

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 Gurkha War in 1815-16, which left the British in possession of the whole tract of hill-country from the Gogra to the Sutlej. Kumaon 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 Patiala, was restored to the hill rajahs, from whom it had been wrested by the Gurkhas. 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 Ambala.

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 Scotch-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; *Arctos, or Songs of the South*, 1846; *Lays of the Palmetto*, 1848; *The Eye and the Wing*, 1848; *The Cassique of Acabce, 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 Beacons*, 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 Julien*, 1845; *The Damsel of Darien*, 1845; *The Lily and the Totem*; *Vasconcelos*, 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 Berniers*, 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 Practicist*; *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 biased 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 than 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), τὸ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ἔθνει ἀσεβοῦς καὶ πάλιν Σιμωνιανῶν διδάγματα κατεφρόνησα. In *Apol.*, i. 26 he makes direct reference to Simon (see also i. 56), and remarks, καὶ σχεδὸν πάντες μὲν Σαμαρείταις, ὅλγοι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν, ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν Σίμωνα θεολογῶντες, Σίμωνα καὶ προσκυνοῦσι. Celsus (quoted in *Orig.*, *C. Cels.*, v. 62) alludes to a sect of Simonians, and says they were also called Helenians; Ireneus (*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):

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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 *Apologetics* and *Dialogue*, and the statements of later writers who had read the *Syntagma*.

⁵ 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.

whom he brought to Rome with him, and who had previously been a prostitute in Tyre,¹ as the "first idea" (πρώτη ἐννοία) of Simon.

As regards the first of these statements we may point to a Samaritan village "Gīt" (Karjet-Gīt), not quite 3 miles south-south-west from the town of Samaria.² Justin's account in this particular seems trustworthy. On the other hand, the allegation that a statue was erected to Simon in Rome is not authentic,³ and consequently most critics have regarded the narrative of Simon's journey to Rome as legendary. Some suppose that Justin was led only through the words of the inscription which he has wrongly referred to Simon to believe that Simon himself was in Rome; others (the Tübingen critics) think, on the contrary, that Justin had been already acquainted with the Jewish-Christian Acts of the Apostles, and had thence learned that Simon (Paul) had gone to Rome and that the inscription therefore only confirmed him in the belief of Simon's presence there. But in either case the distinct assertion of Justin that Simon went to Rome in the time of Claudius remains unexplained; for the hypothesis that Justin added the arrival of Simon under Claudius because he already knew and credited the legend of Peter's having lived twenty-five years in Rome deserves no refutation. Consequently we may assume—seeing there is absolutely no trace of any influence of the Jewish-Christian legend upon Justin—that in the Roman community, in the time of that author, a tradition was current that Simon Magus visited Rome in the reign of Claudius. We are no longer in a position to test the trustworthiness of this tradition; but, seeing there is no indication of any tendency out of which it could have arisen, we have no ground for declaring it incredible. The fact attested by Justin, Celsus, and Origen, that there were Simonians also beyond the limits of Samaria (ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν), favours the view that Simon had travelled. With reference, lastly, to the statement about Helena, we have to observe that here Justin has reported a doctrine not of Simon but of the Simonians. Simon, we are to understand, came to Rome with a woman named Helena, and his adherents afterwards took her for the æon mentioned. Justin gave fuller accounts of Helena and the doctrines of the Simonians in his *Syntagma*; and we know their substance from Hegesippus, Irenæus, Tertullian, pseudo-Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Philastrius. Simon, it would appear, declared himself to be "the highest power"—the Supreme God Himself; he taught that among the Jews he manifested himself as the Son, in Samaria as the Father, and among other nations as the Holy Spirit. Helena, whom he had purchased in a brothel at Tyre, he gave out to be his πρώτη ἐννοία, the mother of all, by whom he had called the angels and archangels into being. She had proceeded from him, had been initiated into his purposes, had voluntarily come down from heaven and become the mother of the angels and powers who created this world; but after the completion of her work she had been laid under bonds by her own children, the world-creating angels, who desired to be independent, and who knew not the first father Simon; they imprisoned her in a human

¹ This does not come directly from the extant manuscript of Justin's *Apology*, but from Eusebius's quotations (Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 13).

