

annual value £30. Rules of court have been framed for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Acts of 1877 and 1882. For more minute information than can be given in this place the Acts and rules themselves must be consulted.

The necessity for a settlement, as far as the wife's interests are concerned, has been diminished by the Married Women's Property Act, 1882 (45 and 46 Vict. c. 75). It is still, however, usual to have a settlement on marriage, especially where there is property of any considerable value. The Act contains a saving of existing settlements and a power to make future settlements with or without restriction against anticipation (not to be valid against a married woman's ante-nuptial debts). No settlement or agreement for a settlement is to have greater validity against a married woman's creditors than such settlement or agreement would have when made or entered into by a man. A future or reversionary interest in settled personalty is specially excepted from the operation of Malins's Act (20 and 21 Vict. c. 5), under which a married woman may by deed acknowledged dispose of her future or reversionary interest in unsettled personalty. The former law as to equity to a settlement seems to have been rendered obsolete by the Married Women's Property Act. The doctrine of equity formerly was in accordance with the maxim, "He who seeks equity must do equity,"—that, where a husband was forced to obtain the assistance of a court of equity to reach property to which he was entitled in right of his wife, equity would only aid him on condition of his settling a certain portion on his wife. Now that a husband cannot succeed to any property in right of his wife during her lifetime, the reason for the doctrine of equity to a settlement has disappeared.

As a rule a settlement can only be made by a person not under disability,—therefore apart from statute not by a lunatic, or a bankrupt, and generally not by an infant. But by the Infants' Settlement Act (18 and 19 Vict. c. 43) infant males of twenty or over or infant females of seventeen or over may with the approbation of the Chancery Division obtained by petition make a valid settlement or contract for a settlement of all or any part of their property. By the Acts of 1877 and 1882 the powers of the Acts may in certain cases be exercised by trustees of a settlement, trustees in bankruptcy, committees of lunatics, and guardians of infants.

Where the parties are not in a position to make an immediate settlement, articles for a settlement are sometimes entered into, but more rarely than formerly on account of the facilities offered by the Infants' Settlement Act. The court will enforce the execution of a settlement in accordance with the articles, and will reform one already made if not in accordance with them. The court will also enforce the specific performance of any contract on the faith of which a marriage has taken place, in spite of the provisions of § 4 of the Statute of Frauds (see FRAUD).<sup>1</sup> It should be noticed that marriage itself is not such a part performance of a contract as to give the court jurisdiction. An imperfect obligation arising from an informal ante-nuptial agreement can be made binding as between the parties by a post-nuptial settlement; but this will not protect such a settlement from being treated as a voluntary settlement against creditors.

A settlement or contract for settlement made in consideration of marriage or for other valuable consideration is as a rule irrevocable by the settlor and good against creditors. The only exception or apparent exception is the provision in the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 (46 and 47 Vict. c. 52, § 47 (2)), that any covenant or contract made in consideration of marriage for the future settlement on or for the settlor's wife or children of any money or property wherein he had not at the date of his marriage any estate or interest, and not being money or property of or in right of his wife, shall, on his becoming bankrupt before the property or money shall have been actually transferred or paid, be void against the trustee in bankruptcy. With regard to voluntary settlements, 13 Eliz. c. 5 avoids as against creditors conveyances of lands or chattels contrived to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors or others, with a proviso protecting estates or interests conveyed on good consideration and bona fide to persons not having notice of fraud. 46 and 47 Vict. c. 52, § 47 (1), enacts that any settlement of property, not being a settlement made before and in consideration of marriage or made in favour of a purchaser or incumbrancer in good faith and for valuable consideration, or a settlement made on or for the wife or children of the settlor of property which has accrued to the settlor after marriage in right of his wife, shall, if the settlor becomes bankrupt within two years after the date of the settlement, be void against the trustee in the bankruptcy, and shall, if the settlor becomes bankrupt within ten years, be void against the trustee unless the parties claiming under the settlement can prove that the settlor was at the time of making the settlement able to pay all his debts without the aid of the settled property, and that

<sup>1</sup> At one time the ecclesiastical courts went farther, and enforced specific performance of the ceremony of marriage itself. After a contract of marriage *per verba de presentis* or *per verba de futuro*, a celebration *in facie ecclesie* might have been decreed. This jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts was finally abolished by 4 Geo. IV. c. 76.

the interest of the settlor in such property had passed to the trustee of the settlement on the execution thereof. 27 Eliz. c. 4 was passed for the benefit of purchasers, as 13 Eliz. c. 5 was for that of creditors, but refers to real estate and chattels real only. It enacts that every conveyance of lands with intent to defraud purchasers shall be void as against such purchasers only, and that conveyances with power of revocation shall be void against subsequent purchasers. The Act has been construed to mean that a voluntary conveyance of real estate is void as against a subsequent purchaser, mortgagee, or lessee for value. With these exceptions a voluntary settlement is good as between the settlor and the objects of the settlement, and as between them and third persons. So far is this the case that the court will not assist a settlor to destroy the effect of a voluntary settlement by compelling specific performance against a subsequent purchaser. On the other hand the court will not enforce specific performance of a voluntary settlement, in spite of its being a contract under seal. Such an instrument, however, creates a debt and will be admitted to proof in a creditors' suit.<sup>2</sup>

*Scotland.*—A disposition and settlement is a mode of providing for the devolution of property after death, and so corresponds rather to the English will than the English settlement. The English marriage settlement is represented in Scotland by the contract of marriage, which, like the English settlement, may be ante- or post-nuptial. The main difference between the ante- and the post-nuptial contract is the extent to which the property the subject of the contract may be withdrawn from creditors. In the former case a preference or *ius crediti* is according to circumstances conferred on the wife or children; in the latter case the wife or children cannot compete with the creditors. A post-nuptial contract is also liable to revocation by the husband or wife. The Married Women's Property Act, 1881, while it makes the wife complete mistress of her property, at the same time does not exclude or abridge the power of settlement by ante-nuptial contract of marriage.

A contract of marriage may be made with or without the creation of trustees, the latter being the more usual form. If the contract settle heritable property, it generally contains a narrative or inductive clause, containing the names of the parties with an obligation to celebrate the marriage, a disposition of the estate with its destination, provisions as to the wife and younger children and a declaration that these provisions shall be in full of their legal claims, a conveyance by the wife of her whole means and estate to her husband or the trustees, an appointment of trustees to secure implement of provisions to the wife and children, a registration clause, and a testing clause. If the contract settle movables, it is, *mutatis mutandis*, in much the same form, with the addition of a clause excluding the *ius mariti* of a future husband of the wife (see *Juridical Styles*, vol. i. p. 174, vol. ii. p. 498). The Rutherford Act (11 and 12 Vict. c. 36) and the Entail Act, 1882 (45 and 46 Vict. c. 53), specially provide that settlements by marriage contract are not to be disappointed until the birth of a child, who by himself or his guardian consents to disentail, or until the marriage is dissolved, unless with the consent of the trustees of the contract. Improvements by limited owners were allowed by law much earlier than in England. 10 Geo. III. c. 31 enabled heirs of entail to charge the entailed estates with the sums of money laid out by them in building mansions. This principle was expressly adopted for England, as the preamble of the Act shows, by the Limited Owners' Residence Act, 1870. The Rutherford Act and other Acts empowered heirs of entail to exchange, to sell, to lease, to charge by bond and disposition in security, to sell, to grant family provisions, and to erect labourers' cottages. The Settled Estates Act and Settled Land Act do not apply to Scotland. Substitution, as in Roman law, can only be made by testamentary or *mortis causa* disposition. The Rutherford Act and the Entail Amendment Act, 1868 (31 and 32 Vict. c. 84), more strict than the law of England against perpetuities, forbid the creation of a life-ent interest in heritables or movables except in favour of a party in life at the date of the deed creating such interest.

