Gaudiosus (6), bishop of Naples, c. 637-644. (Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum, part i. 27; Scriptores Burmitaliacum Lanoy, 1878, p. 413.) [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudiosus (7), bishop of Salernum (Salerno), probably before A.D. 648. He is said to have been of the family of the Dukes of Naples. His successor was Luminosus. (UgHELLI, Ital. Soc. vii. 488.) [R. S. G.]

Gaudiosus (8), the name of two bishops, viz. of Rieti and of Capua, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Mansi, x. 866; Hefele, § 307.) [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudiosus (9), bishop of Segna (Segni), present at the Roman synod, held under pope Agapito in Oct. 679, concerning Wilfrid and the affairs of England. (Hefele, § 390; Mansi, xii. 178.) He also signed the second letter of pope Agapito, which was sent in 690, after a synod in Rome, to the third council of Constantinople. (Hefele, § 314; Mansi, xi. 310.) [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudicus (10), bishop of Puteoli, who signed the second epistle of pope Agatho, which was sent in 680, after a synod in Rome, to the third council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 299; Hefele, § 314.) [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudicus (11), bishop of Brescia, 690. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 568; Ugelli, Ital. Soc. iv. 531; Mancini, Rom. Man. 7; Bull. Acta SS. 7 Mart. i. 648.) [A. H. D. A.]


Gaudicus (13), bishop of Sutri, at the Roman synod of 741. (Mansi, xii. 367; Hefele, § 364). Others call this bishop Gratiosus II. (Ugh. Ital. Soc. i. 1274; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, vi. 225, 267); the synodal subscriptions having both "Gaudiosus Sudrio" and "Hirtioso Sutirino," must be the latter being reckoned a corruption of Gratiosus. [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudicus (14), possibly bishop of Bieda (Biera), south of Viterbo, present at the Roman synod of 743. But the signature is uncertain. (Mansi, xii. 367.) [A. H. D. A.]

Gaudicus (15), bishop of Messina, at the second council of Nicea in 787. (Mansi, xiii. 723, 732.) [A. H. D. A.]


Gaudio, bishop of Strasburg. [GANDOJO.]

Gaudio (2) (Gaud, Galdu, Waldus), ST, second bishop of Eureux, succeeding St. Faurinus, after an interval caused by the devastations of the barbarians, and followed by Maurusio. He is said to have been consecrated by Germanus archbishop of Rouen, and after administering the diocese for forty years, to have resigned the bishopric and retired to a desert spot in Neustria, where he died in 491. His body is said to have been found at the village of St. Pair, near Granville, in 1131. He was commemorated Jan. 31. (Gall. Christ. xi. 566; Hist. des Evesques d'Eureux par Chassant et Sauvage, 5-6; Bull. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 1110.) [S. A. B.]

Gaudricus of Lyons. [Gandericus.]

Gauffridus. [Guyfridus.]

Gaufricus of Troyes. [Gandericus.]

Gaufric (Gery), fourth bishop of Cambrai, succeeding St. Vedulphus and followed by St. Bertholdus (circ. 580-589), was born at Yvoix in Luxembourg, and was ordained priest by St. Magniericus of Troyes. He was nominated to the see by Childeric II., and consecrated by Egidius of Rheims. He devoted himself to the
extirpation of the remnants of idolatry and the settlement of the discipline of the church. He built a monastery close to the city, calling it after St. Medardus, though it afterwards bore his own name, and there he was buried. He was commemorated Aug. 11. The monastery in after times was pulled down to make room for a citadel built by Charles V. (Mart. Usuard.; Boll. Acta SS. Aug. ii. 664; Gall. Christ. iii. 4.)

SAULIUS—May 31. Martyr in Spain with Germanus and Silvanus under Dacian the president in the Diocletian persecution. (Mart. Hieron., Usuard., Notk.)

GAUSBERTUS of Angers. [Godobertus.]

GAUSBERTUS (1) (Godobertus, Gaucohertus), twenty-seventh bishop of Chartres, succeeding St. Malardus and followed by Deodatus. His signature is found to three charters between about 658 and 666. (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 1170, 1181, 1186; Gall. Christ. viii. 1101.)

SAULIUS (2) (Godobertus), thirteenth bishop of Poitiers, succeeding St. Maximinus, and followed by Godo, about the middle of the 8th century. He is named in a charter of king Louis the Pious, not Pippin as stated in the Gallia Christiana, for the monastery of Nobilium (Noallé) as one of the benefactors. (Gall. Christ. ii. 1155, inst. 946; Gams, Series Episc. 601.)

GAUSOLINUS of Metz. [Godislinus.]

GAUSUALDUS, bishop of Como, c. 741, (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia, xi. 319; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. v. 283.)

GAUTERCIUS, twenty-fifth bishop of Troyes, succeeding Allobertus and followed by Ardunus, about the beginning of the 8th century. He is mentioned in an ancient MS. catalogue of Auxerre (Gall. Christ. xii. 469.)

GAUTUS, bishop of Neelon in Arabia. The situation of this town is obscure, the only mention of it being in the record of the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, where Constantinus, bishop of Bostra, and metropolitan, signed on behalf of certain of his bishops, including Gautus of Neelon. It has been conjectured that the name may be an erroneous spelling of Eleole or Alon. (Le Quin, Or. Christ. ii. 867; Mansi, vii. 137.)

GAUZILOENUS (Godislinus), seventeenth bishop of Le Mans. After the death of his predecessor, Herlemondus I, the see was vacant several years, until count Rothgar forced a son of his own, described as "in litteterus et indocetus," upon the unwilling clergy. The metropolitan of Tours refused to consecrate, but the archbishop of Rouen, bribed, as it was said, performed the rite. In 743 he obtained from king Childeric III. a charter of confirmation of privileges for the estate of Ardunum, and another for the monastery of Anisola, both given in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 1147, 1150. Gauzileus was soon afterwards dethroned by Pippin, and succeeded by Herlemondus II. (Gesta Pontificum Canom.; Mabillon, Vet. Anecdot. 285-287; Gall. Christ. xiv. 354.)

SAULIUS (3) (Geslinus, Gavino). Bishop of Calaborra from A.D. 633. Subscribes the fourth, sixth, and eighth councils of Toledo, in A.D. 633, 635, 638. (Mansi, x. 642 a. 1222 a; Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 385, 413, 448; Esp. Sagra. xliiiii. 158.)

GAWAINE. [Gwalchmai.]

GAWEN, Welsh saint. [Govan.]

GAYROIUS. [Gairo.]

GEANBERKT (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. No. 144, A.D. 781), archbishop. [Jenaerbt.] [N. H. W.]

GEBAUDUS or Gebavultus. [Gebul.

GEBMUND, the eighth bishop of Rochester (M. H. B. 616). He was appointed by Theode archbishop of Canterbury to succeed Cucilhelm, who had deserted his see (Bedes, H. E. iv. 12), soon after the year 676, probably about 678. The length of his episcopate is uncertain; and it has been argued that the date 683, to which his death is referred by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (M. H. B. 323), is the probable date, inasmuch as if he had survived archbishop Theodore, Berhtwald, the succeeding archbishop, need not have gone abroad for consecration (Smith, note on Bedes, H. E. v. 8; Wharton, Ang. Soc. i. 330). On the other hand, there is a charter of Osber, the under king of the Hwicci,
GEDALIUS, bishop of Hospitia in Numidia, banished by Huneric, A.D. 464. (Victor Vit. Notit. 57; Mocroll, Afr. Crist. i. 188.)

GEDEON, ST., thirty-seventh bishop of Besançon, succeeding Hervaeus and followed by Bernoinus, about the close of the 8th century. There is extant a royal diploma given by a king Charles, to compose a quarrel that had arisen between Gedeon and Rigbertus abbott of St. Oyan (Eugendin) in the Jura, as to the possession of a cell in which St. Lupicinus was buried. Upon the report of Docto abbot of Luxeuil and Count Adelard, who had been commissioned to investigate the matter, the property was adjudged to the abbat. It has been doubted whether the author was Charles the Great, in which case the date of the instrument is A.D. 783, or Charles the Bald, in which case it would be A.D. 862. Mabillon, after first assigning it to the former date, finally decided for the latter (Annot. an. 790, n. i. tom. ii. 294), and the authors of the Galia Christiana (iv. inr. 3) print it with that date, but their successors (xv. 19) advise reasons for adopting the earlier year, and it seems that the position of Godoin in the indices of the Besançon church supports their contention. Moreover, mention, moreover, is made of him as a charter of Lothair, given in 809 as one of the predecessors of Aroninus, the archbishop then sitting (Gall. Christ. xv. inr. 4). The earlier position is assigned to him in the Series Episcoporum of Gans (p. 514).


GEFEL, clerical witness to a grant to bishop Grecilia of Llandaff, late in the 7th or early in the 8th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 421, 422.)

GEGHIA, of Inis Geghia, is mentioned in Vita S. Faranamani among those who came to salute St. Columba when he visited Ireland, but seems to be otherwise unknown. (Colg. Acta SS. 337, c. 7, 340, n. 47, and Tr. Thauin. 463, c. 55.)

GEGOBERGA, ST. (Segoberga, Cæcilia, Clara), second abbess of the double monastery of Habend, afterwards Remiremont or Romberg, founded cir. A.D. 620 by St. Amatus and St. Romaric on the top of the hill of Habend in the Vosges, near the Moselle, but rebuilt after its destruction by Huns, by the emperor Louis III. in the 10th century, at the foot of the mountain on the other side of the river, giving birth to the town of Remiremont. She succeeded St. Macte fled the first abbess, perhaps A.D. 620, and she was still abbess in 653, when the life of St. Romaric the second abbess and her contemporaries was addressed to her. Her successor, St. Tecta or Gertrude, was residing in 670 (Mabillon, Acta SS. 0. S. B. sec. ii. 670, ed. 1669). This is all that can be gathered from the contemporary lives. Tradition adds that she was the daughter of St. Romaric, and that he built his nunnery for her and her sister Adaltrude, that she changed her name from Segoberga to Cæcilia on becoming a nun, and that she was called Clara after her death on account of the many eures performed at her tomb, particularly of blindness and diseases of the eye (Sollerius in Bull. Acta SS. 12 Aug. ii. 732). Saussaye (Mart. Gallic. p. 321) and other later writers say that she was blind.

GEILA, brother of Suinhilda. (Gaila 8.)

GEINTEN (Gemthenus, Gentenus), priest of Tirguire, commemorated Sept. 2 (Mart. Doneg.); identified by Colgan (Tr. Thauin. 143, c. 102, 180, n. 14, 267 A) with Gemthenus of Esch-sinech, who is mentioned by St. Evinus as a disciple of St. Patrick and a teacher in Magh-Luirg, Connaught.

GELASIA. a virgin eminent for her piety, praised by Palladius for never letting the sun go down upon her wrath either against her domestics or any other person. (Pallad. Hist. Anonic. c. 146, p. 1048.)

GELASINUS, martyr at Athelopeia in Phocidacia, A.D. 297. He was acting as "secundus minus" (Horat. lib. i. ep. 18) in a theatre full of people. Persecuted to death the most of the Christian rise, his fellow actors flung him into a bath and baptized him. Coming forth clad in white, Gelasius said, no longer, however, in mockery, "I am a Christian, for I have seen in the bath an awful and majestic spectacle, and for Christ's sake I am ready to die." The people thereupon took and stoned him, the magistrate terminating his sufferings by beheading him. Theodoret in Sor. 3 de Martyribus refers to such sudden conversions of actors as having occurred more than once. [GENEBIUS] Chron. Paschale. sub ann. 268, i.e. A.D. 297. He was commemorated by the Greeks on Feb. 27. (Boll. Acta SS. Feb. iii. 675.)

GELASIIUS, Sept. 29. [GENEBIUS 10.]

GELASIIUS (I. I), bishop of Rome after Felix III. (or II.) from March 492 to November 496, during about four years and a half. At the time of his acccession the schism between the Western and Eastern churches, which had begun under his predecessor, had lasted more than seven years. Its occasion had been the excommunication by pope Felix of Acacius, the patriarch of Constantinople, for supporting and communicating with Peter Mongus, the once monophysite
patriarch of Alexandria, who had, however, satisfied Acacius by subscribing the Henotican, and afterwards the Nicene creed. There had been other grounds of complaint against Acacius, notably his disregard of the authority of the Roman see; but the above had been the original cause of quarrel. (See Felix III., Acacius.) Acacius being now dead, the subject of dispute was reduced to the retention of his name in the diplomas of the Eastern church. Felix had demanded its erasure as a condition of intercommunion with his successors. But they had refused to comply. The patriarch of Constantinople was now Euphemius, the emperor was Anastasius. On his accession Gelasius wrote a respectful letter of salutation to the emperor, as appears from an allusion to it in an extant letter from Gelasius to one Faustus, of which hereafter. It appears also from this same letter that the emperor did not reply. To Euphemius the patriarch the new pope did not write, as was usual in a matter of his accession. Euphemius, however, wrote twice to Gelasius, the second letter being sent, when no notice had been taken of the first, by a deacon called Similicius, to Rome. These facts, and the purport of what Euphemius wrote, are gathered from the extant letter which Gelasius now wrote in reply to the missus. But it seems, having received no communication from the new pope; he had expressed a strong desire of reconciliation between the churches, and a hope that Gelasius, whom he complimented as “not needing to be taught,” and as “intending all things necessary for the unity of the ecclesiastical body,” wished to see such a concord in a spirit of charity as able to restore concord. He had reminded him of the condescension of Christ. He had insisted that Acacius himself had been no heretic, and that before he communicated with Peter Mango the latter had been purged of heresy. He had asked by what synodal authority Acacius had ever been condemned. He had been of the opinion that the patriarch of Constantinople would never allow his name to be erased, but had suggested that the pope might send an ambassador to Constantinople to treat with them on the subject. Gelasius, in his reply, couched in a tone of imperious humility, utterly refuses any compromise. He speaks of the custom of the bishops of the apostolic see notifying their elevation to inferior bishops as a condescension rather than an obligation, and one certainly not due to such as chose to cast in their lot with heretics. He treats with contempt the plea of the determined attitude of the people of Constantinople. The shepherd ought, he says, to lead the flock, not be led by the sheep. The idea of himself sending to treat with them was out of the question, as if they would listen to him, towards whom they showed themselves but ill-disposed, when their own bishop confessed his inability to influence them. As to the original cause of dispute, Chalcedon had condemned the heresy held by Peter Mango, and by implication, too, he had not been absolved; and Acacius had communicated with him. Acacius had therefore been rightly excommunicated, and those who retained his name in their diplomas were associated in his condemnation. But the main gist of the letter is to assert in no measured terms the supremacy of the see of Rome, and the necessity of submitting to it. "We shall come," he concludes, "brother Euphemius, without doubt we shall come to that tremendous tribunal of Christ, with those standing round by whom the faith has been defended. There it will be proved whether the glorious confession of St. Peter has left anything short for the salvation of those who were given him to rule, or whether there has been rebellious and pernicious obstinacy in those who were unwilling to obey him."

The next year (493) Theodoric, the new Ostrogothic king of Italy, having sent an embassy, headed by two Romans, Faustus and Irenaeus, to Constantinople, Gelasius took the opportunity of writing a long letter to the Eastern bishops. Its main drift was to justify the excommunication of Acacius by asserting that he had exceeded his powers in absolving Peter Mango without the authority of the Roman see, and that for his own condemnation by pope Felix there had been no need (as was alleged to be the case by convention of a new synod. He complains also in the same letter of the expulsion of certain Catholic bishops in the East from their seas. Faustus, one of the ambassadors of Theodoric through whom this letter had been sent, replied in behalf of the Eastern bishops. Gelasius answered this letter in the same spirit, and in which allusion has been made. It is a long justification of his position with regard to Acacius, and of the supreme authority claimed by him for the Roman see. In reply to the assertion that what had been done by Rome was contrary to the canons of the church, he deigns in some parts of his letter to rest his case on the authority, saying (as before) that the council of Chalcedon had virtually condemned Acacius, and adding that in excluding him from communion the bishop of Rome had only done what any other bishop might have done; also that the canons of the church (referring doubts to those of Sardis, which were quoted by the popes of Rome) gave supreme jurisdiction to the see of Rome. But in other parts he plainly asserts the supremacy of the apostolic see over the whole church as due to the original commission of Christ to St. Peter, and as having always existed prior to, and independent of, all synods and canons. He speaks of "the apostolic judgment" which he supposed both the voice of Christ and the tradition of the elders and the authority of canons had supported, that it should itself always determine questions throughout the church. With regard to the possibility of Acacius being absolved now, having died excommunicate, he says that Christ Himself, who raised the dead, is never said to have absolved those who died in error, and that even to St. Peter it was an earth only that the power of binding and loosing had been given, not beyond the grave. An address in such a tone was not calculated to conciliate. The result was that the name of Gelasius himself was now removed from the diplomas of the Constantinopolitan church.

After the return of Faustus and Irenaeus to Rome, Gelasius wrote a long letter to the emperor, in which his position with regard to the question of Acacius is again justified, and the supremacy of Rome, resting on canons as well as original prerogative, is again insisted on, while the emperor is exhorted to use his temporal power to control his people in spiritual as well
GELASIIUS—Pope.

as mundane matters. This letter is noteworthy as containing a distinct expression of the view taken by Gelasius of the relations to each other of the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions. Each he regards as separate and supreme in its own sphere. As in secular things priests are bound to obey princes, so in spiritual things all the faithful, including princes, ought to submit their hearts to priests; and, if to priests generally, much more to the prelate of that see with whom he has proper jurisdiction, which should be over all priests, and to which the subsequent piety of the general church has perpetually accorded such pre-eminence. Gelasius also wrote on the same subjects to the bishops of various provinces, including those of East Illyricum and Dacia. In his address to the last he enlargets on its being the function of the Roman see, not only to carry out the decisions of synods, but even to give to such decisions their whole authority. Nay, the purpose of synods is spoken of as being simply to express the assent of the church at large to what the pope had already decreed, and what was therefore already binding. The pope takes the case in the instance of the council of Chalcedon. Further, instances are alleged of popes having on their own mere authority reversed the decisions of synods, absolved those whom synods had condemned, and condemned those whom synods had absolved. The cases of Athanasius and Chrysostom are cited as examples of the exercise of such power. Lastly, any claim of Constantinople (contemptuously spoken of as in the diocese of Heraclea) to be exempt from the judgment of “the first see” is put aside as absurd, since “the power of a secular kingdom is one thing, the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities another.”

In the year 495 Gelasius convened a synod of forty-six bishops at Rome for the purpose of absolving and restoring to his see Marcus of Cunea, one of the bishops sent by pope Felix I to Constantinople in the affair of Acacius, who had been then overthrown, and in consequence excommunicated. Before receiving absolution the papal letters required to be made the declaration before the synod that he “condemned, anathematized, abhorred, and for ever execrated Dioscorus, Aetius, Peter Mongus, Peter Fullo, Acacius, and all their successors, accomplices, attesters, and all who communicated with them.”

The death of Gelasius in the November of the following year (496) prevented any further steps under his auspices with respect to the great schism, which the attitude assumed by him had certainly not tended to heal.

In addition to his extant letters on the subject, some of which have been quoted, there is a curious treatise of his called Tomus de anathematis voculo. It refers in the first place to those canons of the council of Chalcedon, given independent authority to the see of Constantinople, of which pope Leo had disapproved, setting forth that the fact of this council having done so did not impair the validity of what it had rightly done, and that the approval of the see of Rome was the sole test of what was right. It passes next to the subject referred to in its title, the circumstance of pope Felix I, in his condemnation of Acacius, having bound him with an irrevocable anathema. This, it is argued, could not be taken to imply that the same power that had imposed the anathema could not have removed it on the repentance of the person so bound; for that Arias and other heretics who had undoubtedly been involved in the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost had in fact, on their repentance, been reconciled to the church. The irrevocability, then, of the sentence against Acacius had referred to his heresy if persisted in, not to his person, had he renounced his heresy. But if he had done so, the sentence had become utterly irrevocable now, since Acacius had died impenitent. The intention of the argument seems to be to explain away the apparent limitation of the absolving power of Rome which the terms of the sentence by Felix had implied, and also to justify the now perpetual and irrevocable exclusion of the name of Acacius from the diptychs of the church.

The tract contains further statements and arguments as to Rome alone having been competent to reconcile Peter Mongus or to absolve Acacius, and in reference to the idea of the emperor having power in the latter case without the leave of Rome. The distinction between the spheres of the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions is drawn that was set forth (as above shewn) in the letter to the emperor. In this instance Melchizedek is referred to as having in old times been both priest and king; the devil, it is said, in imitation of him, had induced the emperors to assume the supreme pontificate; but since Christianity had revealed the truth to the world, the union of the two powers had ceased to be lawful: Christ, in consideration of human frailty, had now for ever separated them, leaving the emperors dependent on the pontiffs for their everlasting salvation, the pontiffs on the emperors for the administration of all temporal affairs. Milianus (Lat. Christianity) remarks on the contrast between the interpretation of the type of Melchizedek and that given in the 11th century by by pope Innocent IV, who takes Melchizedek as prefiguring the union in the pope of the sacred and royal dignity.

There are two other works attributed to Gelasius in which views are expressed not easily reconciled with those since endorsed by his successors. One of these is a tract, the authenticity of which has not been questioned, against the Manicheans at Rome, in which the practice, adopted by that sect, of communion in one kind is strongly condemned. His words are, “We find that some, taking only the portion of the sacred body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood. Let these (since I know not by what superstition they are actuated) either receive the entire sacraments or be debarred from them altogether; because a division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege.” Baronius evades the obviously general application of these concluding words by saying that they refer only to the Manicheans, who, in order to avoid suspicion of heresy, communicated with Catholics, but, in accordance with their own principles, in their kind only. In his own view he argues, the condemnation is of their doing so with this intent, not of the thing itself; and thus that the expression “without great sacrilege” means “without taint of suspicion of most wicked heresy.” And this interpretation he says is germane to the sense of the passage.
It can hardly be said to be so to that of the language used.

The passage above referred to occurs in a treatise, *de duabus Naturis*, against the Eutychians and Nestorians. Arguing against the Eutychian position that the union of the human and divine natures in Christ implies the absorption of the human into the divine, the writer adds the Eucharist as the image, similitude, and representation of the same mystery; the point being that, after consecration, the natural substance of the bread and wine remains unchanged, so the human nature of Christ remained unchanged notwithstanding its union with divinity. His words are: "The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we take are a divine thing, inasmuch as through them we are made partakers of the divine nature; and yet the substance or nature of bread and wine remains not to be. And certainly an image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the act of the mysteries. It is then plainly enough shown to us that the main thing is to be thought of in our Lord Christ Himself that we profess, celebrate, and take in His image; and as they (i.e. the elements) by the operation of the Holy Spirit pass into this substance, namely a divine one, yet remain in the propriety of their own nature, so is that principal mystery itself, the essence and vehicle of the Eucharist, that they represent in us." This language, both in its own import and in regard to its relevancy to the argument against Eutychianism, seeming inconsistent with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, Baronius meets the difficulty, first by disputing the authorship of the treatise in which it occurs, and secondly by explaining it away. On the first of these heads it is argued that the Liber Pontificalis speaks of Gelasius having written five books against Nestorius and Eutyches, and that Genadius (Script. Eccles. c. 94) describes his work on this subject as "Grande et praeclarum volumen," whereas the treatise in which the words above quoted occur is a short one, in one book only, and therefore was not written by Gelasius; that the treatise in question quotes many Greek authors, but only two Latin ones, viz. Ambrose and Damasus, which was unlikely to have been the case had the pope been its author; and that it praises the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea, an author whom the pope Gelasius, in one of the documents attributed to him, rejects. Hence Baronius, followed by Bellarmine and others, attributes the probable authorship of the treatise before us, not to the pope Gelasius, but to another Gelasius, of Cyzicus, in the same age. The last of these arguments is worthless, inasmuch as the *Decretum de libri recipiendis*, alluding to rejecting Eusebius, is now generally considered on good grounds to be later than the time of Gelasius. Nor is the untrustworthy authority of the Liber Pontif. of much weight, or the expression of Genadius, "grande et praeclarum," inconsistent with the considerable treatise in question being the work intended, found as it is in all old manuscripts among the works of Gelasius, ascribed to him, and referred to as his, and even distinctly quoted, by St. Fulgentius, his contemporary (St. Fulgentius *Ep. ad Ferrandum*, c. xix.). Dupin on such grounds strongly maintains the pope's authorship against Baronius, and alleges further the internal evidence of style (Dupin, *Noua Bibloia*, second part of 5th century).

But Baronius, as has been said, endeavored also to explain the language of the treatise, by whomever written, to be consistent with transubstantiation. The drift of his explanation is that in every similitude there is some dissimilitude, that in a work of this kind the exact and proper meaning of words need not be pressed as long as the general sense intended can be gathered, and that in this case the writer, in speaking of the substance of the elements of the Eucharist, really meant their accidents. It may be remarked that if, on the one hand, the authoritatively enunciated views of Gelasius on the relation between civil and ecclesiastical authority, in communion in one kind, and on transubstantiation, are inconsistent with those subsequently endorsed by Rome, yet, on the other hand, few, if any, of his successors have gone beyond him in their claims of supreme and universal authority belonging by divine institution to the Roman pontiff.

Many letters of Gelasius, with fragments of others, are given in the standard collections, of which five have been referred to and quoted, viz. those to Euphemius, to the Eastern bishops, to Faustus, to the emperor Anastasius, and to the bishops of Dardania. Among his other works there is a "Tractatus de iure senatorii," in which, against the celebration of the feast of Lupercalia, it appears that the people were for reviving this feast, which the pope had suppressed, under the idea that certain maidens then prevalent were due to its discontinuance. It has been supposed that the feast of Candlemas, kept on the same day, was substituted for the heathen celebration. Other treatises of his have been already described. There is also one against Pelagianism. A *Decretum de libris recipiendis*, fixing the canonical books of Scripture, distinguishes between ancient ecclesiastical writers to be received or rejected, and containing a strong assertion of the supremacy of the bishop see, appears to have been issued, by Gelasius, to a Roman synod under him. It bears signs of a later date, having been first assigned to Gelasius by Hincmar of Rheims in the 7th century. The most memorable of the works attributed to him is the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, which was that in use till Gregory the Great revised and abbreviated it. [R. C. SACRAMENTARY in *Dict. Chr. Antq.*] A Sacramentary in several languages found in the queen of Sweden's library, and published by Thomasius in 1680, is supposed to be the Gelasian one. Gelasius has been canonized, his day being the 18th of November.

The main authorities for his life, besides the Liber Pontificalis are the letters of himself and his contemporaries, and his other extant writings. [J. B.—J.]

GELASIIUS (2), archbishop of Salamis, the metropolis of the island of Cyprus, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325 (Manli, ii. 996). Athanasius (*Apoll. contra Arian.*, 56, in Migne, *P. G.* xxv. 130). Gregory I. Designates him a Cypron bishop of Gerasia, as subscribing to the council of Sardica, 347. Gerasia might have been identified as Gelasius, but for the fact of the name occurring in the third place instead of the first. In the life of Epiphanius his successor Gelasius is said to have attained the glory of a confessor along with
GELASIIUS OF CAESAREA

St. L'appa bishop of Ceitra in the same island. (Bell. Acta SS. Mai. iii. 39 f.; Le Quien, O. C. ii. 1044.)

GELASIIUS (3), third bishop of Arretium (Arezzo), c. A.D. 386. His predecessor was Dematus, his successor was Dominianus or Donatianus. Gelasius is said to have baptized the whole household of Andreas, a nobleman of Arretium, numbering fifty-three persons, who were afterwards martyred. Gelasius himself was probably a martyr. (Ugelli, Ital. Sac. i. 456; Cappellatti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xviii. 68.)

R. S. G.

GELASIIUS (4), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, c. 367-393, "distinguished by the purity of his doctrine and the sanctity of his life." (Theodoret. H. E. v. 8.) He was the son of the sister of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, by whom he was appointed bishop of the metropolitan see of Caesarea, c. A.D. 387. (Epiphani. Haer. lib. ixii. 57.) During the reign of Valens Caesarea was occupied by an intruding Arian bishop, Eusebius, who forced Gelasius from exercising his episcopal function. On the death of Valens and the accession of Theodosius in c. A.D. 379, Eusebius was expelled and Gelasius resumed the quiet possession of his see which he held till c. 394. He was dead in A.D. 395, when Porphyrius, bishop of Gaza, was consecrated by his successor John. He attended the general council of Constantinople in c. A.D. 381, when he took part in the election of Nectarius. (Theod. H. E. v. 8; Labbe, Concil. ii. 955.) He was again at Constantinople in c. A.D. 354, when he assisted at the consecration of the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, erected by Rufinus in the suburb of the Oak, and took part in the council held Sept. 24, to decide the dispute between Bagaudius and Agapius, who each claimed the bishopric of Aix. (Labbe, Concil. ii. 1152.) Jerome speaks with commendation of his literary powers, stating that he was "reported to have written brilliantly, but to have concealed his writings." (De Vir. Ill. c. 126.) Melito of Sardis, writing of Gelasius, (1) a continuation of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, undertaken at the request of his uncle Cyril, which, in deference of chronology, he describes as a Greek translation of Rufinus's history; and (2) a treatise against the Anomoeans, which he praises as being much superior in style to the history. (Phot. Cod. 89, p. 219; Cod. 102, p. 276.) His writings are lost, with the exception of one or two fragments. Theodoret quotes a passage from a sermon on the Epiphany (Eunapius, dia. i. p. 46; dia. iii. p. 251; ed. Schultze, 1772), and Leontius of Byzantium gives two passages from his exposition of the creed (Lavrae). (In Neon. et Euthych. lib. i. p. 978.) Gelasius is said to have been the first to insert the name of his great predecessor Eusebius on the diplomas, (Fabr. Bibl. Gracae, lib. v. c. 24; Le Quien, Or. Chr. iii. 561.)

E. V.

GELASIIUS (5), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, placed by Le Quien next after Irenaeus, who held the see in A.D. 453. He was the author of two books Against the Anomoeans, spoken with much commendation by Photius, who states that in learning, dictation, and argumentative power he far excelled the other two writers on ecclesiastical history of the same name. Photius highly praises the earnestness and conscientiousness of his style, the elegance of his language, and the force of his arguments, but condemns his pedantic abuse of logical terms such as a mere tautology, and the faults of his arrangement. This work is identified, but probably erroneously, by Cave and Baronius (see ann. 498) with the author of the work De Duobus Naturis, ascribed with greater reason to pope Gelasius A.D. 492-496. (Photius, Cod. 88, 89, 102; Fabr. Bibl. Gracae. lib. v. c. 24; Le Quien, Orient. Christ. iii. 567.)

E. V.

GELASIIUS (6), third bishop of Poitiers. Nothing is recorded of him save that he was buried in the church of St. Hilary at Poitiers. (Bell. Acta SS. 26 Aug. v. 817; Gall. Christ. ii. 1142.)

R. T. S.

GELASIIUS (7), bishop of Ipsa in Phrygia Salutaris. Theophylactus, a priest, acted as his representative at the seventh general (second Nicene) council, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xiii. 148; Le Quien, O. C. i. 841.)

G. D.

GELASIIUS (8)—Dec. 23. (Martyr in Crete with nine others in the Decian persecution.)

Evarestus.) (Bas. Menol.)

G. T. S.

GELASIIUS, MARTYR. (GELASINUS.)

GELASIIUS (9), a person whom Eustathius of Sebaste fell in with in Cilicia, and to whom he delivered a statement of his faith, which Basil asserts none but Arisius or one holding kindred sentiments, could have confessed. (Basil. Epist. 130 [196], 224 [345].)

E. V.

GELASIIUS (10), ST., a youth of Placentia (Piacenza), cir. 400, commemorated on Feb. 4. The liturgical offices of the church of that city record that he was of noble and Christian parents, and remarkable for piety from his earliest years. It is said that on one occasion he was privileged to behold angels in converse with his brother Opilius, while the latter was praying in his chamber, on which occasion he heard a voice saying, "Suffer little children to come unto Me." (Bell. Acta SS. 4 Feb. iii. 465.)

C. H.

GELASIIUS (11), a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris. He complains that his name has not been associated with any poetical effusion of Sidonius; he must have something which he may often repeat; he deems Sidonius's page, when he indulges the sporting vein, too much stocked with hendecasyllabics; so begging that the chattering trochee may be dropped, he would have his verses to run in trimeter iambics. Sidonius has long discontinued this measure, but will not disappoint his friend. The result is a sketch in fifty-five lines of trimeter iambics respecting the classic poets, their various metres and graces. (Sidon. Apoll. Epp. ix. 13, Patr. Lat. iiii. 655.) In the concluding letter he refers to Gratus as "virum sat benignissimum."

C. H.

GELASIIUS (12), martyr, commemorated on Feb. 4 at Rome in the Forum Sempronii, with Aquilinus, Geminus, Magnus, Donatus. (Usuard, Mart.)

C. H.

GELASIIUS (13) of Cyzicus, in the second half of the 5th century, author of a work on the
history of the council of Nicaea, entitled by Photius, Πραγματεύματα τῶν πρῶτων Συνόδων ἑτέρων καὶ τῶν ἑπτά, The Acts of the First Council in three books; though, as Photius remarks, the work deserves the name of a History as much as of Acts, διὸ μᾶλλον πραγματεύμα τῶν ἑτέρων (Phot. Cod. 15). Our only knowledge of the author is derived from his own statements concerning himself. Photius acknowledges his inability to determine who he was, though he thinks it possible that he may have been bishop of Caesarea, a different person, however, from the other bishops of the same name, viz. Cyril’s nephew, and the writer of the work against the Anomoeans. Le Quien also places him among the bishops of Caesarea, but with considerable doubt. If he did occupy that see he must have died before A.D. 484, when Timotheus was the bishop (Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 568). But the idea is almost certainly erroneous, and has arisen from the title affixed by some blundering scribe mentioned by Photius, assigning the work to a bishop of Caesarea.

We learn from Gelasius’s own words that he was the son of a presbyter of Cyzicus, and that, while he was still residing in his father’s house, he fell in with an old parchment volume which had belonged to Dalmatius, bishop of Cyzicus, and had got into his father’s hands, containing a full account of the proceedings of the council of Nicea (σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰούσιον Κωνσταντίνον ἐγγύτερον). This document not supplying all the information he desired, Gelasius entered upon an examination of the works of other writers dealing with the same subject, from which he filled up the gaps. He mentions the work of an ancient writer named John, a presbyter otherwise unknown, as well as those of Eusebius of Caesarea, and Rufinus, whom he calls a Roman presbyter, who were both eye-witnesses of the transactions, and many others. If this Rufinus is to be identified with Rufinus Tyrannius, the ecclesiastical historian, Gelasius has been guilty of the grave historical blunder of making him present at a council held twenty years before his birth. It is, however, absolutely certain that some other person of the same name may not have been intended. From these and other sources Gelasius compiled his history of the Nicene council. It is sometimes taken for granted by those who only know the work by report that it contains a complete collection of the synodal acts of the council. There is, however, no evidence of the existence of such a collection, or of anyone having seen or used it. Athanasius had none such to refer to (cf. Athanas. de Decret. Syn. Nic. l. 2), and certainly we do not possess it in Gelasius (cf. Hefele, Hist.-of Councils, Eng. tr. 263, 294). From the work itself, that the principal fact of its importance was Bithynia, and that the thorough knowledge of the proceedings of this council and its decrees had been of great use to Gelasius in confusing the Euchthians in that province during the ascendency they gained under the usurper Basiliscus, 475-477, when they were appealing to the decisions of the Nicene fathers as favouring their cause. The ancient historians are unanimous in the publication of his historical collections, by which alone he is known to us. If this work had answered in any respect to its pretensions it would have been of immense value. But either the original document must have been most untrustworthy, belonging rather to the domain of fiction than fact, or Gelasius himself must have so overlaid it with the inventions of his own imagination, that as an historical authority it is almost worthless. The prolix disputations and lengthy orations, of which it is full, as Caret has justly remarked, are evidently the writer’s own composition. Dupin’s verdict is still more severe. He calls Gelasius “a sorry compiler, who gathered all he met with relating to his subject, both bad and good, without examining whether it was true or false.” His work is little more than a compilation from the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, to which he has added little but what is very doubtful or manifestly untrue. “There is neither order in his narrative, nor exactness in his observations, nor elegance in his language, nor judgment in his selection of facts, nor good sense in his judgments.” As instances of its untrustworthiness we may mention that he states that the council was summoned by the pope, Sylvester I. (Euseb. Hist. viii. 35), while Hosius of Cordova presided as its deacon, and devotes many chapters (Lib. ii. c. 11-24) to disputations on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, which had not at the time become subject of controversy at all. Natalis Alexander also condemns the work as being “levissimi ponderis,” except what is confirmed by other authorities, and says of it “non est verum” (Exch. Hist. iii. iv. dissert. 13). The style, according to Photios, is characterized by poverty and meanness. The work is divided into three books, τὰ ποιήματα. The first book, which deals with civil history, contains the life of Constantine until his victory over Licinius, in eleven chapters. In the second book, in thirty-six chapters, comprehends the history of the council, embellished with imaginary speeches, and discussions between the bishops and heathen philosophers that cannot have taken place. His statement that Arius took these philosophers with him to help him in his disputations with the orthodox party seems, indeed, not probable. It is, however, considered by many a part of the best and most authentic narrative of the debates between Phædus, a heathen philosopher holding Arius opinions, and the most learned members of the council, Eustathius, Hosius, Eusebius, &c. is stamped by Valesius (Annot. in Socr. H. E. l. 8), as decidedly supposititious. The acquaintance with theology and familiarity with the Holy Scriptures, shown in Phædus’s arguments, exceeds all probability. In Bruglie is probably correct in regarding these discussions as specimens of Christian declamation, written as literary exercises, but not with any deliberate intention to deceive, but accepted as authority by the uncritical compiler (L’Étud. et l’Emp. l. 23) to be “most certainly spurious.” “None of the ancient fathers have any thing comparable with one among the moderns has endeavoured to defend their historical value; most do not even mention them; and those who do quote them content themselves with denying their genuineness.” The third book, as we have it, gives only three letters or edicts of the emperor Constantian.
GELASIUS (1) To Arians and the Arians; (2) To the Church of Nicomedia; (3) To Theodorus. Originally, we know from Photius, it carried on the history to the death of Constantine and his baptism, which preceded it, which is stated to have been performed by an orthodox presbyter, who is anonymous. It is supposed that the last book has been mutilated on purpose to destroy the evidence against the story of the emperor having been baptized by pope Sylvester at Rome. The first portion of it, which was printed was the second book, which was included by Alphonsus Pisanus in his History of the Nicene Council. The whole was published with a Latin translation and notes by Robert Balfour, a Scotchman, Paris, 1599. It has been included in all the collections of the councils from those of Sirmondus, 1508, and Binius, 1518. It is to be found in the second volume of Labbe's collection (col. 103-286) as well as in those of Harduin and Mansi. (Photius, Biblioth. Cod. 15, 88, 89; Fabric. Biblioth. Graec. lib. v. c. 24; lib. vi. c. 4; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 454; Dupin, iv. 187; Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 593.)

GELASIUS (14) (Bacchus Junior), monk and martyr; commemorated on Dec. 17. He belonged to Palestine, in the reign of Irene and her son Constantine VI. (790-797), and was of Christian descent, but his father had apostatized to the Saracens and brought up his seven sons in the religion of Mahomet. After his father's death, Galasius sought the laura of St. Saba, where he resided as a recluse under the name of Bacchus. The abbot, fearing punishment from the Saracens for having baptized Galasius, dismissed him, and Galasius, returning home, baptized five of his brothers, but the sixth, who refused baptism, denounced him to Aemar, and Galasius was decapitated. (Basil. Menol. ii. 38.)

GELASIUS (15), a monk who forsake his monastery. A letter is preserved addressed to him by St. Theodorus Studites, in which the latter exhorts him to return without losing an hour. This letter was probably written by St. Theodorus in his first or second labourment, that is, either in a.D. 797-8 or in a.D. 799-811. (S. Theodori Studii Epist. i. 9, in Migne, Patr. Grsec. xxix. 937; Cellier, Histoire des Act. sacr. iii. 308.)

GELATUNA. [GELATUNA] GELLANUS, bishop of Repera In Mauretanian Casarsianis, banished by Hunneric, 484. (Victor. Vit. Notit. 59, Patr. Lat. viii. 274 b; Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 261.)

GELMER, the last king of the Vandals in Africa, 530-534, as usually dated, though Clinton computes the commencement of his reign in June 531 (F. R. i. 734). He was the son of Gelard, grandson of Gentor, great-grandson of Genseric. In the reign of Hilderic he headed the malcontents, seized his king, and his brother Haceric the exterminated the partisans who supported them. The emperor Justinian, who was a friend of Hilderic, sent Belisarius with an army to avenge him, and this general reduced all the Vandal dominion in Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, and the Italian coasts. According to Clinton's chronology (F. R. ii. 756, 758) Belisarius was victorious in Dec. 533, and after three months, when winter was over, that is in March 534, Gelimer surrendered to the imperial commander Phocas. He was sent a prisoner, first to Carthage and afterwards to Constantinople. His reign had lasted two years and nine months (Clinto, P. R. Epit. 221). Gelimer, on being introduced to Belisarius at Carthage, broke into unrestrained laughter, a behaviour which was variously interpreted. The bystanders imputed it to the weakness of his mind, through the calamities he had sustained; but his friends repudiated the imputation and maintained that he was but expressing a humorous sense of the instability of earthly affairs, contrasting his former prosperity with his present humiliation. Others have seen in Gelimer's laugh the laugh of Democritus, as though all the grandeur of human fortune deserved no better than ridicule. His bearing afterwards at Constantinople seems to favour one of the latter interpretations. After gracing the triumph of his conqueror, he was led into the hippodrome where Justinian sat enthroned amid a vast concourse of the people. Gelimer neither uttered a groan nor shed a tear, but kept uttering Solomon's sentence, "Vanitas vanitatum et omnia vanitas." Arrived at the foot of the throne, he was divested of his purple robe; and obliged to bow his head to the ground in obeisance to the emperor. No further sufferings were inflicted on him, and he was allowed to retire on an estate provided for him in Galatia. He would have been honoured with the title of patrician had he not persistently refused to abandon the Arian heresy, which he had inherited from his predecessors (Procop. Bell. Vand. lib. i. c. 9). Thus ended the Vandalic power in Africa, which had endured (according to Clinton) ninety-five years since the first entry of the Vandals into Africa, 429, and one hundred and five years since the conquest of Carthage by Genseric in 439. All that time the Catholic church in Africa had been oppressed by Arian domination, but yet the downfall of the Vandals has restored its supremacy. (C. H.)

GELIONIUS (GILDERNUS, GELDERNUS), said to have been twelfth bishop of Chloun-sur-Sabas, succeeding Waledinus, or, according to Gums, Antedil, and followed by St. Gratian, about a.D. 841. (Gall. Christ. iv. 971.)

GELONICA, martyr. [GALONICA].

GEMARA. [TALMUD].

GEMELLUS (1)—Dec. 10. A native of Paphlagonia and martyr under Julian. Having heard that the emperor was at Ancyra in Galatia, he went and upbraided him for his apostasy. For this, Julian is said to have tortured and finally crucified him in the city of Edessa. (Basil. Menol.)

GEMELLUS (2) (GEMELUS), the Donatist bishop of Tanboca, Tamboca, or Tambaiba, in Byzacena, at the North council of Carthage, in a.D. 393. (August. in Ps. xxxvi. 20; Mon. Vet. Don. p. 257, ed. Oberthür.)

GEMELLUS (3), a layman of distinction residing at Constantinople, a catechumen of Chrysostom's, whose cause he espoused very warmly
regardless of the trouble he thus brought upon himself. (Chrysost. Epist. 192.) He was still unrepentant when Chrysostom was expelled, and he was anxious to receive the sacrament at the hands of his revered teacher. Chrysostom, however, exhorted him not to defer his admission into the church till his return, delighted as he should have been to baptize him, but to receive the rites at the hands of some of his friends and adherents. The intelligence of this would cause him the sincerest pleasure (ibid.). Gemellus having been raised to some important official position in Constantinople, Chrysostom wrote him a very warm congratulatory letter expressing his satisfaction, not so much on his accession to dignity as on the opportunity it afforded him of exercising his power for the good of others, in which he was sure he would not be wanting. (Epist. 124.) Not having received any reply, Chrysostom wrote again in a tone of disappointment, assuring him, however, that he was convinced that his silence did not proceed from pride of station or from any failure of affection towards him. (Epist. 79.) Chrysostom's letters to Gemellus indicate a very high estimate of Gemellus's character and qualifications, as well as that anxious solicitude for his welfare which could only be satisfied by frequent intelligence. In one letter he expresses an eager desire to know whether his health has derived any benefit from the warm baths he was proposing to visit. (Epist. 194.)

GEMLLIUS (4), subdeacon and founder of the church of St. Agnes at Ravenna, and also "rector" of Sicily, in the time of Exuperantius, bishop of Ravenna. (Agnellus, Liber Pontif. Ruvemn. pt. iii. p. 254, ed. 1708, pt. i. cap. 1 in Patr. Lat. cviii. 523.)

GEMLLIUS (5), bishop of Stratonicea, in the ecclesiastical province of Lydia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and subsequently signed the synodal letter of his province to the emperor Leo concerning the death of St. Proterius and the faith of Chalcedon, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 153, 573; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 893.)

GEMLLIUS (6), bishop of Miletopolis, on the Rhynedacum, in the ecclesiastical province of the Hellespont. Diogenes of Cyzicus subscribed his name in his absence to the confession of faith which was read before the emperor Marcian, at the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 164; Le Quien, O. C. i. 779.)

GEMLLIUS (7), 7th bishop of Vaison, succeeding Ethillus and followed by Alethius, was present at the council of Epona in A.D. 517. (Mansi, viii. 564; Gall. Christ. i. 923.)

GEMLLIUS of Antioch. (GEMINIUS (1))

GEMLLIIUS (1)—Sept. 16 (Usuard.). Sept. 17 (Hae. Mm.). Martyr at Rome under Diocletian and Maximian, with Lucia a widow. Her son Eutropius, being an idiot, accused her, now aged 75 years, before the judges Apofrasius and Megasius, who delivered her to death. Gemellius was converted by her patience under torture, and suffered with her. (Mart. Rom. Vat., Adom., Usuard.) [LUCIA.] [G. T. S.]

GEMLLIUS (2), bishop of Mutina (Modena) from before A.D. 380 to c. 388, when the same year he was succeeded by Theodulus. His predecessor had been Theodorus. He was present at the council of Milan under St. Ambrose, a.d. 390. (Mansi, iii. 680; Ambr. Epiph. class. i. 48. Patr. Lat. xvi. 1139; Cappelletti, Le Chier d'Italia, iv. 225.) Sillingard (Catal. Episc. Ital. 5) makes him succeed Antonius in 386 and succeeded by Theodorus in 387.

GEMLLIUS (3), bishop of Volterra, at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649. (Mansi, x. 895; Hefele, § 907.)

GEMLLIUS (4), bishop of Reggio (na Emilia), signing a double donation by Astolph, c. 752, in favour of the abbey of Nonantula (Troyes, Cod. Dipl. iv. 430). He consecrated the abbey, c. 753, according to the author of the Life of Anslem abbat of Nonantula, in Monumentorum Italicum et Langobardicorum, p. 566.

GEMLLIUS (5), bishop of Modena, signing a double donation by Astolph, c. 752, in favour of the abbey of Nonanata (Troyes, Cod. Dipl. iv. 430).

GEMLLIUS (6), bishop of Mutina (Modena) from before A.D. 380 to c. 388, when the same year he was succeeded by Theodulus. His predecessor had been Theodorus. He was present at the council of Milan under St. Ambrose, a.d. 390. (Mansi, iii. 680; Ambr. Epiph. class. i. 48. Patr. Lat. xvi. 1139; Cappelletti, Le Chier d'Italia, iv. 225.) Sillingard (Catal. Episc. Ital. 5) makes him succeed Antonius in 386 and succeeded by Theodorus in 387.

GEMLLIUS (7), 7th bishop of Vaison, succeeding Ethillus and followed by Alethius, was present at the council of Epona in A.D. 517. (Mansi, viii. 564; Gall. Christ. i. 923.)

GEMLLIUS (8), bishop of Modena, signing a double donation by Astolph, c. 752, in favour of the abbey of Nonanata (Troyes, Cod. Dipl. iv. 430).

GEMLLIUS (9), bishop of Mutina (Modena) from before A.D. 380 to c. 388, when the same year he was succeeded by Theodulus. His predecessor had been Theodorus. He was present at the council of Milan under St. Ambrose, a.d. 390. (Mansi, iii. 680; Ambr. Epiph. class. i. 48. Patr. Lat. xvi. 1139; Cappelletti, Le Chier d'Italia, iv. 225.) Sillingard (Catal. Episc. Ital. 5) makes him succeed Antonius in 386 and succeeded by Theodorus in 387.

GEMLLIUS (10), bishop of Mutina (Modena) from before A.D. 380 to c. 388, when the same year he was succeeded by Theodulus. His predecessor had been Theodorus. He was present at the council of Milan under St. Ambrose, a.d. 390. (Mansi, iii. 680; Ambr. Epiph. class. i. 48. Patr. Lat. xvi. 1139; Cappelletti, Le Chier d'Italia, iv. 225.) Sillingard (Catal. Episc. Ital. 5) makes him succeed Antonius in 386 and succeeded by Theodorus in 387.

GEMLLIUS (11), bishop of Mutina (Modena) from before A.D. 380 to c. 388, when the same year he was succeeded by Theodulus. His predecessor had been Theodorus. He was present at the council of Milan under St. Ambrose, a.d. 390. (Mansi, iii. 680; Ambr. Epiph. class. i. 48. Patr. Lat. xvi. 1139; Cappelletti, Le Chier d'Italia, iv. 225.) Sillingard (Catal. Episc. Ital. 5) makes him succeed Antonius in 386 and succeeded by Theodorus in 387.
GEMINIUS (3), Donatist bishop of Cluipa, or Cliepa, an important seaport town on the east coast of proconsular Africa, deriving its name from Cliepa, a shield (Kalbis). (Shaw, p. 89; Dic. of Geo. i. 242.) He was present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. Don. i. 133.)

[ H. W. P. ]

GEMINIUS (1) (GEMINUINIANUS), presbyter of Antioch. Jerome in his Chronicle (where one reads his name as Gemmanus) places him in the year 230, mentioning him with Hippolytus and Berillus of Bostra, "clari scriptores." In his Vr. Ill. likewise Jerome puts him in the time of the emperor Alexander, when Zebennus was bishop of Antioch, 231, and Heraclius was ordained bishop of Alexandria, 233, stating that he composed "a few monuments of his genius." Of these works nothing further is now known. (Hieron. Vr. Illust. cap. 64; Cave, i. 123.)

[G. H.]

GEMINIUS (2)—Jan. 4. Martyr in Africa with Aquilinus, Eugenius, Marianus, Quintus, Theodorus, Triphonis. (Mort. Adon. Usuard.)

[G. T. S.]

GEMINIUS (3)—Feb. 4. Martyr at Rome with Aquilinus, Gelasius, Magnus and Donatus. (Mort. Usuard.)

[G. T. S.]

GEMMINUS (4), confessor in Italy. According to the legend (Boll. Acta SS. 9 Oct. iv. 1039-42) he was by birth a Syrian; his parents Militianus and Bellis were noble; he was brought up as a Christian, though his parents were idolaters, but subsequently converted. After his father's death he found it necessary to seek shelter in Italy, where he landed on the coast of Umbria, and proceeded to Spoletum and Casseretum. Thence he removed to Ferentum, and near to it or at Canerium he died A.D. 815. The Ballondians say he had dedications near Casseretum and Ferentum, at Civitellen, on mount Agnus beside Nocera, and near the city of Hottis, all in Umbria or Etruria. [J. G.]

GEMMANUS (GERMANUS). While St. Columba was a deacon, he is said to have been under the tuition of a Christian bard named Gemmanus, as other hagiographers place him among the famous poets. Gemmanus, who lived in Leinster, probably in the plain of Meath, near to Clonard. Colgan seeks to identify him with Gorman (Oct. 25), of Cill-Gorman, in the east of Leinster, but the name in all likelihood is Gemmanus, and only assumes the form of Germanus from the desire of different writers to make it conform to the familiar type. In the incident related regarding him and St. Columba in the life of the latter by St. Adamnan, St. Gemman was an old man, but we know nothing further of his life or the date of his death, except that he brought his poems and offered them to St. Finnian (Dec. 12) of Clonard, in whose praise he is said to have written a hymn while St. Finnian lived. Lanigan is inclined to think that he was a foreigner, but this idea is based on the name being Germanus. (Colgan, Tr. Thaurnus, c. 25, 383, n. 39, 395, c. 40, 450, n. 4n, Acta SS. 395, c. 23; Reeves, St. Adamnan, i. 137; Skeen, Celt. Scot. ii. 53; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. tr. ii. c. 11, § 8; Todd, St. Patrick, 140; Woulfe, Tr. Woulfe, i. c. 2.) [J. G.]

GEMMARDUS, eighth bishop of St. Paul de Trois-Châteaux, following Sallutianus and succeeded by Ingilbertus, perhaps towards the close of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. i. 708.)

[S. A. B.]

GEMMULUS, a deacon, afterwards an archdeacon, at Rome. Two letters are preserved from him to St. Boniface, of which the priest Deneardus was the bearer. St. Boniface had sent the latter to Rome with letters to the pope, and also to Gemmulus after the synod of Seleucus (A.D. 744), in which he gave an account of what had occurred at the synod, and also of the heretics Aldabert and Clement. In the first of these letters Gemmulus tells him of the condemnation of these heretics and their followers by a council at Rome. He also mentions he had, to the best of his power, taken care of the nuns entrusted by St. Boniface to his charge, and acknowledges the receipt of a present of a silver cup and a sindon or cloth for receiving the bread offered at the Eucharist, which St. Boniface had sent him with his blessing, and sends in return a present of four ounces of cinnamon, two melons of pepper, and a pound of crozerum or crotzerum, which from the second letter appears to have been a remarkably fragrant kind of incense. In the second letter he excuses himself for not having sent him the epistles of St. Gregory he had asked for, on the ground that he had been ill of gout, as Deanesus could bear witness, but promises if he recovers to perform St. Boniface's wishes. We have also a letter from St. Boniface to him, written apparently near the end of the archbishop's life; he addresses Gemmulus or "Jammulius" as archdeacon, and tenderly regrets their separation from one another. (Bonif. ep. 59, 59, 86 in Mornum. Magnai. ed. Jull. 153, 156, 25.)

[F. D.]

GEMTHENNUS, disciple of St. Patrick. (Colgan, Tr. Thaurnus, 143, 163, 297.) [GUINNEN.] [J. G.]

GENBERHIT (Kemble, C. D. 113), archbishop. [JACKENBURT.] [C. II.]

GENEBAUDUS I. (GENEBAUDUS, GENNOBAUDUS), ST., first bishop of Luon, established in the see by St. Remigius bishop of Rheims, the metropolitan, to whose history by Flodoard we are indebted for almost all the knowledge we have of him. The Acta ascribed to Hinneman of Rheims (Boll. Sept. ii. 538) add nothing to Flodoard's account. He was of noble birth, and learned in both sacred and profane literature. Before his ordination he separated from his wife, a niece of St. Remigius. But the separation proved more than he could bear, and after a period of secret intercourse with her he threw himself at the feet of St. Remigius, and tearing off his stole confessed his sin. The saint ordained a penance. A dimly lighted cell and oratory were built against the church of St. Julian, and the door was locked and sealed by St. Remigius. There he passed seven years, his metropolitan presiding over the diocese with his own. On the assurance of an angel that his sin was forgiven, he emerged from his prison with the consent of Remigius. He was succeeded by his son Latro (Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem. I. xiv.) He was re-episcopated at the Synod of Orleans, A.D. 546, by Medallus his archdeacon.
GENEBAUDUS II., seventeenth bishop of Leon, succeeding Madelarius and followed by Waino I. He is one of the bishops addressed in the twelfth letter of pope Zachary, written probably A.D. 748 (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxix. 948). In 762 he subscribed two charters of king Pippin for the foundation and endowment of the monastery of Prüm (Migne, Patr. Lat. xcv. 1537, 1541), and in the same year, or in 765, he signed the Placitum Athinonese (Bar. Pagius, an. 762, n. iv.; Mansi, xii. 661). The date of his death is not known. (Gall. Christ. ix. 512.)

GENEBERN or GENEGBRED, martyr, friend of St. Dimpna. [GENEBERN.]

GENEBRADUS, bishop of Lauda (Lodi). He lived between A.D. 345 and 378. His predecessor was St. Dionysius, his successor St. Bassianus. Ughelli believes that he was bishop of Laodiceum (Laon). (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. iv. 893; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xii. 285.)


GENEREUS, a baker at Ioana in the time of St. Columba, mentioned in the life of that saint by Adamnan. He has had a minor kind of importance thrown upon him through the controversial use made of the various readings in the text regarding his occupation. In the edition of St. Adamnan by Colgan and the Bollandists he is called a “pizzaro” (pistor), and O'Donnell evidently borrows the same from his copy of St. Adamnan; but the true reading, as adopted by Canisius, Messingham, and Dr. Reeves, is “pistor” and “opus pistorum,” so that Generalis is not to be classed among the cultivators of ancient Irish art, but among the lower members of the Columban household. He is called by St. Adamnan “a certain religious brother,” and a “Saxon,” and apparently was in favour with St. Columba. (Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. I., ii. 124, n. 112; Reeves, St. Adamnan, 208, 209; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 430.)

GENEROSA (1), a Christian woman at Rome. [FAUSTINA (25)].

GENEROSA (2)—July 17. Martyr at Scilla in Africa. [FELIX (212)]. [F. T. 8.]

GENEROSUS (1), a Christian gentleman of Constantia (Cirta), to whom a Donatist presbyter wrote, at the command, he said, of an angel, to recommend the claims of Donatism. To this letter St. Augustine, in conjunction with Alypius and Fortunatus, replied [FORTUNATUS], shewing that these claims were groundless, and that the succession of bishops at Rome, notwithstanding the intrusion of a Donatist [FELIX (45)], was unbroken, whereas Donatism was a novelty. To separate, therefore, from the Catholic church was to separate from the Christianity of the whole world. Besides this, some of the Donatist bishops, as Silvanus, had themselves been guilty of “tradition,” the crime which they imputed so fiercely to the Catholics, whereas the repeated inquiries into the case of Caecilianus had only served to establish his innocence of it. But the main principle of the Donatists, that the evil must be separated from the good in this world was itself false, and they themselves were not consistent in their application of it when they readmitted Felicianus of Musti into their community. The writer of the letter to Generosus, when he speaks of an angel, ought to remember that his knowledge of the form of angel of light, or else, if he saw no angel, he has laid himself open to the charge of falsehood. These circumstances are given under A.D. 400 by Tillemont (Mem. xiii. 328, art. 126) and Ceillier (Act. sac. i. 83); but Barouius (A. E. ann. 398, xxii.) under 398.

This letter must have been written between A.D. 398 and 400, during the pontificate of Anastasius, who is mentioned in it as holding the see of Rome. It seems not impossible that by the term “angel” the writer of the letter to Generosus may have meant to denote Petilian, the able and busy Donatist bishop of Cirta, whose knowledge, if not at his suggestion, it was probably written, and who was not without anxious to gain over to his side a layman of high standing like Generosus. Morelli, followed by Gams, considers Generosus to have preceded Profuturus as bishop of Cirta. But this is unlikely, for (1) he is nowhere distinctly called bishop in the letter on which Morelli relies for proof; (2) in the superscription to that letter the names given are those of Alypius, Augustine, and Fortunatus, and in his reply to the letters of Petilian, Augustine speaks of Fortunatus as being at that time bishop of Cirta. This reply was written about A.D. 400, i.e. about the same time as the letter to Generosus. We conclude therefore that Generosus was not at that time, nor at any other, a bishop, but only a Christian layman of high character and position. (Morelli, Afric. Christ. i. 142; Gams, Sgr. Episc. p. 465; Aug. 1. Pet. i. 1; Retract. ii. 25; de Unic. Bapt. xvi. 29; Ep. 53; Tillemont, 126, 127, vol. xii. pp. 328, 333; Ceillier, ix. 430.)

Generosus appears afterwards to have become consular of Numidia, in which capacity Augustine wrote to him in the case of Faventius. [FAVENTIUS (1.)] (Aug. Ep. 116.) Gams (Sgr. Episc. 465) in recording a Generous bishop of Cirta “ante 400” has probably in view, erroneously, the subject of this article. [H. W. E.]
GENEROSUS, a legate from the formentioned monastery. He belongs to the 6th century.

GENEROSUS (3), bishop of the combined sees of Nomentum (La Montana) and Curium (both since merged in the see of Sabina), c. 601. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, i. 598 n.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GENESIUS (1)—Aug. 25. A comedian at Rome and martyr A.D. 285. He was converted while mocking Christian baptism. [GELASINIUS.] He was tortured for the faith, during which he cried, "There is no king but Christ, for whom I will be killed a thousand times, as you cannot take him out of my mouth nor tear him from my heart." A church at Rome was dedicated in his honour from ancient times, which was restored and beautified by Gregory III. A.D. 741 (Anastasius Bibliothec. iv. 199). Baronius fixes the date of his martyrdom at 303, and Tillmont (Moen. iv. 685) at 285 or 286. (Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron. Adom., Usuard.; Kat. Front.; Robert, Acta Sancr.; Surul Vitae Sanctorum; Coll. ii. 467.)

[G. T. S.]

GENESIUS (2)—Aug. 25. A notary at Arles, and martyr A.D. 308. Originally a soldier, he then became registrar of the local court, where he was one day called upon, in the course of duty, to read one of the edicts of persecution issued by Diocletian and Maximian. Though only a catechumen, he refused to do so, but resigned his appointment and fled. Ardently longing to receive baptism, he returned to Arles, where he prayed the bishop to administer it to him. For some reason, whatever through stress of persecution or some defect in preparation, the bishop deferred it for the present, assuring him, however, that, if called upon to die for Christ, "in thus shedding his blood, he should receive the perfection of the grace of baptism." He was soon after arrested, wheedon, as St. Paulinus of Nola has as account says, "by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit," he flung himself into the Rhone, whereby he received baptism, the river having become him for a second Jordan. The officers followed him to the other bank and there beheaded him without any formal trial. Ado, speaking of his death, says that "he received the crown of martyrdom, being baptized with his own blood." (Mart. Rom. Vet., Adom., Usuard.; Prudent. Hymn. 4., Peristephan.; Greg. Turon., de Glor. Mart. cap. 68, 69; Ven. Fortunat. Misc. i. viii. c. 6; Euseb. Epres. Hom. 50, by some attributed to Hilary of Arles; concerning history of Genesius by St. Paulinus of Nola, see Hist. Lit. de la France, t. ii.; Till. Moen. v. 569.) On the point of martyrdom taking the place of baptism, compare the learned dissertation of Doddow (Dis. Cypr. xiii.).

[G. T. S.]

GENESIUS (3), bishop of Brixellum (Brescello). His date is uncertain, but he was anterior to Cyprianus, who was bishop c. 451. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, x. 443.)

[R. S. G.]

GENESIUS (4), 5th bishop of Sisteron, between Avolus and Pologrorius or Polychronius. He subscribed the fourth council of Paris (A.D. 573), and the letter addressed by the assembled bishops to king Sigebert. (Mansi, ix. 868, 809; Gall. Christ. i. 476.)

[S. A. H.]

GENESIUS (5), second bishop of Montpellier, between Bocius and Gumblins. At the third council of Toledo (A.D. 509), he represented his predecessor, while still an archdeacon. In A.D. 597 he was present as bishop at another council of Toledo, and at the fourth of Toledo in A.D. 633, he was represented by his archdeacon Stephanus or Stephanus. (Mansi, ix. 1002; x. 473, 643; Gall. Christ. vi. 732.)

[S. A. B.]

GENESIUS (6), St., 25th bishop of Clermont in Auvergne between Proculus and Gyroindo (A.D. 656-662). He is said to have been born of a family of senatorial rank belonging to Clermont. While archdeacon of the city he undertook the training of Praetextatus (St. Fritz), who was one of his successors in the episcopate. Nominated to the see upon the death of Proculus, he would only accept it after a general fast of three days had borne witness to the sincerity of the choice. In the fifth year of office, wearied of its pomps and dreading its temptations, he removed, secretly with his clerks, so as not to attach the garb of a pilgrim. His flock thrown into confusion by his disappearance, and ignorant whether he was alive or dead, sent a deputation to Rome to ask counsel. There their bishop was found, and with difficulty was persuaded to return. He died in the following year, after founding the monastery of Chantoin. He was buried in the church which he had built and dedicated to St. Symphorian, but which afterwards took his name. He also erected on his own land the monastery of Manlius or Grandilieu (Magniloence), and appointed Evodius director of it. His day of commemoration was June 3. (Vita S. Genesii, Vita S. Procogoti, Bull. d'Ann. 5th June 323, Jan. 639; Gall. Christ. ii. 245.)

[S. A. B.]

GENESIUS (7), St., thirty-eighth bishop of Lyons, succeeding St. Ambrose, and followed by Lantbertus. Before his elevation he was an abbot, according to Milhion not of Fontenelle, as some have supposed, but attached to the palace and camp of the king. (See the note to the Vita S. Amberti, Mabill. Acta SS., Ord. S. Bened. ii. 1053, Paris, 1608–1701.) He was, at all events, assiduous at court, and filled the post of chief almoner to St. Bathildis, the wife of Clovis. (Vita S. Bathildis, Mabill. ut supra, ii, 778-78.) The year of his consecration is not certain, but from a passage in the Life of St. Bertilla (Mabill. ut supra, sec. iii. pt. i, p. 24), where Genesius, described as magnum Sacerdos dominus, terms which seem to imply episcopal rank, was deputed by queen Bathildis to introduce Bertilla and her attendant nuns into the newly built religious house of Nola (Chelles), we may infer that it was before 659, probably to which date the monastery was completed. In 662 or 663 he subscribed the charter of Bertefredus of Amiens, for the monastery of Corbie (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixviii. 1181). A little later he incurred the resentment of Ebroin, the mayor of the palace, by assisting St. Leger, and an armed band was sent to Lyons to expel him. But the archbishop collected a force and successfully defended the city. (Vita S. Lodegarini, Mabill. ut supra, sec. ii. 886, 882.) In 666 he subscribed the charter of St. Drausius, bishop of Soissons, for the monastery of the Blessed Virgin, (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixviii. 1188.) The date of...
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his death cannot be fixed with certainty, but he was still alive in 677 or 678, as is proved by a diploma of Theodoric III. (Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxvii. 1327), in which he is mentioned as one of the judges of Chraminus. Maibillon believes that he died in the latter of these two years. (See the note to the Vita S. Amberti, ut supra.) Nov. 1 is given for the day of his death, and is the day of his commemoration in the diocese of Lyons. St. Bathildis on her death-bed thought she saw her "faithful friend" in a choir of angels waiting to receive her soul. (Vita S. Amberti, xiv., Maibill. ut supra, p. 782.)

He was buried in the monastery of Kula. (Gall. Christ. iv. 47.)

[5. A. B.]

GENESIUS (3), bishop of Anastasiopolis, in Galatia Prima. He took part in the council of Constantinople, A.D. 680. (Mansi, ii. 220 a, 333 a, 628 c; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 496.)

[T. W. D.]

GENESIUS (9), count of Clermont in Auvergne. He is reckoned among the beatiﬁed, and the Bollandists (Acta SS. 5 June i. 504) devote to him a "Synopsis de cultu, actae, actis, e Scripturis Arvern."

and print the "Officium, ex Canonario Capituli Camerarius," but his personal acts are unknown beyond the legend in the office, which abounds with the miraculous. According to this, his father was Andustius and his mother Tranquilla. From youth his sanctity was attended by miracles, of which specimens are recorded. He built and liberally endowed five churches or religious houses in his castle of Cameraria, and was the special friend of St. Bonitus bishop of Clermont and of St. Meneleus abbott of the monastery of Menat near Clermont. He died on June 5, and was buried at Combronde, or Combronde, the Bollandists say, before A.D. 740.

[6. J. O.]

GENESIUS (10) (or perhaps GALADIUS), Sept. 29, martyr at Perinthus, with bishop Entychus or Entychius and two others. (Wright's Syrian Martyr. in Journ. Soc. Lit. 1860, 439.)

[9. T. S.]

GENETHLIUS (1), bishop of Carthage, between Restitutus and Aurelius, from A.D. 374 to 391, according to Morcelli, who calls him Geneclus. He presided over the synod of Carthage which sat in 386, 387, or 390 (Mansi, iii. 957; Hefele, Concilia, bk. iii. § 106, p. 390), and passed thirteen canons, which are extant, the first declaring the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, while the others treat of discipline (cit. Hefele). Augustine says his memory was greatly revered by the Donatists on account of his conciliatory disposition, which would not allow the law against them to be put in force. (August. ep. 44, § 12; Morcelli, Afr. Christ. iii. 298.)

[C. H.]

GENETHLIUS (2), presbyter, a friend and correspondent of Basil, to whom he wrote a long letter exposing the treacheries of Eustathius of Sebaste, and the artifices by which he endeavored to bring Basil’s orthodoxy into discredit. (Basil, Epist. 224 [345].)

[6. V.]

GENETHLIUS (3), bishop of Arges at the synod held at Constantinople by Flavian, A.D. 448, when Entychus was condemned. (Mansi, vi. 752; Le Quien, O. C. ii. 183.)

[L. D.]

GENETIUS or GENIUS, bishop of Tuy from about A.D. 670 to about 682. He subscribes the acts of C. Braga III., A.D. 675, as senior suffragan, immediately after the metropolitan Leodegarius. (Aguirre-Catalina, ii. 262; Esp. Sagra. xxii. 32.) [ANILA.]

GENEVEUS (GENEVAEUS), ST., 6th bishop of Dol in Brittany, succeeding Tiberienius, or, according to some, St. Budocus, and followed by Restitius, perhaps in the early part of the 7th century. He is said to have died on July 23, on which day he is commemorated, though the Bollandists admit him into their Acta with some doubt. (Acta SS. July 23; Gall. Chr. xiv. 1041.)

[5. A. B.]

GENEVIEVE. [GENOFEVA.]

GENGERBERT (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. No. 110), archbishop. [JAENERT.]

GENGULPHUS, ST. (GANGOLPUS, GENGOL), martyr, commemorated on May 11. He was a native of Varennes in Burgundy, where he was murdered, A.D. 760, at the instigation of his wife, by her paramour, for which reason he seems to have been elevated to the rank of martyrdom. He appears to have been a man of a rich and noble family. One of his ancestors, a certain Gengolphus, had been constituted "defensor" and "advocatus" of the neighbouring monastery of Besus by a letter of Clotaire king of the Franks dated Aug. 17, 686 (Chron. Tec. in D'Achere, Spicilegium. iv. 403, ed. 1729). [G. T. S.]

GENIALIS (1), named in the diptychs of the church of Cauvallon as first bishop of that see. His date is ﬁxed by the fact that his name appears in the recently discovered acts of the council of Nismes in 394. (Hefele, Concil. Geok. § 110; Gall. Christ. i. 940.) [R. T. S.]

GENIALIS (2), condemned with Jovinianus as sharing his heresy by pope Siricius, and by St. Ambrose and other bishops assembled at Milia A.D. 390 (Amb. Opp. iii. 1044). [J. L. D.]

GENISTAE. Justin Martyr (Tryph. 89), speaking of Jewish sects, mentions as two of them, the Genistae and Meristae. This notice was for a long time overlooked by writers on heresies, though they generally enumerate pre-Christian sects, and Philostratus in particular to lengthen his list of Jewish heresies. It is just possible that the writer of the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 6) had the passage of Justin in his mind, and identiﬁed the Genistae with the Ebionites, whose notions were heretical concerning the birth of Christ; and the Meristae with the Essenites, who separated themselves from the rest of the people. But for a clear
recognization of the passage we have come down to bisbor of Seville (Oreg. viii. 9) who explains that the Genitae were those who boasted of the pure race of Abraham, by mixture of Babylonish blood, and the Meristae those who separated the Scriptures, denying the divine inspiration of certain prophecies. This is obviously mere guess-work, but no subsequent conjectures can be pronounced to be clearly more fortunate. We do not get as much help as might be expected from a comparison with Hegesippus (Luseb. H. E. iv. 21), who speaks of the seven sects of the Jews; and Justin, without calling attention to the number, enumerates exactly seven. Common to both lists are the Sadducees, Pharisees, Galileans, and Baptists or Hesperbaptists; while against the Hellenists, Genitae, and Meristae of Justin, we have to set the Samaritans, Masbothaeans, and Essenes of Hegesippus. There is an enumeration of Jewish sects in the Clementine Recognitions (i. 54), but no trace there of reference to the passage in Justin. It is possible that the Genitae of Justin may be the same as the people whom Thedorett calls Kaiaour and Cem. Alex. Kaiaour; but if so, we lose the explanation Caiusse for the word without gaining any light on the meaning of the first.

[G. S.]

GENIUS, bishop of Aisch. [EONUS.]

GENIUS (HYGINUS)—May 3, martyr at Lectura (Leuctura), an episcopal city in Aquitaine. He was famous as a Christian teacher, and it is said he had converted thirty soldiers who were sent to arrest him during the Diocletian persecution. They failed to execute their orders, all were put to death. He died in a cave, where he had sought refuge. His acts are very legendary. (Ferrarius, Cat. Ss.; Acta SS. Bull. Mai. i. 384-393. His life is to be found in Labbe, Nov. Bibl. MSS. lib. in Coll. litter. Apul. p. 504, Paris, 1657.) [G. T. S.]

GENNIADIUS (1), bishop of Eibus (Ibiobon) in Murs, present at the council of Nicaea, a.D. 325; (Mansi, ii. 1094; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 863.)

[J. de S.]

GENNIADIUS (2), bishop of Membosa or Membrasa, a town of proconsular Africa, 350 miles from Carthage, 35 miles from Mesti (Medjaz el Bibb). (Ant. His. 45, 3; Procop. Bell. Vand. ii. 15.) He was present at Carth. Conf. a.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. Don. 133.) [H. W. P.]

GENNIADIUS (3), a physician of Carthage, who had also practised at Rome, a friend both of Evodius and St. Augustine. In one of Augustine’s letters to Evodius, Gennadius is mentioned as having at one time doubted the reality of life after death. His doubts were removed by a vision which convinced him that the power of mental and spiritual sight is independent of the body. (Aug. Ep. 159.) [H. W. P.]

GENNIADIUS (4), presbyter and archimandrite, addressed by Cyril of Alexandria. Gennadius had broken off communion with Proclus the patriarch of Constantinople, being scandalized at his liberality in consenting to communicate with Juvenal of Jerusalem. Cyril commends Gennadius for his zeal, and expresses strong disapproval of Juvenal; but at the same time he justifies Proclus under the circumstances, and says that he should himself have acted in the same way. (Cyril. Alex. ep. 56 al. 48; in Pat. Gr. ixvii. 319; Tillem. Mon. xxv. 208.)

[Ch.]

GENNIADIUS (5), bishop of Hermopolis Magna in the Thebaid, present at the Ephesine Latrocinium, a.D. 449. (Mansi, vi. 927; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 593.)

[J. de S.]

GENNIADIUS (6), bishop of Teos, present at the Latrocinium Ephesinum, a.D. 449 (Mansi, vi. 932). But he also, though absent, assented to the council of Chalcedon in 451, and his name was subscribed by the order of Stephen, metropolitan bishop of Ephesus. (Mansi, vii. 168; Le Quien, Or. Christ. i. 728.)

[Le D.]

GENNIADIUS (7), a praepocus Augustalis in the Eastern empire, a.D. 396, in which year there was addressed to him a constitution of the emperor Arcadius, dated from the Eutychian, and his official residence at Diocletianopolis (Procli. Genn. xiv. xcvii. u. 96; Gothofred). Gennadius was still Augustalis when the Libyans invaded the Pentapolis (Synesius, Catastasi in Migne, Patrolog. Gr. lvii. 1563). At some date he also filled the office of proconsul of Achaia (Claudian. Ep. 5). Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, the metropolis of the Pentapolis, c. a.D. 407-415, tells that he was a Syrian, and speaks of him in terms of great praise. (Ep. 73, in Migne, u. s. 1439.)

[TH. D.]

GENNIADIUS (8), the name of two Phrygian bishops, viz. of Moysana and of Acoannes, present at the council of Chalcedon, a.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 159; Le Quien, Or. Christ. i. 817, 823.)

[L. D.]

GENNIADIUS (9), bishop of Gusatus in Crete, was present at the council of Chalcedon, a.D. 451 (Mansi, vii. 161), and subscribed the synodal epistle of the Cretan bishops to the emperor Leo, a.D. 458. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 267.)

[J. de S.]

GENNIADIUS (10), 21st bishop of Constantinople, 438-471, between Anatolius and Aemilianus. His first public appearance was in an attack on Cyril, in two works, 431 or 432, Against the Anathemas of Cyril, and Two Books to Ptolemaus. In the latter he exclaims, "How many times have I heard blasphemies from Cyril of Egypt? Woe to the scourge of Alexandrinus!" "Can we sufficiently deplore the corruptions of which he has been and is the author? There are no blasphemies which he does not vomit against the holy fathers, against the apostles, against Jesus Christ Himself. He destroys the humanity which the Word took of us and for us; he makes that nature suffer which is incapable of suffering." In spite of these heathen censures, it seems probable that in 433 Gennadius was one of those who became reconciled with Cyril, and he may have been the presbyter and abbot who in 444 received Cyril's approbation for making a difficulty about communicating with Proclus. [GENNIADIUS (A).]

At any rate, in 458, he was a presbyter at Constantinople, and designated by Leo to fill the see. The emperor was determined to find a man of spotless reputation, on whom no suspicion had ever breathed, of holy life and conspicuous learning, and such was Gennadius. It was
not a unanimous election; for Anian influences were at work, and Anicius, who was destined to occupy the chair thirteen years later, already received some votes. From the beginning of his episcopate Gennadius gave the orthodox satisfactory proofs of zeal for the Catholic faith and the maintenance of discipline. All the time of his tenure of his great office, an office greater than ever since the policy of his predecessor, occur measures for the good of the body ecclesias-
tical, in which the emperor is associated with the patriarch, and which the patriarch no doubt planned. His discretion was before long tested. Timothy Aelurus, chased from the see of Alexandria by order of the emperor, had obtained, through the canvassing of certain enemies of orthodoxy, leave to come to Constantin-
ople, intending, by a pretence of Catholicism, to re-establish himself on his throne. Gennadius thought it best to consult the experience of the greatest of contemporary ecclesiastics, Stesicorus, bishop of Rome. Leo replied on June 17, 460, urging him to do his utmost to prevent the bad effects to be expected from the voyage of Timothy, and to labour for the immediate con-
secration of an orthodox prelate for Alexandria. The plan succeeded as Leo desired; Timothy Aelurus was banished to the Chersonese, and Timothy Sophianus was chosen for Alexandria in his stead. An appointment which Gennadius made about this time, that of Marcian, who had been a Novatian but had come over to the orthodox church, to the important and influence post of chancellor of the goods of the church of Constantinople, shewed at once his liberality of spirit, and desire for order. The two Egyptian solitaries who de-
scribed Gennadius to Moschus, as mentioned below, communicated a story which is also told by Theodorus Lector. The church of St. Eleu-
therius at Constantinople was served by a reader named Carius. He led a disorderly life and Gennadius gave him a severe reprimand. It was useless. According to the rules of the church, the patriarch had him flogged. The flogging was also ineffectual. The patriarch sent one of his officers to the church of St. Eleutherus to beg that holy martyr either to correct the evil servant of his church or to take him from the world. Next day, says the story, Carius was found dead, to the terror of the whole town. Theodorus also relates how a painter, who had the presumption to depict the Saviour under the form of Jupiter and had his hand withered, was healed by the prayers of Gennadius.

It is related in the life of Daniel the Stylite, that Gennadius ordained that saint presbyter at the request of the emperor Leo, standing at the foot of the Phareos and performing the ceremonies there, because Daniel, who knew what was in-
tended, did not wish his bishop to mount his retreat. "I should have come before," said the prelate, according to that account, "if I had not been prevented by business." You would never come at all," replied the enthusiastic presbyter brusquely, "unless you had been sent." The buying and selling of holy orders was one of the crying scandals of the age. Measures had been taken against simony by the Council of Chalcedon. In 459 or 460, Gennadius, finding that the evil practice had not at all abated, held a council at Constantinople to consider it. An encyclical was issued, adding anathema to the former sentence. The synodal was sent to the bishop of Rome, and to the metropolitans of the East, with a request that it should be published in their provinces and strictly carried out.

In 459 Martyrius had been raised to the see of Antioch, but was driven out by Peter the Fuller, who, by the help of the emperor's brother-in-law, seized his place. Gennadius, by his entreaties with the emperor, obtained the resto-
ration of the extruded patriarch. Peter the Fuller a second time seized the archbishopric. The patriarch of the East again appealed to the emperor, and Julian was made orthodox suc-
cessor to Martyrius.

Towards the end of his life Gennadius is said to have been praying one night before an altar, when suddenly he saw a spectre of a demon. The demon declared that he yielded during the life of Gennadius, but that after his death he would cause manyills to the church, and would reduce it to his obedience. This story may have arisen from Gennadius foreseeing that Anicius would succeed him, and from the alarm which he must constantly have felt at the disorders of the church, with which even his high courage and resolution could not cope. He prayed to God to overawe such a monster; but the anxiety which he felt hastened his end. He died in 471, about August 25. That is his day in the Greek calendar.

Gennadius stands out as an able and successful administrator, about whom no historian has had anything to speak but praise, if we except the petrarchism which was the result of his desire for order. The two Egyptian solitaries who described Gennadius to Moschus, as mentioned below, communicated a story which is also told by Theodorus Lector. He led a disorderly life and Gennadius gave him a severe reprimand. It was useless. According to the rules of the church, the patriarch had him flogged. The flogging was also ineffectual. The patriarch sent one of his officers to the church of St. Eleutherus to beg that holy martyr either to correct the evil servant of his church or to take him from the world. Next day, says the story, Carius was found dead, to the terror of the whole town. Theodorus also relates how a painter, who had the presumption to depict the Saviour under the form of Jupiter and had his hand withered, was healed by the prayers of Gennadius.

It is related in the life of Daniel the Stylite, that Gennadius ordained that saint presbyter at the request of the emperor Leo, standing at the foot of the Phareos and performing the ceremonies there, because Daniel, who knew what was in-
tended, did not wish his bishop to mount his retreat. "I should have come before," said the prelate, according to that account, "if I had not been prevented by business." You would never come at all," replied the enthusiastic presbyter brusquely, "unless you had been sent." The buying and selling of holy orders was one of the crying scandals of the age. Measures had been taken against simony by the Council of Chalcedon. In 459 or 460, Gennadius, finding that the evil practice had not at all abated, held
GENNADIUS—PREBYSUTER


[W. M. S.]

GENNADIUS (11) MASSILIENSIS, prebyster of Marseilles.

Authoritas.—His statement regarding himself, and his treatise De Viris Illuminibus, together with the inferences deduced from this, and his only remaining extant work, the short Epistola de Fide med, which is more commonly known by the title Libelli de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus. (Concerning editions, see below.)

Life. — The existence of Gennadius must have been wholly comprised within the 5th century of the Christian era, inasmuch as he died in A.D. 496. Of the date of his birth and of his ordination to the priesthood we are ignorant. But in the De Viris Illuminibus we learn from himself, through the notice above-mentioned, that he was a prebyster of Marseilles, that in addition to the above-named tracts he wrote a work in eight books against all heresies, another in six against Nestorius, and tracts on the Millennium and the Apocalypse (de Mille Annis et de Apocalypsi Beatit Ioannis). The epistle he sent to pope Gelasius (epistolam de fide mei misi ad beatam Gelasiam, urbis Romae episcopum) is this. This is the last extant work of the Roman see lastfed only four years, namely, from A.D. 492 to 496.

Writings. — It is unfortunate that our estimate of one of the two extant works of Gennadius is rendered difficult by some doubts concerning the correctness of our present copies. If we accept the De Viris Illuminibus as it is commonly published, then the brief notices concerning St. Augustine, St. Prosper, and Faustus the Breton [Prosper, Faustus Rhenensis], warrant us in classing Gennadius of Marseilles with the semi-Pelagians [Semi-Pelagians], inasmuch as he ceases Augustine and Prosper, and praises Faustus. Moreover, the short account of St. Jerome at the commencement of the book, a very tardatory one, seems inconsistent with the hostile reference to Jerome contained under the article Rufinus in the same catalogue.

The most obsessional passages of a semi-Pelagian character are said to be altogether omitted in the two extant copies of this work. In the Loci Locantes and the Verona, and in a MS. preserved at Corbie in France. (Ramsay's art. "Gennadius" in the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Bks, compared with Mabillon Vetusta Annae, ed. Paris, 1723.) This is no doubt an important fact. But it must be borne in mind that it is not certain that these MSS.

were in reality the earliest, and that it is by no means impossible that a copyist, especially in Italy, might omit them as unsuited to the theological atmosphere of his own age and country. The existence of a semi-Pelagian school in the southern Gaul of the fifth and sixth centuries—a school embracing among its more or less pronounced adherents many justly honoured names—is a plain matter of unquestioned history, and it is highly probable that Gennadius belonged to it. To the present writer the passages in question do not look like forgery: they cohere with the context; and Mabillon (I.c.), though leaving the question open for further investigation, does not venture to condemn them.

The account of Jerome given by Gennadius stands on a different footing. The absence of any such notice would not be remarkable because the De Viris Illuminibus (otherwise Cataloga Scriptor. Ecod.) of Jerome, of which the work of Gennadius is at once an imitation and a continuation, ends with a notice of Jerome given by himself. Besides the divergence from the art. "Rufinus" already noticed, the style seems more rhetorical, and the tone more enthusiastic than is common with Gennadius. If it be accepted as a genuine notice by Gennadius, we may add to his list of extant works a longer biography of St. Jerome, occupying nearly three folio pages, and given by Mabillon (I.c.), who seems to incline towards accepting it. The tones of the longer and the shorter notices are concordant, and both are in the singular expression italicized in the following extract from the shorter one: "Ad Bethlehem oppidum juvenis [Hieronymus, &c.] advenit, ubi prudens animal ad praesepe Domini se obtulit permanseram. But the name of Jerome is so completely what an Italian poet has termed

"Nomen d'immensa invicta, "

E d'Indomato amor,

that such an addition as the prefix of the short notice is a probable one, and the genuineness of the longer life must seemingly stand or fall with it. On some evidence as lies before him the present writer would reject them both.

Taking then the De Viris Illuminibus in its most commonly accepted form (which agrees with the above decision), it may be remarked, that it was probably published about A.D. 495, and that it contains, in some ten folio pages, a century of short biographies of ecclesiastics between A.D. 392 and 495. Although lacking the lively touches, so frequent in the similar work of his great predecessor, the catalogue of Gennadius exhibits a real sense of proportion. The greater men stand out in its pages, and it conveys much real and valuable information. With due allowance for the bias referred to, it may be regarded as a trustworthy compilation, for which our gratitude is due.

The other treatise, variously entitled, as has been remarked, Epistola de Fide med, or de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus Liber, begins with a sketch of the profession and doctrines of those retaines in the three creeds retained in the Prayer Book of the English Church, interwoven with the names of those who are considered by the writer (with occasionally questionable accuracy) to have impugned this or that article of belief. A few lines will illustrate this feature: 

"Nihil creatum
GENNADIUS—PRESBYTER

ant servilus in Triallate cedendum, ut vult Dio-
nysi, fons Arii; nihil inaequale, ut Eunomius;
nihil inaequale gratiae, ut vult Aetius: nihil an-
terius posteriorius aut minus, ut Aris; nihil ex-
traneum aut officiale alteri, ut Macedonius (cap. 4)." Gennadius considers (as later writers, e.g. Aquinas) that all men, even those alive at the second Advent, will have to die (7). But this conviction, though derived from a widespread patristic tradition (maximam Patrum turba tradente) is, he admits, rejected by others equally catholic and learned. Of the theories concerning the soul of man subsequently known respectively as the creativist and the traducianist views, he espouses the creativitist side. He will not allow the existence of the spirit as a third element in man besides the body and the soul, but looks upon it as only another name for the soul (19). Heretical baptism is not to be repeated, unless where it has been administered by heretics, who would have declined to employ the invocation of the Holy Trinity (52). He recommends weekly recitation of the Eastern liturgy by all, who are not under the burden of mortal sin. Such as are should have recourse to public penance. He will not deny that private penance may suffice; but even here outward manifestation, such as change of dress, is desirable. Daily reception of holy communion he will neither promote nor blame (55).

Evil was invented by Satan (57). Though celibacy be rated above matrimony, to condemn marriage is Manichaeans (67). A Christian who has been twice married should not be ordained (72). Churches should be called after the martyrs, and the relics of martyrs honoured (73). He does not believe that any but the baptized attain eternal life; not even catechumens, unless they suffer martyrdom (74). Penitence thoroughly avails to Christians even at their latest breath (80). The Creator alone knows our secret thoughts. Satan can learn them only by our movements and manifestations (81). Marvels may be wrought in the Lord, but those evil by bad form the year (84). Men can become holy without such marks (85).

The assertion of the freedom of man's will is strongly asserted in this short treatise. But the commencement of all goodness is assigned to divine grace. The language of Gennadius is here not quite Augustinian; but neither is it Pelsgian, or the work would not have been so long included among those of St. Augustine.

Editions.—The two treatises of Gennadius are easy of access; the De Viris Illustratis is given in most good editions of the works of St. Jerome (as e.g. Vallarsi's, the Benedictine, or that of Victorius, Paris, 1759); and the Liber de Eccelestissis Doctissimis is to be found in the Appendix to Green's Benedictine edition of St. Augustine (p. 75). The former treatise has also been published in company with the similar catalogues by Isodore of Seville and Honorius, as well as Jerome's, by Sulphridus, 8vo. Coloni, 1530; with notes by Miraens, Antwerpiae, 1632, and with notes by Miraens and E. S. Cyprianos, 4to. Helmstadii, 1700, and by F. Exce., in the Juxta Elenchus Hauni, 1718.

The date of the publication of the De Viris Illustratis is, as has been said, about A.D. 495. The De Ecceles. Doctissimis is evidently, from Gennadius's own statement, an earlier work. This limits it to a period between A.D. 492-494, as otherwise it could not have been sent to Gelasius. [J. G. C.]

GENNADIUS (18), bishop of Hermopolis Parva (Demahur) in Egypt. He was the last of the orthodox bishops, and was related to Timotheus of Alexandria (Liberatis, Breviarium, cap. xvii. in Patrol. Lat. Ixivii. 1022). The same writer mentions that Gennadius was sent by Timotheus to the emperor Zeno, c. A.D. 484, and remained some time at Constantinople. (Bod. cap. xvi.; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 516.) [J. de S.]

GENNADIUS (18), bishop of Zenopolis, is Pamphylia, present at the fifth general council, 553 (Manasi, ix. 393). As there is another town of this name in Lycia, writers have supposed two bishops of the name of Gennadius. (Gans, Series Episc. 450, 451; Le Quien, Orient. Chur. i. 993, 1038.) [J. D.]


GENNADIUS, third abbot of St. Germer de Flais in the diocese of Beauvais (Gaz- marius). He was previously vice-domini of the church of Rouen and was succeeded, perhaps in 715, by hiskinsman St. Benignus abbot of Fontanelle. (Gall. Chr. ix. 789.) [C. H.]

GENOCUS, friend of St. Finnian of Clonard, and probably the name as Megenog, bishop of Gill-dumhaha-glaimin. [Mogenou.] (Colgan, Acta SS. 196 b, 394, c. 11, 398, n. 11.) [J. G.]

GENOVEFA (Genevieve), patron saint of Paris and of France. The story of her life, as derived from the most ancient records, is as follows: About the year 430 St. Germans of Auxerre and St. Lupus of Troyes, being on their way to England to combat the Pelagian heresy, stayed one evening at Nantere, then a village, about seven miles from Paris. The villagers assembled to see two prelates of such renown, and a little girl in the crowd attracted the notice of St. Germans. Calling to her, he asked the bystanders who she was, and learnt that her name was Genovefa, that she was seven years of age, and her parents' names were Severus and Gerontia. The parents were summoned to his desire, and in the spirit of prophecy he bade them rejoice in the sanctity of their daughter, for that she would be the means of saving many. Then addressing himself to the child, he dwelt on the high state of virginity, and engaged her to consecrate herself. The bishops then held a service in the church, and at nightfall bade Severus bring his daughter again at early dawn. Before departing St. Germans reminded her of her promise, and giving her a brazen coin marked with the cross, bade her wear it as her only ornament, and leave gold and precious stones for the servants of the world. Henceforth miracles marked her out as the spouse of Christ. Her mother was struck blind for a thoughtless blow, and only healed by the girl's supernatural gift.
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Brought to the archbishop of Paris, generally supposed to have been Felix, to be formally consecrated as a virgin, he recognised her sanctity, and preferred her over the two older girls who accompanied her. In course of time her parents died, and Genovefa was taken by her grandmother to live in Paris. Here she fell ill, and lay three days in a trance, in which an angel led her to see the dwellings of the just, and the rewards prepared for those who love God. She received, too, the gift of declaring men's thoughts. Through these privileges displeased the envious, and people were beginning to murmur against her, when St. Germanus arrived in Paris on a second journey to Britain. Of the people who came to meet him he asked tidings of St. Genovefa, and was met with the murmurs of her detractors. Disregarding their tales, he sought her dwelling, humbly saluted her and showed the people the floor of her chamber wet with her secret tears, and, before departing, commended her to their love. But a fresh source of persecution soon arose. The rumour of Attila's merciless and irresistible progress reached Paris, and the terrified citizens were fleeing with their families and goods. But Genovefa, prophesying that Paris would remain unharmed, and that those places they deemed safe would be ravaged, assembled the matrons and bade them seek deliverance by prayer and fasting rather than by flight. Then the Parisians relied entirely on her, and all the people took counsel to kill her. But at this time there arrived in Paris an archdeacon bearing from St. Germanus the gift of some eulogiae or eucharistic leaves (vid. Dict. Ch. Antiq.) for Genovefa. He addressed the people, declaring the testimony of his bishop, and dissuaded them from their purpose. Nor did the Huns reach Paris, but were diverted through the efficacy of her prayers, as after ages believed (civ. 448).

The accounts we have of her do not enable a connected history to be given of her life. In fact, they are little besides a string of miracles. Nenu, Arcis-sur-Aube, Troyes, Orleans, Tours, the three last are said to have been given by St. Laun, besides Paris, all witnessed the usual commonplace miracles of the age. Childeric, the father of Clovis, having sentenced some prisoners to death, leaves Paris to escape her importunate entreaties for their release. The gates behind him by his order are locked, but fly open at the approach of Genovefa. The same thing happens to the doors of the baptistery of a church at Nenu when she and St. Ciluin, who had resolved to become a nun, were seeking sanctuary from the latter's disappointed lover. To her wonder-working powers, no less than to her zeal, was due the building at Paris of what was in its beginning a humble chapel (vilea mediocria, Geeta Duaperi, i.3; Bouquet, ii. 580) in honour of St. Denis and his companions, whom she held in especial reverence.

But her abstinance and self-inflicted privations are perhaps her greatest characteristic. From her fifteenth to her fiftieth year she ate twice a week, and then only of barley or beans. Wine and strong drink were unknown to her. After her fiftieth year, by command of her bishop, she added a little fish and milk to her bread. Every Saturday night she kept a vigil in her church of St. Denis, and from the Feast of Epiphany till Easter she remained immured in her cell. Such was her fame that it came by means of travellers and merchants to Simeon Stylites, on his pillar in Syria, who sent his greetings to her, and asked for her prayers.

Before her death Clovis, of whose conversion a later legend has made her the joint author with Clotilde, began to build for her the church which later bore her name. Unfinished at his death, it was completed by Clotilde, and dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul. Upon Genovefa's death (Jan. 3, A.D. 512) she was buried in it.

The chief authority for the history of St. Genovefa is an anonymous Life, the author of which asserts that he wrote eighteen years after her death, therefore, about A.D. 530. It was first published by Jean Ravis, of Nevers, in his Des Femmes Illustres, Paris, 1591, and then by Suris, with corrections in the style (Jan. 3), again, by the Bollandists, in 1643, from better MSS., together with another life differing from the former only in unimportant particulars (Acta SS.). The two lives are in considerable divergence of opinion as to the authority to be attached to this life. The authors of the Hist. Litt. de la France (iii. 151) believe in its authenticity, and characterize the author as grave, judicious, full of piety and learned for his age. On the other hand, it has been assailed by Heitmuller, and his successor, St. Genovefa worthy of credence (see Saintyves, Vie de Ste. Geneviève, p. 12, and cf. Valesiana, pp. 43-45, Paris, 1694). If we compare the life of St. Germanus of Auxerre by Constantinus (c. 5, Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vii. 211) with that part of St. Genovefa's which relates to him, we can hardly doubt that they have a common source, or that one of them is taken from the other, with slight alterations. And that episode being subtracted, there is nothing in the remainder which might not well be the work of a later age. It seems clear that the history must be accepted with great doubt. There is no foundation for the story of the woman who was placarded with Genesius, a priest, whose name occurs in the narrative. The life of St. Lupus (c. 2, Acta SS. Jul. vii. 74) has a mere allusion to the history of Genovefa. Immemorial lives of St. Genovefa have appeared in France in modern times, some of which are referred to below, but they are for the most part of a devotional character, and useless for critical or historical purposes.

A noticeable feature in the legend which has grown up round the name of St. Genovefa, and in which it differs from the original sources, is the prominence which it gives to the supposed humility of her birth and condition. The peasant girl of Nantes, feeding her father's sheep, has been the favourite conception of her in sacred art, and the Clois and Parc de Ste. Geneviève are still pointed out near Paris as the scene of her occupation. This is remarkable, as beyond the fact that her parents dwelt in a village, there is no evidence of her birth being humble, whether the other incident of her baptism (Valesiana ut sup.), and the practice of the Catholic church in the treatment of its heroines has certainly not erred in this direction. Nor does it appear that she has ever been considered in any special way the guardian saint of the poor.
GENOVEFA

The posthumous history of St. Genovefa was more eventful than her life. Though Bede's in his first Martyrology in which her name appears, her cult seems to have commenced in very early times (cf. Greg. Tur. de Glor. Conf. s.c.), and to have extended from Paris through France generally. Hers was one of the shrines which, in 696, a synodical council of Paris and of Reruno lowered the rank of its own and of Vienne (Vita S. Eliguais, i. 32, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 504), and her tomb became as celebrated for miracles as she herself had been when alive. In the 9th century her body had to be removed from its resting-place no less than three times to preserve it from the ruin which overtook the church and monastery at the hands of the Northmen. Twice it was carried to a distance from Paris (845 and 856), and the third time (885) within the city walls, where her coffin, carried in solemn procession to the point where the assault was fiercest, brought victory to the Parisians (Abbo, de Bello Parisiaco, lib. ii.; Migne, Patr. Lat. 744). The flight and restoration were on each occasion attended by numerous miracles (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. i. 149, seq.). It was not till 890 or 891 that she, St. Germanus and St. Maclovius were finally restored to their own churches. In 1130, though some place it earlier, occurred the famous miracle of the Germanus Church by order of Pope Innocent II. Paris was devastated by a plague called the ignis sacer, against which all human remedies proved futile. At last the coffin of St. Genovefa was carried in solemn procession and elevated in her church. All who pressed near it were healed, except three, who were in the church and remained unbelievers. Henceforth, the solemn carrying in procession of St. Genovefa was the favourite remedy for every public calamity, such as floods, famine, pestilence, or even unseasonable weather. In 1161 the coffin was solemnly opened in the presence of the archbishop of Sens and two other prelates, in consequence of a rumour that the body was not that of St. Genovefa. The vaults of the church were dismantled, and the coffin of Pope Innocent II. was found secure (Boll. Acta SS. Jan. i. 152). In 1177 the abbey, which had never been completely restored since the ravages of the Northmen three centuries before, was entirely rebuilt by Stephen, the abbot of that time (Epist. 147, 148, 153; Migne, Patr. Lat. ccxi. 434, 485, 488). In 1242 the wooden coffin, in which the remains had hitherto been enclosed, was exchanged for one of gold, silver and precious stones. From 1565 to 1604 the precious relics had to be concealed on account of the civil wars. In 1757 was commenced the present church from the designs of Soufflot to commemorate the recovery of Louis XV. from illness. Thirty years. Reprin

GENSERIC

GENSERIC, king of the Vandals, the illegitimate son of Godigisus, king of the Vandals, reigned for some time in Spain jointly with his legitimate brother Gunicer. [GUNICER.] On the death of the latter, a.d. 428, he succeeded to the undivided sovereignty. He is said to have been originally a Catholic, but early in life embraced the Arian heresy. Before the death of Gunicer, count Benisac, who through the influence of his rival Atius had been forced to seek safety in revolt, but invited the Vandals to invade Africa. This invitation was readily accepted by Genseric, who assembled the Vandals with their families at the Straits of Gibraltar. On hearing, however, that Hermigarius, king of the Suevi, had ventured to enter the province of Carthage, he turned upon the invaders, drove them with their king into the Guadiana, and then in May, a.d. 429, according to Ipatius (in a.d. 427 according to Prosper), crossed into Africa. His host numbered 50,000 warriors, and poured like a torrent over the fertile and defenceless province. At Carthage, and Mactar, the African and the Vandal, met and cast their uncovenanted matches against each other. Neither age nor sex proved any protection against the violence of the Vandals. Hippo was besieged, but through the efforts of Count Boniface, who had discovered the stratagem of Atius, and had returned to his allegiance, supported by an army of allied Goths, the Vandals were obliged to starve, after a siege of fourteen months to abandon the attempt. St. Augustine died in August, a.d. 450, in the third month of the siege. (Possidius, Life of St. Augustine in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxii. 59.) Soon afterwards Boniface, who had received reinforcements from Rome and Constantinople under Aspar, the magister militum, ventured to give battle to the Vandals, but after a hotly contested engagement the Vandals gave way with great loss. He then abandoned Africa and returned to Italy. Genseric, however, who apprehended another expedition of the united forces of the Eastern and Western empires, was not unduly elated by his success, but concluded at Hippo, on February 10, a.d. 455, a peace with Valentinian, by which he undertook to pay a tribute for the territories he had conquered, and to leave unmolested those still held by Valentinian, and sent his son Huneric as a hostage. In a.d. 437, Genseric began to persecute the Catholic bishops in the ceded territories, of whom Possidius Novatus, and Severianus were
the most illustrious, and not only took their
churches from them, but banished them from
their sees. At the same time, four Spaniards,
Arenilus, Yrbusus, Pschasius, and Eutychius,
who were faithful servants of Generisic, but who
refused at his command to embrace Arianism,
were tortured and put to death. Paulillus, a
younger brother of Pschasius and Eutychius,
was cruelly scourged and reduced to slavery.
Generisic, after procuring the restoration of his
son, took Carthage by surprise, Oct. 19, A.D. 439.
The bishops and noble laity were stripped of
their possessions and offered the alternative of
slavery or exile. Quodvultdeus, the bishop of
Carthage, with a number of his clergy were
compelled to embark in unseaworthy ships, in
which, however, they reached Naples in safety.
All the churches within the walls of Carthage
were taken from the Catholics, and handed over
to the Arians, and many of those outside,
especially two dedicated to St. Cyprian, shared
the same fate. It should, however, be recollected
that the Arians in this were only meting out to
the Catholics the treatment they received in
towns where the latter party was the stronger.

[CHERUSSON, p. 524; AMBROSIUS, p. 95.]
Generisic ordered the funeral processions of
the Catholics to be conducted in silence, and sent
the remaining portion of the clergy into exile. Some
of the most distinguished of the clergy and laity
of the provinces divided among the Vandals,
ventured to present themselves before the king
with a petition to be allowed for the consolation
of their people to live in peace under the
dominion of the Vandals. He replied, "I have
resolved to let none of your race and name
escape. How then do you dare to make such a
demand?" and he was with difficulty restrained
by the entreaties of his attendants from
drowning the petitioners in the adjoining sea.
The Catholics, deprived of their churches, were
obliged to celebrate the divine mysteries where
and as best they could.

The year after the capture of Carthage, Gen-
erisic sent another and a third invasion into
Sicily, and besieged Palermo. At the instigation
of Maximus, the leader of the Arians in the
island, he persecuted the Catholics there, some
of whom suffered martyrdom at his hands.
According to Prosper, he was recalled from Sicily
by news of the arrival in Africa of count
Sebastian, the son-in-law of count Boniface, but
Idatius places his arrival ten years later.
Sebastian, however, had come as a friend to
take refuge at his court, but Generisic, who feared his
renown as a statesman and general, at first tried
to convert him to Arianism, that his refusal
might supply a pretext for putting him to death.
Sebastian evaded his demands by a dexterous
reply, which Generisic was unable to answer, but
some other excuse for his execution was shortly
afterwards found.

In A.D. 441, Generisic was attacked by a great
fleet and army sent by Theodosius under the
command of Areobindus, Anaxilus, and Germa-
nus, who, in the invasion, proved rather a burden to
the island than a defence to
Africa. They were recalled the next year to
defend Thrace and Illyricum against an invasion of
the Huns.

The same year a new peace was concluded by
which Valentinian retained the three Mauri-
tanias and part of Numidia, and ceded the
remaining part of his African dominions to
Generisic, who divided the Zenatinae or provin-
cular province, in which Carthage was situated,
among the Vandals and kept all in possession.
The noblest and wealthiest of the natives were reduced to
slavery, and handed over with all their property to
the king's sons Hunneric and Genzo. While the
Vandals, who were in possession of all the
richest lands, were exempted from all imposts or
taxation on the inferior lands, which the former
owners had been allowed to keep, was so crush-
ing that the unfortunate natives were left totally
stitute, and many of them suffered death for
trying to evade the demands of the tax-gatherers
by concealing their money. To guard against
another invasion or a revolt of his subjects,
Generisic dismantled all the towns except
Carthage, to prevent the invaders or rebels from
finding any fortified post they might use as a
basis of operations. About this time Generisic
discovered a plot among his nobles against himself,
and the massacre of the most conspicuous members
of it. Probably from alarm at this conspiracy, he began
a new and severer persecution. The Catholics
were allowed no place for prayer or the ministra-
tion of the sacraments. Every allusion in a
sermon to Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, or Holo-
fernes was regarded as aimed at the king, and
the preacher was forthwith punished with exile.
Among the bishops banished at this time, Victor
mention, Urbanus of Girba, Crescius, a meta-
ropolitans who resided over 120 bishops, Habeldeus
of Teudela, Eustratius of Sufuctum, two of the
provinces of Tripoli, and Felix of Adrumetum.
The last was banished for receiving a foreign
monk. Generisic prohibited new bishops being
consecrated to fill the places of those banished.
In A.D. 454, however, he yielded to Valentinian's
requests, so far as to allow Deogratias to be
consecrated bishop of Carthage. The see had
remained vacant since the banishment of Quod-
vlutdeus fifteen years before. In A.D. 455,
Generisic, Generisic, in league with the son of Eudoxia, sailed to Italy, and took Rome
without a blow. At the intercession of Leo the
Great, he abated from torturing or massacring
the inhabitants, and burning the city, but gave
it up to a systematic plunder. For fourteen
days and nights the work of pillage continued,
the city was sacked of all its remaining
treasures, and Generisic then returned unmole-
to Africa, laden with booty and carrying with
him many thousand captives, among whom was
the empress Eudoxia and her two daughters.
The eldest became the wife of his son Hunneric;
the youngest, with her mother, was eventually
surrendered to the emperor Leo. The most
remarkeable objects among the spoils were the
vessels of the temple and the gild bronze tiles
that formed the roof of the Capitol. The suffer-
ings of the prisoners were alleviated by the
charity of Deogratias. [DEOGRATIAS.] After the death of Valentinian, the whole of
Africa fell into the hands of Generisic, and also
Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearic Islands.
His fleets year after year sailed from Carthage in
the early spring, and ravaged all the coasts of
the Mediterranean. As he was leaving Carthage
on one of these expeditions, the helmsman asked
him whether he ordered him to steer. "Against
those," he replied, "who have incurred the wrath of God." In these expeditions his object was not only to plunder, but to persecute. Spain, Italy, Dalmatia, Campania, Calabria, Apulia, Bruttium, Venetia, Lucania, Epirus, and the Peloponnesse, all suffered from his ravages. The Vandals were not, however, always invincible. In A.D. 458, their fleet of sixty ships was defeated by galleys of Roman workmanship, and the Vandal fleet was driven back to the Gulf of Genoa, according to Idiatus, but according to Sidonius (301 in Migne, Patr. Lat. VIII. 653) off Agrigentum. After the death of Deogratias, A.D. 457, Genseric did not allow any more bishops to be consecrated in the proconsular province, the peculiar domain of the Vandals, so that of the original number of 164 only three were left in Victor's time. One Proculeus was sent to compel the bishops to give up all their books and the sacramental vessels. When this was refused, Proculeus and his escort seized them by force, and made the very altar cloths into shirts for themselves. St. Valerian, bishop of Abbena, was expelled from his see. No one was allowed to receive him into his house, or even to permit him to remain on their land, and he was long obliged to lie by the roadside in the open air. At Regin the Catholics had ventured at Easter to take possession of their church. The Arians, headed by a priest named Adduit, attacked the church, part of them forcing an entrance with drawn swords, and part entering through the windows. The reader was killed by an arrow in the pulpit, and many of the congregation were slain on the altar-steps. Most of the survivors were afterwards executed by Genseric's orders. Genseric, by the advice of the Arián bishops, commanded all who held office about his court to enunciate Arian dogmas. According to Vitae ecclesiasticæ, when Amognat, one of the number, refused, he was tightly bound with cords, but they broke like a spider's web; and when he was hung head downwards by one foot, he seemed to sleep as peacefully as if he were in bed. His persecutors finding themselves unable to overcome his resolution, were about to kill him; but, say the chroniclers, as he was about to die, they would then have been reverenced as a martyr. He was accordingly compelled to labour in the fields and afterwards to tend cattle near Carthage.

Meanwhile the Romans refused to give up Africa as lost without a further struggle. The emperor Majorian, of whom the romantic story is told that he visited Carthage in disguise to explore with his own eyes the resources of his enemy, in A.D. 460 assembled a fleet of 300 vessels at Carthagena for the invasion of Africa. His plans were betrayed by domestic treason to the Vandals, who surprised and carried off the greater part of his ships. Genseric, however, alarmed at this attempt, concluded peace with Majorian.

In A.D. 468, Leo collected a mighty armament of 1113 ships, each containing 100 men (Codices, 350, ed. Dindorf), under the command of his brother-in-law Basiliscus. The campaign opened favourably. Marcellinus, who had acquired Dalmatia, and assumed the title of Patriarch of the West, joined Leo against the common foe and drove the Vandals out of Sarplina. In the opposite direction, Heraclius recovered Tripoli. The main armament landed at the Hermenea promontory (Cape Bon) about forty miles from Carthage. Has Busiris attacked Carthage immediately, it would probably have fallen, but Genseric, by means, as it was generally believed, of a large bribe, induced him to grant a truce for five days. He used the interval to man all the ships he could, and the wind becoming favourable, attacked the Romans and sent them flying. After the charge of the Roman ships, panic and confusion spread through the vast multitude, most of whom tried to fly, but a few fell fighting gallantly to the last. After this victory, Genseric recovered Sarplina and Tripoli, and ravaged the coasts of the Mediterranean more cruelly than before, till a peace was concluded between him and the emperor Zeno. Severus, the emperor's ambassador, when taking leave, requested Genseric, instead of giving him the gifts usually presented to an ambassador on his departure, to set his prisoners at liberty. The king replied he had no power over those who had fallen to the share of the other Vandals, but released to him those who had fallen to his own or his sons' lot, and allowed him to ransom as many of the others as he could. (Malchus de Lagationibus, 3, ed. Dindorf.) At the same time Genseric, at Leo's entreaty, allowed the churches of Carthage to be reopened, and all the exiled bishops and clergy to return.

Soon afterwards he died, on Jan. 24, A.D. 477. He is said to have fallen ill as the law of succession in his family that the eldest male should succeed to the throne, so that the succession should not pass from father to son, but from brother to brother or uncle to nephew. This was, however, the usual rule of succession in early times. The Irish custom of Tanistry is an instance of it, and the best known example furnishes by the law of succession of the house of Otmhan.

According to the description of Jornandes (de Gothorum Origine, c. 33), in Cassiodorus, l. 412, in Migne, Patr. Lat. LXXII. 1274), Genseric was of moderate stature, and was lame from a fall from his horse. He was a man of few words, and thus was better able to conceal the deep designs he had for his nearest relations. His passion for wine was so strong as to even be accounted scorned luxury, and was greedy of empire. He was a master of all the arts by which nations could be won to his side, and quarrels might be excited and the seeds of mutual discord sown among his enemies. A terrible instance of his cruelty is related by Procopius (de Bello Vandalico, i. 22). Enraged by a repulse at Tanarus, he sailed for Zante, captured 500 nobles of the island, and in revenge cut them in pieces and flung their bodies into the Adriatic. In forming an estimate of Genseric's character, it must be remembered that all our information about him is derived from authors who hated and dreaded himself and his nation both as heretics and enemies. After everything that has been said for Sulpian's rhetoric (De Usuriatione Dei, vii. in Migne, Patr. Lat. III.), it must be admitted that, according to his description of the morals of the Vandals and those of the dissolute Carthaginians, the barbarian heretics appear in a more favourable light than the civilized Catholic.

Genseric's name is variously spelt Giceric, Gaicericus, Geisericus, and Zinzirichus. The sources for the above account are the Chronicles of Prosper and Idiatus (in Migne, Patr. Lat. II);
GENETNUS
Procopius de Bella Vandala, i. 3-7; Isidorus, de Rebus Gestorum (Isid. Op. vii. 130-133, in Migne, Pat. Lat. lxxxiii. 1079); and Victor Vitensis de Persecutione Vandalica, 1. (in Migne, Pat. Lat. lxxxiii.) Gibbon, chap. xxi. xxxvi. and xxxvii., modernize and, in Huiniana's dissertation in his appendix to Victor Vitensis, and Ceillier, Histoire des Auteurs sacre's, x. c. 28.

[F. D.]

GENETNUS, priest of Tifernus (Colgan, Tr. Thum. 180 n.44). [GENTEN.] [J. G.]

GENTIANUS, twenty-ninth bishop of Angers, succeeding Maurilius and followed by St. Benedictus, about the close of the 8th century. (Gall. Hist. xiv. 552; Tresvoux, Hist. de l'Eglise et du Diocese d'Angers, i. 80.)

[S. A. B.]

GENTILUS, bishop of Cabda, in proconsular Africa, was present at the council of Cartaghe, a.d. 464. (Mansi, ii. 939; Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 146.) [R. S. G.]

GENULFUS, is regarded as first bishop of Cahors. But the old lection which relates his preaching of the gospel in that part of the country, relates also that after three months he deserted; and this fact seems hardly consistent with the belief that he was bishop. The Bedolland biographer supposes that he was consecrated bishop at Rome, and sent to establish himself in any place where he might be able to found a church. Probably he was but the first missionary. He may be the same with Gundulfs, who appears in the Roman martyrology at June 17 as sent by pope Sixtus II. in the time of Decius, and who came to the country of the Biterigis. He is hence described by Pothast as bishop of Bourges. His biography, with plentiful miracles interspersed, and an appendix of additional miracles by an anonymous Benedictine, is found in Boll. Jan. 17; Acta SS. ii. 82; Gall. Chr. i. 118. [R. T. S.]

GEORGIAN CHURCH, THE. [IEREBAN CHURCH.]

GEORGIUS (1), bishop of Salonae (Spalato) is bishop, between Joannes I. and Thedorus I. He is supposed to have suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Diocletian. (Farlati, Ital. Sacr. i. 647, et seq.) [J. de S.]

GEORGIUS (2), bishop of Prusa in Bithynia, one of the Nicene fathers, a.d. 325. (Mansi, ii. 696; Le Quien, O. C. I. 615.) [L. D.]

GEORGIUS (3), bishop of Laodica ad mare in Syria Prima (335-347), a leading figure in the second rank in the Trinitarian controversies of the 4th century. At first an ardent adherer of the teaching of Arius, he subsequently joined the ranks of the semi-Arians, but seems ultimately, outstepping his original position, to have united with the Anomoaeans, whose uncompromising opponent he had become, and to have died professing their tenets (Newman, Arians, part ii. ch. iv. § 1, p. 275). George was a native of Alexandria. In early life he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, in which he gained considerable distinction (Philost. H. E. viii. 17). He was ordained presbyter by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (ibid.

Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 69). Having embraced the opinions of Arius he united himself to Eusebius of Nicomedia in his exertions to procure their recognition by the church. Having passed from Alexandria to Antioch, he endeavored to act the part of a mediator between Arius and the Catholic body, writing at the same time to Alexander and the leading Arians, with the view of explaining away the differences that kept them asunder. In his letter to the latter he showed how, by a sophistical evasion, based on 1 Cor. xi. 1. (2ρας φυλακαδει, το υπερθυσ του θεου might be accepted by them (Socr. H. E. ii. 45; Athanas. de Synod. p. 887). Naturally, the attempt at reconciliation was a complete failure, while the result to himself was his deposition and excommunication by Alexander, both on the ground of false doctrine and also of the open and habitual irregularities of his life (Athanas. de Synod. p. 886; Apol. ii. p. 728; de Fug. p. 718; Theod. H. E. ii. 9). Athanasius styles him "the most wicked of all the Arians," reproached even by his own party for his grossly dissolute conduct (De Fug. 718). After his excommunication by the church at Alexandria, George endeavoured to obtain admission among the clergy of Antioch, but his application was steadily rejected by Eustathius (Athanas. Hist. Arian, p. 812). On this he retired to Arathusa, where he acted as presbyter; and on the expulsion of Eustathius he was welcomed back to Antioch by the dominant Arian faction. Eusebius of Caesarea having declined the see of Antioch, George was consecrated as bishop in A.D. 332, together with Euphranius, on whom the choice ultimately fell, by the emperor Constantine, as "of much approved faith" (Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 63). He was not long in attaining the episcopate, being appointed bishop of Laodicea on the death of the Arian Theodos (Athanas. de Synod. p. 890; Or. i. p. 290; Soz. H. E. vi. 25). Athanasius states that at his elevation to the episcopate was his own act (De Fug. 718). As bishop he was present and took a leading part in the successive synods summoned by the Arian faction against Athanasius. He was at the council of Tyre in 335 (Athanas. Apol. ii. p. 722), that of Jerusalem in the same year (Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 4), and that of the dedection at Antioch in 341, at which Athanasius was deposed and Gregory appointed bishop of Alexandria (Soz. H. E. iii. 5). It is probably the George named by pope Liberius in his letter to the emperor Constantine (Hilar. Praym. ii. 39-43; Tillemont, Hist. Eccles. Eusebe de Vercell, note 3). On the assembling of the council of Saridica in 347 he kept his seat from joining his brother bishops, by whom he was, with many others, unanimously deposed, as having been previously condemned by Alexander, and as holding Arian opinions (Theod. H. E. ii. 9; Labbe, Concil. ii. 678; Athanas. Apol. ii. p. 765; de Fug. p. 718). Of this deposition George took no heed, and in 358, on Eudoxius, the newly appointed bishop of Antioch, openly siding with Arius and the Anomoaeans, he wrote an earnest appeal to Macedonius of Constantinople, and the other bishops who were visiting Basil at Ancyra for the purpose of consecrating a newly-elected church, calling on them to lose no time in summoning a council to condemn the Anomoaean heresy and eject Arius, unless they desired that city to be lost to them.
altogether. His letter is given in full by Sozomen (Hist. E. iv. 13; Lobbe, Concil. ii. 790). At Seleucia, in 359, when the semi-Arian party was split into two, George headed the more numerous faction opposed to that of Acacius and Eudoxius, whom, with their adherents, they deposed (Soc. H. E. ii. 40). If, as is probably the case, he is to be identified with the George named by Ibas (Epist. 231 [722]) as sharing with Eudoxius and Acacius in the persecutions of the orthodox at Constantinople in 360, the difference was short-lived. One of the frivolous charges against Cyril of Jerusalem, on which he was deposed at this council, was his receiving George into communion after his deposition (Soz. H. E. iv. 25). During his episcopate George was brought into contact with the two Apollinarians (father and son), the younger of whom subsequently occupied the see of Laodicea, where they were both residing as teachers of rhetoric. Their intimacy with the heathen sophist Epiphanius of Petra had been the cause of their excommunication by George's predecessor Theodosus, who was himself an Arian. Another pretext for their excommunication was, according to Sozomen, that Apollinaristus the younger had given a hospitable reception to Athanasius when passing through Laodicea, which had resulted in an intimate friendship. George's obstinate refusal to readmit Apollinaristus, even though his case was assigned by Socrates and Sozomen as the cause of his developing the heresy by which he has become celebrated (Soc. H. E. ii. 46; Soz. H. E. vi. 25). On the vacancy of the see of Antioch after the expulsion of Anianus, George was the chief in-trumenter of the election of Meletius, believing him to entertain the same opinions with himself. He was speedily undeceived, for on his first entry into Antioch the emperor Constantius having desired the bishops who were present to deliver success-ive expositions of the crucial text—"The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old" (Psalms v. 22), after George himself had delivered an equal number of Arrian colophons, and so on and so on, the flight of Athanasius, and for eight months after the adherents of Gregory (meaning George), are said by the Fragmentist to have been put in possession of the churches on "Pavui 21," or June 15, 356. George's installation was a signal for new infictions on Alexandrian church-people. "After Easter week," says Athanasius, "virgins were imprisoned, bishops led away in chains" (some 25 are named in Brev. B. 721); "attacks were made on houses," &c; and on the first Sunday evening after Pentecost a number of people who had met for prayer in a secluded place were cruelly maltreated by the commander, Sebastian, a "pitiless Manichaeus," for refusing to accommodate his "longue." He belonged to the Acacian section of the party; he was consequently obnoxious to the semi-Arians, who "deposed him" in the council of Selucia.
GEORGIUS OF CAPPADOCIA

even allowed the notorious adventurer Aetius, founder of the Anomoeans or ultra-Arianists, to officiate as deacon at Alexandria, after having been ordained, as Athanasius tells us (De Syn. 39), who, although hitherto "compelled" the Arian bishops of Egypt to sign the decree of the Acacian synod of Constantine of 356 against Aetius (Philostorius, iii. 2). He induced Theodore, bishop of Oxyrhynchos, first to submit to degradation from the ministry, and then to be re-ordained by him as a presbyter (year 361) to Dr. bassophamus, Sirmond. i. 135). He managed his own matters so well as to gain and keep the confidence of Constantius, who congratulated the Alexandrians on having abandoned such "grovelling teachers" as Athanasius, and entrusted their "heavenward aspirations" to the guidance of "the most venerable George," and who also exorted the two Abyssinian sovereigns to send their bishop Frumentius (whom Athanasius had consecrated) to Alexandria, in order to be instructed by George in the true knowledge of the "Supreme God" (Ath. Apol. to Const. 30, 31). But, in fact, George was far from recommending his form of Christianity either to the orthodox or to the Persians of Alexandria. "He was not severe," says Sozomen, "to the adherents of Athanasius," not only forbidding the exercise of their worship, but "inflicting imprisonment and scourges on men and women after the fashion of a tyrant;" while, towards all alike, "he acted as if determined to strike terror, and wielded his authority as if it belonged to the episcopal rank and character." He was "hated by the magistrates for his supercilious and imperious demeanour, by the people for his tyranny" (Soz. IV. 10, 30). He stood well with Constantius, who was guided theologically by the Acacians, and whose ears were as "wide open" (so Ammianus phrases it), so that the hands of his chamberlains were to bribes (see Greg. Orat. xxi. 16). It was easy for the "pope" of Alexandria to embitter his sovereign (as Julian says he did, Ep. 10) against the Alexandrian community, to name several of its members as disobedient subjects, and to suggest that its grand public buildings ought by rights to pay tax to the treasury (Ammianus, etc.).

Meantime, he showed himself in the light of a keen, grasping man of business, enriching himself by vexatious and ignoble monopolies, "buying up the nite-works, the marshes of papyrus and reed, and the salt lakes, and even keeping in his own hands, not from humanity, but for profit," the management of funerals; so that it was not safe for the dead to be buried without one buying those who let out biers under his direction (Epiphanius, Haer. ixxvi). He showed his anti-pagan zeal by arbitrary acts and insulting speeches; he procured the banishment of Zeno, a pagan physician in extensive practice (Julian, Ep. 45); he prevented the pagans from offering sacrifices and celebrating the national feasts (Soz. IV. 30); he brought Artemius, "duke" of Egypt, much given to the destruction of idols (Theodoret, iii. 18), with an armed force, into the very citadel of Alexandrian paganism, the superb temple of Serapis, which was forthwith stript of images, votive offerings, and ornaments (Julian, I. c.; Soz. I. c.). He ought to have known the temper of that multi-farious population, which had often been lashed into furious tumult by far less provocation than he recklessly gave. On the 1st day of Thoth, the 29th of August, A.D. 358 ("the consolatio of Tatianus and Cerinthus," adds the Maffian Fragment) he appeared before the church of St. Dioscorus, where George was then residing; and it was with difficulty, and after hard fighting, that soldiers rescued him from their hands. On the 5th of Paophi, i.e. October 2, he was obliged to leave the city; and the "Athanasiots" occupied the churches from October 2 to December 1, 357, again ejected by Sebastian. On June 23, 358,—the year of the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia—an imperial secretary named Paul arrived with a mandate for the restoration of George, and punished many who had taken part against him. So says the Fragmentist; but his next statements involve a difficulty. He says that five months later, on the 30th of Abyr (= Nov. 25), George returned, but that this was in the year of the consuls Taurus and Florentius, which was A.D. 361, "3 years and 2 months," he adds, "after his flight:" and that this return was only "3 days" before the insurrection which proved fatal to him. There is evidently a confusion in his account. It is impossible that the imperial mandate should have been inoperative from June 23, 359, to November 26, 381. Probably George returned soon after he had quitted the Seleucian council, i.e. in the November of 359, and the "3 years and 2 months" represent the period between his flight and that of the emperor; or, perhaps, on his return at this time, if not after some previous visit to "the court," that as he passed by the splendid temple of the genius or Fortune of Alexandria, he fixed his eyes on it with scornful hatred, and exclaimed in the hearing of the crowd that escorted him, "How long will this sepulchre stand?" (See Ammian. I. c.) This speech agrees well with the epitaph here attributed by Ammianus to the reinstated bishop, that he would make many a man suffer for his exile. It would naturally strike "like a thunderbolt" ("velut fulmine," Ammian.) on pagan listeners, and would feed the vindictive wrath which was keeping its accounts and binding its time. That time came at last, as Ammianus thinks, after the emperor Julian had arrived at Antioch in 362, and had put to death Artemius, but as soon as the news of his accession had arrived at Alexandria, Nov. 30, 361. George was in the height of his pride and power; he had persecuted the pagans anew, and wounded them to the quick by carrying about in procession a number of skulls which had been found below the floor of a temple of Mithras, which had been granted to him by Constantius, and on the site of which he intended to build a church (Soc. iii. 2). He was also carrying on, with the assistance of a "count" named Diodorus, the still unfinished works of the great Caesarean church; and Diodorus had shown the long curs of some boys by way of insult to paganism (Maff. Fragm., Ammian.). But now, the pagans were officially informed, there was an emperor who worshipped the gods; the latter, therefore, could at last be avenged. The shout arose, "Away with George!" and "in a moment," says the Fragmentist, they throw him into prison, and with him Diodorus, and Dracontius the master
of the mint, who had overthrown a pagan altar, which he found standing there (see Ammianus). The captives were kept in iron until the morning of Choiaec 28 (Dec. 24). Then, as if "impatient," says Gibbon, "of the tedious forms of judicial proceedings," the pagan mob again assembled, dragged forth the prisoners with "blistered thumbs and fang," beat them with fists and sticks (cf. Epiphanius, l. c.), "pulled their limbs this way and that," and utterly killed the life out of them. As Julian, in his letter of remonstrance, expressed it, "the people actually tore a man in pieces, as if they had been dogs" (Ep. 10, see it in Soc. iii. 3). When the deed was done, they flung the mangled body of George on the back of a camel, which they led through every part of the city, while the two other corpses were drawn along with ropes. At last, at 1 P.M. they burned the remains on the shore, and cast the ashes into the sea, by way of preventing them from being honoured as martyrs by the Christians; the Paschal Chronicle adds that they were mingled with the carcasses of animals. Compare the Fragment with Ammianus, who adds that "the wretched men might have been defended by the Christians, had not all been equally embittered against George."

The murderers were all of them pagans, as was shown to Julian's lament in a letter of which, however, the Arian Philostorgius had the hard-

The journey into the Existence and Character of St. George (1792), shows that the saint was

Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St. George (1792), shows that the saint was

sacred to St. Gregory, referring its later portion to a.

have only been the nameless Christian, who, according to Eusebius, was the first priest of the Diocletian persecution, and the Bollandists think he may have been the nameless Christian who, according to Eusebius, bore the name of George. But the date of his martyrdom is said to have been in the first century.

GEORGIUS (6), the first bishop of Anicium (Le Puy) at some period before the 5th century. The legend is that he was sent from Rome by St. Peter in company with St. Fronto, and that he first exercised his ministry at Vetulia in the diocese of St. Peter, and then at Anicium, and finally at Vetulia in the diocese of St. Peter, and then at Anicium, and finally at Vetulia, where he is said to have been canonized. The see of the bishops of Le Puy was originally at Vetulia. This bishop was commemo-

GEORGIUS (7), bishop of Pelusium. He is mentioned in the life of St. Sabas written by Cyril of Scythopolis (ap. Doudarre, Monum. Eccl. Græci, iii. 220 sq.), as having been consecrated by Zoilus of Alexandria. This dates the period of his episcopate between a.D. 538 and 551, in which latter year Zoilus was consecrated (Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 534.)

GEORGIUS (8), the name of four bishops attending the council of Constantinople in 553, their respective sees being—

Tiberias (Mansi, ix. 173 b, 191 c, 193 b, 202 c, 230 b, 297 d, 346 d, 368 a, 389 a) in Palestine (Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 708);
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Ptolemais (Mansi, ix. 176 b, 392 c), but whether Ptolemais in Phocisicia, i.e. Acre, or Acre in Phocisicia, as Le Quien is uncertain, and places the bishop under both (see C. ii. 621, 816);

Justinianopolis in Armenia (Mansi, ix. 192 d, called Gregorius at pp. 175 c, 391 d; O. C. i. 435);

Novo Justinianopolis in Siria (Mansi, ix. 175 c, 394 d, 391 c), the same as in upstairs on the Haurus in Tarsus (C. i. 1203).

[J. de S.]

GEORGIUS (9), bishop of Pessinus in Galatia, and metropolitan, cir. A.D. 600. Pessinus was suffering from drought, and Theodorus Siceota, bishop of Anastasiopolis in the same province, was invited by George and the people to come and unite with them in a solemn supplication. From the church of St Sophia the assembled citizens made a procession headed by the two prelates to the church of the Holy Angels beyond the walls, and on their return Theodorus celebrated the sacrament at St Sophia's, when rain fell in torrents. (Vit. Theodori, cap. xi. § 68, in Boll. Acta SS. 52 Apr. iii. 52; Le Quien, Oeuvres Chr. i. 491.)

[C. H.]

GEORGIUS (10) I., said to have been ninth bishop of Carpana, between Oloofridus and Petrus f. at the beginning of the 7th century. (Le Coute, Ann. Eccl. Fr. an. 604 s. viii. tom. ii. 563; Gall. Christ. i. 897.) [S. A. B.]

GEORGIUS (11) II., patriarch of Alexandria, between Joannes Eleemosynarius and Cyrus. In the chronological table (rejected by Henschel, viti. Acta SS. Boll. Mart. iii. p. xxvi and Patrol. Gr. civ. 1169) which accompanies the text of Theophanes, George's first year is placed under A.D. 611 (the Alexandrian system being employed), and the first year of his successor under A.D. 625, fourteen years being thus assigned to his patriarchate; but the text, omitting to notice the commencement, places its close in A.D. 621 (Theoph. Chron. in Pat. Gr. civ. 634, 579 b, 690); Patr. Morn. (in Patr. Gr. 1054) gives him eleven years, but without dates. The annals (not very trustworthy) of Eutychius of Alexandria (pt. 2, p. 267) state that George began his rule in the thirteenth year of Heraclius (i.e. A.D. 622), and the first of the caliph Omar, and that after four years, when the Moslem armies had overrun Palestine and were advancing on Egypt, he set sail for Constantinople and was succeeded by Cyrus. In another passage, however, this annalist places the retirement of George in the third year of Omar (Pat. Gr. ex. 1095, 1122).

Nearly all modern writers agree in making him die in 630 (as Baronius, Pagi, Le Quien, Clinton); but Eutychius, in the above, is authority for the fourteen years, dates his accession in 616, as does Ordin. Le Quien thinks there must have been some interregnum after John, owing to the desolate condition of Alexandrian affairs, and he does not therefore date the accession. (Le Quien, Orn. Chr. ii. 447; Baron. A. E. s. v. 630, x. 630 xi. ii., and Pagi iii.; Clinton, F. E. ii. 547.) Baronius states that George may have been the relative of his predecessor mentioned by Leontius; but Pagi remarks that Leontius makes the relative too young for a patriarch.

CHRIST. RORR.—VOL. II.

Photius (cod. 96) describes at great length a life of Chrysostom, entitled τὰ ζητὶ τῆς Χρυσοστομίας, written by a George bishop of Pessinus, under whom he is unable to identify. He calls the style poor, and says the matter is called from Palladius, Socrates, and others; concluding with the observation that the author appears ὀφείλει παραστάσει, Schott taking this participle to mean παρατηρεῖν, "he treats of history," By general modern consent the writer is this patriarch. The life itself is extant in more than one manuscript; that in the imperial library of Vienna is described by Lambecius (Biblioth. Caesar. Vindob. t. viii. p. 578, num. 13, ed. Koller). In 1557 a Latin version of it, by Godfridus Tilmannus, was published under the title "Historiae lineatarum". The editions of Chrysostom's works (vol. viii. p. 157). The editions of Chrysostom's works by Migne and Montfaucon omit the life by George. Le Allatius (in Fabr. xii. 16) that Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and John Moschus, in addition to Socrates and Palladius, are laid under contribution by George. Savile criticizes the life in the form of an "Ammonito" (printed in Pat. Gr. xlvii. p. xxvii). David Blondel in a searching chapter of his De la Primauté en l'Église, 1641, points out (pp. 1229 sqq.) numerous instances of George's corrupt copying of his predecessors besides a long list of his inventions. The reader may also consult Cave (Hist. Lit. i. 577), and especially Oudin (de Script. Eccl. i. 1599 sqq.), who gives an elaborate statement of the reasons which led him to attribute the Chroniques Paschale to this author.

[G. H.]

GEORGIUS (12) I., patriarch of Antioch during the Saracen domination, residing at Constantinople. The chronology is very uncertain. Eutychius of Alexandria (Annal. pt. 2, pp. 1223, 324, 348, in Patr. Gr. ex. 1108 c, 1114 d) states that he was the Macarius who was made Macarius in 197, a.s. [A.D. 638], and that he succeeded Macedonius in the third year of the Caliph Othman, i.e. in A.D. 645 or 646, and was appointed at Constantinople, where five years afterwards he died and was buried, having never visited Antioch; that he was succeeded by Macarius; and that he was anathematized with Macedonius, was banished at Paris (Fabr. Bibl. Gr. viii. 457, ed. Harles) and may be seen in Surius (de Prod. Hist. SS. 27 Jan. i. 474). The Greek was edited, 1612, by Henry Savile in his edition of Chrysostom's works (vol. viii. p. 157). The editions of Chrysostom's works by Migne and Montfaucon omit the life by George. Le Allatius (in Fabr. xii. 16) that Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and John Moschus, in addition to Socrates and Palladius, are laid under contribution by George. Savile criticizes the life in the form of an "Ammonito" (printed in Pat. Gr. xlvii. p. xxvii). David Blondel in a searching chapter of his De la Primauté en l'Église, 1641, points out (pp. 1229 sqq.) numerous instances of George's corrupt copying of his predecessors besides a long list of his inventions. The reader may also consult Cave (Hist. Lit. i. 577), and especially Oudin (de Script. Eccl. i. 1599 sqq.), who gives an elaborate statement of the reasons which led him to attribute the Chroniques Paschale to this author.

[G. H.]

GEORGIUS (13) seventh bishop of Agde, between Tigris and Wilesindus, present at the eighth council of Toledo in A.D. 653. Some have identified him with St. Georgius archbishop of Vienne, but apparently without sufficient reason. (Mansi, x. 1222; Gall. Christ. vi. 668; av. 33.)

GEORGIUS (14), bishop of Syracuse, who received a letter from pope Vitalian in 688. (Mansi, xi. 19; Jaufre, Regest. Pont. 165.)

[A. H. D. A.]
GEORGIUS (15), bishop of Catania, present at the Roman synod, held under pope Agatho, in Oct. 679. (Hefele, § 290; Mansi, xi. 179.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GEORGIUS (16), patriarch of the Nestorians, a disciple of Jesiub, whom he succeeded, A.D. 600. When a young man he gave Beth-habba his inheritance, to the monastery there established, and thus attracted the notice of Jesiub, then bishop of Nineveh, whom he afterwards accompanied to Adiabene. Jesuub, on becoming patriarch, appointed Georgius his successor in the latter see, and finally recommended him to the bishops as his successor in the patriarchate. Georgius bishop of Nisibis at first would not recognise the new patriarch; but when the latter visited him in his own city, the indignation of his flock compelled submission. Scarcely had the patriarch returned when Georgius bishop of Mesene [GEORGIUS (21)] rebelled against him. This necessitated another journey. The quarrel was adjusted by the good help of the rabbi Codah, abbot of Bethel. After this the patriarch restored order among the Cataraneses (Beth-patorye), and then went home to his monastery. The literary labours of Ananias were undertaken at his request. He died at Hirts, after an episcopate of twenty years. Thomas Margaees multisizes a poem by George, which he has De quattuor quadraginta et tercentenam bonus est, neque ex tua bonitate mutatur. His other works consisted of some orations, nineteen canons extant in an Arabic version, and a litany, translated by Schonfelder. (Assem. Bib. Or. iii. i. 149-153; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 1123.)

[C. J. B.]

GEORGIUS (17), bishop of Nisibis, a Persian, contemporary with and an opponent of George patriarch of the Nestorians, and like him ordained by Jesuub. [GEORGIUS (16).] He was author of the hymn, "Praise to thy pity, Messiah our king, Son of God," &c. used in the Nestorian and Marvoute offices. (Assem. Biblioth. Oriental. iii. i. 456.)

[C. J. B.]

GEORGIUS (18) II., patriarch of Antioch. In the period of the Saracen domination between Thomas and Stephen III. He is frequently mentioned at the council of Constantinople in 680, being described as presbyter and monk, the apoconarius and representative of the bishop of Jerusalem (Mansi, xi. 311 c. 5494, &c.). At the Trullan or Quinisext council of Constantinople, A.D. 692, his title is bishop of Antioch (Mansi, xi. 988 c). Eutychius of Alexandria (Anast. pt. 2, p. 363, in Patr. Gr. cxi. 1118) places his ascension in the first year of the Caliph Abdullamelech (I.e. A.D. 683), and assigns twenty-four years to his episcopate. Constans, in his Life of St. Spiritus of Antioch (p. 157), only five, from 690 to 695. (Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 743.)

[C. H.]

GEORGIUS (19) I., 44th bishop of Constantinople, patriarch and metropolitan for six years (678-683) during the interrupted episcopate of 670, and the reign of the emperor Constantine III. Folgonus. At the time of his elevation he was chancellor and treasurer of the church of the Deipara in the district Sphoracium. His patriarchate was remarkable for the 6th General Council, held at Constantinople in 680. Of the council an account is given in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. It remains here to point out the part taken by George, who was at this time a Monothelite. The first occurrence Nov. 7, 680, was an appeal by the Roman legates to George and Macarius to account for the origin of certain novel expressions concerning the nature of Christ, which for forty-six years since the days of the patriarch Sergius had been troubling the churches. George and Macarius replied that they had learned these phrases from the oecumenical councils, from recognised fathers, and particularly from Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter who had in succession filled the chair of Constantinople, from pope Hen- rius, and from Cyrus of Alexandria. The emperor then allowed them to demonstrate their position, provided they adduced proofs only from general councils and recognised fathers. On this, Macarius asked the prince to order the warden of the charters of the church of Constantinople to bring to his hands of the councils from the Patriarchal Palace. The rest of the day was spent in reading the acts of Ephesus.

In the 7th session, Feb. 13, 681, the Roman legates begged Constantine to ask the patriarchs George and Macarius whether they agreed with the letters sent by pope Agatho and his council. The patriarchs asked for copies of them, that they might verify the quaternary at leisure. The originals were carefully sealed up.

In the 8th session, March 7, came the recantation of George. He admitted that the quotations were genuine, and declared his agreement with Agatho. On this, bishop after bishop of bipatriarchate came forward and made the same announcement. The patriarch then requested that the name of pope Vitalian should be replaced in the dip tychs, and the assembly endorse this ratification of peace.

In the 18th session, August 9, George made a request, which was supported by the bishops of his province, that the names of his four predecessors, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, should be excepted from the anathemas pronounced against the Monothelite leaders. But the council refusing to see any grounds for their excommunication, George declared that he yielded to the opinion of the majority, and anathemas were pronounced afresh on the four patriarchs of Constantinople, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Honorius of Rome, Macarius of Antioch, and all heretics.

In the 17th session, September II, the declaration of faith was determined, and was read aloud by Agatho, reader and notary of the patriarch George. It declared for two natural wills and two operations in Jesus Christ. George signed after the signature of the bishop of Jerusalem. The proceedings terminated with the composition of a synodal letter to pope Agatho. Before, however, the legates departed for Rome, news arrived of the pope's death, which took place in Jan. 682.

Nothing more is known of George, except that he was consecrated bishop of Constantinople in 683, and that Theodore returned. George is commemorated as a saint by the Greeks on August 18th. (Theoph. Chronogr. §§ 300, 301, Patr. Graec. civii. 723, 733, &c.; Pope Paul V.'s Concil. General. iii. 8, &c.; Beda, de Temp. Natione, Patr. Lat. xc. p. 568; Paulus Diaconus, &c.)
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Daranal. VId. Cannache.
Flavius in Cilicia, 680 (M. 618 d; O. C. I. 900).
Flaviopolis. VId. Gratian.
Galatius in Palaia, 680 and 692 (M. 618 a; 1004; Parmalaus, O. C. I. 1050).
Hylarima in Curia, 692 (M. 1001 a; Loryna, O. C. I. 915).
Hyninndus in Lycia, 680 and 692 (M. 1001 a; Oenoanda, O. C. I. 989); in some copies of the signatures this bishop appears to be called Gregory.
Irenopolis in Isauria, 692 (M. 997 e, 1018; O. C. I. 1030).
Junopolis or Jonopolis, in Pontus, 680 and 692 (M. 616 b, 577 a, 1000; O. C. I. 556).
Loryna. VId. Hylarima.
Miletus, 680 (M. 613 c; O. C. I. 919).
Naxos, 680 (M. 616 c; the Latin version calls this bishop Gregory; O. C. I. 938).
Nicaea, 692 (M. 989 c; O. C. I. 644).
Oenoanda. VId. Hynianda.
Palaepoloeis in Asia, 692 (M. 693 d, 993; O. C. I. 731).
Paralas. VId. Galasa.
Selymbria, 692 (M. 992 c; O. C. I. 1137).
Syedra in Pamphylia, 692 (M. 997 a; O. C. I. 1007).
Synnada in Galatia, 692 (M. 1000 d; Gianna, O. C. I. 454).
Theoria, 692 (M. 1005 b; Theorium, O. C. I. 491).
Thera, an island in the Aegean, 680 (M. 629 b; O. C. I. 941).
Triocala in Sicily, 680 (M. 306). Pirrii (Sc. Soc. i. 490) reads the name Gregorius.
[GEORGIUS (38)].
Usus in Thrace. VId. Bizya.
Xanthus in Lycia, 692 (M. 1001 a; O. C. I. 984).
Zela in Pontus, 692 (M. 997 e; O. C. I. 543).

GEORGIUS (24), ST., thirty-seventh bishop of Vienne, between St. Bolbonius I. and St. Deodatus. He is mentioned in the Chronicon of ADO as a bishop of great virtue (Migne, Patr. Lat. cxiii. 117 d). There is some uncertainty as to his date. The authors of the Gallia Christiana (xvi. 33) quote an index to the effect that he died Nov. 2, 699, and was buried in the church of St. Peter, while the Necrology of Vienne makes him contemporary with the emperor Anastasius II., who did not reign till A.D. 713. In Gaius's list again he is placed earlier than either of these dates (p. 654). If he was identical with Georgius bishop of Ægea, as has been conjectured, though without good ground, the earliest of the dates is the most probable.

[GEORGIUS (38), bishop of "the Arabs," or of "Nations" (Syr. 'amme), according to Barhebraeus (Lib. Ethnic. 4) a contemporary of Jacobus of Edessa and John of Damascus, cir. 710. (From Barhebr. Chron. we learn that these Arabs were Monophysites, who at last became Moslems, owing to the persecutions of the Eastern emperors.) Syrian writers ascribe many works to him. Georgius Assamyan mentions two, viz. a commentary on the Scriptures, much quoted by Barhebraeus in his Store-

GEORGIUS (20), bishop of Tauronium or Taurinum (formerly a town of the Bruttii in Calabria, near the mouth of the Metaurus). He signed the synodal of Agatho at Rome in 680 (Mansi, xi. 302).

GEORGIUS (21), bishop and metropolitan of Mesene, a district of Mesopotamia at the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates represented by Basora, cir. 650 (Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 1209). He was one of the monks and disciples of Jesus of III, created metropolitan by that patriarch on account of the wide extent of his jurisdiction (Thomas Margensis in Assemani, Bibl. Or. iii. 151). The opposition he offered to Jesus's successor (M. 152) is mentioned under GEORGIUS (19).

GEORGIUS (22), bishop of Agrigentum, who signed the synodal of Agatho at Rome in 690 (Mansi, xi. 306). Georgius is the reading of all the manuscripts, and there is no authority for Gregorius given by Baronius in the notes of his Roman Martyrology, and copied from him by others. See GEORGIUS (35) of Agrigentum.

GEORGIUS (23), the name of other bishops present at the councils of Constantineople in 680 and 692 (Trullan or Quinisext), one or both, viz. the bishops of—

Abramias in Armenia, 692 (Mansi, xi. 1000 d; Arabi ltus, Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 450).
Apem in Thrace, 692 (Mansi, 992 e; O. C. I. 1201).
Antioch in Syria, 692 (M. xi. 987 x; O. C. I. 743). [GEORGIUS (18)].
Antioch by Macander, 692 (M. 1001 b; O. C. I. 1908).
Apem in Thrace, 680 (M. 616 b).
Biyas in Thrace, 680 (M. 613 c), and 692 (according to Le Q. i. 1147, who thinks Biyas must be meant where Mansi, 992 b, has Adauros.
Cadosia in Bithynia, 680 and 692 (M. 649, 985 c; O. C. i. 631).
Camache in Great Armenia, 680 and 692 (M. 613, 993 c; O. C. I. 435, or Dara
Camaliana, 680 and 692 (M. 212, 618 d; O. C. I. 383).
Chios, 680 (M. 616 c; O. C. I. 931).
Cherson in Dora, 692 (M. 992 d; Tauric Chersonese, O. C. I. 1530).
Cinia. See Synnada.
Corolus in Pamphylia, 692 (M. 1004 e; O. C. I. 1092).
Cos, 680 (M. 212 a, 616 c; O. C. I. 936).
Cratia, 680 and 692 (M. 616 b, 677 b, 1000 c, or Flavipolis, O. C. I. 578).
Cyricus, 680 (M. 613 a; O. C. I. 755); accompanied Georgius, bishop of Agrigentum to Rome for the trial of the latter (Simeon Metaph. Nov. 13, in Patr. Gr. cxvi. 252).
house of M. stories, and a dodocasyllabic poem, in twenty-four sections, called De Chronico (Syr. metu Krumiyn). It is a kind of sacred calendar, treating of the ephats, the movable feasts, the solar and lunar cycles, the months, and weeks, and other matters relating to the ecclesiastical reckoning. The poem was written, as the writer himself tells us, to vindicate the honour of the Syriac against the Arabic muse. (Assem. Bibl. Or. i. 494–5). Other works: an epistle to one Joshua, published in Lagarde's Analec.; and a Syriac version of Arist. ἡλίκην ἀγανελάς, Hoffm. de Hermeneuticae acud Syros Aristotelis. Lips. 1889.


GEORGIUS (27), bishop of Martyropolis (Maiherara), in the province of Mesopotamia, on the tributary of the Tigris. This bishop originally presided over the see of Apamea, and was translated to Martyropolis by the emperor Philip in the first year of his reign, A.D. 711 (Theophanes Chronogr. a.m. 6294). He adhered to the orthodox faith according to the decisions of the council of Chalcedon, in behalf of which he wrote works that are quoted in the extant apologetic letter of Elias, a Jacobite bishop. He seems to have also been bishop of Tarsus, a town identified by Assamani with Martyropolis, but probably a separate bishopric lower down in Mesopotamia. Assamani wrongly assigns Georgius to the end of the 6th century. (Bibl. Orient. i. 485; Le Quien, O. C. ii. 1000.)

GEORGIUS (28), bishop of Portus. In Oct. 708, he followed pope Constantine in his journey to Constantinople, with Nicetas bishop of Silva Candida. (C. Constantii a Pontificis, Migne, cxxvii. 949; Jaffé, Regest. Pont. 178.) In 731 he was present at the Roman council under Gregory II. (Mansi, xii. 285).

GEORGIUS (29), bishop of Nepi, present at the Roman synod under Gregory II., in 721. (Mansi, xii. 285; Hefele, § 330.) [A. H. D. A.

GEORGIUS (30), archbishop of Salami, the metropolis of Cyprus, a strong upholder of image worship, and consequently anathematized by name along with Germanus who had resigned the see of Constantinople, and John of Damascus, at the synod held (see Mansi, xii. 575) by Constantine Copronymus, a.d. 754, as recited in the sixth session of the second Nicene council, when this anathema was removed. He is here described as a meek man who endured the blows and insults of the heretics without retort. [GEORGIUS (44.]) (Mansi, xiii. 556–7; Le Quien, O. C. ii. 1051.)

GEORGIUS (31), bishop of Sinagiglia (Senogalla), present at the Lateran synod under Stephen IV. in 769. (Mansi, xii. 715.)

GEORGIUS (32), bishop of Preneaste, who ordained the intruding pope Constantine subdeacon and deacon, June 28, 767. On the following 5th July, with Eustatius bishop of Alba and Cotonatus bishop of Porto, he consecrated Constantine pope. (Vita Stephani, iv. Liber Pontificis, Migne, cxxviii. 1180; Jaffé, Regest. Pont. 198.) He also subscribed a letter of pope Paul I. in June 761, to the abbot John, about the privileges of the monastery of St. Stephen and St. Silvester in Rome. He is there called Gregory. (Pat. Lat. ixxxix. 1184; Mansi, xii. 649; Jaffé, 195.) [A. H. D. A.

GEORGIUS (33), bishop of Ostia, who took part in important missions by the popes in the second half of the 8th century. In 756 he was sent by Stephen III. to Pippin with letters concerning the disasters inflicted by the Lombards (Cod. Carol. Jaffé, p. 47, 54). In 757, after the death of Aistulf, he was sent again to Pippin by Stephen III., and in 758 or 759 by Paul I. In 759 or 760 Georgius was commissioned by the pope to Pippin, and apparently remained for some time at Pippin's court. In 764 Paul wrote, specially permitting Pippin to retain him. In 767 pope Constantine II. wrote to Pippin, asking him to send Georgius back to Rome. (Cod. Carol. Jaffé, pp. 66, 77, 82, 84, 102.) In 769 the name appears among the custodes to the Lateran synod concerning the election of popes and image-worship. (Mansi, xii. 714; Hefele, § 343.)

In 787 (according to Jaffé, Mon. Alloc. p. 155, &c., in 786), Georgius (wrongly called Gregory by Spelman and others) wrote to pope Hadrian announcing what he had done, together with Theophylact bishop of Todi and the abbot Wibgod, a legate of Charles the Great, during his mission to England.

Georgius landed in England in 786. He went first to the court of Offa, then to the court of Northumbria, where a synod was held (probably that of Pincanahale). He returned to Offa, where a synod of bishops was held, probably in Chelsea (Haddan and Stubbs, Concil. and Documents, vol. iii. p. 443, p. 445 note, and Legatina synods p. 447–462; also Jaffé, Monumenta Alcuina, p. 155–162). The acts of the southern synods are to be found in the letter of George, which appears to be incomplete. They are also alluded to in a later letter of pope Leo III. ann. 797 to Kenulf king of the Mercians. (Jaffé, Monum. Alloc. p. 365.) [A. H. D. A.

GEORGIUS (34), bishop of Antioch in Pisidia. He took part in the second Nicene council, which restored image-worship, a.d. 787 (Mansi, xiii. 137). When Leo V. (the Armenian) made a fresh attempt to crush out this form of worship in the East, Georgius refused to comply with his orders, and was driven into exile, where he died, c. a.d. 814. He is commemorated by the Greeks on April 18. (Le Quien, O. C. i. 1039; Basil. Men. in Migne, Patrolog. Græc. cxviii.)

GEORGIUS (35), bishop of Trinumitus in Cyprus, taking part in the proceedings of the 7th general (second Nicene) council, a.d. 787. (Mansi, xiii. 144; Le Quien, O. C. ii. 1072.)
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GEORGIUS (38), given by Ughelli as the first bishop of Neglia (Veglia or Bieglia), and believed to have been Sergius bishop of Neglia, otherwise Bargylia. He attended the second council of Nicaea, A.D. 787. A Sergius is spoken of as having suffered martyrdom at Bieglia, but he does not appear to have been its bishop. (Manzi, xii. 1105 C, xiiii. 147 B; Ughelli, Rer. Sacr. viii. 538; Sarneiuli, Vesc. di Bieglia, p. 12.) [S. S. G.]

GEORGIUS (37), the name of several other bishops attending the council of Nicaea in 787, viz. of—

Antioch in Pisidia (Manzi, xiii. 137 a, Gregorius in the Latin; Le Quien, Or. Gr. i. 1039.);

Appia in Phrygia Pacatiana (M. xii. 1107 a, xiiii. 148 c; O. C. i. 626). Basilinopolis in Bithynia (M. xii. 1003 a; O. C. i. 626). [Gregorius (48).]

Brida or Pruilla in Asia (M. xii. 1098 b, O. C. i. 704). Camuliana in Cappadocia Prima (M. xii. 1098 a; O. C. i. 393).

Gordius in Lydia (M. xiiii. 1102 d; O. C. i. 883). [Gregorius (48).]

Cibyra in Caria, not Libya as M. xiiii. 1105 b, Latin; edde Gregorius (47) of Cibyra.

Midaeum in Phrygia Salutaris (M. xiii. 1107 b; O. C. i. 842).

Nissa or Nessus in Lydia (M. xiii. 145 e, not Gregorius as in the Latin at xiiii. 1103 e; O. C. i. 987). He is the only known bishop of this city.

Oenomus in Lydia (M. xiiii. 148 a, not Gregorius as in the Latin at xiiii. 1105 a; O. C. i. 990).

Pelaius or Feltia in Phrygia Pacatiana (M. xii. 1106 d, xiiii. 148 c; O. C. i. 802).

Plotinopolis in Thrace (M. 1110 c, xiiii. 149 b; O. C. i. 1186). Thermae Basilice in Sicily (M. xiiii. 141 c; Pirri, Sicil. Sacr. i. 494). [C. H.]

GEORGIUS (38) L, patriarch of Armenia (792-795) between Solomon and Joseph II. He was of the town of Aschunag in the canton of Araksidzin (Saint-Martin, Mém. sur l’Arm. i. 439; Le Quien, O. C. i. 1393). [C. H.]


GEORGIUS (40), bishop of Amastris (Sesamum), on the coast of Paphlagonia, in the reign of Constantine VI. and Irene, and under the patriarchates of Tarasius and Nicephorus. He was by the desire of the people of Amastris, he was almost forced away by Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, and consecrated the bishop, although Constantine VI. (c. d. 797) had fixed on some one else. When he had experienced some ill-treatment from his metropolitan of Gangra, he managed to have his see elevated to the rank of an archbishopric, so as to be subject only to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. (Le Quien, O. C. i. 563.) He was a man of great sanctity of life, and was revered as a saint by the Greeks and Latins on Feb. 21 (Acta SS. Feb. iii. 268). Le Quien makes him follow Gregorius, who attended the council of Constantinople in 787, and suspects that they are both the same person. [Gregorius (48).] [L. D.]

GEORGIUS (41), (Gregorius), 20th bishop of Amiens, between Vitulius and Jesse. He was of the bishops who consecrated the churches of St. Saviour and St. Benedict in the monastery of St. Riquier (Mendoloum) in A.D. 798, and also thirteen altars in the church of St. Mary in the same year. (Vit. St. Angilbert, t. ii. Boll. Acta SS. Feb. iii. 99.) Some chronicles edited by Joseph Scaliger, after the chronicle of Eusebius, are attributed to him. (Gall. Christ. x. 1157.) [S. A. B.]

GEORGIUS (42), an obscure bishop of Mitylene in Lesbos (called “Episc. Melitennus,” by Baroni, Annul. a. 735, iii., Pagi ii.). He is treated by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 7 Apr. i. 688-689), but there is much doubt as to his period and acts. According to Basil’s Menologium, April 7 and May 16, he was born of wealthy and piuse parents, and his great virtue was in almsgiving. He was elected bishop of Mitylene, and is said to have been a great opponent of the Iconoclasts in the time of Leo III. The Issarian (A.D. 717-41), but he is also said to have lived in the time of Leo V. the Armenian (A.D. 813-30), and the solution by Papebrochius, that his life may have extended to the times of both emperors, is impossible. [J. G.]

GEORGIUS (43), martyr, Ap. 23 (variously called Megas推广应用, Bas. Mem.; Προκαθορητ. Sym. Metaph.) Theologus, Καλλικράτης, Bickh.; by the Arabs, Abi Manz; by the Persians, Khudz, Burchardt; traditionally the patron saint of England), a military tribune and martyr under Diocletian at Nicomedia, A.D. 303.
He was a native of Cappadocia and of good birth, and akin to St. Nina the woman by whom the Iberians were converted in the reign of Constantine (Malan, Hist. of the Georgian Church, p. 32; Soc. i. 20). He entered the army as a centurion, and rose to be a military tribune. Some time before the outbreak of the great persecution, he accompanied his mother to Lydda, in Palestine, where she possessed property. As soon, however, as he heard of the publication of the first edict (Feb. 23, A.D. 303), he returned to Nicomedia, where, as some think, he was the celebrated person who tore down the imperial proclamation, and then suffered death by roasting over a slow fire (Enseb. H. E. viii. 5). [DIOCLETIAN.] They lay stress on a very doubtful argument, derived from his natalia, and suppose that the edict having been published on Good Friday, which fell that year on April 16, his trial, prolonged torture, and slow death filled up the time to April 23, which, as J. Assemani says (Kal. Eccles. Univ., vi. p. 584), has been universally fixed by all chroniclers as the day of his martyrdom. But then, unfortunately for this argument, Lactantius tells us (De Mort. Pers. xii. xiii.) that the edict which was torn down by the nameless Christian was published on Feb. 24 (cf., however, Acta SS. Boll. April. iii. 109, for a full statement of the argument). The date of the edict is certainly the centenary of the destruction of the edict to a martyr named John). The earliest historical testimony to the existence and martyrdom of St. George comes from an inscription in a church at Etrr's or Edirr's, in Southern Syria, copied by Burchard and Porter, and discussed by Mr. Hog in two papers read before the Royal Society of Literature, published in their Transactions, t. vi. p. 292, t. vii. p. 106. This inscription states that the building had been a heathen temple, but was dedicated as a church in honour of the great martyr St. George, in a year which Hog, by an acute argument, fixes as A.D. 346. (For another view, however, which makes the inscription to a p. 46, see Böckh, l. c. Corp. Inscription. Graec. ed. Kirchhoff, i. iv. num. 8627.) His name occurs again in another inscription in the church of Shaka, twenty miles east of Etrr's, which Hogg dates at A.D. 367. (Böckh. l. c. num. 8609, cf. 8630; for other instances of transformations of heathen temples into churches and hospitals in the 4th and 5th cent., see Böckh, l. c. 8645, 8647.) We next meet with St. George in the decrees of the council assembled at Rome by pope Gelasius, A.D. 494 or 496 (Hefele, Concil. i. 610, iii. 219, ed. Paris, 1889). This synod condemned the acts of St. George, together with those of Cyricus and Julianus, as corrupted by heretics, but expressly asserted that the foundation of the church was reserved to the martyr, and as such worthy of all reverence. (Cf. Pitra, Spicileg. Solemnen. iv. 391, for a repetition, three centuries later in the East, of this condemnation by the patriarch Nicephorus, in his Constitut. Ecclesiast.) After the period of Gelasius, the testimonies to his existence rapidly thicken in value. Gregory of Tours in the 6th century mentions him as highly celebrated in France, while in the East his cultus became universally established (cf. Fleury, H. E. xxxiv. 46), and churches were erected in all directions in his honour, one of the most celebrated being that built probably by Justinian over his tomb at Lydda, whither his relics had been transferred after his martyrdom. This church still exists. (For an engraving of it, see Thomson's The Land and the Book, ii. 292; cf. Robinson's Biblical Researches, iii. 51-55, with Le Quien, Oriens Christian, iii. 1271, for particular St. George's connexion with Lydda.) Another famous one is that of Thessalasia described in Texier and Pullan, Byzantine Architecture, pp. 132-143, where strong reasons are presented for assigning its erection to Constantine (cf. Procopius, De Aedif. iii. 4, ed. Bonn.).

(2) The Medieval Legends.—The condemnation of the acts of St. George by Gelasius gives us the clue to the source whence the legendary stories connected with him sprang. The Arians of the 5th century displayed great literary activity, availing themselves of every chance for diffusing their opinions. (Mai, Nou. Col. t. iii. par. i. pp. 238, 239.) They seem to have corrupted his acts for their own purposes. Their story is that he was hanged by Dianius, the persecutor, according to some, of Rome, according to others, of Persia, by whom he was in vain ordered to sacrifice to Apollo. He was then confronted with the magician Athanasius, who undertook to confound the saint. After various attempts the magician was converted and baptized, as well as the queen Alexandra. After many miracles and various trials he at last ascended to heaven. It is a strange fact that, notwithstanding the decrees of Rome and Constantinople, this Arian corruption became the basis of all the subsequent legends, and even found its way into the hymns of St. John Damascene in honour of St. George (Mai, Spicileg. Rom. t. ix. p. 729; Ceillier, xii. 89). The addition of a horse and a dragon to the story arose out of the imaginations of medieval writers improving upon the allegorical ideas of earlier times. The dragon evidently represents the devil, and was suggested by St. George's triumph over him at his martyrdom. A glance at Eusebius, Vita Constantin. i. 5, where we find the description of a v. 45, see Böckh, l. c. Corp. Inscription. Graec. ed. Kirchhoff, i. iv. num. 8627.) His name occurs again in another inscription in the church of Shaka, twenty miles east of Etrr's, which Hogg dates at A.D. 367. (Böckh. l. c. num. 8609, cf. 8630; for other instances of transformations of heathen temples into churches and hospitals in the 4th and 5th cent., see Böckh, l. c. 8645, 8647.) We next meet with St. George in the decrees of the council assembled at Rome by pope Gelasius, A.D. 494 or 496 (Hefele, Concil. i. 610, iii. 219, ed. Paris, 1889). This synod condemned the acts of St. George, together with those of Cyricus and Julianus, as corrupted by heretics, but expressly asserted that the foundation of the church was reserved to the martyr, and as such worthy of all reverence. (Cf. Pitra, Spicileg. Solemnen. iv. 391, for a repetition, three centuries later in the East, of this condemnation by the patriarch Nicephorus, in his Constitut. Ecclesiast.) After the period of Gelasius, the testimonies to his existence rapidly thicken in value. Gregory of Tours in the 6th century mentions him as highly celebrated in France, while in the East his cultus became universally established (cf. Fleury, H. E. xxxiv. 46), and churches were erected in all directions in his honour, one of the most celebrated being that built probably by Justinian over his tomb at Lydda, whither his relics had been transferred after his martyrdom. This church still exists. (For an engraving of it, see Thomson's The Land and the Book, ii. 292; cf. Robinson's Biblical Researches, iii. 51-55, with Le Quien, Oriens Christian, iii. 1271, for particular St. George's connexion with Lydda.) Another famous one is that of Thessalasia described in Texier and Pullan, Byzantine Architecture, pp. 132-143, where strong reasons are presented for assigning its erection to Constantine (cf. Procopius, De Aedif. iii. 4, ed. Bonn.). The addition of a horse and a dragon to the story arose out of the imaginations of medieval writers improving upon the allegorical ideas of earlier times. The dragon evidently represents the devil, and was suggested by St. George's triumph over him at his martyrdom. A glance at Eusebius, Vita Constantin. i. 5, where we find the description of a v. 45, see Böckh, l. c. Corp. Inscription. Graec. ed. Kirchhoff, i. iv. num. 8627.) His name occurs again in another inscription in the church of Shaka, twenty miles east of Etrr's, which Hogg dates at A.D. 367. (Böckh. l. c. num. 8609, cf. 8630; for other instances of transformations of heathen temples into churches and hospitals in the 4th and 5th cent., see Böckh, l. c. 8645, 8647.) We next meet with St. George in the decrees of the council assembled at Rome by pope Gelasius, A.D. 494 or 496 (Hefele, Concil. i. 610, iii. 219, ed. Paris, 1889). This synod condemned the acts of St. George, together with those of Cyricus and Julianus, as corrupted by heretics, but expressly asserted that the foundation of the church was reserved to the martyr, and as such worthy of all reverence. (Cf. Pitra, Spicileg. Solemnen. iv. 391, for a repetition, three centuries later in the East, of this condemnation by the patriarch Nicephorus, in his Constitut. Ecclesiast.) After the period of Gelasius, the testimonies to his existence rapidly thicken in value. Gregory of Tours in the 6th century mentions him as highly celebrated in France, while in the East his cultus became universally established (cf. Fleury, H. E. xxxiv. 46), and churches were erected in all directions in his honour, one of the most celebrated being that built probably by Justinian...
told in Johnson's Historie of the Seven Champions of Christendom, and the old ballad of St. George and the Dragon, reprinted in the third volume of Percy's Reliques, many features of which Speiser reproduces in his Étudé Queen. Busbecq in the 16th century found in the heart of Asia Minor a legend of the Turkish hero Cheddar to whom were ascribed exploits similar to those of St. George (cp. 1, pp. 93, 95, ed. 1633). He also found the Georgian Christians venerating above every other image that of St. George on horseback, regarding him as having conquered the evil one (ep. 3. p. 209). [IEREMIAN CHURCH.]

(9) Omnasion with England.—St. George and his story were well known from the seventh century, most probably through the Roman missioners sent by Gregory. In the end of the seventh century, Arculf, the early traveler, when returning to his bishopric in France, was carried northward to Iona, about A.D. 699, where he told the monks the story of St. George, whence, through Iona and Scotland, it became widely known in Britain. [ARCELF; ADAMMN]. In accordance with these facts, we find that St. George has a place in the Anglo-Saxon ritual of Durham assigned to the early part of the 9th century, published by the Surtees Society in A.D. 1846, while again, among the publications of the Oxford Society for the Study of the Anglo-Saxon Court of St. George, the work of Aelfric, archbishop of York A.D. 1020–1051. (Passion of St. George, ed. Hardwick, in Percy Society's publications, A.D. 1850; in its preface is much interesting information on this point.) His special fame, however, in this country arose immediately (see further History of Crusades, William of Malmesbury (Gesta Reg. Angl. ed Sir T. D. Hardy, ii. 559) tells us that, when the Crusaders were hard pressed by the Saracens at the battle of Antioch, June 28, 1089, the soldiers were encouraged by seeing "the martyrs George and Demetrius hastily approaching from the mountainous districts, hurling darts against the enemy, who being thus overwhelmed, ran away," (Hieron, S. xvi.); Michael's Hist. of Crusades, i. 173, ed. London; on the military fame of St. Demetrius see Büch, Corp. Inscrip. iv. 8642; Du Cange, Gloss. i. 974; Texier and Pullan, Byzantine Architecture, pp. 123–132). This timely apparition at the very crisis of the campaign led the Crusaders, among whom were ascribed a large contingent of Normans, under Robert, son of William the Conqueror, to adopt St. George as their patron. During the campaigns of Richard I. in Palestine, St. George appeared to that king, so that he became a special favourite with the Normans and English. (Itinerar. of Richard I. in Chronic. of Crusades, ed. Bob. p. 129). It is said that in 1222 a national council at Oxford ordered his feast to be kept as a lesser holiday throughout England. He was not, however, formally adopted as patron saint of England till the time of Edward III. That prince founded St. George's Chapel at Windos in 1348. In 1349 he joined battle with the French near Artois, when, as is reported, he "suddenly impulsive," says Thomas of Walsingham, "he drew his sword with the exultation, Ha! St. Edward, Ha! St. George, and routed the French" (cf. Smith's Student's Histo., cap. x. sec. 8). From that time St. George replaced St. Edward the Confessor as patron of England. In 1350, according to some authorities, the order of the Garter was instituted under his patronage, and in 1415, according to the Constitutions of archbishop Chicheley, St. George's Day was made a major double feast, and ordered to be observed like Christmas Day. In the first prayer book of Edward VI. St. George's feast was a red letter day, and had a special epistle and gospel appointed. This was changed in the next revision and never restored. (Ashmole, Order of the Garter; Astin, Register, and Pott, Antiquities of Windsor and History of Order of Garter, a.d. 1749.) The same influence of the Crusades led to the adoption of St. George as their patron by the republic of Genoa, the kingdoms of Arragon and Valencia, and to the institutions of order of knighthood under his name all over Europe (cf. A.A. S3. Boll. April. iii. 160). In northern Syria, again, St. George's day is even still observed by the Christians as a great festival (Lyde, Secret Sects of Northern Syria, London, 1853, p. 196).

(4) Controversy.—The consentient testimony of all Christendom attested the existence of St. George till the Reformation. Calvin first questioned it. In his Institutes, lib. iii. cap. 20, sec. 27, when arguing against invocation of saints, he ridiculed those who esteem Christ's intercession as of no value unless "St. George, St. Chrysostom, and Hippolytus aut similes larvae," where, unfortunately for himself, he places Hippolytus in the class of ghosts or phantoms together with St. George. Dr. Reynolds, in the beginning of the 17th century, was the first to identify the orthodox martyr of Lydda with the Arian bishop of Alexandria (see further History of Crusades, William of Malmesbury). Against him Dr. Heylin argued in an exhaustive treatise dedicated to king Charles I. (History of St. George of Cappadocia), where on pp. 164–168 will be found a very full list of all the authors who up to that date had referred to St. George, including a quotation from a reputed treatise by St. Ambrose, Liber Præfationum, on which, as he informs us, he has drawn, with no stress. The controversy was continued during the last century, when Pegge discussed before the London Society of Antiquaries (whose anniversary is held on St. George's Day) the theory that St. George was a mere allegory, and Mr. Byron's view that Gregory the Great was the real patron of England. Dr. Milner, in the last century, wrote a book in defence of the historical reality of St. George, provoked doubtless by Gibbon's well-known sneer in cap. xxiii. of his history. For further history of the controversy, see the exhaustive paper of Mr. Hogg already quoted, and an essay on St. George in Baring-Gould's Myths of the Middle Ages, where an ingenious attempt is made to account for the popularity of his cultus in the East by connecting it with the worship of Tammuz and Adonis, and with various other Eastern beliefs. (Mart. Vet. Rom., Mart. Aed., Mart. Ursard, which all fix his martyrdom at Diospolis in Persia (cf. Herod. ed. Rawlinson, i. 72, v. 49, v. 72); Heges., vol. i. 72; Heges., vol. v. 72); Heges., vol. v. 72; Diospolis may be the Bythinian town of that name, which was in the Persian empire under Cyrus. Persia was a term of very vague meaning in the middle ages, specially owing to the frequent irruptions of the Persians into the decaying eastern empire; Puseh. Chron. ed.
sobbing and wailing because of his dream. He thought he was standing by the throne of Christ where many thousand people were depressing His anger, and He would not hear them. At last came a woman robed in purple, and interceded for the suppliants, but still Christ was inexorable. This was at the dawn of Holy Thursday, and on the following day, Good Friday, an earthquake overthrew the maritime cities of Palestine. (Joan. Mosch. Prat. Spir. cap. 50.) [C. H.]

GEORGIIUS (51), prebendar of the church of St. John and Paul at Rome attending the Roman council of 745 (Mansi, xi. 381). The prebendar of the same church in 721 was Gregorius, who may have been the same person, as the two names are frequently interchanged by the error of transcribers. [GEORGIIUS (69)] This George is identified in other letters of the same date (Mansi, 374 B, 377 D, 379 B), from his order in the list, though his church was not mentioned. (See also Jaffé’s Monum. Mon. 136, 141, 144, 147.) [C. H.]

GEORGIIUS, prebendar and messenger of pope Gregory III. [GEORGIIUS (69)].

GEORGIIUS (52), a solitary of Mount Sinai, stated to have been the brother of St. John Climacus. (Daniel, Vit. Joan. Clim. in La Bisa, Max. Bibl. Pat. x. 388 e.) After living the life of an anchorite for seventy years, he was summoned by his brother to succeed him as abbot of the monastery of Sinai, a responsibility which filled him with apprehension. St. John Climacus, when dying, promised that if his prayers were of any avail with God, Georgius should be taken out of the world within a year; and he in fact died six months after his brother. (Joan. Mosch. Prat. Spir. cap. 127 ; Ceillier, Histoire des Auteurs Eccl. xi. 678.) [L. G. S.]

GEORGIIUS (53), a venerable Palestinian monk in the monastery of Theodore bishop of Capadocia (p. 600, Le Quiro, O. C. iii. 717). Theodore, who spoke of him to John Moschus, had for twelve years observed that George was never troubled, although at that time sloth, negligence, luxury, and insubordination were rampant. No one like him could rein the eye, close the ear, control the tongue; he was as a sunbeam in the hearts of all the brethren. (Joan. Mosch. Prat. Spir. cap. 109.) [C. H.]

GEORGIIUS (54), PISIDES, poet, dean of the great church at Constantinople. Little is known of his life, which was probably uneventful. He lived at Constantinople during the reign of the emperor Heraclius, a.d. 610–641, and the patriarchate of Sergius, and was in high favour with both of them, undoubtedly on account of his poetical gifts. He is called by some authorities chartophylax (keeper of the archives), by others scomlepaphys (keeper of the archives), at the church of St. Sophia, and from certain expressions in his poems, De Expeditione Persicâ (ii. 122, iii. 131), it appears that he accompanied Heraclius in some of his campaigns against the Persians. His works may be divided into two classes, (a) those relating to the history of his own times; (b) religious poems. Those that have come down to us of the
first class are, (1) De Expeditione Persicæ, a poem in three books or declamations (hæpodes) narrating the expedition of Heraclius against Chosroes, A.D. 615; it is full of adulation, both of the pious and of the valour of the emperor, and applies to the Persians the verse of the 156th Psalm, "Blessed be he be that taketh thy children and disasbeth them against the stones." [n. 114]; (2) Bellum Avaricum, narrating the fruitless attack of the Avars on Constantinople, whilst the Persian army was encamped at Chalcedon; (3) Hymnus Acastiæus, a hymn to the virgin to be sung standing, a thank-offering for the same defeat of the Avars; (4) In Sacram Resurrectionem, where George exhorts Constantine, the son of Heraclius, to follow the example of his father; (5) Heracleias, a rapid review of the life of the emperor, written on the news of the death of Chosroes. Of the second class there are these: (1) Hexaenomeran, the longest and most elaborate of George's works, dedicated to Sergius. It consists of 191 lines, and must be impeded; (2) De Anastasi Vitoæ, a short moral poem; (3) Contra Securan, against the Monophysite heresy, but ignoring Monothelitism, which was favoured by the patriarch; there is also a prose work, Vita S. Anastatii Martyris, a Persian who suffered martyrdom in Palestine when that country was under the dominion of Chosroes. Great writers quote from other works of this author, of which fragments are alone extant. George composed in iambic metre, and his verses are correct and elegant; greatly admired by his contemporaries, he is a court poet, writing with an eye to his patrons, and profuse in his praises of them; his elegance often sinks into frigidity. He must be distinguished from George bishop of Niemedia, who flourished at the end of the 9th century, with whom Cave wrongly identifies him. (Migne, Patr. Græc. xxii. 1160–1754; Villier, x. 653; Cave, Script. Eccl. Hist. i. 593; Alphatius, de Georgio in Fabric. Bibl. x. 541–50.)

GEORGIES (58, presbyter abbat, who required of St. Maximus concerning the mystery of Christ's person, in reference to the Monothelite controversy. Maximus addresses him as an unwasted student of holy Scripture, and one abstracted from all lower things in the contemplation of the spiritual. (S. Maxim. Conf. Opusc., in La Bigne, Max. Bibl. Pat. tom. xii. p. 521.)

GEORGIES (59), presbyter, a Paulinist, to whom Sergius patriarch of Constantinople wrote c. A.D. 620, seeking for authorities on the Monothelite argument. (S. Maxim. Conf. Disput. cum Pyrrho in La Bigne, Max. Bibl. Pat. xii. 503 a.)

GEORGIES (60), patrician of Africa, c. A.D. 647 (Maxim. Ep. 18; Migne, Patr. Græc. xci. 584). [Gregorius (77.)]

GEORGIES (61), archimandrite of the monastery of St. Theodore, thanked in a letter from pope Martin I. A.D. 640 (Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 162) for having supported Stephen bishop of Dares, the oriental legate of the Roman see under the late pope. Martin exhorts him to yield a similar obedience to his own legate in the East, John bishop of Philadelphia. (Martin. ep. 8 in Pat. Lat. lxxvii. 167, and Mansi, Concil. x. 819.)

GEORGIES (62), presbyter and monk of the monastery of St. Renatus at Rome, present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 680 (Mansi, xi. 616 d). He, or another of the same name, was legate of pope Agatho to the council (6. 611).

GEORGIES (63), of Nesra in Adiabene, also called Bar Sa目da (Sayode), i.e. son of fishermens. He was archimandrite of Beth-haba, A.D. 690, in the patriarchate of Ananias. He wrote a treatise De Obiidentia (di klessemblonemoth). Thom. Marg. (Hist. Monast. lib. ii. cap. 20) says he will not write a life of Georgios, because that has been done by bishop David in chap. i. of the Little Paradise. In lib. i, cap. 21, Marg. tells how Ananias sent some monks accused of heresy to Georgios, who found them not guilty. (Assem. Biblioth. Orient. iii. i. 217–218.)

GEORGIES (64), a native of Scythopolis, presbyter of the great church of Constantinople, mentioned by Phocas bar Sergius of Edessa in the 8th century as having written in defence of the authenticity of the writings of Dionysius Areopagita. Some extracts from George's book are given by Phocas (W. Wright, Cat. of Syriam MSS. in the Brit. Mus. pt. ii. p. 495, col. 1).

GEORGIES (65), deacon of Anambris in Paphlagonia, signing for his bishop Zoius at the council of Constantinople in 692. (Mansi, xi. 1000 b.)

GEORGIES (66), surnamed Cnidopoeus (Κανθώβους), presbyter and logographus in the church of the Severians at Alexandria, late in the 7th century, who disputed with Anastasius Similta the priest and monk (Anastas. Similta. Vinæ Dux, cap. 10 in Migne, Patr. Græc. xiii. 188.).

GEORGIES (67)—Oct. 21. Martyr at Jerusalem with sixty others, at the hands of the Saracens, A.D. 723. They were buried in the church of St. Stephen at Jerusalem. (Acta SS. Boll. Oct. ii. 366–362.)

GEORGIES (68), surnamed Limnetes—Aug. 24. A monk, and opponent of Leo the Isaurian in the iconoclastic controversy, A.D. 736. Like the rest of the monks, he was an enthusiastic supporter of the worship of images. He usually lived a very ascetic life beside a lake near Mount Olympus in Asia Minor, whence his surname. According to some, he was put to death; according to others, he was mutilated by the emperor for his opposition. (Bas. Menal.; Mart. Rom. ed. Baron.; Acta SS. Boll. Aug. iv. 841; Maimbourg, Hist. Iconoclast. t. i. l. 2, p. 108, ed. 1866.)

GEORGIES (69), prior "scholas cantorum," at Rome, mentioned in a letter of pope Paul I. to Pippin, 763, as then dead and having been succeeded by Simeon. (Codex Carolinus, Jaffé, no. 41, ann. 758–67; Pat. Lat. lxxix. 1187; Jaffé, Reg. Pontif. 196.)

GEORGIES (67), martyr, commemorated Aug. 27, according to Usuardus (more cor-
rectly July 27, according to Baronius). He went to Jerusalem upon a pilgrimage, and on his return, bearing relics from the Holy City, he was killed by the Saracens at Cordova, together with Aurelius, Felix, Natalia, and Liliosa, some time in the 8th century. Usuardus fixes Oct. 20 as the day of his translation of his body into France, upon which point his authority may be completely trusted, as he was himself the agent in the removal. In the year 858 Usuard was sent with another monk named Odillard by the abbey of St. Germain, near Paris, to look for the relics of St. Vincent at Valcntia in Spain, a city which was then in ruins, owing to the ravages of the Saracens. They bore with them a commendatory letter from King Charles the Bald. They did not find the relics of Vincent, but discovered and bore away from Cordova the bodies of George the deacon, of Natalia or Natalis, and of Aurelius. On their return to France they found that the community of St. Germain had fallen into a place in the diocese of Sens because the Normans had burned their monastery. They did not, therefore, return to Paris till 863, when Charles the Bald was so delighted with the relics that he ordered Usuardus to compile his famous Martyrology. (Marti. Usuard., Roman. ed. Baron.; Eulogii, lib. ii. cap. 10; M. Bontii, Præf. Mart. Usuard. in Migne's Patrol. Lat. vol. 123, 583–586; Ceillier, xii. 611.) [G. T. S.]

GEORGIUS (69) SYNECELLUS, a monk of Constantinople towards the close of the 8th century, and author of a Chronographia or Chronology of the world, existing from the days of Adam to those of Diocletian, A.D. 285, when the further progress of the work seems to have been stopped by his death. He received the epithet Synecelles from the office held by him near the person of Taurus patriarch of Constantinople. This office was that of a kind of privy councillor of the patriarch, an advisor in all his affairs (Pa Gange, Glossarium, s. v. Synecelles).

Nothing is known of the birth or early history of George, but his writings, the honours received by him in later life, and the testimony of Theophanes of Constantinople, a contemporary writer and a continuator of his Chronographia, are sufficient to prove the high esteem in which he was held. Theophanes speaks of him as an illustrious and most learned man, who had examined with the greatest diligence the works of his predecessors, and had attained a success which had marked none of them. (Theophan. Chronogr. procem. p. 4 in Corp. Scr. Hist. Byz. Bonn.) This tribute of praise has not, however, been received without question by succeeding writers. Scaliger in particular, offended at some of George's depreciatory remarks on his favourite Eusebius, uttered too, it would seem, at a time when Synecelles was making large use of the very authority he was underrating, is very severe in his language of condemnation, styling him light and foolish and insane, and charging him with having obtained his whole history from the person whom he took it upon him to depreciate (Dissertatio by Bredovius, prefixed to the second volume of the works of Synecelles in the Corpus Script. H. B. p. 10). There seems to be but little foundation for these charges. That George but made use of Eusebius is unquestionable, he used all from whom he thought that he could gather materials for his work. Of the writers, such as Julius Africanus, and Alexander Polyhistor, he has preserved many fragments that would otherwise have been lost, and a large portion of the Chronicon of Eusebius has been from him restored to its true author.

The work of Synecelles has always been highly esteemed in the church, more especially for its preservation of passages from earlier writers, who would otherwise have been almost unknown. It is worth noticing that among the quotations given in it are a good many from the Aposlephal book of Enoch. The Chronographia, of which only one MS., in the National Library at Paris, is known, was first published by the Dominican Jacob Goar in the year 1652. The best edition now is that of Dindorf, in the Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, in two vols., with the Dissertatio of Bredovius and the Preface and Notes of Goar. [W. M.]

GEORGIUS (69)—Jan. 22, martyr. During the reign of Leo the Armenian, the pagan Bulgarians attacked Adrianople, seized Manuel the bishop, whom they at once martyred, with a large number of captives, clergy and laity. Tzocus, the Bulgarian prince, gathered together the captives, among whom was Georgius, and upon their refusal to adjure their faith put them all to death. (Bas. Menon; Finlay, Hist. of Greece, i. 114.) [G. F. S.]

GEORGIUS (70), the name of three hegumen of Greek monasteries, present at the council of Nicea in 787, viz. of Dominica (Mansi, xiii. 153 c.).

The Holy Theotokos (ib. 155 b).

Pega (ib. xiii. 1112 d, Gregorius in the Latin). [C. II.]

GEORGIUS (71), presbyter at the council of Nicea, 787, representing the bishop of Cyprus and Cilicia (Mansi, xiii. 145 b, Greek; Gregorius in the Latin). [C. III.]

GEORGIUS (72), a layman of Paepusus, went to Gregory Nazianzen by his friend Theodorus bishop of Tyana, that he might convince him of the guilt he had involved himself in by refusing to be bound by an oath he had taken, on the ground that it had never been registered. Georgius had brought the matter into court, and seems to have gained his suit. Gregory succeeded in bringing him to repentance, and sent him back to Theodorus with the request that he would inflicts suitable penance on him, regulating its length by his contrition (Greg. Naz. Epist. 210). Georgius's letter was read in the second council of Constantinople by Epaenetus, the bishop of Tyana, by whom Georgius was stated to have been the superior of a convent at Paepusus (Labbe, Concil. v. 477). Tillemont doubts the correctness of this statement (Mém. Eccl. ix. 570). [E. V.]

GEORGIUS (73), a prefect under the emperor Phocas. He was sent into Palestine, about 606, to compel the Jews to receive baptism, a course often pursued by the Byzantine emperors, and a notable instance of which occurred a century later, at the beginning of the reign of Leo the
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GERADUS, bishop of Bologna. [GERARDUS.]

GERAINT. [GRANSTIRUS.]

GERALDUS (1) (GARALTY) of Mayo, abbot and bishop, March 13. A life of this saint taken from a MS. of the monastery of All Saints, in Lough Ree, and supposed to have been written by the monk Augustin Magrailand, is given by Colgan (Acta SS. 599 sq.) It is also given by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 13 Mart. ii. 288) from MSS. in the Bodleian Library, but is cut up and presented with a running comm. (Hardy, Descript. Cat. i. pt. ii. 571, pt. ii. 797, gives the MS. and printed authorities; see also the article in O’Hanlon’s Irish Saints. iii. 361 sq.) Unfortunately this life is almost entirely unworthy of credit, being full of anachronisms and fables. Geraldus is believed to have been of Saxon lineage and birth, and is generally supposed to have been one of those who accompanied Colman (Feb. 19) from Lindisfarne after the synod at Whitby (Cogan (23)) in the year 664: but if so, he must have been young when he left Northumbria and settled with the other Saxons in Colman’s new foundation at Mayo, unless, with some, we place his death at a very early date. He became abbot of the monastery of Mayo, but whether he was also bishop or not is a matter of dispute, depending in great measure upon the interpretation to be put upon the entry in the Annals of Ulster and Annals of Tighernach, at A.D. 731 and 732, and thus upon the date assigned to his death. It is not to be credited, as told in the Life of St. Gerard, that Adamnan (Sept. 29), who died A.D. 704, governed the church of Mayo for seven years after St. Gerard’s death, and that therefore St. Gerard died at latest in the year 697, as accepted by Ussher and O’Conor. The Four Masters give his death in A.D. 736, but O’Donovan is very strongly in favour of the entry in the Annals of Ulster and Annals of Tighernach being real, “A.D. 732, the pontiff of Mayo of the Saxons, Gerard, died,” i.e. “Gerald, pontiff of Mayo of the Saxons, dies.” This is the date usually received, but it is not free from doubt, as the reading varies so much from the usual idiom. He is also said to have been superior of a monastery at Elitheria or Killan-alithir, “the church of the pilgrim,” and of another called Teach-Saxon, both in the diocese of Tuam, and probably dependencies of Mayo. His feast is usually observed on March 13, but March 10 and 12 are also named as his commemorations. (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. ii. iii. c. 19, § 7; Gen. &c., of H. &i. 845; O’Donovan, 396 sq.; after O’Donovan, 422.) Reeves, St. Adamnan, liii. iv., Uhsher, Brit. Eccl. Ant. vol. ind. Chron. A.D. 692, 697; O’Conor, Rev. Hist. Script. ii. 219, n. 4, 238, n. 41, iv. 82, n. 2; Ware, Hist. ant. c. 26; Prose, Roy. Accad. viii. 57; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 75; Kelly, Cat. Ir. S. Mar. 12, pp. xvii. 95, 304.

GERALDUS (2) L. (GERALDUS), said to have been thirteenth bishop of Aft, following Magnericus, or Magnicus, and succeeded by Seandrus, but the only authority for his existence is the occurrence of his name in the catalogue of the monastery of St. Aignan. His date is placed towards the close of the 8th century (Gall. Christ. i. 338, 356).

GERALDUS (1) [GERONITUS], sixteenth bishop of Bologna, between Julianus I. and Theodoreus I. The signature Laurentius Bohieniensis occurs in the 5th synod of Rome in 500 (Mansi. viii. 299 c), and Bohieniensis has been suspected as a misreading for Bononiensis, thus making Laurentius and not Gerardus the bishop of Bologna at that date. But Ughelli shows that the suspicion is groundless (Ug. Ital. Sac. ii. 11; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Ital., iii. 462, 579).

[O. H.]

GERALDUS (2) (GERALDUS), bishop of Veltiria (Vettelri), c. A.D. 596–600. He had been a monk under Gregory the Great. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. i. 59; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Ital. i. 458.)

[O. S. G.]

GERARDUS (3), tenth bishop of Lään, succeeding Peregrinus, and followed by Sculfus in the latter half of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 512.)

[O. A. B.]

GERASIMUS (1), one of four bishops named in the inscription of an edict of the emperor Gratin, in which he defines the respective limits of the jurisdictions of ecclesiastical and civil tribunals. The edict is dated Treves,July 17, A.D. 375 (Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 23). The others are Artemius, Eudocius, and Apullus. There was an Artemius bishop of Embrun, A.D. 374 (Gall. Ch. iii. 1055), and an Artemius bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, after A.D. 388 (Gall. Ch. ii. 229; Greg. Turon. Hist. Fr. i. 41; ii. 12).

[T. W. D.]

GERASIMUS (2), a celebrated anchorite of Palestine towards the middle of the 5th century. He was a native of Lydia. After having gained great celebrity by his monastic virtues, he was led astray by Theodosius the intruding bishop of Jerusalem, and adopted his heretical tenets. Having been led to visit Euthymius at his laura he was by him brought back to a sound faith (Cyril. Scythop. Vit. S. Euthym. § 77). Gerasimus afterwards founded a large monastery near the Jordan, affording accommodation for as many as seventy anchorites, in the middle of which he constructed a cenobium for the younger monks, who were not yet accustomed to the austerities of monastic life. His rule, which
is given by Cyrillus, was one of excessive severity. He absolutely refused his anchorites leave to heat water, to partake of cooked food, or to have a lamp to read by. Such indulgences he said were suitable only for coenobites. He is reported to have fasted through the whole of Lent, taking no food for forty days besides the sacramental elements. He died March 5, A.D. 475. John Moschus gives a long account of his familiar companionship with a lion (Joaness Mosch. Prat. Spir. cap. 107; see also Boll. Acta SS. 5 Mart. i. 386).

GERBALDUS, thirty-fourth or thirty-fifth bishop of Liége, beth. Agilfridus and Walcardus. In the Gesta Episcoporum Lothianorum of Anselm the name only occurs (Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 1081). He is said to have sat for twenty-five years, and to have died on the 15th of November, probably in 810, after enriching the church with gifts. He is one of the bishops mentioned as having been present at the canonicalization of St. Liudger in the spurious letter attributed to St. Lindger of Münster. (Gesta Pontificum Leodium, tom. i. 150, ed. Chapenville, Liége, 1612; Gall. Christ. iii. 832.)

GERBERTA, daughter of St. Gertrude abbess of Hamay and mother of St. Adalbald. (Mabillon, Acta SS. O.S.B. saec. ii. p. 941, ed. 1699.)

GEREBERN (Genebern, Genebrard), martyr, commemorated May 15. He was an Irish priest, who baptized and instructed St. Dimma (May 19) of Gheel, while her Christian sympathies were yet unknown. (Dimma.) He also accompanied her from Ireland to the Continent, and was put to death at the same time and place with his pupil. He is commemorated on the same day, and is regarded as the patron of Sonsbeck in the ancient Duchy of Cleves. But by Dempster (Hist. Eccles. Societ. i. 311) he is called S. Gerchernaus Scotus, i.e. S. Philibius Scoti discipulus in extrema senecta ac S. Philibii socius presbyter vitae religiosissimae. &c., and is said to have left Wales for Ireland, and written Ad Dynpanam Institutio, lib. i.; Pro vero Dei cultu, lib. i.; his martyrdom taking place at Gheel in the year 700 (Tanner, Bibl. 312). But evidently much of this is fanciful. (Lanigan, Eccles. Hist. Brit. ii. c. 16, § 13; O'Hanlon, Life of St. Dynpana, pass.; Butler, Lives of the Saints, May 15; Usuard, Mart. Auct. 15 Mai. ap. Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxvii. 57 sq.)

GEREBERTUS, sixteenth bishop of Verdun, succeeding his uncle Gislaufidis, and followed by Armonius. Before his consecration he was a monk of Tholey (Theogelium), a monastery in the diocese of Treves, in which capacity he fought against the exactions of Ebroin. He is said to have died in 689, after an episcopate of twenty-four years (Gall. Christ. xiii. 563, 1170).

GEREBOLDUS, ST., thirteenth bishop of Bayeux, succeeding St. Rognobertus, and followed by St. Framboldus, subscribed the council of Rouen, held under the presidency of the archbishop Anbertus (A.D. 682 or 689). He was buried in the monastery of Liberiacum (Livray) which he founded, and is commemorated in his own diocese Dec. 7. In the Auturia of Grevena to Ussard for that day occurs a legend of his being imposed upon and cast into the sea as a punishment for his firm resistance to the sin of unchastity. (Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxiv. 778; Labbe, Sacr. Conc. xi. 1044, Flor. 1759-98; Gall. Christ. xii. 350.)

GERETRANUS, ST.

GEREMARUS, abbot of Flavicium (St. Germer de Flay) in the district of Beauvais. He is said to have been born at the villa of Girardranda or Walandra, on the Itta, about A.D. 10, his parents being named Rigobert and Aga, the latter of a noble Frankish family. He was invited to court by king Dagobert, who greatly honoured him; married a lady named Domnus; founded a monastery called Insula, near Flavicium, on a spot afterwards named St. Peteris in the Wood, and placed Archarius as abbot over it. Longing at length for monastic retirement himself, he made over his property to his son Amalbert, and retired from court in the eleventh year of the reign of King II., 690, and lived on a piece of land near the town of Pentallum near Rouen, on the river Lirisius. Of this house he became abbot, but resigned his office and withdrew as a hermit to a cave near the Seine, in which seclusion he was ordained presbyter by Audouenus (St. Ouen), bishop of Rouen. His son, who had succeeded him at Court, and followed the king to the war against the Frisons, died in 654 prematurely cut off, and with the property which thus returned to his hands Geremar erected the monastery of Flavicium, on the Itta, over which he presided for three years and a half, until his death on Sept. 24, 658. An anonymous ancient life of Geremar was appended by D'Achery in 1651 to his edition of Guibert of Nogent, and may also be seen in Patrolog. Lat. ciii. 1203. It was edited with a few notes by Mabillon (Acta SS. O.S.B. ii. 455) and by the Bollandists (Sept. vi. 698) with more notes and a commentary by Perier. In these notes some of the obscure localities of the narrative are identified. The Itta is the Epte. Warandrand is Vazres near its left bank, 5 miles from Gournay. Flavicium is Germer de Flay, across the Epte and in a line due east with Beauvais. Pentallum (which was existing in the ninth century) was beyond the Seine between Pontademer and Honfleur; Lirisius the Limais. Geremar's successor in the monastery of Flavicium is not known, but the third abbot is named Gennardus (Gall. Christ. ix. 787).

GEREON, martyr. [LEO THIBAEL]

GERESINA is described by Dempster (Hist. Eccles. Societ. i. 312), as matron and queen of Sicily, a Scot by birth, sister of St. Daria, aunt of St. Ursula, mother of St. Adrian prince and martyr, and of the daughters Babilia Aurea and Victoria, and also sister of bishop Macrinius; she suffered in Germany with St. Ursula and her eleven thousand virgins, A.D. 454. But the whole tale is evidently fabulous.

GERETRANUS, ST., eleventh bishop of Bayeux, succeeding Leudovaldus, and followed by St. Rognobertus, at the close of the 6th century. He is commemorated in the Gallican Martyrology, Dec. 7 (Gall. Christ. xi. 349). [S. A. E.]
GERFRID (1) (GILFREDUS, GILFRIUS), said to have been twenty-second bishop of Laon, following Siegobaudus, and succeeded by Wamilo II, but his consecration for the church of Noyon was contested. He was present in 798 and 799 at the dedication of the churches of the monastery of St. Ricier (Centulense) in the diocese of Amiens. (Le Coite, Ann. Eccl. Franc. an. 799, n. vii. tom. vi. p. 81; an. 818, n. xx. vii. 493; Mabillon, Annales Ord. Ben. ii. 331; Gall. Christ. i. 512.) [S. A. B.]

GERFRID (2) succeeded his uncle Liudger as bishop of Münster in A.D. 809. In A.D. 819 he and his uncle Hildegrim, bishop of Halberstadt, are mentioned together as visitors of the abbey of Werden. In A.D. 824 he received from Frithiward half a farm in the vill of Besig, in the Riparian Gau, with rights of pasture and wood-taking, in exchange for half a farm in the vill of Castorps, in the Brokterga, and 20 "Furlangas" in the vill of Werins, in the Gau of Dregin. In the same year, he granted 3 milia to Noluton, founded by St. Liudger, of which his cousin Heriburgius was abbot. The farms of Buchbildi and Oldinchus. In A.D. 838 he is mentioned as being present at the palatine in Nimeguen, at the settlement before the emperor Louis and his sons Louis and Charles, of a dispute between count Guibert and abbots Ernhaus of Fulda. He died in A.D. 839. (Eichard, Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, i. 89-99; Pertz, Monumenta Germaniae Scriptor. iii. 3.) [F. D.]

GERICUS. [GOERICUS.]

GERNUS. [GARINUS.]

GERIVALDUS, bishop. [GARIVALDUS.]

GERMANA, virgin martyr; commemorated Oct. 1. The Bollandists (Acta SS. 1 Oct. i. 31-4) give her acts taken by Vignierius from three Ms. codices of the priories of St. Germana and St. Machutus (Maclou), and prefix a commentarius praevisus; her acts, written by an anonymous author, have no evident authority, and the date of her martyrdom is unfixed to more than the 5th century. Its place is conjectured to have been at Bar-sur-Asne rather than Bar-sur-Seine, in the French department of the Aube, and her priory was probably or near the present Mont-St.-Germaine. (See also Sausseus, Mart. Gall. 674, Paris, 1637.)