² See Lipsius, *Quellen der röm. Petrusgeschichte*, p. 34.

³ A happy accident of the rarest kind has put us in a position to correct Justin's statement. In 1874 a stone which had once served as the base of a statue was dug out upon the Tiber Island. It bore the following inscription: SEMONI SANCUS DEO FIDIO SACRVM (see Orelli, *Inscr.*, vol. i. p. 337 n., 1860). "Semo Sancus" is a Sabine god (Ovid, *Fast.*, vi. 213 sq.; Lactantius, *Inst. Div.*, i. c. 15). The inscription having been found in the very place where, according to Justin, Simon's statue must have stood, most scholars suppose, and rightly, that Justin by mistake confounded "Semo Sancus" with "Simon Sanctus."

body, and subjected her to every affront; she had to migrate out of one body into another; she became, e.g., that Helen on whose account the Trojan War was waged; finally she found herself in a brothel, out of which Simon at length rescued her, thereby fulfilling the parable of the lost sheep. The supreme god—Simon—had come down in order to redeem his πρώτη ἐννοία, and to bring salvation to all men through the knowledge of himself. He decided upon this descent on seeing that the angels, from their desire for supremacy, were in conflict with each other and were misgoverning the worlds. He assumed every form necessary for the restoration of lost harmony: to men he appeared as man, without being really a man, and in appearance he suffered in Judæa. Henceforth it was a duty to believe in Simon and Helena, but to disbelieve the prophets, who were inspired by the world-creating angels, and not by Simon. Believers in Simon are at liberty to do what they will, for by the grace of Simon should men be blessed—but not on account of good works. Should a Simonian do anything wicked he is nevertheless undeserving of punishment, for he is not wicked by nature but only of his free-will; the law proceeded from the world-creating angels, who thought thereby to enslave their subjects; Simon, however, will bring the world to nought along with the dominion of those angels, and save all who believe on him. To this it is added that the Simonians live dissolutely, vie with each other in the practice of magic, make use of exorcisms, charms, mystic formulas, &c., and further that they worship images of Simon (as Zeus) and of Helena (as Athene), under the names of "The Lord" and "The Lady."

We may regard this account, which, according to Irenæus, is partly based upon direct statements of the Simonians themselves, as essentially derived from the *Syntagma* of Justin.⁴ That we have here before us, not the genuine teaching of Simon, but the gnosis of the Simonians is very evident; this gnosis, however, is just as much bound up with the person of Simon as is the Christian gnosis with the person of Jesus Christ. Simon is the manifested Deity Himself; but—and herein lies the Christian, or more properly the anti-Christian element—Simon is at the same time represented as Christ, i.e., is identified with Christ. The fusing together of Simon and Christ, a syncretistic-gnostic conception of the world and its creation, and an ethic! Simonianism are the distinctive features of this new universal religion. That we have here an attempt to found a new religion, and that a world-religion, upon the principle of embodying all important articles of the older ones, appears also from the fact that Simon is identified not only with Christ but also with Zeus, and that Greek legends and mythologies are utilized for the system. We have therefore in Simonianism a rival system to Christianity, in which the same advantages are offered, and in which accordingly Christian elements are embodied, even Christ Himself being identified with the Supreme God (Simon). The attempt to establish such a system in that time of religious syncretism has nothing incredible about it; and in view of the religious conditions then prevailing in the locality it can easily be understood that it proceeded from a Samaritan.

⁴ This work must also have had something to say about the relations of Simon to other Samaritan pseudo-Messiahs, viz., to Dositheus, Cleobulus, and Menander (see Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22); but the nature of its statements can no longer be with certainty ascertained. We are in the dark especially as to the relation between Simon and Dositheus. But the mere fact that in Samaria, in the time of the apostles, so many Messiahs purporting to be founders of religions should have appeared on the scene is extremely interesting. It is a very noteworthy circumstance also that Justin, Hegesippus, and Irenæus knew nothing about Peter having met Simon in Rome, and having withstood him there.