*United States.*—Marriage settlements are not in as common use as in England, no doubt owing to the fact that the principle of the Married Women's Property Act was the law of most of the States of the Union long before its adoption by England. In Louisiana, in the absence of stipulation to the contrary, community of goods is the rule. Settlements other than marriage settlements are practically unknown in the United States. Property cannot, as a general rule, be tied up to anything like the extent still admissible in England. In those States where entail is allowed the entail may be barred by simple means of alienation. (J. Wt.)

SETTLEMENT, Act of. By this Act, 12 & 13 Will. III. c. 2, passed in 1701 (followed by the parliament of Scotland in the Act of Union, 1707, c. 7), the crown was

<sup>2</sup> See Williams, *The Settlement of Real Estates*; Davidson, *Precedents of Conveyancing*, vol. iii.; Wolstenholme and Turner, *The Settled Land Act*; Midleton, *The Statutes relating to Settled Estates*.

settled upon the Princess Sophia, electress and duchess dowager of Hanover, granddaughter of James I., and the heirs of her body, being Protestants. The Act contained in addition some important constitutional provisions. Those which are still law are as follows:—(1) that whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of this crown shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established; (2) that in case the crown of this realm shall hereafter come to any person not being a native of this kingdom of England, this nation be not obliged to engage in any war for the defence of any dominions or territories which do not belong to the crown of England without the consent of parliament; (3) that after the limitation shall take effect no person born out of the kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland, or the dominions thereunto belonging, although he be naturalized or made a denizen (except such as are born of English parents), shall be capable to be of the privy council or a member of either House of Parliament, or enjoy any office or place of trust, either civil or military, or to have any grant of lands, tenements, or hereditaments from the crown to himself, or to any other or others in trust for him; (4) that after the limitation shall take effect judges' commissions be made *quoadvis se bene gesserint*,<sup>2</sup> and their salaries ascertained and established, but upon the address of both Houses of Parliament it may be lawful to remove them; (5) that no pardon under the great seal of England be pleadable to an impeachment by the Commons in parliament. The importance of the Act of Settlement appears from the fact that in all the Regency Acts it is specially mentioned as one of those Acts which the regent may not assent to repeal (see REGENT). To maintain or affirm the right of any person to the crown, contrary to the provisions of the Act of Settlement, is treason by 6th Anne, c. 7.

SETTLEMENT OF THE POOR. See POOR LAWS.

SÉTUBAL, called by the English St Ubes, a port and commercial town in the province of Estremadura, Portugal, nearly 20 miles south-east of Lisbon, lying for about three-quarters of a mile the north shore of a harbour of the same name, 3 leagues long by half a league broad and inferior only to that of Lisbon, at the end of a fertile valley of 6 miles long from Palmella, where the Sabo river discharges into the Bay of Sétubal, and on the Portuguese railway (Lisbon-Bairro-Sétubal). It is overtopped on the west by the great red treeless range of Arrabida. In the sandhills of a low-lying promontory in the bay, over against Sétubal, are the ruins of "Troia," uncovered in part by heavy rains in 1814, and again in 1850 by an antiquarian society. These ruins of "Troia," among which have been brought to view a beautiful Roman house and some 1600 Roman coins, refer, beyond almost all dispute, to Cetobriga, which flourished 300–400 A.D. In the neighbourhood, on a mountain 1700 feet high, is the cloister Arrabida, with stalactite cavern,<sup>3</sup> whither pious pilgrimages are made. There are five forts for the defence of the harbour, and that of St Philip, built by Philip III., commands the town. Sétubal is an emporium of the Portuguese salt trade carried on principally with Scandinavian ports, the salt being deemed the finest for curing meat and fish. By reason of this advantage and the excellence of its oranges, the best in Portugal, and of its Muscatel grapes, it has much commercial importance, and is the fourth city in the kingdom. It also manufactures leather and does a considerable fishing trade. There are five churches, several convents, a theatre, a monument of the poet Bocage, who was born here,

<sup>1</sup> This clause is virtually repealed by the Naturalization Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 14, § 7), as to persons obtaining a certificate of naturalization.

<sup>2</sup> Their commissions had previously been made *durante bene gesserint*.

and an arsenal. Among its other public buildings are the Stalpal, the Bomfin, which has a handsome fountain, the Fonte Nova, and the Annunciata. Sétubal suffered severely, along with Lisbon, from the earthquake of 1755. The population was 14,798 in 1878.

SEVENOAKS, a market town of Kent, England, situated on high ground about a mile from the railway station, 25 miles south-east of London by the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, and 20 by the South-Eastern Railway. It consists principally of two streets which converge at the south end, near which is the church of St Nicholas, of the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, restored in 1878, and containing monuments of the Amherst family and a tablet to William Lambard, the "Perambulator" of Kent (d. 1601), removed from the old parish church of Greenwich when that was demolished. At the grammar school founded in 1418 by Sir William Sevenoke, lord mayor of London, George Grote received his education. There is also a school founded by Lady Margaret Boswell, wife of Sir William Boswell, ambassador to Charles I. at The Hague, and almshouses founded by Sir William Sevenoke in connexion with his school. The Walthamstow Hall for 100 children, daughters of Christian missionaries, erected at a cost of £22,000, was opened in 1882. Close to Sevenoaks is Knole Park, one of the finest old residences in England, which in the time of King John was possessed by the earl of Pembroke, and after passing to various owners was bought by Archbishop Bouchier (d. 1486), who rebuilt the house. He left the property to the see of Canterbury, and about the time of the dissolution it was given up by Crammer to Henry VIII. By Elizabeth it was conferred first on the earl of Leicester and afterwards on Thomas Sackville, earl of Dorset, by whom it was in great part rebuilt and fitted up in regard to decoration and furniture very much as it at present exists. In the time of Elizabeth county assizes were held in the town. Of late years Sevenoaks has very much increased by the addition of villa residences for persons having their business in London. The population of the urban sanitary district (area 2028 acres) in 1871 was 4118, and in 1881 it was 6296.

SEVEN SLEEPERS OF EPHEBUS, THE, according to the most common form of an old legend of Syrian origin, first referred to in Western literature by Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart.*, c. 95), were seven Christian youths of Ephesus, who, to escape the rage of Decius, lived for some time in concealment in a cave. The enemy at last, however, discovered their hiding place, and caused great stones to be rolled to its mouth that they might die of hunger. The martyrs fell asleep in a mutual embrace. The occurrence had long been forgotten, when it fell out, in the thirtieth year of Theodosius II., 196 years afterwards, that a certain inhabitant of Ephesus, seeking shelter for his cattle, rediscovered the cave on Mount Coelian, and, letting in the light, awoke the inmates, who sent one of their number down to buy food. Cautiously approaching the city, the lad was greatly astonished to find the cross displayed over the gates, and on entering to hear the name of Christ openly pronounced. By tendering coin of the time of Decius at a baker's shop he roused suspicion, and in his confusion being unable to explain how he had come by the money he was taken before the authorities as a dishonest finder of hidden treasure. He was easily able to confirm the strange story he now had to tell by actually leading his accusers to the cavern where his six companions were found, youthful and rosy and beaming with a holy radiance. Theodosius, hearing what had happened, hastened to the spot in time to hear from their lips that God had wrought this wonder to confirm his faith in the resurrection of the dead. This message once delivered, they again fell asleep.