According to her legend, she suffered death at the hands of the Vandals when they came into France; her decapitated body was buried in the church of St. Stephen, or where it afterwards stood. Vignierius calls her deceased. [J. G.]


GERMANICUS (1), a nobleman concerning whom Sidonius Apollinaris (Ep. iv. 13) writes to Vicius. He was son of one bishop and father of another, yet at sixty years of age dressed and lived like a young man. Sidonius is distressed at his spiritual condition, andpraystthe teacher to influence him to enter the sacred ministry. [R. T. S.]

GERMANICUS (2)—Jan. 19. A martyr in the flower of youth with the aged Polycarp at Smyrna, a.d. 167. [POLYCARP.] His courage in provoking the beasts to which he was condemned is praised in the circular letter addressed by the church of Smyrna to other Christian churches. He suffered a short time before Polycarp. (Mart. Rom. Vet.; Adon. Usuard.: Euseb. H. E. iv. 15; Ruinart, Acta Sancora; Celiier, i. 393.) [G. T. S.]

GERMANIO (1), the thirty-second bishop of Jerusalem, who succeeded Pius at the end of the 2nd century. He was succeeded by Gordius. (Euseb. H. E. vi. 10; Epiphanius, Haer. i. 20.) [E. V.]

GERMANIO (2). Pope Innocent I. In a letter to Marcinus, bishop of Naisus, written at Ravenna, states that Germanus and Lupteius, who claimed to be a priest and deacon respectively, had come to him as a deputation from many others in the same position as themselves. They complained that, notwithstanding that their ordination by Bonosus had been long before his condemnation, Marcinus refused to admit them to communion with him, although he promised them to keep possession of their churches. They also accused one Rusticus, who apparently had been ordained by Bonosus, of getting himself ordained a second time. Innocent accordingly reminds Marcinus that he had pronounced that those who had been ordained by Bonosus before his condemnation ought to be received back into the church if they had wished, or even then wished, to return. (S. Innocent. Epist. 16, in Migne, Patr. Lat. xx. 519; Cellier, Histoire des Aut. sacr. vii. 514.) [BONOSUS.] [F. D.]

GERMANUS (1), of a bishop of some part of Egypt, and for a time an adversary of St. Dionysius of Alexandria. In answer to the calumnies, St. Dionysius wrote various letters, parts of which are extant in Eusebius. Germanus had accused St. Dionysius of cowardice in neglecting his people while he took care of his own personal safety, and in taking to flight in order to avoid persecution, and of refusing to hold the public assemblies of the faithful. Germanus' answer to this, St. Dionysius recounts what had happened in the persecutions under the emperors Valerian and Decius. (Eusebius, bk. vi. ch. 40, and bk. vii. ch. 11; Tillemont, iv. pp. 272, 273.) [J. W. S.]

GERMANUS (2), bishop of Neapoli (Sicam, or Nabis), in Palaestina, present at the council of Ancyræ, A.D. 314, and that of Neocossaeas in the same year. (Mansi, iii. 534, 548; Le Quien, Or. Chr. iii. 647.) [J. de S.]

GERMANUS (3), bishop of Petra, who was intrusive by the Arian party into that see, when the orthodox bishop Asterius was banished by Constantius. He assembled the synod at Petra in A.D. 359, a.d., and signed with the semi-Arian party. (Epiphanius, Haer. lxxxiii. § 26; Mansi, iii. 524 a; Le Quien, Or. Chr. iii. 723.) [E. V.]

GERMANUS (4), bishop of Corcyra on the coast of Cilicia. He was present at the second general council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Mansi, iii. 568; Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 879.) [J. de S.]

GERMANUS (5), bishop of Besançon, in the 4th century. His martyrdom is fixed at A.D.
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407. But his acts are disfigured by legends, as that he carried his head after decapitation, the walls of Bourges tottering all the while. But in the Baume, near Besançon, shows no trace of having ever had walls. The foundation of the abbey of that place is ascribed to Germanus. (Boll. Acta SS. 11 Oct. v. 622, 626 e; Gall. Chr. xlv. 7.) [R. T. S.]

GERMANUS (6), the name of two bishops of Mauretanica Caesariensis, viz. of Gyparsia (Catholic) and of Zugabberia, Sugabbaris, or Suebiarita (Donatist), present at the Carthaginian conference of 411. (Mon. Vet. Dom. 128; 135.) [H. W. F.]

GERMANUS (7), one of the bishops who met at Carthage, A.D. 412, against Pelagius and Celestius. (Aug. Ep. 175.) [H. W. F.]

GERMANUS (8), ST, bishop of Auxerre in the fifth century. His life was written about 40 years after his death, i.e. about A.D. 488 (Gallica Christiana, xlii. 262) by Constantius, a presbyter of Lyons, himself an eminent personage in the Gallic church, and highly esteemed by Sidonius Apollinaris (Sidon. Ep. i. i, iii. 2, in which latter epistle he addresses Constantius as "aetate gravis, nobilitate sublimis, religione venerabilis," and as a benefactor in more than one sense to the city of Chalon). Constantius undertook the task at the request of Patiens bishop of Arles, who was not only the bishop of Auxerre, but the presbyter of Lyons, and was hence named at the end of his written life. He published it at the request of Consurius bishop of Auxerre. In his preface he says that a long time has elapsed since the death of Germanus, who was born "probably about the year 378" (Life of St. German, in Lives of the English Saints, p. 15) at Auxerre (Auëssiodorum, Autissiodorium, or Autansion, Ammian. xvi. 2, 5), reckoned as the third city in Lagodunensia Quarta, or Senonea (Bingham, l. ix. c. 6, s. 8), and situated near the southern border of what was afterwards named Champagne, and about the centre of the present department of the Yonne. It is described in Gallica Christiana, as an "old and illustrious city, not inferior to many great Gallic cities in respect to its fertile soil, its vineyards, its navigable river"; it had been evangelized, according to its local traditions, by Peregrinus, sent from Rome in the middle of the 3rd century, and Amator, who came to its see in 388, was reckoned as its fifth bishop. The parents of Germanus (to adopt the familiar abbreviation of his name) were of noble descent; their names (see Tillemont, xv. 8) are given as Rusticus and Germanilla. They caused their son to be baptized, and gave him the best attainable education; he attended "Gallic schools," in which, as St. Jerome wrote in A.D. 411 (Ep. 125, 6) "learning was most flourishing;" among the great number of "auspicia," or the most accessible to a native of Auxerre, was at Lyons; after a time he went to Rome, studied for the bar, and practised as an advocate before "the tribunal of the prefect," on his return he married a lady named Eustachia, and rose to high secular office by becoming one of the six "dukes" of Gaul, each of whom had the government of a certain number of provinces (Gibbon, ii. 320). Auxerre was included in Germanus's district: the young duke, "whose habit then was rather to indulge in the pursuits of youth than to give serious heed to Christian duties," was a keen huntsman, and used to hang up the heads of his game on a large pear-tree in the midst of his native forest. This Amator, who saw in it a resemblance to a Pagan fashion of honouring large trees. He often reminisced with Germanus, but in vain. However, one day the "duke" went to a country estate of his, and the bishop took the opportunity of destroying the pear-tree, and casting away the heads of game, which Constantius calls " aucelec." Germanus, hearing of this, actually set off for Auxerre in order to kill the bishop: Amator, warned of his peril, and "thinking himself unworthy to be a martyr," took the extraordinary step of visiting the prefect Julian, then at Antan, and requesting his permission to make German a cleric, as he was the fittest man to succeed to his own see. Julian reluctantly assented: Amator returned, exhorted his flock to choose his future successor, because he felt his death to be at hand, led them to the church, bade them lay aside their weapons, and set the Germans on them. The two men expired in the doors being barred, laid hands on the duke, cut his hair short, and then conferred on him the clerical character, bidding him live as one who was destined to be bishop. Soon afterwards he fell ill, obtained from his people a promise to elect German and, on Wednesday morning, May 1, 418, caused himself to be carried to the church, and was buried there. Twelve years more upon his throne. He was buried beside his predecessors in the neighbouring Mount Austrics, and German, unanimously elected, was consecrated on Sunday, July 7. "He received the episcopate under compulsion, but it wrought in him a sudden and total change." His wife became to him as a sister: he distributed his property to the poor: he became a severe ascetic, as Constantius says, a "persecutor of his body," abstaining from salt, oil, and even from vegetables, wine, excepting a small quantity muced in Christmas-day or Easter-day, and from wheaten bread, instead of which he ate barley bread, with a preliminary tawing (coinem procelam). He wore the same hood and tunic in all seasons, and slept on ashes in a frame of boards. "Let anyone speak his mind," says Constantius, to whom some details of German's life must have come down not free from exaggeration: "but I positively assert that the blessed German endured a long martyrdom." At that time the hospitable guests a good meal, though he would not share it with them. He founded a monastery outside Auxerre, on the opposite bank of the Yonne, which he often crossed in a boat to visit the abbot and brethren. His biographer, who believes miracles to have accompanied him through life, tells, how by the application to him was effectual against an epidemic affection of the throat, which had proved widely fatal. We must now follow German to Britain. Pelagianism had been rife in its founder's native island; and the British clergy, unable to refute the heretics, requested help from the church, which we may say from their mother church, of Gaul. Accordingly, a number was assembled, and by consent of all application was made to the two glorious luminaries of religion, German and Lupus, the bishop of Troyes, both of whom accepted the call, the more
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really because of the labour involved in it. So says Constantius, who is followed and for the most part trusted by the army, to which he belongs. But here comes a difficulty. Prosper of Aquitaine, a contemporary, in his Chronicle for the year 429, says that pope Coelestinus, "at the suggestion of the deacon Palladius, sent Germanus as his representative" (sic suus) into Britain: and in his Contra Collatorem, written about 432, speaks of Coelestinus as "taking pains to keep the Roman island" (Britain) "catholic" (c. 21, or 24). Now Prosper could not but be well informed about the proceedings of Coelestinus, for he was at Rome, for the express purpose of lodging a complaint against Gallic Semi-Pelagians, in 431. Constantius wrote about sixty years after Germanus' British journey, but with full access to local information. Unless Prosper wrote a mere falsehood, Coelestinus must have had something to do with Germanus' mission; but it is likely enough that Prosper from his "Roman" standpoint would overrate the importance of Coelestinus' action, and also that Coelestinus would dwell simply on the election of the Gallic synod. The truth probably lies in a combination of the pope's action with the councils, at any rate so far as German was concerned. Lupus is not named with German by Prosper; of him evidently Coelestinus took no thought, but we may reasonably believe that Coelestinus' mission was sent by the pope to German either before (as Tillemont thinks, Memoires, xiv. 154) or at the time of the Gallic synod: it is not probable that, as Lingard supposes, the synod's commission was only to Lupus, and German was "sent" by the pope alone (Angil. Sac. Ch. i. 8).

When the two prelates, travelling northward, reached Metrodorum or Nanterre, near Paris, German saw in the crowd which came to meet them a girl named Genovefa, asked her whether she wished to dedicate herself to God, received her affirmative answer, and bade her live as one exposed to Christ. She became "St. Genevieve of Paris." Lupus had a brilliant voyage across the Channel: Constanthus, in whose eyes German's path was, as a matter of course, strewn with miracles, affirms that he stilled the storm by pouring oil into the sea, with invocation of the Trinity. Arrived in Britain, the bishops preached the doctrines of grace in churches, in the country, on the roads, with great effect: at last the Pelagian leaders took heart, and challenged them to a discussion, which took place apparently near Verulam. A great multitude assembled; "on the one hand," says Constantius, "was Divina authority, on the other, human presumption;" the heretics, conspicuous by their wealth and their rich garb, were put to silence by the doughty and discoursing disciples, and opened the debate in speeches more verbose than forcible. The two bishops replied, appealing to Scripture in support of the Catholic position; "pursing forth," says Constantius, "the torrents of their eloquence with the thunder peals (Bede alters this into 'showerers') of evangelists and apostles. They silenced their opponents, and the shouts of the assembly proved their victory. German and Lupus then visited the reputed tomb of the British proctomartyr Alban, and Constantius saw the famous tale of the Alleluia Victory. The Britons were menaced by Picts and Saxons; German and Lupus encourage them to resist, catechize and baptize the still heathen majority. After they had strengthened them, German, after a voyage of 430, station them in a narrow glean, and at the invaders' approach repeat thrice the Paschal Alleluia. The Britons send the shout ring ing through the defile; the enemy is seized with panic, and "faith without the sword wins a bloodless victory." On returning home German found the people of Auxerre suffering under an unusual demand of tribute; he set forth at once for Arles, the seat of the central government, and obtained from the prefect Auxilius a "remedies," or remission of the demands.

In 447 he was again entreated by British churchmen to aid them against Pelagianism. He took with him Severus, bishop of Treves, a disciple of Lupus, and having, on his way, vindi cated Genovefa against calumniators, he landed in Britain, and (not without a miracle, according to Constantius) triumphed again over the Pela gians, and procured their banishment from the island. Welsh traditions have much to tell about German's activities on behalf of the British church. They lay the scene of the Alleluia victory at Maes-garmon, near Mold; they speak of colleges founded by German, of national customs traced to his authority; and although much of this is legendary, and the stories in Nennius about his relations with king Vortigern are apocryphal, it seems improbable that he did more for British Christianity than Constantius knew of, or felt an interest in recording. He had no sooner returned home than another occasion for his humane intervention presented itself. The Armoricians, whose country had not yet acquired, through British immigration, the name of Brittany, were in a state of chronic revolt against the empire. They were, if not the whole, yet the greater part of that vast coalition of insurgents who went by the name of Bagaudae (Life of St. German, p. 219), but who had been goaded into insub ordination on the morrow of rebellions and robberies, the proscriptions and spoliations carried on by the provincial government (Sulpician, Oub. Dei, v. 6). Aetius, now again at the head of affairs under the emperor Valentinian III., and invested with the dignity of patrician, gave permission to Eochar, king of the Alanis, to invade their territory, which had once apparently been under German's rule as duke. He now stepped between the people and their one mics; he went to meet the Alanis, where "cavalry, like an iron mass, filled the road" (Constant. ii. 5). He reached the presence of Eochar, and entreated him to pause; the barbarian put aside the request; the old bishop, taking his life in his hands, mounted his horse, and with his bridles, and this daring act overawed the barbarians to promise a truce until German should have obtained favourable terms for Armorica from the emperor or from Aetius. German set forth at once for Italy, and a beautiful instance of his kindness of heart occurred while he was crossing the Alps. He fell in with a poor old labourer, lame and carrying a burden. They came to a torrent crossed by slippery stones. The bishop of Auxerre, the envoy between Armoricians and their emperor, himself about 70 years old, carried over on his own shoulders
first the bundle, and then the old man himself. It was June 19, 448, when he reached Milan; after leaving it, he yielded, against his attendants' wish, to a request for his presence on the part of a fever-stricken family. He entered Ravenna by night, but his hope of their escaping a public reception was disappointed. Gallia Placidia, the empress-mother, sent him a silver dish full of delicate food, but containing no meat. He sold the dish for the poor, having given its contents to his attendants; in its place he sent back a little wooden patera with barley bread; the empress, we are told, kept the bread, and encircled the plate with gold. He was said to have opened a prison by his prayers; the fact being, apparently, that the empress, at his entreaty, released the inmates. He obtained pardon and immunity for the Armoricans, but unfortunately news came that they had again revolted. His power of helping them was thus destroyed by their own act; they were punished by the invasion which could no longer be delayed. Greenland's life-work was over; he had now a dream in which he seemed to receive from his Lord provision for a journey to his country. The bishops who constantly attended on him, and to whom he told the dream, interpreted it in an earthly sense; he answered, "Well do I know what country is which God promises to His servants." He was soon afterwards taken ill. His lodging overflowed with visitors; a choir kept up ceaseless psalmody by his bedside. He expired on the 31st of July, 448, having been bishop 30 years and 25 days; his body was embalmed, and a magnificent funeral journey to Gaul attested the reverence of the court. In Gaul, roads were mended and bridges made in expectation of the corpse; and the interment took place in a chapel near Auxerre, on October 1. So lived and died St. German, of whom the "Missa S. Germani" says, in a terse summary of his career, "He so began as to increase; he so sought as to conquer." Constantius's Life of Germanus is in Surius's De Pontificibus Sanctorum Bavariae; and Av. in a metrical Life, and a prose account of his "miracles," both by a monk named Hereric, are in Acta Sanctorum, July 31. Hereric wrote under Charles the Bald. He follows Constantius in ignoring a papal commission to German (Monr. Life); but he gives the legend of German sending his disciple Patrick to Celestine, and Celestine sending him to Ireland (De Mirac.). He professes to give incidents which Constantius had passed over. In spite of his wearisome prolixity and exaggerations, one line of his on German's excellence is worth quoting; after mentioning his teaching, labour, kindness, constancy, fervour, he adds: "Quodque est praecipium, dilectio plurima fratrwm."  

[W. B.]  

GERMANUS (9), bishop of Amiens, said by Rosweyd, on the authority of Belgian MSS., to have been "Anglus Natisce" converted by St. Germanus of Auxerre in 429. Other accounts make him Scotch (i.e. Irish) by birth, and relate that his father, prince Audians, came for some purpose to Scotia, and there fell in with the French saint. Rosweyd also believes him to be the same with St. Eloquiws, who came with SS. Fursey, Columbanus, and others from Ireland to Gaul. By others he is supposed to have been a companion of St. Boniface in the 8th century. His legend contains an extraordinary notice if Julian the archdeacon, whom he made a priest. In this legend Germanus of Auxerre meets Audinius and his wife Aquilia with their little son, and struck with their angelic appearance takes the child, gives him his own name, and educates him. The young Germanus, when grown up, sailed on a waggon-wheel to Gaul, and working everywhere miracles, visited Rome, Spain, and England again, but was at last martyred at Amiens. (Boll. Acta SS. 2 Mai. i. 259.)  

[R. T. S.]  

GERMANUS (10), reputed bishop of Ma. In the Mart. Tottiguli on July 30 there is the commemoration of Germanus, son of Goll, said by many to have been the Germanus who was appointed by St. Patrick to be the first bishop of Ma, as related by Joceline. His consecrations is assigned to the year 447, and he is still reckoned patron of the ruined church within the precincts of Peel Castle, in the parish of St. German, Isle of Man. His ancient feast in Ma was July 3. (Colgan, Acta SS. 59, cc. 1, 2, 60, n. 5; and Tr. Thas. 86, c. 92, 98, c. 132, 113, n. 103; Ussher, Brit. Eccl. Ant. vi. 181, Ind. Chron. A.D. 474; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 204, n. 6; 307; Keith, Cat. Scott. Bp. 295.)  

[O. G.]  

GERMANUS (11), bishop of Rouen, at the first council of Tours, A.D. 451. (Man. vii. 947; Gall. Christ. xi. 6.)  

[R. T. S.]  

GERMANUS (12), bishop of Peradam in Byzanada, present at the convention of bishops, A.D. 484, and said to have been scourged in order of Hunneric. (Vit. Vis. Not. 51; De Pers. Vind. 11. 18, v. 1; Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 244.)  

[R. S. G.]  

GERMANUS (13), bishop of Fissanus (Pesaro) c. A.D. 497. He was sent on a mission to Constantinople, together with Creconius, bishop of Tod, by pope Anastasius ii. (Man. viii. 189 d; Ugellii, ItaL Secr. ii. 948; Cappelletti, De Chiese d'It. iii. 341; Jaffe, Regest. Pont. p. 61; Ceillier, Autres Sav. i. 515.)  

[R. S. G.]  

GERMANUS (14), bishop of Verona, probably towards the end of the 5th century. (Cappelletti, De Chiese d'It. x. 747, 813; Biancolini, Vescovi di Verona, p. i. 26, ii. 3.)  

[R. S. G.]  

GERMANUS (15), third bishop of the Verno- mandii (Vermandosia) before the 6th century. The seat of the bishopric was afterwards fixed at Noyon. (Gall. Christ. ix. 979.)  

[R. T. S.]  

GERMANUS (16), bishop of Capua, seat with other legates in 519 to Constantinople by pope Hormisdas. They were instructed to hold communion with no one who would not sign the Lbelius, which contained the condemnation of the patriarch Acacius and his successors, Euphemius and Macedonianus, on the ground of their unorthodoxy in the matter of Monophysitism. The legates were received with great honour in Constantinople. Hormisdas wrote several letters to Germanus and his companions (Jaffé, Regest. Pont. 67–69; Man. viii. 442, seq.). Gregory the Great relates that St. Benedict saw the soul of
GERMANUS OF PARIS


GERMANUS (18) (GERMAIN), ST., 20th bishop of Paris, born at Autun of parents of rank named Eleutherius and Eusebia (c. a.d. 496). He was sent to school at Avallon, between Autun and Auxerre, and next, to Lurs, near Vezelay, to the Loria, where he was well educated. In due time he was ordained deacon by St. Agrippinus, and three years later priest. He was next made abbot of the monastery of St. Symphorian at Autun, by Nectarius the bishop. Here his generosity to the poor was so great that he nearly starved his monks, whom he induced in rebellion. In 516, being present at Paris on some mission to Childerbert, when that see was vacant by the death of Eusebius, he was raised to the archbishopric. His great object seems to have been to check, as far as he was able, the unbridled licence of the Frank kings, and to ameliorate the misery produced by wars. In 517 he was present at the third council of Paris, at which the assembled prelates tried to devise some cure for the evils suffered by the church from the miseries and disturbances of the times. He appears to have exercised considerable influence over Childerbert, though the authenticity of the charter cannot be said to have that kind of sanctity to give to him and the Church of Paris the royal domain of Celles in the district of Melun. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Childerbert's edict against the pagan revelry with which holy days were celebrated was due to St. Germanus (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 1121). It was no doubt, too, that his advice that Childerbert should call the church of St. Vincent to receive the stole of that martyr which he had brought from Spain. (See the charter given by Almoine, de Gest. Franc. ii. 20, ed. Jac. du Brevi, Paris, 1802, and cf. the Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 270.) This church was said to have been consecrated by St. Germanus. Childerbert died on Dec. 23, 538). Childerbert's successor Clothaire was, according to Venantius Fortunatus, at first not equally amenable, but a sickness changed his disposition. It was to St. Germanus that Eadegund in 539 wrote Sacraentales Litteras, conveying him to intercede for her with the king, who was on his way to take her by force from her husband Tarsi. This king himself in tears at Clothaire's feet before the shrine of St. Martin of Tours, the archbishop induced him to forego his resolve and ask the queen's pardon. In 566, at the second Council of Tours, he was one of the seven prelates who signed the letter to Eadegund sanctioning rules for her monas- teries; he consecrated Agnes in 570, and in 588 Charibert was excommunicated by him for sacrilege. In 573 St. Germanus was present at the fourth Council of Paris, at which Promotus was deposed, and he subscribed the letter addressed by the council to Sigebert, with special words of entreaty of his own. In 575 when Sigebert was preparing to crush his brother Chilperic, and for this purpose summoned to his standard the barbarians from across the Rhine, Germanus appealed in a letter to queen Brunichilde to avert the destruction which was impending over the country (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 77; cf. Cellier, xi. 307), and when Sigebert arrived in Paris on his way to besiege Chilperic in Tournay, St. Germanus met him and prophesied his death if he persisted in seeking his brother's destruction. The assassins of Fredegund soon after verified the prediction. Germanus himself survived but a short time, dying the 28th of May. The year is given as 577, but the Leiria, where he was buried in an oratorium near the vestibule of the church of St. Vincent, and a metrical epitaph, ascribed to Chilperic, but not perhaps his unaided composition, was placed above his remains. (Almoine, lit. 10; Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. 445, Paris, 1668-1701; Gall. Christ. vii. 20.)

In some of the Mss. of Aimoin (de Gest. Franc. iii. 9, Bouquet. iii. 69, n.) there is a story, apparently without foundation, that he made a pilgrimage to the holy places at Jerusalem, and on his return visited Justinian at Constantinople, whose presence gave him relief, but gladly accepted some relics for his church of St. Vincent. This story is repeated in the Chronique de St. Denis (liv. iii. 2, Bouquet, iii. 210-211).

In the 7th century his tomb was enriched and ornamented by St. Eligius of Noyon (Audoenus, Vita S. Eligii, i. 32, ed. Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 504), and in a.d. 754 the body was removed with great ceremony by Lantredus, abbot of St. Vincent, from the oratory into the church itself, in the presence of Pippin and his son, Charles the Great, then a child. This church henceforth was called after him (St. German des Prés).

Besides the letter to Brunichilde above mentioned, there is extant by St. Germanus a treatise on the mass, or exposition of the old Gallic Liturgy (Patr. Lat. lxxii. 89; cf. Cellier, xi. 308 seq., for the reasons for ascribing to it). It was first published by Martene and Durand (Theaurus Anecdotorum, v. 91). For a description and criticism of its contents see Cellier ut supr. and the Historia ecclesiastica, iii. (ed. de C. Clarmont) 43. Among its writings is also generally counted the privilege which he granted to his monastery exempting it from all episcopal jurisdiction (c. 565). This document is mentioned by Gisleman, who lived in the 9th century (Vita S. Doctoreci, Bouquet, iii. 430), and given in full by Almoine (de Gest. Franc. iii. 2, pp. 75-8, ed. Jacob du Brevi, Paris, 1608). His authenticity has not vehemently attacked and defended (see Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 81 n. and the authorities there referred to). St. Germanus's life was written by Venantius Fortunatus, his contemporary and friend, but the work is infected with the worst faults of the age, and is, in fact, little else than a string of anecdotes, to be found in Mabillon's Acts SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. 244-245, Paris, 1668-1701. Besides, and more important than it are the scattered notices in Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. 26, 42, 52; v. 8; ix. 39; De Glor. Conf. lxxx.; Venant. Fort. Misc. ii. 13 in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 102; Gesu Reg. Franc. c. xxvii.; Almoine, Hist. Franc. t. 16; Vita S. Doctoreci in Bouquet, iii. 437-8; Vita S.
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Radegundis, sanct. Baudonivis. ii. 6 in Bouquet, ill. 457. See also Boll. Acta SS. Mai. vi. 774 seqq.; Gall. Chr. viii. 18-21; Mansi, ix. 747, 805, 867, 869. For his translation see Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti. sac. ii. pars 2, 94-104; and for the monastery the Dissertation of Runnaitius, in Bouquet, ii. 722. [S. A. B.]

GERMANUS (19), bishop of Damascus, and metropolitan of the province Phoenicia Secunda. He is mentioned by theophylactus Simocatta (lib. ii. cap. 1, 2), as having lived in the time of the emperor Mauricius. He was invited to the camp of Priscus, to perform the ceremonies and services proper to Passion week and Easter, in order to calm a rebellion among the soldiers. (Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii. 883. The account given by Theophanes varies considerably, but it is less trustworthy than that of Theophylact.)

[J. de S.]

GERMANUS (20), bishop of Syracuse, c. 609. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xxi. 619.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GERMANUS (21), a bishop of Bologna. He is said to have succeeded Petrus, who was living A.D. 616, and to have been followed by Constantianus, but his exact date, if not his existence, is very uncertain. (Alidossi, Pont. Bologn. p. 4; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, iii. 470; Ital. Sacr. ii. 11.)

[R. S. G.]

GERMANUS (22), bishop of Dumium in 633. He signs the fourth council of Toledo (A.D. 633) 27th out of 63. (Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 385; Esp. Sacr. xviii. 39.) [S. MARTIN.]

[ M. A. W.]

GERMANUS (23), bishop of Ciumutubium in Africa (in what province is uncertain), at the council held in proconsular Africa A.D. 646. (Mansi, x. 940 c; Mercelli, Afr. Crist. i. 144.) It has been suggested that the name of the town may be a corruption of civ. m. Tuburium, i.e. civitas major or minor) Tuburbi (Victor Vitensis, p. 15, vidi. Patr. Lat. xviii. note 52, 291 b).

[R. S. G.]

GERMANUS (24), bishop of Umana (Numana) near Ancona, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649, which condemned the heresy of the Monothelites. (Mansi, x. 866, 1163; Hefele, § 307.) [A. H. D. A.]

GERMANUS (25), bishop of Tarentum, signed the second letter of pope Agatho, which was sent in 680, after a synod in Rome, to the third council of Constantinople. (Mansi, x. 299.) [A. H. D. A.]

GERMANUS (26), 49th bishop of Constantinople, and patriarch, between John VI. the heretic and Anastasius I. (Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 235). He was born of a noble family, about 635, in the days of the emperor Heraclius. His father, Justianin, was a Patricius, who held many of the highest offices of state, but having become involved in a scheme against the succession of Constantine Pogonatus, was executed with the other conspirators. Germanus was on the same occasion castrated for his violent conduct (Theoph. Chrony. p. 293, sub anno mundi 6160). This was about 668, so that if Germanus was born in 635 he must have been over thirty years of age. By 680 he had risen to a leading position, for it is stated in a subsequent letter of pope Gregory II. to Leo the Isaurian that the sixth general council in that year originated in the zealous efforts of Germanus. (Migne, Pat. Lat. ixxxix. 517 n.)

The date of his appointment to the see of Cyrus is not known; but we learn from Theophanes (Chrony. A.D. 704, p. 320 in Pat. Gr. civiii. 771), and from Nicephorus the patriarch (De Reb. post Maur., p. 54, in Pat. Gr. c. 951) that he was bishop there in the reign of Phili-picus, who was emperor from Dec. 711 to Jan. 713. He is said by Theophanes and Nicephorus to have written at this time against the 5th General Council, and to have helped Philippius in his efforts for the Monothelites. But from the letter of Gregory just referred to, and from the further testimony borne to Germanus at the second council of Nicaea in 787 (Mansi, xiii. 718 n) this accusation is scarcely probable, and it is likely that the story which reached Theophanes and Nicephorus arose among Isaurian opponents.

On June 4, 713, the Catholic Artemius or Anastasius II. received the crown of the East. In his second year, 715, August 11, he held a synod, and procured the deposition of the heterodox patriarch John VI., and the translation of the bishop of Cyrus. Germanus must have been at this time eighty years old. How Stephanus junior, then an unborn child, through the eagerness of his mother obtained the patriarch's blessing at the ceremony of his enthronization in the great church will be related in the life of Stephanus.

Germanus signified his first year of office by holding a synod of a hundred bishops, in which he anathematized his predecessors Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, Paul, and John, and declared for the Two Willis and Two Operations. He thus avowed himself on the side of complete orthodoxy. This Council is said to have been held during the first siege of Constantinople by the Saracens. (Mansi, xiii. 258) it was to the latter that the row began at the end of 715 or the beginning of 716.

About Jan. 716 Anastasius was dethroned by Theodorus IV., the Adramyttian. Germanus was sent with other friends of the fallen emperor to Nicaea to acquaint him with the events of the capital and the hopelessness of his case (Theoph. 325; Niceph. 58), but does not seem to have otherwise suffered by this revolution. The rule of Theodosius, who shewed himself a zealous Catholic, terminated in March 717. The chronology of these few ephemeral reigns is obscure, and we have followed Pagi who has investigated it. (Baron. ann. 714; Fagi, l-rr.)

On March 25, 717, Germanus crowned Leo the Isaurian. The ceremony was performed with the customary honours of an orthodox prince, on the demand of the new emperor himself. Leo swore that he would keep the Catholic faith undefiled in all things, and wrote to pope Gregory II. asking for communion. Germanus also wrote to the pope, assuring him of the truth of the professions of Leonid. The early years of the reign of Leo were disturbed by another siege of Constantinople by the Saracens. It is spoken of by Bede, Paul the Deacon, and Anastasius, and appears to have lasted more than a year. Three hundred thousand persons are said to have died of the plague that
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January, 730, Leo summoned an assembly at his palace, determined to make a new effort to give the patriarch a new robe. The old man was still living, and the contest took off his pontifical robe, and concluded a long speech with these words: "If I am a fool, I throw myself into the sea; apart from a general council, sire, I can make no change in the faith." He retired to an estate of his family, and lived the rest of his life in prayer and silence. He was ninety-five years old at the time of his abdication, and lived rather more than three years afterwards, dying on May 12, 733.

The earliest biographical account of Germanus is a short notice in Basil's "Memoirs" under May 12, on which day he was consecrated bishop. The letters of pope Gregory II. to his contemporaries contain a few interesting passages relating to him. From these sources, and from other later writers, a memoir of the patriarch was drawn up by Hesychius (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. iii. 155). Fabricius (Bll. Gr. xi. 155) gives a list of his works, which were printed with annotations by Migne, and placed with the Vetus by Hesychius in vol. xxiii. of the "Patrol. Grac.

Besides the three letters already mentioned, "A Letter from the Greeks to the Armenians in Defence of the Decrees of the Council of Chalcedon" is attributed with plausibility to Germanus. The "Treatise on the Limit of Life" by Photius (cod. 723) has been reprinted. It defends Gregory of Nyssa from those who imputed to him the doctrines of Origen. "History of the Holy Councils and of the Heresies since the Departure of the Apostles." [HERESIOLOGIST.] This is not to be confounded with a "Treatise on the Six General Councils," edited without a name by Justellus, Harduin, and Galland, and occasionally attributed to Germanus. Another work attributed by Cardinal Mai to Germanus, according to the authority of a very old MS. in the Vatican, is a "Discourse on the Limit of Life," among the questions of Photius to Ambrose. This work sets the fathers on an equality with the Apostles, especially Basil, Gregory the Theologian, and Athanasius.

The mystical treatise on the Mysteries of the Liturgy is thought to be more safely attributed to Germanus II. Patriarch in the 13th century. But there is no reason why the "Sermon and Hymns on the Virgin, the Presentation, the Worship of the True Cross," and others usually given among the works of Germanus I., should not be his. [W. M. S.]

GERMANUS (27)—July 7. Martyr under Trajan. Seeing a martyr, Astus, smeared with honey and stung by wasps, Germanus blessed him, for which act he was arrested with six others, and executed. (Baa. Menel.) [G. T. S.]

GERMANUS, presbyter of Antioc. [GERM NUS (1).]


GERMANUS (29), martyr at Gerona with Paulinus, Justus, and Scicius, during Diocletian's persecution. Germanus and Paulinus are said to
have been brothers, and first cousins of Justus and Sciusus, who were also brothers. They all were stone-cutter and were put to death by Rufinus, the deputy of Dacianus, the praezes of Spain, for refusing to make images of heathen gods. On the taking of Gerona by Charlemagne their bodies were found in the church outside the walls then dedicated to the Virgin, but afterwards to St. Felix, and were translated to the cathedral. Amaldus, canon, and afterwards bishop of Gerona from about A.D. 1198 to A.D. 1216, removed their remains to a chapel he founded in their honour. The only source of our information about these saints is an apocryphal life, said to have been procured at Rome by the above-mentioned Remaelus. This life is considered by the Bollandists editors to be the work of some forger, who imposed upon the simplicity of the good canon. The names of Dacianus and Rufinus were well-known, and the part they had played in Dacielian’s persecution, and the fact that the saints in question were four in number, suggested to the compiler of the “Quatuor Coronati” the circumstances of their having been sculptors, and having suffered martyrdom for refusing to make images of heathen gods. The same editors doubted whether they should include these Acta in the A.A. SS., but finally decided to do so, and leave the reader’s judgment. These saints are commemorated on June 8. (Bell. A.A. SS. June, ii. 58; J. T. Salazar, Mart. Bisp. iii. 463; Esp. Sagra. xiii. 272.)

GERMANUS (30)—Oct. 23. A martyr in Spain with Servandus, under the president Victor, during the Dacielian persecution. Germanus was buried at Emerita (Merida) near St. Eulalia. (Mart. Rom. Vet., Adon., Usuard.)

GERMANUS (31)—Nov. 13. A martyr in Palestine with Antonius and Zebias, A.D. 308. (Ensebis, do Mart. Palæst. c. 9; Bas. Mem. i. 196.)

GERMANUS (32), a presbyter of Constanti- nople, one of Chrysostom’s most faithful adherents. He was one of the deputation who conveyed to the council of the Oak the reply of Chrysostom himself and that of the assembled bishops. (Pallae Dico, pp. 12, 17.) After the confabulation of the cathedral, he with Cassian the deacon, as custodians of the treasury, drew up an inventory of the goods of the church Chrysostom had been accused of confiscating. In A.D. 405 he and Cassian were the bearers of a letter to pope Innocent from the clergy and laity of Constantinople describing the violent deposition and expulsion of Chrysostom and the persecutions to which his friends were still exposed (6. p. 27; Soz., H. E. viii. 26; Innoc. Pap. Epp. 7, 10, in Pat. Lat. xx. 501 note τ, 512; Chrysostom’s first ep. to Innocent, § 2, in Pat. Gr. lii. 531). He was a very intimate friend and probably a relation of Cassian, whom he accompanied in his travels in Egypt and elsewhere. So great was their attachment to one another that they were said to have one soul in two bodies. Germanus’s name frequently occurs in the Conference of Cassian. ( Canon. Cassian. Colot. var. loc. esp. i.

1, 9, where see notes by Gazarus, in Pat. Lat. xii. 485, 489; Cellier, viii. 147, etc.)

[ E. V. and I. G. S.]

GERMANUS (33), April 29, presbyter; martyr at Alexandria. (Wright, Syn. Martyr. in Journ. Soc. Lat. 1869, 428.)

[ G. T. S.]

GERMANUS (34), deacon, who with Memnon, the keeper of the sacred vessels, and the priest Epiphanius, was sent by the council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, to convey their third citation to Eutyches to appear before the council. (Manas vi. 496 n.)

[ F. D.]

GERMANUS (35), presbyter and archimandrite of Constantinople, who subscribed by the hand of the deacon Glycerius the deposition of Eutyches, at the council of Constantinople in A.D. 449 (Labbe, iv. 232). He appears also among the orthodox archimandrites, who appealed to the emperor Marcian against the Eutychians in A.D. 451. (Faustus (28)) [C. G.]

GERMANUS (36), brother of St. Gibrinus, a Scot, one of the many Christian teachers attracted to Rheims by the fame of St. Remigius, the bishop. Colgan says he flourished in the year 509. (Colgan, Acta SS. 232 n. 4, 271, c. 1; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Fr. ii. c. 16, § 15; Dempster, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 301, 303.)

[ G. J.]

GERMANUS (37), nephew of the emperor Justinian I., and addressed as “vir illustrius- mus” during the lifetime of Justinus I. by pope Hormidas, when he wrote to him in A.D. 519, and recommended to his good offices three papal legates, the bishops Helias, Thomas, and Nicestratus (Manas, Conc. viii. 473-4, c. 69, 61). But he appears to have been little mixed up with the church’s history.

[ J. G.]

GERMANUS (Reeves, St. Adamnan, 137), teacher of St. Columba. [GERMANUS] [J. G.]

GERMANUS (38), prior of Westminster. He is said, in the legendary history of Westminster, to have consecrated Oxford, the first abbot, and to have held the title of prior, in the year 616 (Sporley, MS. Hist. West. Mon. Angl. i. 266). The whole list of these early abbots is mere fabrication.

[ G. S.]

GERMANUS (39), abbot of Grandivalle or Münsterthal in Alsace, and martyr, in the 7th century. He was a native of Treves, where his father Optarus was of senatorial rank. In his youth he was educated by Modoaldus, bishop of Treves (cir. 622). When grown up he distributed his property to the poor and sought the monk araulphus, then living as a hermit in the desert of Horenbeg, who gave him the tonsure and sent him to the monastery of St. Romaric, then called Castellum and afterwards Herrnberg on the summit of the mountains. After residing here for a time he went in company with a Burgundian named Chuanes to the monastery of Luzovium (Luselui) in the Vosges mountains, where Waldebert was then abbot. Waldebert having built a monastery upon an estate which he named Sadius, he accompanied in a first visit to the bishop of Alsace, placed Germanus over it. After a time Gudonisus was succeeded in his honours by Bonifacius or Cathicus, who opposed the monastery, devastated its lands, and ill-used the tenantry. Germanus renounced, for which
GERMARUS, abbat. [GERMARUS.]

GERMERIUS, ST., May 16, eighth in the list of the bishops of Toulouse, succeeding Herclianus, and followed by Magnalius, early in the 6th century. According to the apocryphal Acta, purporting to be by Pictorius, his contemporary and comrade, he was born at Aquigluina, or, according to another reading, Jerusalem. Upon the conquest of Toulouse by Clovis, in 507 or 508, and consequent establishment of the orthodox faith, he settled in that city, and was ordained subdeacon, and deacon, by Gregory, bishop of Saintes, and finally consecrated bishop of the diocese by Tornaldus, with the approbation of Clovis, signed by an invitation to his palace and gifts to the church of Toulouse. Upon his death, after fifty years passed in the episcopate, he was buried at Doz, where a monastery was afterwards built and called his name. His remains were said to have been in later times translated to the church of St. James, at Murellum, or Muretum, on the Garonne. (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. iii. 591; Gall. Christ. xiii. 7.) [S. A. B.]

GERMINATOR. [GENIALIS.]

GERMINIUS (1), bishop of Cyrus, the metropolis of the Hellespontine province, who was translated to Sirmium in Pannonia by the emperor Constantius, A.D. 356 (Athan. H. Arian. 307). He belonged to the Arian party, and was the joint composer with Valens, Mark of Antioch, and George of Alexandria of the third Sirmian creed, drawn up in his episcopal city, sometimes called the "dated creed" because its heading recites the consuls for the year and the day of the month, May 22, 359, which provoked the sarcasm of Athanasius (de Synod. 8). At the council of Ariminum, in the same year, his creed was produced and read, but was indignantly rejected by the supporters of the Arian faith, who deposed Germinius along with the other leaders of the Arians and semi-Arians, declaring them enemies and disturbers of the church, and wrote a letter to Constantius telling him what they had done. (Socrates, H. E. ii. 37; Soz. H. E. iv. 15; Le Quen, O. C. l. 740.) [L. D.]

GERMINIUS (2). The eighteenth sermon of St. Gaudensius bishop of Brescia, according to the common reading, is addressed to a person of this name, and this is the reading adopted by Ceillier (Auteurs sacrés, viii. 41). Migne’s editions (Patr. Lat. xx. 971) prefers the reading Germignus, and mentions that one MS. reads Hermigius. Gaudensius praises him as a person who was well acquainted both with profane and sacred learning. The subject of the letter is an explanation of the parable of the Unjust Steward, which Germinius had requested Gaudensius to give him, as he had been unable to find an satisfactory interpretation of it. The precise date of Gaudensius’s episcopate is uncertain, but it is probable that it extended from about A.D. 386 to A.D. 410. [F. D.]

GERMOCHUS, ST., an Irish chief who accompanied St. Brecan (Vol. I. p. 333) to Cornwall in the middle of the 5th century. The parish of Germoe is next to Breage, and they are united parishes. There is a holy well in the parish, and a building called king Germoe’s throne, which may have taken the place of an earlier one. William of Worcester gives St. Germoe’s day as June 24 (p. 107, ed. Nasmith). [C. W. B.]

GEROBOLDUS. [GORALDUS.]

GEROBOCH succeeded St. Willibald as bishop of Eichštät in A.D. 786. He is said to have given to his cathedral a golden chalice and a jewelled case of gold for keeping the Gospels in. The date of his death is given as Feb. 2, A.D. 801. Popov however (Anfang des Christenthumes in Süd Deutschland, 225) points out that the dates of the five bishops who followed St. Willibald are doubtful. The Liber Pontificalis of Gundecar, the source of the early history of the diocese of Eichštät, states their episcopates lasted one hundred years, and later writers divided this period into five nearly equal parts, assigning one to each bishop, and it is in this way the date of A.D. 801 for Geroch’s death is arrived at. (Battistini, 200th. Suppl. p. 311; Pertsch, Monumenta Germaniae, lxx. 243, 256.) [F. D.]

GERODULDUS, forthieth bishop of Mentz, succeeding Richbertus or Rigobertus. According to a quotation in the Gall. Christ. from Mersseus, he was a man of wisdom and capacity, able in the transaction of business, but civil rather than ecclesiastical, of distinguished personal appearance, undaunted courage, and great magnanimity, but fonder of the life of courts than of the services of the church, for which he cared little or not at all. He was killed in battle by the Saxons in one of Charlemag’s campaigns (A.D. 745), and was succeeded by his son Gewiulph, who avenged his father’s death and was deposed at the second council of Germany. [GWELIUSCH.] (S. Bonifaci Vita, lib. i. cap. 37; Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxix. 652; Gall. Christ. v. 437.) In the Gallia Christiana he also appears among the bishops of Worms (v. 663). [S. A. B.]

GERONCIUS (THERONCIUS), bishop of Assio (Medina Sidonia, or Xerze de la Fontera (Esp. Supr. x. 15, Cortes y Lopez, Diez Geogr. Hist. de la España Antigua), from about A.D. 690 onwards. He subscribed the acts of the sixteenth Council of Toledo, A.D. 693. (Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 333; Esp. Supr. x. 60.) [ROFINUS] [M. A. W.]

GERONTIUS. See also GERONTUS.

GERONTIUS (1) (LEONTIUS), bishop of Larissa in Syria Secunda, south of Apamea. He was one of the fifteen bishops who took part in the synod of Neo-Caesarea, c. A.D. 315, held shortly after that of Anery, and attended by nearly the same persons. Considerable doubts have been cast upon the real date, and even the existence, of this synod; however, the record in the Liber Simudicus (Mansi, i. 551) contains several important differences. (Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. 210; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacrés, ii. 640; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 917.) He subscribed also, according to some MSS., the caunus of the council of Nice in A.D. 325.
GERONTIUS (3), bishop of Come-Chartan (Charra) in the province of Phoenicia Secunda, north-east of Damascus. He was one of the bishops who attended the first general council at Nicaea, A.D. 325. (Mansi, ii. 694; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 849.) [J. de S.]

GERONTIUS of Barium. [CERVASYUS (3)-]

GERONTIUS (3), bishop of Raphanae in Syria Secunda, south of Apamea. His name appears among the signatures at the synod of Philippopolis, A.D. 344, where his see is written erroneously “Lampania.” (Mansi, iii. 139; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 921.) [J. de S.]

GERONTIUS (4). Amongst the subscriptions to the canons of the Sardican council, 347, is found “Gerontius a Macedonia de Brebi,” and “de Brevi,” corrupt readings that, in all probability, should be altered to Beryhooē, or perhaps it should stand Doberu. Doberus was a town in Macedonia, of which two bishops are mentioned. (Mansi, iii. 39, 41; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. ii. 77; Tillemont, Mem. Excl. vol. vii. “St. Athanasius,” note 50; Gams, Series Episc. 429.) [L. D.]

GERONTIUS (5), bishop of Tomi, or Constantinople (the modern Kustendji), in Scythia Minor, present at the council of Constantinople, 381 (Mansi, iii. 572); in the law of Theodosius, issued to Auzonius, proconsul of Asia, he is called Terentius bishop of Scythia. (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 1213.) [L. D.]

GERONTIUS (6), bishop of Claudiopolis, the metropolis of the province of Honoria, present at the synod at Constantinople under Nectarius, A.D. 394. (Mansi, iii. 852; Le Quen, Or. C. i. 509.) [L. D.]

GERONTIUS (7), bishop of Nicomedia, metropolitan of Bithynia, “a singular specimen of an ecclesiastical adventurer.” He had been a deacon at Milan during the episcopate of Ambrose, whose grave displeasure he incurred by publishing a ridiculous story of an Empusa, or spectre with asses’ legs (Deoraez). Air, by which he asserted he had been attacked by night. Gerontius set at nought Ambrose’s injunction to remain in seclusion for a year and pass his time in penitence, and repaired to Constantinople, where his skill in medicine, aided by a plausible address and popular manners, gained him favour with persons of power at the imperial court, through whose instrumentality he obtained the metropolitan see of Nicomedia. He was consecrated by Helladius, bishop of Caesarae, and exarch of Poitou, for whose son Gerontius’ court influence had procured a high appointment in the army. Ambrose, on hearing of Geroatius’ elevation to the episcopate, wrote to Nectarius, the bishop of Constantinople, demanding his deposition. The new bishop, however, had speedily managed to ingratiate himself so completely with the people of Nicomedia that the intelligence of Ambrose’s requisition aroused a vehement opposition, which the gentle Nectarius wanted spirit to resist. Chrysostom, however, on being invested with power, speedily employed it to rid the church of so great a scandal. Gerontius was deposed, and Panasiphoni, formerly tutor to the empress Eudoxia, was consecrated in his room. The loss of their favourite bishop gave great umbrage to the Nicomediants. They rose in open sedition, and exiled both in public and private the excellences of Gerontius, and the benefits both rich and poor had derived from his medical skill. Both at Nicomedia and also at Constantinople, to which they sent deputations, the people paraded the streets singing litanies, as in the time of some great public calamity. Chrysostom stood firm, and compelled Gerontius to retire. The Nicomediants parted from him with great reluctance, and showed the utmost aversion to his pious and gentle successor. The deposition of Gerontius was one of the charges brought against Chrysostom at the council of the Oak. (Soz. E. E. viii. 8; Photius, Cod. 59, p. 60; Le Quen, Or. C. i. 888.) [E. V.]

GERONTIUS (8), a Macedonian bishop. Two letters of Pope Innocent I. are addressed to him. The first, in twenty-two other bishops acting along with him, is dated Dec. 13, A.D. 414, and is in reply to letters sent by the bishops to the pope by the archdeacon Vitalis. The questions it chiefly deals with are whether the clergy might marry widows; whether if a man whose wife had died before he had been baptized had married again, he should be considered to have married twice; and how those ordained by heretics, and especially by Bonosus, were to be treated? The second is addressed to him with six “episcopis per Macedoniam constituimus,” and relates to the case of Dabalius and Taurianus, who had been condemned by the Macedonian bishops. (S. Inuocell. Epist. 15 and 18, in Migne, Patr. Lat. xx. 596, 557; Collisius, Histoire des Aut. sacr. vii. 574.) [BONOSUS.] Gerontius is one of the ten orthodox bishops of Macedonia to whom, with Anysius, a letter of Chrysostom is addressed. (Chrys. Epist. 163, in Migne, Patr. Græc. iii. 706.) [ANYSIUS.] [F. D.]

GERONTIUS (9), bishop of Claudiopolis in Iauria, on the Calycadus. He was present at the first meeting of the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and signed the protest against the condemnation of Nestorius. His epistles to the bishop of the church of John of Antioch. (Mansi, iv. 1270; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 1027.) [J. de S.]

GERONTIUS (10), bishop of Basilinopolis in Bithynia, present at the synod held at Constantinople by Flavian, A.D. 448 (Mansi, vi. 757), and also at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; he is probably the bishop referred to by Anastasius of Nicæa at the 13th session as having been consecrated by his predecessor at Nicæa, and so claimed as his suffragan. (Mansi, vii. 305; Le Quen, Or. C. i. 825.) [L. D.]

GERONTIUS (11), bishop of Seleucia Pieris in Syria, present at the Ephesine Latrocinium, A.D. 449, and two years later at the council of Chalcedon. He also signed the catholic epistle of his province addressed to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458, referring to the murder of Proterius at Antioch, and also the encyclical of Gennadius against the simoniacs. (Mansi, vi. 914; Patrof. Gr. Ixxvi. 1620; Le Quen, Or. Christ. ii. 773.) [J. de S.]
GERONTIUS (12), bishop of Arcadiopolis, a town unknown in the province of Asia; at the sixth session of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, his name was subscribed in his absence to the definition of the faith by Hesperius of Pitane at the instance of Stephen of Ephesus. (Mansi, viii. 168; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 711.) [L. D.]

GERONTIUS (13), bishop of Milan, probably c. A.D. 465. He succeeded Eusebius, and was followed by Benignus, but the dates are not precisely ascertained. Gerontius being placed by different authorities at various periods between A.D. 462 and 478. (UgHELLI, Ital. Sacr. iv. 73; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 110.)

[ R. S. G.]

GERONTIUS, bishop of Camerino. (Hierontius.) [ R. S. G.]

GERONTIUS (14), bishop of Fidenae, present at the third Roman synod under pope Symmachus, Oct. 501, according to the reckoning of Dahn (Die Könige der Germanen, iii. 209), who accepts with a slight alteration the arrangement of Hefele, § 220. (Mansi, viii. 252.)

[ A. H. D. A.]


GERONTIUS of Bologna. (Gerardus.)

GERONTIUS (16), a bishop to whom Eudocius, bishop of Pavia, from A.D. 511 to A.D. 521, addresses a poem (Emnod. Carm. lib. ii. 85, in Migne, Patr. Lat. ixii. 350). In it he praises Gerontius, saying that his predecessor had no reason to fear death when he knew he would have such a successor. [F. D.]

GERONTIUS (17), a presbyter living as a solitary, whom in 405 Chrysostom prevailed upon to undertake missionary work among the pagan inhabitants of Phoenicia. He was anxious to visit Chrysostom at Cucusus on the way to the scenes of his labours; but Chrysostom advised him to return straight to Phoenicia as he had already lost time by illness, and he might be detained by winter which was approaching. It is evident that Gerontius was relinquishing his life of solitary contemplation with a reluctance which Chrysostom endeavoured to overcome by urging upon his greater glory and higher reward of the active exertions for the souls of others on which he was about to enter. Constans, he informed him, had orders to supply him with necessary funds for building, and the relief of those in want, and he urged instant despatch. (Chrysost. Epist. 53, 54.) [E. V.]

GERONTIUS (18), priest of Constantinople, deposed in company with Cepodius (q. v.), as a Eutychian heretic, by the archbishop Anastolius in A.D. 451 (Labbé, iv. 522 D). Some one of the same name appears among the Eutychians, headed by Charous, who, claiming to be archimandrites, appealed to the emperor Marcian in the same year asking for a general council (Labbé, iv. 524). The orthodox archimandrites however in the council of Chalcedon did not recognise this Gerontius whether as archimandrite or as anything else, stating Ἐπίσκοπον οἴκεων ἄνθρωπος. (Labbé, iv. 518.) [C. G.]

GERONTIUS (19), bearer of two letters from Julian bishop of Cos to pope Leo (Leo Mag. Ep. 140, 1295; 141, 1296, Migne) in the end of A.D. 454, or the beginning of 455; also carried letters from Leo the pope in September 457 to the emperor Leo (Ep. 148 of Ep. 158, 1328) and at the same time to Julian and to Actius, presbyter of Constantinople (Ep. 152, 158; 1314, 1315). [C. G.]

GERONTIUS (20), archimandrite, to whom Theodoret wrote, thanking him for his letters which expressed the piety of his soul, and his active services on his behalf, and asking for his prayers. (Theodoret, Epist. 50.) [E. V.]

GERONTIUS (21), archimandrite of Palestine towards the middle of the 5th century, successor of Melania in the government of her convent at Jerusalem, which he held for 45 years. He was a resolute Eutychian, and attached himself to Theodosius the intruding bishop of Jerusalem, refusing to communicate with Juvenal the legitimate prelate. He was sent by Theodosius, together with Elpidius another archimandrite, to Euthymius the celebrated solitary, to keep him to his conference without the view of settling their doctrinal differences. This invitation was indignantly rejected by the aged anchorot, whose words convinced Elpidius of his errors, but failed to have any effect on Gerontius (Cyrill. Scytoph. Vit. S. Euthym. §§ 74, 75). He was equally deaf to the exhortations of the emperor Eudocia, who, after an interview with Euthymius, had renounced the doctrines of Eutyches, and by her conversion had led many to adopt the Catholic faith (ibid. 86). When the rest of the schismatic monks (aposchistae) had been prevailed upon by Martyrius, soon after his accession to the episcopal throne, A.D. 476, to return to the unity of the church, Gerontius and Romanus of Thessalonica alone remained obstinate. For this they were expelled from their monasteries, and passed the remainder of their days as homeless wanderers in great misery (ibid. 124). [E. V.]

GERONTIUS (22), a turbulent Eutychian monk, whom the schismatic party at Jerusalem elected as their president (ἄρχων ἰδιός) after the flight of Theodosius the intruding bishop of that see, c. 476, who is stated to have been guilty of as many acts of violence and homicide as Theodosius himself (Cyrill. Scytoph. Vit. S. Euthym. § 113). He seems to be different from Gerontius, St. Melania's successor. (Cf. Tillemont, Mém. Eccl. vol. xvi.; Acace de C. P. a. i.) [E. V.]

GERONTIUS (23) (Geraint), son of Erbin, and king of Damnonia, killed A.D. 508 (or 530) at the battle of Lisnaborough, perhaps near Lym Regis, fighting against Cerdic. (Lappenberg, i. 108, transal.: Nash, Tabulæ, 328: Rees, Welsh Saints, 113, 169, 232.) He was possibly called a saint from his being killed in battle against the pagan Saxons. His pedigree is given under Constantinus, St., Vol. i. 660. The celebrated elegy on him is attributed to Llywarch Héva and he is the hero of the second Mabinogi, which Twsnon has followed in his idyll. [C. W. E.]

GERONTIUS (24) (Geraint), king of Cornwall, died A.D. 590 at Din-gerein, the round
fort existing in the parish of St. Gerrans, near St. Just in Roseland, east of Falmouth Harbour. (Leland, and Earle’s Saxon Chronicle, 290.) In the life of St. Teilo it is said that the saint on his way from Wales to Brittany, at the time of the yellow death, visited king Gerennius and promised to come back to him before his death, which was seven years and seven months afterwards. (Liber Landavensis, 102, 107.) The king was probably canonized by the popular voice. The feast day of this parish was on Aug. 10, and is now on the second Sunday in August. (Whitaker, Cathedral of Cornwall, i. 202, 293, 303; ii. 17.)

[C. W. B.]

GERONTIUS (25), the accuser of Lampetius. (Phoebius, Cod. 52.) [EUCHITIS.] [G. S.]

GERONTIUS (26), abbas, presiding over the monastery of St. Euthymius in Palestine, who related to John Moschus the following story. One day he was ascending the mountains on the other side of the Dead Sea, in company with two other anchorites, when they observed at a distance another anchoret walking on the shore. They saw some Saracens pass him, one of whom presently turned back and decapitated him. As Gerontius and his companions were deploiring the dead, they suddenly beheld a bird swoop down from the sky, carry the Saracen up in the air, let him drop, and kill him. (Joann. Mosch. Prat. Spirit. cap. 21, in Pat. Lat. lxxiv. 129.)

[C. H.]

GERRIG, Welsh saint. [Gerrig.]

GERTRUDIS (1), ST., first abbess of Nivelle in Brabant, daughter of Pippin of Landen, the first of the three Pippins, mayor of the palace under Clothaire II., Dagobert I., and Sigebert II. Landen, the home of the family and the birthplace of Gertrude, was about twenty miles west of Tongres and some forty miles north-east of Nivelle. Pippin and Ida of Montreuil, the daughter of Sigebert II., was honoured as saints, had three children: Grimoald who succeeded his father; St. Begga, mother of Pippin of Herstal and foundress of the monastery of Anden, and Gertrude, the youngest. Gertrude shewed her vocation to a religious and celibate life at a very early age, by her refusal, more decided than courteous, of an offer of marriage made to her by Dagobert I. on behalf of a young nobleman then present. This must have happened in 625. On the death of Pippin in 639 Ita, by the advice of the bishop St. Amandus, built a large double monastery at Nivias (Nivelle) on land belonging to herself and Gertrude. She made her daughter abbess, and passed the rest of her life as a nun under her rule, helping her with advice and sympathy. It was Gertrude's great delight to receive pilgrims and religious travellers, and entertain them hospitably; she often procured relics or sacred books by their means from Rome or elsewhere, or got them to teach her and her nuns hymns or portions of Scripture, of which she was so fond that she is said to have learnt nearly the whole of the Bible by heart in the course of her life. With the assistance of her mother, she gave an estate at Fosse or Mors les Fossez to the Irish monks, SS. Poilhan and Ultan, that they might build a monastery there, to be a perpetual place of reception for pilgrims and travellers journeying that way; she gave them all that was needful for the work, and when it was finished Ultan took the government of it, and Poilhan returned to Nivelle to teach psalmody to the nuns, and be useful to Gertrude in many ways. Twelve years after the death of Pippin, and five from the time that Gertrude became abbess, Iduberga died.

Gertrude then chose a few of the best qualified of her monks and nuns to help her in managing the affairs of the community. Nevertheless she soon found herself overburdened by the duties and responsibilities of her office. She was about the age of thirty when she resigned her post to her niece Wulfetrude, who was twenty, and had been brought up from childhood under the care of her saintly aunt and grandmother. She lived three years in increased asceticism and constant devotion, and died at the age of thirty-three, about 659 or 664; Barolius and Henoch of Gaul give the earlier date, May 11, and the latter. She is one of eleven holy women named Gertrudis venerated by the Benedictines as belonging to their order, four of whom lived in the 7th century, and one in the time of Charlemagne. She seems to have been regarded during her life as a person of supernatural power, and to have been worshipped as a saint very soon after her death; a church was dedicated in her name in the tenth generation by Agnes, third abbess of Nivelle, whom she had brought up with St. Wulfrude. All biographies of this saint are based on one by a contemporary monk, who had some of the facts from herself and the others from eyewitnesses. It is given in full by Malchion (A.A.S. 0.S.B. sac. ii. 464), part of it is in Bouquet (iii. 317, De Dagoberto). She is mentioned in the life of B. Pepin, the duke (Bouquet, ii. 803; A.A. SS. Holland, Feb. iii. 290; Duchesne, Script. i. 594). The accounts of her endowment of the Irish monks and of her death are given at considerable length in a letter of St. Gall (A.A. SS. Holland, Feb. iii. 290; Duchesne, Script. i. 118). She is also incidentally mentioned in most of the biographies and chronicles of her time collected by Bouquet, and generally with some epithet indicating her reputation for sanctity. Her name is in the martyrology of Bede, and in the matrical one attributed to him, and in the modern Roman Martyrology, on the 17th of March. She appears also in the martyrology of Usuard, and in the Additions to that of Ade.

She is patron saint of travellers, pilgrims, cats, of several towns in the Netherlands, against fever and against damage by rats and mice, especially the out of door sorts. She is represented with rats at her feet, or running up her pastoral staff, or on her dress. [A. B. C. D.]

GERTRUDIS (2), ST., abbess of Hamay. Her parentage is not recorded. By her husband Rigomar she became the mother of Gerberta, and perhaps also of Sigfrid. When a widow, Gertrude built the cathedral of Hereford, of which she was so fond that she is said to have learnt nearly the whole of the Bible by heart in the course of her life. With the assistance of her mother, she gave an estate at Fosse or Mors les Fossez to the Irish monks, SS. Poilhan and Ultan, that they might build a monastery there, on the Scarp, very near that of Marchienne, founded by Rictrude, the wife of her grandson Adalbald. She adopted her great-granddaughter Eusebia, daughter of Adalbald, and made her her heir and successor. St. Gertrude died about a.p. 649 or 655, and was honoured Dec. 6. The chief
GERTRUDIS

authority for her is the Life of St. Rictrude (Mabillon, Acta SS. O.S.B. ser. ii. 584, ed. 1689; Boll. Acta SS. 12 Mai. iii. pp. 87 c, 101 f, 154 b). [A. B. C. D.]

GERTRUDIS (3), virgin and martyr of Vandalusia (Vauzduzeliet) in the country afterwards called Lorraine. Her feast immediately followed Ascension Day. She was the daughter of a heathen prince of Brabant, and embraced Christianity without her father's knowledge. He wished to marry her to another pagan prince, but she refused, having determined upon a celibate life. She fled into the wilderness, but was followed and murdered by her brother at Belval. She is reputed to have been the niece of Gertrude, abbess of Nivelles (No. 1), and if so, she belongs to the 7th century; but there is not much reliance to be placed upon her Life. (Acta SS. Boll. Mai. vii. 515.) [G. T. S.]

GERTRUDIS (4), ST. (CÉBERTRUD, CÉBERTRUDE, GERBRITRIDE, GERBERITRIDE, TETTA), third abbess of the double monastery of Habend, afterwards Remiremont, in the 7th century, succeeding Goboberga. [GEOBERBAGA.] In Mabillon's Observations priorum de Vita St. Gertrudis de Nivello (Acta SS. O.S.B. ser. ii. 462, ed. 1669), the Gertrude of this article is called first abbess of Habend; but she was in fact third abbess, as appears from the Life of St. Amatus (Mab. ut supra, 129, 133), that of St. Romairic (p. 415 et seq.), and that of St. Adelpius (p. 602 et seq.). She succeeded St. Cecilia, otherwise Clara or Gogoberga, and was followed by St. Perpetua, according to Mabillon's Observations priorum to the Lives of St. Romairic and St. Adelpius. It is recorded of this abbess that she went out with candles, crosses, and music, at the head of a procession to meet the funeral of St. Adelpius, the third and contemporary abbat of the male side of the community, who had died at Luxeuil, but was brought back to be buried at Habend. [A. B. C. D.]

GERTRUDIS (5), ST., nun at Blangy in Artois, eldest of five daughters of Sigfrid son of Weis, father of Becs, founder and first abbess of Blangy. About a.d. 682, Ruodgiarius, a great man of the court, tried to impose on Gertrude's marrying him although she had taken the veil, and he refused to leave the monastery without seeing her. St. Bertha having allowed him to see her as she stood at the altar singing with the other nuns and dressed like them, told him that if he dared to carry off the bride of Christ he might do so. Ruodgiarius did not dare. The authority for this story is a Life of St. Bertha written in the 11th century, given at length in Boll. Acta SS. 4 Jul. ii. 52, the bulk of it being, as observed by Bouquet (Recueil, iii. 621) and Duchesne (Script. Franc. i. 605), silly and fabulous. [A. B. C. D.]

GERTRUDIS (6), ST., of Neustadt. There is a legend that Gertrude, alleged to have been a sister of Charlemagne, fled from his court to become a nun, and founded a church at Neustadt and a monastery at Carleburg, both near Würzburg in Franconia. The Bollandists, as Mabillon observes, leave no stone unturned to discover anything about this saint, but come to the conclusion that Charlemagne had no sister Gertrude, and that all trustworthy accounts of the saint whose cloak was kept in veneration at Neustadt, are hopelessly lost, the monastery having been sacked by the mob in 1525, and the books and documents destroyed. (Mabillon, Acta SS. O.S.B. ser. ii. pars i. 718, ed. 1672, Life of St. Burchard of Wurtzburg and introduction to Life of St. Gertrude of Nivelles; Boll. Acta SS. 17 Mart. ii. 601, notes to St. Gertrude of Nivelles.) [A. B. C. D.]

GERULPHUS—Sept. 21. Murdered about the middle of the 8th century, at Truncinium (Dronghesse) in Flanders, when returning from a confirmation held by Eliaerus bishop of Noyon. His life was written in the 10th century by a Belgian monk, who inveighs against his father because he left unfulfilled his son's bequests to the church. Gerulphus was buried by his father at his birthplace, a village called Merenbeia, whence, on Oct. 8, 915, his relics were translated with great pomp to Drongessee. In 1030 all the relics in Flanders were gathered to Oudenaarde, in Western Flanders, and borne in solemn procession, to secure peace, when his body, as being that of a Flemish martyr, took the first place. (Molani, Nat. SS. Belg.; Acta SS. Boll. Sept. vi. 250-270.) [G. T. S.]

GERUNTUS (1). Among the works attributed to St. Jerome is a letter addressed to the daughters of Geruntius. Their father had insisted in his will a clause disinheriting them on account of their devoting themselves to chastity, and their love of religion, and the letter is an answer to their inquiries as to what they should do. The writer advises them not to appeal to the secular judge, and exhorts them, if they have offended Geruntius for Christ's sake, to persevere in offending him. For If Christ is the cause of offence, the disinheriting clause of their impious father's will is a reason for joy and not for grief. It appears probable that the author of this letter was the presbyter Eutropius, who is stated by Gennadius (de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis, c. 49, in Migne, Patr. Lat. iviii. 1087), to have written two letters to two sisters who had been disinherited by their parents for their devotion to religion, in which he supported their position not only by arguments but by numerous quotations from Scripture in a description which agrees with the letter ascribed to St. Jerome. This letter was written about a.d. 400, as it speaks of St. Paulinus of Nola's retirement from the world, which took place about a.d. 395, as a recent event (S. Hieronymi Opera, xi. Ep. 2, in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxx. 49; Cellieri, Anteux secreti, vii. 647). [F. D.]

GERUNTUS (2), a presbyter of the Capadocian Caesarea, to whom Firmus his bishop wrote, expressing his regret that he should have been detained so long from his duties, and especially those of the Easter Festival, by sickness, and gently reminding him that now that his indisposition had yielded, and only delicacy of health remained, he should return as soon as he could. Firmus thanks him for his Easter gifts to his table, two brace of partridges, half a home-fed pig, as big as a wild boar, and an amount of wine, as well as a pair of young coots. (Firmus, Epist. 10.) [E. V.]

GERUNTUS (3), abbat, with another named Chalcidonus, over the twin abbeys,
Viviers and Castel, of the monastery founded by Cassiodorus. They appear to have been the first abbas, but it is not said to which of the houses they respectively belonged (Ceillier, i. 238).

Cassiodorus gives his abbas excellent advice for the higher training of their monks. He bids them especially to exercise hospitality, to succour the poor, to instruct the country people in good manners, and in the way of salvation; to study the Holy Scriptures and the commentaries of the doctors, the lives of the fathers, and the Acts of the saints; to mortify their passions, and to believe all that they ought. (Cassiod. Inst. Div. Ltd. cap. 32, in Patr. Lat. lxx. 1147.)

GERUNTUS (9), king of Damnonia, to whom Aldhelm, abbot of Malmsbury, wrote, a.d. 705, at the request of a synod, respecting the time of keeping Easter, and the mode of making the teneur. The letter was addressed, “Domino gloriosissimo, occidentalis regni sceptra gubernator; Geruntoni regis, simulque eunctus Dei sacerdotibus per Domnoniam conversantibus” (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 268: see above, v. ALDELM, I. 78, and Malmsbury’s Gesta Pontificum, v. § 215, p. 361), and it had the desired effect. Gerontius reigned at least till a.d. 710, for in that year the Saxons Chronicle says, “Ine and Neuf, his kinsman, fought against Gerobachus, king of the Welsh.” That the Celtic chronicles preserved no account of this important chief of the West Britons, under whom the schism was healed, proves the truth of Nennius’s words, “I have endeavoured to write some extracts which the broken spirit (hebetudo) of the British monarchy, for the treasures of this island, Britain, have had no knowledge, nor have they set down any memorial in books.” They had no heart to chronicle the misfortunes of their nation. (See Haigh in Yorkshire Archaeol. Journal, 1877, iv. 446.) Ine’s humane laws, about a.d. 690, show that the English had been conciliating their Celtic subjects. Perhaps Gerontius the last of the Celtic kings was the first Christian church that the conquerors spared, and it thus became a meeting-place for the traditions of the two races. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 164.) Probably two bishops of the Cornish church joined with Wini, the English bishop of Wessex, in consecrating Ceddula to York, a.d. 684. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 124.)

GERVASIUS (1), June 19 (U.S.); Oct. 14. (Bsa. Menol). Martyr with Protasius at Milan, under Nero. His story is very curious. They were two brothers, the sons of Vitalis, whose martyrdom at Ravenna and mythical acts are recorded in Mart. Adon, April 28. After 300 years, and when their memory had entirely faded from among men, God is said to have revealed their place of burial to St. Ambrose in a dream. [AMBROSIA]. The empress Justina was striving to obtain possession of one of the churches of Milan for her Ariam worship, and help was needed to sustain the orthodox in their opposition to the imperial authority. Just at this time a new and splendid basilica was awaiting consecration. The people, as a kind of orthodox demonstration, wished it consecrated with the same pomp and ceremonial as had been used in the case of another new church near the Roman Gate. To this St. Ambrose consented, on condition that he should have some new relics to place therein. He therefore ordered excavations to be made in the church of St. Nabor and St. Felix, near the rails which enclosed their tomb. Very soon their labours were rewarded by the discovery of the bodies of “two men of wondrous size, such as ancient times produced” (Amb. 382, § 2). The people in all parts of the city came to view the entire and very much blood. They were removed to the church of St. Fausta, and on the next day to the new Ambrosian church, where they were duly enshrined. At each different stage St. Ambrose delivered impassioned and fanciful orations. In that pronounced on the occasion of their entombment, he waives that they had already expelled demons, and restored to sight a blind butcher, one Severus, who was cured by merely touching the pall that covered the sacred relics. The Arians on the other hand ridiculed the matter, asserting that Ambrose had hired persons to feign themselves demons. The whole affair has afforded copy for the most merciless matter for criticism. Mosheim (cent. iv. p. l. ii. c. 3, sect. 8), Gibbon (c. xxvii), Isaac Taylor (Ancient Christianity, vol. ii. 242–272), consider the thing a trick got up by the contrivance and at the expense of St. Ambrose himself. Taylor, indeed, in the lengthened passage just cited, discusses the action of the present Gerobachus, king of the Welsh. That the Celtic chronicles preserved no account of this important chief of the West Britons, under whom the schism was healed, proves the truth of Nennius’s words, “I have endeavoured to write some extracts which the broken spirit (hebetudo) of the British monarchy, for the treasures of this island, Britain, have had no knowledge, nor have they set down any memorial in books.” They had no heart to chronicle the misfortunes of their nation. (See Haigh in Yorkshire Archaeol. Journal, 1877, iv. 446.) Ine’s humane laws, about a.d. 690, show that the English had been conciliating their Celtic subjects. Perhaps Gerontius the last of the Celtic kings was the first Christian church that the conquerors spared, and it thus became a meeting-place for the traditions of the two races. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 164.) Probably two bishops of the Cornish church joined with Wini, the English bishop of Wessex, in consecrating Ceddula to York, a.d. 684. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 124.)
to Bertrada, Charles the Great's mother, by whose influence he was elevated to the bishopric.

But three years after the Queen mother's death a vacancy occurred in the abbey of Fontanelle by the death of Wilde. The post had been promised to Wittboldus, Wilde's nephew, and Charles the Great's chaplain, but as he was engaged on a mission to Constantinople, which was likely to be of long duration, the abbacy was conferred on Gervoldus (A.D. 786 or 787).

To obtain this dignity, he relinquished the see, in which his successor's name is unknown. Gervoldus had been much employed on state affairs, and at one period of his life had been entrusted by Charles with the direction of the abbey. He was the first known bishop of Barri, present at the council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. v. 599). The name does not occur in Man's lists, and seems to have been taken from the "Geronius de Brebi" and "de Brevi," which occur there (Manii, Ill. 39 b, 42 d, 46 e). (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xxi. 132; Ughelli, Ital. Sac. i. 129.)

Gervysius (3), bishop of Tarentum, 659. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xxi. 132; Ughelli, Ital. Sac. i. 129.)

Gervysius (4)—July 6. He was a native of Chalon-sur-Saône, and living in the 7th century. Having made a pilgrimage to Rome, he was murdered by robbers on his return, when but a few miles from home. He was thereupon elevated to the rank of a martyr, and miracles were attributed to him. His acts are of the 10th or 11th century, and worthless as historical records. They testify, however, to the existence at that time of the practice of infant communion in the West. "At his baptism, which was performed by the bishop, after the ceremony was completed, he placed the holy body of Christ in the infant's mouth, as is the custom. Then, seeing a drop of blood on the child's lips, he said to those around, 'Know, for certain, that this child as he is joined by name to the blessed martyr Gervysius, so he will be a brave soldier of Christ, being joined to Him by His blood.'" On the custom of infant communion, consult Suarez, Disp. 62, de Eucharist. sect. 4, and Disp. 69, sect. 2. Concerning apparitions of Christ's body in the sacrament, sometimes as a boy, sometimes as flesh or blood, see Suarez, Disp. 55, de Eucharist. sect. 1-4. (Acta SS. Bell. Jul. ii. 314-316.)

Gevulio, bishop. (Gewiliebus.)

Gervoldus, sixteenth bishop of Evreux, following Maurinus. He was of aristocratic parents, named Walgarius and Walda, and chosen on that account, while still a clerk, as chaplain at NARBONNE, while AMALARIC and his supporters
fled into Spain. From the time of the battle near Ptolemais until June 508, the victorious Franks and Burgundians pressed their advantage in southern Gaul, finding little or no resistance, and helped everywhere by the Catholic party, whose efforts had been for some time past directed towards transferring the rule of southern Gaul from the Ariani Visigoths to the orthodox Franks. [Euric, Alaric II.] Chlodwig's (Clovis') son Theuderic with the Burgundians under Gundobad marched on the towns of the Rhone and Loire early in 508, and Gesalic, attacked by Gundobad, fled from Narbonne—which was taken over the Pyrenees to Barce-

ona. In June, 508, however, the great Theudoric appeared on the scene from Italy on behalf of his grandson Amalaric, and matters changed greatly. His championship of Amalaric led Gesalic later to seek an alliance with the Franks and Burgundians against his half brother and Theudoric, but as Dahn points out (l. c. p. 114) the conversion initiated by Clovis was carried on by Ambiani, and others, that already in 507 he had betrayed Narbonne and what remained of southern Gaul to the Franks in return for aid against Amalaric in Spain, finds no authority in the sources. After great successes against the Franks and their allies in 508-9, Theudoric's general, Iba or Ebba, attacked the Visigoths near Barcelona and drove him from Spain in 510. He fled to Africa to ask help from the Vandals (mindful perhaps of his grand-
father Euric's old alliance, with Generalis), was however refused it (according to Isidore, Hist. Goth., ad ann. 507. Exp. Sagra. vi. 450), and re-
turning not to Spain, but to Aquitania "ob moenia Thaurdularic," opened negotiations with the Franks. He stayed there one year, and then entered Spain with an army (furnished him by the Franks?), met Iba near Barcelona, was de-
feated, pursued, and killed (512). His personal character was all along such as allowed him no chance of success. During his short reign at Barcelona, he made himself hated by his own people by his jealousy of and envenomation against "socii commercii villasimus, its inficilicata et ignavia summus." He counts, however, as the rightful successor of Alaric, and Amalaric's reign only begins from his death. (Dahn, v. i. c.; Lafuente, Hist. de España, ii. 331.)

[GEWIELEB] (Gewilbo, Gewelio, Gewil, Gewelio, Gewiullius) forty-first bishop of Mentz, deposed at the second council of Germany, A.D. 745. His father Geraldus, who preceded him in the see, fought under Carlemann against the Saxons, and was killed. The see thereupon took orders and was elevated to the bishopric. Soon afterwards (A.D. 744) Carle-
mann gave his daughter Agatha in marriage to a Saxon, and Gewilbo accompanied him. While the two armies lay encamped on opposite sides of the river Wisara, Gewilbo sent his servant to the Saxons to seek the slayer of his father and challenge him to single combat. Riding to the charge the two met in the centre of the stream, and the Saxons fell pierced by the bishop's sword. The battle became general, and the Saxons were routed. For this crime of homicide, and for spoiling with hawks and hounds, he was deposed at the council on the accusation of Boniface, who was made bishop in his place. The deposition is alluded to in a letter from pope Zachary to Boniface (S. Buri-

isci Vita, lib. i. cap. 37 in Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxvii. 652; Zach. Pap. Epistolae, xiili. in Migne, 949; Bur. xii. ann. 745, iii. iv.)

Serrarius (Rerum Moguntinorum, tem. i. p. 170, ed. Frankfort, 1722) quotes from a MS. of D. Latomius to the effect that after his deposi-
tion he left all his property to the church, and received for his sustenance the villula of Spase-
sheim and a church called Caput Montis, where he lived in good repute fourteen years and dis-
played especially the virtue of hospitality. He never again sought to attend councils or synods at Mentz, but sometimes at the Lord's Supper would wash feet in the churches, in tokens of hi
GILBERTUS

GILBERTUS (1) — June 24. Martyr with Agaodus, near Paris; they were, according to legend, converted by missionaries sent into Gaul by St. Peter. (Mart. Usuard.; Acta SS. Bell. Jun. iv. 815-817.)

GILBERTUS (2), 13th bishop of Nevers, succeeding St. Deodatus, or, according to Coquelle's list, twelfth, between Rauracus and Rognes. It is said that in old MS. of the church of Nevers he is described as sitting in A.D. 665 (Gall. Christ. xii. 628; Gams, Series Episc. 584; Coquelle, Hist. du Diocèse, sub fin. Paris, 1012).

GILBERTUS, bishop of Noyon. [GILBERTUS.]

GILDARDUS (GILDARDUS, GODARDUS), bishop of Rouen. A belief prevailed in the middle ages that he and St. Medardus were twin brothers, were ordained on the same day, and died on the same day. But no mention of Gildardus occurs in the earliest lives of St. Medard, and Gildardus attended the first council of Orleans in 511, while St. Medard was not consecrated till 530. He was buried in a chapel of St. Mary, in later times called after him, at that time without the walls, but afterwards enclosed by the growth of the city. He was commemorated at Rouen with his reputed brother, June 8. (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. ii. 67; Mauny, vii. 356; Gall. Christ. xi. 10.)

GILDARDUS (2) ST., priest of Luperciacum (Leury), in the district of Nevers, conjuncturally assigned to the 7th century and comme-

GILABERTUS OF Geneva. [GIBERTUS.]

GIBRIANUS, GIBRIANUS (GIBIANUS, GIBRIAN), commemorated May 8. In the Lives of St. Tressan, S. Gibrian, S. Eliaquin, and others, we have the account of the arrival of a band of Christian teachers in Gaul in the time of Clovis I, but it is very doubtful whether all the reputed members of that band belonged even to the 6th century. According to some accounts there were seven brothers and three sisters, the chief among the former being Tressan, German, and Gibrian. The last-named spent a holy life in the district of Chalons-sur-Marne, and long after he had died there, his remains were translated to the abbey church of St. Remigius at Rheims, where his memory was kept on May 8. (Hist. Lit. de France, v. 876.) He is usually assigned to the beginning of the 6th century. (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Fr. ii. c. 16, § 13; Cambrensis, de Scot. Fort. iii. c. 4, pp. 138-147; Acta SS. 8 May, ii. 297-300; Tanner, Bibl. 316.) [J. G.]

GIBBOALDUS, tenth bishop of Angoulême, in the early part of the 7th century. He is mentioned, though without his see, in the will of St. Berthembrus, bishop of Tuns, as the former possessor of an estate thereby devised. (Mabill. Vet. Anecdot. p. 261, Paris, 1723; Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxx. 404; Gall. Christ. ii. 581.) [S. A. B.]

GIBULDUS (GIBAUDUS, GIBAULTUS), a king of the Alemani, towards the close of the 5th century. In the Acta S. Lupi (Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vii. 70, 81) this king is spoken of as shewing especial reverence for St. Lupus, and setting free, without ransom, some prisoners whom his people had carried off from Brienne, in Champagne, on receiving a letter from that saint. In the Vita S. Severini (c. vi. § 27, Boll. Acta SS. Jan. 1, 491) he also appears as friendly to St. Severinus the apostle of Noricum, to whose entreaties he granted the release of some other captives. We do not know whether he was the king of the Alemani whom Clovis conquered in 486. (Mascou, Hist. of the Ancient Germans, xi. 8, 9; Bar. an. 482 n. liv.-livii.) [S. A. B.]

GIBANTIUS (otherwise SIGANTIUS), a correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. The wicked-

GILLO

humility, and at length died peacefully (785). An epitaph is also given by Serarius expressive of the bishop's piety. In the Gallia Christiana he also appears in the list of the early bishops of Worms (v. 663). See also Monument. Mogunt. ed. Jaffé, pp. 2, 3, 151, 471-473, 495, 496. [S. A. B.]

GILLO (GIOULUS), is said to have been servant of Guthunon, and to have remained at Oustirk in Flanders after Guthunon's death. Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 315-18) puts his death in A.D. 299, yet much doubt the Christianity of Scotia at that time. [GUTHONON.]


GIBERIUS, bishop of Bigastrum from after 565 till before 673. He appears at the eighth and ninth councils of Toledo, A.D. 655, 656, and is represented at the tenth by his vicar Episcopal. (Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 444; iv. 145, 158; Esp. Sagr. v. 127.) [VINCENT.] [M. A. W.]

GIBRANUS (GIBRANUS, GIBRAN), commemorated May 8. In the Lives of S. Tressan, S. Gibrian, S. Eliaquin, and others, we have the account of the arrival of a band of Christian teachers in Gaul in the time of Clovis I, but it is very doubtful whether all the reputed members of that band belonged even to the 6th century. According to some accounts there were seven brothers and three sisters, the chief among the former being Tressan, German, and Gibrian. The last-named spent a holy life in the district of Chalons-sur-Marne, and long after he had died there, his remains were translated to the abbey church of St. Remigius at Rheims, where his memory was kept on May 8. (Hist. Lit. de France, v. 876.) He is usually assigned to the beginning of the 6th century. (Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Fr. ii. c. 16, § 13; Cambrensis, de Scot. Fort. iii. c. 4, pp. 138-147; Acta SS. 8 May, ii. 297-300; Tanner, Bibl. 316.) [J. G.]

GIBALDUS, tenth bishop of Angoulême, in the early part of the 7th century. He is mentioned, though without his see, in the will of St. Berthembrus, bishop of Tuns, as the former possessor of an estate thereby devised. (Mabill. Vet. Anecdot. p. 261, Paris, 1723; Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxx. 404; Gall. Christ. ii. 581.) [S. A. B.]

GIBULDUS (GIBAUDUS, GIBAULTUS), a king of the Alemani, towards the close of the 5th century. In the Acta S. Lupi (Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vii. 70, 81) this king is spoken of as shewing especial reverence for St. Lupus, and setting free, without ransom, some prisoners whom his people had carried off from Brienne, in Champagne, on receiving a letter from that saint. In the Vita S. Severini (c. vi. § 27, Boll. Acta SS. Jan. 1, 491) he also appears as friendly to St. Severinus the apostle of Noricum, to whose entreaties he granted the release of some other captives. We do not know whether he was the king of the Alemani whom Clovis conquered in 486. (Mascou, Hist. of the Ancient Germans, xi. 8, 9; Bar. an. 482 n. liv.-livii.) [S. A. B.]

GIGANTIUS (otherwise SIGANTIUS), a correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. The wickedness of the world around having led him to adopt an ascetic life, he wrote to acquaint Gregory with his determination, and to request him to pay him a speedy visit. His letter also contained a clear statement of the orthodox faith on the Trinity, the perusal of which caused Gregory the greatest joy, which he expressed in his reply. He could not promise to visit him immediately on account of the approach of winter and the feebleness of his health, but he would come when he could (Greg. Naz. Epist. 239). On a subsequent occasion he fulfilled his intention, but found Gigantius absent, so that, as he complains in an epigram, having come to the fountain and found it without water, he went away more thirsty than ever. (Carm. Lamb. ii. 180.) [E. V.]

GIGNANTIUS or GIGANTIUS, a bishop present at the council of Milevis against Pelagianism, A.D. 416. (Aug. Ep. 176.)

GIGNEUS, a disciple of St. Enna, but also a foreigner. He was living at Ballynacourty, co. Galway, when St. Enna visited that district, and he may be the cook of St. Enna, who for a slight transgression of the monastic rule was banished from Aran, and perhaps took up his abode on the island of Tawyn or Tawin, in the parish of Ballynacourty. (Colgan, Acta SS. 709, c. 24, 711, c. 1.) [J. G.]

GIGUEL, Armoricanc prince. [JUDICAE.]
GILDAS (Gildasius, Gildus, Gillas), commemorated January 29. A close and accurate account of Gildas is surrounded with difficulties, and after all that has been written, the facts of his life and his very existence are left in uncertainty. In the medieval Lives he appears in a well-defined individuality, but a more critical view detects so many anachronisms and historical defects, that it has been questioned, first, as to whether he ever lived, and secondly, as to whether there were more Gildases than one, and if more, how many. Though he is mentioned by name, and his writings quoted from by Bede, Alcuin, William of Newburgh, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and Gildas Cambrensis, there is no memoir of him written within several centuries of the time when he is supposed to have flourished, and the two oldest, on which the others are founded, cannot be regarded in a higher light than as ordinary specimens of that unhistorical tone of mind which prevailed in the 11th and 12th centuries. In order to surmount the chronological and historical difficulties, Usheer, Ware, Bale, Pitcairn, Colgan, and O'Connor have imagined that there must have been at least two, and more, and a younger, perhaps even four or six, about the 5th and 6th centuries. These have received different designations to mark them, and thus have obtained a recognised position in history. But the more probable and more generally received opinion is that, though called Albanics, Albanus, Badonics, Cambrians, Hibernicus, Hibernicus, Historicus, and Saxon, the Gildas who is generally accepted could not have lived earlier than about the end of the 5th century, or later than about the end of the 6th. The oldest authority is Vita Gildæ, autore monacho Ruyensi anonymo, first published by Johnnies a Bosco (in the Bibliotheca Floriacensis, pp. 249 sq.), then by Colgan (Acta SS. 181 no. 138 sq. ed. G. J. Low, p. 183 sq. ed. Paris, giving the complete text), and the Bodleian (Acta SS. 29 Jan. iii. 573 sq.). This Life has often been published in Latin and English since that time, and is attributed to the 11th century, or earlier. The other was written by Caradoc of Llancarvan in the 12th century, and first published in Stevenson's Gildas de Excidio Britanniarum (Engl. Hist. Soc. 1838) from two MSS. in the British Museum; on this Capgrave's De S. Gildæ Abb. et Mart. (Nov. Leg. Angl. f. 156) is founded. (For published and MS. Lives, see Hardy's Descript. Cot. i. pt. i. 151-6, pt. ii. 793.) Along with voluminous notes and special sections treating of the many points in dispute regarding Gildas, the Bodleian gives only one Life as above, but Colgan publishes four, the two principal being Capgrave's, followed by some extracts from the Life by Caradoc as given by Usheer, and the Ruyensis: the former he calls Vita S. Gildæ Albanis Abb. et Confess. from Capgrave, and the latter Vita S. Gildæ Badonici Abb. et Confess. from John a Bosco. Proceeding upon what seems more or less a common groundwork of fact, these Lives present much that is irreconcilable in themselves and with each other. "Nor need this seem so very strange," says O'Hanlon (Irish Saints, i. 473-4), "when both accounts had been drawn up several centuries after the lifetime of Gildas, and when they had been written in different centuries and in separate countries. The diversities of chronological events, and of persons hardly contemporaneous, will only enable us to infer that the sources of information were occasionally doubtful, while the various coincidences of narrative seem to warrant a conclusion that both tracts were intended to chronicle the life of one and the same person. It deserves remark, however, that "" (quoting from Mon. Hist. Brit. i. pt. i. 59, n), ""both are said to have been born in Scotland. One was the son of Niu, the other of Cau, the eldest son [7 brothers] of one was Huel, of the other Cull. Both lives have of a bell, both Gildases go to Ireland, both go to Rome, and both build churches. The monk of Ruys quotes several passages from Gildas De Excidio, and assigns it to him; and Caradoc calls him, 'Historiographus Britomart,' and says that he wrote Historiae de Regine Britomart. To this we may add the conclusion of Ep. Nicolson (Engl. Hist. Lit. 39, 3rd ed.): "'He was monk of Bangor about the middle of the 6th century: a sorrowful spectator of the miseries and almost utter ruin of his countrymen by a people under whose banner they had hoped for peace.'" By those who suppose there were two or more bearing the same name Albanius is placed in the 5th century (425-512, Usheer), and Badonius in the 6th (520-570, Usheer). Those who believe there was only one Gildas do not entirely agree as to his dates, one for his birth being sought between A.D. 484 and 520, and one for his death between A.D. 565 and 602. In his De Excidio Britomart, he gives the year of ""obessionis Badonicini monachi, qui prope Subrinum ostium habetur, ..., annos ..., qui jam et mene natiuitatis est "" (c. 26). The Annales Cambriae place the ""bellum ludens"" in the year 516, and the Annales Tiberi-adius Gildas' death in the year 570; these dates are probably to be accepted, for (570 ed. the translation). This writing ascribed to Gildas was long regarded and spoken of as one treatise, De Excidio Britomart; but it is now usually divided into the Historia Gildae and Epistola Gildæ. The former is a dry and barren recital of the events of British history under the Romans, and between their withdrawal and his own time; the latter is a querulous, confused, and lengthened series of bitter invectives cast into the form of a declamatory epistle addressed to the Britons, and relating specially to five kings, ""reges sed tyrannos,"" named Constantius, Aurelius, Coaan, Veretiporus, Cuneglasus, and Maglocnus. Accusations, however, and reproaches are cast so freely against kings, priests, and people, especially against the crimes of the kings, and the ignorance, avarice, idleness and other faults of the priesthood, that many, though probably without quite sufficient reason, have come to regard the composition as the work of a later writer, and as intended in the eclesiastical differences of the 7th and 8th centuries for purely polemical purposes, while others would

2 Skene (Four Anc. Books of Wales, i. 63, 64) reads them as contemporary rulers, and as living one in Essex and Cornwall, two in Wales, and two probably in the north of Ireland.
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...to even a still later date. (See useful notes on both sides in Notes and Queries, 4 ser. i. 171, 271, 511, and on the side of genuineness and authenticity, Hist. Lit. de la France, t. iii. 290 sq.)

Of Gildas's work only two MSS. are known to exist. One is in the library of the University of Cambridge (Dr. I. 17, and Ff. I. 27, the latter having only the Historia); a third MS. (Cotton Libr. Vit. A. vi.) is lost, but fortunately represented with great accuracy in Josselin's edition. The work has often been published in this country and on the continent; edited by Haydock, Paris, 1758; by Josselin, London, 1658; by Stevenson, London, 1838 (Eng. Hist. Soc.); and republished at Berlin, 1844, with German introductions and notes, by San Marte. It is also found in Mon. S. Patr. Orthodox. t. i. Basa, 1555, and t. ii. Basa, 1669; Hist. Brit. Script. xv. ed. Gale, Oxon. 1691; Mon. Hist. Brit. 1847. The Welsh poet Stubbis, Council, &c., Oxford, 1869. Translations are by Habington, Lond. 1638; by Giles, Lond. 1841; republished, with additions, in Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles. (For its bibliography, see Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. Ang.-Sax. per. i. 1654; Mon. Hist. Brit. i. pt. i. 59 sq.; Min. Brit. Hist. 1, 2, ed. Pickard, Lond. 1846; Josselin, Hist. Doc. Acta, &c., Brit. iii. iv. pref.; Hist. Lit. de la France, t. iii. 280-284.)

His history is often confounded with the Historia Britonum of Nennius [NENNUS], and many other works have been attributed to the one or more Gildases; the De Victoria Ambrosii Aurelii, which is quoted by Geoffrey of Monmouth, is not now admitted; and the prophetic verses ascribed to him by Bede are evidently spurious. Some canons or rules of discipline, ascribed to Gildas, are given by D'Achery (Spicil. Vet. Script. t. ix. 4-50, Paris, 1669). He is sometimes (Rees, Welsh Saints, 225 sq.; Williams, Emyn. Welsh, 17, 18, 160) identified with the Welsh poet Awarn, and the Irish annalista associate David, Cadoc, and Gildas in giving an order of mass to the second order of Irish saints, which proves at least the strongly Irish connexion through which he has been called Hibernus and Hibernicus. (Bollandists, Acta SS. 29 Jan. iii. 566-562; Colgan, Acta SS. 176-203, 228-229; Lasagna, Eccl. Hist. II. i. c. 9; Usher, Brit. Eccl. Anti. c. 13-17, and Ind. Chron.; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. Ang.-Sax. per. 115-113.)

[G. G.]

GILDAS. (I.) Albanicus, Albanicus, commemorated Jan. 29. If we assume with Usher and others that Gildas Albanicus or Albanius, was the person with whom the Irish distanced others of the name of Gildas, and that the Vita Gildasae, written by Carodoc of Llanearvan, is the memoir of this saint, we find him to have been one of the twenty-four sons of Nau (called Can by Capgrave, Canus by Mabillon, and Navus by Bale), king of Albania (Scotland); to perfect his learning he went seven years to Gaul, and on his return became anchorite, teacher, and preacher throughout the three kingdoms of Britain (called by Camden, Brit. 573, the Silures, Dimetae, and Ordovices), announcing at this time the birth of St. David. He also passed over into Ireland and resided chiefly at Armagh, where he converted many to the Catholic faith. There the news reached him that his brothers had gone to war against king Arthur, and that his eldest brother Huwel had fallen. Leaving, therefore, his school at Armagh, he returned to Britain, met Arthur, and gave him the forgiveness he desired for having been the cause of Huwel's death, proceeded to Rome with a famous bell (which he wished to present to the pope, but which showed by its silence that St. Cadoc had a better claim to it), and on his return to Britain had a school at Llanearvan, co. Glamorgan, where he wrote a beautiful copy of the Gospel, which was long preserved in the church of St. Cadoc. He afterwards retired, settled at Gwernan, an island in the Severn, and after a time, finding this place disagreeable on account of the pirates from the Orkney Islands, he went to Glastonbury and wrote his Historiae de Regibus Britanniae. He then became a recluse near Glastonbury, built a chapel to the Holy Trinity, died, and was buried there in the middle of the church of St. Mary. Following this Life, Abp. Usher places Gildas's birth in the year 425, his visit to Armoricia in 455, his return to Britain in 462, Huwel or Howel's death in the island of Mona and Gildas's return from Ireland in 508, his resort to Glastonbury in 510, and his death in 512 (Usher, Brit. Hist. ii. 324; Dods, Eccles. Anti. xviii. 326; Plancher, Dans les ouvrages de W. Usher, Brit. Anti. eccl. 215 sq., and Ind. Chron., ed. Elrington; Stephen, de Esc. Brit. xxi.-xii.; Colgan, Acta SS. 179, 180; Creasy, Ch. Hist. Brit. ii. c. 3). There are attributed to him, but without any semblance of truth (except in the one fact of a Gildas having written De Ecclesia Britannica), Commentarii Quart. Evangeliorum, lib. iv.; De urmis habitationum virorum, &c., lib. i.; Vitae Britonum ... censuram, lib. i.; De Sexto Cognozcendo, lib. i.; Super eodem Sexto, lib. i.; Regum Britonum ... historiam, lib. i.; De victorii Aurelii Ambrosii, lib. ii.; Acta Germani et Lapid., lib. i. (Tanner, Bibl. 319, following Bole and Fiteuse; Ware, Jr. Writ. ii. c. 1; Biographie universelle, t. xviii. 395; Fitzmaurice, Histoire de l'Ile Anglo-Sax. t. 92, 93; Balausse, Hist. Mag. Brit. Script. t. 43.)

(II.) Badonicus, Historicus, and Sapiens, commemorated Jan. 29. Accepting this Gildas as different from the preceding, and following the account given by the monks of his name in the S. Gildas Sapientis Vita, we seem to have a distinct historical outline. This Gildas was born at Arcula on the river Ut (Dunbaron on the Clyde in Scotland); his father was Canus, and of his four brothers the eldest was called Cuillus, and succeeded his father in the kingdom. Gildas was educated by St. Illtud, and his school companions were St. Samson and St. Paul, who were afterwards famous bishops in Armorica. From them he learned to distinguish himself from others apparently there, and returned to North Britain, where he laboured among those who were Christians, but not Catholics, being entangled in divers heretical deceits. At the invitation of St. Brigid (Feb. 1), and also of king Ammericus (Ailmire), he returned to Ireland, the foresaid king promising to obey the holy man in all things if he would restore the Catholic faith in his kingdom. From Ireland he passed through England to Rome and Ravenna, and, returning to Brittany in the reign of king Childeric, built a monastery at Ruys (in Monte Reveushi), where he died and was buried. At Ruys he wrote "epistolarem libellum in quo quinque Reges ipsius insulae..."
(i.e. Brittain) redarguit diversitatem sceleribus atque criminibus irretituras." As in this he says of himself that he was born in the year the battle of Mons Badonicus was fought (hence his name Badonomicus), Ussher places his birth in the year 520, his writing his querulous epistle in 584, and his death in 599 at Rheims. (Ussher, Brit. Eoc. Ant. c. xii. xv, Works. v. 506 sq., vi. 316 sq., and Ind. Chron., ed. Elrington; Tanner, Bibl. 319-322, but mixing up the two lives, and adding in a note that he wrote De Immortalitate Animae, lib. i.; De Excidio Britanniae, lib. i.; in suis Temporis Clerum, lib. i.; De Gestis Britonum Histor. lib. i. See also Creasy, Ch. Hist. Brit. xii. c. 10; Colgan, Acta SS. 181-202, with notes and learned appendix of four chapters; Cave, Hist. Liter. 424-426, putting him later than Ussher does; Hist. Lit. de la France, t. iii. 279-285, following the Life in Mabillon, and putting his arrival in Armorica in the year 520, his writing in 530, and his death in 565, giving also a detailed account of the most ancient part of the work, and attributing it to them on the continent; Fleury, Hist. Chr. xxii. 15; Ware, Irish Writ. ii. c. 1; Gen. Eccl. Dict. i. 851, 852; Biographie universelle, t. xvii. 365-367; Balaesus, Ill. Mag. Brit. Scrip. fol. 33; Pitsius, de Ill. Angl. Scrip. 192; Williams, Ensia. Welsh. 155, 156; Howell, Mon. Ant. Hist. 193-195, 2nd edit.)

(III.) Cambrius. This Gildas is evidently a reflexion of the historical writer, but is placed by Pitsius (de Ill. Angl. Scrip. 70), Balaesus (Mag. Ill. Brit. Scrip. t. 15), and others, in the 1st century, in the Christian era, and credited with the authorship of numerous writings; he seems, however, to be entirely fictitious. (Tanner, Bibl. 319.)

(IV.) Quartus has received his name to distinguish him from Albanius, Badonicus and Cambrius, and is said by Pitsius to have flourished as an old man in 860, and by Dempster in 870. According to these writers he was an Irishman, monk at Bangor, and writer of Historia Britonum, lib. i.; Brevarium Gildae, lib. i.; De Mirabilibus Britanniae, lib. i.; De Primis Habitatoribus Britanniae, lib. i.; De Rege Arturo, lib. i.; De Sempuloro ejus incognito, lib. i.; and some others. But these are more than doubtful, especially as the first work is Nennius's History. Ussher places him in A.D. 820, and says he wrote Liber de Comploto, in 99 chapters, of which in his Synode (Wks. iv. 472) he gives the preface, which is addressed to a monk called Rabanus, the work itself being in MS. in the Cottonian Library. (Colgan, Acta SS. 201, 202, 2. 4; Pitsius, de Ill. Angl. Scrip. 70, 160; Balaesus, Vit. Ill. Brit. Scrip. t. 21; Dempster, A.D. 297, and Col. June 23; Dewes, Hist. Eoc. Gent. Scot. i. 308.)

[J. G.]

GILDAS, abbot, fellow-student of St. Samson and St. Paul. He came from Ireland to France in the reign of king Grainlon, who built for him and his disciples a monastery on the island of Bayes in the 5th or 6th century. Colgan (Acta SS. 179) takes this account from the Brevery of Nantes, and presents it at Jan. 29; but the legend is evidently a part of that of Gildas Badonicus, and reappears, only under a different form, and in more detail connecting him with St. Philibert of Jumièges in the 7th century, in the memoir of St. Gildasius, confessors of Blarat at Jan. 31, taken by Colgan (6. 296-8) from the Brevery of Quimper. [GILDAS (II. I.) (O'Flahie, Ir. Saints, Jan. 29 and 31, i. 495, 496, 602-607; Usuard, Mart. Auct. 27 Jan. ap. Migne, Pat. Lat. exxiii. 702.)] [J. G.]

GILD EMIRUS (GULDEMIRUS), bishop of Complutum, from before 681. He is represented by his vicar Annoniobius at the twelfth Council of Toledo, A.D. 681. (Aguirre-Catalan, iv. 370; Exp. Sagra. vii. 188.) [ASTURIUS] [M. A. W.]

GILDO (1), a presbyter appointed to succeed Rufus as bishop of Lanzelum in Numidia, but not yet installed at the time of Carth. Conf. A.D. 411. (Mon. Vet. Don. 200.) [H. W. F.]

GILDO (2), son of Nubel and brother of Firmus (FIRMINUS (7)), invested by Theodosius with the title and authority of count of Africa. Having revolted against Honorius, he was defeated near Berkastel in the winter of 398 and died by his own hand (Gibbon, c. xixi). During the time of his ascendency he favoured the Donatists, and Optatus, bishop of Thamusia, received the name of Gildonianus in consequence of the support which Gildo gave to him, and the violence which he exercised towards the Catholics. (Tillemont, 73, vol. vi. p. 181.) [ORPAA.] [H. W. F.]

GILES. [AGEDUINUS.]

GILLMIR. This is the name, according to Villanueva, (Visigo. Litterario, xiii. 6) of the bishop of Gerona, otherwise known as Miron, whose signature is found to the acts of the sixteenth council of Toledo, A.D. 693. (Masi, xii. 56 a.) Gams, (Ser. Episc. 32) places both Miron and Gillmir in the list of bishops of Gerona. (Exp. Sagra. xiii. 67; Tejada y Ramin, ii. 580.)

GILLAS, British historian. [GILDAR.]

GILENUS is spoken of by the Scotch annalists, Fordun, John Major, Camerarius, and Dempster as a Scot who lived in Gaul, and was a disciple or contemporary of St. Columbanus (Nov. 21). Dempster says he wrote Speculum Vitae Humanae, lib. i.; Epistole ad Pratres, lib. i. and iii. and published A.D. 546 must be too early. Fordun says he lived in the time of the Scotch king Eugenius, or Eocha Buidhe in the beginning of the 7th century, and Camerarius commemorates him on June 23; he must, however, have been a Hibernian Scot. (Fordun, Scotochr. i. iii. c. 32; Joannes Major, de Gest. Scot. i. ii. c. 7; Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 159, and Col. June 23; Dewes, Hist. Eoc. Gent. Scot. i. 308.)

[J. G.]

GILLES. [EIDITUS.]

GILLUS (GELUS), Aug. 30, martyr at Ancyras with six others. (Wright, Syrian Mart. in Journ. Soc. Lit. 1866, 428.) [G. T. S.]

GILULFUS (GULULBUS), bishop of Asti (Asi), c. A.D. 813. It is said that the archives of his cathedral were burnt A.D. 820. His successor was Roserius. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. iv. 479; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia. xiv. 88.) [T. S. G.]

GIOVANNICIIUS. [JOANNICIIUS.]
GIRALDUS

GIRALDUS of Velitrac. [GERARDUS.]

GIRICUS. [GERICUS.]

GIRIGR (GERIGR, GWIGR.), patron of Llangigr or Llangwrig, in Montgomeryshire. The more common form of his name is Curig or Cyricus. [CIRCUS.]

[GEECUS.] (Rees, Welsh Saints, 83, 207; Camb. Quart. Mag. i. 490, iii. 507.) [J. C.]

GISA, daughter of Grimoald king of the Lombards. She was given by her brother Remwald, duke of Benevento, as a hostage to the emperor Constant, who was besieging Benevento, c. 663. She afterwards died in Italy. (Paulus Diaec. v. 8, 14; Monum. Rerum Ital. et Langob. 1578, p. 146-150.) [A. H. D. A.]


GISBLEICUS, Visigoth king. [GISALLEC.]

GISELHERE, GISELHERUS, the seventh bishop of the South Saxons at Selsey (M. H. B. 619). His date, as ascertained by charters, falls between 783 and 787, and in the latter year his successor Totta was in office (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 402), and in the latter his successor Totta (ib. p. 461). The name of Giselhere appears in the list of prelates present at the council of Brentford in 781 (Kemble, C. D. 143; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 408), and in a grant of Gisbert, abbot of the South Saxons, dated at Selsey in 780. (Kemble, C. D. 1012.) [S.]

GISELPERTUS, duke of Verona in the time of Paulus Diaecos. He opened and rifled the grave of king Alboin. (Paulus Diaecos, ii. 28.) [A. H. D. A.]


GISIBARIUS, a priest, Scot, disciple and associate of St. Rubbert, or Rupert. He wrote Ad Boarios Homilias, and flourished about A.D. 630. (Dempster, Hist. Ecol. Gent. Scot. i. 308; Tanner, Bibl. 328.) [J. G.]

GISILARIUS, priest. [GISILARIUS.]

GISIUS, bishop of Mutina (Modern), succeeded Geminianus IV. c. A.D. 796, and died probably A.D. 811 or 812. His successor was Deodata. (Ugellii, Ital. Scol. ii. 113; Cappelletti, Le Chise dell' Italia xv. 235.) [R. S. G.]

GISLA (1) (GISLA, GISLANA), daughter of Pippin and only sister of Charles the Great, born A.D. 737. The robes in which she issued from the baptismal font were sent by her father to the pope, Paul I., in token of her spiritual adoption by him (cf. the letter of Paul, Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxix. 1183). Her hand was sought in marriage by Constantine Copronymus, the emperor of the East, for his son Leo, and later by Adalgisus, son of Desiderius, king of the Lombards; but both offers were opposed by the reigning popes, and neither was accepted (cf. the letter of Stephen III. written in 770 to Charles CHART. M.O.B.—VOL. II. and Carloman in Migne, Patr. Lat. xcviii. 255, and Bouquet, v. 543). Almost from girlhood she was dedicated to religion, and became ninth abbess of Chelles (Cala), the monastery of St. Bathildis, where she built at her own cost the church of St. Mary and St. Saviour. Here she was visited by Charles, when sick, in 804, and by Alcuin, of whom we have two letters addressed to her. (Bouquet, v. 615, 616; Migne, Patr. Lat. c. 362, 363.) There is extant a diploma by which she granted large possessions to the monastery of St. Denys in A.D. 799 (Bouquet, v. 760). Her death took place in 810. (Annales, in Pert. i. 11; Eginhardi Vita Caroli Magni, xiii. in Bouquet, v. 97, 613; Monum. Carolini, ed. Jaffé, var. loc. see index; Translatio S. Bathildis, in Mabill. Acta SS. O. S. B. sac. iv. pars 1, p. 452, Paris, 1688-1701; Gall. Christ. vii. 560.) [S. A. B.]

GISLA (2) (GISOLA), daughter of Charles the Great and Hildegarde, baptized, and received from the font at Milan, by Thomas the archbishop, in A.D. 781. With the rest of her family she is celebrated in the magniloquent verse of Angilbert (225-242; Pert. ii. 25), who lauds her beauty and her horsemanship in the chase, to which she was wont to accompany her father. Alcuin wrote her a short letter (Migne, Patr. Lat. c. 363; Bouquet, v. 616), exhorting her to lead a life of holiness. (Eginhardi Vita Caroli Magni, xviii. in Bouquet, v. 96; Annales Lauriacensium, and Enlart in Pert. i. 160-1.) [S. A. B.]

GISLA (3), daughter of Theodulfus bishop of Orleans (ob. A.D. 821), who addresses one of his poems to her, and gives her the gift of a psalter (ib. i. 4 in Migne, Patr. Lat. cv. 326.) [S. A. B.]

GISLARIUS (GISLARIUS, GISOLARIUS), presbyter of Salzburg about the middle of the 8th century, a companion of St. Hildegib, St. Rudbert and others in Germany; he probably was an Irishman, and seems to have died at Salzburg. Associated with St. Chunibaldus he is commemorated at Feb. 8, Sept. 24, and Oct. 20. The Bollandists (Acta SS. 3 Feb., i. 151) place them among other premonstratensians at Salzburg, and give at Sept. 24 a Spilgeo Historiarum, "de SS. Chunialdo et Gislario presbyteris Salesburgh in Germania, de cultu translatione et gestis, circa sec. viii." (ib. Sept. tom. vi. 708-13.) Colgan was preparing a life of the same two holy men for Sept. 24. (Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. v. 374; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, i. 111, ii. 414; Hanfius, Germ. Scol. ii. 46, 48.) [J. G.]

GISLEBERTUS (GILBERTUS), thirty-third bishop of Noyon and Tournoy, between Dido, or Dodo, and Plun. He was educated in the monastery of Elenon (St. Amand on the Scarpe, dep. Nord) and before his elevation became its abbot. In A.D. 769 he subscribed the Lateran Council under Stephen III. He died A.D. 782 in his own monastery, and was buried in the church of St. Peter and St. Paul. Two epitaphs, one of them by Alcuin, are extant. (Gall. Christ. iii. 250; ix. 998; Massili, xii. 715.) [S. A. B.]

Gislemorius—Sept. 16. One of the Theban legion, and regarded as patron of Borgo di San Donino in Italy. [MAURIUS; LEGIO THEBANAE.] [F. B.] 2 X
GISLENUS (GUILAIN, GUILAINE), ST., founder and first abbot of the monastery of Cella, afterwards St. Gulain, in the 7th century. The story of his life, which has come down to us, is as follows. He was born of noble stock in Attica, and after being trained in philosophy at Athens entered a monastery subject to the rule of St. Basil. In his time he became a priest, and bethinking of the example of St. Dionysius the martyr, who left Athens to seek Rome, he resolved to go thither likewise. He had not been there long when a voice from heaven bade him depart and come to Hainault. Thither he went, accompanied by two disciples, called Lambert and Bellarius. On his arrival he sought an interview with St. Amandus, whose fame filled the neighbourhood, and commenced to build a cell on a spot called Castrilocus. He afterwards obtained from Dagobert a site upon the Halne in Hainault, and here he built a monastery, which was at first called Cella, and afterwards gave rise to the town named from him St. Ghislain or St. Gulain. Autbert, archbishop of Cambray (656-668) and Amandus consecrated it. The remainder of his life was spent in works of piety, and among other good deeds he persuaded St. Walderstrude to purchase the spot on which he had first settled, and there build a monastery. In this work some assistance was given by St. Hildulfus, and the monastery of Castrilocus (St. Vaudre du Mous; cf. Gall. Christ. iii. 144) was there erected. To him too, St. Aldegundis, who founded the monastery of Melodium (Mauheuge), and others, owed their conversion. He died at Cella (A.D. 681, according to Mabillon's conjecture), and was buried in his own church, although, in the time of Charles the Great, when the oratorium was restored by abbot Elefas, his bones were removed for the consecration, and were not again restored to their original resting-place.

The foregoing account is from the anonymous Life published by Mabillon (Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti, ii. 716, Paris, 1698-1708) and by the Bellanens (Acta SS. Oct. iv. 1090). In his preliminary observations Mabillon enumerates as many as six different lives. In the Actarum of Molanus to Usuard (Mart. Oct. 9) Gislenus is called bishop of Athens, but there seems to be no foundation for such a statement. His day was Oct. 9 (Boll. Acta SS. Oct. iv. 1010). [S. A. B.]

GISLERE (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. No. 143, A.D. 781), bishop of Selsey. [GISLERHERE]

[C. H.]

GISLOADUS, fifteenth bishop of Verdon, succeeding St. Paulus and followed by his nephew Gerebertus. He had been a monk of Tholey (Theologium), in the diocese of Trevès. He was perhaps the bishop Gislochardus, one of those consulted by Sigebert as to the foundation of the monasteries of Malmédy and Stavelo in the Ardennes, which took place in A.D. 645, the year of his consecration (Notger, Vit. S. Remodi; Boll. Acta SS. Sept. i. 680). He was also one of the bishops to whom Numerianus, archbishop of Treves, addressed his charter in favour of the monastery built by St. Deodatus of Nevers, in the Vesiges (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 1191). His death is placed A.D. 665. (Gall. Christ. xii. 1179, instr. 291.) [S. A. B.]


GISOLA, daughter of Charles the Great. [GIELA.]

GISTLIANUS (GISTILLIANUS, GISTILLISANUS, GIVSILLIANUS, GWISILLIAN), bishop at Mevrea before St. David his nephew, and son of Gynris of Caer Gawch, by his second wife Anna, daughter of Gwrtysfey Fendigaid (Vortimer). His first house was at Old Mevrea, near the present St. David's, and was endowed by his father Gynris, but was afterwards removed to Rheidol, where the cathedral now stands, at the suggestion of St. David. (Roes, Welsh Saints, 163, 173, 194; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 425; Leland, Collect. iii. 103; Jones and Freeman, Hist. of St. David's, p. 243.) [J. G.]

GISULFUS, first duke of Eruli, and the first Lombard duke appointed upon the invasion of Italy by Alboin in 569. The district was the first conquered by Alboin, who, before proceeding farther into Italy, offered the charge of it to his nephew and marshal (marcheis) Gisulf. Upon condition of being allowed to retain certain selected families to settle with him he consented, and received the title of the "dux." (Paulus Diaconus, ii. 9.) Gisulf was one of the dukes under whose rule the Lombards lived for ten years after the death of Kleph, when there was no king (Paul. Diaconus. ii. 32). After some discord with the king Agilulf, of whom the cause is unknown, he was received peaceably by him, c. ann. 602 (Paul. Diaconus. iv. 27). Together with the king he ratified the appointment of a bishop (or patriarch) to Aquileia, which was then in opposition to the see of Rome. He lost his life, together with the greater part of his army, c. 610, in resisting an invasion of the Avars. His son, Grimoldus, then a child, escaped to the court of Benevento, and afterwards became duke of Benevento, and eventually seized the kingdom. It is possible that the first duke appointed was Grasulf, father of Gisulf, and that Paulus Diaconus is wrong. (Monast. Langob. Rerum, 1878, p. 77; Muratori, Ann. a. 590; Pabst, Forschungen z. d. G. p. 428.) [A. H. D. A.]

GISULFUS, a Lombard duke, who was the son of Romulus, exarch of Ravenna, into Iberia, and saw himself up with his whole grand. He was at the time quite young (Letter of Romanus to Childeric, king of the Franks; Troya, Cod. Dipl. i. p. 132). It is possible that he is the same as the above-mentioned Gisulf. (This is not allowed by Troya, but see Muratori, Ann. a. 590.) [A. H. D. A.]

GISULFUS, duke of Benevento, 899-706, succeeded his brother Grimold. In the time of pope John VI, c. 702, he laid waste Campania, and took many captives, who were all redeemed.
GISISULPHUS


GISISULPHUS, bishop of Chiasso (Clusium), appeared apparently to act as judge upon Aus- treidus bishop of Sienna, mentioned in a letter of pope Stephen III, May, 752, to Stabilis bishop of Aretzo. (Troya, Cod. Dipl. iv. 413; Jaffe, Regest. Pont. p. 189.) [A. H. D. A.]

GISISULPHUS II, duke of Benevento, son of Rembold, and nephew of king Ludwig II. His father died c. 731, when he was quite a child. An attempt was made to kill him, but the people of Benevento protected him. Luitprand then came and carried him off for a while to his court at Pavia, placing another nephew, Gregory, in the duchy. Gregory died in 739, and Godeslaus became duke, but on the arrival of Luitprand, three years after, he prepared to fly to Constantinople, but before embarking was killed by the Beneventans. Guisl then became duke of Benevento in 742. His gifts and concessions to the monasteries of Allis, S. Vincenzo on the Volturno and others, range from September, 742, to the beginning of 751, in which year he probably died. (Troya, Cod. Dipl. n. 553–643 passim. Oelner, Königspap. excurs. i. p. 444; Paulus Diaconus, vii. 55–58.) [A. H. D. A.]

GISISULPHUS, bishop of Cajazzo in Campania, c. 778. (Cappelletti, La Chiese d’Italia, xx. 69.) [A. H. D. A.]

GISVALDUS, confessor, companion, and disciple of St. Dyssibod, accompanied his master to Belgium, and flourished a.d. 654, but Dem- stter (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Sott. 1. 313) refuses the suggestion of Lalescu (de Reb. Sott. lib. iv. p. 154) that he lived at Fulda. [J. G.]

GIULFUS (BULFUS), ninth bishop of Stras- b burg, said to have ruled in the 7th century. (Goll. Christ. v. 779; Potthast, Biboth. Suppl. p. 414.) [R. T. S.]

GIUSTILIANUS. [GIUSTILIANUS.]

GIVERICUS (GIVERINUS), bishop of Mentesa (cr. Jaen), before 646. He sent a deacon, Ambrose, to represent him at the seventh Council of Toledo, a.d. 646 (Agui rre-Catalani, iii. 426; Esp. Syn. vii. 269). [FARDUS.] [M. A. W.]

GIZOLARIUS, priest. [GISLARIUS.]

GLADUSA, Welsh saint. [GWLADUS.]


GLAPHYRA, virgin, of Amasea, Jan. 13. She appears to have been in Licinius’s household at Nicomedia, and afterwards at Amasea, where she became acquainted with Basilieus the bishop, assisted him, with the help of Licinius’s wife, who was Constantine’s sister, to build a church at Amasea, and at last suffered death with him about the beginning of the 4th century. Her Acta are given by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 13 Jan. i. 771–2) from the Acta Martyrum S. Basilie Episcopi Amaseae; see also Assemani (Act. Mart. Occid. et Orient. pt. ii. 310), but they do not amount to history. [J. G.]

GLASANUS (GLASCUS) is commemorated at Oct 1, in Mart. Donyn., and may be the same as the Glassicus, whom St. Patrick left at Kil- glas, when that saint was preaching in Daluradus, co. Antrim, and was being opposed by the sons of Coelhadius. (Colgan, Tr. Thos. 147 c. 181, 182, n. 202; Reeves, Eccl. Ant. 338.) [J. G.]

GLAUCLAS, an alleged interpreter (épaves) of St. Peter, who was claimed as the instructor of BASILEIDES. (Glem. Al. Strom. vii. 17, p. 809.) [G. S.]

GLAUCUS, bishop of Alii (Aliani), in Phrygia Pacatiana, present at the fifth general council, a.d. 553. (Mansi, x. 393; Le Quen, Oriens Christian. i. 809.) [L. D.]

GLEWIS, lay witness to a grant by Erb, king of Gwent and Exyngry, to St. Dubricius and the see of Llandaff (Lib. Laned. by Rees, 318). He may be the same as Glywyw of Glewisia (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 309). [Glympes (2).]

GLIN-MAUR, i.e. magne-genus, surname of Esta de Northumbria. [Kata (3).] (Hist. Nennii in M. H. B. 75 n.) [C. H.]

GLIUSUS, GLYSVIUS, GLIVUSUS, Welsh chieftain, the father of Gywriwyv Filwr (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 145; Hardy, Descript. Cat. i. 87, 88). [Glywywes (2).] [J. G.]

GLODYW, clerical witness to grant of Caer Riou, near Monmouth, by king Athwys, son of Fehruwael, to bishop Cadwared (Ctswgarett and the see of Llandaff in the 8th century. (Lib. Laned. by Rees, 484.) [J. G.]

GLORINUS, bishop of Junce, in Maurotania Caesariensis, and supposed to have been primate of that province, was banished by Hunneric a.d. 484. (Vic. Vitae. Notit. 59; Morcelli, Atr. Christ. i. 182.) [R. S. G.]


GLORIOUS (3), bishop of Camerino, present at the Lateran synod under pope Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Hefele, § 307; Mansi, x. 986.) [A. H. D. A.]

GLORIOUS, a person to whom, in conjunction with Eulius and Felix, St. Augustine addressed two letters. In the first of them the name Grammaticus is added, and other persons are mentioned, though not by name. (Textus (3).) (Aug. Ep. 43, 44.) [H. W. P.]

GLOWYBWY, clerical witness to a grant by king Rhys, son of Ithael, to bishop Cadwared (Ctswgarett) and the see of Llandaff in the 8th century. (Lib. Laned. by Rees, 485.) [J. G.]

GLUIUSUS, Welsh chieftain. [Glympes (2).]
GLUNSALACH, son of Costamhail. O'Clery suggests that this saint, who was of the race of Conall Cearnach, and lived at Slishb-Fusaid, a mountain near Newton-Hamilton, co. Armagh, may have been a famous outlaw, who forsook his evil ways, joined himself to the company of St. Coemgen, and died in sanctity, being commemorated on the same day as his master, June 3. Colgan had a Life in preparation for that day. (Mart. Doney, by Todd and Reeves, 145; Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. vii. 373.) [J. G.]

GLUVIAS (GLYTHIANUS OR GLYTHIACUS), ST., the saint of a parish which includes Fenny, in Falmouth harbour. It is possible that the name is connected with that of Glywys Cerniow in the 6th century (Rees's Welsh Saints, 114, 233, 268). [C. W. B.]

GLYCERIA—May 10. Virgin and martyr at Trajanopolis in Thrace, under Sabinus, the president in the time of Antoninus Pius, or of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 138-180. She seems to have challenged the martyr's fate. When the president was sacrificing, she publicly reproved him, for which she was tortured and cast to the beasts. She converted her guard, Laodicia, who suffered with her. (Bas. Menol.; Surius Vitae SS. 10 Mai.; Acta SS. Boll. Mai. iii. 189-192; Dodwell, Dissert. Cypriani. xi. de Paschit. Mart. sect. 53-57.) [G. T. S.]

GLYCERIA, martyr with Anna and Theodato; commemorated on Oct. 22. They embrace the Christian faith on witnessing the sufferings of bishop Alexander, and shared in his martyrdom. (Basil. Menol. i. 134.) [C. H.]


GLYCERIUS (2), Dec. 18. Presbyter and martyr under Maximianus. (Bas. Menol.) [G. T. S.]


GLYCERIUS (5), a deacon in Cappadocia, who caused Basil much annoyance by his extravagant and disorderly proceedings circ. 374. Glycerius being a vigorous young man, well fitted for the humbler offices of the church, requiring actual labour, and having adopted the ascetic life, was ordained deacon by Basil. The name of the church he served is doubtful. It is given in different MSS. as Veneta, Veneta, and Synnasa. His elevation turned the young man's head. He at once began to neglect the duties of his office, and gathered about him a number of young women, partly by persuasion, partly by force, of whom he took the direction, styling himself their patriarch, and adopting a dress and seeming with his followers. He was supported by the offerings of his female followers, and Basil charges him with adopting this spiritual directorship as a trade, that he might get his living without work. The wild and disorderly proceedings of Glycerius and his deluded adherents created great scandal in his own city as well as in the neighbourhood, where he was admonished by his own presbyter, his choric-scopus, and finally by Basil himself. Glycerius, however, turned a deaf ear to all, and having swelled his fanatical band by a number of young men, he one night hastily left the city with his whole troop, many of the girls being compelled to join him against their will. The scandal of such a band wandering about the country under pretence of religion, singing hymns, and leaping and dancing in a disorderly fashion, great it was, increased by the fact that a fair was going on at the time, so that the young women were exposed to the rude jests of the lowest rabble, who came from such disgrace were driven away by Glycerius with the utmost contumely, and he carried off his whole band to a neighbouring town, of which a certain Gregory was bishop; who this Gregory was is uncertain. Garnier is inclined to believe that it was Gregory Nazianzen (among the names lettres the correspondent foundering Glycerius is found, as well as in the letters of Basil), though he allows that there is much in favour of Gregory Nysen (Vita S. Basil. c. xxii. § 4). Gregory not only allowed Glycerius and his motley band to remain unchallenged, but appears to have been disposed to regard him with some degree of veneration. On this Basil wrote to his narrating the whole circumstances, and shewing how little Glycerius deserved any consideration. He requested him to order Glycerius to return at once with his whole band of virgins. If he did this, and brought commendatory letters from Gregory, he might depend upon lenient treatment; if he refused to obey, Basil begged Gregory to send back the virgins, or to enable those who desired it, to free themselves from Glycerius' spiritual tyranny. If Glycerius continued obstinate he threatened that he should be removed from the ministry (Ibid., Epist. 169 [312]). At the same time Basil wrote to Glycerius himself, promising to deal with matters that were towards him if he would return at once, and send to their homes the disciples whom he was leading not to God but to the abyss (Ibid. 170 [314]). Their return being still delayed, Basil wrote again to Gregory, hinting that his unwillingness to compel them to come back might be due to some desire to carry favour with others. To some who came to resist this himself, and begged him to put all such feelings aside and induce them to return without any apprehension. If they continued obstinate he washed his hands of them. (Ibid. 171 [313]). The future issue is now known. [K. V.]


GLYCERIUS (7), 2nd bishop of Cones, following St. Valerian and succeeded by Theodoreus, subscribed the council of Agde (A.D. 566), and is said to have died in 548. (Gall. Crist. i. 1125; Labbe, Sacr. Conc. viii. 337, Flor. 1759-98.) [S. A. B.]
GLYCERIUS (8), emperor of the West, afterwards bishop of Salona. In March 473, being at that time comes domestoricum, he asserted the imperial title at Ravenna in succession to Olybrius; but the emperor of the East, Leo I. the Thracian, set up Julius Nepos in opposition, who was proclaimed at Ravenna late in 473 or early in 474, marched against Glycerius and took him prisoner at Portus. (See art. Glycerius in the Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.) It is the episcopate of Glycerius that claims the chief notice in this work. He has been reckoned bishop of Portus, of Milan, and of Salona. The Chronicon of Marcellinus Comes under the year 474, states that Glycerius "imperio expulsus, in porta urbis Romae ex Caesare episcopus ordinatus est, et obiit." (Patr. Lat. ii. 931); on the strength of which passage he has been named bishop of Portus, as by Paulus Diaconus, who writes: "Portuensis episcopus ordinatur." (Hist. Marc. lib. xv. in Patr. Lat. xxxv. 973 s). Ughelli (who) claims him Gucerius assigns him to that see between Petrus and Herennius, and Capelliti does the same (Ug. Ital. Sac. i. 111; Capt. Le Chiense d’Ital. i. 497). This conclusion from the doubtful language of Marcellinus might pass were there no other statements to be considered. Bagrius, for instance, relates (H. E. iii. 19) that Nepos appointed Glycerius, bishop of the Romans, to Thebais, scarcely however intending to say, as Canisius understands him, that Glycerius was made bishop of Rome. He must mean (writing as a Greek) that Glycerius was ordained bishop for Salona by the Roman ecclesiastical authorities, that his see belonged to the Roman eastern part of the empire and to the Roman patriarchate rather than the Byzantine. Jornandies likewise states that Nepos "Glycerium ab imperio expel- lus, in Salona Dalmatiae episcopum fecit." (Jorn. de Reg. Saco, in Muratori, Rer. Ital. Script. t. i. p. 239 b.) It is therefore best to understand with Canisius (note on the passage in his edition of Petr. Lat. xvii.) that Nepos appointed Glycerius to take place at Portus, where at the same time he was ordained to the see of Salona. So also Farlati understands (Myr. Sac. ii. 117-120). It should be remarked that the principality of Dalmatia belonged to Nepos independently of the imperial title. Thither he retired before his successful competitor Orestes, and then was brought into contact once more with Glycerius. Photius (Bibloth. cod. 78) mentions the now lost Byzantine History of Malchus the Sophist as stating that Nepos having divested Glycerius of his Caesarian authority and invaded the empire of the Romans, clericiated Glycerius, made him a bishop, and finally perished by his machinations (invidia petitus), not "assassinated" as stated by Gibbon. Farlati assigns six years to the episcopate of Glycerius, placing his death in 480. The supposition that the ex-emperor was bishop of Milan rests on very slender ground. Lanzian bishop of Pavia, who dedicates short poems to several successive bishops of Milan (carmin. 82, in Petr. Lat. xiii. 349); but there is nothing in the verses to identify him with the ex-emperor. Emodius likewise, in his Life of Euphrasius bishop of Pavia, mentions the emperor as shewing so much veneration for that saint as to accept his intercession for some people in the diocese of Pavia, who had incurred the imperial displeasure (Ennod. Vit. Epiph. in Patr. Lat. xiii. 219 A). These are the sole grounds on which Gibbon hazards, though doubtfully, the statement (Decl. and Fall, vol. iv. p. 265, ed. Smith) that Glycerius was banished to the Muses, and that Nepos detained Orestes from the see of Salona to the archbishopric of Milan in reward for his assassination of Nepos. [C. H.]

GLYCON, bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine. His name appears in the catalogue of bishops who accepted the decision of the council of Chalcedon. He signed through a representative, Sozimus or Zoilimus "episcopus Miniodennis" or "Edenensis." (Labbe, Concil. iv. 83, 788.) [E. V.]

GLYWYS (1) Cornw, son of Gwynhlyw-Filwr, and founder of a church at Coed Cornw, now Coedkernew, co. Monmouth, in the 6th century. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 114, 233.) [I. G.]

GLYWYS (2) (Gwilyw, Gwilyus, Glybesius, Gwilybus, Gwilyetus), ap Tegys ap Cadell (Rees, Welsh Saints, 114), was father of Gwynhlyw-Filwr [Gwynlyw (2)], and "nobilissimus rex Australiam Britonum" (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 145). He is supposed to have been chief-tain of a district called from him Glewysig, probably including parts of the present counties of Glamorgan and Monmouth; according to the legend, he married Gwladus, or Gladus, daughter of Brychan, and was father of seven sons, of whom Gwynhlyw was the eldest (Rees, s. 145, 309), and amongst whom his sovereignty was divided at his death. Williams (Emlyn, Welsh. 174) numbers him among the Welsh saints, and says he founded the church of Machen in the hundred of Wentlosg, Monmouthshire (Rees, i. 449 n.). [J. G.]

GNATHNAT (Gnatnad), called abeos of Kildare in Four Masters, and abbot by Tigernach, died a. D. 990. (Ann. Tig. cod. an.; For. Mustr. a. D. 687.) [J. G.]

GNAVAN, disciple of St. Cadoc, probably a Briton. (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 326.) [J. G.]

GNOSIMACHI (Γνωσιμαχος). A sect who are said to have opposed all scientific theology (εστιν γνωριμις χρυσοτμωμον) on the plea that nothing more is required of Christians than a holy life. Damascene mentions it among those which arose after the emperor Marcian, a. d. 451-457. (J. Damasc. de Haeres. Ixxxviii.; Migne, Patr. Gr. xcv. 758; Nicef. Choniat. Theod. Orith. Migne. u. s. xxxix. 1085; Suicer, Theod. s. v.) [T. W. D.]

GNOSIS, one of the mythical beings who, in the Barbelle system described by Irenaeus (c. 29, p. 108), answer to the Valentinian Aeons. From her is represented to have sprung the "Tree," also called knowledge. With this is to be compared that part of the system of Justinus (Hippel. Ref. v. 26) which counts the trees of paradise as angels, and in particular the tree of knowledge, as the angel Naas. In Pistis Sophia also one order of celestial beings is designated as trees (pp. 18, 192). [G. S.]
Gnosticism. The zeal with which a learner commences the study of ecclesiastical history is not unfrequently damped at an early stage, when he finds that, in order to know the history of religious thought in the 2nd century, he must make himself acquainted with speculations so wild and so baseless that it is irksome to read them and difficult to believe that time was when acquaintance with them was counted as what alone deserved the name of "knowledge." But it would be a mistake to think too disdainfully of those early heretics who go by the common name of Gnostics. In the first place, it may be said in their excuse that the problems which they undertook to solve were among the most difficult with which the human intellect has ever grappled; namely, to explain the origin of evil, and to make it conceivable how the multiplicity of finite existence can all have been derived from a single absolute unconditioned principle. And besides, these speculators only did what any theologian has constantly endeavoured to do; namely, combined the doctrines which they learned from revelation with the results of what they regarded as the best philosophy of their own day, so as to obtain what seemed to them the most satisfactory account and explanation of the facts of the universe. Without philosophy and religion is the marriage of a mortal with an immortal; the religion lives; the philosophy grows old and dies. When the philosophic element of a theological system becomes antiquated, its explanations which contented one age become unsatisfactory to the next, and there ensues what is spoken of as a conflict between religion and science; whereas, in reality, it is a conflict between the science of one generation and that of a succeeding one. If the religious speculations of the 2nd century appear to us peculiarly unreasonable, it is because the philosophy incorporated with them is completely alien to modern thought. That philosophy grew by . . . the narrow sense, but this is a matter on which controversy would be only verbal, Gnosticism not being a word which has in its own nature a definite meaning. If we speak, for instance, of the Clementine writings emanated, although some of the most fundamental points their doctrines are diametrically opposed to those commonly reckoned as Gnostic; and his work on Gnosticism includes a discussion of the doctrines of Jacob Boehme, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Hegel. We conform to the usage of many modern writers by using the term "Gnostic" in a narrower sense, but this is a matter on which controversy would be only verbal, Gnosticism not being a word which has in its own nature a definite meaning. If we speak, for instance, of the Clementine writings emanated, although some of the most fundamental points their doctrines are diametrically opposed to those commonly reckoned as Gnostic; and his work on Gnosticism includes a discussion of the doctrines of Jacob Boehme, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Hegel. We conform to the usage of many modern writers by using the term "Gnostic" in a narrower sense, but this is a matter on which controversy would be only verbal, Gnosticism not being a word which has in its own nature a definite meaning. If we speak, for instance, of the Clementine writings emanated, although some of the most fundamental points their doctrines are diametrically opposed to those commonly reckoned as Gnostic; and his work on Gnosticism includes a discussion of the doctrines of Jacob Boehme, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Hegel. We conform to the usage of many modern writers by }
tory proof that their doctrines formed part of Christ's revelation, we might be forced to own that on this subject the difference between them and the church was not one of principle. They did profess to be able to trace their doctrine to the apostles. Basilides was said to have learned from a companion of St. Peter; gospels were in circulation among them which purported to have been written by Philip, Thomas, and other apostles; and they professed to be able to find their doctrines in the canonical scriptures by methods of allegorical interpretation which, however forced, could easily be paralleled in the procedure of orthodox writers. If we made our definition turn on the claim to the possession of Gnosis, and to the title of Gnostic, we should be forced to count Clement of Alexandria among the Gnostics and the First Epistle to Timothy among Gnostic writings; for the church writers refused to surrender these titles to the heretics and, claiming to be the true Gnostics, branded all Gnostics as "false so called." If we fix our attention on the predominance of the speculative over the practical in Gnosticism, which, as Baur truly remarks, led men to regard Christianity less as a means of salvation than as furnishing the principles of a philosophy of the universe, we must allow that the latter writings have not been published in the church which are open to the same criticism. We come very close to what we are in search of if we make the criterion of Gnosticism to be the establishment of a dualism between spirit and matter; and, springing out of this, the doctrine that the way of salvation was not to be found in the power of the Supreme God, yet we might not be able to establish that this characteristic belongs to every one of the sects which we count as Gnostic; and if we are asked why we do not count such sects as the Manicheans among the Gnostics, the best answer is that usage confines the word to those sects which took their origin in the heresy of Manichæism. By Gnostics, meaning by this the later writings have no reason to think that the earliest Gnostics intended to found sects separated from the church and called after their own names. Their disciples were to be Christians, only elevated above the rest as acquainted with deeper mysteries, and called ἡττητοὶ, because possessed of gnosis superior to the simple faith of the multitude. By the earliest instance of the use of the word is by Celsus, quoted by Origen, v. 61, where, speaking of the multiplicity of Christian sects, he says that there were some who professed to be Gnostics. There is no reason to suppose that Celsus would be careful that there should be no overlapping in his enumeration, and hence we infer that other sects are in the same context mentioned apparently as distinct, which we should now count as Gnostic, does not warrant us in inferring that the word was then used in a narrower sense. Irenæus (I. xxv. 5, p. 104), speaking of the Carpocratians and in particular of that school of them which Marcellinus established at Rome, says that they called themselves Gnostics. It is doubtless on the strength of this passage that Eusebius (H. E. iv. 7), quoting Irenæus in the same context, calls Carpocrates the father of the sect called that of the Gnostics. In the habitual use of the word by Irenæus himself it does not occur as limited to Carpocratians. Irenæus, in his first book, when he has gone through the sects called after the names of heretical teachers, gives in a kind of appendix an account of a number of sects, in their general characteristics Ophite, but he does not himself use that name. He calls them "multitudo Gnosticorum," tracing their origin to Simon Magus, and counting them as progenitors of the Valentinians. And constantly we have the expression Basilidian, Valentinians, &c., "et reliqui Gnostici," where, by the latter appellation, the Ophite sects are specially intended. The form of expression does not exclude from the title of Gnostic the sects named after their founders, and the doctrine of the Valentinians is all through the work of Irenæus a branch of "Gnosis falsely so called": yet it is usually spoken of less as Gnosticism than as a development of Gnosticism, and the Valentinians are described as more Gnostic than the Gnostics, meaning by this the latter writings have already mentioned. In the work of Hippolytus against heresies, the name is almost exclusively found in connection with the sect of the Naassenes or Ophites, and three or four times it is repeated (v. 2, p. 93; 4, p. 94; 11, p. 123) that these people called themselves Gnostics, making no claim to the title in the early sense. Though Hippolytus believes Naassenes to have been their older, Gnostics their later, name, the probability is all the other way. The value which they attached to knowledge appears from their saying (pp. 95, 132) that the beginning of perfection was the knowledge of man, and the knowledge of God was complete perfection; see also Hippolytus, v. 36, p. 258, and the statement of Irenæus [H. I. p. 188] that Nicolaitanism was a branch of Gnosis. Epiphanius divides this article into two, making the Gnostics a separate heresy (Haer. 28). He gives several alternative names for them, and from the doctrines and language which he attributes to them it is plain that he had in view one of the Ophite sects. Some later notices have naturally followed Epiphanius in counting one of the branches of the sects now commonly known as Gnostics as constituting a separate sect of "Gnostics." It is plain from this sketch that ancient usage leaves a good deal of latitude to modern writers in deciding which of the 2nd century sects they will count a Gnostic sect.

Classification of Gnostic Sects.—For the same reason that we have thought ourselves able to decline controversy concerning the definition of Gnosticism, we have not found it necessary to make any classification of Gnostic sects beyond the alphabetic arrangement of them forced on us.
by the plan of this work. Some general principles of philosophic classification may be easily agreed on, but when they come to be applied, it is found that there are some sects to which it is not obvious where to assign a place, and that some sects are separated whose affinities are closer than those of others which are classed together. A further difficulty is the division is that made by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iii. 5) into the ascetic and licentious sects: both parties agreeing in holding the essential evil of matter; the one endeavouring by rigorous abstinance to free as much as possible man's soul from the bondage to which it is subjected by union with his material part; and refusing to marry and so enthrall new souls in the prisons of bodies; the other abandoning as desperate any attempt to purify the hopelessly corrupt body, and teaching that the instructed soul ought to hold itself unaffected by the deeds of the body. All actions were to it indifferent, for the body; slavish were its works; God was a duty to set at nought; restrictions only imposed by the commands of that Being who did the evil work of shutting up men's souls in matter. The division of Neander is intended to embrace a wider range of sects than that just described. Taking the common doctrine of the Gnostic sects that the world is the creation by the most different kind from the supreme God, he distinguishes whether that Being was held to have acted in subordination to the Supreme, and on the whole to have carried out his intentions, or to have been absolutely hostile to the supreme God. Taking now into account the generally acknowledged position that the first 400 years of the world were the same as the God worshipped by the Jews, we see that Gnostics of the second class would be absolutely hostile to Judaism, which those of the former class might accept as one of the stages ordained by the Supreme in the enlightenment of the world. Thus Neander's division classifies sects as they are not unfriendly to Judaism or hostile to it; for the purpose of discovering the origin in those Alexandrian schools where the authority of such teachers as Philo had weight, the other among Christian converts from Oriental philosophy whose early education had given them no prejudices in favour of Judaism. Neander, with a good deal of ingenuity, deduces from the opposite decisions on his fundamental point of distinction the leading doctrines of the schools on both sides, though in each case it is easy to see that he has chiefly in view the opinions of one representative sect, and that his descriptions do not equally apply to all the sects which he has joined together. In fact, the sects which are joined together in this classification are not those which regard heathenism, but those which regard heathenism. All regarded Christianity as the absolutely true religion, but the point of difference was whether they represented it as absolutely hostile to the two other systems, or whether they would recognise seeds of religious truth in each of these dispensations. Thus then he divides into (1) sects which were willing to allow Christianity to look with a certain condescension on both Judaism and heathenism, (2) which made Christianity look with absolute hostility on both, (3) which identified Christianity with Judaism while placing both in opposition to heathenism. The last class embraceth the majority of the early Gnostic sects, according to the Clementines; and it may be suspected that it was only in order to maintain the symmetry of his classification that Baur was led to count these as Gnostic at all. Setting these aside, it is found that the result of Baur's method is to place the school of Marcion on one side and all other Gnostic sects on the other, a classification which really carries us but a little way. Gieseler divides into Alexandrian Gnostics, whose teaching was mainly influenced by the Platonico-philosophy, and Syrian strongly affected by Panism. In the former the emmanation doctrine was predominant, in the latter dualism. Undoubtedly the most astonishing of all the systems would be if it were possible, as Matter suggested, to have one founded on the history of the generation of the sects, distinguishing the school where Gnosticism had its beginning, and naming the schools which successively in different places altered in different directions the original scheme. But a god classification of the kind divides into two rival families; the former classed by the scantiness of our materials for the history of Gnosticism. Irenaeus is the first to give us all the full details, and he may be counted two generations later than Valentinus; for Marcus, the disciple of Valentinus, was resisted by one whose Irenaeus looked up to with respect as belonging to the same world as himself. On the other hand, the interval between Valentinus and Irenaeus has been already mentioned that we learn from Hippolytus that it was the boast of the members of the sect of the Neoplatonists that they alone "knew the depths." How we find that the same classing of the Neoplatonists as a sect of Gnostics was an idea suggested by the psychological nature of the older philosophy which was a watchword of the false teachers reprobated in the Apocalypse (Rev. ii. 24). We can hardly avoid the inference that the Neoplatonists of Hippolytus inherited a phrase continuously in use among heretical teachers since before the publication of the Revelation of St. John. Of the writers who would deny the pastoral epistles to be Paul's, a large proportion date the book of Revelation only two or three years after St. Paul's death; therefore, whether we suppose or not that it was Paul who wrote of the "falsely called knowledge," it remains probable that heretical pretenders to Gnosis had arisen in Paul's lifetime. If we find reason to place the beginnings of Gnosticism in the apostolic age, we shall be justified in supposing that the notices of its origin given by Irenaeus, who wrote more than a century afterwards, are so scanty; and that the teachers to whom its origin has been ascribed, Simon, Flavia,才会, Nicolaus, Cerinthus, remain to us shadowy or legendary characters. It follows that any conclusions we come to as to the order of succession of the early Gnostic sects and their obligations one to another, rest less on trustworthy historical evidence than on the critical sagacity of the modern enquirer, and consequently that such conclusions do not form a very secure basis of classification. Still, some general facts
In the history of the evolution of Gnosticism may be considered as fairly certain; and accordingly we are well disposed to accept as a whole the classification of Lipsius, and with him to count three stages in the progress of Gnosticism, even though with regard to particular sects there may be room for dispute as to what place in the division this or that sect is to be assigned. The birthplace of the Gnostic mystery was in the Syrian desert, if we count that word as including Palestine and Samaria, where church tradition places the activity of those whom it regards as the founders of Gnosticism, Simon and Menander. It may also be inferred from the use made of the Old Testament and of Hebrew words that Gnosticism sprang out of Judaism. The false teaching combated in the Epistle to the Colossians, which has several Gnostic features, is also distinctly Jewish, insisting, as it did, on the observance of sabbaths and new moons. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which deal with a somewhat later development of Gnosticism, describe the false teaching as the “fables” of “Jewish fables.” The use of the word “circumcision” as “professing to be teachers of the law,” and as propounders of “Jewish fables” is not likely that what these epistles characterize as “profane and old wives’ fables” may be some of that Jewish Haggadah of which the early stages of Gnosticism are full. The story of Simon the Magician, as told by Irenæus (iii, 30), we hold to date from the very beginning of Gnosticism, if not in its present shape, at least in some rudimentary form, as may be inferred from the appearance of fragments of it in different Gnostic systems; in particular of the representation of the work of Creation as performed by an inferior being who still fully believed himself to be the Supreme, saying, “I am God, and there is none beside me,” until after this boast his ignorance was enlightened. The Jewish Cabala has been asserted to be the parent of Gnosticism; but besides that the records of Caballistic doctrine are quite modern, and that any attempt to pick out the really ancient parts must be attended with uncertainty, we find that there have led to the result (see Lipsius, p. 270, and Gritz, referred to by him) that the Cabala is certainly not older than Gnosticism, its relation to it being not that of a parent, but of a younger brother. If these be direct obligation, the Cabala is the borrower, but many of the common features are to be explained by regarding both as branches from the same root, and as alike springing from the contact of Judaism with the religious beliefs of the farther East. Jewish Essenes especially furnished a soil favourable to the growth of Gnosticism, with which it seems to have had in common the doctrine of the essential evil of matter, as appears from the denial by the Essenes of the possibility of the Deity being the author of evil. It may be added that the Ebionite sects which sprang out of Essenes, while they professed the strongest attachment to the Mosaic law, not only rejected the authority of the prophetic writings, but dealt in a very arbitrary manner with those parts of the Pentateuch which conflicted with their peculiar dogmas. We have parallels to this in theories of some of the early Gnostic sects which referred the Jewish prophetic book to the inspiration of Belial inferior to him by whom the law was given, as well as in the arbitrary modes of criticism applied by some of the later sects to the books of Scripture. What has been said as to the affinities of Essenes and Gnosticism sufficiently illustrates the growth of Gnosticism from Judaism when the latter was brought into contact with the mysteries of the Syrian desert, whether we suppose Essenes to have been a stage in the process of growth or whether we suppose both have been independent growths under similar circumstances of development. Lipsius notes as the characteristics of those sects which he counts as belonging to the first stage of Gnosticism that they still move almost or altogether within the circle of the Jewish religious history, and that the chief problem they set themselves is the defining the relation between Christianity and Judaism. The solutions of this problem at which they arrive are very various. Those Jewish sects whose Essenes passed into the Ebionism of the Gnostics resemble Christ and his Church essentially identical with Judaism, either religion being sufficient for salvation. These sects are quite orthodox in their theories as to the Creation, their utmost deviation (if it can be called so) from the received belief being the ascription of Creation to the immanent wisdom of God. Other Jewish sects accepted a lack of the formation of matter as accomplished by a subordinate Being, carrying out, it may be, the will of the Supreme, but owing to his finiteness and ignorance doing the work with many imperfections. Then came the theory that this subordinate Being was the God of the Jews, to which nation he had issued many commandments that were not good, though is mind by the Supreme so as to carry out his ends. Lastly came the theory of the Colunites and other extreme Ophite sects, which represented the God of the Jews as the determined enemy of the Supreme, and as whose commands it was the duty of every enlightened Gnostic to disobey. With all this variety of results, there is an agreement in the importance they ascribed to the problem of settling the true relations of Judaism to Christianity. They do make use of certain heathen principles of cosmogony, but such as already had become familiar to Syriac Judaism, and introduced not so much with the object of effecting a reconciliation between Christianity and heathenism as with the view of giving an explanation of the exact service rendered to the world by the publication of Christianity, the absolute religion. This is made mainly to consist in the seed given to the soul in its struggles to escape the bonds of finiteness and darkness, by making known to it the supernormal world and awakening to it to a sense of its spiritual origin. Regarding this knowledge as the common privilege of Christians, the first speculators would count their own possession of it as differing rather in degree than in kind from that of other Christians; and so it is not easy to draw a sharp line of distinction between their doctrine on the subject of Gnosis and that admitted as orthodox. Our Lord had described it as the privilege of His disciples to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; later when His followers learned to know the doctrine of a suffering Messiah, and of the fulfilment of the
types and shadows of the Mosaic law in the person of Jesus, they felt that the veil which was spread over the Jewish mind in the reading of the law had been removed for them, and that they enjoyed a knowledge of the meaning of the Old Testament Scriptures to which their unlettersed brethren were strange.

This feeling pervades the Epistle to the Hebrews, and still more that of Barnabas. Another doctrine which Paul describes as a mystery formerly kept secret, but now revealed through his gospel, is the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews to the inheritance of the kingdom of Christ. It was no part of orthodox Christian doctrine that all Christians possessed the knowledge here referred to in equal degree. It was owned that there were among the Christians some who required to be fed with milk, not with strong meat, and who had not their senses exercised by reason of use to discern between good and evil; and, in the 1st Epist. of Clement, the distinction made by Clement of Alexandria between faith and knowledge. We hesitate therefore to say that the earliest Gnostic doctrine concerning the relations between faith and knowledge was specifically different from that of the church, the difference, as we believe, mainly turning on the character of their received and accredited knowledge, much of the Gnostic so-called knowledge consisting in acquaintance with the names of a host of invisible Beings and with the formulae which were useful in gaining their favour.

Gnosticism, in its first state, did not proceed far outside the limits of Syria. What Lipsius counts as the second stage dates from the migration of Gnostic systems to Alexandria, where the myths of Syriac Gnosis came to be united to principles of Grecian philosophy. Different Gnostic systems resulted according as the principles of this or that Grecian school were adopted. Thus, in the system of Valentinus, the Platonic philosophy predominates, the Stoic in that of the Basilidians as presented by Hippolytus. In these systems, tinged with Hellenism, the problem of assigning the true place to Judaism in the history of the world's development drops into the background, the Jewish religion being not so much controverted or disparaged as ignored. The mythical personages among whom in the older Gnosis the work of creation was distributed are in these Hellenic systems replaced by a kind of abstract beings (of whom the Valentinian aeons may serve as an illustrative specimen) which personify the different stages of the process by which the One Infinite Spirit communicates and reveals the mysteries of existence. In these systems, again, the distinction between faith and knowledge, which in the older system had been one of degree, becomes sharpened, the persons to whom faith and knowledge respectively are to serve as guides being represented as essentially different in nature. The most obvious division of men into classes derived existences, but two classes: a kingdom of light, and a kingdom of darkness. Probably, the need of a third class may have first made itself felt from the necessity of finding a place for members of the Jewish religion, who stood on a level so far above heathenism, so far below Christianity. The Platonic *trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit, afforded a principle of threefold classification, and men are divided into earthly (διάφανος ουσίας), animal (ψυχικος), and spiritual (πνευματικος). In these Hellenic Gnostic systems, the second class represents not Jews but ordinary Christians, and the third class the Gnostics themselves (who are the spiritual) is made so to rest on an original difference of nature as to leave little room for human freewill. The mode of salvation by faith and corresponding works is disparaged as suitable only for the psychical, the better sort of whom may, by this means, be brought as high as possible in the order of the universe as their nature is capable of; but the really spiritual need not these lower methods of salvation. It suffices for them to have the knowledge of their true nature revealed to them, when they become certain of shaking off all imprisoning bonds and soaring to the highest region of all. It results from this that the Gnosis of the 1st Epist. of Clement, that Christianity runs the risk of meeting the same fate in the later Gnostic systems that befell Judaism in the earlier. The doctrines and facts of the religion are only valued so far as under their veil can be made to appear the peculiar notions of Gnosticism; and the method of allegorically interpreting the Scriptures leading to the New Testament as well as the Old that all the solid parts of the religion are in danger of being vapidly altered.

The natural consequence of this weakening of the historic side of Christianity was the removal of all sufficient barrier against the intrusion of heathen elements into the systems; while the moral teaching was injuriously affected by the doctrine that there were certain who were secure of salvation by necessity of their nature and irrespectively of their conduct. In the third stage of Gnosticism, it struggles in various ways to avoid these faults, and so again draws nearer to the teaching of the Catholic church. Thus the Docetist of Hippolytus no longer divide mankind into two or three great classes; but allows of immense variety corresponding to the diversity of the ideas derived from the world of seons, which each has received, while again they deny to none a share in our Lord's redemption, but own that members of different sects are enabled, each in his degree, to claim kinship with Jesus, and to obtain forgiveness of sins through him. So again in one of the latest of the Gnostic systems, that of Pistis Sophia, there is no assertion of an essential diversity of nature among men, but the immense development of ranks and degrees in the spiritual world, which the works referred to professors to realize, is used so as to provide for every man a place commensurate to his works. Once more, in the system of Marcion, the theory of essentially different classes of men is abandoned; the great boast of Christianity is made to be its universality; and the redemption which the Gospel brings is represented, not as the mere renewing of the pneumatic soul to consciousness of privileges, which as a fact it had all along possessed, but as the introduction into the world of a real principle of moral life through the rela-

* An Assyrian origin is ascribed to the threefold division (Hippol. v. 7, p. 89).
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of a God of love forgiving sins through Christ.
In the account which we have just given we have closely followed Lipsius; but we shall now attempt to supply materials for constructing or testing any more general classification of Gnostic systems by giving under each head of doctrine, irrespective of any theory, a classified list of the tenets of each. We can only touch lightly, however, on the systems of Valentinus and Marcion, these being too important to admit of satisfactory treatment except in separate articles.

In connection with the First Principle, Irenaeus states that nearly all the heresies acknowledged the unity of God, and in almost identical words he describes several of the earliest of them as counting as the first principle one Father unknown to all; but their systems may be divided into (A) those which, as far as our knowledge of them reaches, do not proceed beyond the limits of the old Jewish monotheism; (B) those which contain some veneration of the Christian Logos doctrine, and personify immanent attributes of deity so as to make them distinct entities; (C) those which imply a knowledge of the Chaldean and Zoroastrian systems, and which represent Saturninus, as far as our scanty knowledge of him extends, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, and the Ebionites, Cerdo and Marcion. To class B we refer Simon and Menander, who, according to Irenaeus, agreed in teaching that angels and archangels were not produced directly by the Supreme, but by his right hand. The conception [Enoea] personified and regarded as a female originating principle. The account given by Hippolytus of the system of Simon more plainly brings it under this class; for Hippolytus himself remarks that the idea of the simulation doctrine concerning the six "roots" and the Valentinian theory of aeons, Basilides, according to the account of Irenaeus, belongs to the same class, interposing, as he does, between the unknown Father and the angels the abstractions Nous, Logos, Phrornesis, Dynamis, and Sophin. These do not appear in the account of Hippolytus (see Vol. I. p. 271). The Barbelite system described by Irenaeus (l. 29) contains a richer greater. It is a development of the method culminates in the soteriology of the Valentinian system. To class C we cannot help referring the Ophite system described by Irenaeus (I. 30). It is scarcely possible to account except through the influence of Christian doctrine for the representation in this system of the first principle as threefold, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, though the title of a feminine name is used for the last to denote the description of the third principle as female, on which was founded some revolting mythology. In the Basilidian system as described by Hippolytus, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have an equally prominent part. The system of the Peratae, who believed in the distinct existence of the Ophites, retains the doctrine of two male and one female principle, but the last of those is changed, the three being now Father, Son, and Matter; and this is substantially also the teaching of Justinus. The Nanaeae, Sethites, and Docetae of Hippolytus, who all appear to be later than the Irenaean Ophites, agree in ascribing triplicity to the first principle.

In the Ophite system, both as described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the name Man is given to the first principle. This has been connected with the Adam Kadmon of the Cabballa; but it seems to us likely that this phraseology is borrowed from the title Son of Man which in the Gospels our Lord applies to Himself (see Irenaeus, i. 12, p. 59).

Creation and Cosmogony.—Philo (Op. Mundi.) had inferred from the expression, "Let us make man," of the Book of Genesis that God had used other beings as assistants in the creation of man, and he explains in this way why man is capable of vice as well as virtue, ascribing the origin of the latter to God, of the former to his helpers in the work of creation. The earliest Gnostic sects ascribe the work of creation to angels, some of whom making use of the same passage in the Book of Genesis (Justin. Dial. x. 29. c. Tryph. and Cres. 44), according to Irenaeus, represent the world as made by angels, but these angels not themselves the immediate work of God, but springing from his consort Enoea. Saturninus appears not to have used this refinement; his angels are represented as made by the unknown Father, and those who represent the conception [Enoea] personified and regarded as a female originating principle. The account given by Hippolytus of the system of Simon more plainly brings it under this class; for Hippolytus himself remarks the analogy between the Simonian doctrine concerning the six "roots" and the Valentinian theory of aeons. Basilides, according to the account of Irenaeus, belongs to the same class, interposing, as he does, between the unknown Father and the angels the abstractions Nous, Logos, Phrornesis, Dynamis, and Sophin. These do not appear in the account of Hippolytus (see Vol. I. p. 271). The Barbelite system described by Irenaeus (l. 29) contains a richer greater. It is a development of the method culminates in the soteriology of the Valentinian system. To class C we cannot help referring the Ophite system described by Irenaeus (I. 30). It is scarcely possible to account except through the influence of Christian doctrine for the representation in this system of the first principle as threefold, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, though the title of a feminine name is used for the last to denote the description of the third principle as female, on which was founded some revolting mythology. In the Basilidian system as described by Hippolytus, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have an equally prominent part. The system of the Peratae, who believed in the distinct existence of the Ophites, retains the doctrine of two male and one female principle, but the last of those is changed, the three being now Father, Son, and Matter; and this is substantially also the teaching of Justinus. The Nanaeae, Sethites, and Docetae of Hippolytus, who all appear to be later than the Irenaean Ophites, agree in ascribing triplicity to the first principle.

In the Ophite system, both as described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the name Man is given to the first principle. This has been connected with the Adam Kadmon of the Cabballa; but it seems to us likely that this phraseology is borrowed from the title Son of Man which in the Gospels our Lord applies to Himself (see Irenaeus, i. 12, p. 59).

Creation and Cosmogony.—Philo (Op. Mundi.) had inferred from the expression, "Let us make man," of the Book of Genesis that God had used other beings as assistants in the creation of man, and he explains in this way why man is capable of vice as well as virtue, ascribing the origin of the latter to God, of the former to his helpers in the work of creation. The earliest Gnostic sects ascribe the work of creation to angels, some of whom making use of the same passage in the Book of Genesis (Justin. Dial. x. 29. c. Tryph. and Cres. 44), according to Irenaeus, represent the world as made by angels, but these angels not themselves the immediate work of God, but springing from his consort Enoea. Saturninus appears not to have used this refinement; his angels are represented as made by the unknown Father, and those who represent the conception [Enoea] personified and regarded as a female originating principle. The account given by Hippolytus of the system of Simon more plainly brings it under this class; for Hippolytus himself remarks the analogy between the Simonian doctrine concerning the six "roots" and the Valentinian theory of aeons. Basilides, according to the account of Irenaeus, belongs to the same class, interposing, as he does, between the unknown Father and the angels the abstractions Nous, Logos, Phrornesis, Dynamis, and Sophin. These do not appear in the account of Hippolytus (see Vol. I. p. 271). The Barbelite system described by Irenaeus (l. 29) contains a richer greater. It is a development of the method culminates in the soteriology of the Valentinian system. To class C we cannot help referring the Ophite system described by Irenaeus (I. 30). It is scarcely possible to account except through the influence of Christian doctrine for the representation in this system of the first principle as threefold, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, though the title of a feminine name is used for the last to denote the description of the third principle as female, on which was founded some revolting mythology. In the Basilidian system as described by Hippolytus, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have an equally prominent part. The system of the Peratae, who believed in the distinct existence of the Ophites, retains the doctrine of two male and one female principle, but the last of those is changed, the three being now Father, Son, and Matter; and this is substantially also the teaching of Justinus. The Nanaeae, Sethites, and Docetae of Hippolytus, who all appear to be later than the Irenaean Ophites, agree in ascribing triplicity to the first principle.

In the Ophite system, both as described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the name Man is given to the first principle. This has been connected with the Adam Kadmon of the Cabballa; but it seems to us likely that this phraseology is borrowed from the title Son of Man which in the Gospels our Lord applies to Himself (see Irenaeus, i. 12, p. 59).

Creation and Cosmogony.—Philo (Op. Mundi.) had inferred from the expression, "Let us make man," of the Book of Genesis that God had used other beings as assistants in the creation of man, and he explains in this way why man is capable of vice as well as virtue, ascribing the origin of the latter to God, of the former to his helpers in the work of creation. The earliest Gnostic sects ascribe the work of creation to angels, some of whom making use of the same passage in the Book of Genesis (Justin. Dial. x. 29. c. Tryph. and Cres. 44), according to Irenaeus, represent the world as made by angels, but these angels not themselves the immediate work of God, but springing from his consort Enoea. Saturninus appears not to have used this refinement; his angels are represented as made by the unknown Father, and those who represent the conception [Enoea] personified and regarded as a female originating principle. The account given by Hippolytus of the system of Simon more plainly brings it under this class; for Hippolytus himself remarks the analogy between the Simonian doctrine concerning the six "roots" and the Valentinian theory of aeons. Basilides, according to the account of Irenaeus, belongs to the same class, interposing, as he does, between the unknown Father and the angels the abstractions Nous, Logos, Phrornesis, Dynamis, and Sophin. These do not appear in the account of Hippolytus (see Vol. I. p. 271). The Barbelite system described by Irenaeus (l. 29) contains a richer greater. It is a development of the method culminates in the soteriology of the Valentinian system. To class C we cannot help referring the Ophite system described by Irenaeus (I. 30). It is scarcely possible to account except through the influence of Christian doctrine for the representation in this system of the first principle as threefold, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, though the title of a feminine name is used for the last to denote the description of the third principle as female, on which was founded some revolting mythology. In the Basilidian system as described by Hippolytus, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have an equally prominent part. The system of the Peratae, who believed in the distinct existence of the Ophites, retains the doctrine of two male and one female principle, but the last of those is changed, the three being now Father, Son, and Matter; and this is substantially also the teaching of Justinus. The Nanaeae, Sethites, and Docetae of Hippolytus, who all appear to be later than the Irenaean Ophites, agree in ascribing triplicity to the first principle.
Into these lower regions the second Sophia descends, prompted, according to one account, by a desire to find a consort, and thence is long unable to return, being detained by the waters which eagerly lay hold of the light which she brings with her (see also Hippol. v. 19, p. 139; viii. 39, p. 254). There she gives birth to a son, Pomet or Ialdabaoth, who in turn generates other angels, and who frames the lower world, all in ignorance of his mother, and unaware that he has any superior; for he cries "I am a jealous God and there is none other beside me." In this legend the story of the creation of man is told nearly in the same words as the doctrine of Saturnus, but with this difference, that the spark of light to animate the first formed man is given not by pity of the superior power, but by his father Ialdabaoth, Sophia having so contrived it, in order that Ialdabaoth may thus be emptied of the light which he had received from her. In accordance to it's myth the world's subsequent history is that of the plans by which Sophia contrives to recover from these lower regions the light which souls of men have inherited, and to effect its restoration to the apparently regions whence it came. Neander (Ch. Hist. ii. 146) sees in this story of Sophia a mythological expression of the way in which it was foreseen that there would be an animus mundi, the source of all spiritual life, which reabsorbs into itself all that has flowed out from it. This tale of a descent and recovery of Sophia early established itself as a part of divergent Gnostic systems. It is the principal subject of the book Pistis Sophia, and it is worked out in much detail in the system of Valentinus, who added certain explanations and developments, besides founding on it an explanation of the origin of matter, the pre-existence of which seems to have been assumed in the earlier systems. The Cosmogony of the Basilides of Hippolytus has been sufficiently detailed (Vol. i. pp. 271 seq.). To the indications noted p. 277, from which it is inferred that the system there described is later than the Valentinian, may be added the use of the text, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (Hippol. vii. 26, p. 239; Clem. Strom. ii. 8, p. 448), which was employed by Valentinian with respect to the fear and conversion of Sophia (Hippol. vii. 32, p. 191); the use made of Ez. vi. 3, 3 (Hippol. ii. 56, p. 196; vii. 25, p. 235); the application of the title Demiurgos to the great Archon (vii. 23, p. 236); the use of the word τέρτος in reference to the Hebdomad (compare vii. 33, p. 191, vii. 24, p. 237, Excerpt. ex Script. Theod. 38), and the doctrine of the "Great Ignorance," which has a certain resemblance to the part ascribed to Horus in bringing different orders of beings to a state of contentment by making known to them the necessary limitations which separate them. Concerning each of the coincidences noted, however, the question arises whether Basilides borrowed from Valentinus or both adopted common elements from the earlier Gnosis. There are points of resemblance also which seem more than accidental between this Basilidian system and that of the Sibyls described in the fifth book of Hippolytus, for instance, the whole doctrine that the progress of the world's history is a resolution into its elements of what had been a confused mixture (Hippol. v. 21, vii. 27), the illustration that a young child possesses potentially the faculties which he afterwards brings into exercise (v. 19, vii. 227), and the use of the spreading of fragrance to illustrate the operation of the Spirit (v. 19, vii. 22). If there be obligation on other side it must be on the Basilidian, for the hypothesis of the Sethite system with the earlier Ophite systems is so much closer than with the Basilidian that we cannot conceive the last interposed between the former. We have noted under DOCTRINES the resemblances between the doctrines of that sect and of this Basilidian system.

DOCTRINE REJECTED TO JUDAISM.—The doctrine that the Creator of the world is not the supreme God leads at once to the question, what then is to be thought of the God of the Jews, who certainly claimed to have created the world? This question is most distinctly answered in the doctrine of the Ophite system (frem. i. 38). According to it, the power of the Sons of the Father, an angel the Son of God, acknowledging none other, was led by sheer ignorance to make a false pretension. He was in truth none other than the chief of the creative angels, holding but a subordinate place in the constitution of the universe. It was he who either Adam and Eve that knowledge by which they might be informed that they were superior to him, and who on their disobedience cast them out of paradise. It was he who brought a deluge on mankind, from jealousy that they did not pay him due honour, though baffled by a higher power in his attempt to destroy them. It was he who made a covenant with Abraham, that if his posterity would serve him they should possess the earth; he who inspired the old Law in Egypt, and gave them a law by Moses. It was he who inspired the Pentateuch and some other parts of the Old Testament; the rest of the volume was inspired by his subordinate angels; but yet his mother Sophia had provided that each of the writers should give intimations of these higher truths whereby the God of the Jews himself was to be substantiated. Accordingly, in some sense he used the Old Testament, but in a very arbitrary way, finding in it where they could confirmations of their theories, and rejecting without scruple whatever made against them. Yet all this polemic against Judaism has the marks of being addressed to men brought up to reverence the Old Testament, and who needed theories to make them feel themselves justified to disregard it in systems previously described by Irenaeus we feel traces of the same theory, though not so fully worked out. Their common statement, already quoted, that the Creative power was far below the supreme God, and ignorant of him, implies a rejection of the Old Testament doctrine, which plainly ascribes the work of creation to the Supreme, as well as a charge of ignorance against him who inspired the claim. It may be inferred also that the knowledge which they professed to communicate contained a revelation that higher power of which the Creator was ignorant. The doctrine ascribed by Irenaeus to Simon is in many points identical with that which he ascribes to Cerpercan. Simon is represented as teaching a transmigration of souls, and a

---

4 The doctrine of a transmigration of souls, not only into human bodies but into those of beasts, is said to
consequent detention of souls in these lower regions until the place has learned to cast off the role of the angel and to imitate the wise one. It is these angels who inspired the teaching of the Jewish prophets which must be disregarded by enlightened men, who will live as they please, knowing that the actions which have the reputation of being righteous are not really so in their own nature, but only through the arbitrary appointment of these angels. This language would lead us to think of a rejection not of Jewish practices merely, but of the ordinary rules of morality; and accordingly church writers agree in accusing the followers of Simon of gross licentiousness of conduct. Besides this freedom of living, magical charms were the means by which they and the kindred sects hoped to bring under their power the makers of the world. The Ophite formules preserved by Origen (cont. Celts., vi. 31), and that of the Marcossians given by Irenaeus (i. 13), are specimens of the valuable secrets which this Gnosis had to communicate. Saturninus and Basilides are described by Irenaeus as agreeing in the doctrines that the God of the Jews was but one of the creative angels, and that the Old Testament owed its inspiration to different sources, as already related. The opposition to the God of the Jews reaches its extreme in the system of the Caineites, which glorified Cain, Esau, Korah, and the others who are described in the Old Testament as enemies to God. An specimen of this doctrine is to be found in the fragments of Peretic teaching preserved by Hippolytus (v. 16). The heroes of the Pereticæ are Cain, who refused to propitiate with a bloody sacrifice the God of this world, who delights in blood, Nimrod the mighty hunter, and Esau, who got no blessing from the blind old man, but whose face, notwithstanding Jacob saw, as though it had been the face of God. But in this system the place of honour is given to the serpent. In the system which we have so often referred to, described by Irenaeus (i. 30), though commonly called Ophite, the serpent is the father of the mundane demons, and the enemy of the human race, though sometimes subdued by this, while he is the minister of good. It is to be observed, however, that the name Nous is given to him, which is the title which in other Gnostic systems is given to one of the primal emanations of Deity. But in the Peretic system the serpent is identified with the Son, and is made the mediator between God and matter; it was he who gave the counsel to Eve; he was the serpent-rod by which means Moses performed his miracles; he was the brazen serpent who saved those who believed on him from being bitten by the serpents of the wilderness; it was he in whose likeness it was said the Son of man should be lifted up. They pointed out what a high place the serpent held among the constellations of heaven, and how the same form could be traced in the anatomy of the human frame. (See also v. 9, p. 119; 19, p. 142.)

The account of Valentinus given by Hippolytus (vi. 55, p. 194) would imply that he completely rejected the Old Testament, whose writers, inspired by the Demiurge, were as ignorant as himself, even as the Saviour said: "All who came before me are thieves and robbers." But from the account of Irenæus (l. 7) we learn that Valentinus made use of the earlier heretics, attaching part of it to Sophia herself, part to her spiritual seed, and only the remainder to the Demiurge. His system looks on the Jews as like the Demiurge, whose people they are, limited in knowledge, but not incapable of enlightenment and spiritual elevation.

Doctrine concerning the Nature of Man.—We have already given the story told by Saturninus of the animation of a previously lifeless man by a spark of light from above. With this myth he connected the doctrine, in which he was followed by almost all the Gnostic sects, that there would be a resurrection of the dead, a spark of light being taken back on death to the place whence it had come, and man's material part being resolved into its elements. Saturninus is said to have taught the doctrine, antagonistic to that of man's free will, that there were classes of men by nature essentially different, and of these he counted two—the good and the bad, the just and the unjust. The doctrine became common to many Gnostic systems that the human frame contained a heavenly element struggling to return to its native place. The Basilides of Hippolytus must be counted an exception, whose doctrine it is that things always tend upwards, and who therefore refuses to describe any of the heavenly elements as derived from human beings. The formule are set forth in a heavenly element from above. But he explains that things below can be affected by things above without any real contact, in the same way as Indian naphtha will light up while still at a considerable distance from the fire. This illustration was also employed by the Pereticæ (v. 17, p. 137), who also used the illustration that heavenly forms are imparted to material things in the same way that forms are transferred by a pointer to his canvas without his removing anything from the objects which he draws. And this seems also to have been the Docetic doctrine (viii. 9, p. 264). The Saturninian twofold division of man's nature was soon replaced by a threefold: the Irenæus, or the heavenly element is described as having (1) a body, before the fall, light and spiritual, but after his expulsion from paradise dark, gross, and sluggish; (2) a soul (mundialis insufflatio) inspired by Ialdaboath; and (3) the sweet savour of the sprinkling of light bestowed on them by the compassion of the mother Prunikos. The Naassenes (All. Hist. Hist. v. 6) divides man's nature into the parts ψυχή, φύσις, and χρόνος. The system of JUSTINUS relates that there have been implanted in man's body two mutually hostile principles, the soul, derived from Eden, the source of all man's errors and misery, and the spirit given by Iochi, destined one day to be liberated. Valentinus completely differed from the Docetic doctrine as formulated. He counted man's bodily part as twofold—a hylic or subtle body, such as Adam was first created with, and a choral or gross earthly body, the "coat of skin" (see Vol. 1. p. 313), with which he was arrayed after the fall; he besides ascribed to man the ψυχή derived from the Demiurge, and the λογική, derived from Achamoth, which, without the knowledge of the

A similar story is attributed by the Naassenes to the Chaldæes (Hippol. v. 7, p. 97).
Demigrie, was through his instrumentality inspired into the spiritual seed. These "spiritual," however, are only an ἄνεμος from among men; they are certain of salvation, whatever be their actions, even as pure gold remains gold though it be rolled in the mine; next to them come the psychological, the use of whose free will will decide whether they will sit at the higher or sink to a lower lot, and who may accordingly be divided into two classes; last of all are the hylic, who are incapable of salvation. In the consummation all that is merely material will be burned up; the purified ψυχή will rise to the highest position below the Pleroma; the spiritual seed leaving their ψυχικόν outside shall enter, pure spirit, into the Pleroma, and there enjoy bridal union with the angels who there have their dwelling. Basilides appears to have agreed with Valentinus in making the difference between the elect and others to be one of nature (Strom. v. 1).

Redemption and Christology.—The Gnostic systems generally represent man's spirit as imprisoned by sin, and needing deliverance, which the majority of them recognize the coming of Christ in the days of Herod as a turning-point in human affairs, but if we ask in what way man's redemption is effected, the answers of almost all reduce the Redeemer's work to the impartation of knowledge and the disclosure of mysteries. With regard to the nature of Christ, we may quote the words of the new Redeemer, the system of Basilides, as described by Hippolytus, reduces redemption to a minimum, for it makes the progress of the world to its perfect state to be a natural process of evolution arising out of the properties which the seminal principles of things possessed from their first constitution. But yet it was the Saviour's necessary work to lift him or they into need for this development. This he did in the first place by the communication of knowledge. As the son of the great Archon caught the knowledge of supermundane things from the sonship above, and communicated it to his father, and likewise the son of the archon of the Hebdomad caught the like knowledge altogether, and so the Hebdomad with it, so the same light came down on Jesus, and enabled him to liberate the sonship entangled in the formlessness of this lower world, and to give it power to rest to that above. And in this system place is found for the work of the Saviour's Passion; for the most striking difference between the Basilides of Hippolytus and of Irenaeus is that the former acknowledges, the latter denies, the reality of the Passion. What was then accomplished is stated to have been the complete separation of the Saviour's component parts. His bodily frame, which belonged to the formlessness suffered, and there remained. Its psychical part was resuscitated, and restored to the Hebdomad in its form as it had come. So in like manner of that part of him which had been derived from the Ogdoad, and of that which had been derived from the liminary spirit, while the most subtle part of all passed into the supermundane regions. In this Jesus was the first fruits of creation, and it is by a separation such as this of the subtler from the grosser elements that the third sonship is enabled to ascend to its destined place.

Authorities.—The great work of Irenaeus against heresies is the chief storehouse whence writers, both ancient and modern, have drawn subordinate to the Supreme. The Irenaeus Ophites, for instance, agree with Cerinthus in distinguishing Christ from Jesus. Jesus is brother to Sophia, of higher nature than his sister. He descends for her rescue and restoration, passing on his way through the seven heavens, and emptying their rulers of their power (see vol. i. p. 125). Jesus is the higher or sith of the Virgin, divinely prepared beforehand as a pure vessel into which Christ might descend, purer, wiser, and more righteous than other men. At his baptism Christ united to Sophia descends into him, and enables him then to work miracles. At the crucifixion Christ departs, leaving Jesus alone to die, but afterwards raises him up again, at least as far as his psychic and pneumatic parts, for the gross earthly body was left to be resolved into its elements. Jesus remains on earth for eighteen mouths instructing his disciples, and after that ascends to sit on the right hand of his father Ialdabaoth, unperceived by whom he unites to himself all holy souls, thus preparing the consummation of all things beyond release. Ialdabaoth is completely exhausted of his light, and all has been collected and united by Christ. The Valentinian theory, of which we shall speak in full afterwards, agrees with that just described in making the rescue of Sophia the primary object of the descent of Christus, and in the complexity of nature, Christ is not the son of Sophia, but the Redeemer. The system of Basilides, as described by Hippolytus, reduces redemption to a minimum, for it makes the progress of the world to its perfect state to be a natural process of evolution arising out of the properties which the seminal principles of things possessed from their first constitution. But yet it was the Saviour's necessary work to lift him or they into need for this development. This he did in the first place by the communication of knowledge. As the son of the great Archon caught the knowledge of supermundane things from the sonship above, and communicated it to his father, and likewise the son of the archon of the Hebdomad caught the like knowledge altogether, and so the Hebdomad with it, so the same light came down on Jesus, and enabled him to liberate the sonship entangled in the formlessness of this lower world, and to give it power to rest to that above. And in this system place is found for the work of the Saviour's Passion; for the most striking difference between the Basilides of Hippolytus and of Irenaeus is that the former acknowledges, the latter denies, the reality of the Passion. What was then accomplished is stated to have been the complete separation of the Saviour's component parts. His bodily frame, which belonged to the formlessness suffered, and there remained. Its psychical part was resuscitated, and restored to the Hebdomad in its form as it had come. So in like manner of that part of him which had been derived from the Ogdoad, and of that which had been derived from the liminary spirit, while the most subtle part of all passed into the supermundane regions. In this Jesus was the first fruits of creation, and it is by a separation such as this of the subtler from the grosser elements that the third sonship is enabled to ascend to its destined place.
their accounts of the Gnostic sects. It was primarily directed against the then most popular form of the heresy of Valentinus; and it has thence not unnaturally happened that this form of Gnosticism has thrown all others into the shade; and that many modern writers who profess to describe Gnosticism really describe Valentinianism. Irenaeus was largely copied by Tertullian, who, however, on Marcionism ranks as an independent authority; by Hippolytus, who in his newly-recovered work against heresies adds to what he has taken from Irenaeus large extracts from his independent reading of Gnostic works, and by Eiphphanes, who also gives a few valuable additions from other sources. The Stromates of Clement of Alexandria, though prolixly salutary and unsystematic, furnishes much valuable information about Gnosticism, which was still a living foe of the church when the work was written. The writings of Origen also yield much important information. The gleanings of matter not borrowed from Irenaeus to be had from heresiologists are scanty, and of doubtful value.

We give the following list of modern works which have made valuable contributions to the knowledge of Gnosticism, omitting monographs on particular sects. Of the authors cited Neander, Baur, and Lipsius are those from whom we have benefited most. In the works of Mau's Irenaeus (1710), Beausobre, Manichaei (1759), Mosheim, De Rebus Christ. antea Constantini, 1753; Neander, Genetische Entwickelung, 1818; and Church History, vol. ii. 1825, and 2nd edition, 1845 (we refer to the latter work by the pages of the translation in Clarke's series); Matter, Histoire Critique du Gnosticisme, 1829, 2nd edition, 1843; Burton, Hampden Lectures, 1829; Baur, Christliche Gnosis, 1835; and Die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, 1833, 2nd edition, 1860; Müller, Kaeonologie, 1860; Lipsius, the article "Gnosticismus" in Ersch und Gruber, 1860; Quickenstedt der Epochen, 1875; out of which arose some interesting discussion between him and Harnack, 1873 and 1875; Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 1875.

We do not think it necessary to give cross references to articles on the names of Gnostic teachers, as these are likely to be known to the reader, and the majority of them have already been mentioned in this article. On the relations between Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism see Plotinus.

[G. S.]

GNOUAN, abbot of the altar of St. Cadoc at Llanharvan, and witness to the restoration of Abermenai by king Ithael to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff in the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century. (Llib. Landoe, by Bev., 429.)

[Q. G.]

GOAUDUS. [GOAUDUS.]

GOAR, Irish saint. [QUARE]

GOAR, ST., a priest of Aquitaine, who settled on the Rhine, where the town now stands which bears his name, in the 6th century. His life, written, according to the common opinion, not long after his death, by an anonymous author, was first published by Mabillon (Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. saec. ii. 276-280, Paris, 1688-1701), and then by the Bollandists, with notes (Acta SS. Jul. ii. p. 333). Moved by the rudeness of the style and the command of his abbot, Wandelbert, a monk of Prüm (circ. A.D. 813-870), re-wrote and polished the old life, and added an account of the miracles performed by the relics of the saint under the first three abbeys of Prüm down to the year 808, and an account of the consolidation by Pipin of St. Goar's cell with the monastery of Prüm. Wandelbert's work was first published at Mainz, in 1489, then by Sauris (July vi.), and from another and fuller MS. by Mabillon. (Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. saec. ii. 281-299, Paris, 1688-1701). The second book containing the surrounding may also be found in Bull. Acta SS. Jul. ii. 337. Rotberg is probably correct in his surmise that neither of these lives are earlier than the 9th century. His view is that the account is a mere legend written with a purpose, that of vindicating the pleasures of the table against ill-natured ascetics. (Kirchen geschichte Deutschlands, l. 481-2.) However, the narrative teems with fable and chronological difficulties, and is, historically, almost valueless. The story is, that in the days of Childerbert, son of Clovis (511-558), there came from Aquitaine a man endowed with all the noblest qualities, named Goar, son of Georgius and Valeria, and took up his abode in the Rhine, between Oberwesel and Boppard, with the sanction of Felician, then bishop of Treves. (No bishop of this name is found in the records of the see.) Here he built a little church, and furnished it with relics of the Virgin and other saints. He passed his days in fasting, prayer and all good works, made converts among the surrounding heathen, and hospitably entertained passing strangers, his habit being, after celebrating religious service early in the morning, to eat with the traveller and the poor who came to him. But in the quaint language of his biographer, the devil, taking it hardly that a pearl of such price should be lost in the dust of a German town, stirred up the bishop of Treves, now Rusticus, to send messengers to spy out whether they could find any new or vain thing. Upon their sanguine report that he spent his days and nights in gluttony, they were sent back again to summon St. Goar to Treves. On his way, by a somewhat grotesque miracle, he delivers his enemies from death by hunger and thirst. Brought before the bishop, he is accused of eating and drinking in the early morning, and the bishop proposes to try him whether he is from God or the devil. The test proposed is that he should cause a foundling, three days old, to declare its parents. The child's mouth is opened, and it declares Rusticus to be his father. The bishop overawed with shame falls at the saint's feet, and confesses his sin. Goar exhoirs him to repentance, and imposes on himself seven years' vicarious penitence. Siegbert, king of the Franks, hearing of these things, summons him to his presence, and would put him in the place of Rusticus, but the saint refuses during the bishop's lifetime. With difficulty he obtains permission to his cell on the plea of reflection, where he remained for seven years. At the end of that time the king's messengers find him sick of a fever, and still firm in his refusal. He lived three years and three months longer, and was
then carried off by fever at a good old age (according to Mabillon, circ. 649). He was buried where he died, and, as he had directed, by two priests named Agrippinus and Eusebius, together with a great company. He is commemorated July 6, on which day he is mentioned in the martyrologies of Wandalbert, Bede, Ursinus, and Adamnán; and notice of his feast occurs towards the close of the 8th century, when it was the subject of a contest between the abbots of Prum and the archbishop of Treves, which was finally composed by Charles the Great. The present church was built 1444–1468, and restored in 1843. In addition to the authorities cited above, see the Observations Praevisae in Boll. A. SS. Jul. 2, 327–332, the Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 501–2; v. 378; and Herzog sub nom. His life is included in Baille's collection. (Vie des Saints, Juillet 6, tom. v. 88.)

[St. A. B.]

GOBALTUS (GEBOLDUS), twenty-eighth bishop of Soissons, succeeding Gellon, and followed by Hubertus or Gerbertus, probably a little before the middle of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 339; Gams, Series Episc. 633.)

[St. A. B.]

GOBBAN (GOBAIN, GOBAN, GUBAN), a common name among the ancient Irish, and a form evidently of the Irish Goban, a smith, and of Gobann, their Vulcan; or black-god (Joyce, Irish Names of Places, 221, 4th ed.). Under this name there are eight commemorations in the Martyr-ology ofDonegal, and another Gobban was the most famous architect belonging to that early period in which he lived.

(2) Abbot of Nais, commemorated March 17. Colgan (Acta SS., March 17, p. 63) has compiled the acts of St. Gobban and his two brothers, mostly from the life of St. Carthach Mochuda (May 14). About or before the year 620, St. Carthach was for some time at Inisect (the name is now obso- lete, but the place was near Sherky Island or Inishowen, beside Cape Clear, off the coast of Cloyne; on the opposite side of the bay is Caher, the monastery of three brothers, Gobban, Graphan (or Straphan), and Lasran, under the charge of bishop Domaingen. Gobban afterwards became a bishop, but whether to succeed Domaingen at Inisect, or to serve elsewhere, is unknown. [DOMAINGEN.] (Laugan, Eccl. Hist. Ir. ii. c. 14, § 15.)

(2) Abbot of Ardime and Ard-Dairinensi, commemorated, March 26 and May 30. On these days the Mart. Doneg. commemorates severally the abbots of Ard-Dairinensi, and the abbots of Ardine, but they probably represent one and the same person. Colgan attempts a memoir at March 26, of the "Abbot of Ardine-Dairinensi," but it is doubt as to whether he was (a) the disciple of St. Alibhe, who became patron of the church of Kinsale, which after his death was founded to his honour, or (b) the friend of St. Laserian, the abbot of Killamery, and possibly the founder of the monastery at Leighlin or Old Leighlin, before St. Laserian came to settle there, and establish the see [GOBAINN]; he evidently leans to the latter, but probably with good reason, though we have as little authority for identifying him with the former. Kelly (Cant. Irish Saints, 105) places Airdine-Dairinensi "near Wexford, close to Beggary." (Colgan, Acta SS. 92, n. 7, 715, c. 7, 750; Ware, Ir. Ant. c. 29.)

(3) Finn, of Cill Lambraidhe and Tigh-da-gobhan, commemorated Dec. 6. Gobban Finn was son of Luighdeich, of the Ui Liathan, who were descended from Oiliill Olum. He is called "the father of a thousand monks," and is said to rest at Clenenagh, a townland near Mountnah, in Queen's County, but in the ancient calendar his name is placed in the latter part of the 10th century. In the monastery of Kilnaheen (now Killamery, co. Kilkenney) and Tigh-da-gobhan (now Seagoe, on the Bann, in the barony of Oneillend East, co. Armagh); or in the latter Dr. Reeves says, Seagoe, "Seasio Gobban," was anciently called "the house of Gobban" or "the house of the two Smiths." He died A.D. 638. He is by some identified with the Gobban of Ard-Dairinensi (March 26) and of Tasscof (May 23) [GOBBAW (2), and GOBAINN]. The people of the old tribe district of Uí Cethina, round Killamery, are said by Aengus to be in possession of several localities which they have themselves, their families, and fortunes under them, i.e. under his patronage and invocation. (Reeves, Eccl. Ant. 107, 108, 317; Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc. iii. 360 n. iv. 253, 254, v. 211, n.; Joyce, Ir. Names of Places, 300, 3rd ed.; Mon. Hist. 22, 101.)

[St. J. G.]

(4) Seairn. The personal history and lifeless descent of Gobban Seirn, the builder, are hid in the deepest obscurity, and his name so freely that some authors entirely ques-tion his ever having really existed or been other than a fancied embodiment and impersonation of ecclesiastical architecture as an art. Yet O'Curry, Petrie, Reeves, and other Irish authors, accept him as a real historical personage, and the architect of churches and city walls in the sixth and seventh centuries, the very legends being vouchers for a certain basis of truth. So famous did his name become, that when a building was afterwards found of more than ordinary beauty, extent, or delicacy of workmanship, it could be attributed to none but Gobban. In the present form of prophecy is likely to become true in fact, that "his fame as a builder in wood and stone will exist in Ireland to the end of time," or, at least, of Ireland as a nation. His father appears to have been called Tuirbhi Thagmac, i.e. Tuirbhi of the Strand (a place now known as the Strand of Turvey, on the coast of Dublin), but it is not known whether Gobban was native or come of foreign descent. O'Curry thinks he was descended from Teige or Tag, son of Cian, son of Oiliill Olum, but Petrie rather inclines to the opinion that, while he was born at Turvey, he did not belong to the Scottic race, but that the very curious account of him, in the Books of Lecan and Ballymote, had best be interpreted as meaning that he was either of foreign extraction, and thus the inheritor of a better skill and style of architecture, or belonged to the race of the Tuatha De Dananns, who preceded and were driven out by the Scotti, and were always referred to as superior to the Scotti in the knowledge and practice of the arts. The tradition in general reason, though, that he is the builder of the round towers of Antrim, Killala, and Kilmacduach, and in the legendary lives of the saints, like those of St. Maedhog (Jan. 31), St. Moling (June 17), and St. Ailbe (Sept. 12), he is often introduced as the church-builder: according to
the Life of St. Macchog (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 247, 570) he owed his eminence, as an architect, entirely to the blessing of St. Macchog. According to the tradition in the country (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, i. 404, n. 2) he was interred at Derry- sarsan, a townland in the parish of Grunysboune, barony of Currphen, wdc. among their praeceptors. In the Mart. Doneg. (by Todd and Reeves, 47) she is entered at Feb. 11 as both Gobnat and Cognat. St. Gobnat was of the race of Conna, son of Modh-Lunna, monarch of Ireland, of the race of Heremon; she was born at Boireann (called also Burness, Baile Mhuire, and now Balloodybury, in the barony of West Munster, co. Cork, and is said to have been made abbess of the monastery there by St. Ailbe (March 15): (for the remains, see Proc. Roy. Irish Acad. viii. 283.) She also had dedications at Ernáidhe (unidentified) and at Molannor, now perhaps Monamore, co. Clare, or more probably Molannor, near Mallow, as it is especially called in Mart. Munster, 276. "At M'lanor, in the south of Erin, is her church." She had also a dedication on Inshere, in Galway Bay, and seems to have flourished in the beginning of the 6th century, but her date is very uncertain. (Laniug, Ecol. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 17, § 6; Colgan,Acts SS. 315, 714; Kelly, Cdl. Irr. iii. 73; Mart. Doneg. by Todd and Reeves, 47; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 462-70, giving a full account of St. Gobnate, her ancient and modern legends and antiquities.)

GOD, the first struggle in which Christians were engaged when they entered on the work of preaching the gospel to the "Gentiles," was that of maintaining the unity and power of God. We have abundant evidence of the character of this struggle in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the letters which St. Paul addressed to Gentile churches. He rejoiced in reminding the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 1. 9) "how they had turned to God from idols to serve a living and true God." At Lystra, he had urged those who would have done him sacrifice "to turn from these vanities unto the living God who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein;" and at Athens he spoke to his hearers of "God that made the world and all things that are therein," and described Him as "Lord of heaven and earth." This truth must, of necessity, have been grasped before the Greeks and Latins and the rest could enter into the mystery of the Incarnation, or have any appreciation of the work of the Son of God; and accordingly we find one great object of the Christian Apologists was to displace the current beliefs of the ordinary Greeks and Romans as to the members of their Pantheon, and lead them up to a belief in one God, the Creator and Governor of the world. It was this effort that met with the bitterest opposition, and brought on the Christians the worst of persecutions. Again and again do we read in the Acts of the Martyrs that this was the testing question: "Would they submit to serve the deities as all the nation did?"
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Again and again the reply was this: "There is one God who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things therein, and one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God. I will not sacrifice to any man; I will not sacrifice to daemons." The anxiety of Tertullian to avoid himself of the name "daemons" is not less than Cyril's fear to use "Gnosticism". Yet if it can be proved that the underlying and the more open popular conception was the deeper belief that there is one God, to whom all power belongs, and to whose will all men look, it is evinced both in his Apology (§§ 17, 18) and The Testimony of the Soul. But the faith of the first Christians refused to attribute to any power, any will, to the objects of their neighbours' reverence; and because of this refusal they were tortured and put to death.

But the Christians had to meet, in connexion with this same subject of the creation, a difficulty from another quarter—the Gnostic heresies, whose origin was in the East. All these sects held that the world was not created by the supreme God, but was framed by inferior or hostile powers [see Demiurgus, Vol. I. p. 804, where the subject is discussed]. It was, undoubtedly, with reference to these divergent lines of thought—the imperfections of the Western philosophies, the vulgar conceptions of the Gnostics—that the article was embodied in the creeds of all the churches, East and West, that God is the Maker of Heaven and Earth.

But even the Christians who had been converted from Greek and Roman conceptions of the Deity, were now, in connexion with this, before their faith in God could be enlarged and purified from earlier mistakes. Thus we find Origen assuming that all Christians held that there is one God, who created and arranged all things, and called all things into existence; but yet he deemed it necessary to contend that God is immaterial and incorporeal. Says he, "We attempted to say, even twisting the declaration of our own Scriptures" (such as our God is a consuming fire, and God is spirit), that "He is a body." It is still one of the most difficult of problems to conceive incorporeal existence; but it is strange to find that a passage, which to us seems most distinctly to affirm such existence, was used in the 3rd century to support the opposite opinion. Origen's argument in support of the incorporeal nature of the Deity may be seen in the first chapter of his work De Principiis. He proceeds to uphold two further truths in regard to God which, to us, seem incontrovertible, but to which it thus appears that Christians were brought by pain and labour, viz. the singleness or simplicity of the Divine nature (nature sterile and perfect), and the impossibility of our measuring it. Again, God is incomprehensible atype inestimable.

Additional light is thrown on the history of the reception of these truer conceptions of God from the great and systematic work which Lactantius addressed to Constantine after his conversion. Lactantius takes up and reviews the chief arguments of his predecessors, combining them in one view. Thus he asserts that it is necessary that God is incorruptible, perfect, impassible, nulli rei subjectus. Neither is He subject to any necessity, for He is Governor of all things, less than Creator. A few years later, we come to the Creed of Nicea, embodying the article of the Creed of Caesarea: "We believe in one God, Father Almighty, the maker of all things, both visible and invisible." A few years later brings us down to another systematic treatise—the collection of lectures addressed by Cyril of Jerusalem to the catechumens. The fourth lecture contains brief teachings on God, on Christ, on the Birth from the Virgin, on the cross, &c. On God, the catechumens were taught that "He is one, alone uncreate, without beginning, incapable of change or mutability; not begotten by another, nor having any successor; not having commencement of life, in time, or a termination of life." Cyril speaks (to reject it) of the thought that the Author of our souls is different from the Creator of our bodies. He teaches that God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (who is God of God); that He is not contained in any place; that He is in all things and out of all things. A few years later in the middle of the 4th century, everything was taught explicitly of God which the church has been permitted to attain to, viz. that He is uncreate, unmeasured, eternal, Almighty.

The relations between the three Persons in the Godhead will be treated in the article THE FATHER.

Instances are so numerous in the Scriptures of the New Testament in which the same God, taken absolutely, is used of the Father, that we ought not to be surprised at finding that the same Name is also used of God of the church. "God so loved the world that He sent His only-begotten Son;" "God raised Him from the dead." "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God." Often, too, we find that this Name is supplemented by the addition "the Father"—i.e. as we find it in our Creeds. Thus "Paul an apostle—through the grace of Christ, and God the Father who raised Him from the dead... grace be to you, and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ." It was recognized that before all worlds, and when time was not, the Son was begotten of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; and thus the Christian writers scrupled not to designate the Father at the origin ἐξ ἀρχῆς, the cause ὁ ἀρχηγός, the root and fountain ὁ Μητρός τοῦ Ἴδου and of the Holy Spirit. Thus, whilst they held most firmly the equality, or rather the unity, of substance, power, and eternity in the three Persons of the Trinity, they scrupled not to assert that this power, essence, and eternity was given by

---

* Bardeleanus, however, did not separate between the supreme God and the Creator of the world. On this ground Dean Mansel held that he must be considered an only partially a Gnostic. (Gnostic Heresies, p. 146.)
* * These words of Rufinus' translation seem to have come from Tertullian's Apologia, cap. xvii.

---

The creed of Caesarea had ὁ θεός ἐξ ἀρχηγοῦ ἐκείνου ἐκεῖνου ὁ ἀρχηγός, as well as ἐξ ἀρχῆς. I suppose that ὁ ἀρχηγός was deemed to be too wide; that it might even be quoted as including the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Nicene creed reads ἐξ ἀρχηγοῦ ἐκείνου.
the Father to the Son and Holy Spirit. So they interpreted the words, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself:" so they appealed to the words, "The living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father." Indeed some of the early writers understood thus the words of our Saviour, "My Father is greater than I"—greater, not in magnitude nor in time, but because the Son had His generation from the Father. Holding most firmly the unity of will, and the unity of essence, they felt no difficulty about our Lord's saying this, "The Son can do nothing of Himself." They adopted in its full meaning language such as this, "Whatever things the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son (Filioque) in like fashion." [See HOMOUSION, TRINITY, TRITHEMIUS, and the various heresies bearing on the subject.] [C. A. S.]

GODA, a deacon who attests the act of archbishop Wulfred dated at Canterbury, April 21, 811. (Kemble, C. D. 195.) [S.]

GODALSADUS, thirty-eighth bishop of Chartres, succeeding Flavinius and followed by Beraulphus, perhaps towards the close of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. viii. 1102.) [S. A. B.]

GODARDUS, bishop of Rouen. [GILDARDUS.]

GODEARDUS, bishop of Mainz. [GOTHARDES.]

GODEBERTA, virgin of Noyon; commemorated April 11. Vita S. Godebertae Virgin. sancto; ui radicis ecclesiae et parvae: in Trier, in Abbeville, in Koniewienis, in three chapters, with introductory notes and a short appendix of his translation, is given by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 11 Apr. ii. 31-8), and her dedication occurs in Molanus (Usuard. Auct. 11 Apr. Antw. 1567), Ussarudus (Mart. Auct. Apr. 11 and 13 ap. Migne, Patr. Lat. xxii. 933, 931, 932), Wion (Lips. Vita S. Godebertis, i. 139), and Venet. Antw., 1565), and Menard (Mart. 11 et 27 Apr. pp. 31, 35, Par. 1629).

