quently 1100 millions, or nearly four-fifths, have been consumed in the arts, lost, &c., or exported to Asia. There are estimated to be about 50 or 60 million pounds sterling worth of silver coins in India,[1] and some trifling amounts each in China, Japan, Persia, &c. On the whole it appears quite safe to estimate the average annual consumption of silver in the arts and through wear, tear, and loss as fully equal to three-fourths of the production. Lowe in 1822 estimated it at two-thirds. Silver is principally used for plate and jewellery; it is also consumed in photography, and in numerous chemical preparations, such as lunar caustic, indelible ink, hair dyes, fulminating powder, &c. (A. DE.)

SILVERIUS, the successor of Pope Agapetus I., was a legitimate son of Pope Hormisdas, born before his father entered the priesthood. He was consecrated on June 8, 536, having purchased his elevation to the see of St Peter from the Gothic king Theodotus. Six months afterwards (Dec. 9) he was one of those who admitted Belisarius into the city. He opposed the restoration of the patriarch Anthimus, whom Agapetus had deposed, and thus brought upon himself the hatred of Theodora, who desired to see Vigilius made pope. He was deposed accordingly by Belisarius in March 537 on a charge (not improbably well founded) of treasonable correspondence with the Goths, and degraded to the rank of a simple monk. He found his way to Constantinople, and Justinian, who entertained his complaint, sent him back to Rome, but Vigilius was ultimately able to banish his rival to Pandataria, where the rest of his life was spent in obscurity. The date of his death is unknown.

SILVESTER I., bishop of Rome from January 314 to December 335, succeeded Melchiades and was followed by Marcus. The accounts of his papacy preserved in the *Liber Pontificalis* (7th or 8th century) and in Anastasius are little else than a record of the gifts said to have been conferred on the Roman Church by Constantine the Great. He was represented at the council of Nice, and is said to have held a council at Rome to condemn the heresies of Arius and others. The story of his having baptized Constantine is pure fiction, as almost contemporary evidence shows the emperor to have received this rite near Nicomedia at the hands of Eusebius, bishop of that city. According to Döllinger, the entire legend, with all its details of the leprosy and the proposed bath of blood, cannot have been composed later than the close of the 5th century, while it is certainly alluded to by Gregory of Tours (*ob.* 594) and Bede. The so-called *Donation of Constantine* was long ago shown to be spurious, but the document is of very considerable antiquity and, in Döllinger's opinion, was forged in Rome between 752 and 777. It was certainly known to Pope Hadrian in 778, and was inserted in the false decretals towards the middle of the next century.

SILVESTER II., pope from 999 till 1003, and previously famous, under his Christian name of Gerbert, first as a teacher and afterwards as archbishop successively of Rheims and Ravenna, was an Aquitanian by birth, and was educated from his boyhood at the abbey of St Gerold in Aurillac. Here he seems to have had Gerald for his abbot and Raymond for his instructor, both of whom were among the most trusted correspondents of his later life. From Aurillac, while yet a young man (*adolescens*), he was carried off to the Spanish march by "Borrell, duke of Hither Spain" for the sake of prosecuting his studies in a district where learning, at that time, flourished more luxuriantly than in Aquitania. Borrell entrusted his young protegé to the care of a certain Bishop Hatto, under whose instruction Gerbert made great progress in mathematics. In this duke we may certainly recognize Borel, who, according to the Spanish chroniclers, was count of Barcelona from 967 to 993, while the bishop may probably be identified with Hatto, bishop of Vich or Ausona from *c.* 960 to 971 or 972. In company with his two patrons Gerbert visited Rome, where the pope, hearing of the young student's proficiency in music and astronomy, induced him to remain in Italy, and before long introduced him to the emperor Otto I. A papal diploma, still extant, shows that Count Borel and Bishop Octo or Otho of Ausona were at Rome in January 971, and, as all the other indications point to a corresponding year, enables us to fix the chronology of Gerbert's later life.

When brought before the emperor, Gerbert admitted his skill in all branches of the quadrivium, but lamented his comparative ignorance of logic. Eager to supply this deficiency he seized the opportunity of following Lothaire's ambassador Garamnus, archdeacon of Rheims, to this city, for the sake of studying under so famous a dialectician in the episcopal schools which were then (*c.* 972?) rising into reputation under the care of Archbishop Adalbero (969–989). So promising a scholar soon attracted the attention of Adalbero himself, and Gerbert was speedily invited to exchange his position of learner for that of teacher. At Rheims he seems to have studied and lectured for many years, having amongst his pupils, now or at a later time, Hugh Capet's son Robert, afterwards king of France, and Richer, to whose history we owe almost every detail of his master's early life. According to this writer Gerbert's fame began to spread over western Europe, throughout Gaul, Germany, and Italy, till it roused the envy of a rival teacher, Otric of Saxony, in whom we may doubtless recognize Octricus of Magdeburg, the favourite scholar of Otto I., and, in earlier days, the instructor of St Adalbert, the apostle of the Bohemians. Otric, suspecting that Gerbert erred in his classification of the sciences, sent one of his own pupils to Rheims to take notes of his lectures, and, finding his suspicions correct, accused him of his error before Otto II. The emperor, to whom Gerbert was well known, appointed a time for the two philosophers to argue before him; and Richer has left a long account of this dialectical tournament at Ravenna, which lasted out a whole day and was only terminated towards evening at the imperial bidding. The date of this controversy seems to have been about Christmas 980, and it was probably followed almost immediately by Otric's death, October 1, 981.

