NYCTAGES, heretics described by Isidorus Hispal., as opposing vigils on the ground that God made the day for work and the night for sleep. They took up merely the same ground as Vigilantius against Jerome and the subdeacon Timotheus against St. Nilus, cf. Nili *Epist.* i. 26. (Isidor. Hispal. *de Eccles. Offic.* i. 22, in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. 83, col. 759.) [G. T. S.]

NYMPHA, a virgin saint of about the fifth century, honoured in Tuscany and at Rome (Peter Natalis, lib. x., c. 42, p. 197; Tillem. iii. 342, 343, 709). [C. H.]

NYMPHIDIANUS, FLAVIANUS, a scholasticus of Philadelphia, who renounced Quartodecimanism at the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1355, v. 610, vi. 893). [C. H.]

NYMPHODORA, martyr in Bithynia in the reign of Maximian, with her sisters Menodora and Metrodora (*vid.* those names in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. v. 160). [C. H.]

NYNIA, NYNYANE. [NINIAN.]

O

OAN, princeps, that is, abbat, of Egg in the Hebrides, died A.D. 724. (*Ann. Ult.*; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 307, 382.) [J. G.]

OBINUS (OUINUS), the fourth name in the mythical list of the British bishops or archbishops of London (Godwin, *de Praesulibus*, ed. Richardson, p. 170; Ussher, *Antiq.* ed. 1639, p. 67.) The compiler of the list in which the name occurs was Joscelin of Furnes, a monk of the 12th century, of whose life and materials nothing satisfactory seems to be ascertained; and the MS. from which Ussher and the other writers excerpted it has not been recognised (Hardy, *Cat. Mat.* i. 64; Fabricius, *Bibliotℎ. Lat. s. v.*). [S.]

OCCILIANUS, addressed by Gregory the Great in A.D. 599, on his appointment as tribune of Hydruntum or Otranto by the exarch, requesting him to redress the wrongs done by his predecessor Viator to the inhabitants of Gallipoli, by exacting forced services from them, and otherwise oppressing them, about which Sabinus, or Sabinianus, bishop of the place, had written to complain. From another letter it appears that Occilianus had personally visited Gregory (*Epp.* ix. 99, 100, 102). [F. D.]

OCEANUS, a Roman of noble birth in the 4th and 5th centuries, connected by birth with Fabiola (q. v.) and the Julian family, and by friendship with Jerome, Augustine and Pammachius. Jerome speaks of him as his son (*Ep.* lxxvii. 1, ed. Vall. and lxix. 10), but as the spiritual father of Marcellinus, the Roman governor (*Ep.* lxxvi. 1, A.D. 411). He was, perhaps, like his friend Pammachius, a senator (comp. their letter among Jerome's lxxxiii. with his expression, *Ep.* xcvii. 3, Vos Christiani Senatus lumina). He probably became known to Jerome during his stay in Rome in 383–5. He was a zealous upholder of orthodoxy and strict discipline, and first comes to our knowledge by a public protest which he made against Carterius, a Spanish bishop who, having married before his baptism and lost his wife, had, as a Christian, married a second wife. Jerome points out that there is no law or principle condemning such marriages, and urges him to silence. This was about the year 397. Either in that or the previous year, Oceanus, in company with Fabiola, visited Jerome at Bethlehem, whence they were driven by the fear of the invasion of the Huns. While there, he appears to have made acquaintance with Rufinus, who, according to Jerome's insinuation (*Adv. Ruf.* iii. 4), had an Origenistic document placed in Oceanus's room in Fabiola's house, with a view to identify him with that tendency. Rufinus having gone to Rome the same year (397), and having published shortly afterwards his edition of the Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, Oceanus and Pammachius watched his actions with critical eyes, and, on the appearance of the work, wrote to Jerome (Jer. *Ep.* 83) requesting him to deny the insinuation of Rufinus that he was only completing a work begun by Jerome, and to furnish them with a translation of Origen's work as it really was. Oceanus, no doubt, took part in the subsequent proceedings which led to the condemnation of Origenism at Rome. On the death of Fabiola, about 399, Jerome wrote to Oceanus his Epitaphium of her (*Ep.* 77), accompanied by his exposition, which had been intended for her, of the 42 resting-places of the Israelites in the desert. At a later time, in 411, Oceanus, who had maintained his correspondence with Jerome, and possessed his books against Rufinus and other of his works, interested himself specially in the questions which arose in connexion with the Pelagian controversy, on the origin of souls. Jerome writes to Marcellinus and Anapsychius (*Ep.* 126) who had consulted him on this subject, referring them to Oceanus as one thoroughly "learned in the law of the Lord" and capable of instructing them. Oceanus was also in correspondence with Augustine, who writes to him in the year 416 on the two subjects on which he had differed from Jerome, the origin of souls, and the passage in Galatians relating to the reproof of St. Peter by St. Paul at Antioch. Augustine speaks also of another work of Jerome's on the resurrection which had been brought by Orosius to Oceanus, and of letters which he had received from him. The tenor of his letter indicates his deep respect and consideration. Oceanus is placed by Migne with Pammachius, among the ecclesiastical writers (*Patrologia*, vol. 20); but no writing of his has come down to us except the letter to Jerome (*Ep.* 83). [W. H. F.]

OCIALDUS, disciple of St. Richarius, whom c. 645 he succeeded as abbat of Centula or St. Riquier in Picardy. (Alcuin, *Vit. S. Richar.* § 14, in *Pat. Lat.* ci. 691; *Gall. Chr.* x. 1243.) [C. H.]

OCLEATINUS, forbidden by Gregory the Great in A.D. 591, in letters to Severus, bishop of Ficulum, and to the governor and inhabitants of Ariminum (*Epp.* 1, 57, 58), on what grounds it is not stated, to be chosen bishop of that city. [F. D.]

OCTAVIANA, wife of Hesperius, used her husband's influence with the usurper Maximus in favour of a Tertullianist teacher whom she had brought with her from Africa to Rome. (Praedest. *Haer.* 86.) [G. S.]

OCTAVIANUS, an archdeacon and martyr in the Arian persecution under Hunneric. (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 3.) [G. T. S.]

OCTAVIUS (1). [MINUCIUS FELIX.]

OCTAVIUS (2), Nov. 20 (Usuard. *Mart.*), one of the martyrs of the Thebaean legion, commemorated, together with his companions Adventitius and Solutor, at Turin. They were the subject of a homily by St. Maximus, bishop of Turin. [MAXIMUS (16).] (Hom. 81, *De Natali SS. Martyrum Octav., Advent., et Solut.* in *Pat. Lat.* lvii. 427). [C. H.]

OCTAVIUS (3), a presbyter of Sirmium, who, *c.* 366, subscribed with INNOCENTIUS (28). [C. H.]

OCTAVIUS (4), a bishop at the council of Nismes in 394 (Hefele, ii. 405). In 401 he and two other bishops, Remigius and Treferius, were acquitted at the council of Turin (can. III.) on the charge of having performed some unlawful ordinations (Hardouin, i. 958). [C. H.]

OCTOBER. [LYONS, MARTYRS OF.]

ODA, widow, said by some to have been daughter of Childebert III., king of the Franks. She was married to Bogo or Boggus, duke of Aquitaine, and after his death, A.D. 688, devoted herself to religion, and specially to active works of charity to the suffering and poor. She died about A.D. 722, and her relics are preserved at Amay. Her feast is Oct. 23. The authority is a late *Life* by an anonymous writer, given with valuable commentarius praevius by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Oct. x. 139), but she is a favourite with French writers as the pattern of chaste widowhood. (Chevalier, *Repert. Moyen Age*, 1661). [J. G.]

ODDA (ODA), virgin, patron of Rhoda in Brabant, commemorated Nov. 27. She is called daughter of a king of Scotia; Dempster says, of Eugenius V. In her legend there is nothing distinctive beyond her residence at Rhoda in the 6th or 8th century, and the elevation of her remains by bishop Othbert in 1103. (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 509; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* ii. 72, giving a useful résumé.) [J. G.]

ODDO, of Mercia. [DODDO.]

ODHRAN (ODRANUS, ORAN, OTTERAN) is a name often met with in Irish hagiology, and perhaps is allied to the Latin Adrianus. (For lists of Odhran or Odranus, see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 372 n.[17], 540 n.[2])

(1) ODHRAN, monk of Iona under St. Columba, to whom he was closely related. His feast is Oct. 27. Colgan (*T. T.* 506 c. 3) calls him monk of Derry, and Skene (*Celt. Scot.* 35 n.) might accept the gloss of Aengus as identifying him with Odhran of Lattaragh, but the dates prevent it. Of his life there is no account till the close, when the curious legend is told by O'Donnell (Colgan, *T. T.* 411 c. 12) of Odhran's choice to die and be the first of St. Columba's followers to take corporal possession of Iona. His death is assigned to 563, the year of St. Columba's arrival. His fame in the West of Scotland is attested by the number of dedications. On Iona the Reilig Odhrain, and St. Oran's chapel, dating from about the 12th century and said to have been the place of burial for the Scotch, Irish, and Norwegian kings, are well known. (On St. Odhran, see Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 35; Boll. *Acta SS.* 27 Oct. xii. 342–4, with full Sylloge Historica by De Buck trying to discriminate the many Odrani and believing this to be St. Adamnan's Brito; Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 203 et al., ed. 1857.)

(2) ODHRAN, disciple and successor of St. Senan at Iniscathay in the Shannon about A.D. 580. (Cotton, *Fast.* i. 431; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 537.) [J. G.]

ODILBERTUS (EDELBERTUS, ODBERTUS, OLIBERTUS, ALIBERTUS, ALIPERTUS, OLDIBERTUS, OLDEPERTUS), archbishop of Milan, to whom Charlemagne addressed a letter of questions on the subject of Baptism (Baluze, *Capitularia*, t. i. p. 483). He presided from 805 to 814 (Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* iv. 75; Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d' Ital.* xi. 134, 202; Ceillier, xii. 185, 238). [C. H.]

ODILIA (ODILA, OTHILIA, OTTILIA), virgin and abbess, has an abundant literature, but her biography is based on a life of the eleventh century, which is entirely unhistorical (Mabillon, *A. SS. O.S.B.* iii. 2, pp. 441, ed. 1734. As patron of Alsace, and specially of Hohenburg, where her relics are still largely resorted to, she is held in great repute on the confines of France and Germany. Very briefly stated, tradition represents her as daughter of Adalric or Ethico, duke of Alsace, and Berchsind his wife. Being born blind, she was exposed by her father's order, but afterwards rescued from death, and at the age of twelve baptized by a bishop called Erhardt, when her eyes were at once opened (but see Boll. *A.SS.* Jul. iii. 212, 214 sq., upon this baptism and miracles, and claiming them as the work of St. Hildulfus of Treves; the father is Ethico or Athicus). Her father in remorse built a nunnery for her at Hohenburg, where she died Dec. 13th, A.D. 720. She is invoked in affections of the eyes, and has as her symbol two eyes lying upon a book (Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* vi. 197; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, viii. 89–1). [HILDULFUS.] [J. G.]

ODILLEOZ, a monk sent to Alcuin in 796 from the brethren of the church of St. Liudgar, which may have been at Autun, or else at Münsterthal in Alsace (Alcuin, ep. 52 and note, in *Pat. Lat.* c. 217), or Murbach (Dümmler, *Mon. Alc.* p. 340). [C. H.]

ODILO (OTILO), dux of Bagoaria (Bavaria), who greatly encouraged the mission of St. Boniface among his people, and in conjunction with him established the first four bishoprics of Bavaria (Othlo, *Vit. Bonif.* num. 31, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 649). [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS.] His marriage in 742 with Chiltrudis or Hiltrudis, the daughter of Charles Martel, and his defeat in 743 at the Lech by Carloman and

Pippin, are recorded by Fredegarius (*Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 681) and some anonymous annals (Bouquet, v. 33, 196, vi. 97, 137). [C. H.]

ODLANDUS, 10th abbat of St. Bertin, circ. 795–804. There is extant a document dated in the 20th year of Charles the Great's reign purporting to be a grant by him to Autlandus or Audlandus, and his monks, of the privilege of hunting wild beasts in the monastery domain, but not in the royal forests, for skins to bind books for the monks and make them gloves and belts. This document was published by Mabillon in the *De Re Dipl.* p. 631, and thence transferred into Migne's collection (*Pat. Lat.* xcvii. 976), but it is rejected as spurious by Le Cointe. Odlandus acquired for his foundation several villages, with their churches and dependencies, and in 797 established his residence at Arques, where he executed some engineering works for the improvement of the channels of the Aa and built flour-mills, for which he afterwards acquired the grant of a monopoly. The church of St. Martin in the same parish which had been destroyed by Northmen, he re-established, and attached to it ten monks. (Laplane, *Les Abbés de Saint-Bertin*, i. 39–42; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 487–8.) [S. A. B.]

ODOACER (ODOVACAR), king. The first is the generally received form of the name, but the latter is correct. (ODOVACAR, Cassiod., *Chron.* and MS. in Marini *Papiri Dipl.* n. 82; ODOVACHAR and ODOBAGAR, Eugyppius, *Vita S. Sev.* 14, 40, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, lxii. 1176, 1192; AUDOACHAR, *Or. Gent. Lang.* in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script. Rer. Lang.* 3, the last form supporting Grimm's derivation from *Audags* and *vakrs* = a good watcher, Pallmann, ii. 168.) His father's name was Edecon (*An. Val.*, Ant. *M.* 209), who has been identified by Gibbon and others with the Edecon mentioned by Priscus, and with Edica, king of the Scyri (Jord. *Get.* 130), but this identification, though possibly correct, is unproved. He was a Teuton, but of what tribe is uncertain. The statement that he was a Scyrian, (Ant. *M.* 209) seems the most probable, though Jordanes (*Rom.* 44) makes him a Rugian. At any rate he sprang from one of the four kindred tribes, the Scyri, Rugi, Turcilingi, or Heruli, who in the middle of the fifth century dwelt between the Danube and the Carpathians in what is now Northern Hungary. He was born in A.D. 433 (Ant. *H.*). He is first mentioned as one of a band of young barbarians who visited the hermit Severinus on their way through Noricum to seek their fortunes in Italy. The saint predicted his future elevation. "Go," said he, "to Italy. Thou art now clad in skins, but shalt soon be able to give costly gifts to many." (Eugyppius, *ubi supra.*) He probably took service in the *Foederati*, the barbarian auxiliaries who had become the backbone of the Roman army, and in A.D. 472 had risen so high that his adhesion to Ricimer in his revolt against Anthemius is expressly mentioned (Ant. *M.* 209). In the summer of A.D. 476 the foederati, whose suspicions may have been aroused by the attempts of Nepos and Orestes to remove them from Italy to defend against the Visigoths the remnants of the Roman possessions in Gaul, demanded from Orestes, the father of the puppet emperor Romulus, a grant of one-third of the lands of Italy (Procopius, *Goth.* i. 1). A refusal was followed by a mutiny, which probably broke out in the north-east of Italy. Recruits from the Rugians, Scyrians, Turcilingi and Heruli may have marched across Noricum to join their kinsfolk, thus supplying a ground for the false conception of Odovacar as a barbarian invader of Italy. The campaign was a short one. On August 23rd (*An. Cusp.*) Odovacar, then one of the imperial guard, was proclaimed king. On the 27th, Pavia, where Orestes had retreated, fell, and the city experienced all the horrors of a storm, though Epiphanius did all he could to protect the inhabitants. [EPIPHANIUS (13).] The next day Orestes was taken and executed at Placentia. Odovacar marched on Ravenna, captured Paulus, the brother of Orestes, at the Pineta on September 4th, put him to death, and took Ravenna, where Romulus had taken refuge. From pity or from policy he spared his life, and granted him the Campanian villa of Lucullus with an annual pension.

The first act of Odovacar was to negotiate a treaty with Genseric, who ceded him the greater part of Sicily on the condition of his paying tribute for it (Victor Vit., *de Pers. Vand.* i. 4, in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 187). His probable motive was to provide for the corn supply of Italy, which had been seriously diminished by the loss of Africa. He granted his soldiers the lands Orestes had refused (Procopius, *ubi supra*), but the execution of Count Brachila on July 11th of the following year (*An. Cusp.*) seems to indicate a mutinous tendency among them.

His relations with the East and the conquered Romans were in a critical state. The latter could not reconcile themselves to the dominion of a barbarian, and the orthodox clergy could still less tolerate the supremacy of an Arian. It is remarkable in the Papal correspondence how completely Odovacar is ignored, and Zeno regarded as the sole legitimate monarch. The emperor Nepos, too, though a fugitive from Italy, retained his hereditary dominions in Dalmatia, and was acknowledged by the fragment of Gaul that remained Roman. After the restoration of Zeno at the close of A.D. 477, envoys from the different parties in the West appeared at Constantinople. The deposed Romulus (no doubt at the instigation of Odovacar), caused the senate to send Latinus and Madusius to inform Zeno that they required no separate emperor in the West, but that one would be sufficient for the whole empire. Odovacar they said was qualified to govern by his ability in both civil and military affairs, and they asked Zeno to grant him the dignity of patrician, and commit to him the government of Italy. From Odovacar a separate embassy came, and Nepos also sent to congratulate Zeno on his restoration and to request his aid in recovering the empire. Zeno, from the influence of his wife Verina and a fellow-feeling for the misfortunes of Nepos, was inclined to favour him, but lacked the power; he therefore returned diplomatic answers. He reproached the envoys of the senate with having killed one of the two emperors they had received from the East and with having expelled the other. They knew, he said, what their duty was, namely, to welcome the surviving emperor on his return. He directed Odovacar to seek the dignity of patrician from Nepos, but added that he would

grant it himself if Nepos did not anticipate him. He trusted that Odovacar would welcome back the emperor who had granted him such an honour, and in his letter to Odovacar, he addressed him as patrician (Malchus). It was probably on this occasion that the imperial regalia of the West were sent to Constantinople (*An. Val.* 64), and probably also that envoys from the fragment of Gaul that was still Roman appeared at Constantinople, and that Zeno was inclined to lean to the side of Odovacar as against them (Candidus).

After the murder of Nepos in A.D. 480, Odovacar invaded and conquered Dalmatia, putting his murderers to death. This war apparently occupied the years 481 and 482 (*An. Cusp.*, Cass. *Chron.*). Odovacar's dominions thus became conterminous with those of Zeno, a fact which did not tend to improve the relations between them. In 484 Illus sought the aid of Odovacar in his revolt against Zeno, which he refused, but two years later he made preparations to assist him (Ant. *M.* 214). Zeno's counter-move was to stir up the Rugians against Odovacar. In the war which followed in A.D. 487, Odovacar was completely successful, almost exterminating the Rugians and capturing their king Fava or Feletheus, who was afterwards executed, and Gisa his queen (Eugypp. 54, *An. Val.* 48, *An. Cusp.*). He sent, perhaps in irony, a portion of the spoils to Zeno, who simulated a satisfaction he did not feel. An invasion by Frederic the son of Fava the next year was repelled by Onulf, Odovacar's brother, and Frederic fled to Theoderic. By Odovacar's orders, Northern Noricum was then evacuated by the Romans that remained there. (Eugypp. xii.)

So far the Eastern diplomacy had failed, but Zeno's next move was more successful. Theoderic, the king of the Ostro-Goths, had in 486 and 487 made two invasions, on the second of which he had penetrated within twelve miles of Constantinople. Zeno now by a masterstroke of policy persuaded him to undertake an expedition against Odovacar, thus ensuring the destruction of one or other of his enemies, and the removal of the most dangerous from his neighbourhood. The fugitive Frederic probably threw his influence into the same scale, and there was apparently some tie of relationship between Theoderic and the Rugian royal family. In the winter of 488 Theoderic with the Gothic nation evacuated Moesia and marched into Italy. Odovacar was defeated on August 28th, 489, on the Isonzo, and a month later in a second great battle at Verona, and fled to Ravenna. Milan and Pavia surrendered, and the greater part of Odovacar's army, headed by Tufa, his magister militum, went over to the conqueror. Tufa was sent to besiege Ravenna, but by a double treason went over to his old master, betraying to him Theoderic's officers. Odovacar was thus enabled to take the offensive; he marched in the spring of 490 on Milan, and besieged Theoderic in Pavia (Ennod. *V. Epiph.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 225). He was rescued from this perilous position by reinforcements of the kindred Visigoths from Gaul, and a third great battle on the Adda on August 11th ended in the total defeat of Odovacar. Still he defended himself bravely for two years and a half in Ravenna, making frequent sallies, including one on July 10th, 491, on the side of the Pineta, which caused great slaughter on both sides. His position grew more hopeless, Cesena alone outside Ravenna was held for him, provisions grew very scarce, and in August 492, Theoderic blockaded Ravenna by sea. On the other hand the Goths were weary of the long siege, and on February 27th, 493, a peace was arranged by the mediation of John the archbishop of Ravenna (Procop. *ubi supra*; Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 303), Odovacar giving his son Thela or Ocla, whom he had proclaimed Caesar (Ant. *H.*), as a hostage, on the terms that Theoderic and Odovacar should reign jointly over Italy, and Ravenna surrendered on March 5th. The arrangement could not be a durable one, and in fact lasted just ten days. Theoderic, perhaps justly, suspected Odovacar of plotting against him, and resolved to anticipate him. Odovacar was sitting in the palace of Lauretum, when two of his men entered and seized his hands as suppliants. Armed men who had been waiting in the adjoining rooms immediately rushed in, but hesitated to strike. Theoderic, however, plunged his sword through his body, crying out, "So thou hast treated my kinsfolk." His brother was shot to death in the church where he had taken sanctuary, his wife Sunigilda starved to death, and his son first was banished to Gaul, and when he escaped was put to death (Ant. *H.*). The remnants of Odovacar's army shared his fate (*An. Val.* 56).

As has been previously noticed, Odovacar interfered little in ecclesiastical matters, and is but little noticed by ecclesiastical writers. Though an Arian himself, he appears to have treated the orthodox with mildness and justice. After his accession he wrote to S. Severinus, promising to grant whatever he wished (Eugypp. 40), and at the request of EPIPHANIUS (13), remitted for five years the taxes of Pavia (Ennod. *V. Epiph.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 224). The only occasion on which he took a prominent part in church matters was at the Papal election after the death of Simplicius, of which a full account is given under FELIX III.

The significance of Odovacar's place in history is due to two facts: that by him the separate line of Western emperors was extinguished, and the first German kingdom established in Italy. Thus the field was left clear for the development of the Papal power, and for the eventual establishment of a Teutonic emperor. Yet no contemporary seems to have marked the significance of the deposition of Romulus or to have realised that the Western line was to end with him. There had been previous interregna, and, not to mention Romulus and Glycerius, Nepos was still emperor de jure and over a considerable territory emperor de facto. The newly discovered fact that Odovacar, probably as a last resource, proclaimed his son emperor, shews that it was quite possible that the Western line might have been restored. Again, Odovacar ruled in a twofold capacity, the Teutonic part of his subjects as king, while over the Roman part he wielded as patrician what was in theory a delegated authority. It is noticed (Cass. *Chron.*) that he did not assume the purple or other royal ornaments, and he seems to have styled himself simply king, without adding any tribal or territorial designation. He is once indeed called

rex Italiae by a contemporary writer (Victor Vit. *ubi supra*), but this is probably a description and not a formal title. Insecure as the position of his successor was, that of Odovacar was far more so. The former was hereditary king of a united and organized nation, while Odovacar could only rely on the support of the army, composed of fragments of different and discordant tribes.

The authorities for his history are very meagre and fragmentary. The principal are the chronicle known as Anonymus Cuspiniani (*An. Cusp.*), the fragments discovered by Valois (*An. Val.*), Jordanes (ed. Mommsen 1882), Cassiodorus (*Chronicon*); and especially John of Antioch, many fragments of whose history are published in Müller's *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* iv. (Ant. *M.*), and others, including one of great value, by Mommsen in *Hermes* vi. (Ant. *H.*). Modern accounts of Odovacar are given by Tillemont, *Emp.* vi., Gibbon, ch. 36, 39, Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen* ii., and a very full one by Pallmann (*Geschichte der Völkerwanderung* ii.). Mr. Hodgkin's *Invaders of Italy* gives an excellent account of his history up to A.D. 477. The relation of the different authorities has been examined by Waitz (*Nachrichten*, Göttingen, 1865–81, and Holder-Egger, *N. Archiv*, i. 215). [F. D.]

ODOARIUS, first bishop of Lugo, after its recovery from the Mahommedans. He had fled before the invaders, and after long banishment, on the recapture of Lugo by Alphonso I., returned there with a number of his retainers and others, rebuilt the city, which he found wasted and uninhabited, and became bishop of it. He built various churches, and settled his retainers in various villages in the surrounding country, and planted vineyards and orchards. Two wills of his are extant, one of which is dated in A.D. 747, in which he styles himself "Archiepiscopus." By them he gave the villages and churches he had founded to the see of Lugo. He also assisted in repeopling Braga after its recovery. According to an ancient Kalendar, he died on September 21st, 786. (*Esp. Sag.* xl. 89; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2), 251.) [F. D.]

ODOBECCUS. [EDOBICHUS.]

ODRENE (ODRINUS, HUIDHREINI, HUIDREN), bishop of Moville, co. Down, died A.D. 694. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 693; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 152; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 219.) [J. G.]

ODUINUS, a presbyter, to whom Alcuin addressed his epistle *De Baptismi caeremoniis* (*Pat. Lat.* ci. 611). [C. H.]

ODULFUS (AUDULFUS, AOTOLFUS), count, a friend of Alcuin, who asks Arno archbishop of Salzburg to remind him to be just in judgment and merciful to the poor (*Ep.* 153, Froben. 113, and notes in *Pat. Lat.* C. 403 A). The letter belongs to the year 805, when Odulfus was a missus regius conjointly with Arno (*vid.* the second capitulary of that year, capit. 7, in Baluze, *Capitularia*, t. i. p. 425; and Meichelbeck's *Historia Frisingensis*, t. i. p. 2, *Instrum.* 118, 123, pp. 90, 93). He died in 819, as recorded in the *Breves Annales Ratisponenses*, given by Mabillon (*Vetera Analecta*, 1723, p. 368). [C. H.]

OEDILRAEDUS, and OETHILRAED (Kemble, *C. D.* 35). [HODILRED.] [C. H.]

OEGETCHAIR, bishop of Mahee Island, co. Down, died A.D. 735. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 734, calling him OEDGEDCAR. See also Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 149; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 218.) [J. G.]

OENGUS (1) (AENGHUS), son of Tibraide or Tipraite, priest or abbat of Clonfad, county Westmeath, is known only for his hymn in praise of St. Martin, written in the Irish character and in rude latinity; it is printed with notes by Dr. Todd (*Book of Hymns*, Fasc. ii. 171 sq.). From the Scholiast's Preface we learn that it was written in expectation of a visitation of the churches of St. Colum-cille in Ireland by the abbat of the parent house, St. Adamnan, probably at the close of the 7th century He died A.D. 746. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 745.) [J. G.]

OENGUS (2), son of Crunnmhael, abbat of Duleek, co. Meath, died A.D. 783. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 782.) [J. G.]

OENGUS (3), son of Urguist king of the Picts. His name assumes many forms—ANGUS, OENGUS, HUNGUS, UNGUS, UNUST, UIDNUIST, UNUIST (Skene, *Chron.* 496; *M. H. B.* 288, 662–3). He was one of the most powerful kings of Pictavia and Hungus of the *Legend of S. Andrew*, but it antedates the occurrence by four centuries. (Skene, *Chron.* pass.; Innes, *Crit. Ess.* i. 101 sq.) [HUNGUS.] [J. G.]

OENNA, Jan. 20, Mac ua Laighisi, abbat of Clonmacnoise, King's County, succeeded the founder St. Ciaran, A.D. 549, and died A.D. 570 (*Ann. Tig.*, as Aengusius; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 212) as a bishop. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* i. 382.) [J. G.]

OFELLUS, bishop of Cleopatris in Egypt. Mentioned in the paschal letter of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria for the year 404 (translated by Jerome, and forming *Ep.* 100 in his works), as then recently appointed. [W. H. F.]

OFFA (1), the youngest son of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria (A.D. 593–617), by his second wife Acha, daughter of Ella and sister of Edwin (Symeon Dunelm. ed. Surtees Soc. i. 209, 218). During the reign of Edwin, Offa and his brothers took refuge in Scotland, and several of them, at least, were baptized at Iona (Id. 210; Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113; *S. C.* 20, 43). They returned on the death of Edwin, but we hear no more of Offa. [J. R.]

OFFA (2), a son of Aldfrith, king of Northumbria (A.D. 685–705). His mother, probably, was Cuthburh, sister of Ina, king of Wessex. Symeon of Durham (*H. R.* sub anno 750, and *H. E. Dunelm.* ii. 17) tells us that to escape from his enemies, he fled for protection to the body of St. Cuthbert at Lindisfarne, whence when half-dead with hunger, he was dragged out and slain. He had probably incurred the animosity of Eadbert, king of Northumbria, who also imprisoned Kynewulf bishop of Lindisfarne, and put his see in commission. The king was probably affronted with the bishop for allowing Offa to take sanctuary (Pref. to Symeon, *H. R.* ed. Surtees Soc. xvii.–xviii.). [J. R.]

OFFA (3), king of the East Saxons, son of Sighere and nephew of Sebbi, who, after a reign of thirty years, died about the year 695. Sebbi, according to Bede, was succeeded by his sons Sighard and Suefred (*H. E.* iv. 11). Offa's accession may have taken place either on his father's death, the date of which is unknown, or on his uncle's death, when he may have obtained his father's share of the kingdom, or on the death or displacement of his cousins. Bede (*H. E.* v. 19) describes him as a youth of great beauty and devotion, most beloved by his people. Out of a spirit of piety he left his country, wife, lands, and kinsfolk, for the sake of Christ, that he might receive a hundredfold more in this present life, and in the world to come life eternal. Accordingly, when Coenred, king of Mercia, in A.D. 709, went on pilgrimage to Rome, Offa accompanied him, received the tonsure, and spent the rest of his life as a monk.

To this story a few other particulars are added by later writers. Florence of Worcester (Appendix, *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 637) alleges that Offa was persuaded to go to Rome by Kineswitha, the daughter of Penda, whom he wished to marry, and that he was accompanied by Ecgwin, bishop of Worcester, who on the occasion of this journey obtained from pope Constantine a confirmation of his foundation at Evesham (*ibid.* 540, 637). William of Malmesbury repeats the story (G. P. lib. iv. § 180; G. R. lib. i. § 98), adding that by Kineswitha he was "edoctus amores mutare in melius." As Penda, Kineswitha's father, died fifty-four years before the pilgrimage was undertaken, the lady must have been too old for Offa's bride, and could hardly be the wife whom Bede mentions him as forsaking. She may, however, have been an instructress, or adviser. The connexion of Ecgwin's visit to Rome with the pilgrimage of Offa and Coenred is also brought out in the Evesham charters, which are incorporated in the life of Ecgwin (Mab. *AA. SS. O.S.B.* saec. iii. pt. 1, pp. 320, 321). Ecgwin himself is made to mention their companionship in a foundation charter (p. 320; cf. Kemble, *C. D.* 64; *Chron. Evesham*, ed. Macray, pp. 17–20); and the two kings are represented as agreeing with and confirming the charter of Constantine, which likewise mentions their visit to Rome (Mab. l. c. p. 321; *Chron. Evesham*, p. 171; *Councils*, &c., ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 281, 282). The life of Ecgwin by Brihtwald further implies that the two kings returned from Rome with the bishop (Mab. l. c. p. 324), but this is at variance with the statement of Bede, and is mixed up with some other unhistorical statements.

The name of Offa appears in other charters in connexion with Ecgwin. A grant of lands at Scottarith, Hnuthyrste, and Hellerelege, made by Offa, "rex Merciorum," but attested by Ecgwin, is referred by Kemble (K. *C. D.* 55) to Offa of Essex; and Offa, as king of the East Angles, is made to join with Coenred in an Evesham charter granted at Rome (K. *C. D.* 61; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 15). This confusion seems to have misled even William of Malmesbury, who calls Offa king of the East Angles (*G. P.* §§ 160, 180, 232). This has led to another mistake; the East Anglian kings being descended from an early Wuffa, bore the name of Uffings: some confusion of this name with that of East Saxon Offa, whose sanctity was well established by his pilgrimage, led perhaps to the idea that the Offings were a saintly stock, and to it accordingly Ercenwold and his sister Ethelburga are referred. The East Saxon Offa had an ancestor of his own name, Offa, father of Escwin, and eighth in descent from Woden (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 628).

[S.]

OFFA (4), king of Mercia, 757–796.

Offa occupies a most important place in the history of the English nation in the eighth century. He is the most powerful king of the greatest of the English kingdoms; his extant charters are more numerous than those of any other king of the age; his relations to both pope and emperor are more definite, and the general impression as to his character and policy, which the history of the time leaves on the mind of investigators, is at once more distinct and more imposing than that left by any other contemporary sovereign except Charles the Great. Yet it must be confessed that the materials for forming a consecutive history of his reign are extremely jejune: they are distinct, but very meagre, and legend has been unfortunately active in filling in the outlines. The following sketch contains no more than is required for piecing together the several incidents of his career, the more important parts of which have been treated under other titles.

Offa was the son of Thingferth, the son of Eanulf, who was the founder of the family monastery of Bredon. Eanulf was the son of Osmod, the son of Eowa, the brother of Penda, and was first cousin to Ethelbald. Offa was eighteenth in descent from Woden, and thirteenth from Offa, the son of Warmund, whose mythological history, going far into heathen times, was a part of the common stock of English and Scandinavian legend. It may be here stated that the lives of the two Offas, ascribed, but on very uncertain authority, to Matthew Paris, are an attempt to bring the two heroes into historical connexion, with the unfortunate result of making the Mercian Offa almost as shadowy as his predecessor. According to this fabulous narrative, the mother of Offa was named Marcellina, and he himself in childhood bore the name of Winefred.

On the death of Ethelbald, which we have good reason for dating in 757, the Mercian throne was filled for a short time by a tyrant named Beornred, whose name is not found in the pedigrees, and who perished within the year, being either driven into exile by his people, as Matthew Paris circumstantially states, or, as is perhaps more probably put by Florence of Worcester, being killed by Offa (M. Paris, *Hist. Major*, i. 342, 343; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 638). The chronicle merely tells us that he was expelled. Wessex and Northumbria experienced a change of sovereigns about the same time, or in the following year. Offa retained his authority without recorded disquietude, and his history is a blank for several years. Unless Ethelbald's power had been sorely diminished in the closing years of his reign, or the influence of Mercia had collapsed under Beornred, Offa must have inherited a claim to the superiority over the East Anglian, East Saxon, and Kentish

kingdoms, a brisk rivalry with Wessex, and a position of triumphant security on the side of the Welsh. It is probable, however, that in most of these respects he had heavy work to maintain his authority: we find him in the course of his reign dealing severally but summarily with each of his neighbours, and the annals of the time breathe no suspicion of any break in his continuous successes.

After he had been for fourteen years on the throne, we learn from the Northumbrian annals preserved by Simeon of Durham (*M. H. B.* 661) that in 771 he subdued the Hestingi: a mysterious notice, which cannot be satisfactorily explained. Possibly the Hestingi are the East Angles, of whose history at the time nothing is known but that they were under the rule of Ethelred, the father of Ethelbert, who subsequently married a daughter of Offa. His next recorded victory was over Kent: in a battle fought at Otford in 775 (corr. for 773, *Chr. S. M. H. B.* 334) he defeated the national army. Unfortunately we do not know the name of the king of Kent, who must have led the host; for Alric, the son of Wihtred, whom William of Malmesbury represents as defeated on the occasion (*G. R.* i. § 15), must have been long dead [ALRIC; KENT, KINGS OF]. The blow seems to have been successful; although there were risings in Kent more than once before the end of Offa's reign, the kingdom was practically dependent on Mercia until it was won by Egbert, about 824.

In the year 779 (*Chr. S.* 777) Offa fought with Cynewulf of Wessex a decisive battle at Bensington, in Oxfordshire. The victory which he there obtained added Oxfordshire permanently to Mercia, and gave the opportunity, taken some half-century later, of bringing the episcopal see of Middle Anglia from Leicester to Dorchester. It is unnecessary to inquire minutely into the possible cause of the struggle between two states which by position and history could not fail to be rivals. Following up the string of Offa's successes, we next come to his relations with the British tribes on the western border. The Welsh annals (*M. H. B.* p. 834) mention two devastations by Offa, one in 778, a second in 784. Possibly we may refer to these dates the construction of Offa's dyke, the great boundary fortification between Mercia and Wales, which extended from the Wye to the Dee. The interest, however, of the years 780 to 790 is mainly ecclesiastical and diplomatic, and will be noticed further on. The years were a period, if we may argue from the silence of historians, of internal peace, and marked by a policy intended to secure the consolidation of the Mercian power.