The Life, which is really part of a sermon, was probably preached on the saint's feast in the church of St. Godbertha, and is printed by Surixs (De Prob. Sact. Hist. 145-6, Cologne, 1819); the Bollandists say that a number of relics were preserved in her church, and especially a bell said to have been her own.

Her Life is of the usual type. She was born of noble and Christian parents at Amiens, and carefully educated. Refusing marriage, she was given by her parents to bishop Eligius at Noyon in the presence of king Clotaire, who presented her with his own palace and the chapel of St. George. There she lived and died, and her body was placed in her own church, which was afterwards dedicated to her memory. If she was contemporary with St. Eligius (bishop c. A.D. 640-659) this must have taken place in the time of the Frankish king Clotaire III. (A.D. 656-670), and the Bollandists say she flourished about A.D. 700. [J. G.]

GODEBERTUS of Chartres. [GAUSBERTUS.]

GODEBERTUS, king. [GODEBERTUS.]

GODEFRIDUS. [GONTFIRIDUS.]

GODEMAR, one of the four sons of Gundechus, the second king of the Burgundians who died about A.D. 470. If we may believe the unfriendly testimony of Gregory of Tours and other Catholic historians, two of his brothers, Clirif and Godomar, fought with the third, Gundobald [GUNSDOALD]. However that may be, in 494 Godegiselus was reigning over a part of the Burgundian territory, with Geneva for his capital, while Gundobald governed the remaining, and apparently the larger portion, from Lyons (Ennodius, Vita S. Epiphani, Acta c. 12.; Baldus, Acta c. 17.; John ii, 37). When Cloris declared war against Gundobald and invaded Burgundy, in 500, Godegiselus fought on his side at Dijon against his brother. As the reward for his treachery to the Burgundian cause he was to be made sole king of the nation under the supremacy of Cloris. But Gundobald, though defeated in that battle, soon recovered his strength, and turned his arms against Godegiselus, who had entered Vienne in triumph, and was supported there by 5000 Franks, whom Cloris had left on his departure northward. Though, like his brother, an Arius, he seems to have made an attempt at this time to conciliate the good-will of the Catholics by founding a monastery at Lyons. See a subsequent chapter of the twenty-sixth year of Guntram, in the Gallia Christiana (v. inscr. i), in which his name is written Gaudisellus, and cf. Binding, Das Burgundisch-Romische Königreich, i. 160. Gundobald's forces, however, succeeded in taking the city, and Godegiselus, who fled for shelter to an Arius church, was killed together with his bishop, as was said, by his brother's hand. The authorities for his life, besides those alluded to above, are Marius Avent. Chron. in Migne, Patr. Lat. ixii. 795-6; Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. i. 28, 32, 33, iii. prologus; Hist. Franc. Epitomata, xvii. xxii. xxiii. xiv.; and Hinmar, Vita S. Remegii, i. Patr. Lat. exxv. 1160. Implicit trust, however, must not be placed in Gregory's details, cf. Richter, Annalen, pp. 37-8. [S. A. B.]


GODEMAR (GODOMAR, French GONDEMAR), the younger son of Gundobald, and sixth and last king of the Burgundians. His elder brother, Sigismund, fell a victim to the hatred borne his race by Clotilda, who excited her son Chlodomer to invade Burgundy. Sigismund fell into his hands, and was soon afterwards murdered with his wife and children. Godemar escaped and was crowned king of the whole nation. A second campaign resulted in the death of Chlodomer at the battle of Vésérance between Vienne and Bellay. Accounts vary as to which army won the day, but whatever the issue of that battle may have been, Godemar soon possessed himself of the kingdom, and established himself on the
GODEPERTUS, left in 681, on the death of his father king Aripert, to divide the Lombard kingdom with his brother, Perthari. He reigned at Milan, his brother at Pavia. A quarrel between them soon broke out, and Godepert sent Garipalp, duke of Turin, to get help from Grimaoald, the powerful governor of Benevento. Garipalp, enraged with Grimaoald, advised Godepert to kill Grimaoald as a traitor at their first interview, told Grimaoald to expect treachery, who, therefore, murdered Godepert with his own hand, c. 662. (Paulus Diaconus, iv. 51.) Godepert left a child, Ragipert, whose son, Aripert II, ultimately became king of the Lombards at the beginning of the 8th century. [A. H. D. A.]

GODESCALCUS (1), 34th archbishop of Sens, succeeding Wilharus and followed by St. Guntbertus (about A.D. 780). His place in the series and the fact that he was buried in the monastery of St. Pierre le Vif remains for us as we know of him. (Gall. Chal. xii. 14; Gams, Series Episc. 629.) [S. A. B.]

GODESCALCUS (2), deacon of Liége, who wrote the Life of St. Lambert, a former bishop of that see, at the request of his bishop, Agilfridus, the materials for which he derived in great measure from St. Theodore of Seville, who was St. Lambert’s disciple (s. 4). He added a small treatise on his miracles, and another, of which a fragment only survives, on the translation of his remains. These were published first by Canisius, then by Chapeville, and lastly by Mabillon. The date at which he wrote, as fixed by internal evidence, was probably A.D. 729 or 730. (Rivet, Hist. Litt. de la France, iv. 57; Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti, iii. 59-74, Paris, 1733.) [S. A. B.]

GODESCALCUS (3), bishop of Osnio from c. 657 to c. 678. Represents Egila at the eighth council of Toledo, and appears as bishop at the eleventh council, A.D. 675. (Aguirre-Canclani, iii. 448, and iv. 145; Exp. Sot. vii. 220.) [M. A. W.]

GODESCALCUS (4), duke of Benevento, 739-742. He followed Gregory, nephew of Luitprand in the duchy, and when Luitprand appeared in 742 with his young nephew, Gisulf, son of his former queen, Godescale prepared to fly to Constantinople, the natural refuge of all the enemies of the Lombards. He was however anticipated by the Beneventans and slain. (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 56-57, Catalogus Regum Langob. et Ducum Ben. in Monum. Rerum Ital. et Langob. 1878, p. 494.) In February 742 he gave judgment in favour of Desiderius, abbot of St. John of Alife. His gifts to the monastery of St. Venantius, on the Volturnus, are mentioned in 766. (Troy, Cod. Dipl. nos. 548, 857, iv. 83, v. 364.) [A. H. D. A.]

GODESCALCUS (5), nephew of Agilulf, king of the Lombards (591-616). He was carried off by Parma with his wife by Callinicus, patrician and exarch, and taken prisoner to Constantinople. (Paulus Diaconus, iv. 20.) [A. H. D. A.]

GODESCALCUS, "dux Campaniae," receives a letter from Gregory the Great, asking his protection for a monastery. (Epist. lib. x. ind. iii. ep. 11.) [A. H. D. A.]

GODINUS, bishop of Lyons. [GODIVINAL]

GODIVINAL, queen. [GODIVINAL]

GODLAM, Welsh bard. [GOLYNDAW]

GODO (1), thirteenth bishop of Verus, between Hermentfredus and St. Paulus. According to Flojord, he was present at the council of Rheims, presided over by Sournius, about A.D. 625. (Hist. Eccl. Rem. ii. 5. Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxxv. 102; Mansi, x. 593; Gall. Christ. xiii. 1169.) [S. A. B.]

GODO (2), St., thirty-first bishop of Mz, between St. Goericus and St. Clodulfus. The name appears in a charter of King Sigebert II. for the construction of the monasterium Cassongudinem, though his see is not mentioned (Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxvii. 319). The catalogues are said to assign ten years and two months as the duration of his episcopate, but another account limits it to eight years. He died about the year 650, and was buried in the church of St. Symphorian. He is commemorated in his diocese May 8. (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. ii. 306; Jun. ii. 128, 129; Gall. Christ. xiii. 698.) [S. A. B.]

GODO (3), St., founder and first abbot of the monastery of St. Peter at Oye (Anglia), in late times called after him St. Godonis (St. Gaul), is the diocese of Troyes. A late and unsatisfactory life of him was published by the Bollandists from a MS. of Andrew du Chesne (Acta SS. Mai. vi. 444). A great part of it is occupied with the acts of St. Wandregisilus, and seems to have been compiled from the life of that saint written by a monk of Fontanne (cf. the Vita S. Wandregisilis, Boll. Acta SS. Jul. v. 276). God was a native of the district of Verdun, and a nephew of St. Wandregisilus, who was a cousin of king Pippin. In company with his uncle, he resolved to quit the world, and the two retired to a monastery. The elder by time precessed and precept, and the younger by zealous imitation vied in a life of devotion to God’s service, and the Divine favour was attested by a miraculous voice from heaven. Before long, St. Wandregisilus, yearning for a lessler habitations, obtained from a prefect named Echimond the gift of a retired spot, on which they founded the famous monastery of Fontanne, so called from its many streams. Close at hand they also built the four churches of St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Lawrence and St. Pancratius, and God was despatched to Rome to obtain relics of these martyrs. He arrived there while Vitalis was
GOEDICUS

GOEDICUS, twenty-eighth bishop of Sens, following St. Wulframanus, who resigned the see. He is said to have been the parents of St. Martin of Tours. In a.D. 696 he subscribed the charter which Agirardus, or Ageradus, bishop of Chartres, gave to the monastery of St. Mary on the Loire (Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxviii. 1228; Mabillon, de
Leovigild's eldest son by his first wife (see arts. LEOVIGILD AND INGUTHOS), she was received by her grandmother Goisvintha with great rejoicing.

"Who, however, did not suffer her to remain long in the Catholic religion, but began to persuade her with soft words to be rebaptized into the Ariano heresy." On the persistent refusal of the girl of twelve (Brunichild and Sigibert were married in 562) to return to the Catholic profession, Goisvintha is reported by Gregory to have proceeded to the utmost legitym of personal violence: "Hec illae audiae, incendiæ furore successae adpresaham per comas capitis puellam in terram collidit et din calices verberatam, ac sanguine crestantam, juxta epolari, et piacuas inmergi" (H. Fr. l.c.). The "piacuas inmergi" has been variously interpreted.

Waccher (art. INGUTHIS, Erich von Gruber) supposes that the whole story arose from an attempt on the part of Goisvintha to impose forcible baptism on her grand-daughter. In any case, it must be taken as a popular exaggeration of the actual discord which may very well have been in the Gothic royal family. It was discovered that the Catholic princess could not be induced to accept Arianism as Brunichild and Gallesvintha had accepted Catholicism, and that the marriage, instead of a source of strength to Leovigild's government, threatened to become—as through the conversion of Hermengild, it actually did become—in a social and danger of weakness. (Gregor, Kritische Untersuchungen über den Austrstand und das Martyrium des Westgotischen Königsohnes Hermengild, Zeitscr. für Hist. Theol. 1873, i. 8, has analysed the probable sources and foundations of the report. Vol. Dahn, König der Germanen, v. 157, und Heilberich, A. Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgotischen Rechts, p. 11.)

The only hint given us by the Spanish sources of this attitude of Goisvintha is contained in the ambiguous words in which Joannes Biscarins describes the outbreak of Hermengild's rebellion, "Nam eodem anno—Hermengildus, faciunt Goisvinthas Regnus tyrannidem assumere, cum Quirico et Guntothi, unless we give Goisvinthas an error for Gunthotha, as Dahn does but apparently without MS. authority, can only mean here, "owing to the factious conduct of queen Goisvintha," and refer to her position of hostility towards the newly married pair. (On this use of facto, cf. collection of instances made by Görres, I. c. note 45; Dahn, v. 137 note, and art. facto in DuCange.) We know nothing of Goisvintha's farther share, if any, in the circumstances attending this memorable revolt (see art. HERMENGLID). But that at Leovigild's death she was still a considerable power in the state is proved by Recared's conduct with regard to her at the beginning of his reign. "Recaredus initit a priori amicitia et a populo (Recaredus' loyalty and national attachment, Dahn, v. 159) cum Goisvintha relicta patris sui, samque ut mater spectat" (Greg. Tur. ix. 1). Her influence as the mother of Brunichild and grandmother of Childebert II. was especially important to the new king, who was anxious to make peace with the Franks, and it was his advice that hence he sent legations to Gunthram and Childebert immediately after his accession (I. c.), as it was also, no doubt, by her advice that his betrothal with Chlodovirtis, Inguthis's sister, was proposed as a lasting sign.
GOLEU, daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog, and mother of St. Kedred, in Llinestyn (or Llineskin), is mentioned in the Pedigrees of Welsh Saints and in the Account of Brycham of Brycheiniog, but is identified with GOLLEUDDYD. (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 600, 604; Rees, Welsh Saints, 148.)

GOLLEUDDYD, daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog, was at Llanhesgin (Llineskin, Llenestyn, Llanegyn) in Gwent, in the 5th century, and may be the same as Goleu, Gwawr, Gweddlydd, and Nefydd. (Myn. Arch. ii. 43; Rees, Welsh Saints, 148, 149; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 608.)

GOLGUS, monk and disciple of St. Columba, is thought to have ruled a monastery among the Picts, A.D. 606, and to have written Miraculis Columbae Magistri, lib. i. according to Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. 1. 31; Tanner, Bibl. 331). Camerarius (de Scot. Fort. 164, and Vol. July 17) calls him abbot. He is called the Coleg, Coleu, or Colucis, son of Colach, mentioned by St. Adamnan in Vita S. Columbae. (Coloa (3).)

GOLINDUCH (Golinduch, Golanduch), martyr in Persia in the reign of the emperor Maurice; commemorated on July 12 (Bous. Mon.).

GOLEU, a wife of one of the chief magi, and in her sleep had revealed to her the happy condition of the just, from which she found herself excluded for not being a Christian, and the lost state of idolaters. She at once received baptism, on account of which her husband and the king had her tortured and put to death (Basil. Mén. iii. 164). Her story is narrated by Theophylactus Simocatta (Hist. v. 12), who says that she was born at Babylon, her father being a magus and a satrap, and that after her marriage she resided at Hierapolis (which must be the Syrian city, five days from Antioch towards Mesopotamia). The vision occurred to her in a trance, which suddenly fell upon her while at table with her husband. Evagrius (H. E. vi. 29) briefly notices the story, and states that the life of Golinduch was written by the elder Stephanus, bishop of Hierapolis. Nicephorus Callistus, who likewise relates the story (H. E. xviii. 29), gives her father's name Asmoch, and her mother's Muxuch. [C. H.]

GOLVENAES, GOLVENES, is described by Dempster (Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot. i. 317) as a Scotch hermit who left his own country and devoted himself to a life of contemplation in Armoric. On the death of St. Paul, Bishop of Leon, he was appointed to the see about A.D. 600, and his feast was on June 23. He is said to have written Rituale Ecclesiae, lib. i. and Laudes Multorum Sancorum, lib. 1 (Tanner, Bibl. 332). But in the Gallieus Martyrology his feast is July 1, and he is said to have died at Rennes, and been buried in the monastery of St. Melanius (Cressy, Ch. Hist. Brit. xiv. 3). Like other ancient saints, he is said to have been endowed with miraculous power, and a curious story is told of his having changed into gold some earth which a pious farmer had given him, and made from the gold a chalice, three bells, and three crowns (Arch. Camb. 4. ser. ii. 272). In the Menologion Soticum, Dempster commemorates "Golvenaeus Leonensis episcopus," with the significant addition, "nonnulli Scotorum putati, sed ego delibero" (Bp. Forbes, Cat. Scott. Saints, 263, 264). In Bollandists' Acta SS. 1 Jul. i. 111-114, there is given Vida S. Golveni episcopi Leonensis, with a commentarius praenium relating to his country, acts, age, and cultus, with annotations and list of miracles. [J. G.]

GOLYDDAN (Gaulan, Golyddian), called bard of Cadwaladr, and his date A.D. 560-600. The historical poem Armes Prydein Evar (Myn. Arch. i. 156; Skene, Four Anc. Books of Wales, i. 436, ii. 123) is usually attributed to him, yet without assured authority, and Turner (Vind. Anc. Brit. Poems, 269) refers to it in the 8th century. It is the earliest Welsh composition which mentions miracles devoted to the aid of a saint. Another poem is given him by Dr. Owen Pughe (Welsh Dict.; Skene, i. 490 sq. 294 sq. 450), but on what authority does not appear. His death, according to the Welsh Triads, was caused by one of the "three atrocious axes-strokes of the island of Prydain." (Rees, Welsh Saints, 68, 72; Myn. Arch. i. 16, 22, 25; Stephen, Lit. Gymry, 207 sq. 197; Tanner, Bibl. 332.)

GOMA, bishop of Lisbon. His signature is
GOMARELLUS. Among the subscriptions to the council of Egar, A.D. 614, is found the name of Fructuosus, a deacon who signed as the representative of a bishop Gomarellus. The subscriptions do not express the sees of the subscribers, and the see of Gomarellus is therefore uncertain. It is however conjectured that he was bishop of Lerida, as it is supposed that the deacon Fructuosus is the same person as the bishop of Lerida of that name, who subscribes the act of the fourth council of Toledo in A.D. 633, and that he succeeded Gomarellus. (Esp. Sagra. xlv. 104. Tejeda y Ramiro, ii. 702.) [F. D.]

GOMBERTUS of Sens. [Guntbertus.]

GOMIDAS, patriarch of Armenia (617-625), between John (called by Le Quien John the Orthodox, and by Saint-Martin John III.) and Christopher III. He was born at Aghtais, in the canton of Arakadzoin, and was bishop of the see of the Maminianus before his call to the patriarchate (Saint-Martin, Memoirs sur l'Arménie, i. 438). The Armenian historian, John the Maminianus, states that for eight years he administered the monastery of St. John the Precursor, and was sent by the patriarch Abraham (594-600) to the Georgians or Iberians with the object of promoting a union with them (Langlois, Histoire de l'Arménie, i. 361). He composed some beautiful hymns to St. Rhinosime, which Langlois says have been translated into Italian by Luigi Carrer, Venice, 1842 (Langlois, Armenian Monast. of St. Lazaro, p. 78). Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1386) writes the name Chomitas, and makes him succeed Abraham, but gives no dates. [Armenians.] [C. H.]

GOMMARIUS. [Gummarus.]

GONDEBALT. [Gundobald.]

GONDEBERTUS (Guntbertus, Gomber- tus), ST., and martyr in the latter half of the 7th century. The earliest account of him is from Flodoard, who wrote in the 10th century. He was a noble, reared at court, and brother of St. Nivardus, the twenty-fifth archbishop of Rheims, who lived in the reign of Childeric II. (660-673). He was married to St. Berta, as his second wife, who also suffered martyrdom, though upon another occasion. The most authentic testimony of him was a deed with his signature, still preserved in the archives at Rheims in Flodoard's time, which recited a dispute between Gondebert and Reclus (St. Riez), the successor of Nivardus, as to some property left by the latter. The archbishop asserted that it had all been given to religious foundations, for the salvation of the donor's soul, while Gondebert claimed it by virtue of relationship. It was settled by arbitration, on the terms of Gondebert retaining the property beyond the Loire, which had belonged to his mother Emma, and the church keeping the rest. It would seem, however, that he did not desire it for selfish uses, as we find him, with his wife, making gifts to the church of Timotheus and Apollinaris, the martyrs of Rheims, building, as was said, the religious house for nuns, dedicated to St. Peter, at one of the gates of the city, and founding with his own and others' contributions, the neighbouring monastery of Avennacum. Not content, however, with these good works, he left his wife, and went on a mission to the parts beside the sea (loca maritimae), and there at a fixed spot, was, according to the barbarians, his widow, Berta, built a convent at Avennacum, a fitting spot being pointed out to her by an angel. But by an unfortunate oversight there was no supply of water within a distance of two miles, which rendered a fresh miracle necessary. At length she suffered martyrdom at the hands of the children of Gondebert's former wife. The crime was miraculously discovered and punished, and the penance imposed upon a niece of Gondebert, called Meaia, who had been privy to it, was the task of transporting his body from the scene of his martyrdom to the grave of his widow. (Flodoard, Hist. Eccl. Rem. i. 4; ii. 10; iii. 27; iv. 46, 47; Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxv. 35, 111, 252, 350.) The Bollandists publish a life of Gondebert, which they describe as extracted "ex antiquis officii proprii lectionibus," (Acta SS. Apr. i. 620) but except that it defines the object of his mission as the people living round the "urae Althiassii." (Oldenbourg, Acta SS. Apr. ii. 540) adds nothing to Gondebert's account but verbiage. Gondebert's day of commemoration is April 29. [S. A. B.]

GONDEBERTUS, king of the Lombards. [Godepert.]

GONDEMAE, king of the Burgundians. [Gode-mar.]

GONDICAIRE, king of the Burgundians. [Gundicarius.]

GONDIUC, king of the Burgundians. [Gundichus.]

GONDOALDUS, eighth bishop of Meaux, following Baudowaldus and succeeded by St. Faro, or, according to one account by Waldbert (Vita S. Furonis, 1x.; Acta S. Benedict, i. 816). It was he who at the instance of St. Eustace, the abbot of Luxeuil, conferred the veil upon St. Faro or Burgundofara, and established her in a convent (circ. A.D. 614). He was present at the council of Rheims (A.D. 625 or 630), and probably died shortly afterwards. (Vita S. Eustasii, 2; Vita S. Furonis, lviii.; Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. ii. 117, 615, Paris, 1668-1701; Labbe, Sacr. Conc. x. 594, Florence, 1759-1798; Gall. Christ. viii. 1596.) [S. A. B.]

GONDOALDUS (Gundoldus, Gundobaldus), thirteenth bishop of Strasbourg, succeeding Labeobus, and followed by Aludus, or according to Wimpeling, by Gaislo (Gall. Christ. vi. 780; Wimpel. Cist. Episc. Argent. 18.) He seems to belong to the second half of the 8th century. [S. A. B.]

GONDFULUS, third bishop of Lyon, between Latro and Elinandus I. about the middle of the 6th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 510.) [S. A. B.]

GONDULPHUS, twenty-third bishop of Maastricht, succeeding St. Monulfus and fol-
assent, was escorted to Carthage, and there received the title of Africanus. Letters were despatched by him to the senate at Rome, submitting his election to their approval. Their assent was given readily. Gordianus and his son were proclaimed as Augusti. Maximinus was declared a public enemy, his statues were thrown down, and his name ordered to be erased from all public monuments. The hopes of a reign of equity and peace were soon dashed to the ground.

Capellius, the procurator of Numidia, refused to acknowledge the new emperors, and led his disciplined legions against the unwarlike crowd of their adherents at Carthage. The younger Gordianus perished in the field, his father, on hearing of his death, died by his own hands. The whole tragedy of their brief reign lies between January and April, of A.D. 238. The third emperor of the name, the son either of Gordianus II. or of a daughter of Gordianus I., was a boy of fifteen at the time of their death. The senate, on hearing what had passed at Carthage, determined to persevere in their resistance to Maximinus, and appointed Decimus Ceilius Balbinus, and Marcus Claudius Pupienus Maximus, both of whom had been consuls, as joint emperors. The people, however, clung to the Gordian family, and the boy, who was at Rome, was proclaimed as Caesar. After the defeat and death of Maximinus at Aquileia at the hands of Pupienus in May, the conqueror returned to Rome. The praetorians and the troops generally, however, submitted reluctantly to rulers who had been chosen by the senate. They attacked the palace and murdered the two emperors, and both troops and senate were in accepting the young Gordianus as Augustus.

The short reign, which so far opened brilliantly, was soon clouded by disaster. The power of Sapor was threatening the safety of the Roman provinces on the Gordian frontier, and the emperor, after marrying Sobrina Tranquillina, the daughter of Mithiheus, went accompanied by his father-in-law, as prefect of the praetorian, to command the troops in person. The temple of Janus was thrown open with the usual ceremonies, and Gordianus preceded through Moesia and Thrace, and Asia Minor. Sapor was defeated in several engagements, and compelled to evacuate Mesopotamia. The death of Mithiheus, however, deprived the emperor of his only trustworthy counsellor. Philip the Arabian, who succeeded him in the emperor's favour, fomented the jealousy and discontent of the troops by secret artifices. They broke out in open revolt. The last of the Gordian house was put to death, and Philip was proclaimed as emperor. The popularity of the new emperor was shown in the fact that the senate decreed divine honours to his memory, and that a tomb with a polyglot inscription, in Greek, Latin, Persian, and Egyptian, was erected over his grave at Circeium. (Capitol. Gordiant; Herodian. viii. viii.; Victor. de Caes. xxi. xvii.; Epit. xxi. xvii.; Entrop. ix. 2; Amm. Marcell. xxiii. 5; Zosim. i. 14. 18; Eckhel, viii. p. 209; Gibbon, i. vii.)
GORDIANUS (3)—May 10. Martyr with Epimachus at Rome, on the Latin Way, in the time of Julian. He was a vicarius, or vice-prefect, to whose care an aged presbyter, Januarius, was entrusted, and by whom he was converted. Remaining steadfast in the faith, he was executed. His acts are given at length in Mart. Adon., but are very obscure. For instance, they represent Silvia as the patroness of Julian as present at Rome when emperor and persecutor of the Christians, whereas he never was there after he had declared war against the church. (Mart. Vet. Rom., Adon., Usuard., Wandalbert.; Kal. Allat.; Kal. Front.; Sacra-
mentar., Greg. Mag.; Till. Mém. vii. 722; Ceillier, iii. 413.)

[C. H.]

GORDIANUS (4), grandfather of Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe. He was a senator of Carthage, and on the invasion of the Vandals under Genseric, A.D. 429, fled into Italy with his family and there died. (Vit. Fulgent. cap. l. § 1, in Patr. Lat. lxxv. 119.)

[C. H.]


[C. H.]

GORDIANUS (8), a Roman disciple of St. Benedict, afterwards a companion of St. Placidus, living under his rule at Messana. In 589 Placidus was taken captive by Mammmus the general of Abdallah, king of the Saracens. Gordinian ministered to him in prison, and buried him after his martyrdom. The next year Gordinian escaped to Constantinople, where he long lived, and by order of the emperor Justinian composed a Greek account of the martyrdom of St. Placidus and his companions. He afterwards returned to Sicily and there died. There is a statue of his name in Lat. Vivi et Passo, S. Placi. Martyris (Mabill. Acta SS. O.S.B. i. 42; Surius, de Prob. Hist. SS. t. iv. 5 Oct. p. 65; Boll. Acta SS. Oct. iii. 114). Ceillier observes that this story is now universally rejected, and that the life of Placidus betrays itself as a fabrication of a later date by reckoning forty-nine popes after Vigilius, which makes the Pseudo-Gratian live in the pontificate of John VIII. (ob. 882). Cave accepts the genuineness of the work as a whole, regarding it as largely interpolated. (Celi. xi. 349; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 523.)

[C. H.]

GORDIANUS (7), father of pope Gregory the Great, was a noble Roman of senatorial rank, and descended from a pope Felix. (Joann. Diacon. in Vit. S. Gregori.; Greg. Dialog. l. 4, c. 16.) John the Deacon says that Felix IV. (Acc. A.D. 523) was his ancestor; but this pope being described as a Samnite, whereas Gregory is always understood to be a Roman, it is more probable that Gordinianus is the father only by having the pallium over it, to mark his ecclesiastical rank. (J. B.—y.)

GORDIANUS (8). There exists a letter purporting to be written by pope Deusdeitl to a bishop of this name. The old reading of the address of the letter was "Gordiani episcopi," which caused its authenticity to be doubted, as Deusdeitis was pope from A.D. 615 to A.D. 618, and St. Isidore was bishop of Seville from A.D. 599 to A.D. 636. However, there is a various reading, "Hispaniarum ecclesiae coepiscopus," guided by which Migne
GORDIANUS, to whom Gregory addressed a poem, which does not present a favourable light. (Greg. 
Naz. Carmin. 41, p. 121.) This conjecture is 
refuted by Tillmont (note xv.). According to 
Elias Cretensis (notas, p. 610), Gorgonia and her 
husband resided at Jerusalem, and had two sons, 
who became bishops. This is very doubtful. 
It is, however, certain that Gorgonia was 
the mother of three daughters, Alypiana, Eugenia, 
and (after her maternal grandmother) N. 
Gorgonia was not baptized till a short time 
before her death, but previous to her last illness 
(Greg. Naz. Orat. 11, p. 188) she had the happy 
ness of seeing her husband and children and 
grandchildren also admitted to the church by the 
same sacrament (ibd. pp. 190, 186). Her daughter 
Alypiana was married to a distinguished 
military officer named Nicobulus, and became 
the mother of several children, in whom Gregory 
took great delight. [NICOBULUS.] Gorgonia 
died in middle life, not long after her brother 
Caesarius, previous to the year 573 (Greg. Naz. 
Carm. ii. pp. 453, 353), leaving her aged parents 
who, as well as the other members of her family, 
were present at her decease, inconsolable 
for their loss (Greg. Naz. Orat. p. 188; Orat. 
19, p. 316). Her brother Gregory pronounced 
her funeral oration, in which he draws a very 
highly coloured portrait of her (Orat. 11). The 
Roman church has placed Gorgonia on the roll 
of saints, and commemorates her on Dec. 8.

GORGONIUS (2) Sept. 9. A chamberlain 
in the court of Diocletian, who was hanged at 
Nicomedea, with Dorotheus, at the beginning of 
the persecution, when all the imperial 
household were called upon to sacrifice in order to 
clear themselves from suspicion about the burning 
of the palace. (Mart. Rom. V. c.; Mart. 
Adon., Usuard., Notker, Waldalbert.; Eusebi 
E. H. lib. viii. cap. 6; Ruinart, Acta Sancra, 
p. 317; Till. Menon. v. 180.) Wright's Syrian 
Martirology (Journ. Soc. Litt. 1809, 425) gives 
a martyr of this name at Nicomedia under 
Mar. 11, and another, Mar. 14, both at the 
beginning of the persecution, the two martyrs 
may be identical. [G. T. S.]

GORGONIUS (3), martyr with Indes 
and Petrus in the reign of Maximian; 
commemorated on Dec. 28. They were seized as 
they stood beyond the burning pile on which the 
alleged 20,000 martyrs were consumed, and were 
drowned in the sea with stones fastened round 
their necks (Basil. Menol. ii. 65). [C. H.]

GORGONIUS of Ciana. [GREGORIUS (4).]

GORGONIUS (3), bishop of Apollonia 
(Lopadum), in Bitinia, one of the Nicene 
fathers, a.d. 329. (Manei, ii. 696; Le Quien, 
Oriens Christ. i. 613). [L. D.]

GORGONIUS (4), eleventh bishop of 
Nala. He succeeded St. Priscus c. a.d. 328, and 
in 360 was succeeded by Quadruvstis. (Remondini, 
Novella Eccles. Storia, i. 637.) [R. S. G.]

GORGONIUS (5), bishop of Liberalia 
in Numidia, deprived of his church by the Donastata, 
but present at Carth. Conf. 411, though not at 
its commencement. (Mon. Vatic. Don. 133.) 

[H. W. P.]
GORGONIUS (6), bishop of Germanicia in Comagene, a Confessor, who, according to some MSS. of Jerome's Chronicle, assisted Lucifer of Cagliari, together with Cynatius of Pultus, or perhaps of Gabala, in Syria Prima, in his ill-advised consecration of Paulinus to the bishopric of Antioch, A.D. 382. (Hieron. Chron. p. 255 in Patr. Lat. viii. 893.)

GORGONIUS (7), bishop of Vasada, in Lycaonia; his name is found subscribed to the document of the synod of Constantineople to the Saracens. John concerning the condemnation of treachery of the Antiochs, and his party, A.D. 518. (Mansi, viii. 1050; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1077.)

GORMAN, Celtic form of Germanus.


(2) Coarb of St. Mochta at Louth, and father of Torbach, coarb of St. Patrick [at Armagh] (Four Mast. A.D. 753). It is added in Ann. Tig. A.D. 758 that he abode for a year at the entrance to St. Fingen's well at Clonmacnois, died in his pilgrimage, and was buried there (O'Conor, Rec. Hibern. Scrip. ii. 254; Colgan, Acta SS. 736, c. 5; Petrie, Round Towers of Ireland, 270).

GORMHAIL appears to have been an intruding bishop or abbot at Armagh, as the Four Mast. A.D. 794, say he succeeded Faileidelach, and we know that at that time there was a struggle for the primacy, Dubhnoelte being the acknowledged successor (Stewart, Armagh, 94). The Ann. Inisf., A.D. 793, call him "mac Dindathigh."

GORMLAITH, daughter of Flathnathach, abbess of Clonbroney, co. Longford, died A.D. 815 (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 810, i. 423).

GORNIS, called also GORMAS and GURNAS, and said to have baptized St. Patrick. He was a priest and blind, but received his sight by ablution in the baptismal water. (Colgan, Tr. Thamn. 11 c. 3, 16 n. 6, 21 c. 3, 65 c. 2, 118 c. 4; O'Hanlon, Irish Saints, iii. 481.)

GORTHENI (Τοποθέτης), a sect mentioned by Hegesippus (Euseb. H. E. iv. 22), called Τοποθετής by Epiphanius (Ancyritis, 12), and likewise Τοποθέτης by Epiphanius (Pamartion, i. 12), and Theodoret (Hær. bab. i. 1). Epiphanius classes them among the Samaritans, and Theodoret derives them from Simon Magus. They were so called from their founder Gortheus.

GOSACHUS of Grabard. [Guascacht.]

GOSBERTUS, thirty-second bishop of Graena, between Lutiberu and Walturnus, or Guaturna. From a letter of pope Stephen III. written A.D. 770, to Charles and Carloman, it appears that a bishop Gausbertus had headed an embassy to be sent from those princes. (Migne, Patr. Lat. xviii. 245.) This Gausbertus may be identical with Gausbertus of Geneva. He cannot at any rate be, as has been suggested, Gausbertus of Chartres, whose date is fixed by the charters he subscribed a century earlier [Gausbertus]. The author of the Gallia Christiana (xvi. 384) quotes the Inca San-Petrinus to the effect that his episcopate lasted sixteen years. [S. A. B.]

GOSCENINUS. [Gauzilomendu.

GOSOLDUS of Padua. [Gonsoldus.]

GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL. Besides our four canonical Gospels a large number of other writings circulated in early times containing either complete narratives of our Lord's life on earth or particular sections of the history. The great majority of these literary products was either interpolated editions and re-castings of our canonical Gospels or additions and appendices to them. The former class is not for the most part the party objects of various horticultural sects which had separated from the Church, the latter were largely in use among Catholic Christians, though these also, in part at least, originated in heretical circles. Many of these writings reach as far back as the 2nd and 3rd centuries; and some of them, for instance the Gospel of the Hebrews, are of no little importance for the investigation of the origins of our New Testament Canon. Alas! scarcely the tenth part of this once extensive literature has come down to us; we possess complete texts only of some Gospels of the Childhood, and of the so-called Acts of Pilate, and even these no longer in their original form.

The Catholic Church, while making most extensive use of the apocryphal Acts of Apostles, was much more reserved in relation to the apocryphal Gospels. Narratives of the deeds and sufferings of the apostles, after being purified so far as possible from heretical ingredients afforded welcome nourishment for pious curiosity; but apocryphal enlargements of the historical details contained in our gospels were long regarded with great distrust, and were adopted only so far as they referred to the Protoevangelium, the histories of Joseph and Mary, our Lord's nativity, and the occurrence of His childhood. And in this case even narratives concerning the child Jesus, which early found acceptance in Gnostic circles, were, till after the 4th century, regarded with great suspicion by the church, and then found only a hesitating reception. More favourable judgments were passed, on the other hand, upon histories of the Passion, harmonized from our four gospels with various apocryphal additions, and narratives of miracles said to have been wrought after the resurrection. Of extracanonical narratives concerning the time of our Lord's public ministry only fragments, more or
LES GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL les numerose, have been preserved in patristic controversial writings or in occasional citations by the Fathers. These citations may here and there add to our knowledge of the words of Jesus, but by far the greater number of these extracanonical utterances of the Lord are either later than many of the traditions found in the canonical gospels or manifest inventions with a purpose which in almost all cases is not far to seek. Many a genuine Saying of our Lord, though once committed to writing, has been either entirely lost or no longer preserved in its original form. Yet may we safely assume that for the greater part of genuine traditions which circulated among the oldest Christian communities have passed into our canonical gospels, though it may be, in many cases through a second or third hand. All reliable tradition must have ceased about the middle of the 2nd century. The earlier authorities employed by such and such a writer as Plutarch (except so far as portions of them had been taken up into our synoptical gospels), or else had been disfigured beyond power of recognition by changes made to suit the taste of various heretical parties. While the text of our canonical gospels became gradually fixed, these extracanonical stories were still continued to be subject to perpetual changes and recastings, by which the traces existing in them of older traditions were gradually effaced. The little that has come down to our own times is found in large citations from Jewish-Christian and Catholic writers of the 2nd century, who besides our canonical gospels made use of other sources.

The remains of extracanonical narratives of the time of Christ’s public ministry are yet scantier than those of extracanonical utterances attributed to Him. Almost all the fragments that have come down to us are borrowed from the Gospel of the Hebrews; but this work had already undergone an early and extensive process of condensation, being composed of a section respectively of the 2nd century, very considerable alterations. The specimens of it, given us in later times by Jerome and Ephraimi prove only that the older tradition was as ruthlessly tampered with by Jewish-Christian as by the various Gnostic sects. This notwithstanding, the loss of most of the gospels once used by heretical sects and parties is much to be regretted. The specimens given us by Catholic doctors do not enable us to form any complete notion of what these gospels really were, but rather lead us to suspect that the pious zeal and prejudice of our authorities induced them to select such passages only as would prove offensive to Catholic ears. When we come to the genuine Nazarenes, written in the Hebrew language, was, in fact, the Hebrew original of our Gospel of St. Matthew, and are told of writings like the Gospel of St. Peter or the Diatessaron of Tatian being publicly read in Catholic communities of the 4th century without objection or offense, it can hardly be denied that some, at least, of such writings must have been, with whatever peculiarities of their own, nearly related to our canonical gospels. If we could but follow the gradual development and alteration of the Gospel of the Hebrews from the time of its first appearance to the end of the 4th century, we should probably obtain much surprising information as to the history and developments of the whole literature. Still greater, doubtless, would have been the gain for our knowledge of the history of the Church and sects of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, if some of these gospels had been preserved entire. Those, for instance, containing the so-called Acts served not only the numerous apocryphal Acts of Apostles, to satisfy the claims of a pious curiosity but also and specially to recommend certain doctrines and customs, traditionally handed down in Gnostic schools. The main purpose of these works was to represent the opinions peculiar to the Gnostics as deduced from the original teaching of Christ and His Apostles. But inasmuch as from the middle of the 2nd century and onwards the Gnostics certainly made use of our canonical gospels, we must assume that those of their own invention were in part at least imitations of the former. The fragments which remain to us of many Gnostic fictions are indeed evidently based on the canonical narratives; but our knowledge of the different sections of Gnosticism is at the same time so imperfect that we cannot but deplore the loss of these writings.

The few remains of this once extensive literature, which remain, form a sort of a loose Catholic form, relate as already observed almost exclusively to the earliest portions of our Lord’s life. We still possess a series of so-called Gospels of the Infancy which on closer inspection may be traced back to three or four distinct writings of the 2nd century.

The narratives concerning Mary and the child Jesus, ending with the slaughter of the Innocents and the Flight into Egypt are contained in three works derived from kindred sources; those of our Lord’s miracles from His fifth to His twelfth year, are preserved in a single writing, of which however several recent editions, differing considerably from one another, have been published. Besides these, there are various compilations containing narratives of the whole period of our Lord’s childhood; among them one which fills up the interval between the flight into Egypt and the return to Galilee with an account of various Egyptian miracles; for this section an original authority, now lost, has been employed, while for all that precedes and all that follows it essentially the same sources appear to have been made use of as in the other Gospels of the Infancy. The Gospels of the Childhood still existing are as follows:

(1) The so-called Protevangelion of James, or according to its title in the manuscripts, The History of James concerning the Birth of Mary (5 Isaiah); this is included in the Eusebian Canon (i.e., Eusebius) also in the Codex Vaticanus. It was first published in the Latin version of William Postellus by Theodore Bibliander (1552), then in Greek by Michael Neander (1564), and frequently since; and finally, after fresh collations of numerous MSS., by Thilo (Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti, tom. 1., 1692, pp. 106-273) and Tischendorf (Codex apocrypha, 1851, pp. 1-49; 2nd ed. 1876, pp. 1-50). There is also a separate edition of this gospel by Stickow (Breclau, 1840), which is critically of small value. The text, as handed down in all MSS. hitherto discovered, presents but few discrepancies. The best MS. is the Cod. Paris., of the 10th century (A. ap.
Thilo, C. op. Tischendorf), which Thilo followed in constructing his text. The fragment of a Syriac translation has been published with an English version by Prof. Wright (Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament; London, 1865, pp. 1–5). The Syriac MS., which is the present form begins with ch. 17 dates from the second half of the 6th century; the text, apart from a few abbreviations, agrees literally with that of the Greek original. The narrative contained in this Protevangelium extends from the birth of the Virgin Mary to the slaughter of the Innocents at Bethlehem and the murder of Zadok. (2) The Gospel of (Pseudo) Matthew concerning the Childhood of Mary and of Christ our Saviour (Liber de Infan tia Mariae et Christi Savoris). This book exists in Latin only, and professes to be a translation made from the Hebrew by St. Jerome. Some MSS. James is named as the author. It is in fact derived from the same original source as the above-mentioned Historia Jacobi, going over the same ground but extending the account of our Lord's history to the flight into Egypt. The text was first edited by Thilo from a Paris MS. (Cod. apocryph. N. T. pp. 357–409), and more recently by Oscar Schade from a MS. in the Stuttgart (Liber de Infantia Mariae et Christi Savoris, Halle, 1869); Tischendorf's edition (Evangel. apoc. pp. 50–105, 2nd ed. pp. 51–112), which announces itself as the first complete one of the Pseudo-Matthew, is based on a text which the apocryphal Gospel of Matthew is combined so as to form one whole with the hereafter to be mentioned Gospel of the Passion of Zacharias. The text contains a correspondence between bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus on the one hand, and St. Jerome on the other, which is prefixed to the work, betrays the fact (against the will of the forger himself) that his alleged translation from a Hebrew original is nothing but a Catholic recast of an old Gnostic writing, which, in compliance with traditional custom, is ascribed by the stemmata. This recast cannot be assigned an earlier date than the second half of the 5th century. It reappears in yet another form, in (3) The Evangelium de Nativitate Mariae, first published among the works of St. Jerome, then reprinted by Fabricius, Jones, and Schmidt in their collections of New Testament Apocrypha, and finally by Thilo (L. c. pp. 217–336) and Tischendorf (L. c. pp. 106–114, 2nd ed. pp. 113–121). The narrative, from which has been carefully expunged everything that could give offence to the strictest Catholic orthodoxy, reaches only to the birth of Christ at Bethlehem. This recast, which must be considerably younger than its prototype, is a Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew—found, however, in a MS. as early as the 10th century, in the Laurentian Library (cf. Schade, l. c. p. 5). To it belongs a second spurious epistle, attributed to St. Jerome, which, in the printed editions, follows the correspondence already referred to between that father and the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus. The author of this second epistle makes express reference to the former correspondence, which, however, he misunderstands, and is misled thereby to suppose the writing which actually lies before him (our Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew) to have been written by the so-called heretical author "Selenium" (Leucius). (Compare Tischendorf, L. c. Proleg. p. xxxii. sq. 2nd ed. p. xxviii. sq. ; Schade l. c.) This recast announces itself expressly as a paraphrase, which gives the sense but not the exact words of the original writer. The first of these writing the so-called Protevangelium is generally regarded as the eldest of the three. Hilgenfeld (Evangel. Johne, p. 153), whose proofs were adopted by Tischendorf (Evang. apoc. p. xxviii. sq. 2nd ed. p. xxvii. sq. ; and the tract, Wann wurden wop. etc. verfaßt ? 4th ed. p. 76 sq.), has collected a series of correspondences between the writings of Justin Martyr and the Protevangelium and Tischendorf drew the conclusion that this apocryphal gospel must have existed in its present form even before the time of Justin, and consequently in the first half of the 2nd century. Hilgenfeld, however, in reply called attention to the fact that the Protevangelium in its present form is not a homogeneous work, while Schade has disputed the cogency of the proofs drawn from the alleged citations of the Protevangelium by Justin. (Die ältesten Zeugnisse betreffend die Schriften des N. T.; Bremen, 1867, p. 155 sq.) A closer inspection of the present text of the Protevangelium brings in fact to light numerous traces of later handiwork, and there are points that are most conspicuous in ch. 18. Whereas James of Jerusalem, i.e. the Alcibiades, names himself as the author of the whole work, we see St. Joseph suddenly coming forward in this chapter as the narrator, and that in a passage with an unmistakable Gnostic coloring. Joseph relates how at the birth of Christ all motions were suspended and a correspondence between heaven and earth. To exclude the whole chapter as an interpolation (see Hofmann, Das Leben Jesu nach den Apostroph., p. 110) is impossible, inasmuch as Joseph still continues the narration in the chapter following. We cannot therefore fail to recognize here an unsuccessful recast of some older document. Other observations lead to the conclusion that the Leucius character of the narrative and frequent reference to things previously related which are no longer found in the context, the abrupt conclusion of the whole, and, at the any rate, partially more original form of the narrations in the Gospel of the Pseudo-Matthew. To which we may add that various citations in the early Fathers appear to be made from an essentially different text from that which now lies before us in our Protevangelium. Origen, for instance, while citing the Book of James (In Matt. tom. x. 17), relates quite differently from our present text the history of the martyrdom of Zacharias between temple and altar (In Matt. tract 23). There is, indeed, no clear warrant for the existence of our present text of the Protevangelium before the time of Peter of Alexandria (+ 311). None of the points of contact which have been pointed out between our Protevangelium and the writings of Justin Martyr can be regarded as decisive for our present form of it. The narrative of our Lord's birth in a cave (Dial. c. Tryph. 78), for instance, rests on a local tradition (De Orig. c. Cels. 1. 51), which is probably older than the Protevangelium in its earliest form. It is not only found in all Gospels of the infancy, even those which borrowed nothing else from the Protevangelium, but is constantly referred to...
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by the Fathers, and does not pretend to be a correction, but only an addition to the narrative in St. Luke (ii. 7–12).

The combination, moreover, of the angel's words to Mary in St. Luke—καὶ παλαίστες τὸ δεσπόζων Ἰωάννην (l. 31)—with those in St. Matthew (l. 21)—ἀμώστηξα καὶ πεθαίνει τὸν λαόν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς λαβαδίας αὐτοῦ—which is found both in Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 33) and the Protevangelium, is simply explained by the fact that St. Matthew himself has already so combined them.

The third and most probable "concordance" between Justin and the Protevangelium are the words καὶ χειρὶς λαβαδίαν Μαρίας ἐπαθεὶς (Justin, Dial. c. Tryph. 101) compared with χειρὶς τῆς λαβαδίας Μαρίας (Protev. c. 12). But here the connexion of the words in Justin with the angelic salutation is more natural than that in the Protevangelium with the address of the priest to Mary in the Temple. Justin is therefore probably quoting the original document, entirely lost to us, except in St. Matthew's Protevangelium. The same original document is probably that referred to by Clemens Alex. (Strom. viii. 16, p. 889 Potter), Origen (i. c.), and Gregory of Nyssa (Oratio in d. natal. Christi, Opp. iii. 546, ed. Paris.). Traces of a Gnostic writing concerning the Nativity of Mary are found as late as IV. N. T., cap. 26; 2 Bar. v. 12; 2 Enoch, xxii. 9; August. c. Faust. xxii. 9; Gelasii Decret. vii. 9, 16). The Protev-Matthew has drawn directly from it. The narratives, for example, contained in the last chapters, which are wholly wanting in the Protevangelium, and more particularly the miracles wrought on the infant Jesus in this narrative, could not possibly be a Gnostic character (cc. 18–24). This notwithstanding, it seems very unlikely that the Gnostic writing concerning the Nativity of Mary was made use of by Origen. The account of the martyrdom of Zacharias which Epiphanius (l. c.) tells in the Gnostic book differs as much from that given by Origen as from that contained in the Protevangelium. The best account of the Gospel may be due to a later reviser of the Gnostic writing, but that found in Origen has no Gnostic features whatever, but is evidently derived from some Jewish-Christian source. To which must be added that while the Gnostic writing expressly named Jesus as its author, that used by Origen, like our Protevangelium, gave this position to St. James.

A closer inspection of the Protevangelium makes evident that its text must have undergone repeated revisions and recastings before it assumed its present form. Side by side with various traditional affinities, and especially ch. 18), there are also numerous features indicating a Jewish-Christian writer or at any rate betraying an intimate acquaintance with Jewish customs. Take, for example, the forty days fasting, the grief of parents who are denied the blessing of children and their suffering contempt as an account, the vow of Anna like her Old Testament mother to devote her child when born to the Lord, the high priest's petalon, the 12 bells on his robe, the veil of the Temple woven by Jewish maidens, the water of curzing, the oracle of the staves, the registers of the twelve tribes, and the many Old Testament types. To explain this twofold character of the book by the hypothesis of a "Gnostic-Ebionite" author is, however, inadmissible, if only because so much is found, notwithstanding, which is in direct antagonism with Jewish thought and custom, e.g. the refusal of Joachim and his sacrifice, the bringing up of Mary in the Temple, the application of the water of curzing to Joseph, and the legendary ornamental development of the oracle of the staves. This curious admixture of intimate knowledge and gross ignorance of Jewish thought and custom compels us to assume and distinguish between an original Jewish-Christian writing and a Gnostic recast of it. The former is to a great extent preserved in the Protevangelium Jacob, but still more fully and faithfully in the Gospel of the Pseudo-Matthew.

In both writings, moreover, we discern the employment and combination of various other original sources. This is evident, for instance, in the twofold account of Mary's Annunciation (Protevangelium, 1, Pseudo-Matthew, 2). In the Protevangelium the angel appears to her at the well, in the Pseudo-Matthew in her chamber as she is working the veil of the Temple. The second account is probably the only one found in the older writing.

We may then distinguish the following strata in the histories of St. Mary and the child Jesus down to the flight into Egypt as preserved to us in these documents: (a) The Jewish-Christian work attributed to James, and already extant in the time of Justin Martyr. (b) A Gnostic recension of the same work which usually bears the name of Joseph, though occasionally also that of James, and which is attributed to Leucius Charinus (cf. the interrelated correspondence between St. Jerome and the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus prefixed to our Pseudo-Matthew). This work may date from about the middle of the 3rd century. (c) Various Catholic productions reduced by piecing together in different ways the two ancient texts. The best account of the Protevangelium, which may have appeared in its present form as early as the latter part of the 3rd century; the Latin Pseudo-Mattheus is a later work, but derived independently of the Protevangelium from the same sources; a still later recast of the Pseudo-Mattheus is the Latin Evangelium de Nativitate Marci, preserved among the works of St. Jerome.

The remaining Gospels of the Childhood which are still preserved are the Gospel of Thomas, the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, and the Arabic History of Joseph.

4. The Gospel of St. Thomas, or the Acts of the lord's wife, and a legend called the Gospel of Thomas. This was originally a Gnostic work, and seems to have been written about the second half of the 2nd century. It was made use of not only by Marcians and Nannasenes (comp. Pseudo-Origen, Philosophum. v. 7, p. 101, ed. Ozen., with Iren. Haer. i. 20), and in later times by Nicanarchs, but is frequently cited from Origen downwards (Hom. i. in Luc.), by fathers of the church. (Compare Thilo, l. c. p. lixix. sqq. and Tischendorf, l. c. p. xxxii. sqq. 2nd ed. p. xxxvi. sqq.). Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) reckons it among spurious writings (vita). Cyril of Jerusalem and later writers assign its authorship to a Thomas, disciple of Man. But the Israelite Thomas who
introduces himself in the beginning of the work as the author is evidently meant to be the
apostle St. Thomas whose purpose is to announce
"the child-deeds of the Lord" to the brethren
among the Gentiles. The present text is a
revised text of the angelic manuscript which of the
Catholic reviser has eliminated all the heretical
portions. The narrative, which treats of the
miracles performed by the child Jesus begins
with His fifth year, and concludes with His
appearance among the doctors in the temple
when twelve years old. The Greek text has
come down to us primarily, one of which
(α) was published by Cotelier from a Paris
fragment in an edition of the Apocryphal
Contestants (vol. 17), and after him by Fabricius;
then in a more complete form from a Venet MS. by
Mingarilli (Mvtn. Eoibnt. d'Opign. Nasci. e
Sidon. 1704, p. 73-152); and, finally with Thilo's
ed. (c. p. 134-144, 2nd ed. pp. 140-157). The second
and more fragmentary text (β) was published
from a Sinaitic MS. by Tischendorf (Weiser
Jacob. 1845, Apoc. p. 51, sqq., and
Of Latin translations of this narrative which have
not been printed but known to exist in a
Venetian manuscript of the 5th century (Tisch. Pellegrin. ed. p. xii. 2nd ed. p. xiv. sqq.), two others
have quite independently been published;
both by Tischendorf. The former of these in the
Vatican MS. discovered by Tischendorf bears
like the Greek original, the name of Thomas
The latter, printed also by Tischendorf from a
Vatican MS. (Cod. A), is improperly alleged by
him to the Pseudo-Mattheus, and regarded as
the second part of the History of the Infancy of
Mary and the Saviour (c. p. 87-105, 2nd ed.
pp. 93-112). A mixed text formed from both
these translations is found in a Parker MS. (Cod.
1652) of the 11th century (D op. Thilis);
from which Thilo was the first to give some
extracts (c. p. viii. sqq.). This Paris MS.
contains, in the first instance (like the Vatican
Cod. A), the histories of the childhood as given
by the Pseudo-Mattheus (cc. 1-24), and then
the histories contained in the Gospel of St.
Thomas, partly from the text of Tischendorf's
Thomas Latina (cc. 25-40, 42, 48); partly
from the second Latin translation of Cod. A
misattributed by Tischendorf to the Pseudo-
Mattheus (cc. 43-47); and, finally, in part,
(c. 41), from a third reception. The Lauretine
of Ambrosius MS. moreover (Tischendorf's
Cod. 99), contains super-added, in the
margin, values, exhibiting in those portions, which
are peculiar to it, the character of a later text.
To all these helps and sources most fully
be added the Syriac translation published by
Wright (c. with English version, pp. 6-11), and
commencing with the second chapter of our
Gospel. The text exhibited by this Syriac
version occupies a middle place between that of
the Greek reception A and that of the two Latin
versions. In both those versions the Gospel of
Thomas is preceded by histories of our Lord's
residence in Egypt and of miracles there
performed. The text represented by what Tischend-
orf calls Cod. Thomas Latina peoples the
events of the period from the flight into
Egypt to the return of the Holy Family to
Nazareth, but merely in the form of a somewhat
abrupt introduction which occupies the time
first chapters; but that this did not originally
form part of the Evangelion Thomas is clear
from the fact that the original text of Cod. A
reads: "Gloriosum est narrare Thomam Israelitam et
Apostolum Domini et de operibus Jesu postea
esse est de Aegypto in Nazaret. Intellige
omnes, frater carissimi, quae secut Domini
Jesus quando fuit in civitate Nazaret; quod
in primo capitolo." The story is continued in the
Gospel of St. Thomas, we are given in the different texts a
curiously varied form, some of them recurring
even in the same MSS. in different reception.
The history of the master who has to teach
the child Jesus the letters of the alphabet, may
serve as an example (Comp. Iren. Her. I. 20).
The story is continued in the Acts of Thomas.
His master as to the mysterious significance of
the characters before him, although we possess
it in five different forms, is so thoroughly
ruined, that its restoration must be despised of.
A series of these miracle-narratives are in
the various texts located now in Egypt and now
in Galilee. Such is the case with the story of
the priesthood of Jesus, which is punished for the
Greek text, and according to one class of narratives is
the son of Hanno, and to another, the son of an
idol-priest in Egypt. The scene, moreover, of
the Galilean boy-deeds of Jesus is not
unanimously laid by all the texts in Nazareth.
Some make the Holy Family remove at once
from Egypt to Capernaum, and another who has a
tell of various places of residence now at
Nazareth, now at Capernum, and now at Bethle-
heh, distributes the miracle-narratives among them.
The arrangement and selection of the various
texts differ widely in the several texts. One
series of sections is only found in one
other of the Latin versions, and others only in
the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy of which
we shall have to speak further on. Still less
agreement will be found between the various
documents as to single features of the narratives,
the persons named, and the words attributed
to them, etc. A great part of the miracles
aaged to the child Jesus is borrowed from New
Testament narratives, or at least from them, and
likewise, many sayings attributed are
undetermined as of well-known utterances in the
prophetic ages; c. e. the answer given by Jesus to
His master: "Thou knowest not the nature of
A and wilt thou teach others B? Then
evil-critic I teach thee first what A is, and then
will ye believe thee in respect to B." As to the
child-life of Jesus, a small portion of them
are miracles of healing, the greater number
stroke of magic or miraculous inflictions of
crueal punishment. Jesus makes arrows out
cloth, and sets them fly away alive, brings
to life a dried fish, dyes cloth, stretches out a
belated, passes through the Jordan, carries water
home in his trough, but with special frequency
He revenges Himself on those who mock or insult Him, smiting them with blindness or striking to the earth, causing them to wither or slaying them outright. The boy Jesus is almost everywhere a terror to those about Him. He is even occasionally banished with his parents from the house of the city, or rebuked by Joseph for his wanton cruelty, whereupon He immediately repairs the mischief by a fresh miracle.

The great acceptance of the book in various Gnostic circles is explained by its original Doctism, all traces of which the Catholic editors or revisers of the present text were unable to eradicate. The numerous miracles related of our Lord have all one tendency—to assign to the child Jesus as He was divine, omnipotence and omniscience, and reducing all human development to mere appearance. The child Jesus knows Himself already to have been born of God. The Rädrig of St. Joseph's, and Siche's Latin version was printed by Fabricius (Cod. apocr. N. T. l. pp. 188-211), and after him by Jones and Schmidt. Thilo (l. c. pp. 63-138) republished the Arabic and Latin texts with corrections (pp. 171-202, 2nd ed. pp. 181-209) the Latin text only, with corrections here and there by Fleischer. The book announces itself as a composition derived from older sources (cc. 1, 25, 55) and is divided into two parts. The first part (cc. 1-25) is a recension of the Evangelium Infantis attributed to the high priest Joseph of Edessa (Thilo, l. c. pp. 25-55) and is probably the same as the Gnostic work made use of in the Proteranganism, and which bore the name of Joseph (not Caiphas, of course, but the husband of Mary). The original work appears to have been nearly related, for the first three or four chapters, to the Proteranganism of St. James, and the latter two, to the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew. It contained also the miracles attributed to the child Jesus during the residence in Egypt. The second part (cc. 26-55) is derived from a recension of the Gospel of St. Thomas, which seems to have differed in various particulars from the other texts which we possess, and, in some places, to have approached more to the original (Gnostic) work. Some of these narratives are given here (as is the case with the Greek and Latin MSS.) in a double form (comp. c. 36 with cc. 46, 47, and cc. 41, 42 with c. 43). The process of Catholicizing has, on the other hand, introduced some minor modifications or in the connexion of parts. The miraculous narratives are, according to resemblances in their contents, arranged in pairs; several particulars appear to have been derived from oral tradition (comp. c. 5), and the compiler seems to have taken a special delight in references to transactions and persons mentioned in the canonical gospels. The child Jesus, they maintain, must certainly have worked some miracles in order to rebuke the Gnostic error, which made the Christ to descend upon Him for the first time at His baptism. In this way is explained how, notwithstanding the opposition to which we have referred, these facts of the childhood also find nevertheless find approval and acceptance among Catholic readers. The Gnostic book of St. Thomas was accordingly dressed up for the use and benefit of the Catholic people by careful revision of all manifestly heretical passages, and various extracts and abridgements were also put in circulation, so that the attractive miracle legends were carefully preserved. Compared with the original compass of the work which, according to the stichometry of Nicephorus (see Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, p. 122 sq.), contained 1300 stichoi, the existing remains of the Gospel of St. Thomas must be regarded as mere fragments.
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S. The Arabic Gospel of the Childhood (Evangelium Infantis Arabicum) is a Catholic recension of all the stories of the childhood from the birth of Jesus till His twelfth year. It is a special favourite with the Nestorians of Syria. The Arabic text is a translation from the Syriac, and the existing MSS. of the Syriac text have not been edited. The book was first published in Arabic and Latin, with copious notes by Heinrich Sike (Utrecht, 1697). Sike's Latin version was republished by Fabricius (Cod. apocr. N. T. l. pp. 188-211), and after him by Jones and Schmidt. Thilo (l. c. pp. 63-138) republished the Arabic and Latin texts with corrections (pp. 171-202, 2nd ed. pp. 181-209) the Latin text only, with corrections here and there by Fleischer. The book announces itself as a composition derived from older sources (cc. 1, 25, 55) and is divided into two parts. The first part (cc. 1-25) is a recension of the Evangelium Infantis attributed to the high priest Joseph of Edessa (Thilo, l. c. pp. 25-55) and is probably the same as the Gnostic work made use of in the Proteranganism, and which bore the name of Joseph (not Caiphas, of course, but the husband of Mary). The original work appears to have been nearly related, for the first three or four chapters, to the Proteranganism of St. James, and the latter two, to the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew. It contained also the miracles attributed to the child Jesus during the residence in Egypt. The second part (cc. 26-55) is derived from a recension of the Gospel of St. Thomas, which seems to have differed in various particulars from the other texts which we possess, and, in some places, to have approached more to the original (Gnostic) work. Some of these narratives are given here (as is the case with the Greek and Latin MSS.) in a double form (comp. c. 36 with cc. 46, 47, and cc. 41, 42 with c. 43). The process of Catholicizing has, on the other hand, introduced some minor modifications or in the connexion of parts. The miraculous narratives are, according to resemblances in their contents, arranged in pairs; several particulars appear to have been derived from oral tradition (comp. c. 5), and the compiler seems to have taken a special delight in references to transactions and persons mentioned in the canonical gospels. The child Jesus, they maintain, must certainly have worked some miracles in order to rebuke the Gnostic error, which made the Christ to descend upon Him for the first time at His baptism. In this way is explained how, notwithstanding the opposition to which we have referred, these facts of the childhood also find nevertheless find approval and acceptance among Catholic readers. The Gnostic book of St. Thomas was accordingly dressed up for the use and benefit of the Catholic people by careful revision of all manifestly heretical passages, and various extracts and abridgements were also put in circulation, so that the attractive miracle legends were carefully preserved. Compared
197). In contrast with those of the Gospel of St. Thomas, these Egyptian miracles are chiefly characterized as works of healing wrought by water in which the child Jesus had been washed, or by articles of His clothing, from which we may infer that they were not originally connected with the former, but derived from some independent source. This must also have originated in Gnostic circles, though it is to be remarked that the Arabic gospel lays special emphasis on the true humanity of Jesus (c. 30).

Its date of composition is comparatively late, being placed in the 2nd century after the Martyrdom of St. Thomas. The statement (c. 7) that Zachariathas had foretold the coming of the Messiah seems to imply the continued maintenance of the Persian religion and worship (comp. Schade, I. c. p. 5).

The reckoning of dates by the era of Alexander (c. 2) held its ground among the Syrians till late in the middle age, and cannot, therefore, be used here as a determinate chronology. The book bears the character of a factual lection for St. Joseph’s day (cf. cc. 26, 30 and Thilo, p. xx sq.) and is a recast made from older sources. It narrates the history of Joseph, who appears at once as a priest and a descendant from David, till his death, which is said to have taken place in the 13th year of the reign of Tiberius. The name of our Lord’s month, which is represented as having imparted it to His disciples on the Mount of Olives. At the opening and conclusion of the whole work the disciples appear as narrators. The section which treats of Joseph’s betrothal with Mary, the birth of Jesus, and the pursuit of the child by Herod (cc. 3-9) is nearly related to the Procopioyan, but appears not to have been borrowed from it. That the Gospel of Thomas was also used is evident from c. 17 where there is an allusion to the narrative in Ec. Thomae, 4, 5 (cf. 16). The histories of Joseph are also preserved in the Coptic Language, and in both dialects, Sahidic and Mophitic. The extracts and fragments communicated by Zoega and Dulauger from the yet untranslated MSS. (op. Thilo, p. xxii. sq. Thienedorf’s notes under the text) prove that the Arabic text was a recension of the Coptic. The latter exhibits traces of a Gnostic origin. The use made of the Gospel of Thomas is here still more evident: Joseph remembers with sorrow that he had once pulled the child Jesus by the ear; the Arabic history holding this for unseemly softens it down into a seizing of his hand. Of special interest is the description in the Coptic text of the departure of Joseph’s soul, of which the Arabic gives only a meagre abstract (cc. 21-23). The Coptic here describes the approach of death, Orcus, and the devil, with innumerable aëons, to take possession of the departing soul, the driving away of these fearful beings by Jesus, the descent at His intercession of Michael and Gabriel with the choir of archangels, who receive the parting soul and conduct it safely through the seven aëons of darkness. This narrative appears to have formed the living nucleus of the original faith. Its Gnostic character cannot be doubted.

Whether the narratives in the first chapters of our Arabic text, which conduct the history of Joseph down to his dying hour, existed in its original work, can be determined after a complete publication of the Coptic manuscripts. According to Zoega’s extracts, the Coptic text appears to begin at the fourteenth chapter, and at exactly this point the Arabic exhibits distinct traces of the manipulation of an older document. Although in preceding and following passages Jesus is the central personage of the narrative (cf. Thilo, p. xx sq.), its original work goes as far back as the 3rd century.

A quite peculiar position is assumed by 7. The Departure of Mary (κολασθείς ης Ἐλασίου τις Μαδαλάζδις ιναις, Τρανσίτις Μαρίας) a work attributed to the apostle St. John and handed down in various forms—Arabic, Coptic, Sahidic, and Sahidic. The Greek text was first published by Tischendorf (Apocryphes apocryphi, pp. 95-112) from several manuscripts. Of the same work exist still in MS. two later recensions in Greek: one entitled Ἐγκύκλιοι τῆς κοιλασθείης τῆς Παραγγελίας τοῦ θεουργοῦ, by the patriarch Euthymius of Jerusalem (beginning of 7th century); comp. Photius Biblioth. cod. 273, the other the Λόγος τῆς κοιλασθείης τῆς Παραγγελίας Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν of archbishop John of Thessalonica (end of 7th century, comp. Tischendorf, I. c. p. xxxviii. sq.). This work of the late 7th century bears, like the former, in several MSS. the name of the apostle, but is rightly distinguished from it by the monk Epiphanius of Salamis, who lived in the 10th century (Epiphanius Monach. ed. Dressel, p. 14). The narrative contained in the Greek Apocrypha and found up in various ways form the groundwork of the festive homilies of St. John Damascene, Germanus Constantinopolitanus, Andreas Cretensis, and others (Thilo, Prolegom. ad Acta Thomae, p. 195). Latin texts were known as early as the 9th century. Pope Gelasius in his Dicta Johni libris recipiendis, reckons the “liber qui appellatur Transitus Mariae apocryphus” among those which are rejected by the church. One of the late Latin recensions which still exist bears its title from the name of bishop Melito of Sardis, the same who is also named as the alleged author of the apocryphal Acts Johannis. The title which takes the form of a letter addressed by Melito to the church of Laodicea, defines the object of the work to be to counteract a certain orthodox narrative derived by oral tradition from the apostle St. John the influence of an heretical book bearing the same title, whose author Leucius claims also to be a disciple of the apostles. The text was published in the Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima Lugdunensis (i. 2. pp. 212-216) and elsewhere, and finally by Tischendorf from a Venetian MS. (L. c. pp. 124-136, Transitus Mariae B) which however does not contain the epistle of the pseudo-Melito.
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Another Latin recension widely differing from this was published also by Tischendorf (as Transitus Mariæ, pp. 113-123) from three MSS. The same object as that aimed at in the work of Pseudo-Melito is that also of the Seminar i d'Assumption B. V. M. et Pandæm et Evætonum, attributed to St. Jerome (Hieron. Op. c. 1). The various circumstances in the life and passion of the apostle Melito betray, a Catholicizing recast of an heretical work. Whether the alleged disciple of the apostles, Lecius Charius, did, as "Melito" reports, compose the original work in his own name, or whether from the first it was entitled after the apostle St. John, can no longer be ascertained. The latter supposition is the more probable. This heretical Apocryphon is probably the same as that mentioned by Pseudo-Jerome, and in the Decretum Gelasianum. Various traces lead to the conjecture that it probably proceeded from the same Gnostic circles as the gospels of the infancy and the Gnostic Acta Apostololorum in some correct form. In a fragment of the second book of this work was published by Cureton in his Ancient Syriac Documents (p. 110 of the English translation). Related to this second recension, but also older and more original is the text (Syr. C) of the fragments also published by professor Wright in his Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, pp. 34-41. To these thesehms of recensions must finally be added the also fragmentary Oneesches of Mary (Wright, Contributions, pp. 42-51). The Arabic text published by Maximilian Eger (Joannis apostoli de Transitus Beatae Mariæ Virginis libri, 1854) is nearly related to Syr. B and C. A Sahidic version moreover exists of a text which appears to differ from all. It is called the 'third recension' of Zoroa. It has been published particularly in the Cod. Civid. Cap. Borgiae, p. 224, num. xvi. (comp. Tischendorf, l. c. p. xxvii.) There exists finally in Ethiopic a Vīnas Marīne Virginīs (Dillmann, Cod. p. 22) which is nearly related to the sixth book of the second Syriac recension. This second, namely, how many rests over the guidance of her divine son, visits the habitation of the blessed and of the lost. The same subject is also dealt with in several Greek MSS. of an Apocryphas Marīae (Tischendorf, l. c. p. xxvii. sq.). The original text of the Transitus Marīae, which seems to have been preserved (approximately) in the Greek text and those of the two Syriac recensions B and C, treated of the last events in the life of Mary—her last visit to the Holy Sepulchre, the Jewish plots against her, her prayers to be taken away from earth, her return to Bethlehem, the miraculous assemblage of the apostles in her chamber, her transport to Jerusalem and fresh miracles wrought after her death. The passion of Christ, at her dying bed, her death and burial. Her soul, according to the promise of her divine son, is received up into Heaven while her body is taken to Paradise. The miraculous resurrection of the Virgin's body is found only in later texts, the assumption into heaven is related only in the Latin copies. A comparison of the various texts proves that the original narrative was now abbreviated and new enlarged in manifold ways with all manner of foreign additions and strange ornaments. Especially remarkable in this respect is the Book of the Oneesches of Mary. It tells, for instance, of a strife taking place among the apostles (when assembled in Mary's presence) concerning the true gospel and of its being decided by Christ Himself in favour of St. Paul. It relates also how after the transport of Mary into Paradise, not she but the apostles visited the lower world.

The Kolonjon Mapsia in all the various forms in which we possess it professes, as that the original recension of this apocryphal was composed by St. John, can no longer be ascertained. The above supposition is the more probable. This heretical Apocryphon is probably the same as that mentioned by Pseudo-Jerome, and in the Decretum Gelasianum. Various traces lead to the conjecture that it probably proceeded from the same Gnostic circles as the gospels of the infancy and the Gnostic Acta Apostololorum. In some correct form. In a fragment of the second book of this work was published by Cureton in his Ancient Syriac Documents (p. 110 of the English translation). Related to this second recension, but also older and more original is the text (Syr. C) of the fragments also published by professor Wright in his Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, pp. 34-41. To these thesehms of recensions must finally be added the also fragmentary Oneesches of Mary (Wright, Contributions, pp. 42-51). The Arabic text published by Maximilian Eger (Joannis apostoli de Transitus Beatae Mariæ Virginis libri, 1854) is nearly related to Syr. B and C. A Sahidic version moreover exists of a text which appears to differ from all. It is called the 'third recension' of Zoroa. It has been published particularly in the Cod. Civid. Cap. Borgiae, p. 224, num. xvi. (comp. Tischendorf, l. c. p. xxvii.) There exists finally in Ethiopic a Vīnas Marīne Virginīs (Dillmann, Cod. p. 22) which is nearly related to the sixth book of the second Syriac recension. This second, namely, how many rests over the guidance of her divine son, visits the habitation of the blessed and of the lost. The same subject is also dealt with in several Greek MSS. of an Apocryphas Marīae (Tischendorf, l. c. p. xxvii. sq.). The original text of the Transitus Marīae, which seems to have been preserved (approximately) in the Greek text and those of the two Syriac recensions B and C, treated of the last events in the life of Mary—her last visit to the Holy Sepulchre, the Jewish plots against her, her prayers to be taken away from earth, her return to Bethlehem, the miraculous assemblage of the apostles in her chamber, her transport to Jerusalem and fresh miracles wrought after her death. The passion of Christ, at her dying bed, her death and burial. Her soul, according to the promise of her divine son, is received up into Heaven while her body is taken to Paradise. The miraculous resurrection of the Virgin's body is found only in later texts, the assumption into heaven is related only in the Latin copies. A comparison of the various texts proves that the original narrative was now abbreviated and new enlarged in manifold ways with all manner of foreign additions and strange ornaments. Especially remarkable in this respect is the Book of the Oneesches of Mary. It tells, for instance, of a
very early, as we find from Tertullian (Apol. 21),
that the procurator himself became a convert to
Christianity. It was consequently assumed
that his report to the emperor must have con-
tained a witness, not only to the innocence of
Jesus, but to His divine mission also, His
miracles, and resurrection. From such conjec-
tures to the evidence of various documents
by Christian authors was a mere step. The
oldest of these which has come down to us
appears to be the Epistle of Pontius Pilate
to the emperor Claudius, incorporated in the
apocryphal Acts of St. Peter and St. Paul (Greek
text in Tischendorf, Acts apost. apocr. p. 16 sq.),
and also found in a Latin version both in Pseudo-
Marcellus (i.e. the Latin version of the so-called
Acta Marcelli), and the spurious Ἀναφορὰς
λαοῦ at the end of the fifth book of Pseudo-
Hegesippus de Excidio Hierosol., as well as in the
so-called Evangelium Nicodemi (of which we shall
have to speak hereafter), to which it is appended
in several Latin MSS. (last reprint in Tischendorf,
Evang. apocr. p. 413 sq., 2nd ed. p. 433 sq.). The
mistaken address to the emperor Claudius is
explained by reference to the primeval Ebionitic
Acts of Peter, which formed the basis of the later
Acts of Peter and Paul, and represented the
prince of the apostles as having come to Rome
under the emperor Claudius for the purpose of
opposing the machinations of Simon Magus.
The epistle can, however, hardly have been pre-
served in its original form, and in the oldest
text from which the Acts of Peter drew, was
probably addressed to the emperor Tiberius.

Of much more recent origin is the Ἀναφορὰ
Παλατίου which has come down to us in two
reductions (both reprinted in Tischendorf, Evang.
apocr. p. 418 sq., 2nd ed. p. 433 sq.). This work
presupposes the existence of the Gesta Pilati, of
which we shall have to speak presently, and
cannot have been composed before the second
half of the 5th century. In the MSS. which we
possess, it forms one whole with the παράξενος
Παλατίου, which contains the oldest form of the
Pilate-legend. It relates how Pilate was by the
emperor Claudius sent to Rome to settle the part
which he had taken in the crucifixion of
our Lord, how he was thereupon tried and
beheaded, but at the same time was received by
Christ Himself among the blessed for the sake
of his penitent and faithful confession (ap.
Tischendorf, l. c. p. 426 sq. 2nd ed. p. 449 sq.).

A forgery of later origin is the Latin Epistola
Pilati ad Tiberium (Tischendorf l. c. p. 411 sq.
2nd ed. p. 433 sq.).

The most important and most widely dissemi-
nated writing of this class—the Gesta or Acta
Pilati—is better known under a title which it
probably first obtained in the course of the middle
age, that of the Gospel of Nicodemus. Its cor-
correct designation is Προμηθεύς του Κεφος του
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ προμηθεύς του Παλατίου.

It has come down to us in two Greek recensions
(Gr. A and Gr. B, Tischendorf, l. c. pp. 203–311,
2nd ed. p. 210 sqq. and p. 287 sqq.), and also in
Latin under the title of Gesta Salvatoris; and
from c. 12 onwards, likewise in two recensions
(Tischendorf, l. c. pp. 312–410, 2nd ed. p. 333
sq., p. 389 sq. p. 417 sq.). Besides these there
exists also a Coptic version published by Peyron.

Peyron's Latin translation of the Coptic text is
also reprinted entire by Tischendorf in his notes
(2nd ed.) to the Greek text. The work is divided
into two parts, of which the former narrative,
with apologetic purpose, and on the basis of our
four canonical gospels, but with numerous apocryphal
additions, the history of our Lord's trial,
condemnation, and crucifixion, while the latter is
intended to establish the truth of His resurrection by
the testimonies of various eyewitnesses. Tertul-
lian's opinion, wherein he has been followed by
Rudolf Hofmann and others, these Acts of Pilate
must have been already known to Justin Mar-
tyr, Tertullian, and Eusebius. Further inquiry,
however, leads to quite a different result. Even
on the assumption that Justin Martyr did make
use of a spurious document that announced itself
as the official report of our Lord's trial, drawn up
by or under the direction of Pilate, it certainly
cannot have been identical with our Acts of Pilate,
since the particulars which Justin is supposed to
have derived therefrom are nowhere to be found
in our Acts. Neither do Tertullian's statements
(Apol. 21, cf. 5) as to the contents of the
Tiberian Acts. These Tiberian Acts, according to
Tertullian, contain anything which specially
belongs to our Acts of Pilate, while referring to
several particulars that were not to be found in
them at all. Even Hilgenfeld's and Volkmar's
opinion, that our Acts may be a recast of an
older work which Justin and Tertullian made
use of, is improbable. For it is incredible that
the statements found in Justin and Tertullian,
who had really been derived from the original
groundwork of our present Acts, could have
afterwards been so completely eliminated from
them; and fully irreconcilable with the character
and composition of the work before us is the
further view maintained by both critics that all
particulars derived from the Gospel of St. John
which it now contains are insertions of a more
recent interpolator. Finally, both Justin Martyr
and Tertullian imply the existence of a docu-
ment drawn up in the form of official An
praecedentia; this is not applicable to our Acts
of Pilate, which themselves indicate Nicodemus
as their author. Supposing, then, these fathers
really had the document to answer to the
former, as it appears, in his hands, it must have borne a similar character
to the already mentioned Epistola Pilati of
Claudium, though, doubtless, with a correct
address indicating it as a report made to the
emperor Tiberius. We know for certain that in
Tertullian's time (and it is possible that also in
Justin Martyr's) a document of this kind was
really in circulation among the Christians. The
church-historian (Eusebius), moreover (H. E. i.
2), and a sermon attributed to Simon Cephas as
preached in the city of Rome (ap. Curet.,
Ancient Syriac Documents, p. 35 sqq. of the
English translation) mention indeed an official
report as made by Pilate to Tiberius, but exhibit
no acquaintance with our Acts. Eusebius seems
rather to have derived the document from Tertul-
lian, and the Syriac author his from the
ancient Acta Petri. On the other hand Eusebius
mentions (H. E. ix. 5 and 7; cf. i. 9 and 11) cer-
tain Acts of Pilate which he designates as pagan
forgeries "full of every kind of blasphemy against
Christ," composed in the time of the Galerian per-
secution and distributed by decree of the emperor
Maximinus in every part of the empire, with
orders that the children in the schools should be
made to learn them by heart. These Acts were
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Therefore, composed between the years A.D. 307 and A.D. 315, and probably after the Tetrarchic Act of Galerius (A.D. 311) which Maximinus had refused to accept. The first trace of any reference to our present Acts will be found in the Encomium of Epiphanius (A.D. 370) who states that the Quartodecimans appealed to a statement in Acts 20:17 as the correct one of their determination of the day of the passion. The statement is actually found in our present Acts.

As to the composition of this work the first Greek recension (Gr. A) comprises in our present MSS. sixteen chapters, of which cc. 1-11 treat of the passion, cc. 12-16 of the resurrection of Jesus. The book has two different introductions. The first designates Aeneas, a contemporary of the emperor Theodosius II. and of Valentinian III., as translator of the following treatise from the Hebrew. The second begins with fixing the date of our Lord's death, and adds the statement that Nicodemus had written an account of the Hebrew language of the events which followed the crucifixion according to the passion of our Lord. The second Greek recension (Gr. B) —under the title of Διώγγειος περί τοῦ πάθους του Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκός—treats of the same subject; but adds eleven more chapters (cc. 17-27) at the end. These chapters contain an account of events dependent on the death of the two Gemini, this was very variously dated by later authors (compare Epiphanius, Hær. li. 23; Chron. Paschale, pp. 398, 391, ed. Bonn; Acta Barsimaei, ap. Cureton, Ancient Syriac Documents, p. 72 of the English translation). The Gentile Acts of Pilate, on the other hand, know nothing as yet of the Eusebian chronology. This suffices to prove that our Christian Acts must, even as to their oldest text, be more recent than the Gentile ones, and that the latter could not have been written, as Tischendorf assumes, in order to supersede the former, but that the opposite assumption is the only one possible. The original text of our Acts must therefore have been written by the Roman ecclesiastical publication of Eusebius's Church History (A.D. 320) and perhaps some decades later still, in the time of the emperor Julian (A.D. 361-363). With this agrees a whole series of linguistic and other peculiarities which all indicate a time subsequent to that of Constantine the Great. (Compare Lipsius, Die Papyrusschriften, 1871.)

The next recension of the text is the Latin, the Collectio Christiani ad Inform. added since the year A.D. 425, must have been originally an independent work, and was probably of Gnostic origin. According to the text of Lat. B, the two resuscitated mortals who relate the deeds of Christ in the lower world bear the names of Leucius and Karinus. Behind these names lies hidden that of Lecinias Charinus, the well-known author of numerous Gnostic apocryphal writings. There are moreover several traces in the work itself of a Gnostic origin, which may, perhaps, be referred as far back as to the former half of the 3rd century; whereas the present text cannot certainly be older than the latter half of the 4th.

Among apocryphal gospels now lost or existing only in fragments, must be first considered those which once possessed more or less authority even in Catholic circles. These are four in number, the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, the Gospel of the Egyptians, and the Diatessaron of Tatian.

(1.) The Gospel of the Hebrews (Ἑβραϊκὸν κεφάλιον κατὰ Ἑβραίους, i.e. the Gospel used by the Hebrews or Jewish Christians of Palestine and Syria, to whom the Aramaic was their mother-tongue) was reckoned by many, according to
Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) among the Homologomena of the New Testament, but was placed among the Antilegomena, by Eusebius himself and in the stichometry of Nicephorus. It owes the high honour in which it was once held to the fact that it was almost universally regarded in the first centuries as the Hebrew original of our canonical Gospel of St. Matthew (Hieronym. tr. xii. 1; cf. Euseb. Hist. xiii. 11. and Porph. Cata. iv. illustr. 3). This opinion was transmitted by the Jewish Christians or Ebionites, among whom the gospel commonly went by the title of The Gospel of St. Matthew, to Catholic Christians, and was by these last in consequence interchangeably designated by both names. (Irenaeus, Haer. i. 26, 2; ii. 11, 7; Epiphanius, Haer. xxviii. 5; xxx. 3, 13, 14; Philaster, Haer. 38; Theodoret, Haer. Fab. ii. 1; comp. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 25, 27; Epiph. Haer. xxix. 9; xxx. 6, etc.) Papias is an early witness for St. Matthew having written in Hebrew (ap. Euseb. iii. 39) and the same tradition is repeated by Irenaeus (ibid.); and Tertullian (ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 10). Origen (ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 25); Eusebius (H. E. iii. 24, and elsewhere); Jerome (in Matth. Proefat. et passim); Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. iv.). The existence of this Gospel of the Hebrews as a distinct work, differing from our canonical Gospel of St. Matthew, is first put on record by Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. ii. 8; p. 455 Potter) and by Origen who makes several citations from it (in Joann. tom. ii. 6; in Jerem. xv. 4; in Matth. tom. xv. 14). Hegesippus is also reported to have borrowed some things from the Gospel of the Hebrews (Euseb. H. E. iv. 22). According to Origen (Hom. i. in Luc.) and Jerome (in Acta Io. Apoc. 12, 10), it also bore among the Ebionites the title of Gospel according to the Apolutes. Jerome translated it into Greek and Latin from a copy found at Beroea (Vir. illustr. 2, 3; ad Mich. vii. 2; in Matth. xii. 13; contra Pelagiam. iii. 1). The distinction which Hilgenfeld has proposed to make between a Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes and a Greek Gospel of the Ebionites (vid. Nowum Testamentum extram. curiosi) rests from its being an error to regard only the Essene Jewish Christians as Ebionites, and to designate all the rest as Nazarenes, it is evident that Jerome knew nothing as yet of any such Greek Gospel, while, on the other hand, he makes the remark that the Hebrew or Aramaic text which he translated was in use both among Nazarenes and Ebionites (in Matth. xii. 13). And yet of this text Greek versions must have existed at a very early date; for not Epiphanius only but Eusebius also makes all his quotations from such a version. It is moreover highly probable that Jewish Christians themselves, if not resident in Palestine or Syria, read the gospel in Greek.

With regard to the form and structure of this Gospel of the Hebrews it is somewhat difficult to arrive at any judgment by means of the scattered fragments which alone have been preserved. One thing is certain, that at various times and in different circles it took very different shapes. According to Epiphanius (Haer. xxx. 13, 14) the gospel commenced thus:—"Εضلην αυτον εν ταυτη δαφθον ταυτης των ιουδαιων, ήλεγε τις λογοττις αληθες ουκατις Βασιλειων Βαστυνομια; metanolas ev tê gi' hodojv paraqem. From this it is evident that in the text which Epiphanius quotes from, and which was in use among gnosticizing Jewish Christians, the chapters relating to our Lord's genealogy, His birth, and childhood, must have been wanting. Other accounts inform us, however, that in the text used by Cerinthus and Carpocrates, while all reference to the genealogy is wanting, there is an account of a supernatural birth, the genealogy (Matt. i. 1–17) was given, concluding (we may conjecture) with the words, Ἰζεβελ ημετρεται τὸν Ἰωάννην (comp. Epiphanius, Haer. xxviii. 5; iii. 3, 14, with Hilgenfeld's remarks, l. c. p. 17). The history of our Lord's baptism in the Jordan was also differently related in different texts (Epiph. Haer. xxx. 13; cf. Hieron. c. Pelag. iii. 2; ad Jesai. xi. 1). These discrepancies prove the existence in early times, not indeed of different works bearing the same title, but of different redactions of one and the same original work. The fragments preserved in the Greek Epiphanius knew very carefully their dependence on our canonical gospels, though it is impossible, on the other hand, to prove that the Hebrew text was a translation back into Aramaic from the Greek. The Aramaic fragments also contain much that can be explained and understood only on the hypothesis that it is a recasting of the canonical text. It is moreover manifest that the recension used by these Jewish Christians who are called by Epiphanius "Ebionites" (and whom we may designate as "Gnostic" or, more properly, "Essene") Judaizers is the result of various alterations, all breathing more or less sectarian Essene spirit, e.g., the saying, "I am come to put an end to sacrifices, and if ye cause not to suffer them, lo! I will come from you." (Epiph. Haer. xxii. 16). Again: "Have I then desired to keep this passover with you by eating flesh?" (Epiph. Haer. xxx. 22). The working of the same spirit is manifested in the substitution of "ολοκλήρωσις" (ολοκλήρωσις) for the "λογοττα" (λογοττα) of Matt. iii. 4. The narrative of our Lord's baptism (Ippianus, Haer. xxx. 13), with its threefold voice from heaven, is also rare. Apart from recent collections of older texts, of which the first is found in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke; the second in the text of the Cambridge Cod. Bezae at St. Luke iii. 22; in Justin Martyr (Dial. c. Tryphon, 88, 103), and Clemens Alexandrinus (Prolog. i. 6, p. 113, Potter); the third in our canonical Gospel of St. Matthew. And this very narrative can suffice to prove that the so-called "Hebrew" text preserved by St. Jerome is by no means preferable to that of our canonical Gospel of St. Matthew, and even less original than the Greek text quoted by Epiphanius. Instead of the voice from heaven we have here an address made to Christ by the Holy Spirit, and in the place of the descent in dove-like form the Holy Spirit upon Him a theological theory as to the Spirit's relation to the prophets and to Jesus. "It came to pass as the Lord ascended up out of the water, that the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit came down and rested upon Him, and said to Him: 'My son, in all the prophets I waited for Thee till Thou shouldst come, and I might rest upon Thee!' For Thou art My rest, Thou art my first-born son, who reignest for evermore.'" (Hieron. ad Jesai. xi. 1). With this
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should be compared the quotation in Origen (in
Jesu, tom. ii, 6; Jerome, iv. 4), which
is repeated also by St. Jerome (in Mich. vii, 6; in
Jesu. xi 12); "Then laid hold of me my
mother the Holy Spirit by one of my hairs and
carried me up into the great mountain of Tabor."
This passage also presupposes a theological theory
as to the relation of the Holy Spirit (The Divine
Father) to the Person of the Messiah. Yet more
decisively manifest is the reflex of a later time in
the narrative of Jesus being driven by His
mother, St. Mary, to baptism almost against
His will. When His mother and brethren say to
Him, "John the Baptist is baptizing for the
forgiveness of sins," Christ says in reply,
"What sin have I committed that I should go
to be baptized of him,—unless it be that this
very word is a sin of ignorance on my part?"
This narrative discusses a problem as remote as
possible from the simple sphere of thought in
which the original gospel moves.

Other tokens may also be discovered that the
Gospel of the Hebrews must have undergone
numerous reconstructions of the original text.
Such, for instance, must have been the case with
the narrative concerning the vocation of the
twelve apostles. St. Matthew is introduced,
speaking in the first person, and Jesus Himself
as addressing him (Epiphani. Haer. xxx. 13); so
also with the appeal made to Jesus by the man
with the withered hand: "I was a stonemason,
and sought to maintain myself by the work of
my own hands. I pray thee, Jesus, heal me that
I may not shamefully have to beg (Hieron.
on Jn. i. 3). To this man Jesus was the ideal of the
reading at Matt. xxii. 33. (Zachariah filius
Jasina), which is based upon an erroneous
correction. To the same category belong such
narratives as these:—That on the death of Jesus
Christ the upper lintel of the Temple ("super-
luminare Tempi infinitae magnitudinis") was
broken (Hieron. Haer. iv. 42; Matt. xxi. 42; Jn.
12. 20 et alibi), that the risen Jesus gave
His linen grave-clothes to the servant of the
high-priests, that James, the Lord's brother,
bound himself with an oath at the last supper to
eat not the smallest piece of bread henceforth
till he had seen Jesus risen, and that the risen
Lord had appeared to James the Just, His brother,
and thus addressed him while offering him a
portion of the broken bread: "My brother, eat
thy bread, because the Son of Man is risen from
among them that sleep" (Hieron. Vit. illust. 2).

In all these cases, and the number might be
increased by further instances, it is evident that
an older narrative has received apocryphal
additions.

But hereby it is by no means proved that the
Gospel of the Hebrews has in no case
preserved what was strictly speaking original.
Apart from the numerous sayings which either
literally, or almost literally, agree with those of
our canonical St. Matthew (and the number of
these was probably much greater than the
fathers have reported), there are also various
traces of very old traditions, among which must
be reckoned that of the flame burning forth
over the Jordan at our Lord's baptism (Epiphani.
Haer. xxx. 13; cf. Justin M. C. Tryph. 88; Orac.
Sibyll. vii. 81 sqq.; Prædic. Pauli ap. Pseudo-
Cyprian. de Rebus dans.) the words of the second
voice from heaven (comp. Psalm ii. 7), and a whole
series of fragments, for most of which we have
ancient testimonies, which exhibit a remark-
able agreement with our Gospel of St. Luke. Such
are the sayings about being reconciled with the
adversary, and the seven-fold forgiveness of the
erring brother (Carpon. ap. Hr. xio. 4; Epiph. Tryph.
xxx. 1; Hieron. c. Justin. iii. 2; comp. Luke xii.
58; xvii. 3, 4); the history of the woman accused of many
37 sqq.; the discourse with the two rich men
(Origen in Matt. tom. xiv. 14), immediately
followed by these saying about the children of
22; x. 25 sqq.; xvi. 19 sqq.; the parable of the
three servants who each receive a talent,
and the description of the prodigal (vii 18 sq.)),
30 (Euseb. Theophan. in Nicola Patr. Bibl. tom. iv.
Rom. 1447, p. 155), to which may be added the
appearance of the risen Jesus to St. Peter, the
invitation to touch and handle the Lord's body,
the eating and drinking (comp. Luke xxiv.
34, 39 sqq.; Ignat. ad Smyrn. 3). The appearance
of our Lord to James is, apart from the mention
of it by St. Paul (1 Cor. iv. 7), recorded nowhere
else but in the Gospel of the Hebrews. In the case
of several of the Lord's sayings, such as the
agreeing with the adversary, and of forgiveness,
it seems natural to conjecture a combination of
St. Matthew and St. Luke, and anyhow the con-
cluding words of the second of these sayings—
kyri oucoun eis tovs prwthsws in to the xronwn
apostov en pneumatikin dyna koinwnta en apostov
prwthsws in pneumatikin dyna koinwnta en apostov
—may have preserved, at least in some
respects, an older text than that of our
synoptical gospels, and a like conjecture may
perhaps be hazarded in reference to the history
of the two rich men and some other sayings
attributed to our Lord.

The various contradictory phenomena can only
be explained by the supposition that our Gospel
of the Hebrews in the form in which it was
read by Epiphanius and Jerome, and even that in
which Origen must have known it, was a re-cast
of an older original that had passed through
several hands. This original work was written
in Hebrew, or, more correctly speaking, in
Aramaic, and was nearly related on the one
hand to the so-called Læva του κυρίου, which
formed the basis of St. Matthew's Gospel, and
on the other, to the Ebionitic writing made use of
by St. Luke, which itself was only a later
redaction of the Læva. The formation of this
third recast, the same original, one might say a
mid-position between the other two, must
be sought, like that of the Ebionitic edition of the
Læva, which we suppose to have been used
In the form assumed by this gospel in the time of
Origen, it already bears the character of a
partisan work subservient to the dogmatic
interest of a sect already separated from the
Catholic Church. In the hands of the Christian
Essenes it has undergone further alterations,
some of which at least appear to indicate the
existence of a Greek text at the time of their
introduction.
Recent critics have been disposed to refer back to the Gospel of the Hébreos, a whole series of utterances attributed to our Lord, which either (like the oft-cited γενέθλιον δόκμων ἱστοριών) are not found in any one of our canonical gospels, or are perpetually and uniformly quoted by the authors of the 3rd and 4th centuries in a form different from that in which they are met with there. The former assumption is in many, if not in all, cases the most probable; to the latter may be opposed with equal right the possibility of different readings in the text of our gospels. Compare, for instance, the long most of the bearing on each other (Justin. Apol. i. 16; Clem. Hom. iii. 55; xix. 2; Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 14, p. 707; vi. 11, p. 872; Potter) the injunction to the rich youth (Justin M. Dial. c. Tryph. 101; Marcossi ap. Iren. Haer. i. 20, 2; Naasseni ap. Pseudorig. Philos. v. 7, p. 102; Miller, Valentin. ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 20, p. 488, and again in 6 and 8, Procop. Strom. i. 13; xii. 1, 3); and, finally, the saying, No man hath known the Father but the Son &c. (Just. Apol. i. 63; Marcossi ap. Iren. Haer. i. 20, 3; Clem. Hom. xvii. 4; xvi. 4, 11, 13, 20; Marcion, in Dial. de recta Fide, sect. 1, in opp. Origen, ed. Lomn. xvi. 283; Justin M. Dial. 100; Tertull. adv. Marcion. cxxxi. 8; Clement in a later ecclesiastical Gospel, writers down to the beginning of the 3rd century made use of times of uncanonical gospels is now generally acknowledged. Justin Martyr, for instance, and the Clementine homilies certainly made use of one or more such along with the gospels of our canon. But the attempt to prove that the two writers had one such extraneous canonical common to them both, either in the Gospel of the Hébreos or in the Gospel of St. Peter (of which we shall speak presently) has altogether failed. It is only in the rarest cases that they literally agree in their deviations from the text of our gospels; they differ in their citations as much, for the most part, from the text of the synoptical evangelists, even in such cases when one or the other repeatedly quotes the same passage, and each time in the same words. Only in very few cases is the derivation from the Gospel of the Hébreos probable, as in the saying concerning the new birth (Justin M. Apol. i. 61; Clem. Homilies, xii. 26; Euseb. Eccl. vi. 9); in other cases where the text holds a mid-position between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke such derivation is at least possible; in most cases, however, it is quite enough to assume that the quotations were made from memory, and so account for the involuntary confusion of evangelistic texts.

(2) The Gospel of Peter (εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἐπιφανίου) is mentioned by Eusebius, who was bishop of Antiach at the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd century (ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 12) and Origine (in Matt. tom. xvii. 10). The former relates that he had found this work in ecclesiastical use at Rhossus in Cilicia; that at first he had not made any objection to it, but had withdrawn on the advice of some of his bishops with its contents, forbidden its use; because, though for the most part orthodox, it yet favoured in some places the heretical views of the Docetae, whom he supposed to be in fact the followers of Marcion. This account makes it probable that this Gospel of Peter was a Gnostic recast of a canonical gospel. Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25; comp. iii. 3) and after him Jerome (Vir. Illust. i.) and the Documenta Gelasii (c. 6) speak of it as an heretical work which no early teacher of the church had made use of. The statement of Theodotus (Mon. Eccl. ii. 21) that Origen had made use of this gospel rested probably on a mis-understanding. The passage moreover in Justin Martyr (Dial. c. Tryph. 106), in which some have thought to find mention of the Memoriae Peter, is very doubtful. Justin does indeed very frequently speak of the ἱστοριών τῆς Ἀρχαὶ and the way of knowing our Lord (ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ Πέρου), and it is quite contrary to his practice to give any names to the evangelistic writings of which he makes use. In the passage in question the right reading is most probably not ἱστοριών τοῦ Πέρου (i.e. of Peter mentioned just before) but ἱστοριών τῆς Ἀρχαί (i.e. τῆς ἱστορίας as elsewhere). Herein fall to the lot of the Narrators. That Justin made the Gospel of Peter into an original work made use of by Justin Martyr, nigh related to the Gospel of the Hébreos, and either the Jewish-Christian basis of our canonical St. Mark, or, at any rate, the gospel of the Gnosticizing Ebionites. Neither does Origen’s statement that according to the Gospel of Jesus the Lord’s brethren were sons of Joseph by a former marriage well agree with the assumption of its Jewish-Christian character, as much as that statement presupposes not only the Lord’s supernatural birth (as actually received by some Ebionites in later times) but also the perpetual virginity of Mary. On this point the Gospel of Peter stood more probably in a near relation to the apocryphal gospels of the infancy.

(3) The Gospel of the Egyptians (Ἐκκλησίαι κατ' Ἐπιφανίου) was in special use in various heretical circles — e.g. among the Ebionites (Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 9, p. 540 sq. Potter, 13 p. 553), Origen (Prolog. in Jo. Origen. p. 98, Miller) and the Sabellians (Epiph. Hist. xix. 2); but was also used without scruple in Catholic circles as authority for sayings attributed to our Lord, as for instance in the so-called second epistle of the Roman bishop Clement. It was already used, as we learn from Clemens Alex., by the Gnostic Julius Cassius, the head of the sect of so-called Ebionites, and is cited not only in the extracts from the writings of Theodotus found among the works of Clemens (c. 67, p. 985, Potter) but also in the Acts of Thomas (Wright, Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, p. 292 of the English translation) and by Pseudo-Linus de passione Petri et Pauli (Biblioth. Patr. Max. ii. p. 70 b). Origen (Hom. in Luc.) and Jerome (in Matt. praef.) mention it as an heretical writing. The fragments which have been preserved confirm this judgment. This gospel was a product of that pantheistic gnostics which we find among the Naassenes of the Philosophumena and some other kindred sects. According to this doctrine the soul is of pneumatic nature, but has sunk down into this lower world, the world of transient births, in which it undergoes the most manifold changes till finally redeemed and delivered by the gnostics. When a man has once obtained an insight into the unmanifesta
character of all the distinctions which prevail among, and separate one from another, the things of this visible world, when he has learned to know that which is divided as one, and things separated as bound together, then has he become a partner of that gnostic which entitles him to enter into the kingdom of God or the upper spiritual world. In this sense must be understood the answer which Jesus makes in this gospel to the question as to when His kingdom will come: “When out of two has been made One, and the Outward has become as the Inward and the Male with the Female neither Male nor Female” (Clemens, ad Corinth. ii. c. 12, comp. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 13, p. 553; Massaer apud Pseudo-Orig. Philos. v. 7, p. 99, Miller; Acta Thomas, ap. Wright, l. c.). Similar to this is the saying preserved by Pseudo-Linus: “Unless ye make equal and alike the Right and the Left, the Left and the Right, Upper and Lower, Former and Hinder, ye cannot know ye face of God” (C. l. c. p. 70). Connected with this pantheistical mysticism is also a sort of practice which this gospel recommends. If the distinctions of sex are one day to cease, and the true gnostic imparts an insight into the vanity of such distinctions, the Encausite prohibition of marriage follows as a natural logical consequence. And so Christ is made to declare that it is the work of His mission to destroy the works of the female (Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 9, p. 540). The words appear to have been taken from the discourse of Jesus with Salome, of which several other fragments have also been preserved. Salome asks: “How long shall Death reign?” and receives the answer: “So long as ye live, and the hither birth” she replies: “Then have I done well that I bare not,” and receives the further admonition: “Eat of every herb, but the bitter one eat not” (Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 6, p. 532; iii. 9, p. 539, p. 541, ex Script. Theod. 67). If death is to last as long as child-bearing, it follows that the female nature must be destroyed, and it can be what is meant by eating the bitter herb. Jesus therefore is made to reply to a further question of Salome’s, the nature of which appears from the answer: “When ye tread under foot the covering of shame” (βαρν τὸ τίς αλεξίνης θέμα παντικού), i.e., when all distinctions of sex are done away. Whereupon followed the words already quoted: “When out of Two is made One,” &c. (Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 13, p. 533).

There may be also other fragments of this Gospel of the Egyptian preserved in the second epistle of Clement and elsewhere. E.g. the saying: “Though ye be gathered in My bosom, if ye keep not My commandments I will cast you away, and make you workers of iniquity” (Clem. Ep. ii. c. 4), and the discourse with the disciples originally connected therewith (Clem. Ep. ii. c. 5), in which Jesus says, “Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves.” Whereupon Peter answers Him: “But if the wolves should scatter the lambs” (Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 13, p. 553; I. c. p. 532). “Jesus with Peter: The lambs after death need not fear the wolves.” (comp. Luke xii. 27, x. 3, and also Isa. xli. 11). By the lambs are meant (according to the mind of the Gnostic author) the Pneumatics, by the wolves, most probably, the Archontes (Rulers) of this present world.

The date at which this gospel was written cannot be fixed much later than about the middle of the 2nd century; the locality, as the name expresses, was most probably Egypt.

(4) The Gospel of Tatian, commonly called the Diatessaron (τὸ δια τεσσάρων) is mentioned by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 29), Epiphanius (Haer. xlvii.), and Theodoret (H. P. i. 20). They both have two had the book itself in their hands. Eusebius concludes, from the title Diatessaron (which in his time meant a harmony or synopsis of our four canonical gospels), that Tatian’s work must have been similar to a synoptical work of the Alexandrine Ammonius, Origen’s teacher, which Eusebius had himself criticized. Although he knew nothing further of the structure of this work, Eusebius remarks that it was still in his own time made use of by “some.” All that Epiphanius has to tell us is that τὸ δια τεσσάρων εὐγενεσικός was said to have been the work of Tatian, and that it was called by some the Gospel of Jesus and the Heavens (Euseb. vii. 3.3).

The first and at the same time the only writer to whom we are indebted for more exact information, is Theodoret. He likewise names Tatian as the author of the Diatessaron, and adds that he had omitted the genealogies and everything having reference to the human descent of Jesus from the house of David. The book then, according to Theodoret, was the work of only a few hands of heretics, but of some Catholics also, who, the historian informs us, had failed to discern the sinister purpose with which it had been put together, and used it in all simplicity as an abstract. Theodoret found over two hundred copies in his own diocese, which he took away, supplying their place with the four canonical gospels. A further testimony to the reception of the work in some parts of the Syrian church may be found in a statement of the Doctrina Addaci (ed. Phillips, London, 1876, p. 34 of the English translation), according to which the Diatessaron was publicly read in the church of Edessa. But Tatian’s name is not mentioned, and it would seem impossible that another synopsis of the four gospels may be thus referred to. If, finally, we could trust the statement of a Syrian writer of the latter half of the 12th century, Dionysius Bar-Salibi (Assemanni Bibl. Orient. i. 57; ii. 159 sq.), we might add that Tatian’s Diatessaron began with the first words of the prologue of St. John—in the beginning was the Word”—Dionysius adds that St. Ephrem had illustrated this harmony of the four gospels by a commentary. But the learned Gregory Bar Hebraeus, bishop of Tagrit, relates precisely the same of the Diatessaron of Ammonius (Assemanni B. O. i. 57 sq.), and Ebed Jesus († 1308) actually makes Ammonius and Tatian into the same person (Assemanni ii. 12). On this work St. Ephrem wrote his commentary cannot be decided till the Armenian translation of it has been published. All that can be drawn with any certainty from the contradictory statements of these later Syrian writers is that they drew their conclusions from the simple fact of the title Diatessaron being applied to the work of which they were authors.

A Harmony of the Gospels, which, after prefixing the prologue of St. Luke’s Gospel, commences with “In the beginning was the Word,” is still preserved both in the Latin and the Frankish languages. The Latin text has been
several times reprinted, now under the name of Ammonius; now under that of Tatian; under the former name in the *Editio princeps* of Michael Membler, Mayence, 1594, under the latter, at first among the *Orthodoxographi* (Basil. 1598, tom. ii. pp. 629—661), and subsequently in the various *Evangelii* of the *Frankish text*, which dates from the 9th century, was published by Schmeller at Vienna in 1841. Victor of Capua (A.D. 546) supplied to this Gospel-Harmony the Ammonian sections as improved by Eusebius; the Latin text, which is that of the Vulgate, he found ready to his hand, and so designated by name as to any author. Victor hesitates whether to ascribe the work to Ammonius or to Tatian, but inclines towards the latter hypothesis, because, according to Eusebius (*Ep. ad Carpian.*), the synopsis of Ammonius followed exclusively the order of St. Matthew (comp. Victor’s Preface ap. Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, Marburg, 1868, pp. 1—5). Of the genuine parts of the Latin and Greek *Tatian* there can be no serious question; but the use of the names of Tatian and Ammonius in this connexion, is one among various proofs that those names have been applied to widely different gospel-harmonies.

The old dispute among critics whether Tatian really made use of our four Canonical Gospels, and especially whether he used the Gospel of St. John, or whether, in the place at least of this last he used an uncanonical gospel, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is, in the absence of more exact information, difficult to decide. The possibility that the Gospel of St. John was one of the four worked up by Tatian into a new whole cannot be disputed, since he certainly made frequent use of it in his *Apology* (*Orat. ad Gracc.*, c. 13, 19, comp. 4, 5), written about A.D. 170. That Tatian made use of the Gospel of the Hebrews along with the four canonical gospels, and perhaps regarded it even as his chief authority, has been inferred from the various *Epiphanius* that to our Latin text has actually regarded his work as identical with the Gospel of the Hebrews, and secondly from that of Victor, that it sometimes bore the title of *Dispente*. But the former statement may rest on some confusion; the latter is too feebly supported by other evidence. We fall back, therefore, on the meagre notices of Theodoret.

These prove so much as this: that Tatian’s work was sufficiently like our four gospels to be regarded and used by many Catholics without scruple as an abstract of them. Its heretical character must therefore have consisted not so much in foreign additions as in omissions with a special purpose. The omission of the genealogies, and of all notices relating to our Lord’s human descent, are indications of *docetic* opinions, and Tatian’s way of working up the gospel narratives so as to make them suit his special objects, reminds one of similar proceedings of Marcion, with whom he has otherwise much in common.

The last group of apocryphal gospels consists of those which were exclusively employed by heretics. Of most of these we know the names only. Of some, more or less important fragments have been preserved.

Some of these heretical gospels are identified with works that are otherwise known to us. Such, for instance, is the case with the gospels of Cerinthus and Carpocrates (Epiph. *Har. loc.*, comp. xxvii. 5, xxx. 14). Neither of these wrote a gospel of his own, but both (as is evident from the account given us) used the Gospel of the Hebrews in that older form which contained the genealogy (St. Matt. 1. 1—17), but at the history of our Lord (St. Matt. 1. 18—ii. 23). Jerome accordingly reckons Cerinthus, and his successor Ebin, as well as Carpocrates, among those who have mutilated the holy gospels (Ado. *Lucifer*. Opp. iv. 2, p. 304, ad. *Martinian*). Of the Gospel of Bartholomew, which was also identified by some with that of the Hebrews, and the Gospel of Boustades, we shall speak further on.

Another section of these apocryphal gospels consisted (like the Gospel of Peter and the Did- testament of Gnostic corruptions of one or another of our canonical gospels. Among those of most interest and importance are—

(1) The Gospel of Marcion. The text of this work has been preserved with tolerable completeness in the notices contained in the fourth book of Tertullian against Marcion—and in Epiphanius (*Har. loc.*), to which may be added some accounts in Irenaeus, and in the *Did. recta Fide*. The first attempt to restore this text was made by Hahn (*Königsegg*, 1823, comp. Volkm. *Evangelion Marcion*, Leipsic, 1824, pp. 401—486); but a complete judgement on doubtful points respecting it has only been attained since special studies have led to a more correct appreciation of the purpose and objects of those champions of orthodoxy, and their peculiar methods of citation. The consequence is that few points in regard to Marcion’s text are now considered obscure or disputable (comp. Volkm. *Evangelion Marcion*, Leipsic, 1825, p. 150 sqq.). His gospel was in fact a Gnosticizing recast of that of St. Luke, which, without any direct interpolation of his peculiar views, excluded everything which, was inconsistent with them, appeared to Marcion to militate against the truth of the gospel. In particular it states the passion that to our Latin text, and explains the origin, to the authority of the Mosaic Law, of the prophets, or to the historical connexion of Christianity with the religion of the Old Testament was carefully eradicated. The whole of the early history was omitted, together with that of John the Baptist, and those of our Lord’s baptism and temptation in the wilderness.

The gospel began with Luke iii. 1, followed immediately by iv. 31, thus: ‘Εν την τεκνιανίαν της ἡμερας του Καριμπο’ και την τεκνιανίαν του Ποιμένος της λειψανος, καταλαβεί δ' ἡ Ἰουσου εις Καριμπο ουν τω την Γαλατακα. Then followed Luke iv. 31—37, and after that the story of our Lord’s appearance at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16 sqq.), with numerous omissions. Thus in verse 16 were omitted the words ἵνα τεθημενον, and again, οὗτο σαρκινών το οτινεστε σως in 20. In verse 21, he left out οτι σιμοερον—οτι ουν ως in verse 22, και ουςιον—ους θησκες; in verse 23, εν τωτε ως ἐν τω ἐνθαντ; the whole of verse 24, and, perhaps also verse 27. Among other omissions and alterations the following are noteworthy:—The omission of Luke viii. 19; xi. 29 (from ει μη το το νικι λει- to v. 32), again vv. 49—51, and xi. 5, 7; xiii. 1—10. The alteration of xiii. 28 (Φανερός τον δικαιον οτι του Αβρααμος—σποραν), and the omission of vv. 29, 30. The following
GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL

passages were also struck out: xiii. 31-35, xv. 11-34, xviii. 19 (from λέγεται ὑπὸ Βούλθρα κάθεια; and xvi. 27, 29, 34, 38, 39, 41-43, 44; (from ὑπὸ διέρχομαι ὁ Παύλος; xxi. 11, 12, 21; xxi. 16-18, 26-30, 35-38, 49-51; xxii. 34, 43; xxiv. 27, 32 (from ὑπὸ διέρχομαι ὁ Παύλος; 44 (from δεῖ τελείωσιν ὁ Παύλος; 45, 46 (to γέγραπται καὶ σωτῆρας) 52, 53. Sometimes single words only are omitted, e.g. iv. 34, Nαυαροή; xii. 21, Παύλος; iii. 8, 9, τῶν άγγέλων, 32, ἄγαν, after ἄρα; xvi. 37, ὁ Ναυαροής; xix. 9, καθένα καὶ καθανεν ἀναθύμησα ἵνα σωτῆρας ἑτούς; xix. 19, τὸ Ναυαροής, and probably also xxiv. 47, ἀδρέςεως ἢ τοιοῦτον καὶ ἱεροκαλήμας, and 49, οὕτως δὲ καθίσατε... ἐλθόντες δέ τιμάσας. Actual alterations of the text, and additions to it, are rare. Yet at x. 21, Marcion read ὁ Ναυαροής τὸ κρυψότας... ἀνεπάλημφησιν, instead of ὁ οὕτως ταῦτα καὶ ένειδήλησα; xii. 42, κακίων instead of κρίσιν. xii. 12, ὁμέρον for ἕμων; xvi. 17, τῶν λόγων μου for τοῦ νόμου; xvi. 14, ἀνεπάλημφησιν τοὺς λόγους δέθεσθαι instead of ἰδίω—ἀνεπάλημφησι. 

In xvii. 18, the words ἐ μὲν ὁ ἀλογοσύνης οὕτως ἐπερρέαζον, etc. are omitted, and their place, viz. (for the second time?) Luke iv. 27, καθάλαλεν · Πάπας. At xx. 35, Marcion read ὁ θεοῦ τοῦ άνέων ἐκεῖνων; xxii. 32, δ οῖροι, καὶ ὁ γενέων ἀστὴρ; xxix. 25, ἀλήθεις ἢμῶν instead of ἀλήθειαν ἢμων.

Nevertheless, by no means all Marcion's departures from our present text of St. Luke are to be laid to his account. Several of them he certainly found in the MS. which lay before him, and among them are some (not without support from other witnesses) where he has used an older and better text. Thus at xviii. 21, was inserted τοίς μου· ἢ μήτε καὶ οἱ δαύληως; (comp. Mark x. 33, Matt. xii. 48): at xx. 21, he read εὐφραντὸ καὶ εὐμολογοῦσιν; at xxii, αἵτες Ἱωάνας τούτον καὶ διότι εἰ μὴ δόος καὶ τί εἰσιν· δόει εἰ μὴ δόος καὶ διότι κατανημνήσομεν: xii. 38, τῆς θεοτοκίας· xvi. 2, εἰ μὴ εὐφράσθη· καὶ κατανημνήσομεν; xvi. 19, μὲ μὴ λαλήσα συν έρικαν τούτον εἰσιν; (τούτον). At xxiv. 2 were omitted (as still in our good MSS.) καὶ καταλύντω φόνων καὶ τοὺς προφητικοὺς καὶ αὐτοῖς πολλά καὶ γινώσκεται καὶ τὰ νόημα. Finally the variations at x. 14, τα τούτο· οἱ μαρτυρίαν οἱ οὗτοι, and vi. 17, το ἐνότοι are perfectly indifferent. With regard to some of these Marcion's reading we are not sufficiently informed, but apparent contradictions between Tertullian and Epiphanius disappear for the most part on a closer inquiry. The title of Marcion's gospel was simply ἐναγγελίαν τοῦ κυρίου. The date of composition is most probably assigned to the first period of Marcion's residence at Rome, i.e. about the year A.D. 145. We find, indeed, a statement of him in his own words, that he had composed the work himself, and that it was simply refuted by Volkmar and Hilgenfeld. The theory was abandoned for the main part by Baur himself, and completely given up by Bittel.}

Probably identical with Marcion's gospel is—

(2) The Gospel of Apelles. Apelles was a disciple of Marcion, Origines Origenis, and ad Amicos in Alex. in Libr. Apol. pro Orig., that he had subjected the Gospels and "the apostle" to a process of purification must probably be understood to mean that he made use of his teacher Marcion's canon (comp. also Epiph. Haer. xii. 4). Epiphanius, however, relates further (Haer. xii. 2), that Apelles had appealed to the saying, γίνεσθαι δόκιμος πραγματεύεται, as being one to be found εν τῇ εὐαγγελίῳ. But as this saying was not found in Marcion's gospel it would seem that Apelles could not have confined himself to that document.

St. Jerome, finally, attributes a similar mutilation of our canonical gospels to Saturninus and the Ophites (adem. Lucifer, l. c.), as well as to Basilides (Comm. in Th. prope). Of a Gospel composed by Saturninus nothing further is known. The Ophites, certainly along with the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, made use of several uncanonical gospels (Epiphanius, Haer. xxvii. 31, and Pseudo-Tertullian, Haer. 6; Pseudo-Origen, Philos. v. 6), of which, however, we cannot tell whether or how far they are to be placed in the category of re-casts of our canonical gospels.

(3) Of Basilides.—Origen (Hom. i. in Luc.) Jerome (proph. in Matth.) and St. Ambrose (proph. in Luc.) report that he wrote a gospel which they presumed to entitle after his own name. In another place, where Origen is speaking of facts of the gospel history of which our canonical books make no mention, he warns against a too hasty rejection of such narratives, adding the remark that much indeed of this kind is to be found in the fictitious compositions of heretics, such as the "Hypthianas" (Sethians) and Basilidians made use of (in Matth. Comm. series 28). If in this passage Origen was thinking of the writing of the Basilides, we might infer from his words that it must have been an entirely different work from our canonical gospels. We know moreover that the Basilidians made use of other apocryphal writings, such as the "Traditiones of Mathias." And we also learn from the testimony of Agridra Castor (cf. Eus. H. E. iv. 7) and Clemens Alexander (Strom. iv. 12, p. 599) that Basilides had composed a work in twenty-four books bearing the title άκρανθέα· τοῦ εὐαγγέλου. A fragment from this work is still preserved in the Acta disputationum I. gnost. et Manetis, c. 55 (Galland, Bibl. Patri. iii. 569 sqq.). It is an exposition of the parable of Dives and Lazarus. Clemens Alex. has also preserved another fragment from the 23rd book, which speaks of suffering as a consequence of the inbred sinful corruption of every man, with special reference to a passage concerning martyrdom (Luke xxii. 12 sqq.). In any case, the work must have been an exposition of some gospel, by whose authority Basilides endeavoured to establish his Gnostic doctrine. And it is anyhow most unlikely that he would have written a commentary on a gospel of his own composition. Of our canonical gospels those of Matthew, Luke, and John were used in his school, and the work is frequently referred to we may reasonably conclude that it was the Gospel of St. Luke on which he wrote his commentary. It is indeed quite possible that, like Marcion, he may have subjected this
gospel to revision and alterations favourable to his special dogmatic purposes; but no certain conclusions can be arrived at on this point.

Numerous other apocryphal gospels in use among the Gnostics carried, like the Gospel of Peter, and the Childhood-Gospels of James, Matthew and Thomas, on their front the names of holy men. To such belong——

(4) The Gospel of Andrew mentioned in some texts of the Decretum Gelasii (vi. 12). The "apocryphal writings bearing the name of Andrew," mentioned by pope Innocent I. (Epist. 6, ad Eczerp.) and St. Augustine (c. adversar. leg. et prophet. 20), are probably the Gnostic περὶ ἀνθρώπων.

(5) The Gospel of Barnabas mentioned likewise in the Decretum Gelasii (vi. 10) and in the catalogue of Anastasius Sinaita (ap. Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, p. 241). A later legend relates that at the discovery of the relics of St. Barnabas in the island of Cyprus, a copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew, written with his own hand, was found lying on the saint's breast. (Thes. Ev. Apocr. Proleg. xxx. and Acta Barnabae, c. 22, ap. Tischendorf, l. c. p. 72.) Further, we must distinguish between the old Gnostic Gospel of St. Barnabas and a Mahometan fiction bearing the same name, which is still preserved in an Italian translation of the 15th century (Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T. iii. pp. 373-394).

(6) The Gospel of Bartholomew (Hieron. prof. in Math.; Gelasii Decretum, vi. 12). According to some accounts this Gospel would be identical with the Gospel of the Hebrews. And indeed we read in Eusebius (H. E. v. 10, cf. Hieron. Vir. Illust. 36) that St. Bartholomew carried with him into India the Gospel of St. Matthew written in Hebrew characters, and that there it was afterwards found by Pantaenus, the teacher of Clemens Alexandrinus, on his missionary visit to that country. But Eusebius knows nothing of a Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew bearing also the name of Bartholomew; and Jerome speaks (in terms like those of the Gelasian Decree) of the Gospel of Bartholomew as of an independent work of heretical origin (St. Jerome and Gelasius) make mention of it in the same series with a number of Gnostic productions.

(7) The Gospel of Judas Iscariot in use among the Cainites (Irenaeus, Haer. i. 31, 1; Epiph. Haer. xxxviii. 1; Theodoret, R. F. i. 15). This work represented Judas's betrayal as a meritorious action, and the traitor himself as the perfect Gnostic who destroyed the dominion of the Demiurge by bringing about the crucifixion of our Lord.

(8) The Gospel of Matthias is mentioned by Origen (Hom. i. in Luc.), Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25), Jerome (prof. in Math.), Ambrose (in Luc. prof.), Innocent I. (Epist. 6 ad Eczerp.), the Decree of Gelasius (vi. 8), and the list in Anastasius Sinaita (Credner, p. 394). The work was a matter of conjecture, identical with the Παπάθεσις Μαρτίου, which were in high esteem in Gnostic circles, and especially among the Basilidians, being regarded by these latter as the chief source of their doctrine (Clemens Alex. Strom. vii. 17, p. 900 Potter, Pseudo-Orig. Philos. vii. 20, p. 250, Miller). According to Pseudo-Orig. the writing was composed in the form of apocryphal discourses, received by Matthias in secret instruction from our Lord. Some fragments of it have been preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus. The first runs thus:—"Behold with wonder the things present, for that is the first step towards a knowledge of the things beyond" (Strom. ii. 9, p. 452). A second:—"The flesh must be consumed with, and evil-entreated, and its unbribled lust must in no wise be yielded to, but the soul must be made to grow through faith and knowledge" (Strom. iii. 4, p. 523). A third saying:—"When the neighbour of an elect person falls into sin then the elect one sins himself; for had he so lived as the word enjoins, his neighbour out of reverence for his manner of life would not have sinned" (Strom. vii. 13, p. 892). The work commended itself by its severe ascetic principles to the school of Basilides; and from some indications in the Philosophumena, it would seem also to have favoured some of their Gnostic speculations.

(9) The Gospel of Philip was, according to Eusebius (Haer. xxvi. 15) in use among the members of a Gnostic sect allied to the Ophites, and alleged by them in justification of indulgence in unnatural lusts. The fragment, however, preserved, and quoted from it by the zealous opponent of heresy, contradicts his statement—"The Lord revealed to me what the soul ought to say when she mounts to heaven, and what answer she should give to each of the higher powers: 'I have known myself, and gathered myself together, and begotten no children for the Archon of this world, but have torn up his roots, and gathered the scattered members, and I know Thee, and who thou art! for I also am descended from the upper world.'" This gospel therefore inculcated, like the Gospel of the Egyptians, and the "traditions of Mathias," a severe asceticism. The prayers of the departing soul as she passes through the various heavens constitute indeed a favourite theme of various Gnostic writings. The Gospel of Philip was also in use among the Manicheans (comp. Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. i. 139-142).


Most of these pseudo-apocalyptic gospels, like the apocryphal acts of Apostles, were attributed to the authorship of Lucianus Charinus, when Catholic tradition has stamped as typical representative of the whole class of pseudo-epigraphical writings. So when the Decretum Gelasii, after recounting a whole series of apocryphal gospels, concludes with these words: Evangelia quae falsavint Lucianus apocrypha, Evangelia quae falsavint Iacius apocrypha (Credner, l. c. p. 216 sqq.), we may conjecture that beneath the names Lucianus and Iacius (Tisch, Eusei. Luci. Iac. Hycr. Hych. Ynus, &c.) may lurk the otherwise oft corrupted names of this Lucius. Rudolf Hoftreez is of opinion indeed that these two names may indicate two men who in early times made themselves noteworthy by labours expended on our canonical gospels, viz. Lucian, the presbyter of Antioch, and the Egyptian bishop Hychius. But in some texts of the Decretum Gelasii the added clause quae falsavint Lucaius is also found after the
enumeration of other Gnostic gospels, such as those of Thaddaeus, Barnabas, Thomas, Bartholomew, Andrew, Peter, Matthew (Credner, l. c.). The name of Lucius was also borne by the Gnostic original of the book (already mentioned), De Insania Mariae et Salutoris (comp. the epistle of Pseudo-Jerome to Chromatius and Heliodorus, ap. Tischendorf. Evang. Apost. ed. ii. p. 33 sqq., and the note by Grabe to Iren. Haer. l. 17).

Beside these pseudo-apocalyptic gospels a number of other gospels are mentioned as used in various Gnostic schools.

(11) The Simonians are reported by a confessedly somewhat recent witness (Praef. Arch. in Const. Nicaen. ap. Fabrius. i. p. 377) to have had a gospel of their own, which bore title—Book of the Four Corners, and Hinges of the World—and was accordingly divided into four parts. But this title reminds one too strongly of the doctrinal proof alleged by Irenaeus for the fourth character of the church’s gospel (Iren. Haer. iii. 11, 8) not to awaken a suspicion of some confusion. To the scher-heric Simon himself is ascribed by the Apostolical Constitutions (vi. 16) the authorship of various apocalyptic writings put forth in the names of Christ and His apostles. Of another work attributed to Simon, and entitled The Great Announcement (ἡ ἀνακοίνωσις ἡ μεγάλη), numerous fragments have been preserved by Pseudo-Origian (Philosop. vi. 1 sq.), but this was not a gospel at all.

(12) An apocalyptic gospel, in use among the Valentinians, is mentioned by Irenaeus (Haer. iii. 11, 9), and Pseudo-Tertullian (Haer. 12). According to Irenaeus, who probably knew it well, and declares it to be a pretty recent fiction, it bore the name of “The gospel of Truth” (Ἐван-γέλιον δωριτίου), and had nothing in common with our canonical gospels. It was probably rather a dogmatic exposition of the speculative tenets of Valentinus than an historical writing. But the Valentinians also used our canonical gospels, and in an unmutilated form (Iren. l. c.; Tertullian, Praes. 83). The Valentinian Heracleon (cir. a.d. 195) wrote a commentary of his own on the Gospel of St. John, of which numerous fragments have been preserved.

(13-16) The Gospel of Perfection (ἐγβαθύνων τελειωμένων), The Gospel of Eve, and the Great and Small Interrogations of Mary (ὁμωφύτως Μαρίας μενεδραΤ and μωμαί) are mentioned by Epiphanius as in use among the “Gnostics” or “Baborites” (Haer. xxvi. 2 sqq.), in a section of the Ophites, along with other apocalyptic writings which (like the Gospel of Philip) were current under apostolic names, and used by these Ophite Gnostics (Epiph. Haer. xxvi. 8). According to the Gospel of Eve she partook of the Tree of Knowledge in consequence of a revelation made to her by the Serpent. Epiphanius gives us the following fragment (Haer. xxvi. 3): “I stood on a high hill and saw a tall and dark column, and to have a voice as of thunder, and I drew near to hearken; and so spoke to me: ‘I am thou, and thou art I, and where thou art there am I also; and in all things am I sown. And from whencesoever thou garest me, in gathering me thou garest thyself.’” This fragment is enough to shew that the work was no gospel, but a Gnostic doctrinal treatise, though presented, it may be, in an historical form. This work, like the Gospel of Judas, appears to have been a favourite among the Ophites of the Cainite branch. Its pantheistic mysticism is declared by the severe Malleus Haereticorum to have an obscene meaning, and such, according to his statement (Epiph. Haer. xxvi. 8), seems really to have been the case with the other two works—The Interrogations of Mary.

(17 and 18) As Manichean works are mentioned—The Gospel of Life and The Gospel of Adda, called also The Bushel (μαζητής). The former of these, which is mentioned by Timotheus Presbyter Constantinopolitanus (De iis qui ad Eccles. accidunt, ed. Maurusius Varus dinum, p. 117), by Photius (Bibl. ord. 85), and in the Anapherastimaniae ruman (Cotelarius, Patr. Apost. i. p. 537), is said to have been written by the fabulous Scythianus, and to have described the Acts of Christ in an heretical spirit. To this same, beside the Gospel, are ascribed three other writings—the “Chapters” (or the “Vocation”), the “Mysteries,” and the “Treasury of Life” (Epiph. Haer. Ixxvi. 2; Cyril. Hieroc. Catech. vi. 22, p. 100, ed. Paris, Petrus Siculo, Hist. Manich. ed. Gieseler, Göttingen, 1846, p. 15; Photius, contra Manich. i. 37 sq.; cf. Fabric. Cod. Apost. i. p. 141).

The Bushel is said to be the production of a disciple of Menas named Adda (Phot. Bibl. Cod. 15). Diodorus, who wrote twenty-five years after the time of the Manichees, directed the first seven against the Gospel of Life, but herein, according to Photius, made a serious blunder, confounding the above-named gospel with that of Adda.

In some lists of Manichean writings mention is made of a Gospel of Philip and of a Gospel of Thomas, of which Mani’s disciple, bearing the same name, is said to have been the author. (Timotheus, presbyter, l. c.; Petrus Siculo, l. c. p. 22; Leontius, de Scotic, art. iii. p. 432; Anapherastimaniae, l. c. comp. Fabricius, l. p. 138, sq., 354 sq.) But these Gospels are probably meant the Gnostic Apocrypha, of which we have already spoken, and which were also read by Manicheans.

[BR. A. L.]

GOSSELINUS (GAUSOLINUS, AUSSOLINUS), several other forms of the name are given by Potthast. He was bishop of Metz about 409. His very existence was at first doubted by J. B. Solierius, who, however, afterwards found mention of him in a MS. Martyrology of the church of St. Peter at Metz. (Boll. Acta SS. 31 Jul. vii. 304.)

[R. T. S.] GOSSVINTHA, queen. [GOSVINTHA.]

GOSWINUS—May 22. A boy martyr at Rome in a.D. 176, supposed to have been of Teuton birth, led to Rome either through business or slavery. There is, however, in reality nothing known of him. (Ferrarii Cat. SS.; Acta SS. Boll. Mai. v. 130.)

[G. T. S.]

GOTHARDUS (GODEARDUS, ROTHARDUS, BUDHARDUS), an early bishop of Mentz. He ruled for fifteen years, and was a successful missionary preacher. He built a church, afterwards dedicated to St. Nicomedes. By his place in the list his period would seem to belong to about a.D. 200. (Gall. Christ. v. 433.) [R. T. S.]
GOTHOBERTA, virgin, of Noyon. (Boll. Acta SS. 11 Apr. ii. 31 a.) [GODEBERTA.]

[. G.]

GOTHS, CONVERSION OF THE. The early Christianity of the Goths is a matter on which no very full light can be thrown. 1. The first conversions appear to have been made through the prisoners whom the Goths carried off with them from their invasions of Asia Minor. Philostorgius, who is the authority for this, says (ii. 5) that among the prisoners made in the region of Cappadocia were some clerics and that not a few conversions were made. He also adds that the ancestors of Ulphilas were of the number of the captives. This is very improbable. There seems little doubt that the invasions referred to took place about the middle of the 3rd century, that they were made by the Goths who lay to the north of the Euxine, and that these early Catholic conversions were made not in the district north of the Danube, where Ulphilas afterwards laboured, but much more probably in the Crimean Chersonese. Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, bears testimony that Dionysius, who was bishop of Rome, 259-269, had sent persons with a view of redeeming the prisoners taken from the Cappadocians. There is also a letter from Basil to Asclepias, bishop of Thessalonica, which confirms the belief that the Goths first received Christianity from Cappadocia, and makes it probable that a certain Eutyches was one of the prisoners who made converts among the Goths. (Ep. 70, § 164; Migne, xxxii. 435, 635.)

The account of Sozomen (ii. 6) is clearly inaccurate and gives no further certain information. At the council of Nice, more than half a century later, we have evidence of the orthodox Christian community of the Goths in the provinces of Thrace, Moesia, and Macedonia. (Procopius, De Bello Goth. iv. 4, ed. Bonn. vol. ii. p. 475.) From this time the Goths, who had settled in the district north of the Danube, were in contact with the barbarians, and it seems probable from an allusion to them in an earlier passage that he is certainly including the Goths (Athan. de Incarn. Verb. § 51; Migne, xxv. 187-190; Neander, Church History, Eng. transl. iii. 179). Further, Chrysostom in his fourteenth epistle speaks of an embassy which has come to him from the Goths to ask for a bishop in the place of Ulphilas, whom Chrysostom had himself consecrated (Migne, l. i. 618.). Procopius also, speaking of the Goths of the Crimean region, says that in the twenty-first year of Justinian's reign, they applied to the emperor for another bishop to replace their own, who had lately died (Procopius, de Bell. Goth. iv. 4, ed. Bonn. vol. ii. p. 475). It seems clear, therefore, on the whole that from the middle of the 3rd century there was a continuous tradition of orthodox Christianity among the Goths who bordered on the Euxine.

2. We turn now to the, historically, more important branch of the Goths who were settled further west. Before the time of Ulphilas we have no knowledge of any conversions to Christianity among the Goths to the north of the Danube. Ulphilas (born 314, died 381), on suffering severe persecution for his labours as a Christian missionary among his own people, was allowed by Constantius to enter the Roman dominions with his Arian converts, c. 348. These Goths — the "Gothi minores" — settled in the region of Moesia and Thrace. For the whole consideration of the life and writings of Ulphilas, his work among the Goths, and the nature of their Christianity see ULPHILAS.

3. There are indications of other preaching and of other conversions to Christianity among the Goths north of the Danube about the time of Ulphilas. We learn from Epiphanius, writing about the year 375, that a persecution had been carried on some years before against the followers of Audianus, who, after his banishment for heresy to Scythia, had laboured among the Goths and converted many. [AUDIUS, anthropomorphitas.]

Epiphanius speaks of Silvanus, a bishop, who had been ordained by Audianus, and of others also who were dead when he wrote (Migne, xxxii. 371). Of Catholic Goths also, and their persecution, probably about the same period, there is some evidence to be found in the Lives of the Saints [see NICETAS, SABA]. The leader of the persecution in these cases, as in that of Ulphilas, was probably Athanaric.

4. Nearly thirty years after the Goths of Ulphilas had entered the Roman provinces, the great martyr of the Visigoths, Alaric (A.D. 395), crossed across the Danube. Of the manner of their conversion to Arian Christianity we know absolutely nothing, nor of any certain link between them and Ulphilas. For the later history of the Christianity of the Goths, see SEVIRIUS, OSTROGOTHUS, VESPASIANUS.

(A. L. H. A.)

GOTSIPTAIA. [CUTZUPITAE (Vol. I. 733 a).]

GOTTESCHALK [GODESALVUS].

GOTUMAR (GOTUMARUS), bishop of Tri Flavia (Santiago), from about 637 till after 646. He signed the sixth and seventh councils of Toledo under Rintila and Kindisvirth, a.d. 637, 646. (Agustino-Catalanii, l. iii. 414, 423; Esp. Sopr. xix. 57. [ORTIZIUS].) [M. A. W.]

GOVEIN (COPEN, COVEN, GAWEN, COVEN, GOVERNINS), wife of Twärdag and mother of Meurig, kings of South Wales, an early Welsh saint [COPEN]. (Recs. Cambro-Briit. Saints, app. 14; Camb. Quart. Mag. v. 132; Notes and Queries, 2 ser. iii. 31, 77, 97; Williams, Iolo MS. 549, 558.) [C. W. B.]

GOVOR, GOWER, Welsh saint, who founded Llanover in Monmouthshire. There are six springs close to each other called Ffynon Otor. He was commemorated May 9. (R. Williams, Enwoegion Cymru, 1852, p. 178; Notes and Queries, 2 ser. iii. 31, 77, 97; Williams, Iolo MS. 549, 558.) [C. W. B.]

GOWIBALDUS, GOWIBOLT, bishop of Ratisbon. [GARIBALDUS (3)].

GRACCUS, a Roman patrician, who held the office of urban praetor towards the close of
the 4th century. During his term of office he destroyed the cave of Mihra and other objects connected with the strange Oriental superstitions which had been introduced into Rome. This may have been done by the magistrates as a mere matter of police; but he afterwards received baptism. He was a neighbour of Tosto-

ius and Lactantius (Ep. i. 9) and this is in a letter to Lactantius that his name is mentioned by St. Jerome. (Ep. civ. 2, ed. Vall.) Prudentius (Cont. Symm. lib. i. 1. 562) mentions the family of Gracchi as the zealous for the Christian religion.

[W. H. F.]

GRACE, ɣρας, in the sense first given to that word in the New Testament, viz., the favour or free gift of the Holy Ghost purchased for man by Christ, and poured out on man under the Gospel; inspiring individual souls with power from above to the regeneration and sanctification of their hearts and lives; and imparting vital efficacy to the sacraments and general work of the church. Grace, therefore, must in this sense be divided under two aspects: (1) grace to the individual—in later times called "gratia graminis faciens"—(2) grace to the church in general, "gratia gratia data." But the commoner name for this under latter aspect is charisms (Rom. i. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6), or charismata (1 Cor. xii. 9 and 31), under which term it has been treated elsewhere (Duct. or Crem. Act. i. 549): but briefly, for all the controversy that has been raised about it on that head are purely modern.

It was the inward, invisible, superhuman, and life-giving action of the Holy Ghost upon the soul of man, which Pelagius denied, and St. Augustine brought out so triumphantly as to have procured for himself in after ages the honourable distinction of "doctor of grace." It was he, likewise, who first laid bare the correlative doctrine to it on the part of man, viz., that of original sin. His opus classicum on the subject is divided into two books; the title given to the first being De Gratia Christi: to the second, De Peccato Originali. It was written A.D. 418, after Pelagius had been condemned by pope Zosimus and a general council of the African church in May of that year.

Pelagius had been brought to book at last, and all his subterfuges exposed. Denial of the grace of God, he had constantly said formed no part of his creed, yet now, in expounding what he held it to be, he struck at the roots of it in the same breath. "Nam gratiam Dei, et adjut- terium quo adjucamur ad non peccandum, aut in natura, aut liberum potest arbitrrio: aut in leges, aut in doc. doctrinis." (L. 3.) That is, he limited it to the natural gifts and powers with which every man is born, or the external help supplied to man in the books of the Old and New Testaments. The capabilities, therefore, with which every man finds himself endowed at his birth, constituted, according to Pelagius, all the inward assistance that men needed or received from God to enable them to do any good or escape condemnation to Him in this life, and be rewarded with heaven in the next. Neither their wills nor their actions wanted any renewing or strengthening from above to be what they ought. "Et ideo, aut non adjutat (Deus) ut velimus, non adjutat ut agamus: sed tantummodo adjutat ut velle et agere valeamus." (ib. c. v.) From this point of view there was, of course, no tint of nature for baptism to wash away, no gift of the Holy Ghost imparted in the new birth at the font. Adam's sin, St. Augustine rejoined, was simply left out in this estimate. As he had urged in an earlier work: "Natura quippe hominis primitus inculpata, et sine ullo vitio creata est: natura vero iusta non est, qua quibus quisque ex Adam nascedat, jure medico indiget quia sana non est. . . . Ac per hoc natura poenalis ad vindiciam justissimam pertinet. . . . Deus autem, qui dives est in misericordia, prop- ter multitum dilectionem, quae dilexit nos, et cum essemus mortui delictis, convirificavit nos Christo, Ouius gratia sumus salvi facti. Hac autem Christi gratia, sine quin nec infantes, nec etate grandes salvi fieri possunt, non meritis redditur, sed gratia datur, propter quod et gratia nominatur. "Justificati, inquit, gratia per sanningunm Ejus." (De Nat. et Grat. c. Fel. c. iii.) When and in what way was this grace bestowed? First at the font, on the recipients of baptism, infants and adults alike—"vitio in se qui non per illam liberatur, sive quia audire nondum potuerunt, sive quia obedere non ulerunt: sive etiam, cum per aetatem audire non posse, lavacrum regenerationis quod accipere possent, per quod salvi fierent, non acceserunt, justu utique damnantur, quia sine peccato non sunt, vel quod originaliter traxerunt, vel quod maiis moribus addiderunt." Omnes enim peccaverunt, sive in Adam, sive in se ipsis, et in gentem mundam Dei. (ib.) But was it merely the remission of sins in baptism, or something else, first bestowed then, over and above, that was denied by Pelagius? This was the crucial point which he could never face, "Quomodo igitur credi potest Pelagium Dei gratiam, quae neque natura est cum libero arbitrio: neque legis scientia, neque peccatorum remissio: sed quae in singula nes actionis est necessaria versus falsum confusorum," asks his opponent, in spite of all his admissions? That inward grace, which, first received at the font, becomes the operating and co-operating principle of a new life in every heart, where it is allowed free course, and not obstructed by the action of a perverse will. Faith, hope, and charity rank amongst its earliest creations; its most prized and lasting achievements. Absolute freedom from sin is not out of the question with such aid: which, however, is never irresistible, and might be withdrawn at any moment, on any wilful reaction from it in its recipient. Such grace was wholly gratuitous on the part of God, and undeserved by any preceding merit whatsoever on the part of man. At one time St. Augustine confesses he thought himself man could merit it by his faith. Afterwards, he became scripturally convinced that faith both originated with, and was increased by grace. "Fides ergo, et inchoata, et perfecta, donum Dei est," is the mature conclusion of his latest work. (De Prædest. c. viii.) "Our wills and our acts are our own," he says, "but our good wills and our good acts are received by God, and are accepted in us by Him with our concurrence." (De Grat. Christi, c. xxv.) In rewarding them, therefore, God does but literally crown his own gifts. (Ep. ccxxv. 19; ad Sist. Presb.) Or as he puts it elsewhere, "Intelligendum est igitur etiam hominis bona merita esset Dei munera, quibus cum vita aeterna redditor, quid nisi gratia pro gra
tia redditur" (Enchirid. c. vii). Or as his faithful Interpreter, Prosper, beautifully puts it, "Duce Deo, venitur ad Deum" (de Vochat. i. 24).

Besides art. CHARMAN in the Dict. of Chr. Ant., and vol. xi. of the Ben. ed. of the works of St. Augustine generally, the following articles of this work must be consulted for special branches of the subject to avoid repetition:—Original Sin, Faith, Hope, Charity, Baptism, Enchirid, Ordination, or Holy Orders. Estius, in Sentent. ii. Dist. 26, is a storehouse of all the subtle points mooted or left in abeyance by St. Augustine, and discussed by others. For instance, whether grace is a habit, an act, a motion, or something intermediate; how it should be defined: whether it is distinct from, or the same with charity: whether it should be divided into created and increated, operating and co-operating, gratia gratis data, gratia gratum faciens, and so forth. But it was in the West almost wholly that they received any special treatment. Marschall’s Concord. Pat. continued by Schramm, and Fessler’s Inst. Patr., give the views incidentally expressed of other Fathers.

E. S. Ff.

GRACIANUS of Cagli. [GRATIANUS (3).]

GRACIANUS, martyr with the virgin Felicianus in the city of Falanis, being stoned and afterwards decapitated; commemorated Aug. 12 (Usuard. Mart.). Baronus (Itin. Mart. Aug. 12) gives the name of the city Faleria in Tuscany.

C. H.

GRADA, ST., the saint of a parish in the Lizard district in Cornwall. The parish feast is kept on the nearest Sunday to St. Luke’s Day.

C. W. B.

GRADESCUS, bishop of Sulmo (Salmona), c. A.D. 701. He appears to have succeeded St. Pamphilus, who was elected c. A.D. 682. (Ugelli, Ital. Sac. i. *253.)

R. S. G.

GRADUS, bishop. [GRATUS (5).]

GRÆEUS, bishop of Marseilles, succeeded Eustasius about 472. He is known to us only from Sidonius Apollinaris, who addresses him in laudatory terms (lib. vi. iii. vii. 2), but in vii. 7 confesses, with the high probability that he was instrumental in effecting a treaty, which was probably that between the emperor Neros and Euiic king of the Visigoths, the result of which was that while the Massilians were at peace the Arvernii were surrendered to the Goths and suffered terrible extremities. Sidonius roundly informs Graecus that this act placed him last instead of first among the bishops of the province, whence the Sammartinae infer that he had sought, through the favour of Euiic, to exercise the powers of metropolitan. He seems, however, afterwards to have been on good terms with Sidonius (Ep. vii. 11). (Gall. Christ. i. 635; Ceillier, Aut. ecc. x. 610.)

R. T. S.

GRAETIS, king of the Heruli. [GREPES.]


J. G.

GRAMMATICUS, addressed along with Gildas, Felix, and Eleusius, by Augustine, on the shamelessness with which the Donatists, though so often sentenced, persisted in their schism (August. ep. 43 al. 192. Opp. vol. 38. p. 422, ed. Gaubil). [C. H.]

GRAMMATIUS (1), bishop of Salerno (Salerno), probably e. A.D. 400, though some authorities place him much later. He is said to have succeeded Bonosius. (Boll. Acta SS. 11 Oct. v. 671; Ugelli, Ital. Sac. vii. 487.)

R. B. G.

GRAMMATIUS (2), ST., twenty-first bishop of Metz, between St. Phrornimus and Agatimber. He is said to have died in the fifteenth year of his episcopate (A.D. 512), on April 25, on which day he is commemorated at Metz. (Boll. Acta SS. Apr. iii. 369; Gall. Chr. xvii. 587.)

S. A. B.

GRAMMATIUS (3), 4th bishop of Vindonissa (Windisch), from whence the see was soon afterwards transferred to Constance. He succeeded Bubulcus, and was followed by Maximus. He was present at three councils—that of Clermont in 533, the fourth of Orleans in 541, and the fifth in 549. (Mansi, viii. 863, ix. 120, 136; Gall. Christ. v. 892.)

S. A. B.

GRANIANUS, SERENIUS or SERENIUS, proconsul of Asia in the reign of Hadrian. He wrote to the emperor in the year 125 for instructions as to how Christians were to be dealt with, but the answer arrived to his successor Minutius Fundanus (Justin. Mart. Apol. i. 69; Euseb. H. E. iv. 9). In his Chronicle (sub ann. 125) Eusebius calls him Serenus Granianus, and states that he called Hadrian’s attention to the gross injustice of sacrificing the blood of innocent men to the clamours of the mob when they could be charged with so crime but that of belonging to a name and a sect.

GRANIANUS.

GAETUS, bishop of Marseilles, succeeded Eustasius about 472. He is known to us only from Sidonius Apollinaris, who addresses him in laudatory terms (lib. vi. 3, vii. 2), but in vii. 7 confesses, with the high probability that he was instrumental in effecting a treaty, which was probably that between the emperor Neros and Euiic king of the Visigoths, the result of which was that while the Massilians were at peace the Arvernii were surrendered to the Goths and suffered terrible extremities. Sidonius roundly informs Graecus that this act placed him last instead of first among the bishops of the province, whence the Sammartinae infer that he had sought, through the favour of Euiic, to exercise the powers of metropolitan. He seems, however, afterwards to have been on good terms with Sidonius (Ep. vii. 11). (Gall. Christ. i. 635; Ceillier, Aut. ecc. x. 610.)

R. T. S.

GRAETIS, king of the Heruli. [GREPES.]


J. G.

GRAMMATICUS, addressed along with Gildas, Felix, and Eleusius, by Augustine, on the shamelessness with which the Donatists, though so often sentenced, persisted in their schism (August. ep. 43 al. 192. Opp. vol. 38. p. 422, ed. Gaubil). [C. H.]

GRAMMATIUS (1), bishop of Salerno (Salerno), probably c. A.D. 400, though some authorities place him much later. He is said to have succeeded Bonosius. (Boll. Acta SS. 11 Oct. v. 671; Ugelli, Ital. Sac. vii. 487.)

R. B. G.

GRAMMATIUS (2), ST., twentieth bishop of Metz, between St. Phrornimus and Agatimber. He is said to have died in the fifteenth year of his episcopate (A.D. 512), on April 25, on which day he is commemorated at Metz. (Boll. Acta SS. Apr. iii. 369; Gall. Chr. xvii. 587.)

S. A. B.

GRAMMATIUS (3), 4th bishop of Vindonissa (Windisch), from whence the see was soon afterwards transferred to Constance. He succeeded Bubulcus, and was followed by Maximus. He was present at three councils—that of Clermont in 533, the fourth of Orleans in 541, and the fifth in 549. (Mansi, viii. 863, ix. 120, 136; Gall. Christ. v. 892.)

S. A. B.

GRANIANUS, SERENIUS or SERENIUS, proconsul of Asia in the reign of Hadrian. He wrote to the emperor in the year 125 for instructions as to how Christians were to be dealt with, but the answer arrived to his successor Minutius Fundanus (Justin. Mart. Apol. i. 69; Euseb. H. E. iv. 9). In his Chronicle (sub ann. 125) Eusebius calls him Serenus Granianus, and states that he called Hadrian’s attention to the gross injustice of sacrificing the blood of innocent men to the clamours of the mob when they could be charged with so crime but that of belonging to a name and a sect.

GRANIANUS.

GAETUS, bishop of Marseilles, succeeded Eustasius about 472. He is known to us only from Sidonius Apollinaris, who addresses him in laudatory terms (lib. vi. 3, vii. 2), but in vii. 7 confesses, with the high probability that he was instrumental in effecting a treaty, which was probably that between the emperor Neros and Euiic king of the Visigoths, the result of which was that while the Massilians were at peace the Arvernii were surrendered to the Goths and suffered terrible extremities. Sidonius roundly informs Graecus that this act placed him last instead of first among the bishops of the province, whence the Sammartinae infer that he had sought, through the favour of Euiic, to exercise the powers of metropolitan. He seems, however, afterwards to have been on good terms with Sidonius (Ep. vii. 11). (Gall. Christ. i. 635; Ceillier, Aut. ecc. x. 610.)

R. T. S.

GRAETIS, king of the Heruli. [GREPES.]


J. G.

GRAMMATICUS, addressed along with Gildas, Felix, and Eleusius, by Augustine, on
by the Bollandists contain a highly coloured tale of ignorant fanaticism and persecution, admiration at the Christians' constancy and consequent conversion, baptism by bishop Florentius, open profession, trial, torture, and death.

[J. G.]

GRATIANUS (2) (Gatianus), martyr at Amiens, not mentioned in Ado and Usuardus; but from a MS. martyrology preserved at Corbeil he found a place in the Asutorias to Usuardus. The date of the martyrdom is fixed between 283 and 287. The legend runs that in his last moments he fixed in the ground a hazel twig which he carried, and which immediately put forth leaves and blossoms; a miracle which the MS. declares to be repeated annually though the festival occurs so late in the season as the end of October (Boll. AA. SS. 23 Oct. x. 18).

[R. T. S.]

GRATIANUS (3) (Gregianus), the first known bishop of Callium (Cagli), present at the council held at Rimini, A.D. 359, protesting strongly against the Arian bishops and their doctrines. He is supposed to have also attended the council of Seleucia in the same year. (Hilar. Pictav. Pros. vii. al. viii. p. 685 in Patr. Lat. xi. 697 e.; Uebh. Itali. Soc. ii. 691; Cappelletti, La Chiese d'Ital. iii. 236.)

[R. S. G.]

GRATIANUS (4). Callidius Gratianus, the officer called Curator Beipublicae at Aptunga, at the time of the inquiry into the case of Felix bishop of Aptunga. [Petr (265)]. (Opt. i. 265.)

[H. W. P.]

GRATIANUS (5) (Flavius Gratianus Augustus), Christian emperor, eldest son of Valentinian I., born A.D. 359; named Augustus by his father, 367; succeeded to his father, Nov. 375; succeeded to his uncle Valens, 378; murdered, Aug. 25, 383.

[1. Authoritics. 2. Life. 3. Character. 4. Ecclesiastical Policy.]

1. Authorities.—Of the secular writers who treat of this period, the principal is the contemporary Ammianus Marcellinus (p. c.), books 37-91. His work finishes with the death of Valentian, and his next book (book 4), who lived in the middle of the 5th century, is the next in importance. Two of the orations of the younger Symmachus refer to Gratian; one delivered on his appointment as Augustus, when he was eight years old, the other on his accession, after Valentinian's death and the execution of Maximinus (Oratio pro patre, p. 44, ed. Mai, 1815). Themistius, the rhetorician of Constantinople, pronounced a curious address on the same occasion in the senate at Rome, viz. Θεμιστίου, § περὶ αὐτοῦ Βασίλειον (Orat. 13). The works of his tutor Ausonius contain several references to his royal pupil; the most important for his reign is the graecorum actio pro consulatu, an oration delivered at Treves in 379. Of the letters of Gratian, some are addressed to Gratian (lib. x. ep. 2; cp. i. 13), thanking him for making him his mouthpiece in the senate soon after his accession; another, the well-known relatio to Valentinian II. and Theodosius (ibid. ep. 61), gives some account of the proceedings with regard to the altar of Victory. In reply to this we have two letters of St. Ambrose, Nos. 17, 18, and the poem of Prodeius; but these really belong to another reign. St. Ambrose is the most important of ecclesiastical...
GRATIANUS, EMPEROR

case was apparently not unlike that of Constantius Chlorus and Helena, and the repudiation of Severa was followed by a match with Jovita, the widow of Magnentius—a beautiful and well-connected Sicilian lady, whose former marriage probably made her popular with many of the troops (Zos. iv. 19, 43; Amm. xxviii. 2, 10).

Hence it was not surprising that, when Valentinian died suddenly of apoplexy at Bregenz, on Lake Constance, in Nov. 375, the infant child of his second marriage (Valentinian II.) was proclaimed Augustus by his principal officers, headed by Merobaudes (Amm. xxx. 10). This bold act was done in reliance upon the youth and good nature of Gratian, who was at Treves at the time, and who recognised his young brother almost immediately. Richter interprets it as a scheme of Merobaudes to keep the crown in the family of Valentinian, as many of the soldiers were axious to make the heathen general Sebastianus emperor (pp. 283–286 and note). Jovita fixed her court at Sirmium, and the Western empire was perhaps nominally divided between the two brothers. Gratian having Gaul, Spain, and Britain, and Valentinian Italy, Ly- ricum, and Africa. The division must have been simply nominal, as Gratian constantly acted in the latter provinces (see Tillemont, Emp. v. p. 140, and cp. the laws quoted in § 4).

For the first years of his reign, till the death of Valens, Gratian resided chiefly at Treves, from whence most of his laws are dated. One of his first acts was to exempt Ancyra from tax, and by her advice he proceeded to punish some of the prominent instruments of the cruelties committed in the name of justice and discipline, which had disgraced his father's later years. He put to death the hated Maximinus, as well as his successors in power at Rome, Simplicius and Doryphorians (Amm. xxviii. 1, 57); and he issued an edict which exempted senators from trial before inferior judges, and gave them assurance of being heard before a court composed of men of their own rank (Cod. Theod. i. 1, 13). Tillemont concludes with great probability that this was the letter sent to Symmachus to read in the senate, of which he speaks in such grateful and flattering terms (Epist. x. 2, and i. 15; the latter is to Ausonius). Another and a more illustrious victim of the reaction was the Count Theodosius, who had suppressed the rebellions of Firmus in Africa with strenuous loyalty and great military skill, but with considerable harshness. He was executed at Carthage in a.d. 376, but whether the disgrace of this act should attach to Gratian or Valens is not quite certain. (Oros. vii. 35; cp. Socr. iv. 9, where the MSS. read, Θεοδοσίου ου Θεοδοσίου ηλικία τ&oacute;ν γενε&omicr&omicron;ς εκ τ&omicr&omicron; των εν αυτω ρω&omicr&omicron;τω τ&omicr&omicron; ιερασίων. Socrates connects his death with the supposed conspiracy against Valens, and the execution of many whose names began with the syllables Θεοδ.; cp. Amm. xxix. 1, 32.) Richter ascribes his death to the fear and jealousy of Merobaudes, but this is a pure conjecture (pp. 401, 402). This removal of a popular prince she was to be the instrument of the general relaxation of severity in all branches of the public service, especially in that of the foecit. Theismius, speaking in the Roman senate in praise of the young emperor, whom he had just
visited, says: "Lamentations are banished from the court, and the instruments of torture are left to rust. The baneful accountants and criminal exactors of old and forgotten arrears have so disappeared that their names are no more remembered, and fire has destroyed all that remained of them." (Orat. 13, p. 175 c, Paris, 1864. Cp. the similar passage in Ausonius pro consulatis, towards the end.) This burning of the official records of public liabilities in the marketplace of each city was no doubt a great boon to the corporations, which had suffered much under Valentinian. But these popular concessions at starting did not ensure contentment on the part of the provinces or good government on that of the emperor.

Another act of Gratian's which it is natural to place at the beginning of his reign showed his determination to break with paganism more effectually than his predecessors had done. This was his refusal to the robe of pontifex maximus, when it was brought to him according to custom by the pontificates; thinking (as the heathen historian tells us) that it was unlawful for a Christian priest to wear it. The title appears indeed to some extent on coins and inscriptions, but it is not easy to fix the date of those monuments. One which is most frequently quoted, e.g. by Clinton, F. R. 2, p. 122 = Orell. 1118, at Emerita, is condemned by Hübner on other grounds. (Inscr. Bap. C. I. L. ii. 452a.) The inscription on the bridge of St. Bartholomew is of course not in point. More remarkable is the language of his tutor Ausonius, who, in his gratiarum actio pro consulatis addressed to Gratian in 379, seems to dwell upon this particular office with evident meaning and emphasis. In allusion to his different titles, he calls him, "Pietatique imperator, virtute victor, Augustus sanctitatis, pontificis religiosi, indulgentia patris," and suggests that the consular emilia be called Pontificialis, "Sic potius, sic victor, quae in Pontificis Maximus Deo participiatus habuit" (cf. "operto conclusiva tui non sanctior ara Vestalis, non Pontificis cubile catius, nec pulvinar Plaminis tam pudicum.

Begnet argues that Ausonius could not have used this language after Gratian's refusal of the office (Destruction du Paganisme en Occident, I, p. 354, where he erroneously puts the consularship of Ausonius in A.D. 382), but this seems doubtful. He might well, in this way, insinuate his wish that the emperor should not altogether break with the old religion to which previous Christian sovereigns had so far accommodated themselves. Such a feeling seems suitable to the character of a man like Ausonius, who was a Christian by profession, but was attached to the old way of thinking by many ties of literary sympathy and personal friendship.

The Eastern empire in the meantime was in great danger in the hands of the incompetent Valens. A large mass of Goths obtained leave to cross the Danube, being pressed southwards by the Huns, who now appear almost for the first time in history. The crossing and settlement of the new-comers was grossly managed by the officers of Valens; and from suppliants the Goths soon became dangerous enemies. Gratian sent a certain number of troops under Richomeres to aid his uncle, but the greater part of them deserted, it was said, on the advice of Merobaudes, who feared, not without reason, to leave Gaul undefended (Amm. xxxi, 7, 4). In 378 the Alamanni invaded the Rhine in great force and threatened the Western empire, but were heavily defeated by Gratian at Argentaria, near Colmar (ibid. xxxi. 10). This set him free to move towards the East; and he had reached Sirmium on his way thither when he heard of the great defeat suffered by his uncle, and of his ignoble death after the battle of Adrianople, Aug. 7 (Amm. xxxi, 11, 6; 12, 10).

The situation was extremely critical, especially for an emperor not yet twenty years of age. The barbarians were in motion on all the frontiers. The internal condition of the West was insecure, from the tacit antagonism between the two courts, and the East was now suddenly thrown upon his hands, as Valens had left no children. In this emergency Gratian showed his judgment by sending for the younger Theodosius, about thirteen years older than himself, who after his father's execution was living in retirement upon his estates in Spain (Victor, Epit. 72, 74, &c.; cp. Themist. Orat. 14, p. 183 a). The youth was loyally distressed for his father, and was at once entrusted with the command of the troops as magister militum. His successes over the barbarians (probably Sarmatians) encouraged Gratian to a more decided step, and he was appointed emperor of the East with general applause. (Theodorez, v. 5, 6, is the only writer who describes these successes of Theodosius before he became emperor, but they are evidently referred to by Themistius, Or. xiv. p. 182 c, and Pacatus, Paneg. Theodori, 10, 2; see Richter, p. 691, note 26.)

Gratian returned from Sirmium to the West by way of Aquileia and Milan, at which places he passed some parts of the months of July and August 379. Before his expedition he had been brought into contact with St. Ambrose, and had received from him the two first books of his treatise de Fide, intended specially to preserve him against Arianism. This teaching had its dual effect; and on his way back he addressed a letter to the bishop of Milan, which is given below (§ 4). St. Ambrose sent him two more books of his treatise, and probably had some other direct personal intercourse with him. Gratian then went on to his usual residence at Treves, and received in the autumn from his old tutor Ausonius a turbid panegyric consisting of congratulations on his victories and thanks for the consularship bestowed while he was at Sirmium. During the following years, however, the emperor resided much more frequently at Milan and in the neighbourhood, especially during the winter. He wished, no doubt, to be nearer the Eastern empire, and not less, perhaps, to enjoy the society of St. Ambrose, whose strength of character and experience as a civil officer (before he became bishop) fitted him particularly to be the director of an amiable and well-versed but somewhat indolent prince. The results which flowed from this intercourse in the confirmation of Gratian in the Catholic faith will be noticed below. There was, however, another side to this practical neglect of the Gallic provinces. The Western provincials—never very contented—felt, no doubt, rather keenly the absence of the imperial court. If Gratian had continued to reside at Treves, the rebellion of
Magnus Maximus would perhaps never have taken place, and certainly would not have grown to such formidable dimensions.

The influence of St. Ambrose is shewn by the ecclesiastical laws, of which we shall speak in § 5. It is thus that Ambrose upheld the old religion in its stronghold. This was the famous removal of the altar of Victory from the senate-house at Rome in the year 381 (S. Ambros. Epist. 17, 5; Symm. Epist. 61, ad init. et ad finem). The heathen senators, though the minority in number, were accustomed to offer incense on this altar, and to touch it in taking solemn oaths (Ambr. Ep. 17, 9). It had been removed or covered over during the visit of Constantius, but was again restored under Julian, and Valentinian's policy had been against interference with such matters (Symm. l. c.). Its removal now caused great distress to the heathen party, who met in the senate-house and despatched a petition to Gratian for its restoration. The latter, who had absented himself from the curia on this occasion, met privately, and sent a counter-petition through pope Damasus to Ambrose, who of course presented it to the emperor (S. Ambr. Ep. 17, 9: "Nam et ante biniem ferme cum hoc petere tentaret, misit ad me s. Damasum ... libellum, quem Christiani Senatores dederunt, et quidem innumerum, postulantes nihil tene mandasse, non congruere gentilium istiusmodi petitionibus," &c.) The weight of this document enabled the advisers of Gratian to prevent his giving the heathen party a hearing. (Symm. l. c.: "Divi principis denegata est ab imprudens audientia"; and at the end, "Praestate etiam divi fratri vestro alieni consilio correctionem ... constat exclusam legationem ne ad eum iudicium publicum perveniret.") This blow was soon followed by another even more telling—the confiscation of the revenues of the temple of Victory, and the abolition of the privileges which belonged to the pontiffs and vestals, a measure which was extended to other heathen institutions. (S. Ambros. Ep. 17, 3-5, and 18, 11 foll.; Cod. Theod. xv. 10, 20. "omnia enim locorum sacrorum privativa, secum divi Gratiani constituta nostrae rei iustum sociari"—a law of Honorius in 415.)

These laws were followed by a famine in Italy and particularly in Rome, which the pagans naturally ascribed to sacrilege. (Symm. Ep. x. 61, "Secuta est fames publica et spem provinciarum omnium mensus segra decepta ... sacrilegii annus exauritus..."") The barbarian, moreover, was very unpopular and harsh measure was adopted of expelling all foreigners from Rome. (Symm. Ep. ii. 7, "defectum timentem annuana pulvis omnium quos exercito et pleno ubere Roma susceperrat ... Quanto nobis odio provinciarum constat illa securitas?"") It has been conjectured that this is the famine of which St. Ambrose speaks, during which he a. (ChroN.) prefect of the city called together the nobility, and prevented the carrying out of the proposal to expel strangers by raising a public subscription. (Ambros. de Officia Ministeriorum, iii. 7. This is the opinion of De Broglie (vol. vi. p. 43), and is suggested by Tillemont, Emp. Gratian, art. 16, p. 173, "cetait peutétre dans de cette année.") But a careful comparison of the passages of Cyprianus and St. Ambrose makes it probable that the action of the Christian prefect took place in a previous year, and that the order to expel strangers was actually carried out in 382. The city prefect in 382 was Anicius Achenius Basus (Cod. Theod. i. 6, 8). St. Ambrose in fact says that such a measure had not been seen at Rome in a long time. (L. c. § 49, "quanto hoc utilius quam illud quod proxime Roma factum est electos esse urbe amplissima," &c. This book was written probably about 390.)

A much more serious danger was the revolt of Magnus Maximus, a former comrade of Theodosius in Britain, who was probably jealous of his honours, and was now put forward as emperor by the soldiers [MAXIMUS]. This rising took place in the year 383 in Britain, where the usurper passed over to the mouth of the Rhine, gathering large bodies of men as he went. Gratian set out to meet him, with his two generals Balio and Merobaudes, the latter a Frank by birth. The two armies met near Paris, and Gratian was deserted by nearly all his troops (Zos. iv. 35; St. Ambros. in Ps. 61, 17). Only three hundred horse remained faithful. With these he fled at full speed, and succeeded in arriving at Lyons. The governor of the place, it would seem, received him with protestations of loyalty, and took a solemn oath on the Gospels not to hurt him. Gratian was deceived by his assurances, and took his place in his imperial robes at a feast, during or soon after which he was basely assassinated, on Aug. 25. The traitor even denied his holy burial. (S. Ambros. in Psalm. 61, §§ 17, 23 foll. Marcellinus sub anno: "Gratianus imp. Maximi tyranni dolo apud Lugdunum occussus est viol. Kal. Sep." Zosimus, iv. 35, puts the place of his death at Singidunum, Belgrade, in Moesia, οδρ ιεροτοδοσίας; but he probably means ιεροτοδοσία in one of his authorities: cp. Hieron. Epist. ad Hieroldorum de morte Nepotiani, p. 24. Gratianus exercuit suo proditos et ab omnibus urbis urbem receptuos, ludibrio hosti fuit; crucienteque manus vestigia paries sui Lugduni testantur; see also Rufin. ii. 14.) Greek writers ascribe his death to the stratagems of Andragathius, the master of the eunuchs who were in the palace, with the object of pursuing the emperor. Socrates relates that Andragathius concealed himself in a litter, in which it is said that Gratian's newly married wife, Laeta, was being carried, and that the emperor, hurring to open the litter, was thus surprised and slain (Soc. v. 11; cp. Zos. i. c.). S. Ambrose tells us that Gratian called upon him in his last moments—"Me inter tua pericula requirerbas, tu in tuis extremis me appellerbas, meum de te plus dolebas dolorum" (de obitu Valentiniani, 80).

His generals Balio and Merobaudes were pursued by the soldiers of Maximus, and perished miserably, perhaps by their own hands. (St. Ambr. Ep. 24, 11; Fac. Pusey. Theodoto, 28, ed. Migne, Patr. xiii. 16, p. 50.)

Gratian thus perished miserably at the age of 24. He was twice married—first (at the age of 16) to Constantia, only and posthumous child of Constantius II., three years younger than himself, who died before him (Amm. Marc. xxii. 15, 8; xiii. 6, 7); secondly, to Laeta, shortly before his death (Soc. vii. 13; Zos. v. 30), says that she and her mother, Pelagiana, were living in Rome in 392, during the siege by Alaric. He left no children.
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(Thedoret, v. 12), and any that he may have had by Constantia must have died in infancy. (S. Ambros. de Fide, i. 20, ad finem, "sint idem pignoris sui praeferat." It is now agreed that the right reading in S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, v. 15, is "cum parvulum haberet fratrem," not "et fratrem.")

3. Character.—Gratian's character is known to us from a good many sources, which agree in their general result. (S. Ambros. xxiii. 10, with the following references.) He was in many respects the exact opposite of his father, Valentinian. He was amiable and modest, in fact too modest to be a good governor in these rough times ("plus vereundus quam repetueuro intercett," Rufin. ii. 13). He was generous and kind-hearted, of an attractive disposition and beautiful person. (For the latter, see Themistius, ep. ad Euseb. Basiliensem; traces of his beauty are, however, hardly to be found on his coins.) His education had been carefully conducted, and his tutor Ausonius had taken pains to inspire him with tastes for rhetoric and versification. He was chaste and temperate, and careful in religious observances for the benefit of the State. (Ambros. de Obiiti Valent. 74, "fuit...declitis in Domino, pius atque mansuetus, puro corde. Fuit etiam castus corpore, qui prater coniugium nescerit feminae alius consuetudinem." His murderers calumniated him on this point, id. in Psalm. 61; so also the Arian Philostorgius, x. 5, compared him to Nero.) His great fault was a neglect of public business through an inordinate devotion to sport, especially to hunting wild beasts with bow and arrows in his parks and preserves (Amm. l. c.; Victor. Epit. 73). His skill in this exercise was comparable to that of Commodus; he once killed a lion with a single arrow (Aus. Epig. 6); and even St. Ambrose alludes to his prowess in the chase in the midst of his pathetic reminiscences, adopting the language of David's elegy over Jonathan.—"Gratiani regis castum esse scriptum est..." (de Obiiti Valent. 13; cp. the old Latin of 2 Sam. i. 22).

The character given by Victor is worth quoting. "Fuit autem Gratiatus litteris haud meliocritor institutus: carmen facere, ornare loci, explicare controversias rhetorum more... Parus ebi somneque... et vini ac libidinis victor; canensque fuisse plenus bonis, si ad magistros opera peripatetica gerenda scientiam minimum intendisset, a qua propere alienus, non modo voluntate sed etiam exercicio fuit." (Epit. 73.) This distaste for public business he seems to have carried even into military matters. He gained one great victory, but on other occasions he seemed rather to have shrunk from war. He is said to have alienated his army by the favours which he showed the Alans, whom he spent large sums, and in whose company he delighted so much as even to wear their dress, to the neglect of the Roman soldiery. (Victor. l. c.; Zos. iv. 35. For the Alans, see the description in Amm. xxxi. 2, 12 foll.)

4. Ecclesiastical Policy.—The ecclesiastical policy of Gratian was more important than his civil or military government. His reign, coinciding with that of Theodosius, saw orthodox Christianity for the first time dominant throughout the empire. Constantine had been too uninstructed to understand the full meaning of theological questions; and he was in his latter years under strong Arian influences. Under Constantius a form of semi-Arianism had been established with all the power of the state. Then came the reaction under Julian, which, though unsuccessful, had materially altered the relations of church and state. His orthodox successor Jovian had reigned but a few months, and Valentinian, though a Catholic, had aimed at a rather strict impartiality; while Valens was a thorough and a persecuting Arian. The reign of Gratian is therefore a noteworthy epoch in church history.

We have already mentioned the most important measures taken by Gratian with respect to the old religion—his refusal of the robe of pontifex maximus; his removal of the altar of Victory from the senate-house, and his confiscation of the temple revenues in Rome. We may here take occasion to refer to an act which was possibly connected with the first of these exhibitions of feeling on the part of the emperor, the destruction of the sanctuary of Mithra by Gracchus, who was prefect of the city in the second year of his reign (S. Hieronym. Epist. ad Lactam, 7, tom. i. p. 51 e, ed. Paris, 1643; Beugnot, Destruction du Panayismes, i. p. 366).

Yet this wonderful act, it is needless to say, went on, especially among certain families, for a considerable period longer.

The laws relating to the stage, particularly to actresses and dancers, are rather numerous, viz. seven in the years 376, 380, and 381 (C. Theod. xv. 7, 3—9). They showed a desire to reform the public spectacles, and grant Christian women the privilege of retiring from the stage. But they betray an evident caution in dealing with so popular an institution, and grate upon our more refined taste by taking for granted that the life of an actress must of necessity be vicious. A Christian woman of this kind, who has relapsed, is condemned to infamy without further reproof in the following ghastly terms: "retrecta in pulpitum, sine ipsis absolutione uulnus ibi non staying, permanent, donee absolutio... nec tune quidem absolutione... sed cum aliqui quam castis esse non possint." (Cod. Theod. xv. 7, 8, May 8, 381, from Aquileia).

We now pass to a series of measures more directly affecting the church, and some of them of very great importance.

It is to be regretted that Gratian's measures in behalf of the church were often tainted with injustice (as it appears to us) towards the sects. But it is probable that the laws were very imperfectly carried out (see Richter, p. 327).

His first general law against heretical sects is dated from Treves, May 1, 376, and speaks of a precious law of the same kind (Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 4); the previous law may, however, be one of Constantine's (Ambrosian) and not, as Richter thinks, of Gratian.

In 377, shortly before the death of Valens, he condemned re-baptism, and ordered that the Donatist churches should be restored to the Catholics, and that their private meeting-houses should be confiscated ("Ad Flavianum Vicarium Africam," himself a Donatist, Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 2. It is dated at Constantinople, but this can hardly be correct: see Tillemont, v. note 12, p. 714). The death of Valens was naturally the signal for the discipline of St. Ambrose to restore the Catholics of the East to their possessions. He recalled all those whom his uncle had banished, and further issued an edict of toleration for all Christian sects,
except the Eunomians (extreme Arians, see Soz. vi. 26), Photinians, and Manichaeans. (Soc. v. 2; Soz. vii. 1.) Theodoret, v. 2, appears to confuse this with the later edict of Gratian and Theodosius. The condemnation of the Manichaeans was extended on the strong representations of Hacicus of Merida to the Priscillianists, an enthusiastic Maslenian, who had made much progress in Spain (Sulpicius Severus, Chron. ii. 47, 6). Some better terms were, however, afterwards procured from them through the interest of Macedonius, master of the offices, to whom they gave large bribes. This did not, however, amount to direct toleration (as Richter assumes, p. 524), but to the transference of their case to another court (Sulp. Serv. Chron. ii. 49). The date of this concession was probably quite late in the reign of Gratian.

On his return from Sirmium, Gratian wrote the following affectionate and interesting autograph (Anbr. Ep. 1, 3) letter to St. Ambrose, desiring him to come and meet him; "I desire much, my pious, my wise, my holier, my more holy friend, I am filled with recollection I carry with me, and with whom I am present in spirit. Therefore, hasten to me, religious priest of God, to teach me the doctrine of the true faith. Not that I am anxious for argument, or wish to know God in words rather than in spirit; but that my heart may be opened more fully to receive the abiding revelation of the divinity. For He teach me, whom I do not deny, whom I confess to be my God and my Lord, not raising as an objection against His divinity that He took upon Himself a created nature like my own [non ei obiciens, quam in me video, creaturam]. I confess that I can add nothing to the glory of Christ; but I should wish to commend myself to the Father in glorifying the Son. I will not fear a grudging spirit on the part of God. I shall not suppose myself such an encomiast as to increase His divinity by my praise. In my weakness and frailty I utter what I can, not what is adequate to His divinity. I desire you to send me a copy of the same treatise, which you sent before [de Rdo. i. ii.], enlarging it by a faithful dissertation on the Holy Spirit: prove that He is God by scripture and reason. May the Deity keep you for many years, my father, and worshipper of the eternal God, Jesus Christ, whom we worship." (This letter is prefixed to St. Ambrose's Epistles.) St. Ambrose replies,exclusive his non-attendance upon the emperor, praising the expressions of his faith, and sending two fresh books of his treatise. For the new books De Spiritu Sancto, he asks time, knowing (as he says) what a critic will read them. The subject was, we may remark, being at this moment largely discussed in the Eastern church. [See Council of Constantinople, in Dict. of Chr. Antiq. i. 437.]

It is assumed by De Broglie that the bishop and the emperor did not meet at this time, but St. Ambrose writes in a letter just quoted, § 7, "veniam plane et festinabo ut iubes," and two laws of Gratian's are dated from Milan in July and August 379 (Cod. Just. vi. 32, 4, July 29, and Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 5, August 3, to Hesperius Pr. Pract. de haereticis). The second of these is important, and may shew the influence of St. Ambrose. It forbids the heresies against which former imperial edicts had been directed, and especially that of re-baptism (the Donatists), and revokes the recent tolerant edict of Sirmium ("antiquato rescripto, quod apud Sirmium nuper emeritis, ea tantum super catholica observatione permaneant quae perennis recordationis pater noster et nos," &c.).

In a letter dated July 5, at Ariminum, he had exempted the clergy in Italy, Illyricum, and Gaul, whose incomes were below a certain sum, from payment of the chrysargyrum (Cod. Theod. xiii. 1, 11); and it is quite possible that St. Ambrose may have met him there, and travelled with him to Milan.

About this time must be dated the occurrences mentioned by St. Ambrose in his book De Spiritu Sancto, i. §§ 19-21. The empress Justina, who was an Arian, had obtained from Gratian a basilica for the worship of her sect, to the great distress of the Catholica. He restored it however, apparently of his own motion, to their equal surprise and delight, perhaps in the year 380 (cp. Richter, note 30, p. 692; De Spiritu Sancto, § 20, neque enim aliud est quis homini subito Basilicam reddidisti). St. Ambrose also obtained another victory over the Arians in 380 in his journey to Sirmium, where Justina apparently also went. In spite of her vehement opposition, he succeeded in consecrating an orthodox bishop to the metropolitan see of Illyria, and thus laid the foundation for the suppression of heresy in that quarter of the empire. (Paulinus, Vita Ambrosii, 11.)

We cannot doubt then that Gratian agreed, not only in name but in feeling, with the important edict issued by his colleague Theodosius on Feb. 27, 380, from Thessalonica and addressed to the people of Constantinople. This remarkable document declared the desire of the emperor that all their subjects should profess the religion given by St. Peter to the Romans, and now held by the pontiff Damascus, and Peter, bishop of Alexandria—that is to say, should confess the one deity and equal majesty of the three persons of the Blessed Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

This decree further declares that they also who hold this faith are to be called Catholics, and their places of meeting churches; while the rest are branded as heretics, and are threatened with an indefinite punishment (Cod. Theod. xvi. 1, 2; cp. the law of the next year, which mentions various Catholic bishops of the East, whose communion was to be the test of orthodoxy, including Nectarius of Constantinople—perhaps the reference to Damascus had given offence).

De Broglie says of these laws, "it was impossible to abjure more decidedly the pretension of dogmatizing from the elevation of the three, which had been since Constantine the means of all the emperors and the scourge of the empire" (vol. v. p. 365). But correct dogmatism is still dogmatism, and the definition of truth by edict emperors kept up the delusion that the right of perpetual interference with religion was inherent in their office.

We have said that Gratian resided more frequently at Milan during his later years that he had previously done, especially during the winter months. From this place he issued two of the laws we have mentioned with respect to
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the stage. In July 381, he ordered that criminals should be set at liberty at Easter, with the exception of greater offenders (Cod. Theod. x. 38, 6). In May 383, at Padua, he issued a penal law against apostates, and those who try to make others apostatize from Christianity. Whoever turns to heathenism, Judaism, or Manicheism, is to be deprived of the right of making a will. Those who have drawn them over are equally punished, and even heavier penalties may be inflicted by the judges.

In citing these laws, we have anticipated a little the course of events. In 381 Gratian summoned the council of Aquileia (which met on Sept. 5) to decide the cases of the Illyrian bishops Palladius and Secundianus, who were accused of Arianism. Their condemnation put an end to the official life of Arianism in that important district (S. Ambros. Epist. 9). The records of this council are preserved in the works of St. Ambrose, who took the chief part in it, though he did not technically preside. (They follow his eighth epistle in the Benedictine edition.) The same council took up the case of pope Damasus and consulted the emperor to interfere against the partisans of the antipope Ursinus (S. Amb. Ep. 11). The relations of Gratian with the see of Rome are somewhat obscure, but it is pretty clear that some extension of its privileges and pretensions dates from this reign. According to the documents first published by Sirmond, a synod held in Rome soon after Gratian's accession made large demands for ecclesiastical jurisdiction and particularly asked that the bishop of Rome should only be judged by a council of bishops or by the emperor in person. Gratian in his rescript to Aquilinus the vicar (of Rome?) grants and confirms several privileges, but says nothing of the latter request. Some doubt hangs over the whole of these documents. (See Godefroy, Cod. Theod. vol. vi. appendix, pp. 17, 18; Baronius, Annu., sub anno 381, §§ 1, 2; Tillemont, Danus, arts. 10 and 11; Greenwood, Cathedra Petri, vol. i. pp. 239–242; Hefele, Concilia, § 91, does not even hint at the existence of these documents.)

In consequence of the success of the council of Aquileia St. Ambrose was anxious to call together an ocumenical assembly at Rome to settle the dispute between Nectarius and Maximus, who both claimed the see of Constantinople, and pressed the emperor Theodosius on the point (Epist. 13 and 14). Theodosius, however, naturally viewed this interference with coldness (Theodoret, v. 8, 9). A council, nevertheless, met at Rome, but without doing much beyond condemning the Apollinarians.

On his return to Milan St. Ambrose took leave of the young emperor for the last time. Their intercourse had been always tender and affectionate, and was (as we have seen) the last thought of the emperor's before his death. We may here mention an instance of St. Ambrose's conduct with respect to Gratian, which may have been at this or at any other period of their friendship (De Broglie, to make a point, puts it here, vol. vi. p. 45, but neither Paulinus, § 37, nor Sozomen, vii. 25, gives any hint of the date). A heathen of quality was condemned to death for abusing Gratian and calling him an unworthy son of Valentine. As he was being led to execution, Ambrose hurried to the palace to intercede for him. One Macedonian, master of the offices, it would seem ordered the servants to refuse him admittance, as Gratian was engaged in his favourite sport. Ambrose went round to the park gates, and entered unperceived amongst the huntsmen, and never left Gratian till he had pleaded his cause to a Council which those of his courtiers and obtained remission of the sentence. "The time will come," he said to Macedonus, "when you will fly for asylum to the church, but the church doors will be shut against you." (Paulinus, Vita S. Ambrosii, 37.)

The anecdote of the criminal is told by Sozomen, i. c.; the words to Macedonus are given by Paulinus. [J. W.]

GRATIANUS (6), made emperor by the soldiers in Britain in 407, as successor to Marcus. He retained power for four months, when he was put to death and succeeded by Constantine. (Soc. E. ix. 11; Zosim. vi. 2; Oros. vii. 4; Bede, i. 11; Olympiodorus, ad init.)


GRATIANUS (8) (Gratianus), bishop of Panormum (Palermo), c. 451. He was at the council of Chalcedon in that year. He is said to have been succeeded by Mamilianus. (Pirri, Scil. Sacr. i. 15.) [R. S. G.]

GRATIANUS (9), bishop of Toulon, said to have been martyred by Euric king of the Visigoths about the year 472 (Gall. Christ. i. 741). [R. T. S.]

GRATIANUS (10), eighth bishop of Orleans in the latter part of 5th century (Gall. Christ, viii. 1413). [R. T. S.]

GRATIANUS (11), second bishop of Dax, the first having been St. Vincent, though at what date is unknown. He was present at the council of Agde in a.d. 506. The authors of the Gallia Christiana quote from an old breviary of the church of Dax to the effect that when peace was at length restored to the church, and unbelievers banished or converted, he turned his whole attention to the restoration of the church of St. Vincent, which had been defiled by the superstition of the heathen, and restored it to the services of the true God. (Gall. Christ. i. 1038; Manet, viii. 337.) [S. A. B.]

GRATIANUS of Numentum. [Gratiosus (2).]

GRATIANUS (12), bishop of Novara, who signed the second epistle of pope Agatho in 680. (Manet, xi. 307; Hefele, § 314.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRATIANUS (13), bishop of Velitri (Veltrui), c. A.D. 621, subscribed a decree of Paul I. (Manet, xii. 645; Patr. Lat. lxix. 1194; Casparelli, Le Chiese d'Ital. i. 460.) [R. S. G.]

GRATIDIUS (14), bishop of Cerasus, in Pontus, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (Manet, vi. 571 e.). He signs the epistle of the Pontic bishop to the emperor Leo as Gratianus (Manet, vii. 605; Le Quien, O. C. i. 513.) [C. H.]
GRATIANUS—Aug. 12. Martyr in the Diocletian persecution with the virgin Felicissima at Faleone, a city of Piacenza, or according to Baronius at Falerium (Civita Castellana). Ferrarius (Cat. SS.) tells us that their bodies were preserved at Civita Castellana, and honoured there. Their acts are very corrupt and worthless in a historical point of view. (Mart. Usuard.; Acta SS. Boll. Aug. ii. 728.)

G. T. S.

G. T. S.

GRATIANUS, bishop of Egabro (Cabra), from a.d. 681 to 687, present at the thirteenth council of Toledo, a.d. 683. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 287; Exp. Supr. xlii. 30.) [Sinaguus.] [M. A. W.]

GRATIOSUS (1), thought to have been bishop of Numana or Umbrana (Umano), present at the council held at Rome by Gregory the Great, a.d. 595. (UgHELLi, Itali. Soc. i. 743; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. iv. i. 79, 191.) But Numentum is the reading of the see in Mansi, x. 486. Vذ. following article. [R. S. G.]

GRATIOSUS (2) (GRATIANUS), bishop of Numentum (La Montana). Gregory the Great writes to him to unite with his see that of St. Anthemius in Curium Sabinorum territorio, on account of the desolation of the church and deficiency of inhabitants. (Lib. iii. indit. xi. Ep. 20.) He was present at the Roman synod of 595, which dealt with the service of the pope, the goods of the church, &c. Also at the synod of 601, which tended to free monasteries from episcopal control. These are separate synods, according to Hefele, § 288, § 289. According to Jaiffe, from a consideration of the signatures, there was only one synod in 595. (Mansi, x. 1292, x. 486; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital., i. 587, 598.)

G. A. H. D. A.

GRATIOSUS (3), according to the legendary history of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, was the fourth abbot of that house; succeeding Ruinanus in 628. He was, according to the same story, a Roman by birth, elected according to the command of Augustine from among the monks of the monastery, the licence having been previously obtained from King Eadbald, and received the benediction from archbishop Justus. He is said to have received Paulinus on his return from Northumbria with many honours, and to have died in 638. Elmham gives his epitaph. (Elham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 3, 4, 155, 173, 174; Thorn, Chr. ap. Twydon, cc. 1768, 1769; Mon. Angli. l. 120.) [S.]

G. A. H. D. A.

GIRATOSUS (4), bishop of Naples, succeeded Caesarius either a.d. 638 or 641, held the see for seven years, and was succeeded by Ensebbenus either a.d. 646 or 649. (UgHELLi, Itali. Soc. vi. 84; Chioccarelli, Antill. Neapol. Eccles. p. 65.) [R. S. G.]

G. A. H. D. A.

GRATIOSUS (5), bishop of Neapel. Present at the Lateran synod under Martin in 649, which condemned the Monothelite heresy. (Mansi, x. 867; Hefele, § 307.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRATIOSUS (6), bishop of Parma, signed the second epistle of pope Agatho which was sent in 680, after a synod in Rome, to the third council of Constantinople. (Mansi, xi. 315; Hefele, § 314.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRATIOSUS (7), bishop of Sutriam. He subscribed the synodal letter addressed to the council of Constantinople, a.d. 680, from Rome by Agatho. (Mansi, xi. 314; UgelLii, Itali. Soc. l. 1273; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. vi. 225.) [T. S. G.]

GRATIOSUS II. [GAUDIOSUS (13)].

GRATIOSUS (8), bishop of Novara, c. 730. A petition by one Rodolaid (Dec. 730), living "in vico Gassino," to Gratiosus, twenty-sixth bishop of Novara, for the consecration upon altar, is given in the Historia Patris Monum. Turin. (Chartarum, vol. i. 18, 19. See also Troyes, Cod. Dipl. iii. p. 511.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRATIOSUS (9), bishop of Velletri, subscribed to a letter of pope Paul I. in June, 761, to the abbot John about the privileges of the monastery of St. Stephen and St. Sylvester in Rome. (Mansi, xi. 649; Jaiffe, Regesta Pont. 195.) He was also present at the Roman synod under Zacharias in 745 for the condonation of the heretics, Adalbert and Clement, at the request of Boniface. (Mansi, xii. 380; Hefele, § 367.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRATIOSUS (10), archbishop of Ravenna 785 or 786 to 788 or 789. Agnellus says that Charles the Great came to Ravenna in his time. If Charles came at all, it must have been on his return from Rome in 787, and this may account for his asking pope Hadrian for mosaics for marble from the palace of Ravenna (Codr Carolinici, Jaiffe, ep. 90, ann. 781-791). Gratiosus had been abbot of the monastery of St. Apollinaris and archdeacon. He was buried in the church of St. Apollinaris in Classis. (Agnell., Liber Pontificial. Eccl. Rav. 164-166 in Monum. Rerum Ital. et Langob. 1878, p. 383.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRATISMUS, bishop of Tridentum (Trent), c. a.d. 499 to 538. (Finizio, Chron. di Trent, p. 61.) [R. S. G.]

GRATISSIMUS, grand chamberlain under the emperor Leo I. He founded at Constantinople a church dedicated to St. Cyriacus, with a monastery attached to it, in which he himself became a monk (Theophan. Chronogr. sub ann. 469). He appears to have still retained his office of grand chamberlain (cf. Theod. Lact. H. E. lib. i. § 17, p. 567 in Migne, Patrol. Gr. lxxxvi. pt. i. 174). [M. F. A.]

GRATUS (1), bishop of Carthage, a.d. 343-353, in which see he succeeded Rufus, the successor of Caecilian. He was present at the council of Carthage, a.d. 347, and was spoken of by Hosius, the president, in a manner which his subsequent conduct at the council of Carthage, a.d. 348 or 349, shows to have had a meaning beyond that of mere compliment. Tillemont suggests that he took advantage of his journey to Sardica to persuade the emperor Constant to send Paul and Macarius into Africa (vol. i. 883). The council of Carthage was summoned by Gratius, as primate of Africa, and was held to discuss chiefly the questions of Donatism in general, "tradition," and rebaptism, and as president he conducted the business with great judgment and prudence. He is styled satis by Ferrandus, and his name appears to have been commemorated in the African calendar on
GRATUS

May 5, but not expressly under the title of saint. (Bruno, Conc. i. 95; 111-117; Tillemont, 45, 51, vol. vi. pp. 110, 124-128, 714; Bingham, vol. i. p. 201; Morelli, Africa Christ. ii. 242-256; Ribbeck, Dom. und Aug. p. 146.)

[H. W. P.]

GRATUS (2), deacon of Forum Livii (Forlì), under its bishop, St. Mercurialis, who probably lived c. A.D. 359. He is said to have miraculously restored the sight of a certain Marcellus. (Boll. Acta SS. 20 Mar. iii. 85; Ughelli, Ital. Sac. II. 614.)

[R. S. G.]

GRATUS (3), bishop of Forum Popilii (Forlimpopoli). He is said to have succeeded the first bishop, St. Rufillus, c. A.D. 382. He was certainly living A.D. 409, about which time his church and people suffered greatly from the incursions of Alaric. (Ughelli, Ital. Sac. ii. 642; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. ii. 440.)

[R. S. G.]

GRATUS (4), a presbyter who represented Eustathius, bishop of Aosta, in the council held under Eusebius of Milan in A.D. 451 (Leo Mag. ep. 98, p. 1083, in Patr. Lat. iv. 948 b). He was probably the successor of this Eustathius in the see of Aosta, and is also probably identical with the St. Gratus or St. Gradus, bishop of Aosta (q. v.).

[C. G.]

GRATUS (4), ST. (GRADUS), bishop of Augusta Presoria (Aosta), patron saint of the cathedral, where his relics are preserved, much venerated in that and neighbouring places. A decree of the bishop of Aosta in 1407 assigns special distinctions to the commemoration of his death on Sept. 7. For reputed miracles performed by his relics see Bolland Acta SS. Sept. 7, pp. 72 c, 73 a/c.

There exist Acta of this saint which make him contemporary with Charles the Great, but they are rejected on all hands as absolutely fabulous and unhistorical. Many authorities, however (recently Gams, Series Episc. p. 828), place him in the end of the 8th century. The Bollandists on the other hand (with Potthast and others) throw him back into the 5th century, and make him identical with Gratus presbyter (q. v.), whom they suppose to have succeeded Eustathius as bishop of Aosta. Some of the details in the fabulous Acta seem to tally with this view, as the mention of a council of Chalcedon, of a pope Leo (Leo III. the Acta say), and the finding of the head of John the Baptist (said to have occurred in 452). Moreover the Acta of SS. Mauritius and his comrades (the Thebaean Legion) record that a bishop Gratus of Aosta assisted at the translation of the relics of St. innocent, one of that band, the discovery of which is put by the Bollandists at the end of the 8th century. (See Bolland. Acta Sanct. September, iii. pp. 73-6; Gall. Chr. xii. 806.)

[C. G.]

GRATUS (5), a deacon of Provence, who composed a treatise (Scriptarum) on the nature of Christ, which he wrote in Greek, and which was not apparent. He sent it to Faustus, abbot of Lerins, for his opinion, who, in the sixth of his letters addressed to Gratus, severely criticizes it, and its author (Migne, Patr. Lat. Iviii. 853). The treatise itself has not come down to us, but the reply is mentioned by Gennadius, who speaks of Gratus as one who had separated from the Catholic faith and became a Nestorian. (De Viris Illust. lxxv. Migne, ut supr. lviii. 1108.)

[8. A. B.]

GRATUS (7), bishop of Oleron, attended the synod of Agde, an. 506 (Mansi, viii. 337 b), and is perhaps the same with St. Gratus commemorated as a martyr in the diocese of Redon. (Gall. Chr. i. 1263; Boll. Acta SS. Oct. 17 and Oct. 15.)

[R. T. B.]

GRATUS (8), ST., thirteenth bishop of Châlon-sur-Saône, succeeding Gellonius or Gederinus, and followed by Desideratus (Dido), was present at the council of Châlons, the date of which has been variously placed between 844 and 850. (Labbe, Sac. Conc. x. 1194, Flor. 1759-98.) This is really the only fact we know of him, as his life, written after the close of the 10th century, is plainly in great part, if not altogether, fabulous. It was published by Perry and Cusset, from an old Legendarium of the church of Châlons, and is to be found in Boll. Acta SS. Oct. iv. 296. The authors of the Acta Gelloniuy (v. 846) wish rather an attempt to separate the fact from the fable. It relates that upon the death of Gederinus, Gratus, being a man of high rank, was unanimously elected to the see, and consecrated by the archbishop of Lyons and his suffragans. Like his predecessors, he was, according to this author, unable to live in the city from fear of the heathen, and had his abode at a place called Martyrmouth, now the suburb of St. Lawrence, across the Saône, near which the church of St. Laurence had been lately constructed. But on the sabbath it was his wont to cross the stream and officiate in the great church of the city. On a certain Sunday it happened that he was much beset by worldly cares, and was crossing the bridge later than usual, and when in the middle of it he heard the words, "Io, missa est" as it were spoken by an angel. Terrified at the omen, and imputing his delay to sin, he drew the ring from his finger, and throwing it into the river, vowed that until the waters gave it up again he could not be called a true shepherd of his flock. Returning to the church of St. Laurence, he built a cell in which he lived seven years in watchful and supplication. A neighbouring hut was occupied by his mother Celsa. During all this time his prayers were so potent a safeguard of the city, that the Saône and its tributaries forbore to drown any one, none were devoured by wild beasts, and no criminal died without first repeating and receiving the visticum. At the end of the seventh year the ring was found in the belly of a fish by the clerk who tended him, and the people hearing of it assembled and dug out their bishop from his cell in spite of his reluctance. He did not, however, long survive his release, but died Oct. 8, on which day he is commemorated. He was buried in the church of St. Laurence, but at the close of the 10th or beginning of the 11th century, his remains were removed, with the consent of Hugo, the bishop, to a newly-built church at Paredum (Paray le Moineau) on May 13. Pope John VIII. canonized him.

[S. A. B.]

GREALLAN. [GRELLAN.]

GREALLLOG OE BLECH, Irish saint. [GRELLLOG OE BLECH.]
GRECIANUS

GRECIANUS of Callium. [GRATIANUS (3).]

GRECELIUS (GRECELIUS), bishop of Llandaff, in the time of Meurgi son of Ithael, king of Glamorgan, late in the seventh or early in the eighth century (Lob. Llandaf. 416-422, 626; Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. Angl. 156; Godwin, de Praevul. Angl. 601). [J. G.]

GREDFIW, Welsh saint. [RHEDIW.]

GREDFIAEL, GREDIFEL, GREDIVEL (GREDIFIAEL, GREDEVEL), the founder of Penmynydd, in Anglesey. His festival is Nov. 15 (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 225). [G. W. B.]

GREGENTIUS, ST., bishop of Taphar in Arabia (of the Homeriatae). He is chiefly known as the supposed author of (o) the Leges Homeriatarum (see Patrol. Graeca, Ixxxvi. 568), and (o) the Disputatio cum Heribono Judaeo (621-784). According to the Greek menaees, Gregenti-us was born at Milan on December 18, in the second half of the 5th century (Gal-land. Ref. in Vet. Patr. Bibl. xi. 599); he lived for many years as an anchorite, and was finally sent by Proterius of Alexander as bishop of the Homeriatae. This account, which would date the episcopate of Gregenti-us from the middle of the 5th century, cannot naturally claim any strong historical weight. Little more can be said for the tradition which ascribes the two works above mentioned to him. Cellier pointed out several points of internal evidence which all attest against the genuineness, and, above all, the fact that the death and burial of Gregenti- us are narrated in the dialogue (Celli. xi. 379, and cf. Patr. Gr. Ixxxvi. 784). It is clear that great part must have been added by a later hand, if we reject Cellier's conclusion that the whole is the work of an anonymous writer. In the dialogue Gregenti-us finally convinces his opponent by a vision of Christ which appears in the midst of the result being the conversion and baptism of five millions of Jews. The Leges Homeriatarum deal mainly with crimes of violence and fornication, and are supposed to have been composed by Gregenti-us at the request of Abraham, king of the Homeriatae. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 663.) [J. de S.]

GREGORIA (1), 7th century, lady of the bedchamber to some Augusta who, from a comparison of dates (vid. Du Cange, Fam. Aug. 88), must have been the empress Constantina, otherwise Constantinia, wife of the emperor Maurice. She had enumerated all her sins with great humility to her confessor, but was afraid that God had not pardoned them. So she wrote to pope Gregory, saying that she would never cease to implore him till he had a revelation that her sins were forgiven. Gregory, whose letter is dated by Jaffé (Reg. Pont. 121) June 597, consoled her with the narrative of the woman who was a sinner, whom he seems to identify with Mary the sister of Martha, saying that believing her devotion to be not less than the love of that woman, he might fairly apply to her the same words, "Thy sins, which are many," &c. What she asked, however, he considered difficult and useless; on the one hand he was unworthy of a revelation, and on the other, she ought to lament her sins to the end of her life, rather than feel assured that they were forgiven. [Greg. Mag. Epist. vii. 25. Patrolo. Lat. lxxi. p. 877, § 868; Cellier, xl. 508.] [W. M. S.]


GREGORIUS (1), bishop of Agriumentum. That there was a Gregory in this see earlier than the more celebrated writer is generally agreed, but his exact period is doubtful. One account places him in the time of Valerian and Gallienus, cir. 260, making him figure in the martyrdom of St. Agrippina at Rome and afterwards at Agriumentum in the course of her translation (Cajetan, Viz. Sac. SS. i. 87). Pirri adopts this view and places him as second bishop, between Libanius and Potamio (Sac. SS. i. 692). Bolland in his notes upon Potamio discusses the question (Acta SS. 29 Jan. ii. 988). Another account makes him sent by Proterius bishop of Alexandria on a mission to Elesban king of Ethiopia, which would place him two centuries later. Perhaps this latter tradition is a confusion with that of Gregory II., who was known to have travelled in the East (see Patr. Gr. xviii. 549, note 59). [C. E.]