It must have been about this time (*c.* 982) that Gerbert received the great abbey of Bobbio from the emperor. That it was Otto II., and not, as formerly supposed, Otto I., who gave him this benefice, seems evident from a diploma quoted by Mabillon (*Annales*, iv. 121). Richer, however, makes no mention of this event; and it is only from allusions in Gerbert's letters that we learn how the new abbot's attempts to enforce his dues waked a spirit of discontent which at last drove him in November 983 to take refuge with his old patron Adalbero. It was to no purpose that he appealed to the emperor and empress for restitution or redress; and it was perhaps the hope of extorting his reappointment to Bobbio, as a reward for his services to the imperial cause, that changed the studious scholar of Rheims into the wily secretary of Adalbero. It was a time of great moment in the history of Western Europe. Otto II. died in December 983, leaving the empire to his infant heir Otto III. Lothaire claimed the guardianship, and attempted to make use of his position to serve his own purposes in Lorraine, which would in all probability have been lost to the empire had it not been for the indefatigable efforts of Adalbero and Gerbert. Into the obscure details of the succeeding years, as they have to be pieced together from the letters of Gerbert and the hints of Richer or the later annalists, there is no need to enter here. Gerbert's policy is to be identified with that of his metropolitan, and was strongly influenced by gratitude for the benefits that he had received from both the elder Ottos.

[1] R. B. Chapman, *Financial Department of Government of India.*

According to M. Olleris's arrangement of the letters, Gerbert was at Mantua and Rome in 985. Then followed the death of Lothaire (2d March 986) and of Louis V., the last Carolingian king, in May 987. Later on in the same year Adalbero crowned Hugh Capet (1st June) and his son Robert (25th December). Such was the power of Adalbero and Gerbert in those days that it was said their influence alone sufficed to make and unmake kings. The archbishop died 23d January 989, having, according to his secretary's account, designated Gerbert his successor before his decease. Notwithstanding this, the influence of the empress Theophania secured the appointment for Arnulf, a bastard son of Lothaire. The new prelate took the oath of fealty to Hugh Capet and persuaded Gerbert to remain with him. When Charles of Lorraine, Arnulf's uncle, and the illegitimate son of Louis D'Outremer, surprised Rheims in the autumn of the same year, Gerbert fell into his hands and for a time continued to serve Arnulf, who had now gone over to his uncle's side. He had, however, returned to his allegiance to the house of Capet before the fall of Laon placed both Arnulf and Charles at the mercy of the French king (*c.* 30th March 991). Then followed the council of St Basle, near Rheims, at which Arnulf confessed his treason and was degraded from his office (17th June 991). In return for his services Gerbert was elected to succeed the deposed bishop.

The episcopate of the new metropolitan was marked by a vigour and activity that were felt not merely in his own diocese but as far as Tours, Orleans, and Paris. Meanwhile the friends of Arnulf appealed to Rome, and a papal legate was sent to investigate the question. As yet Hugh Capet maintained the cause of his nominee and forbade the prélates of his kingdom to be present at the council of Mouzon, near Sedan (June 2, 995). Notwithstanding this prohibition Gerbert appeared in his own behalf. The events of the next few years are somewhat obscure. Council seems to have followed council, but with uncertain results. At last Hugh Capet died in 996, and, shortly after, his son Robert married Bertha, the widow of Odo, count of Blois. The pope condemned this marriage as adulterous; and Abbo of Fleury, who visited Rome shortly after Gregory V.'s accession, is said to have procured the restoration of Arnulf at the new pontiff's demand. We may surmise that Gerbert left France towards the end of 995, as he was present at Otto III.'s coronation, May 21, 996. Somewhat later he became Otto's instructor in arithmetic, and had been appointed archbishop of Ravenna before May 998. Early in the next year he was elected pope (April 999), and took the title of Silvester II. In this capacity Gerbert showed the same energy that had characterized his former life. He is generally credited with having fostered the splendid vision of a restored empire that now began to fill the imagination of the young emperor, who is said to have confirmed the papal claims to eight counties in the Ancona march. Writing in the name of the desolate church at Jerusalem he called upon the warriors of Christendom to arm themselves in defence of the Holy City, once "the light of the world," but now fallen so low. Thus he sounds the first trumpet-call of the crusades, though almost a century was to pass away before his note was repeated by Peter the Hermit and Urban II.[1]

Nor did Silvester II. confine himself to plans on a large scale. He is also found confirming his old rival Arnulf in the see of Rheims; summoning Adalbero or Azelmus of Laon to Rome to answer for his crimes; judging between the archbishop of Mainz and the bishop of Hildesheim; besieging the revolted town of Cesena; flinging the count of Angoulême into prison for an offence against a bishop; confirming the privileges of Fulda abbey; granting charters to bishoprics far away on the Spanish mark; and, on the eastern borders of the empire, erecting Prague as the seat of an archbishopric for the Slavs. More remarkable than all his other acts is his letter to St Stephen, king of Hungary, to whom he sent a golden crown, and whose kingdom he accepted as a fief of the Holy See. It must, however, be remarked that the genuineness of this letter, in which Gerbert to some extent foreshadows the temporal claims of Hildebrand and Innocent III., has been hotly contested, and that the original document has long been lost. All Gerbert's dreams for the advancement of church and empire were cut short by the death of Otto III., 4th February 1002; and this event was followed a year later by the death of the pope himself, which took place 12th May 1003. His body was buried in the church of St John Lateran, where his tomb and inscription are yet to be seen.