In 786 the death of Cynewulf made way for Brihtric to ascend the West Saxon throne [BEORHTRIC]. It is possible that, although the influence of Offa may not have placed him there, he was sustained by Mercian support against the claims of Egbert, who had family pretensions in both Wessex and Kent [EGBERT]. The marriage of Brihtric with Eadburga, a daughter of Offa, intended to secure peace between the two kingdoms, took place in 789 (*Chr. S.* 787). The marriage of another daughter, Ealhfleda, with Ethelred, king of Northumbria, which took place at Catterick on Sept. 29, 792, was probably a political measure also, although it is more probable that Ethelred needed the support of Offa than that Offa feared danger to his northern frontier in the disturbed condition of Northumbria. It was possibly in the same year, or more probably in 794, that Offa ordered the East Anglian king Ethelbert to be beheaded [ETHELBERT], an act which not only suggested a topic for the embellishments of legend, but has left on Offa's memory its one great stain. The circumstances are very obscure, but the tradition of the fact is uniform, and it cannot be disproved. In 795, according to the *Annales Cambriae*, Offa was engaged in hostilities with the Welsh, and ravaged Rienuch. The movement in Kent in favour of Eadbert Praen, which was doubtless in preparation about this time, did not break into war until Offa's death, which occurred in the following year.

This short review of his wars shows that middle and eastern England were entirely under his hand during a great part of his reign, whilst during the latter years, by the marriages of his daughters, he secured a hold on Northumbria and Wessex. This no doubt justified foreign nations in regarding him as the chief ruler of the whole nation, in which character he appears in the correspondence of Alcuin and also of Charles the Great. Our knowledge of his relations with Charles dates from the point of time at which Alcuin took up his abode in the Frank kingdom, about 780 or 781.

Probably the earliest trace of Offa's foreign diplomacy occurs in a letter of Adrian I. to Charles. The pope had heard from the king that Offa, "the king of the nation of the English," had signified to him, Charles, that certain persons, enemies of both kings, had informed the pope that Offa had proposed to Charles to depose him and appoint a German pope in his place. Charles, at Offa's request, contradicted the story, and Adrian accepted the contradiction, adding that until informed by Charles he had heard no such report, and that he would receive with welcome the envoys of the English king (*Mon. Carol.* ed. Jaffé, pp. 279–282). As Adrian and Offa were clearly on good terms in 786, this letter must belong to an earlier year. In 786 the pope sent the legates George and Theophylact to England; they were accompanied by Wighod, a Frank abbat, sent with them by Charles. Their first visit after their reception in Kent was to Offa, who received them with great honour, and, after holding a conference with the West Saxon Cynewulf, took Theophylact with him into Mercia and the British border, whilst George and Wighod went into Northumbria. One result of their mission was the holding of the legatine synods of 787; another, the institution of the see of Lichfield; a third, probably, the consecration of Egfrith, the son of Offa, as his coadjutor and presumptive successor. The last two measures were intended to consolidate the accumulated power of Mercia. [See GEORGIUS (33); JAENBERT.] The canons of the legatine councils, although very interesting generally, afford little that belongs peculiarly to England. They were, however, read in synod, "tam Latine quam Teutonice," and afford important data as to tithes, royal succession, vestiges of paganism, episcopal jurisdiction and visitation, and the differences between monks and canons, the latter

an order which had not yet under that name been introduced into Britain. The southern synod in which these acts were passed was attended and its acts were confirmed by Offa, archbishop Jaenbert, twelve bishops, four abbats, three duces, or ealdormen, and one "comes" (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461; Wilkins, i. 151). But the report of the legates is apparently incomplete, and no mention is made in it either of the division of the province or of the consecration of Egfrith. Both these measures were carried through the next year. We learn further, from a letter of pope Leo III. to Kenulf, that in this synod Offa undertook to pay an annual subvention of 365 mancuses to the pope for the support of the poor and the maintenance of lamps at St. Peter's (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 445, 524). In 790 the two kings had quarrelled; mercantile intercourse was broken off, and Alcuin thought it likely that he would be sent to Offa on an embassy of peace (Alc. ep. 14, *Mon. Alc.* p. 167). How this dispute ended we are not told. The name of Offa does not occur in connexion with the proceedings of Charles on the question of image worship, but he must be understood as acquiescing in the doctrine promulgated by Alcuin in the name of the princes and bishops of Britain (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* p. 667) in 792.

It is probable that Ethelheard, the archbishop who succeeded Jaenbert in 793, was a Mercian, and owed his promotion to Offa's patronage; he certainly aided with the Mercian party under Kenulf against the Kentish or West Saxon party under Eadbert Praen. Whether or no he was apprehensive of an alliance between the Kentish men and their great neighbours across the Channel, Offa must have felt safer with a dependent of his own in the chair of Augustine. A few letters of Charles in the later years of Offa's reign concern England and Kent in particular. In one the king of the Franks writes to Offa to urge the recall home of a Scottish priest who has eaten flesh in Lent, and is now resident at Cologne (*Mon. Carol.* p. 351). In another, Charles urges Ethelheard to intercede with Offa on behalf of certain exiles, attached to a person named Umhringstan, who had died in France, and who may have been concerned in the East Anglian troubles which cost Ethelbert his life, or in the Northumbrian disasters connected with the death of Ethelred (*Councils*, &c. iii. 488, 498). A letter of the year 796 is extant, in which Charles promises to Offa immunity for pilgrims on the way to Rome, and informs him that he has sent presents to the episcopal sees of Mercia in memory of pope Adrian, who died in 795; in another letter from Alcuin to Offa we learn that Charles has dispatched the gifts, but is sorely grieved to hear of the murder of Ethelred, which took place in April 796. This is the last trace of Offa in this direction. He died on the 29th of July 796, leaving his kingdom on the eve of outbreak of rebellion in several quarters, the history of which belongs to the next two reigns. The general impression left by these letters is that both Charles and Alcuin had confidence in the good faith of Offa, and regarded him as the great man of the island.

We turn next to Offa's relations to the churches of his kingdom. A very long series of charters illustrates the monastic and synodical history of his reign. The largest number is found in the Worcester Cartularies (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 105, 117, 118, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 133, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 150, 154, 156, 164, 166, 167); others record gifts to Peterborough (K. *C. D.* 165, 168), Evesham (*ib.* 130, 134, 147), Minster (*ib.* 106, 112), Rochester (*ib.* 111, 132, 152, 155, 157), Christ Church, Canterbury (*ib.* 121, 122, 153, 158), St. Augustine's (*ib.* 107, 108, 109, 119), Chertsey (*ib.* 151), the family monastery at Bredon (*ib.* 120, 138), and to some private persons (*ib.* 137, 148). There are among them many forgeries, chiefly, however, connected with St. Alban's (K. *C. D.* 161, 162), Crowland (*ib.* 163), and Westminster; of the Worcester and Canterbury gifts most have been noticed in the articles on the respective bishops. They fill nearly ninety pages in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, and comprise charters of the Kentish and South Saxon kings granted with the consent or attested with the confirmation of Offa. Of the St. Alban's and Westminster foundations a word is necessary. Offa is the traditional founder of St. Alban's. According to the legend, amplified and embellished by Matthew Paris (*Hist. Maj.* i. 356 sq.; *Vit. duor. Off.* ed. Wats. p. 26; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 214), the murder of Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, was contrived by Offa's queen Kinethritha, in order to place East Anglia at Offa's disposal. The king was bitterly grieved at the murder, and banished his wife from his society. She died soon after, and Offa was left free to fulfil a vow which he had made some time before to build a monastery. By miracle, the place where St. Alban's body was buried was revealed to him; he went with his bishops Ceolwulf and Unwona to Verolamium, and translated the saint. Offa then went to Rome to procure privileges for his monastery, was graciously received by the pope, to whom he promised the tribute of Peter's pence, and on his return founded and endowed the abbey, at the head of which he placed Willegod as the first abbat. The whole of this seems to be fabulous: the charters which are assigned to the period are forged, and the journey to Rome is a mere invention. It is, however, quite possible that Offa was the founder of St. Alban's: such seems to have been the belief in the eleventh century, and it is accepted as true by Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury. At Westminster he was regarded in the age of the Conquest as a restorer, and some of his charters may be genuine (*Mon. Angl.* i. 266; Kemble, *C. D.* 149). His relations to Peterborough rest on a little better authority, or at least on more ancient fabrications, and the evidence of the interpolations in the Chronicles. His confirmation of the possessions of Chertsey is perhaps one degree nearer to authenticity, though still suspicious (*Mon. Angl.* i. 422). But many small Mercian foundations likewise looked back to him as patron, and it is improbable that where so much is ascribed to him some little part of the tradition should not be true. A grant to the abbey of St. Denys at Paris, dated in 790, and sealed, bestowing lands in Sussex, is printed in Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum*, vol. i. pp. 360–362.

Offa's laws for Mercia were in existence in the time of Alfred, who selected, as he says, from

them as well as from those of Ethelbert and Ine, those which were fitted for his subjects (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, p. 27). It is possible that the remnants of recorded Mercian law may be fragments of a code of Offa, but we have no warrant for affirming that they are so, and it would be very natural to ascribe any traces of national customs in any kingdom to its most famous king.

Offa's wife was Kinethritha; his only son was Ecgferth, or Egfrith, who reigned for a few months after him. Of his daughters Eadburga, the wife of Brihtric, had an evil report and a miserable end [EADBURGA]; Ealhfleda was the wife of Ethelred of Northumbria, and had a happier end [ELFLEDA]; Ethelburga, an abbess, was a friend of Alcuin [ETHELBURGA]. Florence of Worcester, who does not mention Elfleda or Ethelburga, names a daughter Elfthritha, who lived in virginity, and may be the Elfrida who was wooed by the unfortunate Ethelbert. Another, named Ethelswitha, occurs only in the Chertsey Charter (K. *C. D.* No. 151).

The date of Offa's death is misplaced by two years in some of the MSS. of the Chronicle, and by other writers who have copied the mistake: it really took place on the 29th of July, 796. (See Will. Malmesb. *G. R.* i. §§ 86, 87–94; Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* i. pp. 128–206.) [S.]

OFTFOR (ESTFOR, *M. H. B.* 622; OSTFOR, W. Malmesb. *G. P.* § 136), the second bishop of Worcester (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 622). He was a pupil of St. Hilda, with whom he spent much time in both her monasteries of Hartlepool and Whitby, in study of holy scripture. Having exhausted the means at his disposal in the northern monasteries he went to archbishop Theodore in Kent, where also he spent some time in study. Thence he proceeded to Rome, a work which, as Bede remarks, was at that time esteemed one of great virtue; after his return he went to preach among the Hwiccii, then under the rule of king Osric, and after long service, was, on the resignation of bishop Bosel, elected "omnium judicio" to fill his place. This event happened when Wilfrid was acting as bishop of the Middle Angles, and in the interval between the death of archbishop Theodore and the appointment of his successor. At the command of king Ethelred, Oftfor was consecrated by Wilfrid (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23). All this information is derived from Bede, and is sufficiently circumstantial to fix the date of Oftfor's short episcopate; the year 691 is the date of the coincidence of Wilfrid's work in Middle Anglia, and of the vacancy at Canterbury.

Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* p. 539) places the death of Oftfor and the succession of Ecgwin under the year 692, which limits Oftfor's pontificate to less than two years; it may, however, be questioned whether this limitation is not conjectural, and whether the date of Ecgwin's accession can be really ascertained.

The Worcester Cartulary (K. *C. D.* 32) preserves a charter of Ethelred of Mercia, in which the king bestows on Oftfor thirty cassates at Heanburg and Aust, for the church of St. Peter at Worcester (cf. *Mon. Angl.* i. 584). This charter is undated, and attested by bishops Headda and Oftfor; it is not open to any suspicion. Another grant, by the same king, of forty-four cassates at Fladbury, also to Oftfor, is rejected as spurious, and with it a charter of Ecgwin which mentions it (K. *C. D.* 33; *Mon. Angl.* i. 585). Kemble's objection to this document is based upon the fact, that in it Ethelred speaks of Osthryth as "conjugis quondam meae," whereas Osthryth was alive until 697, and Oftfor is understood to have died in 692. Supposing Oftfor, however, to have lived longer, that objection would vanish. A more valid one perhaps would be found in the fact that the preamble, which is generally a distinguishing feature of a charter, is nearly the same in the Fladbury as in the Heanburg charter. As the date of Ecgwin's appointment rests ultimately in the words of Florence, the date of Oftfor's death must remain undecided.

Oftfor attests a charter of Oshere, king of the Hwiccii, in which land is granted to a comes or gesith named Cuthbert, to construct a monastery for the abbess Cutswitha (Kemble, *C. D.* 36; *Mon. Angl.* i. 585). This may be genuine, but it is undated. It is, however, attested by archbishop Brihtwald and cannot be earlier than 693. [S.]

OGDOAD. The number eight plays an important part in Gnostic speculations; but it is necessary to distinguish three different forms in which it has entered in different stages of the development of Gnosticism.

Ogdoad 7 + 1. We need not hesitate to place as earliest that which has been described in the article HEBDOMAS (Vol. II. p. 850). Astronomical theories had introduced the conception of seven planetary spheres with an eighth above them, the sphere of the fixed stars. Hence the earliest Gnostic systems included a theory of seven heavens, and a supercelestial region called the Ogdoad. When the Valentinian system had established belief in a still higher place, the supercelestial space was called the middle region (see MESOTES); but Ogdoad was clearly its earlier name. In addition to the references given in the article HEBDOMAS, proving the continued use of the name Ogdoad in this sense even among Valentinians, we cite *Excerpt. Theod. ex script.* 63 (Clem. Al. p. 984).

Ogdoad 6 + 2. In the system of Valentinus, the seven heavens, and even the region above them, were regarded as but the lowest and last stage of the exercise of creative power. Above them was the Pleroma, where were exhibited the first manifestations of evolution of subordinate existence from the great First Principle. In the earliest stages of that evolution we have (Iren. I. i.) eight primary Aeons constituting the first Ogdoad. Though this Ogdoad is first in order of evolution, if the Valentinian theory be accepted as true, yet to us who trace the history of the development of that system the lower Ogdoad must clearly be pronounced the first, and the higher only as a subsequent extension of the previously accepted action of an Ogdoad. Possibly also the Egyptian doctrine of eight primary gods (Herod. ii. 145) may have contributed to the formation of a theory of which Egypt was the birthplace. In any case an Ogdoad 7 + 1 would have been inconsistent with a theory an essential part of which was the coupling its characters in pairs, male and female. Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 20, p. 176) connects the system of Valentinus with that of Simon, in

which the origin of things is traced to a central first principle, together with six "roots." If for the one first principle we substitute a male and female principle, the 6 + 1 of Simon becomes the 6 + 2 of Valentinus. This very question, however, whether the first principle were to be regarded as single or twofold was one on which the Valentinians themselves were not agreed; and their differences as to the manner of counting the numbers of the primary Ogdoad confirm what has been said as to the later origin of this doctrine.

Ogdoad 4 + 4. The doctrine of an Ogdoad of the commencement of finite existence having been established by Valentinus, those of his followers who had been imbued with the Pythagorean philosophy introduced a modification. In that philosophy the Tetrad was regarded with peculiar veneration, and held to be the foundation of the sensible world. The Pythagorean oath by the Tetrad is well known. For references see Meursius, *Demiurg. Pythag.* ch. 7, *ap.* Gronov. *Thes. Gr. Ant.* col. 9; to which may be added Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 23, p. 179. We read there (Iren. I. xi.) of Secundus as a Valentinian who divided the Ogdoad into a right-hand and a left-hand Tetrad; and in the case of MARCUS (*q. v.*), who largely uses Pythagorean speculations about numbers, the Tetrad holds the highest place in the system. [MARCUS (17).] [G. S.]

OIDDI, a priest who assisted Wilfrid in the conversion of the South Saxons (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 13). [PUCH, *s. f.*] [C. H.]

OIDILUALD, hermit of Farne (Bed. v. 1). [ETHELWALD (3).]

OIDILVALD, of Northumbria. [ETHELWALD (1).]

OISSEIN (OISSENE, OSSENEUS, OISSENIUS, OSENIUS), surnamed Fota (the Long), abbat of Clonard, co. Meath, died A.D. 654 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is referred to as an undoubted authority by St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Col.* i. c. 2; Colgan, *T. T.* 339). His feast is May 1. [J. G.]

OISSENE (OSSENIUS), abbat of Clonmacnoise, King's Co., died A.D. 706. (*Ann. Tig.*; *Ann. Ult.* A.D. 705.) [J. G.]

OJA (OLA), bishop of Barcelona, subscribes the canons of 5th and 6th councils of Toledo, held in June A.D. 636 and January A.D. 638. His predecessor Severus was alive in A.D. 633. No bishop of Barcelona is mentioned between A.D. 638 and A.D. 656, when QUIRICUS had been bishop for some years. (*Esp. Sag.* xxix. 133; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 322, 348.) [F. D.]

OLBIANUS, a bishop, whose martyrdom by fire in the reign of Maximian for refusing to sacrifice to Juno, is commemorated in the Basilian *Menology*, May 4 and 29. In one place the see is Anea, and the persecutor is the hegemon Julius; in the other Aelianus, hegemon of Asia, persecutes. In the *Menologium Graecorum*, May 29, the imperial reign is the same, the consuls are Alexander and Maximus, the praesides Julius and Aelianus. A *synaxary* given by Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Mai. vi. 101, twice mentions the name. Under 4 Mai. i. 458, Henschen quotes all the Greek sources, including the *Menaea* for May 29. He makes Olbianus the Latin Ulpianus, and fixes Anea or Enea on the Carian coast opposite Samos, under the metropolitan of Ephesus, in the province of Asia. (Cf. Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 717). [C. H.]

OLCAN. [BOLCAN.]

OLOMUNDUS (OLEMUNDUS), abbat of the monastery of St. John the Baptist, honourably mentioned by Alcuin in a letter to the monks (*Ep.* 217 Frob., al. 226). The monastery, also called Malaste, and subsequently Mons Olivus (Montolieu), was in the diocese of Carcassonne. Mabillon puts his death on Dec. 11, 827. (*Gall. Chr.* vi. 971, *Instrum.* 412; Mabillon, *Annal.* t. ii. pp. 250, 251, 420, 517, ed. 1704.) [C. H.]

OLOPUEN (LO-PUEN), first Nestorian bishop of Sighanfu in India, A.D. 636 to 699. (Le Quien, *Or. C.* ii. 1269.) [J. G.]

OLYBRIUS (1), ANICIUS HERMOGENIANUS, son of Sextus Anicius Probus and his wife Anicia Faltonia Proba, husband of Juliana and father of Demetrias (q. v.), was consul, when still very young, with his brother Probinus in the year 395. He is described by Jerome (*Ep.* cxxx. c. 3, ed. Vall.) as a pious son, a man worthy of love, a kind master, a courteous citizen. He took a distinguished part in the senate, but died while still young, amid the grief of all Rome, not long before the city was sacked by Alaric (410). [W. H. F.]

OLYBRIUS (2), FLAVIUS ANICIUS, emperor of the West. He was descended from the great Anician family. After the capture of Rome by the Vandals he withdrew to Constantinople. When Genseric released Eudoxia and Placidia, the widow and daughter of Valentinian III., the latter was given in marriage to Olybrius (Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 7 in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvi. 2, 2517). Genseric employed this marriage as an excuse for continuing his ravages, declaring he wished the empire should be conferred on the brother-in-law of his son Hunneric, who had married Placidia's sister (Priscus, p. 74). While living at Constantinople, according to the *Vita S Euthymii* (in Cotelier's *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* iv. 64), he wrote to Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II. and the grandmother of his wife, urging her to abandon the Eutychian heresy, which she appears to have done [EUDOCIA (4)]. He also with his wife built a church dedicated to St. Euphemia. In A.D. 472, Olybrius was sent by the emperor Leo to Rome, where civil war was raging between the emperor Anthemius and his son-in-law count Ricimer. There he was proclaimed emperor by Ricimer and his party, according to the *Chron. Pasch.* (in *Patr. Gr.* xcii. 820), against his will. Rome fell after a five months' siege, in which the inhabitants suffered grievously from famine, and Anthemius was murdered by Gundobad, Ricimer's nephew, in the church of St. Chrysogonus, where he had taken refuge. (Joan. Ant. 209, in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Gr.* iv. 617.) Olybrius survived his rival only about three months, dying at Rome of dropsy on October 23, about seven months after

he assumed the Imperial title (Cassiodorus, *Chronicon* in *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 1246). The only recorded act of his reign is his creating Gundobad a patrician. He left one daughter, JULIANA (9) ANICIA. [F. D.]

OLYBRIUS (3), presbyter, addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 191, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxix.). [C. H.]

OLYMPIANUS. [OLYMPIUS.]

OLYMPIANUS (OLYMPIUS), governor of Cappadocia, addressed as an excellent judge and most eloquent orator by Gregory Nazianzen (*Ep.* 234 al. 165), who asks him to return a volume containing Aristotle's epistles. [C. H.]

OLYMPIAS (1), the elder, queen of Armenia. She was the daughter of ABLAVIUS, the famous pretorian prefect in Constantine's reign, and was betrothed to his son, the emperor Constans. Constans after her father's execution took care of her as long as he lived and brought her up as if she had been his wife, but apparently the marriage never actually took place. In A.D. 360, ten years after the death of Constans, his brother Constantius gave her in marriage to Arsaces III., king of Armenia. (Ammian. xx. 11; St. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum ad Monachos.* § 69, in *Patr. Gr.* xxv. 776.) Baronius (*A. E.* Ann. 388, xliv.) supposes that on the death of Arsaces, c. 369, Olympias may have married Anysius Secundus, becoming by him the mother of Olympias the deaconess, the subject of the following article; but the supposition seems untenable (Tillem. xi. 416). [F. D.]

OLYMPIAS (2), the younger, widow, a celebrated deaconess of the church of Constantinople, the most eminent in all respects of the band of holy and high-born women whom Chrysostom gathered round him. The family to which Olympias belonged was one of high rank, but pagan. Her birth is placed by Tillemont in or about 368, A.D. Her father, Seleucus, a count of the empire, died young, and her mother being also dead, Olympias was left at an early age the orphan heiress of a fortune of immense magnitude. Happily for Olympias her uncle Procopius, under whose guardianship she was placed, was a man of high character, an intimate friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. She was equally fortunate in her instructress, Theodosia, the sister of St. Amphilochius of Iconium, whom Gregory desired the young girl to set before her constantly as a pattern of Christian excellence both in word and deed. During Gregory's residence at Constantinople, 379–381, he became much attached to the bright and beautiful maiden, then probably about twelve years old, calling her "his own Olympias," and delighted to be called "father" by her. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 57; Cann. 57, pp. 132, 134.) Olympias had many suitors. The one selected as her husband by her guardian, Procopius, was Nebridius, a young man of high rank and excellent character, to whom she was married in 384 [NEBRIDIUS]. From Olympias's own words, as reported by Palladius, her intimate friend, concerning the happiness of being freed from the heavy yoke of matrimony, and from service, δουλείας, to a husband whom she found it impossible to please, μὴ δυναμένην ἀνδρὶ ἀρέσαι, there can be little doubt that her married life was not a happy one (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 164). In less than two years Olympias was left a widow without children. She regarded this early bereavement as a declaration of the Divine will that she was unsuited to the married life, and ought not again to be united to a husband. But it was by no means in accordance with the will of the emperor that one whose fortune was a prize to be coveted even by men of the highest rank should remain a widow. Theodosius marked her out as wife to a young Spaniard, a kinsman of his own, named Elpidius. Enamoured at once of the person and fortune of the fair young widow Elpidius sought her hand with the utmost importunity. But Olympias steadily refused to listen to his suit, not from any expressed dislike to her suitor, but from her fixed determination not again to entangle herself with the cares of a married life. Theodosius, indignant at her opposition to his will, and resolved that she should not enjoy the wealth she refused to share with his kinsman, commissioned the prefect of the city to take the whole of Olympias's property into public custody, and retain it until she had attained her thirtieth year. The imperial orders were carried out with so much harshness at the instigation of her lover, who hoped thereby to drive her to accept him for her husband, that she was even forbidden to go to church for her devotions, or to enjoy the congenial society of the leading ecclesiastics. Olympias's only reply to this act of unfeeling despotism was a letter of dignified sarcasm, in which she thanked Theodosius for having so graciously relieved her from the heavy burden of the administration of her property, and told him that he would increase her debt of gratitude if he would desire her fortune to be distributed among the poor, and towards the support of churches. She had long since renounced the empty glory of making any such distribution herself, lest she should thereby lose the true riches of the soul. The lady's quiet irony stung the honest soldier to the quick. Ashamed of his unworthy tyrannical behaviour, on his return from the campaign against Maximus, Theodosius revoked his order, and restored to her the management of her estates (Pallad. pp. 164, 165). Thenceforward Olympias devoted herself and her wealth entirely to the service of religion. Renouncing not luxuries only, but the ordinary comforts and even the decencies of life, she practised the greatest austerities, denying herself both food and sleep, abstaining from the bath, and wearing none but coarse and worn-out apparel. Her whole time and strength were given to ministering to the wants of the poor and sick, and to the hospitable entertainment of bishops and other ecclesiastics, visiting the imperial city, who never left her roof without large pecuniary aid, sometimes in the form of a farm or an estate, towards the religious works on which they were engaged. Among others Palladius enumerates Amphilochius, Optimus (whose eyes she closed on his death-bed), the two brothers of Basil, Gregory Nyssen (who dedicated to her the Commentary on a portion of the Song of Solomon, which he had written at her request (Greg. Nyss. *in Cant.* tom. i. p. 468) and Peter, and Epiphanius of Cyprus as well as the three who

signalized themselves subsequently as the unwearied persecutors of Chrysostom, and even of Olympias herself, Acacius, Atticus and Severianus. Palladius also asserts that Theophilus, the first author of the cabal against Chrysostom, when seeking some gift from her, with feigned humility prostrated himself before Olympias and kissed her knees, on which the holy woman, ashamed to behold a bishop assuming such an attitude, threw herself with tears at his feet. Palladius also tells us that when Theophilus found that Olympias, acting under Chrysostom's advice, dismissed him with petty gifts and presents of eatables, his disappointment vented itself in virulent abuse of his benefactress (Pallad. *Dial.* 151, 155). Her house was the common home of the clergy, as well as of the monks and virgins who swarmed from all parts of the Christian world to Constantinople. It is unnecessary to state that Olympias was the victim of much imposition, and that her charity was grievously abused. Indeed, her liberality was so unrestricted and inconsiderate that Chrysostom interposed his authority to limit it, representing to her that her wealth was a trust to her from God, and that she was bound to use it in the most prudent manner for the relief of the necessities of the poor and destitute, not in making presents to the opulent and covetous (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). Olympias followed Chrysostom's advice, which brought upon her the illwill of those who, like Theophilus, had previously made a market of her lavish generosity. But so far from resenting these disagreeable results of his wise counsels, Olympias only manifested increased devotion to Chrysostom, exhibiting a woman's tender care for his bodily wants, of which he was entirely negligent. She made arrangements for his being supplied with food suitable to his enfeebled stomach, at proper intervals, and prevented his abstinences being too prolonged (Pallad. p. 165).

When she was still under thirty years of age Olympias was appointed by Nectarius deaconess of the church of Constantinople. The courtly old prelate consulted her on ecclesiastical matters, in which he was a novice, and was guided by her advice (Pallad. p. 166; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). As has been already intimated, Olympias retained her position as deaconess under Chrysostom, to whom she became the chief counsellor, and his active agent in all works of piety and charity, not only in Constantinople, but in distant provinces of the church.

On the arrival of the Nitrian monks, known as the Tall Brothers, in Constantinople in 401, Olympias received the refugees hospitably, and lodged them for some time at her own house (Pallad. p. 153), careless of the indignant remonstrances of Theophilus, who charged her with shewing favour to the enemies of the truth (*ibid.* p. 155). On Chrysostom's final expulsion from Constantinople, June 20, 404, Olympias took the chief place in the band of courageous women who assembled in the baptistery of the church to take a last farewell of their deeply loved bishop and friend, and to receive his parting benediction and commands (*ibid.* 89, 90). The suspicion of having been instrumental in the conflagration of the cathedral which immediately followed the departure of Chrysostom from its walls, attached to Olympias in common with the other ladies who had shared the bishop's friendship. Olympias was brought before the prefect Optatus, and subjected to a brutally severe examination. No question being made of the fact, it was bluntly demanded of her why she had set the church on fire. The calm courage and piercing irony of her replies foiled the prefect. He proposed that on condition of her entering into communion with Arsacius, as some other ladies had done, the investigation should be dropped, and that she should be freed from further annoyance. Olympias's proud spirit indignantly rejected the base compromise. A charge had been publicly brought against her which could not be substantiated and of which her whole manner of life, which the prefect could not be ignorant of, was a sufficient refutation. Before she even considered the terms proposed she must be cleared of the accusation as openly as she had been calumniated. Force would be unavailing to compel her to hold communion with those whom conscience and true religion forbad her to recognise. Her request that she might have a short respite for the purpose of consultation with her legal advisers as to the proper means of disproving the calumnious accusations was granted (Soz. *Hist. Eccles.* viii. 24). The severe conflict Olympias had sustained brought on a severe and almost fatal illness, πρὸς ἐσχάτας ἀναπνοάς, in the latter part of the year, the intelligence of which caused much distress to Chrysostom in his banishment (Chrys. *Ep.* vi. p. 580 C.). On the recovery of her health, in the spring of 405, she left Constantinople, whether voluntarily or by compulsion is uncertain. Sozomen seems to speak of a voluntary retirement to Cyzicus. But the language of Chrysostom (*Ep.* 16, p. 603 C.) leads us to believe that she was never allowed to remain long in one spot, her persecutors hoping that by perpetually hurrying her from one place to another (τόπους ἐκ τόπων ἀμείβειν, καὶ πάντοθεν ἐλαύνεσθαι), and exposing her to the rude treatment of soldiers and other public officials this noble woman's spirit might be broken, and that she might be induced to yield. This hope being frustrated Olympias was once again summoned before Optatus, who, on her renewed refusal to communicate with Arsacius, imposed on her the heavy fine of 200 pounds of gold. (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24; Pallad. p. 28). This fine was readily paid, and the intelligence of Olympias's heroic disregard of all worldly losses and sufferings endured for the truth's sake was a source of intense joy to Chrysostom in his banishment. He wrote congratulating Olympias on the victory she had achieved, for which he calls upon her to glorify the living God who had enabled her to acquire such great spiritual gain. (Chry. *Ep.* 16, p. 604 A). We know nothing very definitely of the remainder of Olympias's life, nor can we say certainly when it terminated We may safely dismiss the later legendary tales of the credulous Nicephorus (*H. E.* xiii. 24), who states that she was finally banished to Nicomedia, where she suffered many trials and persecutions and ended her days. Our only trustworthy source of information is contained in the letters addressed to her by Chrysostom from his banishment, seventeen in number, some swelling to the bulk of long religious tracts, the composition of which relieved the tedium of his exile and made him almost forget his mise-

ties. We gather from them that Olympias was subject to frequent and severe attacks of sickness, and that the persecution of the party of Arsacius and Atticus was violent and unsparing. The compulsory dispersion of the society of young females of which she was the head, and who had copied her resolution in refusing to hold communion with the intruding bishops, was a great sorrow to her (Chrys. *Ep.* 4, p. 577 A). But the dates of these letters are uncertain, and it would be lost labour to seek to arrange the various references to Olympias's circumstances in chronological order. The style in which Olympias is addressed in this correspondence is "at once respectful, affectionate and paternal" (Stephens, *S. Chrysostom*, p. 383), "but it exhibits a highly-wrought complimentary" tone, full of "bold and lavish praise" of her many signal virtues which is "too widely remote from the mind and taste of our own times to be fairly estimated by us." We cannot conceive of a woman of any delicacy at the present time receiving such fulsome effusions without being grievously offended by them, and regarding the writer as a base and shameless flatterer. But the standard of honesty and of sensitiveness varies with the age, and it is unfair to measure past generations by that of our own day. Besides the letters Chrysostom wrote for Olympias's consolation a special treatise on the theme that "No one is really injured except by himself," *ὅτι τὸν ἑαυτὸν μὴ ἀδικοῦντα οὐδεὶς παραβλάψαι δύναται* (tom. iii. pp. 530–553); as well as one "to those who were offended by adversities"—*πρὸς τοὺς σκανδαλισθέντας ἐπὶ ταῖς δυσημερίαις ταῖς γενομέναις* (*ibid.* pp. 555–612). To both of these reference is made in his fourth letter to Olympias (*Ep.* 4. p. 576, C.). The date of the death of Olympias cannot be determined. She was evidently living when Palladius published his Dialogue in 408 A.D., but was no longer alive when the *Lausiac History* was published in 420 A.D. Olympias is commemorated in the Latin church on the 17th of December, and in the Greek church on the 25th of July. (Palladius, *Dialogus Historicus;* Chrysostom, *Epistolae*, 1–17; Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 24; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* vol. xi.; Stephens, *St. Chrysostom;* Thierry, *St. Jean, Chrysostome.* [E. V.]

OLYMPIODORUS (1), historian of the 5th century. He wrote a work in twenty-two books on the history of the empire under Honorius from A.D. 407–425, which has been preserved for us in an abridgment by Photius (*Cod.* 80), and included in Niebuhr's edition of the Byzantine Historians. He covertly attacks the Christians, and especially Olympius, who is so warmly praised by St. Augustine. [OLYMPIUS (10).] He was a pagan. Hierocles dedicated to him his work on Prudence and Fate. See for a fuller account his life in DICT. GR. AND ROM. BIOG.; and Cave, i. 468. [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIODORUS (2). Various philosophers of this name lived at Alexandria during the Christian period. One was the teacher of Proclus [PROCLUS]. Another was the last philosopher of any celebrity in the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria. He lived in the first half of the 6th century under the emperor Justinian. A third was a disciple of Aristotle, who taught his philosophy at Alexandria about A.D. 565 after the Neo-Platonic school had become extinct. A fourth of this name was a follower of Plato and a correspondent of Isidorus of Pelusium in the 5th century. See the *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* for a full account of them. [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIODORUS (3), a deacon of Alexandria, who lived in the early years of the 6th century, having been ordained by the patriarch John III. surnamed Niciota [JOANNES (13)]. He wrote commentaries on Job, Ezra, Nehemiah and Ecclesiastes (cf. Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. xciii. col. 9–470). For an account of the controversy about him and other works attributed to him, especially a treatise on the state of the soul separated from the body, see Ceillier, xii. 912, 913. Cf. the account of him in the *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* and in Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* ed. Harles, x. 67.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIODORUS (4), an eparch addressed by Nilus about the adornment of a church he is about to erect (lib. iv. ep. 61); another person who admired Plato, but neglected his precepts, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. ii. ep. 256); Isidore shews him how the arguments of the pagans recoil on themselves (iv. 27, 186). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (1), a bishop, sent to Africa on a mission of enquiry in company with Eunomius. [EUNOMIUS (2).] [H. W. P.]

OLYMPIUS (2), bishop of Hadrianople in Pisidia. He opposed the views of Origen about the resurrection of the body. He is mentioned in the Scholia of St. Maximus on Dionys. Areop. *Ecclesiast. Hierarch.* cap. vii. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 1049.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIUS (3), bishop of Aeni in Thrace, expelled from his see by the Arian party along with Theodulus bishop of Trajanopolis (Athanas. *Apol. de Fug.* § 3, *Hist. Arian.* § 19; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 1201). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (4), a Spanish bishop, according to some of Barcelona, according to others of Toledo, but of what see is not certainly known. St. Augustine speaks of him more than once as a man of high reputation in the church, ranking him with Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Ambrose, and quotes with approval a passage from a theological treatise of his concerning original sin, which does not now exist. A bishop Olympius was present at the council of Toledo, A.D. 400. (Aug. *c. Jul.* 1, 3, 8; 2, 10, 33; 3, 17, 33; Gennadius, *de Vir. ill.* c. 23; Hardouin, i. 992; Baronius, v. p. 279; Cave, i. 415.) [H. W. P.]