GREGORIUS (2), early bishop of Calaris (Cagliari) in Sardinia, probably between A.D. 253 and 303. (Cossus, Città di Cagliari, p. 56; Martini, Storia Eccles. di Sardigna, iii. 316; Cap- pelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xiii. 48.) [R. S. C.]

GREGORIUS (3), surnamed THAUMATURGUS, bishop of Neocaesarea in Pontus, cir. 233-270. He was born about 210 at Neocaesarea on the Lycus, the modern Niksar. He was the son of healthy parents, both of whom were both wealthy and noble. His early name was Theodorus, for which some explanation may be found in the fact that his father was scrupulously devoted to the worship of the pagan divinities. His son calls himself Theobalsamos (Migne, ed. Patr. Gr. vol. i.; Greg. Thaum. Orat. de Origene, c. 5). Christianity had made little progress in the neighbourhood of Neocaesarea even in the year of his birth. There is no incipient evidence that at that date there were only seventeen Christians to be found in the whole region (Greg. Nyss. Vita Thaum. Migne, Patr. Gr. xiv. 954). It was an unpromising field for the episcopal labours of the young missionary. Yet the extraordinary success of those labours, and the romantic details with which they were embellished by later hands secured for him the well-known title of Thaumaturgos. This epithet cannot be set down as exclusively due to the credulosity of the age, for as Lardner (Cred. ii. 42, § 5) remarked, such writers as Basil, Jerome, and Theodoret, to say nothing of Gregory of Nyssa, distinguished this particular bishop from all others as "a man of apostolic signs and wonders" (cf. Dr. J. H. Newman, Essays on Miracles, p. 233). No light is thrown upon his thaumaturgic renown by his extant writings, which are conspicuous for their philosophic tone, humility, self-distrust, and practical sense. He must have been a man of singular force of character and weighty judgment, or he would not have been credited with so much spurious literature. Heretics endeavoured to fast the
section of his name upon their own speculations, thus indirectly revealing the confidence in which he was held by all parties.

Theodorus (Gregory) stated that when he was in his fourteenth year his father died, and that about that time he passed through a remarkable spiritual crisis. He attributed the change of sentiment which supervised to "the Divine Logos, the Angel of the counsel of God, and the common Saviour of all." He left it, however, as doubtful whether the change consisted of a bias mysteriously given to him towards Christianity, or whether it merely issued in the circumstances which brought him into the society of his friend and teacher Origen. It happened that his mother suggested the pursuit of the science and art of rhetoric, and he rapidly gave promise of oratorical success. He was advised with this end in view to make a special study of Roman law, and with this object to become an alumnus of a celebrated school of jurisprudence then flourishing at Berytus in Syria. At this juncture it appears that his sister needed an escort to Palestine to join her husband, who was occupying a high position under the Roman government in that region. The young Theodorus (Gregory) and his brother Athenodorus took advantage of this opportunity to travel. They passed numerous cities on their way from Pontus, amongst others, Berytus. "My guardian angel" (says he) "on our arrival at Caesarea handed us over to the care and tuition of Origen." For a while, like birds in a net, they struggled to escape from his influence, to return to their home, or to fulfill their intention of visiting the schools of Berytus; but the converse of this saintly man and illustrious scholar, who was then providentially resident at Caesarea, enthralled them. The personal spell of the teacher was cast over Theodorus and his brother. During five years, he says, that he was submitted to the potent sway of this master; and the mental processes by which he was led to Christ, throw considerable light on the mind of Origen and on the methods of Christian education pursued in the 3rd century. These details are preserved in a panegyric on Origen, which before leaving Caesarea the young student pronounced to a great assembly in the presence of the master. They differ in several particulars from the statements of Gregory of Nyssa (Vita Thaum. Greg. Nyss.; Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. xlii. pp. 893-958). This father, in a florid narrative, represents Gregory as being a student of philosophy at Alexandria, and as being advised by Firmilianus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who was then visiting Alexandria, to make the acquaintance of Origen. The account of his stay lightly over his namesake's relations with Origen, and says nothing of his residence at Caesarea, but gives in considerable detail his life in Alexandria. Tillemont (Mémoires, iv. 320) admits that this is at variance with the express language of the "Panegyric," and suggests that Firmilianus, who had visited Origen in Caesarea during his young friends' residence there, and may thus have introduced them to Origen. Baronius follows Gregory of Nyssa's lead (Ann. 233, viii.), and assumes that the instruction received by Theodorus (Gregory) from Origen took place in Alexandria, that he then returned to Neocae- sarea, and that while there the remembrance of Origen and the advice of Firmilianus induced the young man to undertake a visit to Palestine in order to secure fresh direction from the great scholar (Ann. 233, xii.). All this is at variance with the express statements of the panegyric. This document has been preserved, and is an authentic and valuable memorial of the 3rd century. According to Gregory's own statements (Orat. de Orig. c. vi.), Origen enlaced his pupils first of all to the study of philosophy, which he recommended as a duty that we owe to the Lord of all, "since man alone of all creatures is deemed by his Creator as worthy to pursue it." "A thoughtful man, if pious, must philosophize," says he, so "at length, like some spark lighting on our soul, love was kindled and burst into flame within us, a love to the Holy Logos, the most lovely object of all, who attracts all to Himself by His unutterable beauty." "Only one object seemed worthy of pursuit, philosophy and the master of philosophy, this divine (θεός) man." His love to Origen was like the love of Jonathan to David, and without stint he poured forth at last in his presence his enthusiastic encomium. Gregory praises Origen for his Socratic simplicity, and for the art by which he made his teacher penetrate his inmost soul with questions, and pruned away his native wildness, and repressed his exuberance. He was taught to interrogate his consciousness, and critically to investigate reasonings and the meanings of words. First of all, Origen accustomed the young man to the study of the dialectic method of inquiry, and then, in Aristotelian fashion, led him to contemplate the "magnitude, the wondrouness, the magnificent, and absolutely wise construction of the world." He seems to have followed (strangely enough) the order of the sciences in Comte's classification of the branches of human knowledge. Thus, he began with "the immutable foundation of all, geometry, and then," (says Gregory) "by astronomy he lifted us up to the things highest above us." He reduced things to their "pristine elements," "going over the nature of the whole and of each several section," "he filled our minds with a rational, instead of an irrational, wonder at the sacred economy of the universe and the irreprovable constitution of all things." Those words and much more that might be quoted from the master from de Panegyric are a strange comment on the thetumaturgic actions which are freely attributed to Gregory. Morals followed physics, and emphasis is laid by Gregory on the practical experience by which Origen desired his pupils to verify all theories, "stimulating us by the deeds he did more than by the doctrines he taught." He urged upon them the study of Greco-philosophy for the sake of nearness to the master. The end of the entire discipline was "nothing but this: By the pure mind make myself like to God, that thou mayest draw near to Him and abide in Him." Origen advised Gregory to study all
that was written by the philosophers and poets of old, with the exception of the Atheists, and gave reasons for a catholic and liberal ecclesiastic, and, with a modern spirit, disclaimed the force of prejudice and the misery of half-truths and of fixed ideas, and the advantage of "selecting all that was useful and true in all the various philosophies and putting aside all that was false." Gregory then utters high praise of the way in which his master interpreted the clear and luminous oracles of God, and this remarkable sentence occurs (c. 15): "That leader of all (ἀρχηγὸς πάνω) who speaks in undertones (σήματι) to God's dear prophets and suggests to them all their prophecy and their mystic and divine word, has so honoured this man Origen as a friend as to appoint him to be their interpreter." The idea seems to have been borne in upon Gregory that the gift of interpretation is as much a divine charisma as prophecy itself. So great were the joys thus placed within the reach of his pupil, that he adds with rapture, "He was truly a paradise to us, after the exile of the paradise of God." He regrets his departure from Caesarea, as Adam might bewail his expulsion from Eden, having to eat of the soil and to contend with thorns and thistles, and to dwell in darkness, with weeping and mourning. He says, "I go away of my own will, and not by constraint, and by my own act I am dispossessed, when it is in my option to remain." This is clear enough, but Jerome (de Viris illustris, c. 65) says that the two youths were sent off to their mother ("remittuntur ad matrem"), or as it may be taken, to their mother country.

The influence of Origen's teaching upon Gregory and Athenodorus is confirmed by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 30), who says that the great scholar "seeing them excessively rapt in the prosecution of the studies of the Greeks and Romans, infused into them the love of philosophy, and induced them to exchange their former zeal for the study of divine things. But after being with him five years, they made such improvement that both, though very young, were honoured with the episcopate in the churches of Pontus."

Gregory of Nyssa describes Gregory of Neocaesarea as spending much time in Alexandria, and says, that before his baptism, while resident there, he displayed a high tone of moral propriety; that he was able to resist the advances of an impure woman, and frustrate her accusations. She was paid the sum of money which she demanded as the price of her intimacy with Gregory, but no sooner had she received it, than she was seized with all the signs of a demoniacal possession, from which Gregory's intercession alone delivered her, thus demonstrating his innocence. Gregory makes no reference to this circumstance, which bears a suspicious resemblance to other like charges brought in Alexandria against distinguished bishops. A residence in Alexandria may have occurred in the course of the five years during which Gregory and his brother were travelling in the eastern provinces. These five years were in all probability interrupted by the persecution under Maximinus Thrax, who reigned from July 235 to May 238. The peculiarity of this persecution was, that it was aimed at the great men and leaders of the Church. Origen may then have gone into retirement and left his pupils at liberty to travel into Egypt. If the baptism of Gregory was deferred until Origen was at liberty to return to Caesarea, that ceremony must have been delayed until the close of his intercourse with the great scholar, as it could not have occurred until the death of Maximin and the accession of Gordian in 238. Beckoning towards the five years, Gregory did not reach Caesarea before 233, and probably later; and did not leave the "Paradise" until 238 at the earliest, when he pronounced his Panegyric. This document is of interest from the testimony it bears to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the light it throws upon the faith of Gregory. Bishop Bull, in his Œconomia, has laid great emphasis upon the passage (Orat. de Origine, cap. iv.) in which the pupil of Origen offers his praise to the Father, and then to "the Champion and Saviour of our souls, His first-born Word, the Creator and Governor of all things, ... being the truth, the wisdom, the power of the Father Himself of all things, and besides being both..." (Greek νόημα) the most perfect and living and animate word of the primal mind." Bishop Bull is right in calling attention to the praenicene character of these phrases, and yet to their substantial agreement with the deliverance of the Nicaean fathers (Def. Nic. Creed, vol. i. p. 331). They should be taken into account in estimating the authenticity and significance of other documents.

Gregory had scarcely reached Neocaesarea when he received a letter from Origen (Philocalia, c. 13), revealing on the part of the teacher a most extraordinary regard for his pupil, whom he describes as "my most excellent lord and venerable son." Gregory is exhorbed to study all philosophies, as a preparation for Christianity and to aid the interpretation of Holy Scripture. He is thus to spoil the Egyptians of their fine gold, in order to make vessels for the sanctuary, and not idols of his own. He is then urged with some passion to study the Scriptures, and to seek from God by the light he needs. (Cf. Anti-Nic. Library, Origen's works, vol. i. 388-390, for a translation of this letter.)

Shortly after the return of Gregory to his native place, we are told by Eusebius that he became bishop of that city, and one of the most celebrated (Σαρδέβιος) bishops of the age (Eusebius, H. E. vi. 30, and vii. 14). The curious details of his ordination are referred to in Basil's Memoiricon Graecorum (17 Nov.), where it is stated that he was ordained by Phaedimus, bishop of Amasea. Called to this holy office from each other. We are indebted to Gregory of Nyssa for the romance of this and many other events in his subsequent career. Indeed, we have no other guide than the narrative of that father for the subsequent details of his life. Some of his most extraordinary statements are in a measure vouchsed for by Basil the Great, the brother of Gregory of Nyssa, and by Rufinus himself in the expansion of this narrative of Eusebius. The great historian himself revealed either his ignorance of the supposed facts, or his own good sense, by taking no notice of the bizarre and incredible stories with which the career of Gregory is overlaid. As the later father tells the story, the young and saintly student, on reaching his home,
was entreated by the entire population to remain among them as their magistrate and legislator. Like Moses, he took counsel of God, and retired into the wilderness, but he excelled the man of God in this, that, unlike Moses, he married no wife, and had virtue only for his spouse. Then we are told that Phaedimus, bishop of Amasea, sought to lay surprise hands upon Gregory, and to consecrate him by guile, but failed, and adopted the expedient of electing and ordaining him by prayer when he was distant from him a journey of three days. We are not told how Gregory became acquainted with this act, but we are assured that it induced Gregory to yield to the summons, and to submit afterwards to the customary rites. At this time, about 240, there were, as we have said, not more than seventeen Christians in the city and in its circumjacent territory. Gregory only demanded time for meditation on the truths of the Christian faith before accepting the solemn commission. This meditation issued in the supposed divine revelations which are the most explicit formulae of the creed of the Church of the 3rd century. Gregory of Nyssa admits that the revelation was made to the young bishop in the dead of the night, “after he had been deeply considering the reason of the faith, and blotting out of all sorts.” He saw a vision of St. John and of the mother of the Lord, and we are gravely told that the latter commanded the former to lay before Gregory the true faith. Apart from this romance, the formula which is attributed to Gregory, is undoubtedly of high antiquity, and Lardner (Credibility, vol. ii. p. 29) does not argue with his wonted candour in his endeavour to fasten upon it signs of later origin. It is singularly free from the peculiar phrases which acquired technical significance in the 4th century, and yet it maintains a most uncompromising antagonism to Sabellian and Unitarian heresy. Moreover, Gregory of Nyssa asserts one fact of considerable importance, that when he uttered his encomium, the autograph MS. of this creed was in possession of the church at Nicaæa in the 4th century. He adds that the church had been continually initiated by means of this confession of faith. Basil, moreover, confirmed this statement (Ep. 204, Bas. Opp. Paris ed. t. iii. p. 303), saying that in his tender age, when residing in Nicaæa, he had been taught the words of Gregory by his sainted grandmother Macrina; and again (de Spir. Sancto, c. 29, ib. p. 82), he declared the tenantry with which the ways and words of Gregory had been preserved by that church, even to the mode of reciting the doctrine. Moreover, Basil attributed to his influence the orthodoxy of a whole succession of bishops from Gregory to the Musonius of his own day (Ep. 204). In addressing the Nicaæans (Ep. 207, ib. p. 311), he warns them against twisting the words of Gregory. The formula must be distinguished from the εἴδεις τῆς κατὰ μήνα πίστεως, which is now found among the dubious writings of Gregory, but which no less a scholar than Labbe has con- founded with it. Labbe says that Bellarmine and Petavius had doubted the authenticity of the εἴδεις τῆς πίστεως, but he is wrong, as their scepticism is entirely directed to the other letter and very questionable production (see Bull, S. Iii.). It has been doubted by sundry critics, but the reasons are not convincing. Sandius says that Eusebius, Jerome, and Sophronius were silent about it. The silence, however, of Eusebius proves nothing; and the consequent silence of Jerome and Sophronius may be only regarded as one negative testimony, as Jerome followed Eusebius, and Sophronius was translator into Greek of sundry works of Jerome. God and His Father introduced it into his translation of Eusebius. This formula is given at length in the Vita Thaum. of Gregory of Nyssa. It is found in the Latin psalter (written in golden letters), which Charlemagne gave to pope Adrian I., and it is cited as Gregory’s by the fathers of the second occumenical council held at Constantinople, A.D. 553, by St. Germanus patriarch of Constantinople, and by numerous later writers (Ceillier, Autels sacrés, St. Græg. le Thaum. vol. ii. pp. 441, 442). A very important sentence which has been variously attributed to the saint and his biographer, follows the formula as given in the life of the Thaumaturgos. Dr. Burton, the editor of Bull, referred it to a passage in Migne, often by call attention to the fact that Gregory of Nazianzus (Orat. 10) refers to the closing sentences as the substance of the formula itself. It runs as follows: “There is therefore nothing created or servile in the Trinity; nor anything superincumbent, as though previously non-existing and introduced afterwards. Never therefore was the Son wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son; but there is ever the same Trinity, unchangeable and unalterable.” (cf. Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. x. p. 988.)

Great difference of opinion has prevailed among earlier and later scholars as to the genuineness of this document; thus Bingham, Bull, Cave, Tillemont (iv. 327), Ceillier, Hahn (cf. Dorner’s Person of Christ, A. II. 105), have defended it, and Lardner, Whiston, Münchener, Gieseler, Herzog (Altchr. der Kirchengesch. i. 122), contest it. Neander divided it into two parts, the one genuine revealing its Originensive source, and the other of later growth. Dr. Caspari has, in an appendix to his great work, Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufnamens der Griechen, 1879, defended it with great erudition and argument, and concludes that there is nothing in the formula incompatible with its being the production of a pupil of Origen. He shews, moreover, that it must have been produced between A.D. 260–265. Notwithstanding the Creed is as follows in Bull’s translation—

"There is one God, Father of Him who is the living Word, subsisting Wisdom and Power and Eternal lm press (εἴδεις τῆς πίστεως). Perfect Begotten of the Perfect, Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, Alone of the One, God and of God only, ǀmpress and Image of the Godhead, the operative Word; Wisdom comprehensive of the system of the universe, and Power productive of the whole creation; true Son of true Father, Invisible, Invisiblable, and Incessorable, and Incessorable, and Immortal of Immortal, and Eternal of Eternal. And there is one Holy Ghost, who hath his being of God, who hath appeared (that is to mankind, εἴδεις τῆς πίστεως, a clause which Greg. of Nyssa gives, but which is not found in some of the codices) through the Son, Image of the Son, Perfect God, Life, the Cause of all that live; Holy Fountain, Holiness, the Bestower of sanctification, in whom is manifested God the Father, who is over all and in all, and God the Son, who is through all. A perfect Trinity, not divided nor alien in glory and eternity and divinity.*"
withstanding the remarkable testimonies made by Basil to the orthodoxy of Gregory, and his reference to this creed, which his brother of Nyssa has preserved, an incisive remark by Basil in one of his letters (Ep. 75) to the Neo-
careanians, seems to admit that some of Greg-
ory’s teaching was not so successful in vindicating Gregory from the incisive use of phrases which Arians might boastfully claim. But Lardner (Ibid.) goes far too far when he speaks of Basil as vilifying Gregory. Moreover, if the ἔκθεσις πίστεως is genuine, we have a high testimony to the ortho-
dexy of Gregory. It is easy to call from the most Athanasian writers terms used of the humanized Son of God and to represent him the way applied by a particular author to the divinity of the Word. This is Basil’s excuse for Gregory. The doubtful phrases are said to have occurred in his discussions with Aeliam, a heathen, and may be accounted for, because the bishop was not then weighing his words dogmatically, but speaking in the heat of another controversy. It is, however, remarkable, that no extant docu-
ment, genuine or doubtful, contains the incul-
pated phrases. They are not found in the πίστει καθά μετοχαί, which moreover is charged with unmistakable indications of its later date, and contains expressions which reveal the activity of the Nestorian and Apollinarian controversies. Another work, written we may suppose near the commencement of his episcopate, was the Meta-
phrase of Ecclesiastes. This running commen-
tary on the old book is mentioned with approval by Rufinus (vii. 25), and Jerome (de Viris Illus.
c. 65, and Comm. in Eccl. c. 4), and may still be read with advantage for its sound ethical wisdom. It has been attributed by some to Gregory of Nazianzus, but the style is less ornate and more abrupt than that of that father, while numerous turns of expression to be found in the Panegyric on Origen are to be met with in this singularly modest and sensible commentary. It is now without reserve inserted among the genuine remains of Gregory.

There can be little doubt that the missionary labour of Gregory was great and successful, and that his personal influence was extraordinary. The Panegyric bears in which that influence is arrayed a century later need not blind us to the force of character of which it is the symptom. A few of the marvellous occurrences detailed with ornate and extravagant eulogy by Gregory of Nyssa, are referred to by Basil, his brother and his contemporary, and they doubtless fur-
nished Rufinus with the details which he intro-
duced. Thus Basil tells us (de Socratis Concilio, c. 29, Paris ed. p. 62: “that Gregory was a great and conspicuous lamp, illuminating the Church of God, and that he possessed, from the co-operation of the Spirit, a formidable power against the demons; that he turned the course of rivers by giving them orders in the name of Christ; that he dried up a lake, which was the cause of strife to two brothers; and that his predictions of the future made him the equal of the other proph-
ets . . . that by friends and enemies of the truth he was regarded, in virtue of his signs and prodigies, as another Moses.” But Gregory of Nyssa expands into voluminous legend the record of these deeds. It is to be noticed that, with the exception of the river, on the Calydonian, no reference is made, the panegyric of Gregory of Nyssa contains no verifying element. He does not favour his hearers with names, dates, or places for these astounding portents. They were, as Dr. Newman observes, wrought at such times and seasons as to lead to numerous conversions. They were described as well known facts in a hortatory address and in ecclesiastical gears. But they contrast very forcibly with the philo-
sophical bias of Gregory’s mind, and they are not mentioned or referred to until a hundred years after their occurrence. Some of the more remarkable are as follows:—The bishop was driven by stress of weather into a heathen temple, and by spending the night in prayer he exercised a great power, so that the next morning were unable to obtain their customary responses. This so enraged them that Gregory was threatened by them with numerous calamities, unless he freed them from their spell. The bishop is then said to have written on a parchment, “Gregory to Satan, enter. Where

upon the evil powers were once more at liberty to do their worst. But new applications were covered by the story, it would simply answer to the spiritualistic illusions and fraud with which we are now familiar, and the unwillingness of “spirits” to make their manifestations in pre-

presence of hostile witnesses. Two things should be noticed; the narrative implies Gregory’s belief in the heathen divinities as powers to be propitiated, as living entities, and it reveals considerable weakness of mind in setting free for

work a spirit whom he hailed as Satan, after having for a time at least bound him in a spell. The “miracle” is said to have led to numerous conversions, and to have been fol-

lowed by further manifestations, such as his power in moving stones at his bidding. This story is still further exaggerated by transmission, until the stone becomes a mountain in the Dia-

logues of Gregory the Great. The idolatrous priest became Gregory’s deacon and, according to Rufinus, his successor. The astonishment of the people was augmented by the bishop’s in-
difference to their applause. A great outburst of healing powers is said to have led to the con-

version of multitudes, and to the consequent erection of a Christian church. This during the reign of Philip, would not be remarkable, but according to Tillemont (Mém. vol. iv. 330), it was the first church of which we have express mention. It does not follow that it was the first

consecrated, although few definite references can be found of earlier date to a similar proceeding. The destruction of the church at Nicomedia, referred to by la Gravière, t. 1, p. 336). Gregory of Nyssa declares that this church was standing in his day, and that it must have been spared in the persecutions under Di-
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celian. It is also added that when every house in the city was damaged by earthquake, this building was uninjured. A similar preservation was accorded to it in the year 499 or 503, when a second earthquake produced wide-spread ruin. The following passage is in the epitaph of Nyssa's glowing rhetoric which reflects so favourably on Gregory's missionary and pastoral zeal, that I venture to introduce it. "Early in the morning crowds gathered at his doors, men, women and children, with aged persons and those who suffered from the bodily affliction of demons, or any other chastisement. In their midst he himself, in exact accordance with the need of each of those who had assembled, preached, questioned, admonished, instructed, and healed. It was by means of this that he attracted the masses of men to the preaching of the gospel, namely that sight corresponded with hearing, and it was through both that the tokens of divine power shone forth upon him; for their hearing was everywhere in his discourse, and their sight by his miracles of healing the sick. The mourner was comforted, the young man was taught sobriety, and to the old, appropriate counsel was administered. Slaves were admonished to be dutiful to their masters; those who exercised authority to be kind to their inferiors. The poor were taught that virtue is the only wealth, and that rich they were but stewards of property, and not its owners."

The celebrated story of the drying up of a lake is thus amplified by Gregory of Nyssa: — "Two young brothers who shared between them their patrimony each laid claim to the possession of a lake. Instead of dividing the property between them they referred the dispute to Gregory, who exhorted them to be reconciled to one another. The young men were, however, exasperated and kindled into passion as their hopes of gain grew stronger." Then this led at length to the resolve upon a murderous struggle for the right of possession, "when the man of God, remaining on the banks of the lake and continuing throughout the night in watchfulness, stood upon the water like that of Moses ... for, by the power of prayer, he completely transformed the whole of it into dry land ... so that no drop of moisture was lingering even in the hollows! and having in this manner, by the power of God, decided the controversy, he returned home, while the quarrel between the young men was settled by the fiat of deeds." (Migne's ed. Greg. Nyss. Patr. Gr. xlvii. pp. 921 and 929.)

Basil also refers to another story which his brother presents in discursive fashion, how Gregory altered the course of the Armenian Lycus by planting his staff in the bed of the torrent, which said staff became a tree, and effected a perfect gift of benefit to the neighbourhood. This "miracle" is claimed by Dr. Newman as possessing some of the characteristics of a true miracle, inasmuch as the name of the river, the site of the portent, and the memorial of its occurrence were all appealed to. (Essays on Miracles, p. 267.)

One of the most interesting facts introduced by his panegyrist has reference to Gregory's selection of an obscure person, Alexander the charocal burner, for the office of bishop over the neighbouring city of Comana. He was preferred to men of elegance and station by reason of his humble self-consecration to God, and he was ordained with customary solemnities. This Alexander justified the choice thus made by reason of his excellent discourse, his holy living, and a martyr's death. He is honoured in the Roman calendar on August 11.

Gregory is also credited with miracles of destruction. A Jew once asked alms to bury his dead comrade, who lay on the ground feigning lifelessness. Gregory is said to have thrown his cloak over the prostrate man as his dole. When the saint had departed, the Jew, intending to make off with his prize, attempted to rouse his companion with cries and kicks, but he was found to be really dead. Sozomen (H. E. vii. 27) cites a similar miracle as wrought by Epiphanius, and in doing so refers to this ghastly narrative. The great missionary success of Gregory and the rapid growth of the Church must have preceded the outbreak of persecution under Decius, in the years 250 and 251. The edict of Decius was ferocious, and when the edicts in the hands of sympathetic governors, it was cruelly carried out. [DECIUS.] Gregory of Nyssa gives a withering account of the persecution and its effects. Our Gregory advised those who could do so to save themselves and their faith by flight and concealment. His enemies pursued him into his retreat, but his thaumaturgic force was now used by him to assist his retirement, and they found in place of Gregory and his deacon two trees. This "prodigy" differs so profoundly (as do others we have mentioned) from miracles narrated in the New Testament, both in character and motive, that they form an instructive hint as to the ethnic and imaginative source of the whole cycle.

In 258 he returned to Neocesarea, and when, in 258, peace was restored to the Church, Gregory ordered annual feasts in commemoration of the martyrs who had been faithful unto death. He is credited by his biographer with the devout and wise decision of hoping to secure the allegiance of those who had been in the habit of worshipping idols, by arranging ceremonial in honour of the martyrs resembling that to which they had been accustomed. This time-serving is an unfaavourable indication of character, and does something to explain the melancholy defection from moral uprightness and honour of many of his supposed converts. The conversion of the heathen is said to have been greatly quickened by the occurrence of a fearful plague which was partly, at least, due to Gregory's miraculous potency; the story as given by his panegyrist is sufficiently tragic, and though the narrative closes the panegyric, yet the event is said to have occurred early in his ministerial career. It is as follows:—

"I shall revert to and narrate the event that took place in the early part of his priestly career, which my discourse has omitted while it has hurried on to deal with the rest of his miraculous deeds. There was a public festival in the city, celebrated with certain ancestral rites, in honour of one of the local divinities.

* Gregory of Nyssa speaks of him as the first bishop of Comana. This is doubtful, as Eusebius (H. E. v. 14) speaks of one Zoicus of Comana as concerned in the Montanist controversy.
To this nearly the whole tribe flocked, while all the country kept festival as well as the city. The theatre was crowded with the concourse, and a great crowd of people streaming in everywhere surged over the seats. All were eagerly watching their gaze for every sight and sound, and the building was filled with uproar. The performers were unable to exhibit their marvels, while the confusion among the crowded sightseers not only interfered with the enjoyment of the music, but did not give the conjurors a chance of exhibiting their merits from this noise. After the mob broke forth a cry calling upon the god in whose honour they celebrated the festival, and imploring that he would create ample room for them. And as every man shouted this with his neighbour the cry was borne aloft, and the exclamations which conveyed this prayer to the divinity seemed to come from the whole city as from a single throat. And the prayer was—you could hear its very words—"Zeus, make room for us!" And when the great Gregory heard the shout of those who cried out to the name of the god from whom they desired a wide space to be created in the city, he sent to them one of those who stood by him and said, 'There shall be granted you larger room than you pray for or have, for had it been the will of God and Christ, like some grim utterance, were conveyed away to the crowd, a pestilence succeeded to that sacred public festival. At once lamentation was mingled with the dances, so that they found their mirth changed to sufferings and calamity. Instead of the music of the pipes, and the clashing of the cymbals, wailing dirges pervaded the city. When the disease had once attacked the population it passed through them faster than they anticipated, devouring their homes like fire. The temples were filled with those who were struck down by the plague, and had fled thither in hope of being healed. The springs, watercourses, and wells, were choked up with the bodies of men consumed with thirst in the agony of the disease. The disaster which produced a multitude of other calamities, yielded to the prayers of Gregory. This led to numerous conversions. The ravages of pestilence were not, however, confined to Pontus. Similar disasters affected Upper Egypt, as may be gathered from the letters of Dionysius of Alexandria. (Euseb. H. E. vili. 17; cf. Baron. Ann. 256. x.)

We are not surprised to hear that at the death of Gregory of Neoacaera, the number of heathen who now remained in his diocese had dwindled to seventeen, a number which exactly corresponded with the number of Christians to be found there, when Phaedimus consecrated him to the episcopal office. (Vit. Thaum. l.c. p. 954.) But the Christianity of the Neoacaeraeans must have been in many cases of a very imperfect kind, if we may judge from one of the most authentic documents which is referred to his pen, and entitled Epistola Canonica S. Gregorii ... de his qui in barbarorum incursione idololycy comederanter, et alia quaedam spectacì commissnerunt. Jerome and other writers speak of the "letters" of Gregory, and by the council in Trullo, A.D. 690, the document in question is cited by the above name. Theodorus Barison has appended to each of the eleven canons into which it was divided. Numerous authorities, Dodwell (Dissertationes in Oprium) , Ceillier (l. c. p. 444), question the genuineness of the last, the eleventh, of these canons, but the conviction widely prevails that the previous ten are genuine. They refer to the circumstances by which followed the ravages of the Goths and Borisdi, who ravaged Pontus and Asia Minor generally during the reign of Gallienus, and who committed gross indecency, and carried away Christian captives. Nicephorus (vili. c. 33; cf. Baron. Ann. 263, xxiii.) enlarges on the diffusion of the gospel consequent upon this holy war, and the conversions and discourse of the captives; be that as it may, the disorder which prevailed tempted numerous Christians in Pontus to flagrant acts of impiety and disloyalty. They took possession of the goods of those who had been dragged into bondage, and for selfish purposes actually restored to their captors those who had escaped their hands. Others identified themselves with the barbarians, making common cause with them, actually helping the heathen in their uttermost cruelty towards their brethren.

These facts are gathered from the "canons" in which Gregory denounced strenuously the commission of such crimes, and assigned to them their ecclesiastical penalty. The bishop shows his compassion upon these wretches, who gulled over the mere ceremonial uncleanness that might follow from enforced consumption of meat that had been offered to idols, and by exonerating from blame or any ecclesiastical anathema women who had, against their will, lost their chastity. He lays, however, great emphasis on the vices and greed of those who had violated Christian morality for the sake of gain and personal advantage. Different degrees of penality and exclusion from church privilege were assigned, and those were argued on ground of Scripture alone. The epistle containing these canons was addressed to an anonymous bishop of Pontus, who had asked his advice on the subject, about the year 258. It must have been written, therefore, towards the end of his episcopate. It reveals the importance and character of the whole series of conversions that had followed his remarkable ministry. The eleventh canon is not found in the edition of Zonaras, though Basilamon has commented upon it. The canon contains referents to four classes of penitents, with a technical detail, which, in the opinion of Catholic theologians, belongs to a later date.

Other works have been attributed to Gregory, but they have failed to make good their claim. Such, e.g., as ekdysis tis kata marios eisotinen, which Vossius published in Latin in 1629, among the works of Gregory, and which Cardinal Mai (Scip. Vet. vii. p. 170) has presented in Greek from the Codex Vaticanus. It is given by Migne (l. c. pp. 1103-1123). The best interpretation of the title is, "a creed not of all the dogmas of the Church, but only of that opposition to the heretics who deny them." (Athen. Nicene Library, vol. xx. p. 81). It differs from the former confession in its obvious and technical repetition of Arianism, and its distinct references to the later Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies. Dr. Caspari (ib. cit. pp. 65-146) has called for the first time attention to verbally accurate quotations drawn from it in Theodore's Enarrates (Eπαρατον μετα παλινουφορον), three dialogues between Enarrates
and Orthodoxus, entitled severally ἐπιστολής Ἰωάννου, ἐπιστολής Ἐρώτημα, and ἐπιστολής (Thed. Opp. tom. iv. p. 76, pp. 170-174 ed. Schulz), and in his Demonstrations per Syllogismos. These quotations, however, were referred by Theodoret to Gregory but to a "little book concerning the faith," τε και προφανείας κάποιος, directly attributed by him to Athanasius. Varnings and corroboration of these quotations bestri. Thus the emperor Marcian (450-457) accuses the Eutychians and late Apollinarists of circulating the words of their founder under the pseudonym of the Fathers of the Church. Evagrius (H. E. iii. 31) mentions the same fact, distinctly specifying the names of Gregory of Neoceansa, Athanasius, and Julius of Rome, as being thus made use of. Caspari quotes several other testimonies to similar effect; and proves that the καὶ προφανείας κάποιος must have been written about the end of the fourth century, before the greatest Monophysite and Nestorian conflicts arose, when the strain of theological interest centred still around the doctrine of the Trinity. The recovery of the antithesis as a genuine exhibition of the thought of Apollinaris deserves attention. Caspari discusses the reason of Apollinaris in writing his "confession," the proofs of its unity, the grounds of its false attribution to Gregory. Other treatises and fragments given in the editions of his works, and also translated in the Ante-Nicene Library, are as follows:—Capitul dum de fide, with interpretation, attributed by Gretser to Gregory, ed. Ratisbon, 1741. Ad Titianum Deputatio de Animal, which must have been written by a mediaeval philosopher at a time when the philosophy of Aristotle was beginning to exert a new influence (Ceillier). Four Homilies, preserved by Vossius, on "the Annunciation to the Holy Virgin Mary," and on "Christ's Baptism," are totally unlike the genuine writings of Gregory, they are surcharged with the peculiar reverence paid to the Mother of our Lord after the controversy between Nestorius and Cyril, and they adopt the words of orthodoxy current in the Arian disputes. Two letters, with a commentary on them, are also preserved. One is a comment on Matt. vii. 22-29, from a Catenia, Cod. MS. and published by Galland, Vet. Patr. Bibl. xir. 119, and a discourse, in Omnes Sanctos, preserved with a long Epistola praeceps by Mingarelli.

The bishop of Neoceansa was present at the first council held at Antioch in A.D. 264 to consider the improprieties and errors of Paul of Samosata. His brother Athenodorus is also spoken of as accompanying him, and they are named among the most eminent members of the council. (Eusebius, H. E. vii. 28.) In consequence of the dissimilation of Paul, no sentence of deprivation was then passed. At the close of 269 a second council was held on the subject at Antioch, at which a Theodorus was present. If this name is used for Gregory, he may not have died before 270. There is nothing known positively about the date of his departure, but his panegyrist tells us that his closing words expressed his regret that seventeen heathen should still be remaining in his diocese, a deep anxiety for their conversion, and a solemn injunction that no land should be purchased as his place of sepulture. He wished to carry the law of poverty out to the extreme letter. He was, however, buried in the church which he had built in Neoceansa. He was commemorated on Nov. 17 (Cal. Hippop.) and Nov. 23 (Cal. Arm.).

Editions of his Works.—The most noted have been those of Gerard Vossius, 1640, in 4to, and in 1822, in folio. They had been published in the Bibl. Patr. Coloniae, in 1614. The Pamphlet on Origen by Sirmond 1605, 4to. De la Rue included it in his edition of Origens Opera, vol. iv. The various fragments attributed to Gregory are all published by Migne. (Patri. Gr. vol. i.)

GREGORIUS (4), bishop of Cimna, in the province of Galatia Prima. His signature appears in the Acts of the council of Neoceansa, A.D. 314 (Labbé and Corrard, ii. 1488), and in those of the council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. (Labbé and Corrard, ii. 51; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 484.)

GREGORIUS (5), bishop of Portus August and member of the council of Arles, A.D. 314. (Routh, Relig. Sacr. iv. 95; Mon. Vet. Dom. p. 201, ed. Oberhür; Tillemont, 20, vol. vi. p. 47; Mansi, i. 477; Ugh. Ital. Sacr. i. 111; Cappelletti, La Chiese d'Italia, i. 496.)

GREGORIUS (6), bishop of Berytus. He was the successor of Eusebius of Nicomedia in that see, and is by some called in his letter to the Lycaonians in this prelate among the bishops who had been condemned by Alexander of Alexandria (Thed. H. E. i. 5). He attended the council of Nicaea in 325 (Labbé, Concil. ii. 51).

GREGORIUS (7), ST., THE ILLUMINATOR (Gregorου Ὑλαυρούσχος), "the sun of Armenia," the apostle and first patriarch of Armenia, cir. 302-331.

Of the life and times of the founder and patron saint of the Armenian church the best is not the only authorities are Agathangelos, who was secretary to Tiridates king of Armenia the persecutor and afterwards the convert of Gregory, and Simeon Metaphrastes. A French translation of his fragments was printed in the first volume of the Historien de l'Armenie, 1867, by Victor Langlois, who has shewn that the work in its present form is a second and later edition of the original history of the reign of Tiridates and of the preaching of St. Gregory. This is evident not only from the incredibility of some of the events recorded, but also from the mention of people, such as the emperor Marcian, who lived after the time of Agathangelos. This improved edition is nevertheless of very early date, as it alone was known to Moses of Khorene, the Herodotus of Armenia, who flourished in the 5th century. The life of St. Gregory by Metaphrastes (Migne, Patr. Græc. cv. 941-996) is evidently drawn from Agathangelos. The silence of all Greek writers about St. Gregory is remarkable, though perhaps it can be accounted for by the position of Armenia in a far-off corner of the civilized world. Sozomen (H. E. ii. c. 8) incidentally mentions the conversion of Tiridates, ascribing it to a miraculous occurrence, but he says nothing concerning the human agent. The Rev. S. C. Malan has presented the subject to English readers by publishing, along with two other monographs of interest on the life of St. Gregory of Armenia, his life and works, and his correspondence. The life of St. Gregory by Metaphrastes, by Sozomen, and the works of St. Gregory by Agathangelos, are by far the most important materials for the compilation of a work on the life of St. Gregory of Armenia. The first of these, the life of St. Gregory by Metaphrastes, is the work of a man of genius, of a man who was the first to write the life of St. Gregory, and of a man who was the first to write the life of St. Gregory in the Armenian language. The second of these, the life of St. Gregory by Sozomen, is the work of a man of genius, of a man who was the first to write the life of St. Gregory in the Greek language, and of a man who was the first to write the life of St. Gregory in the Greek language. The third of these, the works of St. Gregory by Agathangelos, is the work of a man of genius, of a man who was the first to write the works of St. Gregory, and of a man who was the first to write the works of St. Gregory.
Armenia and Armenian Christianity, a translation of the life and times of St. Gregory the Illuminator from the Armenian work of the Vartabed Matthew, which is the main source of the following sketch of the saint's life.

Gregory was born in or about 357 at the city of Vahramashat, capital of the province of Ararat in Armenia. His father Anak, or Anag, was a Parthian Arsacid, of the province of Balikh, who, cir. 258, at the instigation of the Sassanian Ardashir (as Agathangelos and Moses of Khorene say, but it must have been his son Sapor I. as stated in Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. art. Tiridates III.), murdered Choreses I. of Armenia. The dying king commanded the whole family of Anak to be slain, but an infant was saved, and being carried to the Cappadocian Caesarea was there brought up in the Christian faith, and received at baptism the name of Gregorius. Gregory, after a training in the fear of God, was married by his foster-mother Mary, a lady of high rank, rich, modest, and pious, who bore him four sons, Vartanes and Aristages (or Rosstaces), the latter of whom succeeded him as patriarch of Armenia. After three years Gregory and Mary separated by consent that they might give themselves more fully to the service of God.

Meanwhile Tiridates III., cir. 284, or a little later, had recovered the kingdom of his father Choreses, by the help of the emperor Diocletian, whose favour he had gained, and whose hatred of Christianity he had imbibed. Gregory attached himself to him as a servant, and soon so endeared himself that he was raised to the rank of a noble. In the first year of his reign Tiridates went to the town of Erez (Erzeng) in Higher Armenia, to make offerings to Anahid the patron-goddess of Armenia; but Gregory refused to take any part in this idolatry, endeavoured to turn the king from his idols and spoke to him of Christ as the judge of quick and dead. The king was enraged, and determined to compel Gregory to join in the idol feast. Then followed what are known as "the twelve tortures of St. Gregory," which, in the exaggerated accounts handed down to us, are valued at forty years of imprisonment, at the amputation of a limb on the one hand, and for unsurpassed fortitude, humility, and patience on the other. After two years Tiridates, who, it is said, had previously been ignorant of Gregory's parentage, ordered the saint to be thrown into a muddy pit infested with creeping creatures, into which malefactors were wont to be hurled, in the city of Oedrashat, and there he lived for fourteen years, being fed by a Christian woman named Anna. In the story of St. Gregory there are a few traces like this of Christianity having existed in Armenia at a period earlier than his episcopate.

It is related that a community of religious women having in or about the year A.D. 300 fled from the neighbourhood of Rome in order to save one of their number, Rhipisime, from the designs of the bishop of the city. They migrated to the city of Valarshab, and built a convent outside the city of Valarshab. Tiridates being struck by the ravishing beauty of Rhipisime, had her brought to the palace. She managed to escape, but was overtaken and murdered, along with three-and-thirty of her companions. St. Gagane, the head of the community, suffered the same fate. By the judgment of God Tiridates, as the story goes, was transformed into the appearance of a wild boar, and his people were plagued. At length it was revealed to the king's sister that as a condition of relief Gregory must be fetched from the pit. This was done, and afterwards the king had him brought to Caesarea, and Gregory then preached publicly for sixty days to instruct the people, and to prepare them for holy baptism. After sixty-five days he narrated to them "his great vision" of the descent of One from heaven, grave and majestic, whose presence was of Light, and of three peleustas surrounded by three crossers of light. Upon his return to his order the people built three churches, one at the place where Rhipisime was murdered, the others where Gagane and the sisters fell, and he called the place Echmiadzin (the descent of the Only Begotten). The churches have given to the spot the Turkish name of Ulchi-Kilise (Three Churches). Some time about 302 Gregory was consecrated the first Catholicos of Armenia by Leontius the bishop of Caesarea and Cappadocia [Armenians]. His cathedral was in the city of Valarshab on the spot on which he had named Echmiadzin. He destroyed the idol temples, conquering the devils who inhabited them, i.e. the priests and supporters of the old religion, and baptized the king and his court in the river Euphrates. This national conversion occurred several years before Constantine in Rome had established the Church in the Roman empire, and Armenia was thus the first kingdom in which Christianity was adopted as the religion of the state.

Gregory practised himself and urged on others the reading of the Holy Scripture, both of the Old and the New Testaments. He also wrote letters to St. James of Nisibis, requesting him to compose homilies on faith, love, and other virtues. After filling the country with churches and ministers, schools and convents, Gregory in 331 retired to lead a military life among the caves of Manyes in the province of Taran, having previously consecrated his son Arisades bishop in his stead. Gregory died in the wilderness, A.D. 332, and the shepherds, finding his dead body without knowing whose it was, erected over it a monument of stone. Gregory is said to have been summoned to the council of Nicaea, but being himself unable to go sent his son, who brought back the decree for the Armenian church. The venerable patriarch at Valarshab greatly rejoiced at reading them, and exclaimed, "Now let us praise Him who was before the worlds, worshiping the Holy Trinity and the Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and ever, world without end, Amen," which words are added to the Nicene Creed when said in the Armenian church (Malan, p. 327, note). He is also said to have visited Constantine along with his sovereign (Nicop. Callist. H. E. viii. 55 in Migne, P. G. cxvi. 609; Baron. 311, xii., i.), a tradition which is magnified in the popular version to a visitation of the Holy Trinity and the Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and reception by Constantine and pope Silvester (Moses of Khorene, cap. 89 in Lusignois, H. de l'Arménie, ii. 128). In the last paragraph of the work of Agathangelos the writer asserts that he was an eye-witness of the things that he narrates, but if it is admitted that the existing work is a later recension, this sentence must have
been taken directly from the original. The Bol-landists have printed Agathangelos, and other lives of Gregory. (Acta SS. viii. Sept. pp. 295–413; Basil. Men. Sept. 30, in Migne, Patr. Græc. cviii.; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 1355, 1371.) In honour of her founder the Armenian church afterwards bore the name of Armeno-Gregorian. Saint-Martin gives 278 for the date of his consecration (Mém. sur l'Arménie, i. 486), and Lancelot the same (Historiena, ii. 327). Saint-Martin also places the death of Choeceros by Anak in 198 (Mém. i. 412), a date which must be far wrong. His festivals are—in the Ethiopian Calendar Sept. 18; in the Byzantine, Sept. 30; in the Armeno-Gregorian, Mar. 25, June 8, June 22. [L. D.]

GREGORIUS (8), THE CAPPADOCIAN, appointed by Arianizing bishops at Antioch in the beginning of 340 (not, apparently, of 339, as the Festal Index says), to supersede Athanasius in the see of Alexandria, on the ground that Athanasius had uncanonically resumed his see without any session of a council compelling the vacant see to be occupied by the council of Tyre in 335. The appointment of Gregory is wrongly assigned by Socrates (ii. 20) to the Dedication Council, which did not meet until 341. He had been a student in the schools of Alexandria, and had there received kindness from Athanasius (Greg. Naz. Ornat. xxi. 15). He was now to be installed by military power, under orders from the emperor Constantius. The announcement being made by his countryman the prefect Philagrius, the Alexandrian church people protested to the other magistrates and to all their fellow citizens: Philagrius replied by encouraging a pagan rabble, in combination with Jews and with countrymen carrying clubs, to attack the church of St. Qurinius, and to perpetrate various profane outrages, four days before Gregory's arrival, which took place on March 23 (cf. Fest. Ind.), Athanasius having retired to a place of concealment. Socrates wrongly connects with Gregory's intrusion the night attack described in Athanas. de Fugâ 24, which took place after the appointment of George, in 336. That Gregory was the chief instigator of the lawless, from the circumstances of his appointment; and although it could not be said of him, as of Pistas, who had at first been thought of for the post, that he had been deposed for overt Arianism, yet, as Athanasius says in an encyclical letter written at this time, his sympathy with the heresy was proved by the fact that only its supporters had demanded him, and that he employed as secretary one Ammon, who had been long before excommunicated by bishop Alexander for his impiety (Encycl. c. 7). Athanasius tells us that on Good Friday, Gregory having entered a church, the people showed their abhorrence, wherenupon he caused Philagrius publicly to scourge thirty-four virgins and married women, as men of rank, and to imprison them. Others were imprisoned on Easter-day itself; Gregory employed Philagrius to use violence to captains of vessels, by way of compelling them to convey his letters of communion: he accused Catholics before the governor for praying apart in their houses, and hindered them from being visited by their clergy. After Athanasius fled to Rome, Gregory became still more bitter: he persecuted the rightful bishop's aunt, and when she died he tried to deprive her of burial; he seized the doles of widows; he caused the duke Balainus to spit upon a letter of remonstrance written to him by "Father Antony" (Athan. Hist. Art. 13). We hear of him as "oppressing the city," in 341 (Fest. Ind.). Auxentius, afterwards Arian bishop of Milan, was ordained priest by him (Hilar. in An. 8). The council of Sardica, at the end of A.D. 343, pronounced him never to have been, in the church's eyes, a bishop (Hist. Art. 17). He died, not by murder, as Theodoret says, ii. 4, through a confusion with George, but after a long illness (Fest. Ind.), about ten months after the exposure of the Arian plot against bishop Euprates, i.e. about February, A.D. 345. This date, gathered from Athanasius, Hist. Art. 31, is preferable to that of the Index, Epil. 2 = June 26, 346. [W. B.]

GREGORIUS (9) II., fourth patriarch of greater Armenia, grandson of Gregory the Illuminator, succeeding Verthanes and occupying the see for eleven years, c. A.D. 347–58. According to another account he was the fifth patriarch, having succeeded his brother Hosyrius or Josue. He is said to have carried the gospel to the Albanenses, a tribe on the Caspian sea, amongst whom he suffered martyrdom. (Galanus, Hist. Armenia, cap. 5; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1574.) [L. D.]

GREGORIUS (10), bishop of Cassena c. A.D. 361. He is said to have been a native of Ticinium (Pavia). He died as a martyr A.D. 361; probably in the persecution of Julian. (UgHELL, Ital. Sacr. ii. 453; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. Sacr., ii. 5236.) [R. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (11), bishop, an uncle of Ibas on the father's side. He exercised a pastoral care over Basil on the death of Basil's father, and Basil speaks of him with much affection. Gregory was present with other bishops of Cappadocia at Basil's consecration. About A.D. 371 an unhappy difference arose between Basil and his uncle, the circumstances of which, and Gregory Nysen's awkward and disingenuous attempts to heal the breach, are narrated elsewhere. [BASILIUS OF CESAERIA, Vol. I. p. 288.] (Basil. ep. 58, 59, 60, in Patr. Gr. xxxii. 408–410.) [F. V.]

GREGORIUS (12) BAETICUS, ST., bishop of Eliberi, Eivissa or Granada cir. 357–384. He is first mentioned as resisting the famous Hosius of Cordova, when under the persecution of Constantius Hosius gave way so far as to admit Arian bishops to communion with him. This must have been in or before A.D. 357, the year of Hosius's death.

At the council of Ariminum Gregory was one of the few bishops who adhered to the creed of Nicea, and refused to hold communion with the Arians Valens, Ursacius, and their followers. The authority for these statements is a letter to Gregory from Eusebius of Vercellae, from his exile in the Thebaid (printed among the works of St. Hilary of Poitiers, ii. 700, in Migne, Patr. Lat. x. 713). Eusebius there acknowledges letters he had received from Gregory, giving an account of his conduct, and commends him highly for having acted as became a bishop. He expels him to those who had fallen away, and
to rebuke the unfaithful, without fearing the secular power, and asks him to write and tell him what success he had met with in his efforts to reform the bad, and what brethren he had either found faithful, or had brought back to the character and conduct of Gregory. He maintains that Gregory was one of the bishops who fell into heresy at Ariminum, and supports his opinion by the following reasons: (i) The letter of Eusebius cannot be considered a witness in favour of Gregoryus, as the only evidence he had before him when he wrote it was derived from Gregoryus's own letter of self-commendation. (ii) Concerning further in which the Libellus Precum, c. 10, states expressly that he never suffered. Gams further identifies him with the Gregoryus who was one of the deputation headed by Bessistus of Cartaghe, who were sent by the council to Constantinian, in A.D. 359, and held communion with the Anian's leaders, Valens, Ursacius, and others (St. Hilary of Poitiers, Ex Opere Historico Fragmentum 8, in Migne, Patr. Lat. x. 702). His grounds for this supposition are the rarity of the name Gregoryus in the West till the 4th and 5th centuries, only one bishop of the name, Gregoryus of Portus, who subscribed the canons of the council of Arles, A.D. 313, being found in western church history before Gregoryus Baeticus, and the fact that Gregoryus must have been a young man in A.D. 359, which agrees with the description given by Sulpicius Severus (Hist. Sac. ii. 45, in Migne, Patr. Lat. xx. 152) of the deputation. (ii) The Syllenderino, who says "Gregetyus Baeticus, Eliberi Episcopus, usque ad extremam senectutem diversos mediocrem sermoct tractatus compreteguit, et de Fide elegantem librum, qui hodie superesse dictur." The last clause is generally considered to refer to Gregoryus himself, and to his book, and some MSS. omit the "qui," which would make this interpretation certain. In that case Gregoryus would have been alive in A.D. 370, the date of St. Jerome's treatise. Opinions have been much divided as to the book De Fide. The Bollandists (Acta SS. Ap. ii. 270) say "etiamnam latent." It was formerly supposed to be the De Trinitate already mentioned. Cellier (Auctores sacrés, iv. 348) and others consider it to be a treatise variously ascribed to St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ambrose, or Vigilius of Thapsus, in which the previous attribution to Phoebeus, bishop of Agin (Histoire Littéraire de la France, i. pt. ii. 273–276), and is printed among his works by Migne (Patr. Lat. xx. 31). Finally, Game, p. 314, thinks that the above-mentioned treatise, De Trinitate, though really written by Faustinus, is the work to which St. Jerome alludes. He considers that St. Jerome was misled by Gregoryus claiming the book as his
OWN, which, according to his notions, he had some right to do. The ideal of the early church, which Gregorius wished to restore, included the community of property, a system which of course extended to mental property, such as writings. He therefore, as head of the church, might assert a claim to the work composed by one of his followers.

It will be seen by the above account that the materials for a life of Gregorius are scanty, that the Liber Pontificalis, which mention him most frequently, is of very doubtful authority, and that widely different estimates have been formed of him. This article has endeavored to set out, as fairly as possible, the conclusions on both sides, with a sketch of the arguments by which they are supported. It should be remembered that Gams, from the favourable view he takes of Hosius, whom he does not consider to have fallen into heresy, is unfavourably predisposed to Gregorius, whom he regards as the author of what are, in his opinion, calumnies against Hosius. Had Gregorius really yielded at Nice or Ariminum, it seems improbable that the opponents of the Luciferians should never have used so telling a retort against them as he does in his letters. The two main charges of Arianism and Luciferianism appear to be mutually destructive. It may be further observed that it seems unlikely that so eminent a leader of the orthodox party as Eusebius, when he wrote to Gregorius, had no other information of the events that had happened at Sirmium and Ariminum, except that supplied by Gregorius's letter, or that the latter should have ventured to give an account of his behaviour, which was diametrically opposed to the truth, to a person who either knew already or soon would be informed of what had really occurred. Gregorius is commemorated on April 24.

[F. D.]

GREGORIUS I. L. bishop of Nazianzus in Cappadocia, father of Gregorius Nazianzenus [Guzzorius (14)]; originally a member of the sect of the Hysiptarini [Hysiptarini], who were numerous in Cappadocia, he was converted to the Catholic faith, married a lady of the name of Nonnus, and was soon afterwards chosen and consecrated bishop of Nazianzus, c. A.D. 328. He was a pillar of the orthodox party, though he was weak enough to sign the creed of Ariminum in deference to the emperor Constantius, A.D. 360. He took part in the ordination of Basil to the see of Caesarea [Basil, Vol. I. 287]; he opposed the attempts of the emperor Valens, A.D. 371, to overthrow the Catholic faith, yet he, as well as Basil, was spared the banishment that was inflicted on many of the bishops (Socr. iv. xii.). After an episcopate of forty-five years, he died A.D. 374. His son frequently mentions his good father, both in his sermons and his verses, and pronounced a funeral oration over him. (Gregorii Nazian. Oratio xviii. in Migne, Patr. Gr. xxx. 330; Le Quien, Orig. Chrest. i. 411.)

[L. D.]

GREGORIUS (14) NAZIANZENUS, bishop (370-390) of Asissa and of Constantinople. He has been fortunate in his biographers. He left them abundant materials in his works, especially in a large collection of letters, and an autobiographical poem extending to nearly two thousand lines. His life accordingly occupies a large space in all the chief histories of the church, and we have in addition the important monographs of the presbyter Gregory (13th century); vid. Greg. Thes. Opus. ed. Hildi, l. I. Gr. and Lat.; Surius, de Prod. Hod. S. Mai. p. 121, Lat.); of Baronius, with notes by P. Jebusch, in the Acta SS. 9 Mai. ii. 373; of Clemenschet prefixed to the Benedictine edition of the works; of Hermant (Paris, 1679); and in our own day those of Ullmann, and the Abbé Benoît. The aim of this article is to select from this mass of materials, and in particular from those which have come to us from St. Gregory himself, the facts which are of chief importance, and to present to the reader (a) an outline of the events of his life; (b) an account of his writings; (c) an estimate of his position as (i) a writer, and (ii) a theologian.

(a) St. Gregory takes his distinctive title from Nazianzus, a small town in the south-west of Cappadocia, which is not known to the early geographers, and owes its chief importance to its connexion with our author. The Romans gave to it, or a place in the immediate neighbourhood, the name of Dioceaseiri; but in the 4th century this name seems to have fallen into disuse, while Nazianzus, as the seat of the bishopric, became the chief. Close to Nazianzus, in a district known as the Tiberine [Ep. ii. Opera, ii. 2; S. Basil, Ep. iv.], was a village called Arianzus, where the father of Gregory possessed an estate, and where the son was born.

Both the parents of Gregory are known to us. His father bore the same name [Guzzorius (14)], and belonged in early life to the sect of the Hysiptarians [Orat. xviii. 5; Opera, l. 333]. The mother's name was Nonnus, a child of Christian parents [Philitius and Gorgonia], and herself praised by her son as a model of Christian virtues. To her life and her prayers he attributes the conversion of his father. A sister and brother are also known to us — Gregoria, probably older than Gregory, and the subject of one of the most touching of his funeral orations [Orat. viii.; Opera, l. 217-232]; and Constantia, who rose to eminence at the court of Constantine, and was in like manner the subject of an eulogy at his death [Orat. vii. Opera, l. 183-216].

The date of Gregory's birth is uncertain, as it depends chiefly on two vague references in his writings, which have been made to give more than one interpretation. He tells us, when speaking of Basil's quitting Athens—

και γαϊς ἀκείμενος τον καταγόμενον θρόνον.

*Ἡς τραπέζης μοι σχεδόν νοῦς* ήτα. Εὐκλ. Carm. xi. de Vīsi Sūrī, 328, 9. Opera, l. 687. Gregory the priest, followed by Papebroch (Acta Sanct. ut sup., p. 380 A) and others, understand these words to refer to a period of thirty years spent in study; but this meaning could only have been extracted from the Greek, or held in opposition to the whole evidence furnished by the life of Gregory and his friend, in order to support the statement, already put forth by Suidas (Ephyrēs, tom. i. p. 497), that Gregory died at the age of ninety or more in the thirteenth year of Theodosius, i.e. about 392, and that his birth is therefore to be placed in the opening years of the 4th century. Taking the words in their almost certain meaning they fix...
the departure of Basil from Athens in about the thirtieth year of Gregory’s life. Now we know that Basil left Athens [Basiliius, p. 283] about the year 355; we know also that Julian, who was with Gregory at Athens, was there in 355; and we get 325 as a proximate date of Gregory’s birth. He was a beardless youth when he went to Athens (Ἄγγελος παραδόθης, Or. viii. 112, Opera, ii. 650), and this would give a time, probable in the life of some ten or twelve years spent there.

In another passage he speaks of his father as trying to persuade him to become his coadjutor at Nazianzus, and saying,—

οὕτω τοιοῦτον εὐσεβέστατος ζύγον δια θᾶλα καὶ τοιοῦτον ζύγον δια χρόνον.
Carm. xi. de Vida Sui, l. 512, 13, Opera, ii. 700.

The simple meaning of these words seems to be that the period of the son’s whole life was less than that which the father had lived as priest and bishop, but not much less; and the resort to any other meaning seems due only to the difficulty which some writers have felt in admitting that Gregory, and, if Gregory, Caesarius, for he was the brother, was also with him, was dead after the father’s ordination. Paproech (Acta Sanct. ut sup. p. 370 έ) would read ἄγνωστοι (trade-winds) for θυσίας, with the sense, “Your life is not as long as mine,” or, according to his later suggestion, as if feeling that this correction would not hold, Σίδη λόγος, meaning, “Your life is not half as long as mine.” Of both emendations it can only be said that they are absolutely without MS. authority, and that a theory which rests upon such support is practically groundless. Stilling (Dissert. de Tempore Natali S. Greg. Naz. p. vi. in Acta SS. Boll. Sep. iii.), seeing that θυσίας, the reading of all the MSS., could not be displaced, found an escape in the insertion of a stop at the close of the first line—”You have not yet measured to the full such a life. The time of sacrifice is wholly passed for me;” or, as others would render it, “Have you not yet measured such a life? What a long time it is that I have been offering sacrifices!” But to all such renderings there is the fatal objection that a polished Grecian such as Gregory would not have used τοσοῦτον and δεῖς in immediate proximity except as correlatives. Clemencet suggests that “victimas eas intellegeris quam quilibet Christianus ex corde porro offret,” and is content to say, with Prudentius Maran (Vit. Basil. p. 38, col. 2), “Satius est cum Tillimontio fateri legem ecclesiasticam de continenti episcoporum nundam in omnibus omnino ecclesiis viguisse quam apertissimum locum ejusmodi conjecturam attendere,” though he significantly adds, “Recte, si prius demonstravi quem legem illum in Capadocia non viguisse, quod quidem probare non facile fuerit” (Vit. S. Greg., Opera, i. pp. lxxxi. lxxiii.; cf. Tillemont, Monumenta, tom. ix. p. 695). But we do not seem necessarily driven either to an alteration of the text or to the conviction that Gregory was born during the episcopate of his father. The words would be literally fulfilled if he was born at any time after the father’s ordination, born the privata hominibus, and there seems good reason to believe that a considerable period intervened between the ordination and the consecration. Gregory himself tells us (Orat. xviii. 15; Opera, tom. i. p. 349) that some short time passed between the bapt-
the Xoles because they have such a protector in heaven.

At Caesarea probably was commenced the friendship with Basil [BASILIIUS, p. 288, col. 2], which, tried by many a shock, survived them all; and was the chieftain of which moulded the life of both friends, and certainly chief among the influences which has moulded the theology of the Christian church. Basil went from Caesarea to Constantinople; Gregory and his brother went to Caesarea in Palestine to pursue the study of oratory [Orat. vii. 6, Opera, ii. 201]. Another reason, read by the chieftain, was the existence of the Holy Sepulchre, which had been consecrated in Jerusalem, and the Asiatic bishops, their own father perhaps among them, had been present in large numbers [Benoit, Greg. de Naz. p. 33]. Pilgrimages were already frequent, and a fresh impulse to them had been given by the supposed discovery of the True Cross. Morosus was until the time of Cyril, who was to succeed him, must have been already a man of mark. At Caesarea the brothers separated; Caesarius departing to Alexandria, and Gregory remaining to study rhetoric in the school made famous by Origen and Pamphilus and Eusebius. At the time, Thessalonica was the greatest renown, and Eusebius was a fellow pupil with Gregory [Hierom. de Eccl. Script. cap. 113]. The latter has celebrated the fame of his teacher in an epitaph which makes Attica ask "Who now possesses the glory of my art?" [Ep. iv. Opera, ii. 1109]. From Palestine Gregory went to Alexandria, which he speaks of as "uniatos kal ἐπιδότος, καλός τε καὶ νῦν ἀφέσιν τε καὶ δοξολογίαν ἐργάσσιμον" [Orat. vii. 6, Opera, i. 200]. Here Didymus now filled the chair of Pantaenus and Clement and Origen, and counted among his pupils the first young thinkers of the Roman empire; and here Athanasius filled the episcopal throne. Gregory does not tell us that he met either the great teacher or the great bishop, yet the latter's letter was an exile at the time. He did not remain long in Alexandria, for already he was within reach of Athens, the centre of the young student's hopes. His eagerness was not checked by the storm of season—it was about November, the worst month of the year—and a ship of Aegina, among the crew of which there happened to be some of his friends, offered him the wishful for passage [Orat. xviii. 31, Opera, i. 351]. When off Cyprus a fierce storm struck the ship. The thunder, lightning, darkness (τὰ κατωτέρας ἀνάλογα), cracking of the yards, shaking of the masts, cries of the crew, appeals for help to Christ, even by those who before had not known (δὴ ἀπὸ φόβου δίκαιος καθαρισμός), all added to the terror of the scene. Wors of all the ship was left without fresh water. To die of thirst or hunger seemed the fate before them when the fury of the storm should abate; but a Phoenician vessel came to their rescue and supplied their need. Still the danger was not past; the storm continued for twenty-two days, during which they saw no chance of deliverance. Gregory's chief fear was not death, but death without having been baptized. In prayer he dedicated himself again to God (Ὑπὸ καὶ ἀλληλομεταρθοῦν τῷ ἀγώνῳ), and sought for help. The prayer was answered, and the whole crew so affected that they received spiritual as well as temporal salvation. Passing by Rhodes they came to Aegina, and thence he went to Athens—"εἰ ἢς τοῦτο καὶ ἐξελθεῖν (Carm. xi. de Vitæ sui, 130–212; Opera, ii. 682, 3; Carm. de Indus sui, 510–540). Gregory has given another account of this storm in the funeral oration for his father [Orat. xviii. 31, Opera, i. 351, 359], when he refers to the danger as having given him to God—"καθ αὐτῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ῥά τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ διδαχόμενος ἐστιν ἡμῶν ἡμιόνοιο". The natural meaning of these words is that by their deliverance from the fear of dying unbaptized, seems to be that he and those with him then received the rite of baptism. So they have been understood by Baronius (Vit. § 17 in Acta SS. ut sup. 378 c), who is followed doubtfully by Clemens (Opera, i. lxxxviiii., and certainly by Benoît (S. Grégoire, p. 49). The priest Gregory states that the baptism took place and his return to Nazianzus (Opera, i. 133), and this is the view taken by Tillemont (Mémoires, ix. 334) and Hermant (Grégoire, i. 76). We have no data for determining more certainly whether the outward rite took place at this time or not; but that Gregory regarded it as the crisis of his life, being, and drew benefit from the rite to the God who had spared it, is beyond doubt.

Among the Athenian sophists of the day, none were more famous than Himerius and Proserenus, at whose feet Gregory continued the study of oratory. To the latter, who was a Christian, Gregory devoted an epitaph (Epit. v. Opera, ii. 1109), which bids youth flee from Athens, since great men were there no more; and Rome honoured him with a statue bearing the words "Regina Roma Regi cloqueintio" (Europia de Vit. Philosoph. et sohists); while Julian, also his pupil, would have exempted him alone from the proscription of Christian teachers, but that he refused to be exempted.

At Athens two arms of a river which had been diverted against the town met (Greg. and Basil), and now they were together again. What that meeting was to Gregory he himself has told us. Athens, with the party factions among the students of different nationalities, and theouting for fresh pupils on the part of every teacher's class, had proved little in accord with his gentler spirit. He had gone there to seek eloquence, and now found Basil; like Saul, who sought his father's asses and found a kingdom [Orat. xiiii. 14; Opera, i. 780]. He was able to render Basil various little friendly offices, which saved the freshman no small inconvenience. It was through his means that Basil was exempted from the rough practical joking which all who joined the Athenian classes had to pass through. [Basiliius, p. 283, col. 2] The Armenians, jealous of the new-comer, whose fame had preceded him, and with some of the old feeling of antagonism against Cappadocia, tried to entrap him in sophistical debates. When they were defeated Gregory felt that the honour of Athens was at stake, came to the rescue, but soon saw the real object they had in view, and left them to join his friend [Orat. xiii. 16, 17; ibid. 782, 783]. These
things are trifles, but they had important effects.

The two friends, rendered obnoxious to their companions, were bound the more closely to each other. Their fellow-students, for various reasons, bore various names and surnames. They were, as it has been said, partial followers of this kind of things in common, and became as one mind possessing two bodies (Orat. iii. 20, 21; Íbid. 785, 786; Carm. x. 221-235; Opera, ii. 687).

Among other students who were at the university with Gregory, was Julian the Apostate. Gregory claims that he had even then discerned the character of the man, that he had read it in his very looks; and that their fellow-students would remember how he used to warn them that Rome was cherishing a serpent (σὺν κακῶ δὲ Ἡρακλείου θρίφει, Orat. v. 24, Opera, i. 162).

Gregory must have spent a long time at Athens, not less probably than ten years. He went there, as we have seen, a beardless youth; he left it a youth of thirty years. No decade of life is as important as the fourth in a man's career. The receptive faculties are still fresh; the active powers are strong with their first energy. To the effect upon Gregory of those years at Athens the matter and the form of his work alike bear witness. But they drew to a close. Basil had already left, and Gregory would have gone at the same time, but the earnest entreaties of strangers as well as friends, superiors as well as equals, prevailed upon him; for only the strength of an oak could have resisted their pleadings and tears (Carm. xi. 245-262, Opera, ii. 685-688).

They apparently wished to retain him at Athens as a teacher of rhetoric (ὅς δὲ λόγων διδάσκητε χέ ψῆφων ὑπέτο, Íbid. 256), or, as Clemensct interpreted the words (note in loco), were willing to give him the first place among the teachers. It does not seem necessary to understand more than that the students gave him the first rank among themselves.

Leaving Athens then, probably about the beginning of the year 356, Gregory went first to Constantinople, wishing to see the new Rome before his return to Asia. The fact is important, as bearing upon his later decision to enter upon his great work there. Here he unexpectedly met his brother Caesarius, who was journeying to Nazianzus from Alexandria, and determined to continue his journey in spite of the attempt to detain at court the young physician whose fame had preceded him (Orat. vii. 5-9, Opera, i. 200-203). The mother had longed to see both her sons return together, and Gregory has left a touching account of her mourning.

The time had now come for entering upon the duties of life. Nazianzus must have expected much from the foremost of Athenian students, and in the ordinary course a career of distinction and preeminent would have been open to Gregory as an advocate, or a teacher of rhetoric.

He did not refuse to give his friends some specimen of his oratorical power. He danced a little and then quitted the stage (Carm. xi.; De Vita sūd, 265-275; Opera, ii. 689). It is at this point that some of the biographers, as we have seen above, fix his baptism. Gregory himself tells us that he now laid down the plan of his life. Every power he possessed—even that of eloquence itself—was to be devoted to God; but the way thus chosen seemed divided into two, and he knew not which to take. Friends could not help him, for they, too, were divided.

Elias, the sons of Jonasb, the Baptist, were types of the life that attracted him; but, on the other hand was the study of the Scriptures, for which the desert offered no opportunities; and the advancement of his profession, which seemed to be imperative duties (Ibid. 300-337). He resolved to seek the good and avoid the evil of both the practical and the contemplative life. The true monastic life is one of habits, not one of physical conditions (τὰς τοιμαίς ἓλθες ἐν συνενοίωσι, Íbid. 329). He resolved to live the strictest life of an ascetic, and yet receive the blessings of society and perform its duties (Carm. i. de Rebus suis, l. 65 sq.; Opera, ii. 683). Not even the pleasure of music did he allow himself (οὐ μόνος ἐναλλάς ἐν κρυβώμαι ὑπὸ διαθήκη, Íbid. l. 69). He found, however, that the details of domestic duties were little in accord with the cast of his mind. "Many cares fretted his body and his heart. To govern an estate was a very important matter (σὲν ἐκλέγετο ἐξ ζητούν). Not to be led masters, and not obedient to good ones, they excited the anger of both much more than they supposed. Then to look after property, here the harsh demand of the tax-collectors, go to law-courts, where the richer man gains the day even if he is wrong—such things a man can no more do all this without being the worse for it than he can go too close to a house on fire without being singed by the flame or blackened by the smoke" (Íbid. 140-164).

In the midst of these trifling irritations, which went far to mar the life he had marked out for himself, Gregory heard from his old friend Basil, who had followed the example of his own sister and mother, and after visiting Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Mesopotamia to compare the rival systems, had resolved to found a coenobitic system in Pontus (Basil. p. 264, col. 2). While students at Athens the friends had formed some such plan of common life as this, and Basil now asked Gregory to join him. He answered that he had not kept the promise to live together and lead an ascetic life (συναγωγαὶ σοι καὶ κυνηγοδεσφαῖον, because the higher claim of filial duties overrode it, but proposed to Basil that he should join them at the Tiberine, where the ascetic life in common could be followed, and the duties of home performed (Ep. i., Opera, i. 1). Basil did visit Arianzus, but remained only a short time. From Cæsarea he again wrote to Gregory. The letter is lost, but we have the reply, fencing a playful rillay on Arianzus in the same style (Ep. ii., Opera, ii. 3). More letters of a like nature were exchanged (Ep. iv., Opera, ii. 5-5), and after one from Basil describing the beauties of the place, and another describing the nature of the life and work, Gregory set out for Pontus. He was no drone in the busy hive. First in intellectual study and spiritual exercise he was no less so in self-denial and in manual labour (Ep. vi., Opera, ii. 4). One substantial result of their joint labours is preserved to us in the Philocelia, a series of extracts from the exegetical works of Origen. Gregory himself speaks of this work, which he sent as a present to his friend Theodosius of Tyana (Ep. iv., Opera, ii. 160). We know from Gregory's own words also that he took part in composing the
famous “Rules” of Basil (Basilii, p. 285, col. 1). It is not clear how long he remained in Pontus. Clemente thinks it was two or three years, and the supposition agrees with the general course of events, and with Gregory’s regret that he had not tasted enough of the life there to excite his longing for more (Orat. ii. 6, Opera, i. 14). The silence of Gregory with regard to his return may be due to another cause. Constantius had removed the bishops throughout the empire to accept the creed of Rimini (A.D. 358-60), and the bishop of Nazianzus, though bitherto faithful to the Nicene doctrine, did so. The monks of his diocese were devoted to Athanasius, and there followed a division in the church, which Gregory few could heal. To his father he was acceptable as a known theologian, and the father’s sin had indeed been one of ignorance rather than one of wilful heresy. To the monks he was acceptable as almost one of themselves. He induced the bishop to make a public confession of orthodoxy, and delivered a sermon on the occasion (Orat. vi., Opera, i. 179 seq.). If this division at Nazianzus occurred in A.D. 360, we have the account of Gregory’s second letter to Tillemon, Mémoires, ix. 345; Schoeck, Kirch. Gesch. xiii. 287; Ullmann, Gregorius von Nazianz. s. 41.) If with Clemente and others (Opera, i. pp. xiv. seq.) it is assigned to the year 363-4, under Julian or Jovian, rather than under Constantius, we must suppose that the return was due to the claim of titular duties which was again felt binding. In any case he came to Nazianzus, and received letters from Basil asking him to return to Pontus. Again there was an interchange of playful letters, followed by more serious ones. Gregory in reality depended on communion with Basil more than upon the air he breathed (Ep. vi. ad fin. Opera, ii. p. 6). His desire to return was soon to be fulfilled. The aged bishop felt the need of support and help, and no one could so fitly give it as his own son. He resolved therefore to overrule the scruples which made Gregory shrink from the responsibilities of the priesthood. We know that the ordination occurred on one of the high festivals, and it was probably at Christmas, A.D. 361 (Socrates, ii. 1021; Tillemon, Mémoires, ix. 352). Nicaeus assumes that the congregation was aware of the bishop’s intention, and that they compelled Gregory to accept ordination. Such forced ordinations were not unknown (Bingham, Orig. Eccles. iv. 2-5, and ix. 7, 1). Basil was in the same way made priest. But Gregory speaks of it in the calm of later years as tyranny, for he can give to it no other name—

(Carr. xii. 21, 2, 345-348; Opera, iii. 5.)

The father had known fully the wishes of the son, and the latter felt he could not bear the tyranny; but, as is so gored by some savages, fled from home and relatives, and went once more to Pontus to receive consolation from his friend (ibid. 350-356). But here once more the voice of duty is heard. It is no longer only the voice of a father speaking to his son, it is also that of a bishop speaking to a priest. Ordained at Christmas, he preached in the church at Nazianzus on Easter-day of the following year. The sermon was but a short address, in which he press the duty of mutual forgiveness as becoming the holy season. “The act was one of tyranny—he cannot forget that; but it was tyranny honourably exercised and honourably borne. There was a time for holding back as Moses and Jeremiah did; there was a time for coming forward as Aaron and Isaiah did. The reason the bishop built the magnificent temple in which they worshipped, and, like Abraham, offered his son to God. Let them all devote themselves to God that day” (Orat. i., Opera, i. 3-6). Gregory had expected that a crowded church would have welcomed his return and have applauded his first sermon; but though it was the festival of Easter, the church was almost deserted. At the time he bore this without complaint; but during the same festival he did not hesitate to express his disappointment and surprise. “Their conduct was like that of the guests invited to the marriage-supper (Matt. xxii. 2; Luke xiv. 16), and indeed worse, for they were neither strangers nor invited guests, but they had invited him to the church as the present worship to welcome their guest” (Orat. iii., Opera, i. 68-72). Gregory could not be ignorant of the cause of this estrangement. His flight from the work of the priesthood demanded an explanation before the church of Nazianzus, and before the wide circle of his friends. In proportion to the hopes of earlier years must have been their disappointment now. The question was of too great importance to be considered settled by the short sermon which he had preached at Easter; on all sides a full answer was expected, and Gregory determined to give an answer worthy of the question and of himself. It is contained in the second oration (Orat. ii. i. 65). In no part of his writings do we find proof of greater study. From its length and form we may feel sure that the biographers are right in thinking that it was never intended for, and never delivered from, the pulpit. It is practically a treatise on the pastoral office, and forms the foundation of Chrysostom’s de Sacramentis and of the Cura Pastoralis of Gregory the Great, while writers in all ages have directly or indirectly drawn largely from it.Benefits notes that Bossuet is much indebted to it for his celebrated pæne-

ergic on St. Paul (Gree. de Naz. p. 138). It is formally divided into two parts, the earlier of which treats of the reasons for his flight, and the latter gives those which led him to return. “He fled because (1) he was wholly unprepared for the ordination, and it came like a sudden thunder-clap, which deprives men of their reason, upon a man who had always been of a retiring nature (Orat. ii. 6); (2) he had always been attracted by the monastic life, and in time of greatest danger had devoted himself to it (6b); (3) he was ashamed of the life and character of the mass of the clergy. There were some men who had called themselves to the holy office—Isaac Saul also among the prophets? (6b. 8); (4) he did not at that time, he did not now—and this reason weighed with him most of all—think himself fit to rule the flock of Christ and govern the minds of men” (6b. 9). From this fourth and chief reason he is led on to consider the duties and difficulties of the true pastor, and discusses them in forty
sections of the discourse (10-49, pp. 17-58). "It is difficult to obey, much more difficult to rule, especially in the kingdom of God. The pastor's blemish is quickly, his virtue but slowly, communicated to his flock. It is too little that a shepherd should be free from positive sin; he ought not to be a man who is in honor, in the porch of the temple, who leads, if he is not a leader. To drive the flock is tyrannical, and that which is exacted by force is never lasting. Man is the most various and complex of beings; to govern him is the art of arts, and science of sciences. The medicine of souls is more subtle than that of bodies. The soul is joined to the body, (1) that, by wrestling with lower elements, it may gain the inheritance of glory, as gold is purified by fire; (2) that it may ennoble the body, and assimilate it to its own nature; that what God is to the soul, this the soul may become to the body. A physician takes note of localities, climates, age of his patient, and such like things. The spiritual physician must have a spiritual character, for they make the body become subject to the soul. The chief difficulties are that men are opposed to the healing of the soul, and seek to hide and excuse their sins, and turn a deaf ear to and hate their physician. Further, in spiritual diseases the diagnosis is more difficult, as none of the symptoms are patent. In spiritual and temporal alike, unpleasant medicines are often profitable. The end aimed at is to give life to the soul, and wean it from the world. The law tended to this, but Christ is the end of the law. For this reason God was joined to man by an intervening soul, and Christ took upon Him the whole nature, that He might heal the whole nature. The whole Incarnation is the medicine of the soul, and priests are the ministers of this medicine. Physicists never spare themselves, and they seek to prolong even useless lives. Pastors have a difficult task on account of the carelessness of those who need healing, and their varied states, habits, and positions; for men differ more in character than they do in form. Minds, then, like bodies, require individual treatment; some precept, some example; some the reign, some the spur; some to be encouraged by praise, some checked by blame, and correctly and carefully even in tristles, some must seem never to observe lest we drive them to despair. The same persons, again, require various medicines at various times; and these can only be known as the moment for their use occurs. The mind cannot frame them, nor discourse tell them. To the medical mind they will be plain. Great danger arises from want of moral skill in the pastor. His first duty is to preach the Word, and this is so difficult that to fulfill it ideally would require universal knowledge. Then, theological knowledge is absolutely necessary, especially of the doctrine of the Trinity, lest he fall into the Atheism of Sabellius, or the Judaism of Arius, or the Polytheism too common among the orthodox. It is necessary to hold to the truth that there is one God, and to confess that there are three persons, and attributes proper to each; but for this there is need of the Spirit's help. Much more is it difficult to extend it to a popular audience, both from the preacher's imperfection and the people's want of preparation. Zeal which is not according to knowledge leads men away from the truth. Then, there is the desire of vainglory, with an insipid, her constant attendant, rashness, inconstancy, based on ignorance of the Scripture; and a subjective eclecticism which ends in an uncertain creed, and leads men to doubt of truth, as if a blind or deaf man were to place the evil eyes, if not in his house, in the eye of Jesus, who leads, if he is not a leader. To drive the flock is tyrannical, and that which is exacted by force is never lasting. Man is the most various and complex of beings; to govern him is the art of arts, and science of sciences. The medicine of souls is more subtle than that of bodies. The soul is joined to the body, (1) that, by wrestling with lower elements, it may gain the inheritance of glory, as gold is purified by fire; (2) that it may ennoble the body, and assimilate it to its own nature; that what God is to the soul, this the soul may become to the body. A physician takes note of localities, climates, age of his patient, and such like things. The spiritual physician must have a spiritual character, for they make the body become subject to the soul. The chief difficulties are that men are opposed to the healing of the soul, and seek to hide and excuse their sins, and turn a deaf ear to and hate their physician. Further, in spiritual diseases the diagnosis is more difficult, as none of the symptoms are patent. In spiritual and temporal alike, unpleasant medicines are often profitable. The end aimed at is to give life to the soul, and wean it from the world. The law tended to this, but Christ is the end of the law. For this reason God was joined to man by an intervening soul, and Christ took upon Him the whole nature, that He might heal the whole nature. The whole Incarnation is the medicine of the soul, and priests are the ministers of this medicine. Physicists never spare themselves, and they seek to prolong even useless lives. Pastors have a difficult task on account of the carelessness of those who need healing, and their varied states, habits, and positions; for men differ more in character than they do in form. Minds, then, like bodies, require individual treatment; some precept, some example; some the reign, some the spur; some to be encouraged by praise, some checked by blame, and correctly and carefully even in tristles, some must seem never to observe lest we drive them to despair. The same persons, again, require various medicines at various times; and these can only be known as the moment for their use occurs. The mind cannot frame them, nor discourse tell them. To the medical mind they will be plain. Great danger arises from want of moral skill in the pastor. His first duty is to preach the Word, and this is so difficult that to fulfill it ideally would require universal knowledge. Then, theological knowledge is absolutely necessary, especially of the doctrine of the Trinity, lest he fall into the Atheism of Sabellius, or the Judaism of Arius, or the Polytheism too common among the orthodox. It is necessary to hold to the truth that there is one God, and to confess that there are three persons, and attributes proper to each; but for this there is need of the Spirit's help. Much more is it difficult to extend it to a popular audience, both from the preacher's imperfection and the people's want of preparation. Zeal which is not according to knowledge leads men away from the truth. Then,
as a temple of the living God. He who has not learned to speak the hidden wisdom of God, and to bear the cross of Christ, should not enter upon the priesthood. For himself he would prefer a private life. A great man ought to undertake great things; a small man small things. Only that man can build the tower who has wherewith to build it. " Such are the reasons which Gregory gives for his flight. He adds those which led to his return. " (1) The longing which he had for them and which he saw that they had for him; (2) the white hairs and feeble limbs of his holy parents—the father who was to him as an angel, and the mother to whom he owed also his spiritual birth. There is a time for yielding as for everything else; (3) the example of the prophet Jonah—and this weighed most with him, for every letter of Scripture is inspired for our use—who deserved pardon, but he himself would not if he still refused. The denunciations of disobedience is Holy Scripture are no less severe than those against the unworthy pastor. On either side is danger. The middle is the only safe course—not to quit the priesthood, nor yet to refuse obedience. There is no merit in obedience, but for disobedience there is hardly any remedy. Some holy men are more, others less, forward to undertake rule. Neither are to be blamed."
The discourse ends with Gregory's own submission, with a prayer for his father's blessing, and an invocation of blessing upon the bishop and his church.

Such is in outline the famous "Ταύ Αὐτῶν Αὐτογραμμάτων." A full summary of it shews at once what was the discourse, and what the man who penned it. Did it alone remain to us, Gregory must still have been thought of as one of the four pillars of the Greek church, and we should still read the chief traits of his personal character. This sermon was written in A.D. 362. Julian the Apostle had entered Constantinople on Dec. 11, A.D. 361. His history is told elsewhere. [Julianus.] It concerns us here only as it crosses the life of Gregory. The first reference to it is in a letter to his brother Caesarius, who had been persuaded by Julian to remain at court, written early in A.D. 362. Gregory was at the time with Basil, who had indignantly rejected like advances, and he blushes that the son of a bishop should accept them. It made their father weary of life, and the fact had to be hidden from their mother (Ep. vili. Opera, ii. 7). What the effect of this letter was upon Caesarius we may judge from his declaration before Julian: "In a word, I am a Christian, and I mean to be one," and from the explanation of the son to the enraged and unhappy children!" (Orat. viii. 13, Opera, i. 206; cf. De Broglie, Constance, ii. 207). Gregory esteemed the victory of Caesarius as a more precious gift than the half of the empire (Orat. vii. 14, ad init.). Yet that letter was meant for no eye but the brother's. The agony of that Christian family as Nazianzus tells what influence that modifiers Gregory's character; his expression of it tells what was the character which was moulded. But Julian had bitterly revenge in store. He, the old fellow-student of Basil and Gregory, and pupil of Prooeresius, ordered that no Christian should teach profane literature. For Gregory this had the effect that he composed many of the poems which we now possess, and which were meant probably as reading-books for Christian schools. It helped to cause another effect. Towards the end of the year 363 or the beginning of 364, he wrote the two Invectives against Julian (κατά Τιμοθεοῦ Βασίλειου Σταυρούντως Γράφοι, Orat. iv., Opera, i. 78—147 ... Αὐτογραμμάτως, Orat. v.; Βιβλ. 147—175).

The emperor had fallen, pierced by an arrow, in the previous June. The orator intended by these philippics to hold him up to heaven and earth as the sum of all that was vile. In the first sentence he is called "the dragon, the apostate, the Assyrian, the common enemy, the great mind" (Is. x. 12, LXX); and this sentence is the keynote of the whole. Words which may well seem to us more than sufficient to picture in darkest colours any character, seem to the orator wholly inadequate to represent that of Julian. He longs for "the eloquence of Herodotus or Thucydides that he may hand down his iniquity to all future time." (Orat. iv. 92, Opera, i. 126 a.)

The discourses, which are regarded as two by the editors, form clearly but two parts of one whole. In the first is kept the life and character of Julian; in the later his death is set forth as an example of God's judgment upon sinners. By writers who regard Gregory as a saint, every sentence of these orations is justified, though they have considerable difficulty in extracting from some of them the odour of sanctity. Looked at dispassionately, they remind one rather of Demosthenes or Cicero than of a Christian bishop; and as we listen to the impetuous torrent of words which only stop in their course to call down fire from heaven, other words are suggested which still seem to say, "Ye know not what spirit ye are of." As orations they are worthy to stand by the side of any of either ancient or modern times, but even when we reflect that they were never intended for the pulpit, we feel that they have little right to stand by the side of the orations of Gregory the Divine. The worshippers of the saint find the invective against Julian much more easy to explain than the panegyric of the Arian Constantius, which these discourses contain. He is "the most divine and Christ-loving of emperors, and his great soul is summoned from heaven. The sin of his life was the human humanity (τὸ γὰρ τὸς ἀνθρώπου φιλεξωμένος) which spared Julian." (Orat. iv. 34 seq., Opera, i, 93 seq.). Gregory, indeed, speaks elsewhere of three things of which Constantius repented when dying: (1) the murder of his relations; (2) that he had named Julian Caesar; (3) that he had given himself to the world and the never sanctified (Orat. xxv. 26; Opera, i. 403 a). And yet he is conscious that the emperor gave his support to impiety, and framed laws against the orthodox doctrine (Orat. xxv. 9, Opera, i. 461 a); nor could he have been unconscious that it was at the hands of Eusebios that baptism was administered to the penitent. When the force of this explanation is admitted, the fact remains that the character of Constantius is an oratorical pendant to that of Julian; and that the one is simply a whitened background, on which the blackened blackness of the other may be seen.

While Gregory was thus employed at Nazianzus, Basil returned from Pontus to Cæsarea, where Eusebios had been made bishop, and was
ordained against his will. He informed his friend of this, and Gregory replied in a letter which is important as marking his thoughts about the position in which both he and Basil had been placed. "Now the thing is done it is necessary to fulfill one's duty—such at least is the teaching of Nicene in the present distress, when many tongues of heretics are raised against us, and not to disappoint the hopes of those who have put their faith in us and in our past life" (Ep. viii., Opera, i. 8). A difference arose ere long between Eusebius and Basil. The grounds of it are not known to us, and Gregory thought it better that they should not be (Orat. xliii. 28, Opera, i. 792); and the difference itself claims notice at this place only because it introduces Gregory in the character of peacemaker. The warm friend of Basil, he was no less an admirer of the bishop, and an advocate for the rights of authority. Invited by the bishop to fill the place made vacant by the retirement of Basil to Pontus, he does not hesitate to answer that it was unjust, and to demand reconciliation with his friend as the price of his own influence (Epp. xvi.—xx., Opera, ii. 16). An indignant reply from Eusebius served only to call forth stronger letters from the same standpoint (Epp. xvii. and xviii., Opera, ii. 17, 18), and these are followed by an equally plain letter to Basil, telling him that Eusebius was disposed to be reconciled to him, and urging him to be first in the victory of submission (Ep. xix. ibid.). The result was that Basil returned to Caesarea, and gave his powerful aid to the bishop in the dangers which were threatening the church, or rather became bishop in reality, while Eusebius was still so in name—"the keeper of the lion, the leader of the leader" (Orat. xliii. 33, Opera, i. 786). When peace was thus established Gregory returned again to Nazianzus. Here new troubles awaited him. Caesarius had been chosen by Valens to be treasurer of Bithynia, and once more his brother was distressed at seeing him among the servants of an adversary of the true faith. On Oct. 11, 368, the city of Nicea was almost destroyed by an earthquake, and Gregory made this the occasion for a typical appeal to his friend to abandon his office (Ep. xx., Opera, ii. p. 19). He was on the point of yielding when he was cut off by sudden death. The funeral oration which was delivered by Gregory is placed by Jerome first in the list of the orator's celebrated works (Catal. Scrip. Eccles. 117). It narrates, in the language of fraternal love, the deeds of a noble life, and seeks in that of Christian submission to describe his patience and his friends' (Orat. viii., Opera, 198, et seq.). Sixteen epitaphs also remain to shew how often a brother's love mourned its loss (Epit. vi.—xxi., Opera, ii. 1111—1115). The death of Caesarius brought other troubles to Gregory, arising from the administration of his estate which had been left to the poor. Against extortioners who tried to seize it he was to the aid of his friend, and even of Sophronius, prefect to Nazianzus (Ep. xix., Opera, ii. 24); and his troubles gave occasion also to the kind offices of Basil. He himself tells us plaintively how he would gladly have fled these business worries, but that he felt it his duty to share the burden of them with his father (Carm. xi. 375—380, Opera, ii. 650). About the same time another shadow of darkness was cast upon the house at Nazianzus by the death of Gorgia, and once again the orator delivered a funeral discourse of most touching gracefulness (Orat. viii., Opera, i. 218 et seq.). These sorrows weighed heavily on the spirits of Gregory, and especially on that of his friend, and side by side with the public discourses in which he sought to console others, we have the private poems which show how hard he found it to console himself. "Already his whitening hairse shew his grief, and his stiffening limbs are inclining to the evening of a sad day" (Carm. de Rebus suis, i. 177—296, Opera, ii. 641 et seq.). In a.D. 370 Eusebius died in the arms of Basil, who at once invited Gregory to Caesarea on the plea that he was himself in extremis. The latter regarded the plea as a pretext, and in the tone of mingled affection and reproach declined to go until after the election of the archbishop (Ep. xi., Opera, ii. 54). The invitation to the bishop of Nazianzus to be present at the election was answered, and the whole assembly chose the archbishop by the hands of the son. He dwells upon the importance of the position and the special qualifications for it possessed by Basil, and promises his assistance if they propose to elect him (Ep. xlii., Opera, ii. 35). He wrote also to Eusebius of Samosata by the hands of the deacon Eustathius, urging him to go to Caesarea and promote Basil's election (Ep. xliii., Opera, ii. 37). Eusebius yielded to this request, but the vote of the aged bishop of Nazianzus was also needed. An illness from which he was suffering disappeared as soon as he started. The son thought it prudent to remain at home, but sent by his father's hands a letter to Eusebius, expressing his esteem and excusing his absence, and referring to the miracle of his father's restored health (Ep. xlvii., Opera, ii. 39). He did not go even after the election, but contented himself at first with writing letters which witness alike to his wisdom and his affection (Epp. xiv. and xlvii., Opera, ii. 40, 41). When the storm had subsided he went in person, but declined the position of first among the presbyters, or probably that of coadjutor bishop (καθετι της καθετης της, Orat. xliii. 39, Opera, i. 370), which was offered to him, and refused the position which he formally declined was in reality accepted. In the opposition caused by the malcontent bishops who were defeated in the election, and in the persecution organized by the prefect Modestius at the command of Valens, Gregory was foremost as a personal friend and as a defender of the faith (Socrat. iv. 11). In the year 370 Valens made a civil division of Cappadocia into six provinces, according to Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, claimed equal rights with the bishop of Caesarea, i.e. the rights of metropolitan of Cappadocia Secunda, of which Tyana was the capital. Basil resisted this claim, which was the more galling to him, as he himself had been the main cause that Tyana was chosen as the capital instead of Podanlus. In this difficulty Gregory, who had made the archbishop of Tyana, was offered, in a letter full of affectionate admiration (Ep. xlvii., Opera, ii. 40), to visit and support his friend, and went to Caesarea. After his arrival they proceeded together to the foot of Mount Taurus in Cappadocia Secunda, where was a chapel dedicated to St. Orestes, and where the people of those parts were accustomed to pay
Gregorius Nazianzenus

their titles in kind. On their return they found the mountain-passes at Sasina guarded by followers of Anthimus. A struggle took place, and Gregory implies that he was personally injured in it (Carm. xi. 453, Opera, ii. 699). He seems soon afterwards to have returned to Nazianzus, whether he was followed by Basil, who had resolved (and, unbeknown to Gregory) to make Sasina a bishopric, and Gregory the first bishop. In this plan he was aided by the elder Gregory, and the son yielded against his own will (Orat. ix., Opera, i. 234–8). At the last moment he sought refuge in flight, but was pursued by Basil, and at length consecrated (Orat. x., Opera, i. 239–41). But still he put off the duties of his see, until Basil sent Gregory of Nyssa to urge that he should enter upon them. He now attempted to do so, but Anthimus was again prepared to resist by an armed force, and Gregory finally abandoned duties which he had never willingly accepted. Basil wrote to him a letter of reproach, and he replied in the same tone. He was not fight with the warlike Anthimus, for he was himself quite experienced in war, and liable to be wounded, and one, moreover, who preferred repose. Why should he fight for sucking-pigs and chickens, which after all were not his own, as if it were a question of souls and of canons? And why should he rob the metropolis of the illustrious Sasina? (Ep. xlviii., Opera, ii. 44). The "Illustrous Sasina." must be described in the warmest terms. De Kidon et, "On a much frequented road of Cappadocia, at a point where it is divided into three, is a halting-place, where is neither water nor grass, nor any mark of civilisation. It is a frightful and detestable little village. Everywhere you meet nothing but dust, noises, waggoons, howls, groans, petty officials, instruments of torture, chains. The whole population consists of foreigners and travellers. Such was my church of Sasina." (Carm. xi. 439–446, Opera, ii. 696). Other letters were exchanged, but Gregory was convinced that the bishopric of Sasina was not the work to which he was called, and nothing could change his determination. Under the pressure of his father's wish and words he was at length prevailed upon to leave the hills and go down for refuge, and become coadjutor at Nazianzus. But this step did not deliver him from the quarrel between Basil and Anthimus, for Nazianzus was in the new province of Cappadocia Secunda, and the bishop of Tyana soon found it convenient to visit the Gregories, and seek to gain them to his cause. They were firm in their attachment to Basil, but Anthimus then asked the son to interpose between Basil and himself, and to seek a conference. The option of having one at all, the time and place if one was resolved upon, was all left to Basil's will, and yet he felt injured, and expressed his dissatisfaction at Gregory's conduct. The latter felt and said, in plain terms, that his friend was puffed up by his father, "it is not due to others. He had himself offended Anthimus by his firm Basilism (Basilismus). Was it just that Basil should be offended for the same reason?" (Ep. i., Opera, ii. 44). He soon gave further proof of affectation in the active part which he took in the election of Eulalius as bishop of Beira, and in a remonstrance on the subject of Basil's teaching, which he felt was due from his friendship. He had heard men cavil at Basil's orthodoxy, and assert that he did not hold the Divinity of the Third Person in the Trinity; and humbly asked him, for the sake of silencing his detractors—he himself had heard so often that there could not be room for doubt—to express in definite words what he held as the true doctrine (Ep. iviii., Opera, ii. 519). "I reply to him that he did not accept the friendly letter in the spirit which dictated it. Gregory saw from the reply, that it had given pain, in spite of his care. Yet he submits, and is willing to place himself entirely in Basil's hands (Ep. lixiv., Opera, ii. 53).

The year 373 was an "annus mirabilis" for Nazianzus, which called forth two remarkable discourses from Gregory. An epidemic among their cattle, a season of drought, and a destructive tempest in harvest reduced the people to absolute poverty. They rushed in their need to the church, and compelled Gregory to address them. The discourse seemed to have been an impromptu. The preacher "regrets that he is the constrained speaker rather than his father—that the street-crier made to flow water from the fountain is dry—and then urges that divine punishments are all in mercy, and that human sins are the ordinary causes of public woes;" then plainly puts before his hearers special sins which belonged to their own city, and invites them to penitence and change of life (Orat. xvii., Opera, i. 289). The inability of the inhabitants to pay the ordinary imperial taxes led to an inscription in Nazianzus. At the approach of the prefect with a body of troops they took refuge in the church, and he himself consented to listen to the pleading of Gregory in their behalf. While the Invective against Julian reminds us of the Philippics or the De Corone, we have here an oration which has justly been placed, without injury in the comparison, by the side of the Pro Licinio or Pro Marcello. When Chrysostom's plea for Eutropius or Flavian (Benois, p. 355). The first part points the afflicted people to the true source of comfort; the second is addressed to princes and magistrates. "The prefect was subject to the authority of the teacher, which was higher than his own. Did he wield the sword? it was for Christ. Was he present at the altar first? it was equal to Christ. The most divine thing was to do good; let him not lose the opportunity. Did he see the white hair of the aged bishop, and think of his long unblemished priesthood, whom, it may be, the very angels found worthy of homage (Xarpelias), and did not that move him?" "I adjure you by the name of Christ, by Christ's emptying Himself for us, by the sufferings of Him who cannot suffer, by His cross, by the nails which have delivered me from sin, by His death and burial, resurrection and ascension; and lastly, by this common table where we sit together, and by these symbols of my salvation, which I conscribe with the same mouth that addresses to you this prayer—in the name, I say, of this sacred mystery which was due to others. He had himself offended Anthimus by his firm Basilism (Basilismus). Was it just that Basil should be offended for the same reason?" (Orat. xvii., Opera, i. 317 et seq.). At the commencement of the year 374 the elder Gregory died, and the son delivered a discourse, at which his mother Neona, and his friend Basil were present, and which was the
eulogy at once of both his parents and of his friend (Orat. xviii., Opera, i. 327). Nonna survived her husband for a few months only, and died as she knelt beside the Holy Table. No less than thirty-five epitaphs were devoted by Gregory to her memory (Epist. lxxv.-c., Opera, ii. 1133–49). The brother and sister were already dead. The father and mother, though spared for a hundred years, were now dead. Gregory was left alone. His first care was to devote the whole of the large fortune which had come to him to the poor, keeping for himself only a small plot of land at Arianzus; and then to invite the bishop-elect to come to him. The fear that the church would be rent by heresy at length induced him to exercise the office temporarily. About the middle of the year 374 Eusebius of Samosata was banished to Thrace, and we learn from a letter from Gregory that he longed to see the exiled bishop on his way, but was prevented by illness, which confined him to his house (Ep. lxxv., Opera, ii. 58). During the same illness he wrote similar letters of affectionate consolation to the procopul Eutropius, who had incurred the displeasure of the emperor (Ep. lxxix., Opera, ii. 62–3). The illness did not last long, and after a visit to Tyana, whence he wrote to Julian, the newly-appointed bishop of Tralles, to ask that the clergy may be exempted (Ep. lxxvii., Opera, ii. 60); we find him again preaching at Nazianzus in the presence of Julian. The sermon is entitled εἰς τοὺς λόγους, καὶ εἰς τὸν Ἱσωτόνον Ἰωαννίδα (Orat. xix., Opera, i. 364 et seq.). For two reasons he had resolved not to preach at Nazianzus again—(1) That he may cause them to elect a successor to his father in the episcopacy; and (2) That by his silence he may check the mania for theological discussion, which was spreading through the Eastern church, and which was leading everybody to teach the things of the Spirit without the Spirit (βδόλα-
κεινς τα καλαί τα τοῦ πνεύματος χωρὶς πνεύ-
ματος, Εἰδ. 364 c). They demanded discourses from him as a tribute which he was not willing to pay, but now Julian, who had sought his counsels, joined in the demand, and made compliance a condition of exemptions being granted to the clergy. The demand could no longer be resisted, and it was met by a supreme effort of eloquence, which dwelt on “the vanity of all things earthly, and exhorted each man to devote to God whatever he possessed—wealth, poverty, the will to do good, the active or the contemplative life, discourse or silence, virginity, temperance, prayer, hymns, care for the poor. God accepts the least offering as the greatest, and it is the duty of each to offer what he has, for the disposition gives value to the offering.” He concludes by “presenting to Julian the poor, the priests, the monks, and exorts him and the people to mutual forbearance.” For the last time he appeared before them as temporary holder of the see.

Two years had passed since the bishop’s death, and in vain had Gregory pressed the election of a successor. His love of retirement was now, as all through life, a powerful influence, and it was strengthened by the difficulty of his position as practically occupying—though he had determined not to occupy—an important see, after he had refused to be bishop of Saisma. Towards the end of the year 375 he disappeared suddenly, and found refuge at Seleucia in Isauria, at a monastery devoted to the virgin Thecla (Carm. xi. 549, Opera, ii. 701). Here he passed three years of which we have no record. What they were a secret; but it was the hour when he did his later work at Constantinople. They were as the intervals of calm in every great life, when principles are formed and resolutions taken which become the hidden spring of noble deeds.

In the beginning of the year 379 Basil died, and we find Gregory writing to comfort his brother. He invites him to visit Basil in Isauria, to comfort him at his funeral, for he was himself dangerously ill at the time (Ep. lxvii., Opera, ii. 65), but his love found expression in twelve epitaphs. These are printed by the Benedictine editors under one number (Epist. cxxix., Opera, ii. 1155–9), but the points of division are clear, and the last lines are:

Γεραμόφυς βασίλει, της κοινής ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐνημερώματι τετελεσθέντα.

A letter from Gregory to Eudocius the rhetorician, written soon afterwards, speaks of “the loss of all who were nearest to him, and of Basil, his spiritual brother, and of death as the only deliverance from the ills which weighed upon him.” (Ep. lxxviii., Opera, iii. 322.)

But the time was at hand which was to witness the chief work of his life. At the date of the Nicaean council Alexander was bishop of Constantinople, and signed the decree which condemned Arius. He was succeeded by Paul, who, in devotion to the true faith, was the rival of Athanasius himself, and suffered martyrdom in 355. For thirty years after the death of Paul, Constantinople was the battle-ground of a constant war with heresy. The followers of Manes and Novatians, Photinians and Marcians, Sabellians and Apollinaris, were to be found there in large numbers; and the adherents of the Nicene faith, few in number, humiliated, crushed, having neither church nor pastor, were obliged to conceal themselves in the remote quarters of the city (Bened. Græc. de Nax. p. 180). In this distress they applied to Gregory to help them, and many bishops urged their plea. For a long time he was unwilling to leave his retirement, but then came to him the old feeling that there was a time to yield and a time to resist, and the conviction that he dared not refuse this summons. The date of his arrival at Constantinople cannot be fixed with certainty, but it was probably before Easter. A.D. 379 (Thierry, Mémoires, ix. 799). A prayer, which took the form of a poem, indicates the spirit with which he entered upon his new work (Carm. iii., Opera ii. 867). In another poem he has left us his estimate of what that work in the new Rome was. “It had passed through the death of indolence; there was left but one last breath of life. He had come to this city to defend the faith. What they needed was solid teaching to deliver them from the spider-webs of subtleties in which they had been taken” (Carm. xi. 562–611, Opera, ii. 705, 6). In a private house, where he himself was lodged by relations, his work was begun. He speaks of this as “the new Shiloh, where the ark was fixed after its forty years of wandering in the desert (Orat. xliii. 26, Opera, i. 706), as the holy mountain where the ark of Noah rested.”
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(Garrn. xi. 1080–2, Opera, ii. 731). It was to him "an Anastasius, the scene of the resurrection of the faith" (Orat. xii. 26, Garrn. i. 1079, 3), for the house was too small for the multitudes that flocked to it, and a church was built in its place. Gregory's fame, as a theologian, rests on the analysis he delivered at the Anastasius. It will be convenient to examine them later, and to note them here only in relation with the incidents of his life. His first work was to gather the scattered members of the flock and instruct them in the practical duties of Christianity, and the danger of empty theological discussions, and the pre-requisite for any true knowledge of God (Garrn. xi. 1210–31, Opera, ii. 737–9). Again and again in the early discourses does he dwell on the truth that it is only through personal holiness that a man can grasp any idea of the Holy One (Orat. xx. and Orat. xxi., Opera, i. 378–384, and 581–603). While doing this work, Gregory exposed himself to the attacks of all parties. His origin, person, clothes, and objects of discourse were all unusual. They would have welcomed a polished orator with external graces; but his manner of life had made him prematurely old, and his gifts to the poor had made him in appearance and reality a poor man. From words they passed to deeds. One night, a mob led on by monks, broke into the place of meeting and profaned the altar and sacred elements. Gregory himself escaped, but was taken before the judges as a homicide; "but He who knew how to save from the lions was present to deliver him" (Garrn. xi. 685–78, Opera, ii. 709). "He cared not that they attacked him—the stones were his delight; he cared only for the flock who were thus injured" (ib. 725, et seq.). His chief sorrow was to come not from any outward opposition but from a division in the flock itself. This division started from the schism of Antioch, which had spread through the whole church; but the immediate question was one of competition for the bishopric. Gregory had kept aloof from this quarrel, but among some of his followers, led by one of his pupils, took an active part in it, and was forced to draw from him a decision for one or other of the rivals. Some seem to have taken the part of Paulinus, some that of Meletius. Gregory, therefore, taking occasion from the greeting, "Peace be with you," and "Peace be with thy spirit," preached a sermon on Peace (Orat. xxi., Opera, i. 414–425), dwelling "on its blessings, and the inconsistence of their faith, servants of the God of peace as they claimed to be, and their practice. Their duty was to remain united when the faith was not in question; to weaken the present struggle by keeping out of it, and thus to do the rivals a greater service than by fighting for them" (ib. 14, p. 423). Soon afterwards the news of the establishment of peace reached Constantinople, and was followed by peace in the little church of the Anastasius. Gregory, though ill, preached almost certainly on this occasion another sermon on peace (Orat. xxxiii., Opera, i. 425–34), thankfully celebrating its return, and urging those present who were divided from them by heresy "to be at peace with them by acceptance of the true faith. It was the work of the sacred Trinity to give the faithful "peace among themselves. The sacred Trinity would heal also this wider breach." At the close of this sermon he promises to deal more fully with the questions at issue between the followers of the Nicene faith and their opponents. This he did in the five theological discourses which soon followed (Orat. xxvii.–xxxi., Opera, i. 457–557; side infra, c. ii.). Other important discourses belong to the same period, of which the most remarkable are a second on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, preached at Whitsuntide A.D. 381 (?) (Orat. xii., Opera, ii. 731–44), and one on Moderation in Discussions—a frequent subject with Gregory—in which heresy is traced to its absence, and on the fact that it is not given to every man or every time to reason about God (Orat. xxxix., Opera, ii. 378–401). About the same period, too, he delivered three (?) discourses of another kind, which gave signal opportunity for oratorical power, and have become models for the great preachers who have chosen as their themes the lives of saints. The subjects of Gregory's panegyrics were Cyprian, whose name was held in deserved honour in Constantinople (Orat. xxiiv., Opera, i. 437–50); Athanasius, who was especially dear to Gregory as the champion of Nicene orthodoxy, and who had died but a few years before (A.D. 373) (Orat. xxxi., Opera, i. 386–411); and the Maccabees (2) whose heroism might well have been specially intended for an example in the present struggle (Orat. xv., Opera, i. 287–298). Of the date of the last of these Clements says, "Quo anno quoque in loco habitis haec oratio certo definire non possimus" (ib. 286). He himself inclines to the period spent at Caesarea, but there seems no good reason for departing from the older opinion of Nicetas, which is here followed. The first of these discourses was hurriedly composed, as Gregory was in the country on the festival of St. Cyprian, and it had escaped his memory. The others, especially that on Athanasius, are considered by all judges, from the time of Jerome downwards, as among the orator's noblest works (Script. Ecol., 117).

Jerome himself became about this time a disciple of Gregory; and the pupil loved to tell how much he had learned from him, and how much he admired him of him "Exe magistri glorior et exulator"; "Gregorius, vir eloquentissimus, praebector meus a quo Scripturas explanans didici" (Ibid.); "Ante annos circiter triginta cum esset Constantinopolis, et apud virum eloquentissimum Gregorium Nazianzenum, tunc ejus urbis episcopum sanctum, Scripturarum studiosi eruditor" (Comm. in Isag., vi.). He has preserved for us Gregory's opinion of the way in which his congregation were led by mere words, and the way in which the teacher himself could playfully avoid a difficulty. Jerome asked him the meaning of the term "ἐν σωμάτω διευγενέστατω," in St. Luke vi. 1. He replied, "I will tell you from the pulpit, and all the people will applaud. And in spite of yourself you will have the blessing that as long as Jack are now ignorant; for if you alone do not applaud, they will look upon you as a dunce" (Hieron. Ep. ad Nepot. xxiii.).

There was another stranger who came to Constantinople, and professed himself a disciple of the now famous theologian. In the works of Gregory he is known to us as Hero, either because he bore two names, or, as Jerome, who had every opportunity of knowing, tells us, because Gregory did not wish the panegyric
which he pronounced upon him to be handed down in connexion with the name Maximus.

"Quasi non licuerit eundem et laudare et vituperare pro tempore" (De Vir. Illust. 117).

The biography of this man will be given in its proper place [Maximus]. Here we have to deal only with the story which began not long after the latter arrived at Constantinople. He represented himself as descended from a line of martyrs, and as one who had suffered much through his adherence to the Nicene faith. He was an ardent adherent of Gregory's sermons (καὶ τῶν ἱματιῶν προφυλάσσων αὐτῆς λόγων, Carm. xi. 914, Opera, ii. 716). "No one was to him as Maximus, to whom he gave lodging and food and made him the sharer of his counsels" (ibid. 808–812). The man who admired Gregory's sermons so much heard one in which his own panegyric was pronounced (Orat. xxv., In Laudem Heronis Philosophi, Opera, i. 454); and the orator regarded it as a mark of a philosophic spirit that he could do so. Maximus had gained a rare distinction by the overthrow of his teacher, and hoped even to establish himself in the episcopal chair. He had two confederates, Gregory tells us. One was an angel who had become a Belial. The other is not known by name, but is described as barbarian in mind more even than by birth, and first among the presbyters (Carm. xi. 810–827).

He had still more important allies in Peter, bishop of Alexandria, who had recognised Gregory as practically bishop of the orthodox party in Constantinople (ibid. 858–931), but—whether from jealousy at the influence he had gained, or from difference of opinion in the Meletian schism, or that he too had been deceived by the craft of Maximus as Gregory had been—now joined in the plot against him. Seven sailors, whose names Gregory has recorded (ibid. 834), were engaged as spies and sent from Egypt to Constantinople. A party of Alexandrian clergy soon followed. At this time a priest from Thasos had come to Constantinople with a large sum of money to buy Proconesian marble for a church. He, too, was beguiled by the specious hope held out to him. Maximus and his confederates had the church in hand and the purchasing of the services of a mob, which was as forward to attack Gregory as it had been to praise him. It was night, and the bishop was ill in bed, when Maximus with his followers went to the church to be consecrated by five suffragans who had been sent from Alexandria for the purpose. Day began to dawn while they were still preparing for the consecration. They had but half-finished the tunic of the corymb philosopher, who wore the flowing hair common to his sect, when a mob, excited by the sudden news, rushed in upon them and drove them from the church. They retired to a flute-player's shop to complete their work, and Maximus, compelled to flee from Constantinople, went to Thessalonica with the hope of gaining over Theodosius himself. Repulsed by the clergy who declared that he could recognise in Constantinople no other bishop than Gregory, he returned to Alexandria and demanded from Peter that he would find him another bishopric or relinquish his own. He was silenced by the prelate, who banished him from Alexandria. Gregory devotes more than 200 lines of the poem De Vitæ et (Carm. xi. 807–1029, Opera, ii. 117–29) to this painful story, and his words of condemnation are bitter in proportion as the words of his panegyric were strong.

We must probably assign to a date later than the treachery of Maximus, Gregory's sermon on the arrival of the conspirators at Constantinople, (Opera, i. 619–627). It opens by a reference to the conquest of envy by a higher zeal; and then the preacher goes on to speak of his desire to "blot out the old calumny by new kindness" (ibid. § 5, p. 621). It is quite in keeping with the orator's character to find him welcoming these Egyptian sailors to his church, and regarding them as "one with himself since they are worshippers of the same Trinity," and even uttering words of highest praise for Peter, their bishop (ibid. § 3, p. 620).

In immediate connexion with the story of Maximus, Gregory tells us that he one day uttered the words, "My beloved children, keep intact this Trinity which I, your most happy father, have delivered and preserved as a memorial of my labours." One of the hearers saw the meaning, and "the whole congregation was in a turmoil as that of a hive of bees at the presence of smoke." People of all ages and conditions and ranks vied with each other in cries of affection for him and hatred for his foes (Carm. xi. 1057–1113, Opera, ii. 729–731).

We have no oration in which the name of Maximus occurs, but they are probably to be regarded as part of one, and to be placed in time soon after Gregory's recovery from the illness during which the plot of Maximus was carried out. His own words show how bitterly he felt that treachery; and bitterly did he feel also that his position was weakened by it. In spite of the cries of men, women, and children until nightfall, and the resolve that they would be buried in the temple rather than leave it until he had promised to remain with them, his determination was unchanged until one voice cried, "If you go you will banish the doctrine of the Trinity as well as yourself" (ibid. 1100). At this cry he yielded, and promised to remain until the arrival of some bishops who were expected at the council of Paphlagonia. By the church in hope—they, that their point had been carried; he, that his departure would not be long postponed. He did not, however, remain in the city. His health was shattered, and he retired for a while to the country to recruit it. On his return he commenced his first sermon with the words, "I kept longing for you, my children, and was persuaded that you in like manner kept longing for me" (Orat. xxvi., Opera, i. 471–485). This relation between the shepherd and the sheep is seen throughout the discourse, which is the loving outpouring and anxious questioning of the heart which knew their need, and knew that there were dangers without and within the flock. Near the end of the discourse (§ 15, p. 485) he refers to the bishopric of Constantinople, declaring that the love and affection of sense had ever longed much for it. For his own part he could wish that there was no primacy or precedence, and that one should be distinguished by virtue only.”

On Nov. 24, A.D. 380, Theodosius made his formal entry into Constantinople. One of his first cares was to restore to the orthodox the
churches of which they had been deprived by the Arians. Demophilius and Lucius were both banished (Socrat. Hist. Eccles. v. 7); Gregory was summoned to the imperial presence. He could hardly believe that the words

\[\text{Γρεγοριους Ναζανεζος} \]

would ever be fulfilled, but early on the morning of Nov. 26, in the presence of an immense crowd, Theodosius and Gregory entered the church of the Holy Apostles. A thick fog enveloped the church, but at the first accents of the chant it was illumined by the rays of the sun, which fell upon the vestments of the priests and the swords of the soldiers, and brought to Gregory’s mind the glory of the Tabernacle of old. At the same time there arose a cry like thunder demanding that he should be bishop. “Silence, silence,” he cried: “This is the time to give thanks to God. It was not enough, hereafter, to name other things.” The service was continued and was ended without further interruption. Only one sword was drawn and that was put back unstained into its sheath (ibid. 1325-90). In no part of Gregory’s life is the true excellence of his character more clearly seen than in this; to his spirit of moderation and forgiveness is it to be attributed that his great religious revolution was effected without shedding one drop of blood. He has himself recorded an incident which exemplifies the spirit in which he returned the sanity of his foes. While he was ill in bed an assassin who had attempted his life, entered his room, and stung by conscience, fell weeping and speechless at his feet. When Gregory learned the fact he said to him, “May God preserve you! It is nothing wonderful that I whom He hath saved should be merciful to you. Your bold deed has made you mine. Take care to walk, henceforth, worthy of God and of me.” Gregory adds that the news of this deed spread through the city, which was softened towards him by it as iron is by fire (ibid. 1445-74).

Theodosius intended to summon a general council, and soon after his entry into Constantinople he carried out his purpose. In May, A.D. 381, the synod of the 150 bishops who formed the second Oecumenical council was held in the capital of the East. Socrates tells us that the object of the council was to confirm the Nicene faith, and to appoint a bishop for Constantinople (Hist. Eccles. v. 8; cf. Sozom. vii. 7; Theodor. v 7; Mansi, Collect. Concil. iii. 525). No Western bishop is mentioned as having been present, and the attempt to show that Damasus of Rome was either consulted or represented is futile; but thirty-six bishops who were followers of Macedonius were present, and every effort was made to induce them to accept the Nicene faith. Meletius, the venerable bishop of Antioch, “honey-named and honey-natured.” (Carm. xi. 1551, Opera. ii. 754), was at first president. The principal question was the consecration of Maximus, which was at once pronounced void. Then followed, naturally, the question who should occupy the vacant seat. The wish of Theodosius that Gregory should be chosen was well known; and the only bishop who opposed it was Gregory himself. He was by force placed in the episcopal chair. But he had this hope—alas! a vain one—that, “as position gives influence, he should be able, like a choragus who leads two choirs, to produce harmony between opposing parties” (Carm. xi. 1525-45; ibid. ii. 755). The joy at the election of Gregory was soon followed by sorrow at the
death of Meletius. The new archbishop, naturally, succeeded him as president of the council, but who should succeed him as bishop of Antioch? It is said that the two bishops, Meletius and Paulinus, had agreed that the survivor should be the successor of the deceased; the chief clergy and laity of both parties were sworn. Meletius himself expressed an earnest wish for it from his death-bed; but a strong party, both within and without the council, was soon organized against it. Gregory has given us in the poem De Vitâ sibi, a résumé of his own speech on the question (Carm. xi. 1591–1678, Opera, ii. 683–683). "It was no light matter; the universe which had received the blood of God Incarnate was troubled by it. Were the struggle between two angels rather than two men, they could not be worthy of it. But now God had given the means of peace; let them confirm Paulinus in the episcopal office, and when the two should pass away let them elect a new bishop. Let them see, that this would be a great conquest. For himself he sought their permission to resign the office which they had conferred upon him, and he would gladly retire to some desert far away from evil men. He cared not to live among men whom he could not convince, and whose opinions forsook him to accept." He could scarcely have expected that this address would be received with favour, for the Meletian party was overpoweringly strong in the synod, and Paulinus had not been invited; but he was not prepared for the storm which followed. "There arose a cry like that of a number of jackdaws, and the younger members attacked him like a swarm of wasps" (ibid. 1890–90). Elsewhere he compares them to "cranes and geese," and speaks of it as "a disgrace to sit among such buzzers of the faith" (Carm. xii. 154, Opera, ii. 787). He left the synod never to return to it. For a while illness was opportunely (καλὰ) the reason of his absence (ibid. 1745), but the council proceeded to name Flavian as successor of Meletius; and Gregory, finding that his opinion had little weight, withdrew altogether and left the official residence which was close to the church of the Holy Apostles (Carm. xi. 1778, Opera, ii. 769). This step led to earnest entreaties from the people that he would not desert his flock: "Who would nourish his children in the faith if he left them? Let him honour those labours which had ruined his health, and let that church be the place of departure at the end of life" (ibid. 1785–85). Moved for a while by these prayers, he was prevented in his determination, which was strengthened by the arrival of bishops from Egypt and Macedon. The East and the West were now opposed to each other, and "prepared for the battle like wild boars, sharpening their terrible tasks" (ibid. 1804). The new members of the synod did not object to Gregory personally; but among the questions brought to the front by another, rather than by reason, was that of his election, which afforded an obvious means of attack, and which was probably in itself obnoxious as an act of Meletius. It was clearly opposed, they urged, to the fifteenth canon of the Nicene council, which forbade any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, to pass from one city to another. By that canon, he might have been sent back, Gregory's party, on the other hand, urged that he was relieved from that obligation by the same authority which imposed it, when another general council elected him bishop of Constantinople; but it could not be expected that this plea would be accepted by bishops who were not a party to that act, nor is Gregory himself justified in speaking of the Nicene canons as obsolete: "

Nómenos στραβόντος τοὺς πέλαν γυναικῶν

Τὸν κλέοντα ἴδων καὶ σωμάτων ἔλεος.

Ibid. 1810, 11.

While they were thus discussing his election, his continued illness confirmed the conviction that it was his duty to resign his office. He appeared before the council, and exhorted them to think of higher things and mutual harmony. "He would be another Jonah to pacify the angry waves. Gladly would he find retirement and rest. He owed but one debt, the debt of death, and that was in God's hands. He had but one anxiety, and that was for his beloved church. He appeared before the Trinity (ch. 1898–55). He left the synod glad at the thought of rest from his labours; sorrowful as one who is robbed of his children. The synod received his resignation with satisfaction, for it removed a chief ground of dissension, and from many it removed, probably, a ground of jealousy (ch. 1869; Carm. xii. 145–5, Opera, ii. 787). Gregory went from the assembly to the emperor, "to demand from him no gifts; he left such demands to others; no—he was weary of the hatred even of his friends because he had sought God only, and all he asked was that the man who had conquered barbarians would seek a new triumph in putting an end to their strife, and would allow him to retire from an office to which, in spite of himself, he had been chosen" (Ibid. 1891–901). Theodorus could not refuse that which he unwillingly granted. Gregory's only remaining care was to reconcile those who had been opposed to him, and to bid farewell to his friends. He did this privately, but he felt also that there must be a public statement of his position and a public farewell to the council and his church. This he delivered towards the end of June, A.D. 381 (Carm. xii. 1753). The oration is entitled, Ξεπληρωμένος τῆς τῷ ἐκκλησίας παρουσίας, and was pronounced before the synod, in the presence of a congregation which filled every corner of the church, and among whom no eye was dry. "Was there need of proof of his right to the bishopric? He would render his accounts. Let his work answer. He found them a rude flock, without a pastor, scattered, persecuted, robbed. Let them look round and see the wretched which had been wretched—priests, deacons, readers, holy men and women. That wretched he had helped to weave. Was it a great thing to have established sound doctrine in a city which was the centre of the world? In that, too, he had done his part. Had he ever sought to promote his own interests? He could appeal like another Samuel. No; he had lived for God and the church, and kept the vows of his priesthood. All this he had done through the Holy Trinity and by the help of the Spirit. He would present to the synod his church at the most precious offering. The reward he asked was that they would appoint some one with pure hands and prudent tongue to watch over it; and that to the white hair and worn-out face of an old man, who could hardly then preach to..."
them, they would allow the longed-for rest. Let them learn to prove these his last words—bishops to see the evil of the contentions which were among them; people to disregard externals, and love priests rather than orators, men who cared for their souls rather than rich men. The preacher then pronounces his lengthened farewell "to the beloved Anastasia, to the large temple, to the churches throughout the city, to the apostles who inhabit the temple, to the episcopal throne, to the clergy of all degrees, to all who helped at the holy table, to the choirs of Nazianzus, to the virgins, wives, widows, orphans, poor; to the hospitable houses, to the crowds of hearers; to prince and palace and their inhabitants; to the Christ-loving city, to Eastern and Western lands; above all, to angels, protectors of the church and of himself; to the Holy Trinity, his only thought and treasure."

With this pathetic climax, unsurpassed elsewhere even by Gregory himself, he concluded his last discourse in Constantinople. He left the city probably in the same month of June, A.D. 381, and returned to Nazianzus. Here he received a letter from Phileas, an old friend of Mesarchus and himself, commending upon him retirement. His answer breathes the same spirit which we find in the poem De Vita sua, and in the farewell sermon. "He was tired of fighting against envy and against venerable bishops, who destroyed the peace and put their personal squabbles before questions of faith." (Ep. Ixxxvii, Opera, ii. 79.) Among other letters belonging to this period, two addressed to Nectarius, who was chosen to succeed Gregory at Constantinople, deserve special note, as shewing that he cherished for him and the church nothing but the most entire good-will (Ep. Ixxxviii. and xci, Opera, ii. 77, 8).

Gregory's difficulties were not yet at an end. On his return to Nazianzus he found the church there in confusion, chiefly through the teaching of the Apollinarists (Carol., cxxii, Opera, ii. 870-7). Hesed was powerful in places where, hitherto, it had never entered. He tried to find a bishop who would stem the evil, but was thwarted in his plan by the presbyters, and by the desertion of seven bishops who had promised to appear on his side. His candidate had been hitherto engaged in secular affairs, but he still thought him the most promising. He seems after this to have succeeded in naming another bishop, and then to have retired to Arianus. But a short time passed before he was again urged to take the governance of the church at Nazianzus and check the Apollinarism which was rapidly spreading, and, in spite of his own strong disacclimation, he agreed to do so. He states in a letter to his friend Bosporius, bishop of Colonia in Cappadocia Secunda, that he was willing only on account of the imminent increase of adversaries (Ep. cxxviii, Opera, ii. 115). During this second administration of the diocese, Gregory was the means of delivering Nazianzus from impending danger. The prefect Olympus threatened to destroy the city in consequence of a seditious attack; and it was saved only by a pacific letter from the bishop, admitting that the offence was indeed grave, but that it was committed not by the city, but by the rashness of a few young men (Ep. cxxi, Opera, ii. 118-20). Other letters of the same kind show that Gregory was as the father of the city, watching over all its interests with loving care.

But Gregory felt that his constant illness unfitted him for his duties, and we even find him writing to the archbishop of Tyana, and in the most earnest tone beseeching him to take steps to appoint another bishop. "If this letter did not effect its purpose, he would publicly proclaim the bishopric vacant rather than that the church should longer suffer from his own infirmity" (Ep. cxxii, Opera, ii. 129). To such a supposition there could be but one answer, but the old opposition recurs when Gregory wished to vote in the election of his successor. It was again urged that if he were bishop of Nazianzus there would be no election; if he were not, he could have no claim to vote. They formally asserted their position, but then elected Eulalius, Gregory's colleague and relation, and the man of his choice. His satisfaction is expressed in a letter to Gregory of Nyssa, in which he also justifies his position on the ground that he was himself consecrated to Sasa and not to Nazianzus (Ep. cxxxi, Opera, ii. 148).

Eulalius entered upon his duties at Sasa, and in the Farewell address the end of the year 383. Gregory at once withdrew to Arianus, and spent in retirement the six remaining years of life. To this period belong certainly a large number of poems and letters; and, probably two discourses, one on the Festival of St. Mamas, which was kept with special honour in the neighbourhood of Nazianzus on the first Sunday after Easter (ενεργητής Κομανής), and one on the Holy Pasover (Οἰκουμ. xiv. and xlv, Opera, i. 834-868).

The place of Gregory's retirement was at first the little plot of ground at Arianus, which he had reserved to himself when all his other property was given to the poor. Here there was a shady walk with a fountain, which was his favourite resort (Carol. xiv. 1-24, Opera, ii. 915-17). But even this peaceful spot was to be denied him, and he was to be "driven forth without city, throne, or children, but always full of cares for them, as a wanderer upon the earth" (Carol. xlii. 1-12, Opera, 913-15). He found another temporary resting-place at a tomb consecrated to martyrs at a place called Carabals, of which nothing is known, and which the Bollandists indeed suppose (Mall. ii. 424 f) to be another name for the little plot at Arianus. But he was driven thence by a relative named Valentine, who settled near him with the female members of his family, as from another paradise by another Eve. Εἰκάουριος δὲ γυναικὶς αἰτία λυπημέροις, διανοθέτοις εὐπρόσωπως, ἐξερεύνησεν ἐνεργητής Κομανής (Ep. cxxii, Opera, ii. 169).

The poems and letters of this period speak of constant illness and suffering, from which he had but short intervals of relief after his retirement from Constantinople. A frame, never strong, had given way under the severe asceticism of the earlier, and was wholly unequal to bear the burden laid upon it by that of the later, life. "I suffer," he says in one of the letters, "and am content, not because I suffer, but because I am for others an example of patience. If I have no means to overcome any pain, I gain from it at least the power to bear it, and to be thankful as well in sorrowful circumstances as in joyous; for I am convinced that, although it seems to us contrary, there is in the eyes of the Sovereign..."
Reason nothing opposed to reason, in all which happens to us" (Ep. xxvi., Opera, ii. 32). These physical sufferings he could bear, but it was added to the bitterness of his lot to suffer intense spiritual agony, which at times took from him all hope either in this world or the next. In the thick of the spiritual combat did thus, as his greatest trial, learn the lessons it was to teach the world. At length the end came, but it found him, swan-like, continuing his song unto death. Jerome tells us in the de Script. Eccles.

"Decessit ante hoc ferme triumniun sub Theodosio Imperatore." The date of that work is the fourteenth year of the same emperor. Gregory's death, therefore, is to be assigned to about the eleventh year of Theodosius, i.e. a.d. 389 or 390.

(9) The Writings of Gregory.—The extant works are contained in two folio volumes of the Benedictine edition. Vol. i. consists of forty-five sermons, of which such an account is possible within our present limits is given elsewhere in this article. The contents of vol. ii. are more varied. It includes 243 letters, addressed to various persons, and on various subjects—theological, pastoral, domestic; the will of Gregory, taken from the archives of the church of Nazianzus, and signed and attested in legal form; the poems arranged in two books, of which a summary account must be given here. The first book (i.) is divided into two sections—(1) dogmatic and (2) moral. The poems of the second book (ii.) are historical, relating (1) to Gregory himself, or (2) to others, this last section including epitaphs and epigrams.

i. (1) The dogmatic poems are thirty-eight in number. Nos. 1-9 form one whole of 688 hexameter verses, with the addition of the sixth, which consists of 116 iambic verses, and is placed here with questionable editorship, because it treats of the same subject as the fifth (Providence). The poem is a brief exposition of the chief theological doctrines.

No. 10 (74 Iambics) is on the Incarnation, against Apollinaris.

No. 11 (16 hexameters and pentameters), is also on the Incarnation. Nos. 12-29 are Maenemonic verses on the facts of Holy Scripture, apparently meant for school use. The subjects are the books of Scripture, the sons of Jacob, the plagues of Egypt, the ten commandments, the miracles of Elijah and Elisha, with an epigram on a temple of Elijah, the double genealogy of Christ, the twelve apostles, the miracles and parables of Christ according to each evangelist, the parables of Christ according to all the evangelists, the stoning of the tempest.

Nos. 29-38 are prayers or hymns addressed to God.

(2) The moral poems are forty in number.

No. 1 (732 hexameters) is a eulogy of virginity. Nos. 2-7, in various metres, deal with kindred subjects, exhortations and counsels to virgins and monks, and the superiority of the spiritual life. Nos. 8-11 are on the secular and religious life, and exhortations to virtue. Nos. 12 and 13 on the fragility of human nature.

No. 14 is a meditation on human nature in 132 hexameters and pentameters. It ranks with No. 1 among the most beautiful of Gregory's poems.

The remainder of the poems in this section are on such subjects as the baseness of the outer man; the blessedness of the Christian life; the sin of frequent oaths and of anger; the loss of dear friends; the misery of false friends. Four of them are satires against a bad-mannered nobleman (26 and 27); miners (28); feminine luxury (29).

ii. (1) There are ninety-nine poems relating to his own life. One of them (No. xi. De Vita sua) is an autobiography extending to 1849 lines, which we have frequently referred to, and another (No. 12, De se impo et de episcopi) is an appendix to it of 836 lines more. There are 19 elegies, 15 meditations, 29 prayers, 3 satires, a defence of the author's poetry, a defence of the religious life. The others are shorter pieces.

(2) Of the historical poems which relate to others 7 (7-8) are epistles addressed (1) to Hellenius on behalf of the monks; (2) to the prefect Julian, asking for exemption for the poor; (3) to Vitalianus on behalf of his sea, from whom he had been pastored; (4) to Valbulus, pleading in the name of his son for means to enter a certain famous school; (5) to Nicobulus, the son, a reply in the name of the father; (6) to Olympias, a famous deaconess of the church of Constantinople excusing himself from her wedding, to which he had been invited, and giving her counsels for the married life; (7) to Nemesis, an eminent public man, baring him the errors of paganism, and urging him to accept Christianity. These poetic epistles are of considerable length, and are a witness to the varied interests and practical wisdom of the writer. (7-8 to Seleucus, vide infra.) There are 129 epitaphs, some of which have been noted above; and ninety-four epigrams, most of which are short poems, with little in them of the modern epigram, though some (e.g. 10-14, Els 'Aanayroutb), that the pen of Gregory could, when occasion required, be pointed with adamant. No less than 63 (31-94), belong probably to the writer's youth, are upon the spoliators of tombs. This résumé will give some idea of the extent and subject-matter of Gregory's poems; though if the statement of Jerome and Suidas, that he wrote 30,000 verses, is to be understood literally, more than a third of them are now unknown.

In addition to these writings, which may be taken as undoubted, the Benedictine editors have printed six pieces which are of questionable authority. Four of these, (1) an interpretation of Ezekiel i. 5 et seq., (2) a paraphrase of Ecclesiastes and (3) two short pieces De Fide Orthodoxa, are printed as an appendix to vol. i. (1) is judged by Tillemont to be unworthy of Gregory (Mémoires, ix. 464), and ought rather to be called "Breves et indigentiae annotationes in Ezexelium et acta quaeamadum Sacram in loco." This view is taken by the Colbertine Scholion and adopted by Billius. The piece is absent moreover from some of the best (e.g. the two Celsi) codices; (2) is by almost common consent to be ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii. 25; Hieron. Script. Eccles. p. 121; Tillemont, Mémoires, ix. 464; Billius in loco). Clemencet, the editor of the first Benedictine volume, regards them to an appendix, because

Hosted by Google
he found them in common editions, but did not judge them to belong to Gregory (Opera, i. 809 and 873). The two tractsates exist only in Latin, though it has been held that they show traces of a Greek original. Their ascription to Gregory is due to very doubtful inference from a passage in Augustine (Ep. clxviii.). Tillemont (Memoires, ii. 559) follows Quatremiure in ascribing them to Gregory Eliebertianus. Clemen- cet follows the author of the Galilia Letteraria in believing them to be the work of one Phaeba- dius. In any case they claim mention here only to be excluded from the works of Gregory, and the reader may be referred for further discussion of their authorship to Clemencet and Tillemont, in supra. The other two pieces are printed in the Benedictine vol. ii.; (1) a poetical epistle to Seleucus (No. viii. Opera, ii. 1089). Some of the older editors, especially Com- bebius, contend that it differs from the genuine writings of Gregory in the list of the canonical books, and, with the support of several MSS. ascribed to Gregory, endeavours to disprove the identity of Gregory, and the only difference in the canon is the addition of Esther and the Apo- calypse, which are not named by Gregory else- where. Billius, Caillau, and most modern editors, have claimed therefore with great probability, on internal grounds as well as with the support of the chief codices, that there is no sufficient reason for excluding an epistle which is entirely in the style of Gregory from the list of his works; (2) The Christus Patiens, a tragedy extending to 2601 lines, in which the personae are Christus, Thetokos, Joseph, Theologus, Magdala- nes, Nicodemus, Nuntius, Pilatus, Congregatio Pontificum, Orato Virginum, Semichorus, Advenementum. This poem, on the other hand, is relegated to an appendix as not the work of Gregory, in accord with the opinion of all the best authorities; though M. Villermain (Tableau, &c. p. 135) has assumed its genuineness without note or question. Reference may be made to Caillau’s Monilum in loco, Tillemont (Histoires, iii. 559), Dom Caillier, Hist. des Ant. eccl. de France, wherein he himself inclined to attribute it to a Gregory who became bishop of Antioch A.D. 572. Of the MSS. in which the works of Gregory have been preserved, and the printed editions, a full account is ready to hand in the prefaces of Cleomenet (Opera, i. pp. 1-6) and Caillau (Opera, ii. pp. 1-6); and in Fabricius, Bibloth. Graeca, ed. et seq. The earliest of the Greek editions is the Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationes Lectissimae XVI. Graecé ex editione M. Musuri; Venetiis in aedibus Aldi, 1516, in 8vo. The earliest of the Latin is Gregoryi Nazianzeni carmina, ad hanc beatique viuendam utilissima, Latiné ex editione Aldi Manutii Romani et Patrici Condadi Monachi; Venetiis, Aldo Manutius, in 4to, 1504. In 1569 there appeared at Paris Prima opera Grgori adornata a Jacobo Bilio Prunaco S. Michaelis in Erone Abbato editione suo interpretatione. It was accompanied by a new translation and by the commentaries of Nicetas, &c. In the same or the following year it appeared at Cologne, and has often been reprinted. Soon afterwards Leuvenklaes published an edition “Basilie anno 1571 ex Officina Bergrensis,” which bore on its first page the words “Ne
cally, the severe charm of which seems to have anticipated the finest inspirations of our melancholy age, while it preserves the impress of a faith still fresh and honest, even in its trouble" (Tableau de l’Eloquence chrétienne au Quatorzième Siècle, p. 135). He then translates the greater part of the "De humana natura" (No. 90, Opera, ii. 468-77) and adds, "There is no doubt that in the mixture of ab-tract thoughts and emotions, in this contrast of the beauties of nature with the realities of a heart tormented by the enigma of existence, and seeking to rest in faith, it is not the poetry of Homer; it is another poetry which has its truth, its novelty, and thence its grandeur. I much prefer it to the artificial limitations in which Christian literature sought to write and impose upon religious subjects the form of the older idiom of the Muses" (ibid. p. 135). Again, he says, in words which exactly characterize the genius of Gregory’s poetry: "It was in the new form of a contemplative poetry, in this sadness of man received in a mystic, religious fashion, a little known to the ancient poets, that the Christian imagination was especially to enter the arena against them without disadvantage. There, this poetry which modern critics seek for, this poetry of reflection and reverie, which enters into the human heart, and describes its immemorial thoughts and vague desires, sprang up of itself." (ibid. p. 158). And at the end of a paragraph, when he is referring to Gregory, though he speaks of "the writings of the bishop of Caesarea," M. Villemain adds, "His funeral eulogies are hymns; his invective against Julian have something of the malice of the prophets. He has been called the ‘Theologian of the East.’ He ought to have been called rather ‘The Poet of Eastern Christendom’" (ibid.).

In both these critiques there is an element of truth, but neither in the pages of Dr. Ullmann nor in those of M. Villemain do we find the Gregory who is portrayed in his own works. Dr. Ullmann knows, but does not always bear in mind, Gregory’s own statement of the aim of his poetry. It must be admitted that "as soon as he falls, in the course of his longer didactic poems, into a sort of sentence or a discursive moralizing strain, all claims to poetry naturally disappear," but Gregory had a higher mission than that of a poet, and he is himself fully conscious that he is sacrificing form to substance, and beauty to necessity (Carm. xxxix. 64 τα Ἐπιμέρους). Nor does the critic remember how large a part of Gregory’s poems are neither dogmatic nor discursive. The criticism, indeed, could hardly have been written had the second volume of the Benedictine edition been already published.

M. Villemain, on the other hand, has seen with his usual keenness of perception, and expressed with his usual felicity of language, the characteristic beauties of these poems; but when in his admiration of the poet he extols him above the theologian, he fails to recognize the true value of the latter, and Gregory himself, who is a theologian. To the critic, who is himself a theologian, Gregory appears as a theologian rather than a poet; to the critic, who is himself a poet, Gregory appears as a poet rather than a theologian; to the careful reader of his own work, he appears as both, but no one who recorded the teaching of dogmatic truth, and the combinator of error, as the work of life to which all besides was made to give way.

(2) Gregory’s extant letters, though upon very various subjects, and written in many cases under the pressure of immediate necessity, are almost invariably finished compositions. In one of them we have his own views as to what a letter should be. "A letter must be a simple statement of facts, with a little in the way of ambiguity added; it must be written in a style suitable to the occasion. The oratorical style is to be avoided, the familiar style cultivated. The best letter is that in which in few words conveys a sense to the unlearned, and yet utters a fuller meaning to him who is in instructed. Another requisite in a good letter is that it should be graceful. It ought to contain nothing without meaning, and nothing without finish. Illustrations and proverbs are suitable to the epistolary style, and it is made pleasant by pleasant words. But here, too, there must be moderation. Such things are to style what the purple colour is to rainment, and are to be used with careful hand. So with figures of speech. They are to be admitted, but the careful balancing of antitheses and like phrases is to be kept to the Sophists, or used playfully rather than in earnest. A good letter is more beautiful than others, just as the eagle of the old story was more beautiful than all other birds, because no one remarked its beauty. The thing to be aimed at in a letter is the beauty which comes from being natural, and which needs no adornment." Gregory modestly concludes by excusing himself from the rules of good letter-writing, because he was oppressed by weightier cares (Ep. ii. Opera, ii. 46). The next letter (ibid. p. 48) accompanied a collection of epistles sent to Nicobulus as specimens for use, not for show, for to ask the writer for letters, seeing that he had long ago given up the culture of literature, was like gathering flowers from an autumnal field; and the next to this (ibid. p. 48) places the letters of Basil before his own. He is led to do this so less by truth than by friendship, though an impartial judgment may think that he was influenced by friendship rather than by truth.

(3) A higher place has been claimed in this article for Gregory’s letter-writing than for his poetry; and examples have been given which may be considered sufficient to justify the claim. The Roman Breviary (Die in Mali) speaks of him as having surpassed all other sacred orators in solidity, and a subsequent of opinions from the 4th century to our own day may be quoted as supporting this view. He is now held to be greater than Basil, or again, to have eclipsed Chrysostom himself, or again, to have combined "the invincible logic of Bolland; the talent, colour, and harmony of Mssillon; the flexibility, poetic grace, and vivacity of Finel; the force, grandeur, and sublimity of Bossuet..." The Eagle of Meaux has been especially inspired by him in his funeral orations; the Swan of Cambrai has followed his advice in his treatise on 'The Litanies of God' (Delarue, Gregory of Tours, p. 721). It will be well enough to refer to such opinions as are found in the prose of the Benedictine editors, or in any of the lives; for the present purpose they are important as placing Gregory in a position which, after making full allowance for the literary weakness of editors and biographers, must be admitted to be in the very
first rank of Christian orators. He was indeed an orator by training and profession. For this he studied at Caesarea, Alexandria, and Athens, and was the acknowledged chief in the schools of the rhetoricians. He not unfrequently refers to the power of his own eloquence, and in a famous passage of the first twenty verses against Justin, who had boasted "ours is eloquence and the arts of Greece and the culture of the gods; yours is ignorance and boorishness" (Ammian Marcell. xxx. 4), he thus speaks of it, "I give up all besides; riches, nobility, glory, power, and all such earthly things. But I cling to eloquence alone; and I do not regret the labours by land and sea which I have undertaken to acquire it" (Orat. iv. 100, Opera, i. 132). The oratory of the Christian pulpit was the creation of Gregory and Basil. It was based on the ancient models, and was akin, therefore, to the speeches of Demosthenes and Cicero, rather than to the modern sermon. The exact orations of Gregory are extant, but it cannot be said that he has written, and are practically a volume of sermons for special occasions. Some of them were not delivered from the pulpit at all. Others were delivered to a multitude moved to tears as they thought of the death of some friend, or excited by the discussion of some burning question, and ready at any moment to burst forth in cries of sympathy, or kisses of dissent, or deafening cheers of approval. It has not unfrequently been a charge against the sermons of Gregory that they are not an exposition of Scripture. As compared with the Homilies of Chrysostom, for example, they certainly (with one exception, Orat. xxxvii., Opera, i. 525) are far behind in the matter of their close and intimate reference to the divine Word. It is impossible that they should be. But the answer to the charge, in the sense in which it is often made, is found in the discourses themselves. The margin of every page abounds with references to Scripture, and no reader can fail to see with Bosquet that "Gregory's whole discourse is nothing but a judicious weaving of Scripture, and a judicious unfolding of the mysteries of God. The reader cannot find acquaintance with it" (Défence de la Tradition, &c. iv. 2; Benoit, Grégoire, &c. 723).

ii. Great as was the position of Gregory as a writer, it is as a theologian that he has left his chief mark upon history. He alone beyond the apostolic circle has been thought worthy to bear the name "Theologus" which had been appropriated to St. John. In the story of his life, frequent allusion has been made to his teaching, and further reference may be made to the elaborate analysis of Ullmann (Gregorius, &c. ss. 209-352), who, following Chlumet (Opera, i. xliv.-xxxviii.), has arranged under their separate headings his views on the articles of faith. Within our present limits the chief of them only can be referred to, as they are contained in the five famous theological discourses delivered at Constantinople (Orat. xxvii.-xxxii., Opera, i. 487-579).

(1) The first is entitled Κατὰ Εὐχαριστίαν ἐνδοτική. It opens by showing "the evil of the desire for fine words," and comparing his "adversaries who left the practice of pietie for the discussion of theological questions to mountaineers who seek the applause of crowds. To discourse about God is a task of the greatest difficulty, not fitted for all times or all persons, nor to be undertaken in the presence of all persons. The heretics, having no strength in their own teaching, find it in the weakness of ours, as flies gather round wounds. We ought not to make our accusers our judges, nor in the presence of the foe draw the sword to our own destruction. The teacher of theology ought first to practise virtue. Thus he obtains for work to refute the older teaching of the pagan philosophers, or to discuss simpler questions of science and theology; but as to the nature of God our words should be few, for we can know but little in this life."

(2) Περὶ θεολογίας. Gregory reasserts here his favourite position, that "it is the pure mind only that can know God. Moses stands the mountain; Aaron is near; the elders are at a distance; the people are far away below; the beast on the mountain, incapable of thought and knowledge of God, is stoned. Heretics are like beasts on the mountain. The theologian beholds part of God, but the divine nature he can neither express in words nor comprehend in thought. He can only perceive the presence of angels even cannot know Him as He is. That there is a creating and preserving cause, we can know, as the sound of an instrument bears witness to its maker and player; that God is, we know, but what He is, and of what nature He is, and where He is, and where He was before the foundation of the world, we cannot know. The Infinite cannot be defined. We can only indicate negative attributes, for the nature of the divine essence is beyond all human conception. There may be various reasons why God cannot be known by man. Three are suggested: (c) we shall hereafter prize this knowledge the more; (d) we should have been in danger, had we the faculty of knowing He was not doing it out of pride, as Lucifer did; (e) they may have a rich reward, who have purged themselves from sin here, and have patiently waited for the fulfilment of their hope. The cause of our present inability is the union of the soul with the body, which prevents it from rising wholly above sensible objects. The mind is soon wearied in this state, and attempts to form ideas of things above. In the descent to our weakness, God is called in Holy Scripture by names drawn from sensible objects. The mind either forms from these ideas the many gods of idolatry, or uses them as stepping-stones to a knowledge of the true God. The mystery of the divine essence is natural, and is analogous to other mysteries which surround us. Man—the juncture of soul and body, the functions and powers of the mind and various organs of the body, the continuity of species and variety of individuals; the wonderful variety and powers of animals, fishes, birds, insects; the many kinds, utility, and beauty of plants, fruits, flowers; the phenomena of earth and sea and sky; the nature of angelic beings; all these are equally beyond human reason."

(3) Περὶ Μαυθ. The two previous discourses were introductory. He now passes to the next subject. "The three earliest opinions concerning God were anarchia, polycraria, and monarchia. The two former could not stand, as leading to confusion rather than the order of the universe. We hold that there is a Oneness, but that God is not limited to one person. If unity is divided, it becomes plurality. But if there is equal dignity of nature, and agreement of will, and identity of movement, and convergence to unity
of those things which are of unity (and this cannot be the case in created things), there may be distinction in number without by any means involving distinction in essence and nature. Unity, therefore (μοναρχία), from the beginning going forth to duality (εἰς διδύμα), constituted a "Theologia". If the words fail to express the generation and procession, and it is better to keep to scriptural terms; but the writer has in his thoughts an overflowing of goodnes, and the Platonic simile of an overflowing cup applied to first and second causes. The generation and procession are eternal, and all questions as to time are inapplicable." Gregory then proceeds to state and answer the common objections of his adversaries.

"The Son and the Spirit can be co-eternal with the Father, and yet be born of and proceed from Him. Eternity does not imply self-originality, but an originality to which it may be referred: just as light proceeds from the sun, but is not later than the sun."

"This generation is free from all passion because it is incorporeal."

"The Father is properly Father because He is not also Son; the Son is properly Son because He is not also Father. Man is both father and son, and is properly neither."

"The Scriptures use the past tense in speaking of the generation of the Son, but every student of Scripture knows that the tenses of verbs are interchanged (e.g. Ps. ii. 1 and xxv. 6)."

"To ask whether the Father begat the Son voluntarily or involuntarily, is as absurd as it would be to ask whether He is God voluntarily or involuntarily."

"The generation of the Son is indeed incomprehensible; but that of every human being is also incomprehensible and yet true."

"The question whether the Son existed before He was begotten is absurd, when eternal generation is thought of. The Arian dilemma is met by another. Is time in time or not?"

"Begotten and not-begotten are not the same thing. Are the Father and the Son, then, the same thing? "The Father and the Son are the same in their essence and nature. These proceed from the divine essence any more than immortality, inoecence, immutability. Otherwise there would be several divine essences. That is the divine essence which belongs to God alone, but we cannot know that essence, as has been already shewn.""

"If the Son is of the same essence as the Father, and the Father is unbegotten (they say), the Son must be unbegotten." But God and "unbegotten" are not the same thing."

"Or, again, to say if God made not an end of begetting, the generation is imperfect; and if there is an end, there must have been a beginning," is to argue from corporeal to spiritual things. What would they say of the angelic or human spirits which have come into existence but will not cease to be."

"According as they say, called God equivocally, as a painting is called an animal, but is really and properly God."

After dealing with other paradoxisms, Gregory passes on to an examination of the passages in Scripture in which the divinity of the Son is expressed, and of the passages which speak of the humanity, and are quoted as opposed to the divinity by the Eunomians. "The Son was equal to the Father, and what He was He remained at the Incarnation; what He was not He assumed. God became man that we might become gods."

"The oration ends with an apology for dealing with such subtleties, which weaken the force of the truth. By this prayer that his adversaries may have faith, by which alone spiritual truth can be discerned."

(4) Πελ Ταῖα. In this discourse the subject of the third is continued. Gregory has already answered the objection, that some passages of Scripture speak of the Son as human. He here enters upon an exhaustive examination, under ten objections, of the scriptural language applied to our Lord, and then passes to an exposition of the names which are (a) common to the Deity, (b) peculiar to the Son, (c) peculiar to the Son as man."

(5) Πελ τοῦ Ἀγίου Νυμφήσεως. Gregory commences this oration on the Holy Spirit by referring to the special difficulties arising from (a) the fact that many who admitted the divinity of the Son regarded the divinity of the Holy Ghost as a new doctrine not found in Holy Scripture; (b) that those defeated by his previous arguments had become the more determined to hold their ground here; (c) that he was himself worn out by the earlier discourses, and that his adversaries were wearied with them. He then expresses, in the strongest terms, his own belief in the divinity of the Third Person in the Trinity, no less than in that of the Father and the Son. "The Holy Spirit is holiness. Had the Spirit been wanting to the divine Trinity, the Father and the Son would have been imperfect."

Historically, it is true that the Sadducees did not believe in the Holy Spirit; neither did they in angels or a resurrection, but it is difficult to see how they avoided the explicit witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c.

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c.

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c.

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c.

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c.

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c."

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c."

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c."

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c."

"Our argument is neither with those who deny that there is a Spirit nor yet with pagans, but with professing Christians who accept the Scriptures. Not the divine essence is the subject of our anxious thought; but how they avoided the expression witness of the Old Testament. The most eminent of the pagan philosophers had a glimpse of the truth, for they spoke of the "Mind of the Universe," the "Mind without," &c."
Son, for nothing can be wanting to God, but on account of the difference of their manifestation and mutual relation. In the same way the Father is not called Son.

"The Spirit is of the same substance with the Father and the Son (δια μορφῶν). Again, we have a mystery beyond human thought, but in the generation of animals there are faint shadows which may help us. Adam was a creature of God, Eve a segment of the creature, Seth the offspring of both. Was the same thing creature and segment and offspring? And yet no similitude can fully represent the truth."

"If they ask who of ancient or modern times worshipped the Spirit, the answer is found in the words of Scripture (John iv. 24; Rom. viii. 26; 1 Cor. xiv. 15). It is true that St. John says of the Son, 'by Him were all things made that were made,' but this does not include the Spirit, for the evangelist does not say 'all things' simply."

"Their chief objection is that to acknowledge the Spirit is to adulterate the Son. Are they themselves then, seeing that they do acknowledge the divinity of the Son, Dithylets (Διθυλετα)? Do they assert that things which have the same substance are numbered together (κατὰ μορφὰς τὰ κατὰ μορφὰς), and that things which differ in substance are numbered separately? This is to forget that number refers to quantity, not to quality; to the quantity of the things contained under it, not to their nature. Three things may be called 'one, one, one,' though they are of the same substance; or 'three' though they are of different substances."

"Do they ask why Holy Scripture is not more express in its statements about the divinity of the Spirit? Let them observe the method of Scripture. Some things are spoken of which are not, e.g. as when God is said to sleep or to wake or be angry. Some things are not spoken of which are. Where do they derive the terms τὸ γενέσθαι, τὸ γεγονός, τὸ ἀδημονοῦντα? Some things are not, and are not spoken of: as an evil God, or a square circle. Some things are, and are spoken of: as God, man, angel, judgment. It is absurd then to render the question one word. The Scripture does not in so many words assert the divinity of the Holy Spirit, but it does in fact. Besides, why do the Arians make this an objection when the most express terms did not convince them of the divinity of the Son? God blesses men with, not against, their own will. Further, the revelation of Father (Old Testament), Son (New Testament), and Spirit (after the Ascension) is progressive. The human mind could not have grasped the full truth at once; it was to be expected therefore that the divinity of the Spirit, who was given after the ascension of the Son, should not be taught during the earlier manifestation. There are, moreover, in Holy Scripture a number of texts which do teach it."

These Gregory quotes and explains, and then passes on to sum up in a restatement of the doctrine of the Trinity.

"There are some faint resemblances which may in a degree help to give an idea of Trinity in Unity. The fountain, the stream, the river; the sun, the ray, the light; the ray falling upon the water and reflected by it. But there is a danger that these images should mislead rather than lead; and the only safe position is that of humble faith."

It has been said with truth that these discourses of Gregory would lose their chief charm in translation. No conception of their subtlety of thought or beauty of expression, can be given in an outline, where a few words often represent several pages. Critics have rivalled each other in the praises they have heaped upon them, but no praise is so high as that of the many theologians who have found in them their own best thoughts. A critic who cannot be accused of partiality towards Gregory has given in a few words perhaps the truest estimate of them. "A substance of thought, the concentration of all that is spread through the writings of Hilary, Basil, and Athanasius; a flow of softened eloquence which does not halt or lose itself for a moment; an argument nervous without dryness on the one hand, and without useless ornament on the other, give these five discourses a place to themselves among the monuments of this fine genre, who was not always in the same degree free from grandiloquence and affectation. In a few pages and in a few hours Gregory has summed up and closed the controversy of a whole century." (De Brolige, L'Eglise et l'Empire, v. 385; Benoit, Gregoire, &c. 435, 436).

Books.—Little is needed for the study of Gregory's life and works beyond the admirable Benedictine edition referred to above, and the Lives by Ullmann (Gregorios von Nazianzen der Theologe, 2. Aufl., Gotha, 1867; first part of earlier edition translated by Cox, Oxford, 1855) and Benoit (Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Paris, 1876). A well-known comparison of Gregory and Basil will be found in Dr. Newman's Church of the Fathers, pp. 116-45, 551. See also a recent important work discussing some of the disputed questions in the life of Gregory by the Abbé Louis Montaut, Revue Critique de questions historiques se rapportant à St. Grégoire de Nazianze et à son siècle. [H. W. W.]"
and we may reasonably conclude that he was brought up in the schools of his native city. That no very special pains had been devoted to his literary and intellectual instruction, we may gather from the words of his sister Macridora to him on her deathbed, in which she ascribed their propriety to the young pious and prudent bishops of his time to the prayers of his parents, since “he had little or no assistance towards it from home.” 

A feeble constitution, subject to frequent illnesses, and a natural shyness disposed the young Gregory to a literary retirement in preference to the active walks of life. His intellectual powers were considerable, and had been improved by diligent private study; but he shrank from a public career, and appears after his father’s death to have lived upon his share of the paternal estate, without adopting any profession. That his religious instincts did not develop early appears from his account of his reluctant attendance at the religious ceremonial held by his mother, the widow of an honoured “martyr.” A day having been fixed for the translation of the relics of these sainted soldiers to a chapel erected for their reception, Emmelia summoned her son to Annesi to take part in the festival. The occasion was one in which a young layman like Gregory had but little sympathy, and he was immersed in occupations which he was unwilling to leave. He records the annoyance he felt at his mother’s having chosen a time for her function so inconvenient to him, and for compelling him to be present even before the ceremonies began. The service in honour of the martyrs was held in his mother’s garden, and lasted all through the night. But it had few attractions for the young student, who, wearied with his journey, threw himself down in an arbour and fell asleep. His mind, however, was not altogether at ease, and as he slept he seemed to be seeking to enter the garden, the approach to which was barred by the martyrs, who beat him with their rods, and would have excluded him altogether but for the intercession of one of their band. On awaking from his dream, full of remorse for the dishonour he had done them, and hastening to the tomb which enshrined their ashes and bedewed it with bitter tears, beseeching God to be propitious to him, and the sainted soldiers to forgive the slight he had shewn them (“Orat. in XL. Martyr., Opp. tom. ii. p. 212”). It is evident that this terrifying vision had a very powerful effect on the young Gregory’s mind, and under its influence he undertook the office of a “lector,” in pursuance of which the friar friend of Nazianzus, Gregory Nazianzen, reminds him, he read the Bible lections in the congregation (Greg. Naz. Ep. 43, tom. i. p. 804). He would seem, however, to have soon tired of his new vocation, which he deserted for that of a professor of rhetoric. This backsliding, caused great pain to Gregory’s friends, and gave occasion to the enemies of religion to suppose that his renunciation was the result of unfounded accusations against him. Gregory Nazianzen, whose affection for him was warm and sincere, addressed to him a very strong remonstrance, expressing the grief felt by himself and others at his gradual and stealthy falling away from his first love; his discarding the Holy Scriptures, so full of the streams of grace, for the brackish and arid channels of secular learning, and seeking for “inglorious glory.” He reproaches his friend for the “demonic ambition” which led him to covet the name of rhetorician rather than that of Christian, as well as for bringing discredit on his Christian profession by the public boasting of his gifts in the disputations and contests. He earnestly entreats him to return to a better mind, to make his apology to God, to the altar, and to the faithful, engaging to pay for his restoration to the God that quickens the dead (Greg. Naz. Ep. 43 [57], tom. i. p. 804). The date of this temporary desertion cannot be ascertained, but since during the short reign of Julian it was forbidden to Christians to act as public instructors we must place it either before 361 or after 363. At or about the same time we may place Gregory’s marriage. His wife was named Theosebeia, and from the description given of her by Gregory Nazianzen in the letter written to console his friend on her death, we may gather the character she bore upon her name. Gregory Nazianzen calls her “the Theosebeia,” conferring spiritual relationship stronger than that of nature. We do not know when her death occurred, but it was after Gregory had become a bishop, and, according to Tillemont, subsequently to the council of Constantinople, in 381. Expressions in Gregory Nazianzen’s letter would lead us to believe that both himself and his friend were somewhat advanced in life at that time; and from Theosebeia being styled Gregory Nyssen’s “sister” we may gather that they had ceased to cohabit, probably on his becoming a bishop. We do not hear of their having any offspring. (Greg. Naz. Ep. 85, tom. i. p. 840; Nis. H. E. xi. 19.)

Gregory did not long exercise his profession of a teacher of rhetoric. The urgent remonstrances of his friend Gregory Nazianzen would have an earnest supporter in his elder sister, the holy recluse Macrina, who would not fail to use the same powerful arguments with him which had proved effectual in inducing Basil to give up all prospect of military life for the service of Christ. It is probable also that the profession he had undertaken may have proved increasingly distasteful to one of Gregory’s sensitive and retiring disposition, and that the small results of his exertions to inspire a literary taste among the youth (who, as he complains in letters to his brother Basil’s tutor Libanius, written while practising his profession as a rhetorician (Greg. Nys. Ep. 43, 14.) Nazianzen much reproves ready to enter the army than to follow rhetorical studies), may have discouraged him from bestowing any further labour on so unproductive a soil. After some struggles he finally resolved to quit the world and its pursuits, and retired to a monastery in Pontus, which we cannot hesitate to identify with that on the river Iiris presided over by his brother Libanius, and by his own solicitation come to Annesi, where was the female convent of which his sister Macrina was the superior. In this conventual retreat he passed several years, devoting himself to the study of the Scriptures and the works of Christian commentators. Among these it is certain that Origen had a high place, the influence of his writings being evident in his
own theological works. During his residence in Pontus, c. A.D. 371, he composed his work, De Virginitate, in which, while extolling the state of virginity as the highest perfection of Christian life, he laments most poignantly the fatal error by which, as by a wall or a gulf, he had separated himself from it, and rendered it impossible that he should ever attain that angelic virtue which seemed to have been his chief vocation (De Virg., lib. iii. tom. iii. pp. 116, sqq.). Towards the close of his residence in Pontus, A.D. 371, circumstances occurred displaying Gregory's goodness of heart together with his simplicity and complete want of judgment in a striking manner. From some unexplained cause an estrangement had arisen between Basil and his aged uncle, the bishop Gregory, whom the family deservedly regarded as their second father. The younger Gregory took on himself the office of mediator. Straight paths having failed to conduct to the desired end, he adopted crooked ones, and forged letters to his brother in their uncle's name seeding reconciliation. The result must have been expected. The letters were indignantly repudiated by the justly offended bishop; strong language was used on both sides, and reconciliation became increasingly hopeless. On the discovery of the deceit, Basil addressed a letter to his brother, which is a model of dignified rebuke. He first ridicules him with his simplicity, unworthy even of one of the lower animals, still more of a Christian, reproaches him for endeavouring to serve the cause of truth by deception, and upbraids him with his unbrotherly conduct in siding affliction to one already pressed out of measure (Basil. Ep. 58, [44]). From this calm retirement in A.D. 372 (the same year which saw the consecration of his friend Gregory Nazianzus to the see of Saisa, as well as that of one of the most widely venerated of the Western prelates, St. Martin of Tours) Gregory was reluctantly forced by his brother Basil to undertake the cares and labours of the episcopate. His unwillingness to exchange his life of studious leisure and religious contemplation for the heavy burden of temporal cares was so great that, as we learn from a letter of Basil's, he had to be used to compel him to allow the ordaining hands to be laid upon him (Basil. Ep. 225 [385]). The see selected for him by his brother was Nyssa, an obscure town of Cappadocia Prima, about ten miles from the capital, Caesarea. So inconspicuous was the place that their common friend, Eusebius of Samosata, wrote to Basil to remonstrate on his burying so distinguished a man in a see so unworthy of him. Basil replied that he had not done this through any want of appreciation of his brother's merits, which made him worthy to govern the whole church gathered into one, but from a desire that the see should be made famous by its bishop, not the bishop by his see (Greg. Th. 98 [259]). Basil's words contained an unconscious prophecy. Nyssa, which would otherwise have been utterly unknown, has gained universal celebrity from its bishop. It was not long after Gregory Nyssenus's ordination that his namesake of Nazianzus was also made to experience the irresistible power of Basil's will in his consecration to the bishopric of Saisa. The ceremony took place at Nazianzus. The future bishop was eagerly expecting the support of his friend Gregory Nyssenus's presence on the occasion. He did not, however, arrive till several days after the ceremony. It was a martyr's festival, and the new bishop was to preach. He devoted the exordium of his sermon to a studied eulogy on the two brothers, Gregory and Basil, whom he compared to Moses and Aaron, mingling with his eulogy covert reproaches, of the one for his absence at his ordination, of the other for forcing him into the episcopate against his will (Greg. Naz. Orat. 6, pp. 336 sqq.).

Basil had speedily fresh cause to complain of his brother's well-intentioned but blundering endeavours to befriend him. We are left in the dark as to the nature of the circumstances to which he refers in a letter to Eusebius of Samosata (Basil. Ep. 100 [256]), but the mention of synods collected by Gregory at Ancyra, and the plots against him caused by his simplicity, render it probable that a mistaken confidence in his powers of dealing with the world had resulted in the gathering of episcopal synods in the hope of rendering his brother effectual assistance, while he was really becoming a tool in the hands of clever and unscrupulous men of the world for his injury. So mistaken an estimate did Gregory entertain of his own powers that about this same time Basil had again to interpose his authority to prevent his brother being sent as his colleague of Dorotheus, the presbyter of Antioch, on his mission to Italy to solicit the intervention of Damasus and the Western bishops in the troubles of the East caused by the Melethian schism. In a letter to Dorotheus, Basil expresses his conviction of his excellent brother's complete unfitness for so delicate a negotiation, both on account of his truthfulness and honesty, and on account of his ecclesiastical matters, and because his simple-hearted goodness would be despised by a haughty character like Damasus, preferring flattery to truth (ibid. 215 [257]).

Gregory's episcopate fell in troublous times for the orthodox. Valent. a zealous Arian, was on the throne, and lost no opportunity of exciting his own party. The, he had scarcely entered into a theological controversy with Basil, would make him look on Gregory with no friendly eyes. [DEMOSTHENES.] After various petty acts of persecution, in which the semi-Arian prelates joined with high satisfaction, as a means of retaliating on Basil, a synod was summoned at Ancyra, at the close of A.D. 375, for the double purpose of examining some alleged canonical irregularities at Gregory's ordination to the episcopate, and of investigating a frivolous charge brought against him by a certain Philecharis, of having made away with some of the church funds left by his predecessor. A band of soldiers was sent to arrest Gregory and conduct him to the place of hearing. A chill on his journey brought on a pleurisie seizure, and aggravated a painful malady to which he was subject. His sufferings were so severe that he
entreated his conductors to allow him to halt for medical treatment. But they were deaf to his entreaties and mercilessly hurried him on. In some unexplained way, however, he managed to elude their vigilance and escaped to some place of concealment where his maladies could be cared for without equal to the operation. Of course, he collected a synod of orthodox Cappadocian bishops, in whose name he addressed a dignified but courteous letter to Demosthenes, apologizing for his brother's non-appearance at Ancyra, and stating that the charge of embezzlement could be shown to be false by the books of the treasurers of the church; while, if any canonical defect in his ordination could be proved, the ordainers, not the ordained, were those who should be called to account, an account which they were ready to render (Ibid. 225 [385]). Basil wrote at the same time in his brother's behalf of a man of distinction named Aburgius, begging him to use his influence to save him from the misery of being dragged into court, and being implicated in the trial. For his part, Gregory's disposition shrank from Demosthenes A.D. 376, through the active instrumentality of Eustathius of Sebaste, for his own episcopal city of Nyssa. Still Gregory refused to appear. He was pronounced contumacious and deposed by the assembled bishops, of whom Anysius and Eudiccus of Parnasse were the leaders, and a successor was consecrated, spoken of with scorn by Basil as a miserable slave who could be bought for a few obols (Ibid. 237 [264], 239 [10]). Gregory's deposition was followed by his banishment by the emperor Valens (Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Macr. tom. ii. p. 192). These accumulated troubles proved utterly crushing to Gregory's gentle spirit. In his letters written at this period he bewails the cruel necessity which had compelled him to desert his spiritual children whom with so much pain he had brought forth, and driven him from his home and all that was dearest to him, his brethren, his kinsmen, his friends, to dwell among malicious enemies who scrutinized every look and gesture, and his every word and mood them in the ground of accusation. He dwells with tender recollection on the home of which he had been deprived,—his fireside, his table, his pantry, his bed, his bench, his sackcloth,—and contrasts it with the stifling hole in which he was forced to dwell, of which only furniture was strictness, darkness, and cold. His only consolation is in the assurance that his brethren would feed him in their prison. (Greg. Nyss. Epist. 18, 22.) His letters to his friend Gregory Nazianzen have unfortunately perished, but the deep despondency in which he was sunk is shown by the replies. After his expulsion from his see his nameakes wrote that, though prevented from gratifying his desire of accompanying him in his banishment, he went with him in spirit, and that he would not lose his brother's loss, for the storm would blow over, and that he would get the better of all his enemies, as a recompense for his strict orthodoxy (Greg. Naz. Epist. 142, tom. i. p. 866). Driven from place to place, to avoid the evil designs of his enemies, he had compared himself to a stick carried aimlessly hither and thither on the surface of a stream; his friend replies that his movements were rather like those of the sun, which brings life to all things, or of the planets, whose apparent irregularities are subject to a fixed law (Ibid. 34 [327], p. 798). Out of heart at the apparent triumph of Arianism, Gregory bids him be of good cheer, and not to censure his brother. If, like serpents, creeping from their holes in the sunshine of imperial favour, who, however alarming his hissing, would be driven back into the earth by time and truth. All would come right if they left all to God (Ibid. 35 [337], p. 799). This trust in God proved well-founded. On the death of Valens, in 378, the youthful Gratian recalled all the bishops and, to the joy of the faithful, Gregory was restored to his see of Nyssa. In one of his letters, not improbably written to his brother Basil, he describes with graphic power the circumstances of his return. The latter half of his journey, which lay through a chain of villages along the riverside, was a triumphal progress. The inhabitants met him, some on horseback, some on foot, escorting him along the road with acclamations and tears of joy. A heavy storm of rain a little before he got to Nyssa driving the inhabitants indoors caused him to enter the city unobserved; but no sooner were his chariot-wheels heard as the pavements than a great crowd collected that his further progress was impeded, and he was prevented alighting, and was near drowning. When he got near the church a river of fire seemed to be pouring into it, from the number of lighted tapers borne before him by the holy virgins who had come forth to welcome back their beloved bishop (Greg. Nyssen. Epist. 3, Zacagni; No. 6, Migne). The happiness of his return was, however, short-lived. Private sorrow soon succeeded to public distress. The first day of the following year, Jan. 1, A.D. 379, saw the death of Basil, whom he loved as a brother and revered as a spiritual father. If not present at his death, he certainly attended his funeral, on which occasion he delivered his funeral oration, to which we are indebted for many particulars of that father's life. In common with Gregory's compositions generally, it is marked by his discursive style, extreme language and turgid oratory (Greg. Nyss. in Laud. Patr. Bas. tom. iii. pp. 479 sq.). Gregory Nazianzen, who was prevented from being present at his friend's obsequies by disabling illness, wrote a consolatory letter, praising Gregory very highly, and saying that the chief comfort he now had was to see all Basil's virtues reflected in him, as in a mirror (Greg. Naz. Epist. 37 [35], p. 799). One sorrow trod close on the heels of another in Gregory's life. The confusion in the churches after the long Arian supremacy entailed severe labours and anxieties upon him, and he was sent hither and thither for the defence of the truth, and the reformation of the erring (De Vit. Macr. tom. ii. p. 192). He had scarcely recovered from the blow of Basil's loss before he had to face the conflict of his sister Macrina, to whose wise instructions and holy example both he and Basil owed so much. In September of this year, A.D. 378, he had taken part in the council held at Asiach for the double purpose of healing the Antiochenec schism (which it failed to effect) and of taking measures for securing victory to the church
over the Arianism which had been lately
1 dominant (Labbe, Concil. ii. 910; Baluz. Not.
Concil. Coll. p. 78). On his way back to his
diocese, Gregory visited the monastery at
Aenea, over which his sister Macrina presided.
He found her suffering from a mortal illness
from which she expired the evening of the
next day. Her last hours, together with a detailed biography
of her from her birth, and even before it, is given
by him in a letter to the monk Olympius
(de Vit. S. Macrinae Virgin. tom. ii. pp. 177 sq.).
In his treatise de Anima et Resurrectiones
(entitled, in honour of his sister, vā Mauplōνa)
we have another account of her death, in
which he puts long speeches into her mouth,
as part of a dialogue held with him on the
proofs of the immortality of the soul and the
resurrection of the body, the object of which was
the mitigation of his grief for Basil's death (tom.
iii. pp. 181 sq.). [MACRINA THE YOUNGER.] After celebrating his sister's funeral, Gregory
came into contact with some of the leaders of
heresy, and on these occasions he
complains to a brother bishop named John, who
had been with him at Antioch (his letter to
whom is our chief authority for this part of
Gregory's history [Epist. xix.]), an unbroken
series of calamities awaited him. The Galatians
had been sowing their united heresies among
his churches. The people at Ibarus on the bor-
ders of Pontus having lost their bishop by death
availed themselves of Gregory's presence to
superintend the election and take the votes,
to elect him to the vacant see. This, in some un-
explained way, became the cause of troubles call-
ing for the intervention of the military, with the
count at their head, "setting the troops of the
commanding officer in motion against him." When
these difficulties had been settled, he was com-
pelled to set out on a long and toilsome journey,
in fulfillment of a commission he had received
from the council of Antioch, "to visit and re-
form the church of Arabia" (tom. iii. p. 653),
by which, as we learn from the same letter, that
of Babylon is intended. He found the state of the
church there "lingering in the wretchedness which
had been represented. The people had grown hardened
in heresy and were as brutal and barbarous in
their lives as in their tongue. They gloried in
the heinousness of their evil deeds, and set such
store by low cunning and violence that Sisyphus
and Sciron would be far greater in their eyes
than Archimedes. Lying was more natural to
them than to speak the truth. We have no
definite information as to the results of this
mission; but from the despairing tone in which
he speaks of it it is evident that he met with but
little success. At the termination of this visit-
tation he availed himself of his proximity to the
Holy Land to visit the spots consecrated by the
life and death of Christ. The journey was made
easier by the facilities afforded by the emperor,
who at the outset had put one of the public
chariots at his disposal, which he records served
him and his retinue "both for a monastery and a
church"; fasting, psalmody, and the hours of
prayer being kept up with the utmost regularity
all through the journey (tom. iii. p. 658). He
accomplished his object as far as seeing the
sacred spots went. He visited Bethlehem, Gol-
gotha, the Mount of Olives, and the Anastasis.
But the result of this pilgrimage was simple
disappointment. His faith received no confirm-
ation, and his religious sense was scandalized
by the gross immorality he found prevailing in
the Holy City itself, which he describes as a sink
of all iniquity. The church of Jerusalem was in
an almost equally unsatisfactory state. Cyril,
after his repeated depredations by Arian influence,
and finally rebuked, but not punished, by
Constantine's last letter, was the scene of the
dissensions of the Christians, or bring them back
to unity of faith. Gregory's efforts were equally
ineffectual, and he returned to Cappadocia
depressed and saddened with the spectacle.
He poured forth the feelings of his heart in two
letters, one to three ladies resident at Jerusalem,
Eustathia, Ambrosia, and Basilissa (tom. iii.
p. 659 sq.), the other the celebrated one "de
Eustathii Hierosolymo," in which he declares his
conviction not of the uselessness only but of the
evil of pilgrimages. "He urges the dangers and
suspicions to which pious reclusees, especially
women, would be subject, with male attendants,
either strangers or friends, on a lonely road;
the dissolute, even wicked, who is inevitable in the inn;
the dangers of robbery and violence in the Holy Land itself,
of the moral state of which he draws a fearful picture.
He asserts the religious superiority of Cappadocia,
which had more churches than any part of the
world, and enquires in plain terms whether a
man will believe the virgin birth of Christ the
more by seeing Bethlehem, or His resurrection
by visiting His tomb, or His ascension by standing
on the Mount of Olives." (Milman, Hist. of
Christianity, bk. iii. chap. 11, vol. iii. p. 192,
note.) His language is so unmeasured that it
has led some Roman Catholic writers, especially
Bellarmine (de Cultu Sacrorum, lib. iii. c. 8)
and Gretzer, to call in question its authenticity.
It is, however, fully supported by Laurus and
Tillemont, and there is no sufficient reason for
questioning its genuineness. The next time we
learn of Gregory is at the second general council,
that of Constantinople, a.D. 381 (Labbe, Concil.
ii. 653), accompanied by his deacon Evangelus,
in which he held a principal place as one of
those who had studied and recognized the
unorthodox theories of Eunomius, the great
archenemies of Nicene orthodoxy, as his friend
Gregory Nazianzen had at an earlier period
termed him. That he was the author of the
clauses then added to the Nicene symbol is an
unverified assertion of Nicephorus Callistus
(H. E. xii. 13). It is probable that it was on
this occasion that he read to his friend Gregory
Nazianzen and to Jerome his work against Euno-
mius, or at least the most important parts of
it (Hieron. de Vir. Illust. c. 123). Gregory
Nazianzen having been reluctantly compelled
to ascend the episcopal throne of Constantinople,
Gregory Nyssa delivered an inaugural oration
which has perished, and soon after a funeral
oration on the venerable Meletius of Antioch,
which has been preserved (Socr. H. E. iv. 26;
587 sq.). Before the close of the council the
emperor Theodosius issued a decree from Her-
cles, July 30, a.D. 381, containing the names of
the bishops who were to be regarded as centres of orthodox communion in their respective
districts. Among these Gregory Nyssa appears
in company with his metropolitan Callistus,
Caesarea and Otireus of Melitene, for the diocese
of Pontus (Cod. Theod. l. iii. "de Fide
Rufinus, under the presidency of Nectarius, to decide between the rival claims of the bishopship of Bagadus and Agapius to the see of Bostra, in Arabia; a question really appertaining to the jurisdiction of the see of Antioch (Labbe, Cod. ii. 1151). It was on this occasion that at the request of Nectarius Gregory delivered the homily bearing the title of Latin name. 

It is probable that he did not long survive this synod. The date of his death is uncertain, but it must be placed before the close of the century, perhaps in A.D. 395.

Writing, Gregory Nyssenus was a very copious writer, and the greater part of his recorded works have been preserved to us. His writings may be divided into five classes: I. Exegetical; II. Dogmatical; III. Ascetic; IV. Funeral Oration; and Panegyric Discourses; V. Letters.

I. Exegetical. — Gregory did not accomplish much for the exegesis of Holy Scripture, and what he has left is of no high value, his system of interpretation being almost entirely allegorical. To this class belong his works on the Creation, written chiefly to supplement and defend the great work of his brother Basil on The Hexameron. These are (1) Απολογίαν περὶ τῆς δαμασκήνης, dedicated to his youngest brother Peter, bishop of Sebaste. It takes its title "Apologiae" from its containing a defence of the actions of Moses, and also of some points in Basil's work which had been called in question. (2) Περὶ καταστασιν νεωτούρ, a treatise on the creation of man, written as a supplement to Basil's treatise (vol. i. p. 45; Soc. H. E. iv. 26). The fundamental idea of which is the unity of the human race—that humanity before God is to be considered as one man; also dedicated to his brother Peter. It is called by Basil, παρισματικός θανάτος. (3) Two homilies on the same subject (Gen. i. 26). These are frequently appended to Basil's Hexameron, and are erroneously assigned to him by Combes and others. There is also a discourse (tom. ii. pp. 22-34) on the meaning of the image and likeness of God in which man was created. (4) A treatise on the Life of Moses; and (5) A treatise on the Life of Moses; and (5) A treatise on the nature of a perfect Christian life; dedicated to Cassiarius. (6) Two books on the Superstitions of the Psalms. In this work he fruitlessly endeavours to show that the five books of the Psalter are intended to lead men upward, as by five steps, to moral perfection. The first book, in nine chapters, investigates the object of each of the five divisions of the Psalter. The second book is in sixteen chapters, and the third in nineteen. It is a treatise in detail, expounding them allegorically, without any critical insight into their real meaning; chapter 7 explains the word Allūrus; chapters 8 and 9 relate to the psalms that are destitute of superscriptions, giving enigmatic reasons for their absence where wanting both
the Hebrew and the LXX, and ascribing their absence in the Hebrew text, when present in the LXX, to the blindness and impiety of the Jews. In chapter 10, he attempts an explanation of the dogmata, and in the remaining chapters he carries out in detail his principle of the progressive becloudery of verities, a tendency which he regards as due to the Holy Spirit, very briefly in the first eleven, and more fully in Ps. xi.–viii.

An explanation of the sixth Psalm concludes this work. (6) Eight homilies expository of Ecclesiastes, ending with ch. viii. 15, "less forced, more useful, and more natural." (Dupin.) (7) Five homilies on Canticles, ending with ch. vi. 9; dedicated to Olympia. (8) Five homilies on the Lord's Prayer, "lectu dignissimae" (Fabric.). (9) Eight homilies on the Beatitudes. (10) A discourse on 1 Cor. xv. 28, in which he combats the Arian perversion of the passage as to the subjection of the Son. (11) A short treatise on the witch of Endor, "Εγγυνωρπαθαντων, to prove that they were demons of the shape of Samuel; addressed to a bishop named Theodocius. II. Dogmatical. — Far more valuable than Gregory's attempts at exegesis are his dogmatical works. These are deservedly regarded as among the most important patristic contributions towards a true view of the mystery of the Trinity, hardly, if at all, inferior to the writings of his greater brother, Basil. (1) The chief of these, both in size and importance, is his great work against Eunomius, written subsequently to the death of Basil, to refute the apology put forth by Eunomius, in reply to Basil's attack upon his teaching, and to vindicate his brother from the calumnious charges brought against him by the adversary. We learn from the dedicatory epistle to his younger brother, Peter, bishop of Sebaste, and his reply, that the work was written at his request, after his return from Armenia. It is in twelve books, of which the last is the longest, being more than a quarter of the whole. (2) Almost equally important with this are the replies to Apollinarius and the exposition against Apollinaris. These treatises are not only valuable as giving the most weighty answer on the orthodox side to the erroneous views of these heretical leaders, but, from the large number of extracts from their writings contained in them, they are really the chief sources of our acquaintance with the real character of their doctrines. The same subjects are treated with great accuracy of thought and spiritual insight in (3) Sermo Catecheticus Magnus, a work divided into forty chapters, containing a systematized course of theological teaching for the use of catechists, proving, for the benefit of those who did not accept the authority of Holy Scripture, the harmony of the chief doctrines of the faith with the instincts of the human heart. This work contains passages asserting the annihilation of evil, the restitution of all things, and the final restoration of evil men and evil spirits to the blessedness of union with God, so that He may be "all in all," embracing all things endowed with sense and reason—doctrines derived by him from Origen. To save the credit of a doctor of the church of acknowledged orthodoxy, it has been asserted from the time of Germanus of Constantinople that these passages were foisted in by heretical writers (Phot. Cod. 233, pp. 904 sqq.). But there is no foundation for this hypothesis, and we may safely say that "the will is father to the thought," and that the simul substitution of all things was distinctly held and taught by him in his writings. The concluding section of the work, which speaks of the errors of Aelia Urbanus, a convert to Christianity, on the way to a new and evidently an addition of some blundering copyist. Other dogmatic treatises from Gregory's pen which deserve mention are, that addressed to Simplicianus, a military tribune, on Faith in the Trinity; another dedicated to Abalbus against Thecesian; one to his brother, Peter of Sebaste, on the difference between "essence," "deity," and "person," 3beritotan; and the Sermones adversus Arius et Sabellianum; and de Spiritu Sancto adversus Macedoniam, first printed by Mai in his Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio (tom. viii.), and in the Nov. Patr. Biblioth., tom. iv. Weighty as Gregory's utterances are on the doctrine of the Trinity and the union of the two natures in Christ, it must be admitted that the human desire to exalt the divine nature he came dangerously near the doctrines afterwards developed by Eutyches, and the Monothelites, if he did not actually enunciate them. While he rightly held that the infinite Logos was not imprisoned in Christ's human soul and body, any more than the light of a torch is confined to the wick, so that while the flame is indispensably limited to the brachamovos or substratum of the torch, the light is not therefore imprisoned in it (Cat. Magn. c. 10)—he cannot be said to have assigned the proper independence to the person of the human soul and will. When he discusses the question how far Christ can be said to have had a free human will, he assigns the passivity alone to the human will, the active agency being simply and solely divine. He views Christ's will as merely something spondos, possessing mutability, possibility, and a passive capability of development, without any power of self-determination (cf. Darby, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii. vol. i. pp. 16, 175, Eng. transl.). Hooker quotes some other words adversus apollinaris. These treatises are not only valuable as giving the most weighty answer on the orthodox side to the erroneous views of these heretical leaders, but, from the large number of extracts from their writings contained in them, they are really the chief sources of our acquaintance with the real character of their doctrines. The same subjects are treated with great accuracy of thought and spiritual insight in (3) Sermo Catecheticus Magnus, a work divided into forty chapters, containing a systematized course of theological teaching for the use of catechists, proving, for the benefit of those who did not accept the authority of Holy Scripture, the harmony of the chief doctrines of the faith with the instincts of the human heart. This work contains passages asserting the annihilation of evil, the restitution of all things, and the final restoration of evil men and evil spirits to the blessedness of union with God, so that He may be "all in all," embracing all things endowed with sense and reason—doctrines derived by him from Origen. To save the credit of a doctor of the church of acknowledged orthodoxy, it has been asserted from the time of Germanus of Constantinople that these passages were foisted in by heretical writers (Phot. Cod. 233, pp. 904 sqq.). But there is no foundation for this hypothesis, and we may safely say that "the will is father to the thought," and that the simul substitution of all things was distinctly held and taught by him in his writings. The concluding section of the work, which speaks of the errors of Aelia Urbanus, a convert to Christianity, on the way to a new and evidently an addition of some blundering copyist. Other dogmatic treatises from Gregory's pen which deserve mention are, that addressed to Simplicianus, a military tribune, on Faith in the Trinity; another dedicated to Abalbus against Thecesian; one to his brother, Peter of Sebaste, on the difference between "essence," "deity," and "person," 3beritotan; and the Sermones adversus Arius et Sabellianum; and de Spiritu Sancto adversus Macedoniam, first printed by Mai in his Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio (tom. viii.), and in the Nov. Patr. Biblioth., tom. iv. Weighty as Gregory's utterances are on the doctrine of the Trinity and the union of the two natures in Christ, it must be admitted that the human desire to exalt the divine nature he came dangerously near the doctrines afterwards developed by Eutyches, and the Monothelites, if he did not actually enunciate them. While he rightly held that the infinite Logos was not imprisoned in Christ's human soul and body, any more than the light of a torch is confined to the wick, so that while the flame is indispensably limited to the brachamovos or substratum of the torch, the light is not therefore imprisoned in it (Cat. Magn. c. 10)—he cannot be said to have assigned the proper independence to the person of the human soul and will. When he discusses the question how far Christ can be said to have had a free human will, he assigns the passivity alone to the human will, the active agency being simply and solely divine. He views Christ's will as merely something spondos, possessing mutability, possibility, and a passive capability of development, without any power of self-determination (cf. Darby, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii. vol. i. pp. 16, 175, Eng. transl.). Hooker quotes some other words adversus apollinaris. These treatises are not only valuable as giving the most weighty answer on the orthodox side to the erroneous views of these heretical leaders, but, from the large number of extracts from their writings contained in them, they are really the chief sources of our acquaintance with the real character of their doctrines. The same subjects are treated with great accuracy of thought and spiritual insight in (3) Sermo Catecheticus Magnus, a work divided into forty chapters, containing a systematized course of theological teaching for the use of catechists, proving, for the benefit of those who did not accept the authority of Holy Scripture, the harmony of the chief doctrines of the faith with the instincts of the human heart. This work contains passages asserting the annihilation of evil, the restitution of all things, and the final restoration of evil men and evil spirits to the blessedness of union with God, so that He may be "all in all," embracing all things endowed with sense and reason—doctrines derived by him from Origen. To save the credit of a doctor of the church of acknowledged orthodoxy, it has been asserted from the time of Germanus of Constantinople that these passages were foisted in by heretical writers (Phot. Cod. 233, pp. 904 sqq.). But there is no foundation for this hypothesis, and we may safely say that "the will is father to the thought," and that the simul substitution of all things was distinctly held and taught by him in his writings. The concluding section of the work, which speaks of the errors of Aelia Urbanus, a convert to Christianity, on the way to a new and evidently an addition of some blundering copyist. Other dogmatic treatises from Gregory's pen which deserve mention are, that addressed to Simplicianus, a military tribune, on Faith in the Trinity; another dedicated to Abalbus against Thecesian; one to his brother, Peter of Sebaste, on the difference between "essence," "deity," and "person," 3beritotan; and the Sermones adversus Arius et Sabellianum; and de Spiritu Sancto adversus Macedoniam, first printed by Mai in his Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio (tom. viii.), and in the Nov. Patr. Biblioth., tom. iv. Weighty as Gregory's utterances are on the doctrine of the Trinity and the union of the two natures in Christ, it must be admitted that the human desire to exalt the divine nature he came dangerously near the doctrines afterwards developed by Eutyches, and the Monothelites, if he did not actually enunciate them. While he rightly held that the infinite Logos was not imprisoned in Christ's human soul and body, any more than the light of a torch is confined to the wick, so that while the flame is indispensably limited to the brachamovos or substratum of the torch, the light is not therefore imprisoned in it (Cat. Magn. c. 10)—he cannot be said to have assigned the proper independence to the person of the human soul and will. When he discusses the question how far Christ can be said to have had a free human will, he assigns the passivity alone to the human will, the active agency being simply and solely divine. He views Christ's will as merely something spondos, possessing mutability, possibility, and a passive capability of development, without any power of self-determination (cf. Darby, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii. vol. i. pp. 16, 175, Eng. transl.). Hooker quotes some other words adversus apollinaris. These treatises are not only valuable as giving the most weighty answer on the orthodox side to the erroneous views of these heretical leaders, but, from the large number of extracts from their writings contained in them, they are really the chief sources of our acquaintance with the real character of their doctrines. The same subjects are treated with
who harshly condemn others for sin, on Charity to the Poor, avoiding fornication, and the like; together with treatises on the chief festivals, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day, &c.

V. Epistles.—The number of Gregory’s letters preserved to us is not great. The chief are that to Flavian, complaining of his contumelious treatment by Helladius, and the two on Pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Fourteen letters were published by Zacagni, librarian of the Vatican, died 1712) in his Collect. Mon. Vet. Eccl. Gracc. et Lat. pp. 354–400 (quarto, Rom. 1698), to which seven were added by J. B. Caraccioli from a Medicean MS. (Florence, 1781). The whole were transferred to Galland’s Isis. Vet. Patr. vol. vi. pp. 604, sqq. and Migne’s Patrologiae (vol. xlii. pp. 999 sqq.).

Editions.—Omitting the editions of separate treatises, the earliest publication of Gregory’s collected works was in a Latin translation issued from the press at Cologne in 1537. This was followed by one from the Basil Press, 1592, L. Sifanius being chiefly responsible for the version. It appeared again at Basel with additions in 1571, and at Paris in 1578, 16th ed. Paris, 1590. These editions were greatly surpassed in elegance and accuracy by that of Paris 1603, under the superintendence of Front du Duc.

Greek and Latin.—The first edition of the Greek text with a Latin translation appeared from Morel’s press at Paris in 1615 in two volumes folio, also edited by du Duc. To this an appendix was added in 1618 from materials supplied by Greuter. It issued again from the same press, but with a great falling off both in elegance and accuracy, in 1638, in three volumes folio. Other complete reprints, including his epistles and other additamenta, are those by Galland (Bibl. Vet. Patr. tom. vii.) and Migne (Patrologia, tom. xivii–xlv). A critical examination of the works of Gregory Nyssen is, however, much wanted. It is matter of surprise and regret that no duly qualified scholar has undertaken a task in which, to quote the Bibliotheca Graccorum of Fabriucius (ed. Harles, vol. i.) “amplissimus patet campus in quo vires ingenii, eruditionis, et difficilem, cae ma laude pariter ac utitale, posset exercere.” Two praiseworthy efforts have been commenced to supply this deficiency in the proposed editions of the Rev. G. H. Forbes, Burntisland, 140, 1855, and of Fr. Oehlens, Halis, 8vo, 1865 (in which last it is to be regretted that sufficient care has not been exercised in the use of the MSS.; neither of which has, we believe, gone beyond the first volume. Oehler has also edited a selection from the works of Gregory Nyssen, accompanied by a good German translation (Bibliothek der Kirchen-Väter, Band 1, 1838). The later editions of Galland and Migne include some very important additions to the original Monellian edition, first given to the world by Zacagni (Collect. Monum. Vet. Ecol. Gracc. Romae, 1698, 4to, tom. i.), and J. B. Caraccioli (Flor. 1731). Some valuable fragments from other sources are also published by Galland and by Mai (Nov. Collect. Vet. Script., tom. i.) The familiar letters published by Zacagni and Caraccioli are very helpful towards forming an estimate of Gregory’s character. They show us a man of great refinement, with a love for natural beauty and a lively appreciation of the picturesque in scenery and of elegance in architecture. Of the latter art the detailed description given in his letter to Amphibias (Epist. 25), of an octagonal “martyrium” surrounded by a conical spire, rising from a clerestory supported on eight columns, proves him to have possessed considerable technical knowledge. It is perhaps the clearest, and most detailed description of an ecclesiastical building of the 4th century remaining. Gregory to Adelphius (Epist. 20) furnishes a charming description of a country villa, and its groves and ornamental buildings, at Vanota in Galaat, on the banks of the Hellespont. He enlarges with evident delight on the vine-clad trellises laden with delicious grapes, the orchards of peaches and other fruits, the arbours bright with roses, the shrubberies vocal with the song of birds, and the stews filled with fish so tame that they came to be fed. Few passages of patristic literature will better repay perusal than this delightful letter, which makes us keenly regret the nearly total loss of his correspondence. He was commemorated in the Cat. Ethip. on Nov. 22.


GREGORIUS (18), Bishop of Merida from cir. 402. He is known to us only from the decretal of Innocent I. addressed ad universos episcopos in Toleso (should be ‘qui in Toleso congregati sunt’). (For a discussion of the mutilated and imperfect form in which this letter appears in the Spanish Codex Canonne, drawn up, according to the majority of authorities, before 633, and of the inferences to be drawn from its mutilation, see dispute between Fr. Manson, Gesch. der Quellen und der Lehrentes Kanonischen Recht, &c., and Gams, Tit. Theolog. Quartalschrift, 1857, 1–23, and Kirchengesch. ii. 2, 463.) Innocent’s letter (which Jaffé dates 404) is concerned partly with the schism of those bishops of Baetica and Cartaginensis who refused to acknowledge the authority of the council held at Toledo in a.d. 460, in which the once Priscillianist bishops, Symphonus and Dictinus, were readmitted to communion, partly with certain irregularities in the manner of ordination then prevalent in Spain. The pope lays down that although strictly speaking the illegal ordinations already made ought to be cancelled, yet, for the sake of peace and to avoid tumults, what is past is to be condoned. The number of canonically invalid ordinands, however, is so great that if all were to be inquired into, the existing confusion would be made worse instead of better.

“How many have been admitted to the priest-
hoad who, like Rufinus and Gregory, have after baptism practised in the law courts? How many soldiers who, in obedience to authority, have been obliged to execute harsh orders (severa praecepta)? How many curiales who, in obedience also, have done whatever was commanded them? How many who have given amusements and spectacles to the people (Magnae familiae populi celebrantur)? have become bishops? (See Gams's comments on Can. 2 of Council of Elberi. 1. 53.) "Quorum omnium neminem ne ad societatem quidem ordinis clericiorum, optuerant pervenire" (see Decret. cap. iv. Tejada y Ramiro; Cod. de Can. ii.). In cap. v. we have the second mention of Gregory, "Let the complaint, if any, of Gregory, bishop of Merida, ordained in place of Patrunius (who presided at C. Tol. 1.) be heard, and if he has suffered injury contra meriti sum, let those who are envious of another's office be punished, lest in the future the spirit of faction should again inconvenience good men."

From these notices it appears then that Gregory succeeded Patrunius in the metropolitan see of Merida shortly after the council of Toledo in 400, that in his youth and after baptism, he had practised as an advocate; that his election to the bishopric of Merida was therefore, strictly speaking, illegal, and that, either on this account or on some other, great opposition had been made to his appointment. The effect of Innocent's letter would naturally be to confirm him in his see and to discredit the party of opposition to him. In all probability, it was during Gregory's pontificate that the irrigation of Vandalia, Alauni, and Suevi into Spain took place (in the autumn of 409, Ida. apud Exp. Sarr. iv. 353), and those scenes of horror and cruelty took place of which Idasius has left us a vivid, though possibly exaggerated, picture. After a first period of indiscriminate devastation and plunder, "Barbari ad pacem inueniunt Domino miseram conversi, sorte ad habitandum sibi Provinciarum dividunt regiones" (Idast. l. c. aann. 411). In this division Lusitania and Carthaginensia fell to the Alani, themselves to be shortly destroyed by the Goths under Alaric (410), and Merida with its splendid buildings and its Roman prestige, together with all the other great cities of southern Spain, "Barbarorum per Provincias dominantium se subjicuit servituti."

Innocent's letter, in which the passages above quoted concerning Gregory occur, is extremely valuable for Spanish church history at the time. It is given in two forms by Tejada y Ramiro II.; in the incomplete and mutilated form in which it appears in the Spanish Cod. Canesum, and in the complete form containing all the names and historical matter, in which it appears in other collections. (Exp. Sarr. xiii. 163; Gams, Kirchengesch. l. i. 420.) [M. A. W.]

GREGORIUS (17), a bishop of Lydia. He was an adherent of Chrysostom, compelled to retire from his see to some place of concealment in his native country, where he was living in A.D. 408. (Pallad. Dial. 195.) [E. V.]


GREGORIUS (19), bishop of Cerusus, sup- Christ. Bioog.—Vol. II.
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peced to be Ciriandus in Puegas, at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1123 c. 1214 d.; Le Quen, Or. Conc. i. 515.) [R. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (20), a bishop of Lilibaum of uncertain date, but probably between A.D. 200 and 450. He suffered martyrdom, but at what time, and whether under some Roman emperor or from the Vandals, is uncertain. (Acta SS. Jun. 5; Firis, Sctt. Ecc. 482.) [R. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (21), bishop of Adriensiople, metropolitan of the province of Hasmimontus, at the council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451; one of the bishops who subscribed the synodal letter of that council to Leo I. (Leo. Mag. Ep. 98, 1304, Migne); present also at the council held at Constantinople under Gennadius against simony, about A.D. 459. (Harduin, Acta Concil. ii. 785.) He was also one of the metropolitans to whom the emperor Leo addressed his imperial letter in defence of the orthodox faith A.D. 457, on the occasion of the massacre of Proterius of Alexandria and the other excesses of the Egyptian Eutychians. No reply of Gregory is extant, as in the case of many other of the metropolitans to whom the emperor's letter was addressed. (Harduin, Acta Concil. ii. 698; Oriens Christ. i. 1173; Tillemont, xv. p. 758.) [C. G. G.]