A few words must be devoted to Silvester II. as regards his attitude to the Church of Rome and the learning of his age. He has left us two detailed accounts of the proceedings of the council of St Basle; and, despite his reticence, it is impossible to doubt that he was the moving spirit in Arnulf's deposition. On the whole it may be said that his position in this question as to the rights of the papal see over foreign metropolitans resembled that of his great predecessor Hincmar, to whose authority he constantly appeals. But it is useless to seek in his writings for any definition of the relationship of these powers laid down with logical precision. He is rather the practised debater who will admit his opponent's principles for the moment when he sees his way to moulding them to his own purposes, than the philosophical statesman who has formulated a theory from whose terms he will not move. Roughly sketched, his argument is as follows. Rome is indeed to be honoured as the mother of the churches; nor would Gerbert oppose her judgments except in two cases—(1) where she enjoins something that is contrary to the decrees of a universal council, such as that of Nice, or (2) where, after having been once appealed to in a matter of ecclesiastical discipline and having refused to give a plain and speedy decision, she should, at a later date, attempt to call in question the provisions of the metropolitan synod called to remedy the effects of her negligence. The decisions of a Gregory or a Leo the Great, of a Gelasius or an Innocent, prelates of holy life and unequalled wisdom, are accepted by the universal church; for, coming from such men, they cannot but be good. But who could recognize in the cruel and lustful popes of later days,—in John XII. or Boniface VII., "monsters, as they were, of more than human iniquity,"—anything else than "Antichrist sitting in the temple of God and showing himself as God?" Gerbert proceeds to argue that the church councils admitted the right of metropolitan synods to depose unworthy bishops, but contends that, even if an appeal to Rome were necessary, that appeal had been made a year before without effect. This last clause prepares us to find him shifting his position still further at the council of Causey, where he advances the proposition that John XVI. was represented at St Basle by his legate Seguin, archbishop of Sens, and that, owing to this, the decrees of the latter council had received the papal sanction. Far firmer is the tone of his later letter to the same archbishop, where he contends from historical evidence that the papal judgment is not infallible, and encourages his brother prelate not to fear excommunication in a righteous cause, for it is not in the power even of the successor of Peter "to separate an innocent priest from the love of Christ."

Besides being the most distinguished statesman Gerbert was also the most accomplished scholar of his age. But in this aspect he is rather to be regarded as the diligent expositor of other men's views than as an original thinker. Except as regards philosophical and religious speculation, his writings show a range of interest and knowledge quite unparalleled in that generation. His pupil Richer has left us a detailed account of his system of teaching at Rheims. So far as the trivium is concerned, his text-books were Victorinus's translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *Categories*, and Cicero's *Topics* with Manlius's *Commentaries*. From dialectics he urged his pupils to the study of rhetoric; but, recognizing the necessity of a large vocabulary, he accustomed them to read the Latin poets with care. Virgil, Statius, Terence, Juvenal Horace,

[1] This letter, even if spurious as now suspected, is found in the 11th-century Leyden MS., and is therefore anterior to the first crusade.

Persius, and Lucan are specially named as entering into a course of training which was rendered more stimulating by a free use of open discussion. More remarkable still were his methods of teaching the quadrivium. To assist his lectures on astronomy he constructed elaborate globes of the terrestrial and celestial spheres, on which the course of the planets was marked; for facilitating arithmetical and perhaps geometrical processes he constructed an abacus with twenty-seven divisions and a thousand counters of horn. A younger contemporary speaks of his having made a wonderful clock or sun-dial at Magdeburg; and we know from his letters that Gerbert was accustomed to exchange his globes for MSS. of those classical authors that his own library did not contain. More extraordinary still was his knowledge of music—an accomplishment which seems to have been his earliest recommendation to Otto I. Probably he was beyond his age in this science, for we read of Garamnus, his first tutor at Rheims, whom he attempted to ground in this subject: "Artis difficultate victus, a musica rejectus est." Gerbert's letters contain more than one allusion to organs which he seems to have constructed, and William of Malmesbury has preserved an account of a wonderful musical instrument still to be seen in his days at Rheims, which, so far as the English chronicler's words can be made out, seems to refer to an organ worked by steam. The same historian tells us that Gerbert borrowed from the Arabs (Saraceni) the abacus with ciphers (but see NUMERALS, vol. xvii. p. 627). Perhaps Gerbert's chief claim to the remembrance of posterity is to be found in the care and expense with which he gathered together MSS. of the classical writers. His love for literature was a passion. In the turmoil of his later life he looked back with regret to his student days; and "for all his troubles philosophy was his only cure." Everywhere—at Rome, at Treves, at Moutier-en-Der, at Gerona in Spain, at Barcelona—he had friends or agents to procure him copies of the great Latin writers for Bobbio or Rheims. To the abbot of Tours he writes that he is "labouring assiduously to form a library," and "throughout Italy, Germany, and Lorraine (Belgica) is spending vast sums of money in the acquisition of MSS." It is noteworthy, however, that Gerbert never writes for a copy of one of the Christian fathers, his aim being, seemingly, to preserve the fragments of a fast-perishing secular Latin literature. It is equally remarkable that, despite his residence on the Spanish mark, he shows no token of a knowledge of Arabic, a fact which is perhaps sufficient to overthrow the statement of his younger contemporary Adhemar as to his having studied at Cordova. There is hardly a trace to be found in his writings of any acquaintance with Greek.

So remarkable a character as that of Gerbert left its mark on the age, and fables soon began to cluster round his name. Towards the end of the 11th century Cardinal Benno, the opponent of Hildebrand, is said to have made him the first of a long line of magician popes. Orderic Vitalis improves this legend by details of an interview with the devil, who prophesied Gerbert's threefold elevation in the famous line that Gerbert's contemporaries attributed to the pope himself:

Transit in R. Gerbertus in R. post papa vigens R.

A few years later William of Malmesbury adds a love adventure at Cordova, a compact with the devil, the story of a speaking statue that foretold Gerbert's death at Jerusalem—a prophecy fulfilled, somewhat as in the case of Henry IV. of England, by his dying in the Jerusalem church of Rome,—and that imaginative story of the statue with the legend "Strike here," which, after having found its way into the *Gesta Romanorum*, has of late been revived in the *Earthly Paradise*.