OLYMPIUS (5), a wealthy layman of Neocaesarea, an intimate and trusted friend and correspondent of Basil's. After the publication of the calumnies of Eustathius Basil wrote to Olympius (c. 373, A.D.) telling him how deeply he had been wounded by them, and begging him not to give any credence to them, or to suspect him of agreeing with Apollinaris. During his retirement Basil wrote Olympius other short letters, complaining of his writing so seldom (*Ep.* 12 [171], 13 [172]), and rallying him for

chasing away the poverty which had been his home-companion and the helper of his studies by his generous gifts (*Ep.* 4 [169]). In A.D. 375, when the people of Neocaesarea were loading Basil with insult and ridicule, he wrote to Olympius to thank him for his friendly letter, and still more for the sight of his sons who had conveyed it, whose company had cheered him and made him forget his trials. He had written some letters to the people of Neocaesarea to exculpate himself and to warn them of the dangers of their line of conduct, and would write again if any good was likely to come of it. (*Ep.* 211 [170]; 63 [207]; 64 [210].) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (6), a solitary of Antioch, a friend of Gregory Nyssen, at whose desire he wrote the life of his sister Macrina (Greg. Nyss. *Vit. Macr.* pp. 177, 178). Olympius's request that he would give him some rules for attaining Christian perfection was also the cause of Gregory's writing his treatise *De Perfectione*, in which he proposes Christ Himself as the only model of the perfect life. (*Ibid.* p. 275, ed. Migne, vol. iii. 251–286.) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (7), governor of Cappadocia Secunda in the year 382, for whom Gregory Nazianzen entertained a high esteem, and whose Christian virtues, as well as the manner in which he fulfilled the duties of his office, he takes every occasion of extolling highly. Olympius on his side shewed an equally affectionate reverence for Gregory, to whom he offered many thoughtful attentions especially valuable to one enfeebled by old age and sickness, which Gregory gratefully commemorates. Fourteen letters written by Gregory to him are still extant. The greater part of these are petitions in behalf of persons who had either some favour to ask from the governor, or some punishment to deprecate. The number of these is an evidence of Gregory's influence over Olympius, and of the readiness with which his requests were granted. He writes on behalf of Aurelius, a deserter (*Ep.* 78); of Leontius, a presbyter who had been deposed for his offences, and was in danger of punishment (*Ep.* 175); of a kinsman of his own, Eustratius (*Ep.* 177); of Paulus (*Ep.* 173); of the citizens of Caesarea, who had committed some grievous offence, for which the governor had threatened to raze the city to the ground (*Ep.* 49); of his niece's husband Nicobulus, who wished to exchange his place as postmaster for some lighter and more agreeable office (*Epp.* 178, 179); of Philumena, a childless widow (*Ep.* 174); of Verianus' daughter, whom her father was desiring against her own will to divorce from her husband (*Epp.* 176, 211). In another letter Gregory excuses himself for neglecting the emperor's commands conveyed by Olympius to attend the Council at Constantinople in 382, on account of age and weakness, and requests Olympius to act as his mediator, recalling the fact, that the same cause had hindered him from paying his respects to him on entering on his office (*Ep.* 76); on his retirement from which he writes a grateful and highly panegyrical letter (*Ep.* 50). The only angry letter in the whole series is one in which he calls upon Olympius to use his authority as governor to punish the Apollinarian party at Nazianzus, who had taken advantage of Gregory's being at the warm baths to elect a bishop of their own and get him consecrated (*Ep.* 77). The correspondence otherwise gives a very pleasing picture of the relations between Gregory and the provincial governor. [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (8), (OLYMPUS), heathen philosopher at Alexandria, c. A.D. 389, said by Valesius to have come from Cilicia. When the Alexandrians rose in tumult against the Christians and the imperial authority, at the destruction of the temple of Bacchus, and held that of Serapis as a fortress, Olympius encouraged the idolaters in their revolt, by assuring them that they should prefer death to the neglect of their ancestral gods, and that the destruction of the statues in the temple was no warrant for forsaking the worship, as the statues were perishable materials, but the gods, therein worshipped, had only removed to heaven. This was the philosophical view of all idol-worship, when the heathen were pressed by the Christian argument. When Theodosius issued an edict favourable to the Christians, and inviting the pagans to Christianity and peace, and when Olympius saw that the temple of Serapis was about to be surrendered, he fled to Italy, but explained his flight by saying that he had heard a voice in the Serapion singing, Alleluia. Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. c. 15) is the only authority for the story of Olympius; but Ruffinus and other authors describe the destruction of the temples at Alexandria (Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 389, cc. 76 sq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xix. cc. 28, 29; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* v. 136 sq. ed. 1732.) [J. G.]

OLYMPIUS (9), the name of various persons addressed by Nilus; a scholasticus (lib. i. epp. 152, 153), monk (ii. 77), a bishop (ii. 190), a quaestor (ii. 305, 306). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (10), a native of a province on the borders of the Euxine Sea, who by the favour of Honorius held an important military command in the imperial palace. He professed to be a Christian, but in the opinion of Zosimus, whose evidence must perhaps be taken with some qualification, his profession was only a mask to conceal depravity. It was he who informed Honorius, on his way from Bologna to Pavia, of the ambitious designs of Stilicho, May 408, and having ingratiated himself with the soldiers there by visiting the sick in the military hospitals, made use of the opportunity to influence their minds against him. When, after the mutiny at Pavia, Stilicho went to Ravenna, it was again Olympius who obtained an order from Honorius that he should be arrested. He took refuge in a Christian church, but having left his asylum under a promise of safety, he was again seized and put to death by Heraclian. Olympius succeeded to his post of master of the offices, and devoted himself to the task of destroying or persecuting all the friends of Stilicho. Eucherius, his son, escaped for a time by taking refuge in a church at Rome, but was afterwards overtaken and put to death. Deuterius, imperial chamberlain (praepositus cubiculi), and Peter, tribune or chief of the notaries (primicerius notariorum), having refused to acknowledge for themselves any complicity with Stilicho, or

to inform against others, were beaten almost to death with clubs. When Alaric was on the point of entering Italy, and was threatening Rome, it was owing to Olympius that Honorius, relying, says Zosimus scornfully, on the prayers of his minister, refused at the same time both the powerful military aid of Sarus and his barbarians to repel the enemy, and the moderate demands which were then made by Alaric on behalf of peace; and when, after raising the blockade of Rome, Alaric allowed the senate to send commissioners to Ravenna to obtain the consent of Honorius to the terms proposed by him, it was Olympius who persuaded his weak master to refuse them, and to send back the commissioners under an escort only numerous enough to provoke destruction. One of the very few who escaped, Valens, the commander, reached Rome in safety, and was able to counteract in some degree the cruel system of confiscation promoted by Olympius towards all the friends of Stilicho. He succeeded in gaining with the Hunnish auxiliaries a trifling success over the invading Goths, but his ascendency was soon to come to an end, for being denounced by the eunuchs to the emperor as the cause of the public disasters, he was dismissed from his office, and, fearing for his safety, left Ravenna, and fled to Dalmatia, A.D. 409. According to Olympiodorus, he returned and was again displaced a second and third time, and then, after being deprived of his ears, was beaten to death with clubs by order of Constantius, the husband of Placidia. (Zos. v. 32–46; Olympiod. ap. Photium, *Bibl.* 80, p. 57; HONORIUS, Vol. III. pp. 144, 147.) These details, which belong more to general than to special church history, are nevertheless important in this latter respect so far as they bear witness to the character of Olympius in his relation to St. Augustine, from whom two letters addressed to him are extant, both of them expressing warm admiration and friendship, and belief in the sincerity of his Christian professions. The first of them was written soon after his promotion to the post of master of the offices, on which it congratulates him, but with the hope and belief that he will not be unduly elated thereby. Its purpose is to request his kind interference on behalf of Boniface bishop of Cataqua in Numidia, who was in trouble as to the possession of some land purchased by Paul, his predecessor, under fraudulent conditions. At a time when he was deeply in debt to the imperial treasury, Paul made a surrender of his property, but reserving privately a certain portion, which he placed on bond in the hands of a person at that time in high office, possibly as Tillemont suggests, Bathanarius, brother-in-law of Stilicho, to be laid out in buying by auction some land, nominally on behalf of the church, but really to provide himself with a maintenance, and made an arrangement with the nominal purchaser that, without paying the debt due to the treasury, he should not be molested by the tax-gatherer. When Paul died, Boniface succeeded in due course to the property as bishop, and, as belonging to the church, might have held it without disturbance, but had scruples of conscience as to his right of enjoyment; and though he might probably have obtained this securely by simply petitioning the emperor to remit the small amount of payment which had become due since the purchase, he preferred to lay the whole case before him, being ready to abandon the property rather than enjoy it clandestinely. To his application on this point no answer had been received, and Augustine wrote to Olympius, as his friend, and in his opinion a sincere Christian, to request him to intercede on behalf of this small boon, suggesting that Olympius might perhaps arrange the matter by obtaining a grant of the land to himself, and that he, in his Christian piety, should bestow it upon the church (*Ep.* 96). The success of this letter may perhaps be inferred from a second, which Augustine wrote to Olympius soon afterwards on another matter. The bishops of Proconsular Africa were much disturbed by the unruly behaviour both of idolaters and of heretics (Donatists), after the death of Stilicho [EVODIUS (3), NECTARIUS (5)], and sent a deputation to the emperor, to request that the laws against the disturbers of peace and of religion should be put in force. Augustine had not seen the members of this deputation, but took advantage of a presbyter from Mileum passing through Hippo on his way to Rome, though it was now winter time, to send a letter by him to Olympius, pressing the matter on his attention (*Ep.* 97). Edicts for the repression of Donatists and other sectaries were issued at various times from A.D. 405 to 407, during the lifetime of Stilicho (*Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 5, 38–41). Stilicho was murdered in August, 408, and the decree of Honorius to Olympius, master of the offices, and Valens, forbidding pagans from being employed in military service within the palace, is dated Nov. 14 in the same year (*ib.* 42). Successive edicts against Donatists and others appeared on Nov. 15, 24, and 27, A.D. 408, and one on Jan. 16, 409, which last may perhaps represent the result of this appeal (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 43–46). The point at issue is the extent of St. Augustine's knowledge of the true character of Olympius. According to Zosimus, a bitter opponent of Christianity, his religious profession was nothing but a cloak for his iniquity. According to Olympiodorus, whose description consists of a few epithets, his behaviour towards Stilicho was "murderous and inhuman," and if any credit at all is to be given to the narrative of Zosimus, his unrelenting persecution of the friends of Stilicho after his death appears to justify this character. In the opinion of Baronius and Tillemont, the favourable mention of him by St. Augustine outweighs any unfavourable judgment on the part of Zosimus, but there is no evidence to shew that Augustine had any personal acquaintance with him; and while, as both Baronius and Tillemont remark, some deduction must be made from the opinion of Zosimus, who never misses an ill-word against Christians, some allowance on the other side is also due on the ground (1) of the exaggerated complimentary phraseology of the day, attributing to Olympius in any case a higher rank of merit than he probably deserved, and (2) of the very natural, though not entirely excusable, warmth of expression on Augustine's part towards a man undoubtedly a Christian by profession, probably up to that time in outward appearance sincere, and now appointed to a high office in the place of one whose Christianity was at the best doubtful, and who, whatever the

demerits of his opponents may have been, was undoubtedly guilty of ambitious designs against the existing government, which Olympius had succeeded in defeating. St. Augustine may have pitched too highly the praises of his friend, without a full knowledge of his character, but we can hardly believe that he was aware of that serious defect in it which a historian with strong antipathies, as was the case with Zosimus, professes to point out. (Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.* vol. v. A.D. 408, p. 316–323; Tillemont, *Mém.* vol. 13, 174, 175; Gibbon, chap. xxx. xxxi.; *Dict. of G. and R. Biog.* vol. iii. p. 913.) [H. W. P.]

OLYMPIUS (11), addressed by Firmus (*Ep.* 27, in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvii.). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (12), the name of various persons addressed by Isidore of Pelusium; a count (lib. i. epp. 377, 378), a deacon (ii. 24), a presbyter and scholasticus (iv. 205), a presbyter (v. 105); others (v. 387, 477). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (13) I., bishop of Constantia, capital of the island of Cyprus, who took part in the "Robbers' Synod" in A.D. 449 (Labbe, iv. 117). He was one of the fifty-eight bishops, chiefly metropolitans, to whom in A.D. 457 the emperor Leo addressed his circular letter relative to the decrees of Chalcedon and the troubles caused in Egypt by Timothy Aelurus. (*Ib.* 891.) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (14) II. (OLYMPIANUS), archbishop of Constantia in Cyprus, in the reign of Justinian. Through the influence of the empress Theodora, who was a Cypriote, he obtained the emperor's leave to enforce the decrees of Chalcedon in his diocese. He also completed what his predecessor Artemion had begun, the ecclesiastical freedom of Cyprus from the patriarchate of Antioch (Étienne de Lusignan, *Descr. de l'Isle de Cypr.* p. 59; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 1048). [C. H.]

OLYMPIUS (15), bishop of Theodosiopolis and Evaza, was present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and signed the decrees. When Bassianus was tried by the council for intruding into the see of Ephesus [BASSIANUS], Olympius was called upon to explain his own part in the transaction, and shewed that he had gone to take his share in what was to be a canonical action, and was then forced by popular tumult into the enthronization of Bassianus. The council appears to have acquitted him of blame. (Mansi, *Conc.* vi. vii. per Conc. Chalc., Actio xi.; Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 127 sq.; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 981; Fleury, *H. E.* xxviii. 26; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* xv. 460 sq., ed. 1732.) [J. G.]

OLYMPIUS (16), a deacon of the church of Antioch, by whom, together with Marianus, a presbyter of the same church, Maximus of Antioch had written to Leo the Great, and by whom he sent his reply, dated June 10th, 453. (Leon. Magn. *Ep.* 119 [92].) [E. V.]

OLYMPIUS (17), a messenger from Anatolius of Constantinople to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Epp.* clv. cap. 1. clviii.) [C. G.]

OLYMPIUS (18), bishop of Scythopolis in Palestine, from A.D. 452 to 466. He was succeeded by Cosmas. (Cotelerius, *Monum. Graec. Eccles.* t. ii. num. 103, p. 286; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 689.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIUS (19), an Arian who died suddenly in the public baths of the empress Helena, at Constantinople, in the year 498. He is said by several writers to have been struck by an angel when blaspheming the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. The angel destroyed him by fire or boiling water, though he was in the cold bath at the time. The emperor Anastasius ordered a picture of the miracle to be painted. John of Damascus in Orat. 3, *de Imag.* tells the story out of Theod. Lect. lib. iv. (Cf. Victor Tunnun. *Chronic.* A.D. 498; Ceill. xi. 103.) [G. T. S.]

OLYMPIUS (20), exarch of Ravenna, sent by the Emperor Constans, c. 649, to enforce acceptance of the Type in Italy. For his dealings with pope Martin I., see MARTINUS (3), vol. iii. 854. He died c. 652, in an expedition to Sicily against the Saracens, of a pestilence that ravaged his army (*Lib. Pont. Vita Martini*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 739). [F. D.]

OLYMPIUS (21), a guard sent by the emperor Constantinus IV. to arrest pope Martin for his rejection of the Type. He is said to have attempted the assassination of the pope. His conduct on this occasion is, however, involved in much obscurity. [CONSTANTINUS IV.; MARTINUS (3) in t. iii. p. 854.] [G. T. S.]

OMAR, the second of the caliphs and one of the numerous fathers-in-law of Mahomet. He was one of Mahomet's three chief companions, upon whom the government and organization of his followers devolved on the death of the Prophet. He was forty-five years old when that event occurred A.D. 632. He succeeded to the caliphate in August 634. It does not fall within the range of this dictionary to trace his career as head of the new movement. This has been amply and clearly done in Muir's *Annals of the Early Caliphate*. We can only note his attitude towards Christianity. Under the rule of Omar, Syria, Palestine and Egypt fell into Mahometan hands. [COPTIC CHURCH.] Jerusalem was besieged for two years, and only succumbed when Sophronius, the patriarch, intervened and agreed to surrender the city if Omar himself would come in person to receive its capitulation. No caliph had hitherto stirred beyond the boundaries of Arabia, but Omar did not care about precedents when a useful object was to be attained. He at once set out for Jerusalem, received its formal surrender, and was shewn over the celebrated sights and holy places by the patriarch himself. He proved himself a very tolerant conqueror, imposing only a light tribute upon the Christians, and in some cases even endowing Christian institutions and praying in Christian churches, as at Bethlehem in the church of the Nativity. While visiting the holy places of Jerusalem the patriarch is said to have shewn Omar a stone venerated as Jacob's pillar. It was covered with filth and clay; so the caliph with a humility which always characterized him, at once applied himself to clean the sacred spot with his own hands, and laid there the foundations of the mosque of

Omar which still exists. Humility indeed and toleration for Jews and Christians were marked features of his character. He hated all kinds of display. On one occasion he was making a journey into Palestine, and was entering a Christian settlement near the head of the gulf of Acaba. He knew the people would be rushing in crowds to see him, so he changed places with his camel driver, and when the crowds came demanding where the caliph was, he simply replied, "He is before you," whereupon they rushed on, thinking he was in advance. Meanwhile, Omar had time quietly to reach the Christian bishop's house, where he tarried during the heat of the day. He had torn his coat on the journey, and he gave it to the bishop to have it repaired. The bishop not only mended the rent, but prepared a new coat as a present, which, however, Omar refused, preferring his old garment. He was an enemy of all kinds of luxury, ostentation and vice among the Mahometans, and strove to carry out rigorously the discipline and precepts of the Prophet. The conquest of Antioch and Damascus was a great trial for Mahometan discipline. Wine was a great temptation to the true believers. At Damascus an immense number were accused of drinking it. So large was the number that the governor became alarmed and consulted Omar as to his course of conduct. His stern reply was this, "Gather an assembly and bring them forth. Then ask, Is wine lawful or is it forbidden? If they say forbidden, lay eighty stripes on each. If they say it is lawful, behead them every one." Three great Mahometan arrangements are ascribed to Omar. (1) He arranged and committed to writing the Coran which was previously preserved by oral tradition merely. (2) He established the Mahometan era of the Hegira or Flight of Mahomet, beginning with the new moon of the first month in the year of the prophet's flight from Mecca. (3.) To him is also ascribed the code called the "Ordinance of Omar" which to this day is the formal law regulating the condition of Jews and Christians in Mahometan lands. Muir thinks that Omar was not its author, as he was too tolerant and too friendly to Christians to have devised it. The emperor Heraclius and Omar had some kindly and courteous communications notwithstanding their frequent wars. [HERACLIUS.] Theophanes (*Chronographia*) gives us some information about Omar. Muir's book is the best modern authority. Gibbon, in his fifty-first chapter gives a good account of Omar and the conquest of Jerusalem. [G. T. S.]

OMER, ST. [AUDOMARUS.]

OMMATIUS (1), senior, a man of rank in Auvergne, whose daughter Iberia was the wife of Ruricius the elder, bishop of Limoges. Sidonius mentions him in his epithalamium to Ruricius and Iberia (carm. 10, 11), and addresses to him carm. 17, which is an invitation to a family birth-day fête. Through Iberia he was the grandfather of OMMATIUS (2), bishop of Tours. [C. H.]

OMMATIUS (2) (OMMACIUS, OMACIUS), junior, grandson of the preceding, son of Ruricius and Iberia, addressed and mentioned by Ruricius (lib. i. ep. 18; ii. 27, 56, and notes, *Pat. Lat.* lviii). He is regarded as the Ommatius described by Gregory of Tours as the 12th bishop of Tours, a man of senatorial family in Auvergne, and of large estates, which he bequeathed to the churches of those towns where they were situated. At Tours he heightened the church of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, beneath and adjoining the walls, and commenced, but did not live to complete, the basilica of St. Mary beneath the wall. He died after an episcopate of either three or four years and five months, and was buried in the basilica of St. Martin at Tours. The *Gall. Chr.* gives him the alternative name of Martius, and from the *Chronicle of Tours* puts his accession to the see in 521 (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* iii. 17, x. 31; Bouquet, ii. 387 note; *Gall. Chr.* xiv. 17). [C. H.]

OMOLINGC, OMULUNG. [HOMOLUNCH.]

OMOTARIUS, bishop of Laon late in the seventh century (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 512). [C. H.]

ONASUS, of Segesta, an opponent of Jerome in Rome (anno 384). He had taken some of Jerome's satirical descriptions as personal to himself. Jerome writes a jeering and unseemly letter about him to Marcella (*Ep.* 40, ed. Vall.), playing upon his name as derived from ὄνος or from Nasus. [W. H. F.]

ONCHU (ONCHON, ONCHUO), Mac-in-Eccis (son of the poet), poet in Connaught in the middle of the 6th century, embraced the Christian faith and settled at Clonmore, co. Carlow or Wexford; he set himself to gather relics of all the Irish saints into one shrine. His feast is Feb. 8, where Colgan (*Acta SS.* 276–7) and O'Hanlon (*Ir. SS.* ii. 402 sq.) have memoirs. [J. G.]

ONESICRATIA, a lady, a correspondent of Chrysostom's, to whom he wrote, from Cucusus, a letter of consolation on the death of her daughter, which had speedily followed some previous bereavement. (Chrys. *Ep.* 192.) [E. V.]

ONESIMUS (1), bishop of Ephesus, sent by the Ephesian church to meet Ignatius at Smyrna on his way to Rome. (Ignat. *ad Eph.* 2; see also Euseb. iii. 35.) [G. S.]

ONESIMUS (2), TITUS FLAVIUS, reputed husband of Flavia Domitilla, daughter of Clement the martyr, and grandniece of Domitian. The name of Tit. Flav. Onesimus appears on two inscriptions in Gruter (*Corp. Ins.* pp. ccxlv. and cclii.), one being a monument erected by him to his wife. The whole question about the Domitillas is in a state of confusion which these inscriptions increase since tradition represents the younger Domitilla as living a virgin. [G. T. S.]

ONESIMUS (3) a correspondent of MELITO of Sardis. See Vol. III. p. 896 a. [G. S.]

ONESIMUS (4), ST., bishop of Soissons, said to have destroyed the remains of idolatry in that region (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 334). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 13 Mai. iii. 204) give a *Vita* of him with notes by Henschen, who assigns him to the year c. 360. [C. H.]

ONESIMUS (5), bishop of Nicomedia in Bithynia in latter part of the 4th century. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 587; Philostorg. *H. E.* i. v.) [G. T. S.]

ONESIMUS (6), one of those who at the Council of the Oak bore testimony against Chrysostom or urged the council to come to a speedy decision. (Phot. lix. p. 60.) [E. V.]

ONESIMUS (7), the name of two persons addressed by Nilus; a monk (lib. ii. ep. 84), a primate (ii. 177). [C. H.]

ONESIPHORUS, bishop of Iconium about A.D. 450. He was present at the general council of Chalcedon, and also at the Robber-synod of Ephesus, 449. He declared at Chalcedon that he had opposed the proceedings of Dioscorus at Ephesus. (Hefele's *Councils*,—Clark's translation, iii. 254, 314; Mansi, vi. 827.) [G. T. S.]

ONIAS, a pupil (under a fancy name, and not otherwise known) of Alcuin (*Epp.* 124, 183, ed. Frob.), who addresses him as a sacerdos c. A.D. 800 (*Epp.* 230, 231, 227, 228); he is also one of those to whom Alcuin addressed his work on *Ecclesiastes*, A.D. 802. [CANDIDUS (16).] (Alcuin, *Opp.* i. 148, 292, 410, in *Pat. Lat.* t. c.) [R. J. K.]

ONOEL. [HEBDOMAS, Vol. II. 850, *b*.]

ONUPHRIUS (1) (ONOFRIO, HONOFRIO), June 12, an Egyptian solitary, who left the monks of the Thebaid, with whom he had been brought up, for the remoter solitude of a spot named Calidonna. Here he lived in a cave for seventy years, cheered by the annual visits of a holy man, when the anchoret Paphnutius in his journeyings discovered him, having more the appearance of a wild beast than of a man. As Onuphrius was narrating the story of his life an extreme pallor was observed to spread over his face, and he intimated that his end was near and that his visitor would bury him; then blessing Paphnutius and committing his spirit to God he expired. Paphnutius wrapped the body in a portion of his own cloak and laid it in a crevice of the rock. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* p. 99; Boll. *Acta SS.* 12 Jun. ii. 527; Tillem. x. 49, 723.) Mrs. Jameson (*Legend. Art*, ii. 280) describes a picture in the Louvre of which Onuphrius is the subject. [R. J. K.]

ONUPHRIUS (2) (HONOPHRIUS), a solitary of Emesa in Phoenicia, by whose prayers Leucippe, the wife of Clitophon, is said to have been relieved of her barrenness upon her forsaking paganism, and to have become the mother of St. Galacteon. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* p. 99; Surius, *De Prob. SS. Hist.* iv. 158.) [R. J. K.]

OPHELIUS (1), a grammaticus addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. *Epp.* 11, 86, ii. 42, 55, 119, 255, 273, iii. 31, 70, 92, 93, 94, iv. 105, 162, 200); (2) a scholasticus (ii. 154, 201). [C. H.]

OPHELLUS. [OFELLUS.]

OPHIANITAE, heretics, in the list of Sophronius (Mansi, xi. 850 D). In Hardouin's version they appear as Ἀφονῖται and Aphonitae (Hard. iii. 1291 A). [C. H.]

OPHITES [Ὀφιανοί, Clem. Alex., Orig.; Ὀφῖται, Hippol., Epiph.] Among the peculiarities of several of the Gnostic sects of the 2nd century, there was one which was felt by members of the church as most striking and most offensive, namely, that the symbol of the serpent, which to Christians generally represented the source of all evil and the enemy of the human race, was by these heretics held in reverence and honour. Accordingly, though "Gnostics" was the title which these people claimed for themselves (Hippol. *Ref.* v. 1, 11), the Catholics called them Ophites, or else, in places where it was the Hebrew word for serpent, Nahash, which appeared in their mythologies, NAASSENES; and ultimately some of themselves took pride in those titles. It is so natural to regard as most fundamental that characteristic which gives the name to a sect, that it is useful to remember that this name Ophite seems to have been at first imposed from without, and that the characteristic from which it is derived was common to many of the Gnostic sects, and in most of them was not entitled to be counted their most prominent feature.

The honour paid to the serpent in these sects may be traced to a twofold origin. Gnostic speculation busied itself much with the problem of the origin of evil, and the favourite solution was that evil was inherent in matter. It followed that the God of the Jews to whom the Old Testament ascribes the creation of matter had therein done a bad work, and therefore that he could not be identical with the Supreme Good God. When the Old Testament went on to relate how the serpent had offered to teach our first parents knowledge and to make them wise, and how the Creator God had cursed them for embracing this offer, it was a consistent theory to maintain, that in this the serpent had shewn himself to be the friend of the human race, and the Creator its enemy. We seem thus to have a sufficient account of the use of the serpent as an emblem of wisdom, and of the honour paid it by those who held it to be a point of duty to run counter to the God of the Jews. But in truth veneration of the serpent appears to be of earlier date than opposition to Judaism. We cannot pretend to trace the history of the totems or animal symbols which different tribes regarded as peculiarly their own: but there is sufficient evidence that in the countries where Gnosticism most flourished, a heathen use of the serpent emblem had previously existed. Sanchoniathon, quoted by Eusebius, in a chapter containing several notices of ancient serpent worship (*Praep. Evan.* i. 10), tells of the honour paid the serpent by the Phoenicians. They admired the quickness of its motions though destitute of the instruments of locomotion employed by other animals. They observed how, by casting its skin it renewed its youth, and they not only ascribed to it great length and tenacity of life, but even fancied that except by violence from without it would never die. A religious use of the serpent emblem was common to the Phoenicians with the Egyptians. We may indeed identify the names of the Phoenician Taaut and the Egyptian divinity Thoth, both of which are connected with serpent worship. The Egyptians are said by the same authority to have derived from the Phoenicians the name agathodaemon,

which a later writer (Lamprid. *Vit. Heliogab.*) tells us was given to the pet snakes which they kept. The serpent represented the vital principle of nature, the world being symbolized by a figure like the Greek theta, a circle with a snake in the middle. In the same chapter of Eusebius, Pherecydes Syrius is said to have derived from the Phoenicians his representations of the god Ophioneus as serpent-formed; but as we know from Celsus (Origen, vi. 42) that Ophioneus was described as a Titan and an opponent of Kronos, Pherecydes would seem to have more in common with those who made the serpent typify the evil rather than the good principle. For the purposes of this article, however, it is needless to ascertain the details of ancient serpent worship; it is enough to know in a general way that there was such a thing, for then we can understand that among the eclectic speculators, included among those known by the name of Gnostics, who adopted only such elements of Christianity as harmonized with their system, there would be some whose previous training would indispose them to share that hostility to the serpent which was common to Christianity and Judaism, and who would be willing to give the emblem an honourable place in their schemes. Accordingly in one Gnostic system (Iren. I. xxx. 5), Nous, the source of intelligence, is serpent-formed; in another (I. xxx. 14), Sophia herself is identified with the serpent. As members of the church were ingenious in finding the figure of the cross in different objects, natural or artificial, so these Gnostics were equally ingenious in discovering the figure of the serpent. By anyone who would lift up his eyes with intelligence it might be seen holding a presiding place among the constellations of heaven (Hippol. v. 16, p. 134). It was to be seen in the form of the brain (Hippol. iv. 51, p. 91, v. 17, p. 137), and in the convolutions of the intestines (Iren. I. xxx. 14). It was the serpent who gave wise counsel to Eve, the serpent rod by which Moses wrought his miracles, the brazen serpent which gave deliverance to the perishing people in the wilderness, it was he in whose likeness the Son of Man was to be lifted up (Hippol. v. 18, p. 133); nay, the serpent was identified with the Logos Son. But perhaps even the wildest extravagance of Ophite theory was not so revolting to Christians as a practice with some of these Gnostics to allow the tame snakes which we have already mentioned, to crawl about and sanctify their Eucharistic bread, thus, as it seemed from a Christian point of view, binding themselves to the author of evil by a sacrament of abomination (Ps.-Tert. 6; Epiph. *Haer.* xxxvii. 5, p. 272). The story is repeated by Augustine (*Haer.* 17) and improved on by "Praedestinetus" (i. 17).

In what precedes we have collected the principal characteristics which justify the application of the name Ophite to these sects: but as we have already intimated, the name has been applied to sects of different degrees of antiquity, and differing a good deal in their principles. It is advisable therefore to state separately what we learn from different sources of information.

The Ophites of Irenaeus.—Irenaeus having given (I. xxiii.–xxviii.) in what seems intended for chronological order, a list of heresies, beginning with Simon and ending with Tatian, adds in a kind of appendix a description of a variety of Gnostic sects deriving their origin, as he maintains, from the heresy of Simon. Irenaeus does not use the name "Ophite," but Theodoret, who copies his description, gives that title to them, and he has been followed by later writers. This system gave the following account of the origin of things. The first principle was a light dwelling in Bythus, blessed and incorruptible, which these heretics called the Father of all and the First Man. His Thought or Conception became a Son, which they called the Second Man, and after these was the Holy Spirit, which they called the First Woman, the mother of all living, the name for spirit in Shemitic languages being feminine. [On this trinity see Vol. II. p. 683.] Beneath lay, in a sluggish mass, the four elements, viz. water, darkness, abyss, and chaos; while above these moved the Holy Spirit. And of her beauty both first and second Man became enamoured, and they generated from her a third male, an Incorruptible Light, called Christ. But the excess of light with which she had been impregnated was more than she could contain, and while Christ her right-hand birth was borne upward with his mother, forming with the First and Second Man the true holy church, a drop of light fell on the left hand downwards into the world of matter, and was called Sophia and Prunikos. By this arrival the still waters were set in motion, all things rushing to embrace the Light, and Prunikos wantonly playing with the waters, assumed to herself a body, without the protection of which the light was in danger of being completely absorbed by matter. Yet when oppressed by the grossness of her surroundings, she strove to escape the waters and ascend to her mother, the body weighed her down, and she could do no more than arch herself above the waters, constituting thus the visible heaven. In process of time, however, by intensity of desire she was able to free herself from the encumbrance of the body, and leaving it behind to ascend to the region immediately above, called in the language of another sect the middle region. Meanwhile a son, Ialdabaoth, born to her from her contact with the waters, having in him a certain breath of the incorruptible light left him from his mother, by means of which he works, generates from the waters a son without any mother. And this son in like manner another, until there were seven in all, ruling the seven heavens, Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloaeus, Oreus, Astaphaeus; a Hebdomad which their mother completes into an Ogdoad. [See the article HEBDOMAD, Vol. II. p. 850.] But it came to pass that these sons strove for mastery with their father Ialdabaoth, whereat he suffered great affliction, and casting his despairing gaze on the dregs of matter below, he, through them, consolidated his longing and obtained a son Ophiomorphus, the serpent-formed Nous, whence come the spirit and soul, and all things of this lower world; but whence came also oblivion, wickedness, jealousy, envy, and death. Ialdabaoth, stretching himself over his upper heaven, had shut out from all below the knowledge that there was anything higher than himself, and being puffed up with pride at the sons whom he had begotten without help from his mother, he cried, I am Father and God, and above me

there is none other. On this his mother, hearing him, cried out, Do not lie, Ialdabaoth, for above thee is the father of all, the first man, and the son of man. When the heavenly powers marvelled at this voice, Ialdabaoth, to call off their attention, exclaimed, "Let us make man after our image." Then the six powers formed a gigantic man, the mother Sophia having given assistance to the design, in order that by this means she might recover the Light-fluid from Ialdabaoth. For the man whom the six powers had formed, lay unable to raise itself, writhing like a worm until they brought it to their father, who breathed into it the breath of life, and so emptied himself of his power. But the man having now Thought and Conception (Nous and Enthymesis), forthwith gave thanks to the First Man, disregarding those who had made him.

At this Ialdabaoth, being jealous, planned to despoil the man by means of a woman, and formed Eve, of whose beauty the six powers being enamoured generated sons from her, namely, the angels. Then Sophia devised by means of the serpent to seduce Eve and Adam to transgress the precept of Ialdabaoth; and Eve, accepting the advice of one who seemed a Son of God, persuaded Adam also to eat of the forbidden tree. And when they ate they gained knowledge of the power which is over all, and revolted from those who had made them. Thereupon Ialdabaoth cast Adam and Eve out of Paradise; but the mother had secretly emptied them of the Light-fluid in order that it might not share the curse or reproach. So they were cast down into this world, as was also the serpent who had been detected in working against his father. He brought the angels here under his power, and himself generated six sons, a counterpart of the Hebdomad of which his father was a member. These seven demons always oppose and thwart the human race on whose account their father was cast down.

Adam and Eve at first had light and clear and, as it were, spiritual bodies, which on their fall became dull and gross; and their spirits were also languid because they had lost all but the breath of this lower world which their maker had breathed into them; until Prunikos taking pity on them gave them back the sweet odour of the Light-fluid through which they woke to a knowledge of themselves and knew that they were naked. The story proceeds to give a version of Old Testament history, in which Ialdabaoth is represented as making a series of efforts to obtain exclusive adoration for himself, and to avenge himself on those who refused to pay it, while he is counteracted by Prunikos, who strives to enlighten mankind as to the existence of higher powers more deserving of adoration. In particular the prophets who (as explained Vol. II. p. 850) were each the organ of one of the Hebdomad, the glorification of whom was their main theme, were nevertheless inspired by Sophia to make fragmentary revelations about the First Man and about Christ above, whose descent also she caused to be predicted.

And here we come to the version given of New Testament history in this system. Sophia, having no rest either in heaven or on earth, implored the assistance of her mother, the First Woman. She, moved with pity at her daughter's repentance, begged of the First Man that Christ should be sent down to her assistance. Sophia, apprized of the coming help, announced his advent by John, prepared the baptism of repentance, and by means of her son, Ialdabaoth, got ready a woman to receive the annunciation from Christ, in order that when he came there might be a pure and clean vessel to receive him, namely Jesus, who, being born of a virgin by divine power, was wiser, purer, and more righteous than any other man. Christ then descended through the seven heavens, taking the form of the sons of each as he came down, and depriving each of their rulers of his power. For wheresoever Christ came the Light-fluid rushed to him, and when he came into this world he first united himself with his sister Sophia, and they refreshed one another as bridegroom and bride, and the two united descended into Jesus, who thus became Jesus Christ. Then he began to work miracles, and to announce the unknown Father, and to declare himself manifestly the son of the First Man. Then Ialdabaoth and the other princes of the Hebdomad, being angry, sought to have Jesus crucified, but Christ and Sophia did not share his passion, having withdrawn themselves into the incorruptible Aeon. But Christ did not forget Jesus, but sent a power which raised his body up, not indeed his choical body, for "flesh and blood cannot lay hold of the kingdom of God," but his animal and spiritual body. So it was that Jesus did no miracles, either before his baptism, when he was first united to Christ, or after his resurrection, when Christ had withdrawn himself from him. Jesus then remained on earth after his resurrection eighteen months, at first himself not understanding the whole truth, but enlightened by a revelation subsequently made him, which he taught to a chosen few of his disciples, and then was taken up to heaven.

We need not doubt that the Gnostic doctrine here expounded claimed to be derived from the revelation thus made to the chosen few (see the article PISTIS SOPHIA, where an account is given of a later work of this school). The story proceeds to tell that Christ, sitting on the right hand of the father Ialdabaoth, without his knowledge enriches himself with the souls of those who had known him, inflicting a corresponding loss on Ialdabaoth. For as righteous souls instead of returning to him are united to Christ, Ialdabaoth is less and less able to bestow any of the Light-fluid on souls afterwards entering this world, and can only breathe into them his own animal breath. The consummation of all things will take place when, by successive union of righteous souls with Christ, the last drop of the Light-fluid shall be recovered from this lower world.

The system here expounded evidently implies a considerable knowledge of the Old Testament on the part either of its inventor or expounder. It begins with "the spirit of God moving on the face of the waters," and it summarises the subsequent history, even mentioning the sacred writers by name. Yet that it is not the work of one brought up in Judaism is evident from the hostility shewn to the God of the Jews, who is represented as a mixture of arrogance and ignorance, waging war against idolatry from mere love of self-exaltation, yet constantly thwarted and overcome by the skill of superior know-

ledge. We have already remarked that the feminine attributes ascribed to the Holy Spirit indicate that Greek was not the native language of the framer of this system, and this conclusion is confirmed by the absence of elements derived from Greek philosophic systems. If, for instance, we compare this system with that of Valentinus, we discover at once so much agreement in essential features as to assure us of the substantial identity of the foundation of the two systems; but the Valentinian system contains several things derived from Greek philosophy, whereas that which we have described can be explained from purely Oriental sources. We are entitled therefore to regard the latter as representing the more original form. The reporter of this system is clearly acquainted with the New Testament, since he adopts a phrase from the Epistle to the Corinthians; he knows that our Lord habitually spoke of himself as Son of Man; and in denying that our Lord performed miracles before his baptism, he adopts the history as told in our Gospels in opposition to that told in apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy. We have already remarked (II. 683) that the place which the doctrine of a Trinity holds in this system indicates that it proceeds from one who had received Christian instruction.