Gregory says he had the legend from the interpretation of "a certain Syrian"; in point of fact the story is very common in Syrian sources. It forms the subject of a homily of Jacob of Sarug (ob. 521 A.D.), which is given in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Another Syrian version is printed in Land's *Anecdota*, iii. 87 sq.; see also Barhebraeus, *Chron. Eccles.*, i. 142 sq., and compare Assemani, *Bib. Or.*, i. 335 sq. Some forms of the legend give, eight sleepers,—e.g., an ancient MS. of the 6th century now in the British Museum (*Cat. Syr. MSS.*, p. 1090). There are considerable variations as to their names. The legend rapidly attained a wide diffusion throughout Christendom; its currency in the East is testified by its acceptance by Mohammed (sur. xviii.), who calls them *Ashab at-Kahf*, "the men of the cave." According to Al-Biruni (*Chronology*, tr. by Sachau, p. 285) certain undecayed corpses of monks were shown in a cave as the sleepers of Ephesus in the 9th century. The seven sleepers are a favourite subject in early mediæval art.

SEVERN, THE, next to the Thames in length among the rivers of England, rises at Maes Hafren on the eastern side of Plinlimmon, on the south-south-west borders of Montgomeryshire, and flows in a nearly semicircular course of about 200 miles to the sea; the direct distance from its source to its mouth in the Bristol Channel is about 80 miles. By the Britons it was called Halfren, and its old Latin name was *Sabrina*. Through Montgomeryshire its course is at first in a south-easterly direction, and for the first 15 miles it flows over a rough precipitous bed. At Llanidloes, where the valley widens to a breadth of one or two miles and assumes a more fertile appearance, it bends towards the north-east, passing Newtown and Welshpool. On the borders of Shropshire it receives the Vyrnwy, and then turning in a south-easterly direction enters the broad rich plain of Shrewsbury, after which it bends southward past Ironbridge and Bridgnorth to Bewdley in Worcestershire. In Shropshire it receives a number of tributaries (see SHROPSHIRE). Still continuing its southerly course through Worcestershire it passes Stourport, where it receives the Stour (left), and Worcester, shortly after which it receives the Teme (right). It enters Gloucestershire at Tewkesbury, where it receives the Avon (left), after which, bending in a south-westerly direction, it passes the town of Gloucester, 18 miles below which the estuary widens out into the Bristol Channel, at the point where it receives from the left the Lower Avon or Bristol river, and from the right the Wye.

From Newtown its fall is 465 feet, the average fall per mile being about 2 feet 3 inches, but from Ironbridge to Gloucester, a distance of about 70 miles, the fall is only about 103 feet. Between Stourport and Gloucester the breadth is 150 feet, but below that town the breadth rapidly increases and the banks become bolder and more picturesque. Owing to the gradual decrease in the width and depth of the Bristol Channel the tide enters with great force, forming a tidal wave or bore about 9 feet in height, which at certain times causes great destruction, among the more serious inundations being those of 1606, 1687, 1703, and 1883. The total area drained by the Severn is about 4500 square miles. Its navigation extends to about 150 miles above its mouth; barges can ascend as far as Stourport, and large vessels to Gloucester. Owing to the difficulties of the navigation the Gloucester and Berkeley Ship Canal, 18 miles in length, was constructed, admitting vessels of 350 tons to Gloucester, the river only admitting vessels of 150 tons. The only other important port is Bristol, but there are a few smaller ports and fishing towns, while by means of canals the Severn has connexion with some of the principal towns of England. With the Thames it is connected by the Stroudwater and Thames and Severn Canals; by various canals it has communication with the Trent and the rivers of the north; and the Hereford and Gloucester Canal connects those two cities. The Severn is a good salmon river, and is specially famous for its lampreys.

SEVERN, JOSEPH (1793–1879), portrait and subject painter, was born in 1793. During his earlier years he practised portraiture as a miniaturist; and, having studied in the schools of the Royal Academy, he exhibited his first work in oil, *Hermia and Helena*, a subject from the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, in the Royal Academy Exhibition of 1819. In 1820 he gained the gold medal and a three years' travelling studentship for his *Una and the Red Cross Knight in the Cave of Despair*, a painting now

in the possession of the representatives of the late Lord Houghton. He accompanied his friend Keats the poet to Italy, and nursed him till his death in 1821. In 1861 he was appointed British consul at Rome, a post which he held till 1872, and during a great part of the time he also acted as Italian consul. His most remarkable work is the *Spectre Ship* from the *Ancient Mariner*. He painted *Cordelia Watching by the Bed of Lear*, the Roman Beggar, Ariel, the Fountain, and Rienzi, executed a large altarpiece for the church of St Paul at Rome, and produced many portraits, including one of Baron Bunsen and several of Keats. He died at Rome August 3, 1879.

SEVERUS, LUCIUS SEPTIMIUS, the twenty-first emperor of Rome, reigned from 193 to 211 A.D. He was born in 146 at Leptis Magna, an African coast town in the district of Syrtes, whose ancient prosperity is still attested by its extensive ruins. In this region of Africa, despite its long possession by the Romans, the Punic tongue was still spoken by the people in general. Severus had to acquire Latin as a foreign language, and is said to have spoken it to the end of his days with a strong African accent. After he had arrived at the throne he dismissed abruptly from Rome a sister who had come to visit him, because he felt shame at her abominable Latin. Yet Severus and his dynasty were almost the only emperors of provincial descent who frankly cherished the province of their origin, while the province showed true loyalty to the only Roman emperor ever born on African soil, and to the successors who derived their title from him.

Of the origin of the Severi nothing is known: it is a natural but very doubtful conjecture that the L. Septimius Severus, a native of Africa, addressed by the poet Statius, was an ancestor of the emperor who bore the same name. The father of Severus was a Roman citizen of equestrian rank, and it may safely be affirmed that the family held a poor position when he was born, but had risen in importance by the time he reached manhood. Two of his uncles attained to consular rank. Fulvius Pius, the maternal grandfather of Severus, is often identified with the man of that name who was governor of Africa, and, after being condemned for corruption by Pertinax, was highly honoured by Didius Julianus; but dates are strongly against the identification. Of the future emperor's education we learn nothing but its results. Spartianus declares him to have been "very learned in Latin and Greek literature," to have had a genuine zeal for study, and to have been fond of philosophy and rhetoric. But the learning of rulers is often seen through a magnifying medium, and we may better accept the statement of Dio Cassius that in the pursuit of education his eagerness was greater than his success, and that he was rather shrewd than facile. No doubt in his early years he acquired that love for jurisprudence which distinguished him as emperor. Of his youth we know only that it was entirely spent at Leptis. Beyond that there is merely one anecdotal fabrication giving an account of youthful wildness.