The basis of it was laid by Simon himself, who claimed to be a god and yet derived something from the Christian missionaries; but the development was due to his followers in the 2d century, who may have borne to the original Simonians exactly the same relation as did the Valentinians to the first Christians. From the circles of these later Simonians, who worshipped Simon especially under the mysterious name of "The Standing,"¹ a book was issued bearing the title Ἡ ἀποφάνσις ἢ μεγάλη, from which Hippolytus has given us extracts in the *Philosophumena*. From these it appears—as indeed might have been expected from the statements of Irenæus (Justin)—that the later Simonianism combined the worship of Simon with a complicated Gnostic system, for which it utilized the Greek mythology, as well as isolated sayings of the Old Testament, of the Gospels, and of the apostolic epistles. In point of form, design, medium, and relationship to Christianity, Simonianism bears a striking resemblance to Manichæism, which sprang up two centuries later; but Mani did not so bluntly as Simon lay claim to be a god, and the Manichæans never had the hardihood to proceed to absolute identification of Mani with Christ; as regards their tenets, however, and viewed as attempts to found a universal religion, Simonianism and Manichæism are widely different.

We can understand, then, how it was that the Christians in the 1st and 2d centuries regarded Simon as the emissary of devils and the father of all heresy; and we can also understand why—apart from Samaria—this effort to establish a new religion bore little fruit. It rests upon falsifications and a wild jumbling of religions, while it is lacking in religious elements of its own.

Until about the year 220 ecclesiastical tradition knows Simon only as a devil-inspired founder of a religion, and as father of heresy; it sees in him a caricature of Christ, not of the apostle Paul, and it knows nothing about Peter having again confuted him after what is narrated in Acts viii. It knows indeed that Simon came to Rome in the time of Claudius, but previous to the 3d century no ecclesiastical writer mentions his having met with Peter there, although all state that Peter went to the capital. The first ecclesiastical author to combine the two traditions was Hippolytus (*Philos.*, vi. 20). Having referred to the events narrated in Acts viii., he proceeds: "Simon even went to Rome, and there met with the apostles. As he led many astray through his sorceries, Peter frequently withstood him. He came at last . . . and taught sitting under a plane-tree. When after lengthened reasoning Simon was on the point of being worsted, he declared that if he were to be buried alive he would on the third day rise again. He actually caused a grave to be dug for him by his disciples, and gave orders that he should be buried. The disciples did as they were bid; he remains in the grave, however, unto this day, for he was not Christ." This legend is found only in Hippolytus; it evidently corresponds with the idea that Simon was a false Christ, but has no relation whatever with the notion that he was Paul. Hippolytus, moreover, does not say that in Rome Simon met with Peter only, but with the apostles, i.e., with Paul and Peter. The origin of the legend is very intelligible from what we know of the historical premises. Given that Simon alleged himself to be Christ, that in Samaria he met with Peter, that he as well as Peter afterwards travelled to Rome, then we can very easily explain the origin of a legend which brings Peter once more into personal contact with Simon in Rome, and alleges that Simon became the victim of his nefarious mimicry of Christ.

At the same time the expression Πρὸς Σίμωνα πολλὰ Πέτρος ἐν Ρώμῃ ἀνακατέστη makes it seem a probable thing to many that Hippolytus already knew of that legend about Simon in which the Tübingen critics think they have found the key to all traditions about him. In the pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* and *Homilies*, or rather in their documentary sources, Simon plays a very important part. He appears as the representative of all possible heresies, and as the great antagonist of Peter, who followed him up throughout Samaria and the east coast of the Mediterranean, engaging him in great disputations, and always coming off the victor. Some of the features attributed in these legends to Simon are indisputably borrowed from the apostle Paul, others from Marcion, others from Valentinus and Basilides. These legends

¹ Clem., *Strom.*, ii. 11, 52; Hippol., *Philosoph.*, vi. 7 sq.; δ ἐστῶς, σὺς, σπρωόμενος.