Although, following Theodoret, we have given the name Ophite to the system described by Irenaeus, it will have been seen that not only does the doctrine concerning the serpent form a very subordinate part of the system, but also that the place it assigns the serpent is very different from that given it by those whom we count as properly to be called Ophites. For this name we think properly belongs to those who gave the serpent the place of honour in their system, but the present system agrees with Christian doctrine in making the serpent and his attendant demons the enemy and persecutor of the human race. If we were to single out what we regard as the most characteristic feature of the scheme, it is the prominence given to the attribute of light as the property of the good principle. This feature is still more striking in the derived system of *Pistis Sophia*, where the mention of light is of perpetual occurrence, and the dignity of every being is measured by the brilliancy of its light. It is natural to imagine a connexion with the system of Zoroaster, in which the history of the world is made to be a struggle between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. This suspicion is confirmed when we refer to what Plutarch tells of the system of Zoroaster (*De Is. et Osir.* 47), for we there find other coincidences with our system, which can scarcely be accidental. In the Persian system, the opposing powers, Ormuzd and Ahriman, each generate six derived beings to aid in the contest, precisely in the same way that Ialdabaoth and Ophiomorphus have each the co-operation of six subordinate and derived beings. The story of Sophia stretching out her body so as to form the visible heavens has a parallel in a similar myth told about Ormuzd enlarging his bulk, and there is a likeness to Ophite doctrine in the account which Zoroaster gives of our resurrection bodies, which are to be so clear and subtle as to cast no shadow. (See also the Persian representations of seven heavens and an eighth region above them (Orig. *Adv. Cels.* vi. 22).) On the whole there seems good reason to believe that the Gnostic system described by Irenaeus is the work of a disciple of Zoroaster, half-converted to Christianity. As to his obligations to previous Gnostic systems, see SATURNINUS. In the section of Irenaeus immediately preceding that of which we have just given an account, there is a summary of a system which has been called Barbeliot, from its use of the name BARBELO to denote the supreme female principle. It contains some of the essential features of the scheme just described, of which it seems to have been a development, principally characterized by a great wealth of nomenclature, and, with the exception of the name which has given a title to the system, all derived from the Greek language. Again, in the passage immediately following the chapter we have analysed, Irenaeus shews acquaintance with a section of the school who may be called Ophite in the proper sense of the word, some teaching that Sophia herself was the serpent, some glorifying Cain and other enemies of the God of the Old Testament See CAINITES.

The Ophites of Clement and Origen.—Clement of Alexandria incidentally mentions Cainites and Ophites (*Strom.* vii. 17, p. 900), but gives no explanation of their tenets. Nor do we suppose that there is any reason to connect with this sect his reprobation of the use of serpent ornaments by women (*Paed.* ii. 13, p. 245).

Origen is led to speak of the Ophites (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 28 sqq.) by an accusation of Celsus that the Christians counted seven heavens, and spoke of the Creator as an accursed divinity, inasmuch as he was worthy of execration for cursing the serpent who introduced the first human beings to the knowledge of good and evil. Origen replies that Celsus had mixed up matters, and had confounded with the Christians the Ophites, who so far from being Christians would not hear the name of Jesus, nor own him to have been so much as a wise and virtuous man, nor would admit anyone into their assembly until he had cursed Jesus. It may be doubted whether Origen has not here been misinformed about a sect of which he intimates that he knows but little. According to all other authorities the Ophites claimed to be Christians. Elsewhere (*Comm. in St. Matt.* iii. 852) Origen classes the Ophites as heretics of the graver sort with the followers of Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, and Apelles. The identity of the nomenclature proves that these Ophites of Origen are a branch of the Zoroastrian sect described by Irenaeus, and therefore justifies our application of the name Ophite to that sect. The names of the seven princes of the Hebdomad, as given by Origen, agree completely with the list of Irenaeus. Origen also gives the names of the seven demons. [See HEBDOMAD, Vol. II. p. 850.] Irenaeus only gives the name of their chief, but that one is enough to establish a more than accidental coincidence, since it is a name we should not have expected to find as the name of a demon, namely, Michael. The name Prunikos is also found in the report of Origen. Origen gives what must have been one of the valuable secrets of this sect, viz. the formula to be addressed by an ascending soul to each of the princes of the hebdomad in order to propitiate him to grant a passage

through his dominions. Perhaps the secret would have been more jealously guarded if it were not that in addition to the use of the formula, it seems to have been necessary to produce at each gate a certain symbol. These would only be in the possession of the initiated, and we may imagine that they were buried with them. We may note a point of which Origen does not seem to have been himself aware, namely, that he gives the formulae in the inverse order; *i.e.* first the formula to be used by a soul which has passed through the highest heaven and desires to enter the Ogdoad; next the formula to be used in order to gain admission to the highest heaven, and so on. Origen also gives a description of an Ophite diagram, which Celsus likewise had met with, consisting of an outer circle, named Leviathan, denoting the soul of all things, with ten internal circles, variously coloured, the diagram containing also the figures and names of the seven demons. Matter (*Histoire du Gnosticisme*, II., p. 221; plate I. D.) attempts to reproduce the figure from Origen's description, but in truth Origen has not given us particulars enough to enable us to make a restoration with confidence, or even to enable us to understand what was intended to be represented. In all probability the picture was not intended to explain or illustrate anything, but merely was supposed to possess some magical virtue. Origen names Euphrates as the introducer of the doctrine of the sect which he describes, whence we may conjecture [see EUPHRATES (1)] that the sect may have been that branch of the Ophites who are called Peratae.

The Ophites of Hippolytus.—The method by which Lipsius has attempted to recover the lost earlier treatise of Hippolytus has been explained (Vol. III. p. 93). This treatise appears to have contained a section on the Ophites, following that on the Nicolaitans, with whom they were brought into connexion. Philaster has transposed this and two other sections, beginning his treatise on Heresies with the Ophites, and making the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethites pre-Christian sects. We may set this aside as a mere blunder, into which Philaster was led by the names. The section of Hippolytus appears to have given a condensed account of the mythological story told by Irenaeus. In giving the name Ophite, however, he appears to have brought into greater prominence than Irenaeus the characteristics of the sect indicated by the word, their honour of the serpent, whom they even preferred to Christ, their venerating him because he taught our first parents the knowledge of good and evil, their use of the references to the brazen serpent in the Old and New Testament, and their introduction of the serpent into their Eucharistic celebration.

The great difference between the earlier and the later treatise of Hippolytus is that the former was a mere compilation, his account of the opinions of heresies being in the main derived from the lectures of Irenaeus; but at the time of writing the latter, he had himself read several heretical writings, of which he gives an extract in his treatise. In this book he makes a contemptuous mention of the Ophites in company with the Cainites and Nochaitae (viii. 20) as heretics whose doctrines did not deserve the compliment of serious exposition or refutation. And it is strange that he does not seem to suspect that these heretics have any connection with those who form the subject of his fifth book. In that book he treats of sects which paid honour to the serpent, giving to the first of these sects the name Naassenes, a title which he knows is derived from the Hebrew name for serpent. Possibly Hippolytus restricted the name Ophites to the sect described by Irenaeus, which has very little in common with that which he calls Naassenes. Another identification which Hippolytus failed to make has also been overlooked by, as far as we know, all his previous readers. The two first sections of the 5th book treat of the Naassenes and the Peratae, and no doubt give an account of two distinct works which fell into the hands of Hippolytus, and which he supposed to represent the opinions of two distinct sects of heretics. But a careful comparison of the two sections shews that both works must have reached Hippolytus from the same quarter, both having evidently proceeded from the same workshop. The doctrines of the heretics of the two sections agree so completely that the statements of the one may be used to clear up obscurities in the statements of the other, several technical words are common to the two sections, and in both the same not very obvious illustrations are employed. Before giving the detailed proof of these assertions, it will be convenient to state the doctrines of each sect as described by Hippolytus.

The book of the sect which he calls Naassenes, a name not heard of elsewhere, professed to contain heads of discourses communicated by James, the Lord's brother, to Mariamne. A very interesting feature of the book seems to have been the specimens it gave of Ophite hymnology. The doctrine has little in common with the Zoroastrian Ophites described by Irenaeus, the contrast for instance between light and darkness not being once insisted on. The writer is in fact not Oriental, but Greek. He does indeed use the Hebrew words Naas and Caulacau, but (see Vols. I. 425, III. 589) these words had already passed into the common heretical vocabulary so as to become known to many unacquainted with Hebrew. He does shew a knowledge of the religious mysteries of various nations, yet as it appears to us not a personal, but a literary knowledge. For instance, he dilates much on the Phrygian rites, but the whole section seems to be but a commentary on a hymn to the Phrygian Attys which had fallen into his hands. It must be remembered that without ever leaving Rome there was opportunity to become acquainted with the religious rites of various nations.

The Naassenes so far agreed with other Ophites that they gave to the first principle the names Man and Son of Man, calling him in their hymns Adamas. Instead, however, of retaining the female principle of the Oriental Ophites, they represented their "Man" as bisexual; and hence one of their hymns runs "From thee, father, through thee, mother, the two immortal names." See this also quoted under MONOIMUS (*Hippol. Ref.* viii. 12, p. 269). Compare also Irenaeus, i. 29, "refrigerant in hoc omnia hymnizare magnum Aeona. Hinc autem dicunt manifestatam Matrem, Patrem, Filium." Although

the coincidence here is but slight, it deserves some attention, because Irenaeus's section referred to contains some Naassene technical words, Adamas, Autogenes, virginalis spiritus; and these Barbeliots of Irenaeus appear to have taught a Greek form of Ophite doctrine. To return to the Naassenes, they taught that their primary man was, like Geryon, threefold, containing in himself the three natures *τὸ νοερόν*, *τὸ ψυχικόν*, *τὸ χοϊκόν*; and so that in Jesus the three natures were combined, and through him speak to these different classes of men. From the living waters which he supplies each absorbs that for which his nature has attraction. From the same water the olive can draw its oil, and the vine its wine, and in like manner each other plant its special produce: chaff will be attracted by amber, iron only by the magnet, gold only by the prickle of the sea-hawk,[a] so each according to his nature attracts and imbibes a different supply from the same source. Thus there are three classes of men and three corresponding churches, angelical, psychical, and choical, whose names are elect, called, captive. We should imagine that these indicate (1) the heathen chiefly captive under the dominion of matter, (2) ordinary Christians, and (3) out of the many called, the few chosen members of the Naassene sect. Elsewhere, however, a greater diversity of men is indicated. For the Saviour, we are told, said, "Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven; but even if ye drink the cup that I drink of, whither I go ye cannot come." For every one must go to his own nature. Therefore it was that he chose twelve apostles for the twelve tribes, and by them spoke to every tribe. So all men cannot receive the preaching of all the twelve, but each only according to his own nature.

The Naassene work known to Hippolytus would seem to have been of what we may call a devotional character rather than a formal exposition of doctrine, and this perhaps is why it is difficult to draw from the accounts left us a thoroughly consistent scheme. Thus, as we proceed, we are led to think of the first principle of nature, not as a single threefold being, but as three distinct substances; on the one hand the pre-existent, otherwise spoken of as the Good Being, on the other hand the "outpoured Chaos," intermediate, between these one called Autogenes, and also the Logos. Chaos is naturally destitute of forms or qualities; neither does the pre-existent being himself possess form, for though the cause of everything that comes into being, it is itself none of them, but only the seed from which they spring. The Logos is the mediator which draws forms from above and transfers them to the world below. Yet he seems to have a rival in this work; for we have reference made to a fourth being, whence or how brought into existence we are not told, a "fiery God," Esaldaeus,[b] the father of the *ἰδικὸς κόσμος*. That is to say, if we understand the theory rightly, it was this fiery being, the same who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, who gave forms to the choical or purely material parts of nature. It is he who supplies the fiery heat of generation by which these forms are still continued. In this work the Logos had no part, for "all things were made through him, and without him was made nothing." The "nothing" that was made without him is the *κόσμος ἰδικός*. On the other hand, it is the Logos, who is identified with the serpent, and this again with the principle of Water, who brings down the pneumatic and psychical elements, so that through him man became a living soul. But he has now to do a greater work, namely, to provide for the release of the higher elements now enslaved under the dominion of matter, and for their restoration to the good God. For the restoration of the chosen seed an essential condition is the complete abandonment of sexual intercourse. The captive people must pass out of Egypt; Egypt is the body, the Red Sea the work of generation; to cross the Red Sea and pass into the wilderness is to arrive at a state where that work of generation has been forsaken. Thus they arrive at the Jordan. This is the Logos through whose streams rolling downward forms had descended from above, and generations of mortal men had taken place; but now Jesus, like his Old Testament namesake, rolls the stream upwards, and then takes place a generation not of men, but of gods, for to this name the new-born seed may lay claim (Ps. lxxxii. 6). But if they return to Egypt, that is to carnal intercourse, "they shall die like men." For that which is born from below is fleshly and mortal, that which is born from above is spiritual and immortal.

The specimens already given present but a faint idea of the author's tyrannical method of Scripture exegesis by which he can prove any doctrine out of any text. One or two specimens more must suffice. In "*ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι*," which occurs in St. Paul's description of the evil deeds of the Gentiles (Rom. i. 27), *ἀσχημοσύνη* is explained to mean the formlessness of the blessed pre-existent Being, *ἡ ἀσχημάτιστος οὐσία*. Again, it is explained that the publicans (*τελῶναι*) who go first into the kingdom of God, are we upon whom the ends of the world (*τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*) have come. The writer, it will be seen, makes free use of the New Testament. He seems to have used all the four Gospels, but that of which he makes most use is St. John's. He quotes from Paul's epistles to the Romans, Corinthians (both letters), Galatians, and Ephesians. There is a copious use also of the Old Testament; and besides we are told there is a use of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and that of St. Thomas. But what most characterizes the document under consideration is the abundant use of heathen writings. For the author's method of exegesis enables him to find his system in Homer with as much ease as in the Bible. Great part of the extract given by Hippolytus is a commentary on a hymn to the Phrygian Attys, all the epithets applied to whom are shewn when etymologically examined, to be capable of a Naassene interpretation. One or two specimens of the etymology will suffice. Every temple, *ναός*, shews by its title that it is intended for the honour of the serpent *νάας*. Again, one of the first of the titles

[a] "*κερκὶς θαλασσίου ἱέρακος*." I don't know what this fish is, nor have I seen elsewhere this remarkable property of its bone.

[b] Schneidewin unwarrantably edits Ialdabaoth, the fact being that this system differs altogether in its nomenclature from that of the Zoroastric Ophites.

applied to Attys is πάπας. Here we are taught to recognize him who brought to rest (ἔπαυσε) all the disorderly motion that prevailed before his appearing. To him all things cry παῦε, παῦε, τὴν ἀσυμφωνίαν. In like manner it is explained that, in this hymn, αἰπόλος does not mean a goatherd, nor ἀμύγδαλος an almond, but the reader will not care to be informed of the mysteries which these words contain. This exegesis can be paralleled by anyone who has chanced to meet some of the insane documents which in our own days are issued from time to time by crazy persons who fancy themselves to be inspired, and who are able to find support for their pretensions in texts of Scripture used with utter disregard of their context. According to our view the Naassene writer under consideration was a person of this kind, not a philosophic writer, nor the originator of the Ophite system which he teaches, but one trained up in it, and proud to give new proofs and illustrations of it of his own discovery. Although the myths of the earlier Ophite system are but lightly touched on, there is some trace of an acquaintance with them, as for example the myth that the first created man lay crawling until a spirit was poured into him from above, and the story of the descent of Christ through the seven heavens on his mission to release the higher elements imprisoned in chaos.

We turn now to the section which treats of the Peratae. It had been known from Clement of Alexandria that there was a sect of that name, though he tells nothing as to its tenets. Hippolytus was acquainted with more books of the sect than one. One called οἱ προάστειοι appears to have been of an astrological character, treating of the influence of the stars upon the human race, and connecting various heathen mythologies with the planetary powers. For the astrology of the Naassene writer, see p. 102. But there was besides a treatise the resemblance of the doctrine of which to that previously described as Naassene we have already remarked. According to this, the world is one, but admits of a threefold division, πατήρ, υἱός, ὕλη. Each of these parts contains in itself an infinity of powers. The first is perfect goodness, unbegotten, μέγεθος[c] πατρικόν, the second is ἀγαθὸν αὐτογενές; the third γεννητόν, ἰδικόν. Intermediate between Hyle and the father sits the Son, the Word, the Serpent, ever turning, now to the immovable father, now to the moving Hyle, drawing powers from the first by means of which Hyle, in itself destitute of properties or of form, is fashioned according to the ideas received from the father. These he draws in some ineffable manner, just as the various colours passed into the sheep from the rods which Jacob set up, or rather as a painter transfers forms to his canvas without detracting aught from his model. When, then, the Saviour says, "Your Father which is in heaven," he means that heavenly father, the first principle, from which the forms have been derived; but when he says "your father was a murderer from the beginning," he means the ruler and framer of Hyle, who, taking the forms transmitted by the Son, works generation here, a work which is destruction and death. For the redemption of this world below, Christ was made to descend in the days of Herod, from the region of the unbegotten, a man himself threefold, having in himself powers from the three parts of the world, "for in Him the whole Pleroma was pleased to dwell bodily," and in Him was the whole Godhead. His mission is in order that those elements which descended from above may by him be enabled to return, while those elements which plotted against the higher ones shall be separated and left for punishment. Thus, then, when it is said "the Son of Man came not to destroy the world, but that the world through Him might be saved," by "the world" is meant the two superior parts, τὸ ἀγέννητον and τὸ αὐτογέννητον; but when the Scripture says "that we should not be condemned with the world," by the world is meant the third part or the κόσμος ἰδικός; for that part must be destroyed, but the two superior parts freed from destruction. When, then, the Saviour comes into the world, just as the amber attracts the chaff, and the magnet the iron, and the spine of the sea hawk the gold, so this serpent attracts to himself those whose nature is such as to be capable of receiving his influence. Such persons are called Peratae, because, by means of their "knowledge" they have learned how safely to pass through (περᾶσαι) the corruption to which everything that is generated is subject. All the ignorant are Egyptians. Egypt is the body, coming out of Egypt is coming out of the body, and passing the Red Sea, that is the water of destruction; or, in other words, generation. Those, however, who suppose themselves to have passed the Red Sea, are still liable to be assailed by the gods of destruction, whom Moses called the serpents of the desert, who bite and destroy those who had hoped to escape the power of the gods of generation. For these Moses exhibited the true and perfect serpent, on whom they who believed were not bitten by the gods of destruction. None but this true serpent, the perfect of the perfect, can save and deliver those who go out of Egypt, that is to say from the body and from the world. In the sketches here given we have by no means touched on all the coincidences between what Hippolytus calls the Naassene and Peratic systems; but we consider that enough has been told not only to shew that in both works the doctrines of the same sect are described, but also that there is a literary dependence of one work on the other. If the two had not the same author it seems to us that the Peratic work is the elder, and that it was made use of by the writer who uses the name Naassene.

In close connection with these two sections ought to be considered what Hippolytus tells under the head MONOIMUS. In the article with that title we have given an account of his system, and pointed out that he belongs to the Naassene sect. The extracts of Hippolytus begin with a quotation from Homer—

ὠκεανὸς γένεσίς τε θεῶν γένεσίς τ' ἀνθρώπων

used by the Naassene writer, pp. 105, 106. He quotes the Naassene hymn, "Father, mother, the two immortal names." He makes his supreme first principle to be "Man" and the "Son of Man." He quotes in exactly the same form the text that "it pleased the whole ple-

[c] The technical use of the word μέγεθος is found also in the Naassene system, p. 107. (See also the Valentinian fragment, Epiph. *Haer.* 31, p. 168.)

roma to dwell bodily in the Son of Man." He teaches the same ascetic doctrine, and describes the men outside his sect as ὅσοι περὶ τὸ γέννημα τῆς θηλείας εἰσὶ πεπλανημένοι. He finds mysteries in Moses' rod (compare p. 133). He employs the same vocabulary ἀβασιλεύτως (pp. 107, 113), μαχίμη (compare pp. 269, 110), μυριόμματος καὶ μυριώνυμος (pp. 270, 117), ῥυείσῃ ἄνωθεν, pp. 270, 115, &c. On the whole the evidence is conclusive that Monoimos was a teacher of this Peratic sect; and apparently his work was used by the Naassene writer.

Coincidences, not less numerous and less striking, are to be found between the Naassene extracts and other writings preserved by Hippolytus. Thus the "fiery god," of whose origin the Naassene gives no explanation, is to be found in the Docetic system (p. 265); and we may also compare the Docetic explanation of the parable of the sower (p. 263) with the Naassene (p. 113). Again, although the system of Justinus differs totally in character from the Naassene, being mythical rather than philosophical, yet there are some striking coincidences. For instance, both find their Good Being in the heathen use of the phallic emblem crowned with fruits (pp. 102, 157), and there Justinus gives a derivation of the name Priapus quite in the style of the Naassene etymology. Again, there is much resemblance between the language in which both speak of the "water above the firmament (pp. 121, 158). The names Naas and Esaldaeus are common to the two writers. Both also endeavour to find their doctrines beneath the veil of heathen mythologies. Under the article SIMON we shall mention some apparent instances of the use in later systems of the work ascribed to that heretic.

When we attempt from such coincidences as have been pointed out, to draw inferences as to the relations between the systems in which they are found, there is an element of uncertainty arising from the fact, that these coincidences are between different documents known to us only through Hippolytus, and that we have no evidence how these documents came into his hands, whether from one source or from several. Gnosticism was evidently in much less credit in his time than it had been in the days of Irenaeus. The works which Irenaeus refutes were in open circulation, but in the time of Hippolytus the Gnostic sects were burrowing underground, and it is his pride to drag to light their secret documents, of which he was evidently an ardent collector. Now collectors are sometimes imposed on by dealers; so that when we find Hippolytus possessed of books purporting to be by heretical teachers of whom we hear from no one else, we cannot quite refuse to put to ourselves the question, did such teachers ever exist, or is it not possible that a heretic who had got a good price from Hippolytus for one of his books, may have been tempted to compose others under different names, with no other object than to sell them to his orthodox customer. But since, notwithstanding many points of agreement, the documents reported as by Hippolytus differ so much among themselves as to make common authorship unlikely, we think their resemblances may be more probably accounted for by the hypothesis, that several reached Hippolytus from the same quarter. He might, for instance, have got hold of the library of the writer whom we have called Naassene, and so have become possessed of the very books which had suggested his speculations.

Besides the two sections already considered, the fifth book of Hippolytus contains sections on two other Ophite systems, that of the Sethians and of Justinus. The latter has been described under its proper head (Vol. III., p. 587). It will be convenient to treat of the former here.

The Sethians [Σιθιανοί, Hippol.; Σηθιανοί, Epiph.; Sethoitae, Ps.-Tert.]. The systems described by Hippolytus under this name in his earlier and in his later work appear to have been quite different. Seth seems to have played no part in the system of the latter book, which appears to have been called Sethite only because contained in a book called the Paraphrase of Seth. It is very closely related to a myth told in the earlier treatise under the head of Nicolaitans, but the Sethite story of the earlier treatise threw some of the commonplaces of Gnosticism into the form of a myth, of which Seth was the hero. This myth is to be found in Epiph. *Haer.* 39; Philaster, 3; Ps.-Tert. 8, the coincidences of language clearly shewing that all three writers drew from the same source. Another article of Epiphanius, on the Archontici (*Haer.* 40) evidently treats of the same school, books of which seem to have become directly known to Epiphanius. Two of these, a greater and a lesser, were called Symphonia; a third was called Ἀλλογενεῖς, by which latter name the sons of Seth were denoted, some books being written in their name, and some in that of their father. The myth assumes the ordinary Gnostic principle, that it was only by inferior angels that the world was made. The myth went on to tell that two of these angels, by intercourse with Eve, became the fathers of Cain and Able respectively. Then arose strife between the angels, which resulted in the death of Abel by the hands of Cain. Then the mother (no doubt the same as the Sophia Prunikos of the other legends), in order to destroy the power of these angels, caused Seth to be born of Adam (and therefore of a "different race" from his elder brothers) and endowed him with a spark of power from above, to enable him to resist the angelic powers and to become the father of a pure seed. The purity of the race, however, becoming corrupted by intermarriages, the mother sent the deluge to sweep away the corrupt brood, but the angels defeated her design by introducing into the ark Ham, one of the race which she had wished to destroy. So the confusion of the world continued and there was a necessity for further interference by the descent of Christ, who according to some of these books was identical with Seth. The angelic nomenclature of these books agrees (but for trifling variations) with that of the Irenaean Ophites. Thus it is Sabaoth, not Ialdabaoth, who is identified with the God of the Jews. The books told of Sethite prophets called Martiades and Marsianus, who were said to have ascended to heaven and apparently to have brought down revelations.

The Sethite section of the later treatise of Hippolytus is of quite a different nature, and aims at being of a philosophic rather than a mythical character, yet, as we have said, it is the development of an older myth told by Epi-

phanius (*Haer.* 25, p. 80), of so repulsive a character that we do not care to relate it at length. As told by Hippolytus it strongly presents Zoroastrian features which are absent from the other sections of his fifth book, the opposition between light and darkness being the main theme. These so-called Sethites, then, teach that there are three principles of the universe, each of those principles containing under it an infinity of powers. These principles are, above, light; below, darkness; and separating between them the spirit, which is to be understood not as a wind perceptible to sense, but as a certain subtle fragrance. The light then pours its rays, the spirit sheds its fragrance, some of which fall upon the terrible waters of darkness, and these eagerly lay hold of the light and strive to detain it. From the concourse of these principles is generated a great womb, namely the seal or type of heaven and earth, which may be seen to have the form of a pregnant womb. In like manner, though the various powers included under the three principles are at rest when by themselves, yet when powers of different kinds come near each other they rush together, and from their concourse is formed a seal or type. In this way, from the concourse of the infinite variety of powers were formed the ideas of the different kinds of living creatures. The agent which gave these actual existence was a principle first born of the water, a rushing mighty wind, the cause of all generation, which is also described as a flying serpent. Through its means some of the light which fell on the darkness and some of the sweet savour of the spirit are bound in human bodies and cannot find release. Then, since the foul womb will admit no form but that of the serpent, the perfect word deceived it by assuming the like form and entering into the womb in order to effect the release of the imprisoned elements. This is what is meant by the "form of a serpent," and by the "Word of God descending into a virgin's womb." By bringing the compounded elements within the reach of this more powerful attraction the compound is resolved. Like runs to like; the Logos elements in man run to the perfect Logos "as chaff runs to amber, as iron runs to the magnet, as gold to the bone of the sea hawk." This resolution of compounds is what is referred to in the saying, "I come not to send peace on earth, but rather a sword."

The appearance for the third time of the illustration[d] from the bone of the sea-hawk arrests attention and forces us to enquire whether, in spite of great apparent unlikeness, this Sethite system may not have affinities with the Naassene and Peratic systems previously described. We find that these heretics have no resemblance whatever to those elsewhere designated Sethites, and that they seem to have been so called by Hippolytus merely because their doctrines were taught in a book bearing the name of Seth. The peculiar character of the book is accounted for when we gain independent knowledge that it is founded on a myth of the Zoroastrian school to which it attempts, with but poor success, to give a philosophic character. But all the fundamental ideas are the same as in the previous sections of the 5th book. We have again the threefold division of the universe, the identification of the Logos with the serpent, the representation of the object of his mission as the releasing of the elements imprisoned in matter. There is the same perverse system of Scripture exegesis; and some sacramental rite of the sect seems to be referred to in what is insisted on in this, as in the other systems, that every one who wishes to put off the form of the serpent, and to put on the heavenly garment, must wash and drink the cup of living water (p. 143: compare p. 158, pp. 100, 116, 121).

Whatever opinion we form as to the authorship of this Sethite document, the affinity of the sect with those previously described is unmistakable. There is, however, far less room to doubt the affinity of the sect with those called DOCETAE (p. 262, sqq.). In a previous article we have noticed the singular discovery of a proof of the triplicity of nature from the three words *σκότος*, *γνόφος*, *θύελλα* (Deut. v. 22). We may here add the technical use of the words *ἰδέα*, *χαρακτήρ*, and the illustration drawn from the eye (pp. 139, 266).

I have no doubt that if any one were to take the trouble to make a concordance to this work of Hippolytus, he would find many coincidences between things told of different sects, which escape one who has made no systematic search for them. On the whole the conclusion at which I arrive is, that we are to take the sections in Hippolytus as representing not necessarily the teaching of different sects, but of different books with which he became acquainted. It is possible that these books may, as he supposed, have emanated from different sects; for the Gnostic sects had affinities between themselves, of which, with our present information, we cannot pretend to give a historical account, many fundamental thoughts and many myths being common to sects which we must recognise as distinct. It is also possible that books which Hippolytus supposed to describe the doctrines of different heresies really emanated from the same sect, nay even may have had a common authorship. So much of what we are told by Hippolytus is peculiar to himself, and cannot be checked by other sources of information that it seems rash to be over-confident in choosing in what way the coincidences that have been pointed out are to be accounted for.

Ophite teaching was, as we believe, dying out in the days of Hippolytus; in the time of Epiphanius it was not absolutely extinct, but the notices in his work would lead us to think of it as but the eccentric doctrine of some stray heretic here and there, and not to have counted many adherents. In the 5th century Theodoret tells (*Haer. Fab.* i. 24) of having found serpent worship practised in his diocese by people whom he calls Marcionites, but whom we may believe to have been really Ophites. But the most curious instance of the spread and survival of the notions of this sect is that Ophite teachers would seem to have penetrated to India (see *Asiatic Researches*, x. p. 40). [G. S.]

[d] Possibly this illustration was found in the work of Simon, and was borrowed thence by later Gnostic writers.

OPILIO, deacon of the church of Venafrum, and Crescentius were accused of selling certain

of the ornaments of the church to a Jew, viz. two silver chalices, two coronae with the dolphins that supported them, the lilies from other coronae, and six large and seven small pallia. Gregory, in August 591, directs the sub-deacon Anthemius to inquire into the matter. (*Epp.* i. 68.) [F. D.]

OPILIUS, bishop of Ebusus (Iviça), attended the council of bishops assembled by Hunneric at Carthage in A.D. 484 (*Notitia Africana*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 276). Ebusus, with the Balearic Islands, then belonged, both civilly and ecclesiastically, to the Province of Sardinia. [F. D.]

OPINATORES (OPINARII, OPINANTES), heretics so named from the Latin rendering of the word Δοκηταί (Baron. *A. E.* ann. 191, ii). [DOCETAE.] [C. H.]

OPPA, bishop of Tuy, signs thirty-third the canons of the 13th Council of Toledo, in A.D. 683. His episcopate must have been short, as his predecessor signs the canons of the 12th, and his successor those of the 15th, Council of Toledo, in A.D. 681 and 688 (Tejado y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 481, 512). Florez (*Esp. Sag.* xxii. 33) disproves the theory that he was the same person as the traitor Oppas. [F. D.]

OPPAS, archbishop of Seville, son of king EGICA, and brother of king WITIZA, the last but one of the Gothic kings of Spain. He became archbishop shortly before his brother's death. That he and his brother Sisebut, and his nephews, the sons of Witiza, headed a party hostile to RODERIC, and that the defeat of the latter by the Arabs, and the conquest of Spain, was mainly due to their treason or treachery seems certain, but the details are wrapt in the obscurity in which all the events connected with the overthrow of the Goths are involved. According to one version (Sebastian, *Chron.* in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 478) they sent messengers to invite the invaders from Africa, and furnished them with ships. Dozy (*Recherches sur l'histoire de l'Espagne*, i. 74) disbelieves this story, as unsupported by Arabian sources, from which he gives the following account. The family of Witiza had been apparently but not really reconciled to Roderic, and avenged themselves upon him by deserting him in the fatal battle. They supposed that the expedition of Taric, like that of his predecessor Tarif, was a mere descent for plunder, and that on his departure they would be able to regain the throne, and indeed Mousa, when he despatched his lieutenant, had no designs of permanent conquest. When they discovered their mistake, they came to terms with the conquerors, and Oppas in particular is accused of taking an active part on their side on two occasions. He arrested and executed certain lords at Toledo, who were meditating flight (Isidorus Pacensis in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 1263), and he accompanied the army that attacked Pelayo in his mountain stronghold, and was taken prisoner in their rout (*Chron. Albeldense* in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 450). According to the Chronicle of Sebastian (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 479) he was sent to summon Pelayo to surrender. (Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2), 242; *Esp. Sag.* ix. 229). [F. D.]

OPPILA, an ambassador from the Spanish Arian king Leovigild to Chilperic, the catholic king of the Franks. On his first arrival he professed to hold the catholic faith, but his Arianism was discovered by an observation he made upon the worship of the Frank church:—"You do not recite the gloria correctly; for whereas we, after St. Paul, say 'Gloria Deo Patri per filium,' you say 'Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto.'" There followed a long debate, which is preserved in Gregory of Tours, but with what effect on Oppila is not known. His colleague Agila, however, after his return to Spain, adopted the catholic view (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Fr.* vi. 40 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 316). [R. J. K.]

OPPORTUNA, ST., abbess of Monasteriolum or Montreuil in Normandy. To other virtues she added extreme gentleness, correcting the faults of her nuns with words instead of blows. When her brother St. Godegrand bishop of Séez returned from a seven years' pilgrimage to Rome, and was murdered at the instigation of his kinsman and locum-tenens, Chrodobert, between Opportuna's monastery and that of her aunt St. Lantildis at Almenèches, she carried him to Monasteriolum, and buried him in her church. She survived him one year, dying about A.D. 770. Her life, written in the following century by St. Adalelmus or Adelinus, bishop of Séez, is given by Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* iii. pars. ii. 220, edit. 1672, and by Henschenius, Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iii. p. 61. Her day is April 22. She is not commemorated in the old Martyrologies, nor in the modern Roman, but is praised in the Acts of St. Godegrand (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. i. 763; *Gallia Christiana*, xi. 677). She is one of the patron saints of Paris and of Almenèches and is represented with an angel near her, in allusion to a tradition that when she entered the monastery to take the veil, the nuns saw her guardian angel walking by her side (Cahier, *Caractéristiques des Saints*, 43, 626, 660). [A. B. C. D.]

OPPORTUNUS (1), abbat of the monastery of ST. LEONTIUS (72), complained to Gregory the Great that certain relics of the martyr had been stolen from his church. Gregory thereupon writes to Petrus, bishop of Hydruntum, (Otranto) asking him to send something to be substituted in their place, as the body of Leontius was preserved in the church of Brundusium, over which Petrus had a visitatorial jurisdiction (*Epp.* vi. 62). [F. D.]

OPPORTUNUS (2), of Aprutium (Teramo) had been rebuked by Gregory the Great, who, hearing afterwards that he was overwhelmed with grief in consequence, wrote to encourage him, exhorting him to turn to God with his whole heart, to be charitable to his neighbours, to forgive injuries, and to think it gain if he had been unjustly blamed. (*Epp.* x. 68.) Gregory afterwards heard that he was leading a religious life, and directs Passivus, bishop of Firmum, to summon him and exhort him to persevere; and if he found he had done nothing worthy of death, to advise him to become a monk or subdeacon, and after a time, commit to his charge Aprutium, which had long been without a pastor (xii. 12). [F. D.]

OPTATIANUS. [PORFIRIUS.]

OPTATUS (1), a bishop stated to have appeared after death in a vision to St. Saturus. Morcelli (*Afr. Chr.* ii. 54) makes him bishop of Carthage, A.D. 201–204. [PERPETUA.] Tillemont concludes that nothing can be decided from the mention of Optatus as to the place of martyrdom of St. Saturus and St. Perpetua. (Tillemont, iii. 151, 644; *Visio Saturi* in Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Mart. i. 636.) [R. J. K.]

OPTATUS (2), African bishop (Cyp. *Ep.* 56). [AHIMNIUS.] [E. W. B.]

OPTATUS (3), Carthaginian confessor, after being lector and master of catechumens (*Doctor Audientium*), to which office he was appointed after examination by the bishop and presbyter-teachers (*doctores*, compare *Aspasius* in *Act. Perpet. et Felic.* xiii.), he was made subdeacon at the same time and for the same purpose as SATURUS was ordained for. (Cyp. *Ep.* 29; *Ep.* 35.) [E. W. B.]

OPTATUS (4), a bishop mentioned in the Acts of ST. JUSTINA (4). He is said to have baptized that saint, and to have ordained her father a presbyter (Boll. *Acta SS.* 26 Sep. vii. 218). The Bollandist Cleus, followed by Le Quien, reckons him bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, about A.D. 300. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* i. 1037.) [G. T. S.]

OPTATUS (5) [SARAGOSSA, MART. OF.]