Gerbert's extant works may be divided into five classes. (*a*) A collection of letters, some 230 in number. These are to be found for the most part in an 11th-century MS. at Leyden. Other important MSS. are those of the Barberini Library at Rome (late 16th century), of Middlehill (17th century), and of St Peter's abbey, Salzburg. With the letters may be grouped the papal decrees of Gerbert when Silvester II. (*b*) The *Acta Concilii Remensis ad Sanctum Basolum*, a detailed account of the proceedings and discourses at the great council of St. Basle; a shorter account of his apologetic speeches at the councils of Mouzon and Causey; and drafts of the decrees of two or three other councils or imperial constitutions promulgated when he was archbishop of Ravenna or pope. The important works on the three above-mentioned councils are to be found in the 11th-century Leyden MS. just alluded to. (*c*) Gerbert's theological works comprise a *Sermo de Informatione Episcoporum* and a treatise entitled *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, both of very doubtful authenticity. (*d*) Of his philosophical works we only have one, *Libellus de Rationali et Ratione uti*, written at the request of Otto III. and preserved in an 11th-century MS. at Paris. (*e*) His mathematical works consist of a *Regula de Abaco Computi*, of which a 12th-century MS. is to be found at the Vatican; and a *Libellus de Numerorum Divisione* (11th and 12th century MSS. at Rome, Montpellier, and Paris), dedicated to his friend and correspondent Constantine of Fleury. A long treatise on geometry, attributed to Gerbert, is of somewhat doubtful authenticity. To these may be added a very short disquisition on the same subject addressed to Adalbold, and a similar one, on one of his own spheres, addressed to Constantine, abbot of Micy. All the writings of Gerbert are collected in the edition of M. Olleris. (T. A. A.)

SILVESTER III. When Boniface IX. was driven from Rome early in January 1044, John, bishop of Sabina, was elected in his stead and took the title of Silvester III. Within three months Boniface returned and expelled his rival. Nearly three years later (December 1046) the council of Sutri deprived him of his bishopric and priesthood. He was then sent to a monastery, where he seems to have died.

SIMANCAS, a walled town of Spain, 8½ miles south-west from Valladolid, on the road to Zamora, is situated on the Pisuerga, here crossed by a fine bridge of seventeen arches. The population within the municipal boundaries was 1258 in 1885. In the north-western angle of the town stands the Archivo General del Reino, originally a fortified castle, to which the national archives of Spain were removed in 1563 (the suggestion was due to Ximenez). The extensive architectural alterations and repairs which were necessary were made under the direction of Herrera, Berruguete, and Mora, and the arrangement of the papers was entrusted to Diego de Ayala. They now occupy forty-six rooms, and are arranged in upwards of 80,000 bundles (30,000,000 documents), including important private as well as state papers, ambassadors' correspondence, and the like. The archives of the Indies, originally lodged here, were transferred in the 18th century to the Lonja of Seville. Permission to consult the documents at Simancas can now be readily obtained.

SIMBIRSK, a government of eastern Russia, on the right bank of the middle Volga, with Kazañ on the N., Samara on the E., Saratoff on the S., and Penza and Nijni-Novgorod on the W., has an area of 19,110 square miles, and a population (1882) of 1,471,164. It is occupied by the eastern parts of the great central plateau of middle Russia, which slowly rises towards the south, and gently slopes in the north towards the great Oka depression of the middle Volga. Its higher parts range from 750 to 1000 feet above the sea, and form the Zheguleff range of hills, which compel the Volga to make its great bend at Samara; while the numerous valleys and ravines which intersect it, and are excavated to a depth of 700 to 800 feet, give quite a hilly aspect to several parts of it, especially in the east, where it descends with abrupt crags towards the broad valley of the Volga. In the west a broad depression, traversed by numerous rivers and streams, extends along the left bank of the Sura. All geological formations, from the Carboniferous upwards are met with in Simbirsk. The Volga flows for 300 miles along the eastern boundary, separating Simbirsk from Samara. The shallow Sviyaga rises in the Samarskaya Luka Hills and flows parallel to the Volga, at a distance of 2 to 20 miles, but in an opposite direction. The Sura, also flowing northwards, waters the western part of Simbirsk; it is navigable for more than 270 miles, and, as it is free from ice earlier than the Volga and flows towards central Russia, goods are sometimes transported by land to the Sura to be shipped on it when speedy transport is desired. Its tributaries—the Barysh, Alatyr (100 miles), Piyana, and others—are not navigable. The Usa (80 miles) and the Syzrañ (100 miles) flow east and join the Volga below the Samara bend. A few lakes and marshes are met with in the west of the government. The forests, although rapidly disappearing, still cover 3,894,800 acres, while of the remainder 5,930,600 acres are arable, 1,150,800 acres prairie and pasture land, and 605,600 acres uncultivable. In the north excellent forests of timber cover large areas, but in the south they are rare. The climate is severe, and the extremes are great. At Simbirsk the average temperature is 38°·7, but the thermometer sometimes reaches 114° F., and frosts of −47° F. are not uncommon; the average rain and snow fall is only 17·6 inches. South of the Samara Hills the climate is much less severe, and gardening, which is prosecuted with great difficulty in the north, flourishes there.

