obtained Pope Silvester II.'s confirmation of this act of sove­reignty. Silvester at the same time sent Stephen a consecrated crown, and approved of the erection of an independent Hun­garian church, divided into the two provinces of Esztergom and Bács. But the power of pagan Hungary could not be broken in a day. The focus of the movement was the Maros region, where the rebel Ajtony built the fortress of Marosvár. The struggle proceeded for more than twenty-five, years, the diffi­culties of Stephen being materially increased by the assistance rendered to the rebels by the Greek emperors, his neighbours since their recon quest of Bulgaria. As early as 1015 Stephen had appointed the Italian priest Gellert bishop of Maros, but he was unable to establish the missionary in his see till 1030. The necessity of christianizing his heathen kingdom by force of arms engrossed all the energies of Stephen and compelled him to adopt a pacific policy towards the emperors of the East and West. When the empcror Conrad, with the deliberate intention of subjugating Hungary, invaded it in 1030, Stephen not only drove him out, but captured Vienna (now mentioned for the first time) and compelled the emperor to cede a large portion of the Ostmark (1031). Of the five sons borne to him by Gisela, only Emerich reached manhood, and this well- educated prince was killed by a wild boar in 1031. Stephen thereupon appointed as his successor his wife’s nephew Peter Orseolo, who settled in Hungary, where his intrigues and foreign ways made him extremely unpopular. Stephen died at his palace at Esztergom in 1038 and was canonized in 1083. For an account of his epoch-making reforms see Hungary: *History.*

See Gyula Pauler, *History of the Hungarian Nation,* vol. i. (Hung.; Pest, 1893); Lajos Balics, *History of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary,* vol. i. (Hung.; Pest, 1885); Antal Pór, *Life of St Stephen* (Hung.; Pest, 1871); János Karácsonyi, *Documents issued by Stephen I.* (Hung. ; Pest, 1892), idem, *Life of St Gellert* (Hung.; Pest, 1887); E. Horn, *St Etienne, roi apostolique de Hongrie.* (Paris, 1899); W. J. Winkler de Kétrszynski, *Vita sancti Stephani* (Cracow, 1897). (R. N. B.)

**STEPHEN V.** (1239-1272), king of Hungary, was the eldest son of Béla IV., whom he succeeded in 1270. As crown prince he had exhibited considerable ability, but also a disquieting restlessness and violence. In 1262 he compelled his father, whom he had assisted in the Bohemian War, to surrender twenty- nine counties to him, so that Hungary was virtually divided into two kingdoms. Not content with this he subsequently seized the southern banate of Macso, which led to a fresh war between father and son in which the latter triumphed. In 1268 he undertook an expedition against the Bulgarians, con­quering the land as far as Tirnova and styling himself hence­forth king of Bulgaria. Stephen was a keen and circumspect politician, and for his future security contracted, during his father’s lifetime, a double@@1 matrimonial alliance with the Nea­politan princes of the House of Anjou, the chief partisans of the pope. He certainly needed exterior support; for on his accession to the Hungarian throne, as he himself declared, every one was his enemy. This hostility was due to the almost universal opinion of western Europe that Stephen was a semi-pagan. His father had married him while still a youth (c. 1255) to Elizabeth, daughter of the Kumanian chieftain Röteny, with a view to binding the Rumanians (who could put in the field 16,000 men; see Hungary: *History)* more closely to the dynasty in the then by no means improbable contingency of a second Tatar invasion. The lady was duly baptized and remained a Christian; but the adversaries of Stephen, especially Ottakar II. of Bohemia, affected to believe that Stephen was too great **a** friend of the Rumanians to be a true Catholic. Ottakar endeavoured, with the aid of the Magyar malcontents, to conquer the western provinces of Hungary, but after some suc­cesses was utterly routed by Stephen in 1271 near Mosony, and by the peace of Pressburg, the same year, relinquished all his conquests. Stephen died suddenly on the 6th of August

1272, just as he was raising an army to recover his kidnapped infant son Ladislaus from the hands of his rebellious vassals.