² A hiatus occurs in the text here.

therefore arose in strict Jewish-Christian anti-Pauline circles; we find them, however, in the *Recognitions* and *Homilies* already subjected to catholic revision. This revision cannot have taken place before the first half of the 3d century, and probably is of much later date. The age of the documentary sources cannot be exactly determined; they may be very old; but what is of most importance is (1) that their influence upon church tradition cannot be traced before the 3d century, and (2) that in those Jewish-Christian sources, as well as in the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* themselves, only disputations between Peter and Simon in Samaria and adjacent countries are narrated, nothing whatever being said of any controversies between Simon and Peter in Rome. Even if, therefore, the Simon of the Jewish-Christians bears unmistakable traces of Paul, it is also true on the other hand that these Jewish-Christians knew nothing of a journey of Simon to Rome. Hence all the combinations of the Tübingen critics as to the origin of the "Peter tradition," and as to the origin of the statement that Simon came to Rome, completely fall to the ground. Hippolytus was the first to combine "Peter in Rome" and "Simon in Rome," without knowing anything whatever of a Simon-Paul legend. Not until after his day, after the Jewish-Christian legends had become naturalized in the catholic church through the medium of the *Recognitions* and *Homilies*, did these legends become current within the church, and only there. It now began to be told that Paul and Peter³ had gone to Rome to withstand Simon. Simon was now represented partly in accordance with those Jewish-Christian legends, the tendency of which was not understood. Much, however, that was new was added, such as that Simon appeared before the emperor, that he miserably perished in attempting to fly, and so on. From the 3d (or rather 4th) century the Simon of church tradition becomes invested with some features of Paul in a distorted form. The *Recognitions*, as translated by Rufinus, were extensively read in the East, and, along with the Acts of the Apostles, kept fresh the memory of the great magian and his Helena in the Middle Ages. Simon also came to figure in popular literature. "Doctor Faustus" has preserved several traits of the ancient magian. Neither are Pauline characteristics wanting in the legendary Faust; they are traceable even in the Faust of Goethe, the "homunculus" of the Simon-Faust being originally a travesty of the "new man" who according to Paul is created through the Gospel. It was not only as the great magian, however, that Simon remained known to the Middle Ages, but also as the first who attempted to purchase spiritual gifts with money, an association made permanent in the word "simony."

Sources.—Acts viii. 5-24; Justin, *Apol.*, i. 26-56, ii. 14, and *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 120; Hegesippus, ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 23; Celsus, ap. Orig., *C. Cels.*, v. 62; Irenæus, *Adv. Her.*, i. 23, et al.; Tertullian, *De Idolol.*, 9, *Apolog.*, 13, *De Præscript.*, 10-33, *De Anima*, 34-57, *De Fuga*, 12; Clement Alex., *Strom.*, ii. 11, 52, vii. 17, 107; Hippolytus, *Syntagma* (Pseudo-Tertull., *Philast.*, 29, *Epiph.*, *Har.*, 21), *Philos.*, vi. 7-20; Origen, *C. Cels.*, i. 57, vi. 11, and vii. 11; Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 1, 14 sq.; Arnobius, *Adv. Gent.*, ii. 12; Pseudo-Cyprian, *De Rebat.*, 16, 17; Pseudo-Ignatius, *Ad Trall.*, 11; *Homil. Pseudo-Clementis*, vv. 11; *Recognit. Pseudo-Clem.*, vv. 11; Cyril, *Catech.*, vi. 15; Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.*, i. Com. in *Matth.*, c. 24; *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 809; Ambrose, *Hexaem.*, iv. 8; Sulpicius Severus, *Hist.*, ii. 41; Theodoret, *H. F.*, l. 1; *Acta Petri et Pauli*, 49; *Acta Pseudo-Marcionis*, *Pseudo-Lini*, *Pseudo-Aditi*, &c.

Sources for Samaritan Pseudo-Messiahs contemporary with Simon.—(1) For Dositheus: Hegesippus, ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 22; Hippolytus, *Syntagma* (Pseudo-Tertull., *Philast.*, 4, and *Epiph.*, *Har.*, 13); *Recognit. Pseudo-Clementis*, l. 54, ii. 8-11; Origen, *C. Cels.*, i. 57, vi. 11, *De Princip.*, iv. 17, *Comm. in Matth.*, ser. 32, *Hom. 25 in Luc.*, in *Joh.*, xlii. 27; *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 8; Eusebius, in *Luc.*, ser. 32, *Hom. Script. Nova Collect.*, i. 1, p. 155; *Opus imperfect. in Matth.*, hom. 48; Macarius Magnus, *Apocrit.*, iii. 43, iv. 15, 21. (2) For Menander: Justin, *Apol.*, i. 26, 56; Hegesippus, ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 22; Irenæus, *Adv. Her.*, i. 23, iii. 4; Tertullian, *De Anima*, 30, 50, *De Resurr.*, 5; Hippolytus, *Syntagma*, &c. (3) For Cleobulus (Cleobius): Hegesippus, ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 22; *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 8; Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Hom. 15 in Matth.*, opp. vi. p. cxcix; Pseudo-Ignat., *Ep. ad Trall.*, ii.; Epiphanius, *Her.*, 51, 6; Theodoret, *H. F.*, l. 1, praef. l. ii, praef.; *Ep. Apoc. Pauli ad Cor.*, &c.