OPTATUS (6), saint and martyr (?), bishop of Milevis, or Mileum (Milah), a town of Numidia, 25 m. N.W. of Cirta (Shaw, *Trav.* p. 63), a vigorous opponent of the Donatists. He says of himself that he wrote about sixty years, or rather more, after the persecution under Diocletian, i.e. c. A.D. 363. St. Jerome speaks of him in general terms as having written during the reigns of Valentinian and Valens, A.D. 365–378. But in the second book of his treatise Siricius is mentioned as bishop of Rome, "qui est noster socius." As Siricius did not succeed Damasus until A.D. 384, these words may have been inserted, as Baronius suggests, by the transcriber of his book, or he may have outlived the period mentioned by St. Jerome, and himself inserted them at a later time. The date of his death, however, is unknown. He is called a saint by Fulgentius, and a martyr by Baronius, on the authority of the Roman Martyrology, which connects his name with June 4. But no church or altar is known to be dedicated to his memory, and no public persecution was raging at any time when his death may be supposed to have taken place. St. Augustine mentions his name once in the same sentence as St. Ambrose, and elsewhere as a church-writer of high authority, even among Donatists. (*Opt. c. Don.* i. 13, ii. 3; S. Hieron. *Vir. Illustr.* c. 110, vol. ii. p. 706; Aug. *c. Don. ep.* (*de Unit. Eccl.*) 19, 50; *c. Parm.* i. 3, 5; *Brevic. Coll.* 20, 38; *Doctr. Christ.* ii. 40, 61; Baronius, *Ann.* vol. iv. p. 243; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 275; Dupin, *Optatus Praef.* 1.)

The treatise of Optatus against the Donatists is in the form of a letter to Parmenian, Donatist bishop of Carthage, and consists of six books, with a seventh of doubtful authenticity.

I. The first book opens with a eulogy of peace, which he complains that the Donatists set at nought by reviling the Catholics. He adds some compliments to Parmenian, as the only one of his party with whom he can communicate freely, and regrets being compelled to do so by letter, because they refuse to meet for conference. Some statements by Parmenian, who is a "peregrinus," i.e. perhaps not a native of Africa, but certainly belonging to a different province, were made in ignorance, especially such as related to the sending of the soldiers. Like the Catholics, Donatists maintain unity of baptism, yet they repeat it, and in so doing covertly commend themselves as the only persons fit to administer that rite. But if it be unlawful for "traditors" to do this, they ought to be excluded, for their own fathers were guilty of "tradition;" and if for schismatics, they themselves are guilty of schism. Five points call for discussion, to which Optatus adds a sixth. 1. In accusing Catholics of "tradition," particulars ought to be specified of time and place. 2. The true church ought to be defined. 3. Which side is really responsible for calling in the aid of the soldiers. 4. What Parmenian means by "sinners" whose "oil and sacrifice" God rejects. 5. The question of baptism. 6. The riotous and rash acts of the Donatists. But before proceeding farther Optatus finds fault with Parmenian for his inconsiderate language about our Lord's baptism, to the effect that His flesh required to be "drowned in the flood" of Jordan, in order to remove its impurity. If the baptism of Christ's body were intended to suffice for the baptism of each single person, there might be some truth in this, but we are baptized, in virtue not of the flesh of Christ, but of His name, and moreover we cannot believe that even His flesh contracted sin, for it was more pure than Jordan itself. It is probable, however, as Ribbeck remarks, that Optatus, in his anxiety to prevent misapplication by others of the language of Parmenian in this matter, has taken it in too literal a sense, and imputed to it a meaning beyond what it was intended to convey. Having complained of Parmenian for dragging in heretical names irrelevantly, as if to magnify his charges against the church, he agrees with him in what he says about heretics, how the gifts of the church, the sacraments, and marriage do not truly belong to them, and he quotes Cant. iv. 12, vi. 9, in support of this view. They have not the keys of St. Peter, nor the ring which is the seal of admission, closing the "fountain," for it was not Caecilianus who withdrew from the chair of Peter and of Cyprian, but Majorinus, whose seat is now filled by Parmenian. As a schismatic, he ought to shrink from joining heretics, for there is a great difference between heresy and schism, yet by their conduct the Donatists condemn themselves in this respect. But it is necessary to recount the history of the past, which he gives in detail, for which the reader may be referred for the most part to the articles on DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 882; CAECILIANUS, *ib.* p. 367; FELIX (26), Vol. II. p. 487; LUCILLA, Vol. III. p. 751. A few particulars, however, may be added. 1. That Mensurius, having been summoned by Maxentius to account for his protection afforded to Felix (187), died on his return to Carthage. 2. The schism at Car-

thage arose partly from the disappointment of Botrus and Celestius, partly from the ill-will of the Seniors against Caecilianus for detecting their dishonesty, and partly from the conduct of Lucilla. The purpose of Optatus is to shew that it was not the church which cast off the Donatists, but they who separated from the church, following in this respect the example of Korah and his company. When they disclaim the right of princes to interfere in the affairs of the church they contradict their forefathers, who, when the matter of Caecilianus was in dispute, petitioned Constantine to grant them judges from Gaul instead of from Africa.

II. In the second book Optatus proceeds to discuss the question, what is the church, the dove and bride of Christ, Cant. vi. 9. Its holiness consists in the sacraments, and is not to be measured by the pride of men. It is universal, not limited, as Parmenian would have it, to a corner of Africa, for if so where would be the promises of Pss. ii. 8, lxxii. 8? And the merits of the Saviour would be restricted, Pss. cxiii. 3, xcvi. 7. The church has five gifts, which Donatists make six. 1. The chair of Peter. 2. The angel which is attached inseparably to the first. By this Optatus appears to mean the power of conferring spiritual gifts, which resides in the centre of episcopal unity. Parmenian must be aware that the episcopal chair was conferred from the beginning on Peter, the chief of the apostles, so that in virtue of this one chair unity might be preserved among the rest, and no one apostle set up a rival opponent. This chair, with whose exclusive claim for respect the little Donatist community can in no way compete [MACROBIUS, MONTENSES, Vol. III. 781, 947], carries with it necessarily the "angel" (ducit ad se angelum), unless the Donatists have this gift enclosed for their own use in a narrow space, and excluding the seven angels of St. John (Rev. i.), with whom they have no communion; or if they possess one of these, let them send him to other churches: otherwise their case falls to the ground. 3. The holy spirit of adoption, which Donatists claim exclusively for themselves, applying to Catholics unjustly the words of our Lord about proselytism, Matth. xxiii. 15. 4. The fountain (probably faith) of which heretics cannot partake, and 5. its seal, "annulus" (probably baptism), Cant. iv. 12. But a want of clearness in the language of Optatus at this point renders his meaning somewhat doubtful. The Donatists add a sixth gift, the "umbilicus" of Cant. vii. 2, which they regard as the altar; but this, being an essential part of the body, cannot be a separate gift. These gifts belong to the church in Africa, from which the Donatists have cut themselves off, as also from the priesthood, which they seek by re-baptism to annul, though they do not rebaptize their own returned seceders. But why do they lay so much stress on gifts, for these belong to the bride, not the bride to them. They regard them as the generating power of the church instead of the essentials (viscera), viz. the Sacraments, which derive their virtue from the Trinity. Parmenian truly compares the church to a garden, but it is God who plants the trees therein, some of which Donatists seek to exclude. In offering the sacrifice to God in the Eucharist, they profess to offer for the one church, but by their re-baptism they really make two churches. Thanking Parmenian for his language about the church, which, however, he claims as applicable to the Catholic church alone, he challenges him to point out any act of persecution on its part. Constantine took pains to restore peace and suppress idolatry, but another emperor, who declared himself an apostate, when he restored idolatry allowed the Donatists to return, a permission for the acceptance of which they ought to blush. It was about this time that the outrages broke out in Africa [FELIX (185), URBANUS], of which when Primosus complained, the Donatist council at Theneste took no notice. Besides others mentioned above [Vol. I. p. 883] they compelled women under vows to disregard them and perform a period of penance, and deposed from his office Donatus bishop of Tysedis. Yet they speak of holiness as if Christ gave it without conditions, and take every opportunity of casting reproach on church ordinances, fulfilling the words of Ezek. xiii. 20.

III. In the third book, after going over again some of the former ground, and as before laying the blame of the schism on the Donatists, Optatus applies to them, in a figurative way, several passages of Scripture, especially Pss. lxxxvii., cxlvii., Is. ii. 3, xxii. 1, 9. In these he considers Zion, though destroyed as a city, to denote the church spread over the Roman empire. The "old pool" (Is. xxii. 9) answers to baptism, which, together with the fish of Tobit vi. denoting Jesus Christ, they have endeavoured to divert. Daniel foretold four persecutions, but neither of these answers to the so-called persecution under Macarius, and their proceedings have made them liable to the denunciation of Ezek. xiii. 10–15, for it was their wall of "untempered mortar" which Leontius and others were obliged to destroy. If these men were to blame, then Elijah and Phineas were so also. They surely come under the denunciation of Is. v. 20, and also the prophecies about Tyre, Is. xxiii., Ezek. xxviii.

IV. In the fourth book, disclaiming all unfriendly feeling, and appealing to the common possessions of both parties, Optatus charges the Donatists with infraction of unity by appointment of bishops, and by proselytism, by forbidding social intercourse, and perversely applying to Catholics Scripture passages directed against obstinate heretics, as 1 Cor. v. 11, 2 John 10. As to the "oil and sacrifice" which they say ought not to be administered by sinners, God is the judge of this, as appears from Ps. l. 16–20, and the word "sinners" in Ps. cxli. 5 ought not to be applied in the sense in which they apply it against Catholics.

V. In his fifth book Optatus returns to the oft-repeated subject of re-baptism. Of his argument an abstract will be found in Vol. I. p. 886, to which little need be added. The repetition of baptism, he says, is an insult to the Trinity, worse than the doctrines of Praxeas and the Patripassians. In the confusion caused by the opposite doctrines of Catholics and Donatists, an umpire seems to be necessary, but what judge, he asks, can be required beyond the plain words of Scripture, John xiii. 8, Eph. iv. 5? Three elements are requisite: (1) the Trinity, (2) the minister, (3) the faithful receiver; but of these the Donatists exalt the second above the other

two. They use as a quotation words not found in Scripture, "How can a man give what he has not received?" (see 1 Cor. iv. 7); but in baptism God alone is the giver of grace. As it is not the dyer who changes the colour of his wool, so neither does the minister of himself change the operation of baptism. Of two candidates for baptism, if one refused to renounce while the other consented, there can be no doubt which of them received baptism effectually. By re-baptizing Donatists rob Christians of their marriage garment, that robe which suits all ages and conditions of life. He who has permitted himself to be rebaptized will rise no doubt at the last day, but he will rise naked, and the voice of the Master will be heard, "Friend, I once knew thee, and gave thee a marriage-garment; who has despoiled thee of it, into what trap, amongst what thieves hast thou fallen?" According to Donatists, he who misses their ministers and doorkeepers is cast out of the heavenly company; will their holiness raise the dead and mend men's lives? If not, why meddle with the living and slay those that ought not to die? (Ezek. xiii. 19.)

VI. In the sixth book he repeats some previous charges against Donatists, and adds others, how they destroyed altars, the "seats of Christ's Body and Blood," at which they themselves must have offered. But during service the tables are covered, and if so, not the wooden tables but the cloths must have been in fault, but if the tables, then the ground on which they stood. They have broken up chalices and sold them to women and even to pagans, yet they quote Hagg. ii. 14; but even impurity of men does not profane the vessels of service, see Numb. xvi. 37, 38. They compelled virgins to change their caps, but St. Paul gave no command about virgins, 1 Cor. vii. 25, thus confessing that he had expended the "two pence" of Luke x. 35, viz. the two Testaments. By taking away these caps, which in themselves are no remedy against sin, they expose the women to danger. They have also taken away sacred books and instruments, and ventured to purify the latter of these; but if so why not the books also? They have washed the walls of churches with salt water, and forbidden in them burial of Catholics. Lastly, they seek to seduce Catholics from the faith.

VII. The seventh book, which is not mentioned by St. Jerome, but which may on good MS. grounds be ascribed to Optatus, is supplementary to the six previous books, and answers a fresh complaint made by the Donatists, that if they are the children of "traditors," as Optatus says, they ought to be let alone, and no attempt made to "reconcile" them; but, says Optatus, though their fathers deserved to be excluded, there is no reason why they should be so, for the church repels no baptized persons. Christ allows two sorts of seed to grow in His field, and no bishop has power to do what the apostles could not, viz. separate them. They might have refused to communicate with Peter because he denied his Lord, yet he retained the keys given to him by Christ. They sometimes quote Eccl. x. 1 regarding "ointment" as God's grace; but if the ointment belongs exclusively to them, how can Catholics corrupt it if Donatists refuse to mix with them? They compare themselves to Moses withstanding Jannes and Jambres, but are the chair and keys of Peter signs of falsehood? The case ought really to be inverted. Lastly their accusations against Macarius cannot be sustained, but Donatists seek to condemn him in his absence by the testimony of persons who do not acknowledge that he acted wrongly.

The foregoing abstract, taken in connexion with the article on Donatism (Vol. I. pp. 885, 886), may perhaps be taken as a sufficient account of the work of Optatus, of which we may say that it is more important in a historical than in a doctrinal point of view. As a theological treatise it is often loose and rambling, and guilty of frequent repetition; but it exposes with clearness and force the inconsistency of the Donatists, and of all who, like them, fix their attention exclusively on the ethical side of religion, estimated by an arbitrary standard of opinion, to the disregard of other conditions of the greatest importance in the constitution of a church. How perversely and inconsistently the Donatists applied this principle in the matter of re-baptism, Optatus again and again demonstrates, returning in various parts of his treatise to this point with much soreness of feeling. That there was a doctrine of re-baptism in the African church, to which Cyprian had lent the weight of his authority, there can be no doubt, but with him it was directed against heretics; on the principle that the followers of Marcion, Praxeas, and the like, were in fact not truly Christians, and thus their baptism was in itself valueless. But Optatus is never weary of urging, that though by their own act Donatists had incurred the charge of schism, the church did not regard them as heretics, and that they ought not to treat as heretical their brethren who disclaimed fastening on them that opprobrious name. In maintaining the unity of the church, a principle upheld by Donatists no less strongly than by Catholics, Optatus insists greatly on communion with the church of Rome and the chair of St. Peter, and he is accordingly cited by Romanist writers with much confidence as an important witness to the supremacy of the papal chair. No doubt his words taken alone appear strongly to support that view, but they must be weighed in connexion with the words and also the conduct of Cyprian and other church authorities, and thus compared they will be found to assert no more than the necessity, so obvious in that day, of communion with the Roman church, and its acknowledged primacy among the other churches of the Christian community. In his application of Scripture passages, especially of a prophetical and symbolical kind, Optatus may be thought too strained and fanciful; but his mode of application is in accordance with the current interpretations of the time, and would probably agree in principle, though not in application, with such as were recognised by his opponents. His style, though not always clear, and often harsh, is for the most part homely and unpretending, and though sometimes pompous and inflated, contains one passage at least which rises to eloquence (v. 20).

The earliest printed edition of the works of Optatus was prepared by John Cochlée, dean of St. Mary, Frankfort, and published at Mentz, 1549, but was full of errors. A corrected edition of this was published at Paris in 1562 by Baudouin, and a further one by the same

editor, with corrections, notes, dissertations, and important historical additions, in 1569. This was followed in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, vol. 4. Other editions followed at various times, including one by Gabriel de l'Aubespine bishop of Orleans, published in 1631, after his death, and probably from that cause containing many mistakes, and one by Meric Casaubon, London, 1631, which as regards the text is mainly a reprint with conjectural emendations, but containing some useful notes. At length the work of a new edition, on the basis of fresh MSS., was undertaken by Dupin, who published the seven books as they now stand at Paris in 1700. This was reprinted at Amsterdam in 1701, and at Antwerp, best ed., thin folio, in 1702, and is the groundwork of all subsequent editions. One of his new MSS. contains documents relating to the Donatists, which were unknown before, and to his revised text he added valuable notes, both of his own and by previous editors. A reprint of Dupin will be found in Galland, *Bibliotheca Patr.* vol. v. The text alone was published by Oberthür in vol. 12 of his *Bibliotheca*, Würzb. 1789, with a second volume (13) of various readings and useful notes, selected and original. The form, 8vo, is convenient, and the additional documents are numbered, but the misprints are very numerous and perplexing. The text, without notes, appears in Caillau's *Collection*, vol. 57. The edition of Dupin has lately been reprinted in the 11th volume of Migne's *Patrologia*, and his pagination is preserved; but the map being smaller in size is less clear than in Dupin's folio, and all the documents previous to A.D. 362 are purposely omitted and must be sought for in vol. viii. of the *Patrologia*. Thus the edition of Dupin, though perhaps in some respects less convenient in size, is altogether the best and most comprehensive. An account of Optatus and his writings will be found in Ceillier, vol. v.

[H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (7), Donatist bishop of Thamugada, in which see he preceded Gaudentius, though in what year he became bishop does not appear. (Aug. *c. Gaud.* i. 38, 52.) He was a violent partisan of the original Donatist party, and as such supported Primian against the Maximianists. He attached himself to Gildo so closely, and as his opponents said, in so servile a manner, as to obtain the name of Gildonianus, and in their opinion deserved every possible epithet of reproach, thief, plunderer, traitor, tyrant, viper, which the excesses of Gildo, during his ten years' ascendancy in Africa, drew down upon him from every one, whether Jew, Pagan or Christian. Perhaps in the violence of the general invective there is some exaggeration, especially in the charge brought against him that he regarded Gildo as a deity, but he certainly appears to have made unscrupulous use of the military force under Gildo's command to carry out a system of persecution both against Catholics and Maximianists, destroying a church belonging to the latter, and even marching, it was said, over the corpses of the slain to accomplish his purposes; and by his conduct bringing more discredit on the Donatist party than any African traitor had brought on the rest of the world. His persecution was so far successful as to compel the people of Musti and Assurae with their bishops Felicianus and Rogatus, who had succeeded to Praetextatus, to return to the original party of the Donatists, by whom his conduct is said to have been cordially approved, and his birthday, i.e. probably the anniversary of his episcopate, celebrated with honour. [FELICIANUS (4).] After the downfall of Gildo he was apprehended, and died in prison, a conclusion which Augustine was falsely charged by Petilian of contributing to bring about. His memory was held in respect by the Donatists, by whom he was regarded as a martyr. Emeritus was taunted by Augustine, if not with sympathy, at least with faint condemnation of his behaviour, and Cresconius and Petilian taxed with declaring themselves unable to express a decided opinion concerning him, either of acquittal or condemnation. In arguing with Petilian on the subject of Baptism, Augustine mentions the argument current among Donatists that Catholic Baptism was invalid, because of the bad character of those who administered it, and in reply he asks how they can regard as valid baptism by such a man as Optatus. While they argued that re-baptism was justified by the fact that St. Paul re-baptized persons baptized by St. John the Baptist, they forget that St. Paul's baptism was not in his own name, but in that of Christ, and that the efficacy of baptism does not after all depend on the personal character of the minister. (Aug. *Parm.* ii. 1, 2; *c. Petil.* i. 10, 11; 13, 14; 18, 20; ii. 23, 53, 54; 37, 85, 88, 103, 237; iii. 40, 48; *c. Cresc.* iii. 13, 16; iv. 25, 32; 46, 55; *c. Gaud.* i. 38, 52. *Ep.* li. 3; liii. 3, 6; lxxvi. 3; lxxxvii. 4, 5, 8; cviii. 2, 5.)

[H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (8), prefect of Constantinople in the latter part of A.D. 404, subsequently to the banishment of Chrysostom and the conflagration of the cathedral. Optatus, who was a bigoted pagan, had held the praefectship of Egypt, c. A.D. 384 (*Cod. Theod.* ed. Gothofred, tom. vi. pp. 310, 311), and that of Constantinople in A.D. 398 (*ibid.* tom. iv. p. 493; xii. tit. i. lex 160 *de Decur.*). He was appointed praefect a second time in the place of Studius, who had shewn himself too lenient in his treatment of the adherents of Chrysostom. No such charge could be brought against Optatus. He felt the implacable animosity of a thorough pagan against the new faith, and evidently rejoiced in the opportunity offered him of treating its adherents with contumely and cruelty. He endeavoured to extort confessions of complicity in the conflagration by the most horrible tortures, under which some of his victims expired. [EUTROPIUS; SERAPION; TIGRIUS.] The noble ladies who were known to be friends and supporters of Chrysostom were dragged before him, and counselled to communicate with Arsacius or to brave the consequences. Some few complied. The majority stood firm, among whom the deaconesses Pentadia and Olympias held a distinguished place for the courage of their confession. It proving impossible to substantiate the charge of setting the cathedral on fire, and equally hopeless to bend her to his will, Olympias was dismissed. Towards the middle of the following year, A.D. 405, Olympias was summoned before Optatus a second time, and was fined 200 lb. of gold

(Socr. *H. E.* vi. 18; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24; Pallad. *Dial.* p. 28). The fourth law *de usuris* was addressed to him, A.D. 405. (*Cod. Theod.* tom. i. p. 237; ii. tit. 33.) [E. V.]

OPTATUS (9), a bishop, perhaps of Milevis, who joined with St. Augustine and other Catholic bishops in exculpating Marcellinus from the charge brought against him by the Donatists of corrupt partiality at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411; Aug. *Ep.* cxli. 169, 13; clxxxv. 6. MARCELLINUS (7). He also wrote to Augustine a letter, of which Renatus was the bearer, requesting his opinion on the metaphysical question of the propagation of the human soul, a subject concerning which there was much discussion in the church at that time, and on which previously to the conference Marcellinus had written to Augustine and also to St. Jerome to ask their opinion, to whom, together with his wife Anapsychia, St. Jerome replied, excusing himself from discussing the question at length on the ground of want of time, but mentioning what he believed to be the opinion generally held by the Western church, viz. that the soul is transmitted by descent, though he himself was disposed to think that each soul is created separately, and recommending his correspondents to consult Augustine as being within their reach in Africa. (Aug. *Ep.* cxliii. 165.) In reference to this appeal Augustine wrote to St. Jerome declining to give any positive opinion of his own on the question, and requesting one from him, approving his condemnation of Origen's notion that, as a punishment for sins committed in other states of being, souls transmigrate into other bodies (Hieron. *adv. Ruff.* iii. 30), mentioning that in his own book on Free Will he had stated the opinions on the subject which were current at that time, and stating some important objections to them of the same kind as those which he states in his subsequent letter to Optatus. (*Ep.* clxvi. A.D. 415.) In his reply to Optatus, Augustine persists in declining to give a positive opinion, but discusses the question cautiously yet with all respect and deference for his friend. The question put by him was whether the soul is derived from a single original creation, as in the case with natural descent, or proceeds in each case from a separate act of the Creator. In his book on Free Will Augustine had mentioned two other notions, viz. that souls which existed in a previous state of being, are either transferred into other bodies by a divine impulse, or pass into them of themselves (*de Lib. Arb.* iii. 21). Dismissing in the course of his letter as untenable, some arguments of a merely verbal kind founded on such passages as Gen. ii. 23; xlvi. 26; Ps. xxxiii. (xxxii.) 15; Eccl. xii. 7; Zech. xii. 1, pointing out the error contained in Tertullian's opinion that the original of the soul was not a spiritual but a bodily substance (Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 7; *de An.* 7; Aug. *Gen. ad lit.* x. 25), and shewing that as in the case of Esau and Jacob, the soul's existence in men's corruptible body is no part of a punishment for sin committed in another state of being (Rom. ix. 11, 13), he points out the necessity of reconciling any opinion on the subject with the two cardinal doctrines (1) of original sin incurred in the person of Adam, and (2) redemption through Christ alone with neither of which can any speculative opinion as to the origin of the soul be allowed to interfere. Even if no answer can be given to the question, the fact of redemption must stand firm. The law came in to take away any notion of men's self-sufficiency, and both they who under the law believed in a Redeemer to come, and also all righteous men at any time, either before or after the Incarnation, are raised through faith in Him. (Acts xv. 10, 11; 2 Cor. iv. 13.) As he pointed out in his letter to St. Jerome, the case appears most strongly in that of infants. Having no actual sin of their own; if they be a new creation, and in virtue of this newness they be exempt from the guilt of original sin, how can it be true, as the church believes, that this sin of theirs is remitted through the sacrament of the One Mediator, while those who die without it do not obtain the benefit which it confers? If these new souls are liable to condemnation, they must have derived their origin not from God but from some other author. God's anger is not a sudden passion but a serious determination, in which He uses the condemnation of the wicked as a warning to the good. Infants dying regenerate and taken to bliss, cannot be said to obtain this by any exercise of free will, any more than those who die without this grace in the lump (massa) of condemnation, in which, except for God's mercy, all would be included. His mercy may thus be said to assist the children and prevent the grown people. The transmission of the soul is not less intelligible than the communication of light from one object to another without diminution of itself, he cannot believe that regeneration of infants is fictitious, or that God is the author of the stain in them. While he is unable to form a definite judgment on the matter from canonical scripture, he warns his friend against falling into a new error like that of Pelagius, on which he will send him the judgment of the apostolic see, if he has not already seen it (ZOSIMUS). This heresy consists in denying, not that souls proceed from a sinful origin, but that children derive from Adam any taint which must be removed in baptism. If, said Pelagius, the soul is not propagated, but only the body, then the body alone ought to be punished. That the soul of the Mediator derived no taint from Adam cannot be doubted, not because he was unable to obtain for himself a soul without sin, nor to create a new one for that body which being free from sin He himself took from his Virgin Mother. (Aug. *Ep.* 190.) [H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (10), a presbyter, bearer of a letter from St. Augustine to Celer, proconsul of Africa. [CELER (1).] (Aug. *Ep.* 56.) [H. W. P.]

OPTATUS (11), bishop of Sitifa, A.D. 525, mentioned in the address of bishop Boniface to the council of Carthage; obliged to absent himself from the meeting of the council on a special commission for king Hilderic. (Hardouin, ii. 1075; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 284.) [R. J. K.]

OPTATUS (12) ST., bishop of Auxerre in the 6th century. Commemorated on Feb. 18 (*Gall. Chr.* xii. 266). [C .H.]

OPTATUS (13), defensor, was charged by Gregory the Great, in A.D. 603, to inquire if

certain clerics at Nursia had women in their houses who were not related to them. If this was true, he was to admonish them to desist, and if they were contumacious to call in the aid of CHRYSANTHUS, bishop of Spoleto. (*Epp.* xiii. 35.) He is probably not the same person as the defensor of the same name mentioned in another letter (*Epp.* xiii. 11). [F. D.]

OPTATUS (14), abbat of Monte Casino. St. Boniface archbishop of Mainz writes to him and his community, exhorting to brotherly love, and recommending the establishment of a confraternity with his own monks, A.D. 752. He ruled the monastery from about 752 to Jan. 4, 760. (Jaffé, *Monum. Mogunt.* 256; Bonif. *Ep.* 82 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix.; Ceillier, xii. 52; *Vid.* Leo, *Chron. Mon. Cas.* in Pertz, *Mon. Hist.* vii. 585, 586.) [R. J. K.]

OPTIMUS (1), bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, to which he was translated from Agdamia (Soc. vii. 36), which Le Quien (i. 817) calls Acmonia in Phrygia Pacatiana. He was one of the most distinguished orthodox prelates of his time, having undauntedly defended the Catholic faith under Valens, and had refuted heretics (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 20). He attended the council of Constantinople in 381 (Theod. *H. E.* v. 8; Labbe, ii. 957), and was appointed one of the centres of Catholic communion for the Eastern church (designated "patriarch" by Socrates, *H. E.* v. 8), by the council and the emperor Theodosius, representing in that capacity the diocese of Asia, together with Amphilochius of Iconium (*Cod. Theod. de fid. Cath.* xvi. tit. i. lex 3, tom. vi. p. 9). While at Constantinople he signed the will of Gregory Nazianzen as a witness. He also shared in the bounty of Olympias for the poor of her diocese, and, dying in the imperial city, his eyes were closed by the same holy woman (Pallad. p. 116). We have a very long letter of Basil's addressed to Optimus in A.D. 377, expounding at his request the passages relating to Cain (Gen. iv. 15), Lamech (*ib.* 23–25), and the words of Simeon (Lu. ii. 34, 35) (Basil, *Ep.* 260 [317]). Optimus is mentioned in the petition of the deacon Basil and other monks, in the acts of the council of Ephesus, among the holy fathers whose doctrine they desired to follow. (Labbe, iii. 426.) [E. V.]

OPTIMUS (2), proconsul of Asia in the time of the Decian persecution, under whom several martyrs suffered at Lampsacus. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Mai. iii. 453 E; Tillem. iii. 345, 346, 392–394; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* pp. 144, 147.) [G. T. S.]

OR. [See HOR.]

ORACH, abbat of Lismore and of Inch Var-Shelmaliere, co. Wexford, died A.D. 781. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 780.) [J. G.]

ORATORIA, the name of an abbess addressed in one of the letters of Caesarius bishop of Arles, according to the reading of Holstenius, "Epistola ad Oratoriam Abbatissam" (*Codex Regul.* iii. 40); but Migne (*Pat. Lat.* t. lxvii. 1135) heads the letter, "Epistola Hortatoria ad Virginem." (Ceill. xi. 152; Boll. *Acta SS.* 27th Aug. vi. 63.) [J. G.]

ORDBRIHT (1), the name assigned to the first of the fictitious abbats of Westminster. He is stated, in Sporley's MS. history of the abbey, to have ruled for twelve years, and to have died on the 13th of January, 616 (*Mon. Angl.* i. 266). The early history of Westminster is very obscure, and the fictitious portions of it are hardly entitled to the name of legends, as they emerge so late from utter darkness. There is no mention of the abbey or of any church on the site, in any contemporary authority before the time of Hardicanute, whom the chronicle states to have been buried there (*M. H. B.* p. 432). Yet within five and twenty years the abbey has risen into the first rank of monastic foundations, and a few years later possesses a history running back to the first ages of the English Church. Under the auspices of abbat Vitalis, who ruled from 1076 to 1082, a monk called Sulcard wrote an elaborate account of the ancient and miraculous foundation; and later writers, Sporley in particular, who lived in the 15th century, threw the history back to the age of King Lucius. According to Sulcard, the founder was a Londoner of the age of Ethelbert, whom Ailred of Rievaulx and Gervase of Canterbury identify with the East Saxon king Sebert. Mellitus, when bishop of London, procured the foundation in 604, and the consecration was miraculously performed by St. Peter himself. A bare list of names carries the story on to the days of Offa, in whose name some charters were forged either in the time of Edgar or more probably on the eve of the Norman Conquest. The languishing foundation was revived under Edgar, under whose name a further collection of charters is produced, in one of which the earlier fabulous history is recorded. In that reign an abbat named Wulfsin is placed at Westminster by William of Malmesbury, who seems to have known of the fabulous history, and whose evidence is therefore of little value. The real history of the house begins with the reign of the Confessor, and the whole of the fabulous history probably originated within a few years after his death. (See *Mon. Angl.* i. 265 sq.; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* § 73; Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* Nos. 149, 569, 779, 824–829; 842–846, &c. &c.) [S.]

ORDBRIHT (2), a second abbat of Westminster, who is made by the fabulous history to preside from 785 to 797, and to have been bishop in Devon. There was no Anglo-Saxon bishopric in Devon for at least a century after that date. (*Mon. Angl.* i. 266, 267; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 149.) [S.]

ORENTIUS, Pelagian bishop at council of Ephesus (Labbe, iii. 666). [ORONTIUS (3).] [T. W. D.]

ORENTIUS or ORIENTIUS, called by Cave (i. 503) and Ceillier bishop of Elvira, is more properly ORONTIUS (5).] [C. H.]

ORENTIUS, bp. Merida. [ORONTIUS (7).]

ORENTIUS, of Tarragona. [ORESIUS.]

ORESIESIS (al. ORESIS), a friend and coadjutor of Pachomius. He wrote a treatise, now lost, on the monastic life. (Gennad. *De Viris Illustr.* s. v.; Cave, *H. L.* s. v.) [I. G. S.]

ORESIUS, a Spaniard of Tarragona, addressed by Sidonius (lib. ix. *Ep.* 12 in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 629), the date of the letter being in or about 484 (Baron. *Ann.* 484 cxxxvi. and Pagi). Baronius names him Orentius, and thinks he may have subsequently become the bishop of Elvira, if it be not Lerida, called Orontius, who attended the council of Tarragona in 516 (Hardouin, ii. 1044). [ORONTIUS (6).] [C. H.]

ORESTES (1), keymaker, addressed by Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 217). [C. H.]

ORESTES (2), prefect of Alexandria [CYRILLUS (2), HYPATIA], incensed against Cyril, chiefly because the archbishop wished to spy into his official acts. For an account of their quarrel, and the riot and bloodshed, vide Soc. vii. 13, 14. His name is also associated with Hypatia, who was regarded as the obstacle to a reconciliation between Cyril and Orestes through her frequent communications with the latter. (Soc. vii. 15.) [R. J. K.]

ORESTES (3), 2nd or 3rd bishop of Bazas, was, according to Gregory of Tours, one of the three bishops who consecrated Faustianus, the nominee of the pretender Gundovald, to the see of Dax. Though Orestes denied complicity he shared the penalty imposed on the other two [FAUSTIANUS]. He was present at the second council of Mâcon held in 585, where the matter was considered. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 31, viii. 2, 20; *Gall. Christ.* i. 1192; Mansi, ix. 957.) [S. A. B.]

OREUS, see HEBDOMAS, Vol. II. p. 580.

OREUS or ORENTIUS, of Auch. [ORIENTIUS.]

ORGARUS, abbat of Westminster (744–56) in the spurious list of the monk Sporley (*Monast. Angl.* i. 267). [C. H.]

ORIBASIUS, addressed by Nilus (lib. iv. ep. 15); another, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 437). [C. H.]

ORIENTIUS, bishop of Auch (Ausci, Augusta Ausciorum, or Auxium), in the early part of the 5th century. Of this bishop it is related that he resolved to abandon the pleasures of the world, and the vices to which he had been somewhat prone, for the devout life; and that he was led, by supernatural guidance, to choose, as the place of his retirement, Bigorra in Vasconia (Bigorre, about 15 miles N.E. of Pau). Here he is said to have lived in austere sanctity until he was chosen bishop of Auch, on the death of Ursianus or Ursinianus. As bishop, he distinguished himself by resisting and overcoming the Arian heresy, which prevailed extensively among the people of his diocese, more especially among the Goths. The date of his episcopate, which is said to have lasted 41 years, is to a certain extent fixed by the statement that he was sent by the king of the Goths (Theodoric) from Toulouse to Aetius and Litorius. This event, late in his life, must have been in the year 439 or 440. The date of 396, given as that of his death by Gams (*Series Episc.* p. 497), has for its foundation a document of the year 1108, quoted in *Gallia Christiana*, i. 974. The *Gall. Christ.* itself, by a miscalculation, gives the date of his episcopate as 323–364. His successor Armentarius was apparently bishop in 451, a date which would agree with the story of Orientius's mission. There are also recorded concerning him several marvels; notably, the purification of a certain mountain, formerly much infested by evil spirits ("immundis spiritibus valde refertum"). His modern title is St. Orens. To him were dedicated a Cluniac monastery at Auch, where his body was laid, and a chapel at Toulouse, of which city he is reckoned the patron saint. To this saint is ascribed the *Commonitorium S. Orientii*, a short poem on the chief points of Catholic doctrine and practice. The poem has indeed been ascribed to Orosius of Tarraco, and to Orontius (perhaps identical with Orosius), who was present at the council of Tarraco, A.D. 516. It appears, however, from internal evidence, to be of the 5th century, and the work of one who not only bore the same name as the bishop of Auch, but had had similar experiences, political and religious. Certain minor works, comprising a poem on the Holy Trinity, an enumeration and explanation of the names of Christ, and fragments of a collection of prayers in verse, are probably of a later date. The *Commonitorium S. Orientii* was first published by Martene (in the *Coll. Nov. Vet. Mon.* 1700), and is also to be found in the Benedictine *Thesaurus Anecdotorum* (v. 18). (Martene, in the *Thesaurus*; Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr.-Lat. Lit.* 392; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 503; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Mai. i. 61.) [H. A. W.]

ORIGENES (1).

I. SOURCES.—The main authority for the details of Origen's life is EUSEBIUS (*Hist. Ecc.* vi.). Eusebius had made a collection of upwards of a hundred letters of Origen (*H. E.* vi. 36). These, together with official documents (*H. E.* vi. 23, 33), and the information which he derived from those who had been acquainted with Origen (*H. E.* vi. 2, 33), formed the basis of his narrative. His account of the most critical period of Origen's life, his retirement from Alexandria, was given in the second book of his *Apology*, which he composed with the help of Pamphilus (*H. E.* vi. 23). This unhappily has not been preserved.

The controversial writings of JEROME and RUFINUS have preserved some facts from the *Apology* of Eusebius and Pamphilus; the first book of which remains in the translation of Rufinus. But Jerome had no independent knowledge of the details of Origen's life. His short notice in *De Viris illustribus*, c. 54, depends mainly on Eusebius; but it contains a few details which may have been derived from the *Apology* mentioned above.

EPIPHANIUS (*Haer.* lxiv.) has preserved some anecdotes of different degrees of credibility.

A few details, taken from the *Apology* of Pamphilus and Eusebius, are due to PHOTIUS (*Cod.* 118).

The writings of ORIGEN himself give but few details as to the circumstances of his life. But the loss of his letters is irreparable. They would have given at least a fuller picture of the man, even if they gave little additional information on the outward circumstances of his life. Only once, so far as I have noted, does he refer to the associations of Caesarea with the early history of the church (*Hom. in Num.* xi. 3). In another place he speaks of having witnessed the constancy of martyrs (*Hom. in Jud.* ix. 1). On the other hand, the *Farewell Address* (προσφωνητικὸς ἢ πανηγυρικὸς λόγος) of GREGORY of NEO-CAESAREA is a contemporary record of his method and influence of unique importance and interest.