GREGORIUS (22), bishop of Sebastopolis in Lesser Armenia; his name is appended to the letter of his province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vil. 589; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 426.) [L. D.]

GREGORIUS (23), supposed Sicilian bishop. There is a great doubt who and what he was. Such a person is supposed to have been driven from Africa during the Vandal persecutions of the 5th century, and to have found refuge in Sicily, where he afterwards met with martyrdom at the hands of some of the remaining heathen inhabitants. (Acta SS. Jun. 18.) [L. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (24), bishop of Modena, mentioned in a minatory letter of pope Simplicius to John, archbishop of Ravenna, who had ordained Gregory, much against his will, bishop of Modena (Simplic. Pap. ep. 2 in Patr. Lat. 1vii. 35, dated at Jaffa May 30, 482, Reg. Pont. 50). Jaffe's date, if correct, must be the period of Gregory's consecration; but in the list of the bishops of Modena, according to Sillingardus (Catal. Episc. Mutinen. p. 14), Gregory sat from 477 to 501, coming between Theodorus and Bassianus. The same author details the circumstances under which Gregory was appointed. The see of Modena had been originally subject to Milan, but in 450 was transferred, along with Bologna, Reggio, Parma, and Placentia, to Ravenna by the emperor Valentinian III., who wished thereby to increase the dignity of his capital city. Accordingly John of Ravenna claimed to consecrate the bishop of Modena, and pope Simplicius was appealed to on behalf of the rights of Milan. [C. H.]

GREGORIUS (25), the name of two bishops who attended the synod of Jerusalem in 518, viz. of—

Metrocomins (Bacatha) in Palestine (Mansi, viii. 1073 b; Le Quen, Or. Conc. iii. 762)
GREGORIUS

Carolum à S. Paulo Fulensis, Geog. Soc. p. 316.
Eleutheropolis in Palestine (M. 1072 c).

GREGORIUS (20), bishop of Jericho at the council of Jerusalem, 536. (Mansi, viii. 1172;
Le Quien, Or. Christ. iii. 655.)

GREGORIUS (27), St., twelfth bishop of Auterre, between St. Theodoseus and St. Optatus, early in the 6th century. He is said to have occupied the see twelve years and six
months, and upon his death, in his eighty-fifth year, to have been buried in the church of St.
Germanus. He is commemorated Dec. 19. (Goll.
Christ. xii. 266.)

GREGORIUS (28), fourth bishop of Saintes, between St. Ambrosius and Petrus I., at the
beginning of the 8th century. All we know of him is from the Acta of St. Germanus,
the scholar of whom was ordained deacon and deacon by him; but these Acta, which purport to be
the work of Pseudo, a contemporary, are quite unnatrustworthy. (Boll. Acta SS. Mai. iii. 592;
Goll. Christ. ii. 1056; Gams, Series Episc. 625.)

GREGORIUS (29), St., sixteenth bishop of Langres, succeeding Albino. He belonged to
one of the highest Gallic families, being related to Euphranius archbishop of Tours, and like-
wise great-grandfather of Gregory the historian, who wrote a short account of him. He was
the uncle, too, of that Attalus who was one of the hostages given by Childebert to Theodoric
and after his rescue from slavery by one of Gregory's servants became count of
Autun. It was not till late in life that he
dedicated himself to the church. For forty
years he was count of Autun, and remarkable,
for his inflexible justice. Upon the death of his
wife, Armentaria, "he turned to the Lord," in
Gregory's phrase, and was elected and con-
corated bishop of Langres (A.D. 500). As bishop he
was noted for his abstemious abstemious,
and in his secret midnight devotions in the
baptistery at Dijon, where he usually lived.
Numerous miracles also are recorded of him,
and especially the finding of the body of St.
Benignus, the martyr of Dijon (A.D. 178), which
his biographer relates at length (De glor. Mort.
ii.). It was Gregory who induced St. John, the
founder of Iconium who had left his monastery
and retired to Arabia, to return to his post
and not abandon his undertaking (Boll. Acta
SS. Jan. ii. 856). Gregory was at the council of
Epaon in A.D. 517, and that of Clermont in 533,
and was represented by Evantius a priest at the
third of Orleans in 536.

He died of a fever caught in walking from
Dijon to Langres to be present at the services of
the Epiphany there on January 6, 509, and was buried, as he had desired, in a church within the walls
of Dijon. His son and successor in the see, Tetricus, translated his remains into a more
gorgeous tomb. He was commemorated Jan. 4.

A vapid epitaph was written on him by
ii; Hist. Franc. iii. 13, 19, iv. 13, v. 5; De glor.

GREGORIUS THEOPOLITANUS

Jan. 1, 167; Mansi, viii. 564, 883, ix. 21; Gall.
Christ. iv. 517.)

GREGORIUS (30), thirteenth bishop of Geneva, between Fappolus I. and Nicetas, about the
middle of the 6th century. (Goll. Christ.
vi. 381.)

GREGORIUS (31) THEOPOLITANUS,
bishop of Antioch A.D. 569-594. In his earliest
youth he devoted himself to a monastic life,
and he became so celebrated for his austerities
that when he became patriarch of Antioch, he
was the superior of the Syrian laura of Pharon or
Pharan (Moschos), called by Evagrius the monastery of the Byzantines. Moschos had the
following anecdote relating to this period of his
life from Sergius the Armenian in the monastery
of the Eunuchs near the Jordan, and the
occurrence is placed by the narrator six years
before Gregory became patriarch (Moschos,
as Antioch was then called. Sergius was
earnestly importuned by Gregory to conduct
him to his venerable master, another Sergius
dwelling by the Dead Sea. When the latter
Sergius saw Gregory approach he cordially
saluted him, brought water, washed his feet,
and conversed with him upon spiritual subjects
the whole day. Sergius the disciplinarian reminded his master that he had never treated
other visitors, although some of them had been
bishops and presbyters, as he had treated father
Gregory. "Who father Gregory may be," the
old man replied, "I know not; but this I know,
I have entertained a patriarch in my cave, and I
have seen him carry the sacred pallium and the
Gospel." (Joann. Mosch. Prot. Spiritual. cap. 136,
140, in Patr. Lat. Ixxiv. 189.) From Pharon
Gregory was summoned by Justin II. to pro-
side over the monastery of Mount Sinai.

During the period of his rule this monastery
sustained a siege from the Arabs, which
placed it in extreme danger (Evagrius. H. E. v. 6).

On the expulsion of Anastasius bishop of
Antioch by Justin in 569, Gregory was appointed
206) does not mention his appointment at
Mount Sinai, but makes him promoted from
the first-named monastery. His administration
is highly praised by the ecclesiastical historian
Evagrius, who was then practising as an
advocate at Antioch, and was fortunate enough
to obtain the favour of the new patriarch.
Evagrius ascribes to Gregory almost every
possible excellence, an imposing person and
sweet address, quickness of perception and pro-
mptitude in execution, dauntless courage both
in meeting danger and in confronting the secular
power, and prudence in counsel both for himself
and for others. Vehement in his indignation
when occasion called for it, he was equally
conspicuous for his gentleness and meekness.
Moschos describes him as famous for his sim.
his forgetfulness of injuries, and his tears of
compassion for sinners. When Chosroes I. had
again invaded the Roman territory, A.D. 572,
Gregory, who was kept informed of the real
state of affairs by his friend the bishop of
Nisibis, which was then being besieged by the
Roman forces, vainly endeavoured to rouse the
feebly empress in his habitual solemnities
and lethargy, by representations of the successs
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of the Persian forces and the incompetence of the imperial commanders. His letters were treated with contempt by Justin, who refused to believe in any serious danger, and during the intervals of the shocks of an earthquake which had thrown down a considerable portion of the city walls, and had compelled Gregory to take refuge in the church, the bishop had the mortification of witnessing Antioch occupied by the troops of A d o r n e n a s , the general of Chosroes (Evag. E. E. v. 9). The latter years of the Emperor were marked by his extreme unpopularity with his people, and embittered by a succession of grave accusations. Soon after the accession of Tiberius, an intimacy with the successful adventurer Anatolius, who was charged with sorcery and other abominable crimes, raised a violent popular suspicion against him, and though examination by torture failed to elicit anything from Anatolius to criminate the bishop, he was placed in extreme danger (ibid. c. 18). In the reign of Maurice, A.D. 588, a quarrel with Asterius, the popular Count of the East, again excited the passions of the excitable Anti Ch on es against their bishop. All charges, however, were withdrawn upon a confession, every complaint being declared he had suffered some injury from him. He could not appear in public without being openly reviled by the mob, and even the actors turned him into ridicule on the stage. On the removal of Asterius, his successor, John, was commissioned by the emperor to make formal enquiry into the charges against Gregory. Asterius was placed in the royal palace with his own sister, and he felt so little hope of justice at Antioch, John having openly sided with the popular feeling against him, that he applied to the emperor and claimed to be heard before a synod. He proceeded to Constantinople, accompanied by E v a g r i u s as his legal adviser, c. A.D. 589, and the charges having been investigated by a special commission, the bishop was acquitted by a triumphant acquittal, his accuser being condemned to be scourged through the city and banished (ibid. vi. 7). Gregory returned to Antioch to witness its almost total destruction by earthquake, A.D. 589, from which he barely escaped with his life (ibid. c. 9). The widespread discontent of the imperial forces, which was soon to issue in the deposition and murder of Maurice and the elevation of Phocas, having extended to Syria, the troops on the Persian frontier broke out into open mutiny. They drove away their general, Priscus, and refused to accept Philippicus, whom Maurice had sent to succeed him. In this emergency, Gregory, who by his largesses had made himself very popular with the troops, was despatched to bring them back to their allegiance. He was suffering so severely from gout that he had to be conveyed to the camp in a litter, from which he addressed the army with such moving eloquence that they at once consented to accept Philippicus as their commander. His barangue is preserved to us by his grateful friend Evagrius (ibid. c. 11-13). Soon after this his diplomatic skill caused him to be selected by the emperor Maurice as an ambassador to the younger Chosroes, when compelled by his disasters to take refuge in the imperial territory, A.D. 590 or 591, and his advice was instrumental in the recovery of his throne, for which the grateful monarch sent him some gold and jewelled crosses, and other valuable presents (ibid. c. 18-21). In spite of his age and infirmities, he conducted a visitation of the remoter portions of his patriarchate, which were much infected with the doctrines of Severus, and succeeded in bringing back whole tribes, as well as many separate villages and monasteries, into union with the catholic church (ibid. c. 22). After this he paid a visit to Simeon Stylistes the younger, who was suffering from a mortal disease, in the last moments of which he was disappointed (ibid. c. 23). Soon after he appears to have resigned his see into the hands of the deposed patriarch Anastasius, who resumed his patriarchal authority in 594. His own death very soon followed. He was poisoned by an excessive dose of the medicine administered to relieve his gout, A.D. 594 (ibid. c. 24). His extant works consist of a homily in M a l a r e s m u s m e t e r s , printed in Greek by Combes (Auctar. Nov. tom. i. p. 727). It is found in Galland (Bibl. Patr. xii. 289), and Migne (Patrol. lxxxviii. p. 1847). There are also two sermons by him on the Baptism of Christ, which have been incorrectly attributed to another, and are also attributed to him a volume of historical collections, now lost (Evagr. H. E. vi. 24). (Fabric. Bibl. Gracc. xi. 102; Cave, Hist. Lat. i. 534.)

GREGORIUS TURONENSI S

of Tours (cir. 573-594). 1. Authorities.—For the life of Gregory the principal historical sources are to be found in his own writings. The Vita S. Gregorii Episc. Turon. per Odilium Abbatem, generally published along with his works, is almost entirely based upon what Gregory says of himself. The Odo Abbes, to whom it is attributed in all the printed editions from that of 1511 downwards, is conjectured to have been St. Odo, abbot of Cluny (cir. 943), who wrote a life of Tours. There is another short life of Gregory by Joannes Egidius (Jean Gilles) of Tours; it is of the 16th century, and of small value. It is to be found in Bordier's edition of the Miraclula, &c. vol. iv. pp. 234-7. There are numerous allusions to Gregory in the poems of Venantius Fortunatus, a contemporary, but there are not many facts to be gleaned from them, nor from the Testimonia of other writers collected in the fourth volume of Guadet and Taranne's edition of Gregory's History.

Gregory himself gives a list of his works. At the end of his history he says, "Deceh libros historiarum, septem miraculorum, unum de vitis Patrum scripsit: in Paullatis tractatus librum unum commentatus sum : de cursibus etiam ecclesiasticis unum librum condidit." (Bk. x. ch. 31, sub fine). Of these all are except the commentary on the Psalms, of which only fragments exist, collected in the third volume of Bordier's edition, pp. 401 sqq. The treatise De Cursibus ecclesiasticis was supposed to be lost till Professor F. Haase of Breslau discovered what he believed to be it in a MS. in the library at Bamberg, and published it under the title of S. Georgii Florentii Gregorii Tur. Ep. Liber ineditus de Cursu stellarum, ratio quidquid ad officium impendium docet observari, sive de Cursibus Ecclesiasticis, Breslau, 1853. Professor Haase adds a short preface and a facsimile of a
St. Martin, together with some of the Opuscula, had appeared in the previous year, edited by Clétoveus. The best text of the works, the standard of all subsequent editions, is that of Ruinart, published at Paris in 1689. A new text of the History, founded on a careful recension of all the extant MSS., has been promised for many years by B. Goeze; but the work has not yet been published. The History is to be found in the second volume of Bouquet, as also in the collections of La Bigne, Duchesne, and Migne. Of recent editions, the most complete are those of the Société de l'Histoire de France, with French translations and notes, viz. the Histoire ecclésiastique des Francs, edited by M. Guadalet et Taranne, (4 vols. 1838–9), and Les Livres des Miracles et autres Opuscula, including the Vita, extracts from Fortunatus, &c., by M. H. L. Bordier (4 vols. 1857–64). M. Bordier has published a separate translation of the History, founded upon that of M. Guadalet and Taranne (3 vols. Paris, Dilot, 1859–61). Of the numerous other French translations of the History the best known is that by M. Guise, originally published in his Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France, 1823, and republished in 1861 (2 vols. Didier), edited by M. Alfred Jacobs, who has appended thereto his treatise on the Geography of Gregory of Tours, and other valuable matter. There is a German translation, with an admirable introduction by W. Giesebruch, in Pertz's Geschichtsrechercher der Deutschen Vorzeit, Lieferungen 12 and 16, or vi. Jahrhundert, Bde. 4 and 5.

Of the commentaries and works bearing on the life and writings of Gregory, the most important and thorough, besides the pseudo- prefixed, &c., of Ruinart, Bordier, Jacobs, and Giesebruch above referred to, are Lébél's Gregor von Tours und seine Zeit, 2nd edit. 1809, and Gabriel Monod's Études critiques sur l'Épître aux Macériens, pt. i. 1872, being Fascicule No. 9 of the Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes Études. Compare also Wattenbach's Deutschlands Geschichts- quellen, 3rd edit. 1873, and for the more detailed bibliography of the subject Monod, pp. 23–24; also Répertoire des Sources historiques du Moyen Âge, par Ulysse Chevalier, Paris, 1877–8, Pothast's Wegweiser, s. v., and Bordier, vi. M. Monod gives a critical list of the extant MSS. of Gregory (pp. 50–54), and examines in detail the textual objections brought against the authenticity of various parts of the history (chap. 3).

3. Life of Gregory.—Georgius Florentius (subsequently called Gregorius, after his great-grandfather St. Gregory, bishop of Langres), son of Florentius and Armentaria, of noble or senatorial family, was born on St. Andrew's day (Nov. 30) of the year 538. So Monod, p. 28, relying chiefly on the passage in the Mir. Mart. iii. 10. Previous authorities have generally placed his birth in the year 543, from the passage in the Vita which states that he was thirty years old at the time of his episcopal consecration, which took place in 573. Members of his father's and mother's families had held high office both in church and state, besides the History of Gregory) gives 522. But that is evidently a misprint, for the 'Privilegio du Roll' which is on the reverse of the same folio is dated 1811, and the separate colophon of the History gives 1812.
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His grandfather, Georgius, on the father's side, and his great-grandfather, Florentius, on the mother's side (V. P. 8, 1) had been senators at Clermont. Gallus, son of Georgius and uncle of Gregory, had become bishop of Avignon; another uncle, Nicetius or Nizier, bishop of Lyons (H. v. 5, V. P. 8); another, Gundulf, had risen to ducal rank (H. vi. 11). Gregory, bishop of Langres, and originally count of Autun, was his great-great-grandfather. All the bishops of Tours, except five, had been of his family (v. 50). It is with justifiable pride, therefore, that he asserts (V. P. 6) that none in Gaul could boast of purer and nobler blood than himself.

His father appears to have died early, and Gregory received most of his education from his uncle Gallus, bishop of Avignon. The history of his adopting the clerical profession is told by himself. Being sick of a fever in his youth, he found relief by visiting the shrine of St. Illidius, the patron saint of Clermont. The fever however returned, and Gregory's life was despaired of. Being again carried to St. Illidius' shrine he asked to be devoted to God to dedicate himself to the ministry if he recovered, nor would he quit the shrine till his prayer was granted (V. P. 2, 2).

Armentaria, Gregory's mother, returned to Burgundy, her native country, and Gregory apparently lived with Avitus, at first archdeacon, afterwards bishop of Avignon, who carried on the work of his education. Avitus directed his pupils rather to the study of ecclesiastical than of secular works. It is Avitus that Gregory looks upon as in the fullest sense his spiritual father. "It was his teaching and preaching," he says, "that, next to the Psalms of David, led me to recognise that Jesus Christ the Son of God had come into the world to save sinners, and caused me to reverence and honour those as the friends and disciples of Christ who take up his cross and follow in his steps." (V. P. 2, Intr.) By Avitus he was ordained deacon, probably about the year 563. (Monod, 29.)

Of Gregory's life before he became bishop of Tours few details are known. There are allusions to various journeys from Avignon to Burgundy to visit his mother (Mir. Mart. i. 96, iii. 41; Fl. Mart. 53; G. D. 1, 4, v. 4), whose affection and piety he on more than one occasion commemorates (Mir. Mart. iii. 10, V. P. v. 12, Monod, 28-29), and he appears to have been well known at Tours before he became bishop (Mir. Mart. i. 32, Vita, ch. ii.); for it was in consequence of the expressed wish of the whole people of Tours, clergy and laity, that Sigebert appointed him, in 573, to the see. He was consecrated by Egidius of Rheims.

He was known to and favoured by Radegund, the widow of Clothaire I, foundress of St. Cross at Poitiers, and according to Fortunatus her favour was of weight in bringing about his election to the bishopric of Tours.

Quam patris Egidii Domino manus alma sacravit
Ut populum recreet, quem Radegundis amant;
Et Sigebertum ovam favet et Brunochilus honorat.
Judice regis, nobis cumulam adeunt. (Carm. v. 2.)

The elevation of Gregory to the see of Tours was contemporary with the renewed outbreak of civil war between Sigebert and Chilperic, the former of whom had inherited the Austrasian, the latter the Neustrian, possessions of their father Clotaire I (died 541). Of the other sons of Clotaire, Guntram had obtained Burgundy with Orleans as his capital, and Charibert Aquitaine together with Toulouse and other territories. On Charibert's death in 587 (see G. Richter, Annalen d. deutschen Reichs, s. a.; in 570 according to Giesebrecht) his possessions were divided, each of the three sons obtaining one-third share in Paris, which thus became a kind of federal capital. The precious bishops under his share of Paris, only a few cities in Aquitaine (v. Charibert, Chilperic, and on these divisions Bonnell, Anfänge des Karol. Hauses, pp. 206-215). Chilperic seized upon Tours and Poitiers (H. iv. 46), but his son Clodius was expelled from thence by the united forces of Guntram and Sigebert under Mummolus. Again later (probably in 573-4, Richter, but the chronology is very obscure), Chilperic sent a plundering expedition into Touraine under his eldest son Theodebert (H. iv. 48). Fearful destruction was committed, and the lamentations of the church were worse than in the days of the persecution of Dioscorus." In the following year (575), however, Theodebert was defeated and slain by Guntram Boso and Godegisil, Sigebert's generals (iv. 51), and Touraine regained for Sigebert. Almost immediately afterwards Sigebert was assassinated at Fredegund's instigation, and Chilperic recovered Tours (v. 13, 14, 49), which remained in his possession till his death in 584.

The possession of the title of prince was thus in some sort the occasion of the war, and these countries suffered from the devastation and ravages of both parties. Gregory's sympathies were with Sigebert, from whom he had originally obtained his bishopric (Vita S. Gregor. § 11), and the people of Tours were generally (iv. 50), though not unanimously (iv. 49), on the Austrasian side. Cruel and pernicious as they were, though all the Merovingian princes appear to have been, Chilperic, according to Gregory, was conspicuously so; he was the "Novo et Heroe of his age" (vi. 49); he not only plundered and burned throughout the country, but he specially destroyed churches and monasteries, slew priests and monks, and paid no regard to the possessions of others.

Tours remained under the subjection of Chilperic till his death in 584, and some of the best traits in Gregory's character appear in the resistance which he made to the murderous violence of the king and the turbulent treachery of Fredegund. Thus he braved their wrath and refused to surrender his rebellious son Merovius (H. v. 14), and their enemy Guntram Boso who had defeated and killed Theodebert (v. 4), both of whom had taken sanctuary at the shrine of St. Martin; and Gregory alone of the bishops dared to rebuke Chilperic for his unjust conduct towards Praetextatus, and to protect Praetextatus from the vengeance of Fredegund (v. 12). So, too, when Chilperic wanted to force on his people his views of the doctrine of the Trinity, Gregory withstood him. Chilperic recited to Gregory what he had written on the subject, and added, "I will that such shall be your belief and that of all the other doctors of the church." "Do not deceive yourself, my lord king," Gregory replied, "you must follow in this matter the teaching of the apostles and doctors of the church, the teaching of Hilary and Eusebius,
the confession that you made at baptism." "It appears then," angrily exclaimed the king, "that Hilary and Eusebius are my declared enemies in this matter." "No," said Gregory; "neither God nor His saints are your enemies," and he proceeded to expound to the king the orthodox doctrine concerning the Trinity. "Holy Father," said Chilperic, feeling very angry, "I shall set forth my ideas to those who are wiser than you, and they will approve of them." "Never," answered the bishop; "it would be no wise man, but a lunatic, that would adopt such views as yours." (v. 45.)

Gregory had a persistent and treacherous enemy in Leudastes, a man of low origin, who had risen to the rank of doctor Charibert to be count of Tours, and who held the same post under Chilperic (v. 49). When removed from office because of his misdeeds, he endeavoured to take revenge on Gregory by maligning him by false accusations to the king, that he was going to deliver over the city to Childebert, Sigebert’s son, and finally that Gregory had spread a report that Fredegund had committed adultery with another bishop. Whether there was any concerted scheme of Fredegund’s to bring about Gregory’s ruin is not clear. Anyhow the king was very angry, "beast and kicked" Leudastes severely, and cast him into prison. Leudastes appealed to the evidence of Riculfus, a clerk of Tours, and a declared enemy of Gregory. Chilperic summoned a council of the bishops of the kingdom at Braine, near Soissons, to investigate the charge. Popular sympathy was entirely on Gregory’s side, a woodcutter, Modestus, being unable to restrain his indignation, and suffering for his pains, and the people outside making an uproar during the council (v. 50). Gregory entirely denied the charge, he had neither heard of nor spoken of such a thing. It was found that the accusation rested solely on the evidence of Leudastes and Riculfus. All agreed that the witness of an inferior was not to be believed against a priest and his superior ("non potest persona inferior super sacerdotem credi"), and so Gregory was acquitted on condition of solemnly disclaiming on oath all cognizance of the charge. Leudastes was condemned to death; at Gregory’s intercession he was spared death, but not torture, which in the most horrible forms was inflicted on him (v. 48-50, Grégoire de Tours au Concile de Braine, par S. Prioux, Paris, 1847, is a mere réchauffe of Gregory’s own account of these proceedings, and of no independent critical value). The subsequent fate of Leudastes illustrates the best side of Gregory’s character. After being a fugitive in different parts of Gaul, Leudastes presented himself at Tours to have his excommunication removed with a view to marrying and settling there. For this end he brought letters from several bishops but none from queen Fredegund, his principal enemy, and when Gregory wrote to her, she replied by asking Gregory to postpone receiving back Leudastes into communion till further inquiry had been made. Gregory, suspicious of Fredegund’s design, warned Leudastes’ father-in-law, and besought him to induce Leudastes to keep quiet till Fredegund’s anger was appeased. “This advice,” says Gregory, “I gave sincerely, and for the love of God, but Leudastes suspected treachery and refused to take it: so the proverb was fulfilled which I once heard an old man tell, ‘Always give good counsel to both friend and foe; the friend will take it, the foe will despise it.’” Leudastes went to the king to get his pardon; Chilperic was willing, but warned him to be careful till the queen’s wrath was appeased. Leudastes merely tried to inveigle Fredegund into the queen. Fredegund was implacable and furious, and Leudastes was put to death with great cruelty. “He deserved his death,” says Gregory, “for he had ever led a wicked life” (vi. 32).

During the wars that followed the death of Chilperic of Tours and Poitou were again the subject of contention, and again suffered accordingly. Their desire was to be subject to Childebert, Sigebert’s son, that is, to resume their allegiance to the Austrasian king; but they were compelled to submit to Guntram, the king of Orleans and Burgundy (vii. 12, 13), and under his power they remained till the treaty of Andelot in 597, in conclusion which Gregory was one of the children of the Bertramish emperor, who were restored to Childebert (v. 29). Gregory appeared during this period at the courts of both sovereigns; at Guntram’s court at Orleans (viii. 2), and again at Coblenz with Childebert (viii. 13). Guntram was guardian of Childebert, and had adopted him as his heir, and one of the terms of the treaty of Andelot was that the survivor of the two should be the heir of him who died first. Guntram died in 593 and Childebert succeeded, and the latest notice in Gregory’s writings is the visit of Childebert to Orleans after Guntram’s death. (M. S. Martin, iv. 37.) The story in the Vita (c. 24) of Gregory’s visit to Rome is very improbable (Monod, p. 97). Gregory himself died on Nov. 17, 594.

Gregory’s activity was not confined to the general affairs of the kingdom. He was even more zealous for what concerned the welfare of his own and the neighbouring dioceses. He was much occupied in his later years with the disturbances caused by Chroichda on the nursery at Pottiers which had been founded by Gregory’s friend St. Riquemont. Gregory’s first interference was ineffectual (ix. 39 seq.), but the disturbance having increased, and having caused an émeute in the town, the two kings, Guntram and Childebert, appointed a joint commission of bishops to inquire into the matter. Gregory was one of Childebert’s commissioners, but he refused to enter upon the work until the civil disturbance had been actually repressed (x. 15, 16). So too he had a great deal of trouble with another rebellious nun, Bertheugenda (ix. 33, x. 12).

With the city of Tours itself his relations were peculiarly intimate. He not only magnifies his office as bishop, but he takes a kind of family pride in it, when he says that all previous bishops of Tours, with only five exceptions, were of his family (ff. v. 50; see above), and he magnifies the sanctity and power of Tours’ great patron St. Martin. He maintained the rights of sanctuary of the shrine in favour of the most powerful offenders, and in spite of the wrath of Chilperic and Fredegund (e.g. Merovens, Guntram Boso, Eburus, vii. 22, 29). He was a builder of churches in the city and see, and especially a rebuilding of the great shrine of St. Martin (x. 31). He did his best to arbitrate.
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in and appease the bloody feuds within the city, whether springing from private or political
partition (vii. 47), and he was a rigorous and
enfeebled defender of the exemption of the city
from increased taxation (ix. 20). Evidently a
man of unselfish earnestness and energy, he was
popular in the city with all. It was to the
popularity of his early years that he owed his
election to the see (Vita, ch. 11); that his popu-
ularity continued during life is manifested at
the council of Braga and on many other occasions,
and his sanctity at death is attested by his
almost immediate generation as a saint. And
his sanctity, his biographer (Vita, pref.) says,
was manifested not so much by the working of
miracles, as in being meek and lowly of heart,
and so following in the footsteps of Christ.

4. The Writings of Gregory.—Gregory began
to write first as bishop, and was induced to
begin on the Miracles of St. Martin by the
increasing wonders which had been wrought by
the saint, since his life and miracles had been
recorded by Paulinus and Severus, and by a
vision of his own mother, who urged him to
undertake the work (Mir. S. Martin. 1. pref.).

Giesebrecht (Pref. pp. 36, 27) concludes from
the fact that Vitoria, in 578, alludes to the work of Gregory on the Miracles
of St. Martin, that a first draft of at least a part
of it, probably the first two books, must have
been written by that time. These two books,
however, were not completed till 583, the third
book not before 587, and the fourth was still
being added at the time of Gregory’s death. It is
Contemporary with the writing of the
Miracles of St. Martin was the composition of the
Miracles of St. Julianus and the Glória
Martyrum about the year 585. Gregory con-
tinued his labours in the same field in the
Gloria Confessorum (completed 588) and the
Vita Patrum, the latter of which was continued
till the time of Gregory’s death, from internal
evidence, that Gregory was in the habit of
making from time to time improvements and
additions to what he had written.

The history appears to have been written
contemporaneously with the books of the Miracles
of the Saints, and most probably in several
divisions and at different times. Giesebrecht
who has carefully investigated the internal
evidence bearing on this subject comes to the
following conclusions. The history was origi-
nally written at three separate periods, and it
falls into three separate divisions. The first
division, comprising Books i. — iv. and the first
half of Book v., was probably composed about
the year 577; the second division, from the
middle of Book v. to the end of the 37th chapter
of Book vii., in the years 584 and 585;
the remainder of the work in the years 590 and
591. The last chapter of the last book is an
epilogue, separately composed; for the history
as a history is unfinished. Had Gregory desired
to bring it to completion he probably would
have carried it on at least to the death of Gun-
tram in March 593. As in the case of the books
of the Miracles Gregory appears to have revised
his History, and we find in the earlier books
insertions, references to Gregory’s other works,
and references to events of later date. This
revision does not appear to have reached further
than the end of the sixth book; hence it is that
several MSS., and these the most ancient, contain
only the first six books, and the authors of the
Hist. Epit. and of the Gesta Reg. Franc. appear
to have known only these first six books. The
conclusions of Monod with regard to the dates
of the composition of Gregory’s works are sub-
stantially the same as those of Giesebrecht.
In the History he also finds a threefold division,
namely, Books i. to iv. composed about 576;
Books v. and vi., composed from 584 to 587;
Books vii. to x. in 590 and 591; and the Epi-
logue or last chapter in 592. (Monod, pp.
115–119.)

The difficulty, that if the composition of the
books of the Miracles and of the History was con-
temporary, there would be allusions to the
History in the books of the Miracles, as there
are allusions to the books of the Miracles in the
History, is got over by Giesebrecht by the con-
jecture that, as Gregory intended his History
to be for the use of posterity (Hist. i. pref.),
whilst the books of the Miracles were for the
edification of contemporaries, he kept the History
secret during his lifetime and did not publish it
in any form (p. 31).

Gregory begins his History, like most chroni-
clers of that time, with the Creation, and his
first book is founded on, and in many cases made
up of extracts from, Eusebius, Jerome, and Oro-
sius (Hist. i. Prior. sub fine, ch. 34, 37). In
the second book, which treats of the Frankish
conquests, he still owes much to Orisius and to
the Lives of the Saints, and quotes from the
works of placitas sermones Alexander, a writer of
the 5th century, whose works are no longer extant. But from
this point onwards he writes directly from oral
tradition and unwritten authorities. The third
and fourth books, dealing with events down to
575, two years after Gregory became bishop,
are, compared with those which follow, much
more probable, and we have in them evidence of
Gregory’s knowledge of the events of his own
time and country. From 575 the narrative becomes fuller and more sys-
tematic, the intervals of time being regularly
marked. And as the writer becomes himself a
more and more important personage in the state,
so he is able to give more and more details
about state affairs. (Giesebrecht, pp. 32–34.
Monod, in his 4th chapter, investigates the com-
parative value in different parts of the work of the
documentary and oral sources of Gregory’s
history.)

Gregory apologizes on more than one occasion
for the rudeness of his style. He has had no
practice, he says (Gloria Conf. sub fine), in
letters, he cannot distinguish the true character
and meaning of words, he mistakes masculine
for feminine and feminine for masculine, &c. (ep.
Hist. pref., and Hist. book i. pref.). And doub-
less this rudeness to a certain degree produces
obscenity, and has damaged his reputation in
modern times, though Gregory (quoted by Monod,
pp. 111) gives him the highest praise, “Gregorius Turonensis episcopus, via
magnea nobilitatis et simplicitatis, scriptis multa
simplici sermone.” But rough though his style
might be, Gregory was far from being without
learning or culture such as his age could afford
Though ignorant of Greek, he had a fair acquaint-
ANCE WITH LATIN AUTHORS, QUOTING OR REFERRING TO LIVY, PLINIUS, CICERO, AULIUS GELLIUS, &C. (MONOD, 112).

In the art of the historian as such, he is quite unskilled; that is to say, he does not attempt to make his history a consistent and well-balanced whole. He cannot subordinate that which is of local to that which is of general interest. The length and fulness of his recital of particular events depends not upon their intrinsic importance but upon the amount of information he has at his command. Hence the great detail in which he recites the quarrels of Ingeltruda and Berthegunda at Tours (H. ix. 33 sqq.) and of Choriledis at Poitiers, matters of merely local interest, but with which he had a very immediate connexion.

So too he follows the dramatic method of writing history, putting speeches into the mouths of individuals which are the composition of the author, not the authentic utterance of the individual. Again, he does not attempt to estimate the value of the evidence of his informants. He retails immediately and at first hand whatever is given to him without crediting it. As to his own words and works, he plainly gives us exactly what he himself has said and done. Never at any time does he repress his personal individuality.

Where, however, he depends upon written authorities he is, in detail, untrustworthy. Where he borrows from writers now extant, and can be compared with them, as in the first two books of the History, his inaccuracy is found to be considerable; he transcribes carelessly, and often instead of transcribing he cites from memory, giving the substance of that which he has read, and that not correctly (see instances ap. Monod, pp. 80 sqq.). It may be laid down generally that little confidence can be placed in his narrative of events outside of Gaul, and less confidence in proportion as the scene of action is farther removed from Gaul.

His authority as an historian, that is to say, his sincerity and impartiality, has been attacked in modern times on various grounds; that he unduly favours the church, or that he traduces the church in the recital he gives of the wickedness of the bishops of the time, or that he traduces the character of the Franks (Kries, DE GREGORII TURONENSIS EPISTOLAE VITAE ET SCRIPTORII, Breslau, 1859), whether from motives of race-jealousy or any other.

With regard to his ecclesiastical sympathies Gregory looks upon history as a struggle of the church against unbelief in the heathen and heretics, and against worldly-mindedness in professed Christians. In accordance with this view he begins his History with a confession of the orthodox faith (Scripturae bella Regnum cum gentibus adversis, Martyrum cum peganis, Ecclesiarum cum haereticis, prius fidein meman proferre capio, ut qui ligeret, me non dubitet esse catholicum.—HIST. I. PROL.). The epithet ecclesiastico applied to the History from Ruinart's time is a misnomer if used in the ordinary modern sense, for Gregory specially defends his method of mixing in his recital things secular and religious (mixte confusque tam virtutes sanctorurn, quam strages gentium memoramus.—HIST. II. PROL.). Of course with a man so passionate and impressionable as Gregory, the fact of his being a priest and the bishop of the see of St. Martin, the ecclesiastical and religious centre of Gaul, does influence his feelings and actions towards individuals. Hence to a certain degree it is that Guntram, the friend of the bishops and of Gregory, is the "good" king Guntram, and Chilperic, who delights in bitter raillery against bishops, is the "Nero Heartless" of his time, and even if ecclesiastical prejudices may have so far influenced Gregory's mode of speech, they did not prevent him reciting events as they were told to him, even though he might have to relate molestation of bishops on the part of Guntram, or deference to bishops, even to Gregory himself, on the part of Chilperic. His professional feelings, no doubt, affect the praise and blame which he assigns to individuals, and the reprobation with which he speaks of evil deeds, but the "impartiality of his narrative corrects the partiality of his judgment" (Monod, p. 134). And that in both directions, for although Gregory's patriotism was love of the church and not love of his country, he is not prevented thereby from recording evil deeds of good and evil priests, such as were the turbulent Salonius and Sagittarius (H. v. 21), the adulterous Dagulf (viii. 19), the immortal Palladius and Bertrand (viii. 7), the drunken Droctigisel (ix. 37, cp. x. 14).

On the much-disputed question of the relation of the Gallo-Roman subjects to the conquering Franks, Gregory gives no support to the theory that there was a continuous contest of races-going on in Gaul, still less that that was a vital political principle at the time. Gregory was himself, as he tells us, a Roman, and he speaks of the Franks often as barbarians, but barbarians in the ancient not in the modern sense of the word. He shews no rancour in treating of the Frankish conquerors, such as would be natural in the victim of an oppressed nation. Lüebel treats elaborately of the question of the distinction and jealousy of Romans and Teutons from the ethnographical point of view (pp. 57-83), and shews further that after the first days of the conquest there was no political subjection of Roman to Teuton as such, and that Romans were not excluded from offices and dignities because of their birth (pp. 101-118).

Whatever may be the defects of the history of Gregory, due generally to the character of the author and lying sufficiently on the surface, his work remains as the great and in many respects the only authority for the history of the 6th century. During that dark period, when the forces out of which the nations of Western Europe and European civilization were to arise, were still in conflict, Gregory's fresh and simple, though not unbiased, narrative is of the greatest value. He tells us exactly what the Franks were like, and what life in Gaul was like. He tells us, in so far as he knows them, all the facts, and he gives us his own judgment on them. We may agree with that judgment or not, but at any rate we are not kept in the dark as to the evidence upon which that judgment is based. [T. R. B.]

GREGORIUS (33) I, bishop of Agrigentum, in the 6th and 7th centuries. He was the author of an extant Greek commentary in ten books on Ecclesiastes. The latest edition (1740) of Cave's Hist. Lit. (i. 517) refers to this com-
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mentary as lost to view since 1681. In 1791 it was edited in folio at Venice by Morelli, with a Latin version and annotations, the life of Gregory by Leontius mentioned below accompanying it. In 1860 this edition was reprinted in the Patrologia Graeca (ccviii. 741), and in 1862 it was noticed by Cessilier (xl. 587), with a criticism of the style and a brief account of the author’s opinions, which were in accordance with the orthodoxy of his day. Morelli discusses the question of the biblical text made use of by Gregory, it being found frequently to vary from the Septuagint. He also seeks to account for the circumstance that a Sicilian of the 7th century wrote in the Greek language.

There is likewise extant a very full Life of Gregory of Aegregintum, under the name of Leontius abbat of St. Sabu at Rome, written not long after the bishop’s death. It is, however, so devoid of dates and all notes of time that nothing more than an inferential and approximate chronology of its events is possible. It is possible to locate the two Gregorys more accurately than near Jerusalem, and baptized by bishop Potamio, of whom no dates are known. At eighteen, being smitten with an ardent desire of seeing the sacred places of the Holy Land, he set sail for Carthage and thence proceeded to Palestine, where he passed some years among the various monastic communities, and especially those in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, by the patriarchate of which city, Macarius, he was ordained deacon. Thence he repaired to Antioch, where Eustathius was bishop, and after a year proceeded to Constantinople, where Justinian was reigning. He next visited Rome, for the sake of its sacred places, and while he was consecrated by the pope bishop of Agrigentum. He had scarcely entered upon his episcopal duties when a plot was contrived to blast his character, his enemies having early one morning, while he was at church, secretly introduced a strange female into his house. He was summoned to Rome to clear himself, was acquitted by the pope and restored to his flock, among whom he continued to labour until his death. The names above given are such as appear in the first edition of the chronology. Macarius of Jerusalem ruled between cir. 544 and 573, but not uninterruptedly (Clinton, F. R. ii. 537, 557, 558). No Eusta-
thius of Antioch later than the Nicene period is otherwise known. Justinian reigned from 527 to 565. We have in addition a statement by Nicephorus Callistus (H. E. xvii. 17), that Gregory was present at the fifth general council, 553. Taking this date for a departure, Cæsedit computes the year of Gregory’s birth to have been 524, and Pirri nearly agrees with him (Cajet. Vit. Sig. SS. i. animad. p. 167; Pirri, Sig. Soci. i. 693). But their calculation is perplexed by certain letters of Gregory the Great. Two of these (lib. i. ind. ex. ep. 72; lib. ii. ind. xi. ep. 12), edited by Jaffé (Elog. Pont. 97, 102), A.D. 591, 592, mention a Gregory bishop of Agrigentum. They are brief, and contain little direct information, but there are other letters which, without naming him, plainly allude to his case (lib. ii. ind. x. ep. 33; lib. v. ind. xiii. ep. 12; lib. viii. ind. i. ep. 23). From this group of epistles it is easy to discern that Gregory of Aegregintum is under accusation, that he is required at Rome with his accusers and the documents, that the see is under sequestration, and that he eventually returns to his church. In other words, here in pope Gregory’s correspondence is an incident disclosed accurately corresponding with that described by Leontius. But the date is inconveniently late for the other computations of Cæsedit and Pirri, who are therefore induced to conclude that there existed another Gregory of Aegregintum subsequent to theirs, labouring under a similar accusation. Him they call Gregory III. Morelli on the other hand, believing this solution unnatural and far-fetched, takes his departure from the papal epistles, and working backwards constructs a theoretical chronology of the life thus:—Birth, 558; ordination at Jerusalem, 579, under John III. and not Macarius; Antioch, 586; Constantinople, 588; consecration at Rome, 590; accusation, 591; restoration, 594; death, cir. 638. But Morelli, finding his scheme interfered with by the statement of Nicephorus, believes himself warranted in rejecting the “fifth synod”, and that of Constantinople, because the records of the council have no mention of the presence of a deacon or priest Gregory (vid. Mans, ix. 175 c, 391 D); secondly, because another writer, Nicetas Pectoratus (Contra Latinos, cap. 12 in Patr. Gr. exx. 1018), puts the council as the sixth, i.e. 688, a discrepancy which makes each writer discredit the other, as proving that neither had access to official documents. Morelli’s investigation is more searching than that of his predecessors, and his conclusion is supported, he thinks, by the internal evidence of the commentary. His Chronological scheme is the one adopted in the new edition of Cessilier.

A Latin version of Leontius is given by Cæsedit in his Lices of the Sicilian Saints (l. 188). The original Greek, with another Latin version, accompanies Morelli’s edition of the commentary as mentioned above. Morelli gives an account of every subsequent Life of Gregory founded on that of Leontius, and cites all the ancient authors by whom Gregory is mentioned. (See also Fabricius, B.D. Gr. viii. 332, x. 232, ed. Harsy. Found are the first part of the Liber de Simeon Metaphrases, the Latin of which may be seen in Suris (de Prob. Hist. SS. Nov. p. 487), Latin and Greek in Patr. Gr. cxxv. 189. The brief entry of Gregory under Nov. 23 in the Menologium Graecorum of Suriel (Canisius, Theaur. ii. 490), assigns his birth to the reign of Justinian; while the Menologium of Basil, Nov. 24, puts it under Justinianus Rhinometus, i.e. 685-711.

Finally it should be noticed that Pirri (at sup.) gives a Gregory IV. of Aegregintum, citing as his authority a note by Baronius under Nov. 23 of the Roman Martyrology edited by him in 1610. This note is to the effect that the signature of a Gregory of Aegregintum is attached to the synodal of pope Agatho at Rome in 680, and must belong to a bishop later than the commentator. But Morelli points out that Baronius here has simply misread his document, since the word in every copy, without a single various reading, is not Gregory but George (Giosforus (22)); (see Mans, i. 305 a). Gregory IV. of Aegregintum therefore disappears as well as Gregory III. [C. H.]
GREGORIUS (34), bishop of Rhinocorura (Fairna) on the frontier of Egypt and Palestine. He is mentioned by Metaphrastes in his life of St. Joannes Eleemosynarius (cap. 1, Patr. Gr. cxix. 901), as being sent c. A.D. 610 by that patriarch to relieve and ransom the Christians who had been seized by the Persians in the invasion of Chersones. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 543.)

[J. de S.]

GREGORIUS (35), bishop of Osma, from a little before 610. He signs the acts of the so-called synod of Carthaginians bishops at Toledo, A.D. 610. [GUNTINAR.] (Aguirre-Catalani, ii. 322; Exp. Sapr. vii. 285.) [M. A. W.]

GREGORIUS (36) IV., supposed bishop of Agrigentum, in 680. [GREGORIUS (33), GEOBRIUS (22).]

GREGORIUS (37), bishop of Crete (nr. Almagon) from 681 to about 690. His signature is 15th among forty-eight at the 13th council of Toledo, 683. He also appeared at the fourteenth and fifteenth councils, A.D. 684-688. (Aguuir-Catalani, iv. 287, 304, 313; Exp. Sapr. vii. 271.) [AUDONIUS.] [M. A. W.]

GREGORIUS (38), the name of several bishops present at the councils of 680 and 692 at Constantinople, viz. of—

Arce in Lesser Armenia, 680 (Mansi, xi. 676; Le Quien, O. C. i. 448).

Azani in Phrygia, 682 (M. 1001; O. C. i. 800).

Caesarea in Asia, 692 (M. 994 a, Greek ἐναυσιν τής Παλατίνης πόλεως. Mansi suggests Σαλέντιον in the Hellespont).

Callo, in the valley of Castrum, 692 (M. 993 c; O. C. i. 725).

Cantanz in Crete, 680 (M. 317, 614 c; O. C. i. 274).

Evan or Theodosiopolis in Asia, 692 (M. 992 c; O. C. i. 313).

Julius in Caria, 692 (M. 995 b, Greek, Georgius in Latin).

Mitylene, 680 (M. 614 c, 693; O. C. i. 856).

Naxos, 680 (M. 615 d, Gregorius in the Latin, Georgius in Greek).

Talos or Galatia, 692 (M. 995 a; O. C. i. 474).

Triocla in Sicily, 680 (Pirri, Sicil. Soc. i. 490). Mansi has Georgius. [GEOBRIUS (23).]

GREGORIUS (29), bishop of Ostia c. 707. The date is fixed by a document containing a privilege granted by John VII. to the monastery of Subiaco. Besides his bishopric, he was “sanctae sedis bibliothecarius et cancellarius.” (Ugellii, Ital. Soc. i. 64; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Ital. i. 445.) [R. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (40), bishop of Pavia at the beginning of the 8th century. He is mentioned by Landulf (Muratori, Scriptores, iv. 76) in a complaint addressed to pope Constantine by Benedict, archbishop of Milan, on the subject of his right of consecration to the see of Pavia.

[A. H. D. A.]

GREGORIUS (41), supposed bishop of Tergeste (Trieste) between 715 and 731. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Ital. viii. 681.) [R. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (42), bishop of Angri, present at the synod of Rome in 721, under Gregory II. (Mansi, xii. 265; Hefele, § 330.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GREGORIUS (43), bishop of Porto, present at the Roman synods of 743 and 745. In 743 another Gregorius appears as Orberentanu. (Mansi, xiii. 363, 380; Hefele, §§ 384, 397.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GREGORIUS (44), bishop of Silva Candida, present at the Lateran synod in 769 (Mansi, xii. 714; Hefele, § 343). He also signed a letter of pope Paul I. in June 761 to the abbot John, (Mansi, xiii. 649; Jaffé, Reg. Pont. 195.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GREGORIUS (45), St., archbishop of Salamis (Constantia) in the island of Cyprus, commemorated in the Menaea on March 5 (Basil. Men., in Migne, Patro. Graec. cxxvii.). He is perhaps to be identified with GEOBRIUS (30), bishop of the see, who was a strong opponent of the Iconoclastic emperor Constantine Cae- gnymus. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 594; Bull. Acta SS. Mart. i. 395.) [L. D.]

GREGORIUS of Praeneste. [GEOBRIUS (32).]

GREGORIUS (46), bishop of Pessinus, the metropolis of Galatia Secunda. He subscribed the condemnation of images by the council of Constantinople of A.D. 754. For this he was called to account at the council of Nicaea, A.D. 787, when he recanted, expressed his regret for what he had done, and subscribed the decrees of that assembly. (Mansi, xii. 729 a, 825 b, 731 b.)

[By E. D.]

GREGORIUS (47) II., bishop of Noecaenaeus, present at the council of Nicaea, 787, where is the sixth session he cites the acts of the Constantinopolitan council of 734 against image worship, Epiphanius the deacon refuting them by a clause through the session (Mansi, xiii. 207, 362 d; Le Quien, Or. Chr. i. 504). It is stated in the Acta Gratiani (xiii. 613) that Gregory of Noecaenaeus, theodosius of Ephesus, and Theodorus of Perga were the head of the bishops who met at Constantinople in 754. But this must be a mistake as regards Gregory. Theophanes mentions only Theodosius of Ephesus and Passilarius of Perga (Theoph. Chronog. a.C. 745, p. 355 in Patr. Gr. cxxvi. 892). The Acts of the council of 754 are lost, except in so far as they are cited in the sixth session of Nicaea as just stated, and in those proceedings Gregorius is always mentioned with the epithet θεοφιλής.

[C. H.]

GREGORIUS (48), the name of several bishops present at the third council of Nicaea in 787, viz. of—

Amastris (Sassamis) in Paphlagonia (Mansi, xii. 1099 c, xiii. 145 d; Le Quien, O. C. i. 563). He is thought to have been also called Georgius. [GEOBRIUS (4C).]

Basilinopolis (M. xiii. 146 a, Latin; Georgius in the Greek). [GEOBRIUS (29)].

Chibra in Caria (M. xii. 1106; O. C. i. 994), not Georgius of Libya as in the Latin of M. xii. 1105 b.

Delceu (Delcos, Deren) in Thrace (M. xii. 995, 1099 c; O. C. i. 1163).

Euchanias (Theodorolopis) in Thrace (M. xii. 1099 b; O. C. i. 1143).
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Gorgius (M. xii. 1102 d, Greek; Georgius in the Latin). [Georgiius (97)].
Hercules Latini in Caria (M. xii. 1106 c, xiii. 147 b; O. C. i. 906).
Mylassa in Caria (M. xii. 1006, xiii. 147 b; O. C. i. 922).
Nisa (M. xii. 1104 c, Latin; Georgius in Greek). [Georgiius (37)].
Palaepolis in Asia (M. xii. 1098 c; O. C. i. 731).
Sinope (M. xii. 145 c; O. C. i. 539).
Stratonicia (Hadrianopolis) in Caria (M. xii. 998, xiii. 148 b; O. C. i. 912).
Temenothyrae in Phrygia Pacatiana (M. xii. 1106 c, xiii. 147 c; O. C. i. 808).

[G. H.]

GREGORIUS II. OF OSTIA. [Georgiius (95)].

GREGORIUS OF AMIENS. [Georgiius (41)].

GREGORIUS (49), tenth bishop of Nismes, between Casatus and Cosatus and Vincterus, towards the close of the 9th century. His name is said to appear in an ancient breviary and other MSS. of that church. [Gall. Christ. vi. 450; Gams, S. Eccl. Episc. 586].

[S. A. B.]

GREGORIUS (50), created first bishop of Mantua by Leo III. c. 804 or 808, and succeeded by Eufulfus, 823. [Ugelli, Ital. Sac. i. 928; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xii. 18].

[R. S. G.]

GREGORIUS (51) I. (called the Great), bishop of Rome from Sept. 3, A.D. 590, to March 12, A.D. 604, between thirteen and fourteen years. He was born at Rome, probably about the year 540, of a wealthy senatorial family, pope Felix II. (or III.) being said to have been his great-grandfather. The family was a religious one. His mother Silvia, and Turricula and Acemilia, the two sisters of his father Gordianus, have been canonized. Under such influences his education is spoken of by his biographer, John the deacon, as having been that of a saint among saints. His intellectual seems not to have fallen short of his moral and religious training. Gregory of Tours, his contemporary, says that in grammar, rhetoric, and logic, he was thought to be second to none in Rome. He was a man of rank and wealth, and prospects he studied law, distinguished himself in the senate, and at an early age (certainly before 573, when he would be little more than thirty years old) was recommended by the emperor Justin II. for the post of praetor urbis. The silk attire, the glittering gems, and the purple-striped robes, with which he walked at this period through the streets of Rome, recurred afterwards to the memory of observers, as in striking contrast to the ecclesiastical garb so soon assumed (Greg. Tur. b. 3). For after a public career of credit, it was not long before the religious ideas of his age, with which he was thoroughly imbued, suggested to him the pursuit of a higher vocation; and on his father's death he resolved to himself but a short time, that the wealth which came to him, employing the rest in charitable uses, and especially in founding monasteries, of which he endowed six in Sicily, and one, dedicated to St. Andrew, on the site of his own house, near the church of SS. John and Paul, at Rome. Here he himself became a monk. The date of this, his first retirement from the world, and its duration, are uncertain; as are also the exact dates of subsequent events previous to his ascension to the see of Rome. What appears to be the most probable order of events will be given. During his sojourn in the desert his asceticism is said to have been such as to endanger his life; had he not been prevailed on by friends to abate its rigour, and in may have partly laid the foundation of the bodily health from which he afterwards suffered. Gregory Turenensis at one time slept on his stomach at this time being so enwrapped by fast and vigil that he could hardly stand. His saintly aspirations were interrupted by the pope, Benedict IV., who, having ordained him as one of the seven deacons (regional) of Rome, sent him to his episcopalsee at Constantinople, being employed in the capacity of ambassador to Constantinople, being employed in the capacity of ambassador to the court of the emperor. He was consecrated as bishop of Constantinople. In the meantime Pope Benedict II. was succeeded by his successor, Pelagius II., who, having been consecrated before the customary confirmation of his election by the emperor had been obtained, sent a nuncio to Constantnople to excite the emperor's anger, and at the time to solicit aid against the Lombards. A letter from the pope is recorded three years after the death of the imperial city. Two noteworthy circumstances are recorded during this stay in Constantineopolis. The first is his controversy with Eutychius, the patriarch, about the nature of the body at the resurrection. Eutychius had written a book in which he maintained that the risen body would be of an immutable kind, subtle as air. Gregory opposed, urging the palpability of the risen body of Christ. The dispute was terminated by the intervention of the emperor Tiberius, who, having heard the two disputants, decided that Gregory had the best of the argument, and ordered the patriarch's trinity to be burnt (John. Dan. vii. 10). John the Deacon adds that the disputants were so enchanted by the long discussion that both had to take to their beds at its close.

The second memorable incident of this period was the commencement at the instigation of Leander, bishop of Seville, who was then at Constantinople, of the famous work called Magna Moralia, of which some account will be given afterwards. Recalled by Pope Benedict to Rome, he was allowed, at his own earnest request, to return to his monastery, where he hoped to pass the remainder of his days, but was still employed as the pope's secretary. During the period of his renewed monastic life, and in his capacity of abbot (to which office he was chosen on the appointment of the previous abbot Maximianus to the see of Syracuse, though whether before or after his stay at Constantinople is uncertain), he was distinguished alike for the strictness of his own life and for the rigour of his discipline. One story which he tells himself leaves the impression of zeal in this regard carried to the extent of almost inhuman hardship. A monk, Julius, who had been a physician, and who had attended Gregory himself, night and day, during a long illness, being himself dangerously ill, confided to a brother that, in violation of monastic rule, he had three pieces of gold concealed in his cell. This confession was overheard, the cell was searched, and the pieces found. Gregory, being made aware of the fact, forbade all to approach the offender, even in the agonies of death, and
after death caused his body to be thrown on a dunghill, and with it the pieces of gold, the monks crying aloud, "Thy money perish with thee." (Greg. Dial. lib. iv. c. 55.)

On Feb. 8, 590, pope Pelagius died. The city of Rome was in great mourning at the time. Without the gates the Lombards ravaged the country and threatened the city, aid being craved in vain from the distant emperor; within famine and plague were raging. Such, at a time like this, was the general recognition of Gregory's merits that he was at once unanimously chosen by senate, clergy, and people to succeed Pelagius. To-day his election was distressing. He at once wrote to the emperor Mauricius (who had succeeded Tiberius in 582) imploring him not to confirm the election. His letter was intercepted by the praefect of Rome, and another sent in its place, in the name of the senate, clergy, and people, earnestly reiterating his objections. It was during the interval before the reply of the emperor reached Rome, that Gregory, in addition to his excitement of the people to repentance by his sermons, instituted the famous processional litany, called Litania septiformis, in connexion with which the story about the origin of the name of the castle of St. Angelo is told; viz. that as the monument of Hadrian was approached in a concluding processional peregrination of the city, Gregory saw on its summit an angel sheathing his sword in token that the plague was staid. At length an answer came from the emperor, confirming the election of Gregory. He still shrank from the proffered dignity, fled the city in disguise, escaping the guards set to watch the gates, and hid himself in a forest cave. Soon discovered, by means it was said of a supernatural light, he was brought back in triumph, conducted to the church of St. Peter, and immediately ordained on Sept. 3, 590, the see having been vacant since Feb. 8 in the same year (Anastas. Bibliothec. and Martyriol. Roman.). Though the sincerity of many others, in that age and afterwards, who, to avoid the temporal dignity by flight, may well be doubted, there is not the least reason for disputing the reality of the feeling in Gregory's case, arising from his devotion to the monastic life, and a fear (as he himself expresses it) lest "the worldly glory which he had cast away might creep on him under the colour of ecclesiastical government." Subsequently to his ordination he ceased not to lament in his letters and other writings the manifold burdens, anxieties, and temptations of his high office, and to look back with regret to the safer quiet of his former monastic life. (Cf. Ep. i. 5; Ep. ad Leandrum, Lib. de Cur. Pastor, &c.)

After his accession, he continued in heart a monk, surrounding himself with ecclesiastics instead of laymen, and living with them according to monastic rule. In accordance with this plan a synodal decree was made under him in 595, substituting clergy or monks for the boys and secular persons who had formerly waited on the pope in his chamber (Ep. iv. 44). Yet he rose at once to his new position. The period, as has been said, was a great one for him, as the times were the most disturbed and disorganized of the time. The fires of contro-

versy that had for the last two centuries inflamed them were not yet extinct; they still raged in the East. In Istria and Gaul the schism consequent on the question of the three chapters continued. In Africa the Donasts had begun once more to oppress themselves aggressively against the Catholics. Spain had but just, and as yet imperfectly, been recovered from Ariusim. In Gaul the church was oppressed under its barbarian rulers. In Italy the ferocious Arian Lombards had destroyed churches and monasteries, slain ecclesiastics, violated consecrated virgins, and wasted the country. The clergy were in great danger. The demoralization of the ecclesiastics was in some sort the result of a declining civilization in the West. The monastic system which had taken such a wonderful hold on Christendom during the preceding age, was suffering the usual declension from the arduous of a first love, and was now notoriously corrupt. Literature and learning, crushed under the protracted struggle with barbarian hordes, had almost ceased with Boethius; and all such causes, combined with the temporal calamities and perils of the age, were such as to lead to a prevalent belief, which Gregory shared in and often expressed, that the end of all things was at hand. Nor was the position of the papacy encouraging to one who like Gregory took a high view of the prerogatives of St. Peter's chair. For since the re-conquest of Italy by Justinian (after the capture of Rome by Belisarius in 536) the popes had been far less independent than even under the Gothic kings. This prince had treated the bishops of Rome as his predecessors had long treated the Eastern patriarchs, regarding them as his creatures, to be appointed, summoned to court and deposed at his pleasure, and subject to the commands of his exarch at Ravenna; and no reigns of popes had been so inglorious as those of Gregory's immediate predecessors, Vigilius, Pelagius I, Benedict, and Pelagius II. His own description of the Roman church at this time was that it was "like an old and violently shattered ship, admitting the waters on all sides, its timbers rotten, shaken by daily storms, and surrounded by wrecks." (Athen. xil. 1.)

We may best obtain a view of the way in which this great pope acquitted himself as pilot of St. Peter's shattered bark, if we review his operations under separate heads, without strict regard to the chronological sequence of events. He will be regarded, first, as a spiritual ruler; secondly, as a temporal administrator and potentate; and lastly, as to his personal character, and as a doctor of the church.

I. Immediately after his accession he set, according to custom, a confession of his faith to the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, in which he declared his reception of the four first general councils, as of the four gospels, and his condemnation of the three chapters; i.e. the writings of three deposed prelates, Theodorus, Theodore, and Ibas, supposed to favour of heresy, and already condemned by the emperor Justinian, and by the fifth council called oecumenical. The strong language in which he exalts the authority of the four councils in this confession, as "the square stone on which rests the structure of the faith, the rule of every man's actions and life, which foundation, as it were, does not move from the ground of the building," is significant of his views on the authority of the church at large, while his
recognition of the four patriarchs as co-ordinate potentates, to whom he sends an account of his own faith, expresses one aspect of the position in relation to the Eastern churches which then satisfied the Roman pontiffs.

He lost no time in taking measures for the restoration of discipline, the reform of abuses, the repression of heresy, and the establishment of the authority of the Roman see, both in his own metropolitan province, and wherever his influence or his definite jurisdiction belonged to the bishop of Rome since the political divisions of the Empire had been reproduced in the metropolitan constitution of the church was threefold; episcopal, metropolitan, and patriarchal. As bishop he had the oversight of the city of Rome; as metropolitan he had the superintendence of the seven suffragans, afterwards called cardinal, bishops of the Roman territory, those of Ostia, Portus, Silva Candida, Sabina, Praeneste, Tusculum, and Albanum; while his patriarchate seems to have originally extended (according to Rufinus, *H. E. l.* [x.] 6) over the suburban provinces which were under the civil jurisdiction of the vicarius, urbs, in civitate. This is especially true of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. But being the only patriarch in the West, he had in fact claimed and exercised jurisdiction as such beyond these original limits, including in his sway all the four vicariates into which the praefecture of Italy was politically divided; not that of Rome only, but those also of northern Italy, with its centre at his capital, and in particular at Aquileia, Sirmium, and Western Africa, with its capital at Carthage. Further, before the time of Gregory's accession, a still wider authority had been claimed and in part acknowledged. As bishops of the old imperial city, with an acknowledged primacy of honour among the patriarchs, still more as occupants of St. Peter's chair and conservators of his documen, he continued to exercise a more or less defined jurisdiction over them all. The power of sending judges to hear on the spot the appeals of condemned bishops, which had been accorded to pope Julius by the Western council of Sardes in 343, had been claimed by his successors as perpetually belonging to the Roman see, and extended so as to involve the summoning of cases to be heard at Rome; and a law had been obtained by Leo I. from the emperor Valentinian (445) by which the pope was made supreme head of the whole Western church, with the power of summoning prelates from all provinces to abide his judgment. On the assumption of such authority Gregory acted, it being one of his fixed principles to abide none of the rights claimed by his predecessors, though scrupulous in respecting and maintaining the existing power of metropolitanos, and though in countries under barbarian rulers, when circumstances did not allow the full assertion of his claims, he was wary, and adroit in his proceedings. Of his relation to the Eastern church something will be said hereafter. Instances will first be given of his measures in the West.

In the year of his accession (590) he endeavoured, though without result, to bring over the I�rian bishops, who still refused to condemn the three chapters, and to whom, during the pontificate of Pelagius, in his name as his secretary, he had addressed letters on the subject. With this view he appointed a council to meet at Rome, and obtained an order from the emperor for the attendance of these bishops. They, however, petitioned for exemption, saying that their faith was the same that had been formerly taught them by pope Vigilius, protesting against submission to the bishop of Rome as their judge, and pleading the state of Italy as a reason for granting them. They disparaged the emperor, as in due time they were prepared to do, of the purity of their faith. The emperor countermanded the order, and Gregory acquiesced. (The letters are given by Baronius, ad ann. 590.) His acquiescence in this case is an early instance of what will appear more distinctly in other cases, his habit of submission to imperial authority, when remonstrance was unavailing.

In the following year (591) his orthodox zeal was directed with more success against the African Donatists. This sect, which had in former days been the object of much persecution, continued to flourish alongside with the Catholics, and lately without conflict or disturbance. It was the custom in those times for the bishops of North Africa to send to the emperor or bishop, whatever his see, to exercise metropolitan authority over the other bishops. Such senior now happened to be a Donatist, and he assumed the customary authority. Gregory therefore wrote to the Catholic bishops of Numidia, and to Genadius, exarch of Africa, urging them to resist and put an end to the assertion of such a claim, and the letter which in his latter (couched, as was Gregory's habit in addressing temporal potentates, in complimentary language) intimating pretty plainly his desire that active measures should be taken to suppress the Donatists (*Ep.* i. 74, 75). He succeeded so far as this, that the Donatist bishop was deposed from his assumed position, but the church itself, although Christianity. It may here be observed that this is not the only instance of Gregory, like others of his age, not being averse to persecution as a means of conversion. In Sicily he enjoined rigorous measures (summopere persequei) for the recovery of the Manichaean to the church (*Ep.* iv. 8); there, and in Corsica, Sardinia, and Campania, the heathen peasants and slaves on the papal estates were by his order compelled to conform, not only by exactions on such as refused, but also by the imprisonment of freemen, and the corporal castigation ("verbolus et cruciatus") of slaves (*Ep.* iii. 28; vii. Ind. 2, 67), and in France he exhorted Queen Brunichild to similar measures of coercion (*Ep.* vii. 5).

On the other hand, there are three letters of his, written in the same year with those about the African Donatists, which evince a spirit of unusual toleration towards the Jews. They are addressed to three bishops, Peter of Tarracina, Virgilius of Arles, and Theodorus of Marseilles, of whom the first had driven the Jews from their synagogues, and the two last had expelled a number of conversions by offering them the choice of baptism or exile. In these letters he strongly condemns such proceedings, "because conversions wrought by force are never sincere, and such as are thus converted seldom fail to return to their vomit when the force is removed." (*Ep.* i. 34, 45; cf. *Ep.* vii. ind.)
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1, 26. vii. ind. 2, 5, vii. 2, 59.) Still, though in these instances adverse to forcing them into the fold by persecution, he had no objection to luring them by the prospect of advantage; for in a letter to a deacon Cyprian, who was steward of the papal patrimony in Sicily, he directs him to offer to the Jews a remission of one-third of the taxes due to the Roman church on condition of their becoming Christians, saying, in justification, that though the conversions thus effected might be insincere, yet the children of the converts would be brought up in the bosom of the church (Ep. iv. 6. cf. Ep. xii. 30). In such apparent inconsistencies we may detect the good sense and Christian benevolence of the man in conflict with the impulses of zeal and the notions of his age.

He was no less active, from the very beginning of his reign, in reforming the church itself than in labouring for the conversion of heretics, heathens, and Jews. Mention has already been made of the laxity at that time prevalent among the monks, of which the life of the contemporary Benedict, founded under the Benedictine order, affords ample evidence. [BENEDICT.] Several of Gregory's letters are addressed to monks who had left their monasteries for the conversion of heretics, heathens, and Jews. Mention has already been made of the laxity at that time prevalent among the monks, of which the life of the contemporary Benedict, founded under the Benedictine order, affords ample evidence. [BENEDICT.] Several of Gregory's letters are addressed to monks who had left their monasteries for the conversion of heretics, heathens, and Jews. Mention has already been made of the laxity at that time prevalent among the monks, of which the life of the contemporary Benedict, founded under the Benedictine order, affords ample evidence.

[Gregory also refers to the case of a certain nun named Augustine in banishing from their houses even such female relatives as the canons allow (Ep. vii. ind. 2, 39; xi. 42, 43). In Sicily the obligation to celibacy had, in the year 588, been extended to subdeacons. This rule he upheld by directing the bishops to require a vow of celibacy from all who should in future be ordained subdeacons, but acknowledging its hardship as such as to have made no such vow on their ordination, he contented himself with forbidding the advancement to the diaconate of existing subdeacons who had continued conjugal intercourse after the introduction of the rule (Ep. i. ind. ix. 42).]

He also set himself resolutely against the prevalent practice of simony, forbidding all bishops and clergy to exact or accept fee or reward for the functions of their office; and he set the example himself by refusing the annual presents which it had been customary for the bishops of Rome to receive from their suffragans, or payment for the pallium sent to metropolitanas. Acceptance of payment for the pallium was also forbidden to all future popes by a Roman synod in 595.

In the year 592 began a struggle in reference to discipline with certain bishops of Thessaly and Dalmatia, in the province of Illyricum, where, though dealing with a province long subjected to the jurisdiction of Rome, he encountered, in one instance, resistance, as some of his predecessors had done. Hadrianus of Thessalonica had been deposed by a provincial synod under his metropolitan the bishop of Larissa, and the sentence had been confirmed by John of Justinianus Prima, the primate of Illyricum, to whom the emperor Mauritius, appealed to by Hadrianus, had referred the matter. The deposed prelate now appealed to Gregory, who, after examining the whole case, declared the proceedings null, as being uncanonical, absolved the appellant, exempted him in future from the jurisdiction of his metropolitan, and, as to John the primate, ordered him to reinstate Hadrianus, at the same time communicating him for thirty days, and threatening severer measures in case of disobedience to the authority of the prince of the apostles (Ep. ii. ind. xi. 6, 7).
the same year (592) he ordered Natalis, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, and metropolitan, under pain of excommunication and eventual deposition, to reinstate his archdeacon Honoratus whom he had deposed (Ep. ii. ind. x. 14, 15, 16). In both these instances he appears to have been obeyed. Not so, however, in the case of Maximus, who succeeded Natalis as bishop of Salona and metropolitan in the same year. Maximus had also been accused of oppressing the alms- for sale archdeacon Honoratus, who had been recommended by Gregory, was alleged to be a man of scandalous life, and to have obtained his election by bribes. Gregory accordingly disallowed it, and wrote at the same time to the clergy of Salona forbidding them to choose a bishop without the knowledge and consent of the apostolic see. In the meantime the emperor had confirmed the election. Learning this, Gregory wrote to suspend Maximus and his ordinaries till such time as he should be assured of the alleged imperial confirmation, and summoned him to Rome to give an account of himself. The suspension and summons were disregarded, and Maximus was empier who, instead of obeying the pope, gave no further trouble to the bishop of Salona. Gregory now wrote to the emperor in a tone of earnest remonstrance, though with his customary deference to imperial authority, saying that he would rather die than suffer any diminution of the authority of St. Peter's see through his own indecision or neglect. But his remonstrance proving vain, he acquiesced for the present. Soon after, he again summoned Maximus to Rome on the ground of new charges brought against him of simony, sacrilege, and other crimes. He wrote also to Constantinople, this time to the empress, informing her of the state of things in a long complaining letter. Maximus again treated the summons with contempt, alleging as before that, if his conduct called for inquiry, it was on the spot and not at Rome, where, according to the canons, the inquiry should be made, and forwarded to Constantinople counter accusations against Gregory, from which the latter wrote to justify himself. After protracted negotiations, the emperor, after eight years, of which seventeen letters were written by Greg- ory, the emperor finally committed the settlement of the dispute to Maximianus, bishop of Ravenna, and the result was that Maximus, having publicly begged pardon of the pope, and cleared himself from the charge of simony by an oath of purgation at the tomb of St. Apollinaris, was at last acknowledged as lawful bishop of Salona (Ep. iii. ind. xii. 15, 20; iv. ind. xii. 34; v. ind. xiv. 3; vi. ind. xv. 17; vii. ind. i. 1; vii. ind. ii. 81, 82, 83).

In countries of the West beyond the limits of the empire, no less than within those limits, he lost no opportunity of extending the influence of the Roman see, and of advancing and consolidating the church. Remember, the Visigothic king of Spain, having renounced Arianism for Catholicism at the council of Toledo in 589, the year before Gregory's accession, he received intelligence of this event from Leander, bishop of Seville, whose intimate acquaintance (as has been already said) he had made during his stay at Constantinople. There are three very affectionate letters from Gregory to this prelate, in which, from the midst of distracting cares of office, and of suffering from gout, to which it appears that Leander also had been a victim, he expresses unbounded joy, and exhorts his friend to watch over the royal convert. In one of these letters he replies to a question as to single or triple immersion in baptism. Three immersions were the practice of the Roman church, regarded as symbols (sacraments, according to the expression of Gregory) of the three days in the grave, or of the Trinity. The same had been the practice of the Arians in Spain, but not of the orthodox, who had hitherto immersed once only, by way of expressing the consubstantial unity of the Godhead. Gregory, with characteristic judgment, recommends, under the circumstances, the retention of single immersion, notwithstanding the difference of the Roman rite. He also sent Leander a pall, accompanied by the blessing of St. Peter, to be used at mass only. He wrote also to Reccared in a tone of warm congratulation, exhorting him to humility, chastity, and mercy; thanking for presents received, and sending in return a key from the house of St. Peter in which he himself had worn it on his neck. Gregory writes of iron from the chain that had bound him, and a cross containing a piece of the true cross, and some hairs of John the Baptist (Canones Eccles. Hispan.).

It is to be remarked that there is no distinct assumption in these letters of jurisdiction over the Spanish church, and that this was the only known instance of a pall having been sent to Spain previously to the Saracen invasion. The ancient Spanish church does not seem to have been noted for its dependence on the Roman see (see Geddes, Tracts, vol. ii. pp. 25, 49; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii. p. 188).

With the Frank rulers of Gaul he carefully cultivated friendly relations, and through them endeavoured to effect his purpose. In 595, at the request of king Childeric, he conferred the pall on Virgilius of Arles, the ancient metropolitan see, whose bishop pope Zosimus had confirmed in his metropolitan right, and made him vicar coaeval as early as 417. He wrote also to Vir- gilius, enjoining the repression of simony and other abuses, and to the empress, enjoining submission to their metropolitan (Ep. iv. indict. xiii. 51, 52). To Severus, bishop of Mar- seilles, he wrote an often quoted letter, blaming him for having destroyed church pictures in his indiscreet zeal against their abuse. "Pictures," said the pope on this occasion, anticipating the position taken by his successors in the subsequent iconoclastic controversy, "are to the unlearned what books are to the learned" (Ep. ii. ind. iii. 111). Not long after he began a correspondence with Queen Brunehild, in the course of which he again and again exhorts her to use her power for the correction of the vices of the clergy and the conversion of the heathen, writing in the complimentary style usual with him in addressing potentates, but which, in this case, jars strangely with the character of the lady addressed. Another royal female correspondent, cultivated and flattered with a similar purpose, and one more worthy of the praise conferred, was Theodelinda, the Lombard queen. To the year 599 is assigned the extensive conversion of the Lombards to Catholicism, brought about after the death of king Anthar through the
marriage of this Theodelinda, his widow, with Agilulph, duke of Turin, and the consequent elevation of the latter to the throne. The queen, a daughter of Gisulf, king of the Bavarians, being a zealous Catholic, influenced her husband the Arian Franks and his court. It is said to have been followed by that of the majority of his subjects, by the rebuilding of churches and monasteries, and the restoration of Catholic bishops to their sees. With this pious lady Gregory kept up a highly complimentary correspondence, sending her on one occasion a copy of his homilies, together with some of his last acts to write to her from his death-bed on the occasion of the birth and baptism of her son Adalaoaldus, and in reference to a theological question on which she desired enlightenment.

Over the church in Ireland also, which in the time of Gregory was bound by no close tie of allegiance to the see of Rome, he endeavoured to extend his influence. In the year 592 he wrote a long letter to the bishops of that country in reply to one, no longer extant, which he had received from them, in which they appear to have spoken of some persecution under which they suffered, to have maintained against the pope their continued acceptance of the three chapters, and to have attributed the Lombard invaders to Jewish incitement rather than divine judgment, and finally sends them the letters which he had addressed to the bishops of Istria on the subject of the three chapters (Ep. ii. ind. x. 36). Though Baronius assumes that the Irish were thus reconciled to orthodoxy, the contrary appears from a letter of St. Columban to pope Boniface IV. in 614 (first published by Archbishop Usher), in which he strongly blames that pope for continuing to condemn the chapters, and, by an ironical vein, cautions him not to forget the claim, superciliously insisted on (as all knew) by the pope, to be the keepers of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The same saint, writing from Burgundy, had previously defended the Irish computation of Easter with equal boldness, and in the same tone of irony that marks his letter to Boniface, against Gregory the Great himself, among other things telling him (in reference to the authority of previous popes being adduced in support of the Roman usage) that a living dog was better than a dead lion, and reminding him of the universal resistance of the Easterns to pope Victor on the earlier Easter question (see Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. div. ii. ch. vi. iii. § 126). There is also among the letters of Gregory a long one to Quiricus, and other Catholic bishops of Iberia, in reply to a request for advice, in which it is directed that Nestorian heretics having been baptized in the name of the Trinity are not to be rebaptized on their reception into the church, and the conditions of their reception are laid down (Epp. lib. ix. i. 4. iv. ep. 68).

Gregory was well acquainted with thus influencing, consolidating, and reforming the existing churches throughout the Western world; he was also a zealous missionary, and as such the founder of our English, as distinct from the more ancient British, Christianity. Before his accession to the popedom, some time during the reign of Pelagius, he incurred, according to the famous incident in the torun of Rome, which is thus related. Observing there one day some boys with fair skin, comely faces, and bright flowing hair, exposed for sale as slaves, he asked whence they came. Being told "from Britain," he inquired whether the inhabitants of that island were Christians or pagans. Learning that they were pagans, he showed them some of his written works, and told them that, if they repented, he would allow them to believe what they wished. One of them, a young chaste, asked, "Alas, that men of such local countenance should be possessed by the author of darkness, and that such grace of form should hide minds void of grace within?" Being told further in answer to his inquiries that they were called Angli, "Well so called," said he, "for they have angelic faces, and should be coheirs in heaven with angels." What is the name of the province from which they come?" Being told that they were called Deirii, "Right again," was his reply, "de ira Dei erutti, et ad misericordiam Christi vocati." Lastly, on hearing that the king of that province was called Aella, he exclaimed, "Alleluia! the praises of God the Creator must be sung in those parts." After this he had, we are told, set out in person, together with a few monks of his convent, in order to preach in Britain; but had been brought back to Rome, at the instance of the people, by order of the pope. It was not till the year 597, the eighth of his pontificate, that the thought so long entertained was carried into effect by the mission of Augustine. An account of this memorable mission will be found under Augustinian. Only such incidents will here be mentioned as serve to illustrate the character and policy of Gregory. Circumstances were now favourable. His previous intercourse with the ruling powers of Gaul favoured the speeding of the mission through that kingdom; and the recent marriage of Ethelbert king of Kent with Bertha daughter of King Chilperic of Paris, in which the exercise of her religion had been stipulated, and who had already her church and priest at Canterbury, afforded a home and centre for the mission, with the inestimable advantage (such as Gregory was always alive to) of the aid and influence of a Christian queen. Augustine and other monks of St. Andrew's monastery were accordingly sent in 597, Augustine being designed as bishop, should the mission succeed. Arrived in Gaul, they turned faint-hearted, and Augustine returned to Rome to beg exemption from the dangerous enterprise. Gregory required him to proceed, and sent him back with letters of encouragement to his fellow missionaries, and commendatory ones to Virgilius of Arles and other Gallican bishops, as well as to the kings Theodore and Theodobert of the Franks, contained in eleven letters in all. After the well-known successful issue of the mission in Kent, the baptism of King Ethelbert, and the consecration of Augustine (according to Gregory's original intention in the event of success) by the bishop of Arles, the cheering news was sent through Laurentius the presbyter and Peter the monk to Rome, and at the same time written letters requested to the bishops of Gaul regarding questions on points about which Augustine was in doubt. The replies sent by Gregory to these
questions erinse great judgment and enlighten-
ment. The following is an abstract of the most
important. Celsibility and coenobitic life, though
imposed on persons in holy orders, are not to be
insisted on for other clerics; natives who before
conversion had married brothers' wives, are not
to be on that account to be debarred communion;
however sinful such connexions for persons already
Christians; a variety of fancied causes of im-
purification; though the monks of St. Mary at
Carmel had felt scruples, are not to be preclude
people from church and communion, some being
natural and unavoidable, others falling under no
positive law of prohibition, though at the same
time persons are not blamed who on such grounds,
out of reverence, absent themselves from sacred
rites; the presence of three bishops at the con-
secration of a new one, though proper and in all
cases desirable, may be dispensed with where it
cannot be had; all assumption of authority over
the Gallican church, or interference with the
ancient rights of the metropolitan of Arles, is
forbidden, though over all bishops in British
jurisdiction is assigned; and lastly, the usages of
church and church discipline, there, though
differing from those of the Roman church,
are to be freely adopted if in themselves desir-
able, since (says this enlightened pope) things
are to be loved for places, but places for the
good things found in them. Gregory also wrote
to the bishop of Arles, desiring him, if requested,
to assist Augustine, and to the latter sent a new
band of assistants, including Justus, Paulinus,
and Rufinius, together with sacred vessels,
vestments, ornaments for churches, relics,
and books. He further fortified him in his authority
by sending him the pallium, and sketched a plan
for the organization of the English church,
according to which there were to be two metrop-
olitan sees, each with twelve suffragan bishops,
at London and York, of which York was to be
subject to London during Augustine's life, but
independent after his death, while to him were
also subjected all the existing British clergy, as
well as such as should be ordained by him or his
coadjutors. Afterwards to the abbott Mellitus,
whom he had sent to Britain, he addressed a
letter, in which he sets forth the importance of
the heathen temples and heathen usages. Idols
were to be destroyed, but temples preserved and
devoted to Christian worship, that so the people
might more willingly renounce their errors, res-
sorting to the worship of the true God in their
accustomed places. Similarly sacrificial feasts
were to be changed into church festivals, holiday
being still kept round the old fames, and the
same banquets enjoyed as of old, only in honour
of God instead of the service of demons. The
introduction into the Mosaic ritual, and the con-
secration to God's service, of sacrifices to which
the people had been used in Egypt, is adduced
as a sanction for this system of accommodation to
ancient prejudices. Another letter to Augustine
himself lays claim to the greatest elation on the ground
of the miracles wrought by him, the reality of
which is not questioned. One to King Ethelbert
exhorts him to perseverance in his new faith,
and to exertions for the extirpation of heathenism,
and tells him of the imminence of the end of the
world, and of the importance of securing to
himself the advantage of Augustine's prayers. In
another to Bertha the queen, she is complimented
on her own right faith and literary attainments,
which she is exhorted to make available in behalf
of the king. What has been related may suffice
for shewing the unwavering zeal, the Christian
temper, and the fine judgment with which Greg-
ory instituted and superintended this important
mission. Its final result was the Christianity of
our English ancestors, and the eventual depen-
dence of the whole church in these islands on the
Bishop and clergy of Rome. As the British and
Scottish clergy to the claims then made,
owing perhaps in part to Augustine's deficiency
in the tact and temper of his master, was for
many years delayed. (Cf. Ep. v. indit. xiv.
53—59; ix. ind. iv. 48—60, 63, 71; Joann. Diacon.
2, 34; Bede, de Gentis Angl. i. 23, &c.)

The events so far referred to have shown Greg-
yory's attitude and conduct in spiritual matters
throughout the West. Instances will now be
given illustrating his relations with Constanti-
ople and the Eastern church. The year 593
affords the first example. Having heard of two
prebendaries, John of Chalcis and Anastasius of
Aeauria, having been beaten with cudgels, after
the convocation of bishops in Constantinople in
the Faster, then patriarch of Constantinople,
he wrote twice to the patriarch, reminding
him for introducing into the church a new
and uncannonical punishment, exhorting him to
restore the two prebendaries or to judge them
canonically, and expressing his own readiness
to receive them should he be in Rome. What
result was that, notwithstanding the patriarch's
protest, the prebendaries withdrew to Rome, and
were there received and absolved by Gregory
after examination of their cause (Ep. ii. 52; v.
64). Though the tone of his letters on this
occasion was one of brotherly remonstrance
rather than of authority, yet his proceeding
implied the right of removing errors that had
been done at Constantinople, and a power of
interference, such as he did undoubtedly claim,as
his predecessors had done. For in other letters
we find him saying, "With respect to the Con-
stantinopolitan church, who doubts that it is
subject to the apostolical see?" and "I know
not what bishop is not subject to it, if fault is
found in him." (Ep. v. 64, 65.) Among the
most memorable incidents in this connexion
are his remonstrances against the assumption by
John the Faster of the title of ocumenical or
universal bishop. They began in 592, being
provoked by the repeated occurrence of the title
in a judgment against an heretical prebendary,
which had been sent to Rome. The title was
not at that time new. Patriarchs had been so
styled by the emperors Leo and Justinian, and it
had been confirmed to John the Faster and his
successors by a general Eastern synod held at
Constantinople in 588, on which occasion pope
Pelagius had protested against it. But the
occasion now referred to seems to have been the
first to excite the indignation of Gregory. He
wrote to Sabinius, his friend at Constantinople,
desiring him to use his utmost endeavours with the patriarch, the emperor,
and the empress, to procure the renunciation of
the title. When neither remonstrance nor
the withdrawal of Sabinius from the patriarch's
communion proved availaing, he wrote himself to
patriarch, emperor, and empress in peculiarly
strong language. The title he called foolish,
proud, pestiferous, profane, wicked, a diabolical usurpation; the ambition of any who assumed it he compares to that of Lucifer; and intimates that its assumption was a sign of the approach of the end of times. We have already stated that his arguments are such as to preclude himself as well as others from assuming the title, though he implies that if any could claim it it would be St. Peter's successor. Peter, he says, was the first of the apostles, yet neither he nor any of the others would assume the title universal, being all members of the church under one bishop. Chalcedon (probably in error) that the title had been offered to the bishop of Rome at the council of Chalcedon, and refused. Failing entirely to make an impression at Constantinople, he addressed himself to the Eastern patriarchs. He wrote to Eulogius of Alexandria and Anastasius of Antioch, representing the purpose of their brother of Constantinople as being that of degrading them, and usurping to himself all ecclesiastical power. They, however, were not thus moved to action; they seem to have regarded the title as one of honour only, suitable to the patriarch of the imperial city; and one of them, Anastasius, wrote in reply that the matter seemed to him of little moment. The controversy continued after the death of John the Faster. Cyrilus having succeeded him in 596, Gregory instructed his aposcarius at Constantinople to demand from the new patriarch, as a condition of intercommunication, the renunciation of the proud and impious title which his predecessor had wickedly assumed. In vain did Cyrilus send a nuncio to Rome in the hope of arranging matters; Gregory was resolute, and in a letter on this occasion to the patriarch affirmed, "I confidently say that whosoever calls himself universal priest, or desires to be so called in his elation, is the forerunner of Antichrist." At this time he seems to have gained a support, if not to his protest, at any rate to the paramount dignity of his own see, in Eulogius of Alexandria, whom he had before addressed with effect. For in answer to the first letter received from that prelate, he acknowledges with approval the dignity assigned by him to the see of St. Peter, and expresses adroitly a curious view of his correspondent, as well as the patriarch of Antioch, being a sharer in it. "Who does not know," he says, "that the church was built and established on the firmness of the prince of the apostles, by whose very name is implied a rock? Hence, though there were several apostles, there is but one apostolic see, that of the prince of the apostles, which has acquired great authority; and that see is in three places, in Rome where he died, in Alexandria where it was founded by his disciple St. Mark, and in Antioch where he himself lived seven years. These three, therefore, are but one see, and on that one see sit three bishops, who are but one in Him who said, I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you." But when Eulogius in a second letter proceeded so far as to style the bishop of Rome universal pope, Gregory warmly rejected such a title, saying, "If you give more to me than is due to me, you rob yourself of what is due to you. Nothing can redound to my honour that springs from the depravity of my brethren. If you call me universal pope, you thereby own yourself to be no pope. Let no such titles be mentioned or ever heard among us." Gregory was obliged at last to acquiesce in the assumption of the obnoxious title by the Constantiopolitana patriarch; and it may have been by way of protest that he afterwards put himself in his own letters by the title since borne by the bishops of Rome, Servus servorum Dei. It is evident that Gregory and his opponents in this dispute took different views of the import of the title contended for. They represented it as one simply of honour and dignity, while he regarded it as involving the assumption of supreme authority over the church, and especially over the see of St. Peter, whence probably in a great measure the vehemence of his remonstrance. It may be observed further that in the different views taken appears the difference of principle on which pre-eminence was in that age thought assignable to sees in the East and West respectively. In the East the dignity of a see was regarded as an appanage of a city's civil importance, on which ground alone could any pre-eminence be claimed for Constantinople. In the West it was the apostolic origin of the see, and the purely ecclesiastical pre-eminence belonging to it from ancient times, to which especial regard was paid. Thus viewed, the struggle of Gregory for the dignity of his own see against that of Constantinople assumes more importance than might at first sight seem due to it, as being a protest against the Erastianism of the East. And it certainly would not have been well for the church had the spiritual authority of the bishops of Rome acceded to the subservient patriarchs of the Eastern capital.

If, as a temporal administrator and pontifex, he gave no less than a spiritual ruler, Gregory evinced great vigour, ability, and zeal, guided by address and judgment. The see of Rome at this time had large possessions, constituting what was called the patri-mony of St. Peter, not only in Italy, Sardinia, and Corsica, but also in more remote parts, including Dalmatia, Illyricum, Gaul, and even Africa and the East. Over all such property Gregory exercised a vigilant superintendence by means of officers called "rectores patrimoni," and "defensores," to whom his letters remain, prescribing minute regulations for the management of the lands, and guarding especially against any oppression of the peasants. The exact amounts of their payments were fixed, they were to be allowed to pay by instalments, assisted by advances from the church treasury; unfair weights and measures were to be destroyed, and new ones provided; the seigniorial payments on the marriage of serfs were lowered; and legal forms of security (securitatis libelli) were to be furnished to peasants, lest the old abuses should be revived. The families of farmers were also secured in their succession to tenancy, and their rights to water and pasture. The revenues accruing to the see, thus carefully secured, though with every possible regard to humanity and justice, were expended according to the fourfold division then prevalent in the West, viz. in equal parts for the bishop, for the clergy, for the fabric and services of the church, and for the poor. And to such distribution, publicly marked by the time-stamped year, Gregory gave his personal superintendence. His own charities were immense, a large portion of the popula-
tion of Rome being dependent on them; every day, before he sat down to his meal, a portion was sent to the poor at his door; provision was made for searching out the sick and infirm in every street, and a large volume was kept containing the names, ages, and dwellings of the objects of his bounty.

A field for the exercise of his political abilities was afforded by his position as virtual ruler of Rome at that critical time. Before his accession the Lombards had conquered nearly all Italy, and the state of Rome was chaotic, and had committed ravages even there, no effectual aid against them being afforded by the emperor. In 594 the exarch Romanus, in violation of a treaty with Agilulph, the Lombard king, had seized an opportunity of invading his territory and carrying hisbooty to Ravenna. Agilulph in return invaded the exarchate, approaching the very gates of Rome, and remained there several months, laying the country waste with fire and sword. Gregory, whose letters and homilies at this time give a lamentable account of the miseries of the country, endeavoured to conclude a peace with Agilulph, who was himself disputing the terms. The emperor was frustrated by the opposition of Romanus, who represented Gregory to the emperor as having been overreached by the crafty enemy. The emperor believed his exarch, and wrote to Gregory in condemnation of his conduct. In vain did Gregory remonstrate in letters both to the emperor and to the empress Constantina, complaining of the ravages of the Lombards as of the cruelty and exactions of the imperial officers who had been sent to defend the country, but who had, on the contrary, burdened the people with intolerable taxes under pretence of raising funds for the war, in consequence of which the Coriscans especially had been compelled to sell their children, and had even over the sea sent the ravages of the Lombards as of the cruelty and exactions of the imperial officers who had been sent to defend the country, but who had, on the contrary, burdened the people with intolerable taxes under pretence of raising funds for the war, in consequence of which the Coriscans especially had been compelled to sell their children, and had even sold their island almost depopulated.

Further, he attributed the opposition raised to his own endeavours for peace to the fear lest, the war being ended, the excuse for such exactions should cease. At length, in 595, he obtained some relief through his pious friend Theodelinda, the Lombard queen, who, more amenable to influence than the emperor or empress, persuaded her husband to withdraw his troops (Ep. iv. 31, 33, 35, 38, 39; and Hom. 18 in Eucher.). This relief, however, was only temporary.

Towards the winter of 596, Agilulph, provoked by the exarch's continued resistance to all overtures for peace, again invaded the exarchate, and threatened to besiege Rome. Agilulph's letters give a deplorable picture of general distress, both within and without the city. But he did more than complain. From his own resources, and through the contributions of bishops and others, both in the West and East, whose sympathy he succeeded in exciting, he expended large sums in the redemption of captives and the relief of distress, and further allowed bishops to sell the sacred vessels of the churches for the same charitable purposes (Ep. v. 29; vi. 13, 21, 23; vii. indii. ii. 13, 14). For several years he continued, unaided, his negotiations with the Lombards, with more or less success. At length, in 600, though at the time he had been for two years confined to his bed by painful illness, he succeeded in concluding a truce from September to the following April. If the results of these protracted efforts were not in all but occasional truces with the enemy, and some mitigation of distress through charity, or through Christian influences brought to bear on the invaders, the blame for the smallness of success was entirely due to the emperor and his representatives, who would neither agree to peace nor assist effectually by arms, nor in any way back up the pope's patriotic labours. Whatever good was done was due to him, and to him alone.

In the year 601 an event occurred which shows Gregory in a less favourable light, with respect to his relations to the powers of the world, than anything else during his career. Phocas, a eunuch, was made emperor by the army. He secured his throne by the murder of Mauricius, whose six sons had been first cruelly executed before their father's eyes. He afterwards put to death the empress Constantina and her three daughters, who had been lured out of the asylum of a church under a promise of safety. Numerous persons of all ranks, and in various parts of the empire, were also subjected to similar treatment. No less than 400 were put to death with unusual cruelty. The new emperor is painted in very black colours by the historians of the age (Theophylact, Hist. viii. 104; Cedren. An. vii. 1. Phocas; Niceph. Hist. xviii. 404; Evagri. v. 23; Theophylact. Inst. Miscell. xvii. 40). Yet to him and to his consort Leontia, who is spoken of as little better than her husband, there were many letters in a style of flattery beyond even what was usual with him in addressing great potentates. He returns thanks to heaven, and calls on both heaven and earth to rejoice at their accession, viliifying at the same time the memory of the murdered Mauricius as a tyrant from whose yoke the church was now blissfully freed (Ep. xi. 18, and others). No doubtless, was in a great measure the hope of obtaining from the new powers the support which Mauricius had not accorded him in his still pending dispute with the Eastern patriarch. This motive appears plainly in one of his letters to Leontia, to whom, rather than to the emperor, with characteristic tact, he intimates his hopes of support to the church of St. Peter, endeavouring to work upon her religious fears.

"I should have entertained you," he says, "to take under your particular protection the hitherto afflicted church of St. Peter, but, as I know you love God, I need not ask you to do what you will do of your own accord, for the more you love God, the more you will love His apostle, to whom it was said, 'You are Peter,' &c.; I therefore, do not doubt that you will take care to oblige and bind him to you by whom you desire to be loosed from your sins." These motives, and the adulatory style then in vogue towards the emperors, account for, though they cannot be held to excuse, the conduct of Gregory in this, the most glaring instance of what was indeed his habit in other cases, that of propitiating the rulers of this world by flattering addresses, if so he might enlist them in what he believed to be the cause of God. That he rightly counted on the disposition of Phocas appears from his successor, Boniface III., having "obtained from the emperor Phocas that the Apo..."
stolic see of St. Peter, that is the Roman church, should be the head of all churches, because the church of Constantinople wrote itself the first of all churches” (Anastas. Bibl. Vit. Pontif.). The statement, often made, that Boniface had conferred on him, and accepted, the title itself which Gennadius had so strongly repudiated for himself, is not supported by evidence, and is in itself improbable.

Gregory lived only sixteen months after the accession of Phocas. He died after protracted suffering from gout on the 12th of March, A.D. 604, and was buried in the basilica of St. Peter.

What occurred immediately after his death makes some of the reverence due to this prince of the people of his day. A famine ensued, which the starving multitude attributed to his prodigal expenditure. They were on the point of expressing their feeling towards their deceased benefactor by destroying his library, which was only saved by the interposition of the archdeacon Peter (his interlocutor in the Dialogues), who asserted that he lived in the form of a do. He hovered over his head as he wrote. Peter’s sudden death in the pulpit, as he was on the point of confirming this assertion with an oath, was curiously taken as a testimony to its truth, and the library was spared (Joann. Diacon. Vit. iv. 69). Hence Gregory is represented in art with a dove above his head.

III. The pontificate of Gregory the Great is rightly regarded as second to none in its influence on the future form of Western Christianity. He lived in the period of transition from Christendom under the imperial power to the mediæval papacy, and he laid or consolidated the foundation on which the latter was built. He advanced, indeed, no claims to authority beyond what had already been asserted by his predecessors; yet the consistency, firmness, conscientious zeal, as well as address and judgment, with which he maintained it, and, further, the peculiar circumstances of the time, when the waning of the power of the Eastern empire left him the virtual ruler of Rome, and the sole power to whom the Western church turned for support, and who the Christian barbarian founders of the new kingdom of Europe, regarded with reverence; such conduct and such circumstances paved the way to the system of papal absolutism that culminated under Gregory VII. and Innocent III. Nor, it may be remarked, were any of his measures in this regard more pregnant with consequences (probably far beyond his own anticipation) than those which he took for the consolidation of the church and of the authority of Rome in France and England.

Of the purity of his motives, and of the eminence of his character as a Christian, there can be no doubt. If his Christianity was that of a monk among monks, intensely ascetic, tinged with credulity and superstition, and not averse to persecution, it was of the type most highly regarded in his age, and thoroughly suited to the times. In some cases, as has been seen, he evinced moderation and tolerance beyond that of his age, and it is impossible to read his letters without recognising the tone and spirit of a genuine Christian. The least defensible part of his proceedings was his excommunication of Brunichild and Phocas, which cannot easily be justified, as has been attempted, by supposing ignorance of the true character of the potentates addressed. It is rather to be accounted for by his zeal for what was or seemed to him the cause of God, together with his peculiar turn for diplomacy, prevailing over complete sincerity, and perhaps in part his view (evident generally in his letters to potentates) of the reverence due to the power of God. A like politic insincerity is perceived by some in many of the narratives contained in his Book of Dialogues, sent as they were to confirm the faith of Theodelinda, the Lombard queen, though too puerile, it might be thought, for the credence of a man of his own intelligence and culture. It is more charitable to suppose this otherwise enlightened pope to have been himself deeply tinged with the superstitious credulity of his day.

As a writer he was intellectually eminent, and deserves the place assigned to him among the doctors of the church. His learning, indeed, and mental attitude, were again those of his age. As a critic, an expositor, an original thinker, he may be either Greek or Hebrew, and had no deep acquaintance with the Christian fathers; literature for its own sake he set little store by; classical literature, as being heathen, he repudiated. Though the story which we find told first by John of Salisbury in the 12th century (Polychron. i. 29) of his having purposely burnt the Palatine library is probably untrue, yet his familiarity with the classics is sufficiently evident from his sharp reproof of Desiderius, bishop of Viene, for reading the heathen poets with his pupils in grammar (Ep. ix. 48). Yet, notwithstanding all this, as a clear and powerful exponent of the received orthodox doctrine, especially in its practical aspect, as well as of the system of hagiology, demonology, and monastic asceticism, which then formed part of the religion of Christendom, he spoke with a loud and influential voice to many ages after his own, and contributed more than any one person that can be named to fix the form and tone of mediæval religious thought.

He was also influential as a preacher. A great part of his extant works are sermons, expository and hortatory; and we find him regretting that other duties interfered with more constant devotion to that of preaching.

He is no less famous for his influence on the music and liturgy of the church; hence called ‘magister cantemontium.’ For the cultivation of church singing he instituted a song-school in Rome, called Orpharamorphium, the name of which implies that it had also a charitable purpose. Of it, John the Deacon gives the following account, after speaking of the centre of antiphons which, like Solomon, he had carefully compiled: — ‘He founded a school of singers, endowed it with some farms, and built for it two habitations, one under the steps of the basilica of St. Peter the Apostle, the other under the houses of the Servite Friars. As far as he could, he brought to the present day his couch on which he used to recline when singing, and his whip with which he menaced the boys, together with his original antiphonary, are preserved with fitting reverence.’ (Vit. Gregor. ii. 6.) Cardinal Bona (de Red. Liturg. i. 23) gives proof of the existence of song-schools in Rome before the time of Gregory, hence concluding that his object was...
the reform and improvement only of existing church music. The exact nature of his reforms cannot now be determined with certainty. It is generally alleged, in the first place that, whereas St. Ambrose had in the latter part of the 4th century introduced at Milan the four authentic modes or scales, called, after those in ancient Greek music that corresponded to them, Dorian, Phrygian, Lydian, Mixolydian, St. Gregory added to them the four plagal, or subsidiary, modes called Hypodorian, Hypophrygian, Hypolydian, and Hypomixolydian, thus enlarging the allowed range of ecclesiastical melody. In explanation of these modes it may be observed in passing that the four so-called authentic ones were scales comprising eight notes of our modern diatonic scale, beginning respectively with the notes D, E, F, and G, which were also the finals of each, and having A, C, C, and D, for their dominant or reciting notes; and that the corresponding plagal modes, while retaining the same finals, began each a fourth lower than the authentic one to which it was subsidiary, and had different dominant or reciting notes, viz. F, A, A, and C. Mr. Chatfield, however, in his Ms. and Essays on the Church Music of the 4th Century, published by Mr. Musical Museum, 1834, does not think that the Hypomixolydian mode, as commonly understood, is the true Hypomixolydian, but a more modern hypothesis. Mr. Chatfield, however, in his Ms. and Essays on the Church Music of the 4th Century, published by Mr. Musical Museum, 1834, does not think that the Hypomixolydian mode, as commonly understood, is the true Hypomixolydian, but a more modern hypothesis.

History of Music, maintains that the ecclesiastical scales used above described "are not of the early date that has been supposed," and that "the two systems called Ambrosian and Gregorian did not exist at the time of their now supposed founders," adding that Ambrosian music and Gregorian music meant simply music according to the Church and the Church's liturgy, and that the so-called "real" and "natural" modes, as they are called, are rather than the less severe style of melodious singing which had become current in the West from Milan; and that there was the most essential difference between the "Cantus Gregorianus" and the "Cantus Ambrosianus." It is in accordance with this view that Gregory is said by subsequent writers to have banished all that was light or popular from the musical settings of the Liturgy and to have confined the singing to the choir, excluding the general congregation. (See on the whole subject Kranze der Liturgie; Martin Gerbert, de cantu et musica sacra; Bon, de rebus literariis; Chappell's Hist. of Music.)

His institution of the Sepulchrum litany immediately before his accession has been already referred to. He was so anxious to be sung by the inhabitants of Rome divided into seven companies, viz. of clergy, of laymen, of monks, of virgins, of matrons, of widows, and of poor people and children. These, starting from seven different churches, were to chant through the streets of Rome, and meet at last for common supplication in the church of the Blessed Virgin. He also appointed "the stations," churches at which were to be celebrated solemn services in Lent and at the four great festivals; at which seasons he visited the churches in person, being received there with stately ceremonial, and taking part in the services. Of the share he had in the composition or arrangement of the liturgy something will be said in the notice of his works, which follows.

His extant works of undoubted genuineness, are:—1. Expositio in sanctum Job, ser Moraviae libro xxxv. In this celebrated work (begun during his stay at Constantinople, before he was pope, and finished afterwards) the book of Job is expounded in a threefold manner, according to its historic, its moral and its allegorical meaning. For his exposition in the first of these senses his ignorance of any language but Latin, of ancient history, and of Eastern customs, rendered him quite unfit. The moral interpretation may still be read with profit, though rather for the loftiness and purity of its tone than for the justness of the exposition. Of the allegorical interpre-
tation, according to which the book was conceived as containing latently in itself the whole theory of the Christian church and sacraments, and a condemnation of all heresies, it may be said that a similar treatment might deduce almost anything from any book that was ever written. Names of persons, numbers, words, even whole books, were, according to this kind of mystic treatments, given their own kind of mysterious meanings.

The above account of the work is extracted from Milman’s History of Latin Christianity.

2. Libri duo in Ecclesiæm: viz. 22 Homilies on Ezekiel, which, having been delivered at Rome in a time of distress during the siege of the city by Agilulf, were afterwards revised by himself, and addressed to a bishop Marianus.

3. Libri duo in Evangelia: viz. 40 Homilies on the gospels for the day, preached by himself at various times, and afterwards edited by himself and addressed to a bishop Secundinus. To these is appended a short sermon, called “Oratio ad plebeum de mortalitate,” delivered during the plague at Rome between his election and consecration. It included directions for the Septiform litany.

4. Liber Regulae Pastoralis, in 4 parts; a treatise on the duties and responsibilities of the pastoral office, addressed (as appears from the preface) to a bishop John with the purpose of explaining and justifying the writer’s former reluctance to undertake the burden of the papacy. This work was held in the highest esteem both at the time of its publication and for ages afterwards. Lenderof de Seville, to whom he sent it, circulated it in Spain; the emperor Mauricius had it translated into Greek; Alfred the Great had it translated into English; a succession of saints in Gaul enjoined a knowledge of it on all bishops; and Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, in the 9th century, says that a copy of it was delivered, together with the book of canons, to bishops at their ordination, with a charge to them to frame their lives according to its precepts (in Praefatione Opusculi 55 Capitulorum).

5. Dialogorum libri IV. de vita et miraculis patrum Italorum, et de aeternitati animae. The authenticity of this work has been doubted, but apparently without adequate grounds. It is written in the form of dialogues between the author and the archdeacon Peter, and contains accounts of a number of saintly persons, among whom a prominent place is given to Benedict of Nursia, the contemporary founder of the Benedictine order. It abounds in incredible marvels, and relates, among other things, visions of the state of departed souls, which have been a main support, if not the principal support of the medieval doctrine about purgatory. The Dialogues were translated into Anglo-Saxon by order of Alfred (Anser. Gest. Alf. in Mon. Hist. Brit. 486).

6. Registrum Epistolorum, in 14 books, of which the 13th is wanting; a collection of 838 letters to persons of all orders and degrees in various parts of the world, and on a great variety of subjects. Nothing that Gregory has left gives us so vivid an idea of his unwearying activity, the multifariousness of his engagements and interests, his address and judgment, and the versatility of his powers.

7. Liber Sacramentorum. This, the famous Gregorian Sacramentary, was an abbreviated arrangement in one volume, with some alterations and additions, of the previous sacramentary of pope Gelasius, which again had been founded on an older one attributed to pope Leo I. What John the deacon says of Gregory’s work is, “Sed et Gelasianum codicum, de Missarum solemnis multa subtrahens, paulo convertens, nonnulla supercificiens, in unius libelli volume coactavit” (Johann. disc. de Viti. Greg. lib. 2, c. 17; cf. Bede, Hist. Eccles. ii. 1). The changes made by Gregory were principally in the Missae, or variable offices for particular days; in the Ordo Missae itself only the two following alterations are spoken of as made by him. First, to the part of the canon beginning, “Hanc igitur obligationem,” he added the words, “Disque nostras in tua pace dispensas, atque ab aeterna damnatione eripi et in electorum tuorum juvenes grade numerari.” Secondly, he transferred the Lord’s Prayer from its former place, after the breaking of bread, to its present place in the canon (Ep. ad Joann. Synag. lib. ix. Ep. 12). Whatever uncertainty there may be as to the original text of Gregory’s Sacramentary as a whole, it is considered certain that the present Roman canon and, with the exception of certain subsequent additions, the ordinarium also are the same as what he left. [See art. SACRAMENTARY in Dict. Chr. Antiq.]

8. Liber Antiphonarius, a collection of antiphons for mass. To what extent this work was original, or founded on a previous collection, and how far it may have been altered or added to since Gregory’s time, are matters of some uncertainty.

Of the following works attributed to Gregory, the genuineness is doubtful:

1. Liber Benedictinum.
2. Liber Responsialis seu Antiphonarius.
4. Expositiones super Cantica Cantorum.
5. Expositio in septem Psalmos Paviniculitis.
6. Concordia quattuorcan testamentorum sacrae Scripturae.

There are also nine hymns attributed to him with probability.

Of Gregory’s personal appearance an idea may be formed from a description given by John the Deacon of a portrait preserved to his own day (9th century) in St. Andrew’s monastery, “in absidicula post fratribus cellarium”; which he concludes to have been painted during the pope’s life and by his order. There were in the atrium of the same monastery pictures of the father and mother of Gregory (see GORDIANUS), shown by the inscription on one of them to have been painted by his order; and that this was the case also with his own portrait is inferred from the head being surmounted, not by a corona, but by a tabula (“tabulæ similitudinem”), which John says is the mark of a living person, and by the appended inscription:

“Christe potens Domine, nostri largior honoris, Indulgentium officiis solita piate turbet gubernam.”

The portrait is thus described. The figure is of ordinary size, and well formed; the face a happy medium between the length of his father’s and the roundness of his mother’s—“most becomingly prolonged with a certain rotundity”; the head is, like his father’s, of moderate size, and somewhat tawny; in the middle of his otherwise
bald forehead are two neat little curls twisting towards the right; the crown of the head is round and large; dark hair, decently curled, hangs under the middle of the ear; he has a fine forehead; his eyebrows are long and elevated, but slender; the pupils of the eyes are of a yellow tinge, not large, but open, and the under eyelids are full; the nose is slender as it curves down from the eyebrows, broader about the middle, then slightly curved, and expanding at the nostrils; the mouth is ruddy; the lips thick and surprised; the teeth regular ("lipsissime"); the chin rather prominent from the confines of the jaws; the complexion is described as "aquilinus et vividus" (al. "vividius"), not "cardinus," as it became afterwards. There is some uncertainty about the colours intended. "Aquilinus" may be equivalent to "aquilus" (scarcely), and "cardinus" may denote the colour consequent on stomach disease ("cardiacus morbus"); in which case, if we adopt the reading "vividius" for "lividus," the meaning would seem to be that he had a dark but fresh complexion when his picture was taken, though in later life it acquired an unhealthy hue. (See Du Cange for this sense of "lividus," and the word "latura." His countenance is mild; his hands good, with taper fingers, were well adapted for writing. His dress is a chestnut-coloured "planeta" over a "dalmatica," which is precisely the same dress as that in which his father is depicted, and therefore not in Gregory's time peculiarly sacerdotal costume. (See Gordinianus.) But he is distinguished from his son, and from them, by the unusual and accepted mode of wearing which are intimated by the description. It is brought from the left shoulder so as to hang carelessly under the breast, and, passing over the right shoulder, is deposited behind the back, the other end being carried straight behind the neck also to the right shoulder, from which it hangs down the side. In the left hand is a book, and the thumb, the palm down, is in the attitude of making the sign of the cross. (John, Disc. in Vit. S. Gregor. 1. 4, c. 83.) John the Deacon describes also his "pallium," woven of white linen and with no marks of the needle in it; his phylactery (or case for relics), of thin silver, and hung from the neck by erisson cloth, and his belt ("sathitius"), only a thumb's breadth wide—which, he says, were preserved and venerated on the saint's anniversary, and which he refers to as evidences of the monastic simplicity of Gregory's attire. (John, Disc. in Vit. S. Gregor. 1. 4, c. 8.)

"Our chief authorities for the life of Gregory are his own writings, especially his letters. Among ancient writers Gregory of Tours (his contemporary), Bede, Paul Warnefried (730), Ado Trivernensis (1070), Simeon Metaphrastes (1300), Isidorus Hispalensis, have detailed notices of him. Paul the deacon in the 8th century, and John the deacon, a monk of Cassino, in the 9th century, wrote lives of him (Greg. Op. ed. Benedict). The Benedictine edition of his works contains also a fuller life, supplemented from other sources. [J. B. y.]

GREGORIUS (52) II., bishop of Rome, after Constantine, from May 19, 715, to Feb. 10, 731, for fifteen years eight months and twenty days, during the reigns of the emperors Anastasius, Theodosius, and Leo the Isaurian.

He is said by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (Vit. Pontiff) to have been a Roman by birth, educated in the Lateran palace under pope Sergius, and a Benedictine monk; also to have accompanied his predecessor, pope Constantine, to Constantinople, where he evinced his learning and abilities by answering certain questions put to him by the emperor Justinian II., the purport of which is not told to the satisfaction of the latter. The same authority describes him as pure in life, learned in Holy Scripture, eloquent in speech, and of resolute will, of the last of which characteristic the events of his pontificate afford sufficient proof.

The most important incidents of his reign were, first, the conversion, and with it the submission to the Roman see, of the German races by the English missionary Boniface, and, secondly, the commencement of the Iconoclastic controversy, in which this pope was at issue with the emperor Leo Isauricus. The popes at this period were still subjects of the Eastern emperors, and required to be confirmed in office by the exarchs of Ravenna, though usually left to themselves to defend their Italian possessions against the neighbouring Lombards, who, having pillaged and invaded Italy, and having subsequently established the two powerful dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, had lately founded, under king Liutprand, a settled kingdom in the district hence called Lombardy. These long dreaded barbarians, though now professing Catholic Christianity, were still objects of fear and aversion; nor did the occasion of the new form of the pontifical tiara, with the pope or with the emperor prevent his watching for every opportunity that might occur for making himself master of the whole of Italy. In the first year of his pontificate Gregory, for security against his troublesome neighbours, began the restoration of the ruined walls of Rome, a work of which subsequent troubles prevented the completion. (731.) In the same year (731) he found himself in conflict with them. They had seized and kept possession of the fortress at Cumae (Cumumnum castrum). Gregory, having failed to obtain its cession by remonstrance, spiritual menace, and offers of money, had at length recourse to the arms of John, duke of Naples (still part of the imperial dominion), who was induced by a bribe of seventy pounds of gold to recapture and restore it to him. Before or after this event we read of Liutprand having shewn a more friendly disposition in restoring to the Roman see its patrimony in the Cottian Alps, which had been previously bestowed on it by the Lombard king Aribert (Paul. Diacon., Bede, Anastas. Bibli.);

The year 718 was marked by the accession of Leo III., called Isauricus, on the abdication of Theodosius; on which occasion the new emperor, far from showing signs of his future religious attitude, sent the pope a confession of his faith, the orthodoxy of which was also attested by the patriarch Germans; whereupon Gregory sent a cordial letter in reply, alluded to in his subsequent correspondence.

The year 718 was memorable for the first visit to Rome of the English Winihrith, better known as Boniface, who came with a commendatory letter from Daniel, bishop of Winchester, to seek the pope's authority and blessing for missionary work among the Germans, on which his
heart had long been set. He had previously attempted a mission in Frisia without much success, having been thwarted by the pagan king Ratbod, who had at that time thrown off the dominion of the Franks, and devastated the churches already founded in his country. Boniface, therefore, set out for England, and arrived at the English monastery of Nursling, and after a stay there of two years, and refusal to fill the office of abbot, he repaired to Rome, arriving there in the autumn of 718. Gregory (says Boniface's biographer Willibald), on learning his purpose, looked at him "with blithe countenance and smiling eyes," and at length, after frequent colloquies, sent him forth with his blessing, and under the protection of St. Peter, in the May of the year 719, as a missionary at large to the German unbelievers. He carried with him a number of relics given him by the pope, and a letter addressed to himself, in which he was straitly charged to follow the directions of the Roman see, as a further commission, if required. (Othlon. in Vit. Bonif. 1. 12; Bonit. Ep. ii. Giles's ed.) Visiting the Lombard king Liutprand on his way, by whom he was honourably received, the missionary proceeded first to Thuringia, a country, it would seem, already in great measure Christianized, where he exerted himself to correct the heresies and irregularities that had crept in among the clergy. Thence he repaired to France, and, having heard of the death of Ratbod and the recovery of Frisia to the dominion of Charles Martel, he prosecuted a successful mission in that country in conjunction with archbishop Willibrord, of Utrecht, who was already at work there. Urged by him to accept the office of bishop, he steadfastly refused on the ground partly of unworthiness, but especially of the absence of any command or leave from Rome. Having at length obtained the old prelate's consent to his departure, he returned to Germany about the year 722, and after extraordinary success among the Hessians and Saxons, of whom he is said to have baptized thousands, he sent a messenger to apprise the pope and request instructions. The result was a summons to Rome, which he at once obeyed, arriving there accompanied by several Frank and Burgundian disciples in the year 723. It was now that Gregory, having previously demanded of him a confession of his faith, which because of his imperfect knowledge of Latin he requested him to prepare in writing, and, being satisfied therewith, ordained him bishop on St. Andrew's day, A.D. 723 i.e., a general missionary bishop, not one of any provincial see. It was on this occasion that the pope is generally said to have given him the name of Boniface, by which, rather than his original one Winfrith, he is best known. Lingard, however (Annt. Sax. Ch. ii. 338), gives reasons for supposing that he had assumed it previously. The memorable oath which he took on this occasion (Othlon. Vit. Bonif. 1. i. 14; Bonit. Ep. ii. 15), was: "I, Boniface by the grace of God, bishop, promise to thee the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and to thy vicar, the blessed pope Gregory and his successors, by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the inseparable Trinity, and by this thy most sacred body, to maintain the purity of the holy Catholic faith, and by the help of God, persevere in the unity of the same; in no wise, through anyone's persuasion, to consent to anything against the unity of the common and universal church; but, as I have said, to evince in all respects my faith, and purity, and concurrence with thee, and the interests of thy church, to whom God hath given the power of binding and loosing, the power of the vicar and his successors. Whenever I find the conduct of the chief officers of the church contradictory to the ancient ordinances and decrees of the fathers, I will have no fellowship or connexion with them, but will prevent it if I can, or, if not, will at once report it faithfully to my apostolic lord. And should I ever in any way attempt to do anything contrary to the tenor of this my promise, may I be found guilty in the eternal judgment, and incur the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, who presumed to commit fraud and to say what was false to thee." The taking of this oath, which was substantially the same as the Indiennus Episcopi then exacted by the pope from the bishop of the own patriarchate (Lob. diam. c. iii. tit. 8 and 9), was of great importance in the history of the church, as being exacted in this instance from the bishop of a German see, outside not only of the hitherto acknowledged patriarchate of Rome, but even of the Roman empire. It was taken afterwards by all bishops of sees constituted by Boniface, and laid in fact the foundation of the close dependence on Rome of the church of central Europe. It is interesting to trace back this result to the memorable mission of Augustine to England by Gregory the Great (597), the consequence of which had been the closer connexion with Rome of the English church than of any other in the north, attested among other ways by frequent pilgrimages and not unfrequent appeals to Rome, and resulting in that entire devotion to the apostolic see that marked and directed the career of the apostle of Germany, Boniface. He now resumed the labours of his mission, fortified by various letters from the pope. One addressed to Charles Martel announces the consecration of Boniface as bishop and missionary to the German races and others on the east coast of the Rhine, and states Charles' support and protection. Another, to bishops, clergy, dukes, earls, and Christians generally, commends the new bishop and his companions to their hospitality and support, promising in return, through the intercession of the two chief apostles, communion with the holy martyrs, and threatening such as should oppose them with anathema and damnation. In a third, the clergy and laity of Germany are assured of Charles' support and protection. Another, to bishops, clergy, dukes, earls, and Christians generally, commends the new bishop and his companions to their hospitality and support, promising in return, through the intercession of the two chief apostles, communion with the holy martyrs, and threatening such as should oppose them with anathema and damnation.
seventh, and tenth months, or at the beginning or middle of Lent, or "vesperae sabbato sacro" (i.e. Easter eve); and that, except in cases of danger of death, he should administer baptism only at Easter and Pentecost. Another letter, to the chiefs and others among the Thuringians who were Christians, praises them for steadfastness in the faith, exhorts them to prefer death to apostasy, and enjoins obedience to the new bishop. Two more letters, probably sent on this occasion, are addressed to the Thuringian Alt-Saxons, both Christian and not Christian. The Thuringians are exhorted to hearken to, and build a house and churches for, the holy bishop who had been sent among them for no earthly gain, but to win their souls, and lead them on the way to everlasting bliss. The letter addressed to the Alt-Saxons (as the Saxons on the Continent were called in distinction from the English Saxons) is mainly made up of quotations from the epistles of St. Paul. They are told, among other things, that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand, they are warned against any one seducing them "with excellence of speech" to the worship of idols in which the devils dwell, against being spurred on with empty spectacles, by the children of darkness, as are the children of light. They are finally warned to put no bar in the way of the conversion of any of their people, and to receive Boniface, whom he, Gregory, had sent, his brother and fellow bishop, to deliver them from the devil and number them among the children of God. (Bede, E. x. v. 8, 10, 11, 12, n. 6; J. a. d. 735.) The remaining career of Boniface brings him into no further connexion that is known of with Gregory II., except in respect to two subsequent letters, of which mention will be made in the final enumeration of the extant writings of this pope.

Mention may here be made of a visit of St. Corbinianus, bishop of Freising, to Rome in 724, to beg of Eugenius III. a return from him to Bavaria, which he had held for eight years, to a monastery, or to some desert. He was honourably received, and a synod was held in which the desired leave was refused. An account of this is given in the history of Aribro, the successor of St. Corbinianus. One of the noted pilgrimages from England to Rome was made in the next year, 725, when Iza, king of the West Saxons, after reigning thirty-seven years, renounced his kingdom, and visited the tombs of the apostles with Ethelburga his queen. Both spent the remainder of their days at Rome (Bede, H. E. v. 7). Bede speaks of this being at that time a common practice among the English, both noble and ignoble, laity and clergy, men and women. According to Matthew of Westminster, inscribed at the close of the Saxon school for such of his countrymen as might choose to be educated there, adding a church for their use; to support which, and to provide a subsistence for the English who should dwell there, he imposed a tribute of one penny on each family of his subjects, called Romanseot (Matth. de Westmonest. ann. 727). William of Malmesbury attributes the foundation of this school to king Offa, who died in 794. This has been supposed (Higden, Polydore Virg.), though without sufficient ground, to have been the origin of the Romanseot or Peter's penge, afterwards paid by way of tribute from England to Rome; which, however, Malmesbury attributes to King Ethelwulf.

In the year 726 was published the first edict against image-worship by the emperor Leo Isauricus. At this time the renovation of representations of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the saints, as well as of relics, had become ingrained in Christian devotion, both in the East and West. Not, however, without some protest, not only from Jews and Mahometans, who charged Christians with idolatry, but also from remonstrants within the church. By whatever influences moved, Leo, having reigned for ten years without signing any deposition to impose any religious matter, except in the way of persecuting Jews, suddenly set himself the hopeless task of eradicating the prevailing worship. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his objection to it, which he grounded on the scriptural prohibition of idolatry (Greg. II. Ep. 1), whatever may be thought of the wisdom or justifiableness of his high-handed procedure. His first edict, issued with the sanction of a senatus-consulturn, but without the concurrence of the patriarch, merely forbade the worship of images by genuflections, prostrations, and the like, and ordered them to be placed high on the walls of churches, so as to prevent such a deceitful abuse of them. It was not till 730, after a series of conflicts, that he issued a second edict requiring their absolute destruction. His first edict was enough to provoke the most violent resistance. The populace of Constantinople, among whom the women and monks are said to have been especially zealous, rose in insurrection, and had to be controlled by armed force. Similar insurrections ensued in the provinces. The inhabitants of the Cyclades went so far as to proclaim a rival emperor (one Cosmas, a zealous supporter of image-worship), and to equip a fleet with which they sailed for Constantinople with the view of deposing Leo. But they were successfully met, and their fleet destroyed. In Italy it was to be expected the sees of Rome and Milan would be violent. Leo had acquainted the pope with the purpose of his edict, and was by him strongly remonstrated with by letter. Notwithstanding this, the edict was sent to Scholasticus, exarch of Ravenna, to be published and enforced. The people of Ravenna rose in insurrection, and bloodshed ensued. Luitprand, the Lombard king, now seized the opportunity, such as he had long desired, of making himself master of Ravenna, and afterwards of all the Pentapolis, being received as a deliverer rather than an enemy; and he proceeded to form it into a duchy under his grandson Hildebrand. But the permanent loss of the exarchate to the empire, which did afterwards ensue, and which these iconoclastic measures of Leo certainly paved the way for, was deferred for the present. Urrac, duke of Venice, solicited by the pope, came to the aid of the exarch, and together they recovered the territory. The next few years in Italy were occupied by a course of insurrection and warfare, of which the following is a summary. Scholasticus the exarch, suspected by the emperor of connivance with the pope, was superseded in 728 by Paul the Patriarch, who marched to Rome in order to seize Gregory, but was prevented by a body of Lombards sent by Luitprand, who at this stage of affairs espoused his cause. Paul now, by the emperor's order, required the edict to be published at Rome, and in all the
cities of Italy subject to the emperor. The pope excommunicated Paul; the Roman people rose, overpowered the imperial garrison, broke the statue of the emperor, and renounced their allegiance to him. The pope addressed a circular to the Italian cities, to the Lombards and Venetians, exhorting them to continue steadfast in their faith. All imagination of the emperor was now at an end. They renounced their allegiance, appointed magistrates of their own provisionally, and were only prevented from proclaiming a rival emperor by the remonstrances of Gregory. Paul, renewing his attempt to enforce the edict in Ravenna, was killed in an inscription. Exhilaratus also, duke of Naples, having in vain tried to enforce the edict there, and having, it is alleged, employed two persons to assassinate the pope, was torn in pieces by the multitude. The eunuch Eutychius, sent as exarch to Ravenna in the place of Paul, though received by the people there, failed in inducing them to accept the edict; and having, it was said, sent to Rome a letter from the emperor requiring the imperial officers there to assist in the great work of church and state, he was also excommunicated as his predecessor had been, and his messenger only saved from death by the pope's intervention. Eutychius now endeavoured to gain Luitprand to the emperor's side by promising him the cession of the cities that had been seized by him. Such overtures, however, were unavailing till the dukes of Spoleti and Benevento took the advantage of the disturbed state of things to assert their own independence; when Luitprand, having been assisted by the exarch in reducing them to obedience, proceeded with him to besiege Rome. At this crisis Gregory repaired in person to the camp of the Lombard king to implore mercy for the Roman people. The king, according to Anastasius Bibliothecarius, received him with the utmost deference, throwing himself at his feet, and divesting himself in the church of St. Peter of his arms, crown and royal mantle, which, with a silver cross, he placed upon the tomb of the apostle. But, though he granted the required amnesty, he required the pope and the Roman people to acknowledge the authority of the exarch. While the latter was still in Rome, the people of Tuscany proclaimed one Tibertius (who claimed imperial descent) emperor in the place of Leo. Gregory on this occasion supported the imperial authority, persuading the Romans to join the army of the exarch, who, thus aided, defeated the rebels, and sent the head of the usurper to Constantinople. The magnanimity of the pope in this instance is much lauded by his historians, and is an example of the course in all these transactions Baronisius, taking his facts from Anastasius, counts up six separate attempts on the life of the pope, authorized by the emperor or his officers; but the silence on this head of other early narrators, and of the pope himself in his subsequent letters to Leo, renders such allegations doubtful.

There seems, however, to be no doubt that attempts were made to seize the pope and carry him prisoner to Constantinople (this is all that he in his extant letters speaks of as attempted against himself), and on the other hand that the pope, in his resolute defence of the prevailing worship, and, indeed, of the freedom of the church from tyranny, fomented, directly or indirectly, insurrection, though not to the extent of sanctioning the proclamation of a rival emperor, or (as far as we know) encouraging violence.

In 730 was issued the second edict above referred to, after a great council assembled by Leo at Constantinople, in which the absolute destruction of all imagination of the emperor and the walls of churches, was ordered. This led to the resignation of the patriarch Germanus, and the appointment of Anastasius in his room. It led also to new and still more serious disturbances at Constantinople, especially in connexion with the destruction of an image of Christ called Antimachris (Saracens), which stood over the gate of the imperial palace called the Bronze Gate. On this occasion the people are said to have attacked the imperial officers, some of whom were killed, and the women especially to have pulled down the ladder on which a person employed to remove the image was placed, and to have murdered him after his fall; and also to have assaulted the new patriarch during divine service in the church in a furious language and with stones. Notwithstanding all resistance, the edict was enforced throughout the East, and sent to the exarch of Ravenna for publication in the West also. The emperor on this occasion wrote twice to the pope, whose replies are extant, though neither his former letters nor any of Leo's are. To the emperor's allegation of the Old Testament's prohibition of idolatry in the second commandment Gregory replies that this prohibition extended only to the images of animals and other creatures set up by the heathen in honour of the devil, not to images in honour of God; and he addsuce the works done in gold, silver, and brass by Bezekel and Aholiah, the tables of stone, the ark, the cherubim, and the pot of manna, as symbols of divine things. He states that pictures of Christ, of James the Lord's brother, of Stephen and other martyrs, had been taken by their contemporaries, and used from the first in the conversion of the heathen; he adduces as a fact the sending of his own portrait by Christ to Agabus, king of Edessa; and alleges that the six general councils had handed down the tradition of image-worship. On Leo, in reply, asking how it was that these councils had never mentioned the subject, Gregory rejoins that their silence was equivalent to approval, since the practice was known to have been prevalent at the time of the councils, and habitual to the fathers who composed them. Neither, says he, was anything said in these councils about images being the source of error or ought not to be eat and drink. Leo had referred to the destruction of the bruzy serpent by Uzziah (meaning Hezekiah) as justifying his own iconoclasm. Gregory, in replying, falls into the same mistake as to the king referred to, and speaks of his act as one of sacrilege. "Truly," he says, "Uzziah was thy brother, and had thy persuasion, and like thee he tyrannized over the priests of the Lord; he put the holy David's priest on the ark into the temple; and the anger of the image of he rejoins, as the usual assertion of the devotions they were the means of kindling, of the instruction they afforded especially to the young and ignorant, and of the real objects of all such
worship being not the images themselves but the originals represented by them. The tone of the letters towards the emperor himself is contemptuous and insulting: he is addressed as insolent, proud, headstrong, unlearned, stupid, and with a deuce78 military intellect incapable of entering into spiritual things; he is bid to go to an elementary school, and announce himself as a destroyer and persecutor of images, when the children would at once throw their tablets at his head. The emperor's provocation and a general council to settle the matter of dispute Gregory replies, "Thou art a contumelious persecutor, enemy, and destroyer of images: leave off, and grant as the favour of thy silence, and then the world will enjoy peace, and scandals will cease. When is the Christ-loving and pious emperor to sit in council in the accustomed way, and reward those who speak aright, and dismiss those who babble contrary to the truth, when thou, the emperor, waverest and imitate barbarians? Only keep quiet, and there is no need of a council." Further, the emperor is reminded of the entire distinction between the functions of emperors and of bishops, and how the former have many honorary names, and the latter are in things proper to the latter. Lastly, significant warnings are given of the possible consequences of the emperor's persistence in his schemes. "I (to this effect writes the pope) have no fear of you. I have only to pass into Campania, and I shall be safe. The whole West venerates St. Peter as a terrestrial god. I purpose visiting the western regions of the West, where my missions have been requesting my aid in bringing princes to baptism. Naked and unarmed as we are, we call on Christ the prince of the supernal powers to send a demon upon you, as says the apostle, 'to deliver such a one to Satan,' &c. Consider what may ensue. Already, in the East, women have been found inflamed with zeal, and, emulous of the glorious exploits of their predecessors, when they had in vain implored your agent to spare the image of the Saviour, pulled away the ladder on which he stood, and killed him with clubs. Already your authority has been disowned, and your statues broken in Italy. Should you send your satellites to Rome to overthrow the image of St. Peter, the Westerns are ready to avenge the Easterns. See, we protest to thee, we are innocent of the blood which they will shed: back on thy neck and thy head will these things fall!" A synod afterwards held at Rome is alluded to by pope Hadrian (Ep. 1, ad Car. Magn.), in which, after a speech from the pope setting forth the usual arguments for image-worship, the retention of the practice was decreed, and its impugners condemned. In return the emperor is said to have confiscated the patrimonial estates in Sicily and Calabria, and subjected these provinces, as well as Eastern Illyricum, to Constantinople instead of Rome. But it is not certain whether the synod referred to was held under Gregory II. or his successor Gregory III., in whose reign the reprints of the emperor above mentioned seem to have taken place. The Greek historians, Théophanes, Colreneus, Zonarins, Nicephorus, followed by Baronius, by Bellarmine (de Pont. Rom. v. 8), and on the Protestant side by the Magdeburg Centuritars (Cent. viii.), assert that Gregory II. excommunicated the emperor himself as well as the patriarch Anastasius. But his excommunication of the emperor is not mentioned by Paulinus Diaconus, by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, nor by any other Latin writers, and is now generally discredited.

Gregory, besides his activities in the ways that have been detailed, was memorable for his restoration of churches ruined by the Lombard ravages, and his re-establishment of neglected monasteries. Among the churches restored by him are mentioned especially the basilica of St. Paul, and that of St. Lawrence without the walls, to which he also conveyed water by pipes. Among the monasteries restored by him, and replenished with monks, were those about the basilica of St. Paul, one called Gerontocomium, behind the apse of St. Mary ad Praesepum, and especially the original Benedictine monastery on Mount Cassino.

He died Feb. 10, 731. He appears as a saint in the Roman Calendar, his day being the 13th of the same month. The following letters of this pope are preserved:—

1. The fragment of one to Turpin, archbishop of Rheims, with respect to a bishop Rigobert, who had been uncanonicaly deposed by Charles Martel. (Char. Martel, 171.)

2. To Austroburt, archbishop of Vienne, commanding Boniface to him, dated prid. Cal. Sept. ann. 3. Leon. imp. (Baron. ad ann. 718.)

3. To Boniface himself (above referred to), giving him commission to preach to the heathen under the authority of, and in subjection to the apostolic see, dated ad Mai. am. ca. Leon. Imp. (Baron. ad ann. 719; Boniface. Epist.)

4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Six letters commentary of Boniface after his consecration, which have been specified above. (Baron. ad ann. 723; Boniface. Epist.)

10. To Boniface himself, mentioning among other things that the writer had sent a letter to Charles Martel exhorting him to take measures against a band of bandits who had deserted to evangelize the Germans, and also to Thuringians and Germans exhorting them to found sees and churches. (Baron. ad ann. 724; Boniface. Ep. 15 in Giles's edition.)

11. To Boniface in reply to various questions with respect to matters of discipline. In consideration of the barbarity of the people they may be allowed to marry after the fourth degree of consanguinity; a husband whose wife "intimata corrupra non valuerit debuit tori reddere" may be allowed to marry another, "because here great people are concerned," but must maintain his first wife; an accused presbyter, if the proofs against him are uncertain, may purge himself by his own oath: one cup only is to be used in the celebration of mass, in conformity with the original institution by Christ. St. Paul's rule about not eating things that had been sacrificed to idols is to be observed, even though the sign of the cross had been made over the meats, infants placed by their parents in monasteries are not to be released on coming to years of discretion; persons baptized by adulterous and unworthy priests, and without interrogation as to their faith, are not to be rebaptized if the right form had been observed; children taken from their parents, of whose baptism there is no proof, are to be baptized. No one once confirmed by a bishop is to be confirmed again; faithful lepers, though not to be allowed to eat with
between Italy and Constantinople, together with renewed Lombard aggressions, consequent on the Iconoclastic controversy. It was further especially noteworthy for the first step taken towards the transference of Rome politically from the suzerainty of the Eastern emperors to that of the Frank rulers of the West.

Immediately after his accession this pope took up the cause of image-worship, in which his predecessor had been so zealous, sending a letter to Leo and to his son Constantius Copronymus (associated with him in the empire since 720), calling on them to renounce their errors. His messenger, Gregory, a Roman presbyter, having returned to Rome without having had the courage to deliver the letter, and having been again despatched, was arrested in Sicily by the emperor's order, and sent into exile. Gregory had convened a synod at Rome, attended by ninety-three bishops and the clergy generally, the laity being also present, in which image-worship was again established as agreeable to the practice of the Apostles, profaners and blasphemers of sacred images were mitigated, and a resolution was come to that a new attempt should be made to convert the emperor. Accordingly two more unsuccessful legations were sent to Constantinople. The first was headed by Constantine, defender of the Roman church, carrying a second letter from the pope; but he was stopped on his road and imprisoned for a year. The second (in 730), headed by Peter the Defender, was charged not only with letters from the pope both to the emperor and to the patriarch, but also with a memorial from the people of Italy, representing the disturbances which had arisen from the imperial edict against images, and their determination to oppose it. The members of this legation were arrested in Sicily by Sergius, the commander of the imperial troops there, and sent back to Rome. (Anastas. Biblioth.) Next year (734) the emperor sent a fleet under Manes, in the hope of reducing his Italian subjects to obedience. The fleet was wrecked by a storm in the Adriatic, after which all attempts on both sides ceased (Theophan. ad ann. Leon. 17).

The exarch remained powerless at Ravenna, unable even there to enforce the edict, and the Romans once more appointed magistrates of their own, forming a sort of independent republic, under the pope as their head. In the meantime Gregory is said to have expended large sums, amounting to seventy-three pounds weight of gold, and 376 of silver, in filling the churches at Rome with pictures and images, and in collecting relics from various quarters, for the keeping and veneration of which he founded an oratory with an establishment of monks. Peace continued till 740, when the Lombards became the authors of new disturbances. The two dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, who in the time of Gregory II. had rebelled against Luitprand, the Lombard king, and been by him reduced with the exarch's aid, again revolted. Defeated by Luitprand, they took refuge in Rome, where the pope protected them. In the spring of 741 Luitprand invaded and devastated the Roman territory, and having given up to plunder the church of St. Peter without the walls, laid siege to the city. Now it was that Gregory began the overtures to the Franks, which led eventually to such impor-
tient results. Charles Martel had now for twenty-six years been the virtual ruler of the Franks, as mayor of the palace, and had a few years before won his memorable victory over the Saracens at Tours. To him, the most powerful magnate of the age, Gregory sent an embassy, carrying, among other valuable presents, keys of St. Peter’s tomb, and supposed filings from the chain with which the apostle had been bound in Rome; and imploring protection to the apostle, his patron. Upon this occasion a letter was sent, though it received the embassy with great respect, and bestowed presents in return, was unmoved by the request. Gregory now addressed to him a most pathetic letter, which is extant (Greg. iii. Ep. 5, Concil.; Baron ad ann. 749), in which he represents himself as overwhelmed with grief, tears streaming day and night from his eyes, on beholding the church of God abandoned by all her children, even by those in whom she had most reason to confide. He draws a most lamentable picture of the devastation and destitution caused by the Lombard invaders, and attributes their aggression, not to the protection required, but to the humiliation of the church, and the latter having refused to join Luitprand in making war on the church and people of God. Those, he says, who accuse these persecuted dukes of treason and rebellion are guilty of a lie. St. Peter, he declares, is able to defend his own house and people without the aid of mortal man, though, with some apparent inconsistence, he speaks of his whole kingdom and his dominions depending on Charles’s answer. He beseeches them to appeal by both his pride and his religious fears, as well as to his compassion and piety. “O that you could but hear the insulting and reproachful language with which they revile us, or rather you! Where is that mighty Charles, or they, whose protection you have implored? Where are those formidable Frank armies? Let them come to deliver you, if they dare, out of our hands!” And, appealing to his religious fears, he implores him, as he regards the salvation of his own soul, to hasten to the relief of St. Peter’s church, lest the apostle in his turn should shut the gates of heaven on him; and he, the pope, undertakes, if delivered from the present danger, to pray day and night before the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul for Charles and all his subjects. But neither this nor a second letter had the desired effect; and it was not till a substantial temporal equivalent for the aid demanded was offered that anything was done. Such an equivalent was offered, through a second embassy, by ordinary promise; and the business should altogether renounce their allegiance to the emperor, and put themselves under Charles as their protector, on whom the title of Patrician and Consul of Rome was to be conferred, he undertaking to protect them against the Lombards, and against the emperor in case of his molesting them. Charles now sent Griman, abbot of Korneuburg, as his emissaries to Rome. After their arrival the Lombards withdrew their troops and ceased from hostilities, retaining, however, four cities in the Roman territory which they had captured. The death of Charles Martel on Oct. 22 of the year of this treaty (741), and of Gregory on Nov. 27 of the same year, prevented any further immediate results. (On this whole
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Danube, or elsewhere at the discretion of Boniface, and to receive him there with due honour, and accept from him the faith and order of the Roman Church, rejecting Britons and all false and heretical priests, as well as lingering rites of heathenism. 4. To Boniface himself in reply to an answer to have sent of his preaching. In Germany he had reported the conversion, with the aid of Charles Martel, of as many as one hundred thousand. In Bavaria, when he had found but one bishop, Vivilius, ordained not long before by the pope, he had announced his establishment, with the consent of duke Odilo, of the four new sees already mentioned. Of this measure the pope approves, urges him not to relax his endeavours to procure entire uniformity to the traditions of the Roman see, directs him to assemble a council on the banks of the Danube, and enjoin him not to stay in one place, but go and ordain bishops, and require uniformity with Rome wherever he can, regardless of difficulties. (Bonif. Ep. 43, 44, 45, 46, Giles's ed.)

It appears from the above summary that the establishment of Roman orthodoxy and order, and of Roman supremacy, was as difficult a part of the work of Boniface, and equally at the heart of his master, as the planting of the cross among unbelievers.

England was not overlooked by Gregory III, who, in 735, sent the pall to Eghbert bishop of York, who was the first, according to Bede, since Paulinus who had thus been constituted archbishop of that see (Bede, H. E. Contin.).

To this pope is attributed the institution of the feast of All Saints on Nov. 1, in place of that in honour of the blessed Virgin and all martyrs, which Boniface IV. had appointed for the 13th of May (Anastas. Bibloth.).

Besides the letters above referred to, an extant document is attributed to this pope Excerptum ex epist. dictis et canonum consentientibus, about sins and penances, for the use of confessors. Anastasius states that he also left a book of epistles no longer extant. He describes him as learned as well as mild, pious, and charitable, being versed in the Latin and Greek languages, and in holy writ, and mentions as a thing then new and unheard of that he knew all the Psalms by heart. He appears as a saint in the Roman calendar, his day being the 28th of November.

For the authorities for his life, see the list appended to the life of Gregory II. [J. B.—y.]


GREGORIUS (55), abbat, fl. 390. He migrated from Palestine to Cyprus. Epiphanius, afterwards bishop of Salamis, appears on arriving in Cyprus to have entered his monastery. In one of his letters Gregory calls Epiphanius his son, and exhorts him to greater austerities. The high esteem of the latter for his old abbat is evident from an epistle of Epiphanius addressed to John of Jerusalem, and translated into Latin by St. Jerome. Gregory died before or soon after Epiphanius. He was the author of a Syriac work of unknown title and contents; ten discourses to his monks; and three epistles, one addressed to his disciple Theodore, and two to Epiphanius. (Assem. Bibloth. Orient. i. 170.) [C. J. B.]

GREGORIUS (56), a deacon and monk of Nazianzen, formerly a slave of Gregory Nazianzen, but manumitted by him as a reward for the loyalty of his service. He was one of the executors of Gregory's will, together with Marcellus the deacon and monk, and Eustathius. Gregory made him universal legate of all his property both real and personal, to hold it for the benefit of the church of Nazianzen and its poor. As a personal legacy Gregory bequeathed him and Eustathius a farm at Anianzus, together with the live-stock, and fifty gold pieces. (Greg. Naz. Testam.) [E. V.]

GREGORIUS (57), a presbyter and abbot of a monastery near Jerusalem, or perhaps of Epiphanius's own house at Eleutheropolis, who was mixed up with the dispute between Epiphanius and John of Jerusalem, arising from the ordination of Jerome's brother Paulinian. John asserted that he had sent a message through Gregory to Epiphanius forbidding him to ordain any one, which was denied by Gregory (Hieron. Epist. i.; Rufin. Hist. E. c. ii. 157). [E. V.]

GREGORIUS (58), abbat of Zeugma on the Euphrates, contemporary with Theodoret in the 5th century. (Theodoret, Philoth. cap. 5.) [C. J. B.]

GREGORIUS (59), presbyter and archimandrite of the monastery of Cyprus, according to one place in the lists, and in the Latin only. [Georgius (48).] [C. H.]

GREGORIUS (60), St., a local saint of Alcalá del Río, on the Guadalquivir, near Seville. His relics were preserved there in a church built by Ferdinand and Isabella in his honour. The epitaph on the tomb in which they were found states that he lived about seventy years, and died in peace on the 9th of September, 542 of the era of the Goths, corresponding to A.D. 504. He is commemorated on the 9th of September. (Boll. Acta SS. Sept. iii. 308.) [F. D.]

GREGORIUS (61), abbas, presbyter in the coenobium of Scholares, from whom John Moschus, while residing in Nuceis at Alexandria, heard a story about an aged brother of his society. The brother was of such extreme simplicity that he indifferently communicated in the Eucharist, wherever he chanced to be. One day an angel appeared to him and revealed to him how he would like to be buried after death, whether according to the manner of the Egyptian monks or the manner of the Jerusalem monks. The old man was unable to say, and the angel gave him three weeks to consider. He consulted one of the brethren as to the answer he should give. "Where do you receive the sacrament?" asked the brother. "Wherever I find it," was the old man's simple reply. "In future then," returned the brother, "never communicate out of the Catholic apostolic church, within which the four holy synods are recognised, the Nicene of 318 fathers, the Constantinopolitan of 150, the first Ephesian of 200, the Chalcedonian of 650. Tell the angel you wish to be
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buried as the monks of Jerusalem.” The angel returned and the old man replied accordingly. “Well, well,” said the angel, and the old man immediately died, being thus spared the disorder of having laboured in vain and being buried with heretics. (Ioann. Mosch. Prat. Spirit. cap. 145, in Patr. Lat. lxxiv. 209.)

GREGORIUS (62), archimandrite of the monastery of St. Theodosius in the wilderness of Jerusalem, who told John Moschus the story of GREGORIUS the Cappadocian (cf. No. 69).

GREGORIUS (63), the Cappadocian, an anchorite, regarding whom John Moschus was told the following story by GREGORIUS the archimandrite of the monastery of Theodosius in the wilderness of Jerusalem. Gregory the Cappadocian, a brother of this society, had his duties at Phaselis. On a certain baking day he had lit the fire, but when he came to clean out the oven the cloth was not to be found, for the brethren had hidden it in order to try his patience; so Gregory got into the oven, swept it out with his own coat, and came out uninjured by the fire. Another day he was feeding swine at Phaselis when two lions approached and tried to carry them off. Gregory took a switch and drove the lions down to the Jordan. (Ioann. Mosch. Prat. Spirit. cap. 92, in Patr. Lat. lxxiv. 165.)

GREGORIUS (64), abbas, anchorit, respecting whom John Moschus was informed by one of the anchorites of Theopoli near Mount Amanus. When Gregory, who wandered naked in the desert for thirty-five years, was in the mountains near the monastery of Theodosius in Scopus, the disciple by whom he was accompanied died. Gregory having no implements for digging a grave, descended to the shore, where he found a party of sailors just arrived and begged them to come and bury the holy. They did so, and one of them named Thalaeus remained to take the dead man’s place. After a year he found his frame wonderfully invigorated, but in two years and a half more Thalaeus, believing he was going to die, begged Gregory to go with him to Jerusalem, where he might adore the cross before his departure. Thither they went, and after visiting the sacred spots descended to the Jordan, where Thalaeus died and was buried in the monastery of Copratha. Here Gregory himself soon afterwards died and was buried. (Ioann. Mosch. Prat. Spirit. cap. 91 in Patr. Lat. lxxiv. 164.)

GREGORIUS (65) THE BYZANTINE, abbas, anchorit, respecting whom John Moschus was informed by the anchorites of Raithu, near the Red Sea. This Gregory took up his abode with another anchorit, his disciple, named GREGORIUS Pharonites, on a neighbouring island where he had to remain for a long time and was to be fetched from the mainland in a boat which they kept. One day they had moored the boat to a rock, and let her float, but a storm in the night broke the rope and wrecked the boat. After eight months some monks of Raithu landed on the island and found both of their brethren dead, and on the back of a turtle there was an inscription recording that Gregory Pharonites died after going without water twenty-eight days, and his master had lasted none for thirty-seven days. (Ioann. Mosch. Prat. Spirit. cap. 121, in Patr. Lat. lxxiv. 181.)

GREGORIUS (66), abbot of St. Theodore in the district of Palermo, who by his neglect had caused great harm to his monastery, and was not allowed by Gregory the Great to be restored till after long punishment. (Greg. Magn., Epist. lib. i. indict. ix. ep. 12; lib. v. indict. xiii. ep. 6; Migne, lxxi. 455, 727.)

GREGORIUS (67), surnamed BORMITANUS (ος ὑρρόμενος), a Serenerian of Alexandria in the 7th century. He held more than one public disputation in that city with Anastasius Sinaita, who in his Hodogus or Vase Dux speaks of him with little respect as in habit of mind a SyroEgyptian. (Anastas. Sinait. Vase Dux, cap. 10 in Migne, Patr. Græc. lxxix. 161, 169 n., 173, 181, 184.)

GREGORIUS (68), presbyter, messenger of pope Gregory III. (Gregorios (63), p. 796.) (Anastas. Bibliothec. de Vit. Rom. Pontif. s. 191, in Patr. Lat. cxviii. 1024, the readings vary between GREGORIUS and Georgius.)

GREGORIUS (69), Roman prebendaries present at Roman councils, and belonging to the following churches:
St. John and St. Paul, in 721 (Mansi, xi. 265), possibly the Georgius of 745 (M. 381). (Georgios (61).)
St. Clement in 745 (M. 385, 380).
St. Balbina in 745 (M. 381); at council of Paul I. in 761 (M. 649).
St. Anastasius, at council of 761 (M. 650).
Two prebendaries of churches unnamed at council of 743 (M. 367, 368).

GREGORIUS (70), ST., disciple of Boniface, abbot and administrator of the church of Ulricb (Trajectum). His life was written by his disciple St. Ludger, first bishop of Minster. He was born about A.D. 708, at Treves, of a noble Frank family, his father, Albricus, being a grandson of king Dagobert II. St. Boniface, on his way from Frisia to new labours among the Hunsians and Thuringians, rested by the way at the convent of Poly (Palatium), near Treves, of which Adala or Adela, the grandmother of Gregory, was abbess. The youth, who had just left school, and was fourteen or fifteen years of age, was sent for, at the suggestion of Boniface, to read the Scriptures for the edification of the company at the convent meals. He read well, but Boniface, by his questions, elicited that he did not understand what he had read, so as to render it into his own Teutonic language. Thereupon the saint expounded and commented on the passage so eloquently that the boy’s heart was touched, and he announced his intention of accompanying him on his mission. In vain his grandmother remonstrated. Gregory declared that if she would not provide him with a horse, he would go on foot, but go he would. Arrived in Thuringia they found the country desolated and impoverished by war. The labour of their hands provided them with the barest sustenance; and often some outbreak of the heathen compelled them to a hasty, though temporary, flight. But
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their labours were rewarded by the gradual conversion of the land.

In time St. Boniface became bishop of Mentz (743), and his disciples were appointed administrators of the neighbouring districts, and among them, St. Gregory of the church of Utrecht, where he was assisted by a coadjutor of English race, named Alubert. He never became bishop, though his biographer does not state it in so many words, it seems to have been the abbot of a monastery in that city, for in the Acta of St. Ludger (s. 8; Migne, Patr. Lat. xcl. 773), we read: "Friedlandus discipulus ei habitavit in monasterio in Uræthtum, when he became St. Gregory's disciple.

He accompanied St. Boniface on one of his journeys to Rome, and brought back many sacred volumes, and two boys of English race named Marchelinus and Marciuvinus, who became his disciples.

His biographer dwells on his contempt of money, the simplicity of his food and raiment, his sobriety, his gentleness to enemies and detractors, and his almsgiving. Two of his half-brothers, returning from France to their own country, were set upon and killed by robbers. The murderers, when captured, were brought to Gregory, that he might inflict upon them what death he chose. Disdaining all thought of vengeance, he loosed their bonds, and when they had been tended and fed, dismissed them with exhortations and words of charity.

His disciples were very numerous, and were drawn, we are told, from high-born Franks, the "religious gens" of the Angli, the newly converted Saxons and Saxons, and even from the Bavarians and Suevi. Many of them rose to high place in the church.

At the age of seventy he was stricken with paralysis of the left side, which for three years, until his death in A.D. 781, rendered him nearly helpless, so that at last he was carried about by his disciples. Feeling his end approaching, he had himself borne to the oratory of St. Salvador, where he breathed his last, and where he was probably buried. He is commemorated Aug. 25. A letter written to him in 752 by Lullius, bishop of Mainz, is extant (Migne, Patr. Lat. xxvi. 821). His successor at Uræthtum was a kinsman and adopted son named Albrigicus. (Vita S. Gregorii Abatæ, nec. Ludgeri in Migne, Patr. Lat. xcl. 732; Bull. Acta SS. Aug. v. 240; Mabillon, Acta SS. (éd. S. Bened. sec. iii. pars ii. 319 seqq., Paris, 1668-1701.)

GREGORIUS (71), the name of the following presbyters at the council of Nicaea in 787:—

Representing the bishop of Caphellenia (Mansi, xiii. 146 b, Latin; Georgius in the Greek).

Representing the bishop of Smyrna (M. xii. 1096 a).

Representing the bishop of Nicopolis (M. xii. 1096 e). [C. H.]

GREGORIUS (72), the name of the following bishop of Caphellenia in 787, viz. of Agaurus (Mansi, xiii. 151 a).

Callistratus (s. 151 b).

Ludgerus (s. 151 a).

Hynaihys (s. 151 n, xii. 1111 k).

Monagrus (xiii. 151 d).
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Pega (xii. 1112 n, Latin, Georgius in Greek).

[GREGORIUS (70).]

St. Clement (xiii. 156 e). [C. H.]

St. Theokotos (s. 158 d).

GREGORIUS (73), a soldier, who with two others, Theodosius and Leo, in the time of Constantius, took refuge from the Arian persepcution in the island of Cephalonia, where they lived in the ruins of a temple concealed by a thick wood. Their remains are said to have been miraculously revealed to Michael, a rich nobleman of the island, who was a leper, and who was cured by touching them. They are mentioned in the additions to Usuard's Martyrology in the Cologn edition of A.D. 1515 (in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxiv. 396). They are commemorated on August 24. (Boll. Acta SS. Aug. iv. 771.) [F. D.]


GREGORIUS (75), a governor of Capadocia, to whom shortly after his arrival Gregory Nazianzen wrote in behalf of his niece Alypiana, the widow of Nicobulus, and her children. The recent death of her husband had plunged Alypiana in such a sea of troubles that she and her children had no leisure even to bemoan their misery. Gregory earnestly commends the widow and orphans to Gregory's protection. (Greg. Naz. Epist. 44.) [E. V.]

GREGORIUS (76), prefect of Gaul, at the end of the reign of Gratian (Sulp. Sever. ii. 49). [Petrissianus.] [M. B. C.]

GREGORIUS (77), Patriarch of Africa, 465. He presided at the public disputation which was held in Africa that year between the abbat Maximus of Prague and the exile of Constantinople (Maxim. Dein. c. Pyrro, Migne, Patr. Gr. xci. 297-354). A.D. 647 he revolted, by the aid of the Saracenis, and was soon afterwards killed in battle by his allies (Theoph. Chron. s. a.). Joannes Moschus, who praises Gregory very highly, has a characteristic story about him. He also states that he was a native of the province of Apamene, Syria Secunda (Paul. Spirit. c. 196; Migne, Patr. Gr. lxxx. 83); Baromias, s. a. 645, i. iii. vi. xxv. s. a. 646, xxx. s. a. 647, i.; Pagi, s. a. 646). Maximus also calls him GREGORIUS (ep. 18, Migne, u. s. 585). [T. W. D.]

GREGORIUS (78), duke of Benerveto (752-758), nephew of Luitprand, by whom he was put into the duchy during the minority of Giululf, another nephew, son of the former duke of Romnald. (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 55, 56; Cata

GREGORIUS (79), protopatriarch or commander of the imperial guard, martyr for image
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worship, with Maria a patrician lady and others [Maria].

GREGORIUS (80) DECAPOLITES, lived under Leo V. the Armenian, A.D. 813-820. He took his surname from being born at one of the cities of the Isaurian Decapolis, named Irenopolis. Joseph the Hymnographer was a pupil of his, and was dispatched by him to Rome to appoint pope Leo III. with the unhappy state of the kingdom under the reigning emperor, who was an ardent adherent of the Iconoclasts, and cruelly persecuted those who took the opposite side. Gregory was a considerable traveller, and visited many foreign countries. On his return to Constantinople he had the grief of finding that Joseph had been apprehended by Leo, and carried prisoner to Crete, where he remained in confinement till the emperor's death in 820. Gregory found another confessor, named Simeon, at Constantinople, suffering on account of his resistance to the Iconoclasts, and visited and comforted him in his prison. He did not long survive the emperor, and Joseph, on his return from Crete, found his old master dead, and erected a monument to his body and that of his fellow pupil John. Gregory is commemorated in the Menonac on Nov. 20, though he is placed by some on April 18. We have extant a historical sermon of his, narrating the conversion of a Arab marauder named Ampelous, who was sacrilegiously profaning a church at the time of the celebration of the Eucharist, by the miraculous appearance of a living child to the pater and blood in the chalice. (Galland. Vit. Patr. B. vol. xiii. p. 13; Migne, Patrol. vol. c. p. 1199; Pagius, ad ann. 731, No. 2, ad ann. 817, No. 18.)

GREGORII (GALLAN, GREALLAN, GRIULAN, GRIULLAN), (1) the son of Rotan, commemorated April 15 (Mart. Donog.; Mart. Tall). He has been identified with one of the companions of St. Columba when he came from Ireland to Iona. Reeves and Fordun call him Grillan, and Leslieus and Bohius, Gallan, but all place him last in the list. On the authority of the last two authors, Dempster and Camerarius tell of Galliana's piety and labours in the conversion of the Picts and the establishment of a monastery in A.D. 584, and died in A.D. 606, and died in A.D. 623. He is named among the reputed authors of Acta S. Columbae, and also wrote Exhortatio ad munaches, lib. i., but if so, his writings are lost. Camerarius commemorates St. Gallanus, monachus et confessor, at Dec. 7, and Dempster at Sept. 11 (and Mem. Scot.). (Colgan, Tr. Thumun. 470, col. 2, 490 n. 70 et al.; Fordun, Scotich. i. c. 261; Reeves, St. Adamnan, 246; Bohius, Hist. Scot. i. 167; Leslieus, de Reb. Gest. Scot. 145; Dempster, Hist. Eo. Gent. Scot. 298; Tanner, Bibl. 307; Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 201.)

(2) Of Craebh Greallaigh, and patron of the Hy-Many, commemorated Nov. 10. Of this saint there are Lives, written not on vellum but on paper, in one of the Brussels Irish MSS., and in the library of the Royal Irish Academy; extracts are given by Colgan (Tr. Thumun. 206-208), and in a much fuller form by O'Donovan from the Book of Lecan (Trises and Customs of the Hy-Many, 8-18, Dublin, 1843; Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. iii. 485, vii. 372-73). His father was Cuillia or Callinus, son of Caidre Cristh. Bioch. — Vol. II.

GRIFFON, of Leinster, and his mother's name was Ethene or Ethene. According to the lives he was born in the time of St. Patrick, but this probably puts him too early; he is more likely to have been a pupil of St. Finian of Clonard. Yet in the lives he is represented as having obtained a place called Achadh Fionnabhrach from Duach Gallach, king of Connaught, where the saint built a church, before Maine Mor arrived in Connaught: this place was afterwards called Craeagh-Greallian, from the Irish Cnaobh, a branch, the symbol given to Grellan by St. Patrick and king Duach, in token of possession, and is said to have been in the east of Magh Luirc, now the plains of Boyle, co. Roscommon. He also erected a church at Coll-cluinna, now Kilclooney, near the town of Ballinasloe, in the barony of Clonmacowen, co. Galway. When Maine Mor came with the Cola-da-Chirici and displaced Cian with his Firbolgs, St. Grellan resigned the care of the conquerors, and put himself under heavy tribute in return for his support. His catabh or battle craszer, which was used as the standard of the tribe of the Hy-Mayne in the counties of Galway and Roscommon, and with which he is reported to have wrought a miracle by rescuscitating the infant Loghan Sricadh, was up to 1836 preserved in the family of the O'Ronchaille or Cronelly, the ancient comharbas or coars of the saint, but is now lost sight of. He probably lived about the end of the 6th century, if he be not regarded as a contemporary with the aged St. Patrick. (Colgan, Acta SS. 252, n. 14, 337, c. 7, 339, n. 24, 376, c. 28, 399, n. 14; Tr. and Cust. Hy-Mayne, by O'Donovan, ut supra, p. 81.)

GRELLOG OEBLECH (Gallan, Greallan, Grullan, Grullan), commemorated July 13. O'Clyr (Mart. Donug. by Todd and Reeves, 159) says Grellog Oeblock, of Tamlacht Charuna, in Ul Bresail-northir, "may be Grella, sister of Manchán of Lios, and of Grellabach; and Mella was the mother of all three." [Mangan.]


GRIEBERTUS of Geneva. [Guerburtus.]

GRICINIANUS, martyr. [Gratianus.]

GRICINUS (Cricinus), bishop of Verona, c. A.D. 356-360. He seems to have been the seventh bishop, and to have succeeded Lucillus and been followed by St. Zeno. (Ugheelli, Ital. Soc. v. 550; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Itali. x. 744; Biancelli, I vescovi di Verona, ii. p. 1.)

GRIFFO, son of Charles Martel. [Griffo.]

GRIFFO, bishop of Aosta. [Griffo.]
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GRIMOALDUS (2), king of the Lombards, 662–673, youngest son of Gisulf the first duke of Friuli. When Gisulf lost his life in resisting an incursion of the Avars in his own dominions, he put his two young sons before the court of Arighis, duke of Benevento, a friend of their family; or, as Paulus Diaconus says, their former instructor. Arighis, on his death, not considering his own son Aio fit to succeed him, commended the two young sons of the duke of Friuli to his subjects. Aio, however, became duke, and was killed in a year’s time, c. 662, fighting against the Slaves. Radalod succeeded him, and on his death, c. 647, Grimald became duke of Benevento. For fourteen years we know nothing about him; but in 651, the Lombard kingdom having been divided between the two sons of Aripert, one of them, Godepert, sent to Grimald for help. Gurpal, duke of Turin, the royal messenger, intrigued with Grimald, who, having left his duchy in the hands of his son Romuald, marched northwards with a constantly growing army to take the kingdom. Ultimately, rightly suspecting treachery from Godepert, he killed him with his own hand at Pavia, and became king, and married Godepert’s sister. Upon this Godepert’s brother Persibari, who ruled in Milan, fled. In 663 Grimald was summoned to Beneventum by his son Romuald to help him against the emperor Constans, who had landed at Tarentum, and was besieging Beneventum. At the approach of Grimald, the emperor withdrew to Naples. On his return to the north Grimald carried matters with a high hand. Lupus, duke of Friuli, had been left in charge at Pavia; but, having betrayed his trust, Grimald’s return to Friuli, Grimald did not wish for civil war, and so called in the Avars to suppress power of the mayor of the palace with the regal title. Accordingly Grimald took possession of the infant king, cut off his long hair, the badge of royalty, and sent him away secretly by Dolo, or Dulo, bishop of Pavia, to a certain Cunigunde, his own son Childebert proclaimed king. The Franks, however, were not yet prepared for this revolution, and the Austrasian nobles rose in rebellion, and, capturing Grimald by stratagem, delivered him to Clovis king of Neustria, who imprisoned him at Paris, and put him to death with torture (a.d. 650). The annals of the time generally err in attributing the fall of the Austrasian authorities to Grimald’s life are, besides those mentioned above, the Chronicon in Bouquet, ii. 446, 552; iii. 304, 328, 343, 350–1; Frevigard, Chron. Ixxxv. Ixxxvii. Ixxviii.; Aimoin, iv. 38; Gesta Reg. Franc. cap. xliii. in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxvi. 1459; Vita S. Sigeberti, iv. 10–12, v. 14 in Bouquet, ii. 446–7; Audo. Chron. Migne, Patr. Lat. xxvi. 117; and for two letters to him from Desiderius (Didier), bishop of Cahors. See Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxvii. 249, 251; Bouquet, iv. 37–8; cf. also Richter, Annales, 184–7. [S. A. B.]

GRIMOALDUS (1), son and successor of Pippin of Landen, mayor of the palace in Austrasia, who died 638. The office was not yet hereditary, and the claim of Grimaud, who was personally popular, to succeed his father was stoutly contested by Otto, who had been tutor to the young king Sigebert III., and seems to have had command of the influence of the court. Grimoald, aided by Cunibert archbishop of Cologne, the friend of his father, endeavoured for three years vainly to replace him in the palace. In 640 the rebellion of Radulphe Sigebert and his army into Thuringia. Grimoald was present among the generals at the defeat on the Unstrut, which resulted in the virtual independence of Thuringia. The ill-success of this expedition may possibly have contributed to discredit Otto. But Grimoald’s success was not complete till 642, when his rival was slain by Leutharius duke of the Alemanni and Grimoald became mayor of the palace without further opposition. His policy seems to have been principally directed towards securing the kingdom against external troubles, and strengthening the central authority; and, no doubt, to him must be ascribed the resolution of Sigebert which forbade the holding of episcopal synods without the king’s permission. See the letter to Desiderius of Cahors, Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxvii. 264, and cf. Gerard, Hist. des Francs d’Austrasie, l. 359, Paris, 1866.) He does not appear, however, to have been an enemy of the church. When in 647, Sigebert, in his desire for an heir, as it was said, resolved to found twelve monasteries, Grimoald zealously cooperated in his design, and the charters of the two greatest foundations Stavelo and Malmandum, in the Ardennes speak of Grimoald as the builder (Bouquet, iv. 635). The precept, too, which installed St. Remaclus as first abbate of Casseneonguindinense (Cugnon) is addressed to Grimoald (ibid. 634; Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxvii. 319), and Grimoald himself seems to have made a grant of Germigny to Stavelo (see Bouquet, iii. 635; Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxvii. 325). For his efforts towards strengthening the position of the throne, see Pertz, Geschichte der Merowingischen Hausmeir, p. 43 seq., and Bonnell, Anfänge des Karol. Hauses, 110. On the death of Sigebert (a.d. 650) Grimoald attempted a measure which more than a century later, when the man of Charles the Great, carried out. Sigebert’s son, Dagobert, was but three years of age, and his opportunity seemed favourable for uniting the almost regal
GRIMOAULUS.

Lupus, and ultimately had some difficulty in getting rid of them. He caused the daughter of Lupus, Theuderada, to marry his son Romuald, duke of Beneventum. He married his own daughter to Thrasamund, formerly count of Capus, who had helped him to obtain the kingdom, and he made Thrasamund duke of Spoleto. He thus united the kingdom and the two great and independent houses in his family. In the early years of his reign he repelled an invasion of the Franks, and c. 675 he made a treaty with Dagobert. (Paulus Diaconus. v. 32, and note in Monum. Rerum Langob. 1878, p. 155.) He entirely destroyed the town of Oderzo, where his elder brothers had been treacherously killed. He laid waste also the town of Fortipolopoli, whose inhabitants had impeded him on his way to and from Beneventum, and even slew the deacons who were baptizing children at the font. "Fuit autem," says Paulus Diaconus, "corpore pravissimae, audacia primus, calvo capite, barba prominente, non minus consilio quam viribus decoratus." If its later rulers had been as peaceable as the father of the Lombard kingdom might have been different. On his death Perthari succeeded to the kingdom, turning out Grimoald's young son Garibald, and the Lombard power was again divided. Grimoald was buried in the basilica of St. Ambrose at Pavia, which he built. He was the first king who added to the Edict of Rotharis. He added nine sections in the year 688, the most important of which dealt with the responsibility of masters for their servants' actions, the inheritance of grandchildren, and the protection of married women. (Monum. Germ. Legg. iv. p. 91, ed. Blume; Fontes Juris Italici Medii Aevi, Padelletti, 1877, i. p. 171.) The only authority of importance for the life of Grimoald is Paulus Diaconus, lib. iv. 39, 46, 51; lib. v. 1-33. [A. H. D. A.]


GRIPPO (GRIPPO, GRIPPO), third son of Charles Martel by Sonihilde or Swanhildis, the niece of Odilo, duke of Bavaria. Shortly before his death Charles called together his nobles and divided his whole principality between Carolman and Pippin, the elder half-brothers of Grippo. But at the last he was prevailed upon by Sonihilde to allot to her son, whose position seems to have been something between that of his two half-brothers and the sons of Charles' concubines, a portion in the centre of his possessions, comprising a part of Neustria, a part of Austrasia and a part of Burgundy. But this arrangement was upset almost immediately after his death (741). The Franks upon these severed portions of the kingdom resented the forcible transfer of their allegiance from those whom they regarded as the rightful heirs, and, rising in arms, put Carolman and Pippin at their head, and marched against Grippo. He took refuge with his mother and a few followers in Laon, but was soon compelled to surrender, and was placed by Carolman under guard at Neuähltel in the Ardennes, while Sonihilde was shut up in the monastery of Chelles (Calis). Grippo remained in this imprisonment till 747, when Pippin, moved by compassion, released and instilled him honourably in his own palace, and gave him a countship with considerable revenues. But Grippo was not long content. Conspiring with some of the younger nobility, he withdrew to the Saxons, the implacable foe of the Frank power. Pippin pursued with an army through Thuringia into Saxony, and found Grippo with his allies encamped on the river Oker, near where Brunswick now is. But the night before the battle distrust arose, and the Saxons, who seem to have been but half-hearted in his cause, dispersed homewards. Grippo took refuge in Bavaria, whither he was soon followed by Pippin and captured. No thoughts of revenge seem to have actuated the latter, and he gave him the city of Le Mans and twelve counties (749). But Grippo, who, claiming a kingdom, scorned a pension, soon resumed his plots, and secretly repaired to Waithus, duke of Aquitaine, the hereditary foe of Pippin. It seems that about this time the Lombard kingdom had been re-nounced by its king and entered an Italian monastery, had prevailed on Pope Zachary to use his good offices towards reconciling the brothers, as appears from a letter of the latter to the bishops of France (see Bouquet, iv. 98, and Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxix. 933). Grippo could not hope to elude Pippin's pursuit long in Aquitaine, and accordingly resolved to seek Astolfus, or Haitsulfus, the king of Lombardy, and enemy of the papacy and Pippin. But on his way he was met, near Maurienne, by Theodowinus, or Theodonus, count of Vienne, who had been deputed to guard the passes of the Alps, and killed in the combat which ensued (751). There is extant a letter of Boniface to Grippo, in 749, conjuring him, if God should give him the power, to help the clergy in Turinlingia, and protect the monks and nuns there against the heathen (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxix. 741; Bouquet, iv. 98). For the history of Grippo see the Annales Eibardi, Annales Mediolanenses and others in Pertz, i. 135, 137, 139, 327, 330-1, 10, 11, 115-16, and Bouquet, tom. v. v. Frederic. Cont. c. 117, 118; Simondi, Hist. des Francs, ii. 151, 161-4, 201. [S. A. B.]

GRIPPO (GRIPPO), twenty-third archbishop of Rouen, between St. Ambertus and Radulphus. He is probably the "Grippo episcopus" who subscribed the charter of Agirardus or Agerardus for the monastery of the Blessed Virgin on the Loire, though his name is not appended (A.D. 690). (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 1228-31; Gall. Christ. xi. 17.) [S. A. B.]

GRIPPO, bishop of Vohore, c. 715. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xviii. 216; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 1427.) [A. H. D. A.]

GRISTOLOUS, Welsh saint. [CRISTOLOUS.]

GRISUS, bishop of Trevi (between Spoleto and Foligno), present at the Roman synod under Zacharias in 743. (Manu, xii. 367; Hefele, § 364.) [A. H. D. A.]

GROD (Grod, Malal.; Topogas, Cedron.), king of the Huni who dwelt near the Cimmerian city of Bosporus. He came to Constantinople.
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GROSSUS, bishop of Siena, present at the Roman synod under Zacharias in 743. (Mansi, xii. 396; Hefele, § 394.) [A. H. D. A.]

GROTALDUS, ST. (CROTOLDUS), fourth bishop of Worms, between Carolus and Amandus II. (circa. 500). The authors of the Gallia Christiana (v. 661) quote Demochares (De Die. Miss. Sacrif. c. 35), to the effect that he began to build at Worms a noble temple for twelve monks and an abbot, on the walls of which his picture still remained, and where it was believed that he was buried. Le Coïteux, quoting from Franciscus Irenicus, says that Grotaldus and his successors were for a time metropolitans of all Germany, until later that dignity was restored to Mentz. (Le Coïteux, Ann. Ecol. Franc. an. 503, n. iv. tom. i. p. 216.) [S. A. B.]

GRWST, ST. (GORUST, GORWST), the founder of Llanrwst, in Denbigh. His festival has been held on Dec. 1. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 295.) Grwst is the Welsh form of the Irish Drest and Scotch Drust and Drostan (Skene, Celt. Scit. i. 210). [C. W. B.]

GUADILA, bishop of Emporias. [GUNDILANUS.]

GUAGHINUS, bishop of Volterra, c. 706. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xviii. 216; UgHELLI, Ital. Socr. i. 1427.) [A. H. D. A.]

GUAIRE (GOAIR), bishop in Gobhail, is not commemorated in the Mart. Doneg., but in the Mart. Tallaghon on Jan. 25. Colgan (Vol. Thaum. 490, n. 45, 502) suggests that he may be a disciple of St. Columba, and the Saxon or Anglo-Saxon-baker at Hy who is mentioned by St. Adamnan (Vit. S. Columbae, iii. c. 10). [GENEÆRUS.] Gobball, Gobhal, Gowel, is a name of very extensive local use in every part of Ireland, so that we have no means of further identification. (O'Flahion, Irish Saints, 436; Kelly, Cat. Ir. SS., xiii.) [J. G.]

(2) Beg commemorated Jan. 9. As traced by Colgan (Acta SS. 223, c. 4) Guaire Beg (Little, in stature or reputation), was son of Lasren, son of Fergus, and in the fifth degree of descent from Colla Uais, monarch of Erin (A.D. 327-331). His church was at Aghadowey, a parish on the west of the Bann, co. Londonderry, and he apparently had a cell at Agivey in the same parish. If he lived in the 7th century, as is commonly said, some steps in his pedigree must have been omitted. (O’Flahion, Irish Saints, i. 148-50; Mart. Doneg., by Todd and Reeves, 11; Reeves, Ecol. Ant. 330; Book of Rights, by O'Donovan, 133, n. ".) [J. G.]

(3) Mor, of Aghadowey—Jan. 22. Belonging to the same place and family as the preceding, Guaire Mor (Great) was son of Colman, son of Fuatgase, son of Fergus, and thus sixth in the line of pedigree from Colla Uais. (O’Flahion, Irish Saints, i. 400; Mart. Doneg., by Todd and Reeves, 25; alií ut supra.) [J. G.]

(4) Abbat of Glendaloch, co. Wicklow, died A.D. 810. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 805, i. 415; Ann. Ult. A.D. 809.) [J. G.]

(5) Ua Tibeirida, abbot of Clonfad, co. Westmeath, died 795. (Four Mast. by O'Donovan, A.D. 790; Ann. Ult. A.D. 794.) [J. G.]

QUALIPERUS was a bishop, or at least used the episcopal title; he accompanied St. Rumbold, the Irish-Scott, to Mechlin, and partook of his labours and martyrdom about A.D. 775, but his nationality is only inferred to have been Scotch or Scoito-Irish from that of his master. Dempster would of course regard him as an Albanic Scot. (Dempster, Hist. Ecl. Gent. Scot. i. 317; Camerarius, de Scot. Fort. 182, Oct. 29; Lanigan, Ecol. Hist. Ir. iii. c. 19, § 15.) [J. G.]

QUALITARIUS (GUALTARIUS), bishop of Firmum (Fermo). A "Gualterius episcopus de Firmo" is mentioned as having been present with other bishops as an assessor at the tribunal of Hildebert, or Hildebrando, Duke of Spoleto, A.D. 777. (UgHELLI, Ital. Socr. ii. 735; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. iii. 591.) [R. S. G.]

QUALTERANUS. [GUINTERANUS.]

QUALTERNUS (WALTERNUS), bishop of Geneva, acceded c. A.D. 780, and died A.D. 816. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. iii. 590, n. 48; at the synod of bishops at Rome, at which Charlemagne was crowned emperor. (Mullinen, Histoire. Socr. p. 17; Besson, Dioc. de Genève, p. 7.) [R. S. G.]

GUANHUMARA, the wife of Arthur. Geoffry of Monmouth, ix. 8, says that after Arthur had restored the country to its former prosperity, he married Guanhumara, who was descended from the noble race of the Romans (vi. 5, there is a similar marriage of Constantine), and had been brought up by Cador duke of Cornwall; and later on that when Guanhumara heard that Modred had entered Winchester, she fled in despair from York to the city of Légies (Caerleon upon Usk), and in the church of Julius the Martyr resolved to become a nun. Her name does not occur in Gildas or Nennius. The Historia Britonum, attributed to Nennius, has been shown by Paulin Paris to represent the Breton form of the Celtic legends; and in its present shape it contains the results of several recensions, each of which added new matter to it, including legends of Germanus and Patrick, with genealogies and chronological data, and two-legends. The earliest part may date back nearly to the time of Gildas, the latest belongs to the 10th century. The Celtic imagination continually added fresh names and details from other stories; and Geoffry of Monmouth, whose real basis is Nennius, gives us a much enlarged form of the legend, nor did the assimilating process stop with that. It is curious that his work should have appeared in Henry I’s reign, just when Turpin’s Chronicle of Charlemagne appeared in France; these two famous legends influenced the spirit of the two great nations that were now forming, opposed in interest and
glory to each other. Much of the detail in Gaffry is invented to account for facts and names which had no existence till long after the English settlement in Britain, and for feudal notions of a still later age; the manners are those of the feudal knights, while knight errantry is not at all a Cynric conception. William of Newburgh at once expressed his diabolism of Gaffry's story, as did Higden afterwards, but Higden's translator, Trevissa, defends it. The story of Arthur in Nennius, though not authentic history, is founded on the traditions of the streams from the proto-Celtic population of the British and the English invaders. That native chiefs who had married Roman wives should have taken the lead in the struggle is probable enough. The names of Arthur's first battles point to North England, where the Roman troops and colonists were settled more thickly along the Great Wall. "The first war was at the mouth of the Glein, the second, third, fourth and fifth on the Douglas in the region of Linnaus, the sixth on the river Bassas, the seventh in the wood of Celdion, the eighth near Castle Guininion (the name Castellum seems to point to a Roman station), the ninth at the city Leogis, called in British Caer Lion, the tenth on the shore of the river, the eleventh on the mountains of the moun
tain Breguoin, the twelfth on mount Bedon; and in all these wars he was victorious, as were many other British warriors." So the text of the Vatican MS., written in the fifth year of king Edmund, A.D. 946, which Gunn edited, and which Mal reprinted in his "Appendix ad opera edita" (only issued in 1871), without being aware that it was the text of the book as commonly assigned to Nennius. But while the earlier battles seem to be in the north, some of the later may be assigned to Wessex, and we know that the earliest settlements of the Saxons were in the north and in Wessex. It is probable that, as usual in legend, the great name has swallowed up the little ones, and that under the name of Arthur is summed up the death of several chiefs "perplures militari Brittones" as the Vatican MS. says; in fact, in the poems attributed to the early Welsh bards the name of Arthur appears very seldom. Thus in Llywarch Hen's Elegy on Geraint ab Erbin, the Devon chief who was killed at the battle of Longborth, "at Longborth were slain to Arthur valiant men who hewed down with steel; he was the emperor and conductor of the toils of war," where it is worth noting that Arthur is called Amme
he-rhawyr, i.e. imperator; as if, to shew his leadership of the Celtic tribes, he continued the old Roman title which Maximus and other British commanders of the legions had claimed. Dr. Guest would identify him with the son of Aurelius Ambrosius, one of the Roman or Romanised chiefs. The Mabinogion stories place Arthur's palace at Camelot or Gelligiv, both in Cornwall, just as his place of birth is at Tintagel (Stephens' Lit. of Kymry, 319); and put other equally eminent heroes by his side. Since the emigration to Brittany took place largely from Cornwall, this would account for Arthur assuming greater eminence in the Breton tradition, from which we conceived his legend back again in its expanded form. As the Celts recede before the invaders, they naturally took their legends with them, and relocalized the stories in their new homes. This accounts for the number of Arthurian localities in the various Celtic districts. Similarly in the Historia Britonum, which is the nucleus of Nennius, all the references to Gwreth-gren connect him with the Welsh king Mabon, the account of Germanus, which has been inserted at a later time, all the local allusions point to places in Wales. But the story of Arthur was not brought back to Wales till the 11th century. The Arthur of Romance is a creation of the Armoricans, and strange to say the Bretons have not preserved their own romance. It was natural that one form of the story should occur at Glastonbury, the first British church which the English spared. This "island of Avilion" is situated in the midst of peat swamps, extending to the Bristol Channel, from which a boat might even now come up to Glastonbury when the country is flooded with rain, and here in Henry II.'s time was found the tomb of Arthur and Guanahumara, and Giraldeus Cambrensis (de Jure Prae. pp. 191-93, Speculum Ecclesiae pp. 47-49) dwells on the fact that her hair crumbled into dust when it was exposed to the air. The amount of literature on Arthur is now so great that particular references in this place are hardly necessary. [C. W. B.]

GUARULPUS, twenty-fifth bishop of Noyon, between Gundulucius and Framengerus. He was present at the translation of St. Lambert, in A.D. 721. (Gall. Christ. ix. 993; Gall. Wars. Episc. 585.) [S. A. B.]

GUASACHT (Gusacchus), bishop, son of Maelchu, in Granard, commemorated Jan. 24. In the Lives of St. Patrick Guasacht is frequently spoken of. He was son of Maelchu or Miltch, whom St. Patrick in youth served as a swine
herd. When St. Patrick returned to evangelize Ireland, Guasacht and his two sisters, both named Emedia, became disciples of their former companion, and renowned the world. (Elmham.) Guasacht became bishop at Granard, in the baronies of Araghd and Grannan, in Longford, and as such always finds his place in the Irish Kalendars. Beyond his being a contemporary of St. Patrick in the 5th century, we cannot fix a date. (Colgan, Acts SS. 378, n. 1, and Tr. Thom. pass.; O'Flahertie, Irish Saints, i. 428; Hany, Script. St. Patrick, 408; Lennon, Eccl. Hist. i. c. 5, §§ 1-3; O'Flahertie, Oyppiga, ii. pt. iii. c. 85; Ware, Bishops, by Harris, i. 13; Mart. Doneg. by Tod and Reeves, 27.) [J. G.]

GUBA, the seventh of the English abbots of Glastonbury, in the list drawn up by William of Malmesbury (ap. Gale, p. 328), who assigns him a period of two years, 743-44. No such name occurs in the ancient list in MS. Tiberius B. 5; and although William of Malmesbury's list is not a mere fabrication, it is too weak in authority to prove the existence of an abbot otherwise unknown. In another section of his work this writer states that in the year 760 Cynwulf, king of Wessex, gave Guba five hides of land at Sudeton, and that he received other benefactions for the abbey (7b. p. 314), but does not give copies of the charters on which the state
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GUBERTUS

GUBERTUS (GILABERTUS, GILABERTUS GRIEBERTUS, POSTHERTUS), twenty-ninth bishop of Geneva, between Eucherius and Renenbertus in the second half of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. xvi. 384.) [S. A. B.]

GUDA, bishop of Tuccis (Martos) from about A.D. 634 to 646, subscribes the acts of the sixth Council of Toledo, A.D. 648. (Aguirre-Otaliani, ii. 413; Esp. Sagr. xii. 390.) [CAMERINUS.

[S. A. W.]

GUDA, a priest and abbot, who attests the charter of Othoiled to Barking, cir. 693 (Mon. Angl. i. 439; Kemble, C. D. 35): the same name with the title of presbyter appears among the attestations of a somewhat questionable charter of Ceawlinha of Wessex, dated 688 (Kemble, C. D. 994). As the former charter is genuine, the occurrence of the name of Guda in the latter may add somewhat to the probability of its genuineness; both are attested by Earconwald, Wilfrid, and Hadda. [S.]

GUDALUSA, mother of St. Cadocus: more properly called Gudadusa, Gladusa and Gwladus (Colgan, Acts SS. 160, c. 2). [GWLADUS.

[G. J.]

GUDDENE—July 18. Virgin and martyr at Carthage, A.D. 203. She suffered by command of the proconsul Rufinus. (Mart. Rom. V., Adon., Usuard.; Till. Mém. iii. 125.) Tilmont, t. c., thinks that Gaudens, or Gaudentius, martyr in Africa, commemorated by St. Augustine, Serm. 294, may be identical with Guddene. (Ruinart, p. 197.) [T. S.]

GUDELINA, queen of Theodosius or Theodotus king of Italy. Among the letters of Cassiodorus are some addressed by her, or in her name, to the emperor Justinian and the empress Theodora. (Casiod. Var. lib. x. opp. 20, 21, 23, 24, in Patr. Lat. lxxii. 811-814.) [G. H.]

GUEDEVALUS. [GUDWAL.

GUBIRANDUS, duke of Florence, the first certainly known, mentioned in a letter of Hadrian to Charles the Great, asking for the restoration of property to the monasteries of Galliana. (Codex Carolinus, infra, p. 90, 784-791; H. Pobel, Forschungen x. d. G. p. 483.) [A. H. D. A.

GUDILIAN, deacon of Toledo, bosom friend of Julian archbishop of Toledo. Their friendship is warmly described by Felix, bishop of Toledo, in his life of Julian, cap. 2. (Patr. Lat. xcvii. 415.) He died in 680. [C. H.]

GUDILIIVA, a Gothic noble mentioned in one of the best known of the Hispanic-Gothic inscriptions (Hübner, Inscrip. Hisp. Christ. 115). He is described as having built with his own workmen, and at his own cost, the churches of St. Stephen, St. John Baptist, and St. Vincent "in the Morva" during the reigns of Leovigild, Recared, and Witigis. "The inscription, evidently put up shortly before the consecration of the church of St. Stephen, by bishop Paulus of Acci (Guandix) under Witteric (603-610)"—says Dr. Mommse, in a note to one of the reports addressed by Hübner to the Berlin Academy—"mentions at the same time two other consecrations, that of the church of St. John in 577, and that of the church of St. Vincent in 594" (Monatsbericht Berl. Akad. 1861, p. 25). The stone bearing the inscription was found among the foundations of the church of Santa Maria del Alhambra at Granada, in the 16th century, and is now in the southern wall of that church. Nativola, therefore, was evidently the Roman name of Granada, or of a quarter of Granada; and Gama supposes—wrongly—that the name Granada is derived partly from Nata, the shortened form of Nativola (Kirchengeographie, ii. [2] 22; conf. however, Doxy, Recherches, l. c. 1. "Observations géographiques sur quelques anciennes localités de l'Andalousie," p. 336). Hübner thinks that Nativola belonged to the mountain diocese of Acci, and not to the bishopric of Elvira, which he supposes to have been confined to the valley of the Xénil (Monatsberichte Berl. Akad. l. c.). and this is no doubt the true explanation of the parts played in the different consecrations by the bishops Paulus and Lilibolus of Acci. Gama's contrary theory, that Nativola was a suburb of Illiberi, is grounded upon ignorance of the real position of Illiberi, which was placed about six miles to the north-west of Granada (Doxy, Recherches, l. c. p. 328). Who Gudiliva was is unknown. That portion of the stone which would probably have given us the name of his office or dignity is missing (Hübner, l. c. note). Prof. Doxy, however, quotes a passage from the Arabic chronicler Ibn-Al-Khatib which probably refers to Gudiliva. "The Christians of Granada had a celebrated church two arrow-flights from the town opposite the gate of Elvira. It had been built by a great seigneur of their religion, whom a certain prince placed at the head "d'une obscure armée de Roum," and it was unique in beauty of construction and ornament." The term Roum, which, according to Prof. Doxy, is only used by the Arabic authors when speaking of independent Spaniards, points back to a time before the Mussulman conquest, and he is therefore led to identify "the great noble of their religion" with Gudiliva (whom he calls Gudils, depending on Macene and Florez's uncorrected text of the Latin inscription). Who was the prince? One is led to suppose the date of the inscription—597, the eighth year of Leovigild. Was Gudiliva one of Leovigild's generals in the campaign of 592 against the imperialists (see art. LEOVIGILD), and was Nativola the "urbes et castella" then wrested from them by the great Gothic king? (Joannes Bicharaeus, Esp. Sagr. vi. p. 377.) [M. A. W.]

GUDINUS, archbishop of Lyons. [Gowinus.

GUDLOCUS has his history sketched by Camerarius (de Scot. Fort. 129, April 11), who, however, gives no authority for his statements, Son of Penuild and Teota, he became famous in the southern wall of the church of Merchia (Mene) for his piety and miracles; there, among the kindred of his parents, he lived fifteen years as a recluse, and was specially tempted by evil spirits, who transformed themselves into lions, bulls, bears, etc., before him. He died about A.D. 716, at the age of 45, and his name has become synonymous with the phrase "good luck." [G. G.]

GUDWAL, ST. (GUDWALUS, GUDWALUS, GUDPAL, GUDWALDUS, GUDWALUS), a saint whose name occurs in the Breton Litany of the 10th century in Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 82, 85, "Guoldwale" (see too i. 28, 31, 36, 161). For his life, written in the 12th century, see Acta Sanctorum June 6, i. 739-742; Hardy's Catalogue of Materials, i. 371-373. He was commemorated in Flanders, where he is said to have died, June 6, 403, and the feast of the translation of his body to the monastery of Ghent was celebrated on Dec. 3. A parish in Corwall, now called Gulval, on Mount's Bay, is dedicated to him, and there is a famous holy well there, but the old oratory has perished. [C. W. B.]

GUDWAL, bishop of St. Malo. [GURWALUS.]

GUEDNERITH, GUINERETH, king or chief of Glamorgan. [GWENEDERTHA.]

GUENEGANDUS, bishop. [GUENNOC.]

GUENGALOCUS, GUENNOLÉ, Armorican saint. [WINWALLUS.]

GUENNINUS (GUENNIUS, GINNINSUS), ST., an early bishop of Vannes, placed third in the list of the Gallia Christiana, succeeding St. Paternus II. or Mansuetus, if he is to be assigned to this diocese, and followed by St. modestus. Le Coîne believes that he was consecrated A.D. 618, but nothing trustworthy has come down on him. He is commemorated Aug. 18. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 916; Le Coîne, Ann. Eccl. Franc. an. 618; n. x. tom. ii. Boll. Acta SS. Aug. iii. 662.) [S. A. B.]

GUENNOC (CONGANUS, GUENEGANDUS, SUCHUS, VENEGANDUS, VENERANDUS), ST., an early bishop of Quimper, succeeding St. choréntius, and, according to Gans, followed by Albinus. A Venerandus, or Varandus, whose see is not appended, was represented at the first council of Tours (A.D. 461) by Jucundinus, and may possibly be Guenoc. Others, however, identify him with the Albinus, the Latin version of Guenoc, who was present at the Council of Vannes (A.D. 462 or 463). A doubtful list of names is all that remains of his successors till Felix is reached in the 9th century. (Gall. Ch. xiv. 873; Mansi, viii. 947, 955.) [S. A. B.]

GUENOLLÉ, saint. [WINWALLUS.]

GUERICIUS (GOERRICUS), bishop of Ausa (Vich) from about A.D. 643 until after 653. His signature appears twenty-fifth among those of fifty-two bishops at the eighth council of Toledo, A.D. 653. (Aguirre-Catalani, iii. 448; Esp. Sagr. xxvii. 60.) [CINIDUS.] [M. A. W.]

GUERICKUS. [GOERRICUS.]

GUERIN. [GAIRINUS.]

GUERUR, ST., whose chapel in the parish of St. Neot, in Cornwall, is mentioned by Asser as the place where Alfred, while visiting it in a hunting expedition, was cured of his malady. See v. Guierus in Boll. Acta Sanctorum, 4 Apr. i. 377. [C. W. B.]

GUBERTUS I, seventh bishop of Rete, between Tewton and Iarnmunsio, i. c. A.D. 770. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. v. 300.) [R. S. G.]

GUBERTUS II, eleventh bishop of Rete, between Sinumdus and Peter L., A.D. 778. The date is fixed by communions which he had with Hildebrand, duke of Spoleto. He held his see scarcely a year. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. v. 304.) [R. S. G.]

GUBERTUS III, thirteenth bishop of Rete, between Peter L. and Alfedredus A.D. 780. His name and date are known from documents, in which Charlemagne and Hildebrand, duke of Spoleto, are mentioned. He seems to have sat less than two years. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. v. 305.) [R. S. G.]

GUIDO (1) (Viro), bishop of Volterra (Volterra). He succeeded Martianus, c. A.D. 682, held the see sixteen years, and was succeeded by Petrus. (Ughelli, Ital. Enc. l. *533; Ammirato, Vescovi di Pisa, § 96, p. 66.) [R. S. G.]

GUIDO (2) (Viro), a count, at whose request Alcuin composed his treatise De Virtutibus et Vitiis. Engaged in war he had asked for a short manual of instruction, which Alcuin, as he says, gladly composed and divided into chapters for easier reference in his busy life (Migne, Patr. Lat. cl. 613). [S. A. B.]

GUIDULPHUS. [GUILLUS.]

GUERUS, Cornish saint. [GUEREDUS.]

GUIGNER, martyr in Cornwall. [FINIAL.]

GUIGNOLÉ, saint. [WINWALLUS.]

GUILAIN, abbot of St. Guidalin. [GUIGELAIN.]

GUILEMUS (WILLELMUS), ST., duke or count of Aquitaine, founder and monk of the monastery of Gellone, afterwards called St. Guillelmo-des-Desert. The story of his life is as follows: He was born in the time of Pippin, of aristocratic parents, Theodoric and Aldana. His father, who was a consil, according to his biographer, has been identified with the count of the same name whom Einhard speaks of as a relation of Charles the Great (Annales ad ann. 782, Pertz, i. 163), but others trace a relationship to that monarch through his mother. He was liberally educated in divinity and philosophy, as well as the martial exercises which belonged to his rank, and in due course was sent to court, where he gained the love of his peers and the respect and affection of Charles, who had now succeeded his father Pippin, and who often had recourse to him for counsel. It happened that the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees, and were devastating the south of France. Charles appointed Guilemous commander of the expedition sent against them, and created him duke of Aquitaine. Crossing the Rhone into Septimania he gave battle at Orange, where the enemy had established themselves, and recovered
the city in a victorious engagement. He pursued his success until they were utterly routed and driven back again into Spain. He then set himself to repair their ravages in the province. The ruined churches were rebuilt and new ones erected. He restored justice, religion, and charity, and characterized his rule. Determining to be himself the founder of a monastery he sought a spot in the mountainous district of Lodève, where he reared his buildings and collected monks from the country round, especially from the foundation of St. Benedict of Aniane, about a league distant. To this monastery his own was, by his wish, subordinated. His sisters, Almuna and Bertania, desirous of taking the veil, applied to him to aid them, and he established them at the church of St. Bartholomew, not far from the monastery. He now returned to his worldly duties, but the desire of embracing the monastic life had also seized him and was daily increasing in strength, when he was summoned to court. Here he made his mind to become a monk. Charles consented, and he left for his new home, stopping at Brioude to offer his weapons at the shrine of St. Julian the martyr. Arrived at Gellone, he entered the monastery barefooted and clad in sackcloth, laid his gifts upon the altar, and announced his desire of joining the community (A.D. 806). His first work was with the aid of his sons, Bernard and Gauzelinus, or Gotelmus, to complete the building, and render it accessible by cutting a road up the rugged valley. Next he planted gardens and vineyards, and laid out the valley in orchards. Lobis, son of Charles, and king of Aquitaine, granted him a charter for his foundation. This he devoted himself to the routine of the monastic life. Of his own choice he discharged the meanest offices. At the desire of the monks he consented to abandon these servile tasks, and entered upon a life of meditation. The gift of prophecy was vouchsafed to him, and revealed the hour of his death. His end was signalized by an earthquake, which shook the country round (May 28).

The life, of which the foregoing is with slight additions an abridgment, was first published by Suger of St. Denis, in Augsburg in 1161, and may also be found in Mabillon's Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti, sec. iv. pt. i. p. 70, Paris, 1668-1701, and in the Bollandists' Acta SS. Mai, vol. vi. 811. In the latter it is preceded by a short account of Guilemms, extracted from the life of St. Benedict of Aniane by his disciple Ardo (Feb. ii. 615), which differs but very slightly from the fuller account, and is followed by a separate account of his miracles. The date of this life is not known, but its style has impressed commentators with respect. It was, at least, written previously to the year 1066, since Ordericus Vitalis alludes to that year in his Ecclesiastical History (lib. vi.) that it had lately been shewn to him, and he gives a summary, which, in many cases, preserves the words and phrases of the life as we have it.

In his appendix to the Life (p. 83) Mabillon prints two instruments of gift of Guilemms, one resembling a will, and the above-mentioned charter of Louis dated in 808 (see also Migne, Patro. Lat. civ. 982).

The life of Louis the Pious states (Bouquet, vi. 88) that Guilemms succeeded Chorso in the dukedom, who was deposed for misconduct (A.D. 790), and successfully coped with a rising of which his predecessor was the cause. From the same source, and also from the charter or will above-mentioned, we learn something of his relatives, of whom the most famous was his son Bernard, who inherited his rank and married Dodana, whose manual, with an inscription to her son, Guilemms still survives (Migne, Patro. Lat. cxi. 109; cf. Rivet, Hist. Lit. de la France. v. 17). Cellier has a short account of his life, Hist. des Auteurs Sacer., xiii. 234. [S. A. B.]

GUILLEBRADUS (WILARDUS), bishop of Fistoria and Pratum (Piosteo and Prato), succeeded Joannes A.D. 801. He is mentioned as acting in various affairs in 806 and 812, under the authority of Charlemagne. (Ughelli, Itali. Sac. l. iii. 354; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. xvii. 81.) [B. S. G.]

GULLOBOLDUS (WILALDUS), twenty-ninth bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, between Ricarius and Bofo I., or Bono circ. 750. (Gall. Christ. ix. 863.) [S. A. B.]

GUIMILDUS (GUIMILUS). [GUIMILDER.]

GUINALUS, GUINALOE, GUINGALOIS, GUINGALOIS, Armenian saint. [WINWALLUS.]

GUINNINUS of Vannes. [GUINNINUS.]

GUINNIUS (GUINUINUS, GUINIBUS), accompanied St. Padarn from Armorica to Llanddaru (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 504 sq.), early in the 6th century. In the account of St. Ondocius's election to the see of Llandaff, "Guinins magister," called also Gunibus, and in the translation Cynfn, was one of the three clerical electors named, with the abbeys and laity, and was one of the three legates sent with the bishop-elect to Canterbury. (Lib. Landav. by Lers, 124, 372; Usher, Brit. Eccl. Ant. iv. c. 8, p. 324, a.) [J. G.]


GIRMINNUS, Irish saint, daughter of Conghallius. [GIRMIN.]

GUISLEIN, abbat. [GISELENUS.]

GUISO. [GISO.]

GUISTLIANUS. [GISTLIANUS.]
GUITELIN

GUITELIN stands in the lists of bishops at London and at Caer Leon, and Nennius numbers twelve years "a regno Guorthigerni usque ad discendiam Guiiolini et Ambroeli," if this be the same person as Guittel (Mon. Hist. Brit. i. p. ii. 77). Geoffrey Monmonier says he was sent to Armoricum for aid against the Saxons. (Stubbs, Reg. Sacr. Angl. 152, 154.) [GWYTHELIN.] [J. G.]