Literature.—Baur, "Die Christusparthei in Korinth," in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift*, 1851, part 4, p. 116 sq.; Baur, *Paulus*, 1st ed. (1844), p. 23 sq., 218 sq., 2d ed., p. 83 sq.; Baur, *Das Christentum der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 2d ed., p. 35 sq.; Simon, "Leben und Lehre des Simons des Magiers," in the *Zeitschrift f. Hist. Theol.*, 1841, part 3; Schürer, *Die Simonis M. facta romanis*, Meissen, 1844; Hilgenfeld, *Die Clementinischen Recognitions und Homilien*, 1848, p. 311 sq.; Zeller, *Apostelgeschichte*, 1854, p. 158 sq.; Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitions des Clemens*, *Romanus*, 1854, p. 80 sq., 281 sq.; Grimm, *Die Samaritaner*, 1854, p. 151 sq.; Volkmar, "Ueber den Simon Magus der Apostelgeschichte," in the *Tübing. Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, p. 279 sq.; Noack, "Simon der Magier," in *Psyche*, 1860, p. 267 sq.; F. K., "Ueber das Denkmal des Magiers Simon zu Rom," in the *Historisch-Polit. Blätter*, vol. xiv. 1, 1861, p. 630 sq.; Ginzel, in the *Oestr. Vierteljahrscr. f. Kathol. Theol.*, vol. vi. 1867, p. 455 sq.; see also his *Kirchenhist. Schriften*, Vienna, 1872, vol. i. p. 76 sq.; Renan, *Les Apôtres et L'Antechrist*; Hilgenfeld, "Der Magier Simon," in the *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol.*, 1868, p. 357 sq., 1874, p. 294 sq., 1878, p. 32 sq., 1881, p. 16; Huelsen, *Simonis Magi vita doctrinaque*, Berlin, 1868; Lipsius, *Die Quellen der römischen Petrus-Sage*, 1873; Harnack, *Zur Quellenkritik der Geschichte des Gnosticismus*, 1873; Joh. Dollzsch, "Zur Quellenkritik der besten Berichte über Simon Petrus und Simon Magus," in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, part 2, p. 213 sq.; Lipsius, "Simon Magus," in *Eckenkell's Bibellexicon*, vol. v., 1875, p. 301 sq.; *Ibid.*, "Petrus in Rom," in the *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1876, p. 561 sq.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, vol. xiv. p. 163 sq., 463 sq.; Moeller, "Simon Magus," in Herzog's *B. Encycl.*, 2d ed. 1884, p. 246 sq.; Hase, *Ketzergeschichte auf der Grundlage akadem. Vorles.* part 1, 1885, p. 26 sq.; also the commentaries to the Acts of the Apostles by Meyer, Overbeck, Wendt, and others; the accounts of Gnosticism by Neander, Baur, Müller, Lipsius, Mansel, and others; and the numerous investigations with reference to the sojourn of Peter in Rome. (A. H.A.)

³ See *Acta Pauli et Petri*.

SIMON, ABRAHAM (1622-1692), medallist and modeller, was born in Yorkshire in 1622. He was originally intended for the church, but turned his attention to art, and, after studying in Holland, proceeded to Sweden, where he was employed by Queen Christina, in whose train he travelled to Paris. He returned to England before the outbreak of the Civil War, and attained celebrity by his medals and portraits modelled in wax. During the Commonwealth he executed many medals of leading Parliamentarians, and at the Restoration he was patronized by Charles II., from whom he received a hundred guineas for his portrait designed as a medal for the proposed order of the Royal Oak. Having incurred the displeasure of the duke of York, he lost the favour of the court, and died in obscurity in 1692. Among the more interesting of his medals are those of the second earl of Dunfermline, the second earl of Lauderdale, and the first earl of Loudon; that of the duke of Albemarle, and many other fine medals, were modelled by Abraham Simon and chased by his younger brother Thomas, noticed below.