The removal of Severus from Leptis to Rome is attributed by his biographer to the desire for higher education, but was also no doubt due in some degree to ambition. From the emperor Marcus Aurelius he early obtained, by intercession of a consular uncle, the distinction of the broad purple stripe. At twenty-six, that is, almost at the earliest age allowed by law, Severus attained the quaestorship and a seat in the senate, and proceeded as *quaestor militaris* to the senatorial province of *Bætica*, in the Peninsula. While Severus was temporarily absent in Africa in consequence of the death of his father, the province of *Bætica*, disordered by invasion and internal commotion, was taken over by the emperor, who gave the senate Sardinia in exchange. On this Severus became

military quaestor of Sardinia. His next office, probably in 174, was that of legate to the proconsul of Africa, and in the following year he was tribune of the plebs. This magistracy, though far different from what it had been in the days of the republic, was still one of dignity, and brought with it promotion to a higher grade in the senate. During the tribunate he married his first wife Marcia, whose name he passed over in his autobiography, though he erected statues of her after he became emperor. In 178 Severus became praetor, not by favour of the emperor, but by competition for the suffrages of the senators. Then, probably in the same year, he went to Spain as legate; after that (179) he commanded a legion in Syria. The death of Marcus Aurelius seems in some way to have interrupted his career; he was unemployed for several years, and devoted great part of his leisure to the study of literature, religion, and antiquities (so says Spartianus) at Athens. The year of Severus's first consulship cannot be determined with precision, but it falls within the space between 185 and 190. In this time also falls the marriage with Julia, afterwards famous as Julia Domna, whose acquaintance he had no doubt made when an officer in Syria. Her two sons Bassianus (known as Caracalla) and Geta were probably born in 188 and 189. Severus was governor in succession of Gallia Lugdunensis, Sicily, and Pannonia Superior. He was in command of three legions at Carnuntum, the capital of the province last named, when news reached him that Commodus had been murdered by his favourite concubine and his most trusted servants.

Up to this moment the career of Severus had been ordinary in its character. He had not raised himself above the usual official level. He had achieved no military distinction,—had indeed seen no warfare beyond the petty border frays of a frontier province. But the storm that now tried all official spirits found his alone powerful enough to brave it. Three imperial dynasties had now been ended by assassination. The Flavian line had enjoyed much shorter duration and much less prestige than the other two, and the circumstances of its fall had been peculiar in that it was probably planned in the interest of the senate and the senate certainly reaped the immediate fruits. But the crisis which arose on the death of Nero and the crisis which arose on the death of Commodus were strikingly alike. In both cases it was left to the army to determine by a struggle which of the divisional commanders should succeed to the command-in-chief, that is, to the imperial throne. In each case the contest began with an impulsion given to the commanders by the legionaries themselves. The soldiers of the great commands competed keenly for the honour and the material advantages to be won by placing their general in the seat of empire. The officer who refused to lead would have been deemed a traitor to his troops, and would have suffered the punishment of his treason.

There is a widespread impression that the Praetorian guards at all times held the Roman empire in their hands, but its erroneousness is demonstrated by the events of the year 193. For the first time in the course of imperial history the Praetorians presumed to nominate as emperor a man who had no legions at his back. This was Pertinax, who has been well styled the Galba of his time—upright and honourable to severity, and zealous for good government, but blindly optimist about the possibilities of reform in a feeble and corrupt age. After a three months' rule he was destroyed by the power that lifted him up. According to the well-known story, true rather in its outline than in its details, the Praetorians sold the throne to Didius Julianus. But at the end of two months both the Praetorians and their nominee were swept away by the real disposers of Roman rule, the provincial legions. Four groups of legions at the time were strong enough to aspire

to determine the destiny of the empire,—those quartered in Britain, in Germany, in Pannonia, in Syria. Three of the groups actually took the decisive step, and Severus in Pannonia, Pescennius Niger in Syria, Clodius Albinus in Britain, received from their troops the title of Augustus. Severus far outdid his rivals in promptness and decision. By what means we do not know, he secured the aid of the legions in Germany and of those in Illyria. These, with the forces in Pannonia, made a combination sufficiently formidable to overawe Albinus for the moment. He probably deemed that his best chance lay in the exhaustion of his competitors by an internecine struggle. At all events he received with submission an offer made by Severus, no doubt well understood by both to be politic, insincere, and temporary. Severus sent a trusted officer, who confirmed Albinus in his power and bestowed upon him the title of Cæsar, making him the nominal heir-apparent to the throne.

Before the action of Severus was known in Rome, the senate and people had shown signs of turning to Pescennius Niger, that he might deliver them from the poor puppet Didius Julianus and avenge on the Praetorians the murder of Pertinax. Having secured the co-operation or neutrality of all the forces in the western part of the empire, Severus hastened to Rome. To win the sympathy of the capital he posed as the avenger and successor of Pertinax, whose name he even added to his own, and used to the end of his reign. The feeble defences of Julianus were broken down and the Praetorians disarmed and disbanded, without a blow being struck. A new body of household troops was enrolled and organized on quite different principles from the old. In face of the senate, as Dio tells us, Severus acted for the moment like "one of the good emperors in the olden days." After a magnificent entry into the city he joined the senate in execrating the memory of Commodus, and in punishing the murderers of Pertinax, whom he honoured with the most splendid funeral rites. He also encouraged the senate to pass a decree directing that any emperor or subordinate of an emperor who should put a senator to death should be treated as a public enemy. But he ominously refrained from asking the senate to sanction his accession to the throne.

The rest of Severus's reign, as it is read in the ancient histories, is in the main occupied with wars, over which we shall rapidly pass. The power wielded by Pescennius Niger, who called himself emperor, and was supposed to control one half of the Roman world, proved to be more imposing than substantial. The magnificent promises of Oriental princes were falsified as usual in the hour of need. Niger himself, as described by Dio, was the very type of mediocrity, conspicuous for no faculties, good or bad. This very character had no doubt commended him to Commodus as suited for the important command in Syria, which might have proved a source of danger in abler hands. The contest between Severus and Niger was practically decided after two or three engagements, fought by Severus's officers. The last battle, which took place at Issus, ended in the defeat and death of Niger (194). After this the emperor spent two years in successful attacks upon the peoples bordering on Syria, particularly in Adiabene and Osroene. Byzantium, the first of Niger's possessions to be attacked, was the last to fall, after a glorious defence.

Late in 196 Severus turned westward, to reckon with Albinus, who was well aware that the reckoning was inevitable. He was better born and better educated than Severus, but in capacity far inferior. As Severus was nearing Italy he received the news that Albinus had been declared emperor by his soldiers. The first counter-stroke

of Severus was to affiliate himself and his elder son to the Antonines by a sort of spurious and posthumous adoption. The prestige of the old name, even when gained in this illegitimate way, was probably worth a good deal. Bassianus, the elder son of Severus, thereafter known as Aurelius Antoninus, was named Cæsar in place of Albinus, and was thus marked out as successor to his father. Without interrupting the march of his forces, Severus contrived to make an excursion to Rome. Here he availed himself with much subtlety of the sympathy many senators were known to have felt for Niger. Though he was so far faithful to the decree passed by his own advice that he put no senator to death, yet he banished and impoverished many whose presence or influence seemed dangerous or inconvenient to his prospects. Of the sufferers probably few had ever seen or communicated with Niger.