The population, which was but 1,192,510 in 1867, had reached 1,471,164 in 1882, of whom only 100,740 lived in towns. The greater number (about two-thirds) are Great Russians, the remainder being Mordvinians (13 per cent.), Tchuvashes (9·3 per cent.), and Tartars (8·8 per cent.), with about 1000 Jews. The Mordvinians are chiefly settled in the north-west, in Ardatoff and Alatyr (40 and 26 per cent. of population), and on the Volga in Senghilei; the Tchuvashes make about one-third of the population of the districts of Buinsk and Kurmysh, contiguous to Kazañ; the Tartars constitute about 35 per cent. in Buinsk and 18 per cent. in Senghilei. Only the Tartars (about 100,000) are Mohammedans, the remainder being Greek-Orthodox or Dissenters. As in other Volga governments, the villages in Simbirsk are mostly large, many of them having from 3000 to 5000 inhabitants. Agriculture, favoured by a fertile soil, is the chief occupation, grain being exported or manufactured into spirit. Linseed and hempseed are cultivated for exportation, as also kitchen-garden produce and some fruit. Bee-keeping is a favourite and remunerative occupation with Mordvinians, and fishing (sturgeon) is carried on in the Volga and the Sura. The timber-trade in the north and the shipbuilding on the Sura are considerable sources of wealth; wooden sledges and wheels are made and exported, as well as bags of lime-tree bast,—the last-named industry giving occupation to whole villages. Other petty trades, also carried on in conjunction with agriculture, are the manufacture of felts and felt hats, linen stuffs (especially among the Mordvinians), cottons, boots, and small metal wares. A characteristic feature of Simbirsk is the trade in wooden vessels, which are exported to Vyatka, Perm, Orenburg, Samara, and the Don, and there exchanged for cat, squirrel, and hare skins. Flour-mills are numerous. Watered by the Volga and Sura, and moreover traversed in its southern portion by the railway connecting Orenburg and Samara with Penza and Ryazañ, by Batraki and Syzrañ, the government has an active trade. Its exports, however, are much below those of Samara and Saratoff. Batraki and Syzrañ are important centres of traffic, the aggregate amount of merchandise entered and cleared by rail and boat being respectively 2,435,000 and 2,000,000 cwts. (timber not included). The chief ports of lading on the Sura are Alatyr, Promzino-Gorodische, and Berezniki, each with exports valued at about 750,000 roubles. Corn, linseed, woollen stuffs, timber, potash, and wooden wares are the principal articles of trade.

Simbirsk is very backward as regards education. There were in 1882 only 462 schools (17,795 boys and 2663 girls) and 8 secondary schools (497 male and 516 female pupils).

The government is divided into eight districts, the chief towns of which, with their populations in 1880, are—Simbirsk (36,600), Alatyr (15,000), Ardatoff (4740), Buinsk (4130), Karsuñ (3740), Kurmysh (1930), Senghilei (3500), and Syzrañ (24,500). Kotyakoff (580) and Tagai (2400) have municipal institutions. The above-mentioned ports of lading are more important than most of the towns.

The first Russian settlers made their appearance in the Simbirsk region in the 14th century, but did not extend east of the Sura. Not till two centuries later did they cross the Sura and the district begin to be peopled by refugees from Moscow. The Zheguleff Mountains in the south still continuing to be a place of refuge for the criminal and the persecuted, Simbirsk was founded in 1648, and a palisaded earthen wall was built, running south-west of the new town, with small forts extending to the Sura. The region thus protected was soon settled, and, as the Russian villages advanced further south, Syzrañ was founded, and a second line of small forts, extending also towards the Sura, was erected. The colonizers settled rapidly, and the aboriginal Mordvinians soon adopted many of their customs, so as to lose their ethnographical individuality, especially within the last fifty years. Simbirsk received the name of an old Tartar settlement, Sinbir, situated 9 miles south of the present town, on the opposite bank of the Volga.

SIMBIRSK, capital of the above government, is situated 576 miles east-south-east of Moscow, between the Volga and the Sviyaga, here separated by an isthmus only 2 miles broad. The central part of Simbirsk—the Crown (Vyenets), containing the cathedral and the best houses—is built on a hill 560 feet above the Volga, whence there is a beautiful view over the low left bank of the river. Adjoining is the trading part of Simbirsk, while farther down on the slope, towards the Volga, are scattered the store-houses, the shops for the sale of stoneware and other merchandise brought by the steamers and boats, and the poorest suburbs of the city; these last also occupy the western slope towards the Sviyaga. There are three suburbs on the left bank of the Volga, communication with them being maintained in summer by steamers. A great fire having destroyed nearly all the town in 1864, it has been again built on a new plan, still mostly of wood. The cathedral of St Nicholas dates from 1712. The new one, that of the Trinity, was erected by the nobility in commemoration of 1812. The old church of St Nicholas on the Karamzin Square is architecturally pleasing. A public garden has been laid out on the top of the Vyenets Hill and another in the outskirts of the city, while no fewer than three hundred private gardens, where fruits are grown for exportation, are scattered throughout the town. The historian Karamzin (born in 1766 in the vicinity of Simbirsk) has a monument here, and a public library bearing his name contains about 15,000 volumes. Gardening and fishing occupy many of the inhabitants. The trade is brisk, corn being the principal item, while next come potash, wool, fruits, wooden wares, and manufactured produce. The Simbirsk fair, having a turnover of some 6 million roubles, still maintains its importance. The population (24,600 in 1867) was 36,600 in 1880.

SIMEON (שִׁמְעוֹן), second son of Jacob by Leah (Gen. xxix. 33). The tribe of Simeon, like that of Levi, was broken up at a very early period, under circumstances of which we have some indication in Gen. xxxiv. and xlix. (see ISRAEL, vol. xiii. p. 400 *sq.*, and LEVITES). In Judges i. the Simeonites appear as sharing the conquests of Judah in the extreme south of Canaan, but there is no mention of them in this region in 1 Sam. xxx., and the tribe is not named at all in the blessing of Moses. It reappears, however, in 1 Chron. iv. 24–43 (*cf.* xii. 25), and is reckoned to the kingdom of Ephraim (2 Chron. xv. 9; xxxiv. 6). The Arabian wars of Simeon spoken of in 1 Chron. iv. have been connected by Hitzig and others with a supposed Israelite kingdom of Massa, which they find in Prov. xxxi. 1, translating "Lemuel, king of Massa," and comparing Gen. xxv. 14 and Isa. xxi. 11 *sq.*, where, however, it is quite gratuitous to suppose an embassy to the prophet from Israelites in Arabia. The whole speculation and the further development of Dozy (*The Israelites in Mecca*) is fanciful; *cf.* Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, Eng. tr., pp. 212 *sq.* The heroine of the book of Judith is made to be of the tribe of Simeon, but this book is quite unhistorical.