SIMON, RICHARD (1638-1712), the "father of Biblical criticism," was born at Dieppe on the 13th May 1638. His early studies were carried on at the college of the Fathers of the Oratory in that city. He was soon, by the kindness of a friend who discerned the germs of those talents which were afterwards to render him so celebrated, removed to Paris and enabled to enter upon the study of theology, where he early displayed a taste for Hebrew and other Oriental languages. He was allowed great indulgence in the prosecution of his studies by the authorities of the Congregation of the Oratory, being exempted from those exercises of piety which for an entire year were binding on the other students. This dispensation aroused the ill-will and jealousy of the other Oratorian novitiates. Simon was charged with reading "heretical" books, this designation being applied to *Walton's Polyglott*, the *Critici Sacri*, and other works of a similar kind. But this jealous opposition proved abortive. Simon, after investigation, was allowed and encouraged to continue his favourite pursuits. At the end of his theological course he was sent, according to custom, to teach philosophy at Juilly, where there was one of the colleges of the Oratory. But he was soon recalled to Paris, and employed in the congenial labour of preparing a catalogue of the Oriental books in the library of the Oratory. This gave him full access to those works, the fruits of the study of which appear so fully in his after writings. His first essay in authorship was the publication of a work entitled *Fides Ecclesie Orientalis, seu Gabrielis Metropolitae Philadelphiensis Opuscula, cum interpretatione Latina, cum notis* (Paris, 1671), the object of which was to demonstrate that the belief of the Greek Church regarding the Eucharist was the same as that of the Church of Rome. Simon entered the priesthood in 1670, and the same year wrote a pamphlet in defence of the Jews of Metz, who had been accused, as they have so often been before and since, of having murdered a Christian child. It was shortly before this time that there were sown the seeds of that enmity with the Port Royalists which filled Simon's after life with many bitter troubles. The famous Arnould had written a work on the *Perpetuity of the Faith*, the first volume of which treated of the Eucharist. M. Diroys, a doctor of theology, and a friend of Arnould's, asked Simon his opinion of the book. Simon replied that it was one of the best works which had been published by the Port Royalists, but that it nevertheless required correction in several important passages, and agreed reluctantly, and after some delay, at Diroys's request, to write a letter referring to these passages, on the understanding that the

original was to be returned to him. The criticisms of Simon excited great indignation among the friends and admirers of Arnould, and he felt the effects of their vindictiveness to the latest hour of his life. Another matter was the cause of inciting against him the ill-will of the monks of the Benedictine order. A friend of Simon's, one of the Oratorians, was engaged in a lawsuit, in his capacity as grand vicar of Prince Neubourg, abbé of Fécamp, with the Benedictine monks of that establishment. Simon lent to his friend the aid of his powerful pen, and composed a memorandum in which he employed pretty strong language against the opponents of his friend. They were greatly exasperated, and made loud complaints to the new general of the Oratory that they were virulently assailed by a member of the brotherhood, with which they had always been on friendly terms. The charge of Jesuitism was also brought against Simon, apparently on no other ground than that his friend's brother was an eminent member of that order. The commotion in ecclesiastical circles was great, and it was seriously contemplated to remove Simon not only from Paris but from France. A mission to Rome was proposed to him, but he saw through the design, and, after a short delay dictated by prudential motives, declined the proposal. He was engaged at the time in superintending the printing of his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*. He had hoped, through the influence of Père la Chaise, the king's confessor, and the Duc de Montausier, to be allowed to dedicate the work to Louis XIV., but as His Majesty was absent in Flanders at the time the volume could not be published until the king had accepted the dedication, though it had passed the censorship of the Sorbonne, and the chancellor of the Oratory had given his *imprimatur*. The printer of the book, in order to promote the sale, had caused the titles of the various chapters to be printed separately, and to be put in circulation. These, or possibly a copy of the work itself, had happened to come into the hands of his ever-watchful enemies—the Port Royalists. It seems that, with a view to injure the sale of the work, which it was well known in theological circles had been long in preparation by Simon, the Messieurs de Port Royal had undertaken a translation into French of the Prolegomena to *Walton's Polyglott*. To counteract this proceeding Simon announced his intention of publishing an annotated edition of the Prolegomena, and actually added to the *Critical History* a translation of the last four chapters of that work, which had formed no part of his original plan. Simon's announcement prevented the appearance of the projected translation, but his enemies were all the more irritated against him on that account. They had now obtained the opportunity, which they had long been seeking, of gratifying their hatred of the bold Oratorian. The freedom with which Simon expressed himself on various topics, and especially those chapters in which he declared that Moses could not be the author of much in the writings attributed to him, especially aroused their opposition. The powerful influence of Bossuet, at that time tutor to the dauphin, was invoked; the chancellor Le Tellier lent his assistance; a decree of the council of state was obtained, and after a series of paltry intrigues the whole impression, consisting of 1300 copies, was seized by the police and destroyed, and the animosity of his colleagues in the Oratory rose to so great a height against Simon for having so seriously compromised their order by his work that he was declared to be no longer a member of their body. Full of bitterness and disgust Simon retired to the curacy of Bolleville, to which he had been lately appointed by the vicar-general of the abbey of Fécamp.