The collision between the forces of Severus and Albinus was the most violent that had taken place between Roman troops since the mighty contest at Philippi. The decisive engagement was fought in February of the year 197 on the plain between the Rhone and the Saône, to the north of Lyons. Dio tells us that 150,000 men fought on each side. The fortunes of Severus were, to all appearance, at one stage of the battle as hopeless as those of Julius Cæsar were for some hours during the battle of Munda. The tide was turned by the same means in both cases—by the personal conduct and bravery of the commander.

By this crowning victory Severus was released from all need for disguise, and "poured forth on the civil population all the wrath which he had been storing up for a long time" (Dio). He particularly frightened the senate by calling himself the son of Marcus and brother of Commodus, whom he had before insulted. And he read a speech in which he declared that the severity and cruelty of Sulla, Marius, and Augustus had proved to be safer policy than the clemency of Pompey and Julius Cæsar, which had wrought their ruin. He ended with an apology for Commodus and bitter reproaches against the senate for their sympathy with his assassins. Over sixty senators were arrested, on a charge of having adhered to Albinus, and half of them were put to death. In most instances the charge was merely a pretence to enable the emperor to crush out the forward and dangerous spirits in the senate. The murderers of Commodus were punished; Commodus himself was deified; and on the monuments from this time onward Severus figures as the brother of that reproduction of all the vice and cruelty of Nero with the refinement left out.

The next years (197-202) were devoted by Severus to one of the dominant ideas of the empire from its earliest days—war against the Parthians. The results to which Trajan and Verus had aspired were now fully attained, and Mesopotamia was definitely established as a Roman province. Part of the time was spent in the exploration of Egypt, in respect of which Dio takes opportunity to say that Severus was not the man to leave anything human or divine uninvestigated. The emperor returned to enjoy a well-earned triumph, commemorated to this day by the arch in Rome which bears his name. During the six years which followed (202-208) Severus resided at Rome and gave his attention to the organization of the empire. No doubt his vigorous influence was felt to its remotest corners, but our historians desert us at this point and leave us for the most part to the important but dim and defective conclusions to be drawn from the abundant monumental records of the reign. Only two or three events in the civil history of this period are fully narrated by the ancient writers. The first of these is the festival of the Decennalia, or rejoicings in the tenth year of the emperor's reign. Contemporaneous with this festival was the marriage of Aurelius Antoninus

(Caracalla) with Plautilla, the daughter of Plautianus, commander of the reorganized Prætorian guards. This officer holds a conspicuous position in the ancient accounts of the reign, yet it is all but impossible to believe a good deal that we are told concerning him. Nevertheless, without a clear view of the career of Plautianus, it is difficult to grasp definitely some important features in the character of Severus, or to appreciate exactly the nature of his government. According to Dio and Herodian, Plautianus was allowed for years to exercise and abuse the whole power of the emperor, so far as it did not relate to the actual conduct of war. He was cruel, arrogant, and corrupt; and the whole empire groaned under his exactions. Geta, the brother of Severus, tried to open the emperor's eyes, but the licence of Plautianus was merely restricted for a moment, to be bestowed again in full. Finally, in 203 this second Sejanus fell a victim to an intrigue set on foot by his own son-in-law Antoninus (Caracalla), the details of which were not clearly known even to contemporary writers. It is hard to see in what way we are to reconcile this history with the known facts of Severus's character and career, unless we assume that Plautianus was really the instrument of his master for the execution of his new policy towards the senate and the senatorial provinces. That Plautianus abused his authority and brought about his own fall is probable enough,—also that Severus had destined him at one time for the guardianship of his sons. Plautianus was succeeded in his office by two men, one of whom was the celebrated jurist Papinian.

Severus spent the last three years of his life (208-211) in Britain, amidst constant and not very successful warfare, which he is said to have provoked partly to strengthen the discipline and powers of the legions, partly to wean his sons from their evil courses by hard military service. He died at York in February of the year 211. There are vague traditions that his death was in some way hastened by Caracalla. This prince had been, since about 197, nominally joint emperor with his father, so that no ceremony was needed for his recognition as monarch.

The natural gifts of Severus were of no high or unusual order. He had a clear head, promptitude, resolution, tenacity, and great organizing power, but no touch of genius. That he was cruel cannot be questioned, but his cruelty was of the calculating kind, and always clearly directed to some end. He threw the head of Niger over the ramparts of Byzantium, but merely as the best means of procuring a surrender of the stubbornly defended fortress. The head of Albinus he exhibited at Rome, but only as a warning to the capital to tamper no more with pretenders. The children of Niger were held as hostages and kindly treated so long as they might possibly afford a useful basis for negotiation with their father; when he was defeated they were killed, lest from among them should arise a claimant for the imperial power. Stern and barbarous punishment was always meted out by Severus to the conquered foe, but terror was deemed the best guarantee for peace. He felt no scruples of conscience or honour if he thought his interest at stake, but he was not wont to take an excited or exaggerated view of what his interest required. He used or destroyed men and institutions alike with cool judgment and a single eye to the main purpose of his life, the secure establishment of his dynasty. The few traces of aimless savagery which we find in the ancient narratives are probably the result of fear working on the imagination of the time.

As a soldier Severus was personally brave, but he can hardly be called a general, in spite of his successful campaigns. He was rather the organizer of victory than the actual author of it. The operations against Niger were carried out entirely by his officers. Dio even declares that the final battle with Albinus was the first at which Severus had ever been actually present. When a war was going on he was constantly travelling over the scene of it, planning it and instilling into the army his own pertinacious spirit, but the actual fighting was usually left to others. His treatment of the army is the most characteristic feature of his reign. He frankly broke with the decent conventions of the Augustan constitution, ignored the senate, and candidly based his rule upon force. The only title he ever laid to the throne was the *pronunciamento* of the legions, whose adherence to his cause he commemorated

even on the coinage of the realm. The legions voted him the adopted son of Marcus Aurelius; the legions associated with him Caracalla in the government of the empire. Severus strove earnestly to wed the army as a whole to the support of his dynasty. He increased enormously the material gains and the honorary distinctions of the service, so that he was charged with corrupting the troops. Yet it cannot be denied that, all things considered, he left the army of the empire more efficient than he found it. He increased the strength of it by three legions, and turned the Prætorians, heretofore a flabby body without military experience or instinct, into a chosen corps of veterans. Their ranks were filled by promotion from all the legions on service, whereas previously there had been special enlistment from Italy and one or two of the neighbouring provinces. It was hoped that these picked men would form a force on which an emperor could rely in an emergency. But to meet the possibility of a legionary revolt in the provinces, one of the fundamental principles of the Augustan empire was abrogated: Italy became a province, and troops of the regular army were quartered in it under the direct command of the emperor. Further to obviate the risk of revolution, the great commands in the provinces were broken up, so that, excepting on the turbulent eastern frontier, it was not possible for a commander to dispose of troops numerous enough to render him dangerous to the government.