SIMEON OF DURHAM. See SYMEON.

SIMEON STYLITES. See MONACHISM, vol. xvi. p. 701.

SIMFEROPOL, the capital of the Russian government of Taurida, is situated in the south-western part of the Crimea, on the Salghir (which frequently becomes dry), 900 miles from Moscow. Occupying an admirable site on the northern slopes of the Tchatyr-dagh, it has on the eastern side many beautiful gardens, and is divided into two parts,—the European, well built in stone, and the Tartar, which consists of narrow and filthy streets peopled by Tartars and Jews. Although it has grown somewhat since the railway brought it into connexion with the rest of the empire, it still remains a mere administrative centre, without either manufacturing or commercial importance. The population was 16,550 in 1866 and 29,030 in 1881.

In the neighbourhood stood the small fortress Napoli, erected by Skilur, the ruler of Taurida, some hundred years before the Christian era, which existed until the end of the 3d century. Afterwards the Tartars had here their settlement Ak-metchet, which was in the 17th century the residence of the chief military commander of the khan, and had the name of Sultan-serai. In 1736 it was taken and burnt by the Russians, and in 1784, after the conquest of Crimea by the Russians, it received its present name and became the capital of Taurida.

SIMLA, a small district in the lieutenant-governorship of the Punjab, India, situated among the hills of the lower Himalayan system in 31° 6′ N. lat. and 77° 11′ E. long. It consists of several detached plots of territory, together comprising an area of only 18 square miles. The mountains of Simla and the surrounding native states compose the southern outliers of the great central chain of the eastern Himalayas. They descend in a gradual series from the

main chain to the general level of the Punjab plain, forming a transverse south-westerly spur between the great basins of the Ganges and the Indus. A few miles north-east of Simla the spur divides into two main ridges, one following the line of the Sutlej in a north-westerly direction, and the other, crowned by the sanatorium of Simla, trending south-eastwards, till it meets at right angles the mountains of the outer Himalayan system. South and east of Simla the hills between the Sutlej and the Tons centre in the great peak of Chor, 11,982 feet above the sea. Throughout all the hills forests of deodar abound, while rhododendrons clothe the slopes up to the limit of perpetual snow. The principal rivers here are the Sutlej, Pabar, Giri Ganga, Chambar, and Sarsa. The scenery of the immediate neighbourhood of Simla is very grand and picturesque, presenting a series of magnificent views. The climate is considered highly salubrious and admirably adapted to European constitutions; the district has therefore been selected as the site of numerous sanatoria and cantonments. The average annual rainfall amounts to about 72 inches.

The population of the district in 1881 was 42,945 (males 27,593, females 15,352); Hindus numbered 32,428, Mohammedans 6935, and Christians 3353. Cultivation is widely carried on in all the lower valleys of the hills, and the fields are sown with maize, pulses, or millet for the autumn and with wheat for the spring harvest. Poppy, hemp, turmeric, ginger, and potatoes form the principal staples raised for exportation to the plains. The trade of the district centres mainly in the bazaars of Simla, which forms a considerable entrepôt for the produce of the hills. Another important trade-centre is the town of Rampur on the Sutlej, from which the great part of the shawl-wool (*pashm*) finds its way for exportation to British India.

The acquisition of the patches of territory forming the district dates from various times subsequent to the close of the Gúrkha War in 1815–16, which left the British in possession of the whole tract of hill-country from the Gogra to the Sutlej. Kumáun and Dehra Dun were annexed to the British dominions, but the rest, with the exception of a few localities retained as military posts and a portion sold to the raja of Patiála, was restored to the hill rajas, from whom it had been wrested by the Gúrkhas. Garhwal state became attached to the North-Western Provinces, but the remaining principalities rank among the dependencies of the Punjab, and are known collectively as the Simla Hill States, under the superintendence of the deputy-commissioner of Simla, subordinate to the commissioner at Ambála.

SIMLA, the administrative headquarters of the above district, and the summer capital of India, stands at an elevation of 7084 feet above sea level. Since the administration of Sir John Lawrence (1864) it has been the resort, during the hot weather, of the successive governors-general of India, with their secretaries and headquarters establishments. In 1881 it had a population of 13,258.

SIMMS, William Gilmore (1806–1870), an American poet, novelist, and historian, was born at Charleston, S.C., April 17, 1806, of Scoto-Irish descent. His mother died during his infancy, and his father having failed in business, and joined Coffee's brigade of mounted Indian fighters, which kept him in the Seminole country, young Simms was brought up by his grandmother, who gave him as good an education as her limited means would allow. He was clerk in a drug store for some years, and afterwards studied law, the bar of Charleston admitting him to practice in 1827, but he soon abandoned his profession for literature. At the age of eight he wrote verses, and in his 19th year he produced a *Monody on Gen. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney*. Two years later, in 1827, *Lyrical and Other Poems* and *Early Lays* appeared; and in 1828 he began journalism, editing with conspicuous ability and partly owning the *City Gazette*—a paper opposed to the doctrine of nullification. The enterprise failed, and the editor devoted his attention entirely to letters, and in rapid succession published *The Vision of Cortes, Cain, and other Poems* (1829), *The Tricolor, or Three Days of Blood in Paris* (1830), and his strongest poem, *Atalantis*, a story of the sea (1832). *Atalantis* established his fame as an author, and *Martin Faber*, the story of a criminal, his first tale, written in the following year, was warmly received. From this time forward his writings became very abundant; a classified list is given below. Though sensational and full of excessive colouring, they are held in good repute in the Southern States. During the American Civil War Simms espoused the side of the Secessionists in a weekly newspaper, and suffered damage at the hands of the Federal troops when they entered Charleston. He held a seat in the State legislature for some years, and the university of Alabama conferred on him the degree of LL.D. He died at Charleston on 11th June 1870.