GULFARUS, "magister militum," probably in the district of Istria, where there was a severance from Rome on the subject of the "Three Chapters." Gregory the Great writes to commend him for his zeal in bringing back schismatics to the church. (Epist. lib. ix. ind. ii. ep. 93; Migone, Ixvii. 1019.) [A. H. A. D.]

GULOSUS, bishop of Beneventum, in Proconsular Africa, was banished to Corsica by Hunicus after the convention at Carthage, A.D. 484. (Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 100.) [R. S. G.]

GULOSUS, bishop of Pupit or Pudput, in Proconsular Africa, A.D. 646, is said, in the vacancy of the bishopric of Carthage, to have called together the synod held in that year at Carthage, and to have been the first to subscribe the letter against the Monothelites, addressed by the assembled bishops to Paul, patriarch of Constantinople. (Morelli, Afr. Christ. i. 236.) [R. S. G.]

GUMBERTUS (I), ninth bishop of Térouanne between Adelgerus and Aetherius, in the first half of the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. x. 1532.) [S. A. B.]

GUMBERTUS (II) (CUNIBERT), St., reputed founder and first abbot of the monastery of Ansbach, in Germany, in the 8th century. A life of him was published by the Bollandists from the parchment lectionary of the Franciscan fathers at Würzburg (Acta SS. Jul. iv. 69). At the time when St. Boniface was archbishop of Mentz (743-c. 754), an Englishman named Burchard came to him there, and after a short stay, went on to Rome. There pope Zachary consecrated him to the episcopate, and sent him back to Boniface, who escorted him to his diocese of Würzburg. The new bishop's name came to Gumbertus, who was a noble of Eastern France, and a soldier. Making his way to Würzburg, he submitted himself to the commands and instruction of Burchard. Part of his wealth he devoted to enriching the church of St. Kilian, the martyr. The rest he reserved, having it in his mind to found the monastery of Oonolbach, or Ansbach, in the diocese of Würzburg. He readily obtained authority from Charles the Great, then emperor, to build his monastery in any spot he chose. Accordingly, he founded the religious house of Ansbach. The rule of St. Benedict was established, and a large number of monks thronged thither. The monastery church was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. The remainder of his life was devoted to the government of his monks, and on his death (March 11), at an advanced age, he was buried in the church he had built. He is commemorated July 13.

A shorter but almost identical account is found in the life of Burchard by Egilward in the 12th century (Boll. Acta SS. Oct. vi. 588), and it seems not unlikely that the two writers were indebted to a common source.

GUMMARIUS, "auctor ecclesiasticus," second bishop of Maguelonne between Genesius and Vincentius. He was in possession of the see in 672 or 673. In the former year he joined in the revolt against Wamba king of the Visigoths, and when in the following year the forces of Wamba were closing in upon Maguelonne by sea and land, he fled to Nimes to join Paul, the leader of the rebellion. On the fall of the latter city, which was not long deferred, the bishop with the other rebels obtained their lives, but were subject to the indignity of being shaved and dragged barefoot and raged in the train of the conqueror, upon his triumphant entry into Toledo some months later. He was not liberated till the fourth year of Erigvius, Wamba's successor. His after history is unknown (S. Juliani, Hdb. Rebellionum Paul., xiii. seq. Migone, Pass. Lat. xvi. 774 sqq.; Gall. Christ. vi. 732). [S. A. H.]

Two early charters are extant for his monastery, one purporting to be granted by Charles the Great in 786, and the other by Louis the Pious in 837 (printed nos. 9 and 10 in Wurtemmann's Germania Sacra, tom. i.). In the former he is twice called episcopus, and for this, among other reasons, the document has been generally considered spurious. The whole story of Gumbertus rests upon the very slightest foundation. In addition to the above-mentioned accounts consult Retberg (Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 336-343) and the authorities there quoted as to his life and the two charters, and the Germania Sacra (tom. i. p. 429 sqq.) [S. A. B.]

GUMBERTUS, martyr [GONDELBERTUS]; bishop of Sens [GONDELBERTUS]; bishop of Reate [GUNDERTUS].

GUMMARIUS; bishop of Toledo. (Exp. Sacr. v. vi.)

GUMILUDUS (GIMELUDUS, GUIMILUS, WIXILUS), third bishop of Maguelonne between Genesius and Vincentius. He was in possession of the see in 672 or 673. In the former year he joined in the revolt against Wamba king of the Visigoths, and when in the following year the forces of Wamba were closing in upon Maguelonne by sea and land, he fled to Nimes to join Paul, the leader of the rebellion. On the fall of the latter city, which was not long deferred, the bishop with the other rebels obtained their lives, but were subject to the indignity of being shaved and dragged barefoot and raged in the train of the conqueror, upon his triumphant entry into Toledo some months later. He was not liberated till the fourth year of Erigvius, Wamba's successor. His after history is unknown (S. Juliani, Hdb. Rebellionum Paul., xiii. seq. Migone, Pass. Lat. xvi. 774 sqq.; Gall. Christ. vi. 732). [S. A. H.]

GUMMARIUS (GUMMARUS, GUMMARUS), St., founder of the monastery of Lis (Lire, Lier), near Malines in Belgium, in the latter part of the 8th century. According to the story which has come down, he was born at Embréheim, about a mile from Lira. Though his parents were of high rank, he was uneducated, and could not even read the Scriptures. But his natural disposition was good, and the practice of fasting and alms-giving was familiar to him even in early years. In opening manhood he was sent to Pippin's court, where he gained the affection of the king and his nobles, though only deference to the wishes of his parents reconciled him to the worldly life. He was soon honoured with high command, and sent on a distant military expedition. During his absence his home was left under the sole control of Gummaria, the wife whom he had married at Pippin's desire. Her one delight was in cruelty, and against the serfs and dependents of the house she raged, in the words of his biographer, "quidam bellumina fertate." After seven years, Gummarus returned from the wars, sternly rebuked his wife, and made amends to all who had been wronged. His thoughts were now bent on a monastic life, and on an island in the river Nethe (Nethe), which was called Nivesdum or Nivesdouch (the Bollandists suggest Nieuwendoch), he erected a church in honour of St. Peter. The remains
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of his life he passed between his house and the new monastery. St. Rumoldus, an Irishman, was at this time leading a life of devotion and solitude at Malines. The two were drawn to each other, and a meeting-place was found half-way between their houses by the citizens, which they resolved should be the scene of a yearly assembly and religious services for the country round. At length a mortal disease came upon him, and he died Oct. 11, the day of his commemoration, towards the close of the 8th century.

The foregoing account is from the life written by Theobald, a monk of Lira, and dedicated to Sigera, the abbot. It was first published by Surius (Oct. xi), but without the dedication, and in part abridged. Later, it was republished in full by the Hollandists (Acta SS. Oct. v. 682), together with an account of miracles performed by the saint's relics about 1475, related by an anonymous but contemporary author. The life itself was written about the middle of the 12th century, and what is said that the earliest mention of Gummarus is in the Gesta Pontificum, Cameracensium (ii. 48, Migne, Patr. Lat. cxlix. 142), written in the 11th century, it may be easily understood that authentic information about him is absolutely wanting. There is now at Lierre a church of St. Gommarius, begun in 1445 and completed in 1537. [S. A. B.]

GUMPERSGA, niece of king Luitprand and wife of Romsald, who was duke of Benevento in 706. (Paulus Diaconus, vi. 50.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GUNDAMUND (Gentius, Gunthie-mund), king of the Vandals. He was the son of Genzo, the son of Genric, and succeeded his uncle Huneric as king, according to the Vandal law of succession (GENEERIC). Dec. 11, 484. He had numerous contests with the Moors, who had revolted in the reign of Huneric. According to Procopius (Bell. Vind. i. 8) and Theophanes (Chronog. A. M. 6026, p. 159) he cruelly persecuted the Catholics. According to Isiobre, however, de Rebus Gatharum (Isid. Opp. vii. 133 in Migne, Patr. Lat. Lxxiii. 1079), and the Chronicle of Victor Tununensis (in Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 946), on his accession he restored peace to the church and recalled the Catholic exiles. The appendix to the Chronicle of Prosper (in Migne, Patr. Lat. li. 606) appears to offer a means of reconciling these conflicting statements. It is there stated that Gundamund, in the third year of his reign, surrendered to the Catholics the cemetery of St. Agileus at Carthage, having already recalled St. Eugenius, bishop of Carthage, from exile. In the tenth year of his reign he opened the Catholic churches which had been closed for ten years and a half; and at the intercession of Eugenius recalled all the exiled bishops and priests. From this it appears that, though Gundamund showed some favour to the Catholics soon after his accession, the persecution did not wholly cease till the tenth year of his reign. Gundamund died Sept. 24, A.D. 496. (Ceillier, Autours sacrés, x. 464.) [F. D.]

GUNDEBALD, king. [GUNDEBALD.]

GUNDECAR, king. [GUNDICARIUS.]

GUNDEGESILUS, twelfth archbishop of Bordeaux. According to Gregory of Tours, Bertram, his predecessor, returning from the second council of Mâcon (A.D. 585) was seized with a fever. Summoning to his bedside a deacon, named Waldo, he nominated him, as far as he was able, as his successor. Upon his death, Waldo, with the consent of the citizens, who were ready to the king to obtain his sanction, but this was refused, and orders were given for the consecration of Gundegesilus, surnamed Dodo, a count of Saintes, which took place (Hist. Franc. viii. 22). He took the lead in attempting to quell the disturbances excited by Chroiseldis at the monastery of the Holy Cross at Poitiers [CUNDEHEL], and his life was endangered by the strength of cutthroat assembled in the church of St. Hilary. In the same connexion he was one of the subscribers of the letter addressed to the bishops, assembled by king Guntram at Poitiers in 590, the rescript to which is given by Gregory (Hist. Franc. ix. 41, x. 15, 16). There is a lacon of more than 200 years in the series of the Bordeaux archbishops after Gundegesilus. Sicharius is the name of the next known (Godd. Christ. ii. 795). [S. A. B.]

GUNDELBERTUS, ST., supposed archbishop of Sens, and founder and first abbot of the monastery of Senoniæ (Senone) in the Vesiges. His life, written after the middle of the 13th century by Richerius, a monk of that foundation, in the Chronicum Senoniense (iii.), may be found in the Spicilegium, ii. 604, and with previous observations in Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedict. spec. iii. p. 468, Paris, 1668–1701. The story he relates is that Gundelbert, a Gaul of noble birth, in the year 720 was archbishop of Sens, and filled that office with great honour, but aiming at higher sanctity resolved to seek the desert. According to Gestas antiqua, relinquishing the wealth and honours of the archbishopric, but retaining the office, that he might be able to converse with churches and ordain ministers in the wilderness, he penetrated, with a few disciples, into the country of the Vesiges. His biographer describes the scene from personal acquaintance. It is a land full of lofty mountains crowded with savage rocks. The valleys between are profound, and renowned by dark and dreary gloom of their pine forests. Wild beasts abound, and men shun it as they would a leper, one of these valleys was the spot where St. Guendbert rested, selecting for his abode the most remote and uninviting part of it. A grant was readily obtained from Childeric, at whose court he had once been familiar. A church soon rose, and on the window of a vision was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, and close by he built his monastery in honour of St. Peter and the Apostle. The rule of St. Benedict was enacted, and under it his biographer was still living. The scene of his death and burial are alike unknown, though the former did not take place at the monastery. The difficulties in this story are very great. Mabillon (see the observations preceding) would reject the date of 720, and suggests the substitution of 670 for it. He considers that St. Guendbert must be placed earlier than Emma, the twenty-fifth archbishop of Sens who held the see from about 658 to 675. It seems clear that he must be distinguished from Gunzbertus, who, according to all the MSS. and authors (Godd. Xrist. xii. 14) was the thirty-fifth archbishop, and lived about
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779-786. In short, it seems very doubtful whether he ever belonged to Samps at all. In the prooemium of Childefar A.D. 661 (Migne, Patr. Lat. Lxxxvi. 1287), and the privilegium of Otto (949) no see is appended to his name. And Mabillon himself in his Mon. tom. i. p. 462) seems to suggest that he was possibly a chœrubicus only. Gams omits him from his Series, recognising only the later Gumbertus (p. 629). It might easily happen that the connexion with Samps was suggested by the name of his monastery. His day of commemoration is Feb. 21. (Boll. Acta SS. Feb. xii. 263.)

[S. A. B.]

GUNDEMAR, king. [GODEMAR.]

GUNDEMAR, king. [GUNTHER.]

GUNDEMAR, bishop of Viseo (of Gothic descent apparently), signs the disputed Decretum Gundemari (A.D. 610 ?). [GUNTHER.] [Exp. Sgr. iv. 314; Aguirre-Catalani, ill. 324.] [REMISOL.] [M. A. W.]

GUNDERIC (1), son of Godegisilus king of the Vandals, succeeding him jointly with his illegitimate brother Genserics. According to Renatus, quoted by Gregory of Tours, Hist. Franc. ii. 61 (in Migne, Patr. Lat. Lxxvi. 205), Godegisilus was killed in a great battle by the Franks soon after the Vandals had crossed the Rhine, which occurred on the 31st Dec. A.D. 406 (Prosper, Chronicon, in Migne, Patr. Lat. li. 590); but according to Procopius (de Bello Vandalico, i. 3) it was under his leadership that the Vandals invaded Spain, which took place in September or October, A.D. 409 (Ibidius, Chronicon, in Migne, Patr. Lat. li. 876), and the expression of Isidore (Historia de Reibus Gothorum, Isidori Opera, vii. 131, in Migne, Patr. Lat. Lxxviii. 1099).

"Primo autem in Hispania Gunderics Rex, Vandarorum successit," appears to support the statement of Procopius. The first attacks of the Vandals, Alani, and Suevi were repulsed by two young men of high rank, named Dikyamus and Verinius, who armed their slaves, and occupied the passes of the Pyrenees. This obstacle was however removed by the usurper Constantine, who put these brothers to death, and the hosts of barbarians then poured into Spain, and ravaged the country cruelly. (Orosius, Hist. vii. 40, 577, in Migne, Patr. Lat. xxxi. 1166.)

About A.D. 411 however they became quieter, and made a kind of partition of Spain. Gallicia was occupied by the Suevi and the Vandals, Lusitania and the province of Carthagena by the Alans, and the tribe of the Vandals, known as Selingui, after ravaging the Baleric islands, took possession of the province of Baetica. In the language of Orosius (Hist. vii. 41, 579), they turned their swords into ploughshares, and treated the remnant of the Romans as their friends and allies. This calm however was but a short one. The Goths, under Wallia, invaded Spain in A.D. 416, and carried on war for two years against the Vandals and their allies. He destroyed the tribe of the Selingui, and defeated the Alans with great slaughter, their king Ataces being among the slain. The remnant of the Alans then united themselves with the Vandals of Gallicia under Gunderic, and they disappear from history as a separate tribe. In A.D. 418, after the retreat of Wallia into Gaul, a quarrel broke out between the Vandals and the Suevi, who were blockaded by the former in the mountains of Narbona, or Ebba, between Orondo and Leon. The blockade was however raised by Asturias, the capital of the Suevi, and the Vandals retired into Bactria, where they were attacked, in A.D. 421, by Castinus, who had been sent against them by the emperor Honorius. Castinus refused to allow count Bonifacius to join the expedition, and after reducing the Vandals to great straits by blockade, imprudently offered battle, was defeated, and obliged to fly to Tangier. The infuriated Vandals, in A.D. 424, ravaged the coasts of Mauritania and the Baleric Islands, and took and plundered Carthagena and Sevile, and devastated the whole of Spain. Gunderic died in A.D. 428. According to Isidore and Isidore, his death was a punishment for having put his hands against the church of St. Vincent at Seville. According to Procopius, however, his brother Genserics was the cause of his death. From the praises bestowed on him by the Catholic Draccontius, the statements of Isidore and Isidore that Genserics was originally a Catholic, and the language of Orosius, who says that the mercy of God was to be praised for having by the invasion of the barbarians led them to a knowledge of the true faith, it appears probable that Gunderic was, at least originally, a Catholic, and not an Arian. For an account of his character, and his relations with the poet Draccontius, see DRACCONTIUS. His name is variously spelt Gundericus, Gontharis, Gantharius, and Gantharius.

[GUNDERIC, king. [GUNDERICUS.]

GUNDERIC (2) (GANDICUS, GANDICUS), twenty-seventh archbishop of Tares, succeeding St. Magnericus and followed by St. Neundus, at the close of the 8th century. He was supposed by some to have been identical with Genserics of Cumbray, and to have been elevated from that diocese to the archiepiscopal see of Tares, but the theory appears to be without authority. (Boll. Acta SS. Jul. vii. 172, 173; Toll. Christ. xiii. 384; Gams, Series Episc. 318.) [S. A. B.]

GUNDERIC, (3) bishop of Segobriga (Soguenza), from about A.D. 685 till after 693. He appears at the sixteenth council of Toledo, A.D. 693. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 333; Esp. Sgr. viii. 126.) [PHOTOGENES.] [M. A. W.]

GUNDERIC (4), 38th bishop of Toledo and metropolitan, cir. 700-710. He is but briefly mentioned by Isidorus Pascensis (Chron. § 30, in Pat. Lat. xcvii. 1262 b), and Roderic of Toledo (De Reb. Hsp. lib. iii. cap. 15 in Lorenzana, Patron. Toledo, i. iii. p. 62), who record that he was a man of great sanctity and reputation. He is thought to have presided in the 15th council of Toledo, A.D. 701 (Mansi, xliii. 163; Florez, Esp. Sgr. v. 301; Baron. A. E. an. 701, xvi.).

[GUNDERICHUS (GUNDRECHUS, GUNDREICHUS, GUNDRECHUS; French, GUNDRECH, GUNDERICH), a king of the Burgundians, one of the two sons of Gundechus. According to Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. ii. 28), he was of the family of Athanaric, king of the Visigoths. This statement, if not an error, must probably refer to the fact that he had married the sister of Rici-
mer, the patrician, who was a grandchild, on the mother's side, of Wallia, king of the Visigoths. (Paulus Diaconus, Hist. Miscell. lib. xv.; Migne, Patr. Lat. xcv. 963; Moscuz, Hist. of the Ancient Germans, ii. 358.) He succeeded his father about 437 in the straitened territory, which the victories of Aetius and the Huns had left to the Burgundians. In A.D. 443 probably, Sabaudia, nearly coincident with the modern Savoy, was given up to him and his people. In 455, when Avitus in Gaul usurped the throne of the West, Gundeuchus, and his brother Chilperic, with the greater part of Gaul, declared for him, and joined the force of Theodoric, the Visigoth, which, at his desire, marched into Spain to quell the Suevi (Jornandes, c. xiii.) In the confusion of these events the Burgundians seem to have found an opportunity for extending their territory in Gaul, sharing the lands encroached upon with the resident Gallic senators (Marius Avent. Chron. Carol. 673; Varrase Cos. 456; Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxii. 793.) Patr. as a matter of necessity, to have embraced in this year the Prima Lugdunensis, the Maxima Sequanorum, the Vien-nensis, the Alpes Graiae et Penninae and the Provincia cis Drusi tenium (Baron. Pap. an. 456, n. xiii.) Lyons, however, seems to have been afterwards forcibly recovered by Majorian, who was too much occupied at first to resist these encroachments. (Chron. Apoll. Carm. v.; Migne, Patr. Lat. lviii. 675.) From a letter of pope Hilary to Leontius, archbishop of Arles, we learn that Gundeuchus held the rank of magister militum. (Ep. ix., Migne, Patr. Lat. lviii. 27; Bar. an. 463, n. iv.) And, from the terms of respect and affection in which he is spoken of in this letter, we may conclude that the family had not yet been perverted to Arianism. He left four sons, Gundobald, Godesegil, Chilperic and Godeumar (Greg. Tur. ut supr.) [S. A. B.]

GUNDICARIUS (Guntiarus, French, Gondicaire), the first of the Hengids, or chiefs, of the Burgundians who attained to royal power.

The Burgundians were one of the nations of Germany, though they themselves, like other races of a mixed origin, themselves of German extraction, suggested probably by their name, was that they were the descendants of the Roman soldiers of Tiberius and Drusus left to garrison the burg-festen on the German frontier (Orosius, vii. 32; Ammianus Marcellinus, xxviii. 5). Their name first occurs in Pliny, who treats them as one of the component races of the Vandals (Hist. Nat. iv. 28), and their original position seems to have been between the Oder and the Vistula (Procopius, de Bello Goth. i. 12). From scattered notices in Jornades, Zosimus, Claudius Mamertinus, Ammianus Marcellinus and Orosius, we learn that amid various vicissitudes, like the other German nations, they gravitated towards the Gallic border. At the earliest period of which we have information there were gauls who had been between, or chiefs, apparently elective, and liable to be deposed for failure in war, or even on account of a bad season. Their high priest, called Sinistus, on the other hand, was irresolvable from office (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxviii. 5). Although their warriors passed the Rhine before, it was not till 406 that they finally made good their footing in Gaul. In that year a part of the nation crossed the Rhine in company with Vandals, Suevi and Alani (Orosius, vii. 40; Hieronymi Epist. cxxii. § 16, Migne, Patr. Lat. xxii. 1057). Whether they had been converted to Christianity at this time is somewhat doubtful. If we may credit the account of Socrates (Hist. Eccl. vii. 30), they had been zealous Christians for some years. His story is that at some time, probably about 392, while they were still on the east of the Rhine, and, according to him, led a peaceful life, being for the most part artisans (trivores), they were harassed by the incursions of the Huns. Disturbing human aid, they resolved to put themselves under the protection of some god, and having reflected that the deity of the Romans was a God of might, they resolved to embrace the Christian faith. Accordingly they approached one of the Gallic cities (Treves is suggested), and asked the bishop to baptize them. This he did after first ordaining a fast of seven days and instructing them in the elements of the faith (The evangely), whereupon their converts marched against the Huns, whom they attacked the day after the death of their king Othar from surfeit, and defeated, 10,000 of the enemy falling before 3000 Burgundians. Henceforth they were zealous Christians (ευαγγελισθεν οι Βουργουνδοι εαυτους). On the other hand Orosius, writing in 417, says, "By the provisions of God all have lately become Christians and Catholics, thanks to the care of our clergy whom they have welcomed. They treat the Gauls as brothers in Christianity, and lead lawful and innocent lives." (Orosius, vii. c. 32.) Revillout (Du l'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques, 65-6) thinks they were converted to Arianism by missionaries from the Visigoths, who appear under Euric to have subdued them (Chron. Sieg. Genblain, and Jornandes in Bouquet lii. 336, 884). But see Pigny (Etudes sur l'époque Mérovingienne, tom. ii. 50), who distrusts Orosius, and believes the Burgundians to have been Arians at the time they entered Gaul, though, unlike the Goths and Vandals, never propagandists or persecutors. In 413 Gundarr and his people espoused the cause of Jovinus the usurper. His purple was not long to last. At the battle of 411 (Olympiodorus, Bouquet, i. 600) Jovinus was killed in 413, but the emperor made peace with the Burgundians, and settled them on a portion of territory bordering on the Rhine, with Worms for its capital (Prosper. Chron. ad Lecian. Cons. Patr. Lat. li. 591; Cassiodorus, Chron. Patr. Lat. ixx. 1243; Richter, Annuen, p. 19). In 435 or 440 Gundicar revolted against the Roman power, but was defeated by Aetius, with the loss of 20,000 men, and compelled to sue for peace (Idatius, Chron. ad Ann. Valent. xii. 33; Migne, Patr. Lat. li. 880; Prosper. Chron. ad An. Theodos. xv., Valent. iv. Cos. (435) Patr. Lat. li. 596-7; Cassiodorus ad Ann. An. Patr. Lat. ixx. 1244). If we may believe the panegyric of Avitus by Sidonius Apollinaris (carm. vi. 280), or Hesychius, or chief apparent elective, and liable to be deposed for failure in war, or even on account of a bad season. Their high priest, called Sinistus, on the other hand, was irresolvable from office (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxviii. 5). Although their warriors passed the Rhine before, it was not till 406 that they finally made good their footing in Gaul. In that year a part of the nation crossed the Rhine in company with Vandals, Suevi and Alani (Orosius, vii. 40; Hieronymi Epist. cxxii. § 16, Migne, Patr. Lat. xxii. 1057). Whether they had been converted to Christianity at this time is somewhat doubtful. If we may credit the account of Socrates (Hist. Eccl. vii. 30), they had been zealous Christians for some years. His story is that at some time, probably about 392, while they were still on the east of the Rhine, and, according to him, led a peaceful life, being for the most part artisans (trivores), they were harassed by the incursions of the Huns. Disturbing human aid, they resolved to put themselves under the protection of some god, and having reflected that the deity of the Romans was a God of might, they resolved to embrace the Christian faith. Accordingly they approached one of the Gallic cities (Treves is suggested), and asked the bishop to baptize them. This he did after first ordaining a fast of seven days and instructing them in the elements of the faith (The evangely), whereupon their converts marched against the Huns, whom they attacked the day after the death of their king Othar from surfeit, and defeated, 10,000 of the enemy falling before 3000 Burgundians. Henceforth they were zealous Christians (ευαγγελισθεν οι Βουργουνδοι εαυτους). On the other hand Orosius, writing in 417, says, "By the provisions of God all have lately become Christians and Catholics, thanks to the care of our clergy whom they have welcomed. They treat the Gauls as brothers in Christianity, and lead lawful and innocent lives." (Orosius, vii. c. 32.) Revillout (Du l'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques, 65-6) thinks they were converted to Arianism by missionaries from the Visigoths, who appear under Euric to have subdued them (Chron. Sieg. Genblain, and Jornandes in Bouquet lii. 336, 884). But see Pigny (Etudes sur l'époque Mérovingienne, tom. ii. 50), who distrusts Orosius, and believes the Burgundians to have been Arians at the time they entered Gaul, though, unlike the Goths and Vandals, never propagandists or persecutors. In 413 Gundarr and his people espoused the cause of Jovinus the usurper. His purple was not long to last. At the battle of 411 (Olympiodorus, Bouquet, i. 600) Jovinus was killed in 413, but the emperor made peace with the Burgundians, and settled them on a portion of territory bordering on the Rhine, with Worms for its capital (Prosper. Chron. ad Lecian. Cons. Patr. Lat. li. 591; Cassiodorus, Chron. Patr. Lat. ixx. 1243; Richter, Annuen, p. 19). In 435 or 440 Gundicar revolted against the Roman power, but was defeated by Aetius, with the loss of 20,000 men, and compelled to sue for peace (Idatius, Chron. ad Ann. Valent. xii. 33; Migne, Patr. Lat. li. 880; Prosper. Chron. ad An. Theodos. xv., Valent. iv. Cos. (435) Patr. Lat. li. 596-7; Cassiodorus ad Ann. An. Patr. Lat. ixx. 1244). If we may believe the panegyric of Avitus by Sidonius Apollinaris (carm. vi. 280), or Hesychius, or chief apparent elective, and liable to be deposed for failure in war, or even on account of a bad season. Their high priest, called Sinistus, on the other hand, was irresolvable from office (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxviii. 5). Although their warriors passed the Rhine before, it was not till 406 that they finally made good their footing in Gaul. In that year a part of the nation crossed
GUNDILANUS (GUDILA), bishop of Emperor (Amphiar) before A.D. 683. "Segarius abbae" represents him at C. Tol. xiii, but he attended the fifteenth and sixteenth councils, 683, 685, in person. (Agurc.-Catalani, iv. 287, 313, 333; Excer. Supr. xii. 273.)

[M. A. W.]

GUNDIFERA, daughter of Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, and her second husband Agilulf. She married Ariowel, who succeeded her brother Adalad as king in 626. (Fredeg. Chro. cap. 49; Migne, lxi. 637; Paulus Diaconus is wrong, cf. note Hist. Lang. in Munimenta Rerum Ital. et Langob. 1875, p. 136.) She was imprisoned for three years on false suspicion of crime by Ariowel, and ultimately reinstated. Fredeg. says that she afterwards married Rotharis, who became king in 636. She built the basilica of St. John the Baptist in Pavia. (Paulus Diacon. iv. 47; Fredeg. Chro. cap. 51; Migne, lxi. 638; Pabst, Forschungen c. d. G. ii. 428.)

[A. H. D. A.]

GUNDLEAUS, GUNDELEUS, GUNDLOU, Welsh king. [GWYNLLWY]

GUNDOALDUS, bishop. [GONDOALDUS.]

GUNDOBALD (GUNODRABUS, GUNODRADEUS), fourth king of the Burgundians. His father, Gondeuchus, died about 470, leaving four sons, Gundobald, Godegiselu, Chilpere and Godomar (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. ii. 28.) In 472, on the death of his uncle Ricemer, Olybrius created him patrician and magister militum (Paulus Diacon. Hist. Maccell. lib. xvi; Migne, Patr. Lat. x. 961). In the same year Olybrius died, and Gundobald took part with Glycerius, who assumed the purple at Ravenna (Casiodor. Chron., Migne, Patr. Lat. ix. 1246). According to Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. ii. 28) Gundobald murdered his brother Chilpere, the father of Clotild, and drowned his wife. But the statement is open to grave doubts; because solely on the authority of Gregory, who wrote about a century after the alleged murders, was a Catholic writing of an Arian, and who was the personal friend of Guntram, the French king who reigned over the territory usurped from the Burgundian kings. The Epitomata, xvii., the Gesta Regum Francorum, xi., the Chronicon of Ado (Bouquet, ii. 660), &c. are mere reproductions of Gregory on this point. On the other hand Avitus, archbishop of Vienne, could scarcely have written "Plebis quondam pietae inferius funera germanorum," &c. (Ep. v.; Patr. Lat. lxx. 223), if he was addressing the murdered one of those brothers. The manner and date of Chilpere's death, therefore, remain unknown, as also that of his brother Godomar, whom he is said to have burnt alive. About A.D. 492 Cloris was brought into close relation with the Burgundians by his marriage with Clotilda, Chilpere's daughter (Greg. Tur. ii. 28; Epitomata, xvii.; but the details of Cloris's betrothal are not historic, Richter, Annales, 35). At this time, Chilpere and Godomar being dead, the kingship of the Burgundians, which extended from the Vosges to the Durance and from the Alps to the Loire, was divided between the two surviving brothers, Gundobald and Godegiselu,
seq.) This code may be found in Bouquet, iv. 257 seq., and Pertz, Leges, iii. 497 seq.

Though he professed Arianism, he did not persecute, but on the contrary secured the Catholics in the possession of their endowments. Avitus wrote to him, "In domo tua domus protesters, et omnes ecclesiæ nostræ, vestrum est, de substantia quam vel servasti hasten vel donasti." (Ep. xxxiii. Patr. Lat. lix. 256.) The circumstances relied on by Rebillout (De l'Arisonisme des Peuples Germaniques, 180, 181), who takes the opposite view, are trivial, compared with the testimony of Avitus and the silence of Gregory.

His whole correspondence with Avitus and the conference of Lyon demonstrate both the interest he took in religious subjects and his tolerance of orthodoxy. Several of the bishop's letters survive, addressed to him in answer to enquiries on various points of doctrine on which he had asked for explanations, for instance, on the Eutychian heresy (Ep. 3 and 4), repentance in articulo mortis (Ep. 30), and on the way by faith to Axigone (Ep. 5). Only one of Gundobald's remains (Ep. 19), asking an explanation of Isai. ii. 3, 4, 5, and Micah iv. 4. These letters may be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. lix. 199, 202, 210, 219, 223, 238, 244, 255, and are commented on in Ceillier's Hist. générale des Acteurs sacrés, x. 554 seqq. He probably died an Ariam, but it is not quite certain. According to Gregory he was convinced and begged Avitus to baptize him in secret, fearing his subjects, but Avitus refused, and he perished in his heresy (Hist. Franc. ii. 34, cf. iii. prologue). On the other hand there are two passages in Avitus's letters, (Ep. v. sub fin. Patr. Lat. lix. 224, "unde cum iactatum—orbitatem," and Ep. ii. sub init. Patr. Lat. lix. 202, "Unicum simul—principaliter de tuenda catholicae partis veritate curritis") which seem almost to imply that he was then a Catholic. See too Gregory's story of the piety of his queen (De Mirac. St. Juliani, ii. 8). [S. A. B.]

GUNDOVALDUS, surnamed BALLOMER, or Pretender, was the son of a concubine of Clotaire I., though disowned by that monarch. By his mother's care he was well educated, and brought up in the little court, by the childless brother of Clotaire, and committed to his protection. Clotaire soon heard of it, and sent for him, but on his arrival vowed that he was no son of his, and ordered his flowing locks, the insignia of royalty among the Franks, to be cut off. Upon Clotaire's death (A.D. 561), his son Charibert received him, but another son, Sigebert, to whose court he was summoned, again cut off his hair, and sent him into exile at Cologne. He seems to have suffered considerable hardship, and at one time to have earned his living as a fresco painter (Greg. Tur. vii. 36). From Cologne he made his escape to Narses, then ruler of Italy. Here he married, and had children, and after the death of his wife migrated to Constantinople, where he was well received by the emperor Maurice, and lived prosperously for many years. But towards the close of 579 or beginning of 580, Guntram, brother of the Austrasian Franks, sought him out at Constantinople, and invited him to France, in the name of the nobles of Childerbert's kingdom, who, in their struggle against the power of the monarchy, probably expected assistance from a contest for the crown. Boso gave the most solemn assurances of the successful issue of the expedition. Accordingly, in 582, he landed at Marseilles, where the bishop Theodurus was favourable to the design, and furnished him with a body of cavalry. He landed at Axigone, where Mummolus, the eldest general of France, who had abandoned the service of king Guntram, and joined the conspiracy, was settled. But the sight of the great treasure with which the emperor had supplied Gundovald for the expedition soon excited the avarice of Guntram Boso, who stole as much of it as he could, and deserted Gundovald. This defection was so serious that Gundovald retired to an island, the name of which we are not told, to await the progress of events (583). The following year, however, he returned to Avignon, and with Mummolus, Desiderius, a duke of Chilperic's kingdom, Sagittarius, bishop of Gap, and a considerable body of followers, marched towards Limoges, and on the way works at Brittany (Gundobald 5).

GUNDOVALDUS, twenty-fourth bishop of

GUNDIUSUS, twenty-fourth bishop of
GUNDULFUS

Noyon, between Autigarius and Guenulfus, early in the 8th century. (Gall. Christ. ix. 985.) [S. A. B.]

GUNDULFUS, bishop. [GUDULPHUS.]

GUNDULFUS, sixteenth bishop of Noyon and Tournay, between Faustinus and Chresma-
rus. (Gall. Christ. ix. 981.) [S. A. B.]

GUNDULPHUS, bishop of Lamego, from before A.D. 681 onwards. He appears at the
twelfth and thirteenth councils of Toledo. (Aguirre-Catalani, iv. 270, 287; Esp. Sagr. xiv. 125.) [SABINARIUS.] [M. A. W.]


GUNDVALDUS, son of Gariwald, duke of Bavaria, accompanied to Italy his sister Theo-
delinda, who married first, king Autharius, and afterwards king Agilulf. He was made duke of Asti, and died c. 612 by an arrow from an un-
known hand. His son Arigert became king of the Lombards in 653. (Origo Gentis, 6; Paulinus Diaconus, iii. 30; iv. 41, 48; Fredegar, Chronic. cap. 34; Migne, lxxi. 623.) [A. H. D. A.]

GUNIBALD, saint. [WINIBALD.]

GUNIFORT, martyr. [GUNIFALD.]

GUNLEUS, GUNLYN. [GWINLFYW.]

GUNNULUS, GUNBUL. [GUNNUS.]

GUNTASIO, Donatist bishop of Benevent, or Benaia, in proconsular Africa, present at the
Maximian council of Carthage, A.D. 303. (Aug. En. in Ps. 36, 20.) [H. W. P.]

GUNBERTUS (GOMBERTUS), thirty-fifth
archbishop of Sens, succeeding Godo-calculus and
followed by Petrus I. (circ. 770-790). The
authors of the Italia Christiana (xii. 14) quote a
MS. of the monastery of St. Peter to the effect
that he died in the seventh year of his episcopate,
and was buried in the church of that foundation.
His day of commemoration is March 1. He is
not to be confused with St. Gundelbertus, the re-
puted archbishop of Sens, who founded the
monastery of Seinoni in the Vosges in the pre-
ceding century. [S. A. B.]

GUNBERTUS, martyr. [GONDEBERTUS.]

GUNTHRAMNUS. [GUNTRAMNUS.]

GUNTERANUS (or GUALTERANUS), c. 670,
bishop of Siena. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d’Italia,
xvii. 374; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. iii. 558.) [A. H. D. A.]

GUNTFRIDUS (GOEPFRIDUS, GAUFREDUS),
thirteenth bishop of Cambrai, between Trau-
rardus, or Trawardus, and Albricus. He
subscribed the charter of Etho bishop of Stras-
bourg, for the foundation of the monastery of
Schwarzachum (Arnulfi-Anglia), in Lower Alsace
(Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxxviii. 1314). He is said to
have translated the remains of St. Laudelius,
founder of the monastery of Lobbes, on June 15,
770 (Usuard. Jun. xv. Auct. Molani, Migne,
Patr. Lat. cxxiv. 159; Bull. Acta SS. Jun. ii.
1062). He died probably soon after that date.
(Gesta Pontificum Cauconormann. Lib. i. 37;

GUNTHAMUND. [GUNNAVIND.]

GUNTHAMAR (GUNDMAR), king of Gothic
Spain from Oct. 610 to Aug. 614. From the
Hist. Gothorum only two facts are to
be learnt of his short reign, that he carried
through a successful expedition against the
rebellious Vascones, and that he besieged—
unsuccessfully?—some of the remaining Byz-
antine strongholds of the peninsula (“alia expedi-
tione militem Romanum obsidit.”—Isid.). Besides
these two statements of Isidore’s, however, we
have various documents which relate to profets
which he died, and which have been
and are still disputed. It will be necessary
to notice briefly: I. The letters of the comus
Bulgarianus; II. The so-called synod of Car-
thaginesian bishops held at Toledo in 610, and
the Decretum Gundemari attached to it—two
famous documents, upon which the much dis-
put ed presence of Toledo was practically built
up; III. The church laws which, in the 15th
century, Alfonso of Castagena first attributed
to Gunthamar.

I. Three out of the seven letters of the Comus
Bulgara or Bulgarum were published for the first time in the excellent Valencian edition
of Mariana’s Historiae, 1792, vol. ii. app. On
more, a letter of consecration to Gunthamar,
and similar to the death of his king, Hidaiaa, was
partially
ly, printed by Flocruz in his Regum de Espaia, vol. i.
Three others— one addressed “Domino san to ar
Beatinusino et Apostolicae meritis equando, nesque
semper praefecto Dumo Agapio episc pal Bulgar.”
the second, “ejus suprema ar cumdum de Gallia”
the third, “quidam ad Aquam,” which may
not, of course, be a letter of the comus, and still
remain unpublished. They are extant in the 10th
century copy taken by Morales, and now in the
Madrid Library, of the famous Codex Oviedo (see art. FLORES (3), note). Morales speaks
of another still older MS. of them at Alcalá (Hist. de España, vi.), of which, however, so far as we
know, no modern mention has been made. On the
strength of the three barbarous and all but
unintelligible letters published in the appendix
to Mariana, and well known in MS. to earlier
scholars, it was commonly asserted by older
authors—Morales, Mariana and Ferreras, for
instance—that Gunthamar had paid tribute to
Theuderic of Burgundy, the son of Childerict II.
and grandson of Brunichild, possibly in return
for services rendered him by Theuderic in the
palace revolution which overthrew his prede-
sessor Witteric (Mariana, lib. vi. cap. ii.) a
tory still further developed by Hefler, who
regards the revolution as a church conspiracy,
and Gunthamar as the clerical and Frankish
instrument (Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgots-Rechts, p. 50). Dahn already
refuted the tribute theory; but his explanation
of the real bearing of the letters is still some-
what incomplete (Könige der Germanen, v. 176).
A careful examination of them gives the follow-
ing results. In the year 611, when the final
successful campaign of Brunichild and Theuderic against Theudibert of Austrasia (Fredigar, cap. 37, 38) was about to begin, it was rumoured in Gothic Gaul, of which Burgundy was the governor (conf. "in hac provinci—ad ordinansionem nostram pertinente," ep. ii.), that Brunichild and her grandson were exciting the heathen Avars against Theudibert. Bulgara writes for information to a bishop of Theudibert's kingdom (Theudibert is spoken of in the second letter as "filius vester Dominus Theudibertos," and again as "gloriosissimi Thuderic") promising that "a report ... hateful to Catholic souls" would turn out to be true, solemn fasts and prayers shall be held throughout Septimania for the success of the "orthodox prince" Theudibert against so disgraceful a conspiracy. At the same time the comes refers (ep. i.) to negotiations already going on between Theudibert and Gunthimar, and asks the bishop for news as to whether the letters sent have reached Theudibert, and whether the Missi have returned "[ut] certius aiciamus—quomodo aut ubi, pecunia praepareatur." In the second letter ("cujus supra ad episcopum Franciae directa") reference is again made, not only to Theudibert's present negotiations with the Goths, but to his relations with past Gothic princes ("decidentibis principibus")—an evident allusion to the alliance between Wittéric, Theudibert, and the Lombard Agilulf against Theuderic—Dahn, l. c. 174), and it is explained that Theudibert had promised to furnish Gunthimar with troops ("numerum gentia Francorum—impertire") in return for a sum of money ("merito pecuniae"). The bishop is implored to further the execution of this compact, and is, moreover, again asked for news as to Theudibert's war with the Avars. Evidently Bulgara and Gunthimar are mainly anxious about this latter matter because it may prevent the performance of Theudibert's promise. What the Frankish troops were wanted for is of course unknown to us, unless we may suppose that they were to be used in the expedition against the Vascons of which Isidore speaks. Whether they ever left Burgundy, or whether they even reached their destination, Bulgara's third letter ("detectissimo atque in Christo reverendissimi. Patri Epo. Bulg,)—which may be dated 612 with great probability—is one of angry remonstrance addressed to a bishop, not of Theudibert's kingdom, but of Theuderic's (conf. "cartas gloriosissimorum Regum—vestrorum Brunichildis Regine et Theuderic Regis"). The comes complains that noble Gothic legates, Totila and Gunthimar by name, have been unjustly captured by the bishop's sovereign, imprisoned by the bishop, and made to suffer the disgrace of exile together with the shame of destitution." On account of these proceedings the king and people of the Goths have a large money claim against the bishop's masters ("non exigua sed magna pecuniae repetitio") and unless the legates are released, Bulgara refers to allow Frankish legates permission to enter Spain, or to give up to Brunichild the towns of Lubiniunum (Juvignac) and Cornelianum (Cornelianum), which she claimed as a cession from Recared, but which the comes declared were only ceded by Recared for the confirmation of that peace between the Goths and Franks which she and Theuderic have now broken.

It appears tolerably clear then that the money sent to Theudibert by the Goths was captured by his cousin and rival Theuderic in the same year which saw the downfall of the former at the hands of the latter; that Gunthimar did not reverse, but rather carried out, the Frankish policy of his predecessor, Wittéric; that therefore there is no ground for supporting a combination of Gunthimar and the Franks against Wittéric for which an alliance between Gunthimar and Theuderic, not between Gunthimar and Theudibert, would be necessary; that the absence of any church action in the matter, and the tributary story, on which Helserich builds so much, is quite untenable.

In the fourth letter of the comes (unpublished), addressed to the bishop Agapius, and probably written after the death of Gunthimar, he describes his sufferings at the hands of one Atebo, or Asebo, whom he calls "tyrant," and who seems to have been the head of some revolt at Narbonne. He was released from the prison into which he had been thrown, he tells his correspondent, by the good offices of the metropolitan Sergius of Narbonne. We shall find the mention of this bishop's name of importance in the investigation of our second point.

II. The so-called synod of 610, and the Decretum Gundemarii. The Constitution Carthaginensis Biscodatun and the Decretum Gundemarii were first published by Lozya in 1590. Since then they have been generally treated as at least open to question by the various council editors (conf. Mansi, x. 511; Harduin, iii. 546), and of late the German scholar Dahn has pronounced decisively against them (Könige der Germanen, vi. 439). They are found in only three out of the nine council MSS, used by the latest editors of the Spanish Codex Carolinianus, and two of these at least, the Codex Aesilinianus and the Codex Vigilanus, rank as the best and fullest of the extant MSS. (see description of them in Florer, ili. app., and Tedaja y Ramiro, Cod. de Can. i. c. i. pref.). The Decretum and the Constitutio follow immediately after the name of the one of the bishops of Toledo, held under Encio (q. w.), in which the famous sixth canon secures to the king and the metropolitan of Toledo the right of appointment to bishops all over Spain. After this canon, which raised the bishop of Toledo to the position of primate of Spain, the earlier decrements, which conferred upon Toledo the metropolitan authority over the whole of Carthaginensis, seem to have been added, honestly or dishonestly, as tending to illustrate the history and enhance the dignity of the royal see. The Constitutio which is signed by fifteen bishops of Carthaginensis confesses that the see of Toledo has metropolitan authority ("metropolitani nominis habere auctoritatem"), and that it precedes the other churches of Carthaginensis, "et honoris potestate et meritis," Nor are its honours in any way of any creation of the see or other the "syonal sententiam antiquorum patrum" in the council held under bishop Montanus (A.D. 527; Montanus), and are now reiterated lest at any future time any of the comprovincial bishops should venture to despise the primacy of the Toledan church, and to appoint bishops without regard to the rights of the Toledan see ("res hapax sedis potestate") as had been
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hitherto done. Deposition and excommunication are threatened in case of any such presumption in future. The synod is dated the 23rd of October in the first year of the most pious and glorious Gundemar era, 648 (A.D. 610). The fifteen signatures, headed by that of Progenes of Ségontia (Sigguenza), follow.

The Decretum Gundemari, which, although it precedes the synod in the MSS., has always been considered as confirmatory of the synodal acts (Duhm, l. c.; Heilicher, l. c. p. 52; Esp. Segr. vi. 158), is an extremely curious and interesting document, whether forged or genuine. It is addressed to "our venerable fathers the bishops of Carthaginensis," and announces at the outset the king's desire to glorify his reign not only by due care for and arrangement of secular matters, but also of matters pertaining to divinity and religion. The passage which follows is almost unintelligible. "Nonnulnum enim in disciplinis ecclesiasticis contra canonum auctoritatem per meras praecedentium [Florez has "noves procedentium," vi. 333] temporum licentiam sibi de usurpatione praesterti principes [Florez, "praesterti Principis"] fecerunt: its ut quidam episcoporum Carthaginensis Provinciae non reverentiam, sed saepe necesse, per quasdam fratris afflatum, in persecutione et persecutionis exsperiatum vitae omnes (? homines) episcopali officio preversi atque hanc ipsum praefatae ecclesiae dignitatem imperii nostri solio sublimatam conterremeri." As to the historical meaning of these sentences, we shall have a few words of suggestion to offer when going on to declare that nothing of this kind is to be allowed in future, but that the honour of the primacy over all the churches of Carthaginensis is to be conceded to the church of Toledo, which excels the rest in dignity of name and office. Nor is it to be suffered that the province of Carthaginensis should be split up into two parts with two different metropolitans, which may lead to schism, to the overthrow of faith, and the destruction of unity. As for the signature of the venerable bishop Euphemius in the general synod of the Toladan council (C. Tol. III. A.D. 589; EUPHEMIIUS), where he calls himself metropolitan of the province of Carpentania, the king corrects, "ejusdem ignorante sectentiam," since the "regio" of Carpentania is not a province, but part of the province of Carthaginensis, as ancient documents declare. As Baetica, Lusitania, and Tarraconensis are separate provinces with separate metropolitans, So Carthaginensis is one province, and must obey one primate. Let not the bishops then venture to do again such presumptuous things as have been done. Indulgence is to be accorded to past transgressions, but if any disobey in the future, they are to be visited with degradation, excommunication and "nostre severitatis censuram." The king signs first, "propria manu." Then follow Isidore of Seville: "dum in urbe Tolentam pro occure ns Regio adventisse agnitus his communicatis regio, Rasonacum suo compositaque subscriptus..." Innocenti merita, id.; Eusebius of Tarraco, Sergius of Narbonne, and, among the suffragans, the two historians Joannes of Gerona [JOANNES BICALAESI] and MAXIMUS of Saragossa, and Isidore's brother, Fulgentius of Astigi. There are twenty-six signatures, of which four are metropolitans.

CHRIST. DIOR.—VOL. II.

Arguments for and against the Synod and Decretum.—Duhn's objections, based wholly on internal evidence, are—(1) the unusually good Latin of the documents, especially of the Constitutio, compared with that of other contemporary specimens, with the acts of C. Hisp. II. for instance, which we know to have been drawn up by Isidore himself; (2) the use of the title "majestas nostra," which we find nowhere else applied to a Gothic king, and of the word fratrises, also unknown according to Duhn to the laws of that time and country; (3) the sharp definitions of the words regio and provincia, the meaning of which varied greatly in official and public use; and (4) the absence of the name of the bishop of Toledo from the list of signatures (Könige der Germanen, vi. 430).

To these objections of detail we may add the generally suspicious character of these documents relating to metropolitan privileges (conf. the acts of the so-called council of Oviedo, in 811, and the supposed councils of Lugo, Esp. Segr. iv. 141 and xxxvii. app.); and we may point to the averted connexion between these documents and the synod of Montanus, another doubtful matter in the eyes of some scholars, though the grounds for rejecting it are as yet far from convincing (MONTANUS).

On the other hand, it may be urged—(1) that the Latin of the Constitutio is no better than, if as good as, the Latin of the second synod of Barcelona, held in 599, the acts of which were possibly drawn up by the historian Joannes Bicalaensis. The king went on to declare that nothing of this kind is to be allowed in future, but that the honour of the primacy over all the churches of Carthaginensis is to be conceded to the church of Toledo, which excels the rest in dignity of name and office. Nor is it to be suffered that the province of Carthaginensis should be split up into two parts with two different metropolitans, which may lead to schism, to the overthrow of faith, and the destruction of unity. As for the signature of the venerable bishop Euphemius in the general synod of the Toladan council (C. Tol. III. A.D. 589; EUPHEMIIUS), where he calls himself metropolitan of the province of Carpentania, the king corrects, "ejusdem ignorante sectentium," since the "regio" of Carpentania is not a province, but part of the province of Carthaginensis, as ancient documents declare. As Baetica, Lusitania, and Tarraconensis are separate provinces with separate metropolitans, so Carthaginensis is one province, and must obey one primate. Let not the bishops then venture to do again such presumptuous things as have been done. Indulgence is to be accorded to past transgressions, but if any disobey in the future, they are to be visited with degradation, excommunication and "nostre severitatis censuram." The king signs first, "propria manu." Then follow Isidore of Seville: "dum in urbe Tolentam pro occure ns Regio adventisse agnitus his communicatis regio, Rasonacum suo compositaque subscriptus..." Innocenti merita, id.; Eusebius of Tarraco, Sergius of Narbonne, and, among the suffragans, the two historians Joannes of Gerona [JOANNES BICALAESI] and MAXIMUS of Saragossa, and Isidore's brother, Fulgentius of Astigi. There are twenty-six signatures, of which four are metropolitans.
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the Constitution." "The signature of Venerius," says Helfferich, "speaks very much in favour of the Decretum—a forger would hardly have taken notice of such a point." Among the whole forty-one signatures to the documents, there is not one against which a charge of anachronism or impossibility can be made, while several are unexpectedly illustrated by contemporary documents. For instance, Sergius of Narbonne is known to us from the synods of Toledo, 589, and Narbonne, in the same year, only as Sergius of Carcassonne, but the fourth letter of Bulgaranus (unpublished; see above) shews him to us as advanced to the metropolitan see of Narbonne; Innocentius of Merida does not appear in any other synod of the time, but his life among the biographies of the bishops of Merida, current under the name of Paulus Emanetiana (a work of the first half of the 7th century), proves that an Innocentius was bishop of Merida just at this date. Eusebius of Tarraco is known to us from a letter of Braulio to Isidore (Pat. v. 933; S. Greg. xxi. 336) and from the well-known letter addressed to him by king Sisebut [EUSEBIUS (85)], and he may possibly be identified with the Eusebius signing the council of Egara in 614. In general it may be said that we are able to identify most of the bishops signing the Decretum, who belong to the provinces of Tarraconensis, Narbonensis, and Baetica. This is only because we have synods in 589, 592, 599, and 619 hold in these provinces. There is no Gallican or Lusitanian synod between the third and fourth councils of Toledo, and also no synod beside the synod of Gunthimar in which the names of Carthaginanian bishops appear, between 589 or 597, if we accept the doubtful synod of Recared (Gams, K.-G. ii. 2, 25; Exp. Sagra. vi. 154) and 633. This explains how it is that only one of the Lusitanian, none of the Gallican, and very few of the Carthaginian names can be substantiated from outside, but as the names that can be checked are right, it is at least probable that those which cannot are also so.

One of two alternatives, therefore, must be the case, either the documents are genuine, or they are the work of an extremely clever forger extending back as far as 610 and 619 a very small part of the history of the time. On the latter supposition, three separate suggestions may be made: (i.) that they are connected with the synod of Montanus, that both are forgeries of the time of Eugenius II., and that Ilefonson conscienciously or unconsciously made use of the deception; (ii.) that the Constitution and Decretum are forgeries of the time of the ambitious Julian, to whose initiative Pope G. Tol. I. and during whose episcopate the see of Toledo assumed a position it had never attained before, and never equaled again until the time of archbishop Bernard and Alfonso VI. (conf. Gams, K.-G. ii. [2] 210); (iii.) that the forgeries of these Toledan documents is connected with the efforts of Orihlo in the 10th and 11th centuries to obtain metropolitan rank, and to play the part of the heir of Toledo in things ecclesiastical as it had become the heir of the Gothic capital in civil status. This latter suggestion would require a careful re-examination and comparison of MSS. before it could be proved or finally refuted. Comparison could be brought made of Toledan supremacy over Carthaginensis in the acts of the so-called council of Orihlo in 811 (Exp. Sagra. xxxvii. app.).

On the other hand, if the documents are genuine, we are in possession of the key to the ecclesiastical history of Carthaginensis in the first half of the 7th century. Between the modest signatures of Euphemius in 589 as "metropolitan of Carpetania" and the glorification of the see of Toledo as the illustrious and privileged head of Carthaginensis which we find in Ilefonson (conf. de Vir. Ill. passim, but especially the preface), and see realized in Julian's career [JULIAN], the synod and Decretum would then occupy a middle and explanatory place. Such is the case in 614. It throws some light on such an ecclesiastical attempt as these documents, if authentic, represent. In 589, many of the older bishops, certainly most of the maritime bishops of Carthaginensis and Baetica were in the hands of the Byzantines. The sees of Cartagena, Malaga, Urci, and Assidonia as least were in their possession, and possibly, as Gams suggests, Ilici, Dianum, and Sasae. The two bishops of Gregory the Great to the Defensor Ioannes (Epist. i. 13, ep. 45, Migne, Patr. Lat. lxvii.) imply the existence of a considerable but indefinite number of bishoprics within the Byzantine boundaries.

Euphemius then, at a time when several of the suffragan bishoprics of Carthaginensis, including Cartagena itself, up to 429 at least— as we can scarcely doubt notwithstanding the scanty nature of the evidence—not only the ancient civil but the undisputed ecclesiastical head of the province, were in the possession of the Eastern empire, could not truthfully assume the title of metropolitan of Carthaginensis, even if such a rank had formerly at any time belonged undisputedly to Toledo. And it was possible and it is now the moment the synod of 619 had been later, for the bishop of Toledo to assume the title without possessing the reality because of the existence of the distinguished Lician of Cartagena, the friend of Gregory the Great, who undoubtedly, as his letters show, possessed and exercised metropolitan powers either over the whole of the Spanish territory within the Greek borders, together with the Balearic islands, or over a portion of it (Ep. i. 9, ad S. Greg. Pap. and ii. ad Vincentium Ep. Eobotaniae Inclusae; Exp. Sagra. v. 421, 425).

But after the death of Lician of Cartagena (about A.D. 600), to whom we know of no successor, although he may have had one, and after the reigns of Recared and Witteric, during which the Gothic power was steadily increasing and the Visigothic-Roman power steadily decreasing (as is shown by the rapid successes of Sisebert and Suintila), the condition of things changed. In 610 Toledo was not yet even the civil head of the whole of Carthaginensis (the final renunciations of territory on the part of the Greeks were made in 615 and 625), but an energetic bishop
such as we know Aur cursius to have been (ibid. 

\textit{Vir. Illustr.} cap. \textit{v.}) with some plausibility have claimed the ecclesiastical headship. In or about 615 Cartagena itself was destroyed (conf. 

\textit{Friedeberger. Chron.} c. 33 with \textit{Etymolog.} \textit{xv.} \textit{i.} \textit{67}), and no possible rival remained to dispute the pretensions of the \textit{urba regia}. At a time, therefore, when the Gothic power was rapidly advancing towards this conclusion, Aur cursius may have made his attempt, just as Montanus may have made an earlier attempt in the same direction, when Cartagena, the ancient civil and ecclesiastical metropolis [see art. \textit{Hilarus}], was still suffering from the ruin and destruction wrought by the Vandals in 425 (frat. ad an.), and before her restoration by the imperialists. (The Byzantines entered Spain in 554 at the invitation of \textit{Athanasig.) \textit{A}}fter Toledo became under Leo Vivid the seat of the Gothic government, the aggrandisement of the see was assured. If the synod and \textit{Decretum Gundemari} are genuine, then we are in possession of the steps which led from the position of \textit{Euphemius} to the position of \textit{Julian}. If not, we are in the dark.

Among the exciting causes of the synod and \textit{Decretum} may very well have been the obscure proceedings in the south-eastern corner of Spain revealed to us by Gregory's letters to the Defender Johannes, and by the \textit{sentensoria} or judgment of Johannes upon the causes he was sent to investigate. The words in the \textit{Decretum}, \textit{licentiam sibi de usurpatione praestet rit principis securum}, refer possibly not to Witteric, as Dahn supposes, but to Justinian or Maurice, and allude to the split of some bishops within the Greek borders from the rest of Carthaginensis, perhaps to the doubtful cases where part of the bishopric had fallen into Byzantine hands, and the bishop had taken advantage of the fact to separate himself from the Carthaginensis synod. Space fails us to dwell on the question, but the more those letters are studied, the more probable will it appear that the synod and \textit{Decretum} of Gunthamar were in great measure an answer to the papal proceeding represented by them. The pope says that one of the bishops—of unknown secular status—was required to be tried by a synod and not be a metropolitan or patriarch. Therefore Rome takes up the matter and the Defender Johannes is sent out. Toledo replies about six years later by claiming the whole of Carthaginensis, and sharply denouncing those who had tampered with her metropolitan privileges in the matter of appointment to bishoprics. Marked jealousy of the claims of Rome is shown by Toledo throughout the 7th century. (See art. \textit{Julian}; 

\textit{Gams, K.-G.} ii. [2] 222-238.) The synod and \textit{Decretum} of Gunthamar are not improbably one of the first symptoms of it.

III. On the subject of the supposed church laws of Gunthamar, see \textit{Helfirsch} (\textit{Westphalischen- 

\textit{Eckrich}, p. 59), who supposes that the four anony-

\textit{mous} laws on the right of asylum in the \textit{Lex \textit{Visigothica}} ii. 3, may with some probability be traced back to Gunthamar. Dahn, however, is of a contrary opinion (\textit{Könige der Germanen}, v. 175, n. 6).

\textit{(Exp. Surrañëa}, vi. 158, 330; v. 162; \textit{Agüere-Catalani}, \textit{Collectio Maxima Conc. Hisp.} iii. 392, 554; \textit{Tejeda y Ramiro}, \textit{Colles. de Conc.} ii. 403.)

\textit{M. A. W.}
a life of rapine, for the most part hidden in the earth to provide against all contingencies, was forfeited to the crown.

Gregory's estimate of him is curious evidence of the desperate lawlessness of the times. Though himself the chronicler of all his crimes, it is his perjuring only which impressed him, and those apart, he admits that Guntram had good qualities (aliae sane bonus), though avaricious and greedy of others' goods. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. vii. 14, 26; v. 6.) In 584 the bishops of Aix and Arles (vii. 14, 32, 36; viii. 21, ix. 8, 10, 23; De Mirac. S. Martini, ii. 17; Epitomata, lxxx.; FREDEG. Chron. viii.; THIERRY, Récits des Temps mérovingiens, iii. iv.)

[S. A. B.]

GUNTRAMNUS (3) (GUNTCHRAMNUS, GUNTTRAMNUS, GUNTRAN), ST., king of Burgundy, son of Clotaire I., and Ingundis (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. 5). Upon his father's death in 561, Guntram's half-brother Chilperic seized the royal treasure at Braine, and entering Paris with the Franks, whose support it enabled him to purchase, endeavoured to usurp the government of the whole kingdom. Thereupon Guntram, Sigebert and Charibert, having united their forces, drove him out, and proceeded to make a judgment of the kingdom by lot. The lot fell to Guntram, who had been the share of his uncle Chlodomer, viz., the kingdom of Burgundy, which at this time extended from the Vosges to the Durance, and from the Alps to the Loire. (For the territories of the sons of Clotaire, see Bünne, Die Anfänge des Karoli- nischen Hauses, sub fn.) Orleans was his nominal capital, but in fact he made his ordinary residence at Clion-sur-Saône (iv. 21, 22). The external history of his reign, owing to his pacific and enterprising disposition, is uneventful. His wars were almost all defensive, and on one occasion only did he take the field in person. Upon Chilperic's death, about A.D. 567, his kingdom was distributed between the three surviving brothers, the city of Paris with its territory being divided equally among them, and a compact was entered into to the effect that entry into the city by any of them should be followed by the forfeiture of the offender's share, an agreement under which Guntram later on claimed his two brothers' portions (vii. 6, 14). Sigebert soon broke the peace by endeavouring to deprive Guntram of Arles, but his expedition was defeated and he lost Avignon to Guntram's generals, though it was restored to him again out of good faith (iv. 37). In 571, and the following year, the Lombards broke into France from Italy. On the former occasion Guntram's general, Amatus, was defeated and slain with a terrible massacre of his Burgundian army, but on their return the superior generalship of Mummolus triumphed, and the Lombards were annihilated or driven back across the Alps (iv. 42). About this time began the conflict between Sigebert and Chilperic, which only ended with the former's murder in 575. Guntram at first joined Sigebert, and through Mummolus recovered for him Tours and Poitiers, which Chilperic had wrongfully usurped (iv. 46). But he would gladly have held aloof altogether, and in 573 he assembled all the bishops of his realm at Paris, that they might decide upon the pretensions of the two brothers, but without avail, for they refused to listen (iv. 48). In 577, all his four sons having died he solemnly adopted Childebert, the infant son of Sigebert, and declared him his heir (v. 18). In 584 Chilperic was murdered, and at Fredegund's request Guntram went with a force to Paris, and protected her and her infant son, Clotaire II., against the nobles of Childerich's kingdom (vii. 5). Here too he undid some of the wrongs committed by Chilperic, restoring the property which his followers had taken, and reviving the wills of pious donors which had been annulled. In 585 he voluntarily relinquished Marseilles (vi. 46); he upheld his title, in spite of the remonstrances of Childerich, and the Austrasian nobles, to the part of Charibert's territory which had been inherited by Sigebert and Chilperic, on the ground that they had forfeited their shares by entering Paris (vii. 6, 12, 13, 14). In 584 Tours and Poitiers, which had formerly belonged to Sigebert, reverted from Guntram to Childebert, the former's son, but were speedily subdued, their territories being devastated by fire and sword (vii. 12, 13). In 585 Poitiers revolted again, and Guntram in person led an army against it, which pillaged, burned and murdered in the surrounding country till the city submitted. His soldiers afterwards pillaged Toulouse, though loyal (vii. 24). In 582 there had also been at Marseilles a pretender to a share in the kingdom of the Franks, in the person of Gundoald, a son of one of Clotaire's concubines, but disavowed by Clotaire himself. Induced by Guntram Beo and Mummolus, who had for some reason deserted Guntram, to leave Constantinople, where he had hitherto lived, on the solemn assurance that the nobles of Childerich's kingdom were eager to espouse his cause, he found himself, after a time, betrayed and plundered by those who had invited him, and after a hopeless struggle was treacherously murdered at Comminges in a.d. 585 (vii. 14, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38). At this time, induced perhaps by the need of an ally against Gundoald, Guntram restored to Childebert the territory he held which had formerly belonged to Sigebert, and again solemnly made him his heir (viii. 33). In 586 he sent an army against the Visigoths in Septimania, to avenge the injuries of Ingundis, his niece, and the death of her husband, St. Hermenegild, but the expedition, accompanied by more than the usual devastation and sacrilege, broke up and failed. Reprisals followed almost immediately in the invasion of the territory of Toulouse and Arles by Richardus Labeque, while Sigebert's son Chartrres was assigned to Guntram, while Massa., Sensalis, Tours, Poitiers, Arrancches, Aire,
Conseans, Bayonne, and Albi were given to Childebert. In the event of either dying without leaving a son, the other was to take the whole. As to the towns which had belonged to Galampha as a son or morgengabe, viz., Bordeaux, Limoges, his own seat at Tarbes, they were to be held by Guntram for life, and then belong to Brunehilda, except Cahors, which should become hers at once (ix. 20). About the same time he became involved in a war with Breton war on his borders, which though settled for the time broke out again later (ix. 18; x. 9). In 589 he sustained a severe defeat from the Goths at Campania, losing 5000 men (ix. 31). In 591, at Fredegund's request, he was present at the baptism of her son Clotaire II, and received him from the font. He died in 593, in the thirty-third year of his reign, on the 28th March, on which day the church commemorates him as a saint, and was buried in the monastery church of St. Marcellus, where the deacon had enjoined silence for the mass, Guntram turned to the people, and said, "I beseech you, men and women who are present, do not break your faith to me, but forbear to kill me as you killed my brothers. At least, let me live three years, that I may rear up the nephews whom I have adopted, lest mayhap, which God forbid, you perish together with those little ones when I am dead, and there is no strong man of our race to defend you" (vii. 8, cf. Michelet, Hist. de France, i. 231, "Ce bon homme semble chargé de la partie comique dans le drame terrible de l'histoire mérovingienne").

But on one occasion, at least, he had not the excuse of either rage or fear for his cruelty. His wife, Austrechilde, on her death-bed, expressed a wish that her two physicians should die with her, and though they were in no way responsible for her death, Guntram commanded their execution as she desired (v. 30).

On the other hand, the mere absence from wanton wrong-doing and aggression must be counted for a virtue in his family and age. For the crown ofOLUTE of the repugnance in favour of Austrechilde (Greg. Tur. iv. 25, v. 17). Upon Charibert's death he entertained the proposals of marriage made to him by his widow, Theudechilde. "Let her come without fear," said he, "and bring her treasure with her." But no sooner was she in his power than he appropriated her riches, and shut her up in a monastery at Arles, where she soon after died (iv. 26).

In the absence of provocation or panic he was mild, and even merciful, in temper, but on occasion he readily committed the barbarities of his age. The two brothers of the forsaken Marcarudis, who, in resentiment at their sister's injuries, spoke against her successor, were put to death, and their goods confiscated (v. 17). He did not hesitate to beat, imprison and torture the ambassadors of Gundovald, though one of them was an abbot, and Mummolus and the rest of the pretender's generals were put to death in breach of the condition of their surrender (vii. 25, 32, 38). His chamberlain, Chundo, being accused of killing a wild bull in one of the royal forests, was sentenced, despite his protestations of innocence, to the ordeal by combat, and when his champion fell at the same moment with his opponent, was tied to a stake, and stoned to death (x. 10).

The merest suspicion or accusation connected with his personal safety was sufficient to throw him into a panic, when torture was freely applied to obtain confessions. Assassination was the haunting fear of his life, and to guard against it he always wore a sword, and continually strengthened the escort by which he was attended everywhere, except in church (vii. 8, 14, viii. 11, 44). The murder of Chilpéric made a deep impression on him, and when Fredegund denounced Eberulfus as the assassin, he swore before his nobles that he would kill not only him but his posterity to the ninth generation, to stay this "appalling pest of killing princes" (vii. 21). Childerich's ambassadors played upon this fear, when they assured him to his face that "the axe which had dashed out his brother's brains had not lost its edge" (vii. 14).

His apprehension at times took an almost comic aspect. Gregory tells us that one Sunday at church in Paris, when the deacon had enjoined silence for the mass, Guntram turned to the people, and said, "I beseech you, men and women who are present, do not break your faith to me, but forbear to kill me as you killed my brothers. At least, let me live three years, that I may rear up the nephews whom I have adopted, lest mayhap, which God forbid, you perish together with those little ones when I am dead, and there is no strong man of our race to defend you" (vii. 8, cf. Michelet, Hist. de France, i. 231, "Ce bon homme semble chargé de la partie comique dans le drame terrible de l'histoire mérovingienne").

But on one occasion, at least, he had not the excuse of either rage or fear for his cruelty. His wife, Austrechilde, on her death-bed, expressed a wish that her two physicians should die with her, and though they were in no way responsible for her death, Guntram commanded their execution as she desired (v. 30).

On the other hand, the mere absence from wanton wrong-doing and aggression must be counted for a virtue in his family and age. For the crown of OLUTE of the repugnance in favour of Austrechilde (Greg. Tur. iv. 25, v. 17). Upon Charibert's death he entertained the proposals of marriage made to him by his widow, Theudechilde. "Let her come without fear," said he, "and bring her treasure with her." But no sooner was she in his power than he appropriated her riches, and shut her up in a monastery at Arles, where she soon after died (iv. 26).

In the absence of provocation or panic he was mild, and even merciful, in temper, but on occasion he readily committed the barbarities of his age. The two brothers of the forsaken Marcarudis, who, in resentiment at their sister's injuries, spoke against her successor, were put to death, and their goods confiscated (v. 17). He did not hesitate to beat, imprison and torture the ambassadors of Gundovald, though one of them was an abbot, and Mummolus and the rest of the pretender's generals were put to death in breach of the condition of their surrender (vii. 25, 32, 38). His chamberlain, Chundo, being accused of killing a wild bull in one of the royal forests, was sentenced, despite his protestations of innocence, to the ordeal by combat, and when his champion fell at the same moment with his opponent, was tied to a stake, and stoned to death (x. 10).
his attendance at all religious services, and especially by the freedom and condescension with which he ate, drank and conversed with them (vii 29; viii. 1-7, 9, 10; ix. 3, 20, 21; x. 29).

Gregory says, "You would have thought him a priest as well as a king" (ix. 21). "With priests he was like a priest," says Ps. 136:25 (Chron. i.), and "he showed himself humble to the priests of Christ," says Aminon (Hist. Franc. iii. 81, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 751). Chilperic once intercepted the letter of a bishop, in which it was written that the transition from Guntram's sway to his was like passing from paradise to hell (Greg. Tur. vi. 22).

In estimating Guntram's character, therefore, it must always be borne in mind that the authors on whom we depend for our information belong to this favoured class. Especially is this true in the case of Gregory of Tours, who was on very friendly terms with him (viii. 2-7, 13; ix. 20, 21) and goes so far as to ascribe miracles to his sanctity during his lifetime (ix. 21; cf. too Paulus Diaconus, de Gest. Langob. iii. 39, Migne, Patr. Lat. xcv. 535, and Aminon. iii. 3, Patr. Lat. cxxxix. 683).

There is extant an edict of Guntram addressed to the bishops and judges of his realm, commanding the observance of the Sabbath and holy days, in conformity with the canon of the second council of Mâcon. It is dated Nov. 10, 585, and is to be found in Mansi ix. 592, and in Boll. Acts SS. Max. iii. 720; cf. Hist. Litt. de la France, iii. 369, seq.

Several authors relate of Guntram the following story, which Valesius (Gest. Vct. Fr. lib. xv. 452) takes pains seriously to refute. One day, weary with hunting, he was resting on the bosom of his esquire by the bank of a rivulet, and the esquire saw a little reptile issue from his mouth and vainly attempt to cross the water. The esquire held his sword across, and the creature passed over upon it, returned and re-entered the king's mouth. Guntram awoke in agitation, and said he had been dreaming that he had crossed a great river by an iron bridge, and in a cavern beneath a mountain discovered a vast treasure. Advancing beyond the stream he came to the treasure, which he devoted to the service of the church. (Paul. Diacon. Gest. Langob. lib. iv. cap. 33; Almain, Monach. Floriac. lib. iii. cap. 2; Sigebert, Chron. ann. 585; Regino, Chron. in Pat. Lat. cxxxii. 31; Wendover, tom. i. p. 93, ed. Coke.)

[S. A. B.]

GUNTRAMNUS (2) (Guntharius), seventeenth archbishop of Tours following St. Baldus or Beudinus, and succeeded by St. Erminonius. Gregory says that he was a disciple of the monastery of St. Venantius in the same city, whence he was raised to the episcopate. Before his elevation he was a man of wisdom, and a trusted ambassador of the French kings, but after he became addicted to wine to such an extent that he grew stupid, and was unable to recognise his fellow-revelers, whom he cursed with abuse. He sat two years, ten months, and twenty-two days, circ. A.D. 552-554, and on his death was buried in the church of St. Martin. Gregory also relates the miraculous refusal of the bishop's horse to pass an oratory of St. Martin, where as a protomartyr he had been wont to pray, until the duty had been performed.

(Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. 4, 11. x. 31; De Glor. Confess. cap. viii.)

[S. A. B.]

GUNTRAMNUS (4) (Guntharius), 36th archbishop of Tours, succeeded Ido and followed by Ido. According to the Chronicon Taurinense Magnus (Salmon, Recueil de Chroniques de Tauraine, pp. 91-2), he sat from 730 to 743. He may be the bishop who is mentioned in the archbishopric of St. Martin's (Gall. Christ. xix. 32, 160).

[S. A. B.]

GUNTRUTA, daughter of Telepert, duke of the Bavarians, became the wife of Luitpold, king of the Lombards (713-744). Paulus Diaconus, vi. 43.

[A. H. D. A.]

GUNWALLUS, saint. [WINWALLUS]

GUODLOIUS, GUODOLIUS, suffragan bishop of Llandaff. [GWODELOW and GWYDDOLN]

GUOZBERTUS of Poitiers. [GAUBERTUS]

GURAM, the first of the race of the Bagratiad kings who ascended the throne of Georgia towards the end of the 6th century of our era. He was the adopted son of Stephen, last Georgian king of the house of the Sassanides. The dynasty of the Bagratiad kings is said to have been descended from David king of Israel, emblazoning on their arms the slings that served to kill Goliath. David's harp, a pair of scales as emblem of Solomon's wisdom, a crown which rested Solomon's head, our Lord's coat, and St. George slaying the dragon. All round this device were the verses: "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David: he will not turn from it: of the fruit of thy belly will I set upon thy throne" (Ps. xxxii. 11). Constantine Porphyrogenitus (de Administr. imp. cap. 45) tells us that the kings of Georgia are descended from the prophet David, and that they quitted Jerusalem about the year 500 of the Christian era. (Makan, Hist. of Georgian Church, p. 15.)

[G. T. S.]

GUREBERTUS of Reate. [GUERIBERTUS]

GURGEN king of Georgia, about the time of the emperor Justinian. He was persecuted by the Persians on account of his faith. (Mialis, Hist. of Georgian Ch. p. 81.)

[G. T. S.]

GURHEI, Welsh saint. [GWRHAL]

GURIAS, Nov. 15 (Cal. Byz.); in the Armenian Calendar, Nov. 14; presbyter and martyr with another presbyter, Samonas or Shamuna, in the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 306, at the city of Bodessa, where a magnificent church was raised to their memory, which the Mahometans afterwards turned into a mosque. Their acts were written by Arcatus, bishop of Cäsarea in the 6th century. The deacon Habubius is usually joined with them in commemoration, but he suffered some years after under Liciinian. (B. Menol.; Assesar. Mart. Orient. i. 226; Cureton, Anct. Syriac Docum. p. 72; Wright's Sgr. Mart.) [G. T. S.]

GURMAET, ST., a companion of St. Teilo after his return from Brittany to Wales, and the saint of a church corresponding to Llandeily Fan, in Brecknock, which was bestowed by Rhysderch, king of Wales, on the bishopric of Llandaff. It is called Langurueset in the great.
GURNERTH (C. W. B.)

GURNERTH [Gurneth]

GURNIN (Gurnin), virgin daughter of Cughneala or Conghil, is commemorated in Mart. Domus. and Mart. Tall. on Feb. 22, and is given as Gurninna among the Præternomina of the Bollandists. (Acta SS. 22 Feb. iii. 280; O’Hanlon, Irish Saints, ii. 670.) [J. G.]

GURNEUE (Gurnue, Gurnue), bishop of Menevia about the beginning of the 9th century. (Giraldus Cambr. H. Kambri. ii. c. i. wks. vi. 105; Stubbs, Reg. Sac. Angl. 155; Godwin, de Praecl. Angl. 692.) [J. G.]

GURON, ST., a hermit, probably Irish, who had settled at Bodmin, in Cornwall, before the arrival of St. Petrock from Ireland. (Leland, Collect. i. 75.) William of Worcester (p. 107) says, “St. Woronus confessor die 7 Aprilis.” A chapel is dedicated to him in St. John’s parish on the part of Cornwall which projects out into Plymouth Sound. The parish of Gorran is on Menagissey Bay further west, and the episcopal estate there is called Polgarran. See Dugdale’s Monasticon, i. 213. [C. W. B.]

GURYVALUS (Gudval, Gurrval), ST., said to have been one of the early bishops of St. Malo in the first half of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 995.) [S. A. B.]

GURVAN, bishop of Menevia. [Gurnue.]

GUTARD (Guttardus), the thirteenth abbot of St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, who ruled according to the Chronologia Augustinensis, from 787 to 803. (Elmham, pp. 12, 13, 335, 340.) According to the Canterbury historians, he was blessed by archbishop Jaemberth. (Thorn, c. 1. 75; Elmham. p. 335.) Although he was abbot during a most stirring period of Kentish history, nothing is recorded of his acts. [S.]

GUTHAGHON, commemorated July 3; according to tradition a Scott-Irish prince, who was the brother of Magra, and his servant on occasion Ghillo [Ghillo], into Flanders, and, after a life of penitence and piety at Oosterkerk, near Bruges, died there in the year 299, aged fifty-one, according to Dempster. (Usher, Brit. Ecl. Anc. c. 16, wks. vi. 314–16; Dempster, Hist. Ecl. Gent. Scot. i. 314–15; Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, July 3, p. 97; Butler, Lives of the Saints, July 3, Bp. Forbes, Kgl. Scott. Saints, 204, 213.) [J. G.]

GUTHLAG, ST., presbyter and hermit of Crowland or Croyland (609–714). He is known through a Latin Life by Felix, whose information was derived from the saint’s intimate associates, the abbot Wilfrid and the presbyters Cissa (§ 2) and Bettelin (§ 35). It has been printed with notes and comments by the Bollandists (Acta SS. 11 Apr. ii. 37) and by Mabillon (Acta SS. 2, B. iii. 256 or 263). A free Anglo-Saxon version from the Latin was made at some period unknown, and manuscript executed, it is believed, soon after the conquest. This version was edited in 1848 with an English translation by Mr. C. W. Goodwin.

Felix must have written about thirty-four years after Guthlac’s death, since he dedicated his Life of Ethelwald king of the East-Anges (747–749). The work is thus of much interest, as it carries on Anglo-Saxon historical literature a step in immediate succession to Bede. Bede’s Life of Cuthbert, Felix’s Life of Guthlac, were long regarded as companion memoirs of early English saints. In one respect Felix’s memoir is even of more interest than Bede’s, as containing much less of the marvellous in its details, and giving more reality to the saint. It is not known who Felix was. Of course he could not have been the bishop of Dunwich, which some have called him. He says of himself that he is a domestic (vernacularus) of a “catholic congregation,” the latter phrase apparently indicating a monastery which adhered to Roman usage in a period when Roman and Celtic rivalries were yet in memory and possibly still alive. “Vernacularus” might further import that he was bred on the estate of the monastery, like Bede at Jarrow, or was of foster child of the monks, and perhaps his Latin name from the monks. An unsupported reading in one manuscript makes him a monk of Jarrow. The objection to assigning him to Crowland is that Ethelwald was his lord and Crowland was a Mercian house. It is more natural to suppose that he was a monk somewhere in East Anglia, in which kingdom there had then been founded the monasteries of Coberhure, Betrichesworth, Soham, and Ely.

Guthlac’s father Penwall or Penwald, who resided among the Middle Angles, was descended from the Icings, a noble race of Mercia, and belonged to the tribe of the Guthlacings, after whom the son was called (§ 8). His mother Tecta or Tetta also belonged to a family of rank. The birth of their son is not dated. Felix interprets the name Guthlac as meaning bello-souvere, an augury of the reward he was to obtain for contending against evil. A later interpretation (Capgrave’s) is bello-bonnin in the sense of bonum donum. Godlac has been suggested as the modern representative of the name, Guthlac was located in Julian Abbey. His early life, however, was in a series of adventures, with the ambition of rivaling the heroes of ancient story, and taking up the profession of arms he collected a band of followers, at whose head he “wreaked his grudges on his enemies, burned their city, ravaged their towns, and wildly through the land made much slaughter, and took from men their goods” (Godlac. p. 15). The biographer seems to exaggerate the exploits, but he evidently does not regard Guthlac as a brigand, for he notes that “by a divine admonition” he restored to the vanquished one-third of the spoil. In another place (Felix, § 20) it is incidentally stated that Guthlac had once lived in exile among the Britons, and had learned their tongue. His enemies were called his persecutors. It may be supposed then that his hostilities were undertaken against the hereditary British foe, from whom the lands of his family or tribe had received special wrong. The case of Hereric appears to have been somewhat parallel. After eight or nine years thus spent, Guthlac suddenly one night, in a fit of reflection, and apparently with a presentiment that his life would not prove a long one, resolved to devote the rest of his days to religion. Promptly in the morning, having signed himself
with the cross, he bade adieu to his comrades and repaired to the monastery of Repton in the Middle Angles. The little that is known of Repton during the heptarchal period is almost all contained in the pages of Felix. It is in Guthlac's Life we become aware of the existence of the house, and learn the names of two of its abbesses (Mont. Angl. vi. 429). The burial of the etheling Cynehard at Repton in 755 rests solely upon the statement of Rudborne (Angl. Soc. i. 198) against every other authority. The lady presiding over Repton was Eolfried or Ecildyrhynna [Erfrieda (1)], and under her Guthlac receives St. Peter's tonsure. Repton was a "Catholic congregation," as Felix elsewhere (§ 15) expressly calls it. Guthlac was then in his twenty-fourth year (§ 11 fin.). Florence of Worcester (in M. H. B. 539 n) records the date as 697, so that 674 is the computed year of Guthlac's birth. This is the year before Ethelred became king of Mercia, whereas Felix in opening his story within the reign of Ethelred appears to contradict him. Felix, however, knew that the time was ignorant of the precise time, or he would have recorded it; for when he thought he knew a date, that of his saint's death, he gave it; the period of his birth he wraps up in vague and general language. The discipline of Repton under abbess Erfrieda is illustrated by the unpopularity which Guthlac incurred by abstaining from strong drink (§ 12). After a time, however, his worth was discerned, and he became a favourite. He was then in his manly prime, tall and handsome, modest, patient, wise, chaste, and "with divine love burning in his soul" (§ 12). The lives of early solitaries were recited at Repton, and they made Guthlac ardent for a new adventure in imitation of them. Guthbert's life at Farne island (civ. 679-688) might have helped to kindle the enthusiasm, though Bede's account of it was not then written, Bede being a young man of Guthlac's own age. In two years he had learnt the psalms, canticles, hymns, and prayers after the ecclesiastical order, and thus spiritually equipped, with the sanction of the elders he departed from Repton (§ 13). The one spot named from which his route can be ascertained is Grunte, Granta, or Grantchester (§ 13, 21, 22). The Remonstrance of the Roman road from Repton, then Watling Street, and Icknield Street, would have brought him into that neighbourhood. At Grantchester he found himself near the border of the great fen country, which Felix describes as stretching far to the north, with a black pool of water, now foul running streams, many islands also, and reeds, and hillocks, and thickets, with manifold windings and lanes. The inhabitants of Grantchester, Guthlac heard of Crowland, the most desolate island of the waste, and known to very few besides Tatwine himself. Crowland therefore he resolved to reach, with Tatwine for a guide. We know that they embarked in a fishing skiff, but again the route is left to conjecture. They could, however, have dropped down the Cam in the direction of Ely monastery, then up the Ouse to Ely, then up the Erse to Crowland, and at the threshold of a long northerly stretch of true fen occupying east Huntingdonshire. Pursuing that direction, and thus skirting the western edge of the great marsh land, they could doubtless have threaded their way through streams and pools and meres up to Medeshamstead (Peterborough), and then gain the Nene, which would carry them to Crowland in the extreme south of Lincolnshire. The charter of the foundation of Crowland abbey dated 710 (Hist. Angl. Gale, i. 5; Kemble, C. D. 86; Gough, Hist. Croyl. 1783, p. 4, app. p. 1) is authentic, but its delimitation of the ground used not be rejected. Here we find the island extending four "leucas" by three and bounded by the Shephees on the east, the Nene on the west, Asendyke on the north, Southoe on the south. These waters but partially survive in the modern map of the locality. Gough, who describes (at sight) the original estate of Crowland Abbey as extending about 8 "miliaria" by 5, places Asendyke on the east, and calls it a fossa, an artificial work, which indeed its name implies. Roman engineers had by no means in their day neglected the drainage and embankment of the fen country. Guthlac's Crowland must have been a wilder one than that of Camden's days, when it was described as lying in the midst of pools and waters stagnating off muddy lands, so shut in and environed as to be inaccessible on all sides except the north and east, and that only by narrow causeways (Camd. Brit. ed. Gough, ii. 224). Guthlac certainly found no causeway; the spot was accessible by water only, and the language of Felix, "umbrosa nemora" (§ 14), "infer nobilissos locus" (§ 15), suggest nothing better than a marsh jungle. A few days were spent in examining the capabilities of the spot, and Guthlac then went back to take final leave of Repton. In ninety days he returned, bringing with him two youths as servants, and arrived once more at Crowland on Aug. 24, the day of St. Bartholomew, Guthlac's chosen saint (§ 15).

For a Christian station Crowland was an advanced post into an unoccupied tract. Its monastic neighbour was Medeshamstead, about twelve miles in the west, while southwards, nearer to him, on the spot where Thorney Abbey afterwards rose, was Ancarig, a hermit settlement like his own, planted by Medeshamste (Mont. Angl. ii. 595); but neither Medeshamste nor Ancarig, nor yet Ely, are named by Felix. As he looked northwards into Lincolnshire Guthlac, the Roman road parallel to Lincoln, upon which line there lay Bardney and Partney eastward towards the sea. Beyond Lincoln there was only Barwe, somewhere by the Humber. It has been conjectured, however, with much plausibility (M. H. B. 1000; C. H. Pearson, Hist Maps of Engl. p. 69), that the minster built by St. Botolph in 654 (A. S. C. a. n.) was Boston or Botolphstone, as this minster was said to have been, as far as can now be known, Guthlac's nearest neighbour in Lincolnshire.

In a cistern-like hollow (§ 16), upon the slope of a hillock thrown up in earlier times by diggers for hidden treasure, as Felix supposed, but more probably one of those ancient British barrows which are not uncommon in those parts (cf. Stukeley, Azim Caries. p. 5, ed. 1776). Guthlac made a dell illing half a mile long, and with the skins, and at sunset he took his single daily meal of barley-bread and water (§ 16). A man of his energy and resource would soon have made this spot habitable and productive. The worst hardships of his lot were those horrors which solitary
GUTHLAC, ST.

everywhere have experienced—temptations, the consciousness of sin, and an imagination haunted by demons. His temptations were to an excessive rigour. Stings of conscience, which had not driven him into solitude, came to him there (§ 17). But his fame more particularly rested on his conflict with demon powers, which caused him to be represented in medievial art in the form of a monk wielding a scourge with a dragon or evil spirit at his feet (Parker, Angl. Ch. Cat. p. 242, engrav.). Felix describes how in the stillness of the night his tormentors would flock about him, with their great heads, long necks, loose vales, squint eyes, round ears, ugly faces, horse teeth, grating voices, crooked shanks, big knees (§ 19). One night he heard the accursed host speaking in the British tongue, for, adds Felix, many were the conflicts between the British and Mercians in those days when Coenred was king (§ 20). Was it that Guthlac's memory was haunted with the British and his warlike days? Or were the fens themselves held by a British remnant reduced by malaria to types of demonical ugliness? The devils of Crowland, as they have been called, were misshapen humanity to the view, wild cattle to the ear, and the natural tenants of those desolate swamps could not dispel his imagination with both. That he once, after a night's hard conflict with the enemy of mankind, had a waking view in the morning watch of St. Bartholomew in his celestial splendour, is one of the embellishments of Felix's story. The relief he really found was described by himself in his last illness, when Beccel begged to know who that invisible being was that had been his master, conversing every night and morning. "The second year after I dwelt in this wilderness," replied Guthlac, "at even and at daybreak God himself sent His angel of my comfort to me, who opened to me the heavenly mysteries which it is not lawful for man to tell, and the hardness of my conflict he quite softened with heavenly angelic help." (§ 35). This may be taken as a description of his daily devotional hours and the alleviation he found in them. But in addition to solitary prayer there before long commenced an intercourse with the outer world (§ 31), which must have rendered life more interesting to him and more tolerable. Guthlac was not one of the class that sought absolute isolation. A distinction has been drawn between an anchorite who lived so and a hermit, according to which view Guthlac was a hermit. Felix uses this word of him (§ 17; cap. 2, heading); but he also calls Guthlac's companion Egbert an anchoret (§ 35, p. 49 e). Some later writers call Guthlac hermit (Hen. Hunt, Matt. West, Jo. Timnouth in Smith's Catalogue at infra); the Anglo-Saxon uses the word "ereman" (Goodw. 87); others style him anchoret (Orderic, Flor. Wig., Sim. Dun, Higden). Whether hermit or anchoret, Guthlac was none the less a missionary; but instead of itinerating to seek a flock, he attracted one to his own ground and taught them there, for prophets of the desert have always drawn out crowds. Guthlac's domain was ample for their entertainment, and an incidental mention of "harvest" implies that he and his two Repont servants, and Tatwine, and Beccel, and Cissa, and Egbert, as they successively joined him, were no idlers. Occupying their several cots, they gave the island a home-like and a farm-like appearance, and became the pioneers of a larger settlement. The island had its one entrance from the river, and its stated landing-place, where a recognised signal-sound brought Guthlac down to receive his visitors (§§ 26, 27). These visitors were "men of divers conditions, nobles, bishops, abbots, poor, rich, from Mercia and all Britain" (Goodw. 67). Among the visitors came his bishop, Hedda of Lichfield, and accompanying him was Wigfrith, a man of books and learning. Wigfrith had "long dwelt among the Scyths," and had his doubts whether Guthlac were a true man of God or a pretender. While they were conversing together, Guthlac shewed himself so mighty in the Scriptures that the bishop urged him to accept of holy orders, and Guthlac was ordained a priest. The year of this occurrence is not mentioned, but it was five days before St. Bartholomew's day. "The hallowing of the island of Crowland and also of the blessed man Guthlac took place at harvest time" (§ 32; Goodw. 75). Crowland, which had always been shunned as demon-haunted (§ 14), had now its priest, its chapel and its altar (§ 35); the bad spell was broken, the island was under the church's wing, and Guthlac's cell was the meeting place of men not only. Instead of demonical human shapes were flocks of human pilgrims, and the demons were dispossessed (§ 27); instead of demon sounds distracting his devotions were swallows singing on his shoulders or nestling in his bosom as he turned the page of holy writ. "Who hath led his life after God's will," remarked Guthlac to one of his visitors, "the wild beasts and wild birds have become more intimate with him, and the man who will pass his life apart from worldly men, to him the angels approach nearer" (§ 25; Goodw. 53). The visitor to whom this was said was the abbot Wilfrid, "a venerable brother, who had been of old united with him in spiritual friendship" (§§ 2, 23), and Holy Scripture is mentioned in the context (Goodw. 87) of their conversation (§ 29). Of what monastery Wilfrid was abbot Felix does not say. His Hollinder edition suggests Medeshemestede or Bardney. Their intimacy was evidently close and of long standing. It was from Wilfrid that Felix obtained material for his memoir. Wilfrid introduced another important visitor, Ethelbald the exiled heir of Mercia. This nobleman, then persecuted and hunted by king Coeled (§ 34), frequently retired to Crowland, where he found both security and sympathy. Guthlac predicted his ultimate succession, and one of Ethelbald's earliest acts after becoming king was the foundation of the monastery at Crowland. The supposed gift of prophecy gained Guthlac much credit; and he was thought besides to have the faculty of revealing the secret. It was in vain that two brethren "from a certain monastery" had hidden their flasks under the turf before landing on the island (§ 30) and two others who had been carousing at a widow's house found themselves in confusion before him (§ 29). Guthlac's connexion with Repton was never completely broken until his death, and hardly even then. Another abbes, Eggburgh [Eadburga (3)], daughter of king Aldulf, sent him a leaden sarcophagus and a linen winding-sheet, requesting to know whom he should designate as his suc-
GUTHMUND, a Kentish priest, who attests a charter of Archbishop Wulfred, dated April 21, 811. (Kemble, C. D. 193.)

GUTTARDUS, abbat. [GUTTARD.]

GUTHAARD, a Mercian abbot who attests a charter of 777 granted by Offa to Abred the waldorman of the Hwiccii (Kemble, C. D. 131; Mon. Angl. l. 587). The same charter is printed by Hickes, Thesaurus, i. 171, with the date 775. Kemble's date, however, is right. It is just possible, supposing the chronology of the abbots of St. Augustine's to be erroneous, that, as Kest had fallen under the rule of Offa in 774, the person here denoted may be identical with Guttard, abbot of St. Augustine's. [GUTTARD.]

GUYNLEEU, Welsh saint. [GWYNLEEU.]

GUYNNAUC, GWYNNAUW, Welsh saint. [GWYNNAUW.]

GWAEDNERTH (GUAEDNERTH, GULDNERT), called king, in reality prince or chieftain, of Glamorgan, in the 7th century. He killed his brother Merchon in a contest for the chieftaincy, and was excommunicated for three years by bishop Oudocers of Llandaff; in addition he was directed to go on pilgrimage for a year to the archbishop of Cornouaille, Britany, who was also a Welshman. But as Gwaednerth returned within the year, Berthgwyn, who had succeeded Oudocers, refused absolution. On the earliest extant history, however, of kings of Mercant and Gwaednerth with many elders, and a solemn promise by the latter that he would make satisfaction with alms, fasting, and prayers, he was duly absolved, and gave to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff, as satisfaction for his sin, Llan Catgulas or Llangadwaladr, now Bishton or Bishopston, near Caerleon, co. Monmouth. (Wilkins, Cosali, l. 18; Lodo. Brit. by Rees, 450—2.) [G.]

GWALCHES, named with Barrow, Barrow, or Barroccus, as accompanying St. Cadoc from the island of Echii, now the Holmes, to the island of Barry; he was buried on the island of Echii, and the stone found in Flatholme, off the coast of Glamorgan, in the Bristol Channel, and marked with a plain cross, may perhaps have marked his grave. [BARCHUS. (Rees, Cambro-Brit. 357; Cressey, Ch. Hist. Brit. xxi. c. 18; New, Welsh Saints, 304.)

GWALCHMAI, son of Gwyar, one of the heroes of the Arthurian cycle, better known under the name of Gawaine, which comes from the Latinized forms Galvagius and Walwyn. He is called one of the four sons of King Lot of Lothian and of Orkney, and of Morgaw, Arthur's sister, and is the type of courtesy, just as Arthur was the type of valour. The name is William of Malmesbury (iii. § 287) says that in 1086 the tomb of Walwyo was discovered on the sea-shore in a certain province of Wales called Ross; still known by the same name in Pembroke, where there is a district called in
GWALLONIR

Welsh Castell Gwalchmai, and in English Wallwyn's Castle. The pedigree runs thus:

Cynwarth, son of Maelchon

Augwaelus | Urtan | Lot

Gwen | Gwalw

See Geoffrey of Monmouth, ix. 9, 11, xi. 1, and Guest's Moningion, ii. 122. Geoffrey says "Wall-wynus filius Lot duodecim annorum juvenis, obsequio Sulpicii papae ab avunculo traditus, a quo arma recepta." By Sulpicius may be meant Simplicius. [C. W. B.]

GWALLONIR, clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff, Trychyn and Cadwared being the bishops. (Llib. Landav. by Rees, 455-66.) [I. G.]

GWARDOGWY (Gwroddogwy) (1), disciple of St. Dubricius, and clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff in the time of bishops Dubricius and Teilo (Llib. Landav. by Rees, 318 sq. 359-9).

(2) Abbatt of Llandedu. [Gwroddog (1).] [I. G.]

GWARAFEU. [Gwrefawy.]

GWAROG, saint. [Winwallus.]

GWARTHAN, Welsh saint, son of Dunawd. Dunawd or Dinawd assisted in establishing the famous monastery or college at Bangor Iscoed, Flintshire, in the 6th century. [Dinuth.] (Rees, Welsh Saints, 103, 206, 260.) [I. G.]

GWABR, daughter or granddaughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog, wife of Elidyr Lydianw, and mother of the celebrated bard, Llywarch Hen; she is classed among the Welsh saints of the 5th century, and Rees (Cambro-Brit. Saints, 605 sq.) suggests that she may be the same as Gwendiwyd and Goleuuddyd. (Myv. Arch. ii. 43; Rees, Welsh Saints, 147; Camb. Quart. Mag. iv. 368, n.1; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 600, 605 sq.) [I. G.]

GWAREDDYDD (Gwendiwyd), daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog in the fifth century, wife of Cadell Deyrallug, and ancestor of many Welsh saints; she was buried at Towy or Tywyn, co. Merioneth. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 137, 148, 161; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 600; Williams, Ewain. Welsh. 191.) [I. G.]

GWDDIDIN, Welsh saint of the fifth century, patron of Llanwddyn, on the borders of Montgomeryshire and Denbighshire. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 145, 339.) [I. G.]

GWEITH, clerical witness to the grant of Treliech, Monmouthshire, to bishop Trychyn and the see of Llandaff, about the beginning of the 7th century. (Llib. Landav. by Rees, 452, 453.) [I. G.]

GWELVARCH. [Gweddarch.]

GWEN (1), wife of Brychan, Brachan, or Frachan, and mother of St. Winwaleo, in Armorica where she and her husband went from Wales, and were accounted saints. Malebrancha (Cressy, Ch. Hist. Brit. ii. c. 10) translates her name Alba. (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 606.) [I. G.]

GWEN (2), ST., granddaughter of Brychan, in the 5th century. "She founded the church of Talgarth, in Brecon, where she is said to have been murdered by the pagan Saxons. She is also called Gwendeline. (Myv. Arch. ii. 44; Rees, Welsh Saints, 150; Williams, Loso JINS. 320.) [C. W. B.]


GWEN (4), Welsh saint. [Gwenghroban.]

GWENAFWY (Gwennawy), Welsh saint, daughter of Carw, but without church dedication. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 260.) [J. G.]

GWENAN, Welsh saint. [Gwinygo.]

GWENASETH, Welsh saint, daughter of Rhunob ab Cunedda Wledig, and wife of Pabo Post Prydain. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 111, 186 sq. 265.)

GWENODYDD, Welsh saint, supposed to be the same as Gwarodydd (Rees, Welsh Saints, 149). [Gwendiwyd.] [J. G.]

GWENDIDELINE, Welsh saint. [Gwen (2).]

GWENDOLEU (Gwendolau), son of Ceidio ab Garthwy, was educated with his brothers, Cor and Nudd, at St. Illtyd's College, Llantwit Major, and the three are numbered with the Welsh saints. He was a distinguished chieftain of North Britain, and in the Trials is called one of the "bulls of battle of the island of Prydain;" he was patron of the bard Myrddin the Caledonian, and fell in the battle of Arthrydd, A.D. 577. (Myv. Arch. 4, 7, 60, 70; Rees, Welsh Saints, 103, 206.) [J. U.]

GWENFAEN, ST., a daughter of Paul Hen, in the 6th century. She was the foundress of Rhoscyn in Anglesey, anciently called Llanwvymyn. Her festival is Nov. 5. (T. Rees, Welsh Saints, 237.) [C. W. B.]

GWENFREWI, Welsh saint. [Winfrew.]

GWENFYL, ST., a daughter or descendant of Brychan in the sixth century. She founded a chapel called Capel Gwennyl, now extinct, subject to Llundedd Brefi, in Cardigan. Her feast day is Nov. 1. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 153.)

GWENGAD is associated with bishop Odocus, the abbots of Llanercha, Docnani or Docnani, and Llanllyfyr, and other clerics, as witnesses to the restoration of Lannamorgau (now Bishopston or Llan-dello-Vernalt, co. Glamorgan), by Morgan, king of Glamorgan, to the see of Llandaff, and to the grant of Llewes, to king Meurig to bishop Odocus and the same see. He is in the first called "prince of Lancynuwr" (now Llangunnor, co. Carmarthen), and in the second "prince of Penaly" (now Penally, co. Pembroke). As distinct from abbat he must have been corb or eirenach, and he flourished in the 6th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 387, 388, 392, 393.) [J. G.]

GWENGALEU, clerical witness to a grant by king Rhys ab Ithel to bishop Cadwared (Catgware) and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 465.) [J. G.]
GWENABWY, disciple of St. Dubricius, and clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff in the time of bishops Dubricius and Comerog; but it was probably another Gwenabwy who was witness in the time of bishop Cadwar (Catgwar). (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 321, 324, 411-12, 460.)

GWERYDD, ST., a Welsh saint of the 6th century, who founded the church of Llannerwyd in Glamorgan, which is now called St. Doas. (R. Williams, Emwolion Cyrmru, 195.)

GWESLAN, Welsh bishop. [GENTILANUS.]

GWHARAFEU (GWRAFEU), clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaf, under bishops Trychan and Cadwar (Catgwar), or more probably different persons under the two prelates. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 455, 463.)

GWINEAR, ST. [FINGAR.]

GWINOCUS, Welsh saint. [GWYNOGL.]

GWILADUS (GWILADIS, GWILDAUS, GWILDA, GWILADUS), called daughter, but more probably granddaughter of Brychan, of Brycheiniog, if not the daughter of another Brychan, who went to Armorica, and was father of St. Winwale. (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 606.) She was wife of Gwyllwyn Filwr, mother of St. Cadoc (Cattwg), and flourished about the middle of the 6th century. (Myr. Arch. ii. 43; Rees, Welsh Saints, 157, 146, 170.)

GWLECED, clerical witness to grant of Merthyr Tyced (probably Llandegwedd, co. Monmouth) to bishop Trychan and the see of Llandaff, about the beginning of the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 452.)

GWYMN, disciple of St. Dubricius at Hatland, co. Hereford, in the study of divine and human wisdom. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 324.)

GWYNFYW (GWYNFYW), reader, clerical witness to grants to bishop Berthwyn and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 430-2, 438.)

GWYNNOG, Welsh saint. [GWYNOGL.]

GWYNNFYW, reader. [GWYNYW.]

GWYODLOEW, GWYODLOHW (GWOLDO, GWODOLIN, GWYDDOLIN), son of Gwyddyn Ceri ab Gwyddyn Filwr, was first a teacher at St. Cadoc's school at Llanlcarvan, and then becomes suffragan bishop of Llandaff, standing in the deeds of grants as Gwyddyn. With Gwyddyn, his father, he founded Coedkernew, co. Monmouth, and flourished in the 6th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 415, 623; Godwin, de Præsenul. Angl. 923; Stubbs, Reg. Sacer. Angl. 158.) But Rees (Welsh Saints, 114, 208) is of opinion that Gudofin, bishop of Llandaff, must have lived at an age too late for being the son of Gwyddyn Ceri, and perhaps belonged to the end of the 8th century.

GWORAFWY. [GWRIAFWY.]

GWORDOG (GWROG, GWRODDGW, GWRODDGWY). (I) Abbot of Llantwni (now Dewstow, near Chepstow) and witness to several grants made to the see of Llandaff in the time of bishops
GWRODG

GWRODG (2), Disciple of St. Dubricius. [GWRODGOWY (1).]

GWORFAN (GORFAN), disciple of St. Dubricius, and clerical witness to grant to St. Dubricius and the see of Landaff in the 5th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 314 sqq., 324.)

GWORGAELD, clerical witness to grant to bishop Trychyan and the see of Llandaff early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 454, 455.)

GWORGENEU, clerical witness to the grant of Llewes, co. Radnor, to bishop Oudocesus and the see of Llandaff in the 5th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 392, 393.)

GWORGYFIETH, clerical witness to the grant of some villages to bishop Trychyan, and the see of Llandaff early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 456.)

GWORMOI, clerical witness to the grant of Llan Garth by king Iddon to bishop Teilo and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 358, 359.)

GWORFYDD, clerical witness to grant of Meithyr Cittawg (now Codicor, co. Hereford) to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff by Ithel, son of Morgan, king of Gweysig, with the consent and approbation of his heirs and heirs' heirs, all named. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 446-448.)

GWRAFUE, GWRAFWY. [GWRAWFY.

GWRCIEWID, clerical witness to grant to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff in the 6th or early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 435, 436.)

GWRRDELW, GWRRDDLY, Welsh saint, son of Caw, flourished early in the 6th century, and is said to have had a church at Caerleon upon Usk. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 231; Williams, Emin. Welsh, 198.) There is no feast day assigned to him.

GWRFARWY, of Lennineison, clerical witness to grants of a number of churches by king Athwys to bishop Comereg and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 411, 412.)

GWRFOWD, clerical witness to grants to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 428, 442.)

GWRFWY, clerical witness to the grant of Porthcasseg, near Chepstow, to bishop Oudocesus and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 393-4.)

GWRFYW (GORFTW, GORYTYW, GRYTVW), Welsh saint of the 6th century, son of Pasgen ab Urian Eheged, seems to have had a church dedicated to him in Anglesey, and a "cafel Gorfwy" in Bangor uchw Conwy, co. Carnarvon. (Myth. Arch. ii. 45; Rees, Welsh Saints, 103, 280.) His feast day is not mentioned.

GWROGI (1), clerical witness to a grant of the village of Bertus by Ithel, king of Gweysig, to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff, late in the 6th or early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 440, 441.)

GWROGI (2) Gwrgi and Peredur, sons of Elifer Gosgorddawr, were trained at St. Illtyd's college, but in the Welsh Triads appear as warriors, being at the head of one of the "three disloyal households" of the "island of Prydain," the last to desert their leaders; that of Gwrgi and Peredur, on the eve of the battle with the Saxon Ida at Caer Grau, did so, and allowed them both to be slain, a.d. 584. (Myth. Arch. ii. 13, 70, 80; Rees, Welsh Saints, 103; Skene, Four Anc. Books of Wales, ii. 455; E. Williams, Iolo MSS. 390, 654; R. Williams, Emin. Welsh, 199.)

GWROGON, daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog, and wife of Cadoc Cadchwydd, who flourished about a.d. 430. (Myth. Arch. ii. 44; Rees, Welsh Saints, 147.) She was also called Gwrgon Godden, and was abused by Trawed Faglaw, a chief of one of the "three strong-crowned ones of the island of Prydain." (Myth. Arch. ii. 5; Skene, Coll. Scot. i. 160, n.)

GWROGYNUF, clerical witness to grant of In-pan by Gwchein ab Gwywyn to Gwyddela (Gwenloch) and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 415.)

GWROHAEBEU, clerical witness to grant to bishop Trychyan and the see of Llandaff in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 453, 454.)

GWROHAFAFL, GWROHAFARN, abbot of Llanilltyd (Llaethit Majoor, co. Glamorgan) and witness to many grants to the see of Llandaff during the episcopate of Oudocus, Trychyan, and Berthgwyn (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 347, 348 et al. ad p. 450). Another Gwrohafl appears as clerical witness in the time of bishop Cadwrod (64, 465).

GWROHAFWY (GWROHAFAF, GWROHAFWY, GWROHAFUW), clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff under bishops Trychyan and Cadwrod (Caergwent). (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 451-463.)

GWROHAI (1) (GWRIHEL, GWREHII), Welsh saint early in the 6th century, son of Caw, and founder of the church of Perynystawd in Arwysili, Montgomeryshire. (Myth. Arch. ii. 29, 43; Rees, Welsh Saints, 231; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 597, 598; Williams, Emin. Welsh, 199, adding that he was a member of the college of Deiniol.)

GWROHAI (2), son of Clywys and uncle of St. Cadoc. He ruled over Gurild or Gorwennwy, a district probably co-extensive with the deanery of Gromesh, Glamorganshire (Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 310, and notes), and was witness to a grant to bishop Arwysili and the see of Llandaff (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 413.)

GWROHAL, clerical witness to grant of Llan Garth (probably Llanarth, co. Monmouth), by king Iddon to bishop Teilo and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 358-9.)

GWREHEL, Welsh saint. [GWRAWEL.]
GWRHIR, the bard of St. Tello, was a saint of the college of St. Cattwg (Cadoc), who lived in the 6th century. He founded the church of Llŷnysfaen, in Glamorgan. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 251.)

[C. W. B.]

GWRHYDPENNI, clerical witness to grants to bishop Comereg and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 411–12.)

[J. G.]

GWRIN, Welsh saint, founder of Llanwri, co. Montgomery; he was son of Cynddilig ab Nwython ab Gildas, and belongs to the 6th century (Williams, Emin. Welsh, 200) or more probably to the middle of the 7th, if he is to be accounted third in the line of descent from Gildas.

[J. G.]

GWRMAEL, Welsh saint of 4th century, son of Cadfwrod ab Cadfan. His feast day is unknown, and no church is known to have been dedicated to him. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 89, 102; Williams, Emin. Welsh, 200.)

[J. G.]

GWRMAET, disciple of SS. Dubricius and Tello. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 351, 352.) Languruet in Brecon belonged to the see of Llandaff. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 248.)

[J. G.]

GWRNERTH, ST., a Welsh saint of the 6th century. A religious dialogue, in verse, between him and his father, Llewellyn of Welshpool, said to be by St. Tysilio, is preserved. His day is April 7. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 279.)

[C. W. B.]

GWRON, clerical witness to grant by Ffernwael, king of Glamorgan, “before the seniors of Gwent and Ergyny,” to bishop Trychan and the see of Llandaff, early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 451, 452.)

[G. J.]

GWRTHAFAR, abbat of Llanillydd (Llanwit Major, Glamorganshire), and witness to grant of Llan Oudocoi (Llandogo, co. Monmouth?) by Morgan, king of Glevysig, to bishop Oudocoeus and the see of Llandaff, in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 400.)

[G. J.]

GWRTHHEVYR (surnamed Vendigaid, the blessed) better known as Vortimer, son of Vogrtim, who for a short time headed the Britons on the deposition of Vortigern, but was poisoned by his Saxon stepmother Rhonwen about A.D. 465. In the Triads he is called one of the “three canonized kings of Britain,” and, as he was not an ecclesiastic, he was honoured with this title, it is thought by Rees, for his care in restoring the churches which had been destroyed by the Saxons, and likewise for the respect which he paid to men of religion. (Williams, Emin. Welsh, 201; Camb. Quart. Mag. 1. 578 sq.; Rees, Welsh Saints, 134.)

[G. J.]

GWRTHWLI, ST., the saint of Llanwrthwl, in Brecknock, and Maeslanwrthwl, in Carmarth, then. The saint’s day is March 2. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 308.)

[C. W. B.]

GWRTRI, clerical witness to grant by king Rhys ab Ithel of Glamorgan to bishop Cadwared (Catwgware) and the see of Llandaff. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 406.)

[G. J.]

GWRWAN (Gyraw). (1) Bishop of Llandaff or local suffragan at Ystradyw, excommunicated Tewdwr ab Rhun, king of Dyfed, for the perfidious murder of Elgystyl ab Awt, king of Brecknock, and as an atonement from Tewdwr, received Llanmihangel Tref Ceriau, probably Llanmihangel on St. Michael’s mount, co. Brecknock. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 413–15, 625.) He is not given by Stubbs (Reg. Sacer. Angl.), and in Godwin’s list of prelates at Llandaff (de Præs. Angl. 622) is called Gyrawan.

(G) GWRWAN Hermit. Two brothers, Lybiaw and Gyrawan, and their sister’s son, Cynrr, some time after the death of St. Clydog, came from Glamorganshire and lived as hermits at the place of his martyrdom, Merthyr Cittawg, now Glockow, co. Hereford. With the advice and assistance of the bishop of Llandaff, probably Berthwgyw, they built a new and better church, and king Penbarw and Pennargart endowed it with lands along both sides of the Mywyw, with all privileges and immunity from perpetuity. There the two brothers remained till death, and it was probably this endowment which “Ithael ab Morgan, king of Glevysig, with the approbation of his sons and heirs, Ffernwaed and Mearig, and with the consent of their heirs, Ithael and Firewddyr, sacrificed to God and to St. Dubricius, St. Tello, and St. Oudocoeus, and Clydawg the martyr, and bishop Berthwgyw,” etc. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 446–48.)

[J. G.]

GWRWAREU, pupil of Gwawr (abbat of Lannarthbenni), was clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff under bishops Aidan and Lunepeus in the 5th or 6th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 408–410.)

[J. G.]

GWRWEITH, GWRWEITH, clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff under bishops Berthwgyw and Trychan, late in the 6th or early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 437, 436, 435, 452.)

[J. G.]

GWTFL, Welsh saint. [TANGLWST.]

G Wyoming, Welsh saint of the 7th century, son of Helig Foel, and brother of two other Welsh saints, Brenda and Euryr. No feast-day is assigned to him. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 302; Williams, Emin. Welsh, 213.)

[J. G.]

Gwyddelan, tre, the saint of Llanwydelan in Montgomery, and of Dolwydelan in Carnarvon in the 7th century. The saint’s day is Aug. 22. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 308.)

[C. W. B.]

Gwyddlew, Welsh saint. [Gwyddlew.]

Gwyddfarch. [Gwyddfarch.]

Gwyddlew (Gwyddlew), Welsh saint of the 5th or 6th century, son of Gwynyllu Flwyr of Gwyllwlg, and brother of St. Cadoc or Cattwg. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 114, 293.) No feast day or church dedication is recorded of him.

[G. J.]

Gwyddlon, bishop. [Gwodlow.]

Gwyddolon, clerical witness to the grant of Cilpdeoc (now Kilpeck, Herefordshire) by Flaw, son of Benjamin, to bishop Grecielis and the see
GWYDDUARCH, a member of the college of St. Cybi at Caergybi, in Anglesey, and son of Llywelw of Welshpool (Williams, Emlyn, Welsh, 204), but is not given by Prof. Rees (Welsh Saints).

GWYDDYL, clerical witness to grants to the see of Llandaff in the time of bishop Cadwared, probably in the beginning of the 9th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 463–5.)

GWYLERION, clerical witness to the grant of the village of Bertais by Isdael, king of Glamorgan, to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff, late in the 6th or early in the 7th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 440, 441.)

GWYNDAF HEN, the father of St. Meugan. He was said to have been a confesser in Llwyd's monastery, and afterwards superior of the college of Dubricius, at Caerleon, and to have retired in his old age to Bardsey island, near the north point of Cardigan bay, where he died. He may be deemed the founder of Llanwada, in Carnarvon, and of another church of that name in Pembroke. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 164, 219.)

[GWYN (1), Welsh saint of the 6th century, one of five sons of Cyneir Fardredw, viz. Gwyn, Gwynno, Gwynoro, Celynin, and Ceitho, who were also the patrons of Llanpumsaint, in the parish of Abergwili, and of Pumsaint, in the parish of Conwil Cayo, or Cynwyd Gai, Carmarthenshire. He was commemorated on Nov. 1. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 52, 111, 213, 329.)]

[GWYN (2) Son of Helig ab Glanawg, and buried, with Boda, his brother, at Dwygyfylchi, now Dwy-Cyrchli, Carnarvonshire (Camb. Quart. Mag. iii. 45). He is probably Rees’s Gwynin.]

GWYNN, classed as a son, but probably only a deacon of Brychan of Brycheiniog; he was brother of Gwynnau, but had no church dedication or feast. (Rees, Welsh Saints, 153; Camb. Reg. iii. 219.)

GWYNAW, GWYNAWG, GWYNNAWG, Welsh saint. [GWYNNOG.]

GWYNYFWY, called Master, was clerical witness with three Welsh abbots and others to a grant made by Mecrig, king of Glamorgan, to bishop Odocenus and the see of Llandaff in the end of the 6th century. (Lib. Landav. by Rees, 381–3.)

GWYNGAD, son of Caw (Jones, Welsh Bard, ii. 22), but not classed by Rees among the Welsh saints, as he followed a different list of Caw's descendants. (Lady Ch. Guest, Mabonion, i. 297, 335, London, 1849; Williams, Emlyn, Welsh, 205.) He may be the same as Gwynnar.

GWYNAR, GWYNGAW, son of Gildas ab Caw, and brother of SS. Gwynog, Noethan, and Tydecho. (Myvyr. Arch. ii. 44; Camb. Quart. Mag. i. 30.) “Guennan a Noethon Melbyon Gildas M. Kudwy,” in the Bendis S. Ffyn.
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GWYTHIANUS, ST., gives name to a parish on the north coast of Cornwall. He was one of the Irish saints who came over with St. Breesca (Vol. I. p. 359), and his oratory is buried in the sand, like the more famous oratory at Perran Zabuloe, the sand having very much encroached all along this coast, possibly in the 12th century. The parish feast is on the nearest Sunday to Nov. 1. The name Guidiane occurs in the Breton Litanu of the 10th century in Haddan and Stubbs ii. 82.

[ C. W. B.]

GYBRIAN. [GIBRIANUS.]

GYMNASIUS, a bishop who at the council of the Oak was the first to propose the deposition of Chrysostom. ( Photius, Cod. 69, p. 69.)

[ G. S.]

GYMPONOPDAE, the name given by "Prædestinatus" (68) to the Excalciati of Philaster.

[ E. V.]

GYNARWY, Welsh saint. [CYNPARWY.]

GYNYR, of Caer Gwawch, originally chieftain of Pebbidiog, or Dewsland, Pembrokehire, and afterwards enrolled among the saints of the Welsh church, which he enriched by his possessions, when he embraced the religious life. He first married Mechell daughter of Brychan of Brycheiniog, and then Anna daughter of Gorthefy Fendigaid or Voritimer; by the latter he had Gislius, bishop of Mevania, Non mother of St. David, and Gwen mother of St. Cybi. He endowed the see of Mevania with his lands, to which the cathedral was transferred, and where the see of St. David's now has its episcopal seat, in Giraldus's Vailis Bosina 'DAVID (5). ( Rees, Welsh Saints, 162, 163; Williams, Eunnu, Welsh, 207; Leland, Collect. iii. 103.)

[ J. G.]


[ S. A. B.]

H

*Note.—Reference should be made to the unspirited form of any name which the reader may fail to find under this letter.

HABALAHHA, the name of one of the thirteen presbyters and confessors of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, and likewise of a deacon and confessor in Persia, mentioned in the Syriac Martyrology (Wright's translation, Journ. Soc. Lit. 1886, 439).

[ G. T. S.]

HABERRILLA (HABRILLA), Jan. 30, virgin honoured at Augia near Bregenz, on the lake of Constance. According to the Chronicon Constantinense quoted by the Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. ii. 1035), she was a recluse, whom St. Gall consecrated as abbess of the cell of Bregen, of the order of St. Benedict. But nothing trustworthy is known of her. Her tomb in the

[ C. W. B.]

Gwynefn, son of Cyfr Farfáriwch. [GWYN (1).]

GWYNNOC. [GWYNNAOC, GWYNAWG, GWYNAGHW, GWYNAWG, GWYNNOGW, GWYNNOGW, GWYNNOGW, and latinized GWYNOCUS, GWYNOCUS), Welsh saint of the 6th century, son of Gildas ab Caw, and member of the society of St. Catwg or Cadog; commemorated Oct. 26. He was patron of Y Vaenor, Brecknockshire, is said to have assisted St. Illtyd and St. Tyfodwg in founding Lantryisant, Glamorganshire, under which there was a chapel called Llanwynno dedicated to him; he also founded Llanywnno or Llanwng Montgomeryshire, where in a painted glass window of the 14th century he is represented in episcopal habits, with mitre and crozier, and underneath in old black characters is the inscription, "Sanctus Gwionocus, cujus animae propitiatur Deus. Amen." (Camb. Quart. Mag. i. 30-1, from a Parochial History of Llan-Wynn, in Montgomeryshire, by Gwiler Mechan; Rees, Welsh Saints, 180, 257; Myr. Arch. ii. 25, 44, where in Benedictant Ynys Prydain he appears to be called Guenan; Rees, Cambro-Brit. Saints, 597; Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, Oct. 26, p. 646, calling him son of Anuria, also called Gildas.

[ G. J.]

GWYNORO, Welsh saint. [GWYN (1)].

GWYNOGL, ST. (GUYNODDD, GWYNOEDHEL), Welsh saint of the 6th century, the founder of Llangwyddl, in Carnarvon. His festival is Jan. 1. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 238.)

GWYNOGW, Welsh saint. [GWYNNOGW].

GWYNWS, ST., the saint of Llannwys in Cardigan in the 5th century. His festival and that of his brother Gwynau is Dec. 13. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 155.)

[ C. W. B.]

GWYRAWM, clerical witness to grant by king Athwys of Glamorgan, to bishop Cadwared (Catgwared), and the see of Llandaff (Lch. Llandav. by Rees, 464). [G. J.]

GWYTHELIN. [GITEYLEN.]

GWYTHENOC. [WINOC.]

GWYTHERRIN, ST., Welsh saint of the 6th century, the founder of a church called Gwytherin, in Denbigh, at which St. Winifred was afterwards buried. (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 275.) No feast day is assigned to him. [C. W. B.]

Note.—Reference should be made to the unspirited form of any name which the reader may fail to find under this letter.

HABERILLA, Jan. 30, virgin honoured at Augia near Bregenz, on the lake of Constance. According to the Chronicon Constantinense quoted by the Bollandists (Acta SS. Jan. ii. 1035), she was a recluse, whom St. Gall consecrated as abbess of the cell of Bregen, of the order of St. Benedict. But nothing trustworthy is known of her. Her tomb in the
HABETDEUS, bishop of Carthage, who appears to have been employed by Primianus, his bishop, at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411, especially on the first day, to recognize and identify the bishops of his party as they appeared before the president, and sometimes to account for their absence. The part which he took in discharge of this duty excited the indignation of Fortunatianus, bishop of Sicca Veneria [Fortunatus], who complained that as a deacon he was overstepping his position, and taking on himself duties which belonged to a bishop; but the president overruled the objection, pointing out that in doing this he was acting only as a witness, and not as a member of the assembly. (Mon. Vet. Don. pp. 405, 406, 422, ed. Oestherth; Gest. Coll. Carth. p. 270 in Pat. Lat. xi.)

HABETDEUS (3), bishop of Marsazana, Marazania, or Maraziana, a town of Byzacene, between Sufes and Aquis Regius (Haouch Sultani) (Ant. Rin. 47, 4), who at the Carth. Conf. A.D. 411, when Eunomius the Catholic bishop asserted that there were no Donatists in Marazana, replied by complaining that both his own predecessor and the Donatist congregation there had been expelled by force, and that he himself had been forcibly prevented from entering the place. (Morcelli, Afr. Christ. i. 213; Mon. Vet. Don. pp. 415, 416, ed. Oestherth; Gest. Coll. Carth. p. 270 in Pat. Lat. xi. 1305 A.)

HABETDEUS (4), bishop of Theudal, in Proconsular Africa, banished by Genseric c. A.D. 457. He has been supposed to have retired to Italy, and to have been identified with Habetdeus bishop of Luna. (Morcelli, Afr. Christ. i. 313.)

HABETDEUS (5), supposed bishop of Luna (Luna) in Eturuia in the 5th century. It is said that, during the Vandal persecution in Africa, having strongly opposed Arianism, he was banished, then recalled and forcibly re baptized in the Arian manner, and afterwards put to death, in consequence of his continued resistance. It is much more probable, however, that he was an African bishop, who suffered martyrdom either in Africa from the Vandals, or, as a refugee in Italy, from the Roman Goths. (Boll. Acta SS. 17 Feb., iii. 15; Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. i. 834; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. iii. 427.)

HABETDEUS (6), bishop of Tamalluna in Byzacene, banished by Hunneric A.D. 484, having previously suffered much persecution...
HABRILIA, virgin. [HABERILLA.]

HACCA. (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. 58.) [ACCA.]

HACONA, abbat. [HAGONA.]

HADALINUS, Feb. 3, confessor, a.D. 690
A monk and missionary from Aquitaine, who preached and founded a monastery in Belgium.

HADDA, a Mercian abbat who attests the forged charter of Medeshamstede, purporting to be granted by Ceddweniga, Sighera, Sibeheard, Wifried and Ethelred. (Kemble, C. D. 40; Mon. Angl. i. 384.) [S]

HADDE, a West Saxon abbat, whose name is appended as a witness to the charter of Coirend of Wessex to the Tisbury charter in 759. (Kemble, C. D. 104.) [S]

HADDI (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. 48, a.D. 701), bishop. [HEDDA (I).] [C. H.]

HADECERDITAE. [ADECERDITAE.]

HADELOGA (ADALOGA), ST., said to have been the first abbes of the nunnery of Kissingen in the 8th century. According to an anonymous life published by the Bollandists (Acta SS. Feb. i. 306), and attributed to the 12th century, she was the daughter of Charles Martel and Kunehildis. So renowned were her beauty and virtue that kings, princes and nobles came to woo her from Britain, Panonius and Greece. But from her earliest years she had resolved to consecrate her virginity to God, and, in spite of her father's anger, rejected all her suitor's. Her meekness under persecution enlisted the sympathy of all the court, and especially of one of the royal chaplains. Accused to the king by malicious tongues of shameless commerce with him, she was expelled in his company from the court. The chaplain, who was possessed of some wealth, built a nunnery and bought some land for its endowment. Here he collected a few nuns, over whom he set Hadeloga as abbess, and instituted the rule of St. Benedict. The place was called Kittingen, or Kissingen, from Kuccingus, a shepherd. In time, the king, hearing of the sanctity of her life, and filled with compunction for his unjust suspicion, visited her, and enriched the foundation with lands and property. The nuns became numerous, and a congregation of monks was instituted hard by. She ruled her nunnery prosperously for many years, and at last, worn out with self-inflicted privation, died Feb. 2, the day of her commemoration, and was buried at Kissingen before the altar of St. Mary amid universal grief.

The credibility of this somewhat late history is affected by the statement in Otholous's Vita Bonifacii (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxixx. 646-7), to the effect that Bouiface established St. Tecla, or Thecla, at Kissingen. Attempts have been made to reconcile the two accounts. Some have supposed the two names to have denoted the same person, others, as the later Bollandists (Oct. vii. 62), that Hadeloga was the first and Tecla the second abbess, but no satisfactory
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explanation has been given (cf. Rethberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 334–5).

The Bollandists also publish from two MSS. of the Cartusian foundation at Würzburg an Edictum of emperor Adrian, addressed to the nunnery of Kissingen (Acta SS. Feb. i. 944–58). [S. A. B.]

HADES. [DEATH AND THE DEAD, ESCHATOLOGY.]

HADO (ADO), thirty-sixth archbishop of Chartres, between Leobertus and Flavinus, in the first half of the 8th century. He is said to have instituted canons in the place of monks in the cathedral church (Gall. Christ. viii. 1102). [S. A. B.]

HADOINUS (HADINUS, CHAUDINUS, CADINUS, CHIDAENUS, HARDINUS, CLODAENUS) ST., thirteenth bishop of Le Mans, St. Bertrannus, and St. Berarius, was present at the council summoned by Sonnatus at Rheims in A.D. 625, and was represented by Chapoaldeus, an abbot, at that of Chilons held about 650. His name is contained in many documents admitted to be forgeries. His will, however, is genuine. It is to be found in Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixx. 567, Boll. Acta SS. Jan. ii. 1142, Vetera Anaelota, p. 267, and Bar. Annales, an. 652, n. xiv. It was dictated to his deacon Cadulphus, in the fifth year of the reign of Clivius II. (A.D. 643). He makes the church of Le Mans his heir, and leaves to it the dispensation of his other bequests to churches and monasteries. In 630 he had founded the monastery of Ebrenium (Notre Dame d'Evron). His death is placed about the year 652, and he was commemorated Jan. 20. The Bollandists publish his Gesta from an old MS. (Acta SS. Jan. ii. 1140), but they are historically worthless. (Floidoard, Hist. Ecc. Rem. ii. 5.; Patr. Lat. cxxxv. 102; Mansi, Conc. x. 1194; Gall. Christ. xiv. 349; Gesta Fonslucum Conclipium Conveniens, p. 264; Mabill. Vetera Anaelota, p. 284, Paris, 1723.) [S. A. B.]

HADRIANISTAE. The title ADRIANISTAE occurs in an enumeration by Theodoret (Haer. Phot. Feb. i. 1) of short-lived heretical sects, the origin of which he ascribes to Simon Magus; and in the preface to his second book, Theodoret includes in a list of heretics Adrianus, no doubt the supposed founder of this sect. But Valois has pointed out that Theodoret got the name from a corrupt reading in his copy of Eusebius (H. E. iv. 22). In an enumeration of heretical sects there quoted from Hegesippus, the followers of Menaikon are mentioned as τῶν Ἀδριανίστων. Nicephorus (H. E. iv. 7) reproduces the passage with the reading Ἰωάννης τῶν Ἀδριανίστων, and the reading Adrianistae is still found in several MSS. of Eusebius. There can be no doubt that Theodoret so read, and that thus he obtained the name. [G. S.]

HADRIANUS (1), PUBLIUS AElius (117–137). The early life and the general policy of this emperor may be compressed for our present purpose within comparatively narrow limits. Born in A.D. 76, and placed at the age of ten, on his father's death, under the guardianship of his cousin, Ulpius Trajanus, afterwards emperor, he was conspicuous in his youth for his study of Greek literature, and entered on his career as military tribune in Lower Moesia in A.D. 95. On the death of Nerva in A.D. 97, Trajan, whom he had adopted, became emperor, and Hadrian, on whom he bestowed such favours that men looked forward to his adoption, served in various capacities in the wars with the Dacians, Pannomians, Sarmatians, and Parthians. During the campaign against the last-named enemy, Trajan, leaving him in command of the army and of the province of Syria, started for Rome, but died at Scilinus in Cilicia in A.D. 117. Hadrian, on hearing of his death, had himself proclaimed emperor by the army, communicated the election to the senate, and in due course received their formal sanction.

The external policy of Hadrian was marked by the abandonment of any idea of extending the eastern frontier of the empire. The Euphrates was recognised as a natural boundary in that direction, and the emperor, after suppressing a real or alleged conspiracy at Rome by the execution of four men of consular rank, and gaining popular favour by gladiatorial games, large donations, and the remission of fifteen years' arrears of taxes due to the state, devoted himself in A.D. 120 to a personal inspection of the provinces of the empire, which was prolonged for several years. In that and the following year he visited Gaul, Germany, Britain, and the Euphrates, erecting fortresses and strengthening the defences of the frontiers. The Roman wall carried from the Solway to the mouth of the Tyne remains as a memorial of his activity in the last-named province. Possibly also we may find traces of the eclectic tendency of his mind and his readiness to adopt foreign forms of worship in the altars dedicated to Mithras, and to an otherwise unknown goddess named Brenna or Corentina or Convintia, which have recently been found in the neighbourhood of one of the stations near the Wall not far from Hexham. In A.D. 122 he came to Athens, and found the eager speculative activity of the place so congenial to his taste that it was henceforth his favourite residence, and his love for making experiments, as it were, in different forms of worship led him to seek information in the Eleusinian mysteries (A.D. 125). The next four or five years were spent in the same restless travelling and insatiable desire to see all remarkable places. He ascended Aetna, he returned to Athens, he went up the Nile. The death, probably the self-sought death, of his favourite Antinous, a Bithynian page of great beauty and genius, in the last-named journey plunged him into deep grief as his nature was capable of, and he sought to...
console himself by surrounding the memory of his union with the divine honours which had been paid to emperors. Constellations were named after him in the heavens, cities dedicated to him on earth. Incense was to be burnt in his honour, and the art market was flooded with statues and busts representing his exceeding beauty. The new form of worship thus introduced probably did much to alienate the better class of minds that were halting between two opinions. The apotheosis of such an one as Antinous was the reducito at once ad absurdam and ad horribile of the decayed and putrefac pant polytheism of the empire. (Euseb. H. E. iv. 5; Justin, Apol. i. 39.) Shortly afterwards the state of affairs in Palestine called for the emperor's serious attention, and, as connected with the history both of the Jewish and the Christian churches, may be dealt with here with somewhat greater fulness than his general administration of the empire. Disturbances which had threatened the tranquillity of Judaea at the beginning of his reign had been repressed by Martius Turbo, and for fifteen years they were not heard of; and the words bore the inscription of "Telus stabilita." In A.D. 131, however, the emperor began to execute the plan, conceived earlier in his reign, of transforming Jerusalem into a Roman colony, and rebuilding it under the title of Aelia Capitolina, the first word commemorating the gens to which the emperor belonged, the second its consecration to the Capitolian Jupiter. At first the proposal was received tranquilly. The work of rebuilding was placed in the hands of a Jew, Aquila of Pontus (the reader will note the coincidence of name and country with those of the preacher of Acts xviii. 2); the great rabbi Akiba was on friendly terms with Rufus, the emperor's representative, and the Jews even ventured to petition for permission to rebuild their Temple. They were met with what must have seemed to them a studied indignity, and a plough was drawn over the site of the sacred place in token of its desecration. The city was filled with Roman emigrants, and Jews were forbidden to enter the city of their fathers, with the solitary exception, granted as if in bitter irony, that they might on the anniversary of the capture of the city by Titus come to bewail their fate within its gates. On one of the gates of the new Aelia the figure of the uncanny beast in marble sent a shudder through any Jew who approached the walls. The feelings of Christians were in like manner outraged by seeing a statue of Jupiter on the site of the Resurrection and one of Venus on that of the Crucifixion. Trees and statues were placed on the platform of the Temple, and a grove in honour of Adonis was planted near the cave of the Nativity at Bethlehem. The persistent defiance of national feeling thus displayed roused a wide-spreading indignation, which, after amoudering for a time, burst out under a leader whom we know only by his assumed name of Bar-Cochba, the son of a star. The choice of the name was probably determined by the imagery of the prophecy of Balsam in Num. xxiv. 17, possibly also by the recollection of the "star in the east." of Matt. ii. 2. The man himself is described by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 3) as being of the Barab'bas type, a murderer and a robber (ψευδός καὶ ἄρρητος), but he was recognised by Akiba, the leading rabbi of the time, as the Messiah, obtained possession of fifty fortresses and 985 villages, and established himself in the stronghold of Bethera, between Caesarea and the old town of Lydda, which, like Jerusalem, had been rebuilt and renamed by Hadrian as Diospolis. The Christians of Palestine, true to the apostolic precept of submission to the powers that be, took no part in the insurrection, and were accordingly persecuted by the rebel leader, and offered the alternative of denying the Messiahship of Jesus or the penalty of torture and of death (Euseb. H. E. iv. 8). Severus was recalled from Britain, the rebellion was suppressed with a strong hand, and edicts of extremest stringency were issued against the Jews, forbidding them to circumcise their children, to keep the Sabbath or to educate their youth in the study of the law. Akiba died in tortures under the hands of the executioner, and the prohibition of instruction in the law led to the formation of a secret school, continuing the rabbinic traditions, at Lydda. (Jost, Judentrüm, ii. 7) To the Christian church in Judaea, the suppression of the Bar-Cochba revolt and the generally tolerant spirit of the emperor brought a relief by which they were glad to profit. They left Pella, where they had taken refuge during the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, and returned to the holy city under its new name. Their return was marked by a change in the character of the community. The succession of fifteen bishops, all Hebrews, and belonging to the church of the circumcision, came to an end, and the mother-church of the world found itself under the care of a gentile bishop. (Euseb. H. E. iv. 5.)

In his general treatment of the Christians of the empire, Hadrian followed in the footsteps of Trajan. The more cultivated members of the church felt in addressing the tolerant, eclectic, enquiring emperor, "curiositatem omnium explorator," as Tertullian calls him (Apol. c. 5), that they had a chance of a favourable

---

*e The death of Antinous was enveloped in a mysterious darkness. According to some accounts he was drowned accidentally. Other rumours reported that he had sought a voluntary death in order to avoid and prevent disaster from his master; or that Hadrian had sacrificed him, with his own consent, in order that he might practise the form of augury known as extispicum (the scrutiny of the viscera of the victim), and so penetrate the secrets of the future. It is not necessary to examine here the evidence in favour of these conflicting statements. The fact that the last gained currency is, however, characteristic of the popular belief as to Hadrian's restless and feverish superstition. See an elaborate discussion of the whole question in these two articles (1879), by Mr. J. A. Symonds, in the Cornhill Magazine for February 1879. The practice of extispicium appears again, it may be noted, among the enormities of Elagabalus.

---

*d So Julian describes him in his survey of the charac- ter of the Caesarea, αἰεν πολυχρυσομοῦν τα ἀπόφραμα. The rest of the picture is worth quoting as showing what the philosopher-apostle thought of his predecessor. He is described as bustling and pretentious (μεμορίζομεν), wearing a long beard, occupied in many studies, and especially in music, prying into hidden mysteries (νυών). Silenus, as Hadrian comes into the presence of the gods, asks what is this "Egyptian devia- tion?" and gives orders, "Tell him that the youth is not here, and stop his garrulous chattering." (Julian, Caesareae, p. 29, ed. 1863.)
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hearing, and the age of apologists began. Quadratus, according to one tradition [but see Quadratus], bishop of Athens in A.D. 126, and famed as possessing prophetic gifts (Euseb. H. E. iii. 37, iv. 3), presented his Apologia, laying stress on the publicity of the works of Christ, and appealing to the testimony of eye-witnesses who were even then surviving. Aristides, a philosopher of the same city, followed, and addressed (A.D. 135) a treatise to the emperor, which was extant and admired in the time of Justinian. It was in favour of the Christians, and it was said even to have been admitted to a personal hearing. [ARISTIDES] Early in his reign, but probably after receiving these apologies, an Asiatic official of high character, Serenus Granianus, applied to him for instructions as to the treatment of the Christians of that province, complaining that their enemies expected him to condemn them without even the formality of a trial. The result was that the emperor addressed an official letter to Minucius Fundanus, proconaul of Asia, regulating the mode of procedure against the persecuted sect. No encouragement was to be given to common informers (συνομοδέρας) or to popular clamour. If the official persons of the district (διαχρηστοί) were confident that they could sustain a persecution, the matter was to be investigated in due course. Offenders against the laws were to be punished according to the measure of their guilt; but, above all things, the trade of the informer was to be checked (Euseb. H. E. iv. 8, 9). The character of Hadrian's mind may be inferred from what has been stated as to the policy of his government. He had not the zeal of a persecutor, he was not influenced by the fear that leads to cruelty. His philosophy and his religion did not keep him from the infamy of an impure passion of the basest type. He adapted himself without difficulty to the worship and the thoughts of the place in which he found himself. At Rome he maintained the traditional sacred rites which had had their origin under the republic, and posed as the patron of Epicurus and the Stoicism which was identified with his name. At Athens he was initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, and rose to the dignity of an Eoptes in the order, as brought within the circle of its most esoteric teaching. He became an expert in the secrets of magic and astrology. To him, as he says in his letter to Servianus, describing the character of his Egyptian subjects, the worshippers of Serapis and of Christ stood on the same footing. Rulers of synagogues, Christian bishops, Samaritan teachers, were all alike trading on the credulity of the multitude (Flavius Vopiscus, Saturn. c. 7, 8). According to the statement of Lampridius, one of the later writers of the history of the emperors (in Alexsand. Sever. c. 43), the wide eclecticism of his nature led him at one time to erect temples without statues, which were intended to have been dedicated to Christ. He was restrained, it was reported, by oracles, which declared that, if this were done, all other temples would be deserted, and the religion of the empire subverted. The testimony of Lampridius as to the fact that temples such as he describes, known as Hadrian's, existed in his time may be received without much hesitation, but the absence of contemporary evidence of such an intention, on which it would have been natural for the Christian apologists of his own reign, or those of his successors, to lay stress, compels us to reject his explanation of the fact as an unauthenticated conjecture. The more probable solution of the problem is that adopted by Casaubon (Annot. in Lamprid. c. 43), that the temples in question were built by Hadrian, but not formally dedicated, and that they were intended ultimately to be consecrated to himself. So the imperial Sophist—the term is used of Hadrian by Julian (ut supra)—passed through life, "holding no form of creed and contemplating all," and the well-known lines—

- "Animula, vagula, blandula,
  Hoesper, comasque corporis,
  Quae nunc abibis in loco,
  Pallidula, rigidâ, nudula?
  Nec ut soles, dabis iocis."

show that the same dilettante spirit was with him to the last.

It lay in the nature of the case that a reign like that of Hadrian was on the whole favourable to the growth of the Christian church. The popular cry, "Christianos ad leones," was not crushed, and no organized persecution took its place. The appearance of an apologetic literature was a sign that the disciples of Jesus made their appeal with confidence to the intellect and judgment of mankind. The frivolous eclecticism of the emperor and yet more his dedication of Antinous were enough to shake the allegiance of all serious minds to the older system. The succession of bishops in all the great centres of the church's life went on without the interruption of martyrdom or imprisonment. The tolerance, which was favourable to the growth of the good seed was also, however, equally favourable to that of the tares; and it is to the reign of Hadrian that we have to trace the rise and growth of the chief Gnostic sects of the 2nd century, the followers of Nataulus in Syria, of Baridas, Carpophates, and Valentinus in Egypt, of Marcion in Pontus (Euseb. H. E. iv. 7, 8). (Compare, in addition to the authorities cited, Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chaps. iii.; Milman, History of Christianity, b. ii. c. vi.; Lardner, Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, chap. xi.) [K. H. P.]

HADRIANUS (2), servant of Hilarion the hermit. He brought to his master, then in the oasis west of Egypt, the news of the death of Julian; but he afterwards proved unfaithful, and is recorded to have died of the Morsus Reginus. (Jerome, Vit. Hilar. § 34, Opp. vol. ii. p. 34, ed. Vall.) [H. W. F.]

HADRIANUS (3), rector patroniunii under Gregory the Great in Sicily. He is generally addressed as "notarius;" he is once spoken of as "chartularius." When he was at Palermo,

* Prior's version is familiar to most readers. The following is from a less-known writer:

"Poor soul of mine, who cannot rest,
Flitting still within my breast;
Of the body mate and guest,
Whither bound art thou?"

"Fled, bare, and shivering left,
Of thy wonted mirth bereft,
Jests are done with now."
Gregory wrote to him that the husband of a certain Agathos, who had become a monk, was to be restored to her even if he had received the tonsure, for no man may leave his wife without her consent, except for the cause of fornication. In another letter, Gregory praised him "quia quodam incunctatores et sortilegos fueris insanui-tus." Hadrian was transferred from the estates of Palermo to be rector patrimonii of those of Syracuse. For the papal estates in Sicily, and the system of papal officials, see Carl Hegel, Städteverfassung von Italien, i. 162. (Greg. Magn. Epist. lib. xi. indict. iv. 50. 53. lib. xiii. indict. vi. 11, in Migne. Pat. Lat. lxviii. 1169-1171, 1278.) [A. H. D. A.]

HADRIANUS (4), bishop of Thebae Phthioticæ in Thessaly on the Pelagia gulf, whose condemnation both by John of Justiniiana Prima on a charge of peculation, and by John of Larissa his metropolitan, on a criminal charge, gave an opportunity to pope Sylvester I. to interfere. When Hadrian appealed, the matter was carried to Rome, and Gregory revoked the sentence of deprivation from the priesthood pronounced against him, and ordered John of Larissa if he had any suit against Hadrian, either to conduct it before the pope's agents (responseals) at Constantinople, or to bring it to Rome (Ep. iii. 6 and 7). The emperor Maurice, a.d. 582-602, ignored the interference of Gregory, and directed Hadrian's appeal to be heard by the bishop of Corinth, by whose efforts a reconciliation was effected between Hadrian and his metropolitan. Gregory sent a deacon to watch the proceedings, lest, he said, there be any pecuniary corruption between the two parties. (Epist. iii. 39; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 121.) [L. D. H.

HADRIANUS (5), bishop of Reggio Lempidi, (Reggio in Lombardy), between Donoues and Benoavus, his period being a.d. 600, judging from his place on the list. (Ugh. Ital. Soc. ii. 243; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xv. 361, 397.) [C. H.]

HADRIANUS (6), bishop of Rieti, signing the epistle of pope Agatho in 680. (Mansi. x. 303; Hefele, § 314.) [A. H. D. A.

HADRIANUS (7), second bishop of Numana, Numana, or Umana, signing the epistle of pope Agatho in 680. (Ugh. Ital. Soc. i. 743; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, viii. 79, 191.) [C. H.]

HADRIANUS (8), L. bishop of Rome from Feb. 3, 772, to Dec. 25, 785, during twenty-three years, ten months, and seventeen days. He is said by Anastasius to have been a Roman of noble race, son of one Theodorus, and of "elegant" personal appearance. Left an orphan early in life, he had been educated under the care of Theodorus (or Theodulus), a distinguished Roman, and had shewn signs of precocious piety, had been noticed on this account, and ordained subdeacon, by Gregory. Pope Gelasius I. had joined him in Italy, and had been enthusiastically received. Anastasius (Vit. Hadr.) gives a long account of the proceedings. Hadrian, on hearing of his unexpected approach, caused all the judges of Rome to meet him nearly thirty miles from the city; and at a mile's distance he was received and escorted by the Romanmilitia, and children carrying olive branches, and singing in his praise. Early next day, which was Easter eve, he conducted the pope to be received him in St. Peter's. On reaching the steps leading up the church the king knelt and kissed each step as he ascended. At the door of the church the two potentates embraced, and proceeded hand in hand, while the choir sung "Beneficent qui venit in nomine Domini," to the tomb of St. Peter, where they prostrated them-
selves together, and returned thanks. After solemn services in various churches during the Easter festival, and suitable entertainments, it was on Wednesday in Easter week, in the church of St. Peter, that the memorable event of this visit of Charlemagne to Rome took place. In the presence of the clergy and notables of Rome, Hadrian reminded the king of the donation of his father Pippin to St. Peter and his vicars for ever, the promise of which had been assented to by himself and his vicars before Carassus at Carasaum (Chieri), and admonished him to confirm it; whereupon the king, having caused the engagement entered into at Chieri to be read, ordered a new instrument of donation to be written, which he signed, and placed, first on the altar, and then on the tomb of St. Peter, having sworn to observe its conditions. The exact extent of territory assigned to the pope by this memorable donation, as well as that of the donation of Pippin, is uncertain, the original documents having perished, and contemporary writers giving us no certain information. Anastasius (in Vit. Hadr.) speaks of large additions to the exarchate of Ravenna, granted previously by Pippin, including Corcis, Istria, Venetia, and the dukedoms of Beneventum and Spoleto. It may be that the evidence in this respect is conflicting and contradictory, and others are partly due to a confusion between the "patrimony of St. Peter" in various countries and temporal dominion over them. The dukedoms of Spoleto is indeed spoken of in one of Hadrian's letters (Cod. Carol. Ep. 58) as specifically made over to him, and, as has been seen, Anastasius tells us of its having already submitted to him. But, with this exception, and perhaps some other subsequent concessions, it was certainly the Greek exarchate, not the Lombard kingdom, of which a donation was made. Charles ever after styled himself "rex Francorum et Longobardorum," and was absolute in Northern Italy. The nature of the pope's temporal authority over the lands of the donation is also open to dispute. He assumed certainly all the rights of a former exarch, and Hadrian, writing to Charles, speaks as possessing sovereign power in his own domains (Cod. Carol. Ep. 85); but Charles was still "patriicus Romanorum," whatever the title implied, the pope claiming in distinction the "patriicus b. Petri" (Cod. Carol. Ep. 85); Charles on being crowned emperor by Leo III. was adored by the pope and Roman people, as the Greek emperors had been by their subjects; Rome remained an imperial city (see Charles's will, in Vit. Car. M. per Einhard, c. 33); the popes afterwards had to swear fidelity to the Frank emperor; and it was not till the time of Innocent III. (1198) that the pope exacted from the praefectus Urbis the oath of allegiance formerly taken to the emperor.

In a subsequent letter from Hadrian to Charles (A.D. 777), an innovation has been proposed: (the son Desiderius, who had escaped to Constantinople, to attack Rome with Greek aid, and restore the kingdom of the Lombards. He repeatedly implores Charles to come again into Italy (Cod. Carol. Ep. 54, 58, 59). But the latter, engaged in his Saxon wars, contented himself with sending emissaries till, when in 775 he crossed the Alps and put down the rebellion, but did not on this occasion visit Rome (Annals

---

nostris S. Dei Ecclesiae, i.e. b. Petri apostoli, germinet atque exsultet:—quia ecce novus christianissimus Dei Constantinus imperator, hic tempus sui. But the allusion appears to be only to some fabulous acts of St. Sylvester, referred to by Hadrian also in his letter to the second Nicene council (Concil. Nicen. ii. n. ii.), though the language may have suggested the late forgeries.

During the disputes about investiture it was maintained by the imperial party that, Charlemagne having returned to Rome after the reduction of Pavia, a synod was held in which Hadrian granted him the powers contended for. Thus in the Collecta Cann. tripartita, written in the time of Urban II., and in Ino's decree (in Perti, Monum. iv. li. 160, note), "Carolo Romam reversus, constituit ibi synodum cum Adriano paep. Adriano autem popa cum universo synodo tradiderunt Carlo jus et potestates eligendi pontificem et ordinandi apostolicam sedem, dignitatem quoque patriasticum eis conces-

serunt. Insper archiepiscopos, episcos per singulas provincias ab eo investiturum accepere dividuerunt, et usi, nisi a rege laudetur et investitare episcopos, a nomine consecutur. Et quiunque contra hoc decretum esse, anathema maturi est, qui de consilio hominum seque et consilii secreto, bona ejus publicari praecipuerunt." The same account was inserted (Pagi, Crit. iii. 343, shows it to be an interpolation) in the Actaurium Aquenense of the Chronicle of Siegert of Gombrich, a.d. 1113 (Pertz, Monum. vi. 393).

It appears, too, in different words in a treatise composed a.d. 1109 at Naumburg by bishop Wultram or the abbot Conrad. But there is no early notice of any such synod, and Charles appears evidently to have gone straight to France from Pavia without returning to Rome:—"post-

quam vostra excellencia civitates Pavia in partibus Franciae removeris" (Ep. Hadr. ad Carol. M. Cod. Carol. Ep. 52). The fact, doubtless, was that Charles exercised the same rights in ecclesiastical affairs as he always had in the Frankish church, and that it was not till a later age that the pope's concession of such rights was conceived as necessary (see Gieseler, Ehr. Hist. div. i. pt. ii. ch. ii. § 5 and § 6, and note).

Charles having left Italy after his capture of Pavia and complete subjugation of Lombardy, and having taken Desiderius with him into France, Hadrian did not all at once enjoy his donation in peace. There are a number of letters addressed to him by Charles, in which he complains of Leo, archbishop of Ravenna, retaining cities in the exarchate on the plea that they had been granted to him by Charles; of the arrogance of Hildebrand, duke of Spoleto; and in one letter of the latter being engaged in a conspiracy with the dukes of Beneventum, Chusium (Choise), Forum Jolii (Privuli), and ambassador from King Desiderius (the son Desiderius who had escaped to Constantinople), to attack Rome with Greek aid, and restore the kingdom of the Lombards. He repeatedly

---

notwithstanding this occasion visit Rome (Annals.
HADRIANUS—Pope

Lauriss. ann. 775, 776). After this the pope continued to send letters of complaint; in one he complains of the duke of Chiuse, who had seized the patrimony of St. Peter in his dukedom, and frequently of the archbishop of Ravenna, whom he describes as defying St. Peter and himself in retaining territory included in the donation; and he repeatedly urges Charles to come to the rescue (Cod. Carol. Epp. 53, 60). At length, the Saxons being subdued and multitudes of them having been obliged to accept baptism, Charles, in 786, found leisure again to visit Italy, and stopped for about a year in Pavia. He reserved his second visit to Rome for the Easter of 781, taking with him his queen Hildegard and two of his sons by her, Carloman and Lewis, with the intention that Carloman, born in 776, whose baptism had been deferred that he might receive it from the pope, should receive it on Easter Eve. On his baptism he received the name of Pippin. Two of his children were also anointed and crowned by Haddrian, Pippin, the elder, as “rex in Italian,” Lewis as “rex in Aquitaniam” (Annal. Lauriss. et Einhardi). The pope's difficulties with regard to his temporal claims appear to have been settled during this visit; and in return he concurred with Charles, before the latter left Rome, in appointing two episcopal legates to act with those of the king in a mission to Tassilo, duke of Bavaria, who was waver ing in his allegiance sworn to Pippin and his successors. The mission, thus strengthened by spiritual authority, is said to have resulted in temporary success. (Annal. Lauriss. et Einhardi)

At the close of the year 786 Charles again crossed the Alps, and, spending Christmas in Florence, repaired without delay to Rome to take counsel with Hadrian. The purpose of this expedition was to crush a rebellion concocted by Archis, duke of Beneventum, who, surprised by the sudden invasion, sent at once his eldest son, Romald, to Rome with rich presents, professing submission. But Charles, advised by the pope not to trust the duke, proceeded with his forces to Capua; on which Archis, having left Beneventum, was taken to Tarsius, who fled to Bavaria. Charles, sent again to sue for mercy, offering both his sons, with others, as hostages. Charles, having accepted his submission, returned to Rome, where he again kept Easter (787) with his friend Hadrian joyfully. While he was still at Rome, the pope again endeavoured to aid his benefactor in differences that had again arisen between him and Tassilo of Bavaria. Ambassadors arrived from this duke to beg the pope's good offices with a view to peace. He accordingly interceded with the king, who expressed himself ready to come to terms; but, when the ambassadors pleaded want of authority for ratifying any terms proposed, Hadrian, moved to anger and convinced of their duplicity, brought forth his spiritual weapons, laying their master and his followers under excommunication, and rendered full obedience to Charles and his sons, and declaring the latter free from all guilt for the calamities of war that might ensue. The anathema however failed of its intended effect; for it was not till Charles had coerced him by war that Tassilo made the required submission, and was secluded in a monastery (Annal. Lauriss. et Einhardi. et Vita Car. M. per Einhardi).
that his acceptance of him as patriarch would depend on his zeal and success in getting image-worship restored. In both letters he sets forth more than once the strong personal and spiritual affection which he entertained towards the emperor as to accept the council held under his auspices. At the beginning of his letter he had shewn similar uneasiness by disclaiming with an ‘abint’ the intention of defending any man whatever (quemlibet hominem) in replying to the Caroline books, and before concluding he says in effect, ‘If the council having rightly received its image-worship, I could not refuse to accord it, lest the Easterns should return to their heresy. But I have not yet written to the emperor on the subject. I am still much dissatisfied with him for not yet restoring portions of the patrimony of St. Peter which had been alienated by the Iconoclasts; and, if your God-protected royal excellence approves, I will admonish him to restore them, and, on this account, though not on the other, declare him a heretic if he refuses’ (Epp. Hadr. ad Car. M. de imaginibus, post Act. Concil. Nicon. ii. Labbe). Neither the arguments nor the authority of Hadrian converted Charlemagne and his divines. In the year 794 was held the council of Frankfort, at which the pope was represented by two legates, Theophylact and Stephen, and his own primacy by him. His own primacy was to condemn Adoptionism, i.e. the doctrine that Christ in His Divinity was the natural Son of God, but in His humanity the adopted Son. It had been taught in Spain by Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, bishop of Urgel, and had penetrated into France. Felix had been made to recant before a synod at Ratisbon (792), and then before Hadrian at Rome, to whom he had been sent by Charles. Elipand having complained to Charles, the latter called the Frankfort synod, at which Adoptionism was unanimously condemned, a letter from the pope to the Spanish bishops on the subject having been read. The question of the second Nicene council was then introduced, and the result was that all adoration of the images of saints, such as that council had enjoined, was repudiated and condemned. The legates of Hadrian are not said to have disented from this canon, or he himself, notwithstanding his strong language on the subject at issue as against the Greeks, to have condemned the Franks. Image-worship continued to be rejected in the Frank empire through the 9th century without denunciation from Rome, and a synod at Paris (923) expressly condemned pope Hadrian himself for his action in the matter, saying among other

---

"Aliata est in medium quas et de nova Graecorum synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopolis fecerunt, in quas scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ha ut deificae Trinitatis, servium aut adorationem non impendere, anathema judicarentur. Qui supra sanctissimi patres fecerunt, cum deimage-worship restored. In both letters he sets forth more than once the strong personal and spiritual affection which he entertained towards the emperor as to accept the council held under his auspices. At the beginning of his letter he had shewn similar uneasiness by disclaiming with an ‘abint’ the intention of defending any man whatever (quemlibet hominem) in replying to the Caroline books, and before concluding he says in effect, ‘If the council having rightly received its image-worship, I could not refuse to accord it, lest the Easterns should return to their heresy. But I have not yet written to the emperor on the subject. I am still much dissatisfied with him for not yet restoring portions of the patrimony of St. Peter which had been alienated by the Iconoclasts; and, if your God-protected royal excellence approves, I will admonish him to restore them, and, on this account, though not on the other, declare him a heretic if he refuses’ (Epp. Hadr. ad Car. M. de imaginibus, post Act. Concil. Nicon. ii. Labbe). Neither the arguments nor the authority of Hadrian converted Charlemagne and his divines. In the year 794 was held the council of Frankfort, at which the pope was represented by two legates, Theophylact and Stephen, and his own primacy by him. His own primacy was to condemn Adoptionism, i.e. the doctrine that Christ in His Divinity was the natural Son of God, but in His humanity the adopted Son. It had been taught in Spain by Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, bishop of Urgel, and had penetrated into France. Felix had been made to recant before a synod at Ratisbon (792), and then before Hadrian at Rome, to whom he had been sent by Charles. Elipand having complained to Charles, the latter called the Frankfort synod, at which Adoptionism was unanimously condemned, a letter from the pope to the Spanish bishops on the subject having been read. The question of the second Nicene council was then introduced, and the result was that all adoration of the images of saints, such as that council had enjoined, was repudiated and condemned. The legates of Hadrian are not said to have disented from this canon, or he himself, notwithstanding his strong language on the subject at issue as against the Greeks, to have condemned the Franks. Image-worship continued to be rejected in the Frank empire through the 9th century without denunciation from Rome, and a synod at Paris (923) expressly condemned pope Hadrian himself for his action in the matter, saying among other

---

"Aliata est in medium quas et de nova Graecorum synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopolis fecerunt, in quas scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ha ut deificae Trinitatis, servium aut adorationem non impendere, anathema judicarentur. Qui supra sanctissimi patres fecerunt, cum deimage-worship restored. In both letters he sets forth more than once the strong personal and spiritual affection which he entertained towards the emperor as to accept the council held under his auspices. At the beginning of his letter he had shewn similar uneasiness by disclaiming with an ‘abint’ the intention of defending any man whatever (quemlibet hominem) in replying to the Caroline books, and before concluding he says in effect, ‘If the council having rightly received its image-worship, I could not refuse to accord it, lest the Easterns should return to their heresy. But I have not yet written to the emperor on the subject. I am still much dissatisfied with him for not yet restoring portions of the patrimony of St. Peter which had been alienated by the Iconoclasts; and, if your God-protected royal excellence approves, I will admonish him to restore them, and, on this account, though not on the other, declare him a heretic if he refuses’ (Epp. Hadr. ad Car. M. de imaginibus, post Act. Concil. Nicon. ii. Labbe). Neither the arguments nor the authority of Hadrian converted Charlemagne and his divines. In the year 794 was held the council of Frankfort, at which the pope was represented by two legates, Theophylact and Stephen, and his own primacy by him. His own primacy was to condemn Adoptionism, i.e. the doctrine that Christ in His Divinity was the natural Son of God, but in His humanity the adopted Son. It had been taught in Spain by Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, bishop of Urgel, and had penetrated into France. Felix had been made to recant before a synod at Ratisbon (792), and then before Hadrian at Rome, to whom he had been sent by Charles. Elipand having complained to Charles, the latter called the Frankfort synod, at which Adoptionism was unanimously condemned, a letter from the pope to the Spanish bishops on the subject having been read. The question of the second Nicene council was then introduced, and the result was that all adoration of the images of saints, such as that council had enjoined, was repudiated and condemned. The legates of Hadrian are not said to have disented from this canon, or he himself, notwithstanding his strong language on the subject at issue as against the Greeks, to have condemned the Franks. Image-worship continued to be rejected in the Frank empire through the 9th century without denunciation from Rome, and a synod at Paris (923) expressly condemned pope Hadrian himself for his action in the matter, saying among other
things as well might be said) that his letter to Irene and Constantine contained things "valde absona, et ad rem de qua ageatur minus pertinueta" (Manzi, Concil. xiv. 421D, who is the first to include this in his collection of councils).

Thus the old cordiality between Charles and Hadrian had not been interrupted would appear from Einhard's account of the king's sorrow when he heard of the pope's death ("the decease of the Roman pontiff being announced to him, whom he held chief among his friends, he wept as if he had lost a son or a very dear brother") and also from the epistle in Latin elegies, full of affection and respect, which Charles wrote, and had inscribed upon Hadrian's tomb. They were always fast allies and friends, and there were several reasons for their being so.

In addition to personal regard and mutual respect, there was the deep religious reverence undoubtedly felt by Charles for the Roman see, which Hadrian lost no opportunity of fostering; and the two were allies in this which was retained in their close alliance. To Charles it was of importance to have so great a spiritual potentate, owed to temporalities to himself, for an ally in Italy, while Hadrian clearly saw that from no earthly power could he get so much reverence, immunity, and temporal sway as from the generous and religious Charles. Zeal and pertinacity in contending for the temporal claims of St. Peter's see; and by the assertion of spiritual prerogative invoking temporal aid for their enforcement, are leading characteristics of Hadrian, as shown by his letters. As has been intimated, he does not shine in the field of controversy; but there is no reason to doubt the account of him by Anastasius, confirmed by Charles's epistle, that he was sincerely devout, and very liberal in his gifts for charitable and ecclesiastical purposes. Anastasius, in his life of him, goes at great length into his expenditure on churches and other works in Rome, in which undertakings he was aided by Charles, who, as his biographer Einhard tells us, sent him large gifts, gold, silver, and gems, for such purposes, having nothing more at heart than that the city of Rome might be strewed with the edifices of her ancient dignity, and the Church of St. Peter should be not only defended by him, but also adorned and enriched beyond all others.

There is extant a large collection of letters from Hadrian to Charlemagne preserved in the Codex Carolinus, some of which have been referred to above. A large proportion refer to political events in Italy, complaining of wrongs done to St. Peter's see, or of machinations against Charles, and often begging him to come to the rescue. In others he congratulates Charles on the subjugation and forced conversion of the Saxons; orders at his request litanies to be sung in celebration of these successes; directs how to deal with Saxons renegades from the faith; sends palls, and confirms the political privileges of the bishops of Rheims and of Bourges in Aquitania; grants a bishop of their own to the abbat and monks of St. Denys; undertakes, having been complained of to Charles, to control the irregularities of Lombard bishops, and to suppress simony; courteously denies Charles's claim to intervene through his legates in the election of archbishops of Ravenna; on one occasion thanks for the present of a cross; on another gives Charles marbles and mosaics from Ravenna, and on another the dead body of a martyr.

On the occasion of one of the visits of Charles to Rome (probably the first, A.D. 773) Hadrian gave him a collection of the canons of the church for his guidance in his own country, to which was prefixed an epistle in Latin verse (if verse it can be called) of which the first letters of the lines form the sentence, "Domino eccle. filio Carolo regi Hadrianus papa" (Labbe, viii. 583). Also, when Charles was at Rome (Easter, 787), he is said to have taken home with him, as a gift from the pope, the Antiphonary of St. Gregory, with musical notes inserted by the pope himself, together with two singing-masters, learned in Gregorian music, in order that the corrupt method of singing then prevalent in France might be reformed according to the ancient Gregorian use, which was retained at Rome. There had been, we are told, contentions between the French and Roman singers during the Easter services, the former saying that their own singing was the sweetest and the best, the latter defending their own style as orthodox Gregorianism. Charles, being referred to, decided in favour of the Roman use on the ground that the fountain must be purer than its stream, and accordingly took measures for having it taught and maintained in France, founding schools for the purpose with the assistance of the two Roman teachers, who also taught organ-playing (artem organandi). (Annot. Lauri.)

The authorities for this life are Anastasius Biblioth. in Vita Hadr.; Codex Carolinus (collection of letters from popes to Charles, &c., contained in Muratori, Script. rerum Italic. in Cajet. Cenni, Monumenta Domina. Pontific. and in Jaffé's Regesta); Monumenta Carolina, ed. Jaffé; Annales Lauriscenses, Annales Einhardi, &c., and Vita Caroli M. per Einhard. (in Pertz, Monumenta Germanica, Histor. Scriptores); the Standard Collection of Councils, &c.

J. B.—Y.

HADUFRITH, priest. [HATHUFRITH.]

HADUINDUS, bishop of Le Mans. [HAUINDUS.]

HADULAC, bishop of Elmhamb. [HEATHOLAC.]

HADULUS, St., eleventh bishop of Cambrai and Arras, between Hunaudus and Truvardus. He was, according to some, a son of St. Ragnulfus the martyr. He is said to have entered the monastery of St. Vasat (Vedasti) in early youth, and risen to be first prior and then abbat, in which office he succeeded St. Hatta, the first of the series. He died in the year 728 or 729, after ruling the monastery for nineteen years and the see for twelve. His tomb in the church of St. Peter, near the walls of his monastery, became famous from the numerous miracles said to have been worked there, and in the 10th century his remains were exhumed and elevated by one of his successors in the see named Enguerranus, or Engranus. His epitaph of four Latin lines in the church of St. Peter is preserved. He is commemorated May 10 and Aug. 31 (Gesta Pontificum Cambresacensium, 34, 35, Migne, Patr.
HADUMARUS, bishop. [HATHUMARUS]

HADWALD, a servant of Elfeda abbess of Whity, cir. A.D. 685. He was killed by a fall from a tree, and St. Cuthbert is said to have seen angels bearing his soul to heaven at the very time of the accident. Cuthbert mentioned the circumstance to Elfeda, and on the following day the news of Hadwald's death was brought to her (Bed. Vita Cuth. c. 34).

HADWIN, a bishop, consecrated in 768 to the see of Machui, or Mayo of the Saxons, on the west coast of Ireland. (Sim. Dun. in M. H. B. 685; Hoved. Chron. Ann. 768; tom. i. p. 9, ed. Stubbs.) He died in 773, when his successor Leufeth was consecrated (c. 684).

HAEDDI, bishop of Wessex. [HEDDA (1)]

HAEGA, an abbat who attests the charter of Ine to Malmesbury dated May 26, 704. (Kemble, C. D. 50; W. Malmesb. G. P. lib. v. ed. Hamilton, p. 389; Ang. Soc. ii. 22.) Although the charter is a forgery, several of the abbats whose names are attached to it are historical persons, such as Witrada, Bearwald, and Aldhelm, so that Haega also may be a real name.

HAELRIC, an abbat who attests a grant of Ethelred king of Mercia to Worcester, in 692. (Kemble, C. D. 34.)

HAEMATITAE (Almuaretal). An early heretical sect mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as deriving their name, like the Docetae, from the opinions which they held (Strom. vii. 17). What those opinions were, however, he does not say.

HAEGMILLS, a monk mentioned by Bede. (H. E. v. 12.) He lived in the neighbourhood of the solitary Drythelm, probably at Melrose, and was a priest. At the time Bede closed his history, he was living as an anchorite in Ireland, and subsisting on bread and water. It was Haegmills who reported the visions of Drythelm to Bede. His name appears among the anchorites in the Liber Vitae Dulcmbraisi, p. 6. [S.]

HAEMGILLS, abbat of Glastonbury. [HEMGILLS.] [S.]

HAEMORRhOISSA [VERONICA.]

HAERES (HERES) (Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 631; Fabricius, Bibl. Med. et Inf. Lat. lib. i. vol. i. p. 134, ed. 1754; Velser, Rec. Boic. p. 308, making haeres the Latin equivalent of the old German Arobo or Erbo), monk. [CYRINUS (2)]. [C. H.]

HAERHUNEN (HAERNUNEN), bishop of Menevia in the 8th century. (Stubbs, Reg. Scir. Angl. 134; Godwin, de Frang. Angl. 601.)

HAESITANTES, the current rendering of θεσσιτάντες (Phot. cod. 24; Valcuscio, note 79 on Theodor. Lect., E. H. ii. 28, p. 578; Asseman, Bibl. Or. ii. § 4), those who held aloof from the council of Chalcedon. Timotheus the presbyter reckons up twelve various sects of these separatists, as Eutychianists, Acrophili, Julianists, Menandrians, Gnostic, &c. (Timoth. Presb. de Recept. Haerit. p. 405, Migone, Patr. Gr. Ixxvi. 51; Leont. Hist. Synod. act. vi. § 1, act. ix. Migone, n. s. 1234 B, 1259.)

HAGISOAUSTAE. The opponents of image-worship were so called. They were anathematized under that name by a synod convened at Jerusalem by Theodorus the patriarch, A.D. 738 (ἱπποκρίσις ὕπερ, Liber. Synod. ap. Mansi, xii. 273; Hefele, Concilienesch. iii. 374).

HAGONA (HAGUNA, HUGON, HACONA), an abbot whose name appears among the signatures of charters of the last decade of the 7th century. He attests the grant of Oehthred to Barking (Kemble, C. D. 35; Mon. Angl. i. 439), the grant of Earconwald (Mon. Angl. i. 439), that of Ine to Malmesbury (spurious, K. C. D. 50), that of Caedwalla to Winchester (K. C. D. 894), and one of Nothelm of Sussex to Selsey (K. C. D. 932). Although most, if not all, of them are forgeries, the coincidence of the name seems to imply that some such person was known to tradition in the 10th century, and the charter of Oehthred may be genuine.

HAIARNGEN (HAERNGEN), clerical witness to the grant of the church of Ma Mouriace, that is, Laun Vulen, to bishop Cadware (Cadwar) and the see of Llandaff. (Llib. Landan. in Hees, 460.)

HAICO (NAICO), twenty-second bishop of Nantes, between Taurinus and Salutius, towards the middle of the 7th century. (Gall. Christ. xiv. 801.)

HAIDO, bishop of Hude. [HATTO.]

HAIMO, ST. [HAYMO.]

HAINMARUS (AYMAR), twenty-sixth bishop of Anzeria, succeeding Savinianus. According to the annals of the see, he was of noble birth, and of possessions so extended that he became duke of nearly the whole of Burgundy. He followed Pippin upon two campaigns, first against Aino king of Burgund, when, bringing up his forces after the battle had commenced, he decided the event for Pippin with great slaughter of the Saracens. In the second expedition, he assisted Pippin against Eudo duke of Aquitaine, who, from an ally on the former occasion, had been changed into a foe. The Aquitains were defeated, but Eudo escaped, and it was suggested to Pippin by the bishop's enemies that it was not without his connivance. He was accordingly imprisoned at Bastogne (Bastonia villa) in the Ardennes. After a few days, he escaped on horseback by the aid of a nephew, but was pursued and overtaken at Lifol in the district of Toul. Despairing of escape, he spread out his arms in the form of a cross, and, raising his eyes to heaven, was pierced by the lances of his pursuers. He was supposed to have been buried on the same spot (circ. A.D. 736). This account, however, can only be brought into harmony with history by substituting the name of Charles Martel for that of Pippin, and that of Waifarius...
for Euso, and putting the events in 765, as does Le Coite. Hainmarus has been counted among the number of martyrs. He was succeeded, after an episcopate of fifteen years, by Theodranus, whom he had associated in the bishopric during his lifetime, that the diocese might not suffer from his secular occupations. (Gesta Austriacodizensium, Bouquet, v. 434; Gall. Christ. xii. 270; Le Coite, Anna. Ecl. Franc. 765, n. xlviii. tom. v. 677-8; Fisquet, Le Franc. Pontificale, Diocese d'Autunne, p. 232.) [S. A. B.]

HAITO, bishop of Basle. [Hetto.]

HALACHAE. [TALMUD.]

HALANUS (Alanus), sixth abbat of the monastery of St. Mary at Fafra, a Saline town in the Roman states, upon the Fafra, a tributary of the Tiber, about twenty miles north of Rome. The Historiae Forfenses (in Pertz, Scriptores, xi. 528) represent him as a man deeply versed in spiritual philosophy and sacred wisdom. Being a monk of Fafra, under the abbacy of Wandelbert, he retired for greater privacy to a spot near the oratory of St. Martin, in the mountain Motilla overhanging the monastery, and it is in that seclusion he may have composed the work which is attributed to him. On the death of Wandelbert, at the close of 759, the whole fraternity of St. Mary's came out to request Halanus to take his place. He complied, and presided nine years, until his death on March 3, 769, nominating as his successor a monk of English birth named Wigbert. Another authority (Catalogus Abbatum Forfense, in Pertz, xi. 585) dates his accession 761, and places him between Wandelbert or Guandelpert and Probatus. The work attributed to him is a Homiliarium, the prologue of which is given in Pex (Theaur. Anecd. vi. 83). This prologue describes the plan of the work as a series of discourses appropriate to the leading seasons of the church year, commencing with the eve of the Nativity. (Cellier, xii. 145.) [C. H.]

HALMUND, an abbat who attests a grant made by Cuthred, king of Kent, to archbishop Wulfred in a synod at Acle, in Aug. 805. (Hasdian and Stubbs, iii. 559, from MS. Lambeth, 1212; cf. Remble, C. D. 190.)

HANANIAS (Hanina in Syr. Mart.), a priest and martyr with another priest named Abdecalees and Simeon Barsaboe archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, the primates of the Persian church, in the persecution begun by Sapor II. in a.D. 345. A decree having been issued by Sapor for the execution of the clergy of the three first grades, and the demolition of the churches, Simeon and two attendant presbyters were conveyed in chains to Ledan, a city in the province of Huizitis, where Sapor then resided. Being required by Sapor to do homage to the sun, and being assured that upon their compliance depended the safety of themselves and of the Christians at large, they refused, and were condemned to be executed with one hundred others of the clerical order, upon the day which the Persian Christians had consecrated to the memory of Christ's passion. Simeon and his two companions were reserved till the last, the emperor designing to shake their constancy by the sight of so much bloodshed. Simeon, however, confirmed the band of confessors by his exhortations, and at last died himself with his two companions. It happened that Hananias, when it was his turn to strip himself and be bound in order to receive the stroke of the axe, was suddenly seized by the natural fear of death, and trembled through his whole frame; the flesh only, however, being weak, while the spirit was strong as before. When this was observed by Phusus, an officer of rank, superintendent of all the workmen in the palace, who was himself a Christian, he said to the martyr, "Take courage, shut your eyes for a moment, you will soon see the light of Jesus Christ." For this speech he and his daughter, who was a consecrated virgin, were seized, cruelly tortured, and executed. (Sozomen, H. E. i. ii. c. 8-11; Assemani, Acta Mart. Orient. t. i. pp. 10-42; Wright, Syr. Mart. in Jour. Soc. Lit. for 1865, p. 45, and 1866, p. 423.) [G. T. S.]

HANNO, c. 758, bishop of Verona. (Cappelletti, Le Citea d'Italia, z. 751.)

HANNO, HANNUS, alleged bishop of Constantia, also called JOANNES II. (Gall. Chr. v. 894.) [C. H.]

HANTO (Hatto), fourteenth bishop of Augsburg (809-815), between St. Sinibert and St. Nitger. He was at the same time abbot of Neustadt, where he succeeded Waldéricus. Eckhart suggests that he may have been the son of that Hatto from whom St. Megingandus acquired the site of Neustadt, then called Rorich. On two occasions he was commissioned by Charles the Great to settle disturbances in monasteries, first when the territory of Benedictoburium (Benedictheurn) was invaded by wrongdoers (Nichelbeck, Chron. Benedictobur. p. 21), secondly, in 812, when he was sent with the bishops of Mainz, Worms and Würzburg, to compose the disturbances which had arisen between Ratgarius abbass of Fulda and his monks (Annal. Lauriss. Min. 812, Pertz, Scriptores, i. 121). In 815, the year of his death, he is said to have assisted his brother Raptardus in building a church on the site where afterwards stood the monastery of Diesen in Bavaria (De Fundatoribus Mon. Diesa, Pertz, Scriptores, xvii. 329). For Hante, see also Eckhart, Franc. Orient. i. 139, 473; Retzberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 152. [S. A. B.]

HANUS (1), presbyter and martyr in Persia under Sapor II. in the month of May, A.D. 375. He suffered with forty others, including two bishops, sixteen priests, nine deacons, six monks, and seven consecrated virgins. (Assemani, Mart. Orient. i. 144.) [G. T. S.]

HANUS (2), deacon and martyr on the same occasion as the preceding, A.D. 375. (Assemani, Mart. Orient. i. 144.) [G. T. S.]

HARDUINUS, bishop of Le Mans. [Hay

HARDUINUS, a presbyter and recluse at the monastery of Fontenelle. For the sake of more undisturbed contemplation he inhabited the cell of St. Saturninus, built by the abbat Wandregillus, near Fontenelle, and there gave

HARIBERTUS [Arretbertus], fourth abbot of the monastery of Murbach (Morbacum, Murbacum) in the diocese of Basle, succeeding Baldebertus in A.D. 783 (Annales in Pertz, Scriptores, i. 28, 29). Soon afterwards we find him at Rome, where he returned when he was entrusted with a letter from the pope, Paul I., to king Pippin (Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxix. 1144). Upon Paul's death in 767, he was sent to Rome a second time by Pippin (Annales, Pertz, i. 31). Several documents relating to him are preserved, a letter of a matron named Herchiniida to him in A.D. 768, a deed of grant from one Ustericus in the same year, a charter of immunity from public burdens granted to his monastery by Charles the Great in A.D. 772, and a gift of land from one Willarius to the foundation in 774 (Schoepflin, Alsatia Diplomatica, i. 40, 44, 47). In this last year Haribert died, and was succeeded by Amicho (Annales, Pertz, i. 40; Gall. Christ. xv. 537). [S. A. B.]

HARIFEUS of Besançon. [Hervar].

HARIMARUS, bishop. [Huthmar].

HARIOLEUS, thirty-fourth bishop of Langres, between his brother Erlolus and Waldricus. He was founder and first abbot of Ellwangen, in Württemberg, on the river Jast, in the 8th century. He is said to have been of noble family, and not undistinguished while still a layman. In later life he was much loved by Charles the Great, who habitually addressed him as his father. His life was written by Ermeric, a monk of the same foundation, between A.D. 845 and 855. It is in the form of a dialogue between the author and one Mahlotus, and contains but little information, being principally occupied with his miracles. His choice of the spot for his monastery at Ellwangen, according to this narrative, was determined by a vision. His brother, the bishop of Langres, assisted him in constructing the monastery, and under his influence Harioleus adopted the monastic garb and became abbot. The relics of the martyrs St. Sulpicius and St. Servilius, which Erlolus had received from pope Adrian, were translated to Ellwangen. The date of the foundation is given in A.D. 784. His later life in the diocese of Langres is unknown to us, but he appears to have returned to Ellwangen to die. In the list of the Gallia Christiana (iv. 526) he is confused with his brother Erlolus, who preceded him in the see, and was present at the Lateran council in A.D. 768 (Manisi, vii. 719). The day of his death is given as August 15, but the year is unknown. An epitaph, discovered on an old parchment MS. in the monastery, is printed by Pertz at the end of the Life. (Scriptores, x. 11-14, Annales Eclanumenses, Chronicon Eclanum, Pertz, ibid. 18, 35; Retzbach, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 160.) [S. A. B.]

HARMACARUS (Harmacatus), fifth bishop of Utrecht, between Theodardus and Richiridus or Rixfridus. He is said to have been a Frisian by birth, and a canon of Utrecht before his elevation to the episcopate. He sat about thirteen years, from 791 to 804, and was buried in the church of St. Saviour at Utrecht. (Van Heussen, Hist. Episcopat. Federal. Belg. i. 6; Retzbach, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 353.) [S. A. B.]

HARMASUS, a Eucharistic and Monothelite of Alexandria, contemporary with Sophronius bishop of Jerusalem, c. A.D. 636. He is mentioned by that writer in a letter to a singular and unique paragraph of his celebrated synodical which is published by Coteler, as "qui Alexandrinæ adhuc Seraphitarum Hagios Harmonius pateat haereticus esse." (Exct. Gr. Monmm. i. 790). The authenticity of the paragraph, however, is questioned by Coteler (u. s.), and also by Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. ed. Harles, x. 45); but it is admitted by Le Quien (Prose. in Jo. Damasc. de duch. Vohunt. Migne, Patr. Gr. ecv. 129). Anastasius Sinaita mentions the Harmasitae, who would seem to have been followers of Harmasus (Usag. c. 13, Migne, vii. lxxix. 225; Petavius, de Theol. Dogm. v. 43). [T. W. D.]

HARMATIUS (1), a pagan, whose son was converted to Christianity. Basil writing to Harmatius, styling him to be a man to be respected for his son's conscientious convictions, and suggested that he should rather admire the young man's nobility of soul in professing the heavenly relationship to the earthly. (Basil. ep. 276, p. 420, in Pat. Or. xxxii. 1011.) [U. H.]

HARMATIUS (2), a gentleman, the possessor of property at Cucumar, to whom Chrysostom wrote a playful letter, A.D. 404, telling him how much better pleased he should be if, instead of bidding his people supply all his bodily wants, which were none at all, he would spend a little paper and ink in informing him how he and his family found themselves. What he should like best would be a visit from him; but the fear of the Iasurian banditti forbade all hope of that. (Chrys. Epist. 75.) [E. V.]

HARMATIUS (3), bishop of Misthium in Lycaonia, subscribed to the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, by Onesiphorus of Iconium. (Manisi, vii. 165; Le Quien, Orient. Christ. i. 1087.) [L. D.]

HARMOGEN. [Armoghen, Armagil].

HARMONIUS (1), son of Bardesan (Bar-daisan) of Edessa, A.D. 190. He is said to have studied at Athens, where he became familiar with the language and philosophy of Greece. He wrote much in Greek and in Syriac. With his father's peculiar tenets he combined others

HARMONIUS (2).
HARMONIUS

drawn from Greek sources, relating to the origin of the soul, the decay of the body, and transmigration (ζωογραφεία). He sought to popularize his doctrines by presenting them in the form of hymns to be sung on the feasts of the martyrs. He was the first componist in Syria, doubtless in imitation of Greek models. Later onwards, in the 4th century, St. Ephrem wrote hymns in the same metre and to the same airs as those of Harmonius, in order to supplant the hetero-
dox originals. (Theodoret, H. E. iv. 26, p. 1008; Id. Haeret. Fidel. Compend. i. 22, p. 313; Id. ep. 145, p. 1248; Mansi, Concil. xi. 499 E.; Cass. Hist. Liti. i. 86; Collilius, i. 496; Tullemont, Mém. hist. eccl. ii. 457.) (Barth., B.D. p. 252, col. 1.) [C. J. B.]

HARMONIUS (2), apparently a disciple to whom Gregory Nyssen dedicated his treatise De Professione Christiana (Greg. Nyssen. Opp. in Pat. Gr. xli. 228.) [E. V.]

HARMONIUS (3), bishop of Lamprocus, on the Asiatic coast of the Hellespont, signed the synodal letter of the Cyzicene province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 587; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 773.) [L. D.]

HARMONIUS (4), bishop of Callipolis (Gallopil) on the Hellespont at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 536. (Mansi, viii. 879; Le Quien, Ori. Christ. i. 1123.) [J. de S.]

HARPOCRAS (1), one of the seven emissaries of Peter of Alexandria, probably bishops, sent by him to Constantinople, A.D. 380, as spies, to prepare the ground for the clandestine ordination of Maximus the Cynic as bishop of Constantinople (Greg. Naz. Caron. i. p. 14.) [E. V.]

HARPOCRAS (2) (APPOCRAS), one of the orthodox Egyptian bishops who, with some Alexandrian clerics, fled to Constantinople, in A.D. 437, to escape the persecution of Timothius Aelurus and the Eutychians. His name appears in their petition to the emperor Leo (Harduin, Concilia, ii. 896; Labbe, iv. 891), and at the head of the letter addressed to them by the pope Leo (Leo Mag. Ep. clx. 1336). He appears also in the list of bishops subscribing the encyclical letter of the council held at Constantinople in 459, under Gennadius, against simony (Harduin, ii. 783). In the petition to the emperor he appears as “Episcopus Gavaesium” (Tavoerum), among the subscribers to the decree of the council as “Episc. Tavoe.” His see was probably Tavoa, in the province of Aegyptas Prima (Oriens Christ. ii. 526.) [C. G.]

HARPOCRATIANS. Celsius, quoted by Origen (Adv. Cel. v. 82), mentions a heretical sect “κραταρικατος και Ταυερομος.” It is natural to conjecture that Harpocratians are intended, and though we have no independent testimony that this sect professed to have derived traditions from Salome, we know that she is frequently mentioned in apocryphal gospels (Propt. Soc. 19, 20; Clem. Al. Strom. iii. 6, 13; Pistis Sophia, p. 102.) [G. S.]

HARPOCRACTON (1), bishop of Cypopolis in Egypt, on the right bank of the Nile. He was present at the first general council at Nicea, A.D. 325, according to the statement of Socrates (Hist. Eccl. i. 13; Le Quien, Ori. Christ. ii. 591). The list of the Nicene fathers in Mansi (ii. 692 b) names him Alphocration and Arrapocration, bishop of Nauchraetis (see also Le Quien, ii. 523). A bishop of the same name was present at the synod of Tyre, A.D. 335, but his see is not mentioned. (Mansi, ii. 1143 C; Athanas. Apol. Patr. Gr. xxv. 392.) [J. de S.]

HARPOCRATION (2), bishop of Bubastus (Basta) in Egypt. He was one of the bishops consecrated by Melchius, according to the Breviary given to Alexander. (Athanas. Apol. contra Arians, in Patr. Gr. xxv. 376; Le Quien, Ori. Christ. ii. 561.) [J. de S.]

HARUCHUS (HARRUCHE, HARRUTH), third bishop of Verden, between Tanko and Haligad, 808–830 (Potthast, Bibl. Suppl. p. 435). He was of Irish birth, and before his elevation to the episcopate held the post of abbat in the monastery of Amarbaracum, which was usually supposed to be in Ireland, but according to Eckhart and later critics was in Germany, not far from Fulda, with which Ireland maintained friendly relations. (Francon. Orient. i. 700, ii. 23; Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, c. xx. vol. iii. 221.) According to the Chronicle of Verden he was a man of great excellence, and after his death wonderful cures were reported to have been performed at his tomb. Eckhart quotes from the Noveologium of Fulda to the effect that he died in the year 829, and that his remains, together with those of the first bishop, Spatello, and the dalmatic of Tanko the second bishop, were carried back to Verden, from which he infers that these three bishops may have governed the see by chorepiscopi (Francon. Orient. ibid.). Though he finds a place in some hagiologies, principally the Irish, on July 15, Haruchus is omitted by the Bollandists. For their reasons see the Acta SS. Jul. iv. 3. [S. A. B.]

HASSEA, Irish saint. [HEISE.]

HASTULPHUS. [HEISTULPHER.]

HATES, virgin and martyr in Persia under Sapor II. A.D. 443. She is noted in Rom. Mart. on Oct. 17; in Bas. Men. on Oct. 5. In the former she is commemorated under the name of Manemla, and we are told that she was converted from idolatry by an angelic voice, stoned by the heathen and drowned in a lake. (Assenmai, Mart. Orient. i. 96–101.) [G. T. S.]

HATHELAC, bishop. [HEATHELAC.]

HATHOBERHT (Keblem, Cod. Dipl. 175, A.D. 788), bishop. [HEATHOBERHT.][C. H.]

HATHOBERHT (Keblem, Cod. Dipl. 116, A.D. 767), bishop, the same as Eadbert bishop of Leicester. [EADBERT (9).] [C. H.]

HATHORED, bishop. [HEATHORED.]

HATHOWARD, a priest of Worcester, who attests an act of bishop Deoneberht in or about the year 802. (Keblem, C. D. 181.) [S.]

HATHUBERT, bishop. [HEATHOBERHT.]
HATHUFRITH

HATHUFRITH (Hadufrith), a priest who was present at Ripon in A.D. 799 when Wilfrid gave his last instructions to the clergy, and he was also one of those deputed by that prelate to return from Mercia to tell them who was to be their abbot (Eddi, cap. 63). [J. R.]

HATHUMARUS (Hadumarus, Harumarus), first bishop of Paderborn in Westphalia. This district was previously under the care of the bishop of Würzburg, but had become neglected on account of its distance from that place. According to Ido, who wrote the history of the translation of St. Liborius, Hathumarus was a Saxon, who when a boy had been given to Charles the Great as a hostage, and was sent by him to reside at Würzburg. Here he was educated, and in time took the tonsure, and devoted himself to study. He was afterwards consecrated first bishop of Paderborn by command Charles. The year is usually given as A.D. 795, but this seems too early a date to harmonize with Ido’s narrative. He was alive in the year 815, as we find Louis the Pious, when asked for a charter for the foundation of the monastery of Corvey, summoning Hathumarus as the bishop of the diocese in which the proposed site lay, that the step might not be taken without his sanction (Hist. Transl. S. Vita, vii., Pertz, Scriptores, ii. 579). He was succeeded by Baduradus. (Boll. Acta SS. Jul. v. 415, 417.) His day of consecration was Aug. 9. (Schäfer, Annalium Paderbornensis, tom. i. p. 29 sqq.; Boll. Acta SS. Aug. ii. 448; Retberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 440–1.) [S. A. B.]

Hatto, eighth bishop of Passau (A.D. 807–818), between Urrolf and Reginald or Reginarius, is said to have obtained the see through the influence of Arno of Salzburg. Probably out of gratitude for his elevation he made no claim to the pallium, which at this time had gone to the see of Salzburg. He was present at two councils, that of Salzburg, in 807, and another at Regensburg, the date of which is not known. His name also occurs in some charters of Louis the Pious for the church of Passau (Auctor, Cronicon sancti Austriacii, 807, 818, Pertz, Scriptores, ix. 551, 559; Hanslitzius, Germania Sacra, i. 152–4; Retberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, ii. 251; Potthast, Biblioth. Suppl. p. 381.) [S. A. B.]

Hatto, bishop of Augsburg. [Hatto.]

Hatto, bishop of Basle. [Hetto.]


HAWYSTIL, St., a daughter of Brychan, in the 5th century, who founded the church of Dlanhawystil, supposed to be Awest in Gloucestershire (R. Rees, Welsh Saints, 152). [C. W. B.]

HAYMO, St. (Haino), flourished towards the end of the 5th century. He and his brother Veremundus while hunting near Milan were pursued by bears, both of which by way of a vex which they made in the hour of danger, founded a monastery at Meda, a village mid-way between Milan and Como. They were commemorated on Feb. 13. (Boll. Acta SS. Feb. ii. 705; Mabill. Acta SS. O. S. B. sacred. iii. ii. 380.) [I. G. S.]

HAYNIUS, thirty-second bishop of Chartres, between Berthegnannus and Agirarius. He is said to have been in occupation of the see in A.D. 696. But the history of the diocese of Chartres at this time is involved in the greatest obscurity. (Gall. Chr. viii. 1101.) [S. A. B.]

HEABERT, king of Kent. [EADBERHT.]

HEABERT (Kemble, Cod. Dip. 162, spurious charter of Offa king of Mercia, A.D. 793), bishop; perhaps Heathberht bishop of London. [C. H.]

HEABURGA, abbess of Minster. [EADBURGA (2).]

HEADHERT (Kemble, Cod. Dip. 1029, A.D. 799), bishop. [HEATHOBERT.]

HEADDA (Headdi), bishop of Winchester. [HEDDA (3).]

HEADDA (Kemble, Cod. Dip. 36, A.D. 693; 52, A.D. 704), bishop of Liechfield. [HEDDA (2).] [C. H.]

HEADDA (1), a priest of the diocese of Worcester, who attains an act of Eanberht, Uhtred and Aldred, ealdormen or underkings of the Hwiccio, to Worcester in 757. (Kemble, C. D. 102.) He is probably the same person as the following. [S.]

HEADDA (2), priest and abbot of the diocese of Worcester; kinsman of bishop Heathored, to whom in 759 the three Hwiccio ealdormen granted lands at Osnaford (Kemble, C. D. 105). and who some years later left his hereditary estates to the monastery at Worcester (6, 189). The condition of the bequest is curious: the estates are to be held by the abbot's heirs so long as there can be found in the family one who is sitted to rule a religious house, and they are never to come into lay hands. The date of the bequest falls between 781 and 798. [S.]

HEADDA, the eighth bishop of Hereford, (M. H. B. 621, v. l.) [CEADDA.]

HEADRED, bishops. [HEARDRED.]

HEABHERRT, a priest of the diocese of Rochester, who attested the acts of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547.) [S.]

HEABERT, abbot of Reculver, to whom Eardulf, king of Kent, made a grant of land at Perhamstead. (Dugdale, Moni. i. 435, from the Canterbury Cartulary in the Bodleian.) He is called Eadberht in Kemble’s recension of the charter, which is extant, but would fall about 747. (Kemble, C. D. 1004.) [S.]

HEAHSTAN, a priest of the diocese of London, who attested the acts of the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547.) He may possibly be identical with the person who behest bishop of Sherborne in 824, and survived until 867; but this is scarcely likely. [S.]
HEAMUND, a Kentish priest, who attested the act of archbishop Wulfred, dated April 21, 811. (Kemble, C. D. 195.)

HEAN, the founder of the monastery of Abingdon. In the chronicles of that abbey he is represented as nephew of Cissa, the ealdorman of Wiltshire under Kentwin and Ceadwalha successively kings of the West Saxons. Cissa is called by William of Malmsbury (G. F. ed. Hamilton, 191, 354), father of king Ine; this, however, is not the case, being son of Ceard; and the relationship here asserted being part of a notion, common to the Malmsbury traditions, which was intended to make the family of Ine a nucleus of monastic sanctity. But this mistake as to the father of Ine need not invalidate the testimony of the Abingdon writers with respect to the relationship of Hean and Cissa. (Hist. Abingdon, ed. Stevenson, ii. 263.)

Ceslawtha, or Cilla, the foundress of Helenastow nunnery, is on the same authority said to have been Hean's sister. According to this tradition, which in this point again has something in common with the Malmsbury and Glastonbury legends, Abingdon (which was no doubt named from some ancient Saxon Abba who has left other traces of his occupation of the upland country (see Stevenson, Hist. Abingdon. vol. ii. pref. p. r.) had been the home of an Irish anchorite named Abbennus or Awen in the 5th century. (Chr. Abingdon. i. 2, 3; ii. 268.)

The name of Scevakesham was also ascribed to Abingdon before the foundation of the monastery by Hean. It was in the reign of Kentwin that the foundation was first contemplated: Hean about the year 675 obtained from Cissa, a place for his monastery, and devoted his own inheritance to the endowment. Under Ceadwalha the successor of Kentwin, the work which, according to the legend, had been begun upon the hill of Abbennus, and been stopped by miraculous agency, which every night threw down what had been built during the day, was removed to the plain by the Thames, where a furrow had been cut by supernatural means to mark the place for the foundation, and where a hermit of Cumnor had directed Hean to build. About this time Ciss died, and was buried first on the hill, then translated to the church on the plain. Hean here completed his work, and obtained charters for his monastery from Ceadwalha, and, after his death, from Ine, who had at first shown himself unfriendly, but was soon reconciled. He was made first abbot and ruled his monks until the reign of Ethelheard, Ine's successor, when he died, and was succeeded by Conan. (Chron. Abingdon. ii. 268-272.)

The chronicle gives a detailed description of Hean's monastic buildings. Unfortunately the whole story rests upon very untrustworthy authority, and accordingly the charters, which are added in the account, a portion of forgery over and above the internal evidence of spuriousness. Of these, however, the most important are the will of Hean (Kemble, C. D. 998; Chron. Abingdon. i. 13), in which as abbé he provides for the disposition of his property at Bradosfeld, Escedune and Earmundes, by his sister Cilla, with reversion to his monastery; this is confirmed by Ine and the bishop Daniel, and must be dated therefore after the year 705: a fragment of a charter of Ceadwalha (Chr. Abingdon. p. 8): a charter of Ine restoring to Hean 273 casates or hides of land granted to him and Cilla by king Cissa, which Kemble condemns as a clumsy forgery, but which, as far as its material portions go, is defended by Stevenson (ib. 9, Kemble, C. D. 46); another grant by Ine of some of the lands mentioned in Hean's will (Chr. Abingdon. i. 11; K. C. D. 45), which is rejected on account of the false date (A.D. 687), which may have been a late addition; and a charter by the same king to Hean and Cesso, confirming an earlier grant by Eodfrith, son of Iddi, of lands in Bradfield, Bestlesford and Streltech; this last, although rejected by Kemble, may be genuine. (Chr. Abingdon. i. 12; Kemble, C. D. 31.)

The main features of the tradition must have been current before the days of William of Malmsbury, who without, however, mentioning Hean, calls Cissa, the father of Ine, the founder. When in the reign of Eadred, St. Ethelwald settled a monastery at Abingdon, he found there the remains of a small monastery, possessing forty manse, and claiming a larger territory which was in the hands of the king (Alfric, Life of Ethelward, Chr. Abingdon. ii. 257; Welstan, v. Ethelw. ap. Mab. A.A. SS. O. S. B. saec. v. p. 500); the extent of the territory was thus attested by evidence of the age of Dunstan. But it must be feared that as Bede, the chronicles, Asser and Ethelward are silent as to the traditions, they were either invented or developed from the genuine portions of the charters, in the reign of Edgar. See besides the chronicles of Abingdon, edited by Mr. Stevenson, the extracts from the Abingdon copy of Peculiarities of Worcester, Ang. Soc. i. 183; Mon. Angl. i. 505-526; W. Malmsby. Gesta Pontificalium, lib. ii. § 88; Ralph de Diceto, ii. 211; Harpsfield, Hist. Angl. Ecol. p. 78.

HEANBALD (Gaimar, Estoriç, v. 2199, in M. H. B. 780), archbishop of York. [EANBALD II]

HEANFLET (Gaimar, Estoriç, v. 1196, in M. H. B. 779), daughter of Edwin king of Northumbria. [EANFLET (2)]

HEANFRID (Gaimar, Estoriç, v. 1258, in M. H. B. 780), king of Northumbria. [EANFRID]

HEARDBERHT, brother of Ethelward king of Mercia, c. a.d. 736. (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. 80, 83.) [C. H.]

HEARDRED (HEARDREAD, HEARDRED), the seventh bishop of Dunwich after the division of the East Anglian sees. (M. H. B. 618.) His name occurs in the act of Heathore at the council of Brentford in 781 (Kemble, C. D. 143; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 439), and under the corrupt form Harchelus among the attestations of the acts of the added council of 787. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461.) He is also in the charter granted by Ófrí to the gesith Oesht in the council of Æłcylith in 788 (K. C. D. 153), and in other documents dated at a similar assembly at the same place in 789. (K. C. D. 155, 156, 157.) The latter year seems to be the last of Heardred's pontificate, as his successor Aelfhaun [ALHUN] appears in 790. If these dates are correct, Heardred would be one of the bishops transferred from the province of
HEARDRED

Canterbury to that of Lichfield, supposing the account given by the later writers of the arrangement, and made in 787 to be trustworthy. [HUBERT.]

HEARDRED (HEARDRED), bishop of Hexham. [EADRED (2).] [S.]

HEARED, a deacon of the diocese of Rochester, who attended the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 547.) [S.]

HEATHOBALD, a deacon of the diocese of Hereford, who attended the council of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 546.) [S.]