But, while the policy of Severus was primarily a family policy, he was by no means careless of the general security and welfare of the empire. Only in one instance, the destruction of Byzantium, did he weaken its defences for his own private ends—an error for which his successors paid dearly, when the Goths came to dominate the Euxine. The constantly troublesome Danubian regions received the special attention of the emperor, but all over the realm the status and privileges of communities and districts were recast in the way that seemed likely to conduce to their prosperity. The administration acquired more and more of a military character, in Italy as well as in the provinces. Retired military officers now filled many of the posts formerly reserved for civilians of equestrian rank. The præfect of the Prætorians received large civil and judicial powers, so that the investment of Papinian with the office was less unnatural than it at first sight seems. The alliance between Severus and the jurists had important consequences. While he gave them new importance in the body politic, and co-operated with them in the work of legal reform, they did him material service by working an absolutist view of the government into the texture of Roman law. Of the legal changes of the reign, important as they were, we can only mention a few details. The emperor himself was a devoted and upright judge, but he struck a great blow at the purity of the law by transferring the exercise of imperial jurisdiction from the forum to the palace. He sharpened in many respects the law of treason, put an end to the time-honoured *questiones perpetuae*, altered largely that important section of the law which defined the rights of the fiscus, and developed further the social policy which Augustus had embodied in the *lex Julia de adulteriis* and the *lex Papia Poppæa*.

Severus boldly adopted as an official designation the autocratic title of *dominus*, which the better of his predecessors had renounced, and with which the worse had only toyed, as Domitian, whom Martial did not hesitate to call "his lord and his god." During Severus's reign the senate was absolutely powerless; he took all initiative into his hands. He broke down the distinction between the servants of the senate and the servants of the emperor. All nominations to office or function passed under his scrutiny. The estimation of the old consular and other republican titles was diminished. The growth of capacity in the senate was effectually checked by cutting off the tallest of the poppy-heads early in the reign. The senate became a mere registration office for the imperial determinations, and its members, as has been well said, a choir for drawing conventional hymns of praise in honour of the monarch. Even the nominal restoration of the senate's power at the time of Alexander Severus, and the accession of so-called "senatorial emperors" later on, did not efface the work of Septimius Severus, which was resumed and carried to its fulfilment by Diocletian.

It only remains to say a few words of the emperor's attitude towards literature, art, and religion. No period in the history of Latin literature is so barren as the reign of Severus. Many later periods—the age of Stilicho, for example—shine brilliantly by comparison. The only great Latin writers are the Christians Tertullian and Cyprian. The Greek literature of the period is richer, but not owing to any patronage of the emperor, except perhaps in the case of Dio Cassius, who, though no admirer of Severus, attributes to encouragement received from him the execution of the great historical work which has come down to our time. The numerous restorations of ancient buildings and the many new constructions carried out by Severus show that he was not insensible to the artistic glories of the past; and he is known to have paid much attention to works of art in foreign countries where his duties took him. But he was in no sense a patron or connoisseur of art. As to religion,

if we may trust Dio, one of the most superstitious of historians, Severus was one of the most superstitious of monarchs. But apart from that it is difficult to say what was his influence on the religious currents of the time. He probably did a good deal to strengthen and extend the official cult of the imperial family, which had been greatly developed during the prosperous times of the Antonines. But what he thought of Christianity, Judaism, or the Oriental mysticism to which his wife Julia Domna gave such an impulse in the succeeding reign, it is impossible to say. We may best conclude that his religious sympathies were wide, since tradition has not painted him as the partisan of any one form of worship.

The energy and dominance of Severus's character and his capacity for rule may be deemed, without fancifulness, to be traceable in the numerous representations of his features which have survived to our days.

The authorities for this emperor's reign are fairly full and satisfactory, considering the general scantiness of the imperial records. Severus himself wrote an autobiography which was regarded as candid and trustworthy on the whole. The events of the reign were recorded by several contemporaries. The first place among these must be given to Dio Cassius, who stands to the empire in much the same relation as Livy to the republic. He became a senator in the year when Marcus Aurelius died (169) and retained that dignity for more than fifty years. He was well acquainted with Severus, and was near enough the centre of affairs to know the real nature of events, without being great enough to have personal motives for warping the record. Though this portion of Dio's history no longer exists in its original form, we have copious extracts from it, made by Xiphilinus, an ecclesiastic of the 11th century. The faults which have impaired the credit of Dio's great work in its earlier portions,—his lack of the critical faculty, his inexact knowledge of the earlier Roman institutions, his passion for signs from heaven,—could do little injury to the narrative of an eye-witness; and he must here make upon the attentive reader the impression of unusual freedom from the commonest vices of history,—passion, prejudice, and insincerity. His Greek, too, stands in agreeable contrast to the debased Latin of the "scriptores historice Augustæ." The Greek writer Herodian was also a contemporary of Severus, but the mere fact that we know nothing of his life is in itself enough to show that his opportunities were not so great as those of Dio. The reputation of Herodian, who was used as the main authority for the times of Severus by Tillemont and Gibbon, has not been proof against the criticism of recent scholars. His faults are those of rhetoric and exaggeration. His narrative is probably in many places not independent of Dio. The writers known as the "scriptores historice Augustæ" are also of considerable importance,—particularly in the lives of Dilius Julianus, Severus, Pescennius Niger, and Caracalla, attributed to Elius Spartianus; those of Clodius Albinus and Opilius Macrinus to Julius Capitolinus; those of Antoninus Diadumenus, Antoninus Heliogabalus, and Alexander Severus to Lampridius. The personal history of Severus and his family is known to us mainly through these writers. Their principal authority was most probably L. Marius Maximus, a younger contemporary of Septimius Severus, who wrote, in continuation of the work of Suetonius, the lives of eleven emperors from Trajan to Heliogabalus inclusive. If we may believe a few words about him dropped by Ammianus Marcellinus, he was a kind of prose Juvenal, whose uniformly dark pigments can hardly have sufficed to paint a true picture even of his own times. The very numerous inscriptions belonging to the age of Septimius Severus enable us to control at many points and largely to supplement the literary records of his reign, particularly as regards the details of his administration. The juridical works of Justinian's epoch embody much that throws light on the government of Severus.

The principal modern works relating to this emperor, after Tillemont and Gibbon, are—J. Schulte, *De Imperatore L. Septimio Severo*, Münster, 1867; Hüfner, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers L. Septimius Severus*, Gießen, 1875; *Untersuchungen zur römischen Kaiserzeit*, ed. by M. Budinger; H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Götting, 1880-83; De Coulonger, *Essai sur le Règne de Septime Sévère*, Bruxelles, 1880; Réville, *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, Paris, 1886. Controversy about the many disputed matters pertaining to Severus has been intentionally avoided in what has been said above. (J. S. R.)

SEVERUS, MARCUS AURELIUS ALEXANDER, Roman emperor from 222 to 235, was of Syrian parentage, and was born at Arca near the Syrian Tripolis (now Irka; Yâkût, iii. 653; cf. Gen. x. 17), probably in the year 205. His father Gessius Marcianus held office more than once as an imperial procurator; his mother Julia Mamaea was the daughter of Julia Mæsa, the scheming and ambitious lady of Emesa who had succeeded in raising her grandson Elagabalus to the throne of the Cæsars; see the genealogical table in HELIOGABALUS. His original name was Alexius Bassianus, but he changed it in 221, when Mæsa persuaded Elagabalus to adopt his cousin as successor and create him Cæsar. In the next year Elagabalus was murdered, and Alexander was proclaimed by the Prætorians and accepted by the senate. He was then a mere lad, amiable, well-meaning, but somewhat weak, and entirely under the dominion of his mother, a woman of many virtues, who surrounded her son with wise counsellors, watched over the development of his character, and improved the tone of the administration, but on the other hand was inordinately jealous of her influence, and alienated the army by extreme parsimony, while neither she nor her son had a strong enough hand to keep tight the reins of military discipline. Mutinies became frequent in all parts of the empire: to one of them the life of the prætorian præfect Ulpius was sacrificed; another compelled

the retirement of Dion Cassius from his command (see *DION*). On the whole, however, the reign of Alexander Severus was prosperous till he was summoned to the East to face the new power of the Sásánians (see *PERSIA*, vol. xviii. p. 607). Of the war that followed we have very various accounts; Mommsen (vol. v. p. 420 *sq.*) leans to that which is least favourable to the Romans. At all events, though the Persians were checked for the time, the conduct of the Roman army showed an extraordinary lack of discipline. The emperor returned to Rome and celebrated a triumph (233), but next year he was called to face German invaders in Gaul, and there was slain with his mother in a mutiny which was probably led by Maximinus, and at any rate purchased him the throne. Whatever the personal virtues of Alexander were, and they have not lost by contrast with his successor's brutal tyranny, he was not of the stuff to rule a military empire.