Some books of modern times may be mentioned at once. An account of Origen's opinions, so far as they seemed open to objection, was given by Sextus Senensis in his *Bibliotheca, Librr.* vi. vii. (1566) in the spirit of a generous apologist. Genebrard arranged these points under general heads, in the introduction to his edition of Origen's *Works* (1574), and advocated Origen's cause with too great partiality in the judgment of Huet. P. Halloix went further in his elaborate account and defence of Origen (*Origenes defensus*...Leodii, 1648) dedicated to Innocent X. (G. B. Pamfili: "Solent similia a similibus, si quidem Παμφιλίοις, in re non dissimili παμφιλίως expectari"). The book was attacked and placed upon the *Index*, 'donec corrigatur,' but it had a powerful effect. The great work of Huet (*Origeniana*), prefixed to his edition of Origen's *Commentaries* (1668), was more complete and just. Nothing which has been written since shews greater or even equal mastery of the facts, though Huet's treatment is scholastic and necessarily deficient in historical feeling. Meanwhile the controversy on Origen's doctrine of the pre-existence of souls had spread to England. "*A Letter of Resolution concerning Origen and the Chief of his Opinions*" (London, 1661), published anonymously by G. Rust, fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and afterwards bishop of Dromore, seems to have attracted considerable attention. Fabricius speaks of it with respect; and it is in every way a remarkable piece of theological criticism. Two letters by S. Parker, afterwards bishop of Oxford, on the "Platonick Philosophy," and the "Origenian hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls" (Oxford, 1667), may be referred to as representing the other side. J. H. Horbius concludes his *Historia Origeniana* (Francofurti, 1670) with the words of Justinian, and holds that Origen may "fairly be called the fountain of all heresies" (p. 91). Other works are mentioned by Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* vii. 241 ff.) It must be sufficient to refer generally to the accounts of Origen's life and opinions given by—

Tillemont (*Mémoires*, iii. Paris, 1695, *ed.* 2, 1701).
Lardner (*Credibility*, p. ii. vol. iii. London, 1750; vol. ii. ed. Kippis).
Ceillier (*Auteurs Sacrés*, ii. Paris, 1730).
Maréchal (*Concordantia Patrum*, Paris, 1739).
Lumper (*Hist. Patrum Theol. Critica*, ix. August, Vindob. 1792).
Walch (*Gesch. d. Ketz.* vii. viii. Leipzig, 1762, ff.).
Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclés.* tom. i. Paris, 1690.

The histories of Mosheim (*De reb. Christ. ante const. Comm.*, Helmst. 1753) and Schroeckh (*Kirchen-Gesch.*, Leipzig, 1772–1803) contain useful materials. The analyses of Schramm (*Anal. Patrum*, Aug. Vind. 1780–96) are good: his literary notices are taken from Delarue.

More recently Origen's life and doctrine has been discussed, with special reference to his historical position in the development of Christian thought, by—

Guericke, *De Schola Alex. Catech.*, Halis Sax., 1825.
Neander, *Kirch. Geschichte.*
Thomasius, *Origenes*, Nürnberg, 1837.
Redepenning, *Origenes*, Bonn, 1841–6.
Moehler, *Patrologie*, Regensburg, 1840.
Huber, *Philos. d. Kirchenväter*, München, 1859.
Schaff, *Church History*, New York, 1867.
De Pressensé, *Histoire des trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1858–77.
Boehringer, *Kirchengesch. in Biogr. Klemens u. Origenes*, Zurich, 1869, 2te Aufl.

To these may be added—

Joly, *Etude sur Origène*, Dijon, 1860.
Freppel, *Origène*, Paris, 1868.
Denis, M. J., *La Philosophie d'Origène*, Paris, 1884.

The notice of Origen in Ritter's *Gesch. d. Christ. Philos.* 1858–9 is very meagre: that in Ueberweg's *Gesch. d. Philos.* is much more satisfactory. Unhappily Origen did not fall within Zeller's scope.

II. LIFE.—The nationality and birthplace of Origen are uncertain. It is probable that he was born at Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 1), but it has not been recorded whether he was of Egyptian or Greek or mixed descent. The statement of Epiphanius, that he was "an Egyptian by race" (*Haer.* lxiv. 1, Αἰγύπτιος τῷ γένει), is not decisive even if his authority were higher; and the loose phrase of Porphyry, that he "was a Greek and reared in Greek studies" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19), is in itself of little value, but the name of his father (Leonides) points in the same direction. His mother's name has not been preserved. Is it possible that she was of Jewish descent? Origen is said to have learnt Hebrew so successfully that in singing the psalms "he vied with his mother" (Hier. *Ep.* 39 (22), § 1). Origen was the eldest of seven sons (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). Nothing however is known of his brothers. His fame probably overshadowed them; and his father, though himself a martyr, was distinguished as "Leonides the father of Origen."[a]

[a] This appears to be the meaning of the words of Eusebius (vi. 1), ὁ λεγόμενος Ὠρ. πατήρ, which caused Tillemont difficulty: *Mémoires*, Orig. note ii. According to some late and insufficient authorities (Suidas, *s. v.* Ὠριγένης and some MSS. of Hier. *de Vir. Ill.*) Leonides was a bishop.

The full name of Origen was ORIGENES ADAMANTIUS. The name *Origenes* was borne by one contemporary philosopher of distinction,[b] and occurs elsewhere. Thus the name of "*Aurelius Origenes*, also called *Apollonius*," a prytanis of Arsinoe, occurs in a Greek inscription set up in the city in A.D. 232–3 (Boeckh, *Inscrr. Gr.* No. 4705). Another, "*M. Aurelius Apollonius*, also called *Origenes*, a Roman knight," is mentioned in another Greek inscription in the Vatican as having constructed a "private box" in some theatre (*id.* No. 6189 *b*).

The name *Leonides* is found in an inscription at Kosseir (*id.* add. No. 4716 *d* [23]) and in other places. There can be no doubt that Origenes (which is written in MSS. not unfrequently with the rough breathing) is formed from the name of the Egyptian deity Orus or Horus, popularly identified with Apollo. Such names (*e.g.* Dionysius) were common among Christians. The name Adamantius (bishop of Athens) occurs in Boeckh, *l.c.* No. 9373. See also Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

The name ADAMANTIUS has commonly been regarded as an epithet describing Origen's unconquerable endurance (Hier. *Ep.* 33 (29), § 3, where he also claims for Origen the epithet χαλκέντερος given to Varro), or for the invincible force of his arguments (Photius, *Cod.* 118). But the language of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 14, ὁ γέτοι Ἀδαμάντιος καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τῷ Ὠριγενεῖ ὄνομα) and of Jerome himself (*De Vir. Ill.* 54, Origenes qui et Adamantius) shews that it was a second name, such as is given in the cases quoted above, and not a mere adjunct. Epiphanius characteristically misrepresents the truth when he speaks of Origen as having "given himself in vain the surname of Adamantius" (*Haer.* lxiv. 73).

The date of Origen's birth is fixed within very narrow limits by that of his father's martyrdom. Leonides suffered in the persecution of the tenth year of Severus (A.D. 202), and Origen at the time had not completed his seventeenth year (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). He must have been born therefore A.D. 185–6, a date which is consistent with the further statement (Euseb. vii. 1) that he died in his sixty-ninth year, in the reign of Gallus (A.D. 251–254). In Origen we have the first record of a Christian boyhood, and he was "great from the cradle." His education was superintended by his father, who specially directed him to the study of Scripture, in addition to the ordinary subjects of instruction (ἡ τῶν ἐγκυκλίων παιδεία). The child entered into the study with such eager devotion that his inquiries into the deeper meaning of the words which he committed to memory caused his father perplexity, who, while he openly checked his son's premature curiosity, silently thanked God for the promise which he gave for the future. As years went on Origen became the pupil of Pantaenus (after his return from India) and Clement, in whose school he met Alexander, afterwards bishop of Jerusalem (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14) with whom he then laid the foundation of that life-long friendship which supported him in his sorest trials.

When Leonides was thrown into prison, Origen would have shared his fate if he had not been hindered by the device of his mother. As he could do no more he addressed a letter to his father—his first recorded writing, still extant in the time of Eusebius—in which he prayed him to allow no thought for his family to shake his resolution. Such an act shews at once the position of influence which Origen already enjoyed in his family and the power of his self-sacrifice. Leonides was put to death, and his property was confiscated. Upon this the young Origen seems to have fulfilled the promise which his words implied. Partly by the assistance of a pious and wealthy lady, and partly by teaching, he obtained all that he required for his own support and (as may be concluded) for the needs of his mother and brothers. Already he collected a library. At first he gave lessons in literature; but as the Christian school was now without a teacher, all having been scattered by the persecution, he was induced to give instruction in the Faith. Thus in his eighteenth year he occupied, at first informally, the position which belonged to the head of the Christian school in Alexandria in a season of exceptional danger.[c] In this work he obtained such success that after no long time Demetrius, the bishop of Alexandria, definitely committed to him the office, which had been thrown upon him by circumstances. The charge decided the tenor of his life (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54, "decimo octavo aetatis suae anno κατηχήσεων opus aggressus, postea a Demetrio...in locum Clementis presbyteri confirmatus"). From this time Origen devoted himself exclusively to the office of a Christian teacher; and to ensure his independence he sold his collection of classical writers for an annuity of four oboli (sixpence) a day, on which he lived for many years, refusing the voluntary contributions which his friends offered him (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3). His position at this time is a remarkable illustration of the freedom of the early church. He was a layman, and yet recognised as a leading teacher. His work was not confined within any district. Numbers of men and women flocked to his lectures, attracted in part by the stern simplicity of his life, which served as a guarantee of his sincerity. For he resolved to fulfil without reserve the precepts of the Gospel. For many years he went barefoot, and wore only a single robe (Matt. x. 10). He slept upon the ground. His food and sleep were rigorously limited (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3). Nor did his unmeasured zeal stop here. In the same spirit of sacrifice he applied to himself literally the words of Matt. xix. 12, though wishing to conceal the act from most of his friends. The act however could not remain hid. It was against the civil law (comp. Just. M. *Ap.* i. 29, Otto's note), and utterly at variance with the true instinct of the church, which at a later time found formal expression (*Conc. Nic.* can. 1, and Hefele's note). Origen's own comment on the words of the gospel which he had misunderstood, is a most touching confession of his error (*in Matt.* tom. xv. 1 ff.).[d] But for the time the purpose of the act was accepted as its excuse.

[b] On this Origines, the Platonist, see Zeller, *Die Philosophie d. Griechen*, v. 407.

[c] The anecdote preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxiv. 1) of his proclaiming Christ on the steps of the temple of Serapis, when forced there by the heathen population, is probably to be referred to this date.

[d] Boehringer (*Origenes*, pp. 28 ff) endeavours to shew that the narrative is a fable, but his arguments are not convincing.

And when the matter came to the ears of Demetrius, the bishop, so far from inflicting any punishment, urged him still more to devote himself to the work of Christian instruction (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 8).

For twelve or thirteen years Origen was engaged in these happy and successful labours; and it was during this period, in all probability, that he formed and partly executed his plan of a comparative view of the LXX in connexion with the other Greek versions of the Old Testament, and with the original Hebrew text [HEXAPLA], though the work was slowly elaborated as fresh materials came to his hands (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 16). To fit himself the better for the work he learnt Hebrew, "contrary to the spirit of his years and race" (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54, contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam), though he seems to have found a fellow-student in his mother (Hier. *Ep.* 39 (22), § 1). From time to time he refers to interpretations which were given to him by his "Hebrew master" (*De Princ.* i. 3, 4; iv. 26; ὁ Ἑβραῖος, Gr. fr. 7); and Jerome says that he referred to "the Patriarch Huillus," as having given him information on many points (*adv. Ruf.* i. § 13, comp. *Sel. in Ps.* xi. p. 352, L. Ἰουλλος). A short visit to Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, to see "the most ancient church of the Romans" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14) and an authoritative call to Arabia (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19) alone seem to have interrupted the fixed tenor of his life. Persecution tested the fruit of his teaching. He had the joy of seeing martyrs trained in his school; and his own escapes from the violence of the people was held to be due to the special protection of Providence (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 4, f. 3).

During the same period Origen devoted himself with renewed vigour to the study of non-Christian thought, and attended the lectures of Ammonius Saccas (comp. Porphyry, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19; Theodoret, *Graec. affect. cur.* vi. p. 96).[e] Heretics and Gentiles attended his lectures, and he felt bound to endeavour to understand their opinions thoroughly, that he might the better correct them (comp. *c. Cels.* vi. 24). His conduct in this respect excited ill-will, but he was able to defend himself, as he did in a letter written at a later time (*Ep.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19), by the example of his predecessors and the support of his friends.

So Origen's work grew beyond his single strength, and he associated Heraclas in the labours of the catechetical school. Heraclas had been one of his first converts and scholars, and the brother of a martyr (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3). He was a fellow-student with Origen under "his teacher of philosophy" (Ammonius Saccas); and when he afterwards became bishop of Alexandria he did not even then lay aside the dress or the reading of a philosopher (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19).

At length, c. 215 A.D., a tumult of unusual violence (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19, οὐ σμικροῦ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἀναρριπισθέντος πολέμου; comp. Herodian. iv. 8, 9; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, i. 224 f.) forced Origen to withdraw from Alexandria and from Egypt. He took refuge in Palestine, at Caesarea. Here his reputation brought him into that position of prominence which became the occasion of his later troubles. His fellow pupil, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus (Theotecnus; Photius, *Cod.* 118), bishop of Caesarea, begged him to expound the Scriptures in the public services of the church, though he had not been ordained. Demetrius of Alexandria expressed strong disapprobation at a proceeding which he ventured to describe as unprecedented. Alexander and Theoctistus defended their conduct by precedents. Demetrius replied by action. He recalled Origen to Alexandria, and hastened his return by special envoys, deacons of the church (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19).

The stay of Origen in Palestine was of some considerable length, and it seems most probable that it was during this time he made his famous visit to Mamaea, the mother of the emperor Alexander (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 21), who was herself a native of Syria.[f]

Some time after his return to Alexandria (c. 219), Origen entered upon a new form of work, the written exposition of Scripture. This was not the result of his own choice, but was due in a great measure to the influence of Ambrosius [AMBROSIUS], whom he had rescued not long before from the heresy of Valentinus, or, as Jerome says, of Marcion (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 56). Ambrosius not only urged him to the task, but amply supplied him with the means of fulfilling it. More than seven shorthand writers (ταχυγράφοι) were provided to take down his comments, and other scribes were ready to copy out fairly what they had written (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 23).

These literary occupations considerably curtailed Origen's work in the catechetical school. Some years before he had, as we have seen, associated Heraclas with himself in the conduct of it, assigning to him the introductory instruction of students (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 15). He could now therefore withdraw in a great measure from the charge without disturbing the method of teaching. At the same time the first parts of his *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* marked him out more decisively than before as a teacher in the church even more than in the school. But the exhibition of this new power was accompanied by other signs of a bold originality which might well startle those who were unfamiliar with the questionings of philosophy. The books *On First Principles*, which seem to have been written spontaneously, made an epoch in Christian speculation, as the *Commentary on St. John* made an epoch in Christian interpretation. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that Demetrius yielded, in the words of Eusebius, to the infirmity of human nature (*H. E.* vi. 8), and wished to check the boldness and the influence of the layman. It became clear that Origen must seek somewhere else than in Alexandria the full sanction and free scope for his Scriptural studies. He did not however precipitate the separation from a place where he had laboured

[e] The difficulties and objections which have been urged in regard to this fact, from a supposed confusion of other persons bearing the names of Ammonius and Origen, have been considered at length by L. Krüger in an essay in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1843, i. 47 ff.

[f] Mamaea was probably at Antioch in 218. Clinton places the visit during Origen's later visit 226 (*F. R.* i. 239), on the assumption that Eusebius states that the visit took place "in the reign of Alexander and in the episcopate of Philetus;" but the language of Eusebius, due regard being had to his desultory style of narrative, does not require this interpretation.

for more than five and twenty years. The occasion came in an invitation to visit Achaia for the purpose, as it seems, of combating some false opinions which had arisen there (Hier. *de Virr. Ill.* 54). The exact date is uncertain, but it was probably between 226 and 230. Origen availed himself of this call to visit Caesarea. It was natural that he should seek counsel from his oldest friends as to his future course; and the invitation to Achaia seems to have brought his relations with Demetrius to a crisis. Photius, on the authority of Pamphilus' "Apology" (*Cod.* 118), says that he went "without the consent (or even contrary to the judgment) of his own bishop" (*χωρὶς τῆς τοῦ οἰκείου γνώμης ἐπισκόπου*). Jerome again states that he was furnished with "commendatory letters" (*l. c.* sub testimonio ecclesiasticae epistolae). He may therefore have gone to Caesarea to consider whether he should accept the invitation, and, in that case, to obtain the proper authorization. No record remains of the deliberations which took place. But the meeting issued in the ordination of Origen as presbyter "by the bishops there" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 23), Theoctistus of Caesarea and Alexander of Jerusalem (Hier. *de Virr. Ill.* 54; Photius, *Cod.* 118). After taking this decisive step Origen continued his journey to Greece. He visited Ephesus (*Ep. fragm.* ap. Ruf. *Apol.*, Delarue, i. p. 6) and stayed some time at Athens, and during this stay it is not unlikely that he heard some of the teachers of philosophy there (Epiph. *Haer.* lxiv. 1). At length, having completed his mission, he returned to Alexandria.

In returning to Alexandria Origen could not have been unprepared for the reception which awaited him from Demetrius. It is by no means unlikely that Demetrius had shewn clear unwillingness to admit him to the priesthood. He may have regarded the act which had appeared venial in the lay catechist as a fatal bar to ordination, according to the tenor of later canons. He may perhaps have taken exception to some of the details of Origen's teaching. But at any rate the fact that Origen received orders from Palestinian bishops without his consent, and probably against his judgment, might be construed as a direct challenge of his authority. Origen at once perceived that he must retire before the rising storm. The preface to the sixth book of the *Commentary on St. John* shews how deeply he felt the severance of old ties and the hostility of former colleagues. But there was no choice. In A.D. 231 he left Alexandria never to return.[g] The act however was his own; and his influence to the last is shewn by the fact, that he "left the charge of the catechetical school" to his coadjutor Heraclas (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26).[h]

It is difficult to trace the different stages in the condemnation which followed. Eusebius treated of the matter at length in his "Apology" (*H. E.* vi. 23), and therefore thought it unnecessary to repeat in his "History" what he had already given in detail. The fragmentary notices of writers at second or third hand are therefore all that remain. Photius (*Cod.* 118) following the "Apology" of Pamphilus and Eusebius, gives the most intelligible and consistent account. According to him Demetrius, completely alienated from Origen by his ordination, collected a synod of "bishops and a few presbyters" (*ἐπισκόπων καί τινων πρεσβυτέρων*), in which it was decided that Origen should leave Alexandria and not be allowed to stay or teach there. He was not however deposed from the priesthood, though it is implied that Demetrius had made a proposition to that effect. Demetrius was dissatisfied with the result; and combining with some Egyptian bishops (without presbyters) he afterwards excommunicated Origen (*καὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀπεκήρυξε*), and those who had voted with him before now subscribed this new sentence. Jerome describes with greater severity the spirit of Demetrius' proceedings, and adds that "he wrote on the subject to the whole world" (*De Vir. Ill.* 54) and obtained a judgment against Origen from Rome (*Ep.* 33 (29), § 4).[i]

So far the facts are tolerably clear, but in the absence of trustworthy evidence, it is impossible to tell on what points the condemnation of Origen really turned. Demetrius unquestionably laid great stress on formal irregularities (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 8), and it is possible that the sentence against him was based on these, though Origen's opinions may have been displeasing to many. Such a view finds support in the fact, that no attempt was made to reverse the judgment after the death of Demetrius, which followed very shortly, and perhaps within three years, when Heraclas, the pupil and colleague of Origen, succeeded to the episcopate. Nor again was anything done by Dionysius, the successor of Heraclas, another devoted scholar of Origen, who still continued his intercourse with his former master (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46).

Whatever may have been the grounds of Origen's condemnation, the judgment of the Egyptian synod was treated with absolute disregard by the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, and Achaea (Hier. *Ep.* 33), and Origen defended himself warmly (Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* ii. 18). He soon afterwards settled at Caesarea, which became for more than twenty years, up to his death, the centre of his labours. It had indeed not a few of the advantages of Alexandria, as a great seaport, the civil capital, and the ecclesiastical metropolis of its district.

At Caesarea Origen found ungrudging sympathy and help for his manifold labours. Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Caesarea remained devoted to him; and Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia was no less zealous in seeking his instruction (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 27;

[g] In Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26 the reading *δέκατον* is better supported than *δωδέκατον*.

[h] It is hardly necessary to refer to the monstrous story related by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxiv. 2). If any one cares to consider it, it is enough to refer to Delarue's note on Huet's *Origeniana*, i. 2, § 13.

The passage quoted by Justinian, as from Peter of Alexandria, in his letter to Menas, in which he is represented as saying that "the frantic Origen" caused great trials to Heraclas and Demetrius, is not of weightier authority. The passage occurs in a speech in the martyrdom of Peter (*Acta Sincera*, Migne, xviii. p. 460). Comp. Huet, *l. c.* § 15.

[i] The statement quoted by Justinian, that Origen was expelled by Heraclas, is wholly unworthy of credit. It probably arose from the fact that Heraclas did not recal him. The reading *δωδέκατον*, in Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26, may be a trace of the belief in this apocryphal statement. Comp. Huet, *Origeniana*, i. 2, § 15, and Delarue's notes.

Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54, diu Caesareae in sanctis Scripturis ab eo eruditus est). Ambrosius was with him to stimulate and maintain his literary efforts. He formed afresh something of a catechetical school; and the highest forms of his philosophical teaching were exercised by the presence of a continual succession of distinguished students. At the same time he was unwearied in the public exposition of Scripture. It was his practice to explain it popularly to mixed congregations in the church, to Christians and to catechumens (*Hom. in Ezech.* vi. § 5). As a rule he gave these lectures on Wednesdays and Fridays (Socr. *H. E.* v. 22, τῇ τετράδι καὶ τῇ λεγομένῃ παρασκευῇ), but in practice he gave them daily, and at times oftener than once a day. His subjects were sometimes taken from the lessons (*Hom. in Num.* xv. 1; *in* 1 *Sam.* ii. § 1), and sometimes specially prescribed to him by an authoritative request (*Hom. in Ezech.* xiii. 1). His aim was the edification of the people generally (*Hom. in Lev.* vii. 1; *in Jud.* viii. 3); and not unfrequently he was constrained to speak, as he wrote, with some reserve, on the deeper mysteries of the Faith (*Hom. in Num.* iv. 3; *in Lev.* xiii. 3; *in Ezech.* i. 3; *in Rom.* vii. 13, p. 147 L; viii. 11, p. 272; comp. *Hom. in Jos.* xxiii. 4 *s.f.*; *in Gen.* xii. 1, 4).

These labours were interrupted by the persecution of Maximinus (A.D. 235–237). Ambrosius and Protectetus, a presbyter of Caesarea, were among the victims. Origen addressed to them his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, while they were in prison. He himself escaped (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28). During part of the time for which the persecution continued he seems to have been with Firmilian in Cappadocia, and while there is said to have enjoyed the hospitality of a Christian lady, Juliana, who had some of the books of Symmachus, the translator of the Old Testament (comp. Hier. *l. c.* Firmilianus...cum omni Cappadocia eum invitavit et diu tenuit. Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 147).

In 238 or perhaps in 237,[k] Origen was again at Caesarea, and Gregory (Thaumaturgus) delivered the *Farewell Address*, which is the most vivid picture left of the method and influence of the great Christian master. In this the scholar recounts, with touching devotion, the course along which he had been guided by the man to whom he felt that he owed his spiritual life. He had come to Syria to study Roman law in the school of Berytus, but on his way there he met with Origen, and at once felt that he had found in him the wisdom for which he was seeking. The day of that meeting was to him, in his own words, the dawn of a new being: his soul clave to the master whom he recognised, and he surrendered himself gladly to his guidance. As Origen spoke, he kindled within the young advocate's breast a love for the Holy Word, the most lovely of all objects, and for himself the Word's herald. "This love," Gregory adds, "induced me to give up country and friends, the aims which I had proposed to myself, the study of law of which I was proud. I had but one passion, philosophy, and the godlike man who directed me in the pursuit of it" (c. 6).

Origen's first care, Gregory says, was to make the character of a pupil his special study. In this he followed the example of Clement (Clem. *Strom.* i. 1, 8, p. 320, P). He ascertained, with delicate and patient attention, the capacities, the faults, the tendencies of those whom he had to teach. Rank growths of opinion were cleared away: weaknesses were laid open: every effort was used to develope endurance, firmness, patience, thoroughness. "In true Socratic fashion he sometimes overthrew us by argument," Gregory writes, "if he saw us restive and starting out of the course... The process was at first disagreeable to us and painful; but so he purified us ... and ... prepared us for the reception of the words of truth ...," "by probing us and questioning us, and offering problems for our solution" (c. 7). In this way Origen taught his scholars to regard language as designed, not to furnish material for display, but to express truth with the most exact accuracy; and logic as powerful, not to secure a plausible success, but to test beliefs with the strictest rigour.

This was the first stage of intellectual discipline, the accurate preparation of the instruments of thought. In the next place, Origen led his pupils to apply them first to the "lofty and divine and most lovely" study of external nature. Here he stood where we stand still, for he made Geometry the sure and immovable foundation of his teaching, and from this rose step by step to the heights of heaven and the most sublime mysteries of the universe (c. 8). Gregory's language implies that Origen was himself a student of physics; as, in some degree, the true theologian must be. The lessons of others, he writes, or his own observation, enabled him to explain the connexion, the differences, the changes of the objects of sense. Such investigations served to shew man in his true relation to the world. A rational feeling for the vast grandeur of the external order, "the sacred economy of the universe," as Gregory calls it, was substituted for the ignorant and senseless wonder with which it is commonly regarded.

But Physics were naturally treated by Origen as a preparation and not as an end. Moral Science came next; and here he laid the greatest stress upon the method of experiment. His aim was not merely to analyse and to define and to classify feelings and motives, though he did this, but to form a character. For him ethics were a life, and not only a theory. The four cardinal virtues of Plato, practical wisdom, self-control, righteousness, courage, seemed to him to require for their maturing careful and diligent introspection and culture. And here he gave a commentary upon his teaching. His discipline lay even more in action than in precept. His own conduct was in his scholar's minds a more influential persuasive than his arguments.

So it was, Gregory continues, that Origen was the first teacher who really led me to the pursuit of Greek philosophy, by bringing speculation into a vital union with practice. In him I saw the inspiring example of one wise at once and holy. The noble phrase of older masters gained a distinct meaning for the Christian disciple. In failure and weakness he was enabled to perceive that the end of all was "to become like to

[k] Dräseke, *Der Brief d. Orig. an Gregorios, Jahrb. f. Protest. Theol.* 1881, s. 106. Dräseke gives good reasons for dating Origen's letter to Gregory in 235–6 (not in 240 from Cappadocia, when Gregory had retired to Alexandria.

God with a pure mind, and to draw near to Him and to abide in Him" (c. 12).

Guarded and guided by this conviction, Origen encouraged his scholars in theology to look for help in all the works of human genius. They were to examine the writings of philosophers and poets of every nation, the atheists alone excepted, with faithful candour and wise catholicity. For them there was to be no sect, no party. And in their arduous work they had ever at hand, in their master, a friend who knew the difficulties of the ground to be traversed. If they were bewildered in the tangled mazes of conflicting opinions, he was ready to lead them with a firm hand: if they were in danger of being swallowed up in the quicksands of shifting error, he was near to lift them up to the sure resting-place which he had himself found (c. 14).

Even yet the end was not reached. The hierarchy of sciences was not completed till Theology with her own proper gifts crowned the succession which we have followed hitherto, Logic, Physics, Ethics. New data corresponded with the highest philosophy, and Origen found in the Holy Scriptures and the teaching of the Spirit the final and absolute spring of Divine Truth. It was in this region that Gregory felt his master's power to be supreme. Origen's sovereign command of the mysteries of "the oracles of God" gave him perfect boldness in dealing with all other writings. "Therefore," Gregory adds, "there was no subject forbidden to us, nothing hidden or inaccessible. We were allowed to become acquainted with every doctrine, barbarian or Greek, on things spiritual or civil, divine and human; traversing with all freedom, and investigating the whole circuit of knowledge, and satisfying ourselves with the full enjoyment of all the pleasures of the soul..." (c. 15).

Such in meagre outline was, as Gregory tells us, the method of Origen. He describes what he knew and what his hearers knew. There is no parallel to the picture in ancient times. And when every allowance has been made for the partial enthusiasm of a pupil, the view which it offers of a system of Christian training actually realised exhibits a type which we cannot hope to surpass. The ideal of Christian education and the ideal of Christian philosophy were fashioned together. Under that comprehensive and loving discipline Gregory, already trained in heathen schools, first learnt, step by step, according to his own testimony, what the pursuit of philosophy truly was, and came to know the solemn duty of forming opinions which were to be not the amusement of a moment, but the solid foundations of life-long work.

The method of Origen, such as Gregory has described it, in all its breadth and freedom, was forced upon him by what he held to be the deepest law of human nature. It may be true (and he admitted it) that we are, in our present state, but poorly furnished for the pursuit of knowledge, but he was never weary of proclaiming that we are at least born to engage in the endless search. If we see some admirable work of man's art, he says, we are at once eager to investigate the nature, the manner, the end of its production; and the contemplation of the works of God stirs us with an incomparably greater longing to learn the principles, the method, the purpose of creation. "This desire, this passion, has without doubt," he continues, "been implanted in us by God. And as the eye seeks the light, as our body craves food, so our mind is impressed with the characteristic and natural desire of knowing the truth of God and the causes of what we observe." Such a desire, since it is a divine endowment, carries with it the promise of future satisfaction. In our present life we may not be able to do more, by the utmost toil, than obtain some small fragments from the infinite treasures of divine knowledge, still the concentration of our souls upon the lovely vision of truth, the occupation of our various faculties in lofty inquiries, the very ambition with which we rise above our actual powers, is in itself fruitful in blessing, and fits us better for the reception of wisdom hereafter at some later stage of existence. Now we draw at the best a faint outline, a preparatory sketch of the features of Truth: the true and living colours will be added there. Perhaps, he concludes most characteristically, that is the meaning of the words, "to every one that hath shall be given;" by which we are assured that he who has gained in this life some faint outline of truth and knowledge will have it completed in the age to come with the beauty of the perfect image (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 4).

While Caesarea remained Origen's permanent home he visited different parts of Palestine; Jerusalem,[1] Jericho, the valley of the Jordan (*Tom.* vi. *in Joh.* § 24); Sidon, where he made some stay (*Hom. in Josh.* xvi. § 2), partly at least to investigate "the footsteps of Jesus, and of His disciples, and of the prophets" (*in Joh. l. c.*). He also went again to Athens and continued there for some time, being engaged on his Commentaries (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Two visits to Arabia were of more characteristic interest. In the first he went to confer with Beryllus of Bostra, who had advanced false views on the Incarnation (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33); and in the second to meet some errors on the doctrine of the resurrection (*id.* vi. 37). In both cases he was specially invited, and in both cases he justified his reputation by persuading those whom he controverted to abandon their opinions.[m]

Origen's energy now rose to its full power. Till he was sixty (A.D. 246) he had forbidden his unwritten discourses to be taken down. Experience then at length enabled him to withdraw the prohibition, and most of his homilies are due to reports made afterwards. The *Books against Celsus*, and the *Commentaries on St. Matthew*, belong to the same period, and shew, in different directions, the maturity of his vigour.

Thus his varied activity continued till the persecution of Decius in 250. The preceding reign of Philip had favoured the growth of Christianity; and there is no sufficient reason to question the fact of Origen's correspondence with the emperor and his wife Severa (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36). Such intercourse marked Origen out for attack to Philip's conqueror and suc-

[1] Perhaps the story given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxiv. 2) of his reading Ps. l. 16, when constrained to address the church there, and then closing the book with tears while all wept about him, may be a reminiscence of something which happened during this time.

[m] Specimens of his oral controversy with a Jew are preserved in *c. Cels.* i. 45, 55 f.

cessor. His friend Alexander of Jerusalem died in prison. He himself suffered a variety of tortures, probably at Tyre,—chains, the iron collar, and the rack, but his constancy baffled all the efforts of his enemies (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 39). He was threatened with the stake, and a report gained currency in later times that his sufferings were crowned by death (Photius, *Cod.* 118, p. 159). During this sharp trial his former pupil Dionysius, now bishop of Alexandria, addressed to him a letter on martyrdom (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46). The testimony is valuable as shewing that the old affection was still alive, in spite of long separation. Origen himself described his sufferings and his consolations in letters which Eusebius characterizes "as full of help to those who need encouragement" (*H. E.* vi. 39).

The death of Decius (251, Clinton, *F. R.* i. 270), after a reign of two years, set Origen free. But his health must have been broken by the hardships which he had endured. He died at Tyre, in the next year (253), "having completed seventy years save one" (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 1; Hieron. *Ep.* 65 *ad Pammach.*). Origen was buried in the city where he died (William of Tyre (c. 1180), *Hist.* xiii. 1: "haec (Tyrus) et Origenis corpus occultat sicut oculata fide etiam hodie licet inspicere"), and his tomb was honoured as long as the city survived. When a cathedral, named after the Holy Sepulchre, was built there, his body is said to have occupied the place of greatest honour, being enclosed in the wall behind the high altar (Cotovicus (1598), *Itin. Hier.* p. 121: "pone altare maximum magni Origenis corpus conditum ferunt"). The same church received, in a later age (A.D. 1190), the remains of Barbarossa; but the name of the great theologian prevailed over the name of the great warrior. Burchard, who visited Tyre in the last quarter of the 13th century (c. 1283), saw the inscription in Origen's memory in a building which was amazing for its splendour. (Burchardus, *Descript. Terrae Sanctae*, p. 25, *ed.* Laurent.: "Origenes ibidem in ecclesia sancti sepulcri requiescit in muro conclusus. Cujus titulum ibidem vidi" (the edition of 1587 adds *et legi*). "Sunt ibi columpnae marmoreae et aliorum lapidum tam magnae, quod stupor est videre.") Before the close of the century the city was wasted by the Saracens; but if we may trust the words of a traveller at the beginning of the 16th century (c. 1520), the inscription was still preserved on "a marble column sumptuously adorned with gold and jewels." (Bart. de Saligniaco, *Itin. Hier.* ix. 10: "In templo sancti sepulcri Origenis doctoris ossa magno in honore servantur, quorum titulus est in columna marmorea magno sumptu gemmarum et auri.") It is not unlikely, I fear, that this statement is a false rendering of Burchard's notice. Burchard's book was very widely known in the 16th century. The statements of Adrichonius (*Theatr. T. S. Tr. Aser*, 84), which are repeated by Huet and others, have no independent value whatever. Not long after, the place where Origen lay was only known by tradition. The tradition however still lingers about the ruins of the city; for it is said that the natives point out the spot where "Oriunus" lies under a vault, the relic of an ancient church, now covered by their huts. Prutz, *Aus Phönicien*, 219, 306, quoted by Piper, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* 1876, p. 208.

Into the later fortunes of Origen's teaching we do not enter. It is enough to say that his fate after death was like his fate during life: he continued to witness not in vain to noble truths. His influence was sufficiently proved by the persistent bitterness of his antagonists, and there are few sadder pages in church history than the record of the Origenistic controversies. But in spite of errors which it was easy to condemn, his characteristic thoughts survived in the works of Hilary and Ambrose and Jerome, and in his own Homilies, to stir later students in the West. His Homilies had indeed a very wide circulation in the middle ages in their Latin translation; and it would be interesting to trace their effect upon mediaeval commentators down to the time when Erasmus wrote to Colet in 1504: "Origenis operum bonam partem evolvi; quo praeceptore mihi videor non-nullum fecisse operae pretium; aperit enim fontes quosdam et rationes indicat artis theologicae." That however cannot be done here. [ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.]

III. CHRONOLOGY OF WORKS.—The works of Origen, of which some notice has been preserved, were produced, as far as can be ascertained, in the following chronological order. The titles of those which still remain, wholly or in part (otherwise than in isolated fragments), in the original, or in a translation, are printed in capitals.

1. *Before Origen's removal from Alexandria* (A.D. 231).

The commencement of the HEXAPLA.
Commentary on the *Canticles*. Ὑπομνήματα (perhaps not published: Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 18).
228–231. COMMENTARY (Τόμος) ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN (Books i.–v.), Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24.
Commentaries on *Ps.* i.–xxv. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24).
Commentaries on *Genesis*, Books i.–viii. (Euseb. *l. c.*).
On the Resurrection (two books), mentioned in the Commentaries on the Lamentations (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24).
Commentaries on the *Lamentations* (five books remained in the time of Eusebius, *H. E. l. c.*).
Commentaries on *Exodus*, books i. ii.
ON FIRST PRINCIPLES, four books (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24).
Miscellanies (Στρωματεῖς), ten books (Euseb. *l. c.*). Comp. *Tom. in Joh.* xiii. 45; Hier. *Praef. ad Gal.*; *Comm. on Dan.* xiii.; *Ep. ad August.* cxli. 6; *ad Pammach.* lxxxiv.
ON PRAYER (date uncertain).
On free-will (the date is doubtful: comp. *in Rom.* vii. § 16.; Cramer, *Catena*, 1 Pet. i. 4).

