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 works 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 Salmasius), 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 ; Grafs article in the first vol. of the *Beitr. zu. d. Theol. Wissensch.,* &c., Jena, 1851 ; Reuss’s article in Herzog’s Encyklopädie*,* 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 Amoegos 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