SEVERUS, SULPICIUS (c. 865-c. 425), early Christian writer. A native of Aquitania, he was thoroughly imbued with the culture of his country and time. The seven southern provinces of Gaul, between the Alps and the Loire, had long been completely Romanized. The very name "Gaul" was repudiated by the inhabitants and confined to the natives of the ruder northern districts. The lifetime of Severus exactly coincided with the period of greatest literary development in Aquitania, then the truest or only true home of Latin letters and learning—their last place of refuge, from which Severus saw them driven before he closed his eyes on the world. Almost all that we know of his life comes from a few allusions in his own writings, and some passages in the letters of his friend Paulinus, bishop of Nola. In his early days he was famous as a pleader in the courts, and his knowledge of Roman law is reflected in parts of his writings. He married a wealthy lady belonging to a consular family, who died young, leaving him no children. At this time Severus came under the powerful influence of St Martin, bishop of Tours, by whom he was led to devote his wealth to the Christian poor, and his own powers to a life of good works and meditation. To use the words of his friend Paulinus, he broke with his father, followed Christ, and set the teachings of the "fishermen" far above all his "Tullian learning." He rose to no higher rank in the church than that of presbyter. His time was passed chiefly in the neighbourhood of Toulouse, and such literary efforts as he permitted to himself were made in the interests of Christianity. In many respects no two men could be more unlike than Severus, the scholar and orator, well versed in the ways of the world, and Martin, the rough Pannonian bishop of Tours, ignorant of learning, suspicious of culture, the champion of the monastic life, the seer of visions, and the worker of miracles. Yet the spirit of the rugged saint subdued that of the polished scholar, and the works of Severus would have little importance now did they not reflect the ideas, influence, and aspirations of Martin, the foremost ecclesiastic of Gaul, and one of the most striking figures in the church of his day.

The chief work of Severus is the *Chronica*, a summary of sacred history from the beginning of the world to his own times, with the omission of the events recorded in the Gospels and the Acts, "lest the form of his brief work should detract from the honour due to those events." The book was in fact a text-book, and was actually used as such in the schools of Europe for about a century and a half after the *editio princeps* was published by Flavius Illyricus in 1556. Severus nowhere clearly points to the class of readers for whom his book is designed. He disclaims the intention of making his work a substitute for the actual narrative contained in the Bible. "Worldly historians" had been used by him, he says, to make clear the dates and the connexion of events and for supplementing the sacred sources, and with the intent at one and the same time to instruct the unlearned and to "convince" the learned. Probably the "unlearned" are the mass of Christians and the learned are the cultivated Christians and

pagans alike, to whom the rude language of the sacred texts, whether in their Greek or their Latin form, would be distasteful. The literary structure of the narrative itself shows that Severus had in his mind principally readers on the same level of culture with himself. He was anxious to show that sacred history might be presented in a form which lovers of Sallust and Tacitus could appreciate and enjoy. The style is lucid and almost classical. Though phrases and even sentences from many classical authors are inwoven here and there, the narrative flows on easily, with no trace of the jolts and jerks which offend us in almost every line of a patchwork imitator of the classics like Sidonius. In order that his work might fairly stand beside that of the old Latin writers, Severus boldly ignored the allegorical methods of interpreting sacred history to which the heretics and the orthodox of the age were alike wedded. Possibly he was not unshaken in his adherence to the peculiar reading which nearly all men then gave to the maxim that "the letter killeth but the spirit maketh alive."

As an authority for times antecedent to his own, Severus is of little moment. At only a few points does he enable us to correct or supplement other records. Bernays has shown that he based his narrative of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus on the account given by Tacitus in his "Histories," a portion of which has been lost. We are enabled thus to contrast Tacitus with Josephus, who warped his narrative to do honour to Titus. In his allusions to the Gentile rulers with whom the Jews came into contact from the time of the Maccabees onwards, Severus discloses some points which are not without importance. But the real interest of his work lies, first, in the incidental glimpses it affords all through of the history of his own time, next and more particularly, in the information he has preserved concerning the struggle over the Priscillianist heresy, which disorganized and degraded the churches of Spain and Gaul, and particularly affected Aquitaine. The sympathies here betrayed by Severus are wholly those of St Martin. The stout bishop had withstood to his face Maximus, who ruled for some years a large part of the western portion of the empire, though he never conquered Italy. He had reproached him with attacking and overthrowing his predecessors on the throne, and for his dealings with the church. Severus loses no opportunity presented by his narrative for laying stress on the crimes and follies of rulers, and on their cruelty, though he once declares that, cruel as rulers could be, priests could be crueller still. This last statement has reference to the bishops who had left Maximus no peace till he had stained his hands with the blood of Priscillian and his followers. Martin, too, had denounced the worldliness and greed of the Gaulish bishops and clergy. Accordingly we find that Severus, in narrating the division of Canaan among the tribes, calls the special attention of ecclesiastics to the fact that no portion of the land was assigned to the tribe of Levi, lest they should be hindered in their service of God. "Our clergy seem," he says, "not merely forgetful of the lesson but ignorant of it, such a passion for possessions has in our days fastened like a pestilence on their souls. They are greedy of property, and tend their estates and hoard their gold, and buy and sell and give their minds to gain. Those of them who are reputed to be of better principles, who neither hold property nor barter, sit and wait for gifts, and pollute all the grace of their lives by taking fees, while they almost make market of their holiness; but I have digressed farther than I intended, through vexation and weariness of the present age." We here catch an interesting glimpse of the circumstances which were winning over good men to monasticism in the West, though the evidence of an enthusiastic votary of the solitary life, such as Severus was, is probably not free from exaggeration. Severus also fully sympathized with the action of St Martin touching Priscillianism. This mysterious Western offshoot of Gnosticism had no single feature about it which could stanch the hostility of a character such as Martin's was, but he staunchly resisted the introduction of secular punishment for evil doctrine, and withdrew from communion with those bishops in Gaul, a large majority, who invoked the aid of Maximus against their erring brethren. In this connexion it is interesting to note the account given by Severus of the synod held at Rimini in 359, where the question arose whether the bishops attending the assembly might lawfully receive money from the imperial treasury to recoup their travelling and other expenses. Severus evidently approves the action of the British and Gaulish bishops, who deemed it unbecoming that they should lie under pecuniary obligation to the emperor. His ideal of the church required that it should stand clear of and above the state.

