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 Ή *ἀποϕάσις ἡ 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 . . .@@2 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 *∏ρὸς Σίμωvα πολλὰ ∏έτρoς ἐν* Pώ*μη 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

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 Peter@@3 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 Faustus ; 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.”
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