2. *After Origen's withdrawal to Caesarea* (231).

Commentaries (Homilies) on 1 *Cor.* (before Comm. on St. Luke).
Homilies on *Deuteronomy*.
Commentaries on *St. Luke* (five books): Hier. *Prol. Hom. in Luc.*
HOMILIES ON ST. LUKE.
232–238. COMMENTARIES ON ST. JOHN continued, Books vi. ff. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28).
235–6. Letter to Gregory of Neo-Caesarea.
Commentaries on *Genesis*, Books ix.–xii. (xiii.).
Mystical Homilies on *Genesis*.
235. EXHORTATION TO MARTYRDOM (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28).
Homilies (nine) on *Judges* (date uncertain; before Comm. on *Canticles*).

235. Homilies (nine) on Isaiah (date uncertain). Commentaries on *Isaiah* (thirty books, extending to "the vision of the beasts in the wilderness:" extant in the time of Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 32).

c. 238–240. Commentaries on *Ezekiel*, twenty-five books on the whole prophet, finished at Athens (Euseb. *l. c.*)

c. 240. Letter to Julius Africanus on the Greek additions to Daniel.

Commentaries on the Canticles, five books written at Athens, the remaining five at Caesarea (Euseb. *l. c.*).

c. 241. Homilies (nine) on Psalms xxxvi.–xxxviii. To this period may probably be assigned the Commentaries and notes on *Exodus* and *Leviticus:* the Commentaries on *Isaiah* and the *Minor Prophets:* the Notes on *Numbers:* the Homilies and detached notes on the *Historical Books:* the completion of the Commentary on the *Psalms*.

after 244. Homilies taken down from his extempore addresses (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36) on the first four books of the Pentateuch, on Joshua, on Judges (doubtful), on Jeremiah (probably), on Ezekiel.

Commentaries (fifteen books) on the Epistle to the Romans.

Hexapla finished (Epiph. *de pond. et mens.* 18).

Commentaries on St. Matthew (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36).

Letters to Fabianus and others (Euseb. *l. c.*).

Commentaries (three books) on 1 *Thess.*, and (perhaps) the Commentaries on *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, the other Epistles of St. Paul, and on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

249. The eight Books against Celsus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36).

Pamphilus made a collection of Origen's writings in the library at Caesarea, transcribing a great part of them with his own hand (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 75). In the next century the library had fallen to decay, and it was restored by Euzoius, bishop of the city (*id.* 113). A relic of it remains in the Coislin MS. (H_3 of St. Paul's Epistles), which is said to have been collated with a copy at Caesarea written by Pamphilus.

IV. Writings.

The multitude of Origen's writings was a marvel to later scholars, and even a cause of anxious thought to himself (*Philoc.* c. v.). Epiphanius says (*Haer.* lxiv. 63) that in popular reports (ὁ ᾄδεται) no less than 6000 works were ascribed to him. Jerome denies the truth of his statement (*Ep.* lxxxii. 7), and brings down the number to a third (*Adv. Ruf.* ii. c. 22; cf. c. 13). It is not unlikely (comp. Redepenning, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 1851, 67 f.) that there was some early error in the cipher used by Eusebius in his Life of Pamphilus, from whom others drew their information (as of Stigma, 6000, for Sampi, 600); but the question is of no moment. The fact of the voluminousness of Origen's works does not depend upon determining their number. His works will be noticed in the following order: A. Exegetical, pp. 104–18; B. Dogmatical, pp. 119–122; C. Apologetic, pp. 122–4; D. Practical, p. 124; F. Letters, p. 125; G. Philocalia, pp. 125–6.[n]

[n] Jerome, in a letter addressed to Paula about 384, of which parts have been preserved by Rufinus (*Apol.* ii. 20; Hier. *Ep.* xxxiii.), compares the writings of Origen with those of the most voluminous classical writers, Varro and Didymus the grammarian (Chalcenteros); and after giving a catalogue of Origen's works, concludes: "Videtisne et Graecos pariter et Latinos unius labore superatos?"

The catalogue in the common texts is reduced to a few lines; but Sir T. Phillips was fortunate enough to find a copy of the letters in a MS. of the 12th century at Arras, in which the list of the works of Varro and Origen is given in full. The catalogue of Origen's writings has been reprinted, from a copy privately circulated by Sir T. Phillips, with a short notice by Redepenning, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 1851, 66 ff. It has not seemed worth while to reprint the catalogue at length, but I have added under the different heads the testimony of the catalogue with the letters H. C.

The list does not include the *Book against Celsus*, or the address on *Prayer;* the latter, however, may have been included in the collections of letters. On the other hand, it contains the title of a *Homily on Peace*, two *Homilies, de jejunis de monogamis et trigamis*, and of two *Homilies at Tarsus*. It also mentions the *Dialogue with Candidus the Valentinian*, which was known to Jerome (*Apol. adv. Ruf.* ii. 18 f.)

A. Exegetical Writings.

Epiphanius states, in general terms, that Origen undertook to comment on all the books of Scripture (*Haer.* lxiv. 3). Such a statement from such a man is of very little value, but independent and exact evidence goes far to confirm it. In the following sections a short account will be given, in the common order of the books of Scripture, of Origen's labours upon them.

His exegetical writings, it must be noted, are of three kinds: detached *Notes* (Σχόλια, σημειώσεις, in the narrower sense, *excerpta, commaticum interpretandi genus*), *Homilies* addressed to popular audiences (Ὁμιλίαι, *Tractatus*), and complete and elaborate *Commentaries* (Τόμοι, σημειώσεις in the wider sense, *volumina*). Comp. Hier. *in Ezech. Prol.*; *Praef. Comm. in Matt.*; Rufin. *Praef. in Num.*

1. *Writings on the Old Testament.*

i. The Pentateuch.

Genesis.

Origen, according to Eusebius, wrote *twelve* books of Commentaries (Τόμοι) on Genesis, of which the first eight were written before he left Alexandria (*H. E.* vi. 24). Jerome gives the number of books as *thirteen* (Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 20), and mentions that the thirteenth book contained a discussion of Gen. iv. 15. In *c. Cels.* v. 49, Origen refers to his work on Genesis "from the beginning of the book to v. 1;" and there is no evidence that his detailed commentary went further.

The two books of mystical Homilies (Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 20) seem to have been distinct from the seventeen homilies which remain in a Latin translation; and the notice of Melchizedek, to which Jerome refers (*Ep. ad Evang.* 72), was probably found in them. (14 "Books" on Genesis; 2 books "localium [moralium] omeliarum;" 17 Homilies.—H. C.)

Of these writings there remain:

Greek.

(1) On Gen. i. 2; *Fragm.* of *Tom.* iii. on Gen. i. 14; i. 16 f.

Huet, i. 1–17.
Delarue,[o] ii. 1–24.

[o] It may be worth while to notice that the name is always spelt as one word in the titles and notices in the French as well as in the Latin text.

(2) *Fragm.* of *Tom.* iii. (Euseb. *H. E.* **iii. 1**); notes from Catenae; *Fragm.* of *Hom.* **ii.**

Delarue, ii. 25–52, 60 ff.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *Biblioth.* xiv. app. 3 ff. The additional notes from Galland, and some of those from Mai, with one note from Cramer's *Catena*, are given in a supplementary volume of Migne.
(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, viii. 1–104.

Latin.

Seventeen *Homilies*, of which the last is imperfect, translated by Rufinus. The translation, as in other cases, is sometimes falsely ascribed to Jerome, *e.g.* in Merlin's edition.

Delarue, ii. 52–110.
Lommatzsch, viii. 105–298.

The MSS. of the Latin Homilies on the books of the Old Testament, it may be observed once for all, are very abundant. The most interesting which I have seen is one in the British Museum, Add. 15,307, written in 1163, which deserves collation.

One of the fragments of the Commentary on Genesis contains a remarkable discussion of the theory of fate in connexion with Gen. i. 16 (quoted by Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* vi. c. 11, and given in *Philoc.* 23 [22]; comp. Euseb. l. c. vii. 20); and in the scattered notes there are some characteristic remarks on the interpretation of the record of Creation. (See notes on i. 26; ii. 2, 16; iii. 21.) For Origen all Creation was "one act at once," presented to us in parts, in order to give the due conception of order (comp. Ps. cxlviii. 5).

The Homilies, which were taken down from Origen's extemporary addresses (after A.D. 244), were translated by Rufinus, with such additions as he thought requisite to complete the interpretation of the passages touched upon (*Praef. ad Rom.*). They deal mainly with the moral application of main subjects in the book:

i. Gen. i. *The origin of the world and of that which is in it.*
ii. „ vi. 13–16. *The construction of the Ark.*
iii. „ xvii. 1–14. *The circumcision of Abraham.*
iv. „ xviii. 1–21. *The visit of the three men to Abraham.*
v. „ xix. *Lot and his daughters.*
vi. „ xx. *The history of Abimelech.*
vii. „ xxi. *The weaning of Isaac and ejection of Ishmael.*
viii. „ xxii. 1–14. *The offering of Isaac.*
ix. „ xxii. 15–17. *The renewed promise to Abraham.*
x. „ xxiv. *Rebecca at the well.*
xi. „ xxv. *Abraham and Keturah; Isaac at the well of vision.*
xii. „ xxv. 21 ff.; xxvi. 12. *The birth of Esau and Jacob.*
xiii. „ xxvi. 17 ff. *The wells of Isaac.*
xiv. „ xxvi. 26 ff. *Isaac and Abimelech.*
xv. „ xlv. 25 f. *The return of the sons of Jacob from Egypt.*
xvi. „ xlvii. 20 f. *The policy of Joseph.*
xvii. „ xlix. *The blessings of the patriarchs.*

They contain little continuous exposition, but abound in striking thoughts. Among the passages of chief interest may be named the view of the Divine image and the Divine likeness, as expressing man's endowment and man's end (i. §§ 12, 13), the symbolism of the ark (ii. §§ 4 ff.), the nature of the Divine voice (iii. § 2), the lesson of the opened wells (xiii. § 4), the poverty of the Divine priesthood (xvi. § 5).

EXODUS and LEVITICUS.

Of the Books, Homilies, and Notes, which Origen wrote on Exodus and Leviticus, no detailed account has been preserved. (Comp. *in Rom.* ix. § 1, p. 283 L; Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 20; Hier. *Ep.* 33.) (Notes on Exodus; ten "Books" on Leviticus; Notes. Thirteen Homilies on Exodus; eleven on Leviticus.—H. C.)

The following remain:

EXODUS.

Greek.

(1) On Ex. x. 27. (Several fragments.)

Huet, i. 17–25.
Delarue, ii. 111–120.

(2) Notes from Catenae. Two short *fragments* of *Hom.* viii.

Delarue, ii. 121–129, 158.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* p. 5.
(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, viii. 299–332.

Latin.

Thirteen *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.

Delarue, ii. 129–178.
Lommatzsch, ix. 1–162.

The main fragment of the Commentary on Exodus (*Philoc.* 27 [26]) deals with interpretation of the "hardening of Pharaoh's heart" (Ex. x. 27), which Origen (to use modern language) finds in the action of moral laws, while Pharaoh resisted the divine teaching.

The Homilies, like those on Genesis, were translated by Rufinus from the reports of Origen's sermons, which he supplemented with interpretative additions (*l. c.*). They deal with the following topics:

i. Ex. i. 1–10. The multiplying of the people and the strange king.
ii. „ i. 15–22. The Egyptian midwives.
iii. „ iv. 10–v. The Mission of Moses and Aaron.
iv. „ vii. ff. The ten plagues.
v. „ xii. 37 ff. The Exodus.
vi. „ xv. 1–22. The Song of Moses.
vii. „ xv. 23–xvi. 12. The waters of Marah and the Manna.
viii. „ xx. 1–6. The first Two Commandments.
ix. „ xxv. The Tabernacle.
x. „ xxi. 22–25. Miscarriage from strife.
xi. „ xvii. xviii. Rephidim: Amalek: Jethro.
xii. „ xxxiv. 33 f. The glory of the face of Moses.
xiii. „ xxxv. Freewill offerings of the Tabernacle.

Throughout Origen dwells upon the spiritual interpretation of the record. "Not one iota or one tittle is," in his opinion, "without mysteries" (*Hom.* i. 4). The literal history has a mystical and a moral meaning (*e.g. Hom.* i. 4 f.; ii. 1; iii. 3; iv. 8; vii. 3; x. 4; xiii. 5). Some of the applications which he makes are of great beauty, as, for example, in regard to the popular complaints against religious life, and the troubles which follow religious awakening (Ex. v. 4 ff., *Hom.* iii. 3); the difficulties of the heavenward pilgrimage (Ex. xiv. 2, *Hom.* v. 3); the believer as the tabernacle of God (*Hom.* ix. 4); turning to the Lord (Ex. xxxiv. 34, coll. 2 Cor. iii. 16, *Hom.* xii. 2); the manifold offerings of different believers (Ex. xxxv. 5, *Hom.* xiii. 3).

LEVITICUS.

Greek.

(1) *Fragm.* of *Hom.* 2 (5).

Huet, i. 26.
Delarue, ii. 192 f.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 180–184.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 6 f.

(4) A fragment (comp. *Hom. in Lev.* viii. 6), Mai, *Class. Auct.* t. x. p. 600.

(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, ix. 163–171.

Latin.

Sixteen *Homilies* (translated by Rufinus).

Delarue, ii. 184–269.
Lommatzsch, ix. 172–446.

The main substance of the Greek Notes is contained in the translation of the Homilies. The fragment given in Philocalia (c. 1), as from the *second* Homily, is found in the *fifth* Latin Homily (§ 1), though, by a strange oversight, writers, from Huet (*Orig.* iii. 2. 1 : "cujus ne apicem quidem in Homilia Latinae editionis secunda aliisve reperias") downwards, have said that it is not found in the Latin.

The Latin translation of the Homilies was made by Rufinus, who speaks of it as having been a work of considerable labour, as he altered their character from hortatory to interpretative (*Peror. Ep. ad Rom.* : "quae ab illo [Origene] quidem perorandi stilo a nobis vero explanandi specie translata sunt").

The Homilies treat of the following subjects :

i.	Lev. i. 1–9.	On offerings generally.
ii.	„ iv. 3 ; 27 f.	On the different persons who offer : the priest, "a soul of the people of the land."
iii.	„ v. 1 ff.	On offerings for involuntary offenses.
iv.	„ vi. 1–23.	Offering for offences committed knowingly : burnt-offering.
v.	„ vi. 24–vii. 34.	Sin-offering : trespass offering : peace-offering.
vi.	„ vii. 35–viii. 13.	The consecration and array of the priests.
vii.	„ x. 8 ff.–xi.	Special laws for the priests. Animals clean and unclean.
viii.	„ xii. 2 ff. xiii. xiv.	Ceremonial uncleanness : leprosy.
ix.	„ xvi. 1–17.	The day of Atonement.
x.	„ xvi.	The fast on the day of Atonement and the scape-goat.
xi.	„ xx. 7 ff.	Consecration.
xii.	„ xxi. 10.	The High Priest.
xiii.	„ xxiv. 1–9.	The lamps, the shewbread, &c
xiv.	„ xxiv. 10–14.	The blasphemer.
xv.	„ xxv.	Sales and redemptions.
xvi.	„ xxvi. 3 ff.	The blessings of obedience.

In the interpretation of Leviticus Origen naturally dwells on the obvious moral and spiritual antitypes of the Mosaic ordinances. Not unfrequently the use which he makes of them is impressive and ingenious. Such, for instance, is his view of man's soul and body, as the deposit which he owes to God (Lev. vi. 4, *Hom.* iv. 3); of the office of the Christian priest foreshadowed in that of the Jewish priest (Lev. vii. 28 ff., *Hom.* 7. 12); of the priesthood of believers (Lev. viii. 7 ff., *Hom.* vi. 5 ; comp. *Hom.* ix. 9); of the Saviour's sorrow (Lev. x. 9 coll. Matt. xxvi. 9, *Hom.* vii. 2), of the purification by fire (Lev. xvi. 12, *Hom.* ix. 7). Throughout Christ appears as the one Sacrifice for the world, and the one Priest (*Hom.* i. 2 ; iv. 8 ; v. 3 ; ix. 2 ; xii.), though elsewhere He is said to join with Himself apostles and martyrs (*Hom. in Num.* x. 2).

NUMBERS.

No mention is made of "Books" on Numbers, unless the reference in *Prol. in Cant.* p. 316, &c. is to a commentary and not to a lost Homily. (Twenty-eight Homilies.—H. C.)

Of Notes and Homilies (comp. *Hom. in Jer.* xii. § 3) the following remain :

Greek.

(1) Notes from Catenae. Small *Fragment* of *Hom.* xiii.

Delarue, ii. 270–274 ; 321.
Lommatzsch, x. 1–8 ; 156 note.

(2) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 7 f.

Latin.

Twenty-eight *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.[p]

Delarue, ii. 275–386.
Lommatzsch, x. 9–370.

The Homilies follow the whole course of the narrative :

i.	Num. i. 1–3.	The idea of "numbering."
ii.	„	ii. 1 f. The ordering of the tribes.
iii.	„	iii. 11 ff. The separation of the Levites.
iv.	„	iii. 39. The number of the Levites.
v.	„	iv. 18 f., 47. The work of the Levites.
vi.	„	xi. 24 ff., xii. 2. The seventy elders. The Ethiopian wife of Moses.
vii.	„	xii. 5 ff. The leprosy of Miriam.
viii.	„	xiv. 8 ff. The report of the spies and the murmurings of the people.
ix.	„	xvi., xvii. The sedition of Korah. Aaron's rod.
x.	„	xviii. 1 ff. The vicarious office of the priests.
xi.	„	xviii. Of the first-fruits.
xii.	„	xxi. 16 ff. The song of the well.
xiii.	„	xxi. 24 ff., xxii. The defeat of Sihon and Og. Balaam and the ass.
xiv.	„	xxii. Balaam.
xv.	„	xxiii. 1–10. The first prophecy of Balaam.
xvi.	„	xxiii. 11–24. The second prophecy.
xvii.	„	xxiii. 27–xxiv. 9. The third prophecy.
xviii.	„	xxiv. 10–19. The fourth prophecy.
xix.	„	xxiv. 20–24. The fifth prophecy.
xx.	„	xxv. The sin with Baal-peor.
xxi.	„	xxvi. The second numbering of the people.
xxii.	„	xxvii. 1 ff. The daughters of Zelophehad. Provision for Moses' successor.
xxiii.	„	xxviii. On the various Festivals.

[p] Cassiodorus (*Instit.* 1) mentions thirty, but this is probably only a difference of numbering. Several Homilies might be properly divided : *e. g.* ix. xiii., xxii. The translation of the Homilies (twenty-eight) on Numbers was among the latest works of Rufinus. It was made in the year of his death (410), after the desolation of Rhegium by Alaric, and while Sicily was still threatened by the Goths (Ruf. *Prolog.*). Rufinus incorporated in his translation the notes (*Excerpta*) which he found (*l. c.*) In offering it to Ursacius, at whose request it was undertaken, he proposes, if his health allows, to translate the Homilies on Deuteronomy, which alone remained of Origen's writings on the Pentateuch. This design however was hindered by his death.

xxiv. Num. xxx. On various offerings.
xxv. „ xxxi. The vengeance on the Midianites.
xxvi. „ xxxi. 48 ff., xxxii. Differences among the people.
xxvii. „ xxxiii. Stages in the people's journeyings.
xxviii. „ xxxiv. The borders of the land.

One main idea is prominent throughout. The struggles of the Israelites on the way to Canaan are the image of the struggles of the Christian. The entrance on the Promised Land foreshadows the entrance on the heavenly realm (*Hom.* vii. 5). The future world will even, in Origen's judgment, offer differences of race and position corresponding to those of the tribes of Israel and the nations among whom they moved (*Hom.* i. 3; ii. 1; xi. 5; xxviii. 4). The interpretation of the record of the stations (*Hom.* xxvii.) is a very good example of the way in which he finds a meaning in the minutest details of the history. Of wider interest are his remarks on man's spiritual conflict (*Hom.* vii. 6), on the wounds of sin (*Hom.* viii. 1), on advance in wisdom (*Hom.* xvii. 4), on the festivals of heaven (*Hom.* xxiii. 11), on self-dedication (*Hom.* xxiv. 2), on the stains of battle (*Hom.* xxv. 6).

Deuteronomy.

Cassiodorus (*de Instit.* 1) mentions four Homilies of Origen on Deuteronomy (in quibus est minuta nimis et subtilis expositio), and there can be no doubt that it was these (*oratiunculae*) Rufinus proposed to translate if his health had been restored. Origen speaks of the interpretation of Deuteronomy as a work still future in the latest book of his commentary on St. John (*in Joh.* Tom. xxxii. § 11). On the other hand he refers to his discussion of Deut. iv. 17 in his homilies on St. Luke (*Hom.* viii.).

(Thirteen Homilies.—H. C.)

The scanty remains are:

(1) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 386–393.
Lommatzsch, x. 371–382.

(2) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 8–14.

One interesting note at least among those which have been collected from Catenae appears to be a fragment of a homily (*in Deut.* viii. 7).

It is probable (Hier. *Ep.* 84, 7) that considerable fragments of Origen's comments on the Pentateuch are contained in Ambrose's treatise on the *Hexaemeron*, but the treatise has not yet been critically examined.

ii. Joshua–Second Kings.

Origen appears to have treated these historical books in homilies only, or perhaps in detached notes also.

(Twenty-six Homilies on Joshua.—H. C.)

There remain of the several books:

Joshua.

Greek.

(1) *Fragm.* of *Hom.* xx.

Huet, i. 26 ff.
Delarue, ii. 442 f.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 393–6.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 14 f.

(1) and (2) are given by Lommatzsch, xi. 167 ff. 1–166, 170–214.

Latin.

Twenty-six *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus

Delarue, ii. 397–457.
Lommatzsch, xi. 6–214.

The homilies on Joshua belong to the latest period of Origen's life. They were delivered after the homilies on Jeremiah (*Hom.* xiii. 3), and the reference to a systematic persecution in *Hom.* ix. 10 seems to point to that of Decius 250. In this case the Latin translator Rufinus appears, from the language of his preface, to have adhered faithfully to the texts before him. (Comp. *Peror. Ep. ad Rom.*: quae in Jesu Naue scripsimus simpliciter expressimus ut invenimus.) Perhaps for this reason these homilies offer the most attractive specimen of Origen's popular interpretation. The parallel between the leader of the Old Church and the Leader of the New is drawn with great ingenuity and care. The spiritual interpretation of the conquest of Canaan, as an image of the Christian life, never flags. Fact after fact is made contributory to the fulness of the idea; and the reader is forced to acknowledge that the fortunes of Israel can at least speak to us with an intelligible voice. Rufinus himself may have felt the peculiar charm of the book, for he selected it for translation in answer to a general request of Chromatius to render something from Greek literature for the edification of the church.

The homilies cover the whole narrative up to the settling of the land (c. xxii.):

i. Introductory.
ii. Josh. i. 1 ff. The charge to Joshua.
iii. „ i. 16 ff., ii. The preparation.
iv. „ iii. The passage of Jordan.
v. „ iv.–v. 9. The renewal of the Covenant.
vi. „ v. 10 ff. The Passover at Gilgal; and the divine vision.
vii. „ vi. The capture of Jericho.
viii. „ vii.–viii. 29. The failure before Ai and its capture.
ix. „ viii. 30 ff. The altar in Ebal, and the blessings and cursings.
x. „ ix. The craft of the Gibeonites.
xi. „ x. The battle of Beth-horon.
xii. The spiritual interpretation generally.
xiii. Josh. x. 28 ff. The taking of Libnah, &c.
xiv. „ xi. 1 ff. The conquest of Jabin.
xv. „ xi. 9 ff. Vengeance on the enemies of the Lord.
xvi. „ xiii. 1. Joshua at the close of life.
xviii. „ xiii. 14. The Levites without earthly inheritance.
xviii. „ xiv. 6 ff. The request of Caleb.
xix. „ xv. 1. The borders of Judah.
xx. „ xv. 13 ff. Caleb and his daughter.
xxi. „ xv. 63. The Jebusites unconquered.
xxii. „ xvi. 10. Ephraim and the Canaanites.
xxiii. „ xviii. 8. Distribution by lot.
xxiv. „ xix. 47 (LXX) ff. The remaining Amorites. The portion of Joshua.
xxv. „ xxi. 2 ff. The cities of the Levites.
xxvi. „ xxi. 42 (LXX), xxii. 11 ff. The burying of the stone knives and the altar of the trans-Jordanic tribes.

Among other passages of special interest may be mentioned those on the help which we gain from the old fathers (*Hom.* iii. 1); the broad parallel between the Christian life and the history of the Exodus (*Hom.* iv. 1); the Christian realising Christ's victory (*Hom.* vii. 2); growing wisdom (*Hom.* xii. 2).

(Nine Homilies on Judges: eight *in Paschae.*—H. C.)

JUDGES.
Greek.
(1) Notes from Catenae.
Delarue, ii. 457 f.
Lommatzsch, xi. 215 f.

(2) Additional notes.
Galland, *l. c.* 15.

Latin.
Nine *Homilies*, translated by Rufinus.
Delarue, ii. 458–478.
Lommatzsch, xi. 217–284.

RUTH.
Greek.
A note on i. 4.
Delarue, ii. 478.
Lommatzsch, xi. 284.

The Homilies on Judges contain a reference to Homilies on Joshua (*Hom.* iii. § 3), but Origen may have treated the book more than once. Rufinus translated them, as he says, literally as he found them (*Peror. Ep. ad Rom.*). They are of much less interest than those on Joshua, and deal with the following subjects:

i. Jud. ii. 7. The Israelites serving the Lord.
ii. „ ii. 8 ff. The death of Joshua.
iii. „ iii. 9 ff., 12 ff. Othniel and Ehud.
iv. „ iii. 31, iv. 1 ff. Shamgar, Jabin, Sisera.
v. „ iv. 4 ff. Deborah, Barak, Jael.
vi. „ v. The song of Deborah.
vii. „ vi. 1 ff. The oppression of Midian.
viii. „ vi. 33 ff. Gideon.
ix. „ vii. The victory of Gideon.

A passage on martyrdom—the baptism of blood—is worthy of notice (*Hom.* vii. 2). In another passage (*Hom.* ix. 1) Origen seems to refer to the persecution of Maximinus, which was but lately ended.

FIRST and SECOND SAMUEL, FIRST and SECOND KINGS (First to Fourth Kings).
Greek.
(Four Homilies on 1 Kings.—H. C.)
(1) *Hom.* on 1 Sam. xxviii. (*On the Witch of Endor*).
Huet, i. 28–37.
Delarue, ii. 490–498.

(2) Notes from Catenae and Fragments.
Delarue, ii. 479–81.

(3) Additional notes.
Galland, *l. c.* 16–24.
(1) and (2) are given in Lommatzsch, xi. 317–332, 285–288.

Latin.
Homily on 1 Sam. i. ii. (*De Helchana et Fenenna*), delivered at Jerusalem (§ 1: nolite illud in nobis requirere quod in papa Alexandro habetis). The translator is not known.
Delarue, ii. 481–489.
Lommatzsch, xi. 289–316.

The remains of Origen's writings on the later historical books are very slight. Origen himself refers (*Hom. on Josh.* iii. § 4) to a Homily on Solomon's Judgment (1 Kings iii.); and in the time of Cassiodorus there were, in addition to the two extant Homilies, four Homilies on 1 Sam., one on 2 Sam., one on 2 Chron. (*Instit.* 2), and "two on the book of Ezra, which were translated into Latin by Bellator" (*Instit.* 6). It is possible that at least the two last may yet be found.

The Homily on the witch of Endor provoked violent attacks. In this Origen maintained, in accordance with much early Christian and Jewish opinion, that the soul of Samuel was truly called up from Hades. Among others Eustathius of Antioch assailed Origen in unmeasured terms. One passage in the Latin Homily may be specially noticed, in which unity is set forward as the special privilege of saints (§ 4).

iii. THE HAGIOGRAPHA.
JOB.
Origen composed many Homilies on Job (Eustath. Antioch. *de Engastr.* 391), which were rendered freely into Latin by Hilary of Poictiers (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 100; *Ep. adv. Vigil.* 61, 2). The scattered Notes which remain are not sufficient to enable us to estimate their value. Comp. *Hom. in Ezech.* vi. 4; Hier. *Ep. ad Pammach.* 57, 6; *Lib.* 1. *c. Ruf.* § 2.[q]
(Twenty-two Homilies on Job.—H. C.)

There remain:
Greek.
(1) Notes from Catenae.
Delarue, 500–510.
Lommatzsch, xi. 335–350

(2) Additional notes.
Galland, *l. c.* 30–54.
Mai, *Class. Auct.* tom. ix. in Procopius (many additional passages).

Latin.
Fragment quoted from a homily of Hilary by August. *Lib.* ii. *c. Jul.* § 27, and assumed to be translated from Origen.
Delarue, ii. 500.
Lommatzsch, xi. 333 f.

THE PSALMS.
The Psalms engaged Origen's attention before he left Alexandria. At that time he had written commentaries on Pss. i.–xxv. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24). He continued and completed the book afterwards. Jerome expressly states that he "left an explanation of all the Psalms in many volumes" (*Ep.* cxii. § 20); and his extant books contain references to his commentaries on psalms scattered throughout the collection (comp. Hier. *Ep.* xxxiv. § 1).

In addition to these detailed commentaries Origen illustrated the Psalter by short Notes ("a handbook:" enchiridion ille vocabat, Auct. ap. Hier. *Tom.* vii. *App.*[r]), and by Homilies.

---

[q] The two works on Job printed with Origen's writings are not his. Comp. Tillemont, note 34.

[r] The passage is worth quoting: "Cum Origenis Psalterium, quod Enchiridion ille vocabat .... in commune legeremus, simul uterque deprehendimus nonnulla eum .... intacta reliquisse, de quibus in alio opere .... disputavit .... Igitur .... studiose .... postulasti ut quaecumque mihi digna memoria videbantur signis quibusdam annotarem .... non quod putem a me posse dici quae ille praeteriit, sed quod ea quae in tomis vel homiliis ipse disseruit vel ego digna arbitror lectione in hunc angustum commentariolum referam." There can be no doubt therefore that this *Breviarium in Psalmos* contains much of Origen's work and deserves consideration in this respect.

The Homilies which are preserved in Rufinus's Latin translation belong to the latest period of Origen's life, c. 241–247 (*Hom.* 1 *in Ps.* xxxvi. § 2; *Hom.* 1 *in Ps.* xxxvii. § 1). They give a continuous practical interpretation of the three psalms, and are a very good example of this style of exposition. One passage on the permanent effects of actions on the doer may be specially noticed (*Hom.* ii. § 2).

The Greek fragments preserved in the Catenae offer numerous close coincidences with the Latin Homilies, and there is no reason to doubt that they represent the general sense of Origen's comments. Comp. *Comm. in Rom.* iv. § 1 (cum de Psalmis per ordinem dictaremus); *id.* § 11; *Hom. in Jer.* xv. 6.

(Notes on Psalms, in all forty-six books; and one hundred and eighteen Homilies.—H. C.)

There remain still of writings on the Psalms:

Greek.

(1) *Fragments* from the Τόμοι and *Homilies.*

Huet, i. 1–51.
Delarue, ii. 525–529, 532, 565–572.

(2) Additional fragments and notes from Catenae.

Delarue, ii. 513–524, 529–849.

(3) Additional notes.

Galland, *l. c.* 54–73. Comp. Delarue, ii. *Praef.* p. ii.
(1) and (2) are given in Lommatzsch, xi. 351–458; xii. xiii. 1–165, with an additional fragment from Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 38.

Latin.

Nine *Homilies* on Pss. xxxvi. xxxvii. xxxviii. (translated by Rufinus).

Delarue, ii. 655–679, 680–689, 691–700.
Lommatzsch, xii. 151–234, 237–271, 274–306.

PROVERBS.

(Three Books; seven Homilies; one book of questions.—H. C.)

On the book of Proverbs there remain:

Greek.

(1) Fragments.

Delarue, iii. 2–10.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 219–234.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Galland, *l. c.* 25–29.
Additional notes, Mai, *Bibl. Nov. Patrum*, vii.

Latin.

Fragments.

Delarue, iii. 1.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 217 f.

ECCLESIASTES.

(Notes; eight Homilies.—H. C.)

Notes on iii. 3, 7, 16 f.

Galland, *l. c.* 30.

LAMENTATIONS.

Origen wrote commentaries on the Lamentations before 231, of which five books had come down to the time of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 24). The Greek notes are probably derived from these.

(Five Books.—H. C.)

Delarue, iii. 321–351.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 167–216.

CANTICLES.

It was natural that the book of Canticles should occupy Origen early. He wrote a small volume upon it, of which a fragment remains in the *Philocalia*, c. vii. At a much later time, when he was at Athens 240, he composed five books of a full commentary, which he afterwards completed at Caesarea (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Jerome speaks of the work with enthusiasm: "in his other books Origen," he says, "surpassed every one else, in this he surpassed himself" (*Prol. in Hom. in Cant.*). The prologue and part of the full commentary (to *Cant.* ii. 16) were translated by Rufinus.[s] Jerome himself shrank from undertaking the task, and rendered instead two Homilies, which cover the same ground but in a simpler form. No work of Origen's more widely influenced later commentators. He marked in it once for all the main lines of allegorical interpretation which they followed. The writing contains also some passages of more general interest, as the examination of the three books of Solomon—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles—in connexion with the popular types of speculation (*Prol.*).

(Ten Books; two Books written early; two Homilies.—H. C.)

There remain:

Greek.

(1) *Fragments* of his early work.

Huet, i. 51 f.
Delarue, iii. 11.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 232 f

(2) Extracts by Procopius.

Delarue, iii. 94–104.
Lommatzsch, xv. 91–108.

Latin.

Two *Homilies* (translated by Jerome).

Delarue, iii. 12–22.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 235–278.

Prologue and four books on Canticles, translated by Rufinus.

Delarue, iii. 26–94.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 287–437; xv. 1–90.

iv. THE PROPHETS.

ISAIAH.

Origen interpreted Isaiah in each of the three forms which he used in Books (τόμοι), in Notes, and in Homilies. Thirty books of his Commentaries remained when Eusebius wrote his *History* extending to c. xxx. 6 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Some of these had already perished in the time of Jerome, who speaks of the work as abounding in allegories and interpretation of names (*Prol. in Lib.* v. *in Es.*: liberis allegoriae spatiis evagatur et interpretatis nominibus singulorum ingenium suum facit ecclesiae sacramenta). Besides these Commentaries Jerome was acquainted with twenty-five Homilies and Notes.

(Thirty-six Books; thirty-six books of notes (?); thirty-two Homilies.—H. C.)

[s] This appears to be the real meaning of what Cassiodorus says, *De Div. Instit.* § 5, though he apparently describes Rufinus' work as only an amplified translation of the same original as Jerome rendered: quos item Rufinus...adjectis quibusdam locis usque ad illud praeceptum quod ait *capite nobis* ... (ii. 15) tribus libris latius exposuit.

All that at present remains of these Commentaries and Homilies is:

Latin.

Two fragments of the "Books."

Nine *Homilies*.

Delarue, iii. 105–124.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 235–301.

The last of the Homilies is imperfect. They were translated by Jerome, who is accused by Rufinus of having modified the original text for dogmatic purposes.

The Homilies were addressed to a popular audience, including catechumens, but they want the ease of the latest discourses, and follow no exact order.

i. Is. vi. 1–7. The call of the prophet.
ii. „ vii. 10–16. The virgin's son.
iii. „ iv. 1. The seven women.
iv. „ vi. 1–7. The vision of God.
v. „ xli. 2; vi. 1 ff.
vi. „ vi. 8 ff. The mission of the prophet.
vii. „ viii. 18 ff. The prophet and his children.
viii. „ x. 10–13.
ix. „ vi. 8–vii. 11. (A fragment.)

One passage of characteristic excellence may be mentioned (*Hom.* vi. 4), in which Origen describes the "greater works" of Christ's disciples.

JEREMIAH.

Cassiodorus enumerates forty-five homilies of Origen on Jeremiah "in Attic style" (*de Instit. div. litt.* § 3). Of these Jerome translated fourteen "confuso ordine" (*Praef. in Hom. in Jer. et Ezech.*), which have been preserved; and Rabanus Maurus (*Praef. in Jerem.*), referring to the statement of Cassiodorus, states that he could find only fourteen homilies translated. Of the nineteen Greek homilies twelve are identical with twelve of Jerome, so that altogether twenty-one homilies remain. The homilies were written in a period of tranquillity, and therefore, in all probability, after the close of the persecution of Maximinus, c. 245 (*Hom.* iv. 3).

(Twenty-four Homilies.—H. C.)

There remains then altogether:

Greek.

(1) Nineteen *Homilies* (with Jerome's version of twelve). Fragment of *Hom.* xxxix.

Huet, i. 53–199.
Delarue, iii. 125–276, 285 f.
Lommatzsch, xv. 109–388 (without Jerome's translation).

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, iii. 287–320.
Lommatzsch, xv. 418–480.

Latin.

Two *Homilies*, translated by Jerome.

Delarue, iii. 277–286.
Lommatzsch, xv. 389–417.