The work thus confiscated in France it was proposed to republish in Holland. Simon, however, at first opposed this, in hopes of overcoming the opposition of Bossuet by

making certain changes in the parts objected to. The negotiations with Bossuet lasted a considerable time, but finally failed, and the *Critical History* appeared, with Simon's name on the title page, in the year 1685, from the press of Reenier Leers in Rotterdam. An imperfect edition had previously been published at Amsterdam by Daniel Elzevir, based upon a MS. transcription of one of the copies of the original work which had escaped destruction and had been sent to England, and from which a Latin and an English translation were afterwards made. The edition of Leers was a reproduction of the work as first printed, with a new preface, notes, and those other writings which had appeared for and against the work up to that date.

The work which had excited so much controversy and opposition consists of three books, the first of which deals with questions of Biblical criticism, properly so called, such as the text of the Hebrew Bible and the changes which it has undergone down to the present day, the authorship of the Mosaic writings and of other books of Scripture, with an exposition of his peculiar theory of the existence during the whole extent of Jewish history of recorders or annalists of the events of each period, whose writings were preserved in the public archives, and the institution of which he assigns to Moses. The second book gives an account of the principal translations, ancient and modern, of the Old Testament, and the third contains an examination of the principal commentators. He had, with the exception of the theory above mentioned, contributed nothing really new on the subject of Old Testament-criticism, for previous critics, as Cappellus, Morinus, and others, had established many points of importance, and the value of Simon's work consisted chiefly in bringing together and presenting at one view the results of Old Testament criticism. The work is written in a clear style, and its tone is confident and frequently sarcastic. He displays great contempt for tradition and the opinions of the fathers. This latter peculiarity it was which specially aroused the enmity of Bossuet and other leading Romanists. But it was not only from the Church of Rome that the work encountered strong opposition. The Protestants felt their stronghold—an infallible Bible—assailed by the doubts which Simon raised against the integrity of the Hebrew text. Le Clerc ("Clericus"), the distinguished Dutch divine and critic, in his work *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, controverted the views of Simon, and was answered by the latter in a tone of considerable asperity in his *Réponse aux Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, which he signed under the name of Pierre Ambrun, it being a marked peculiarity of Simon rarely to give his own name, but to assume *noms de guerre* at various times.

The remaining volume of Simon may be briefly noticed. In 1689 appeared his *Histoire Critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament*, consisting of thirty-three chapters, in which he discusses the origin and character of the various books, with a consideration of the objections brought against them by the Jews and others, the quotations from the Old Testament in the New, the inspiration of the New Testament (with a refutation of the opinions of Spinoza), the Greek dialect in which they are written (against Salmassius), the Greek MSS. known at the time, especially Codex D (Cantabrigiensis), &c. This was followed in 1690 by his *Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Testament*, where he gives an account of the various translations, both ancient and modern, and discusses the manner in which many difficult passages of the New Testament have been rendered in the various versions. In 1693 was published what in some respects is the most valuable of all his writings, viz., *Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament depuis le commencement du Christianisme jusques à notre temps*. This work exhibits immense reading, and the information it contains is still valuable to the student. The last work of Simon that we shall mention is his *Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte et les Versions du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1695), which contains supplementary observations upon the subjects of the text and translations of the New Testament.