See Ignacz Acsády, *History of the Hungarian Realm,* vol. i. (Hung.; Budapest, 1903). (R. N. B.)

**STEPHEN, SIR JAMES** (1789-1859), English historian, was the son of James Stephen, master in chancery, author of *The Slavery of the West India Colonies* and other works, and was born in London on the 3rd of January 1789. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, graduating B.A. in 1812, after which he studied for the bar and was called at Lincoln’s Inn. He obtained an extensive practice as a chancery barrister, being ultimately counsel to the colonial department and counsel to the board of trade. In 1834 he became assistant under­secretary for the colonies, and shortly afterwards permanent under-secretary. On his retirement in 1847 he was made a knight commander of the Bath. In 1849 he was appointed regius professor of modern history in the university of Cam­bridge, having already distinguished himself by his brilliant studies in ecclesiastical biography contributed to the *Edinburgh Review,* which were published that year under the title *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography and Other Subjects',* a 4th edition, with a short memoir, appeared in i860. He was also the author of *Lectures on the History of France* ( 2 vols., 1851; 3rd ed., 1857), and *Desultory and Systematic Reading,* a lecture (1853). He died at Coblentz on the 15th of September 1859.

**STEPHEN, SIR JAMES FITZJAMES,** Bart. (1829-1894), English lawyer, judge and publicist, was born in London on the 3rd of March 1829, the third child and second son of Sir James Stephen *(q.v.).* Fitzjames Stephen was for three years (1842— 1845) at Eton, and for two years at Ring’s College, London. In October 1847 he entered at Trinity College, Cambridge. Notwithstanding exceptional vigour in mind and body, he did not attain any of the usual scholastic or athletic distinctions. The only studies then seriously prosecuted in the university course were mathematics and classics. Neither of these at­tracted him in their academical forms, nor did he care for com­petitive sport. But his Cambridge time was fruitful in other ways. He was already acquainted with Sir Henry Maine *(q.v.),* six years his senior, and then newly appointed to the chair of civil law. This acquaintance now ripened into a perfect friend­ship, which ended only with Maine’s death in 1888. No two men’s intellectual tempers ever presented a stronger contrast. As Stephen himself said, it took them a long time to know when they really agreed. Maine was subtle, swift and far- reaching; Stephen was massive, downright, indefatigable and sincere even to unnecessary frankness. Their qualities were an almost exact complement of one another, but neither of them would take opinions on trust, or acquiesce in commonplace methods of avoiding difficulties; and it might have been said of either of them without exaggeration that, if all his technical and professional requirements could be taken away, a born man of letters would be left. By Maine’s introduction, Stephen became a member of the Cambridge society known as the Apostles, in form not very different from many other essay societies, in substance a body with an unformulated but most individual tradition of open-mindedness and absolute mutual tolerance in all matters of opinion. Perhaps the golden age of the society was a few years before Stephen’s election, but it still contained a remarkable group of men who afterwards became eminent in such different ways as, for instance, James Clerk Maxwell and Sir William Harcourt. Stephen formed friendships with some of its members, which were as permanent, though in few cases so little subject to external interruption as his intimacy with Maine. Probably the Apostles did much to correct the formalism inevitably incident to the evangelical traditions of the first Sir James Stephen’s household.

After leaving Cambridge, Fitzjames Stephen, having practi­cally to choose between the Church and the bar, decided for the bar. He was called in 1854, after the usual haphazard prepara­tion which was then (and still practically is) considered in England alone, and even in England for one kind of learning

@@@1 Charles, the son of Charles of Anjou, was to marry Stephen’s daughter Maria, while Stephen’s infant son Ladislaus was to marry Charles’s daughter Elizabeth. Another of his daughters, Anna, married the Greek emperor Andronicus Palaeologus.