In addition to the works mentioned above, Simms published the following poetry:—*Southern Passages and Pictures*, lyrical, sentimental, and descriptive poems, 1839; *Donna Florida*, 1843; *Grouped Thoughts and Scattered Fancies*, sonnets, 1845; *Areytos, or Songs of the South*, 1846; *Lays of the Palmetto*, 1848; *The Eye and the Wing*, 1848; *The Cassique of Accabee, a Tale of Ashley River*, with other pieces, 1849; *The City of the Silent*, 1850. To dramatic literature he contributed *Norman Maurice, or the Man of the People*; *Michael Bonham, or the Fall of the Alamo*; and a stage adaptation of *Timon of Athens*, all of which have been acted with success. His revolutionary romances are—*The Partisan*, 1835; *Mellichampe*, 1836; *Katherine Walton, or the Rebel of Dorchester*, 1851; *The Scout* (originally *The Kinsman*), *or the Black Riders of the Congaree*, 1841; *Woodcraft* (originally named *The Sword and the Distaff*), and *Eutaw*, 1856. These tales describe social life at Charleston, and the action covers the whole revolutionary period, with faithful portraits of the political and military leaders of the time. Of border tales the list includes *Guy Rivers, a Tale of Georgia*, 1834; *Richard Hurdis*, 1838; *Border Beagles*, 1840; *Beauchampe*, 1842; *Helen Halsey*, 1845; *The Golden Christmas*, 1852; and *Charlemont*, 1856. The historical romances are *The Yemassee*, 1835, by far the greatest of his works, and dealing largely with Indian character and nature; *Pelayo*, 1838; *Count Julian*, 1845; *The Damsel of Darien*, 1845; *The Lily and the Totem*; *Vasconselos*, 1857, which he wrote under the assumed name of "Frank Cooper"; and *The Cassique of Kiawah*, 1860. Other novels, belonging to the series of which *Martin Faber* was the first, and treating principally of domestic life and motive, are *Carl Werner*, 1838; *Confession of the Blind Heart*, 1842; *The Wigwam and the Cabin*, a collection of short tales, 1845–46; *Castle Dismal*, 1845; and *Marie de Berniere*, 1853. Simms's other writings comprise a *History of South Carolina*; *South Carolina in the Revolution*, 1854; *A Geography of South Carolina*; lives of *Francis Marion*, *Capt. John Smith*, *The Chevalier Bayard*, and *General Greene*; *The Ghost of my Husband*, 1866; and *War Poetry of the South*,—an edited volume,—1867. Simms was also a frequent contributor to the magazines and literary papers, six of which he founded and conducted. He wrote on a great variety of subjects, and discussed with spirit and boldness the leading political, social, and literary topics of the day. In the discussion on slavery he upheld the views of the pro-slavery party. He edited the seven dramas ascribed to Shakespeare, with notes and an introduction to each play. In the capacity of lecturer and orator, he was in frequent request on public occasions. His principal orations are *The Social Principle the True Secret of National Permanence*, 1842; *The True Sources of American Independence*, 1844; *Self-Development*, 1847; *Poetry of the Practical*; *The Battle of Fort Moultrie*; and *The Moral Character of Hamlet*.

SIMON MAGUS. In the extant documents of the first three centuries we meet with Simon Magus in a threefold aspect:—(1) as Samaritan Messiah attempting by the aid of Christianity to establish a new religion; (2) as founder of a school of Gnostics and as father of heresy; (3) as a caricature of the apostle Paul. The Tübingen critics (Baur, Volkmar, Zeller, Lipsius, and until the year 1878 Hilgenfeld also) have tried to show that the oldest accounts are those in which Simon is represented in the last-named aspect; they have accordingly denied his existence, maintaining that all the features attributed to him in the oldest sources are accounted for by the life and personality of Paul. In particular they would explain Simon's visit to Rome by the apostle's journey thither, and further would have it that the church tradition of Peter's having gone to Rome arose solely out of the supposition that the great apostle who had withstood the Paul-Simon everywhere else must have followed up his

victory in the capital of the world also. According to this view, Simon Magus is an invention of the Jewish Christians, a distorted Paul, whom the church at large partly accepted as historical and partly catholicized, adding fresh touches to the picture of Simon, making him the father of all the heresies, the head of all the magi, a pseudo-Messiah, and so forth, but at last destroying the whole point of the story by adding that Peter and Paul had jointly overcome the magian in Rome.

Were this view of the Tübingen critics established, their whole conception of apostolic and post-apostolic times would also be proved; it would have been made out (1) that legends of an anti-Pauline tendency form the basis of the tradition of the church; (2) that the Acts of the Apostles is a compromise, and rests upon Jewish-Christian myths in part no longer understood; (3) that the ecclesiastical tradition about Peter's journeyings had its origin merely in those of Paul; and (4) there would be established an indisputable example of the production of biassed and fabricated history within primitive Christianity so remarkable that upon the ground of it alone we should be justified in simply regarding the greater part of the historical statements of the first two Christian centuries as deliberate inventions.