HEATHOBERT (HATHUBERT), the thirteenth bishop of London. (M. H. B. 617.) His name is attached to charters of 798 and 799. He attests a grant of Kenulf of Mercia, confirmed in synod in 798 apparently at Clovesho (Kemble, C. D. 175; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 514), and an act of Withenagemot at Tamworth (K. C. D. 1020) in 798, where his name appears as Headbert. There is likewise a document of the year 801, in which Heathobert appears as a witness. (K. C. D. 414, 418; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 531.) Such being the evidence of charters to Heathobert's data, it is satisfactory to find his death noted under the year 801 by Simeon of Durham (M. H. B. 672), and, as no intervening name occurs, he probably succeeded Eadbald, who left England in the year of Offa's death, 796. [EADBILD (3).] It is, however, to be observed, that in a remarkable charter, purporting to be granted by Offa to Canterbury in a council at London in 799, no name of a bishop of London is found. (K. C. D. 159; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 485, 486.) Simeon records that shortly after Heathobert's death great part of London was burnt. (M. H. B. 672.) [S.]

HEATHOLAC (HADULAC, HATHIELAC; ETELATUS, ANG. SAC. I. 404), the third bishop of Elmham after the division of the East Anglian sees (M. H. B. 618). He was bishop at the time Bede closed his history (H. E. v. 25), and must have attained that dignity after the year 716, in which his predecessor, Nothhelm, was living. (Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 300.) His successor, Ethelfrith, was consecrated by archbishop Nothhelm in or about 736. (ANG. SAC. I. 404.) [S.]

HEATHORED (1), 8th bishop of Worcester (M. H. B. 623). According to Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 545, 546) he succeeded bishop Tilhere in 781, and died in 798; and these dates are amply borne out by the evidence of charters, from which also we learn more of Heathored than we know of most of the contemporary bishops. In 781 we find him at the council of Brentford, making an agreement with Offa by which the monastery of Worcester resigned to the king its rights at Bath, on condition of retaining lands at Stratford, Sture in Usmere, Bredon, and Hontume. (Kemble, C. D. 149; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 438, 439.) The same year he attests some questionable charters of Offa (K. C. D. 141, 142), and in 785, the fabricated grant of that king to Westminster. (F. C. 149; MON. ANGL. I. 201.) In 787, under the name "Adoredus," he appears at the legislative council. (Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 401.) In 789 Heathored was engaged in litigation with Wulfheard, the son of Cosa, touching the inheritance of Hemehe. (Kemble, C. D. 154; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 465; MON. ANGL. I. 587.) This cause was tried in the council of Acre in that year, and it was then decided that Wulfheard should retain the property for life; the matter was again brought forward after Heathored's death in the council of Clovesho in 805. (K. C. D. 183.) The division of the province of Canterbury in 787 or 788 would have the effect of making Heathored's see subject to Lichfield. His name, however, appears in the list of bishops who attended with Ethelheard at London in 795 (K. C. D. 159; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 485, 486). In 794 at a council at Clovesho, attended by both archbishops, he recovered an estate at Ause from Byna, a "guesth" of Offa (K. C. D. 184). He continues to attest Mercian charters of Offa and Egfrith, and appears as signing a grant of Kenulf to the ealdorman Oswulf in the synod of 798. (K. C. D. 175.) Besides occurring in genuine charters his name is found in the spurious grants of Offa to St. Alban's (K. C. D. 161, 162) and Westminster (K. C. D. 365, 366). His last act of importance is as charter of Kenulf to Christ Church, Canterbury, of the year 799. (Kemble, C. D. 1020.) If this charter is genuine, the date given by Florence for Heathored's death will require the common rectification by two years, and belong to the year 800. (Thomas, Suryce of Worcesters, pp. 19-22; Bemig, Ciuatuory of Worcesters, ed. Hearne, passim; ANG. SAC. I. 471.) [S.]

HEATHORED (2), bishop of Lindsey, properly the 13th in succession, but omitted in the ancient list (M. H. B. 620), and inserted among the bishops of Whithern (Bod.). Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 547, 548) gives the date of his promotion to Lindsey as 619, and dates his death in 629; in the margin of the MS of Simeon of Durham, he is dated, by mistake, 611 (ib. p. 685). The latter author, in his History of the Church of Durham, recognizes Heathored as bishop of Lindsey, assigning him an episcopate of nine years between Egbert and Egred (LIB. II. c. 5; AP. TWYDEN, p. 13), which probably signifies from A.D. 821 to 830, as in the latter year the accession of Egred is noted (M. H. B. 673). Of Heathored as bishop of Whithern nothing is known, but he may have taken charge of that diocese after the death of Badwulf. [S.]

HEATHORED (3), a priest of the diocese of Sinderacre, who attests the act of Clovesho in 803. (K. C. D. 1024; Haddon and Stubbs, iii. 546.) [S.]

HEATHORED (4) (HETHERED), an undated abbot of Malmsbury, whose name occurs twelfth in the list in the Cotton MS, Vitellius, A. 10. (Birch, ABOBTS OF MALMSBURY, p. 7.) [S.]

HEBDOMAS. All the early Gnostics of whose opinions Irenaeus gives an account, in a section (I. 23 sqq.) probably translated in England by a writer, agree in the doctrine that the world was made by the instrumentality of angels. The brief account given of the teaching of the first two in the list, Simon and Menander, does not state
whether or not they defined the number of these angels; but it is expressly told of the third, Saturninus (ca. 24), that he counted them as seven. At the end of the first book of Irenaeus is a section to all appearance derived from a source different from that just referred to. He here (c. 29) relates the opinions of heretics to whom he himself gives no title, but whom his copist Theodoret (Haer. Fab. i. 14) calls Ophites. We have noted (Vol. I. pp. 382, 426) coincidences between this chapter and the former chapter on Saturninus, which have led us to the conclusion that in both chapters the doctrines of the same school are described. The former chapter might be regarded as an abstract derived from a previous treatise on heresies; the fuller details of the latter might have been obtained by Irenaeus himself from a work of the school written when the system had received some development. In any case the Ophite teaching may be used to illustrate that of Saturninus, and to throw some light upon his doctrine than with any other. It would have been natural to think that the number of seven angels was suggested to Saturninus by astronomical considerations; and this supposition is verified by the statement in the later chapter (c. 30, p. 111) that the holy Hebdomas are the seven stars called planets. In fact, the sphere of the seven stars, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon, were supposed to be presided over by a different angel. Their names are differently given; Irenaeus (c. 30) giving them, Ialdaboth, the chief, Isao, Sabboth, Adonaeus, Eloeeus, Oreus, and Astaphes. With this closely agrees Origen, who, writing of the Ophites (Adv. Cels. vi. 31, 32), gives the names Ialdabooth, Isao, Sabboth, Adonueus, Astaphueus, Elooeus, Horaeus. Epiphanius (Haer. 26, p. 91), relating the opinions of what was clearly a branch of the same school, places in the highest heaven Ialdaboth or, according to others, Sabboth; in the next, Eliinaeus according to one version, Ialdaboth according to the other; in the next Adonaeus and Eloaeus; beneath these Dades, Seth, and Sochua; lowest of all Isao. It was thought that each of the Jewish prophets was sent by a different angel to announce some special secret that the glory that prophet was to declare. Thus (Ireneus, i. 30, 109) the first angel sent Moses, Joshua, Amos, and Habakkuk; the second Samuel, Nathan, Jonath, and Micah; the third Elijah, Joel, and Zechariah; the fourth Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel; the fifth Tobit and Haggait; the sixth Micah (q. m. Malachi?) and Nahum; the seventh Ezra and Zephaniah. The ancient astrologers thought that seven above the seven planetary spheres was an eighth, the sphere of the fixed stars (Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 25, xxxv. p. 638; see also his quotation, v. 11, p. 692, of a mention of the fifth heaven in apocryphal writings ascribed to Zephaniah). In the eighth sphere, these Gnostics taught, dwelt the mother to whom all these angels owed their origin, Sophia or Pandora. According to the version of Irenaeus, Barbelo according to that of Epiphanius. In the language of these sects the word hebdomad not only denotes the seven angels, but is also a name of place, denoting the heavenly regions over which the seven archons presided; while Ogdoad denotes the supercelestial regions which lay above their control.

Again, beside the higher hebdomad of the seven angels, the Ophite system told of a lower hebdomad. After the serpent in punishment for having taught our first parents to transgress the commands of Ialdaboth was cast down into this lower world, he begat himself six sons, who, with him himself form a hebdomad, the counterpart of that of which his father Ialdaboth is chief. These are the seven demons, the scene of whose activity is the lower earth, not the heavens; and who delight in injuring the human race on whose account their father had been cast down. Origen (Adv. Cels. 30) gives their names and forms from an Ophite diagram; Michael in form as a lion, Suriel as an ox, Raphael as a dragon, Gabriel as an eagle, Thuthabathoth as a bear, Erathanoth as a dog, Onoeel or Tartharaoth as an ass.

It does not appear that the Oriental philosophy, or the earliest Gnostic systems, recognized any place higher than the eighth sphere; and it is here that the account of Epiphanius (Haer. 26, p. 91) dwelt Barbelo the mother of all. But Grecian philosophy came to teach that above the sensible world there lay a still higher, and Clem. Alex. (I. c.) speaks of the eighth sphere as lying nearest τῇ νεκτῷ κόσμῳ. Accordingly, those Gnostic systems which are tinctured by Grecian philosophy, while leaving untouched the doctrine of seven or eight material spheres, develop in various ways the theory of the region above them. In the system of Basilides, as reported by Hippolytus (vii. 20 sqq.), Ogdoad and Hebdomad are merely names of place. In that system the universe is divided into the Kosmos and the hypercosmical region. At the highest point of the Kosmos presides the great Archon, ruling over the Ogdoad, or otherwise region, which is described as reaching down to the moon. Beneath the Ogdoad is the Hebdomad presided over by its own Archon. In one place (p. 238) the names Ogdoad and Hebdomad seem to be given to the archons themselves. In any case the names shew marks of having been derived from a previous system, for the system of Basilides itself gives no account of the numbers seven or eight; and the number of heavens is not mentioned. In Iren. i. 24, 25, the number is 365 being counted. In the latest form of Basilidianism, that contained in P Tatia Sophia, the doctrine of the higher regions receives such enormous development that the seven planetary spheres are thought of as contemptibly low; and laldaboth, once their ruler, in this book sinks to a demon.

In the system of Valentinus again the names Ogdoad and Hebdomad occur in the same signification. Above this lower world are the seven heavens, where dwells their maker the Demiurge himself also, on that account, called Hebdomas (Iren. i. v. p. 24). Of those seven heavens Marcus taught in more detail (Iren. i. xiv. 7, p. 72). Above these heavens is the Ogdoad, also called ἡ μεθεοτότης, and Jerusalem above, the abode of Achamoth, who, some thought, was the mother of Irenaeus, Barbelo according to that of Epiphanius. In the language of these sects the word hebdomad not only denotes the seven angels, but is also a name of place, denoting the heavenly regions over which the seven archons presided; while Ogdoad denotes the supercelestial regions which lay above their control.
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different sense in the system of Valentinus himself, whose Ogdoad within the Pleroma was probably intended to answer to the Ogdoad outside. Irenaeus (ii. 107) argues from what is told of Paul's ascent to the third heaven against the low place assigned to the heavens in the Valentinian scheme.

The word Hebdomad occurs also in the Clementine Homilies, but its use there is quite unconnected with the teaching hitherto described. The mystery of the Hebdomad there unfolded (Hom. iv. 10) is an independent position of the six days' work of creation, and the seventh day's rest; illustrated by the six directions, into which infinite space extends, viz. up, down, right, left, backward, forward, together with the central point considered as making a seventh.

The mysteries of the number seven are treated of by Clem. Alex. (Strom. vi. 18), and in the source whence he borrowed (Philo, de Op. Mundi. and Leg. Allegor., where the theme is enlarged on, χαίρε ἡ φωνή ἡ βούλανσα). See also Hippol. Ref. iv. 51; Routh, Rel. Sac. i. 416. On the Jewish theory of seven heavens, see ISRAEL, ASCENSION OF.

[O. S.]

HEBREW LEARNING AMONG THE FATHERS. Judging from a priori grounds it would not be unreasonable to expect that we should find evidence in the works of the earliest Christian writers of some acquaintance with the Old Testament Scriptures in their original tongue. The facts that Christianity has its roots firmly planted in Judaism,—that the writers of the New Testament uniformly appeal to the words of Moses and of the prophets,—that the new law went forth from Jerusalem,—and that its first preachers and converts were Jews,—naturally suggest the probability that we should find in the writings of the early fathers indications of their habitual use of the Old Testament Scriptures in the original tongue. It is well known to every ecclesiastical student that the fathers use very little, but very little labour has been hitherto bestowed (especially in this country) upon any attempt to ascertain the extent to which the study of Hebrew was cultivated within the first few centuries of the existence of the Christian church.

It is not difficult to trace the chief causes of the neglect of this study. Jerusalem soon ceased to be the centre from which the new faith was propagated, and Judaism soon ceased to supply its ablest expositors and apologists. Moreover, whilst the use which was made of the LXX version by the writers of the New Testament sufficed to establish its authority amongst Christians, the prevailing use of the Greek language accounts for the general adoption of that version, both for the instruction of converts and for the contention of adversaries. And further, whilst the bitter animosity which existed on the part of the Jews towards Christianity may have so far reacted upon Christians as to create within them a prejudice against the Hebrew language, there existed a strong reluctance, and in some places a strict prohibition against the imparting of a knowledge of Hebrew by Jews to those whom they regarded as enemies alike to their country and to their religion.

These considerations may serve in some measure to account both for the prevalent neglect of the Hebrew language, and also, to a certain extent, for the disposition on the part of those who possessed some acquaintance with it to restrict their statements on the authority of Jews rather than to advance them on their own responsibility. In confirmation of this view the following extract may be adduced from the Apologia adversus Rufinum of St. Jerome. "Iose Origines et Clementis et Eusebios atque alii complures, quando de Scripturis aliquis disputant, et volunt apparebunt quid dicant, sic solent scribere: Referat mihi Hebraeus, et audiri ab Hebraeo, et Hebraeorum ista sententia est. Certe etiam Origines patriarcharum Huilium, qui temporibus ejus fuit, nominat, et tristesimum tomum in Esaiam, in cujus fine dedisserit Vasi tibi ... illius expositione conclusit" (tom. iii. p. 91, Basil. 1516).

JUSTIN MARTYR.—The controversy of Justin with Trypho deserves notice in connexion with this subject on several grounds. Justin Martyr was a native of Samaria. He was born at Flavia Neapolis, a town which occupied the place of Sichem, the old capital of Samaria, and which was colonized with Greeks by the emperor Vespasian. He dialogues with Trypho, and esteems one of the most learned Jews of his time, was held at Ephesus about the year a.d. 148. We have here the case of one who, though born and brought up in the land of Palestine, was not only ignorant of the vernacular language of that country at the time of his conversion to Christianity, but who appears to have been insensible of the great disadvantage under which, by reason of this ignorance, he engaged in controversy with a Jew; and who, as far as we know, never subsequently applied himself to the study of those Scriptures in their original tongue from which the arguments which he urges against Trypho are mainly derived.

The indications which Justin gives of his entire ignorance of the Greek version (or versions) of the Old Testament, and of his ignorance of a Hebrew text, are of a very marked and conclusive character. The following will suffice by way of illustration.

(1) In c. 49 Justin's argument based upon Ex. xxvii. 16, "A hand upon the throne (or, as some read, 'upon the banner') of the Lord," is derived from the LXX, who appear to have had a reading entirely different from the present Hebrew text, and one which is unsupported by the other versions, viz. ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, "with a hidden hand."

(2) Although Justin's quotation, in c. 50, from Is. xxxix. 8 to xi. 18, presents several verbal variations from the LXX, he agrees with the LXX and with the Vulgate, and differs not only from the Hebrew, but also from the other Greek versions, in adopting the masculine instead of the feminine gender in ver. 9, δὲ ἐγγενεῖς ἦσαν, "thou that bringest good tidings."

(3) In c. 113, Justin prefers it as an accusation against the Jews that, whilst taking no account of the change of Oshea into Joshua, they made it a theological question why ας was added to the name of Abraham (Ἀβραάμ for ᾼβραάμ) and a second ς inserted in that of Sarah (Σαρά for Σάρα). It is difficult to imagine that this "vulgar mistake of the Greeks," as it is
described by bishop Pearson,* could have been made by any one who knew that the real change was the addition of the letter Λ (Λ) in the name of Abraham (i.e. Abraham for Abram), and the change of Λ(Ξ) into Λ (Λ) in that of Sarah (i.e. Sarah for Sareh). It is remarkable, however, that Trypho who is described by Eusebius (Hist. iv. c. 18) as “the most distinguished of the Hebrews of his time,” instead of insisting upon the production of direct evidence of so grave an accusation, contented himself with remarking that “the thing appears incredible.” Upon the whole it seems not unreasonable to conclude that neither Justin nor Trypho was able to refer to the Hebrew text.

Whist, however, Justin shews his entire ignorance of the Hebrew language, he gives evidence of some familiarity with the Jewish traditional interpretation of many passages of the Old Testament. Thus, e.g., in his Dialogue with Trypho (c. xx.), he adopts the same view of the meaning of Genesis xxvi. 29, which is found in the Midrash on Ps. cxlvi. 7, viz. that whereas only the flesh of some animals was allowed as food by the Mosaic laws, the flesh of all animals, without restriction, was granted to Noah and to his sons. In c. xxi. of the Dialogue Justin refers to the Jewish interpretation of Daniel’s “time,” 71 (xii. 25), as denoting a hundred years. Again, in c. xi. of the same Dialogue Justin, by the use of the word γίνομαι, as applied to the two goats, of which one was killed and the other sent into the wilderness on the day of Atonement, shews his acquaintance with the in-junctions of the Mishnah (treatise Yomah) respecting the exact resemblance of the two goats, on which, indeed, though nowhere prescribed in the law of Moses, it makes the validity of the enjoined rites to depend. In c. xxii. of the Dialogue he shews his acquaintance with the Jewish traditional interpretation of Gen. xxi. 15, where mention is made of female camels only, not males, and of the number of measures of fine flour, and of oil in the appointed offerings. And once more, in c. xxiii., Justin refers to the interpretation of Deut. viii. 4, which appears to have been more generally received by his Jewish contemporaries, viz. that the clothing of the children of the Israelites, during their wanderings in the wilderness, increased in size in proportion to the growth of the wearers. (Cf. Justinus Martyr and die Agada, von Dr. Alex. Heinrich Goldfahn, Breslau.)

TERTULLIAN, QUANTUS SEPTIMIUS FLORENS, the earliest of the Latin fathers of the church. The precise date of his birth is uncertain. It was probably between A.D. 145 and A.D. 150. There are passages in his writings which lead to the inference that he was brought up as a heathen, but Jerome, in his Catalogus Scriptrorum Ecclesiasticorum, gives no information on this point. There can be little doubt (notwithstanding the adhesion of some Roman writers) that, although a married man, Tertullian was a presbyter, either of the church of Rome, or of

---

* Note on Art. II. p. 113, Qz. 1977.

† It is obvious, however, that in some places either the text which Justin used differed from any which is now known, or that Justin did not strictly adhere to it. Thus, in the quotation from Is. lv. which occurs in c. 13, we observe that whereas the LXX omit two negatives which are found in the Hebrew in ver. 4, and insert two negatives which are not found in the Hebrew in ver. 6, Justin follows the Greek text in the former case and the Hebrew text in the latter. We may observe also that in the quotation in c. xiii. from Is. lii. 12, where the version of the LXX is ψεύδοται γὰρ ψεύδοτας ἡμῖν, Justin, in accordance with the Hebrew, which has δὲ γὰρ ἡγήσασθαι, i.e. before your face, reads ψεύδοται γὰρ ψεύδοτας ἡμῖν. Justin refers particularly to Is. vii. where he says (cf. c. 11 and c. 84) that the Jews presumed to corrupt the translation made by the LXX and to substitute γίνομαι for ἔγινομαι.
that of Carthage. He appears to have been acquainted with all those branches of science and of literature which were studied in his time; and he sometimes speaks, as bishop Kaye has observed in his Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian (p. 66, foot-note, 1839), as if he was acquainted with Hebrew. Thus, e.g., in his Five Books against Marcion (iv. 39), we find him giving the correct meaning of the name Israel, viz. one who peregrini with God (in martyr's name cum Deo praestans, i.e. pretatio Israelis). This is the more remarkable when we remember that Jerome, in his treatise on proper names, as well as Origen, adopts the interpretation of the name then commonly received, viz. one seeing God, and that the former afterwards assigned as his reason for so doing the names of great weight by which that interpretation was supported (see under Jerome in this article). Again, in his work Against Praxea (c. 5), Tertullian says, "There are some who allege that even Genesis opens thus in Hebrew,—"In the beginning God made for Himself a Son" ("in principio Deus fecit sibi filium"), on which statement Tertullian observes, "Hoc ut firmum non sit, alia me arguments dedecundam est in omne Genesim in Hebraico. The remark of Jerome refers to these words of Tertullian, and having first observed that the Hebrew is יִהְיֶה וּלְךָ and not יִהְיֶה וּלָךָ, which latter reading would mean that God created the heaven and the earth by the Son, Jerome remarks that the reference to Christ must be understood rather according to the sense than according to the letter. The remarks of Tertullian do not appear to justify the inference that he rejected the statement to which he refers from a personal examination of the original. It is quite possible that the evidence of the version or versions which he used may have satisfied him of its incorrectness.

In his treatise Against Marcion (iii. 22) Tertullian quotes Ezekiel ix. 4 thus, "Fertranii in medio portae, in media Hierusalem, et da signum, et proficiscant hujus viri vnum." He goes on to observe that the Greek letter Τυα and the Roman letter T have the form of the cross, but he does not appear to have been aware that in the old characters which Jerome says the Samaritans used in his time, the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet has the form of the cross. Tertullian quotes the passage from Ezekiel again at greater length in his treatise Ad. Judaeos (c. 11), but in this place the MS. which Oehler usually follows omits the word Tυα after signum. Now insomuch as the Greek version of the LXX has simply σημειον both in v. 4 and in v. 6, in both of which the Hebrew has the word הָיָה, it is possible that Tertullian may have derived his version from the original Hebrew; on the other hand it seems more probable that the old Latin version or versions, which are thought to have existed in the time of Tertullian, had the Tυα as the present Vulgate has it.

It may be observed here that the Tυα is found in the version of the Theodotion, according to Origen and Jerome, and also in the versions of Aquila according to Origen; but independently of the question whether these versions, especially that of Theodotion, could have been known to Tertullian, there appears no evidence of his use of them.

In his treatise Adversus Judaeos (c. 9), Tertullian refers to the meaning of the word Ιησοῦς in the Hebrew: "Soros enim Hebraicus, quod est Ιησοῦς, id est nobiscum Deus, suae gentis est." These words, however, like those to which reference has already been made, do not warrant the inference that Tertullian was capable of referring to the Hebrew text; and the wide deviation of his quotations from it, even when arguing against the Jews, affords presumptive evidence that he was unable to do so. Amongst many incidental indications that such was the case reference may be made to the following: (1) In common with many of the early Christian writers, Tertullian quotes the words "from the tree" (indisputably transferred it may be, in the first instance, from Acts xiii. 29 to Ps. cxvi.), as if they occurred in Ps. cxvi. 10 (Ado. Jud. c. x). (2) When quoting Is. xiv. 1, Tertullian either read Κυρίῳ for Κύριος or quotes from some old Latin version which was based upon that reading: "Sic dixit Dominus Deus Chris tus, qui erat Deus omnis gentium et deo omnium (i.e. quod est oblatum, the reading is obvious to any one who refers to the LXX, but such a rendering would have been impossible if reference had been made to the Hebrew, which has Σωτήρ, "to Cyrus." (3) Tertullian’s quotation from Micah v. i. (δ. c. xiii.) agrees more closely with the Greek of St. Matthew ii. 3–6, than with the Hebrew or the LXX. (4) Tertullian’s rendering of Ps. xxii. 17 is "exterminaverunt meus mea et pedes." (5) Tertullian follows the LXX in his version of Jer. xvii. 9, and c. xiv. "homo est et quis cognoscet illum," where the Hebrew word שָׁכֵן which is taken in the Vulg. and in the LXX as an adjective, or past participle from שָׁכֵן to be sicken, is read by the LXX as the Aramaic סָכַי, or the Hebrew סָכַי, סָכַי. The above instances of Tertullian’s mode of quotation, which it would be useless to multiply, appear to prove the conclusion that there is no sufficient evidence of Tertullian’s knowledge of Hebrew, and that when his quotations are not made from memory, “Tertullian,” as bishop Kaye has observed, “in quoting the Old Testament, appears either himself to have translated from the Greek, or to have used a Latin version made from the Greek, not from the Hebrew” (Eccles. Hist. of the Second Century, p. 310).

IRENAEUS.—Very little is known of the early history of Irenaeus. He was probably born in Syria, and his great work, Against Heresies, appears to have been written towards the close of the 2nd century, during the episcopate of Eleutherus, who was succeeded as bishop of Rome about the year a.d. 190. This work was composed in Greek, but the greater portion of the original has been lost, and the portion which remains has been preserved in quotations made by different authors. An ancient Latin translation, however, has been preserved. Irenaeus believed in the miraculous composition, and consequently in the inspiration, of the Septuagint versions which he commonly follows, although,
in common with other early writers, his quotations are frequently made from memory. He was aware of the existence of the versions of Aquila and Theodotion, and refers to their incorrect translation of Is. vii. 14 (iii. 21, 1).

In his reference to the appearance of the Son of man in Dan. vii. 13 in the LXX translation, he seems to allude to the commonly accepted meaning of the name Jesus as a man seeing God. In the same chapter he says that our Lord was foretold by Moses, in a figurative manner, "by the name given to the passerover," in reference, apparently (to Tertullian and other early writers), to the etymology which connects πάσχα (Heb. פֵּ֣שָׁ֔א) with πάσχω, to suffer. In his quotation from Ps. xi. 7 (iv. 17), if the old Latin translation may be trusted, Ireneaus follows the version of the Vulgate "aures autem perfecisti mihi"; which, if we may read perfestis for perfecisti, agrees with the Hebrew, whilst the LXX read σάμα τὸ κατηργήσας μου. But whilst this correspondence affords no evidence of the ability of Ireneaus to consult the original Hebrew, there is strong presumptive evidence to the contrary, as, e.g., in iv. 18, where he not only adopts the Septuagint version of Gen. iv. 7, but dwells with particular emphasis upon the word ἁρκάσαρος, which is found in some copies of the LXX, but which has no warrant whatsoever in the original Hebrew. The quotation from Dan. xii. 3 gives rise to an interesting inquiry respecting the Greek version then in use in the churches. The words of Ireneaus, as they are found in the Latin, are "a multis justis," which correspond with the version of Theodotion ἄνω τῶν δικαίων τῶν πολλῶν, but which accord neither with the Hebrew (unless the οὗ of the Hiphil particle בְּמַ֣מְתָּם were read as the preposition ב (mīn, from), and the absolute form of the word were read in place of the construction), nor with the Greek of the LXX as it is found in the edition of Daniel, published at Rome in 1772. It has been thought remarkable that Ireneaus should have seen the version of his contemporary Theodotion. It is still more remarkable that one holding the view which Ireneaus did of the authority of the LXX should have followed any other. Upon the whole there does not appear any ground for the supposition that Ireneaus made use of the Old Testament Scriptures in their original language.

THEOPHILUS.—Theophas is said by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. iv. 20) to have been the sixth bishop of Antioch in Syria, and to have been appointed to that bishopric in the eighth year of Marcus Aurelius, that is A.D. 185.

The following remarks refer to the three books which he addressed to his friend Autolycus.

(1) In book i. c. 12, Theophas says "that which among the Hebrews is called the Sabbath is when translated into Greek ἑβδομάς." It is obvious that Theophas has here fallen into the error of supposing that the word Sabbath is connected with some form of the numeral πλ, sheba, seven, rather than with the verb πλασμα, skodath, which denotes rest, and from which the noun πλ, skodath, is derived.

(2) In book i. c. 15, Theophas follows the LXX version of Gen. ii. 2, where the sixth day is substituted for the seventh.

(3) In book i. c. 24, Theophas observes rightly that in Hebrew the word Eden (ܐܝܕܢ) signifies delight. This information, however, he may reasonably be supposed to have derived from others, as also the interpretation which he gives in book iii. c. 19, respecting the meaning of the name Noah, which he says in Hebrew signifies rest.

(4) In book ii. c. 10, Theophas writes thus: "First he named the 'beginning' and 'creation,' then he thus introduced God." This observation may imply that the writer was aware of the order observed in the Hebrew קָדָשָׁא יִשְׁרָאֵל. It is not conclusive proof, however, that such was the case, inasmuch as the order of the Greek is the same as that of the Hebrew.

(5) In book ii. c. 21, Theophas follows the LXX version of Gen. iii. 15, in reading σατανάς instead of σατινα. Upon the whole there seems no evidence that Theophas was acquainted with Hebrew.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.—Clement of Alexandria was born about A.D. 150-160, but the place of his birth is uncertain, and his early history is involved in obscurity. Eusebius says that he became the scholar of Pantaenus (Eclog. Hist. book v. c. 11), who was the chief of the catechetical school at Alexandria, and that Origen was numbered amongst his scholars (ib. book vi. c. 8). He withdrew from Alexandria at the time of the persecution under Severus, A.D. 202-203, and it is thought that he visited Syria.

His quotations, both from the Old and New Testaments, appear to have been commonly made from memory, but it is evident that he used the version of the LXX, as, indeed, it would have been reasonable to anticipate from his residence at Alexandria. It will suffice, in proof of this statement, to refer to the following instances from the Exhortation to the Hebrews, in the early chapters of which the citations from Scripture are not numerous.

(1) "For it was before the morning star," which is evidently taken from Ps. cx. 3, where the LXX read χὶς ῥωσάμων ἐξενηπνεύθη αὐτῷ (c. 1).

(2) In his quotation from Is. i. 1, although evidently made from memory, Clement follows the LXX in the latter part of the verse verbally (c. 1).

(3) In c. iv. Clement quotes Ps. xxxiii. 6 and Ps. viii. 4, almost verbatim from the LXX.

(4) In c. vi. Clement quotes Deut. xv. 13 almost verbatim from the LXX.

In the eighth chapter the quotations from the Prophets are numerous, and they adhere for the most part very closely to the version of the LXX, whilst, at the same time, the blending of different quotations, and the ascription of the words of Amos to Hosea, shew that Clement was quoting, for the most part, from memory. Amongst other proofs that Clement did not refer to the

---

The reading of the LXX in the Roman edition is καὶ οἱ καταχώρισται τούτος λόγος μου, κινούμενος;
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Hebrew, the citation in this chapter from Ps. ii. 12, Ἀληθείας τὰς σκότης, may be added, as also that in c. vi. 17, where instead of "their righteousness is of (or from) Me," the LXX read καὶ ἀληθείαν Ἰσραήλ μοι δόθησαν.

The following instances shew that, although brought into contact with at least one, if not more, of the Hebrew race (Miscellanea, book i. c. 1), Clement did not possess any knowledge of the Hebrew language.

(1) In the epigramma (i. c. 7) he says that Jesus was called Israel "because he saw God the Lord," with evident allusion to the prevalent etymology of the word נָעַם, Israel, as if derived from שָׁם, a man, מִן, he saw, and ב, God. He refers to the same etymology in c. 9 of the same book, where he says "Israel means he that sees God." And again in the Miscellanea (book i. c. 5), he says that he who is "really endowed with the power of seeing is called Israel."

(2) In the place last quoted, Clement adopts Philo's etymology of the word Isaac as meaning self-taught; of Jacob as meaning exerciser; and of Joseph denoting patience.

(3) In book i. c. 21 of the Stromateis, Clement represents the prophet Issias as the son of the prophet Amos, not being aware that the name of the father of Issias was Amos, whilst the name of the prophet was Amos, Amos.

(4) In the same chapter he identifies מְלָל, Jehoakim, with מְלָל, Jehoash, and represents the latter as the namesake of the former.

(5) In the Stromateis (book v. c. 5) Clement explains the word כָּרְבֻּן as meaning much knowledge; and the word מָבָדָת (which not being aware, as it should seem, of the distinction between the Hebrew מָבָדָת and the Chaldaic מָבָדָת, or מָבָדָת, he says is derived from the Hebrew word מָבָדָת, as signifying לֵאָבָד מָבָדָת תְּפָנָא.

It would be superfluous to adduce further evidence in support of the position that Clement was altogether ignorant of the Hebrew language.

ORIGEN.—Origen, who was born about the year A.D. 185, was remarkable in his early youth for his acquaintance with Holy Scripture, and his anxiety to attain to its inner meaning. His father Leonidas fell a victim to the persecution of the Christians which broke out at the beginning of the 3rd century. Whilst still a layman and very young, Origen was appointed by Demetrius, the bishop of Alexandria, as the successor of Clement in the catechetical school of that city; and from this time he devoted his energies to the investigation and elucidation of the Scriptures. With a view to accomplish these objects more thoroughly, he is said to have engaged upon the study of the Hebrew language—an undertaking which, as is implied in the terms in which it is mentioned by Eusebius and by Jerome (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. c. 16; Hieron. CataI. Script. Eccles.; and Ep. ad Paulum super Obita Blesilae) was almost unknown in those times. Origen diligently pursued his biblical researches for some years in Palestine, whither he repaired for safety during the persecution which was then raised against the Christians in Alexandria on the occasion of the visit of the emperor Carus in the year A.D. 216; and his studies were renewed at a later period of his life with fresh vigour both at Caesarea in Palestine and at Cassareon in Cappadocia, after he had been degraded by the Arian bishops from the order of the priesthood into which he had been admitted by Theocletus, bishop of Cassareon. It was at Caesarea in Cappadocia that Origen appears to have come into possession of some of the MSS. which had formerly belonged to Symmachus, the Ebonite translator of the Old Testament, but it is a matter of some uncertainty at what time he commenced his magnum opus, the Hexapla, or how many years were occupied in its completion. The work itself may be briefly described as follows. It consisted of six columns, whence was derived the name of Hexapla. The first of these contained the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; the second, the Hebrew text in Greek characters; the third, the text of Aquila, probably, as being the most literal version of the Hebrew; the fourth, that of Symmachus; the fifth, the Septuagint version; and the sixth, that of Theodotion. Two other anonymous versions called the fifth and the sixth, the extent of which is uncertain, were added to this work, and hence its name of Octapla; whilst, on the other hand, the four Greek versions already mentioned constituted the Tetrapla, to which reference is made by Eusebius as a separate work.1

The critical value of this work, as it proceeded from the pen of Origen, consisted in the emendation of the Greek text of the Septuagint by the aid of the other versions. This was effected in the following manner. When Origen observed any omission in the text of the Septuagint, he supplied it, marking the place with an asterisk, and adding the initial letter of the translator from whose version the omission was supplied. When he observed any redundancy in the text of the Septuagint, he marked it by prefixing to it an obelus. He added two points (,) in order to mark how far either an insertion or an omission extended. He also made use of some other signs by which appears to have been to show the extent of the coincidences between the version of the LXX and that of Theodotion, though epithet gives a different and fanciful interpretation of them based upon the fabulous account of the composition of the Septuagint which was current in his time. It is reasonable to suppose that the extreme jealousy which the Jews displayed towards the Christians, in regard to the acquisition of the Hebrew language in the time of Jerome was equally strong, and perhaps even stronger, in the time of Origen. His writings, however, afford evidence that he did not fail to avail himself of such opportunities as were afforded him of obtaining assistance from Jewish sources, as—e. g., when he observes, in regard to the dimensions of the ark (in Gen. Haei. ii. 2), that he had obtained

1 Such is the account of Epiphanius (De Mss. Script. Funderis), but others make mention of three anonymous Greek versions.

1 The term is probably used by Eusebius in a different sense from that in which it is used by Origen himself. The latter appears to have used it simply as descriptive of the four Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, and Theodotion. Cf. Sozomen in General, p. 136.
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information on that subject from one of those who were held in repute among the Hebrews. Again, in his commentary on Psal. iii. 7, in reference to the insertion of the word μηδίνειον by the LXX, and the omission of any equivalent for בָּלַע, lesi, cheek-bone, Origen observes that certain Jews said that the ancient copies differed from those which were then received; whilst his references to one of their number, whom he describes as δρόπασοι, are frequent; but if we may judge from this Jew's interpretation of 1 Kings ii. 6, which he appears to have read without the word πυξίδα, lo, not, the information which Origen derived from these sources, if correctly represented, appears to have been of very unequal value.

Although Origen acquired a high reputation as a scholar amongst his own contemporaries, and was held in equally high estimation by later writers, especially by Jerome, it needs but a slight acquaintance with his works to perceive that his Hebrew scholarship was rather of a theoretical than of a critical character; and that he was indebted for the criticisms which he introduced into his writings rather to the information of others than to any original research. This conclusion appears to be justified by the following considerations:—

1. The language employed by Origen when he had occasion to refer to persons who were conversant with the Hebrew language favours the inference that he did not reckon himself amongst that number. Thus e.g. if we may rely on the Latin version of the Fourthteenth Homily on the book of Numbers, Origen says that the name of God is said to be differently written in Hebrew when the true God is denoted, and when a false god is intended; that when the tetragrammaton is found the reference is undoubtedly to the true God, but that in other places the reference is uncertain. He then proceeds to comment thus upon Numbers xxi. 12:—"Alium ergo, qui hēbraicas litteras legunt, in hoc loco Deus, non sub sigmo tetragrammati esse positum, de quo qui prolekt, requirat" (tom. vi. p. 393; Wicburgi, 1753).

We meet with a similar passage in Origen's answer to Celsus (p. 27, cont. 1077), in which he alleges that the word מְלֶאכָּה, a servant, occurs in Deut. xxi. 23, Διακονος, in which place, and indeed throughout the whole of the Pentateuch, if we except Gen. xiv. 43, and Ex. ii. 8, unless the copies extant in the time of Origen differed from the present Masoretic text, the word is not found, and consequently, Origen's informers must have misled him. It cannot but excite surprise in any case that in the interpretation of so important a passage as Isa. vii. 14, Origen should not have referred to Deut. xxi. 23 for himself, rather than have relied on the information of others. It is important to add that מְלֶאכָה does not appear to have been found in the text of Deut. xxii. 23 in the time of Jerome, who, in his commentary on Isa. vii. 14, observes, in reference to this passage, "Sub puellae et adolescentiae nomine virgo intelligentia."

It can hardly be supposed that in thus writing upon a passage, which, as he informs us, he had carefully examined, Origen would have failed to refer to the Hebrew text, had he been accustomed so to do. It is equally difficult, on the supposition that he did consult the Hebrew text, to account for the language which he here employs, if his words were correctly represented in the Latin version which is now extant.

Another illustration of Origen's neglect, or inability to consult the Hebrew text, occurs in the same treatise (i. 55), where he appeals, in support of the Messianic reference of Isaiah liii., to the LXX rendering of v. 8, where they read מָלֵאךְ, to death, instead of מִלֶּאךְ upon Him, or upon them.

Again, in his Twelfth Homily on Genesis, when explaining the supposed etymology of the name Esaü, he acknowledges that his information was borrowed from others: "Ut hoc Dei cognomen understandatur;" and again: "Ut alius visum est." Moreover, if the Latin version can be trusted, he gives a very confused account of the information which he had received, inasmuch as he assigns as one etymology of Esaü that of Edom, viz. "vel a rubore, vel a terra," whilst he assigns as the other, "factura dictus videtur"—an etymology which connects וּסָעוּ, Esaü, with עָשַׂ, asah, fece. It is probable that Origen derived this information from one of the Onomastica which are still extant both in Greek and Latin. One of the latter gives rubens (ruddy) as one of the meanings of Esaü, but it is probable that this meaning has arisen out of a confusion of Esaü with Edom. Jerome says (Quaest. Heb. in Gen.), "Et dixit Esaü Jacob, da mihi gustum de coctione rubae isha, quasi dico: proprieta vocatum est nomen ejus Edom."

On the other hand, it is due to Origen to state that in his Sixth Homily on Exodus (tom. v. p. 400) he gives, according to the Latin version, ferreus as the interpretation of Edom. We have a similar instance of this confusion of etymologies, whether arising from ignorance or from carelessness, in Origen's explanation of the meaning of Syria, which he appears to confound with Arum, and explains as meaning lofty. (Select. in Gen. tom. v. p. 96.) It is unsafe, especially in regard to the works of writers of the

— Genseni, in his Commentary on Isaiah, remarks that both Symmachus and Theodotion read מָלֵאכָה, and he observes that the reason why neither Origen nor Celsus referred to the difference between the reading of the Hebrew text and that adopted by the LXX was, without doubt, that the Alexandrian Jew understood as little Hebrew as Origen. "Allein der Grund liegt ohne Zweifel darin, dass dieser alexandrinische Jude so wenig hebräisch verstand als Origenes, wie dieses der ala. Juden gewisslich der Fall war, und von Origenes hochst wahrscheinlich ist." Commentar. über den Jesaja, ii. 184, Leipzig, 1821. Cf. Genseni, Geschichtc der heb. Sprache p. 91, Leipzig, 1816. In exact accordance with the judgment of Genseni, is that of Redepenning, who writes as follows: "Obige Origenes die strenge Unterscheidung des Hebräischen oder nur oberflächlich unternichtet war, darüber hat eine fruhere Zeit ganz anders entschieden als fast einstimmig die unerreichte." (Origenes, Eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seiner Lehre, i. 367, Bonn, 1841.)
first four centuries, to attach too much importance to etymological errors. The following instances, however, when due allowance has been made for the misconceptions and misrepresentations of the editors of his works, will suffice to show that Origen's Hebrew scholarship was of a very defective nature. In his Selecta in Genesis he explains מִלְשָׁן, Keturah, as meaning "smaller," i.e. he confounds it apparently with מִלְשֶׁנַּה, Ketannah, although elsewhere he explains both words correctly. Again, he adopts Philo's explanation of γυναῖς, Eve, as meaning "thy favour" (Die hebräischen Worterklärungen des Philo, von Dr. Carl Siegfried, p. 18, Magdeburg, 1863), and he explains עַבְדָּה, Abbáh, as meaning the height of my father. He adopts Philo's derivation of אֶרֶץ, a derivation accepted at one time, though afterwards rejected by Jerome, as if from וְיָשֶׁר, as, וֶיהָ, וְיָד, and וּנְסֶה (ibid. p. 24); and he gives an interpretation of the name Samuel, as if it were derived from סֵמֶך, shem, שֵׁמֶךָ, שֵׁם, and וּנְסֶה, En Enc. II. Other indications are not wanting of Origen's lack of a critical acquaintance with the Hebrew language. Thus e.g. in his Selecta in Genesis, he endeavours to explain the "solecism" which he finds in the Greek version of Gen. i. 11, ἐπὶ ὄντων χρόνων σείρην σφήμα, κατά γένος, by suggesting the insertion of a stop after χρόνων, and by continuing thus, κατά γένος σείρην σφήμα, a rendering which it is almost superfluous to observe that no one who had consulted the original would have thought of proposing.

Again, in his Commentary on Ps. ix., Origen follows Philo and the Greek interpreters in supposing that the change made in the name of Sarai consisted in the addition of a second ρ, i.e. in the change of סָפָה into סָפְּה. It is true, indeed, that according to the Latin version of his sixth Homily on Genesis, he says, "Puto ergo Saram, quae interpretrat principes vel principatum agens, formam tenere sperga," but when the whole of his fanciful exposition of Gen. xxvi. 7 is taken into account it may well be doubted whether Origen was not one of those to whom St. Augustine referred when he wrote the following words: "Sic autem qui scripserant interpretationes nomine Hebraeoaram, quise litteris sacris continentur, Sarai (or, as some editions read, Sara), interpretatur princes nesci, Sara (or, as some editions read, Sarra), autem, virtus" (De Civitate Dei, lib. xvi. c. 28).

III. The opinion which has been here expressed as to the small amount of Hebrew scholarship possessed by Origen is confirmed by his servile adherence to the Greek versions, especially the Septuagint, when they widely differ from the Hebrew text. It is true, indeed, that Jerome draws a distinction between Origen's Homilies in which he follows the Greek text, and his more elaborate and scholarly works in which he is said to follow the Hebrew. Moreover, Origen appears to have shared, to a certain extent, the opinion which prevailed during the early ages of the Christian church as to the co-ordinate authority of the Septuagint version, as e.g. in his commentary on the second Psalm, where his remarks upon the tenes employed in the prophecies of the Old Testament by the Holy Spirit appear to refer to the Greek version rather than to the Hebrew original. Independently, however, of the consideration that it was the object of Origen's great work, not to restore the text of the LXX to its original form, but rather to show where, and how, it differed from the Hebrew, and by the aid of other versions to make it more conformable to it, it is almost impossible to suppose that anyone who recognised the authority of the Hebrew text, to the extent to which it is recognised by Origen in his letter to Africanus, in which he speaks of doing away with the Greek version then used in the churches, and procuring a genuine text from the Jews (tom. iv. p. 298), should, except from necessity, not only adopt the LXX as the basis of his commentaries, but should pass over in silence the most palpable divergences of the Greek versions from the Hebrew original, and, in regard to doubtful and obscure passages, should fail to have recourse to the latter for their true interpretation.

The following instances will suffice to illustrate what has been here advanced:—

(1) In his exposition of Gen. ii. 2 (tom. v. p. 70, Wircburgii, 1783), Origen adopts the reading of the LXX, "the sixth day," without any reference to the Hebrew, which has "the seventh day;" and inasmuch as he adopts the same reading in two places when arguing against Celsius (lib. v. c. 59, and lib. vi. c. 61), it is obvious that the adoption of that reading was not the result of a conciseness on the part of Origen to the version commonly used by his hearers.

(2) In his homily on Exodus xi, and in his De Principiis, l. 5. 2, Origen adopts the reading of the LXX in his allusion to Deut. xxii. 8, "according to the number of the angels of God," instead of the hebrew "according to the number of the children of Israel," and he grounds the remarks which he makes on the passage upon the Greek version without reference to the Hebrew. This is the more remarkable, inasmuch as Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho (c. xxii.), takes notice of the difference between the Hebrew text and the version of the LXX.

(3) In his Commentary upon Numbers xxiv. 17 (tom. vi. p. 449), he adduces, in proof of the proper humanity of Christ, the reading of the LXX, "And there shall arise a man," (καὶ ἐρχόμενος), an argument which it is scarcely probable that he would have used, especially if the passage be viewed in connection with the context, in which he refers to the rejection of Christ by the Jews, had he been aware that the Hebrew here "and there shall arise a sceptre" (καὶ ἐρχόμενος, shall).

(4) In Origen's Commentary on Jeremiah xi. 19 (tom. ix. p. 480), which appears to have been written subsequently to the year a.d. 245, he adopts as the basis of his remarks the rendering of the LXX, καὶ ἐκδόθη τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄνοιξιν εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον αἰώνοις, "let us cast wood into his bread," and takes no notice of the entire discrepancy of this rendering from the Hebrew text, יָנָעֲדָה.
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In his Commentary on St. Matt. cap. xii., Origens follows the version of the LXX in his quotation from Ps. cxvii. 7, al χειρος αυτου εν τω κομμων νοελαςων, where it is obvious that the LXX read του δυνατου instead of του δυνατου. It is wortby of observation that whereas in his version of the Psalms according to the LXX, Jerome renders the passage "manus ejus in soiphino servierunt," in his version according to the Hebrew he renders it "manus ejus a soiphino recerperunt."

Once more, when discussing at some length the difference between the Greek and Latin renderings of Gen. xliv. 27 (om. v. p. 266), it does not seem to have occurred to Origens to refer to the Hebrew text in order to ascertain which of the two versions more nearly accorded with it, whilst in one of the earlier Homilies on the same book, "On the Circumcision of Abraham" (tom. v. 179), where he has occasion, in combating the Ebionites, to compare the text used in the church with the Hebrew text which they (the Ebionites) said to be more correct ("quae veriora dictis exemplaria"), he alleges that certain words occur in Exodus which are not really found in the parallel passage in Exodus vi. 30.

Other indications of the same character, and leading to the same conclusion, are not wanting. The following is an extract from Origens's Commentary on Ezekiel ix. 2-7, a work which, according to Eusebius (lib. vii. c. 32), was composed during his residence at Cesarea in Palestine, and was finished at Athens, i.e., between A.D. 215 and A.D. 240. "The Seventy say that the man who was clothed with a long robe was commanded to put a sign (σημειω) upon the foreheads of those who groaned and were in pain. But Aquila and Theodotion say that the mark of the letter Θau was placed upon their foreheads." Origens then proceeds to give the explanation of the import of this mark as he had received it from the seventy, the last of whom, one who had been converted to Christianity, said that "in the old alphabet the letter Θau resembled the figure of the cross" (tom. i. p. 282).

Two observations naturally suggest themselves in connexion with this passage. (1) The rendering of Aquila and Theodotion, καὶ σημειώσεις τοῦ Θαυ, is nothing but a simple transliteration of the Hebrew text הכנפים, שׁחיתיא תאו, and had not referred to the Hebrew text he would hardly have quoted the version of Aquila and Theodotion. And (2) it is somewhat remarkable that Origens, who, in his Commentary on Ps. ii., refers to the change of Hebrew characters which is said to have been made by Ezra during the captivity (tom. vii. p. 226), should have been unacquainted with the well-known fact that the letter θau or θau bore the shape of a cross in the old Hebrew, as well as in other ancient alphabets. Again, in Origens's letter to Africanus, in defence of the canonicality of the Story of Susanna, he refers to the authority of Aquila, not to the original text itself, in support of the assertion that the words, "Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonied and rose up in haste," etc., are found in Daniel iii. 24 (tom. iv. p. 295), whilst, in the same letter, he affirms that the words "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it" (Job i. 7), are not found in the Hebrew copies of the book of Job, an assertion which, unless the text used by Origens greatly differed from the present Masoretic text, is utterly without foundation. Moreover, when in doubt as to the Hebrew equivalents of the Greek verbs σχισαν and παρεκακαν, both of which occur in the LXX (the former frequently), Origens speaks of consulting "not a few Jews," in order to obtain the information which he needed, but it does not seem to have occurred to him to have recourse to the Hebrew Bible, with a view to ascertain the point for himself; whilst the simplicity with which he relates the answer which he received from his Hebrew friends to a similar inquiry respecting the Hebrew equivalents of the trees, σχειδω and πρωζης, viz., that if Origens could tell them where those words were to be found in the Greek version of the Old Testament they could tell him of what Hebrew words they were the representatives, still further confirms the impression that it had not entered into Origens's head to make an examination for himself, or that he was conscious of his own inability to do so. One more specimen of Origens's critical skill, which is found in this letter, is too significant to be overlooked. One of the arguments justly urged by Africanus in proof that the story of Susanna and the Elders had no Hebrew original is the play upon the Greek words just mentioned, viz., σχισαν and σχισαν and παρεκακαν and παρεκακαν. Origens's answer to this argument is that the translators, either found this play upon the Hebrew words, which he vainly endeavoured to ascertain from his Jewish authorities, or that being unable to represent in Greek the play upon words which they found in the Hebrew, they adopted one nearly resembling it. He then illustrates his position by reference to Gen. ii. 23, which, in the Greek version, reads ταυτα ετελειον του θαυ συμπληρων ανημ. "She shall be called woman because she was taken out of man." He observes upon this passage that the Jews say that a woman is called ἐσσα, παν, ʾisštah. He then says: that this word ἐσσα (we presume he means a word pronounced in the same manner), means I tob, ἱκαβον, in proof of which he refers to Ps. cxvi. 13, which, in the Hebrew, reads thus, יִבְשָׂם, יִבְשָׂם, יִבְשָׂם, יִבְשָׂם, יִבְשָׂם, יִבְשָׂם. It is easy to multiply indications of Origens's habitual disregard of the Hebrew text, of his constant recurrence to Jewish authority upon points on which it is difficult to account for such recurrence on the supposition that he was capable of pronouncing an

Jerome says that Aquila and Symmachus as well as the LXX have σημειω, and that Theodotion only has the Θαυ.

Theodotion appears to have adopted the same etymology of the word; "assumptio quia ex viro sumpta est." (Hieron. Quest. In Gen.).
independent opinion, and of the singular errors into which he has fallen when he ventures into the domain of Hebrew criticism.

It may, indeed, be justly urged in opposition to the view here expressed of the extent of Origen's Hebrew scholarship that it is absolutely impossible that the blunders thus ascribed to him could have been committed by anyone who was capable of accomplishing the herculean task of copying out the whole of the Hebrew Bible, or transliterating the same into Greek characters, and reproducing the whole of the transcribed Greek version, clause by clause, with the original and with the three (or five) other Greek translations. The force of this argument cannot be resisted if the premises are allowed. But if, after due allowance has been made for the errors which may have crept into the Greek text of Origen's writings, and after still greater allowance has been made for those of the Latin translator, there appears conclusive evidence that Origen's scholarship was utterly inadequate to the task of a just discrimination between a true and a false rendering of the Hebrew text, we are reduced to the consideration of the plausibility of any theory upon which we can account for the execution of a work involving such prodigious labour, and apparently executed with a considerable amount of learning as well as with an almost incredible amount of industry, by one who does not appear to have possessed the requirements necessary for such an undertaking. Now the number and the nature of the allusions made by Origen to his Jewish instructors seem to justify the conclusion that he was more largely indebted to their aid than has been commonly supposed. There is no difficulty in the supposition that the first two columns of the Hexapla, containing the Hebrew text and the transliteration of the same in Greek characters may have been the exclusive work of Origen's Jewish amanuenses. Nor is there any insuperable difficulty, as it should seem, in the supposition that an extremely small amount of Hebrew scholarship may have sufficed for Origen's share in the correction of the text of the Septuagint at the aid of the other versions. An accomplished Hebrew scholar may well be supposed to have rendered the Hebrew text literally into Greek, whilst Origen compared the version of the LXX with that rendering, marking with the obelius those passages which had no corresponding words in the original, and in the case of omissions, inserting from one or other of the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the words which most nearly corresponded with the original version of the Jew. Some such theory as this appears to offer the most probable solution of the problem how a work of such immense labour and importance, as the Hexapla undoubtedly was, could have been the production of one whose critical scholarship appears to have been so unequal to the task.

This theory receives some confirmation from the fact that we have no sufficient evidence of the Hebrew scholarship of Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, or of Hesychius, the Egyptian bishop, both of whom undertook to amend the text of the Septuagint about the beginning of the 4th century, and whose recensions are mentioned by Jerome in his second book against Rufinus, as being in common use in the countries to which they respectively belonged (iii. p. 102).

The Clementine Writings. — The arguments which have been adduced in support of the Eastern origin of the document to which the Clementine writings owe their existence entitle these works to a short notice in the present article. At the same time the uncertainty which exists as to their authorship, and as to the date of the composition of their respective portions, detracts in some measure from the value of the results of any minute examination of their contents with a view to ascertain whether the writers did, or did not, possess any acquaintance with the Hebrew language.

The Clementine Homilies. — (1) In Hom. iii. c. xxv., we read that "Cain is interpreted both possession and entry." The reason assigned for the name in Gen. iv. 1 connects its etymology with the verb נִדֵה, קְנָה, which means to acquire or possess. The alternative etymology (which is adopted in c. xvi.) connects it with נָקָה, קנה, which in the Psalm signifies to be ever so jealous.

(2) In Hom. iii. c. xvi. it is said that "without any ambiguity Abel is translated grief." It is obvious that the writer, if acquainted with Hebrew at all, identified נִדֵה with נָעַה, and transferred to the former of these words the meaning which belongs to the latter.

(3) In Hom. iii. c. 45, the meaning of the phrase בָּניָהוּ הַיָּוָהוּ, בָּניָהוּ הַיָּוָהוּ (Num. xii. 34), is explained to be בָּנוֹבֶית אֶרֶבֶן, to which explanation, if designed as a literal rendering, exception may be taken on the ground that the Hebrew word for graves is in the plural number, and the Hebrew word denoting head is in the singular number.

(4) In Hom. iii. c. 47, the LXX version of Deut. xxxiv. 6, γῆς ἄνων γῆς, is adopted.

(5) In Hom. iii. c. 48, the LXX version of Gen. xix. 10 is for the most part followed, but instead of εἰς ἥσσωτος εἰρητικὴ, we find εἰς ἡσσων as the rendering of יָהָשָׂה, שדוק, as if equivalent to יָהָשָׂה.

(6) In Hom. viii. c. 5, the LXX version of Exodus xix. 9 is adopted almost verbatim.

(7) The quotation from Exodus xxii. 28, in Hom. xvi. c. 6, follows the LXX almost verbatim, but in the quotation from Deut. iv. 33 in the same chapter, the word φέρεσ κκαὶ φέρεσ is inserted before θέλος and reasoned on by Simon, and the insertion is not noticed in the following chapter by Peter. There does not appear to be sufficient evidence that the writers of this work or of the Recognitions possessed any acquaintance with Hebrew.

EUSEBIUS, the father of Ecclesiastical History, was born in Palestine about a.d. 264, and became bishop of Caesarea a.d. 315. It might be anticipated from the country in which he lived, and from the subjects on which he wrote, as well as from his admiration of the learning of Origen, and his frequent references to the Ἐσχέρης, that
he would have acquired some acquaintance with Hebrew. A very slight examination of his writings, however, will suffice to shew that, in this respect, he was not in advance of the age in which he lived.

If, e. g., we refer to his Praeparatio Evangelica (lib. xi. c. 6), we shall find an explanation of the meaning of many Hebrew words and proper names, from which we select the following particulars:—

(1) The Hebrew word סגנה, esnōw, man, as distinguished from שגר, adam, man, is said to mean forgetful, and reference is made to Ps. viii. 4, by way of proof. "What is man סגנה that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man שגר that thou visitest him?"

(2) Eusebius says that Moses rightly called heaven סתרפיא, firmament, because it was a solid (סתרפיא) body, and one perceptible to the senses. How utterly remote the Hebrew word יheten, expanse, is from the notion of solidity, is well known to everyone who is acquainted with its etymology.

(3) He explains Israel in common with Philo, Origen, Lactantius, and (at one time) Jerome, as one who sees God, i.e. as if derived from ישת butorieh, רוז, and רוז (cf. lib. v. c. i 1); Demonstr. Evangel. lib. vi. c. 15.

Again, the remarks of Eusebius upon Habakkuk iii. 2 are scarcely reconcilable with the supposition that he was able to read the Hebrew text. Having first given the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, all of whom appear to have translated from the present Masoretic text, he proceeds, apparently without being conscious that the LXX took the word רוזיכל, shanim, years, for the numeral שמות, ש, and that they read the following word, יherent, as if some form of the noun יherent, life or beast, to explain the passage in accordance with the version of the LXX (אכד, דכו שומם), as having references to the divine and human natures of Christ. In the same chapter Eusebius explains the proper name יherent, תמא, as meaning consumption, סתרפיא, as though derived from סתרפיא; and once more, in the 18th chapter of the same work, he explains the meaning of the proper name יherent, אزال (Zech. xiv. 5), as understood by the Hebrews, to be the work of God, ברי, דכו שומם תמן אתראים פּוֹרְפַּר פּוֹרְפַּר חָזְקָנוּ, פּוֹרְפַּר חָזְקָנוּ. It is true, as Eusebius observes, that the form of the word adopted by the LXX is יאשר, which, according to the sound, would naturally suggest to the mind of anyone acquainted with Hebrew the two words יherent, fecl, and יherent, Deus, and it is easy to imagine that, when thus pronounced, Eusebius may have received from a Jew the etymology which he has here recorded. It is difficult, however, to suppose that anyone who had consulted the Hebrew text, and who possessed a competent knowledge of the language, could have accepted such an explanation.

We will now adduce some other instances of the imperfect Hebrew scholarship of Eusebius, as we find them in his Demonstratio Evangelica (Parisii, fol. 1629).

(1) In book viii. c. 2, in common with other early writers, Eusebius not only confounds Nazarēnec with Nažirīl, but relying on the LXX version of Lev. xxi. 12, he takes הָלִיך, nēzer, Ps. i. 2.

(2) In chap. i. of the same work, he confounds the word יַלֵּש, Shiloah (Gen. xlix. 10.) with יַלָּש (or יַלָּש), Shiloah (Is. viii. 6), and he does so, notwithstanding that he gives the correct meaning of the latter word, viz. sent, whilst he quotes the LXX version of the former, viz. יַלְשֵׁנֶר, he for whom it is sent.

(3) In his exposition of Jer. xxxi. 5 (lib. vii. c. 3), he transliterates the Hebrew words יַלָּש and יַלָּש by יַלָּש, and explains the meaning to be יַלָּש יַלָּש הָלִיך, יַלָּש יַלָּש, the righteous ones of God.

(4) When referring to the words of Ps. xxii. 1, as uttered by our Lord upon the cross, Eusebius speaks of them twice as if they were the very words of the Psalmist, not the Syro-Byzantine version of them (lib. x. c. 6). It is remarkable that such an error should be committed by a resident in Palestine.

(5) At the end of the 8th book of the Demonstratio Evangelica, Eusebius has occasion to cite Is. xix. 20. Having quoted the version of the LXX דיקי יַלָּש, אַלַּש, קְוֹמֵי אַשָּׁרָה גֵּרֵי עֵמֶלְוּ, and אַלָּש, אַלָּש, כֹּּוּרֵי הָלִיך, he fails to notice in this rendering of יַלָּש, יַלָּש, the rendering not of יַלָּש, but of יַלָּש.

It would be easy to multiply illustrations of the imperfect Hebrew scholarship of Eusebius. It is due, however, to so eminent a man and so voluminous a writer, to notice the aid which his writings afford in the recovery of a portion of the great work of Origen, as will at once appear, even on the most cursory reference to Dr. Field's edition of the remains of the Hexapla.

Ephraim the Syrian, or Ephrem Syrus (as he is commonly called), is said to have been born at Nisibis early in the 4th century, and he died about the year A.D. 370. He was born of Christian parents, and, according to some accounts, was instructed in Christianity by James, the bishop of Nisibis. He was ordained as a deacon by Basil the Great at Caesarea, but the greater part of his life was spent at Edessa, where he expounded the scriptures to a large number of scholars. He is commonly thought to have remained in desec's orders throughout life, but he speaks of himself as having hidden the talent of the priesthood in the earth through idleness (tom. iii. p. 467; Assemanni, Rom. 1732), and his refusal of the episcopate confirms his own statement that he had been admitted into the order of the priesthood. His works occupy six folio volumes, three of which contain his Syriac writings, and the remaining three the Greek writings commonly ascribed to him, and which are supposed to consist of translations from the Syriac. The former of these appear to have been considerably interpolated; and there is much doubt as to the genuineness of some of the latter, although we are told by Sozomen that some of the writings of Ephraim were translated into
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Greek during the lifetime of the author, and we
find references to them in the works of Chrysostom
and other contemporary writers.

If any inference respecting Ephrem's know-
ledge of Hebrew may be drawn from the Greek
works which are ascribed to him, that inference
would be of an unfavourable character, as will
appear from the following instances, taken from
his Paranaessis, which might be indefinitely
multiplied:—

(1) Ephrem adopts the reading of the LXX in
Gen. vi. 22, "three hundred" where the Hebrew
and the Syriac Peschito read "three hundred"
(Parsenasis xi. p. 341; Ox. 1709).

(2) In his reference to Gen. xxi. 13, although
Ephrem does not quote the words of the LXX,
viz. κατοικήματος ἐν φυγή ζαβίκ, he was evidently as
much perplexed as to the meaning of the Hebrew
word יַבֵּית אֱלֹהִים as were the LXX, and
he appears to have regarded it as the name of
some particular tree or shrub, Ἰδού κράτει ἐν ητό
φυγή τοῦ σαβίκ (In Abraham et

(3) In the twenty-ninth Paranaessis (ib. p.
295), Ephrem, in opposition to the present
punctuation and division of the Hebrew verses,
and to the Peschito version, connects the word
Jerusalem with v. 1 of Ps. cxvi., instead of v. 2,
and associates it with sábáh.

(4) In his quotation from Prov. ii. 13, in
Paranaessis xi. (ib. p. 315), Ephrem departs both
from the Hebrew and the Syriac, and adheres
nearly to the LXX.

(5) In his quotation from Prov. xviii. 1,
Ephrem adds the words ἐν τῇ αὐτῷ πολιᾷ
παροιμία, which are not found in the Hebrew,
the Syriac, or the LXX, and which appear to be
a free rendering of the Vulgate, “abique ter-
rorre eirit.” (Paranaessis xviii.; ib. p. 339.)

(6) In the fifteenth Paranaessis Ephrem adopts
the LXX rendering of Isaiah xxxii. 9: Μαθαύρος
ἐν ἔχει ἐν ζωοί σφέρῳ καὶ οἰκίον ἐν ἱερου-
sαλήμ (ib. p. 276), a rendering which entirely
differs from the Hebrew and the Syriac, and
concerning which Jerome writes thus: “Sic
in Galli scriptura posuit ut dicam præsentis
loci sensui convenire.”

(7) When quoting from Isaiah li. 8 in his
forty-first Paranaessis (ib. p. 310), Ephrem follows
the LXX, who seem to have read the word ἡμᾶς time instead of ἡμᾶς mort, where again he has no
support from the Syriac.

(8) In his quotation from Habakkuk iii. 2,
(Paranaessis xiii.; ib. p. 328), where the LXX
follow an entirely different reading from that of
the present Masoretic text, Ephrem adopts the
rendering of the LXX. The Peschito version
in this place does not entirely follow the Masoretic
text, but agrees much more closely with it than
does that of the LXX.

(9) In the quotation in the same Paranaessis,
from the 16th verse of the same chapter of
Habakkuk, where, as Jerome observes, all the
versions differ widely from the Hebrew, Ephrem
follows the LXX (ib.).

He does not, however, invariably follow the
LXX in his Greek writings, or rather in those
works which now exist in Greek, as e.g. in his
sermon on “The life-giving Cross of the Lord,”
where he adopts the interpolated words from
the tree, which have the support neither of the Syriac
nor of the LXX. On the other hand, in a quota-
tion from Ps. xxxix. 4, Ephrem adopts the
rendering of the Syriac, “‘If there is craft, in
my tongue,” where the Hebrew has only רֵאשָׁה
word, and where the LXX have δέος ἢ μεταο.

It may fairly, however, be questioned whether
the evidence here adduced does not point to the
inaccuracy of the translation of Ephrem's Syriac
works into Greek, inasmuch as it is, in the
highest degree, improbable that Ephrem should
habitually have followed the LXX, where that
version differs as much from the Syriac as from the
Hebrew.

The instances which follow are taken, for the
most part, from his Rhythms (portions of which
have been translated from the Syriac by Mr.
Morris, and published at Oxford in 1847), and
will suffice to shew that Ephrem in his Syriac
works quotes habitually from the Peschito
version, and that he does not appear to have made
much use of the original Hebrew.

(1) In his quotation from Ps. lxxii. 17, Ephrem,
in common with the Syriac and the Chaldean
versions, regards the second member of the first
clause of the verse as having reference to the
past, and reads, “His name was before the
sun,” instead of reading, according to the present
Masoretic text and the version of the LXX,
“His name shall continue (or be continued)
as long as (or before) the sun.”

(2) In his quotation from Gen. xlix. 10, 11
(Rhythm against the Jews, c. 18), Ephrem follows
the Syriac in rendering窠็บינא, lawyer (or staff
of the ruler), by expositor or interpreter, but in
the following verse he does not follow the Syriac
and the LXX in regarding קינא as a form of the
construct-state of the noun, but translates it
(perhaps accidentally) as if it were taken directly
from the Hebrew אָנָשׁ זַן; whilst, on the other hand,
in the twenty-seventh chapter of the same
Rhythm he renders the same words, “the
man’s soul.”

(3) In his quotation from Amos vii. 7 (ib. v. 19)
Ephrem follows the Syriac and the LXX in
rendering נדנמ, not the adverbial.

(4) In his paraphrase of Is. xliii. 14, 15.
(ii. c. 20) Ephrem follows the LXX and the
Hebrew and the Syriac in making the walls the
subject of the verb: “I have gra\n
(5) In his fifty-third Rhythm Ephrem, with
evident allusion to Deut. xxxii. 26, speaks of
the words of chaste women as being placed in
the ark. It is evident that he has here followed
the Syriac version, which has “in the side of
the ark of the covenant of the Lord,” instead of
the Hebrew, which has “in the ark of the ark,” and
with which the LXX and the Chaldee agree.

(6) In his Commentary on 2 Kings ii. 9,
Ephrem adopts the Peschito text, which does not
retain (as the LXX has) the same rendering of
the Hebrew ואֹמָה, which is found in the Syriac
version of Deut. xxiii. 17, and consequently over-
looks the obvious reference to the elder son’s
portion of his father’s goods, which is there
denoted.

(7) A yet stronger proof of Ephrem’s ignorance

*The introduction of the past tense instead of the future in the Syriac and Chaldee versions probably arose
(as Mr. Morris suggests in his translation of the select
works of Ephrem, p. 67, note) from the fact that some of the Jews regarded the word כָּל or פֶּן as a proper
name. "Before the sun His name was opotetem."
or neglect of the Hebrew text is found in the argument which he derives from the alleged use of the plural verb in Gen. xi. 7, where the Syriac and the Chaldee have "Come ye," but where the Hebrew has the singular 7277. The LXX 5634 cannot be alleged on either side, inasmuch as it is used in conjunction both with singular and with plural verbs. It is possible, indeed, inasmuch as Ephrem occasionally refers to readings found in the Hebrew, that there may have been a different reading in this case, but no other reading is now known to exist.

One may make the deduction from the unprinted MS, containing Ephrem's Commentary on Jonah, Assemani gives the following: "Jonah began to enter into Nineveh a journey of three days, and he preached and said, 'Within, or yet, forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.' The Greek reads, 'There are yet three days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.'" Ephrem endeavours to reconcile the discrepancy thus: "Now both of them limit not only the preaching of Jonah, but also the period of reprieve as assigned to the Ninevites to three days, the whole of this Metrical Homily on the Repentance of Nineveh, which has been translated, with an introduction and notes, by Dr. Burgess, proceeds on the view commonly entertained by the Syrians, in accordance with the Hebrew text, that the period of reprieve was not three but forty days. The object, however, for which the quotation from Ephrem's Commentary is here adduced is to show that unless the Hebrew text of Jonah iii. 4, to which Ephrem refers, differed from the present Masoretic text, either Ephrem had never consulted it, or he was unable to comprehend it.

Upon the whole, it is clear that if Ephrem was able to consult the Hebrew text, he made the best possible use of the knowledge which he possessed, and that he relied mainly on the Peshito in his Syriac writings; and that the version of the LXX is, for the most part, adopted in those of his writings which are now extant only in Greek. Mr. Morris, indeed, refers, as a proof of Ephrem's acquaintance with the Hebrew, to the fact that he notices the various reading in 2 Kings viii. 10, וַיָּתָר, to him instead of וַיָּתָר not, as in the Masoretic text. The various reading is here obviously the correct one, and is adopted by the Vulgate, the Syriac, and the Chaldee, but Ephrem probably obtained his information from Jewish sources.

Cyril of Jerusalem.—Amongst those early fathers of the church who might reasonably be expected to have been acquainted with Hebrew

we must include Cyril, who was born about A.D. 315, probably in, or near Jerusalem, and who was bishop of that city about thirty-five years. We should the rather have expected to find indications of such knowledge in the writings of Cyril because, whilst they do not afford evidence of any great amount of ability or eloquence, they contain ample proof of the intimate acquaintance of the writer with the books both of the Old and of the New Testament.

We should not be justified in inferring that Cyril was altogether ignorant of Hebrew from the fact of his adherence to the Greek version of the Old Testament, even in passages in which it fails to represent the true meaning of the original, (1) because in many cases these variations do not materially affect the general scope of the passage, or the argument of the writer, and therefore the version in common use amongst his hearers may have been employed just as the A.V. is by ourselves, even when the rendering is known to be not strictly accurate; and (2) because it appears from Lecture IV. c. 34, that Cyril was one of those who ascribed divine authority to the Septuagint version. His opinion on this point deserves notice. Having first related the traditional account of the verbal agreement of the translations independently made, as alleged, by the 72 interpreters, he continues thus: "For the matter was not one of witty invention, or a contrivance of man's cunning devices; but the interpretation of the divine Scriptures, spoken by the Holy Ghost, was, of the Holy Ghost, accomplished." (Library of the Fathers, ii. p. 50, Oxford, 1839.)

Independently, however, of the numerous citations which Cyril makes from the LXX,* in which that version differs very materially from the Hebrew, the following instances will suffice to show that he did not possess even a superficial acquaintance with the Hebrew language.

(1) In Lecture I. 14, Cyril writes thus: "That Samuel may come, and thy barren soul may hear the salvation of God who hears prayer; for this is the meaning of the word Samuel." Now it is quite true that different opinions exist as to the true derivation of the name Samuel; some deriving it from דָּמָה, Shem Eli, name of God, others from יִשָּׁמָה יִשָּׁמָה, Shaul me-Eli, asked of God (Josephus renders it by the Greek name Thecetetus, Θεατήτες), and others again, and, as we think, correctly from דָּמָה, Shammah Eli, heard by (or of) God; but, unless Cyril has very imperfectly expressed his meaning, he has assigned to the name a derivation of which it is altogether inapplicable.

(2) In Lecture II. 9, Cyril writes thus in

* The following instances, which might be almost indefinitely multiplied, will suffice by way of illustration:—

(1) Ps. xxxii. 1, as quoted in Lect. I. c. 16.
(2) Prov. xxiv. 32, " II. c. 18.
(3) Ps. lxxv. 15, " II. c. 16.
(4) Ps. xlv. 6, " VII. c. 16.
(5) Job xi. 14, " VIII. c. 4.
(6) Hag. ii. 8, " VIII. c. 6.
(7) Is. xiv. 14, 16, " XI. c. 16.
(8) etc. etc.

* In his quotation from Micah v. 2, Cyril does not follow the Hebrew or the LXX, nor does he adopt the ὀφθαλμόν of St. Matt. ii. 6, but inserts µ before ἀπόφθαλμον.
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reference to Rahab: “And if thou wouldst receive a written witness that she was saved, thou hast it recorded in the Psalms, ‘I will think upon Rahab and Babylon,’ but with this added, ‘with them that know me.’” On men therefore, and likewise on women, is salvation, viz. that which is secured to us through repentance.” 13 (p. 18.)

The Hebrew scholar will perceive that Cyril has been misled by the Greek version, which reads “Padb in Josh. 11 and Ps. xxviii. 4, whereas the name of Rahab the harlot is in Hebrew ⃞, rahab, i.e. wide, whilst the allegorical name of Egypt, in its subsequent allusion to Isaiah (cf. xxxvii. 7), is ה, rahab, i.e. tumultuous violence, a word different in orthography as well as in meaning from the former.

(3) In Lecture X. c. 4 we read thus: “Fifty is He called Jesus deriving His name from His salutary medicine.” This remark refers to the Greek word, Ἰησοῦς, and to its supposed derivation from ἱδωμαι, as Cyril says in c. 13.

“Jesus then means among the Hebrews ‘a Server’; in the Greek Torah ‘a Healer’ (ὁ λυσσαμένος).” The fact that Cyril should seriously imagine that there is any connexion between Ἰησοῦς and ἱδωμαι is somewhat remarkable.

But, further, in the 11th chapter of the same Lecture we read thus: “And He has two names, Jesus Christ; Jesus because He saves, Christ because of His priesthood. And, knowing this, the inspired prophet Moses conferred these two titles on two men. The first being the name of his own successor in the government, Ahas, to Jesus, and surmising his own brother Aaron, Christ, that by two special men he might represent at once the high-priesthood and the kingdom of Him who was to come, the One Jesus Christ.” (ib. p. 104.) The origin of the statement respecting Aaron is, we presume, the Greek rendering of Lev. iv. 6, where the Hebrew is יִהְיֶה הָאָן הַקֹדֶשׁ, the anointed priest, and the Greek ἐσπερῆς ἦς ἤραος. It is obvious that had Cyril been capable of referring to the Hebrew text he would not have made this singular statement.

(4) In Lecture X. c. 16, Cyril writes thus: “Your name was ‘Jews’ and ‘Israelites’ in the time of Moses and the other prophets, and after the return from Babylon, and up to the present time.” This statement indicates something more than the lack of Hebrew knowledge on the part of Cyril. It is quite true that there are passages in the book of Jeremiah, as well as in the later books of the Old Testament, in which the word “Jews” may be understood as comprising more than the subjects of the kingdom of Judah. But when Cyril speaks of the name “Jews” as being used in the days of Moses, he betrays not only ignorance of the use of the Hebrew word יִשְׂרָאֵל (Yishwah), but also of that of its Greek equivalent, Ἰσραήλ.

* The editor of the Oxford translation, in a footnote, vindicates Cyril’s faithful reasoning in the following words: “As what is said of Hagur in Gen. xxii. 18 is meant of Jerusalem, so Rahab may really be named in this Psalm yet Egypt meant as its scope.” This note has obviously escaped the eye of the learned Regius Professor of Hebrew whose name stands first amongst the editors of the Library of the Fathers.

† Thus, e. g. in Jer. xxxiv. 9, יִשְׂרָאֵל Hebrew, and Ἰσραήλ appear to be used as synonymous words.

(5) In Lecture XIII. c. 9, Cyril says that “Judas” means “confession.” Now it is quite true that the Hebrew word נָדַע (Yadah) from which Judas = Judah is derived, bears the meaning to confess, as well as to praise. There are two passages in Genesis in which reference is made to the meaning of the name, viz. chap. xxix. 35 and chap. xlix. 8. In the latter of these passages we read thus: “Judas, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise” where the LXX has αἰνεῖσαι or (according to another reading) αἰνεῖσαν. Cyril does not appear to have had this passage in his mind, but to have ground his observation upon the LXX version of Gen. xxix. 35, where, instead of rendering the Hebrew word by αἰνεῖσαι, as in xlix. 8, the LXX substitute εὐλογοῦσαι; and whereas we rightly read in the A.V. “Now will I praise the Lord,” they read, Νῦν ἐτῶτι εὐλογοῦσαι Κυρίος. It is possible indeed that this instance ought to be addeduce, not so much as a proof of Cyril’s ignorance of Hebrew, as of his blind adherence to the LXX. We think however, that it may fairly be alleged as one amongst many proofs that Cyril derived his knowledge of the Old Testament solely from the Greek, inasmuch as the rendering of the LXX in this place can scarcely be regarded, in any just sense of the word, as a translation of the original.

(6) In Lecture XIII. c. 11, Cyril expends some labour on the attempt to prove that there is no discrepancy between the account contained in Zech. xi. 13, where, as he alleges, the prophet states that the thirty pieces of silver were cast into “the refining house,” and that contained in St. Matthew xxvii. 7, which speaks of “the potter’s field.” It will be obvious (1) that Cyril does not touch upon the real difficulty involved in the interpretation of the words of Zechariah (xi. 13); and (2) that Cyril’s difficulty is altogether out of his ignorance that “the refining house” (τὸ χαρακτήριον) is not found in the Hebrew, which has, as the A.V. has rendered it, “to the potter” (ץ וְאֶפֶן). It is worthy of observation that Jerome remarks upon the discrepancy between the translation of the LXX and the words of the Evangelist. He adds, however, “Sed et in Hebraeo sum sensus idem sit, verba praepostero sunt, et pene diversa” (Ep. ad Pamphilium, iii. p. 167).

(7) In Lecture XIII. c. 27, Cyril writes thus: “Essais saith, ‘Who is this that cometh from Edom? the redness of His garments is from Bosor,’ who is this who for a diaphora weareth purple? for Bosor hath in Hebrew this meaning.” The only key which we can discover to this extraordinary statement is that in Micah ii. 12, the LXX appear to have read הַנַעָם לוֹ (hō nephēs) instead of הַנַעָם. Jerome in his Commentary on Micah explains the word in the same way, “in tribulation.” Jerome’s alternative explanation of the meaning of the word, viz. İşch, arises out of his view of the interchangeableness of the sibilants 5 and 6.

EPHIPHANUS.—Ephiphanius, bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamis of Cyprus, was born in

* He rightly renders the Hebrew words יִשְׂרָאֵל and "ad substantiam."
the early part of the 4th century at Besan dus, a village of Palestine, not far from Eleutheropolis, and was brought up by the monks of Palestine. He is said to have been of Jewish extraction, and to have been acquainted with the Hebrew, the Egyptian, the Greek, and to some extent, the Latin languages, in addition to his native tongue, the Syriac. The writings of Epiphanius bear witness to a certain amount of familiarity with the Hebrew language, as will appear from the following instances.

When speaking of the different names given to the Christians, he distinguishes between Nazarenes and Nazivites; i.e., between a word derived probably from נצר, ntsr, a shoot, and a word derived from נזר, nazar, to separate; and he observes that our Lord was called a Nazarene after the name of the city Nazareth, in which he was brought up; whereas he explains Nazivites as persons sanctified or dedicated to God, as was Samson. (Adversus Haereses, lib. 1, tom. ii. c. 5. Haer. 29, tom. i. p. 121, fol. Colon. 1882.) It deserves notice that when speaking of the tenets of the heretical sect who assumed the name of Nazarenes, he says that they were admirably skilled in the Hebrew language, and that the books of the Old Testament were read by them in Hebrew as by the Jews. (ib. p. 123.)

Again, when Epiphanius has occasion to refer to the words uttered by our Lord upon the cross, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani," he lays great stress upon the fact that this quotation from Ps. xxii. 1 does not accord with the Hebrew original, but that having pronounced the words "Eli, Eli," our Lord uttered the words which follow in the Syriac tongue (ib. p. 792). Now this statement is not entirely correct, insomuch as the word lama (or as it is printed in Petavius's edition of Epiphanius, λαμα) does not accord with the Syriac lemma, but with the Hebrew lama. The verb, however, is, as Epiphanius observes, not the Hebrew word azabthani, but the Aramaic word shebethani.

Again, when Epiphanius quotes the first verse of Psalm cxlii, he does not adhere to the Hebrew, but, as if quoting from memory, he substitutes ירוש for ירוא: if he inserts the words לatron, let God hear, which do not occur in the original, and he substitutes for ירא the words יברוק, let him have regard to the voice (tom. ii. p. 163). Other explanations may be given of these variations, but they are, at least, consistent with the theory that Epiphanius was familiar with Hebrew as a spoken language, and that, in quoting from memory, he readily substituted one form of expression for another, and whilst deviating whether by insertion or by omission from the original, preserved the general sense of the passage which he designed to reproduce.

Once more, when referring to the words of Jacob, Gen. xii. 3, Epiphanius points out the departure of the LXX from the Hebrew in rendering ידוע µη deēψε, and he observes that the Hebrew words may be rendered µη διακανείς (Β. ii. p. 100), oµ διακανείς, oµ δηθείς.

But whilst thus displaying a certain familiarity with Hebrew as a language which has many points of affinity to his native Syriac, Epiphanius, in common with the other early fathers who possessed some slight knowledge of Hebrew, shows that his knowledge was not of a critical character.

Thus, e.g., whilst rightly explaining דוע, Elom, as meaning God always, or for ever, supposing probably that it was equivalent to עלוג, El olam, 'the everlasting God' (Gen. xxi. 33), (p. 792).

Again he explains יושב, Israel, as meaning God; ימד, Jacob, as meaning Lord, Kôrús; ימ, Adam, as de uKôrús; ימך יאכ, Yaqob, as de יאכ kal kavai kal ësi ëv (tom. i. p. 296).

It is difficult to account for three out of these four explanations.

As another instance of false etymology we may refer to the derivation of כיסר, a measure, from קוס, to cover, and the somewhat forced and unwarranted indication of this etymology in the words קפרים רחמה ד מי ובו הכיסר בה, instead of כיסר, following the Hebrew, which has the seventh day (tom. ii. p. 179).

JEROME,—Eusebius Hieronymus Sophronius, the son of Eusebius, a Christian, was born at Stridon in Dalmatia, as some say about the year A.D. 329, but, as seems more probable, about the year 344, and he died at Bethlehem on Sept. 30, A.D. 420. He was sent to Rome at the age of eighteen, and after a residence of some years in that city, during which he studied under the grammarian Donatus, he travelled in the East and in the West. In the desert of Chalæs, near Antioch, about the year A.D. 374, he devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. In A.D. 383 he returned to Rome, and after the death of Pope Damasus he retired to Bethlehem (about A.D. 387), where he remained until his death, pursuing the study of Hebrew with renewed ardour. Up to this time Jerome's work in respect to biblical revision had been chiefly restricted to corrections of the old Latin version by the aid of the Greek. About A.D. 390 he began his new translations from the Hebrew, a work which appears to have extended over a period of about fifteen years, and, notwithstanding the numerous defects which exist in the version of Jerome, of some of which he was himself fully conscious, and which were almost inseparable from the imperfect scholarship of his age and the haste with which some portions of the work were executed, his maxim opus, commonly known as the Vulgate, will ever remain a noble and unique monument of the linguistic skill, as well as of the indomitable courage and perseverance of its highly-gifted author. Whatever opinion may be formed of the philological accuracy of Jerome's Hebrew scholarship, his superiority in this respect to all the ecclesiastical writers who preceded him, and to all who for many centuries followed him, will be universally allowed. At the same time it is a task of considerable difficulty to determine
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the precise nature and extent of Jerome’s obligations to his Hebrew teachers (Baraibausai and others), and thus to discriminate accurately between those criticisms which were original, and those for which he was indebted to his Jewish instructors. Some idea of the extent to which Jerome was indebted to Jewish sources of information may be gathered from the comparison instituted by Rahmer, in his “Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus, of the Quaestiones in Genesis, with the Hebrew traditions preserved in the Talmud and other Jewish writings. The following instances will suffice by way of example:

1) In Gen. ii. 8, where the A.V. reads “And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden,” Jerome’s translation is “Plantaverat autem Dominus Deus paradisum in Eden, a principio.” This interpretation of the Hebrew word וַיִּבְנָה is found in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and in two of the Talmudic treatises (Pessachim, 54, a; Nedarim, 39). The Greek versions of Symmachus and Theodotion, moreover, appear to favour it in the renderings ἐν πρώτοις and ἐν πρώτων.

2) Jerome’s explanation of Gen. vi. 3, “Yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years,” is: “Hoc est, habebunt centum viginti annos ad agendum poenitentiam. Non igitur humana vita, ut multi errant, in centum viginti annos contracta est.” The Targum of Onkelos renders the passage thus: “A term will I give them, an hundred and twenty years, if they may be converted.” In like manner the Targum of Jonathan: “Behold I will give them a prologue; in a hundred and twenty years I will bring them to repentance, and not perish.” The Midrash on Genesis explains the passage in the same manner.

3) In his explanation of Gen. xi. 28, Jerome, in common with the Midrash and the Jerusalem Targum, explains the Hebrew word הַמֵּדָר, which in the A.V. is regarded as a proper name, Ur, as denoting the furnace in which Haran was consumed, and from which Abraham was delivered. It is true, indeed, that Jerome speaks of the Jewish account as a fable (juduluro), but when explaining the apparent discrepancy between the age of Abraham when he left Charran, viz. 75, and the statement that this event took place after the death of Terah who, if only seventy years of age at Abraham’s birth, must have lived sixty years after his departure, Jerome refers to the Hebrew tradition as true, and explains the age of Abraham as dating not from his natural birth, but from the time of his renunciation of the idolatry of the Chaldeans.

4) Jerome’s explanation of Gen. xix. 14 appears to be borrowed from Jewish sources. He does not, indeed, accept the whole of the explanation which is found in the Midrash on that place, viz., that Lot had four daughters, of whom two were already married, and two were about to be married. But he adopts the Jewish interpretation of the words כָּל כָּלָה כָּלָה,为其 acceptiur erant filias ejus, who were about to take his daughters in marriage, and rejects that of the LXX, τοὺς λαμώνας τούς θυγατέρας αὐτοῦ, who had married his daughters.”

(3) In his explanation of Gen. xxi. 14 Jerome remarks upon the difficulty of supposing that Ishmael at eighteen years of age should have been placed upon Hagar’s shoulder. Accordingly he rejects the version of the LXX, καὶ ἠδενεῖτο τῷ δόμῳ αὐτῆς τῷ ναῷ, “and he placed the child upon her shoulder,” and instead of connecting the words ἀπέδενετο, “and the child,” with ἔτοιμος, ἵνα “he placed upon her shoulder,” he connects them with the preceding verb ἀπέδενετο “and he gave,” and in conformity with the views of some of the old Jewish commentators, he explains the passage thus: “Et hoc facto, dedit puerum materi: hoc est, in manus ejus tradidit, commendavit, et eum emissit domo.”

The following criticism, for which it can scarcely be doubted that Jerome was indebted to his Jewish teachers,* exemplifies not only the extent to which he was in the habit of borrowing from others, but also the readiness with which he received and transmitted statements without investigation. In his Commentary on Galatians i. (tom. i. p. 80) he states that when the Hebrew word בְּנֵי, sons, occurs with the letter צו occurs it means “son’s son, but that when it occurs without the letter צов it means the fifth year, or year of jubilees, in support of which latter statement he refers to Exodus xxix. 6, where the word is written without צו, and also to Deut. xxxii. 4, where the צו is inserted.

Our next inquiry must be into the direct evidence which exists respecting the amount of Hebrew scholarship possessed by Jerome. On this subject he sometimes speaks with much diffidence; and when we contrast with this diffidence the very different language in which Jerome, not only in other places, but even in his very same treatises, adopts in reference to his other qualifications, it is reasonable to conclude that the language which he employs was not altogether the result of a præmonio under rate his own acquirements. Thus e.g. in his Apologia aduersus Rufinam he writes thus: “Nos non solum quia Hebrewam linguam usque ad heliades habemus scientiam ... et de aliquo magno passuum judicare, et e quae ipsi intelligimus in nostrâ lingua exprime” (tom. iii. p. 103 b, Basil, 1516). And, again, in the same treatise, when speaking of his familiarity with the Latin grammarians, rhetoricians, and philosophers, he observes, “et Hebræam sermonem ex parte didi culsum” (ib. p. 103 a). And, once more, in his Epistulam Paulam matris he says: “Hebraearum linguam, quam ego ab adolescentia, multo labore ac audore ex parte didici, ... discere volui” (tom. i. p. 86). On the other hand it must not be overlooked that in this same treatise Jerome describes himself as “trilinguis,” i.e. “Hebraeus, Graecus, Latinus,” and that in his Preface to the Apocryphal Book of Tobit, he says that in one day he translated into Latin the version which

* Amongst other similar acknowledgments of this indebtedness, we find the following statement in a letter addressed to St. Augustine (I, p. 286, Clariæ edition).

It would have been but fair to have given me credit for the same fidelity (i.e. as that which he had shown in the revision of the translation of the New Testament) in the Old Testament; for I have not followed my own imagination, but have rendered the divine words as I found them understood by those who speak the Hebrew language. If you have any doubt of this in any passage, seek the Jews what is the meaning of the original.”

3 E
was made for him viā vocē out of the Chaldee into Hebrew by one who was acquainted both with the Hebrew and Chaldee languages.  

The following examples, which might be almost indefinitely multiplied, will suffice to afford some idea of the deficiency of Jerome’s critical scholarship, when tried by a standard applicable to that of the present day.

We shall refer, in the first instance, to his treatise on Hebrew proper names, one of the earliest of his productions, but one in the face of which he observes that he had undertaken it at the request of those who thought that he had acquired some proficiency in the Hebrew language, "quī me putat aequid in Hebræis linguae noticīa profecisse" (tom. iv. p. 136 d).

(1) Jerome regards the Hebrew gutturals נ, ז, and ה as interchangeable. Thus, in his explanation of the name Abel, בַּלֵּא, he assigns it as one of its meanings tucūs, grief, identifying בַּלֵּא with בַּל. He assigns as one explanation of the proper name בֵּרֶא, בְּרֶא, creature, creature, thus identifying בֵּרֶא with בְּרֶא. He identifies בֵּרֶא, בֵּרֶא, with בַּרְשָׁא, בַּרְשָׁא, and gives as an explanation of the former name בֵּרֶא, בֵּרֶא, as an explanation of the latter בֵּרֶא, בֵּרֶא, he confounds בֵּרֶא, בֵּרֶא, drought or desolation, Zeph. ii. 14, with בֵּרֶא, בֵּרֶא, and renders the word by corvis, venem. He explains בר, בר, as meaning ignis, ut lumen, thus identifying בר with בר. Again, after giving happy (beatus) as the explanation of the meaning of the proper name אֵשָׁר, אֵשָׁר, he observes that if written by ו and י instead of ו and י it means a corner, וּל, latus, atrium. In his Questions Hebraicae in Genesis he regards ו and י as interchangeable words; and whilst assigning the meaning happy to Asher, the son of Jacob and Leah, he observes, “Aser ergo non divinae, sed beatus dictum, duntaxat in prae senti loco. Nam in alios secundum ambiguitatem verbi possunt et divinae sic vocari.” And, again, in his remarks upon Gen. iii. 14, in the Questions Hebraicae, he regards ו as dux, as convertible with ו, ashes, and observes that the former word is rendered רות, once more, in his able and elaborate commentary upon Isaiah he regards the word רות as interchangeable with רות (Is. vii. 12), and observes that the meaning may be either temp or exalt.

The uncertainty which attaches to any attempt to determine the amount of scholarship possessed by early writers from their etymological conceits is increased in the case of Jerome by the undue deference which he attached to the views of his predecessors in this field of inquiry.

Thus e.g. in his treatise on proper names he writes thus: “Israēl est videre deum, sive vir, aut mens videns Deum,” while in his Quaest. Heb. in Genesis (ib. p. 100) he says that when he gave the explanation of the name Israēl as if derived from ו, ו, and ל, he did so under the influence of names of great weight and authority, and instead of adhering to that view, he explains the meaning of the word, in accordance with the obvious import of Gen. xxiii. 28, as principe cum Deo, or princeps Dei, i.e. as derived from ו and ו (or ו and ו). Moreover in his later etymology of the word Israel, he seems to regard ו and ו as a noun, and he transliterates it siri, and explains it thus, principem sani; whilst, in allusion, as it should seem, to yet another etymology, he adds: “sive directus Dei, hoc est eisverbos Ως.”

(2) After making ample allowance, however, for Jerome’s undue respect for the opinions of earlier writers, and also for the wide field for speculation which is opened in all etymological researches, it is difficult for Hebrew scholars of the present time to understand how Jerome could have been satisfied with etymologies of which the following will suffice as specimens:—He explains the meaning of the word Adullamite, גִּלְגָּל, (Gen. xxxviii. 1) as the testimony of water, testimonium aquae, as if it were derived from ו and ו. Again, he explains the word Amraphel, ארמִפּאל, thus: dizit ut caderet, as if derived from ו and ו. He explains Hadoram הָדוֹרָמִי (Gen. x. 27), by generatio exsulta, as if derived from ו and ו; Arphaxad, אַרְפָּחָד, by sanam de populosam, apparently as if derived from ו and ו; and פֹּלָה, פֹּלָה, by cadentiae, (as if from ו ו), or ruinā poculi, or cadentiae potionēs, apparently as if from ו and a form of ו; and Ramoth, Heb. רָמוֹת, as visio mortis, as if from ו and ו. Jerome’s attempts to determine the Egyptian source of a Hebrew word are of a somewhat singular character. Thus e.g. he explains the meaning of Pharaoh, Heb. פַּרְו, dissipans sive discoperiens eum, as if derived from the Hebrew word פַּרְו; that of the word Abroch (Gen. xii. 43), as tender or delicate father, as if derived from ו and ו. Here, however, as in other instances, Jerome appears to have followed the guidance of earlier writers, for whereas in his Questions in Genesis he considers the word ואֵשֶׁר, (Gen. xii. 2) as a Hebrew word, and explains it by palus, in his Commentary on Isaiah xix. 7, he says that he was told by the learned that in the Egyptian tongue everything green which grows in marshes is called by this name. One more example of Jerome’s etymological conceits may be cited from his opinion of Ps. cxvi. 21, in his Quaestiones de Studio Scripturae, in which he assigns iniquitas as the meaning of the proper name Haman.

We shall now adduce a few illustrations of the lack of critical accuracy and discernment which pervades the writings of Jerome.

(1) In his remarks on Gen. iii. 17 in his Quaest. Heb. he translates and observes as follows: “Maledicta terra in operibus suis. Opera hic non ruris coelesti, ut plerique putant, sed peco..."
HEBREW LEARNING 867

significant; ut in Hebraeo habetur. Et Aquila non discordat dicens: Maledicta humus proper te, Et Theodoto, Maledicta adama in transgressione tua."

We remark here (1) that Jerome appears to have read לְּעָרְבִּים; or some other form of רָעָבָּב, operatus est, instead of רָעָבָּב; and (2) that he does not appear to have observed that Aquila read in accordance with the present Hebrew text לְּעָרְבִּים, or that Theodotion appears to have read לְּעָרְבִּים or some other nominal form of רָעָבָּב, transgressus est.

(3) Jerome’s rendering of the LXX version of Gen. iv. 7, in which the words “thou shalt rule over him” are made to refer, as in the English version, to Abel, not to sin, is that in Greek the word ἁμαρτία, sin, is of the feminine gender, whereas in Hebrew the word נחמה is masculine. The inaccuracy of the explanation is obvious, even had Jerome’s statement as to the gender of נחמה been correct; but it seems to have escaped his notice (1) that the word ἁμαρτία is not found in the LXX in this verse; and (2) that in every other place in which נחמה occurs it is of the feminine gender.

Amongst other indications either of an imperfect acquaintance with Hebrew or of great carelessness, we may notice the following:

(1) Jerome’s rendering of בִּלּוּל, minnegeb, in Gen. xlii. 3, by the words per anum. It may perhaps be inferred from this rendering that Jerome was not aware of the fact that The South, or The Negeb, was the name of a district of Judaea, and consequently that there was no difficulty in understanding the meaning of verse 1, in which it is stated that Abraham came up "out of Egypt into the south." This ignorance, however, furnishes no sufficient justification for rendering בִּלּוּל minnegeb "through the South."

(2) Jerome’s rendering of מֵאָסֵל, מֵאָסֵל, Gen. xxxix. 26, in justior est ista quom ego. Not content, however, with this rendering, which is a correct version of the Hebrew, he proceeds to observe, "In Hebraeo habet justiuota est ex me" (Quast. Heb. 101 a).  

(3) Jerome renders הרויה תַּנֵּבֵי, Gen. xlix. 18, saleotarem tuum excitabo. The rendering is the more reasonable, inasmuch as that of the LXX is Θεωτρείας ταῦτα ἐνεργευόμενοι.

(4) Jerome appears to have been unable to give any account of the Septuagint version of Gen. xxvi. 32, where the Greek translators evidently read נַו not for נַי to him (Quast. Heb. in Gen. p. 98 a).

(5) When noticing the obvious play upon the words מָשָׂא הַדָּאָה and מָשָׂא הַדָּאָה, and upon נַו וּבֵדָא וּבֵדָא in Is. v. 7, Jerome says, "volumus latinis insinuare suribus quod ad hebraeos diciscimus"; and he then proceeds to give the meaning of each word, and to show the difference which was caused in each case by the change of a single letter. It may, perhaps, be thought by some that Jerome wished to avoid the comparison implicit in his remarks by the statement that he was indebted for them to Jewish sources. It is scarcely probable, however, that a Hebrew scholar would have deemed it necessary to ascribe to his Jewish teachers information of so obvious a nature, and of which it is difficult to understand how any one who was tolerably versed in the Hebrew language could have been ignorant.

(6) Jerome’s remarks on the word נַעְלָה, afflicted, of the Niph. part. of the verb נַעְלָה, its constr. form, which he renders by the Latin word nuper, arv: "Sciimus in Hebraeo ipsum Latinum esse sermonem et propter eam nobis lax in Hebraeo erat positum; ut nuce possemus linguam, Hebraicism omnium linguarum esse mistricem." (Comment. in Zeph. iii. 18.)

(7) In his commentary on Is. ii. 16, Jerome gives it as the opinion of the Jews that שֶׁמֶרֶן, Tarshish, is the Hebrew word for the sea, and that ד’ is a Syriac word.

(8) In his commentary on Habakkuk iii. 5, he renders נִפְרוֹר blifrite, or persicentilia feter, by diabolus.

(9) Jerome’s opinion that a portion of the book of Job was written in hexameters shows to how great an extent he relied upon the authority of Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius, not one of whom appears to have been competent to form any opinion upon the question, and either how little he relied upon his own judgment, or how incompetent he was to arrive at any independent conclusion on such a subject. In his treatise on proper names Jerome observes upon the words Hiram, Ira, Ishtob, and Ishboeth as follows:—"Idcirco cum aspirazione haec nomina posuimus, quia et apud Graecos et apud Hebrews per diphthongum scribuntur." It will suffice here (1) to call attention to the reason fallaciously assigned for the aspiration of these names, that they begin with a dipthong; and (2) to present to the eye of the reader the four names in their Hebrew and in their Greek form:

1. דִּיֵּר, דִּיֵּר, Hiram.
2. דִּיֵּר, דִּיֵּר, Ira.
3. דִּיֵּר, דִּיֵּר, Ishtob.
4. דִּיֵּר, דִּיֵּר, Ishboetha.

It would be an easy task to multiply to an almost indefinite extent the indications afforded in the writings of Jerome of his imperfect scholarship, of his unseemly haste," and of his reliance upon sources of information which were not unfrequently fallacious. It is a more agreeable task, however, to direct attention to the very great value which his writings, especially his commentaries, possess (1) as laying the foundation, however imperfectly, of a sounder method of biblical exegesis than is to be found in the writings of any of his predecessors or contemporaries; (2) as preserving so much of the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion which would otherwise have been lost;

* E.g. in his preface to the book of Proverbs, Solomon’s Song and Ecclesiastes, Jerome writes thus: "Quae longa segetationis et fructus, ne penitus hoc anno reiteremus, et apud nos cumus omen, erat et quae nominis versus conseravi, interpretationem videlicet tristium Solomontus voluminius " (om. iv. p. 10, 2). And again, at the end of his commentary on Obadiah, he excuses himself thus, "Aliud est, mi Pamphlici, saepe siltum vertere, et quae memorabilis signum scribere. Aliud notarium est, praepratiris pueros reticienti dictare quodcunque in buccam teneris." He adds, "In hoc precepto et adolescunti tulli usum et senes praecumposimus."
and (3) as pointing out, in many instances, the superiority of those versions over that of the LXX, which was commonly regarded as an inspired work, and to which Jerome himself at times was led to assign an authority which at other times he refused to recognize, and also over the old Latin version which was based upon it, and which, notwithstanding all the opposition which it had to encounter, the great work of Jerome ultimately superseded.

The most cursory comparison of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, first with the version of the LXX, and then with that of Jerome, will suffice to establish the vast superiority of the latter over the former. A few instances taken from the first chapter of the Book of Amos will serve by way of illustration.

(1) In v. 1 the LXX treat δύσης, herdersmen, as a proper name, Ακακίον; they represent the words of the prophet as being uttered in that place, not the prophet himself as being in it, although the verb ἄναβει is in the singular number; and they translate the word Ἰσραήλ, Israel, by Jerusalem, thus misrepresenting, in a very important point, the main drift of the prophecy. Well might Jerome say in his preface to this book, “Septuaginta autem, necio quasi subtili et discreti sunt. Amos qui facti sunt in Acharim de Thecanae quos vidit pro Hierusaleme.” On the other hand, Jerome renders the verse thus from the Hebrew: “Vereba Amos qui fuit in pastorilibus (or pastoribus) Thecanae quae vidit super Israel.”

(2) In vv. 6 and 9, where the adjective μάλα, whole or entire, occurs as qualifying the captivity spoken of, the LXX renders it as a proper name, αἰγανασία τοῦ Ζαλαμώδους, whilst Jerome renders it correctly as an adjective, “captivitas perfecta.”

(3) In v. 11, whilst the LXX render ἔρρινα σπείρας, a net, by καὶ ἐκμεγυνοί μεγίστοι τινες γιγάντες and assign to the word the abstract meaning of ἔρρινα, μαρτυρον, witness, Jerome rightly renders the former phrase, “vulvateris meriorum ejus,” and ἔρρινα, usque in finem.”

It would be easy to multiply illustrations in proof of the superiority of Jerome’s work over the LXX, but any elaborate comparison of the two versions would unduly increase the length of the present article.

It will be obvious from what has been here alleged that it is by no means an easy task either, in the first instance, to form a correct judgment of the extent of Jerome’s Hebrew scholarship, or, when such judgment has been formed, to convey to readers of the 19th century a just estimate of the excellence and the defects of that scholar.

ship as compared with the more critical and exact scholarship of the present day. If any credence is to be given to words which breathe no spirit of arrogance or of intentional exaggeration, it will follow from Jerome’s account of his version of the book of Tobit, to which allusion has already been made, that however defective may have been the amount of his critical scholarship, Jerome must have acquired a very considerable amount of practical acquaintance with the Hebrew language, and a generally correct apprehension of the signification of Hebrew words and phrases. The same conclusion may be gathered from the success which crowned his labours as a teacher, as may be seen by reference to letters which he addressed to Paula and to Eustochium, her daughter (see p. 155, Gotha, 1865), who appear to have acquired by his aid a sufficient amount of acquaintance with Hebrew to enable them to have recourse to it for the better understanding of the Old Testament Scriptures.

THEODORET.—Theodoret was born at Antioch towards the close of the 4th century, and was made bishop of Cyprus, a small town of Syria, near the Euphrates, about the year A.D. 420, from which office he was deposed in the year A.D. 449, as a partisan of Nestorius. In addition to his History of the Church, and several controversial treatises, he has left behind him commentaries on a large portion of the Old Testament and on the Epistles of St. Paul.

These writings prove that Theodoret possessed a certain amount of acquaintance with Hebrew as well as with Syriac; and he appears to have had also the advantage of personal intercourse with learned Jews. Thus, e.g., in his Questions in Ezechias (Inter. xxv.), he observes that the Samaritans pronounced the sacred tetragrammaton as Ἰαβ (Yahweh), but the Jews as Ἰαχ. His remarks under the Hebrew language (Ezechias, in Gen. Inter. i.) are of a somewhat singular character. He observes, in proof that Hebrew is a sacred language and the direct gift of God, that whereas children commonly speak the language of the nation to which they belong, the children of Jews do not at once speak Hebrew, but the language of those amongst whom they are born; and he appeals to Ps. lix. 5, as it is rendered by the LXX, ἡ δυναμική πατρίδος ἡ Ἰουδαΐα, and ἡ ἑπαρκής ἡ Ἰουδαΐα. He proceeds to state his own views as to the derivation of the word Hebrew. After noticing the opinions of those who derive it from ἔβαρ, which he rejects, he expresses his belief that it is derived from the circumstance that Abraham crossed (יוֹפָד) the Euphrates. He observes that the Syriac for יָפָד, which is used by the LXX in Gen. xiv. 13, as the equivalent of יָפָד, Hebrew, is Hebri, and that he himself found that in the Hebrew the word was Hebri, and that the Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew Hebri is Ἐβραῖος, in support of which assertion he appeals to Gen. xxxix. 14, where the LXX have Εβραῖος as the equivalent of Ἰουδαΐα.

Again, in his Commentary on Ps. xciv. 20, where the LXX render the Hebrew יִבָּד by σώκρονιος, Theodoret observes that Symmachus renders it more clearly by consgregari (congregari, in his Commentary on Ps. lixii. 15), he notices the fact that Symmachus renders יִבָּד by אֲלֵי.
the Greek versions is found in his Commentary on 1 Kings i. 33, where David commands Solomon to be taken to Giloh. Theodoret observes upon this passage that the Nile is called Giloh; and he refers to Jer. ii. 18, where the LXX read Γάλι εἰς the equivalent of Νεῖλος, Siloh.

The use of a converse appears to have been unknown to Theodoret, for he observes on Ps. cxxi. 11, where the LXX has Καὶ ὁ Θεός αὐτὸν as the rendering of דאדרי, thus Symmachus, Theodotus, and the Hebrew itself, have אתֹּם, thus shewing that Theodoret regarded it as equivalent to אֲבֹהַה. Again, Theodoret’s remarks upon the derivation of the proper name אֶלֶוֹ, Jedidiah, 2 Sam. xxii. 25 (Quast. in II. Reg. Int. 26), seem to denote that he did not rightly understand the derivation of the word, or perceive the drift of the comments of Aquila and of Symmachus. The version of the LXX is as follows. Καὶ ἦλθεν τὸ βοῦς αὐτὸν, and which οὖν ἐρώτησεν, on which Theodoret observes, “Aquila interpreted the word ἔρωτην ἐρώτησεν on account of the Lord, but Symmachus εἰς βασιλείαν διήρισεν, set apart as a king.”

Once more, while Theodoret appears to have diligently compared the versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotus with that of the LXX, and has recorded the variations in many instances, he does not appear to have been fully sensible of the linguistic grounds on which these variations rested, or he did not consider that they would be appreciated by those for whom he wrote. Thus e.g. in his Commentary on Ps. xxvii. 11, he observes, that, whereas the LXX render γνώσθησαν me, teach me, Aquila* and Theodotus render the same word enlighten me, φῶτον, but he does not allude to the fact that these interpreters, in common with the LXX in another place (e.g. 2 Kings xii. 3), confounded the Hiphil form of the verb γνώσθη and of the verb φῶτον, i.e. γνώσθη and φωτίζω.

And once more in his Commentary on Ps. x. 14, 15, when pointing out in support of his statement that the time denoted in the verse has been changed in the LXX, he appeals only to the versions of Aquila and the other Greek interpreters by whom the words ὡσαύτης, safely us, and ὡσαύτης, made us glad, are correctly rendered in the imperative mood, and not in the past tense as by the LXX and in the Vulgate.

Upon the whole, whilst the writings of Theodoret display a considerable amount of careful research, and have preserved many of the readings of the Greek interpreters, it seems that his acquaintance with Hebrew was rather such a superficial acquaintance as one living in Syria would have acquired by intercourse with those who spoke a cognate language, than such a grammatical acquaintance with it as would have qualified him for the task of an original interpreter or commentator.

There are other writers, as e.g. Lucian a disciple of Macarius of Eledess, about the end of the 3rd century, and Derothaeus, a presbyter of Tyre or of Antioc, and a contemporary of Eusebius of Caesarea, who are said to have possessed some

---
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Upon the whole, whilst the writings of Theodoret display a considerable amount of careful research, and have preserved many of the readings of the Greek interpreters, it seems that his acquaintance with Hebrew was rather such a superficial acquaintance as one living in Syria would have acquired by intercourse with those who spoke a cognate language, than such a grammatical acquaintance with it as would have qualified him for the task of an original interpreter or commentator.

There are other writers, as e.g. Lucian a disciple of Macarius of Eledess, about the end of the 3rd century, and Derothaeus, a presbyter of Tyre or of Antioc, and a contemporary of Eusebius of Caesarea, who are said to have possessed some
knowledge of Hebrew. Eusebius says that Dorotheus was "devoted to the study of Hebrew, and that he read the Hebrew Scriptures with great facility." (Hist. Ecles. vii. 32). Eusebius of Emessa, moreover, if the works ascribed to him be genuine, seems to have used the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, as well as the Peshito version, in the commentaries which bear his name, on Genesis and on some of the Psalms. Little, however, remains of the genuine writings of these and of similar authors who lived in the first half of the Christian era, and in the few references to their reputed works there is an unduly length of the present article. We have already briefly examined the works of the most distinguished writers of the church of the first four centuries who possessed, or who might reasonably be supposed to have possessed, any acquaintance with the Hebrew language. It would be a useless task to examine at length the works of those writers who neither possessed, nor professed to have, any knowledge of Hebrew. A few references, however, to the works of St. Chrysostom and of St. Augustine will not be devoid of interest as illustrating the general neglect of Hebrew which prevailed alike in the East and in the West.

The most cursory examination of the writings of Chrysostom will suffice to show his ignorance of Hebrew. Thus, e.g., in his Fourth Homily on Genesis i. he tells his hearers that those who are well skilled in Hebrew (οἱ τῶν γλώττων διατηροῦν ἀρετῆς ἁρματον) say that in that language the word denoting heaves is of the plural number, and he informs them that further that it is the custom of the Hebrew language to use the plural number to denote a single object. He not only adopts the LXX version as the groundwork of his commentary, but he reasons from the use of the same Greek words in different places, without regard to the fact that the corresponding Hebrew words are different; e.g. ἔστασις, which answers to the Hebrew verb סנה, as in Gen. i. 17, compared with Gen. ii. 2, where the same verb corresponds with the verb דָּשָׁה, sum, whilst Chrysostom affirms that "sacred Scripture uses the same word in both places." Again, Chrysostom comments on Gen. ii. 2 in apparent ignorance that the Hebrew has "the seventh day," where the Greek has "the sixth." When explaining the meaning of the name Abraham in the Thirty-ninth homily on Genesis, Chrysostom adopts the erroneous etymology which connects it with עַבְרָהָם, transcrib., and observes that "they know this who are skilled in the Hebrew tongue;" whilst in the following homily he adopts the common error of supposing that the change in the name of Sarah consisted in the addition of a second ד, (ך) i.e. in the change from זָבָה to זָבַה, as he found the words transiterated in the Greek version.

In regard to the writings of St. Augustine we find several allusions to his own ignorance of that language, of which the following will suffice. In the 11th book of his Confessions Augustine writes thus: "Et si Hebraeæ voce loqueretur, frustra pulsaret sensum meum . . . . si autem Latine, scirem quid dicercet" (xv. 3.) And again, in his De Doctrina Christianâ (ii. c. 16) he not only implies his own ignorance of Hebrew, but also the prevailing neglect of that language, when he expresses his conviction that "if any one could interpret the meaning of the Hebrew names, he would be of great value and service in solving the enigmas of Scripture." It would obviously be useless to multiply proofs of the truth of Augustine's statement in regard to his own acquirements. It will serve, however, to illustrate still further the prevailing ignorance of Hebrew in his days if we refer to the eleventh chapter of his own treatise on doctrine, where he adds the two "Hebrew" words ῥαχα and ἡξανα as instances of words which cannot be translated into another language. It will suffice to observe that the former of these words is Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic, not Hebrew, and although some difference of opinion exists as to the precise import of this word, which is one of common occurrence in post-Biblical Hebrew, it is difficult to understand how it was that those who were not only able (to use Augustine's words) "to mark and to ask about them," but who had access to the Greek and Latin versions of Ps. cxvi. 25, ἐκείνος ὁ δόξα τιμή μηδεμιον, O Domine salutem me fecit, should not have obtained from those versions some idea of the meaning of the word ἡξανα. b Socrates. His Ecclesiastical History (vii. 409), makes mention of one George, a presbyter belonging to the Arian fashion, who devoted himself to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, and who "evinced in his public expositions of the Old Testament no inaccessible acquaintance with the Hebrew language."

It deserves notice that Gildas, in the preface to his declaratory Epistle, refers to the fact that the fourfold Lamentations of Jeremiah are written in alphabetic order. It is indeed possible that this information was not given by Gildas as the result of his own examination of the Hebrew text. It is, however, quite correct; for whilst the first four chapters of the Lamentations are written in alphabetic order, the first, second, and fourth chapters, consisting of twenty-two or

b One amongst numerous illustrations of the extent to which the value of the original text of the Old Testament was disregarded and the study of literal Hebrew neglected. In the time of St. Augustine, occurs in a letter addressed to St. Jerome (i. p. 282, Clarke's edition), in which he urges the following considerations in favour of a translation into Latin from the LXX rather than from the Hebrew: "For if your translation begins to be more generally read in many churches, it will be a grievous thing that, in the reading of Scripture, differences must arise between the Latin churches and the Greek churches, especially seeing that the discrepancy is easily condemned in a Latin version by the production of the original in Greek, which is the language very widely known both in society and the Church, if any one has been disturbed by the occurrence of something to which he was not accustomed in the translation taken from the Hebrew, and alleges that the new translation is wrong, it will be found difficult, if not impossible, to get the Hebrew documents, by referring the objection to exception which is taken may be defended. And when they are obtained, who will submit to have so many Latin and Greek authorities pronounced to be in the wrong?" Besides all this, Jews, if consulted as to the meaning of the Hebrew text, may be engaged to open from yours: in which case it will seem as if your presence were indispensable, as being the only one who could refute their view; and it would be a miracle if one could be found capable of acting as arbiter between you and them."
verses each, alphabetically arranged, and the third chapter of sixty-six verses (three verses consecutively beginning with the same letter), the fifth chapter is not composed in alphabetic order.

Fabricius, one of the biographers of Aldehelm, bishop of Sherborn, who died about A.D. 709, speaks thus of his familiarity with the Hebrew language: Prophecatae exempla, Davidis Psalmos, Salomonis tria volumina, Hebraici litteris bene novit, et legem Mosaicam." (Ald. Opp. ed. Giles, p. 357.)

There is one writer, however, of the Western church, whose works, though belonging to a later period, seem to demand a special notice, viz. the Venerable Bede.

Beda, or Venerable Bede, as he is commonly designated, was born between the years A.D. 672 and A.D. 674, in the immediate neighbourhood of the twin monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow. He was educated at one or both of these places under the care of Abbat Benedict, and was instructed in the Holy Scriptures, as he tells us in his Ecclesiastical History (iv. 4), by Trumbert, a monk who had been educated under Ceddus, bishop of Lichfield. Bede possessed considerable knowledge of Greek as well as of Latin, and appears to have had some acquaintance with Hebrew, as may be gathered from his commentaries, which were confessedly, for the most part, compilations from earlier works, particularly from those of Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine, none of whom appear to have been acquainted with the Old Testament in its original tongue.

It is quite clear, indeed, that Bede, in common with other early expositors of the Old Testament, was indebted for some of his Hebrew criticisms to the learning of others. There is undoubted evidence that the works of Jerome were familiar to him. At the same time, when the state of learning in the age and country in which Bede lived is taken into account, there is less probability than in the case of most of his predecessors that he was able to have recourse for aid to those who were familiar with the Hebrew language, and consequently in those cases in which his information does not appear to have been derived from Jerome, there is the greater probability that he was in the habit of consulting the Hebrew Scriptures for himself.

The following instances from the Commentary on Genesis, in which Bede generally adopts the Vulgate as the basis of his remarks, but occasionally refers to an older translation, will suffice as illustrations of Bede's mode of reference to the Hebrew.

(1) In his notice of the account of the second day's work of creation, Bede observes that in this case only the words are not added, "And God saw that it was good." Now, when it is remembered that these words are found in the LXX, it is improbable that Bede would have made this statement on the authority of the Vulgate without reference to the original.1

(2) In his Commentary on Gen. ii. 2, Bede notices the variation of the Vulgate from the LXX, which latter version reads "sixth" instead of "seventh," and observes concerning the Latin version "quae de Hebraicis veritate fonte descendit" (ib. vii. p. 29).

(3) In his Commentary on Gen. ii. 8, Bede notices the difference between the Greek and the Latin renderings of δακτυλος, which is rendered in the LXX κερατος ουρανος, as orintum, and in the Latin, a principio, and he remarks concerning the latter version "quae de Hebraicis veritate translatat est." It is deserving of notice that Bede alludes to the opinion of certain persons that the site of the garden of Eden was far removed from all the regions of the earth which were inhabited by the human race, and that the waters of the flood which covered the surface of our world could not reach it. "Unde nec aquae diluvii, quae totem nostris orbis superficiem altissime cooperuerunt, ad eum pervenire potuerunt" (ib. p. 42).

(4) In his Commentary on Gen. ii. 19, Bede observes in proof that Hebrew was the original language of the whole human race, that all the names which are found in the Book of Genesis up to the division of tongues, appear to belong to it (ib. p. 51).

(5) In his Commentary on Gen. iv. 5, Bede observes in proof that Hebrew was the original language of the whole human race, that all the names which are found in the Book of Genesis up to the division of tongues, appear to belong to it (ib. p. 51).

(6) Bede's Commentary on Gen. iv. 7 is as follows, "Justa idiomata linguae Hebraicae indicativum modum pro imperativo posuit, quia habes innumera." Now although it is evident that Bede had the Quaestiones in Genesis before him, and that he adopted some of the very words of Jerome (as e.g. "quia liberis arbitrii es, moneo", nevertheless these words show that Bede was capable of examining the Hebrew text for himself. It is true that Jerome uses the words "esse dominium dominium," but it is extremely improbable that Bede should, on the strength of these words, have inferred that here, as elsewhere (e.g. in the Decalogue to which he here refers) the future tense is used in the Hebrew, not the imperative mood. On the other hand it is strange that Bede should insert in the text, and comment upon the words, "Egrediamur in agrum," corresponding to the Greek Διαφεύγων εκ τος χελεως, and to the Vulgate, "egrediamur foras," without noticing the fact that they are an interpolation, a fact, however, of which he could not have been ignorant, if the Quaestiones of Jerome were before him, inasmuch as the following words occur there: "Superfluum ergo est quod in Samaritanorum, et nostros volumine reperitur; transanes in campum." It should be observed that Bede repeats these words in the same context in both direct and indirect, of the use which Bede made of the writings of Jerome, he appears to have exercised his own judgment upon the information thus derived. Thus, e.g. in his Commentary on Gen. iv. 16, where Jerome, in his Quaestiones in Genesis, rejects altogether the view that Noah was the name of a country, and understands the word as denoting the wandering

---

1 Venerabilis Bedae opera quae supersunt omnia, vii. p. 11.
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very superficial it was sufficient to enable him to consult the original text of the Old Testament for himself, and to appreciate, at least, the value of the researches of his predecessors.

The results of this inquiry may be summed up in a few words. With the exception of Jerome, and perhaps of Origen, none of the early Christian writers appear to have possessed any knowledge of Hebrew which was worthy of the name. The knowledge possessed by Eusebius, to whom we may perhaps add Eusebius and Theodoret, was of an extremely superficial character, and served only, if indeed it extended so far, as to enable them to appreciate the value of the great work of Origen. Origen's scholarship was also very rude and elementary; and it yet remains to be ascertained to what extent the Hexapla represented the fruit of his own investigations, or the results of his wise and laborious appreciation of the knowledge of others. The name of Jerome stands out conspicuously above the roll of his predecessors and of his successors until the time of the Reformation as far as the most distinguished, perhaps the only Christian writer of antiquity who was qualified to make an independent use of his Hebrew acquirements, and to whom the whole Christian church will ever owe an estimable debt of gratitude for the preservation of so large a portion of the results of Origen's labours, and still more for that unrivalled and imperishable work which has been not inaptly described as having "remained for eight centuries the bulwark of Western Christianity" (see Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. "The Vulgate," ill. p. 1701).

[CR. J. E.]

HEGA, bishop of Duawich. [ETTL.]

HECATE, in the system of PISTIS SOPHIA, one of the five great archons presiding over the punishments of the "middle region." She has three faces, and has under her twenty-seven demons, which entering into men cause them to lie, perjure themselves, and covet what is not theirs. Such guilty souls are delivered over to her demons to be tormented by the dark smoke and wicked heat for 115 years, after which they are cast back into the sphere. (Plato Sophia, p. 368.)

[G. S.]

HECBURCH (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1372, in M. H. R. 781), king of Kent, son of Herewerg. [EGERTH (1).]

[Ch.]

HECCA (ECCA, ACOA), the seventh bishop of Hereford. (M. H. B. 621.) His name once occurs in a charter (Kemble, C. D. 183) which belongs to the year 758, and contains a grant of Cynewulf, king of Wessex, to the monastery of Bath. His predecessor Fodda appears last in 747, and his successor Ceadda possibly in 770; his date cannot be more nearly approximated to. (Will. Malmes. G. F. ed. Hamilton, p. 288.)

The interpolated dates assigned in one MS. of Florence of Worcester (M. H. B. 546, 545, v. 786 and 826, are arbitrary inventions. [S.]

HECCCE (Gaimar, Estorie, v. 1461, in M. H. B. 782), bishop of Lindsey. [EADRED.]

[Ch.]

HECIDIUS, son of Avitus. [Eccl. 5.]

HEBELENIUS or HECEBOLUS, a rhetor in the reigns of the emperors Con-

life of Cain, Bede writes thus, "Nay autem in profugum, sive, ut in libro Hebræorum nomine sives, instalibem motum et fluctuationem vertiur, quod nonnulli, quibus et Josephus conceptam locum esse, in quo habitaverit Cain, autamatur" (ib. p. 78).

(7) In his Commentary on Gen. iv. 18 and iv. 23, Bede shews that he was acquainted with the Jewish tradition respecting the death of Cain at the hands of Lamech, but not, as it should seem, through Jewish sources, but from the writings of Jerome: "sicuct Hieronymus in quodam Hebraeo volumine scriptum esse testatur" (ib. p. 82).1

(8) In his Commentary upon Gen. v. 3, Bede gives a full account of the discrepancies between the Hebrew text and the version of the LXX.

(9) In his Commentary on Gen. vi. 4, Bede refers, by way of illustration, to Ps. xii. 6, where the LXX have δε γεγαρ, and the Vulgate "ut gigas." He is, aware, however, of the fact that the Hebrew word there used is "תִּהְוָה"; and he writes thus: "Quasvim in Hebraico veritate memoratus paeni vsicula its scripta siti: exaltata iuvenis et currendum vir" (ib. p. 83).

(10) In his Commentary on Habakkuk, Bede follows one of the ancient Latin versions, probably the Balsa, which agrees for the most part with the LXX, but differs greatly from the Hebrew and the Vulgate. He is not, however, altogether unmindful of the Hebrew original. Thus, e.g., whilst adopting as the rendering of the beginning of v. 3, Deus a Libsao veniet, where the LXX read ο τ Θεός δ τ Θεός ηθερ, and the Vulgate has, Deus ab Austron veniet, Bede remarks as follows: "Notandum autem quod ille versus in Hebraico veritate ita habetur, Deus a Thaeman, id est, ab austro veniet" (tom. ix. p. 408).

(11) Lastly, in regard to Bede's stigmata of proper names, we may observe that they are for the most part adopted verbatim, or with slight alteration from Jerome's Quaestiones in Genesim, or from his Treatise on Proper Names and Places.

Thus, e.g., whereas Jerome gives Audito Dei as the meaning of Ishmael, Bede gives Exaudito Dei as its rightful interpretation (Comment in Gen. xvi. ib. p. 184). His explanation of the meaning of the change from Sarai to Sarah is almost identical with that of Jerome in his Quaestiones (ib. p. 191). His explanation of the meaning of Bélá is the same as that of Jerome, devoratio. Bede's explanation of the meaning of Καδήθ is Sancta, sive Communata (ib. p. 213), the former of which is that of Jerome. And lastly, his interpretation of the meaning of Μαρκιας is Ἰησοῦς Dei, sive Nomen ejus Dei, the latter of which is that of Jerome in his De Nominibus Hebraiciis; and his Interpretation of Jonathan is Columbae dominus (ib. tom. viii. p. 51), which is derived from the same source. Upon the whole, the inference from the above premises seems to be that whilst Bede's knowledge of Hebrew was

1 Hieronymus Damaso, tom. iv. p. 142, Basil. 1616.

2 Allegorica Expositio in Lib. 1 Sam. cap. 1 (ib. p. 119).
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stantius, Julian, and Jovian. Under Constanti-
us he practised at Constantinople, and pro-

fessed himself to be a "fervent" Christian
(δικτάρεω κριτικής [κριτικής]) on which
account he was selected by that emperor as one
of the teachers of the Julian, he being afraid that,
if the young prince came under the influence of
a pagan, he might be seduced to heathenism.
(Socrates, iii, 1, 13.) After the death of Con-
stantius, however, he followed the example of his
former pupil, and became a "fierce pagan"
(γυρρόνος ΟΛίγος; Soc. a. d. 115.) He was in
great favour with Julian, and appears to have
been one of his familiar correspondents. (Julian,
Ep. 19, ed. Heyler, p. 23; Επιστολάς.) Under
that emperor, Hecebolius also seems to have had
some civil office at Edessa. The Arians of that
city, "in the insolence of wealth," had violently
attacked the Valentinians there. Julian wrote
to Hecebolius to say, "since they had done a
what could not be allowed in any well-governed
city," "in order to help the men more easily
to enter the kingdom of heaven as it was
prescribed," by their "most wonderful law, he
had commanded all moneys to be taken away
from the church of the Edesenes, that they
might be distributed among the soldiers, and
that its property should be confiscated to his
prince as was good, so that he might become
wise and not lose the kingdom of
heaven which they hoped for." (Julian, Ep. 43,
ed. Heyler, p. 82; Baronius, a. d. 362, xiii.; Soz.
v. i. 1.) Such appropriation of church property
was one of the great crimes of which Julian was
Ost. iii.) The emperor adds that he had
charged the inhabitants of Edessa to abstain
from "riot and strife," lest "they themselves"
should suffer "the sword, exile, and fire." The
last sentence in the letter appears to intimate
that he would hold Hecebolius personally respon-
sible for the future good conduct of the city.
After the death of Julian, and the reversal of
the imperial policy, which immediately followed,
Hecebolius ostentatiously professed extreme peni-
tence for his apostasy, and on one occasion pro-
strated himself at the church door, and cried
to all that entered, "Trample upon me—the salt
that has lost its savour" (σωτηρέω με... το
δόσι το κάτωστον; Socrates, iii, 13; Baronius,
a. d. Matt. v, 13.) Baronius assumes the iden-
tity of the magistrate of Edessa with the
"riector" of Constantinople (a. d. 362, xiii. xiv.)
but Tillemont regards them as different persons
(Mon. vii. 321, 322). Libanius also mentions a
Hecebolius, but gives us no clue to his history.
(Ep. 309.)

HECFFERD (Gaimar, Estoric, v. 1466, in M.
H. B. 782), king of Northumbria, son of Oswy.
[SOPHRID (1.3).]

Sopsrail (1.)

HECHBERACTUS, April 24, an English
saint supposed by the Bollandist (Acta SS. April,
iii. 291) to have been the same as Hechbertus
or Egbert, archbishop of York.
[EGBERT (6).]

[O. T. S.]

HECHERIUS, eleventh bishop of Nevers,
between Leodebonus and St. Deodatus, in the
lists of the Gallia Christiana and Gams, but
omitted altogether from Coquille's series. He
subscribed the charter of Emmo, archbishop of
Sens, for the monastery of St. Peter in that dio-
cese (St. Pierre le viif) in a.d. 659. As his pro-
decessor subcribed a procopium of Emmo dated
in the same year, Hecherus's episcopate must
have commenced, but passed over, an doubt in
consequence of the difficulties of the times.
(Mich. Patr. Lat. lxxxvi. 1171-4; Coquille, Hist. du
Nouveau, sub fin. Paris, 1612; Gall. Chr. xii. 627;
Gams, Series Episc. 584.)

HECHTACH, virgin. [ECHTACH.]

HECTOR, as bishop of Cartagena, subscribes
the acts of the council of Tarragona, a.d. 516
(Coleccion de Canones de la Iglesia Espanola, ii.
115; Gams, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 444.)

HEED ABBUS. [EWAEN.

HEDDA (1) (Haddi, Heddi, see AETLA),
fifth bishop of the Gewioci, or West Saxons (M.
H. B. 619). He was appointed, according to Bede,
to succeed Letherius, during the time of the
West Saxons anarchy, in or about 676, and was
consecrated at London (H. E. iv. 12). If he was
identical with the pupil of St. Hilda, whom Bede
calls Aetla, and makes bishop of Dorchester (H.
E. iv. 23), he must from the beginning have had
the two sees of Dorchester and Winchester as his
predisposition to hold them; if they were
different persons, Aetla must be supposed to have
had but a short tenure of Dorchester, and then
to have made room for Hedd. One of the most
important acts of his administration must have
been the final fixing of his see at Winchester, a
measure which was completed by the translation
of the body of St. Birinus (Bede, H. E. ii. 7).
This event is placed in the Winchester Annals in
the year 683 (Ang. Soc. i. 189), but the authority
is slight, and the chronological signs discordant.
Rudburn, the later Winchester nunuid, has pre-
served a curious fragment of archbishop Theo-
dore's legislation, which helps, if genuine, to show
that Hedd was opposed to the subdivision of
the West-Saxon diocese, which was thus deter-
red until after his death. The subdivision of dioces
has generally been mooted at the synod of
Hertford in 674, but there is no doubt in con-
sequence of the difficulties of the times
(Bede, H. E. iv. 5). Letherius was then bishop
of Wessex, and Bede mentions, as something
special, that he held the two sees by synodal
decree. The attempt was renewed by Theodore in
679, when he succeeded in dividing the Mercian
diocese, and may have so far succeeded in Wes-
sex as to appoint Aetla to Dorchester. Accord-
ing to the decree preserved by Rudburn (Ang.
Soc. i. 193; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 126, 127),
the archbishop determined that as Hedd had by
the translation of St. Birinus, at the command of
pope Agatho, added so greatly to the honours of
Winchester, his diocese should not be di-
minished so long as he lived. Nothing certain,
however, can be affirmed about this transaction.
Hedd's opposition to the division of dioceses
continued as long as he lived. In the year 704,
a synod was held in which the West Saxons
were excluded from communion unless they
would obey archbishop Britwald's injunction,
"in ordinance episcoporum." They were still
contumacious in 705; but the measure was
adopted as soon as Hedd died. (Haddan and
Stubbs, iii. 269, 275.) More satisfactory is the
evidence of Bede as to this prelate's character;
HEDDA

"he was a good man and just, and practised the life and learning of a bishop rather by the instruction of his own innate love of virtue than by lessons (lectionibus)"; from which we may infer that he was not a great scholar, another point in which a distinction between him and Aetla, the pupil of St. Hilda, might be discerned (H. E. v. 18). He was a close ally of Theodore; and the verses found at the end of Theodore's Penitential shew that he had influence with him. They are supposed to be written by a transcriber, but might be translated so as to appear the words of Theodore himself:

"Te nunc sancte spectulum
Verbi Deiigne dator
Haezdia pie praesul pater,
Posticulum ditem decor,
Pro me peregrino,
Preces funde Theodooro."—
Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 293.

With Ine also Heddá was closely associated, and his name appears in the preamble of the laws of that king as one of the counsellors and advisers by whose help he was legislating; (Thorpe, Ancient Laws, p. 45; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 214, 218.)

It can hardly be questioned, the inference from Bede's words being so clear, and the coincidence in time being significant, that Heddá opposed the division of Wessex into dioceses. The reason for this must be sought in the distracted condition in which he found the kingdom at the beginning of his episcopate. In 676 Wessex was divided among its eldersmen; that year Centwine succeeded in establishing his power, but on no very certain basis; he reigned until 685, when Caedwalla took the kingdom; his whole reign was devoted to war; Ine succeeded in 688; but by that time it was tolerably clear that if the West Saxons were to remain one kingdom, they must remain one diocese; after fifteen years of good government it was different, and a subdivision impossible in 679 was quite practicable in 705. Wessex was passing, moreover, through the first stage of monastic and missionary foundation. The institution of Westminster, of Malmesbury, Glastonbury, and Abingdon, with other smaller houses, such as those at Tisbury and Nursling, no doubt dates from the episcopate of Heddá. Hence his name frequently appears in charters, whether spurious or genuine. Thus in 680 he attests a grant of Caedwalla (whose proper reign began in 685) to Wilfrid (Kemble, C. D. 18); the same year he himself appears as granting three caskets at Lontoclo to Heminga, abbat of Glastonbury (Kemble, C. D. 19; Mon. Angl. i. 47), in 681 he consents to a grant by a king Baudred to Glastonbury (Kemble, C. D. 20; Mon. Angl. i. 48); in 682 he attests a grant of Caedwalla to Malmesbury (Kemble, C. D. 24; Mon. Angl. i. 258); in 688, a grant of Baudred to Malmesbury (Kemble, C. D. 29; Wilfrid, C. D. iii. 693); in 692 to the abbot of St. Ethelred, abbot of Oshtilred to Barking (Kemble, C. D. 35), and in 695 a grant of Erkenwald to the same house (Kemble, C. D. 38); in 701 he attests Ina's charter to Malmesbury (Kemble, C. D. 48; Ang. Sac. ii. 12); in 702 a grant to Glastonbury (ib. 49; Mon. Angl. i. 48). Bede places the death of Heddá at the beginning of the reign of Osred of Northumbria, whose reign commenced in 705: his memory was observed on the 30th of July. (Smith's note on Bede, H. E. v. 18.)

The venerable historian had heard from Peccheim, who served St. Aldhelm as deacon, that miracles were wrought at his grave; and that a deep ditch was made in the place by the practice of visitors carrying off portions of the dust, which possessed miraculous powers of healing.

William of Malmesbury (G. P. lib. ii. § 75) adds some particulars to Bede's account; asserting that Heddá, before he was bishop, had been a monk and abbot; and his name as abbot is appended to a charter of Leutharius (spurious), K. C. D. 11; the abbacy is generally supposed to have been Whitby (Rudburn, Ang. Sacra. i. 192), but this seems to depend on the identification with Aetla; and Whitby was properly ruled by an abbes. William of Malmesbury also asserts that he had read letters of Heddá to Aldhelm, "non nimis inducere compositas," and therefore doubts Edius's assertion about his bishop; however, preserved no letter of Heddá, although (G. P. lib. v, § 195) he gives a letter of Aldhelm to him, in which he gives an account of his studies (Aldh. Opp. ed. Giles, Ep. 5, p. 96; Mon. Mogunt. edit. Jafé, p. 32). The same historian found his name on one of the ancient illegible 'pyramids' at Glastonbury (Anct. Glast. ed. Gile, p. 300).

HEDDA (3), eighth bishop of the Mercians, holding a see at Lichfield (M. H. B. 623). Very little is known about Heddá, except that he fills a place among the bishops of Mercia, which would otherwise be vacant. We learn from Edius (V. Wilfr. c. 44, ed. Gale, p. 75) that when Wilfrid in 692 was driven by king Aldfrith into Mercia, he found that Saxulf, who was bishop there, was lately dead, and undertook the administration of his see. Saxulf appears to have united the dioceses of Leicester and Lichfield after the death of Cuthwin; and on his death Wilfrid is enumerated among the bishops of Leicester, Heddá taking the same place among those of Lichfield. (M. H. B. 623, 624; Will. Malmesb. G. P. lib. iv. § 172, ed. Hamilton, p. 307.) When Wilfrid returned to Northumbria, Heddá renewed the episcopal see at Lindisfarne (ibid.). Although this evidence is comparatively late, it rests on the foundation of the ancient lists, and has some confirmation from charters and tradition. According to the Lichfield History (Anglia Sacra, i. 428), Heddá built the church of Lichfield, which was dedicated Dec. 31 (or 24) 700; and translated the bones of St. Chad; dying in the year 721. His name appears among the attestations to the act of the Synod of Clavesho in 716 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300) in company with that of his successor Wor, a difficulty which may be explained by supposing one to have sat at Leicester and the other at Lichfield. In some other documents there is a difficulty in distinguishing the signature of Heddá of Lichfield from those of his contemporary and namesake Heddá of the greater part of Northumbria, but the following probably belong to the former: a charter of Ethelred of Mercia to bishop Offor of Worcester in 691 or 692 (Kemble, C. D. 32; Mon. Angl. i. 584), two spurious charters granted to Worcester by the same king (K. C. D. 33, 34), a charter of Osberhe (K. C. D. 36; Mon. Angl. i. 585), a grant of Suebried of Essex to Walhere bishop of London, dated June 13, 704 (Kemble,
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C. D. 52). As all these fall between 676 and 705, they may possibly belong to the West Saxon bishop, but as they are connected more or less closely with Mercian, it seems more natural to refer them to the bishop of Lichfield. The Heuda who attests the charter of Osric in 676 (K. C. D. 12) is not Heuda of Winchester, for Leuthgiris also signs: Hedda and Saxulf sign together, so that if the charter be genuine, Heuda must have been already consecrated. (Cason. Lich. Ang. Soc. i. 427, 428.) It is curious that this prelate is not even mentioned by Bede.

A story is told in the life of St. Guthlac (Mab. Acta SS. O. S. B. sac. iii. p. 1, p. 270) in which bishop Hedda is mentioned. The bishop was on his way to visit Guthlac; his attendants were discussing the stories of his sanctity; one of them, Wigferth or Wilferth, declared that he could distinguish by certain signs between a true and a false anchorite. On arriving at Crowland Hedda prevailed on Guthlac to be ordained priest, and to accept an invitation to dine. At dinner Guthlac looked at Wigferth, and asked him what he thought of the clerk whom he had undertaken to judge. Mabillon supposes this Heuda to be the bishop of Winchester, but it is much more reasonable to refer the story to the bishop of Lichfield, in whose diocese Crowland would probably be at the time.

HEDDE (Kemble, Cod. Dipl. 1009, charter of Osmund king of Sussex, A.D. 770; c. 1018, spurious charter of archbishop Ethelward, A.D. 789), bishop; perhaps Geada bishop of Hereford, as suggested by Stubbs, Regist. Sac. p. 7.

HEDDIUS, historian. [EDITUS.

HEDDO, bishop of Strasburg. [ETHRO.

HEDESIUS, martyr. [AEDESIA.

HEDIBIA (Edina), a lady in Gaul, who corresponded with St. Jerome (then at Bethlehem) about A.D. 405. She was of a remarkable family, descended from the Druids, and held the hereditary office of priests of Belen, who was identified with Apollo, at Bayeux. Her grandfather and father (if majoris is to be taken strictly) Patera and D pylus (the names being in each case derived from their office) were remarkable men. Of Patera, Jerome says in his Chronicle, at the year 339, "Patera rhetor Romae gloriosissime doctus." D pylus was a writer in prose and verse, and also a celebrated advocate, as we learn from Ammianus Marcellinus (xviii. 1), who tells a story of his pleading before the emperor Julian. They each in turn became professors at Bordeaux, and as such are celebrated by Ausonius (Carmen, Prof. Burd. iv. and v.) in two short poems, from which the details above given are derived. The wife and daughter of D pylus became entangled in the Zoroastrian teaching of Priscillian, and suffered death in the persecution of his followers (Sulp. Sert. Hist. Sac. ii. 63, 64; Prosper Aquit. Chron.; Auson. Carmen, v.).

Hedibius was a diligent student of Scripture, and, finding no one in her neighbourhood who could assist her, she sent, by the hand of her friend Apodemus, a list of questions to Jerome, begging him to answer them. He did so in a long letter (ep. 120, ed. Vall.). We hear of her again as a friend of Artema, wife of Rusticius, (c. 40), on whose account she again wrote to Jerome (ep. 122, ed. Vall.).

[H. W. F.]

HEDILBURGA (Kemble, C. D. 359), abbess of Beddanhium. [ETHILBURGA (39).]


[H. T. S.]

HEDISTUS (1), Nov. 13, martyr at a place called Perinthius or Pulinthius (Wright, Syn. Mart. in Jour. Sac. Lit. 1866, p. 431).

[H. T. S.]

HEDISTUS (2), bishop of Cues in Bitinia, at the synod of Constantinople under Menas, A.D. 356. (Mansi, viii. 1143; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 633.)

[H. D.]

HEDONE, an Aecon in the system of Valentinus, the consort of Antiphanes, according to the account of Ireneus (i. p. 6; ii. xiv. p. 135), but of Acinetus according to that of Epiphanius (Haer. 31, p. 169). Some light is thrown on the introduction of the name into the system by the phrase in the Valentinian fragment, Epiph. Haer. 31, p. 170: ἡ Ὑβόνοι σῶσθαι μετὰ ἡδονῆς γεγονότος καὶ ἄφθερος μείνας. (G. S. Y.)

HEGEMONIUS, a writer said by Photius (cod. 85) to have written out (ἀργολόφωνος, perseript) the disputation of Archelaus against Manes. Ceiller (ii. 455) thinks that Hegemonius may have translated Archelaus's work into Greek, or have re-edited it with additions.

[C. H.]

HEGESIPPUS (1), commonly known as the father of Church history, although his works, with the exception of a few fragments which will be found collected in Bouth (cit. Naur. I. pp. 207-219), and in Grueh (Neposlogia, ii. 203-214), have perished. Nothing positive is known of his birth or of the early circumstances of his life. From his use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, written in the Tyro-Chaldaic language of Palestine, his name in his history of words in the Hebrew dialect, and his mention of unwritten traditions of the Jews, Eusebius infers that he was by birth a Hebrew (E. H. iv. 22). The inference appears to be correct, although it is possible, as conjectured by Weissacher (Hergott, Acyco. v. 647), that Eusebius, by the mention of these particulars, may only intend to confirm a fact which he had ascertained from other sources. The Jewish birth of Hegesippus, however, and his conversion from Judaism to Christianity afford no sufficient ground for the conclusion that he belonged in after life to the Judaizing rather than the Catholic section of the Christian church. Many Christians, Jews by birth, were in the second century entirely free from Judaizing tendencies. We owe whatever information we possess as to the time in which Hegesippus flourished to a statement of his own preserved by Eusebius (iv. 22), who quotes him as saying that he made a voyage to Rome, spending many happy days at Corinth by the way. Hegesippus then adds, γενέσθαι δίκ ν Ἐλευθέρου, which is understood to mean that when at Rome he compiled a succession of the bishops of the Roman see to the time of
Anictus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. After this statement Hegesippus is represented as adding, "and to Anictus succeeds Soter, after whom Eleutherus." Much as the meaning of these words, in their connection with those preceding them, has been disputed, it does not seem difficult to gather the sense. Hegesippus means that the list of bishops compiled by him at Rome was drawn from the authentic records of the church there. That list closed with Anictus. He was afterwards able, either from his own knowledge, or from the information gained from other sources, to add the names of Soter and Eleutherus. It appears that he was at Rome in the days of Anictus, and that he made his inquiries then, although he did not publish them till a considerably later date. But Anictus, according to the careful calculations of Lipsius (Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe), was bishop of Rome from A.D. 156 to A.D. 167. Eleutherus again presided over the see from A.D. 175 to A.D. 189. We are thus furnished with two dates on which it seems possible to rely. Hegesippus had written much of his history previous to A.D. 167. He published it in the time of Eleutherus, and perhaps early in his episcopate. Any difficulty in accepting these dates has been occasioned by the rendering given to another passage of Eusebius (iv. 8), where he again quotes Hegesippus as speaking of certain games (ἄγων) instituted in honour of Antinous, a slave of the emperor Hadrian, of which he says ἄγων ἱμάτια γεγομένα (a better established reading than γυναικέας). But the meaning of these words seems simply to be that the games referred to had been instituted in his own time, thus illustrating the ἡ τέσσαρα ἀποκαθήμενα of the preceding sentence. Hadrian possessed the throne from A.D. 117 to A.D. 138, so that if Hegesippus published about A.D. 180, being then well advanced in life, he might well remember the times of that emperor. What has been said derives confirmation from a statement of Jerome, generally regarded as somewhat extravagant, that the life of Hegesippus had bordered on the apostolic age (vicius universae ecclesiasticae, c. 24). But there is no extravagance in the remark. If Hegesippus was born about A.D. 120, and he might have been born considerably earlier without being too old to publish in A.D. 180, he may well be described as having lived near the times of St. John, to whose death, close upon the end of the first century, the apostolic age continued. It appears then that all our information hangs well together, and that we shall not be far wrong, if we fix the bloom of Hegesippus's life about the middle of the 2nd century. The work of which we have spoken as containing the list of the Roman bishops was by no means confined to this, or to particulars connected with it. It was entitled πίνακας ἐκκλησιατικῶν πράξεως, and it embraced, so far as we may judge from its fragments, numerous miscellaneous observations, traditions, arranged without any regard to order, and jotted down just as they might have occurred to its author, or come under his notice during his travels. This must be the meaning of Jerome when he tells us that the work contained the events of the church from Palestine to Rome, and from the death of Christ to the writer's own day. Anything like a regular history of the church is not to be thought of. Weitzacker well remarking that, in that case, the story of James the Just ought to have been found in the first book, not in the last.

The general style of the work was thought plain and unpretending, sermo simplici, says Jerome, ut quorum vitam sectatatur dicendi quoque expireret charactere. With this description what remains of it sufficiently agrees. The question as to its trustworthiness is of greater moment, for the account given in it of James's death is in conflicting hands, and we must, according to the degree of credibility we attach to it, greatly affect our view both of that distinguished man and of the relations subsisting between Judaism and Christianity in the period immediately following the crucifixion of our Lord. That account has led to many charges against Hegesippus as not having been careful enough to prove what he relates, and as having followed too readily the wonderful stories which could not fail to spring up and circulate in the infant church with regard to its apostles and martyrs. In particular it has been thought to be contradicted by Josephus, who tells us that "Ananus, the high-priest, assembled the Sanhedrin of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others. And, when he had formed an accusation against them, he delivered them to be stoned." (Antiq. x. 9, 1.) We may be permitted to doubt, however, whether the sentence thus referred to was carried out, for not only was it unlawful for the Sanhedrin to inflict the punishment of death without consent of the Roman authorities, but Josephus informs us in the immediately following portion of his narrative that, when the most equitable of the citizens complained to the procurator of what had been done, their charge against Ananus was, that it was not lawful for him to assemble a Sanhedrin without the procurator's assent. Nothing is said of the stoning to death. When we add both that Eusebius, who has preserved the narrative, together with the other events that he alludes to, appear to have placed in it implicit confidence, and that there is nothing improbable in most, if not even in all, of the particulars mentioned, we may be permitted to doubt whether the charges against Hegesippus founded upon this passage are substantiated. In no other passage of our author's writings that has come down to us is there any evidence of a too easy credibility, or of a love of the marvellous that might throw suspicion upon the general accuracy of his statements. It is clear that Eusebius had a high opinion of him. He both speaks of him in the most commendatory terms, and quotes him on numerous occasions (see E. H. ii. 23; iii. 11, 16, 20, 32; iv. 8, 11, 22), illustrating his own words in iv. 8, πλεῖστα περιπλακατούμενα. Such confidence appears to have been deserved. Hegesippus was possessed of an interesting mind, and as we have already seen he travelled much; he endeavoured in the course of his journeys to learn all that he could both of the past and present state of the churches that he visited; at Corinth the first epistle of Clement excited his curiosity; at Rome the history of its early bishops. Combine with all this his unpretending and unexaggerated style, and we are entitled to
inferred that he was very far indeed from being either a hasty observer or a credulous chronicler.

An important question relative to Hegesippus remains to be considered. What were his views of Christian truth? Was he of the Judaizing Christian party, or was he not? The question bears closely upon the estimate to be formed by us of the prevailing element in the Christian church of the first half of the 2nd century.

Baur has expressed himself strongly upon this point, looking upon Hegesippus as a representative of the narrowest section of the Jewish Christians of his time, even of the sects of the Jewish declared enemies of the apostle Paul, and describing him as travelling like a commissioned agent in the interest of the Judaizers. (K. G. i. p. 84.) The same view has been advocated by Schwager (Nachap. Zeit, i. p. 342, &c.). It is founded mainly upon an extract from his works, preserved in Photius (see in Routh, R. S. i. p. 219), in which he speaks in a language of the first quotation in the form in which they appear in 1 Cor. ii. 9, wherein indeed of "the just" we have them "that love Him." The substitution of the one expression for the other suggests at once that Gnostic arrogance which so often sought satisfaction in titles of that kind.

(2) The inference now drawn as to the object of the first quotation is rendered still more probable by the fact that it is impossible to apply to St. Paul the second quotation in the second of the extracts above. To describe that apostle as hiding himself in a hole of darkness is to present him in a light the very opposite of that which is most prominent in his whole character and life and labours. (3) The probability that Hegesippus had Gnostics and not St. Paul in view, is still further increased when we consider that Eusebius, who had his whole work before him, speaks in decided language of his soundness in the faith, and of his having recorded the pure tradition of apostolic preaching (iv. 8), language that he would certainly not have used had he not had ample evidence that the opinions of his author were in accordance with catholic truth. Besides this, he tells us that Hegesippus had in his work given the "greatest testimony as to his own opinions" (E. H. iv. 22). He was not, therefore, judging hastily. (4) Hegesippus himself, when relating what he had found in each succession of bishops examined and in each city visited by him, declares that he found all things in a condition conformable to what was required by "the law and the prophets and the Lord," authorities which Ritschel (n. a. p. 208) has shown to be precisely those of the Catholic church of the time, to which it made its appeal, and in which it instructed its catechumens. (5) If Neander be right in thinking (Ch. Hist. ii. p. 464, T. and T. Clark) that the mode in which Hegesippus speaks of the first epistle of Clement shows that he believed himself to find in it the pure doctrine of Christ, the conclusion to which all these remarks lead may be considered uncontroversial for the Pauline. The propriety of Clement's epistle is denied by no one. (6) It may still further be noticed, as not without a bearing upon the point before us, that Hegesippus, who approved of the epistle of Clement, must have known that this father quotes in Ch. xxiv., for a purpose precisely similar to that of the apostle, the very passage in question, though with a slight variation in the words, which, however, was not possible, but should hold the very contrary opinion as to the use made of it by St. Paul? It is obviously a particular application of the passage, different from that of the apostle, that he has in view.

In the light of all these considerations it is not too much to say that Hegesippus appears to have been not a Judaizing but a Catholic Christian, and, if so, he becomes a witness not only for that use of the Gnostic Christian church of the 2nd century, but for the extent to which Catholic truth prevailed in it, and for the hold which that truth had acquired over the minds of its members. It ought not to be forgotten throughout this whole controversy that, whatever Hegesippus witnesses for, his evidence has reference to the condition of the
church upon a large scale. It is of no small corner that he speaks, but of a very large, and that probably the most active, portion of it. Either, therefore, over this wide extent the church was marked by a narrow Judaic spirit, with some members perhaps, yet not worthy of mention, of a freer and a better one, or over the same wide extent the church was catholic in spirit, with heretical sects struggling to corrupt its faith. Which of the two views is most in correspondence with all that we know of the first half of the 2nd century, the reader may be safe left to say. If it be verdict in favour of the latter, it becomes impossible to look at Hegesippus in the light in which he has been presented by the Tubingen school. We must regard him as a Catholic, not as a Judaizing Christian, and his statements as to the condition of the church in his day become a powerful argument against, rather than in favour of, the conclusions of that school.

[W. M.]

HEGESIPPUS (3) (EGESIPPUS), the alleged author of a work of which a translation from Greek into Latin, or what purported to be such, appeared somewhere about a.d. 400, and is commonly referred to under one of the titles De Belo Judaico, De Excidio Urbis Hierosolymitanae. The work is in five books, the first four of which are taken from the corresponding ones of the Wars of Josephus; and the fifth in great part from the sixth and seventh books of the same. It is not a translation, properly so called. The translator freely adds to his author, sometimes from the later books of the Antiquitates of Josephus, sometimes from the Roman historians and other sources. He also freely composes speeches for the actors in the scenes which he narrates.

It is clear that the author was a Christian, from the language in which he speaks of the death of our Lord and the subsequent persecution of His disciples by the Jews (ii. 12, p. 151); of Simon, and of the apostles Peter and Paul (iii. 2, pp. 170-173); and of Judaism (iv. 5, p. 230). The entire work indeed is that of one who was an earnest defender of the Christian faith. An approximation to his work is supplied by several passages; as when he speaks of Constantine having long become the second city of the Roman empire (iii. 5, p. 179), and of Ancyra, once the metropolis of the Persians, being in his time the defence of the Byzantines against that people. He also speaks of the triumphs of the Romans in “Scotia” and in “Saxon,” using language strikingly similar to that of Claudian (c. A.D. 398) on the subject (v. 18, p. 299; Claud. De in. Conc. Honor. 31-34).

The work early acquired a considerable reputation. It may possibly be referred to by Cassiodorus towards the close of the 5th century, who, when speaking of the writings of Josephus, says that their translation has been attributed to Jerome, to Ambrose, and to Rufinus (Cassiod. de nat. Litterar. in Migne, Patrol. Lat. ixx. 1192). It was certainly made use of by Isidore of Seville (599-636), whose language in reference to the Dead Sea, the lake of Gennesaret, the Orontes, and other subjects, is often a literal translation from Hegesippus.

A MS. of the work ascribed to Hegesippus, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and of about the 7th century, has at the close of the first book “Egesipp liber primus explicit,” and at the commencement of the second “Ambrosius Episcopus ita codicem instigavit ut in his praebat” (Mabillon, Mus. Ital. p. 13). Other manuscripts likewise ascribed the translation to Ambrose, while some attribute the original itself to that father; and these are followed by the editor princes (Jodoc. Ascens. Paris, 1511). The Benedictines, however, strongly reject the Ambrosian authorship, asserting that the work contains nothing written in Ambrose’s lifetime; while Galland earnestly contends for it, and reprints an elaborate dissertation of Mazochius, which he regards as conclusive (Galland. Biblioth. Patr. vii. prolegom. p. xxix.). The editors of the Patrologia incline to the condition of the Benedictines, but print the work among the writings of Ambrose (xv. 1865). The latest and most correct edition (Marburg, 1856, 1864, 4to) is that which was commenced by professor C. F. Weber of Marburg, and completed after his death by professor Julius Caesar, who has elaborately discussed the question of the authorship and date (pp. 389-399). It is at least possible that Hegesippus was a misreading of an early copyist, who had before him Ex Joossip (Gronov. Observationes in Script. Exot. Monobiblos. 1651, 1-20). This work has been frequently translated into Italian by P. Lauro, a.d. 1544, into French by J. Millet, a.d. 1556, into Dutch anonymously a.d. 1711, and a.d. 1722.

[ T. W. D.]

HEIMARMENÉ, elapromy. According to the account given in PISTIS SOPHIA of the constitution of the universe, above this world lies the firmament (arpolamios); above that the first sphere, that of the Zodiac, and above that again the second sphere, elapromy, the light of which is forty-nine times greater than that of the first sphere, and whose archons rule the earthly world. They again are subject to the twelve aeons who dwell in the next highest region. Seen from the sphere elapromy this world appears but as a speck of dust, and its light as utterly dark, but is equally insignificant in the appearance of the sphere elapromy as seen from the region of the twelve aeons. (Pistis Sophia, pp. 22, 184.)

[G. S.]

HEINIF, clerical witness to the grant of the village of Bertus by king Ithael of Glamorgaon to bishop Berthgwyn and the see of Llandaff, late in the 6th or early in the 7th century. (Lob. Lond. by Rees, 181, 441.)

[ J. G.]

HEINYN, bard of Maegwn and Gwynedd and belonging to the college of Llanelithyn, nourished between a.d. 530 and 560. In the Myn. Archæology of Wales (i. 592) there is printed a prediction of his addressed to Maelgwn, according to the Chweddeu y Ddoothos his characteristic saying was, “The brave are never cruel.” (E. Williams, Iolo MSS. 252; R. Williams, Emin. Welsmyn. 213.)

[ J. G.]

HEIRA, sister of pope Damasus. (Boll. Acta SS. 21 Feb. ii. 244–5.) [IRENE.

[ J. G.]

HEISE (HASEEA), of Airidh-foda, commemorated Feb. 24. Her place was perhaps Ard-foadh, a fort on a hill near Ballymaggerty, in
the barony of Tirhugh, co. Donegal. (Martyr Denog. by Todd and Reeves, 57; Four Most. by O'Donovan, i. 256, n. *; O'Halton, Irish Saints, ii. 633.) Mart. Tall., Feb. 24 (in Kelly, Cat. Ir. SS. xvi.), has a mangled reading, "Ciaran b-messa, I. Airdfota," and the Bollandists (Acta SS. 24 Feb. iii. 435) mention Hassese among their pretermissi. [J. G.]

HEISTULFUS (ASTULFUS, HASTULFUS), apparently a Lombard, to whom Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, wrote a letter from Frankfort, A.D. 794, severely reprimanding him for his barbarous treatment of his wife, whom he had murdered, on a probably false charge of infidelity which had been brought against her by one person only, a man of most disreputable character. Paulinus offered him the choice of retirement to a monastery, or a lifetime of penitential discipline, which he describes at some length. The letter early passed into the Canon Law, circ. A.D. 866. Wulfadus archbishop of Bourges prayed Hinencmar archbishop of Rheims, the great canonist of his age, to send him a copy of it, as he needed its guidance in a similar case, which appears to have arisen in his own jurisdiction. Hist. Eccl. Rem. ii. 21, in Patrolog. Lat. cxxxv. 204). In the early part of the 11th century Burchardus bishop of Worms adopted it as authoritative in his Decreta (vi. 40, Ep. Paulin., ... ad Heistulf., in Patr. Lat. cxl. 774). Towards the close of that century Ivo bishop of Chartres similarly adopted it both in his Decretum and his Panormia. He, however, ascribes the letter to pope Stephen V. A.D. 816-817 (Decr. viii. 126, Hastulpho, in Patr. Lat. clxv. 610, Panormiv. vii. 16, Astulfio in Patr. Lat. o. 1283). Gratian also adopts it in his Decretum, but like Ivo ascribes it to Stephen V. (excxi. ii. c. 8, Hastulpho in Patr. Lat. clxxviii. 1512). Labbe published the letter from a Rheims MS., which seems to confirm Burchardus both as to the orthography of the inscription and as to the authorship of the letter (Concil. vii. 1064; Migne, Patr. Lat. xcir. 186). [T. W. D.]

HELEO, bishop of Baale. [HERETO.]

HEIU, a Northumbrian lady, the first person in that province who took the veil, which she received at the hands of bishop Aidan. She founded a nunnery at Heretoe, or Hartlepool, in the county of Durham, over which Hilda subsequently presided. The burial-ground of this ancient house of religion was discovered in 1838, and some remarkable slabs were found bearing crosses and inscriptions in Latin or Runic. After a short residence at Hartlepool Heiu retired to Calcaria, where she established another house of devotion. The Roman Calcaria is the English Kaelcascaster, and is generally considered to be the modern Tadcaster, a small town country about six miles to the south-west of York. It is possible that the neighbouring village of Heanlung means Heiu's heog, or lee, and that her residence was there. In the cemetery of that place Mr. D. H. Haigh detected an ancient grave-stone bearing Heiu's name. The sole authority for the events of Heiu's life is Bede, H. E. iv. 23.

The author of The Life and Miracles of St. Beda, who wrote in the 12th century, identified her with Heiu, making her reside on the Cum-
HELENAN

HELENAND, alternative name of ELDAD.

HELDALDOUS of MAEBUS. [ELOLDUS.]

HELEBICIANUS. [ELLEBICIANUS (2).]

HELENA (1), said to have been the companion of SIMON MAGUS. According to Justin Martyr (Apoll. 1. 28) and Ireneus (i. 23, p. 99), who possibly makes use of a lost work of Justin’s, she is said to have been the prostitute to whom Simon had sold her from a brothel at Tyre, and whom he led about with him, holding her up to the veneration of his disciples. Giving himself out to be the Supreme Power and the Father above all, he taught, says Ireneus, that “she was the first conception of his mind, the mother of all things, by whom in the beginning he conceived the thought of making the angels and archangels; for that this conception [ENNOUA] proceeded forth from him and, knowing her father’s wishes, descended to the lower world, and produced the angels and powers, by whom also he said that this world was made. But after she had produced them, she was detained by them through envy, since they were unwilling to be considered the offspring of any other being; for he himself was entirely unknown by them: but his conception was detained by those powers and angels which were put forth from her, and suffered every insult from them that she might not return upward to her father; and this went so far that she was even confined in a human body, and for ages passed into other female bodies, as if from one vessel into another. He said, also, that she was Helen on account of whom the Trojan war was fought; for reviling of whom by his verses, Steichorucus was struck blind, and afterwards, on account of his penitence and malindore, restored to sight; that after passing from one body to another, and constantly meeting with insult, at last she became a public prostitute, and that she was ‘the lost sheep.’ On this account he had come that he might first of all reclaim her and free her from her chains, and then give salvation to men through the knowledge of himself.” The same story is told by Hippolytus (Ref. vi. 19, p. 174); Tertullian (de Anima, 34); Epiphanius (Haer. 21); Philaster (Haecr. 29); Theodoret (Haecr. Fob. i. 1). Tertullian evidently knows no more than he read in Ireneus, but Hippolytus, who himself read the Megadn, Ἀμφίδρωτος, gives some additional particulars, as for instance, that Simon allegorized the story of the wooden horse and of Helen and her torch. The wooden horse must also have been mentioned in the earlier treatise against heresies, used by Epiphanius and Philaster, both of whom state that Simon expounded it as representing the ignorance of the nations. Epiphanius, then, it may be believed, did not invent some other particulars, in which he differs from or goes beyond Ireneus. He states that Simon gave to this Ennoea of his, the names Prunicus and Holy Spirit; and he gives a different account, in some respects, of the reasons for her descent into the lower world. According to this account, she was sent in order to rob the Archons, the framers of this world, of their power, by enticing them to desire her beauty, and setting them in hostility to one another.

The honour paid to Helena by the followers of Simon was known to Celcus, who tells (v. 62) that certain of the Simonians were also called Heleniani, from Helena, or else from a teacher Helenus. We are told, in addition, by Ireneus and Hippolytus, that the Simonians had an image of Simon in the form of Jupiter, and of Helen in that of Minerva, and that they honoured them, calling the former lord, the latter lady. This adaptation of the myth of Athene springing from the head of Zeus to the form of Ennoea to the first Father, is of a piece with the appropriation of other Grecian myths by these heretics.

The doctrine attributed to Simon in these representations, has close affinity with that of other Gnostic systems, more especially with the Ophite system, described at the end of the first book of Irenaeus, except that in the Gnostic system, one female personage fills parts which in other systems are distributed among more than one. But in several systems we have the association with the First Cause of a female principle, his thought or conception; and we have (see, for instance, PISTIS SOPHIA) the myth of the descent of a Sophia into the lower material regions, her subjection of the powers who rule there, her struggle with them, and her ultimate redemption. What is peculiar to Simon is his doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and his identification, by means of it, of himself and his female companion with the two principal personages of the Gnostic mythology. The fictions that have been invented concerning other founders of heresies do not at all resemble this story, for Simon persuaded his followers not only to concede his connexion with a degraded person, but to accept the fact of her degradation fully admitted as only a greater proof of his redemptive power. And we find it easier to believe, therefore, that the story had a foundation in fact, than that it was imagined without any. On the other hand, it does not seem likely that the hero of the Gnostic story was a follower of Simon. The Gnostic, it being more credible that he turned to his account a mythology already current, than that he could have obtained acceptance for his tale of Ennoea, if invented for the first time for his own justification.

Baur has suggested (Christliche Gnosis, p. 308) that Justin in his account of the honours paid at Samaria to Simon and Helena may have been misled by the honours paid to the Phœnicians sun and moon deities of similar names. On this and other questions connected with the subject of this article, see Simon. Suffice it here to say that one strong fact in support of his theory, viz. that in the Clementine Recognitions (ii. 14, preserved in the Latin of Rufinus) the companion of Simon is called Luna, may possibly have originated in an early error of transcription. She is Helena in the corresponding passage of the Clementine Homilies, ii. 23; and we find elsewhere the false reading Selene for Helene, as for instance in Augustine (de Haecr. 1). We attach little weight in this argument to the statement of the Clementine Homilist already quoted under DOSTHEUS, Vol. i. p. 902, that as Jesus, the Sun, had twelve apostles corresponding to the twelve months of the year, so John the Baptist, the Moon, corresponding to the twenty-nine and a half days.
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of the month, had in his circle twenty-nine men and this woman.

[ős.]

HELENA (2), St., or FLAVIA JULIA HELENA AUGUSTA, first wife of Constantius Chlorus, and mother of Constantine the Great, born about A.D. 248, died about 327.

1. Life.

2. Invention of the Cross.

1. Life.

Little is known of the life of St. Helena. Little beyond the two facts that she was mother of Constantine the Great and that at the age of about eighty years she undertook a royal and holy pilgrimage to Palestine, which resulted in the adornment and increased veneration of the holy places in that country.

The date of her birth is only arrived at by inference from her age at the time when she undertook this pilgrimage. The place where she was born is also doubtful; but the most probable of those which are mentioned is Drepanum in Bithynia, whence she is said to have called Heleneopolis in her honour (Procopius, de Aedificiis, v. 2, vol. iii. p. 311, ed. Bonn; Chron. Pasch.). The story that she was daughter of a British prince, Coel, and born at York, Colchester or London, is merely a portion of the legend which afterwards arose connecting the origin of her famous son with Britain. [Constantine the Great, Vol. I. p. 625.]

She was doubtless of humble parentage, being, according to one story, the daughter of an innkeeper (Anon. Valesi 2, 2, "matre vilissima.", St. Ambros. de Obitu Theodos., § 42, p. 295, "Stabularism hanc primo fuisse aedidit, cific cognitam Constantio seniori, qui postea regnum adeptus est. Bona stabularia quae tam dilligenter praesepe Domini requisitum," etc.). Constantius at the time when he made his acquaintance was a young officer in the army, of good family and position, nearly related, by the female line, to the emperor Claudius, and he appears to have at first united her to himself by the looser tie which was then customary between persons of such different conditions (St. Hieron. Chron. anno 2322; Orosius, vii. 25; Chron. Pasch. A.D. 304, vol. iii. p. 517, ed. Bonn; Zon. ii. 6). The relation of "concubinatus" might be a life-long one, and did not necessarily imply anything of immorality. In outward appearance it differed nothing from the ordinary civil marriage by mutual consent of the parties to live together, and was sometimes called "conjugeum inaquale."

Her son Constantine, who was also apparently her only child, was born probably in the year 274, at Naisus in Dardania, the country where his father's family had for some time been settled (Nish, recently acquired by Servia). After his birth it is probable that Constantius advanced Helena to the position of a lawful wife.

That she had this position is expressly stated by some of our authorities, but the very emphasis of their assertion implies that there was something peculiar about the case (Hist. H. E. vii. 13, 12, "verum pergam . . . extra communem et inscriptionem Salerno given below."). Respect for Constantius would naturally prevent the writers who lived in his reign from stating the circumstances in detail. It may be conjectured, however, that the law to legitimate the children of a concubine "per subsequens matrimoniium" was suggested to that emperor by his mother's experience. After living with Constantius some twenty years Helena was divorced by him on the occasion of his elevation to the dignity of Caesar in 292. The Augustus Maximian, in choosing him for his colleague, required him to take this step, as a matter of policy, in order that he might marry his own step-daughter, Theodora, and Galerius was obliged to do the like by Diocletian (Cons. Bren. ix. 22; Victor, de Caesaribus, 39; Epitome, 54). Such a proceeding has its parallels, especially in Roman history, e.g. Valentinian similarly repudiated Marina Severa, the mother of Gratian. The looseness of the marriage tie among the Romans is quite adequate for the explanation of these acts, without supposing any offence or misconduct on the part of the wife, or any special heartlessness on that of the husband. We know nothing of her life during the remainder of her husband's reign. When Constantine succeeded him in 306, it would seem probable that he recalled his mother to the court, but direct evidence on this point is wanting. We have a coin stamped HELENANEP.E. i.e. nobilitas femina, with a head on one side and a star in a laurel crown upon the other, which may have been struck in her honour whilst Constantine was still Caesar. The statement of Eusebius that Constantine paid his mother great honours, and caused her to be proclaimed Augusta to all the troops, and struck her image on gold coins, is no doubt generally quite correct, but it is unfortunately unaccompanied by any details (Vita Const., col. 47). Silver and copper coins are found with the name Flavia Helena Augusta, struck in her lifetime. Others with the remarkable epigram Fl. Jul. Helenae Aug. were struck at Constantinople and Treves as memorials after her death, and at the same time Theodora was commemorated in like manner, to mark the reconcilia-

See Cod. Just. v. 27, 5. and Godedro's note Cod. Theod. iv. 6. 1. It seems likely that Constantine's abridgment of the rights of inheritance possessed by natural children was intended to induce their parents to marry.

* Eichholz, vol. viii. pp. 143, 145, conjectures it to belong to a wife of Crespius, cf. p. 102, and so does Sandurs. But Helena, wife of Crespius, is lost in the Roman law, a conjecture from the law of Constantine, Cod. Theod. ix. 30, 1, addressed to Maximus, prefect in Rome in 322, "propter Crispi atque Helenae partum omniu... indigentiam prater venenosis, homicidias, adulterias..." and Godedro very plausibly seems to introduce a "apparatum" or "apparatus," and refers it to a journey to Rome. The late Count J. F. W. de Salls was of opinion that there was no evidence from the history of the existence of such a person as Helena, wife of Crespius, see Constitutiones Rex GREAT, Vol. I. p. 649, and the following article. 3 L
tion of the two branches of the family. But as yet none of gold have come to light. She is also styled Augusta in inscriptions, but in none I believe necessarily earlier than 320. (Mommsen, Inscr. Nova P. 106, given below: Inscri. Urbis Romae, C. I. L. vol. v. 1134–1136.)

Eusebius also tells us that it was through Constantine that she became a Christian (V. C. iii. 57). His authority on such a point is good, and it is supported (whatever the support may be worth) by the probably spurious letters preserved in the acts of St. Silvester (see CONSTANTINE, p. 646). We must therefore reject the other story which ascribes his conversion to his mother’s influence (Theodoret. i. 18, τὴν τῆς εὐφρασίας ἀνόητα προσωνομάξειν τρόφῃ, and the late and fabulous Eutychius Alexandrinus, pp. 408, 456, ed. Oxon.).

In the year 322, according to Godefroy’s probable emendation of the law in the Theodosian code, Constantine granted a release of prisoners on account of a journey of Crispus and Helena to Rome (Cod. Theod. ix. 38, 1). This is one of several indications of the close tie existing between the aged empress and her eldest grandson, with whom she naturally took part rather than with the child of Fausta, her half-sister of her rival Theodora. The following inscription from Salerno belongs to one of the next years and marks the power of Helena in her son’s court. It must have been set up after the younger Constantius was appointed Caesar, Nov. 8, 323, and before the death of Crispus, whose name was afterwards erased (Mommsen, Inschr. Napol. 106, Orell. 1074, Willmams 1079).


i.e. “To our sovereign lady Flavia Augusta Helena, the most chaste wife of the divine Constantius, the mother of our Lord Constantine, the greatest, most pious and victorious Augustus, the grandmother of our Lord Crispus and Constantine, the most blessed and fortunate Caesars, this is erected by Alpinius Magnus, vir clarissimus, corrector of Lucania and Bruttii, devoted to her excellence and piety.”

In the year 326 Crispus was put to death on an obscure charge by his father’s orders [see CONSTANTINE, p. 630]. Tradition connects this dark act with the name of Fausta; and Helena’s bitter complaints about her grandson’s death are said to have irritated Constantine to execute his wife by way of retribution (Victor, Epit. 41, Fausta coniugis ut putant suggesta Crispum filium necari insuit. Dehinc uxorem suam Faustum in balnes ardentes concepit interm., cum sum mater Helena dolore nimio nepotis increparet).

We may fairly suppose that it was as much distress and penitence for these tragic and cruel acts, as thankfulness for the success of the Nicene council, that roused Constantine to found and endow a number of churches at this time, and to give other material advantages to the Christian church. Helena no doubt shared in her degree in the same feelings, and made a vow to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land (Eus. V. C. iii. 42).

The details of her journey, as regards the holy places, are given in the next section. Eusebius speaks strongly of her youthful spirit, notwithstanding her great age, nearly eighty years (V. C. iii. 42, ἦ γὰρ δὴ συνεδροῦσα ἄνωθεν ἢ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν, ἤδη τριῶν χρόνων). She received a limited supply of money from her son and spent it in royal charities to the poor and bounties to the soldiers; as well as using her power to free prisoners and criminals condemned to the mines and to recall persons from exile (36). She was a frequent attendant at the church services, and adorned the buildings with costly offerings (36, 45). The date of the death of the emperor is uncertain, but it cannot have been earlier than 327, because she did not take her journey to Palestine until after the death of Crispus. Tillemont therefore puts it in 328, and it may have been later. (See further in Clinton, F. R. ii. 80, 81.) Her body was carried with great pomp to ‘the imperial city,’ that is probably to Constantinople (Eus. V. C. iii. 47; Sozomen, i. 17, thus glosses the phrase—τὴν τακτικὴν περί Παλαιμπτήσας: see CONSTANTINE, p. 632). It was believed however in the Western church that she was buried at Rome, and there is a tradition that in the year 480 her body was stolen from thence by a monk Theoguis and brought to Hautvilliers, in the diocese of Rheims. Others say that it is still in the porphyry vase in the church of Ara Coeli (Tillemont, Mem. Hist. Eccl. tom. vii. note 7).

The place too of her death is strangely uncertain. Eusebius’s silence would lead us to conclude that she died in Palestine; but if the traditions of her bounty to the people and church of Cyprus on her way home are of any value it must have been somewhere nearer Rome or Constantinople. These traditions may be seen in M. de P. Lettre’s Histoire de l’Eglise de Chypre sous les Lusignans, Paris, 1852–1861; Church Quarterly Review, vol. vii. p. 186 foll.

J. W.

Invention of the Cross.—It is in connexion with this famous story that the name of Helena is especially interesting to the student of church history. Its truth has been much discussed, and in order to enable the reader to form a definite judgment the following account will be summarized briefly the evidence of our ancient authorities, noticing the points on which they agree and those on which they differ.

1. In the very interesting itinerary of the anonymous Pilgrim from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, which is generally referred to the year 333, seven years after the date assigned to the finding of the cross (Migne, Patr. xlvi. 771), we have a description of the main sites and events both in the Old and New Testament are mentioned. Among these are the house of Caiaphas, with the pillar at which our Lord was scourged, the praetorium of Pontius Pilate, the little hill (monticulus) of Golgotha, and, a stone’s throw from it, the cave of the Resurrection. On the latter spot a beautiful
basilica erected by Constantine is noticed, as also on Mount Olevit and at Bethlehem. Yet there is no allusion to the cross or any part of it, nor is the name of Helena once mentioned.

2. Our second authority is Eusebius, whose Life of Constantine was written probably in 356, five years after the visit of the pilgrims. He records the visit of Helena to Jerusalem, but does not connect her name in any way with the place of Crucifixion, nor with the Holy Sepulchre.

He tells us that Constantine built a house of prayer on the site of the Resurrection, and that he also beautified the two other caves connected respectively with our Lord's Birth and His Ascension, and that he did so in honour of his mother's memory, who went to Palestine and built two churches, one at Bethlehem, the other on the Mount of Ascension. We therefore have this remarkable fact, that, of the three famous caves, Eusebius connects Helena not with that of the Resurrection, but only with the other two. It is true that the name Cyril is mentioned, but it is hardly conceivable that he should have left the one on the site of the Resurrection unspecified.

The original motive of her journey, he says, was to return thanks to God for His peculiar mercies to her family, and to enquire as to the welfare of the people of the country. His account of the discovery of the tomb by Constantine is not free from difficulty. It is not easy to say whether he represents the discovery of the sepulchre as being before or after the death of Helena. His language is quite general, but the presumption, as has been said, is that, if it had been before it, her name would have been connected with the event.

He does not imply that any difficulty was experienced in finding the site of the tomb, but there is nothing as to the cross. All the words which he uses in his minute description bear upon the Resurrection, not the Passion, of our Lord. But in Constantine's letter to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, which he inserts, there are one or two expressions of which the same cannot be said. Allowing for the excesses of hyperbolical language, it still has to be remembered that the words that, "when the cave was opened, the sight which met the eyes excelled all possible eulogy, as much as heavenly things excel earthly," unless some kind of memorial other than the tomb itself was discovered; and immediately afterwards we have two expressions referring definitely to our Lord's passion. The first is, τὸ γὰρ ναὸν τοῦ σωτῆρος τοῦ κόσμου, τὸν κτίσας τὸν πάντων, ἀτιμία τὴν πάλαι κρίστιμον, and the second, ἀγίου σαρκοῦ τὸν πάντων πίστις ἀπό σώσεις και ἀπὸ τῆς πορείας και τῆς τελειωμένης. At the same time it is difficult to believe that, had the cross or any part of it been discovered, it should not have been more exactly described, and the most probable explanation is that ναός is used to describe the whole scene of Redemption, of which the Resurrection was a part (Chro. Pagi. Const. iii. 26–42, Patr. Gr. x. 1086). The fact that the place very soon came to be venerated is proved by Eusebius's own statement in his Commentary on Ps. xxvii. 18, that marvels (θαύματα) were even then wrought at the tomb of Christ.

3. Our next authority is St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose catachetical lectures were delivered, he says, upon the very spot where our Lord was crucified, and, as we know from other sources, not more than twenty years after the alleged discovery (viz. in 340). In these there are three allusions to the wood of the cross (iv. 10, x. 19, xiii. 10). The last one, in book iv., dedicated to the Bishop of Auxerre, he describes it as "until to-day visible amongst us" (μέχρι οὖν τοῦ ουρανοῦ), and now filling nearly the whole world by means of those who in faith take from it." In his letter to Constantius, which, however, is of doubtful authenticity [Cyril], it is distinctly stated that the cross was discovered in the reign of Constantine (Cap. 3). The first quotations are quite sufficient to prove the existence of a belief in his day that the real wood of our Lord's cross had been discovered, but they do no more than this. They do not give us the grounds of the belief. We know how credulous many were in the matter of relics, and there is nothing to shew us that St. Cyril was more discriminating than his contemporaries, and we are bound to regard the name of Cyril as not free from another matter from the suspicion of insincerity and unscrupulousness in the use of means to attain what he regarded as a good end. [Cyril.] Nor, though he speaks of the cross, does he connect it with the name of Helena. The context certainly does not require it, since the fact of the discovery, and not the author of it, is what he is insisting upon. Still, as regards Helena herself, it remains true that none of our three earliest authorities speak of her as the discoverer.

4. St. Chrysostom, writing probably before the year 387, speaks of the wood of the true cross and of the anxiety felt by many to procure a piece of it (Quod Christus et Deus, cap. x., Patr. Gr. xvii. 820).

5. Sulpicius Severus, who must probably have been next in order (circa 395), tells us that Helena built three basilicas (not two as in Eusebius), one on each of the great sites of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension. No other writer, except Paulinus, mentions separate churches of the Passion and Resurrection. The site of the passion, he says, was discovered by Helena, but he does not add that it was by supernatural means. At the Mount of Olives he found the footsteps of Christ, and the ground by its hardness resisted all attempts to pave it. Three crosses were discovered, and the right one ascertained by the miraculous restoration to life of a dead body. (Hist. Sacr. i. 33, Patr. Gr. x. 148.)

6. St. Ambrose, writing in 395, agrees with Eusebius that the main object of Helena's visit was to procure for the prosperity of her land, that adds that on her arrival she was inspired by the Spirit with the desire to search for the cross, that she distinguished the true cross by its title (thus differing from Sulpicius and all later writers), that two of the nails were used by the emperor, one being fixed in his crown and the other employed as a bit for his bridle (de Obit. Theod. cap. xiv., Patr. Gr. xii. 572). St. Ambrose begins a year later, but he is referring to the first of February, 393, when he heard the footsteps of Christ, and the ground by its hardness resisted all attempts to pave it. Three crosses were discovered, and the right one ascertained by the miraculous restoration to life of a dead body. (Hist. Sacr. i. 33, Patr. Gr. x. 148.)

7. Rufinus (writing in 400, according to the Life in Migne's edition) tells us further that not only was the journey inspired by God, but that the place of the Passion was miraculously revealed; that the three crosses were found "confuso ordine," and the title separately;
that the true cross was discovered by the miraculous healing of a sick lady (not the revival of a corpse, as above); that part of the wood was sent to Constantine, and part left at Jerusalem in a silver casket (cf. μετὰ σήμερον τοῦ παιινοῦ in Cyril's description above). (Hist. Eccles. i. 7, 9, Patr. Gr. xxi. 475.)

5. St. Jerome, in his Commentary on Zech. xiv. 20 (Patr. xxv. 1546), which probably was written in 387, mentions of the nail wall at the cross which was used for the emperor's bridle, according to the story which we find in many other writers, and also in Ep. lviii. (Patr. xxii. 581), speaks of the image of Jove which stood until the time of Constantine on the site of the Resurrection, and that of Venus on the site of the Passion.

10. St. Cyril of Alexandria (about 420), mentions as a report (σημεῖο) that the wood of the cross had been found at different times (καὶ κατολόοι) with the nails still fixed in it (Comm. on Zech. xiv. 20, Patr. Gr. lxxii. 271).

11. Socrates (about 430) informs us that Helena was told in a night vision to go to Jerusalem; that she found the site of the Passion with difficulty, though he alludes to no supernatural aid; that many suggested the means of distinguishing the true cross, viz. by applying it to a woman on the point of death; that the emperor erected "new Jerusalem" on the site (a phrase evidently taken from Eusebius); and that of the nails was put by the emperor on his statue at Constantinople, a fact witnessed to by many inhabitants (Hist. Eccles. i. 17, Patr. Gr. lxvii. 118).

12. Sozomen, on the same date, claims good authority for his account, and states that Constantine, in gratitude for the council of Nicaea, wished to build a church on Golgotha; that Helena about the same time went to Palestine to pray and to look for the sacred sites. He does not, however, mention any divine impulse. The difficulty of discovering was caused, he says, by the Greeks, who had defiled them, in order to put a stop to the growing ἁθροῖα; the site of the sepulchre was made known, as some say, by a Hebrew living in the East, from documentary evidence, but more probably by signs and dreams from God. He says further that the crosses were found near the same spot (τῇ τοῦ άμβού τῶν τάφων) as they had been left by the soldiers, and therefore naturally in confused order, and that the tablet had its inscription until it had been removed. He enumerates the miracles: the healing of a woman with an incurable disease, the other the raising of a corpse, combining the other accounts; adding that the greater part of the cross was still preserved at Jerusalem. (Hist. Eccles. ii. 1, 2, Patr. Gr. lxvii. 929.)

13. Theodoret (about 448) inserts the letter of Constantine to Macarius, and follows the order of Eusebius, representing, however, Helena's journey more definitely than Eusebius does, as consequent upon the finding of the sepulchre by Constantine. Yet immediately afterwards he speaks of her as bringing the spot to light; so that his account seems inconsistent with itself. The crosses, he says, were found near the Lord's tomb—σαρώτα το μυθήμα το άνιστατός (Hist. Eccles. i. 16, 17, Patr. Gr. lxxix. 555).

14. St. Leo (454), in writing to Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, speaks of the constant witness borne at Jerusalem to the reality of Christ's Passion by the existence of the cross (Ep. cxxix. 2, Patr. liv. 1106).

15. St. Gregory of Tours (died 595) adds the following details: that the date of the discovery was May 3, 320; that during a great storm which occurred soon after Helena put one of the nails into the sea, the nail was at once calmed so that two more were used for the emperor's bridle, and the fourth placed on the head of his statue; that the lance, crown of thorns, and pillar of scourging were also preserved, and were effectual in working miracles (Liber Mirac. i. 5, Patr. lxxi. 709); and that the cross was found by the aid of a Jew, afterwards baptized as Quiricinus (Hist. Franc. i. 34, Patr. lxxi. 179).

So much then for our authorities. We observe that no detailed story is found until nearly seventy years after the event, and then not in the East, but in the West. The vagueness of tone in St. Cyril of Alexandria is particularly observable. Small differences of detail have been noticed, and the last author cited adds several particulars not included in the other accounts. There are some features in the story which look like invention or exaggeration, e.g. the fact that in the process of discovering the true cross the other two are almost invariably said to have been first applied in vain, just such a detail as is added in a fable to give it completeness. On the whole, considering what has been already noticed, that our earliest authorities do not represent Helena as the discoverer, and that the story gradually grows as time goes on, it seems most probable that she had no part in the discovery at all, even if it took place, which itself seems exceedingly doubtful. That the site of the Holy Sepulchre was discovered, or supposed to be discovered, in the reign of Constantine, there seems every reason to believe; and considering the temper of the times, it is easy to understand how marvels would grow up around it. One of the objections to the story is the vagueness of the topographical touches. The Bordeaux Pilgrim alone is definite, describing the tomb as a stone's throw from Calvary. Most of the other writers confound the two, the crosses being represented as found in the tomb and yet in confused order just as they fell. It may easily have happened that, after the discovery of the tomb, some devout person may have fancied that he had found a portion of the cross, and persuaded others to believe it too; and when once this had been done, the assigning, as time went on, of the discovery to the royal pilgrim Helena.
is perfectly natural, and an instance of an exceedingly common tendency. [M. F. A.]

HELENA (3) CRISPI. A Helena, wife of Crispus eldest son of Constantine the Great, has been imagined by some historians on account of the following text of the Theodosian Code, ix. 38, 1:—"Imp. Constantianus A. ad Maximum / fratricem / [rectum] / [fratricem] / Proper Crispi atque Helena partum omnibus indulgentia, praeter veneficos, homicidas, adulatoros . . . [rectum] / in hal. Nov. Romeae Praebito et Juliano cost." (322). Godfrey, in his commentary on this passage, emends "propter Crispi atque Heleneae partum" or "apparatum," that is to say, "preparations for their journey to Rome," the persons being in that case Crispus and his grandmother, not Crispus and his wife. This seems more probable than that there should be an utterly unknown Helena, mentioned in this public manner, especially as nothing is elsewhere recorded of Crispus's children. Banduri assigns to this supposed Helena the coin with the epigraph Helena [obolissima] / [femina]. And Eckhel is inclined to follow him (Doc. Num. Vetus. viii. pp. 142-145). But this is probably an early coin of the mother of Constantine; see the preceding article.

Constantine's daughter Helena was born perhaps about the date of this law (see next article); but even if partus Heleneae could mean the "birth of Helena," Crispi partus is inexorable. [J. W.]

HELENA (4) JULIANI, daughter of Constantine the Great and Fausta. Historians sometimes give Constantine three daughters: Constantia, wife in turn of Hannibalian and Gallus; Constantia, a virgin and a saint; and Helena. But Tilmont has shown that the second of these is probably a legendary person (Empire, vol. iv. p. 624, note 18 to Constantine). Constantia was called Augusta by her father, according to Philostorgius, iii. 22, 28, and so we may probably suppose was Helena (Eckhel, Dict. Num. Vetus. viii. pp. 137-145). She was thirty-one or thirty-two years old, according to the account of Duscanus, when she was married by his brother Constantius (on the advice of his wife Eusebia) to her cousin Julian, in Nov. 355; but it is not easy to discover the authority for this statement of her age, which may merely be a hazardous inference from the Theodosian Code quoted in the preceding article (Empire, loc. cit., p. 51). If this date however is correct, she must have been born about the year 323, and her husband was about eight years younger than herself. It is not improbable that he cared very little about her, viewing her rather as part of the family compact which he made with her brother. He refers to her several times, but without expressing any feeling of attachment or dislike, whereas he speaks with great regard of Eusebia, his cousin's wife (ad Ath. p. 248 b; cp. Or. iii. Laudes Eusebiae, p. 123 D, esp. the phrase, δε μη διε προς το βασιλει τω γαμεν ημων [Eusebia], as if the marriage was merely a matter of policy).

Julian and Helena had one child born in Gaul, but it died directly after birth, through the unskilfulness or malice of the midwife. Ammianus, who reports this fact, tells us further that Helena was afterwards taken by Eusebia with her to Rome, under the pretext of affection, and there given poison by her sister-in-law to cause her miscarriage. (Amm. xvi. 10, 18; cp. Orosius, vol. i. p. 529 ed. Lum, who says of Eusebia, της γαμενων δε τοις ομολογησας τοις υπερερ ομολογησας.) The motive of this cruel act is supposed to have been jealousy, as Eusebia herself was barren; but it is not necessary to believe the story, which is just the kind of scandal that is capable neither of proof nor disproof. Ammianus, it may be remarked, says nothing of it in his laudatory character of Eusebia in recording her death (xvii. 6, 4).

The date of Helena's journey to Rome may have been 356, when we know that Eusebia visited Rome, whilst her husband was engaged with the barbarians from beyond the Rhine (Jul. Orig. iii. p. 129 a, c; cp. Amm. xvii. 13, 16; Clinton, F. R. i. p. 407). Or it may have been in the following year, 357, when Constantius and his wife spent the month of May in the city, and this is what we should, gather from Ammianus as most probable (Amm. xvi. 10, 13 b; cp. Clinton, F. R. i. p. 454).

Helena was still alive when Julian was proclaimed Augustus by the troops at Paris in the spring of 360 (Jul. ad Ath. p. 248 a). She died in the autumn of the same year, just about the time when her husband was celebrating his quinquennalia, the fifth anniversary of his appointment as Caesar and their marriage. Julia sent her body to Rome to be buried beside her sister's—"in suburbo vico Nomentanae condenda, ubi uxor quaque Galli quondam, soror eius, sepulta est Constantia." (Amm. xxi. 1, 5).

We know nothing whatever of her character, which is remarkable considering her connexion with Julian, of whom we know so much.

Some antiquaries suppose that this Helena appears as Augusta on coins, but this cannot be considered as by any means proved, and was denied by the late Count J. F. W. de Salis, whose authority is entitled to great weight (cp. Eckhel, Dict. Num. Vetus. viii. pp. 142-145).

More difficult is the question of the coins with the epigraph Inci Paria. It is discussed in the article on Julius, in the section on the coins. Whether they refer to her or not, it is probable that they were struck after her death. [J. W.]

HELENA (6), virgin of Auzerre, commemo-rated May 22. She is named in the acts of St. Amator as having been present at his death, witnessing the miracles which attended the event. St. Amator died in 418; how long afterwards Helena may have survived is uncertain. (Boll. Acta SS Mai. v. 152). [R. T. S.]

HELENA (6), virgin of Troyes, commemo-rated May 4. The inhabitants of Troyes in the 13th century believed that they possessed the undecayed remains of Helena a Corinthian martyr, which had been brought from Greece by a warrior who had taken part in the fourth crusade. Some held that she was Helena, the mother of Constantine. (Boll. Acta SS Mai. i. 530). [R. T. S.]

HELENIANII, followers of Simon Magnus. [HELENA (1).]
HELENUS (1) (Elenus), bishop of Alexandria (Soudarea, Iskenderum) in Cilicia, mentioned in the Menologium Graecorum Dec. 24, (Canisius, Thesaur. Monum. iii. 498), as having baptized the martyr Eugenia in the reign of Commodus. (Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 903.)

[3. de S.]

HELENUS (2), bishop of Heliopolis in Egypt. He is mentioned in the Martyrologies (cf. Lipomani de Vitis SS. ed. Surius, December 25) as the companion of St. Eugenia. But so many inconsistencies appear in the narrative that Le Quien seems fully justified in regarding it as almost wholly mythical. (Or. Christ. ii. 583.)

[3. de S.]

HELENUS (3), bishop of Tarsus and metropolitian. He was involved in the controversy as to rebaptism, and we learn from a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. H. E. vii. 5. 7) that, during the dispute between Cyprian and Stephen of Rome, A.D. 256, Stephen renounced communion with him and Firmilian, together with the bishops of Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Galatia, because they insisted on rebaptizing those who had been baptized by heretics. He attended the two synods held at Antioch on the historical views of Paul of Samosata, A.D. 265 and 272. Before the opening of the former synod, Helenus, with the other leading bishops, wrote to request the venerable Dionysius of Alexandria to give them the benefit of his theological learning and practical wisdom. The advanced age of Dionysius prevented him from complying with the request, but he wrote a letter giving his judgment on the points in controversy (Euseb. H. E. vi. 46, vii. 27, 28). On the assembling of the second synod in 272, Firmilian of the Cappadocian Caesarea, the former president, being dead, Helenus presided over the meeting, which is expressly termed in the Libellus Synodicus *Synodus Heleni* " (Labbe, Concil. i. 883, 901; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 870.)

[E. V.]


[G. T. S.]

HELI, martyr with Zotiens and Lucianus in Scythia, in the reign of Licianus; commemorated on Sept. 13. (Basil. Menol. i. 55.)

[C. H.]

HELIADES, bishop of Zegnus on the Ephrates, in the province of Commagene, one of the Easterns who accompanied John of Antioch to the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he signed the letters and decrees of the rival council of John, and was consequently cut off from the communion of the orthodox (Mansi, iv. 1270, 1426, v. 776). It appears that Heliaedes did not remain in his obstinate, as his name is not found in the list of fourteen bishops who were ultimately ejected from their sees. (Mansi, v. 965; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 942.)

[L. D.]

HELIANUS (1) (Elianus), one of the forty martyrs of Sebaste. His relics were said to have been transferred to Beneventum in 763. (Borgia, Mem. Istor. della Pontif. Civ. di Benevento, i. 199.) [FORTY MARTYRS.] [C. H.]

HELIANUS (2), a bishop in Palestine, one of those to whom the letter of Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, in condemnation of Origen in the year 400, was addressed. (Jerome, ep. 92, ed. Vall.)

[W. H. P.]

HELIAS (Elias), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, deposed by the emperor Anastasius I. before 512. On the accession of Justin I., Hormisdas bishop of Rome pleaded with him for the restoration of Elias to his see, which had long being occupied by Soterichus. At the same time he wrote to the empress Euphemia, to Justinian, whose influence with his uncle was already paramount, to Germanus, a Vir Illustriissimus, to his own legates Germanus bishop of Capua and Blandus a presbyter, to solicit their intercession in his behalf, and to Helias, and two of his fellow sufferers, to inform them of what he had done (Hormisd. Pap. Ep. 57–60; in Pat. Lat. xliii. p. 480; Mansi, v. 471; Jaffé, Regest. Pont. pp. 68, 69). He only succeeded, however, in obtaining a promise that on the death of Soterichus Helias should be his successor. Soterichus was still bishop A.D. 536 (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 377), and it may be inferred that Helias died before him. The letters of Hormisdas are not dated, but as the reply of Justinian was written on June 7 in the consulum of Vitalian, i.e. A.D. 550 (Chron. Pasch. O. eccxv.) they must have been sent from Rome A.D. 519 (Baronius, ann. 519, cccxv.)

[T. W. D.]

HELIO, ST., one of the children assigned to king Brychan of Brecknock. He is said to have settled on the Cornish coast, giving his name to the parish of Eglos-hayle (William of Worce. B. H. 130). Cornwall, Devon, and the opposite coast of Wales seem to have been under the same rulers of the old Celtic race even after Caewlin's victories had severed the connexion by land, which led the way to the occupation of Bristol, perhaps in the time of Ethelbald of Mercia (Rees, Welsh Saints, 160; Kerlake, St. Ewen, Bristol, and the Welsh Border, 1874; Freeman on King Ine, pp. 47, 53).

[C. W. B.]

HELICON, a sophist or professor of rhetoric at Constantinople, who composed in ten books an Abstract of Chronology and History from Adam to the reign of Theodosius the Great, taking it down to 395 (Suidas, s. v.). Simlerus and Vossius state that the work still exists in manuscript in Italy. (Simlerus, Biblioth. p. 270; Vossius, de Historia Graec. ii. 19, p. 255; Hiera, Bibl. Gr. v. 90; vii. 446; viii. 82; xi. 633; Ceillier, vi. 290.)

[W. M. S.]

HELICONIA (Bas. Men.), HELICONIS (Rom. Mart.)—May 28. A native of Thessalonica martyred at Corinth, under the proconsul Perennius, during the reign of Gordian and Philip, A.D. 243. His name is preserved in the Roman and Latin with a pretended edict of Gordian for a general persecution. (Dodwell, Dissert. Cypriani xi.; Acta SS. Boll. Mai. vi. 736–744.)

[G. T. S.]

HELIG FOEL, Welsh saint, without any known church dedication, descended from Caradog Frichfras. He owned a low-lying tract of land on the coast of Carnarvonshire, which became
HELIGWYDD

submerged in the 7th century, and now forms
the Llanc Sands in Beaumaris Bay. In the
Cornwall Quarterly Magazine (iii. 39-48) there
is a translation of the Hanes of Heig ab Glan-
seug, with an account of his lands which were
lost, his sons who were saints, and his other de-
sendants. (Myv. Arch. ii. 45; Rees, Welsh
Saints, 298, 301-2; Williams, Emlyn. Welshm.
213.)

[J. G.]

HELIODORUS

HELIGWYDD (HELIGUDD), clerical witness
to a grant of Ithac ab Morgan king of Gla-
morgan, late in the 6th or early in the 7th
century. (Ll. Landau. by Rees, 186, 448-8.)

[J. G.]

HELMENAS (HELENAE, ELIMENES), presby-
byter and martyr with the presbystres Parmenius
and Chrysostes, at Cordula; commemorated on
Wand., Notker.)

[G. H.]

HELINGAUSD. [HELMGAUSD.]