Simon is described, as a man of middle stature, with somewhat unprepossessing features. His temper was sharp and keen, and as a controversialist he displayed a bitterness of tone and an acerbity of expression which tended only to aggravate the unpleasantness of controversy. He was entirely a man of intellect, free from all tendency to sentimentality, and with a strong vein of sarcasm and satire in his disposition. His reading was immense, and his memory powerful and retentive. He is said to have usually prosecuted his studies lying on the floor of his apartment, on a pile of carpets or cushions. Few men have written more that is worth reading on Biblical subjects

than he, considering the hardships and vicissitudes of his chequered life. He died at his native city of Dieppe on the 11th April 1712, at the age of seventy-four.

The principal authorities for the life of Simon are the life or "éloge" by his grand-nephew De la Martinière in vol. i. of the *Lettres Choisies*, 4 vols., Amsterdam, 1730; Graf's article in the first vol. of the *Beitr. zu d. Theol. Wissensch.*, &c., Jena, 1851; Reuss's article in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, vol. xiv., new ed.; *Richard Simon et son Vieux Testament*, by A. Bernus, Lausanne, 1869. For the bibliography, see, in addition to the various editions of Simon's works, the very complete and accurate account of Bernus, *Notice Bibliographique sur Richard Simon*, Basel, 1882. (F. C.)

SIMON, THOMAS (1623?-1665), medallist, was born, according to Vertue, in Yorkshire about 1623. He studied engraving under Nicholas Briot, and about 1635 received a post in connexion with the Mint. In 1645 he was appointed by the Parliament joint chief engraver along with Edward Wade, and, having executed the great seal of the Commonwealth and dies for the coinage, he was promoted to be chief engraver to the mint and seals. He produced several fine portrait medals of Cromwell, one of which is copied from a miniature by Cooper. After the Restoration he was appointed engraver of the king's seals. On the occasion of his contest with the brothers Roettiers, who were employed by the mint in 1662, Simon produced his celebrated crown of Charles II., on the margin of which he engraved a petition to the king, setting forth the excellence of his own productions and praying for redress. This is usually considered his masterpiece. An impression of the coin fetched £225 at an auction in 1832. This admirable medallist is believed to have died of the plague in London in 1665.

A volume of *The Medals, Coins, Great Seals, and other Works of Thomas Simon, engraved and described by George Vertue*, was published in 1753.

SIMONIDES (or SEMONIDES, as some write the name) OF AMORGOS stands midway both in time and reputation between the other two iambic poets of Greece—Archilochus and Hipponax. A native of Samos, he led a colony to the island of Amorgos in the Archipelago, and lived there about 660 B.C. in Minoa, a town of his own founding. Besides two books of iambics, we are told that he wrote elegies, and a poem on the early history of the Samians; but only one insignificant elegy has been with any degree of plausibility attributed to him. We possess about thirty fragments of his iambic poems, written in clear and vigorous Ionic, with much force and no little harmony of versification. With Simonides, as with Archilochus, the iambic is still the vehicle of bitter satire, interchanging with melancholy, but in Simonides the satire is rather general than individual, and in other respects, especially in his gnomic and reflective tendency, he paves the way for the tragic trimeter. One of his two longer fragments dwells pathetically upon the misery of our lot, in which, as he says elsewhere, "we have many years of death, but of life only a few sad years"; the other, far his most famous poem, is a "Pedigree of Women," tracing their descent from different animals according to their different characters. The idea may have been suggested by the beast fable, as we find it in Hesiod and Archilochus; it is clear at least that Simonides knew the works of the former. The same conception recurs a century later in Phocylides. Simonides derives the dirty woman from a hog, the cunning from a fox, the fussy from a dog, the apathetic from earth, the capricious from sea-water, the stubborn from an ass, the incontinent from a weasel, the proud from a high-bred mare, the worst and ugliest from an ape, and the good woman from a bee. The remainder of the poem (vv. 96-118) is undoubtedly spurious. There is much beauty and feeling in Simonides's description of the good woman; and the skilful portraits of character and