But on no other point are the proofs of the Tübingen school weaker than in this. Only by inverting the historical order of the original documents, by dint of violent assertion, and by declaring with reference to the most important arguments that they existed in writings which now are lost, has it been possible for them to give even the appearance of stability to their hypothetical structure. The three assertions of the Tübingen critics—(1) that the written sources of the pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* go back to the 1st century, (2) that already in these Paul has become distorted into Simon Magus and Peter is represented as having combated the Simon-Paul in Rome, and (3) that the Acts of the Apostles, Justin, and other church fathers in their statements about Simon and about Peter's stay in Rome depend upon these Jewish-Christian writings—can none of them be proved. On the other hand,—apart from the Acts of the Apostles,—the existence of a Samaritan magus, Simon, in apostolic times, as well as of a sect of Simonians in the 2d century (in Samaria, and elsewhere in the Roman empire), is quite conclusively attested through Justin Martyr, and also through Celsus, Clement, Hippolytus, and Origen.[1] Even the Tübingen critics themselves could not deny the existence of a sect of Simonians; they have therefore been obliged to advance the desperate theory that the sect arose solely on the basis of the Jewish-Christian romance of Simon.

The oldest account of Simon Magus occurs in the Acts of the Apostles. When Philip the evangelist came to Samaria about 37 A.D. he found a great religious movement going on. One named Simon had given himself out for some great person, and by dint of his extraordinary works had stirred up and gained over the whole population, who took him for the exalted manifestation of the Divine Power itself. Philip converted the majority of Simon's adherents; and Simon himself, amazed at the deeds wrought by Philip, received baptism, and joined the evangelist's society. Peter and John then came to Samaria to impart to the baptized the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands; and Simon offered the apostles money to invest him with a like power of conferring the gift. But Peter sternly rebuked him, exhorting him to repent and beseech God that the evil thought of his heart might be forgiven him. Simon thereupon begged the apostles to pray on his behalf. We have no means of checking this account, since we possess no other independent source. The author of the Acts seems to have known nothing of Simon Magus from other quarters, else he would hardly have closed the narrative as we have it. Simon is not yet viewed as hostile to Christianity. There is no justification for doubt as regards the main points of this account. That in the fourth decade of the 1st century a pseudo-Messiah, named Simon, appeared in Samaria; that he gained a considerable following; that he tried to effect a union with the Christian missionaries, who, however, soon perceived his real character and shook him off,—these facts must be treated as historical.[2] They are vouched for by Justin, whose statement is not borrowed from the Acts.[3] Justin, it is true, makes no direct statement about any relations whatever between Simon and Christianity, but represents him as one who gave himself out for God and as the founder of an entirely new religion; but, since on the other hand he groups him with Menander and Marcion, and thinks of him as the devil-sent father of heretics, it is plain that he knew quite well of some relation between Simon and the Christians.

The conception of Simon as the father of heresy within the church is in no way suggested in the Acts; nor has Justin in the writings which we possess given any hint of a reason why Simon should be viewed in such a light. But the testimony of the Acts (viii. 13) that Simon received baptism, and for a while joined himself to the Christians, enables us at least in some degree to understand how he afterwards got the reputation alluded to. We shall see presently, moreover, that Simon must have introduced certain Christian elements into his teaching.[4]

Justin has a good deal more about Simon that is not to be found in Acts:—(1) he gives his birthplace as Gittha in Samaria; (2) he states that Simon came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and there by his magical arts gained some followers, and was taken for a god, and that a statue was erected to him on the Tiber Island with the inscription SIMONI DEO SANCTO; and (3) he states that the adherents of Simon passed off a woman named Helena,

[1] The testimony of Justin derives its great importance from the fact that he was himself a Samaritan; he says expressly (*Apol.*, ii. 15; see also *Dial.*, 120), *τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ἔθνει ἀσεβοῦς καὶ πλάνου Σιμωνιανοῦ διδάγματος κατεφρόνησα*. In *Apol.*, i. 26 he makes direct reference to Simon (see also i. 56), and remarks, *καὶ σχέδον πάντες μὲν Σαμαρεῖς, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑλλοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν Σίμωνα ὁμολογοῦντες, Σίμωνα καὶ προσκυνοῦσι*. Celsus (quoted in Orig., *C. Cels.*, v. 62) alludes to a sect of Simonians, and says they were also called Helenians; Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, i. 23) is acquainted with the ritual and writings of this sect; Hippolytus (*Philosoph.*, vi. 7–20) gives extracts from a Simonian book *Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη*. Particularly interesting is the testimony of Origen (*C. Cels.*, i. 57; *cf.* vi. 11): "Also Simon Magus, the Samaritan, wished to gain disciples by his magical arts. His impositions were virtually without result at the time, while at present, in my belief, the number of his adherents throughout the world does not amount to thirty. And perhaps this estimate is too high. At most there are only a few in Palestine, while in the other parts of the world where he desired to make his name illustrious it is quite unknown. Where it is known, the fact is entirely due to the Acts of the Apostles. Christians alone still speak of him." Some would fain find a testimony in Josephus also; but the Jewish conjurer Simon, of Cyprus, mentioned in *Ant.*, xx. 7 has nothing whatever to do with the Samaritan. Renan would recognize Simon Magus in the second beast of Rev. xiii.; but this hypothesis is utterly baseless.

[2] The same historical certainty cannot be claimed for the meeting of Peter and Simon, because in the Acts (ch. i.–xv.) Peter is throughout pushed to the front, and because the motive assigned for his journey to Samaria is open to some suspicion. Still, the fact that even in the Jewish-Christian Acts of the Apostles Peter and Simon have personal dealings affords presumptive evidence that they did meet.

[3] Unfortunately, Justin's *Syntagma* against the heretics, in which he dealt at greater length with Simon, is no longer extant; we are therefore limited to the meagre references in his *Apology* and *Dialogue*, and the statements of later writers who had read the *Syntagma*.

[4] Justin repeatedly and emphatically says that Simon pretended to be a god, and was regarded by his adherents as the Supreme God; see *Dial.*, 120.