After the *Chronica* the chief work of Severus is his *Life of Martin*, a contribution to popular Christian literature which did much to establish the great reputation which that wonder-working saint maintained throughout the Middle Ages. The book is not properly a biography, but a catalogue of miracles, told in all the simplicity of absolute belief. The power to work miraculous signs is assumed to be in direct proportion to holiness, and is by Severus valued merely as an evidence of holiness, which he is persuaded can only be attained through a life of isolation from the

world. In the first of his dialogues Severus puts into the mouth of an interlocutor a most pleasing description of the life of cenobites and solitaries in the deserts bordering on Egypt. The main evidence of the virtue attained by them lies in the voluntary subjection to them of the savage beasts among which they lived. But Severus was no indiscriminating adherent of monasticism. The same dialogue shows him to be alive to its dangers and defects. The second dialogue is a large appendix to the *Life of Martin*, and really supplies more information of his life as bishop and of his views than the work which bears the title *Vita S. Martini*. The two dialogues occasionally make interesting references to personages of the epoch. In Dial. 1, cc. 6, 7, we have a vivid picture of the controversies which raged at Alexandria over the works of Origen. The judgment of Severus himself is no doubt that which he puts in the mouth of his interlocutor Postumianus: "I am astonished that one and the same man could have so far differed from himself that in the approved portion of his works he has no equal since the apostles, while in that portion for which he is justly blamed it is proved that no man has committed more unseemly errors." Three epistles complete the list of Severus's genuine works. He is said to have been led away in his old age by Pelagianism, but to have repented and inflicted long-enduring penance on himself.

The text of the *Chronica* rests on a single MS., one of the Palatine collection now in the Vatican; of the other works MSS. are abundant. Some spurious letters bear the name of Severus; also in a MS. at Madrid is a work falsely professing to be an epitome of the *Chronica* of Severus, and going down to 511. The chief editions of the complete works of Severus are those by De Fazio (Verona, 1741) and by Halm (forming vol. I. of the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna, 1866). There is a most admirable monograph on the *Chronica* by Bernays (Berlin, 1861). (J. S. R.)

SÉVIGNÉ, MARIE DE RABUTIN-CHANTAL, MARQUISE DE (1626-1696), the most charming of all letter-writers in all languages, was born at Paris on February 6, 1626, and died at the chateau of Grignan (Drôme), on April 18, 1696. The family of Rabutin (if not so illustrious as Bussy, Madame de Sévigné's notorious cousin, affected to consider it) was one of great age and distinction in Burgundy. It was traceable in documents to the 12th century, and the castle which gave it name still existed, though in ruins, in Madame de Sévigné's time. The family had been "gens d'épée" for the most part, though François de Rabutin, the author of valuable memoirs on the sixth decade of the 16th century, undoubtedly belonged to it. It is said that Bussy's silly vanity led him to exclude this François from the genealogy of his house because he had not occupied any high position. Marie's father, Celse Bénigne de Rabutin, Baron de Chantal, was the son of the celebrated "Sainte" Chantal, friend and disciple of St Francis of Sales; her mother was Marie de Coulanges. Celse de Rabutin shared to the full the mania for duelling which was the curse of the gentlemen of France during the first half of the 17th century, and was frequently in danger both directly from his adversaries and indirectly from the law. He died, however, in a more legitimate manner, being killed during the English descent on the Isle of Rhé in July 1627. His wife did not survive him many years, and Marie was left an orphan at the age of seven years and a few months. She then passed into the care of her grandparents on the mother's side; but they were both aged, and the survivor of them, Philippe de Coulanges, died in 1636, Marie being then ten years old. According to French custom a family council was held to select a guardian of the young heiress, for such she was to some extent. Her uncle Christophe de Coulanges, Abbé de Livry, was chosen. He was somewhat young for the guardianship of a girl, being only twenty-nine, but readers of his niece's letters know how well "Le Bien Bon"—for such is his name in Madame de Sévigné's little language—acquitted himself of the trust. He lived till within ten years of his ward's death, and long after his nominal functions were ended he was in all matters of business the good angel of the family, while for half a century his abbacy of Livry was the favourite residence, both of his niece and her daughter. Coulanges was much more of a man of business than of a man of letters, but either choice or the fashion of the time induced him to make of his niece a learned lady. Chapelain and Ménage are specially mentioned as her

tutors, and Ménage at least fell in love with her, in which point he resembled the rest of the world, and was constant to his own habits in regard to his pupils. Tallemant des Réaux gives more than one instance of the cool and good-humoured railery with which she received his passion, and the earliest letters of hers that we possess are addressed to Ménage. Another literary friend of her youth was the poet Saint-Pavin. Among her own sex she was intimate with all the coterie of the Hôtel Rambouillet, and her special ally was Mademoiselle de la Vergne, afterwards Madame de la Fayette. In person she was extremely attractive, though the minute critics of the time (which was the palmy day of portraits in words) objected to her divers deviations from strictly regular beauty, such as eyes of different colours and sizes, a "square-ended" nose, and a somewhat heavy jaw. Her beautiful hair and complexion, however, were admitted even by these censors, as well as the extraordinary spirit and liveliness of her expression. Her long minority, under so careful a guardian as Coulanges, had also raised her fortune to the amount of 100,000 crowns—a large sum for the time, and one which with her birth and beauty might have allowed her to expect a very brilliant marriage. That which she finally made was certainly one of affection on her side rather than of interest. There had been some talk of her cousin Bussy, but very fortunately for her this came to nothing. She actually married Henri, Marquis de Sévigné, a Breton gentleman of a good family, and allied to the oldest houses of that province, but of no great estate. The marriage took place on August 4, 1644, and the pair went almost immediately to Sévigné's manor-house of Les Rochers, near Vitré, a place which Madame de Sévigné was in future years to immortalize. It was an unfortified chateau of no very great size, but picturesque enough, with the peaked turrets common in French architecture, and surrounded by a park and grounds of no large extent, but thickly wooded and communicating with other woods. The abundance of trees gave it the repute of being damp and somewhat gloomy. Fond, however, as Madame de Sévigné was of society, it may be suspected that the happiest days of her brief married life were spent there. For there at any rate her husband had less opportunity than in Paris of neglecting her, and of wasting her money and his own. Very little good is said of Henri de Sévigné by any of his contemporaries. He was one of the innumerable lovers of Ninon de l'Enclos, and made himself even more conspicuous with a certain Madame de Gondran, known in the nickname slang of the time as "La Belle Lolo." He was wildly extravagant. That his wife loved him and that he did not love her was generally admitted, and the frank if somewhat coxcomb-like accounts which Bussy Rabutin gives of his own attempt and failure to persuade her to retaliate on her husband are decisive as to her virtue. At last Sévigné's pleasant vices came home to him. He quarrelled with the Chevalier d'Albret about Madame de Gondran, fought with him and was mortally wounded on the 4th of February 1651; he died two days afterwards. There is no reasonable doubt that his wife regretted him a great deal more than he deserved. On two different occasions she is said to have fainted in public at the sight once of his adversary and once of his second in the fatal duel; and whatever Madame de Sévigné was (and she had several faults) she was certainly not a hypocrite. Her husband had when living accused her of coldness,—the common excuse of libertine husbands,—but even he seems to have found fault only with her temperament, not with her heart. To close this part of the subject it may be said that though only six and twenty, and more beautiful than ever, she never married again despite frequent offers, and that no aspersion was