HELO (1) ('Halaw), a civil officer of high rank
under the emperor Theodosius II. It was by him
that Theodosius sent the diadem to his nephew
Valentinian, a.d. 424. Helo was then patricius
and magister officiorum (Olympiodor. ap. Phot.
380 c, in the Latin version Helicon; Socr.
H. E. vii. 24). Some years afterwards he was
sent by Theodosius to conclude a peace with the
Persians, one result of which was that the per-
secution, which the Christians of that country
had long suffered, ceased (Socr. H. E. vii. 20;
Theophanes, Chron. s. a. 421, Migne, Patr. Gr.
eviii. 234).

[T. W. D.]

HELO (2), addressed by Firmus
bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who expresses
his delight in writing to him, and his desire that
he will return the favour (Firm. Epist. 28).

[ E. V.]

HELIODORUS (1), bishop of Laodicea (La-
akeh) in Syria. The only mention of his name is
by Dionysius of Alexandria, who relates that he
5; Le Quen, Oriens. Chr. ii. 791.)

[J. de S.]

HELIODORUS (2), bishop of Zabulon
in Palestine, present at the first general council
at Nices, a.d. 325. (Mansi. ii. 693; Le Quen,
Or. Christ. iii. 678.)

[J. de S.]

HELIODORUS (3), bishop of Nicopolis, the
metropolis of Vetus Epirus, subscribed the
council of Sardica, a.d. 347. (Mansi, i. 39;
Le Quen, Oriens. Christ. ii. 133.)

[L. D.]

HELIODORUS (4), Arian bishop of Soraey
in Libya Prima, on the coast of the Mediterranean.
He signed the declarations of the Selucian
council, a.d. 359. He was deposed, together
with other semi-Arian bishops, in the following
year. (Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. ii. 28; Le Quen,
Or. Christ. ii. 617.)

[J. de S.]

HELIODORUS (5)—April 9. Martyr at the
banks of Sapor II. king of the Persians. He was
bishop of Bezabde, a town on the banks of the
Tigris. In 362 Sapor invaded Mesopotamia and
swayed away a vast number of exiles, including

Heliodorus, who fell sick after his capture and
died. Before his death he consecrated as bishop a
young priest named Qualis, and delivered to him the
portable altar which Eastern bishops when travelling
conveyed with them. (Asc. Mart. auct. i. 134; Basil.
Men. iii. 49, in Migne, Patr. Gr. cxvi.; Sirleit's

[G. T. S.]

HELIODORUS (6), bishop of Tricea in
Thessaly. He introduced into Thessaly the custom
of episcopal marriage, and was the author of
several erotic books called Aethiopica (Socrates,
H. E. v. 22). Though these works were written in his youth, yet so great
was the scandal caused by them that Heliodorus
was deprived of his bishopric by the provincial
syndes (Nicomachus Callist. H. E. xii. 34). He
must have lived before the 5th century. (Le
Quen, Orient. Chr. ii. 117; Migne, Patr. Gr.
cxv. 296.) Photius, who describes the Aethiopica
(cod. 75), states that the author was of Phoecei-
ian origin, and was said to have become a bishop.
Valentian disbelieved in the author being the
bishop of Tricea, while the modern writer by the
signature of Heliodorus of Jerome's epistles.

(Vales. and Varior. notes on Soc.)

[L. D.]

HELIODORUS (7), bishop of Altinum near
Aquileia, cir. 400. He served originally as a
soldier (derelicti militiae—Jerome, ep. xiv. 6,
ed. Vall.), but had left that calling and been
ordained before the time when we first hear of
him. He formed one of the band of friends who
were drawn together at Aquileia, about the year
372, for the study of Scripture and the prac-
tice of asceticism, which included St. Jerome,
Evagrius afterwards bishop of Antioch, Rufinus,
Bonosus, and Chromatius afterwards bishop of
Aquileia. The passion for asceticism and the
troubles which arose about Jerome made the
companions resolve, under the guidance of
Evagrius, to go to Syria. They went by land,
probably passing through Constantinople and
Asia Minor to Antioch (Jerome, ep. iii.
3. ed. Vall.). There they stayed some time.
Heliodorus went to Jerusalem, where he enjoyed
the hospitality of Florentius, who, having devoted
himself to the ascetic life, employed his wealth
in the entertainment of pilgrims (Jerome, ep.
iv. ed. Vall.). He there heard that Rufinus had
arrived in Egypt with Melania (Jer. ep. iii. 2).
Returning to Antioch he found Jerome, who had
been ill, resolved to go into the solitude of the
desert of Chalcis. But he determined not to go
with him. He was himself a presbyter and had
a call for the pastoral life, and he had a sister
and a nephew, who were dependent on him
(Jerome, ep. ix. 9, ed. Vall.). He therefore
determined, with regret, to return to his native
place, Aquileia, holding out to his friends the
hope that he might rejoin him one day in the
desert (ibid.). Jerome wrote to him on his
return to Italy (ep. 14) a letter which after-
wards had a great effect in furthering the cause
of asceticism, and became so celebrated that a
Roman lady, Fabiola, knew it by heart (Jerome,
ep. ixvii. 8, ed. Vall.). It was a remonstrance
to Heliodorus on his having gone back from
that whichelope Jerome believed at that time
to be the way of the perfect life, and it re-
proached him with turning his back upon the
higher service of Christ, and bade him think of the account he must render for this at the day of judgment (ep. xiv. 11). At other times Jerome charged himself with having by his sins driven his friend away (ep. vi.). But their friendship was never broken. Heliodyrus continued in the pastoral office, and not long afterwards became bishop of Altinum. His nephew Nepotianus, like himself, was brought up for a military career, but was afterwards ordained; and Jerome, writing to him in the year 396 (ep. lvi.), bids him take his uncle as a model of a Christian pastor. Heliodyrus was present in 381 as a bishop at the council of Aquileia. In after years he was closely allied with Chromatius bishop of Aquileia, and in common with him kept up a communication with their former friend Jerome, then residing at Bethlehem. On the death of Nepotianus in 396, Jerome wrote to Heliodyrus a letter of condolence, in which all the affection of the friend is expressed. Heliodyrus on his side took a warm interest in Jerome's translation of the Scriptures. He, with Chromatius, frequently wrote to him, exhorting him to complete the work, which was for a long time delayed. They supported amusements habit of mind; and by the grateful mention of their aid in the prefaces to the books last translated, their names are for ever associated with the great work of the Vulgate. ("Preface to the Books of Solomon and Tobit," Jerome's Works, vol. i. 1305, x. 26; Migne's edition of Vallarsi's Jerome). Cappelletti (Le Chiese d'Italia, v. 516, 610) reckons his successor in the see of Altinum to have been Ambrosius, A.D. 407.

[W. H. F.]

HELIODORUS, bishop of Amathus in Cyprus, subscribed the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, by Soter bishop of Theodosiana. (Mansi, vii. 160; Le Quen, Or. Chr. ii. 1064.)

[L. D.]

HELIODORUS, bishop of Pinares in Lycia. His name was subscribed to the synodal letter of his province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458, by archdeacon Nicolaus, where Narenis is an evident error for Pinaris. (Mansi, vii. 580; Le Quen, Oriens Christian. i. 975.)

[L. D.]

HELIODORUS (9), bishop of Cufruta in Byzacena, banished by Huneric, A.D. 484. (Victor Vit. Notit. p. 68; Morcelli, Afr. Christ. i. 147.)

[R. S. G.]

HELIODORUS (11), 12th bishop of Sedumum (Sion), between Agricola and Honorius, represented at the second council of Magon in A.D. 585 (Mansi, ix. 958; Gall. Christ. xii. 735).

[S. A. B.]


[E. V.]

HELIODORUS (13), presbyter, a friend of St. Hilary of Poitiers. It appears that Hilary was in the habit of seeking from Heliodyrus explanations of those points which he could not understand in Origen's commentaries. (Hieron. ep. 34, al. 141, ad Marcellanum, 13. 23.)

[J. C. C.]

HELIODORUS (14), presbyter, commemorated by Gennadius. He wrote a work against the Manichaeans, entitled, De Natura Rerum Exor- dicium, proving that the universe and all things in it had one only Creator, and refuting the idea of a coeternal power who was the author of evil. (Gennad. de Scriptor. c. 6; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 206.)

[E. V.]

HELIODORUS (15), presbyter of Antioch c. 440, who is mentioned by Gennadius as the author of an excellent treatise De Virginitate, well furnished with Scripture proofs. (Gennad. de Scriptor. c. 29; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 430.)

[E. V.]

HELIODORUS (16), a monk addressed by Nilus, who cautions him that his temperament being of so warm a nature in respect of the female sex, his only safe course is to avoid all converse with women, never even to behold them without absolute necessity, whether they be living under monastic rule or otherwise. (Nil. Epp. lib. ii. ep. 46, p. 138, in Patr. Gr. ixix. 208.)

[C. H.]

HELIODORUS (17), martyr with Dosa, perhaps under Constantine Copronymus; commemorated by the Greeks on Aug. 20. (Boll. Acta SS. Aug. iv. 96.)

[C. H.]

HELIODORUS (18), martyr at Antioch in Pisidia with Marcus, Sico, Neo, and others, under Diocletian; commemorated on Sept. 23. (Bos. Men. i. 74.)

[C. H.]

HELOGABALUS. [ELAGABALUS]

HELIOTROPTAIE (Ἄλειστροπταί), according to Joannes Damascenus, a heretical sect who worshipped the planet heliotrope, which they conceived to turn round towards the sun in virtue of a divine power which dwelt in it. Damascenus speaks of the Heliotroptae as having arisen between the reigns of the emperors Mar- cian and Heruchius (Jo. Damas. de Haeres. cap. iv. § 89, p. 108 in Migne, Patr. Gr. xiv. 738, 758, 785).

[T. W. D.]

HELIUS, a deacon, present at the time when Silvanus committed the act of tradition of which he was afterwards convicted. (Sil- vanus.) (Mon. Vet. Don. p. 170, ed. Oertelhürt.)

[H. W. P.]

HELIX (HELICO), a heretic, the evidence for whose existence consists in the fact that Anastasius in the 7th century gives passages which purport to be extracts from a work of Hippolytus against Beron and Helix. In the article HIPPOLYTUS the reasons are given for thinking this tract not to be a work of that father; and if it be a forgery of the time of the Monophysite controversies, Beron and Helix, who are heard of nowhere else, are likely to be imaginary personages. Fabricius gives, rid of the name Helix, better, conjecturing, but apparently without sufficient reason, that the true reading was καὶ δύο ἡμέρας καὶ ἄραντ ἀπετείχαν. (G. S.]

HELLADIUS (1) (ELLADIUS), 4th bishop of Auxerre, between Valerianus and Amator. He was present at the synod of Valence, 374, died
HELLADIUS (3), a Cappadocian bishop addressed by Gregory Nazianzen, perhaps to be distinguished from Helladius of Caesarea, the subject of the preceding article. Gregory wrote him his thanks after Easter, 382, for a paschal present and letter. Gregory wishes Helladius a long life, but for himself a speedy death; Helladius could confer on him no greater boon than that he was a layman which he wished to be accepted a bishop to Nazianzus. (Greg. Naz. Epist. 173 in Patr. Gr. xxxviii. 289; Tillemont, Mém. Ecclés. ix. "Grég. de Naz." note lvi.)

HELLADIUS (4), bishop of Tarsus c. 430. He was a disciple of St. Theodosius of Antioch, and after his death (c. A.D. 412) presided over the monastery he had founded near Rhousus in Cilicia. Having spent sixty years in monastic life, he was raised to the episcopate as successor to Marianus bishop of the metropolitan see of Tarsus (Theod. Vit. Jur. c. 10). His episcopate illustrates the stormy period of the church of Ephesus. He was one of those who protested against commencing the council before the arrival of John of Antioch and the oriental bishops (Baluz. Nov. Concil. Coll. p. 697), and he joined the opposition council, conciliabulum, presided over by John upon his arrival. He supported the counter-remonstrances addressed to the emperor Constantine (ibid. by Nestorius). He appended his name to the synodal letter to the clergy and laity of Hierapolis (ibid. 705), and to that to John of Antioch and Theodoret and the other members of the Oriental deputation to Theodosius (ibid. 725). Helladius steadily ignored the deposition of Nestorius, and withheld all recognition of Maximian as his successor. John of Antioch wrote, commending him for what he had done (ibid. 752, c. 48).

When the leaders of the rival parties were taking steps for the restoration of peace, Helladius kept aloof, and on the receipt of the six articles drawn up by John at a council held at Antioch, which ultimately opened the way for reconciliation, he united with Alexander of Hierapolis in the profession of faith against Nestorius (ibid. 790). Gregory Nazianzen, however, on more than one occasion, had recourse to his good offices in behalf of his relatives, Nicobulus, and his son Nicobulus the younger (ibid. 218). Helladius got considerable discredit by ordaining (Soz. vii. 6) Gerontius bishop of Nicomedia, in return, it was said, for his good offices in obtaining by his court influence a high military office for his son. [GERONTIUS (7).] He attended the ecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, and was declared by the emperor, together with Otreius of Melitene and Gregory Nyssen, a centre of Catholic communion for Pontus and Bithynia (Theod. H. E. v. 8; Soc. H. E. vii. 9; Soc. v. 8; Labbe, Concil. ii. 956; Mansi, iii. 569). He was again at Constantinople in 384, at the synod held at the time of the consecration of Boniface's church, to decide the rival claims of Apagynus and Bagadicius to the see of Beroea (Labbe, ii. 1151, Palladius being a manifest error for Helladius). A biography of his great predecessor Basil is erroneously ascribed to Helladius by Johannes Damascenus (de Imagin. lib. i. p. 59). (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 373; Cave, Hist. Lit. vol. i. p. 287; Fabric. Biblioth. Gracc. vol. iv. p. 293.)
Maximian, were ordered to accept the concordat or resign their see. All eventually yielded but the stubborn old bishop of Hierapolis. The questor Domitian, who was entrusted with the execution of the imperial decree, exhorted Helladius to consult the peace of the church, and resume communion with John and consequently with Cyril. Theodoret also wrote to his old friend, telling him that he said John had found Cyril’s letter orthodox, entrusting him not by his obstinacy to destroy his flock (ibid. 859, c. 160). The path was much cleared by the death of Maximian, April 12, 434, and the succession of the sainely Proclus (Socr. H. E. viii. 41). The orthodoxy of the new bishop of Constantinople was readily acknowledged by Helladius, who was evidently glad to be helped out of his dilemma by the removal of the first intrusive occupant of Nestorius’s see (ibid. 850, c. 149). Having determined on yielding, Helladius wrote to Alexander to explain his conduct. The bishops of Bilicica Secundus had resumed communion with John and Cyril, and he was compelled by the urgency of the bishops and clergy of his own province to follow their example to avoid worse evils (ibid. 862, c. 164). Alexander bitterly reproached Helladius with his weakness (ibid. 863, c. 164). Helladius, however, lost no time inコンvoxing the bishops of his province, whose synodal letters were drawn up and despatched to Theodosiius, declaring in the most decided language their complete acceptance of all that was required of them: admission of the decrees of the council of Ephesus, communion with Cyril, the ratification of Nestorius’s sentence of deposition, and the anathematization of him and his adherents (ibid. 887, c. 199). Helladius had saved himself from deposition and exile at the expense of consistency. He had now to justify his conduct to Nestorius, whom he had repeatedly promised never to forsake. The task was no easy one; nor can we say that he fulfilled it with any honour to himself. He wrote Nestorius a short letter to the effect that though he had met with every evil from beginning to end had turned out directly contrary to his prayers, his feeling towards him remained unchanged, and that as he knew he was still struggling for true piety, he believed that he would joyfully endure all that was laid upon him, and that he hoped he might be reckoned with him at the last judgment, when his soul, tried by so many and great temptations, would shine forth. He excuses himself for joining Theodoret and those who with him had accepted the concordat, on the ground that the letters produced from Cyril were in perfect harmony with apostolical traditions (ibid. 888, c. 193). At this period Helladius passes off the stage, and we know no more of him. The letters are printed by Chr. Lupus in his Epistulae Ephesinae. No. 68, 111, 114, 144, 154, 193. They are also given by Balaure, Concil. Nov. Collect. in the Tragodia Irenaei, c. 68, 111, 114, 117, 130, 164, 192, 193. (Tillemont, Mem. Écclés. tom. xiv. Le Quen, Or. Christ. tom. ii. p. 874; Cave, Hist. Lit. tom. i. p. 418.)

HELLADIUS (6), a bishop identified by Muratori with the bishop of Tarsus of this name. Firmus de Casarea wrote to warn him of a woman who having devoted herself to a religious life, had fallen into gross licentiousness, and with the aid of her parents plundered another lady of her property, and carried off her slaves, and had fled to the city of which Helladius was bishop. Firmus desires Helladius to punish her as she deserves, and pronounce excommunication upon her, if not perpetual, at least until she repents and reforms (Firm. Ep. 41, and Muratori’s note).
HELLADIUS (18), pagan grammarian, a priest of Jupiter. He was distinguished as a professor at Alexandria until A.D. 389, when the demolition of pagan temples under Theodosius made him retire to Constantinople, and there Socrates the historian, then a very young man, received instructions from him. (Soc. H. E. v. 16.) In 425 Theodosius II., by an edict conferred upon him and other public professors at Constantinople the rank enjoyed by ex-ricarii (Cod. Theod. VI. xxii.) Besides other works Helladius compiled a Greek lexicon described by Photius as λέξεως παντοτε χρήσις κατά στοιχείων (cod. 1653), and τῶν λέξεως συλλογή (cod. 158, sub fin.), to which work Suidas was indebted, as appears from the mention of Helladius among the authors at the commencement of his Lexicon. See also the Index Scriptorum de quibus Suidas (Migne, Pat. Gr. cxvii. 1269). [T. W. D.]

HELLADIUS (18), a Lucarian, interlocutor with "Orthodoxus" in Jerome's Dialogue com. "De fide et amor."

HELLADIUS (17), a layman of rank, occupying a high official position at Caesarea in Cappadocia, addressed by Firmus, who congratulated him on having escaped the dangers of a tempestuous voyage and reached Caesarea in safety, begging him to do what he could to relieve the famine under which the city was labouring, and lessen the burdens caused by the presence of the troops and their frequent transit. In a second letter Firmus thanks him for the proofs of his friendship and promise him his prayers. (Firm. ep. 12, 26.) [E. V.]

HELLADIUS (19), one of the friends made by Chrysostom during his stay at Caesarea on his way to Cucusus, to whom he wrote on his arrival, acquainting him with his comfortable condition, and begging him to write to him often. (Chrys. Epist. 172.) [E. V.]

HELLADIUS (20), an anchorite, afterwards bishop, to whom Cassian addressed the first ten books of his Colossians or treatises on the monastic life, about the year A.D. 423. (Jo. Cassian. Colat. praecl., in Patr. Lat. alii. 478, 479.) [I. G. S.]

HELLADIUS (21), a presbyter, who with his son Lucianus restored the walls of Asses in Mysia. Their names are recorded in an inscription on the walls of the city copied by Boeckh (Corp. Inscrip. iv. 8835), who fixes the date about the time of Justinian, and by Eusebius (Aria Minor, p. 20). To his exertions it may be due that the wall is still perfect on the west side, and that, as Lekke observes (Aria Minor, p. 129), the whole gives the most perfect idea of a Greek city which anywhere exists. [U. T. S.]

HELMENIUS, surveyor of customs at Naxianzus, the confidential friend both of Basil and Gregory Naxianzus. He was an Armenian by birth, was married and the father of a family, and, together with his brother, who, like himself, had acquired reputation by his eloquence, was employed in the administration of justice (Greg. Naz. carm. 47, Opp. ii. p. 105, ed. Bill., or in Migne, Pat. Gr. cxvii. 1451, Carm. lib. ii. s. c. 2, p. 993). We find him in 371 conveying a letter from Gregory to Basil (Basil. Epist. 71 [33]), and in 372 a message from the bishops of Lesser Armenia (ibid. 98 [259]). Having asked Gregory to send him a homily, he received in 372 the above poem instead, in praise of the sollicitude of his district. [H. E.]

HELMINGAUDUS (Ellmgaudus, Hellingaudus, Helmknauous, the spelling is very uncertain) was an officer (comes) of Charlemagne sent on an embassy along with the bishop of Amiens to the court of the Greek emperor in 802. (Einhardi Annales sub anno; Monum. Carol. ed. Jafke; pp. 309-312, 813.) [R. B.]

HELOGARUS, fifth bishop of St. Malo, succeeding St. Armaulos, and followed by Emmorus, was abbot of St. Mevennius (Mén) at the same time, as we learn from a charter of Louis the Pious, dated in 817, which confirms concessions granted to that monastery by Charles the Great (Migne, Patr. Lat. civ. 1042; Gall. Christ. xiv. 997). [S. A. B.]

HELPIDIUS. See also ELPIDIUS.

HELPIDIUS (D), Donatist bishop of the place whose name is variously written Thudræs, Tukdræs, Tuderæs, Tyrdræs, and later, Turdæs, and perhaps Dydris, a town of Byzacene, about thirty-two miles equidistant from Leptis Minor and Uaala [El Jama] (Ant. Rost. 59, 1; Hist. Bel. Afr. 76; Shaw, p. 157), present at the Maximianist council of Carthasius, a.d. 384; Aug. En. in Ps. xxvi. 30; Mos. civ. Dom. p. 258, ed. Oberthur). [H. W. P.]
HELPIDIUS (2), a bishop of Cyprus at the close of the 4th century. To him and the other suffragans of Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, the letter condemning Origen was addressed by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, in the year 400. The letter was translated by Jerome. ([Ep. 92, ed. Vall.] [W. H. F.])

HELPIUS, wife of Boethius. (Elpis [2].)

HELVAEUS, HELVACUS (Elveus, Elvius), bishop of Menev. [AELFW.]. His name is inserted in the second edition of Wilson's English Martyrology, and in the Sarum Brev. at March 1. The Bollandists (Acta SS. 27 Feb. iii. 678) identify him with the Munster bishop Helvacus, who in Vict. S. Davidis, baptized St. David, and is probably St. Alibhe. (O'Halton, Irish Saints, iii. 9, 10.) [J. G.]

HELVE, FORM OF ALIBHE.

HELVIANDUS. [ELVIANUS.]

HELVIDIUS, alphabetically, though not chronologically, the first of those westerns who, like Novatian and Pelagius, Jovinian and Vigilantius, put forward opinions on anthropological subjects opposed to the generally received teaching of the church in their day, that have nevertheless been revived in modern times. In the East, where the interest for pure theology has never cooled, any serious discussion of such questions is still all but unknown.

The only contemporary notice preserved of Helvidius is the short tract against him by St. Jerome (Opp. ii. p. 293-30, ed. Vallars), written when they were both at Rome, while pope Damasus was alive, as we learn from the latter. It appeared, according to Vallarius, a. D. 385. St. Jerome put off answering him, who was also, for some time: "ne respondendo dignum fieret, qui vinceretur;" and he describes him throughout as "hominem rusticannum, et vix primis quoque imbutum literis" (§ 1); besides being wholly unknown to him: "Ego ipse, qui contra te scribebo, quum in eadem urbe consistam, albus, ut aiunt, atrevus suis, nescio." St. Jerome speaks of his own work in writing to Pammachius as "librum contra Helvidium de ecclesiis mari sumus virginitate perpetua" (ep. lviii. § 17), this being what his opponent had denied in the first instance, though the outcome of his opinions had been to rank virginity below matrimony. Helvidius sought countenance for his first point in the writings of Tertullian and Victorinus. St. Jerome shews (§ 17) he had misrepresented the latter; of Tertullian, whose writings may still speak "Ecclesiae hominem non suisse." But, in any case, he retorts with much force: what avail straggling opinions against primitive truth? "Num quid non possum tibi totam veterem scriptorum seriem commovere: Ignatium, Polycarponum, Irenaeum, Justinum Martyrem, multoque alios apotosticos et eloquentes viros, qui adversus Eblionem, et Theodotum Bryantium, haec eadem sentientes, plena sapientiae volumina conscriberunt. Quae si legis esse aliquando, plus sapere." This argument is just as suitable to our own, as it was to patristic times, never losing anything by repetition. What had Helvidius to oppose to it in this case? Nothing, unless his adversary misrepresents him, but novel interpretations of Scripture by himself. St. Jerome therefore refutes him only so far as to point out, that there is no necessity for understanding any of the passages adduced by him otherwise than the church had understood them hitherto; but that, in any case, the interpretations of them offered by Helvidius are delusive. One specimen must suffice. Πρωτόκος is a term which is applied to our Lord by St. Matthew and St. Luke conjointly with marked emphasis. And St. Luke further deposes to its being applied to him in a strict legal sense. Helvidius, heedless of this, drew his own inference: "Nilitatur probare primogenitum non posse dici, nisi eum qui habet et fraternos: sicut unigenitus ille vocatur qui parentibus solus sit filius" (§ 10). But the fact of the matter was, this word, legally construed, had exclusive reference to two things: first, the act of the mother; and secondly, the sex of the child. The first born of a woman was not a legal first-born, unless it was a male; and the first born in wedlock was not a legal first-born, unless it was the first born of the woman. But these conditions having been fulfilled in any given case, the son was a first-born in the eyes of the law from that time forth, whether any subsequent issue followed or not; and such Jesus was decided to have been when He was presented in the temple: "Omnis unigenitus est primum: non omnis primumgenitus est unigenitus," as it has been tersely put. The "sisters" attributed to Him in two Gospels, and the "brethren" in all four, St. Jerome further shews are no proof of any subsequent issue by His virgin-mother, for either they may have been half-brothers and sisters—children of St. Joseph by a former marriage—or else, simply first-cousins, children of the sister of the Virgin, married to a pagan, to whom she was, as in both cases, Hebrew usage would justify the application to them of the closer tie. St. Jerome winds up his argument in these words: "Natum Deum esse de virgine credimus, quia legisimus: Mariam nupisse post partum, non credimus, quia non legisimus. Nec hoc ideo dicimus, quo nuptiis confinuimus, ipsa quippe virginissima fructus est nuptiarum; sed quod nobis a sancta viria tempore estematur nihil illatis" (§ 19). In what follows he admits being ever rhetorical and declamatory. Still as, even in this, he nowhere charges Helvidius with having been "a disciple of Auxentius," the Arian bishop of Milan; or "an imitator of Symmachus," the champion of idolatry, we may well ask with Vallarius where Gennadius, who wrote more than a century later, got authority for such statements (de script. Excit. c. 32), which Cave repeats in part (Hist. lit. i. 278). Neither St. Ambrose nor St. Augustine mention him in their treatises on Virginitatis, where they make common cause with St. Jerome in condemning his views. His followers, indeed, constitute the eightieth-fourth of the heroes enumerated by the latter. ([E. S. R.]}

HEMEL, HEMELI. The eleventh bishop
HEMELIN, CONFESSION. [HIMELINUS.]

HEMERIUS (Hæmærius, HEMERIUS), a civil catholicos (see Dic. Chr. Antiq.). According to Athanasius he was enjoining by the emperor Constantine to have a church erected for the prebyster Ischyros. Athanasius has preserved a letter of Himerius addressed to the exactor of Martyrius, one of his subordinates, giving instructions relating to the work in question. (Athanas. Apol. cont. Aris. 35, in Pat. Gr. xxxv. 402.) Wernsdorff mentions him among the Himerius in his life of Himerius the sophist prefixed to his edition of that author's works (p. xxxv.).

HREMETHIERUS, one of the twelve sons of the centurion Marcellus, martyred with him in Spain under the prelates Agricolus, A.D. 298. (Baron. Annal. ann. 298, ix.)

HEMGISLUS, HEMGISSEL (Hæmgisla), abbot of Glastonbury. In the ancient list preserved in the Cotton MS. Tiberus B. 5, Haemgis appears as the first English abbot. William of Malmsbury assigns the first place to Beorwald, who was afterwards archbishop of Canterbury (693), and places Hemsigel second. As there is no probability that archbishop Berwald was ever abbot of Glastonbury, the place remains open for Haemgis. According to William of Malmsbury (Ant. Hist. ap. Gule, p. 308) Haemgisel became abbot in 675 and held office for 25 years; in another place he gives the date 680 to 705 (6. 329). It may be inferred that he was the chief agent of Ine and Hædæli in the restoration of the abbey, although the record of his acts and the charters which bear his name cannot stand critical investigation. He is the recipient of the grant of Luntocal, made by bishop Hædæli, July 6, 680 (K. C. D. 19; Mon. Angli. i. 47); in 681 a king, Baldred, with the consent of Kentwin, gives him land at Pennard (K. C. D. 20; Mon. Angli. i. 48; Malms. Antq. Hist. p. 403); in 704 Inæ bestowed large immunities on the abbey, which was still under Haemgelis (K. C. D. 22); and in 723, Hæmgiselle, abbot of Glastonbury gives an account of a charter of Kentwin dated 679, in which he states that, with the consent of Hædæli and at the petition of the monks, he has made Hæmgiselle abbot and gives him lands on Quatock, Caric, and Crucan (Antq. Hist. p. 308), but the original charter, which might possibly be the foundation charter of Glastonbury, is apparently not forthcoming. According to the same authority Haemgelis died and was buried in the old church of Glastonbury in 705. His tomb seems to have been regarded with special honour, and to have been in the wooden church (K. C. D. 93). The Cotton MS. names as his successors Wellitho, Coeniga, Beorthwyld, Caduling, and Muns; the last of whom was present at the council of Clowesæ in 803 (K. C. D. 1024); William of Malmsbury gives instead Beorthwald, 705-712; Aldberht, 712-719; Atfrith, 719-729; Hemsigel 729; and six obscure abbots between Hemsigel and Munc, to whom he assigns the years 803-824. Of these Walthan (754-786) may represent Caduling; Beorthwald is known as a contemporary of the early days of Boniface (Mon. Mon. p. 439); and see Beorthwald 710-716 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 295, 296); and Coenilis is the recipient of a letter preserved among those of St. Boniface, but without trustworthy mark of date (Mon. Mon. p. 129). Whilst none of these lists can be regarded as satisfactory, the more ancient one is more in agreement with other data, and was probably manipulated by William of Malmsbury to agree with spurious charters. (See Memorials of Dunstan, prep. p. lxxxiii; Mon. Angli. i. 5.)

HEMIAREIANS (Hæmiareiæ, Hæmiareiæ, in iii. 500; Hæmiariæio, Jo. Dan. de Haeres, num. 72). [SEMIRARIANS.]

HENANUS (Enannus), hermit in the diocese of Meath, given by the Bollandists among their prætextermisia at Sept. 18, perhaps Eunan of Drumrath. [Enan (3)] (Acta SS. 18 Sept. v. 758 n.)

HENEN, HENENN, HENENNEKEN, Welsh saint. [HYWYN.]

HENOC, BOOK OF. [HENOCH, BOOK OF.]

HENOSIS, in the system of Valentinus, or Aeon, the consort of Agarnous. (Irenæus, I. ii. p. 6; ii. iv. p. 133; Epiph. Hier. 31, p. 109.)

HENOTICON, THE, or "INSTRUMENT OF UNION," a document owing its existence to Acacius, the patriarch of Constantinople, and probably the production of his pen, put forth by the emperor Zeno, A.D. 482, on his restoration to the throne, after the discomfiture of the usurper Basiliscus, with the view of putting an end to the dissensions caused by what Gibbon designates "the obstinate and sanguinary zeal of the Monophysites." The attempt was well meant, and we may accept that historian's verdict, that it is "in ecclesiastical history that Zeno appears least contemptible." But like every endeavour to cover radical differences by a vague comprehensiveness, it contained in itself the seeds of dissolution, and became eventually the fruitful source of still fiercer enmities between those who had been forced by it into a fictitious agreement. Not only did the "Henoticum" fail in securing the union which was its professed object, and aggravate the divisions it was intended to cure, but it created a schism which divided the churches of the East and West for nearly forty years, lasting down to the reign of Justinian and the popehood of Hormisdas.
The immediate cause of the issuing of the "Henoticon" was the dissension between the rival occupants of the patriarchal see of Alexandria. On the death of Timotheus Salaphiocianus in A.D. 482, John Talaias, the eunucos of the Alexandrian church, was elected by the orthodox party. He at once, according to custom, despatched synodal letters to the chief bishops of Christendom, to notify his election. Those addressed to Simplicius of Rome and Calandion of Antioch were duly received; but the letters intended for Acacius and Zeno were sent under cover to Illy, the "magister officiorum," whom it was rumoured he had made his friend by large bribes from the treasures of the church, requesting him to present the documents to the emperor and patriarch, and use his influence to secure their favourable reception. Unluckily, Illy was at Antioch on important business when the messenger arrived; and before the parcel of papers reached him and the letters could be placed in his hands, Zeno had ventured upon the unplanned enterprise. Acacius had heard of John's appointment from another quarter. Fired by a neglect which he deemed a studied insult, Acacius resolved to get rid of the man who had so slighted him. It happened that Gennadius, bishop of Hermopolis Minor, a relation of Timotheus Salaphiocianus, and "apocrisarius" or legate of the see of Alexandria, was then at Constantinople. He conceived that he too had been slighted by the new patriarch, and gladly united with Acacius in compassing his overthrow. They represented to Zeno that Talaias was unworthy of the patriarchate, both as having replaced the name of Dioscorus on the diptychs, and as having perjured himself by accepting the see of Alexandria, after having, as was asserted, taken an oath that he would not seek it. Zeno readily gave credence to these charges, and when it was further represented that, if he recognised Peter Mongus, the deposed patriarch, who, by his agents, had been practising on Acacius, peace would be restored, he wrote to Simplicius, stating his grounds for hesitating to sanction the appointment of John, and urging that the restoration of Peter Mongus would put an end to the dissension. Acacius then caused the document to be revealed, June A.D. 482, that, though he had been on the point of recognising John as patriarch, he delayed doing so until the grave charges brought by Zeno could be investigated. At the same time he utterly refused to allow the elevation of a convicted heretic, such as Peter Mongus, to the patriarchal see. His return to the true faith might restore him to the communion of the church, but he could not render him worthy to be one of its chief rulers (Liberat. Dial. Brevar. cc. 16, 17; Evagr. H. E. ii. 12). This opposition to his wishes roused the indignation of Zeno, who, without delay, issued imperative commands to Pergamius, the new prefect of Egypt, then about to sail for Alexandria, and to Apollonius the governor, to expel John Talaias and seat Peter Mongus in his place. This was the time chosen by Apollonius to proclaim himself to the world in the novel character of an expounder of the faith of the Catholic church. Peter Mongus had agents at Constantinople, of whom an abbot named Ammon was the leader, actively working for his restoration under colour of seeking the peace of the church. Their strong representations that nothing would be so effectual for this end as the recognition of Mongus, were only too readily credited. The "Henoticon" was drawn up, which, since, as will be seen, it did not directly mention the council of Chalcedon, and the hypothetical allusion contained in it was capable of being construed in a depreciatory sense, might be accepted by those who, like Mongus, had hitherto rejected its decrees. Ammon and his companions engaged for Mongus that he would adopt this instrument of union; and on their word he was recognised by Zeno and Acacius as the canonical patriarch and his name inserted in the diptychs. This "Henoticon" was directed to the bishops and people in Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; but, as Tillemont has remarked (Mémo. Éccl. xvi. 327), it was really addressed only to those who had separated themselves from the church, i.e. to the Monophysites or semi-Eutychians. The original document is given by Evagrius, who renders a Latin translation by Liberatus (Brevar. c. 18; Labbe, Concil. v. 767). It commences by stating that "certain abbas, hermits, and other reverend persons, had presented to the emperor a petition, supplicating him to restore the unity of the churches, and enlarging on the lamentable results of the late divisions, which had caused vast numbers to depart this life destitute of the sacred laver and of Holy Communion, and produced such countless acts of homicide that not the earth only, but the air, reeked with blood." On this account, and knowing also that the strength and shield of the empire rested in the one true faith declared by the holy fathers gathered at Nicaea, and confirmed by those who met at Constantinople, and followed by those who had condemned Nestorius at the council of Ephesus, the emperor declares that "the creed so made and confirmed is the one only symbol of faith, and that he has held, holds, and will hold no other, and will regard all who hold another as aliens, and that in this alone those who desire saving baptism must be baptized." All who hold other views he anathematizes, and recognises the twelve chapters of Cyril as a symbolic book. The document then proposes the following formula of the holy vif. "that our Lord Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, and Himself God, incarnate, consubstantial with the Father according to His Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to His manhood, that He came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and that He is One Son, not two." That "it was this One and the same Son of God, written as type and endured the sufferings which he underwent voluntarily in His flesh." Those "who divide or confound the natures, or admit only a phantastical incarnation," are to be rejected, "since the incarnation without sin of the Mother of God did not cause the addition of a Son, for the Trinity remained even when one Person of the Trinity, God the Word, became incarnate." It asserts the fitness to pressume of the Word, and anathematizes all who have ever thought, or do think, "anything to the contrary, either now or at any other time, either at Chalcedon or in any other synod, especially Nestorius and Eutyches and their followers. The document closes with an earnest appeal to all to unite them-
selves to the church which, "as a loving mother, opens her long arms to receive them."

Such was the document which was to "combine all the churches in one harmonious confederation." It was "a work of some skill, of some cunning, of some public spirit, involving evading difficulties; it is subtle to escape subtleties" (Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christ.* bk. iii. ch. i. vol. i. p. 248). The crucial test of the unity or duality of the natures of the Incarnate Word is cleverly avoided; this being treated as an open question, on which a difference of opinion might be lawfully permitted. Gibbon's verdict is by no means an unfair one, that "it accurately represents the Catholic faith of the incarnation without adopting or disclaiming the peculiar terms of the hostile sects" (vol. vi. p. 44, ch. xlvii). But its fatal error was its feebleness. Zeno and Acacius, the promulgators of the "Henoticum," lacked the vigorous intolerance with which Cyril of Alexandria and the Emperor were prepared to substitute for real, even though unwilling and enforced, unity of doctrine, a fictitious cohesion of discordant elements. Each was left to hold his own views undisputed, provided that he would not disturb others, and refrained from stigmatizing their opinions as heretical. The Monophysites who subscribed the instrument were to be admitted into the communion of the church, without being required to give up their distinctive doctrines, while their opponents, the so-called Catholic party, were left free to maintain the authority of the decrees of Chalcedon, and the tome of Leo. The peace resulting from such a concordat was naturally more apparent than real, and satisfied no one. The Catholic party, jealous in their advocacy of the council of Chalcedon, had no liking for a document which disparaged its authority, and suggested the possible erroneousness of its decisions. The Monophysites, on the other hand, complained that it did not go far enough, and clamoured for a more definite condemnation of a council which they regarded as heretical. The strength of the contents lay on one side with the high Chalcedonian party, chiefly consisting of the monastic orders, who condemned the "Henoticum" as tainted with Eutychianism, and on the other with the Eutychians or Monophysites, who, indignant with Mongus for turning traitor to their cause, separated themselves, and, forming a distinct body without any chief leader, and not holding communion with the patriarch, were designated "the houndless sect," "Acæphii." A third body of dissent was formed by the high ecclesiastical party, who were offended at the presumption of the emperor in assuming a right to issue decrees and spiritual matters, "a right," writes Milman (u. s. p. 235), "complacently admitted when ratifying or compulsorily enforcing ecclesiastical decrees, and usually adopted without scruple on other occasions by the party who affected the court, hastened to rejoice." To these three parties, fourth, when added, the party of the centre or the moderates, who, without very strong feelings either in the Nestorian or Eutychian direction, were weary of strife, or, as loyal subjects, were disposed to accept without much question the imperial decrees on subjects involved in so much mystery, together with those who were too cowardly to resist the power which held the sword. This party of the centre was in communion with Peter Mongus, who had once signed the "Henoticum," and given it all the weight of his authority to secure its general reception. Immediately after it had reached Alexandria, he took advantage of a public council held in church, and openly commenced it to the adoption of the faithful. The "Henoticum" was singularly unfortunate in its chief patron. Mongus was a thoroughly bad man. Violence and falsehood characterized all his conduct. As soon as he felt himself safe in his seat, his overbearing temper knew no bounds. He at once removed from the diptychs the names of Proterius and Timotheus Salpachicius, distastarng the remains of the latter, and casting them out of the church, and inserted those of Dioscorus and Timotheus Aelurus, and anathematized the council of Chalcedon and the tome of Leo. When called to account by Acacius, he coolly denied the anathemas, and professed his adherence to the faith as a member of the Chalcedon. He wrote to the same effect to Simplicius, expressing a desire to be received into communion by him. (Evagri. *Hist.* iii. 17; Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 18.) Such disgraceful double-dealing estranged a considerable number of his own party, and the discussions of which the unhappy "instrument of union" was the parent were still further aggravated by the cruel persecution of the orthodox, carried on not in Alexandria alone, but through the whole of Egypt by the new patriarch. In bold defiance of the prohibitions of the emperor, conveyed by officials despatched on purpose, all, whether clerics, monks, or laymen, who refused to accept the "Henoticum," were subjected to expulsion and serious maltreatment (Evagri. *Hist.* iii. 22). At this crisis Simplicius died, A.D. 464. The first act of his successor, Felix II., was an indignant rejection of the "Henoticum," as an insult to the council of Chalcedon, and an audacious act of the emperor Zeno, who dared to dictate articles of faith, and as a sced-pilot of simony. (Theod. *Lact.* ap. Milman, u. s. p. 236.) He also anathematized all the bishops who had subscribed this edict. This anathema included nearly all the bishops of the East, for though the "Henoticum" was originally addressed to the church of Egypt alone, it was imposed by Zeno and by his successor Anastasius, on all, under penalty of deposition and exile. A strong admonitory letter was addressed by Felix to Acacius, and another in milder terms to Zeno, the authors of the "Henoticum." All remonstrance proving vain, Felix fulminated an anathema against Acacius, depositing and excommuni- cating him, July 28, A.D. 464. (Liberat. c. 18; Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1072.) This anathema severed the whole of the Eastern church from the West for nearly forty years. [ACACIUS.] Neither emperor nor patriarch took much heed of the condemnation of the Roman see, and continued to press the "Henoticum" everywhere, ejecting the bishops who withheld their signatures, and referring to communists with Petronian threats. (Theoph. p. 114; Liberat. c. 18; Victor. *Tunn. Chron.* ; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xvi. p. 168; Auce, *Art. xcv.*) Calandariu, the patriarch of Antioch, was deposed, and Peter the Fuller reinstated. Thus the three chief sees of the East were in constrained communion, and nearly the whole of the suffrangent bishops had
been either silenced or deposed. Zeno and Anastasius had "made a solitude and called it peace." It would be tedious to narrate in detail the subsequent issues of this unhappy attempt to fold the discordant elements into external union, continued under Anastasius's successors in the see of Constantinople, and the emperor Anastasius. Anastasius, in his earnest desire for peace, required toleration of the bishops of the empire, who were forbidden to force the decrees of Chalcedon on a reluctant diocese, or to compel one which had accepted that council to abandon it. No change was to be introduced in either direction, and those who violated this truce of toleration were deposed with impartial severity. (Evagr. H. E. iii. 30.)

Euphemius was deposed from Constantinople A.D. 495. Macedonius, his successor, began by subscribing the "Henoticum," but overawed by the obstinate opposition of the "Acceomitae" and the other monastic bodies of Constantinople, whom he had endeavoured to reconcile to that instrument, he became an ardent partisan of the council of Chalcedon, and, after having headed the religious tumults in the city, which at one time threatened Anastasius's throne, was, in his turn deposed, and was succeeded by Timotheus, A.D. 511. The new patriarch not only signed the "Henoticum," but pronounced an anathema on the council of Chalcedon. Flavianus, accused of being a concealed Nestorian, was ejected from Antioch in A.D. 512, where the Monophysite Severus, who had raised religious riots in the streets of Alexandria and Constantinople, reigned supreme. Elias of Jerusalem, in spite of his large concessions to the Catholic party, refusing to go all lengths with them, was deposed the next year. "Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly, or, where resistance was made, the two factious fighting in the streets, in the churches. Cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood." (Milman, i. s. p. 245.)

The "Henoticum," having proved so fruitful a source of dissension in the East, was destined to become the watchword of rival parties in the West. Gelasius, the successor of Anastasius II., had sought to re-unite the churches by the proposal, which was also made by the "Henoticum," that Acacius's name, which Gelasius had proposed to expunge, should be quietly left on the dipluchs, and that no more should be said on the subject—a crime against rigid orthodoxy for which Dante consigns him to eternal torments. On his death, in A.D. 498, a contested election ensued, which was exasperated by differences of opinion on the "Henoticum" and the schisms in the East. Two rival pontiffs were consecrated on the same day, Dec. 22, A.D. 499, Laurentius and Symmachus. The former was the advocate of union, the latter its uncompromising opponent. Theodoric, to whom the claims of the rival pontiffs were submitted, decided in favour of Symmachus, who had received the largest number of votes. This choice was fatal to the restoration of peace in the East on the terms of the "Henoticum." The pope and the emperor hurled at one another charges of heresy and messages of defiance. The turbulent orthodox party at Constantinople was supported by representatives of the emperor by the Roman sea. The rebellion of Vitalian, characterized by Gibbon as "the first of the religious wars," whose battle-cry was the council of Chalcedon, was not obscurely censured by Symmachus's still more haughty successor, Hormisdas, who reaped the fruits of the humiliation of the aged Anastasius, and became "the dictator of the religion of the empire."

The final repudiation of Hormisdas of the public anathematization of the authors and maintainers of the "Henoticum" was indignantly rejected by Anastasius. But far from retracting, the pontiff rose in his demands. Anastasius, however, to his honour, though enfeebled by age and calamity, stood firm. He refused to anathematize the memory of Acacius, whose only crime had been that of carrying out measures of toleration with a view to union, and he broke off all communication with Hormisdas. The conflict only ended with the life of Anastasius, who died worn out by strife at the age of nearly ninety years, A.D. 518. His successor, Justin, was an unlettered soldier of unbending orthodoxy. The new patriarch, John of Capadocia, "a man of servile mind though unmeasured ambition," was prepared to adopt any course which would secure his power. He had seconded all the measures of Anastasius, but at the demand of the mob he now hastily assembled a synod of forty bishops, by which anathemas were passed on all upholders of the "Henoticum," the banished bishops were recalled, and the so-called usurpers deposed. All heretics, i.e. those who refused the council of Chalcedon, were made incapable of civil or military office. Hormisdas profited by the favourable opportunity to press his demands, which were admitted without question. The names of the patriarchs Acacius, Fravitta, Euphemius, and Macedonius, together with those of the emperor Zeno and Anastasius, were erased from the dipluchs, and Acacius was branded with a special anathema. The acknowledged orthodoxy of the two last-named patriarchs, though not conspicuous in the "Henoticum," the successor could not outweigh the damming crime of their having dared to recognise Acacius as a legitimate bishop. Fresh disturbances were created by this rigour, especially when it was found that Hormisdas demanded the condemnation of all who had communicated with Acacius, and turned a deaf ear to the repeated applications both of the emperor and the patriarch for some relaxation of these terms. (Evagr. H. E. iv. 4; Labbe, Concil. iv. 1542; Natal. Alexand. Hist. Eccl. tom. ii. p. 448.) Hormisdas at last consented that Epiphanius, John's successor, should act for him in receiving churches into communion. Some honoured names were allowed to remain on the dipluchs, and eventually Euphemius and Macedonius, with Flavian of Antioch, and Elias of Jerusalem, and some others who had died during the separation, were admitted to the Roman Calendars (Tillern. Mon. Eccl. tom. xvi. p. 697; Bolland 25 Apr. p. 373).

Thus ended the unhappy schism which had separated the East and West for nearly forty years. The "Henoticum," the parent of all these
divisions, without being formally repealed, was allowed to sink into oblivion. The four eccumenical councils, including that of Chalcedon, were everywhere received, save in Egypt, and one common thread expressed the religious faith of the Christian world.


HENRIUS, sixth bishop of Vicenza (Vicenzi), circ. 580, between Apollonius and Horotius. He refused to hold communion with his metropolitan, Elias patriarch of Aquileia, and to obey any citation to his synods, lest he should seem to countenance his errors. [Elias (19)].

(Ughell. Ital. Sac. v. 1031; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Ital. v. 821, 954.)

HENWYN, HENY. [HYWYN.]

HEORDWALD, bishop. [HEREWALD.]

HEORTASIUS (HEORTICUS, EORTASUS), bishop of Sardis, who signed the synodal letter issued by the council of Ancyr, 358 (Epiph. Haer. lxxii. 11, p. 859; Manili, iii. 287, where the name is given HEORTICUS). He was deposed by the Acacian council of Constantinople 360, as having been ordained metropolitan without the consent of the bishops of the province (Sozomen, iv. 24). He was present, however, and active in the council of Lampacus, A.D. 364 or 365 (Manili, iii. 213, 377), where he united with a number of other Macedonian bishops in sending a legate to Liberus bishop of Rimous with a libella formally declaring their submission (Socrates, iv. 12), and Liberus wrote them a congratulatory letter in reply. The "letter" is not dated, but Liberus died in the September of A.D. 366. (Jaffé, Reg. Pont. Rom. p. 17.) (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 861; Ceillier, iv. 578.) He is sometimes called EORTASUS.

[7. W. D.]

HEORTICUS, bishop of Metropolis in the province of Pisidia, present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. In the subscriptions he is called bishop of Nicopolis Metropolis. (Manili, viii. 159, 407; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 1057.)

HEORTIS, bishop, an old and attached friend of Chrysostom, who wrote to him from Cucurna, A.D. 404, begging him to cheer his extreme solitude, many trials, and constant dread of banditti, by frequent letters. (Chrys. Epist. 30.)

[6. V.]

HEPHAESTIUS, bishop of Commacum in Pamphylia, who signed the letter of his province to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Manili, viii. 576; Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 1025.)

HERACLITUS, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 233-249. He was the brother of the martyr Philarutus, one of Origen's converts (Eusebius, H. E. vi. 3), and from being a pupil he became an assistant in teaching to Origen, who left the

school to him when he retired from Alexandria to Caesarea (Eusebius, H. E. vi. 15, 20). Heraclea returned the school but a short time, for on the death of Demetrius, he was elected to the archiepiscopal see. Though a disciple of Origen Heraclea did not adopt any of his peculiar views, but voted for his deprivation both from his office as teacher and from his orders, and for his excommunication at the two synods held by Demetrius, nor when elected bishop did he make any attempt to rescind these sentences. Heraclea seems to have been a man of ability, from the fact that he was Origen's successor in the catechetical school. Eusebius (H. E. vi. 31) narrates a visit paid Heraclea by Africanus the amanuensis on the report of his great learning, as also (H. E. vii. 7) on the authority of his successor Dionysius the rule which he followed respecting the treatment of heretics. (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. ii. 392; Photius, Cod. 118; Acta SS. Bell. Jul. iii. 945-7. He was commemorated on Dec. 4 (Cal. Aethiop.). [L. D.]

HERACLEIDAS. [HERACLEIDES.]

HERACLEON (1), a Gaetic described by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iv. 9, p. 585) as the most esteemed (bokwérare) of the school of Valentinus; and, according to Origen (Comm. in S. Joh. p. 2, § 8; Opp. tom. iv. p. 86), said to have been in personal contact (páraisous) with Valentinus himself. He is barely mentioned by Ireneaeus (ii. 41) and by Tertullian (Adv. Val. 4). The common source of Philaster and Pseudo-Tertullian (i.e. probably the earlier treatise of Hippolytus) contained an article on Heracleon between those on Polteraeanus and Secundus, and on Marcus and Colarbasus. Lipsius has conjectured that the sketch of Valentinianism, given in the later treatise of Hippolytus (book 8), is derived from a work of Heracleon, the reason for his guess being that Hippolytus, in the preface to this section, promises to give an account, amongst others, of the doctrines of Heracleon, and that this promise remains unfilled, unless we assume that the general account of the teachings of Valentinus really represents that of Heracleon. But a closer examination of the method of Hippolytus shows that this argument has no force. Hippolytus in his preface follows the order of the earlier treatise, and proposes to treat of the doctrines of Valentinus, of those of Secundus, Polteraeanus and Heracleon, of those of Marcus and Colarbasus. The theory of Lipsius requires Hippolytus to treat separately of each of these heretics, yet it makes him depart from this programme at first starting; for if the section on Valentinus be taken as the fulfilment of the promise to detail the opinions of Valentinus, what becomes of the promise to detail the opinions of Valentinus? It is in any case plain that Hippolytus does not treat separately of Colarbasus. Actually this part of the work diverges itself, in continuity with its preface, into three sections. In the first, which is the only original section, he gives a general account of Valentinianism, and tries to show that it is derived from the heathen philosophy of Pythagoras. Hippolytus (vi. 42, p. 203) appears to claim to have a direct knowledge of the writings of Valentinus; but if we allow that he may have here taken for his guide a treatise, not by Valentinus himself, but by one
of his followers, we have no special reason to think of Heracleon. Hippolytus then copies with abridgment what Irenaeus had said about Secundus, Ptolemaeus, and certain unnamed members of the school; and then what Irenaeus had said about Marcus. There is every reason to think that Hippolytus identified with Heracleon one of the unnamed heretics of the second section, having possibly been taught to do so by Irenaeus in his voce lectures at Rome. For Irenaeus in the passage in question names it as a sect which divided the Valentinians, that some of them commenced their apologetics with a dyad, consisting of a male and female principle, others with a monad, or single principle without consort. Now, Philaster and Pseudo-Tertullian agree in specifying it as the distinctive feature of the teaching of Heracleon, that he commenced with a single principle; though their accounts differ in this, that the former would lead us to think that the original principle, together with its first emanation, formed the first pair of seons; whereas the latter, and probably more correctly, would make the original principle give being to a pair, and would not include itself in the system of pairs of seons. Hippolytus (vi. 55, p. 195) mentions another subject of dispute which divided the Valentinians; the submitters, the Italians, asserting our Lord's body to have been animal (ψωμίου); the other, or Eastern school, maintaining it to have been spiritual. Heracleon and Ptolemaeus are mentioned by Hippolytus as belonging to the first school, Axionicus and Ardesianes (BARDEIANES) to the second. Lipsius has analysed the section in Epiphanius on Heracleon (Haer. 30) and shown that it possesses no independent authority. It is almost all made up by putting together notices in Irenaeus of different unnamed Valentinians. On the whole, it seems to us that the best way of reconciling the celebrity of Heracleon with the small space given to him by writers against Valentinianism is to suppose that he was not the author of any formal exposition of Valentinian doctrine, but only of exegetical works in which the principles of Valentinianism were assumed. At all events it is only of such works of his that we have any express knowledge.

In fact, the chief interest that now attaches to Heracleon is that he is the earliest commentator on the New Testament of whom we have knowledge. Origen, in the still extant portion of his commentary on St. John, quotes Heracleon nearly fifty times, usually controverting, occasionally defending, him. We thus recover large sections of Heracleon's commentary on the 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 8th of John. We have no doubt lost many extracts, owing to the mutilated condition in which Origen's commentary on St. John has come down to us; and the phrase used by Origen, ἐν δὲ καταλαλοστιν ἐξομιλήσεως, suggests that Heracleon's commentary on St. John was written in a like condition of mutilation. Photius (134, Ep. ad Daphn. p. 178; Amphiloch. 246), speaking on the text John i. 17 repels the idea that the words, "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," were spoken in disparagement of the law which "was given by Moses," remarking, "Heracleon might say this, and the disciples of Heracleon." He probably refers to an extract from Heracleon contained in one of the lost sections of Origen's work; for Origen is the only father who quotes Heracleon's commentary, which is not likely to have survived to the time of Photius. There is reason to think that Heracleon wrote commentaries on St. Luke as well as on St. John. He is twice quoted by Clement of Alexandria: in one of the places (Strom. iv. 9) Clement expressly says that his citation is from Heracleon's exposition of Luke xii. 8; in the other (Eclog. ex Script. Proph. p. 995), Clement's quotation is in a commentary on the verses Luke iii. 16, 17, so that it seems probable that it is from an exposition by Heracleon of these verses. The fragments of Heracleon were collected by Grabe (Sporileg. ii. 85, &c.), and reprinted as an appendix to Massuet's, Stieren's, and Migne's editions of Irenaeus. Three short notices may be mentioned in addition; De la Rue, iv. 117, 140, 226; the second recording that Heracleon in John i. 29 read Bethany, not Bethabara; the third referring to the use made by Heracleon of the "preaching of Peter."

The first of the passages quoted by Clement bears on an accusation brought against more than one of the Gnostic sects, that they taught that it was no sin to avoid martyrdom by denying the faith. No exception can be taken to what Heracleon says in this respect. Possibly his judgment might have been different from that of the orthodox as to the occasions when "reason would require" public confession before the magistrates; but his words do not go beyond a perhaps necessary protest against the exaggerated veneration given at the time to such confession. He says, "Men mistake in thinking that the only confession is that made with the voice before the magistrates; there is another confession made in the life and conversation, by faith and works corresponding to the faith. The first confession may be made by a hypocrite; and it is one not required of all; there are many who have never been called on to make it, as for instance Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi [Lebbæus]; the other confession must be made by all. He who is conscious of having sinned in his disposition of heart will confess with the voice also when need shall arise and reason require. Well did Christ use concerning confession the phrase 'in me' (ἐν με) or ἐν ἐμοί), concerning denial the phrase 'me.' A man may confess 'Him' with the voice who really denies Him, if he does not confess Him also in action; but those only confess 'in Him' who live in the confession and in corresponding actions. Nay, it is he himself whom they embrace and who dwells in them who makes confession 'in them'; for 'He cannot deny Himself.' But concerning denial, He did not say whosoever shall deny 'in me,' but whosoever shall deny 'me;' for no one that is 'in Him' can deny Him. And the words 'before men' do not mean before unbelievers only, but before Christians and unbelievers alike; before the one by their life and conversation, before the others in words."

The reader must be struck with the manner in which this exposition assumes the significance of every word in the sacred text commented on; and this characteristic runs equally through the fragments of Heracleon's commentary on St. John, prevailing alike whether the words com-
mented on be our Lord's own or only those of the Evangelist. Thus he calls attention to the facts that in the opening statement of the gospel "all things were made by him," the preposition used is διά, that Jesus is said to have gone down to Capernaum and gone up to Jerusalem; that he was born and not but born to the οίκος, not to θύρα, that he said salvation is of the Jews not in them, and again (iv. 40) that our Lord tarried with the Samaritans, not in them; notice is taken of this in our Lord's discourse with the woman of Samaria, where he first emphasizes his assertion with "Woman believe me"; and though Origen occasionally accuses Heracleon of deficient accuracy, for instance in taking the prophet (ii. 21) as meaning no more than a prophet, "in three days" (li. 19) as meaning no more than "on the third day," yet on the whole the minuteness of Heracleon's examination of the words on which he comments, could not be exceeded by the strongest believer in verbal-inspiration at the present day. He attempts to reconcile the differences between the Evangelists, as for instance our Lord's ascription to the Baptist of the titles "Elias" and "prophet," with John's own disclaimer of these titles. He finds mysteries in the numbers which occur in the narrative, in the forty and six years which the temple was in building, in the six husbands of the woman of Samaria (for such was his reading), in the two days which our Lord abode with the people of the city, in the seventh hour at which the nobleman's son healed. He thinks it necessary to reconcile his own doctrine with that of the sacred writer, even at the cost of some violence of interpretation. Thus he declares that the Evangelist's assertion that all things were made by the Logos must be understood only of the things of the visible creation, his own doctrine being that the higher or second world was not so made, but that the lower creation was made by the Logos through the instrumentality of the Demiurge. Instances of this kind where the interpreter is forced to reject the most obvious meaning of the text are sufficiently numerous to shew that the gospel was not written in the interests of Valentinianism; but it is a book which Heracleon evidently recognized as of such authority, that he must perforce have it on his side.

When striving to find Valentinianism in the Gospel, the instrument he usually employs is the method of spiritual interpretation. Thus the nobleman (Basaλιγδος, iv. 47) is the Demiurge, a petty prince, his kingdom being limited and temporary, the servants are his angels, the son is the man who beholds the Demiurge. As he finds the φύσις represented in the nobleman's son, so again he finds the φύσις οριστή in the woman of Samaria. The water of Jacob's well which she rejected is Judaism; the husband whom she is to call is no earthly husband, but

her spiritual bridegroom from the Pleneros; the other husbands with whom she previously had committed fornication, represent the matter with which the spiritual have been entangled; that she is no longer to worship either in "this mountain" or in "Jerusalem," means that she is not, like the world, a demigod, the Hyle, or kingdom of the devil, nor like the Jews to worship the creator or Demiurge; her watering-pot is her good disposition for receiving life from the Saviour. It must be observed that, though the results of Heracleon's method are heretical, the method itself is commonly used by orthodox fathers. They do not merely find spiritual interpretations for the details of parables, but they do not find it inconsistent with their full faith in the literal truth of the scripture histories, to trace a spiritual significance in many of the things recorded.

Heracleon's doctrine is not orthodox, but his principles of interpretation cannot be said to differ essentially from those of Origen himself.

Many other parallels between instances adduced to Heracleon's exposition, that the cords with which our Lord drove out the traffickers from the temple, represent the power of the Holy Spirit; and the wood to which he assumes they were attached, the wood of the cross; and in the same context, Origen gives explanations of the colt and ass on which our Lord rode into Jerusalem, of the village in which He found them, the branches cut from the trees, the crowds that accompanied Him, and so forth.

Origen even occasionally blames Heracleon for being too easily content with more obvious interpretations. Heracleon, for instance, at first is satisfied to take "whosoever catcheth I am not worthy to loose," as meaning no more than "for whom I am not worthy to perform menial offices," and he has to admit Origen's objection when he tries, however unsuccessfully, to investigate what the shoe represented. Heracleon understands the Jew's question "will he kill himself?" (viii. 22), as most readers do now; Origen observes that the Jews could not rationally have supposed Jesus to mean that he was going to a place worse than that reserved for them; they must have had a traditional knowledge that the Saviour was not to have His life taken from Him, but to yield it of Himself; and they must have supposed Him to mean to claim the power of doing this, and so of ascending to a place which they could not attain. It does not appear to us that Heracleon used his method of interpretation controversially to establish Valentinian doctrine, but rather that being a Valentinian of the second generation, thoroughly imbued with a belief of the truth of the familiar doctrines of that sect, he found those doctrines indicated in the passages on which he commented, precisely in the same way that orthodox commentators have found the doctrines which they believed to be true.

One other of Heracleon's interpretations deserves to be mentioned. The meaning which the Greek fathers, John vii. 44, most naturally convey, is that of the pro-Hieronymian translation "mendax est sicut et pater ejus," and so they are generally understood by Greek fathers, though in various ways they escape attributing a father to the devil. Origen here makes το φάσεστε the nominative to Λαοδ, and understands
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it to mean any lying spirit: Epiphanius (Haer. xi. 6, p. 287; lxxvi. 64, p. 677) makes Judas the liar and Cain the father; Cyril. Alex. in loc. refutes the opinion of some of his predecessors, who inferred from the text that the chief and father of the devils had been in our Lord's time already consigned to the abyss, and that it was a subordinate devil who tempted the Jews. His own opinion is that the father of the Jews is Cain, and his father the devil. We learn from a catena that this was also the interpretation of Ammonius. Philebus (Quoted. Amphil. lib. iii. ch. 88) says that the speaker of the lie is the Jew, and his father the devil. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar consider that the Evangelist shews that he embraced the opinion of the Valentinians and some earlier Gnostic sects that the father of the devil was the Demiurge or God of the Jews. But this idea was unknown to Heracleon, who here interprets the father of the devil, that is, the chief and father of a civil nature or spiritual. Origen objects that if the devil be evil by the necessity of his nature, he ought rather to be pitied than blamed.

To judge from the fragments that remain, Heracleon's bent was rather practical than speculative. He says nothing of the Gnostic theories as to stages in the origin of the universe; the prologue of St. John does not tempt him into mention of the Valentinian Aenology. Indeed it is to be noted that he does not use the word aëon in the sense employed by other Valentinian writers, but rather where according to their use we should expect the word Pleroma; and this last word he uses in a special sense, describing the spiritual husband of the Samaritan woman as her Pleroma, that is to say the complement, or supply of what was lacking to perfection. We find in his system only two beings unknown to orthodox theology, the Demiurge, and apparently a second Son of Man; for on John iv. 37 he distinguishes a higher Son of Man who sows from the Saviour who reaps. Heracleon gives as great prominence as any orthodox writer to Christ and to His redeeming work. But all mankind are not alike in a condition to profit by His redemption. The church is the new order of creatures; first the Hylie or material, formed of the Æm, which is the substance of the devil, incapable of immortality. Secondly, the psychic or animal belonging to the kingdom of the Demiurge; their ψυχή is naturally mortal, but capable of being clothed with immortality, and it depends on their disposition (θέωσ) whether they become sons of God, or children of the devil; and, thirdly, the pneuma or spiritual, who are by nature of the divine essence, though entangled with matter and needing redemption to be delivered from it. These are the special creation of the Logos; they live in Him, and become one with Him. In the second class Heracleon seems to have had the Jews specially in his mind, and to have regarded them with a good deal of tenderness. They are the children of Abraham, who if they do not love God, at least do not hate Him. Their king, the Demiurge, is represented as not hostile to the supreme, and though shortsighted and ignorant, yet as well disposed to faith and ready to implore the Saviour's help for his subjects whom he had not himself been able to deliver. When his ignorance has been removed, he and his redeemed subjects will enjoy immortality in a place raised above the material world.

Besides the passages on which he comments Heracleon refers to the Epistles to the Corinthians. He is of that opinion that a typographical error has caused the text to be translated, and what he means is to demonstrate from the whole of the narrative how the Savior's help for his subjects whom he had not himself been able to deliver. When his ignorance has been removed, he and his redeemed subjects will enjoy immortality in a place raised above the material world.

The story Pseudo-Epiphanius tells is that the heresy of Heracleon consisted in his teaching that a baptized person cannot be affected by sin, no matter what actions he may commit; that as snow melts when brought into contact with fire, so the quality of sin disappears out of all his actions. He tells that certain Sicilian bishops assembled a synod against him, which drew up a letter to Alexander (bishop of Rome about a.d. 115), begging him to send some one to confute Heracleon; that Alexander accordingly both wrote a book against him and sent a presbyter, Sabinianus, who confuted the heretic so effectually that he took ship by night and fled no one knew whither. Sbarrales, quoted by De Rossi (Rom. Sott. ii. 207), and after him by Lipaius (Chron. der röm. Emp. 125), states that some strange account may have originated in a distortion of the story of the anti-pope Heraclius, who "vetuit lapsos peocata dolore," and who possibly may, like his competitor Eusebius, have been banished to Sicily. But it seems to us rather too complimentary to "Pseudo-Epiphanius" to assume that a story peculiar to him has been built on any substratum of fact.

Considerable interest attaches to the determination of the date of Heracleon on account of his use of St. John's Gospel, which clearly had attained so high an authority when he wrote that it must then have been a work of considerable standing. It seems to us, however, that the mere fact that a book was held in equal honour by the Valentinians and the orthodox proves that it must have attained its position before the separation of the Valentinians from the church; and, therefore, that as far as the controversy concerning the Fourth Gospel is concerned, it is of less importance to determine the exact date of Heracleon. To us it seems that the decade 170-180 may probably be fixed for the centre of his activity. This would not be inconsistent with the truth of the report that he had been person-

Possibly this may have been the earlier use of the word; see in the manner in which the phrase "incorruptible Aeon" is used (Irenæus, i. 30).

4 Heinrich refers to Irenæus, i. xii. 4, but the question there discussed is quite different, viz. whether the title Son of Man has reference to the Aeon Anthropos or to the first Principle, which in the older Gnostic systems was given the title Man.
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ally instructed by Valentinus, who continued to teach as late as 180. And it would allow time for Heracleon to have gained celebrity before Clement wrote, one of whose references to Heracleon is in what was probably one of his earliest works. He had evidently long passed from the scene when Origen wrote. Concerning Heracleon may be consulted Neander (Gen. Entwick., 143, and Gesch. Hist. ii. 135); Heinrici (Val. Gnom., 127); Westcott (N. T. Com., 299).

HERACLEON (2) (TRACLEON), bishop of Tralles (Evanthia), in the plain of the Maeander in the ecclesiastical province of Asia, present at the council of Ephesus, 431. (Mansi, vi. 586 c; 613; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 996.) [L. D.]

HERACLEONAS, FLAVIUS (also called Heracleius by Niceph. C. and Suidas), emperor, A.D. 641, son of the emperor Heracleus and his second wife Martina. Many particulars of his short reign are given by Nicephorus patriarch of Constantinople in his Breviarium, and a few circumstances are given by Theophanes. He was born in the province of Lazica in Colchis, which his father was traversing, accompanied by Martina, in his expedition against Persia (Brev. p. 17, ed. Petav. in Patr. Gr. tom. c. p. 899). This was the first expedition of Heracleus into the east, and Petavius fixes 622 as the year, while others give 626. In 631 Heracleonas was created Caesar by his father (Br. 26); about 632 he was crowned (ib. 30), and soon afterwards named consul (ib. 31). On his father's death Heracleonas and his half-brother Constantinus reigned jointly for one hundred and three days (Br. 33), from March 11 to June 23, 641, as Petavius reckons, until the death of Constantius, after which Heracleonas shared the throne with his mother. One of the first acts of Heracleonas was to dedicate to God in the great church his father's crown, valued at seventy pounds of gold. It had been buried with Heracleus, but was afterwards removed from the church by Constantinus. He also restored Cyrus patriarch of Alexandria to his see. But acts of tyranny against the nobility and the ministers of the crown brought the emperor very near to a civil war, and the troops under command of Valentius took up a hostile position at Chaledon. Martina and her son, as well as the patriarch Pyrrhus, were accused of plotting against the life of young Heracleus Constans the orphan son of Constantius. In vain Heracleonas stood sponsor for the infant at the font and crowned him with the diadem of his great father, and made every ostensible profession of affection and goodwill before the people. The patriarch was expelled in a riot, Martina and her son were banished, she suffering the loss of her tongue and he of his nose. Valentius also, who had come to terms with the court, seems to have been implicated in the same charge, as he shared in the sentence of exile. Theophanes states that Heracleonas reigned six months after Constantius, and Petavius computes the expulsion to have occurred in Dec. 641, though some assign the event to Jan. 642. Heracleonas was succeeded by his nephew Heracleus Constantus already mentioned. (Theoph. Chron. A.C. 632, p. 253; Du Cange, Fam. August. 101.) [C. H.]

HERACLIANUS (1), bishop of Pismirus (Pessinus), c. A.D. 347. He was a disciple of St. Severus archbishop of Ravenna, who appointed him bishop of Pismirus. He was present at the council of Sardica. (Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. ii. 948; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, iii. 341.) [R. S. C.]


HERACLIANUS (3), sixth bishop of Sens. [ERACLAINUS.]

HERACLIANUS (4), seventh in the series of the bishops of Toulouse, his predecessors for nearly a century being unknown. He was present at the council of Agde, in A.D. 506, and was succeeded by St. Germanus not many years afterwards (Gall. Christ. xiii. 7; Mansi, viii. 337). [S. A. B.]

HERACLIANUS (5) (HERACLIUS), count of Africa, succeeding Bathanarius. In the opinion of some he was the husband of Thermantia, niece of the emperor Theodosius (Du Cange, Fam. August. p. 61). In the reign of Honorius, A.D. 415, he revolted, and his brief usurpation seems to have brought a temporary triumph to the Donatists (Hieron. Dial. adv. Pelag. lib. iii. cap. 19, p. 804, Patr. Lat. xxii. 588 c). Passing over with a fleet to Italy he was defeated at Uricium by count Maruinus, and returning to Carthage was beheaded. Jerome in his commentary on Ezekiel refers to him as an illustration of Ps. ixxiii. 7, "Ye are gold," &c., as one of the highest rank forfeiting his honour and his life (Comment. in Ezek. lib. ix. cap. 28, p. 329, in Patr. Lat. xcvii. 268 a). [C. H.]

HERACLIANUS (6), bishop of Chaledon, a vigorous opponent of the Manicheans. (Phot. Bibl. cod. 231, p. 287.) Photius (cod. 85) describes his work Adversus Manichaeos in twenty books, as composed in a clever and dignified style, refuting the Erosionomia, the Liber Giganteus, and the Theauri of the Manicheans. Heracleianus reviews the authors who preceded him in writing against this sect, such as Hegemonius, Titus, George of Laodicea, Serapion, Diodorus, briefly supplying their omissions and citing in full their best arguments with comments of his own. A fragment of his letter to a certain Achiilus, to whom his work appears to have been addressed, has been preserved by Maximus the Confessor. (Maxim. Confess. Opusc. Thed. p. 65, in Migne, Patr. Gr. xcii. 125 c; and also in Cave, i. 551.) [C. H.]

HERACLIDAS (1), Manichean. [APHRODITUS, HIERACAS.]

HERACLIDAS (2), steward (procurator) of the imperial revenues in Africa, to whom reference was to be made in case of necessity, in order to provide money sufficient to pay the clergy to the Catholic clergy, at the command of Constantine, A.D. 312 (Euseb. H. E. x. 6). [H. W. P.]

HERACLIDAS (3), a young friend of Amphilochius, with whom he denounced the profession of a barrister, and devoted himself to an
ascetic life. Having passed through Caesarea on his way to join his friend, he was detained by Basil, whom he had visited for the purpose of receiving his instructions, and lodged by him in the hospital he had recently erected, c. 373. Basil wrote a long letter to Amphilochius in the name of Heraclides, containing instructions as to a religious life, and begging him to come and share with him the benefit of his instructions. (Bas. Epist. 150 [392].) [E. V.]

HERACLIDAS (4), bishop of Nyssa about 440, wrote two epitaphs in imitation of a Messalian book, using language which in the judgment of Photius (Cod. 52) furnished a proof of the antiquity of the veneration of images. [G. S.]


HERACLIDAS (2). In the subscriptions to the creed of the first Constantinopolitan council, A.D. 381, is found Heracleides Cituaneus, in the margin Ptoymenas (Mansi, iii. 570). Heraclides is supposed to have been bishop of Petneasus on the river Eurymedon in Blemmyca, or of Tyrus (Tyrnæum) in Pisdia. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 1023, 1047; Gams, Series Episc. 450, 451.) [L. D.]

HERACLIDAS (3), bishop of Oxyrhynchus in the Heptanomus, in Lower Egypt. He succeeded the heretical bishop Theodorus, c. 384, and is possibly referred to by Rufinus. (Ruf. Hist. Monach. cap. 5, in Patrolog. Lat. xxi. 408; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 578.) [J. de S.]

HERACLIDAS (4), a bishop in Cyprus in the end of the 4th century; one of those to whom the letter of Theophilus of Alexandria in condemnation of Origen was addressed, A.D. 400. (Jerome, ep. 92, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

HERACLIDAS (5) CYPRUS, bishop of Ephesus; a native of Cyprus, who had received a liberal education, was versed in the Scriptures, and had served in some years in the desert of Scetis under Evagrius. He then became deacon to Chrysostom, and was in immediate attendance on him. On the deprivation of Antoninus bishop of Ephesus, A.D. 401, there being a deadlock in the election through the number of rival candidates and the violence of the opposing factions, Chrysostom brought Heraclides forward, and he was elected by the votes of seventy bishops to the vacant see. The election at first only increased the disturbance, and loud complaints were made of the unfitness of Heraclides for the office, which detained Chrysostom in Asia. (Socr. H. E. vi. 11; Soc. H. E. viii. 6; Pallad. p. 138.) At the assembling of the synod of the Oak, A.D. 403, Heraclides was summoned to answer certain specified charges brought against him by Macarius, bishop of Magnesia, a bishop named Isaac, and a monk named John. Among these charges were those of having stolen a deacon's clothes at Caesarea, and of having unjustly scourged some persons at Ephesus and dragged them in chains through the city, and of entertaining Origениzeng tenets.

The urgency with which the condemnation of Chrysostom was pressed forward retarded the suit against Heraclides, which had come to no issue at the time of his great master's deposition and banishment. The sudden recall of Chrysostom did not at once free Heraclides from the machinations of his persecutors. According to Socrates and Sozomen, whose account, however, is called in question by Tillemont (vol. xi. 599, "Chrysost." note lxiii), fresh accusations were brought against him after Chrysostom's return. His friends and those of Chrysostom protested against the illegality of taking proceedings against him in his absence, and the matter was expounded so warmly by the populace that singular frays took place in the streets between the people of Constantinople, who were ardently attached to the cause of Chrysostom, and the Alexandrian sailors at the beck of Theophilus. The quarrel became at last so serious that Theophilus and those who thought with him consulted their safety by flight (Socr. H. E. vi. 17; Soc. H. E. viii. 19; Phot. Cod. 59). After Chrysostom's second and final exile in 404 Heraclides was his fellow sufferer. He was deposed by the party in power, and put in prison at Nicomedia, where, when Palladius wrote, he had been already languishing four years. A eunuch who, according to Palladius, was stained with the grossest vices, was consecrated bishop of Ephesus in his room (Pallad. Dial. ed. Bigot, p. 139). Olympias informed Chrysostom, at Heraclides' request, of the miseries of which he was involved. He replied that, much as he desired to help him, he could do nothing for him but acquaint Pentadis with his case, and beg her to do what she could to relieve him (Chrys. Epist. 14, p. 600).

On the subscription to this Heraclides of the Jeanic History of Palladius, under the name of Paradosus Heraclides, see article PALLADIUS; also Fabricius, Dih. Grec. x. 117; Cellarius, vii. 487. [E. V.]

HERACLIDAS (6), bishop of Thyinis or Potolémais in the Thebaid, present at the third general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. (Mansi, iv. 1128; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 605.) [J. de S.]

HERACLIDAS (7), bishop of Heraclea Superior in the Heptanomus. He was present at the third general council at Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Mansi, iv. 1128, 1221), and is possibly the same bishop Heraclides to whom Isidore of Pelusium addressed several epitaphs. (Isidor. Epist. lib. i. 19, 182, 183; lib. ii. 74, 220, 241, 242; ill. io; Patrof. Grac. xivii. 195 seq.) [J. de S.]


HERACLIDIANUS, bishop of Settae (Satta, Sitiae), in the province of Lydia, signed the synodal letter of the province of Lydia to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 378, where "Sena" is for Settenus; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 880.) [L. D.]

HERACLITAE (Pseudo-Hieron. Indic. de Haeres. cap. 24 in Oehler, Corp. Haeres. i. 293), heretics, properly Hiericitae. Catelius observes
HERACLITUS

HERACLITUS (1) (Ὑδακλείς, Euseb.; Ὡδακής, HERACLITUS Al. HERACLITUS, Jerom.), author of Comentarii in Apostolum, not extant, in the period of Commodus and Severus. (Euseb. H. E. v. 27; Jerom. de Vir. Ill. cap. 46; Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 95; Cellier, i. 537.) [C. H.]

HERACLITUS (2), bishop of Tamiathis, present at the council of Ephesus, 431 (Mansi, iv. 1129). Le Quen (Or. Chr. ii. 589) doubts whether the city is to be identified with Damietta, and places it in the Heptanomus. In this uncertainty Gams puts the bishop of Tamiathis in both localities (S. Epc. 461). Both Le Quen and Gams write the bishop's name Heraclius. [C. H.]

HERACLITUS (3), bishop of Arca or Arca in Phoenicia, between Tripolis and Antioch. He is stated in some of the Latin codices to have been present at the fourth general council, A.D. 451, where Photius of Tyre signed in his name (Mansi, vii. 436; Le Quen, Or. Chr. i. 826). He also signed the synodical epistle of his province addressed to the emperor Leo, assenting to the decrees of Chalcedon, and describing the recent murder of Proterius. [J. de S.]

HERACLITUS. [ERACLITUS.]

HERACLITUS (1), bishop of Amastris on the coast of Paphlagonia, mentioned in the Menaeus as contemporary with the childhood of St. Hyacinth, c. A.D. 300. (Basil. Menal. Jul. 18; Le Quen, Or. Chr. i. 861.) [L. D.]

HERACLITUS (2), anti pope. [EUSEBIUS (1), p. 304.]

HERACLITUS (3), the first known bishop of Zela. He subscribed the canons of the councils of Ankyra and Neocesarea in 314. (Mansi, ii. 534, 548.) The subscriptions in Manzi represent the see as belonging to Armenia Major. Le Quen (Or. Chr. i. 541) places it in the ecclesiastical province of Helenopontus. The next known occupant of this see is Atticus. [F. A.]

HERACLITUS (4), bishop of Baris in Pisidia, one of the Nicene fathers, A.D. 325. (Mansi, ii. 695; Le Quen, Or. Chr. i. 1049.) [L. D.]

HERACLITUS (5), fourth bishop of Troyes in the 4th cent. (Gall. Christ. xii. 484.) [R. T. S.]

HERACLITUS (6), bishop of Cidissus in Phrygia Pacatiana. His name was subscribed to the faith of Chalcedon in his absence by Nunechius of Laodicea, A.D. 451. (Mansi, vii. 165; Le Quen, Or. Chr. i. 801.) [L. D.]

HERACLITUS (7), bishop of Azotus. He took part in the "Latriocium" at Ephesus, A.D. 449, but retracted at Chalcedon. (Mansi, vi. 850, 918; vii. 440; Le Quen, Or. Chr. iii. 661.) [J. de S.]

HERACLITUS, bishop of Tamiathis. [HERACLITUS (2).]

HERACLITUS (8), bishop of Comana, in the province of Armenia Secunda; present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. He subscribed the condemnation of Dionysus at the third session of the council (Hard. Concil. ii. 304 A), and the synodical letter of the council to Leo the Great (Leo Mag. Ep. 98, p. 1104; Oriens Christ. i. 443.) [C. T.]

HERACLITUS (9), fourteenth bishop of Sais, c. 496, was present at Rheims when Chas was baptized. He erected a convent for nuns (or, according to the Bollandists, a monastery for men) at Sais, and was there buried. His acts are lost, having been burnt. He was commemorated on June 8. (Boll. Acta SS. Jun. ii. 78; Gallia Christ. xii. 5; Gams, S. Epc. 629.) [R. T. S.]

HERACLITUS (10) (ERACLITUS), bishop of Chalcedon in Bithynia c. A.D. 500, a strong opponent both of the Monophysites, and of the Manichees; fragments exist of his books against Soterichus of the Cappadocian Caesares, the friend of Gelasius of Antioch; Photius (Bib. Cod. 85, 251) high praises his works against the Manichees. (Le Quen, Oriens Christ. i. 602; Migne, Patr. Gr. cii.) [L. D.]

HERACLITUS (11), fifteenth archbishop of Paris, between Astdemus and Probaus. He was present at the first council of Orleans in 511, and is addressed, together with two other prelates, in a letter of St. Remigius, archbishop of Rheims (Migne, Patr. Lat. ixv. 996; cf. Cellier, xi. 80; Manzi, viii. 356; Gall. Christ. vii. 16.) [S. A. B.]

HERACLITUS (12), twelfth bishop of St. Paul de Trois-Chateaux, between Floriacus and Victor, was present at the council of Carpentras held in A.D. 527, the second of Orange and the third of Vaison in 529, and the fourth of Orleans in 541. It has been conjectured that the Heraclius, to whom Avitus, archbishop of Vienna, addressed his forty-seventh letter, was identical with this bishop. He praises him for his defence of the catholic faith before the Arian Gundobald, and prophecies his ascension to the episcopate. The answer of Heraclius is also in existence (Lubbe, Sac. Conc. viii. 708, 718, 728, ix. 120, Florence, 1739-98; Migne, Patr. Lat. ii. 924 n. 265; Cellier, x. 562; Gall. Christ. i. 707; Hist. Lit. de la Fr. iii. 187.) [S. A. B.]

HERACLITUS (13), 9th bishop of Saintes. When the bishops assembled at the council of Saintes deposed Emerius from that see, they put in his place Heraclius a priest of Bordeaux (562 or 563). But Emerius was immediately restored by Charibert, in defiance of the sentence of the council [EMERITES]. (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. iv. 26; Gall. Christ. ii. 1057.) [S. A. B.]

HERACLITUS (14), 8th bishop of Digne, succeeding Hilarius, and followed by Agapius and Bebe, present at the fourth council of Paris, A.D. 573, the first of Magon about 581 and the second of Magon in 593 (Mansi, i. 998, 916, 997; Gall. Christ. iii. 1115.) [S. A. B.]

HERACLITUS (15) (ERACLITUS), eighth bishop of Angoulême, between Frontenius and Nicatius. He had been employed as ambassador by Childebert I., and was consecrated about 577. He suffered much from the persecution of Natusius,
HERACLUS

count of Angoulême, who accused him of harboring the murderers of his uncle Marcellinus, and took away by force from the church of Angoulême, the lands which his uncle had bequeathed to it. Heracleius died about A.D. 580. [Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. v. 37; Gall. Christ. ii. 980.]

[SA. B.]

HERACLUS (16), ST., eighth archbishop of Tarentaise, succeeding Martinus, and followed by Firminus or Firmius, towards the close of the sixth century. [Gall. Christ. xii. 703.]

[SA. B.]

HERACLUS (17), bishop of Samos at the Nicene council of 787; his name is found at the beginning of the seventh session. (Mansi, xiii. 373; Le Quien, Oeces. Christ. i. 931.) [L.D.]

HERACLUS (18), bishop of Junopolis (Abonotichus) on the coast of Phaphagonia, present at the Nicene council, A.D. 787. (Mansi, xiii. 369; Le Quien, Oeces. Chr. i. 556.) [L.D.]

HERACLUS (19)—May 4. Martyr with Justus and Maurus at Fulginiun in Umbria. He was converted by Felicianus the apostle of Umbria in the 3rd century. He was arrested by the president Aurelius during the Decian persecution, and beheaded outside the city at the first milestone on the Roman road. [FELICIANUS (1).] (Ugell. Ital. Sacr. i. 688 B.; Acta SS. Bell. Mai. i. 452.) [G.T.S.]

HERACLUS (20)—March 9, martyr. [FORTY MARTYRS.]

HERACLUS (21), count mentioned by Athenasius as inciting the populace to persecute the Catholic congregations. (Athenas. Opp. i. 298; Baron. A. E. ann. 342, xia.) [C.H.]

HERACLUS (22), a native of Tyre, who had been priest of Hercules in that city. To avoid the charge of sorcery he fled to Cyzicus, where he preserved himself a convert and received baptism from the bishop Eleusius, by whom he was also admitted to the diocese without due investigation. When apprised of the charges against him, Eleusius refused to degrade and excommunicate him. This was made one of the grounds of Eleusius's deposition by the council at Constantinople, A.D. 360 (Socr. H. E. ii. 42; Soz. H. E. iv. 24). [E.V.]

HERACLUS (23), a deacon of Pannonia at the end of the 4th century, the bearer of letters to St. Jerome, then at Bethlehem. He was sent (A.D. 397) by Castrutius (q. v.), who had intended to go to Bethlehem, but through old age and blindness could get no further than Cissa; and also by his bishop, Amabilis, who after urging Jerome many times by letters to interpret for him the visions of Isaias, and receiving no reply, applied to him, in person, for a personal agency of Heraclius. Jerome replied to Castrutius (ep. 68, ed. Vall.), and also wrote the commentary, which, thirteen years afterwards, he incorporated as the fifth book in his Commentary on Isaias (Pref. to Comm. on Is. Jerome, vol. iv. 168, ed. Vall.). Heraclius seems to have endeared himself to Jerome, who exacted from him a promise to return, which he performed in the following year (398), when he brought with him the letter of Vitalis (q. v. ep. 72, ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

HERACLUS (24)—May 17. Martyr with Paulinus Aquilinus and two others at Nividunum or Novidunum (Nyons), on the Lake of Geneva. (Mort. Usuard.) [G.T.S.]

HERACLUS (25), a deacon of Theopolis (as Antioch was then called) representing Ephraim, his metropolitan at the council of Constantinople in 536 (Mansi, viii. 880, 920, 928, 938, 949, 977). [T. W. D.]

HERACLUS (26), emperor A.D. 610-641. He was son of an archax of Africa of the same name, who had distinguished himself in the wars against Persia under Maurice, A.D. 586 (Le Beau, x. 245), and to whom the inhabitants of Constantinople, oppressed by the tyranny of Phocas, emperor A.D. 602-610, appealed for deliverance. He was in turn probably a descendant of an Heraclius, a consul and native of Edessa, who had distinguished himself under the emperor Leo, and had been sent by him against the Vandals, A.D. 471 (Theoph. Chron. p. 181, ed. Bohn). The elder Heraclius handed over the conduct of the expedition which he fitted out in response to this invitation to his son, aided by his cousin Nicephorus. After a reign now so fruitful for the rise within sight of the imperial palace, and the execution of Phocas, Heraclius mounted the imperial throne and established a dynasty which arrested for a time the decay of the Roman empire, and survived directly throughout the 7th century, and indirectly through the iconoclastic emperors, for well-nigh two centuries. [LEO III.; IRENE; PHOCAS.] A man whose reign was so fruitful in practical results, being "one of the most remarkable epochs, both in the history of the empire and in the annals of mankind" (Finlay, Hist. of Greece, i. 313), is well worthy of careful attention. The history of his wars with the Persians and other barbarian nations will be found in detail in the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, and in the authorities there quoted. Here we shall deal with his life solely in its religious aspects, referring the reader for fuller details to the article on MONOTHEISM, the origin of which is due to his efforts after ecclesiastical comprehension. Three points are specially worthy of notice under this head: (1) his attitude towards the Jews; (2) his celebrated Ethesia, which originated Monothelism, A.D. 638; (3) the policy which he pursued in the eastern provinces of Europe. (1) His attitude towards the Jews.—In the beginning of the 7th century the Jews had vastly increased in numbers and importance in Greece, Africa, Spain, Georgia, and Arabia. This increase of their numbers and wealth soon roused the bigotry and jealousy of the Christians, while the deplorable condition of the Roman empire, and of the Christian population in the East, inspired the Jews with expectations of re-establishing their national independence, under the long-expected Messiah (Milman, Lat. Christ. tom. ii. p. 183, ed. 1807; Finlay, L. c. p. 325). (GURAM.) This feeling had already found vent under Phocas in an active persecution of the Jews, but it was carried out more rigorously under Heraclius, who attempted, by enforcing compulsory baptism, to bring them over to the church.
[GEORGIUS (73).] Heracleius not only practised every cruelty to effect this object within the Roman empire, but also induced the Gothic sovereigns of Spain to second his exertions in this direction, though, to their credit be it said, even then some Christians were found enlightened enough to disapprove of such violent conversions. (Isidor. Hisp. Chron. Goth., where speaking of king Sisebut, with whom Heracleius concluded a treaty with such a provision, he says, "Aemulationem quidem Dei habitae sed non secundum scientiam. Potestas enim compellat quos provocare dei ratione oportuit"; cf. Neander, Th., ed. v. 203.) A prophecy, said to have been current about this time, which declared that the Roman empire would be overthrown by a circumcised people, may have helped to intensify the persecution.

(2) Heracleius's efforts after ecclesiastical comprehension found a vent in the celebrated Ἀθέσεως τῆς πίστεως, published towards the close of 633, and again, according to Clark's ed. v. 203. The history of this celebrated document will be further discussed and illustrated in the article MONOTHEISM. The causes which led up to its issue were briefly the following. Mono-physitism had broken up the unity of the empire. Egypt and Syria had been alienated from Constantinople by ecclesiastical disputes which Heracleius, in view of the attacks of the Persians on the one hand and of the Saracens on the other, strove to compose by an imperial edict. But instead of composing the dissensions, this edict served only to intensify fresh life into them. (See the articles CYRUS OF Alexandria, HONORIUS of Rome, SOPHONIUS of Jerusalem, SIGEOS of Constantinople, MAXIMUS Abbot, THEODORUS of Pharan, MONOTHEISM; Neander, H. E. v. 116, 239-254, ed. Bohn; Gieseler, H. E. ii. 172, ed. Clark; Ceillier, x. 760; Mansi, x. 992; Hefele, Concil. iv. 48, ed. Paris, 1870; Ersch und Gruber, Encyklop. lxxxiv. 160; Herzog, Real Encyklop. v.)

(3) The establishment of the people now constituting the principality of Servia, which has exerted such an important influence on Eastern Europe, is originally due to Heracleus. He formed a permanent barrier in Europe against the encroachments of the Avars and Slavonians. The imperial armies which, in the time of the emperor Maurice, had waged an active war in Illyricum and Thrace, and frequently invaded the territories of the Avars, had melted away during the reign of Phocas. The only feasible plan then was the establishment of powerful colonies of tribes hostile to the Avars and their Slavonian allies, in the deserted provinces of Dalmatia and Illyricum. To accomplish this object, Heracleus induced the Serbs or Western Slavonians, who occupied the country about the Carpathian mountains, and who had successfully opposed the extension of the Avar empire in that direction, to abandon their ancient seats, and move down to the south into the region of the Huns, that is to say, into the Adriatic. The Slavonian people of Illyricum and Dalmatia long regarded themselves as bound to pay a certain degree of territorial allegiance to the eastern empire (Constant. Porphyry. de Administ. Imp. cc. 31-36). A careful study of the original settlement under Heracleus would perhaps throw considerable light upon the long history of the eastern question, and even upon its present position (cf. Evagri. H. E. v. 1; Finlay's Hist. of Greece, ii. 331).

Among the other notable events of his reign was the capture of Jerusalem and of the supposed true cross by the Persians in the earlier years of his reign, and the great victory by Heracleus in 628, and its solemn restoration in 629. His latter days were rendered miserable by the invasions of the Saracens, combined as it would seem with most distressing neuralgia in the head, the result, perhaps, of consequent mental anxiety. The Arab historians tell us that in exchange for a splendid ransom which Heracleus sent in present to the Caliph Omar, he returned him a miraculous cap, which, so long as he wore it, gave him relief from his pain. On this they ground a tale of his conversion to the religion of Islam. The same writers represent him however as practically holding his throne by the pleasure of the caliph, which is clearly contrary to fact (Neale, Book of the Rise and Progress, i. 65; Finlay, Hist. of Greece, chronol. table prefixed to tom. i.).

Heracleius was twice married; first to Eudokia, daughter of Bogatus an African nobleman; secondly, to his niece Martina, a union which was looked upon as incestuous, and from which the patriarch Sergius in vain endeavored to dissuade him. (Theophan. Chronog. p. 459. ed. Bonn; Le Beau, Le Bas-Empire, tom. xi. c. 56, 57, 58, ed. Saint-Martin; Gibbon, cap. xlvii.; Du Cange, Fam. August. p. 100.)

HERACLONAS, emperor. [HERACLIDIANAE.]

HERAIS—June 28, martyr at Alexandria, a disciple in the school of Origen. While yct a catechumen she received, as Origen expressed it, "baptism by fire." (Chrys. H. E. vi. 4; Mart. Vet. Rom.; Mart. Usuard.) [Q. T. S.]

HERASMUS, martyr. [EMMANUEL (C.).]

HERASTUS, martyr at Philippi, commemorated on July 26; supposed to have been the Erastus of Acts xix. 22. (Usuard.) [C. H.]

HERBALDUS, bishop. [GAMALDULUS.]

HERBERT (HERBERET, HERBERT), a priest, and one of St. Cuthbert's oldest and most attached friends. He lived as a hermit on the beautiful isle on Derwentwater which bears his name. It was his custom to pay a yearly visit to Cuthbert, for his spiritual advice and help. They met together in Carlisle, Cuthbert's own city, in A.D. 686. "Ask me, brother Herbert," said the saint, "whatever thou art in need of, for after we have parted asunder we shall never in this world look into each other's face." The listener threw himself at Cuthbert's feet, and implored him with tears, in the Lord's name, to bear his faithful comrade in his mind, and to ask of God that they might serve Him at the same time in the same place, and cleave to each other. The saint sought the boon in prayer, and told his companion that it should be vouchsafed to him. They separated and died apart, but on the same day, the 20th of March, 686-7, Herbert suffering heavily from sickness before his end (Bell. H. E. iv. 29; Vita S. Cuth. c. 28; Anon. Vita S. Cuth. p. 280). "Those holy
HERCULES, bishop of Narnia (Narni). A.D. 455-470. He was a son of his predecessor, Pancratius I., and brother of his successor, Pancratius II. The father and the two sons were buried in one tomb. (Ugelli, Ital. Socr. i. 1084; Cappelletti, Ital. Socr. iv. 544.) [R. S. G.]

HERCULANUS (HERCULLANUS, Ruinart, Acta Sanc. 596), soldier martyr at Antioch. [JOVIANUS.] [C. H.]

HERCULANUS, bishop of Perusia, martyr. [HERCULANUS (2).]

HERCULIUS (1), a person of rank, to whom Chrysostom wrote from Cucusus, expressing the confidence he felt in his deep affection which no silence could lessen, but entitling him to write often. (Chrys. Epist. 201.) [E. V.]

HERCULIUS (2), first recorded bishop of Otriculum (Oricia, Otricoli), present at the council of Rome under Felix, A.D. 487 (Manz. vii. 1171 p; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, iv. 573, 579).

HERCUMBERTUS. [HERCUMBERTUS.] [C. H.]

HERDULF, bishop. [EARDULF (3).]

HEREBALD, a young scholar under the charge of St. John of Beverley, with whom he was a great favourite. On one occasion, when the master and his pupils were riding out, the young lads reached a level bit of ground, and got John's permission to run races. Herebald, however, was not to go with them. The youth, disappointed at being left behind, stole off, and was thrown violently from his horse, which stumbled at a stile. The lad's skull was fractured. A very interesting account is given of his curse, which is said to have been effected chiefly by John himself. In Herebald's great peril John rehabilitated him, having discovered by inquiry that the rite had been insufficiently administered at the first. Herebald recovered, and told the tale to Bede with his own lips, being at that time the abbot of a monastery at the mouth of the Tyne, the predecessor of the modern Tynemouth (Bede, H. E. v. 6; Folcard, Vita S. Joh. c. 8). According to Symeon of Durham, "Herebalb abbas" died in A.D. 745. (Chron. Regum, ed. Surtees Soc. 18.) [J. R.]

HEREBERHT, HEREBERHT, HEREBERT, priest and anchorite. [HERBERT.]

HEREBERGIS, HEREBURGIS, abbes. [HEREBURG.] [HEREBURG.]

HEREBERHT (1), a Kentish abbot, whose name is attached to a charter of Sigirael king of Kent, granted to Rochester in the time of archbishop Bregwin, 759-765. (Kemble, C. D. 114; Mon. Angl. i. 163.) [S.]

HEREBERHT (2), a priest of the diocese of Sidnaecaster, who attests the act of the synod of Clovesho in 803. (Kemble, C. D. 1024; Haldan and Stubbs, iii. 546.) [S.]

Nov. 26, we are told that Alexander suffered on Sept. 21, and that his relics were translated by pope Damasus on Nov. 26, which he ordained as his festival. [G. T. S.]

HERC, Welsh saint. [ENC.]

HERCAITH, disciple of St. Patrick. (Todd, S. Patrick, 510.) [J. G.]

HERCHERNRADUS. [ESCHERNRADUS.]

HERC-NASCA. [ENC (3).]

HERCONWALD (Kemble, Cod. Diploma. 994, A.D. 689), bishop. [ERKENWALD.] [C. H.]


HERCUANUS (2) I., bishop of Perusia (Perrugia) c. 290-310. Ugelli makes him to have been the first bishop, to have lived A.D. 57-90, and to have been put to death under Domitian, but this is in all probability erroneous. His life and actions have been much confused with those of Herculanus II., his successor in the see c. A.D. 534. (Ugelli, Ital. Socr. i. 70; Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, iv. 459.) [R. S. G.]

HERCUANUS (3), bishop of Brescia, c. 553. (Cappelletti, Le Chiese d'Italia, xi. 562; Acta SS. Boll. 12 Aug. ii. 731.) [A. H. D. A.]

HERCUANUS (4) II.—Nov. 7. Bishop of Perugia, where he was beheaded by the soldiers of Tottila. St. Gregory assures us that his body was found with his head joined to the body as perfectly as if no sword had ever touched it. (Murt. Rom. Vet., Adon, Usuard.; Sigebert. Gempl. Ann. 544, in Patr. Lat. clx. 105; Gregor. Dialog. lib. iii. cap. 13; Boll. Acta SS. Mart. i. 51, Jul. i. 33; Mabill. Acta SS. Ord. Ben. secn. i. p. 109.) [G. T. S.]


HERCUANUS (6)—Sept. 27. A martyr at Rome mentioned in the acts of a certain bishop Alexander, whose see is unknown (Murt. Adon., Usuard.). In Mart. Rom. Vet., under date of
HERECA, a West Saxon abbot, probably of Malmsbury. He is mentioned in a letter written by an unnamed monk to Lullus of Mainz (Mon. Mogunt. ed. Jaëf, pp. 289, 300), in which the writer reminds the bishop of their ancient friendship in the town of Malmsbury under abbot Eaba. The writer, who is probably Hereca himself or his secretary, sends to Lullus the kind remembrances of the convent over which he presides, and Hereca places his sign at the close of the letter. It is not quite clear from this over what monastery Hereca ruled, and the name does not occur in William of Malmesbury's list of the abbots of that abbey. Hereca appears as a witness to two charters which have some claim to authenticity; one in which Ethelbald of Mercia grants lands to abbay Eanberht (Kemble, C. D. 100), and another in which Cynewulf of Wessex grants lands to Malmsbury (K. C. D. 103). In both these Hereca is associated with West Saxon bishops, and the date of both is 758 or thereabout. [S.]

HEREDNAT, Irish saint. [EREÑAT.]

HEREFERTHIUS (Wend. Flor. Hist. ann. 712, ed. Coxo), bishop of Worcester between Tilhere and "Deberty." He is therefore the same as Heathore. [C. H.]

HEREFRITH (1), the familiar priest and friend of St. Cuthbert, to whom we are indebted for many valuable reminiscences of his life. He gave Bede an account of Cuthbert's serious bodily infirmity after he was attacked by the plague in A.D. 661 (Bede, V. S. Cuth. c. 8). In A.D. 686-7, when Cuthbert died on Farne Island, Herefrith was abbatt of Lindisfarne, and had the privilege of attending his master in his last illness, hearing his last request and command, closing his eyes, and afterwards interring his remains. He gave to Bede a description of the scene, which for pathos and simple beauty cannot be surpassed. (Ld. cc. 37-40; Symeon, Hist. Ecol. Dun. 57.) When Bede wrote the Life of Cuthbert, the MS. was frequently submitted to Herefrith's critical eye when he visited the historian at Jarrow. (Preface to Life of Cuthbert.) He is there styled Herefrith the priest, having probably resigned his office of abbott, and sought, after his old master's fashion, a more ascetic life. The name of "Herefrith presbyter" occurs in the Liber Vitæ at Durham among the abbots of the priestly grade (p. 6). There is a letter from Boniface to Herefrith presbyter, but he can scarcely be identified with Cuthbert's friend. Boniface died in A.D. 754. [J. R.]

HEREFRITH (2), a priest to whom St. Boniface wrote, about the year 746, requesting him to urge Ethelbald of Mercia to comply with the advice given him to reform. (Monum. Mogunt. ed. Jaëf, p. 177; Haddan and Stubbe, iii. 357, 358.) He can scarcely be identified with the abbott of Lindisfarne, but may be the person whose death is recorded under 747 by the continuator of Bede as "Herefrith the man of God." (M. H. B. 288.) [S.]

HEREMIUS (EREHNUS), bishop of Thessalonica, the metropolis of Macedon, present at the council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, after which he was banished and most cruelly treated in order to make him renounce communion with Athanasius. (Athen. Apol. od Const. 827, p. 247; Migne, Pat. Gr. xxv. 630 b; Le Quien, Oriens Christ. ii. 29.) [L. H.]

HEREMOD, a Kentish priest, who attests an act of archbishop Wulfred, dated April 21, 811. (Kemble, C. D. 195.) [S.]


HERENA, Mart. Cæth. A.D. 250. (See ARISTO.) [E. W. B.]

HERENAT, virgin. [EREÑAT.]


HERENNUS (2), the 7th recorded bishop of Portus Romanus, next to Glycerius and preceding Castus. He occurs among the bishops present at the third council of Rome held by bishop Felix III. A.D. 487. (Mansi, Cons. vii. 1171; Ugellh, Ital. Sacr. i. 111.) [C. H.]

HERENNUS, bishop of Jerusalem. [ANTEIUS, EREHNUIUS.]

HERENUS, Mart. Cæth. A.D. 250. (See ARISTO.) [E. W. B.]

HEREFRIK, son of Edfrith, and a nephew of Edwin, king of Northumbria, who was baptized with him by Paulinus on York on Easter Sunday, A.D. 627. He continued a Christian, and was the father of Hilda, abbess of Whitby, and of the abbess Hesiread. He was poisoned whilst in exile under Ceolwulf, a British king. His wife's name was Bregusuid (Bede, H. E. iv. 26). [J. K.]

HERESIOLOGY. For a defintion of heresy, as the term was understood in the early church, the reader is referred to the article HERESY in the Dict. of Christ. Antiq. We shall here limit ourselves to some brief notice of those writers who have treated the subject of heresies generally; referring for fuller information to the articles under their several names. The earliest known heresiologist is JUSTIN MARTYR (c. 103-166), in his Σταυρομαχία κατά τῶν γεγονόσιν ἀληθείας, of which we know nothing but the title and the fact that it was written before the author's first Apology (Apol. i. 26). The earliest enumeration of heresies and heretics is one that occurs in a fragment of the Πρώτος βιογραφίας ἤρωων τῆς εἰρηνικῆς (c. 129-185), preserved in Eusebius, and it men-
the works of Clement of Alexandria had appeared, whose *Protrepticos* and *Summaries from Theodotus*, if indeed this last is the same (c. 216), have greatly added to our knowledge of the earlier heresies. To Clement also we are indebted for several fragments of the earlier heretical writings: e.g., those of Basilides (Str. iv. 12), Cassianus (Str. i. 21, iii. 13), Epiphanes (Str. iii. 2), Heracleon (Str. iv. 9), Isidorus (Str. ii. 20, iii. 1, vi. 6), Tattian (Str. iii. 12), and Valentinus (Str. ii. 8, 20, iii. 7, iv. 12).

Towards the commencement of the 3rd century Hippolytus Romanus published his Treatise (ὁ Ἐλγύς) against all Heresies (Hipp. Refut. Omn. Haer. ed. Duncker, 1859). Some time previously he had published a shorter Treatise (σρωτγα) against the Thirty-two Heresies, commencing with the Mithraeans and ending with Noetus and the Noetians (Phot. Biblioth. cxxx.). The *Σρωτγα* is unhappily lost; but Hippolytus endeavoured to restore it by means of the use made of it by Epiphanius and Philastrius (Quellenkritik der Epiphanius). The *ὁ Ἐλγύς* is a much more extensive work and contains numerous quotations from Irenaeus, as well as several fragments of heretical writings, e.g., Echesaites, Nasses, Peratic, and Sethian, and besides those of Basilides and Valentinus, fragments also of the works of Justinus, Marcus, Monomithus, and Saturninus. The first heresy treated of by Hippolytus in his surviving work is that of the Arians, and the last that of the Elchasaites. There are also ascribed to him special treatises on the heresy of Noetus and on that of Beron and Helix.

In the last quarter of the 4th century Epiphanius published two works on the subject of heresies, the *Akhpopahds* and the *Pasphov*. The heresies of the first are treated of in the same as the latter, but the *Pasphov* is much the fuller and the more complete. It commences with twenty heresies which existed in the time of our Lord. Then follow sixty heresies which had arisen since the time of our Lord, among which are the Cebonians and the Gnostics of Hegesippus. The first mentioned are then the last; and the last the Marcionian. Epiphanius also made use of Irenaeus, from whom he quotes largely. Each section of the *Pasphov* has a summary prefixed. These summaries appear to have been early collected and circulated as a separate work. A considerable fragment of another epistle has recently been brought to light, and is published by Dindorf in his edition of Epiphanius. It contains the sixty-four heresies mentioned heresies of the *Pasphov*, and ends with the Marcelli.

About the same date, Philastrius bishop of Brixia (A.D. 378–387), published his Liber de Haeresibus. The first twenty-eight chapters are occupied with pre-Christian heresies, commencing with the Ophites, and ending with the Herodian. Philastrius assigns the Caunian (c. 2), the Sethians (c. 3), and the Nazarens (c. 8) to this class. He also speaks of Basilides as "Judaeus generis" (c. 4). In the remainder of his work, c. 29–156 (ed. Ohler, al. 150), he treats of the heresies which had arisen since the time of our Lord. A number of the heresies in both classes are not named, so that many of his chapters treat only of heretical opinions, and among those which he has named are several which do not occur in his great contemporary, who also supplies several which are frequently of some historical and dogmatic interest. The edition of Philastrius published in the *Patrologia* is enriched with very valuable notes. That of Ohler, in his Corpus Haeresiologicum, has critical notes, and also the learned commentaries of J. A. Fabricius.

In 397, Jerome, writing to Magnus, a Roman orate, enumerates some forty-four writers, the greater number of whom had written against one or more of the heresies of their times. The earliest named is Cyprian, and the latest his own contemporary, Amphilocius of Iconium.

Some years later Augustine published his De Haeresibus Liber, limited to heresies that had arisen in Christian times. He notices eighty-eight, the first being the Simonians and the last the Pelagians. Among them are ten to which he assigns no name, nine of these being also unnamed in Philastrius, and the tenth, number 68, named by Philastrius as that of the Excalceati. The Luciferians (clxxxi.), for whose omission by Epiphanius and Philastrius he accounts by the supposition that they believed them to be schismatic only and not heretics, the
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Jovianists, the Arabic, the Hebridiani, whom he supposes to be the Antidicomarianists of Epiphanius, the Paterniani, the Tertullianiists, the Abeloni, and, as might be expected, the Pelagianists, Nesterians for the first time. His Friscoliastae are the unnamed heretics of Philastrius, number 84. At the close of the Liber, Augustine tells his friend he has heard that Jerome has written on heresies, but he knows from whence to procure the book.

The Τριγόνος τοῦ Ἰς of Josephus is placed about this time by Cave and Galland. Fabricius places the 10th and 11th books beyond our limits; but on the hypothesis of the earlier date we proceed to remark that four chapters of this work are devoted to the subject of heresies: one of which is entitled Πάσα αἱ ἀριστεία κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίαστατίκης πίστεως ἑνανκενήτων. In this Josephus gives brief notices of sixty-two heresies, which he enumerates in a different order from his predecessors, and mentions some by names that do not occur elsewhere: e.g. Berylliani and Marianites. The first is that of the Herodiani, which Epiphanius notices among those of the Jews, the second that of the Theodiani, which Josephus says arose in Egypt, and the last that of the "Anthropomorphita, which arose in the region of Eleutheropolis," (Socrates, H. E. vi. 7; Sozomen. H. E. vii. 11; Cyril. Alex. adv. Anthropomorph. Migne, Patr. Gr. Ixxi. 1068). Josephus explains the origin of the name Erebion as πτωχοί ἐρημωμέναι διὰ τὸ περί τῆς πίστεως των ἐρημώτων, and makes the Nazoreiæ to be an Ebonite sect. In noticing the heresy of Origen of Alexandria, he says that that teacher "brought thirty heresies into the church."

MARIUS MERCATOR (A.D. 418-450), published his Commentarium de Caesario Imperatori oblatum, his Liber Substitutionum in corba Juliani, and his collections relating to the Nestorian controversy, which, with the admirable Dissertations of Garnier in the edition of these treatises reprinted in the Patrologia, leave little to be desired on the subject of the two great heresies which arose in the first half of the 5th century.

Towards the commencement of the second half of the 5th century, THEODORET bishop of Cyrus published his Liber omnium Nesticorum et Eutychianorum, which is not only valuable for these particular heresies, but also for the information which it contains as to the numerous sects to which they gave rise. In the first chapter he enumerates the authorities upon which he relies. The Ecclesiastis Historia to which he refers is the Historia Tripartita compiled at the request of Cassiodorus (Hist. Trip. prael., Patr. Ixx. 879). Liberatus also made use of the Breveolis Historiarum Eutychianistorum, c. A.D. 484, which is ascribed to Gelasius III., bishop of Rome A.D. 492-494 (Labbe et Cossart, iv. 1079).

Somehow about A.D. 500, GENNADIS, a presbyter of Mediolani, published a continuation of the De Viris Illustribus of Jerome, at the end of which he says he has written eight books against all heresies, six against Nestorians, three against Pelagians, and that he has sent Gelasius bishop of Rome an epistle concerning his faith. The epistle still survives under the title of Liber de Ecclesiastis Doctrinibus, and may not be overlooked in this article, as it covers the whole field of heresy from the commencement of the
Christian era down to the time at which it was written. Oehler has republished it with the valuable notes of Geeverhart Elmenhorst (u. s. i. 336-400).

About the same time appeared the Origines et Etnymologiae of Iordanis bishop of Seville a.D. 599-636. Two chapters of the eighth book are devoted to the subject of heresies, the one entitled, De Haeresibus Judorcrum, which it treats of in ten sections, and the other De Haeresibus Christianorum, in seventy-one sections. This last is copied by Gratian, in his Concordia Discordantium Canonom (c. xxiv. q. iii. c. 39). It is mainly an abridgment of Augustine de Haeresibus, with the addition of Nectarios, Eutychians, Aaphalii, Theodosiani and Gaianitae, and Agnoitae and Trithitae.

About the year 600, Leontius, a scholar of Byzantium, compiled his Σχολα ἀπὸ φωνῆς Θεοδοροῦ τοῦ Θεοφιλοστάτου Ἀββᾶ, more generally known by the title of De Sectis (Fabric. Bibl. Graec. viii. 310). The work is divided into ten books, of which the last two, Leontius treats of the heresy of the Gaianites. It is especially valuable for the history and doctrines of the numerous sects which arose after the council of Chaledon, a.D. 451. On some of these still further light is shed by his Κατά Νεωτομάριαν καὶ Εὐτύχιανων καὶ Κατὰ ἄραρτοτοκίων.

During the first quarter of the 7th century, Timotheus, a presbyter of the great church of Constantinople, published his important work entitled, Περὶ τῶν προσεχρηστῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας, which is generally quoted as De recipienda haeretica. As the title suggests, it is a manual of ecclesiastical discipline with regard to heretics, and accordingly treats of three classes of them, such as need baptism, such as only need the chiasm, and such as need neither. Of those who belong to the first class, the first mentioned are the Tascodrugi, and the last the followers of Pelagius and Coelestius, to whom he adds the Melchisedeciani, who, in his day, were known as Ἀθμιγαζου. The first mentioned in the second class are Tessaerescaecatitae, and the last the Apollinaristae; the first mentioned in the third class are the Melitiani, and the last the Eutychianistae. On this follows a tract entitled, Περὶ τῶν αὐτοχριστῶν, an exposition of the doctrine of the Apostles, a treatise on the Marcianists, in which by whom he means the Messalitani, and another on the twelve sects of the Διακρινόμενα, those who withheld subscription to the council of Chaledon, a.D. 451. This last is especially valuable as a guide to unravel what otherwise might well appear to be an almost hopeless complication. (Migne, Patr. Gr. xxxvi. pt. i. 54 et seq.)

About the same time also Antioccius, a monk of the monastery of St. Saba, published his Ομολογία, in one of which, No. 139, he gives a long list of the heretics and heresies which had arisen up to his time. The first sixty-one are taken from Epiphanius, then follow Evagrius and Didymus, Origenistae, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Didymus, Nectarius, Marsæ the Persian, Dioscorus, Theodosius, Gaius, Timotheus Alerius, Petrus Fullo, Petrus Mongus, Soterichus, Severus, Philoxenus Hieropolitanus, Jacobus Syrus, and Julianus of Halicarnassus, of all of whom he says οὐ διώκω τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς καλεῖντα. The homily is addressed to Eustathius, abbot of the monastery of Atalina or Ancyra in Galatia.

Somewhat later, c. 636, Sophronius bishop of Jerusalem, issued a synodal letter, which was read at the council of Constantinope, a.D. 680 (actio xi. Mansi, xi. 462 ; Photius, Bibl. cod. 231). This merely names some hundred and twenty heresiarchs, beginning with Simon Magnus and ending with Menas the Gauinite bishop of Alexandria, and thirty-three heresies, beginning with the Nicolaitae and ending with the Trithiteae. Among the heresies named are several which are not mentioned elsewhere, and some of the designations given to heresies are given only there. Catelerius, in the notes to his Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae (i. 790), published another paragraph of this letter, which mentions eleven other heresies after Menas; Cyrus of Alexandria, Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius of Constantineopol, and Honorius bishop of Rome, leaders of the heretics of whom are anathematized accordingly; Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus of Constantineopol, Macarius of Antioc, and his master Stephanus, Polychronius, of whom Sophronius speaks as then living at Alexandria, and Harmasius. The Harmasii [Harmasius] also appear in the σχῆμα on the Ὀθόγοι of Anastasius. Fabricius and Hardouin question the authenticity of this paragraph; Le Quien, however, accepts it as genuine. (Io. Damasc. Op. Migne, Patrol. Gr. xct. 129.)

Theodorus, a monk of the monastery of Rhaithu in Palestine, also belongs to the middle of the 7th century. His work, commonly known as De Incororatione, is of some value for heretical Christology. The first heresy of which it treats is that of Menas, and the last of Julianus of Halicarnassus. The Indeicillus de Haeresibus, first published by Menard, a.D. 1617, and ascribed by him to Jerome, is a work of certainly not earlier than towards the latter half of the 7th century, as the writer clearly made use of Isidore, e.g. his article "Hemerobaptista" is taken verbatim from the Etnymologiae. Many passages are taken from the De Virtus Lusit. of Jerome. The latest heresies which the author mentions are the Agnoitae and the Trithiteae (Oehler, u. s. i. xii. 283-400).

The 'Oθόγοι, otherwise called Vice Deus adversus Apehala, of Anastasius, a monk of Sinai, bears internal evidence of belonging to the same period. It is chiefly valuable for the materials which it furnishes for the history of the Monophysites.

Germanius, patriarch of Constantinopol, a.D. 715-730, in his Narratio de Synodis, devotes the first thirty sections to an account of the heresies which had arisen before the council of Chaledon, 451, and of the writers by whom they were severely opposed. Then follow twenty sections which more fully notice the Monophysites, the Monothelites, the Iconoclasts, and the Maronite controversies. These last especially are of great interest and value. The work appeared first in Mai's Spicilegum Romanum, and afterwards in Migne's Patrologia Graeca, t. xlviii.

The latest heresiologist of the period to which this article is limited is Ioannes Damascenus, whose Περὶ αὐτοσεϊν ἐν συνώσει theon ἐγεραυο
monastic life, was desirous of going to Gaul, where her sister Hereswita, the mother of King Aldulf, in the monastery of Chelles near Paris was "expecting her crown." This language seems to imply that Aldulf was rigorously devoted to Hereswita near the end of her life, but the chronology shows that it was before she became a queen and a widow. Bede in referring to Aldulf as king must have been assuring his anticipated.

[C. H.]

HERESWYTHA, a Kentish abbess between A.D. 696 and 716, whose name is attached to the privilege of Wiltred. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 240.)

[C. H.]

HEREWALD (HEORDWALD, HEREWARD) the third bishop of Sherborne (M. H. B. 620). He succeeded bishop Forthere when the latter went to Rome in 737, having been consecrated by archbishop Nofhelm before Forthere's departure, if the charter in (K. C. D. 82), which the attestations of the two bishops appear, be genuine. Any how he was consecrated by Nofhelm in or about 736 (Sim., M. H. B. 629). He succeeded the council held by archbishop Cuthbert at Clovesho in 747 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 360, 362). In charters his name occurs with that of Forthere in 738, at a synod held by Nofhelm (Kemble, C. D. 82; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 337, 338), in a grant of Hilla in 744 to Glastonbury, where his confirmation is specially mentioned (D. 92; Mon. Angl. i. 47); in another Glastonbury charter of the same date, granted by Cuthred (K. C. D. 93); in the grant of Ethelbald to Eambridge, attested by Cynewulf and the West Saxon Witun, 755 to 757 (K. C. D. 100); in the grant of Cynewulf to Malmesbury in 758 (K. C. D. 103); in the charter of Tisbury of 759 (ib. 104); and for the last time in the charter of Cynewulf to Wells, dated 766 (K. C. D. 116, Mon. Angl. ii. 295). After this date West Saxon charters are rare, and as Ethelred appears as bishop in 774, Herewald's death must be fixed between that year and 766.

[S.]

HEREWARD, the name of a bishop attached to a doubtful charter of a king Cyneulf, whom Kemble (C. D. 193) wrongly identifies with Kenulf of Mercia, dated 808. The charter really belongs to the year 758 and to Cynewulf of Wessex, and Hereward is identical with Hereward bishop of Sherborne.

[S.]

HERGUST, a bishop of the Scottish Picts (Ware, JR. Hist. c. 4), but in reality Fergusius. [FERGUSTUS.]

[3. G.]

HERIBURG (HERBURGES, HERBURGO), the abbess of a Yorkshire nunnery called Vedatun (Watten, E. R. Y.). When John was bishop of York (A.D. 705-15) he cured one of her nuns, and gave Heriburg some useful advice about surgery. The story is in Bede, H. E. v. 3; and in Felcand's Life of St. John, of Beverley, § 12.

[J. R.]

HERICERUS, reputed eleventh bishop of Mainz before the 4th century; ruled for eight years, and was martyred. (Gal. Christ. v. 134 Pothstatus, Bibl. Suppl. p. 353.) [R. T. S.]

HERIMBERTUS. [HERIMBERTUS.]
HERLUNDIS (HARLINDIS), ST., abbas of Eike, near Massacum, in Belgium, together with her sister St. Renildis or Reinius, about the middle of the 8th century. They were the daughters of pious and wealthy parents, Adalhardus and Guinmarus, and were variously brought up in the monastery of Valenciennes. Their parents having built the monastery of Eike near the river Mos (Meuse), died and were buried there, leaving their property, including Eike, to Herlindis and Reinius. The sisters were now consecrated abbesses by the bishops Willibrordus and Bonifacius, and took twelve other virgins into their convent, where they passed their time in good works. Herlindis is said to have written out and illuminated the four gospels and a psalter. She died on Oct. 12, her sister surviving many years; both are commemorated on March 22. (Boll. Acta SS. Mar. iii. 385; Mabill. Acta SS. Octob. sac. iii. l. 607.)

T. W. D.

HERLINGUS, twenty-first bishop of Meaux, succeeding St. Hildevertus and followed by St. Paternus, towards the close of the 7th century. He may be identical with a Herlingus episcopus, who subscribed a charter of Agilbertus of Meaux for the monastery of St. Mary, in the eleventh year of Theodoric's reign. (Migne, Patr. Lat. Ixxxvii. 1241 n.; Gall. Christ. viii. 1601.)

[S. A. B.]

HERMAEI (Epaenaeus). A Valentinian sect, called from their leader HERMAEUS, and said to have borne anything but a good character (Timoth. Presb. de Recipiendi. Lactert.; Migne, Patr. Gr. ixxxvi. 17). According to Nice they were also called Basilidae (Ex Niceonis Pundecte, lib. 70).

T. W. D.

HERMAEON (1), bishop of Saia (Saú) on the Nile Delta; mentioned in the Brevarium of Melitius as one of the bishops consecrated by him. (Athanas. Apol. contra Arianos, Patrol. Graec. xxv. 376; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 519.)

[J. de S.]

HERMAEON (2), bishop of Cynopogeton Inferior (or Cynum), in the Egyptian Delta. He is mentioned in the Brevarium of Melitius as one of the bishops consecrated by him prior to the council of Nicaea. (Athanas. Apol. contra Arianos, Patrol. Graec. xxv. 376; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 567.)

[J. de S.]

HERMAEUS, bishop of Balbara, in the ecclesiastical province of Lycia, present at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. i. 987; Mansi, iii. 571.)

[L. D.]

HERMAGORAS—July 12. Reputed to have been a martyr at Aquileia under Nero. He is said to have been appointed bishop of that see by St. Mark the Evangelist, and to have suffered death with Fortunatus, his archdeacon. [FORTUNATUS.] The reputed acts of the martyr are worthless. Attributing to such an early age the ecclesiastical ideas and arrangements of later times, they demonstrate their own falsity. They profess to have been written by a certain Gregory, out of whom Hermagoras cast a devil. (Mart. Vot. Rom., Adon., Usuard.)

[G. T. S.]

HERMAannon, a bishop of some part of Egypt. Letters to him "and the brethren in Egypt" from Dionysius of Alexandria, are mentioned or quoted in Eusebius, vii. 1, 10, 23. They treat of the affairs of the emperors Gallus, Valerian, and Gallienus. (Tillemont, iv. pp. 276, 277.)

[J. W. S.]

HERMANFROIZ (Chron. S. Denys. v. 24 in Bouquet, iii. 306 d). [EREMENFRIDUS (2).]

[C. H.]

HERMANNUS (HERMANES, HERMANUS, HERHANNEUS) said by Dempster (Hist. Ecc. Gent. Scot. ii. 351) to have been one of the presbyters addressed by pope John [ERAN (8)]. There is ascribed to him an Epistola ad Hilarionum de Pelagiana haeresi (Tanner, Bibl. 398; Spotswood, Hist. Ch. Scot. 13; Sp. Forbes, Ital. Scot. Saints, 196, April 2).

[J. G.]

HERMAS (1), bishop of Philippopolis in Thrace, reputed to have been the Hermas mentioned by St. Paul, Rom. xvi. 14. (See Basili. Menolog. Nov. 4.)

[J. de S.]

HERMAS (3). In the latter half of the 2nd century there was in circulation a book of visions and allegories, purporting to be written by one Hermas, and which was commonly known as The Shepherd. This book was treated with respect bordering on that paid to the canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, and came into the public reading of different churches. A passage from it is quoted by Ireneus (iv. 20, p. 253) with the words, "Well said the Scripture," a fact taken notice of by Eusebius (H. E. v. 8). We may with probability infer that in the time of Ireneus the work was publicly read in the Gallican churches, for if Ireneus were not quoting a well-known text, he would be likely to have named the source of his quotation; but that he did not place the book on a level with the canonical Scriptures may be inferred from his having quoted it but once, not appealing to it in his discussion of Scripture testimonies in his third book. The multifaceted tomemementon of the Stromaticis of Clement of Alexandria opens in the middle of a quotation from The Shepherd, and about ten times elsewhere he cites the book, always with a complete acceptance of the reality and divine character of the revelations made to Hermas, but without any explanation of his opinion who Hermas was or when he lived. In the next generation Origen, who frequently cites the book, says (in Rom. xvi. 14, vol. iv. p. 663) that it seems to him very useful, and he gives it as his iadi-
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vidual opinion that it was divinely inspired. He further makes a guess, which was repeated by others after him, but which appears to rest on no earlier authority, that it was written by the Hermeneutics that he was a disciple of the Romans. His other quotations show that less favourable views of the book were current in his time. His quotations from The Shepherd are carefully separated from those from the canonical books; he generally adds to a quotation from The Shepherd a saving clause, giving the reader permission to reject it; he speaks of its use in the church, writing: "The teaching of the apostles," as not canonical, but useful to be employed in catechetical instruction. The Shepherd is found in the Sinaitic MS following the Epistle of Barnabas, as an appendix to the books of the New Testament. After the 4th century the book rapidly passed out of ecclesiastical use in the East.

The Western writer to whom the book deserves more attention, as internal evidence shows Rome to have been its place of composition. Foremost comes the writer of the Muratorian Fragment on the canon, who tells us that the book had been written during the episcopate of Pius by Hermas, a brother of that bishop, a period which the writer speaks of as within then living memory. He concludes that the book ought to be read, but not to be publicly used in the church among the prophetic writings, the number of which was complete, nor among the apostolic. The statement that the book not only might but ought to be read is a high recognition of the value attributed to it by the writer, and we may gather that at least in some places the church use of the book at the time had been such as to cause danger of its being set on a level with the canonical Scriptures. Tertullian, in one of his earliest treatises, De Oratione, disputes against a practice of sitting down immediately after prayer, for which he knows no other reason assigned than that in The Shepherd Hermas is said, on prayer ended, to have sat upon the bed. He points out the unreasonable- ness of converting a narrative statement into a rule of discipline, and remarks that, if it were so regarded, the precept of sitting on a bed would not be satisfied by sitting on a bench or chair. A book which could so influence the prac- tice of churches must evidently have enjoyed high authority at the time, an authority which Tertullian's argument does not dispute. It had probably been translated into Latin, and was used in church reading. That Tertullian read it in a Latin translation may be inferred from his describing it by the Latin title Pastor, and not by a Greek title, as he usually does when he refers to Greek writings. Very different is Tertullian's treatment of the book some ten years later in his Epistle to the Hermeneutics. Montanius. When the authority of The Shepherd is urged in behalf of readmitting adherents to communion, he rejects the book as not one of the works of being included in the canon, but placed by every council of the churches, even of the Catholic party, among false and apocryphal writings (De Pudic. cap. 10). Quoting the Ephesus, he says that this is at least more received than that apocryphal Shepherd of the adulterers (cap. 20). The phrase "more received" warns us to take cum grano Tertullian's assertion as to the universal rejection of The Shepherd; but we may well believe that the line of distinction between apostolic and later writings was then being drawn more sharply than it had been before, and that in the interval between Tertullian's two writings The Shepherd was excluded from the public reading of many churches which before had admitted it. Possibly to this result may have contributed the publication by the Muratorian writer of the strongest testimony in which he included Hermas from apostolic times. The statement of this writer is repeated in an entry in the Liberian papal catalogue, that under the episco- pate of Pius his brother Hermas wrote a book in which the commands and precepts were contained which the angel gave him when he came to him in the habit of a shepherd. It has been thought, with high probability, that this entry was derived from the catalogue of Hippolytus, which is the basis of the Liberian catalogue. [CHRONICON CANDIANUM.] It will be observed that, while refusing to assign the book to apostolic times, it makes no doubt of the reality of the angelic appearance to Hermas. Later biographical notices of papa undertake to tell what the message given to Hermas was, namely, that Easter should always be observed on a Sunday. This notice clearly is the offspring of a time when all knowledge of the book of Hermas had been lost, and when it was attempted to supply by invention the imperfection of the earlier entry. This story of a revelation to Hermas about Easter celebration is amplified a little in the forged decreal letter of Pius I (Mansi, Concil. i. 872). The later papal catalogues make Pius the brother of Pastor, and another spurious letter of Pius tells of a contemporary presbyter Pastor. The poem of the Pseudo-Tertullian against Marcion had described the brother of Pius as "angeli- cus Pastor." A confusion between the name of Hermas and that of his book would imply that the book was not at the time in use. Jerome, when copying what Eusebius had said about the book (De Vir. Illust. v. 10, vol. ii. p. 843) adds that among the Latinos it was almost unknown. He himself speaks contemptuously of it (in Hieroc. i. 14, vol. vi. p. 604), for it seems to us certain that the book of Hermas is what he here refers to. It is marked in the Gelasian decree as apocryphal. Notwithstanding, there are several traces that some use of the book con- tinued in the West, one decisive fact being that there still exist some twenty MSS. of the Latin
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version. In the African church of the 4th century we find from the list in the Codex Claromontanus (Westcott, Canon N. T. p. 537) that it was placed with the Acts of Paul and the Revelation of St. Peter as an appendix to the New Testament books; and it occupies a similar place in the Sinaitic MS., the only Greek Bible known to have contained it. But in some of the existing Latin MSS. it is placed with the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, a position no doubt assigned to it in conformity with the opinion of Athanasius already quoted, which was known through Rufinus in the West.

Turning now from the external history of the book to the book itself, we find it divides itself into three parts. The first part consists of visions. It opens with what reads like the narration of a real dream. Hermas tells that he who had brought him up had sold him to Rome to a lady named Rhoda, that after a considerable time he renewed his acquaintance with her and began to love her as a sister; that she saw her one day bathing in the Tiber and assisted her out of the water; that admiring her beauty he thought within himself how happy he should be if he had a wife like her in person and disposition. Further than this his thought did not go. But a little time after he had a vision. He fell asleep, and in his dream he was walking and struggling in ground so rugged and broken that it was impossible to pass. At length he succeeded in crossing the water by which his path had been washed away, and coming into smooth ground knelt to confess his sins to God. Then the heavens were opened, and he saw Rhoda saluting him from the sky. On his asking her what she did there, she told him that she had been taken up to accuse him, because God was angry with him for having sinned in thought against her. Then Hermas was overwhelmed with horror and fear, not knowing how he could abide the severity of God’s judgment, if such a thought as his was marked as sin. Rhoda now passes out of his dream, and he sees a venerable aged lady clad in shite garments sitting in a folding chair and holding a book in her hand. She asks him why he, usually so cheerful, is now so sad. On telling her, she owns what a sin any impure thought would be in one so chaste, so singleminded and so innocent as he; but she tells him that this is not why God is displeased with him, but because of the sins of his children, whom he, through false indulgence, had allowed to corrupt themselves. At this point the vision was open if he would warn them. Then she reads to him out of her book, but of all she reads he can remember nothing save the last sentence, save that this alone was comforting, and all which preceded was terrible and threatening. She parted from him with the words, “Play the man, Hermas.” After reading of the admiration of Hermas for Rhoda, one discovers with interest that in his time he is an elderly man with a grown-up family, and that his former mistress Rhoda must have been at least as old as himself. If the tale is an invented one, this is certainly an incongruity; but if it be a true story, it is quite conceivable that the thought may have occurred to Hermas, who seems to have been not happy in his family relations, how much happier it would have been for him if Rhoda had been his wife; and that afterwards, in a dream, this thought may have recurred to his memory as a sin to be repented of. To us, the vision, as he tells it, presents all the characteristics of a real dream; the want of logical connexion between the parts, the changes of scene, the fading out of Rhoda as principal figure and the appearance of the aged lady in her room, and in like manner the substitution of quite a different offence for the sinful thought which weighed on his conscience at the beginning; the physical distress in his dream of being first presenting the idea of walking on and on without being able to find an outlet, afterwards of mental grief at words spoken to him; the long reading which leaves no trace on the memory save of the words spoken immediately before awaking—all these marks indicate that we are reading not a literary invention like the dream of Pilgrim’s Progress, but a dream of a little dressed up it may be, of a dream which the narrator really had had. In another vision, a year after, he saw again the lady and her book, and received the book to copy, but still it conveyed no idea to his mind. Then he set himself by fasting and prayer to learn the meaning of it, and after about a fortnight was gratified. He learns, too, that the lady whom he had seen is not, as he had imagined, the sibyl, but the church, and that she appeared as old because she was created first of all, and for her sake the world was made. On this discourse of the pre-existence of the church, see ECCLESIA. The Epistle to the Ephesians, which probably suggested it, is one of the New Testament books of whose use by Hermas there are clear traces.

In subsequent visions we have a different account of the matter; he sees in each a woman more and more youthful in appearance, whom he is taught to identify with the church of his former vision; and it is explained that he saw her at first because the spirit of Christians had been broken by infirmity and doubt, and afterwards more youthful as by the revelations made him their spirit had been renewed. After his vision of the two right wings of the church, Hermas eagerly for new revelations, and set himself to obtain them by fasting and prayer. In those later visions, while the pictures presented to his mind are such as we can without difficulty believe to have been dream representations, the explanations given of them have a coherence only to be found in the thoughts of a waking man. This is still more true of the second and third parts of the work. At the end of the first part he has the vision in which he sees him who gives the name which in strictness only belongs to these two latter parts of the work, a man dressed like a shepherd, who tells him that he is the angel of repentance, who has come to dwell with him, being the guardian to whose care he had been entrusted. From this shepherd he receives, for the instruction of himself and on time at the “Similitudes,” which form the second, and the “Similitudes,” which form the third, part of the work. The Shepherd has been compared to the Pilgrim’s Progress, and it is in the last part, the “Similitudes,” that the likeness is greatest; but these do not form one continued allegory like Bunyan’s, but rather resemble the detached
emblematic representations exhibited in the Interpreter's House. The Similitudes of Hermas, we may well believe, were suggested by the parables of the New Testament, though it need hardly be said how infinitely below these are the latter cases. Hannel, in which the central thought is usually overlaid by uninteresting details.

But the judgment we may form on the literary merits of the work of Hermas is of little importance compared with that of deciding rightly the fundamental question, our determination of which must rule our decision as to the date of the compositions, and also, as far as possible, to determine, namely, whether the book does not claim to be an inspired document, the writer of which aspires to no literary merit, save that of faithfully recording the revelations made him. When Bunyan says that in a certain place he fell asleep and dreamed a dream, we do not believe, and we do not suppose that he intended us to believe, that all the stories which he proceeds to relate actually was presented to his mind in the form of a dream. Are we to suppose that, in like manner, Hermas wished his readers to understand that in relating his visions he intended no more than to present edifying lessons in an allegorical form, and are we to suppose that this was merely in the light of an instructive fiction that the book was regarded when it was introduced into the public reading of the church? As a specimen of the way in which these questions may be answered, we quote Donaldson's argument. He says:—"If the book be not inspired, then either the writer fancied he had seen these visions, or tried to make other people fancy this, or he clothed the work in a fictitious form designedly and undisguisedly. If he did the first, he must have been silly. If he did the second, he must have been an impostor." But as he believes the author to have been "an honest, upright, and thoughtful man," he concludes that he did the third, "as multitudes of others have done after him, with John Bunyan at their head." From this view it follows that we can lay no stress on anything the author tells us about himself and his family. All these details are as likely to be fictitious as the angels, the towers, and the beasts of the visions. We cannot even assume that the writer's name was Hermas, for the narrator of the visions, who bears this name, may have been an imaginary personage. For ourselves, we feel ourselves bound to reject this as altogether mistaken criticism, and as an application to the 2nd century of the standards of the 19th. To us it seems plain that, whatever the author intended, the first readers of Hermas did not receive the book as mere allegorical fiction. Bunsen (Hippolytus and his Age, I, 315) tells us that Niebuhr used to pity the Athenian (sic. Qu. Roman?) Christians for being obliged to listen at their meetings to this "good but dull novel." If the authorities of the church looked on it merely as a novel, would they have insinced the reading of it on other people? At the end of the century, Clement and others show no doubt of the reality of the visions. Were the men who lived a couple of generations earlier likely to have been more severe in their judgments, and would an angelic appearance seem to them a thing so incredible that one who had related it would be regarded by them as the narrator of a fiction that he did not intend should be believed? The book itself contains directions to the rulers of the Roman church to send the volume to foreign churches. If we suppose that it really was sent to them, and that the writer of the authority of the Roman church, we have an explanation of the consideration, only second to that of the canonical Scriptures, which the book enjoyed in so many distant churches. If the work were supposed to be only an edifying allegory, the place which it occupied in church reading would be quite inexplicable. We must hold then that, of all the disputations by which the Church has tried to determine that which has been adopted is infinitely the least probable, namely, that the book is undisguised fiction, written without any intention to deceive. A man at the present day might publish a story of visions, and be persuaded that his readers would not take him seriously, but no one in the 2nd century would be entitled to hold such a persuasion, and if the book of Hermas was accepted as inspired, the writer cannot be acquitted of the responsibility of having foreseen and intended this result. Dismissing then Donaldson's third supposition, we fall back on the other two, that the writer was either a fool or an impostor. This is the only alternative considered by Mosheim, de Rebus Christianis, Const. 163, 166, who holds that the writer must either have been "mente captus et fanaticus," or else that he "scientem volentemse felfellisse," the latter being the opinion to which he inclines, believing that the lawfulness of pious frauds was a fixed opinion with many Christians at the date of the composition we are discussing. We must maintain, however, that it is quite possible to disbelieve in the inspiration of Hermas without imputing folly either to him who made the claim or to those who admitted it. We do not count a young man a fool because he has not learned the lessons which only experience can teach. We must not regard the men of the 2nd century as fools because their views as to God's manner of governing His Church were different from those which the experience of so many following centuries has taught us. A Christian cannot regard them as fools for believing that in the time of our Lord and His apostles a great manifestation of the supernatural was made to the world. How long, and to what extent similar manifestations would present themselves in the ordinary life of the church, only experience could show, and they are not to be scorned though their expectations have not been borne out by the facts. In particular, if we are to set down as fools all who have believed that supernatural intimations may be given in dreams, our list would be a long one, and would include many eminent names. And as for those abnormal mental states which are called not dreams but visions, though modern science may regard them as phenomena admitting a natural explanation, it is not reasonable to expect such a view from the science of the 2nd century. Things impress different minds differently, but to us what Hermas tells of his personal history, and of the times and circumstances of his visions, conveys the impression of artless truth. His information about himself is against the incident is mentioned, which it is not very easy to piece together; and
we cannot think that the author of a fictitious narrative would have conveyed so obscurely what he has to tell about the hero of his story. He would be likely also to have made this hero a man of some eminence, holding high church office, whereas the Hermas of this book always speaks of the presbyters as if he were not one of them; and he could have had no motive for representing this hero as one who had been engaged in trade which he had carried on unsuccessfully and not very honestly, and as an elderly married man with a termagant wife and ill-behaved children. When this book, if the thing be true history, it is very much to the point that Hermas should get a revelation, directing his wife to keep her tongue in better order, and his children to pay more respect to their parents; nor need we suppose Hermas guilty of any dishonesty in thus turning his gift of prophecy to the advantage of his family comfort; for nothing can be more natural than that the talk of the family should be turned to such a topic. If Hermas, in his waking moments should present himself to him again in his visions. We have already said that there is nothing incredible in the supposition that the pictures of the first vision did present themselves to the mind of Hermas as he relates them. They must have been very vivid, and have impressed him strongly. Still it is a year before he has another vision. Then he sees the lady and her chair again. After this he begins to fast and pray and look out eagerly for more revelations, and it is not wonderful to read that he soon has more visions on the subjects which have now come completely to occupy his mind. Finally he comes to believe himself to be under the constant guardianship of the shepherd angel of repentance, and he ascribes all the lessons he desires to teach to the inspiration of this heavenly monitor. This is the part of his work which it is hardest to clear from the charge of conscious deception, and probably he cannot be completely cleared. But perhaps his language expresses no more than his belief in the divine inspiration under which he wrote, for elsewhere he states that he does not regard the personages of his visions as his own invention, but that they are similar to and in the earlier part are represented as spoken to him by the Church are afterwards said to have been spoken by God's Spirit under the form of the Church. That he sincerely believed himself to be the bearer of a divine message appears to us to be the case. In fact, we might give a summary of his convictions which would serve also for those of a man in many respects very unlike, Savonarola. (c) that the church of his time had corrupted itself, and had become deeply tainted with worldliness; (d) that a time of great tribulation was at hand, in which the cross should be purged away; (e) that there was still an intervening time, during which repentance was possible, and would be accepted; (f) that he was himself divinely commissioned to be a preacher of that repentance.

We have nothing to discuss the date and authorship of the book, concerning which antiquity furnishes authority for three suppositions: (a) the author was the Hermas to whom a salutation is sent at the end of the Epistle to the Romans; (b) he was brother to Pius who was bishop of Rome at the middle of the 2nd century; (c) he was contemporary with Clement who was bishop at the very beginning of the century or at the end of the preceding. The first may be set aside as a mere guess of Origen's, and a highly improbable one. It has been conjectured, however (as, for instance, by Hilgenfeld), that the author wished his book to pass for the work of this Hermas, and Lipsius has combined this with supposition (b), holding that the author really was Hermas, the brother of Pius, but that he wished to pass for the apostolic Hermas. This may be pronounced a most improbable combination. A man forgoing all the book, in which he wished to pass as the work of a former age does not usually put his own name to it. When this Hermas published his work, he either let his contemporaries know who wrote it or he did not. If he did not, the tradition that he was brother of Pius is worth nothing; if he did, he could not expect to be taken for a contemporary of the apostles. The book itself shews no trace that the author had any such pretension to be regarded as an apostle or not of Hermas. In fact, he distinctly speaks of the apostles as in his time all dead. A forger could easily have found many names better suited to his purpose than Hermas, one of the least prominent of Scripture names, and of which, except in connexion with this book, there is no trace in ecclesiastical tradition. If the view taken in the preceding paragraphs be correct, the author had no motive for antedating his work. His prophecy announced tribulation close at hand, and only a short intervening period for repentance. To represent such a prophecy as being at the time fifty or one hundred years old would be to represent it as having failed, and in fact The Shepherd did lose its credit when it had been so long in existence. Hermas seems to have thought that, if the worldliness of the church could be repented of and reformed, it would be possible to keep it pure during the brief remainder of its existence. He announced therefore forgiveness on repentance for sins of old Christians prior to the date of his revelation, but none for those of new converts, or for sins subsequent to his revelation. It is inconceivable he could be so stupid as to defeat his own purpose by antedating his book. If the latter part of the work of Elcesar or of the Clementine homilies put the natural question, Why did we never hear of these things before? these books had provided an answer in the fiction that the alleged authors had only communicated them under a pledge of strict secrecy; in this book, on the contrary, Hermas is directed (Vit. iii. 8) to go after three days and speak in the hearing of all the saint who were at all the saints he had heard; he is in the strictest vision. Elsewhere he enables us to understand how this direction could be carried out. We learn (Mand. 11) that certain persons were then recognised in the church as having prophetic gifts, and that at the Christian meetings for worship, if after prayer ended one of them were
filled with the Holy Spirit, he might speak unto the people as the Lord willed. It seems to us then that the simplest explanation how the Roman church came to believe in the inspiration of Peter, who had already admitted the inspiration of its author, that he held the position of a recognized prophet as in the East did Quadratus and Ammia of Philadelphia (Euseb. H. E. v. 16), and that he really did publicly deliver in the church assembly the message with which he states he was commissioned. As to the 2nd century, which went on, the public exercise of prophetic power in the church seems to have ceased, and when it was revived by Montanus and his followers, it had to encounter much opposition. The controversy that ensued induced the church to insist more strongly on the distinction between the inspiration of the writers of the canonical books of Scripture and that of holy men of later times, and the Muratorian fragment exhibits the feeling entertained towards the end of the century that the list of prophetic writings had been closed, and that no production of the then later years of the church could be admitted into it.

Having arrived at the conclusion that the Hermas of The Shepherd is not a fictitious character but a known person in the church of Rome in the 2nd century, we have next to settle the question, Are we to place him in the middle of the century under Pius or at the very beginning under Clement? First, we would remark that this is a question on which arguments drawn from the doctrinal characteristics of the book can yield only precarious conclusions. We have no independent trustworthy source of information as to the development of doctrine and ritual in the Roman church during the first half of the 2nd century; so that, if we choose to say that it is credible that this or that development should be found in the year 140, and not credible that it had existed in 110, such an assertion must rest solely on our subjective theories, and not on scientific knowledge. Thus Westcott (N. T. Canon, p. 190) has given as a proof of late date the mention of the “stations” (Sim. v.). We must ask what knowledge is possible to us of the date when weekly fasts were instituted in the Roman church, or when the name “stations” was given to them. Corresponding questions might be asked with reference to all the other indications noted by Westcott in the same place, or by others. And in particular the same objection may be urged if conclusions as to the date of The Shepherd are drawn from the state of church government indicated by it. For ourselves, although the impression which the book makes on us is in favour of an early date, yet, if any good external evidence could be produced that the book is as late as 150 or as early as 100, there is nothing in the teaching of the book which would entitle us to reject it, knowing so little as we do of the progress of doctrine during the interval. Turning, then, to the external evidence, the highest respect is due to the fact that at Rome, where a true tradition was most likely to be found, it was believed at the beginning of the 3rd century that Hermas was the bishop of Rome. This belief, however, may have been ultimately derived from the statement of the Muratorian writer. The credit to which a witness is entitled is proportionate to the amount of care he habitually takes to make a statement without sufficient evidence. In the case of an anonymous letter, however, by which a single fragment, we have no means of estimating what this amount may be; and therefore the provisional assent we give to him is liable to be withdrawn when we find good reason to believe him to be in error. Such reason is in this case afforded by the statement of the book itself, that Hermas was instructed, as the revelation should be completed, to send two copies of them, one to Clement for transmission to foreign churches, the other to Grotte to be used in admonishing the widows and orphans. Notwithstanding the respect with which the idea is entertained by Westcott (Canon, p. 190), we cannot seriously discuss Origen’s suggestion (Philocal. l. 11) that these names are only intended to have a mystical meaning. Origen finds that Grotto and Clement denote the literal and spiritual methods of interpretation. Only a few degrees less improbable is the supposition of Donaldson and Harnack that Clement is a real person, but not the Clement who wrote the Epistle to the Corinthians. It is no doubt possible, but it is extremely unlikely. In fact, no one who has followed the writing of that letter should be another Clement whose function it also was to communicate on behalf of the church of Rome with foreign churches, but who has left in ecclesiastical history no trace of his existence. We conclude then that the Clement in question is he who was counted one of the first bishops of Rome, and then it must follow that, if Hermas was a real man at all, he must have been his contemporary. It is immaterial whether we can maintain the perfect veracity of Hermas, or whether we are bound to take his words that he received a divine message for Clement, or that he delivered it to him; still, if the book did not drop down from the clouds, but was communicated to the church of Rome by a real man, who told his countrymen what he had been instructed to communicate his vision to Clement, we must suppose him to be mad or them to be fools, if we put his date so late that Clement must have died before he was born or while he was a child. On these grounds we hold that even the respectably attested tradition about Pius must be rejected if it is inconsistent with allowing Hermas to have been contemporary with Clement. It is not absolutely impossible to combine the two suppositions if we assume that Hermas was considerably older than Pius, and published his visions not during his brother’s episcopate, but twenty years earlier or more, and perhaps also if we place the death of Clement somewhat later than in the common reckoning. But, as after every allowance made, this puts a strain on the chronology, we prefer to believe that Pius really had an eminent brother named Pastor, whose identification with the Shepherd of Hermas was a rash combination of the Muratorian writer. Zahn, whom we follow in relying more on the connexion with Clement than on that with Pius, places The Shepherd about A.D. 97; but it seems to us that if we assign that date to the end of the 1st century, Pius has our few years for that letter to have obtained the celebrity and success which the notice in Hermas...
HERMAS

implies. That notice need not necessarily have been published in the lifetime of Clement, for Hermas is not instructed to deliver his message immediately, but only after the completion of his revelations, and this may be supposed to have been after Clement's death.

We may next examine whether any of the indications of date to be found in the book are inconsistent with the early date we have assigned, only premising that, as Lippius, who holds fast to the Pius tradition, still feels himself obliged to place The Shepherd in the very first years of Pius (i.e. the accession of Pius at earliest 139, The Shepherd about 143), so we may expect that, when the Pius tradition is discarded, a still earlier date may be found admissible.

(a) The Mention of Gropte.—This mention would have been unmeaning unless she were known to have been a contemporary of Clement; but however well known such a woman might be in her lifetime, her reputation would not be likely to survive her death.

(b) Montanism.—There is much affinity between the leading ideas of Montanism and of the book of Hermas. In both the difficulties were strongly felt that arose from the facts that the church, which was in its ideal an assembly of holy men, actually included many unworthy of the name of saints, and that many who had been baptized for the remission of sins had stained with blood because they had come to a knowledge of the truth. The question was asked, Was it possible to renew such again to repentance? In both our Lord's second coming was eagerly looked forward to, and in both a knowledge of God's coming dealings with His church was sought for from visions and revelations. But it did not need that a century should pass since Christ's death before the pressure made itself felt of the difficulties we have referred to; and on examination we find that the answers given by Hermas are quite independent of Montanism, and have all the marks of being earlier. We have already remarked on the much greater willingness in the church to accept prophetic pretensions in the time of Hermas than in the age of Montanism. The Montanists refused recognition to gross mistakes; Hermas held complete removal to be had, however, only one for the worst of sins. He will not allow the husband of an adulteress to marry again, because she might repent; in that case she ought to be taken back. To abstain from a second marriage was a duty with the Montanists; with Hermas it was a counsel of perfection—meritorious if followed, but which might be disregarded without sin. The Montanists added to the facts of the Gospels of Hermas no mark lying a matter of obligation, and he insists on the spirit in which it shall be observed, directing that it shall not be mere self-discipline, but made useful to others by giving in charity the cost of the meal saved by abstinence. In these and in other respects the teaching of Hermas is less rigorous than the Montanistic, and all that is special to Montanism is unknown to him.

(c) Church Government.—Nothing interferes more with the historical use of early writers than reading them in the light of modern controversies of which these writers were not thinking. It is natural to think that, if parity of presbyters was the church's original rule, the government of a single head could not have been established without some resistance on the part of those who were dispossessed of their equal authority. An exception to the almost total silence of church history as to such resistance has been supposed to be found in the language in which Hermas rebukes the presbyters among Christians, (Viz. iii. 9; Mand. ix.; Sim. viii. 7.) Although it might be supposed that, if the Muratorian writer could truly speak of the episcopate of Pius as his own time, he would be less likely to mistake as to the constitution of the church at that time, than as to the date of the publication of a work supposed to have appeared at the beginning of that episcopate, the same persons who take the word of the fragmentist that Hermas rebukes the presbyters for his assertion that Pius then occupied the chair of the Roman church. Their theory is that, up to that time, parity of presbyters had prevailed, that Pius was but a leading presbyter, whose attempts to fix himself in a position of permanent precedence called forth resistance from the other presbyters, and gave occasion for the rebukes of his own brother. All this theory seems to me quite chimerical. The language does not make efforts almost exclusively to combating the relaxation of morality in the church; he scarcely notices doctrinal errors. The only thing to be found in his book which seems to refer to a point of Gnostic teaching is that it would appear from Sim. v. 7, which ought to be compared with a passage probably derived from it (2 Clem. 9), that there were some who took licence to misuse the flesh on account of a denial of the resurrection of the body. But the false teachers noticed by Hermas seem to have been all in the church, not separate from it. In the passage which seems most distinctly to refer to Gnostics (Sim. ix. 22), they are described as "wishing to know everything and knowing nothing," as "praising themselves that they have understanding, and wishing to be teachers, though they were really fools." Yet he adds, "to these repentance is open, for they were not wicked, but rather silly and without understanding." We have reason to believe that the seeds of Gnosticism had begun to spring up even in apostolic times; but we cannot think that Hermas would have written as he did after Gnosticism had become a dangerous enemy to the Roman church. Irenaeus (iii. 4) dates the coming of Valentine and Cerdo to Rome in the episcopate of Hyginus, the bishop before Pius, about A.D. 135. It is therefore reasonable to believe that the work of Hermas was earlier. We might also argue, from the language of Hermas concerning the pre-existence of the church, that he must have been ignorant of the Aeons of Valentineus. We have used this argument (Vol. I. p. 558) to infer that the so-called second epistle of Clement was anterior to Valentineus. We shall argue a fortiori for the antiquity of Hermas if we could rely on some indications that the Clementine author was acquainted with the work of Hermas, but we cannot venture to lay stress on this argument.
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duction. He appears to use the word ἐνθυσμὸς as synonymous with προφητεία, and he always speaks of the government of the church as in the hands of the elders, without giving any hint that one elder enjoyed authority over the others. The only thing looking that way is that Clement is recognised as the organ by which the church of Rome communicated with foreign churches; but whether this implied a like pre-emminence in domestic rule, we are not told. Similarly, though we infer that the presbyters had seats of honour in the church assemblies, we are not told that they had a seat higher than the rest. Either it was not the case or it was too much a matter of course to be mentioned. But a message on the subject of dissensions is sent τοῖς προφητείοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς προφητείοις. It is a very forced explanation of the last plural noun to suppose it means some one of the προφητείων who desired to make himself the first, nor have we any reason to think that the word implies any sarcasm. It is more natural to understand that besides the presbyters there were others who in church assemblies were given seats of honour. Who these were, we may gather from other passages. We find (Mand. xi.) that one who claims to be a prophet is represented as sitting on a “cathedra,” while the hearers sit before him on a “subcellum.” Again, in the first vision the church, when she reads her book, sits on a cathedra. We may infer that such a seat was the prerogative of teachers. We find also from Mand. xi. that prophets were allowed to speak in the church assemblies; and the direction to Hermas himself to read his book with the presbyters, seems plain, so when to a public reading in the presence of the congregation. We are thus led to the conclusion that, besides the presbyters there were lay preachers, who, as having a gift of prophecy, were allowed to address the church assemblies, and in that capacity were given seats of honour. But as held no permanent official position, their claims would probably be ill-defined, and disputes on the subject were very likely to arise. This was a question in which Hermas was personally far more interested than in disputes concerning priority among presbyters. We may gather from his discovery (Vis. iii. 10, 13), that a subcellium is a firmer and better seat than a cathedra, that his own claim to a cathedra had not been admitted; and the authorities of the Roman church may reasonably have hesitated to place in the teacher’s chair a pious visionary, neither well read in Scripture nor accurately instructed in doctrines.

* The perverse ingenuity of commentators has also extracted the sentiments of Hermas about episcopacy and about the propriety of paying the clergy from a passage, intelligible enough in its obvious meaning, in which he contrasts the false prophet and the true. “The false prophet sets up as a soothsayer, receives persons who consult him in private, undertakes to answer their questions, and takes money for doing so. Sometimes his answers are correct, for he is enabled to use his instrument to deceive the righteous. He abuses the public assemblies of the righteous for prayer; there his earthly spirit deserts him, and he is unable to speak when not questioned. Not so the true prophet, who speaks at God’s bidding, and little wishes him to speak, but in the public assemblies, when the angel of the prophetic spirit moves him to speak. The true prophet is meek and humble, and simple in his manner of life; not ambitious of the first place, impatient, talkative, and for the most part, like the false prophet.” Compare Euseb. H. E. v. 18.
Christian venturing past the lions at the gate of the House Beautiful. The doctrine of Hermas concerning the person and work of the Son of God is entirely Christian. The Son of God is older than all creation, and was a fellow counsellor with the Father in the work of creation. He is the rock on which the church is built, His name the only gate by which any can enter into the kingdom of God. Even the most glorious angels cannot enter unto God apart from Him. (Sim. ix. 12.) It has indeed been contended that, because Hermas speaks of six chief angels, and the Ebonite systems of seven, Hermas means that the Son of God should be thought of as an angel, the chief over the six. But this combination is altogether unwarranted, and depends on the quite groundless assumption that Hermas has any affinity with Ebonism. The number seven is nowhere employed in the imagery of Hermas; on the contrary, the angels are twelve, consisting of six principal and six subordinate. Hermas tells of the toil and suffering which the Son of God underwent for the sake of the children of His people, and of the reward which He receives in the exaltation of His human nature and in His joy at receiving His purified people into union with Himself. It has been questioned whether Hermas distinguishes the personality of the Holy Spirit from that of the pre-existent Son of God. We ourselves are disposed to agree with Zahn (p. 201) that he does; but there is room for doubt, arising from the fact that in the Similitudes of Hermas, as well as in other parables, there may be a difference of opinion what things belong to the framework of the parable and what are intended to be symbolical. Bull (Def. Fid. No. 1, 2), vindicates the language of Hermas, but if it should appear that Hermas had not made the doctrine in question the subject of scientific thought, we have only another proof of the early date of his work.

The only express quotation in Hermas is from the lost apocryphal book of Eldad and Modad. Of his Old Testament allusions, we have spoken already. His use of either Old or New Testament not being indicated by formal quotation, but only by coincidences of language or thought, there is room for difference of opinion as to his use of particular books. Some of the allusions of the Epistle of James and of that to the Ephesians seem to us absolutely decisive. Only a little less strong are the proofs of the use of the First Epistle of Peter and of the First to the Corinthians. There are other New Testament books of his use of which we are ourselves persuaded, though we admit that the evidence is not conclusive. Among these we mention in particular the use of the Gospel of St. John. We believe also that the knowledge of sayings of our Lord which Hermas unmistakably exhibits was obtained from our synoptic Gospels, the coincidences with St. Mark (see Zahn, p. 457) being most striking.

Where Hermas had lived before he was sold to Rome is a point on which we can only conjecture. According to a reading which there seems no good ground for disbelieving, he supposed himself in one of his visions to have been transported to Arcadia, and Mr. Mahaffy reports (Rambles in Greece, p. 330, 2nd ed.), that the scenery that he describes is such as may be witnessed in Arcadia, and is not to be seen in the neigh-

(p. 133) that Hermas was one of those victims of the tyranny of Domitian to whom, as Dion Cassius tells (68, 2), Nerva made restitution by giving land instead of the goods of which they had been deposed.

If the view taken in this article be correct, that we have in the work of Hermas an authentic specimen of the teaching of one of those who were recognised in the Christian church as prophets at the beginning of the 2nd century, it is disappointing to be obliged to add that the book is not one which an ordinary Christian of the present day would much care to read either for amusement or edification, and that the historical student finds much less light thrown by it than might have been expected on the questions in which he is interested. Hermas himself is altogether absorbed in trying to bring about a practical reform; he shews much less interest in questions of doctrine, in which possibly as a layman he might not have been accurately instructed; he never quotes the Scriptures en masse, not even when his subject is his language much influenced by Scripture phraseology, and there are those who would describe Hermas as having preached not the Gospel, but a "fusionless screech of dry morality." The inference was natural, if Pauline Christianity is so much in the background in Hermas, he must have been an anti-Pauline Jewish Christian; and this inference may seem to be confirmed by the fact that the New Testament book which has most stamped itself on the mind of Hermas is the Epistle of St. James. Yet a closer examination finds no real trace of Judaism in Hermas. It is scarcely credible that one who had been brought up a Jew should seem so unfamiliar with the Old Testament. The Jewish nation and its privileges are not even mentioned; there is nothing about the distinction between Jew and gentile, and in fact a reader of Hermas would not discover that the Jewish nation had ever existed. Michael is not the guardian angel of that nation, but of the Christian church. Once where the phrase "twelve tribes" occurs, it turns out to mean not the Jewish tribes, but twelve nations into which the whole human race is classified; as for imposing on gentile Christians and other books that he did not have any knowledge that such a thing had ever been thought of: Indeed, the morality of Hermas is singularly free from formalism. For the new forgiveness of sins which he announces, he requires as conditions no ceremonial washings as in the book of Elchessai, no penances, no increased rigour of fasting, no formal abstinence, nothing but repentance and reformation. Baptism is the only church rite on which he insists; that he counts so essential that he believes that the holy men of the old dispensation received baptism from the apostles in the under world; fasting he uses, but attributes to it no exaggerated value; he does not even cross himself when venturing to pass the terrible beast in a scene like that of

\* The contrast is striking if we compare the fulness of Old Testament quotation in Clement's epistle with the scantiness in Hermas. Harnack gives a list of seven passages which seem to show acquaintance with the Old Testament. Four of these relate to passages quoted in New Testament books which seem to have been read by Hermas; the other three are doubtful.
bourhood of Rome. Zahn found a conjecture that Hermas was born in Egypt on the resemblance between the architectural character of the tower of Hermas's visions, and the description given by Plutarch of the Jewish temple in the Egyptian Helopolis.

Translations. We have already spoken of the probability that a Latin translation of The Shepherd existed in the time of Tertullian. Harnack is of opinion that the present received Latin translation dates from the middle of the 2nd century, relying amongst other arguments on the fact that in one place amongst where we have diereza in the Greek, the Latin has "episcopi id est praesides ecclesiarum," an explanation which would not be required except at a very early date. It has been questioned whether our Greek text is not a translation from the Latin. No argument in support of this opinion can be founded on the Latinisms in the Greek text, since they are sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the author lived at Rome. The hypothesis of a double original seems not unworthy of consideration. Hermas was directed to make two copies of his book. That the one which was to be sent to foreign churches must have been written in Greek may be taken for granted; in what language was that written which Graape was to read to the widows and orphans at Rome? A second Latin translation, clearly different from the Vulgate text, was published by Dresel from a Codex Palatinus. Harnack (p. 1xv) produces proof of the use of this version in the 6th century. How much earlier it was cannot be determined; but it is generally agreed that it is later than the Vulgate, and Harnack is of opinion that the older version was employed in making the new translation. More recently an Ethiopic version has been discovered, which was published in 1860. The transcriber has a note maintaining that the author of The Shepherd was the apostle Paul. He relies on Acts xiv. 12, which he quotes in the form that the Lyconianis called "Sias" Zeus, and Paul Hermes. Until quite modern times, The Shepherd was only known to the West by the Latin translation. In 1856 the first edition of the Greek text was printed by Anger and Dindorf. It was founded ultimately on a MS. found at Mount Athos, of which Simonides brought three leaves to Leipzig, and a transcript of the rest; but this edition was spoiled by the bad faith of Simonides, who at first sold a copy which he had corrupted by a number of emendations of his own. An independent source for the Greek text has been obtained in the Sinaiitic MS., which, as has been said, includes the work of Hermas. Besides these there have been employed the quotations of Clement of Alexendria, copious unacknowledged quotations by Pseudo-Athanasius (Doc. ad Antioch. Migne, Pat. Gr. xxviii. 555), separately published by Dindorf, Leipzig, 1857; and similar quotations by Antiochus Monachus, a writer of the 7th century (Pat. Gr. ixxx. 1415, concerning whom see Fabri, Bibl. Gr. Harles, x. 500). From these sources Hermas has been edited by Hilgenfeld (Nov. Test. ext. Can. Rec. 1866), and by Gebhardt and Harnack (Patres Apostolici, 1877). The latter edition we count so indispensable to the student that, as it contains a full list of editions, and as it is a fairer treating of Hermas, we think it needless to transcribe what the reader will have in his hands. Only we mention Zahn, Der Hirt des Hermas, 1868, as the work from which we have learned most. Since Gebhardt's edition Hermas has been edited by Funk (Pat. Apost. Tübingen, 1878). Some later and more detailed discussion is also to be found in the reviews of Gebhardt's edition, among which we mention that by Overbeck (Schirer, Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1878), by Donaldson in Theological Review, 1878, and by Zahn, Göttingen gelehrte Anzeigen, 1878.

HERMAS (3) (Hermes), confessor at Nicibia, commemorated on Friday after Easter week, the local feast of commemoration of all the confessors. (Wright's Spr. Mart. in Jour. Soc. Lit. 1866, p. 485.)

HERMAS (4), a Messalina, condemned at Antioch. (Theodoret, E. H. iv. 10; Id. Haer. Fab. iv. 11.) [EUCHEIΣ.] [G. S.]

HERMEAS (Eucles), one of the three principal disciples of Manes, the other two being Addas and Thomas. Hermas was sent by Manes before his death to propagate his doctrines in Egypt, where he prevailed on many to become Manicheans (Epiph. Haer. 1xv. 5, 12, in Migne, Patr. Gr. xili. 37, 47). Epiphanius heard of him from many who had come in contact with him there. [T. W. D.]

HERMELANDUS (Usuard, Mart. Mar. 25), abbat. [HERMELANDUS.] [C. H.]


HERMELLUS (Hermillus, Hermoldus), martyr, commemorated at Constantinople on Aug. 3. (Usuard, Bull. Acta AX, Aug. 1, 212.) [C. H.]


HERMENARIUS, archbishop of Bourges. [HERMENARIUS.]

HERMENARIUS, bishop of Autun. [HERMENARIUS (2).]

HERMENFREDUS (Hermonfredus), 12th bishop of Verdun, succeeding Charrinera, and followed by Gode, or, according to the Vite S. Pauli Episc. Verdunensis (Bouquet, iii. 515), by St. Paulus. He was born near Strasbourg of noble parents, and educated at the court of Childerbert II. king of Austrasia, with Theoderic and Theodebert his sons. Upon Childerbert's death (A.D. 556) he was left to himself. Theoderic, whose kingdom comprised Burgundy, but retired after a time to the monastery of Luxeuil, of which Columbanus was then abbot, and from thence he was chosen to fill the see of Verdun. He is said to have died Dec. 8, A.D. 621, after an episcopate of nine or ten years, and in some martyrologies he appears as a saint. (Gulf. Christ. xiii. 1188.) [S. A. B.]

HERMENGILD (Ermengild), ST., Visi-
goth catholic prince in Spain, son of the Arian king Leovigild. 

Hermenigild and Recared were the sons of Leovigild's first wife (Joh. Bl. apud Exp. SSgr. vi. 378), who was already dead in 569, in which year the king married Gisvintha, the widow of his predecessor Athanagild. The dates of the princes' births are unknown (? 560-62), but it is plain from Greg. Tur. Hist. Fr. v. 39, that Her- menigild was the elder of the two brothers. In 575, immediately after the conquest of Sar- aces in Leovigild's first campaign, both sons were made "consortes regni" (Joh. Bl. l. c. For remarks on the circumstances and meaning of this step, see art. LEOVIGILD). Thenceforward, up to 579, the Spanish sources give no information of Hermengild. Between the two dates of 573 and 579, however, most probably between 573 and 575 (conf. Greg. Tur. iv. 38), Hermengild was betrothed to Inguthis, the daughter of Sigibert of Rheims and Brunhild, and grand-daughter, therefore, of Brunhild's mother, Gisvintha (q. v.), Leovi- gild's second wife and Hermengild's step-mother. In 579 (Joh. Bl. l. c. 381), Inguthis, then twelve years old, reached Spain, and in the same year, owing to dissensions between the Catholic Frankish princess and her Arian grandmother (see art. INGUTHIS), Leovigild sent the newly married pair to a distance, assigning to Hermen- gild the government of Baetica, or a portion of it, with Seville for a capital (Jo. Bl. l. c.). Here later in the same year (conf. Gürres, Kritische Untersuch. über den Aufstand und das Martyr- um des Westgoten Königsohnes Hermengild, in Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol. 1875, i. note 83; Dahn, Künst. der Germ. v. 137, gives 580 as the year), Hermengild renounced Arianism, was confirmed in the Catholic faith by Leander the Catholic metropolitan of Seville, and took the name of Joannes (Greg. Tur. v. 39; Greg. Magn. Dif. iii. 31; Paul. Dif. iii. 21). This important step was immediately followed by the rebellion of Hermengild (Joh. Bl. l. c.), who shortly afterwards formed a close alliance with the Byzantines in the south, and with the recently catholicized Suevi in the north, i.e. with the two most formidable enemies of his father's state and church. Nothing (conf. Dahn, p. 138). Thus the struggle shaped itself as a conflict of confessions and nationalities, of Arianism and Catholicism, of Goth and Roman, although Leovigild had adherents among the provincials, and Hermen- gild counted some Gothic partisans. (Dahn, v. 140.)

From 580 to 583 Leovigild was occupied in various measures of precaution and preparation. From a later date (late 582) it was the end of 582 that he felt himself strong enough to attack his son. Late in 582 or early in 583, Merida, which we may suppose to have been the most northerly of Hermengild's towns, was conquered (Greg. Tur. vi. 18), and the siege of Seville followed immediately. Towards the end of 583 or the beginning of 584, Hermengild escaped from the beleaguered city (possibly at the same time Leovigild was about to seek help from Constantine; see art. LEANDER) and took refuge with the Byzantines at Cordova, which, after having been subdued by Leovigild in 572, had declared for Hermengild, and invited a Greek garrison. Seville fell in 584 (Joh. Bl. l. c. p. 383), and shortly afterwards Hermengild was captured in or near Cordova, the Basilians effect having been bribed to give up both the town and the fugitive to the father (Greg. Tur. v. 39, vi. 43; Joh. Bl. p. 383). He was deprived of the government of Basetica, and, in all probability, of his claim to the succession (Joh. Bl. c. regno privatru appears to cover both penalties), and was sent an exile to Valencia. In the following year (585), "Hermengildus in Urbe Tarracoensis adhibeit interfectur" (Joh. Bl. D. 384). This is all the notice that the abbat of Bicalo, our best source, gives to the fact. Isidore does not mention the death of Hermengild at all. Gregory of Tours mentions it drily in passing as one of the causes of Guntharinnus's attack upon Septimania (Hist. Fr. viii. 28; "Leuvichildus vero Herm. filium suum—morti tradidit").

Upon the account given by Gregory the Great alone, therefore (Dipl. iii. 31), rests the claim of Hermengild to be considered not as a rebel suffering the too harsh penalty of a political crime, but as a martyr for the Catholic faith. According to the pope, Hermengild, after a painful imprisonment, "in cilio vivaculculo jacens," was beheaded on the night of Easter Sunday, by his father's "apparitores," because he had refused to receive the sacraments from the hands of an Arian bishop, "atque per hoc patria gratiam redire merebatur." After the execution, miracles were not wanting to substan- tiate the martyr's claim to veneration: "For in the silence of the night, the sound of psalmsody began to be heard around the body of the king and martyr, truly king because truly martyr." His body, therefore, "ut videlicet martyris, jure cunctis fidibus venerari debuit." In his grave, also, according to Gregory, were laid the foundations of Visigothic Catholicism. For after Leovigild's death, his son Recared "non patrem perfidum sed fratre martyrum sequens" was converted by Leander and led over the whole people of the Visigoths to the true faith. Nor was it wonderful that he should become a preacher of the true faith, since he was the brother of a martyr, whose merits helped him in his task of leading back so many souls to the bosom of the Church. But that the Visigoths could have been if Hermengild had not died. Thus, one of the Visigothic race died that many might live, and while one grain of wheat had fallen to the ground, "seges multa surrexit".

In the face of this apparent conflict between Gregory's testimony and the silence of the Spanish source, modern opinion has always been much divided as to Hermengild's martyrdom. It is plain that neither to Joh. Bichareses, his contemporaries nor to Isidore, Leander's younger brother, nor even to Gregory of Tours, did Her- menigild appear in the light of a martyr for Catholicism. "Tyranus" and "rebellis" are the words used of him by Joannes; Isidore follows the same line: "deinde filium suum tyranni- zantiem imperii sui obsessum experspertavit," and again in the Hist. Suev. "rebelliam filium." Another Spanish poet, Gregory of Tours, says that upon his return from Paris to Merida, a writer of the 7th century (Ma- billon, Ann. Ord. Sancti Bened. l. 72, dates the De Vit. et Mir. Patrum Emeritensium about 833), whose record of the bishops of Merida was avowedly suggested by the Dialogues of Gregory
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the Great, thus transforms the passage from the
Dialogus, already quoted:

Greg. M. Dial. 3. 31.  

"Post ejus (Leovigild)  
mortem Recaredus rex non  
patrem perdum sed pro-
tres martyres sequens, ab  
Arianae haeresis pravitate  
convertus est."

This writer's fanatical hatred of Leovigild is  
visible in every page of his life of bishop  
Masons (q. c.). Had Hermengild really died a  
martyr's death, what motive could have induced us  
assailant of his Arian father to thus implicitly  
deny a fact so useful to one of his main purposes?  
To these passages from the Spanish sources we  
have also to add the striking and often quoted  
words of Gregory of Tours, whose sympathy with  
the Catholicks of Hermengild and Inguthis is,  
of course, beyond question: "Hermenigildus—  
patrisque ejus ex arcebro, cognovit, consiliumque  
inuit, qualiter venientem aut repelleret aut  
 necaret, necesse misit, judicium sibi imminere  
dicitum, qui contra genitorem quamlibet haereticum  
talia cogitaret."

We are naturally led in this state of the  
evidence to examine more closely the genesis and  
character of St. Gregory's narrative. The  
Dialogue in question was written about 594  
(Görres, L. c. p. 13, note 38). The sources of it  
appear to have been—for the fact and immediate  
causes of the conversion, the testimony of  
Leander received at Constantinople, between the  
year 583 and 586 [see art. LEANDER]—for  
Hermengild's death on the other hand, the witness  
of unnamed Spanish emigrants, in all probability  
exiles belonging to the political party of  
Hermengild (sicut multorum, qui ab Hispaniarum  
partibus veniunt relationes cognovimus, & c.).  
The account entirely passes over the political  
circumstances under which Hermengild met  
his death. There is no mention whatever of  
war or rebellion. No names of localities or  
persons beyond those of Leander and the father  
and sons are given, and immediately upon the  
conversion, the new imprisonment and death.  
Whereas we know that between the conversion  
and Hermengild's capture at Cordova five years  
elapsed of incessant military or diplomatic action  
upon the part both of father and son. The miracles  
following the martyrdom, and the extremely  
improbable story of Leovigild's remorse and  
repentant recommendation of Leander to Recared  
[see art. LEAOVID] increase the unhistorical  
aspect of the whole. Nevertheless in the course  
of time Gregory's narrative won complete ascen- 
dancy, and upon it was founded the canonization,  
which a thousand years later was accorded to  
the tyrannus and rebellis of the Spanish sources.  

Various explanations have been offered of  
the attitude of the Spanish reporters towards  
Hermengild. Aguirre declare the positively that  
the narrations in question had been mutilated by  
Arians (Conc. Hosp. Coll. Max. i. 422), an opinion  
shared by the Spanish antiquary Joseph Perez  
[see quotation in Arevalo, Isid. Op. i. 422].  
Arevalo, however (l. c.), has long ago disposed  
of these assertions, as of certain other explana- 
tions and harmonizations put forward by Nicolas  
Antonio (Bibl. Vetus, lib. v. cap. 4, 134). The  
editor of Ibsen suggested in his turn that  
Joannes and Isidoro writing under Recared dared  
not favour the cause of Hermengild, because his  
young son Athanagild was still living, and  
might have been a dangerous weapon in the  
hands of Inguthis's Frankish brother and uncle.  
The argument against this position rests in fact  
by Görres (l. c. p. 80). Another and more-  
plausible theory refers to Hermengild's alliance  
with the Byzantines, which, after Recared's  
reign, during which such great strides were made  
towards the fusion of the Goths and Romans, and  
the formation of a Spanish nationality, must have  
appeared as an act of unpardonable treachery  
to every loyal subject of the Gothic state—to  
the writer of Roman descent like Isidore, as well as  
to a writer of Gothic descent such as the abbot  
of Bicalo. Gams has put this explanation as strongly  
as it admits of being put (Kirchengesch. von Spanien  
ii. 2) 5, and it does no doubt explain the dis- 
approval of the revolt shewn by Isidore and  
Joannes. It is difficult, however, to believe that  
had Hermengild really met his death as a  
martyr for the orthodox belief, such a considera- 
tion would have altogether prevented them from  
mentioning the fact. Both—Isidore more  
especially—write as accusers of Leovigild, while  
with such an act in itself both must of course  
have been in full sympathy. And in any case  
the theory leaves Gregory of Tours' blame and  
silence unexplained.

Such are some of the difficulties of this famous  
story. "A close examination of all the sources,"  
says Görres (in 1873, l. c.), "has led me to  
the conclusion that the supposed martyrdom of  
Hermengild cannot be substantiated." While  
the most recent ultra-Catholic view is that of  
Gams: "On the one hand, therefore, stands Gregory I,  
who represents him as a martyr and a saint, on  
the other the Spanish sources, who represent him  
as a rebel. I believe the explanation lies in the  
practice and teaching of the church, according to  
which martyrdom, as a baptism of blood (via  
Martyrdom), offers all previous faults.

Growth of the Hermengild cultus.—The first  
mention of Hermengild as a martyr, after  
Gregory I, occurs in the De rebus sanctorum  
sanctorum of 24, the greatest and most useful  
biography of the 7th century, Fructuoso, written  
towards the end of the 7th  

century, where, among a list of royal martyrs,  
appears Regum Gothorum Ermenegildii (Esp.  
Sagr. xvi. 373). In the Mozarabic liturgy,  
the work of the 7th century Spanish churchmen,  
Hermengild has no place, nor does he appear in  
the 9th century Memoriales Sacerdotum of  
Eulogius (Schott, Histor. iii. p. 223). Beda's  
Martyrology makes no mention of him, nor up to  
the 9th century does any single author beside  
Gregory I, Paulus Diaconus following him (Hist.  
Langob. iii. 31), and Valerius—speak of Hermen- 
gild as a martyr. In the 9th century, however,  
his name was generally admitted into the  
Martyrologies (Ap. 13 ; Ado, Usuardus, Notker,  
Wandelinus ; all basing on Gregory's Dialogus  
[conf. Ado, "ut scribit beatus Papa Gregorius"]);  
while the 13th-century Spanish historians,  
entirely reversing the judgment of their prede- 
cessors, even made additions to Gregory's nar- 
ative (conf. Lucas Tud. "Alix sanum nefasid  
rutilis communare nolentem diversa tormenta  
prorsus excruciatum, interfeceris justit?" ; and Rod.  
Tol. de Rebus Hisp. ii. 14, both apud Schott,
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HISP. Ill. iv. ii.; Cronica General [Estoria de España], part ii. cap. 39). Thenceforward the cultus grew rapidly, and found its natural issue in 1585, when Sixtus V., urged by Philip II., issued an apostolic brief, instituting the cult of Hermingildus in Galicia, which became a sure sign of the deaths of father and son, and the first of which we know to have been largely caused by the impression made on Gunthramm by the news of Hermingildus's death. We are therefore obliged to fall back upon Easter Day, 585. This would give March 24–25 for Hermingildus's death, and would also necessitate the conclusion that Leovigild's seventhenth year began before March 24, 585. Again, we are still to find a place for the important Suevian campaign against Audika in the same year before Hermingildus's death, we may conjecture with some probability that the year in question began in January or February 585. An interesting reflection here suggests itself, supposing the date just arrived at established. If Leovigild were engaged during the early months of 585 in subduing and annexing the Suevi in the extreme north-west of the peninsula, how could he have played the direct personal part in the death of Hermingildus at Tarraco, i.e. the extreme north-east of Spain on March 24 of the same year which St. Gregory assigns to him?

For the well-known inscription at Alcalá de Guadaira, dating from the rebellion period, "In nomine domini anno feliciter secundo [581] regni domini nostri Ermingildi regis, quern preaequitur genetor sus domus (sic) Liuwigildus rex in civitate Hispaniae, ducti Aione," see Hübner's Inscr. Hisp. Christ. p. 22, No. 76, and for coins struck by Hermingildus, Flores's Medallas sec. iii. and the admirable recent work of M. Heiss, Description générale des monnaies des rois Visigoth d'Espagne par Alouise Heiss, Paris, 1872. For general references see list given under Leovigild. [M. A. W.]

HERMENILDA (Kemble, C. D. 44), abbess. [EREMENILDA.] [O. H.]

HERMENLANDUS or HERMENLANDUS (ST.), abbot of Antrim (Aindre) at the beginning of the 8th century, was born of noble parents at Noviomagus (Nimwegen) in Holland, and was when very young sent as a page to the court of king Clothaire, where he was brought up. When come to years of maturity he refused marriage, and in spite of all opposition entered on a monastic life, first as a novice, and was afterwards consecrated priest in the monastery of Fontanella under St. Landbertus, by whom he was soon sent to Nannetum (Nantes) at the request of Passquarius, bishop of that diocese, for the purpose of founding a monastery. On his arrival Hermenlandus was cordially received by the bishop, and after surveying the island of Antrim on the Ligeris or Loire in Armorica (Brittany), he chose that for the site of the new monastery, which he at once proceeded to build. On its completion he became abbat, and presided over it for many years. Before his death he appointed Donatus as his successor. Miracles are said to have been worked at his tomb, and he is commemorated on March 25. (Marti. Usuard.; Boll. Acta SS. Marth. 574; Mabill. Acta SS. O.S.B. spec. iii. i. 365.) [O. S.]
HERMIONIC. [HERMIC.]  

HERMIONTAE, HERMORTAE, HERMEOITAE (Phil. de Haeq. lvi.), a heretical sect. [HERMIA (1).] [T. W. D.]  

HERMIC and HERMIGAR, joint kings (?) of the Suevi in Spain (409-440). In the autumn of 409 (between Sept. 28 and Oct. 13, Dahn, Königre der Germanen, vi. 559) a Suevic tribe accompanied the Vandals and Alani into Spain, and the land was parcelled out among the invaders by lot. (See the famous passage in Istius [see Corpus Ins. Arch. ii. final map].) In entry into the peninsula, apud Exp. Saur. iv. 353, 354.) To the Suevi and a section of the Vandals fell (A.D. 411) the extreme north-west of Spain, practically the Roman province of Gallicia ("Gallaeciam situm in extremate oceani maris occiduum," Idat. l. c.). In 417 the Suevi, together with the Vandals and Alani, concluded a treaty with Honorius, by which they engaged to defend Spain for the empire against other barbarians. In 418 Walja, the Gothic king, acting for the empire, "Romani nominis causa" (Idat. l. c.), destroyed the Alani, and the Suevi were relieved from their supremacy, to which they had been for a time forced to submit. They were thus, however, brought face to face with the Vandals, who appear to have been greatly their equals in point of numbers, and in 419 we find the Suevi, under their king HERMIC, shut up in the "Montes Nerviai" (between Leon and Oriedo, Dica. Geogr. de la España Antig. Cortez y Lopez, iii. 220) by the Vandals (Idat. l. c.). The voluntary retreat of the Vandals southward (HERMIC) relieved the Suevi, and soon encouraged them to follow on the track of their retiring rivals in the hope of appropriating the country left vacant by them. In 429 Genseric was already on the sea-coast planning the migration to Africa, when he heard of the Suevian advance upon Lusitania, and promptly retraced his steps to meet them. A battle followed at Merida (A.D. 429) in which the Suevians were heavily defeated, while their leader Hermigar was drowned in the Guadiana during their flight. Who Hermigar was is doubtful. Istius does not speak of him as rex, but only as Sueus. Possibly he was Heremic's dux only, but possibly also his brother and under-king (cf. Dahn, l. c. note 8). Upon this overthrow by the Vandals, followed hostilities on the part of the inland provincials of Gallicia acting from the towns and strong places, who inflicted heavy damage on the weakened Suevi and compelled the restoration of all prisoners, as the price of peace. In the following year however (436) Istius himself, the faithful historian of the time and bishop of the Gallician see of Aquae Flaviae (Claviae), was sent by the Gallician provincials to Aetius in Gaul to report a breach of the just concluded peace by Hermic and to ask for help against the Suevi. Just at this time, as Dahn points out (l. c. 561), the Suevi were for more than thirty years practically masters of the peninsula. From 429 to Euric's accession in 466, 482, 489, with but one or two interludes, we find them for the conquest and colonisation of the country, goes far towards proving their small numbers" (Dahn, l. c.).  

From 433 to 440 Hermic was obliged by illness ("diurno morbo additus per annos septem," Idat.) to maintain a more peaceful attitude. He made peace with the Gallician provincials, "sub intervinta episcopali" (Idat.), and appointed his son Rekill co-regent. Between 437 and 439 Rekill won important successes over the Romans on the Xeull and Guadiana. Merida was once more captured, and a Roman comes with legati were forced to give themselves up at Myrtillas (Mertola on the Guadiana; see Corpus Ins. Arch. ii. final map). In 440 Hermic died and was succeeded by Rekill, under whom, as under his grandson Rekbar, the Suevian power in Spain reached its highest point. Of all this complicated and tumultuous time from the entry of the barbarians to the beginning of the reign of Euric, the contemporary chronicle of Istius is an invaluable report. (Dahn, Königre der Germanen, l. c.; Ferreras, ed. D'Hermilly, ii. 44, 47, 55; Idat. Chron. l. c.; Isid. Hist. Suev. apud Exp. Saur. v. 503.) [M. A. W.]  

HERMIS. See also HERMAS.  

HERMES (1) TRISMEGISTUS. Under this title have come down to us a variety of writings of uncertain date and unknown authorship. There is no uncertainty, however, as to the country where they were produced; from external and internal evidence it is alike plain that this was Egypt. It is probably superfluous to remark that the name "Hermes Trismegistus" never belonged to any single writer. What, then, will be asked, is the meaning of it, and why is it attached to these works? This question will be answered for us by Jamblichus, who at the beginning of his treatise De Mystikè tells us that "Hermes, who presides over speech, is, according to ancient tradition, common to all priests; he is who exists in all of them. That is why our ancestors attributed all discoveries to him, and composed their works under the name of Hermes." There was, in fact, a long-continued series of books called "hermetic," extending in their production over several centuries. Hermetic books are mentioned by Plutarch (de Iside, c. 61), Galen (de Simplic. Med. vi. 1), and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vi. 4, p. 457), and hence it is apparent that some of them date from a period not later than the 2nd century after Christ. But the books described by Clement would seem to have been for the most part of a distinctly sacerdotal and even technical cast; it would not appear that they were of wide or deep philosophical or spiritual import. Tertullian, however (cont. Valentin. c. 15), speaks of Hermes Trismegistus as a master in philosophy; and the extant hermetic books show us from their date, philosophical and spiritual relations of a very interesting kind. They belong, as is now generally agreed, to the Neoplatonic school; and while far from powerful or original books, they shew much reflective appreciation of what is truly powerful and original, and gather up in a synthesis, the artificiality of which is not at first sight apparent, large elements of all the different factors of religious belief in the Roman world of the second and third centuries. The two principal of these works are the
(the "Shepherd of men"), and the Ἀδείς τῆλες (or "discourse of initiation"), otherwise called "Asclepius." These two works, together with a variety of fragments, have been translated into French by M. Louis Ménard (Paris, 1867), and accompanied with a preliminary essay of much interest on the hermetic writings and their affinities generally. The most important fragments translated by M. Ménard are taken from a work entitled Κόρα κόσμων (the "Virgin of the World"), which consists of a dialogue between Isis and her son Horus on the origin of nature and of all existing beings. Other less noticeable works attributed to Hermes Trismegistus will be found named in the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography (art. "Hermes Trismegistus").

But we must recur to the two first-named works, the Ποιμάδης (Poemander) and the Ἀδείς τῆλες (Asclepius). It is not to be assumed that these two works are by the same author; but from the great similarity of tone and thought between them, this will appear an improbably hypothesis. Both works are quoted by Lactantius (who ascribed to them the same fabulous antiquity and high authority which the early fathers were accustomed to attribute to the Sibylline books); and as Lactantius died about A.D. 350, this fixes a point before which the works of Hermes and the Asclepius must have been written. If the Latin translation of the Asclepius (the Greek original, except in the quotations by Lactantius, has been lost) were correctly attributed to Apuleius of Madaura, then this work must have been composed at latest in the 2nd century; but the attribution is now considered an error; and the historical allusions in the work distinctly point to a time when heathenism was about to perish before the increasing power of Christianity. Hence we may, with much probability conclude that both these works were written towards the close of the 3rd century. Some, however, have brought the Poemander into connexion with the Pastor of Hermas, and have even assigned it to the same author; this, however, is not probable.

Three motives (if we may so speak) are discernible in the tendency to take an intellectual survey of the whole spiritual universe, without marking any points where the understanding of man fails and has to retire unsatisfied; this is a disposition which, under different forms and at different times, has been called Pantheism or Gnosticism (though the Gnostic idea of an evil element in creation nowhere appears in these treatises). The ideas of the author on these points are presented under the form of a gorgeous material imagery; and, speaking generally, he regards the material world as interpenetrated by the spiritual, and almost identified with it. The power and divine character which he attributes to the sun and other heavenly bodies is peculiarly Egyptian, though this also brings him into affinity with Stoic, and even with Platonic, views. There is much more of symbol and imagery than of elaborately constructed theories in these representations. Secondly, the Pantheism or Gnosticism above described is modified by moral and religious elements which certainly might to some degree be paralleled in Plato, but to which it is difficult to avoid ascribing a Jewish and even a Christian origin. Great stress is laid on the unity, the creative power, the fatherhood and goodness of God. So, too, the argument from design appears. "No one pretends that a statue or picture can exist without a sculptor or painter, and can this creation be without a creator?" (Poemander, c. 5.) Even the well-known terms of baptism and regeneration occur, though in different connexions, and the former in a metaphorical sense. One of the chapters of the Poemander is entitled "The Secret Sermon on the Mountain." The future punishments for wrongdoing are described with emphasis. Many of these affinities have been collected by Baumgarten-Crusius (in the essay mentioned below). At the same time there is no moral teaching in detail. But, thirdly, these respectively intellectual and religious elements are associated with a third of a very rare and noticeable character. The Asclepius contains a passionate and vigorous defence of the heathen religion, including idol worship, and a prophecy of the evils which will come on the earth from the loss of piety. In fact, this is the only part of the treatises which go by the name of Hermes Trismegistus in which something like powerful sentiment appears; sentiment, it is true, on behalf of a system wholly wrapped up in unreality, but still not unintelligible nor wholly condemnable to one who regards the long ages, the countless memories, with which the worship of Zeus and Athene, of Ares and Aphrodite, was then associated. It may be worth while to quote (with abbreviations) part of this passage. "Knowest thou not, Asclepius, that Egypt is the image of heaven, the representation on earth of every celestial ordinance? Our land is the temple of the world. Yet, as the wise ought to foresee everything, one thing you must know: the time will come when it will appear that the Egyptians have in vain observed the worship of the gods with so much piety, and that all their sacred prayers have been barren and unheard. The divinity will leave the earth. Religion, piety, the worship of the gods will be proscribed and punished by the laws. This land, sanctified by so many shrines and temples, will be covered with tombs of Egyptians; and of thy sacred things nothing will remain save words graven on the stones that record thy pious deeds. The Scythian or Indian, or some other barbarian, will inhabit Egypt. Thou wepest, Asclepius? Still worse will happen. Egypt herself will be tamed and seduced. She, once the holy land, the most faithful lover of the gods, will be the perverter of saints, the school of impiety, the example of all violence. Then, full of loathing, man will change the world neither admiration nor love. He will turn away from that perfect work. In weariness of soul, he will but disdain this vast universe, this changeless work of God, where the will of God has gathered all together in harmonious synthesis, worthy for ever of veneration, praise, and love. ... Then will evil angels mingle with miserable humanity, and push it on to crimes, wars, rapine, falsehood. The sea will be no more navigable, the stars will change their courses, the fruits of the earth will be corrupted. Such will be the old age of the world, irreligion, anarchy, confusion of all law and of all good. When this shall have happened,
O Asclepius, then God, the Lord and Father, seeing the seeds of men, will correct these evils by an act of His will and divine goodness; to put an end to this corruption, He will drown the world by a deluge, or consume it by fire, or destroy it by war and pestilence, and will restore its first beauty to the world, that the world may seem again worthy to be admired and adored, and that praise may again be given to God, who has created and restored so beautiful a work. This second birth of the world will take place after the period fixed by the divine and eternal will.” Such is the only extant lamentation of expressing heathenism; perhaps one may say that there were even elements of preciosity in the forecast; certainly it is not without pathos. But for the most part the style of these works is hierocratic, pretentious, and diffused.

Those who wish to know more about Hermes Trismegistus may consult (besides the work of M. Ménard above referred to) Fabric. Bibl. Graec, vol. i. pp. 46–94; and Baumgarten Crusi, de Liberalium Hermeticon Origen atque Iorole, Jena, 1827. Vacherot gives a short disquisition on the hermetic works, and Zeller notices them slightly.

[3. R. M.]

HERMES (8), bishop of Salona (Spalato) in Dalmatia, supposed to be the Hermes mentioned by St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 14), to have succeeded Titus as bishop of Dalmatia, and to have suffered martyrdom. (See the Menæa and the Monologium Basilianum for Nov. 4, Migne, Patr. Gr. cxxii. 149; also Farlati, Hyligic. Sacr. i. 393–404.)

[4. D.]

HERMES (9)—Aug. 28. A prefect of the city of Rome, who is mentioned in the apocryphal acts of pope Alexander I. A.D. 180, by whom he, his wife, his children, and his sister Theodora are said to have been converted and baptized. (Mart. Rom. Vet., Adom., Usuard.; Kal. Front.; Tillemont, Mémo. i. 238, 590; Baron. Annal. A.D. 182, num. i.)

[5. T. S.]


[6. B.]

HERMES (6)—March 1. Martyr with Adrian at Marseilles. (Mart. Usuard.)

[6. G. T. S.]

HERMES (6), archdeacon of Narbonne not earlier than 445, bearer of a letter from St. Leo to Rusticus, bishop of that place. About 460 Hermes was consecrated by Rusticus to the see of Beziers, but the inhabitants rejected him, as of unworthy life. On the death of Rusticus he assumed the bishopric of Narbonne without due election, and pope Hilary (epis. 7 and 8) permitted him to retain the office, but without the privilege of ordaining (Lev. Ep. 167, p. 1416).

[7. T. S.]


[8. G. T. S.]
&c. all agree in nothing but repelling and refuting one another. Who the author was seems to have baffled all enquiries. Some would identify him with Hermias Sozomen the ecclesiastical historian. Even the martyr of May 31 has been suggested (Cell. ut infr.). Cave, who discusses the subject at some length (i. 81) attributes this work to the 2nd century. As it was plainly written when bestiery was triumphant, Cellier (vi. 332) fixes its publication under Julian. Neander (H. E. ii. 429, ed. Bohn) regards Hermias as "one of those bitter enemies of the Greek philosophy whom Clement of Alexandria thought it necessary to censure, and who, following the idle Jewish legend, pretended that the Greek philosophy had been derived from fallen angels. In the title of his book he is called the philosopher: perhaps he wore the philosopher's mantle before his conversion, and after it passed at once from an enthusiastic admiration of the Greek philosophy to extreme abhorrence of it." (Du Pin, H. E. t. i. p. 69, ed. 1723.)

HERMIAS (8) SOZOMEN. [SOZOMEN.]

HERMIAS (7), presbyter, to whom Cyril of Alexandria addressed his Dialogues on the Trinity. (Patr. Gr. ixv. 659.) He has been suggested (Cell. vi. 332), as possibly the author of the Irrissio. [HERMIAS (8)]. [C. H.]

HERMIAS (8), bishop of Abydos on the Hellestom, was present at the council of Chalcedon A.D. 451, and signed the synodal letter of the Cyzicene province to the emperor Leo concerning the faith of Chalcedon, A.D. 458. (Mansi, vii. 587; Le Quien, Orient Christ. i. 773.) [L. D.]

HERMIAS (9), a Syrian, the father of Felix presbyter of Nola. A brother of Felix was also named Hermias. (Paulin. Nol. poem. xv. vv. 76, 79, p. 30 in Patr. Lat. ixi. 470 A, B.) [C. H.]

HERMIGAR. [HERMERIC.]

HERMINARDUS (HERMINARIUS), thirty-seventh archbishop of Bourges, succeeding Landoarius, and followed by Deodatus, was present at the Lateran council convoked by pope Stephen III. in A.D. 769. He is said to have died in 774. (Mansi, xii. 715; Gall. Christ. ii. 19.) [S. A. B.]

HERMINARIUS. [ERMINARIUS (2)].

HERMINGILD, prince. [HERMENIGILD.]

HERMINUS (HERMIMUS), count, a correspondent of Isidore of Pelusium, of whose letters forty-three are addressed to him. The most interesting are the following: bk. i. ep. 18, on the perpetual virginity of the blessed Virgin Mary; i. 136, on the episcopacy office; i. 187, Isidore mentions a lost work, λόγος κατά Ὕψυχας, in which he defends Christianity from certain accusations; iii. 195, on infant baptism; iii. 285, Isidore mentions a book, also lost, against fate, πρὶς τοῦ λοι Μιχαύλε τοῦ σταυρικοῦ; v. 276, on the prevalence of simony. (Migne, Pat. Gr. lxviii. 191 sqq.; Cellier, viii. 479-487.) [J. W. S.]

HERMION, bishop of Tanis, in the Delta. He was present at the synod of Alexandria, A.D. 382, and signed the epistle addressed to the church of Antioch. (Mansi, iii. 345; Le Quien, Or. Christ. ii. 535.) [J. de S.]

HERMIONE (1)—Sept. 4, daughter of Philip the apostle, according to Bas. Men. probably the deacon being meant (Acts xxi. 9). She lived at Ephesus until Trajan's time with a sister named Eutycha. The emperor, making an expedition against the Persians, came to Ephesus, where, hearing of her fame as a Christian prophetess, he tortured her, but released her when she predicted his triumph over the Persians. She is said to have been martyred under Adrian. The whole story is devoid of any really ancient authority. Cf. however a learned note on the subject of the residence of the apostle Philip in Asia Minor, in Dr. Lightfoot's Commentary on the Colossians, p. 45. See also articles on "Philip the Apostle" and "Philip the Evangelist" in Dictionary of the Bible. (Bas. Men.; Acta SS. Bell. Sept. ii. 185; Dodwell, Dissert. Cyprian. xi. 17-28.)

HERMIONE (2), virgins in Elouериopolis (Freistadt), commended by Marcellinus and Faustinus, priests who were attached to the schism of Ursinus and Lucifer in the 4th century. (Faustinum et Marcellini Ep. Precum ad Imperatores, c. 29; Migne, Patr. Lat. xii. 109; Cellier, Histoire des Auteurs Ecclés. v. 154.) [I. G. S.]

HERMONITAE, heretics. [HERMIS (1)].


HERMOCRATES, martyr. [HERMIPPUS]