The Greek homilies were first published in 1548, from a MS. in the Escurial under the name of Cyril, which they bore in the MS., by B. Corderius. A second MS., containing the same Homilies, was afterwards found in the Vatican by M. Ghisler, who published the Greek text of the seven not translated by Jerome (3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 18, 19) in his *Commentary on Jeremiah* (1623). The various readings of this text were added by Huet to his reprint of the text of Corderius, and they are given from him in later editions of Origen.[t]

The nineteen Greek *Homilies* follow the order of the text:

i. Jer. i. 1–10. The mission of the prophet.
ii. „ ii. 21 f. The degenerate vine.
iii. „ ii. 31. The universal goodness of God.
iv. „ iii. 6–10. Perils of degeneracy.
v. „ iii. 22–iv. 8. Call to repentance.
vi. „ v. 3 ff. Insensibility.
vii. „ v. 18 f. Chastisement.
viii. „ x. 12 ff. The work of God for men.
ix. „ xi. 1–10. The word of God to His people.
x. „ xi. 18–xii. 9. The apostasy of the Jews. Christ's work.
xi. „ xii. 11–xiii. 11. The rejection of the Jews.
xii. „ xiii. 12–17. Just judgment.
xiii. „ xv. 5 ff. Punishment of backsliders.
xiv. „ xv. 10–19. The lot of the rejected prophet.
xv. „ xv. 10 ff.; xvii. 5. The sorrow of Christ. No hope in man.
xvi. „ xvi. 16–xvii. 1. Fishers and hunters of souls. The record of sin.
xvii. „ xvii. 11–16. The image of the partridge. Divine help.
xviii. „ xviii. 1–16; xx. 1–6. The potter. The punishment of the impenitent. The lesson of Pashur.
xix. „ xx. 7–12. How God deceives. Endurance of reproaches.
xx. (Latin.) Jer. l. 23–29. The hammer of the earth broken.
xxi. (Latin.) „ li. 6–9. Flight from Babylon.
xxxix. (Gk. fragm.) Jer. xliv. 22. Each word of Scripture has its work.

For the most part the Homilies give a full interpretation of the text, accommodating the language of the prophet to the circumstances of the Christian Church. But Origen's total want of historical feeling makes itself felt perhaps more in his treatment of this book than elsewhere, for the teaching of Jeremiah is practically unintelligible without a true sense of the tragic crisis in which he was placed. There are however many separate passages of the Homilies of considerable beauty, *e. g.* on the fruitful discipline of God (*Hom.* iii. 2), the ever-new birth of Christ (*Hom.* ix. 4), the marks of sin (*Hom.* xvi. 10). Comp. *Hom. in Josh.* xiii. § 3.

The selected Notes probably supply the general sense of the lost homilies on the passages to which they refer. As far as the Homilies extend, they contain the main substance of the Notes.

EZEKIEL.

(Twenty-nine Books; twelve Homilies.—H.C.)

Of Origen's writings on Ezekiel there remain:

Greek.

(1) Fragments.

Huet, i. 200 f.
Delarue, iii. 352 f.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 1 ff.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Delarue, iii. 406–437.
Lommatzsch, xiv. 179–232.
Mai, *Bibl. Nov. Patrum*, vii.

[t] It is commonly said, as even the language of Huet seems to suggest, that Ghisler found only seven homilies. His own account (*Praef.* c. vii.) is quite clear that he found twenty homilies, nineteen on Jeremiah with one other, and that he printed the seven homilies on Jeremiah which were not translated by Jerome. It does not appear that either of the MSS. have been re-examined.

Latin.

Fourteen *Homilies.*

Delarue, iii. 353–406
Lommatzsch, xiv. 4–178.

Eusebius records that Origen wrote a Commentary on Ezekiel in twenty-five books, which was finished at Athens, c. 238 (*H. E.* vi. 32). Of these the notes may contain some fragments; and one fragment of the twentieth book is given in the *Philocalia* (c. xi.). The Homilies belong to a later date. Of these (it is unknown how many were published) Jerome translated fourteen, preserving in his version, as he says, the simple style of the original (*Prol. in Ezech.*). These treat of the following passages:

i. Ezek. i. 1–16. The first vision of Ezekiel.
ii. „ xiii. 2–9. The message to false prophets.
iii. „ xiii. 17–xiv. 8. The heaviness of the prophet's charge.
iv. „ xiv. 13 f. Personal salvation of the righteous.
v. „ xiv., xv. 2. The judgments of God.
vi. „ xvi. 2–15. The misery of God's people in sin.
vii. „ xvi. 16–29. The abominations of false teaching.
viii. „ xvi. 30–33. The issues of false teaching.
ix. „ xvi. 45–52. The heinousness of pride.
x. „ xvi. 52–60. The fruit of chastisement.
xi. „ xvii. 2, 3. The parable of the eagle.
xii. „ xvii. 12–24. Judgments and promises.
xiii. „ xxviii. 12, 13. Corruption of blessings.
xiv. „ xliv. 2. The closed gate.

It will be seen that the Homilies cover only a small portion of the book; nor do they offer many features of special interest. The passages which speak of the responsibility of teachers (*Hom.* v. 5; vii. 3) are perhaps the most striking.

Daniel.

Origen commented upon the histories of Susanna and of Bel (Dan. *Apocr.* xiii. xiv.) in the tenth book of his *Miscellanies* (Στρωματεῖς), and Jerome has preserved a brief abstract of his notes as an appendix to his commentary on Daniel (Delarue, i. 49 f.; Lommatzsch, xvii., 70 ff.).

In a collection of notes on Daniel printed by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nova Coll.* i. 2, Romae 1825), I have observed two notes referred to Origen on Dan. i. 8; iv. 25, but they might well have been taken from homilies on other books.

The Minor Prophets.

Origen wrote extensive commentaries on the twelve minor prophets, of which twenty-five books remained in the time of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 36); and Jerome says that he found a manuscript of them "written by the hand of Pamphilus" which he kept "as the treasures of Croesus" (*De Vir. Ill.* § 75). Of the number of these were probably the two volumes on Zech. i.–v., the three on Malachi, and the two on Hosea, which Jerome mentions in the prefaces of his own commentaries on those books. The fragment on Hosea xii., preserved in the *Philocalia*, c. viii., is all that now remains.

(Two Books on Hosea (one on Ephraim); two on Joel; six on Amos; one on Jonah; two on Micah; two on Nahum; three on Habakkuk; two on Zephaniah; one on Haggai; two on Zechariah (principio); two on Malachi.—H. C.)

Hosea.

Fragment.

Huet, i. 201 f.
Delarue, iii. 438 f.
Lommatzsch, xiii. 302 ff.

2. Writings on the New Testament.

St. Matthew

There remain.

Greek.

(1) Fragments of Τόμοι i. ii. Τόμοι x.–xvii. (Matt. xiii. 36–xxii. 33).

Huet, i. 203–469.
Delarue, iii. 440–829.
Lommatzsch, iii. 1–lv. 172.

(2) Notes from Catenae.

Galland, *l. c.* 73–83.

(3) A large number of additional notes from *Cod. Coislin.* xxiii.

Cramer, *Catena*, vol. i., Oxford, 1840.

Latin.

(1) Fragments.

(2) An old version of the commentary on St. Matthew, xvi. 13–xxvii.

Delarue, iii. 521–931.

Lommatzsch gives the Latin version from the point where the Greek fails; iv. 173–v. 84.

Eusebius states that Origen wrote twenty-five Books (τόμοι) on St. Matthew (*H. E.* vi. 36); and Jerome, in the preface to his commentary on St. Matthew, says that he had read that number; but in the prologue to his translation of Origen's homilies on St. Luke he speaks, according to the common text, of "thirty-six books" (the Corpus Christi Coll. Camb. MS. reads *twenty-six*), and Rufinus again (*Apol.* ii. § 22) of "twenty-six." From the proportion which the remaining books bear to the whole gospel, the statement of Eusebius appears to be correct. The largest number is certainly wrong.

The commentaries seem to have been written c. A.D. 245–6. He refers in them to his (lost) homilies on St. Luke (Tom. xiii. 29; Tom. xvi. 9); and to his commentaries on St. John (Tom. xvi. 20; *Comm. Ser.* §§ 77, 133, John xix. 18) and on the Romans (Tom. xvii. 32). In addition to the "Books" Origen also wrote Homilies and Notes (scholia) upon the Gospel (Hier. *Praef. in Matt.*). Fragments from these may be preserved in some of the notes from Catenae.

(Twenty-five Books; twenty-five Homilies. —H. C.)

The Greek text of the Commentaries is preserved in four MSS.

1. *Codex Holmiensis*, in the Library of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, B. 8, 10, quoted by Delarue as *two* MSS.: collated by Bentley, in a copy of Huet, in the same library, F. 7, 13.[a]
2. *Codex Regius*, a Paris MS., used by Huet.
3. *Codex Vaticanus* 597, used by Delarue.
4. *Codex Venetus* 43, examined partially by Petermann for Lommatzsch.

To these may be added a copy of a MS. made by Tarinus and used by Delarue.

[a] Huet seems to insinuate some doubts as to Thorndike's title to the MS. The inscription in the MS. is quite definite: "Hic est ille codex Holmiensis quem toties laudat Dan. Huetius in suis Origenianis. (Then apparently in another hand.) Donavit Herberto Thorndicio Isaacus Vossius." A MS. of the *Dialogues against the Marcionites* in the same collection (B. 9. 110) bears an inscription in the same hand: "Dedit Herberto Thorndicio cl. v. Is. Vossius."

All the MSS. are from one archetype (see lacunae, xii. 20, 42; xiii. 28; xvii. 29, 31).

The Latin text of the *editio princeps* (Merlin) represents a good MS. Delarue in the Appendix in vol. iv. pp. 388 ff. has given a collation of two MSS., one of the 8th and the other of the 12th century, which Lommatzsch has incorporated in his edition; and there is a very fine MS. (*Saec.* xii.) in the British Museum (*Add.* 26,761).

The Latin MSS. like the Greek, seem to represent a single archetype.

The work was probably addressed to Ambrosius. Personal addresses occur in it not unfrequently (xiv. 24, *σὺ ζητήσαις ἄν*; xv. 5; xvi. 7, § 19).

The *Cod. Holm.* gives the tenth and eleventh books under one heading—*ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὸ* K. M. *εὐαγ.* T. *ιᾱ* (the later books are headed *Τόμις ιβ̄*, &c.), and the same heading is found in other authorities. The commentary however does not seem to be a mere series of extracts; and the old Latin version is not more remote from the text than other Latin versions of Origen's works in which the translators introduced from time to time notes from other parts of his works.

The *tenth* book gives a continuous exposition of Matt. xiii. 36–xiv. 15. The most interesting passages are those in which Origen discusses characteristically the types of spiritual sickness (*c.* 24); and the doubtful question as to "the brethren of the Lord" (*c.* 17). In the latter place he gives his own opinion, on internal grounds, in favour of the belief in the perpetual virginity of the mother of the Lord. In the account of Herod's banquet he has preserved definitely the fact, that "the daughter of Herodias" bore the same name as her mother (*c.* 22), in accordance with the true reading in Mark vi. 22 (*τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρῳδιάδος*); but he strangely supposes that the power of life and death was taken away from Herod in consequence of the execution of the Baptist (*c.* 21).

The *eleventh* book (*c.* xiv. 15–xv. 32) contains several pieces of considerable interest on the discipline of temptation (*c.* 6), on *Corban* (*c.* 9), on the conception of things unclean (*c.* 12), on the healing spirit in the Church (*c.* 18), and perhaps, above all, that on the Eucharist (*c.* 14), which is of primary importance for the understanding of Origen's view.

The most important passages in the *twelfth* book which gives the commentary on *c.* xvi. 1–xvii. 9, are those which treat of the confession and blessing of St. Peter (*cc.* 10 ff.), and of the Transfiguration (*cc.* 37 ff.). In the former he regards St. Peter as the type of the true believer. All believers, as they are Christians, are Peters also (*c.* 11: *παρώνυμοι πέτρας πάντες οἱ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ...Χριστοῦ μέλη ὄντες παρώνυμοι ἐχρημάτισαν Χριστιανοί, πέτρας δὲ πέτροι*). His ignorance of the Hebrew idiom leads him, like other early commentators, to refer the "binding and loosing" to sins (*c.* 14).

The *thirteenth* book (*c.* xvii. 10–xviii. 18) opens with an argument against transmigration. Later on there is an interesting discussion of the influence of the planets upon men (*c.* 6). Other characteristic passages deal with the various circumstances under which the Lord healed the sick (*c.* 3), the rule for avoiding offences (*c.* 24), and especially the doctrine of guardian angels (*cc.* 26 f.).

The *fourteenth* book (*c.* xviii. 19–xix. 11) contains a characteristic examination of the senses in which the "two or three" in Matt. xviii. 20 may be understood (*cc.* 1 ff.); and a somewhat detailed discussion of points connected with marriage (*cc.* 16 ff.; *cc.* 23 ff.).

The *fifteenth* book (xix. 12–xx. 16) has several pieces of more than usual interest: the investigation of the meaning of Matt. xix. 12 f. with (as it appears) clear reference to his own early error (*c.* 2); a fine passage on the goodness of God even in His chastisements (*c.* 11); and some remarkable interpretations of the five sendings of labourers to the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1 ff.), in one of which he likens St. Paul to one who had wrought as an apostle in one hour more perhaps than all those before him (*c.* 35).

The *sixteenth* book (xx. 17–xxi. 22) gives some striking pictures of the darker side of Christian society, of the growing pride of the hierarchy, of the faults of church officers, of the separation between clergy and laity (*cc.* 8, 22, 25). In discussing the healing of Bartimaeus Origen holds that a choice must be made between supposing that the three evangelists have related three incidents, if the literal record is to be maintained, or that they relate one and the same spiritual fact in different words (*c.* 12).

The *seventeenth* book (xxi. 23–xxii. 33) contains interpretations of the parables of the two sons (*c.* 4), of the vineyard (6 ff.), of the marriage feast (15 ff.), which are good examples of Origen's method; and his explanations of the questions of the Herodians (*cc.* 26 ff.) and the Sadducees (*c.* 33) are of interest.

The old Latin translation continues the commentary to Matt. xxvii. 63. As passages in it of chief interest may be noticed: the application of the woes (Matt. xxiii. 1 ff.), §§ 9–25; the legend of the death of Zachariah the father of the Baptist, § 25; the danger of false opinions, § 33; the gathering of the saints, § 51; the limitation of the knowledge of the Son (Matt. xxiv. 36), § 55; the administration of the revenues of the church, § 61; the duty of using all that is lent to us, § 66; the eternal fire, immaterial, § 72; the supposition of three anointings of the Lord's feet, § 77; the passover of the Jews and of the Lord, § 79; on the Body and Blood of Christ, § 85; the lesson of the Agony, § 91; tradition of the different appearance of the Lord to men of different powers of vision, § 100; the reading *Jesus Barabbas* to be rejected, § 121; tradition as to the grave of Adam on Calvary, § 126; on the darkness at the crucifixion, § 134.

ST. MARK.

A Latin commentary attributed to Victor of Antioch, published at Ingoldstadt in 1580, is said to contain quotations from Origen on *cc.* i. xiv. (Ceillier, p. 635). These, if the reference is correct, may have been taken from other parts of his writings.

(Fifteen Books; Thirty-nine Homilies.—H. C.)

ST. LUKE.

There remain of Origen's writings on St. Luke:

Greek.

(1) Fragments.

Delarue, iii. 979–983.
Lommatzsch, v. 237–244.

(2) Notes from a Venice MS. (xxviii.)

Galland, *l. c.* 83–109.

(3) Additional notes, Mai, *Class. Auct.* tom. x. p. 474 ff.[y]

(4) Additional notes from *Cod. Coislin.* xxiii.

Cramer, *Catena*, ii., Oxford, 1841.

Latin.

Thirty-nine *Homilies.*

Delarue, iii. 932–979.
Lommatzsch, v. 85–236.

Origen wrote four Books on St. Luke (Hier. *Prol. ad Hom.*) from which the detached notes were probably taken.

There is a MS. of the Homilies of sec. viii.–ix., written in Lombardic characters, in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (No. cccxxxiv.), which is of the highest importance. This gives in the prologue "viginti sex tomos in Matthaeum ... triginta *duos* in Johannem." It has lost one leaf containing the end of *Hom.* i. and the beginning of *Hom.* ii.

The short Homilies on St. Luke, an early work of Origen, were translated by Jerome; and in spite of the objections of Daillé (*De Scriptis quae sub Din. Areop. et Ign. nomine feruntur*, pp. 439 f.), which were answered by Pearson (*Vindic. Ignat.* pars i. c. 7), they appear to be certainly genuine, and abound in characteristic thoughts.

They deal with the following passages:

i.	Luke i. 1–3.	The four canonical gospels.
ii.	„ i. 6.	The righteousness of Zachariah and Elizabeth.
iii.	„ i. 11.	The appearance of the angel to Zachariah.
iv.	„ i. 13–17a.	The angelic message to Zachariah.
v.	„ i. 22.	The dumbness of Zachariah.
vi.	„ i. 24–32a.	The faith of the Virgin.
vii.	„ i. 39–45.	Mary and Elizabeth.
viii.	„ i. 46–51a.	The Magnificat.
ix.	„ i. 56–64.	The birth of the Baptist.
x.	„ i. 67–76.	The Benedictus.
xi.	„ i. 80–ii. 2.	The growth of John.
xii.	„ ii. 8–10.	The angel's message to the shepherds.
xiii.	„ ii. 13–16.	The angelic hymn.
xiv.	„ ii. 21–24.	The Circumcision and Purification.
xv.	„ ii. 25 f.	Simeon.
xvi.	„ ii. 33 f.	The prophecy of Simeon.
xvii.	„ ii. 33–36.	The prophecy of Simeon: Anna.
xviii.	„ ii. 40–49.	The finding in the temple.
xix.	„ ii. 40–46.	Jesus in the temple.
xx.	„ ii. 49–51.	The subjection of Jesus.
xxi.	„ iii. 1–4.	The mission of John.
xxii.	„ iii. 5–8.	The call of John to repentance.
xxiii.	„ iii. 9–12.	The call to different classes: the publicans.
xxiv.	„ iii. 16.	The baptisms of water and fire.
xxv.	„ iii. 15.	Mistaken devotion.
xxvi.	„ iii. 17.	Divine sifting.
xxvii.	„ iii. 18.	The work of John: the descent of the Spirit.
xxviii.	„ iii. 23 ff.	The genealogies.
xxix.	Luke iv. 1–4.	The first temptation.
xxx.	„ iv. 5–8.	The second temptation.
xxxi.	„ iv. 9–12.	The third temptation.
xxxii.	„ iv. 14–20.	Jesus at Nazareth.
xxxiii.	„ iv. 23–27.	Jesus at Nazareth.
xxxiv.	„ x. 25–37.	The good Samaritan.
xxxv.	„ xii. 58 f.	Make peace with thine adversary.
xxxvi.	„ xvii. 33–21 (order inverted).	The kingdom of God within.
xxxvii.	„ xix. 29 ff.	The ass's colt.
xxxviii.	„ xix. 41–45.	Cleansing the temple.
xxxix.	„ xx. 27 ff., 20 ff. (order inverted).	Questions of Sadducees and Herodians.

The passages of greatest interest are those which deal with the four canonical gospels (*Hom.* 1), spiritual manifestations (*Hom.* 3), the nobility and triumph of faith (*Hom.* 7), spiritual growth (*Hom.* 11), shepherds of churches and nations (*Hom.* 12), spiritual and visible co-rulers of Churches (*Hom.* 13), Infant Baptism (*Hom.* 14), second marriages (*Hom.* 17), Baptism by fire (*Hom.* 24), man as the object of a spiritual conflict (*Hom.* 35).

Besides these Homilies Origen wrote other Homilies upon the gospel which are now lost. References to them are found *in Matt.* tom. xiii. 29; xvi. 9; *in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 2

St. John.

(Thirty-two Books; some notes.—H. C.)

The remains of the Commentary on St. John are in many respects the most important of Origen's exegetical writings. There are left:

Τόμοι i. ii. (iv. v. small fragments), vi. x. xiii. xix. (nearly entire), xx. xxviii. xxxii.

Huet, ii. 1–422 [x] (with Ferrarius's version).

---

[y] Mai adds in a note: "Plura deinceps ex Origenis scriptis daturus nunc scholiorum eius in Lucam gustum brevem exhibeo," a promise which he partially fulfilled by publishing the notes on Proverbs in *Bibl. Nova Patrum*, vii. Romae, 1854.

[x] Huet has retained the arbitrary division of the remains of the Commentary into *thirty-two* books which is given in the Venice MS. followed by Ferrarius. As Huet gives no sections, it may be convenient for reference to give the beginning of these "books."

Huet.	Delarue.
Tom. i.	Tom. i.
„ ii.	„ ii. 1.
„ iii.	„ ii. 10.
„ iv.	„ ii. 20.
„ v.	„ ii. 25.
„ vi.	„ vi. 1.
„ vii.	„ vi. 6.
„ viii.	„ vi. 15.
„ ix.	„ vi. 30.
„ x.	„ x. 1.
„ xi.	„ x. 15.
„ xii.	„ x. 20.
„ xiii.	„ xiii. 1.
„ xiv.	„ xiii. 17.
„ xv.	„ xiii. 31.
„ xvi.	„ xiii. 43.
„ xvii.	„ xiii. 50.
„ xviii.	„ xiii. 57.
„ xix.	„ xix.
„ xx.	„ xx. 1.
„ xxi.	„ xx. 7.
„ xxii.	„ xx. 14.
„ xxiii.	„ xx. 19.
„ xxiv.	„ xx. 21.
„ xxv.	„ xx. 24.
„ xxvi.	„ xx. 28.
„ xxvii.	„ xx. 31.
„ xxviii.	„ xxviii. 1.
„ xxix.	„ xxviii. 6.
„ xxx.	„ xxviii. 12.
„ xxxi.	„ xxviii. 17.
„ xxxii.	„ xxxii.

Delarue, iv. 1–456 (with Ferrarius' version).
Lommatzsch, i. ii.

These remains extend over the following portions of the gospel:

Tom. i.	John i. 1a.
„ ii.	„ i. 1b–7a.
„ vi.	„ i. 19–29.
„ x.	„ ii. 12–25.
„ xiii.	„ iv. 13–44.
„ xix. (part)	„ viii. 19–24.
„ xx.	„ viii. 37–52.
„ xxviii.	„ xi. 39–57.
„ xxxii.	„ xiii. 2–33.

The fragment of tom. iv. treats of the rude style of the apostolic writers; and those of tom. v. contain an interesting apology for the length of his own work, and a comparison of the sonship of Christ with that of believers.

The continuous text depends upon four MSS.:

1. *Cod. Venet.* S. Marci, xliii., written in 1374, followed by Ferrarius. Comp. Petermann, ap. Lommatzsch, iii. *Praef.* p. ix.
2. *Cod. Regius*, Paris, followed by Perionius, and used by Huet.
3. *Cod. Bodleianus*, Miscell. 58, saec. xvii., used by Delarue. Of this there is a collation by Bentley, in a copy of Huet, in the library of Trinity College Cambridge, with some emendations, and a transcript, with conjectural emendations, by H. Thorndike, in the same library, B. 9, 11. It seems likely that this MS. was one of the transcripts made for Tarinus (Delarue, *Praef.* § vii.). The published collations are most imperfect.
4. *Cod. Barberinus*, used by Delarue.

All are derived from one archetype, and have many lacunae. The text is consequently full of errors, which editors have done little to remove. A series of conjectures on book ii. is given in a *Programm* by Dr. J. L. Jacobi (Hales, 1878), and it is to be hoped that he will continue a work which he has begun happily.[y]

The commentary on St. John was undertaken at the request of Ambrosius (*in Joh.* tom. i. §§ 3, 6), and was "the first-fruits of his labours at Alexandria" (*id.* § 4). It marks an epoch in theological literature and in theological thought. Perhaps the earlier work of Heracleon [HERACLEON] may have suggested the idea, but Origen implies that the Gospel of St. John, by its essential character, claimed his first efforts as an interpreter. The first five books, extending to John i. 18, were written at Alexandria (tom. vi. § 1), and part, in all probability, before 228, while Origen was still a layman. The work was resumed afterwards at Caesaraea (tom. vi. § 1), and continued till after the persecution of Maximinus, 235–8 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28), but it does not appear that it was ever completed. The last book (tom. xxxii.) deals with John xiii. 2–33, and contains no such promise of a future continuation as is found in some of the other books. On the contrary Origen speaks at the beginning with doubt as to the fulfilment of his purpose of an explanation of the whole gospel (§ 1: *πότερον βούλεται τὸν ἡμῶν νοῦν τελέσαι... εἰ (l. ἤ) μή, αὐτὸς ἂν εἰδείη ὁ θεός*).

[y] One conjecture of Bentley's in Book ii. is of great excellence: § 7 *s. f.*, *καὶ τί τὸ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ οὐ γενόμενον μὲν ὂν δὲ οὐδέποτε*. He reads also, § 13 *init.*, *τὰ δύο ἐν*, as indeed every one must read, though the edition and MSS. give *ἕν*.

In the time of Eusebius twenty-two books remained of all that Origen had written "on the whole gospel;" and Jerome (*Praef. in Luc.*), according to the MSS., speaks of "thirty-four" or "thirty-nine" books in all, though the reading is commonly altered on the authority of Rufinus (Huet, *Orig.* iii. 2, 7) to "thirty-two." Rufinus speaks of thirty-two books only (*Apol.* ii. § 22), and it is probable that the work ceased where it now ends. The commentary on the whole gospel would have extended to fifty books at least, and it is most unlikely that every trace of the later books would have been lost by the time of Rufinus if they had been published. The language of Eusebius (*l. c.*), on the other hand, is too vague to allow any certain conclusion to be drawn from it.[z]

The *first* book deals mainly with the fundamental conceptions of "the gospel" (§§ 1–15), and of "the beginning" (§§ 16–22), and of "the Logos" (§§ 19–42). The gospels are the first-fruits (*ἀπαρχή*) of the Scripture, the gospel of St. John is the firstfruits of the gospels (§ 6). As the law had a shadow of the future, so too has the gospel: spiritual truths underlie historical truths (§ 9). The gospel in the widest sense is "for the whole world," not for our earth only, but for the universal system of the heavens and earth (§ 15).

The discussion of the title Logos lays open a critical stage in the history of Christian thought. In what sense, it is asked, is the Saviour called the Logos? It had come to be a common opinion "that Christ was as it were only a 'word' of God" (§ 23). To meet this view Origen refers to other titles, Light, Resurrection, Way, Truth, &c. (§§ 24–41), and following the analogy of these he comes to the conclusion, that as we are illuminated by Christ as the Light, and quickened by Him as the Resurrection, so we are made divinely rational by Him as the Logos, *i.e.* Reason (§ 42). By this method he preserves the personality of the Lord under the title of Logos, which expresses one aspect of His being and not His being itself (as a word). At the same time he recognises that Christ may also be called the Logos (Word) of God as giving expression to His will.

In the *second* book Origen continues his discussion of the meaning of the Logos, distinguishing, in a remarkable passage (§ 2), God and Reason taken absolutely (*ὁ θεός, ὁ λόγος*) from God and Reason used as predicates (*θεός, λόγος*). "The Father is the foundation of Deity, the Son of reason" (§ 3). Afterwards he discusses the sense of the words "came into being through him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*)," and the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son (§ 6); and further, what "all things," and what that is which is called "nothing" (*i.e.* evil) which became without Him but is not (§ 7). The conceptions of life and light, of darkness and death, are then examined (§§ 11 ff.). In treating of the mission of John (§§ 24 ff.) Origen questions whether he may not have been an angel who sought to minister on earth to his Lord (§ 25); and characteris-

[z] It must however be added that in the note on Matt. xxvii. 44, in *Comm. ser. in Matt.* § 133, Origen says: "apud Johannen sicut potuimus exposuimus de duobus latronibus." The reference may be to some separate comment.

tically remarks that he was "the voice" preceding "the Word" (§ 26). Perhaps it is not less characteristic that he blames those who, like Heracleon (tom. vi. § 2), hold that John i. 16–18 are the words of the evangelist and not of the Baptist.

The *sixth* book, as has been already noticed, marks a new beginning. In this, after describing with calm dignity the circumstances which had interrupted his work, he examines in detail John i. 19–29. The question, *Art thou Elias?* leads to a remarkable discussion on the pre-existence of souls, and the entrance of the soul into the body, "a vast and difficult subject," which he reserves for special investigation (§ 7). The words of the Baptist (i. 26) give occasion for a minute comparison with the parallels in the other gospels (§§ 16 ff.), in the course of which (§ 17) Origen strikingly contrasts the baptisms of John and Christ, and explains Christ's presence "in the midst of the Jews" (*v.* 26) of His universal presence as the Logos (§ 22). The mention of Bethany (*v.* 28) leads him to a hasty adoption of the correction "Bethabara" (§ 24), which he justifies by the frequent errors as to names in the LXX. His brief exposition of the title of Christ "as the Lamb of God" (§§ 35 ff.) is full of interest; and in connexion with this he notices the power of the blood of martyrs to overcome evil (§ 36).

The *tenth* book deals with the history of the first cleansing of the temple and its immediate results (ii. 12–25). At the beginning Origen thinks that the discrepancy between the evangelists as to the sojourn at Capernaum (*v.* 12) is such that its solution can be found only in the spiritual sense (§ 2), to which every minute point contributes, though in itself outwardly trivial and unworthy of record (§§ 2 ff.). In the following sections the phrase "the passover *of the Jews*" leads to an exposition of Christ as the true Passover (§§ 11 ff.). The cleansing of the temple is shewn to have an abiding significance in life (§ 16); and Origen thinks that the sign which Christ offered is fulfilled in the raising of the Christian church, built of living stones, out of trials and death, "after three days."—the first of present suffering, the second of the consummation, the third of the new order (§ 20).

The *thirteenth* book is occupied with the interpretation of part of the history of the Samaritan woman and the healing of the nobleman's son (iv. 13–54). It is chiefly remarkable for the number of considerable quotations from Heracleon's Commentary which it contains, more than twice as many as are contained in the other books. These still require careful collection and criticism. Lommatzsch failed to fulfil the promise of his preface (I. p. xiii.). Passages of interest in regard to Origen's own views and method are those on the relation of Christ's personal teaching to the Scriptures (§ 5), on the five husbands as representing the senses (§ 9), on the incorporeity of God (§ 25), on the joy of the sower and reaper, and the continuity of work (§§ 46 f.), on the unhonoured prophet (§ 54), on spiritual dependence (§ 58), on the distinction of signs and wonders (§ 60).

Of the *nineteenth* book, which is imperfect at the beginning and end, a considerable fragment remains (viii. 19–25). In this the remarks on the treasury (John viii. 20) as the scene of the Lord's discourses (§ 2), and on the power of faith (§ 6), are characteristic.

The *twentieth* book (viii. 37–53) has much that is of importance for Origen's opinions. It begins with an examination of some points in connexion with the pre-existence and character of souls; and later on Origen, in a striking passage (§ 29), illustrates the inspiration of evil passions. Of a different kind, but still of interest, are the passages in which he treats of love as "the sun" in the life of Christians (§ 15); of the ambiguities in the word "when" (§ 24); of the need of help for spiritual sight (§ 26); on spiritual influences (§ 29).

The most remarkable passage in the *twenty-eighth* book (*c.* xi. 39–57) is perhaps that in which Origen speaks of the power of self-sacrifice among the Gentiles as illustrating the vicarious sufferings of Christ (§ 14). Other remarks worthy of special notice are those on the lifting up of the eyes (John xi. 41) (§ 4), on the lesson of the death of Lazarus (§ 6), on the duty of prudence in time of persecution (§ 18), on the passover of the Jews and of the Lord (§ 20).

The *thirty-second* book (*c.* xiii. 2–33) treats of St. John's record of the Last Supper. Origen discusses the feet-washing at length, and lays down that it is not to be perpetuated literally (§§ 6 f.): he dwells on the growth of faith (§ 9), on the difference of "soul" and "spirit" (§ 11), on the character of Judas and moral deterioration (§ 12), on the sop given to Judas (§ 16).

From this slight sketch of the ruins of Origen's Commentary some idea may be formed of its character. It is for us the beginning of a new type of literature. It has great faults of style. It is diffusive, disproportioned, full of repetitions, obscure and heavy in form of expression. It is wholly deficient in historical insight. It is continually passing into fantastic speculations. But on the other hand it contains not a few "jewels five words long." It abounds in noble thoughts and subtle criticisms. It grapples with great difficulties: it unfolds great ideas. And, above all, it retains a firm hold on the human life of the Lord.

ACTS.

(Seventeen Homilies.—H. C.)

Greek.

(1) A single fragment from "the fourth homily on the Acts" is preserved in the *Philocalia.*

Huet. ii. 422.
Delarue, iv.
Lommatzsch, v. 245.

(2) A few notes are given in Cramer's *Catena*, col. iii. 184, on the following passages:

iv. 32; vii. 3, 53; xxi. 38.[a]

ROMANS.

(Fifteen Books.—H. C.)

Greek.

(1) Fragments from the first and ninth books contained in the *Philocalia.*

Huet, ii. 423 ff.
Delarue, iv.
Lommatzsch, v. 247 ff.

[a] The MS. in the Chapter library at Worcester, said in the *Catal. Codd. Angl.* to contain "Orig. in Num. xii. Proph. Ep. Can. Act.," does not unhappily answer to the description.

(2) A number of important notes are contained in Cramer's *Catena*, tom. iv. 1844, on the following passages:

i. 1, 10.
ii. 8, 16, 27
iii. 2, 4, 9, 13, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31.
iv. 2.

Latin.

Ten books of Commentaries, translated and compressed from the *fifteen* books of Origen, by Rufinus, at the request of Heraclius. Rufinus seems to have had difficulty in finding a complete and satisfactory text to work upon (*Praef.*), and he undoubtedly used considerable freedom, both in other respects and in adapting the Commentary not unfrequently to the current Latin text of the Epistle.

Many MSS. ascribe the translation to Jerome, and alter the preface and epilogue in this sense. The work is so given in the earliest editions. Erasmus pointed out the blunder.

The earliest MS. which I have seen is *Brit. Mus. Harl.* 3030, saec. x.

The translation brings into prominence one important point in regard to the critical use to be made of the text of the translations of Origen's works which has not received proper attention. Unless Origen's Greek reading is expressly noted, the reading given must be regarded as a Latin reading and not as Greek.

The language of Rufinus himself seems to shew beyond doubt that he gave a current Latin text, and not a version of Origen's Greek text, as the basis of his adaptation of Origen's Commentary. Thus, after he has given the Latin version, he remarks several times that the Greek is better or more expressive, and seeks to express the full meaning of the original. Thus on vi. 11 he remarks upon the rendering "*existimate* vos mortuos esse peccato," "melius quidem in Graeco habetur '*cogitate* vos mortuos esse peccato;'" And again upon xii. 2: "ut probetis quae sit voluntas Dei, *quod bonum et beneplacitum et perfectum*," "sciendum est quod in Graeco habetur, 'ut probetis quae sit voluntas Dei *bona et beneplacita et perfecta*,'" "but we," he continues, "follow the custom of the Latins." The criticism may be faulty, but it shews his usage. This is marked again upon xii. 3, where he says, "we must first observe that when we have *omnibus qui sunt inter vos*," the text which he has given, "it is in the Greek *omni qui est in vobis*;" and in viii. 3 he gives "*de peccato*," the common Latin rendering, and adds, "or, as it is more truly in the Greek text, *pro peccato*." In one place, xv. 30, he quotes the Greek words which correspond to the Vulgate rendering, "*ut adjuvetis me in orationibus*," adding, "in quo hoc est quod indicatur, *ut adjuvetis me in agone orationum*..." But perhaps the most remarkable passage is xii. 13, where he gives the rendering "*usibus* sanctorum communicantes," with the note, "memini in Latinis exemplaribus magis haberi '*memoriis* sanctorum communicantes,' verum nos nec consuetudinem turbamus, nec veritati praejudicamus, maxime cum utrumque conveniat aedificationi." There are difficulties in the interpretation of his words, but they shew at least that the Latin text had a principal place in his thoughts.[b] The reference to the conflict of Latin copies is illustrated by his note on xii. 11: "*Domino* servientes," "scio autem in nonnullis Latinorum exemplaribus haberi '*tempori* servientes.'"

Apart from these statements the character of the text is decisive. It is essentially an old Latin text throughout. Sometimes it is directly in conflict with Origen's Greek text, or his interpretation, or with the groups of authorities with which Origen agrees:

iii. 9. *om.* οὐ πάντως.
iii. 20. in conspectu *Dei*; in commentary, *in conspectu eius*.
iii. 22. *in omnes et* super — against Origen's Greek text.
v. 8, 9. quoniam *si* cum...multo magis justificati—against Origen's Greek text and the commentary.
v. 16. per unum *peccatum*—against Origen's Greek text.
viii. 16. ipse *enim, id.*
ix. 19. quid *ergo, id.*
ix. 33. et *omnis* qui, *id.*
x. 3. suam *justitiam, id.*
xi. 36. in saecula *sacculorum*.
xiii. 9. Add. *non falsum testimonium dices*— against Origen's Greek text.
xv. 8. *Jesum Christum, id.*
xv. 14. *σια. μού.*
xv. 19. spiritus Dei; in commentary, spiritus *sancti*.
xv. 30. *om.* ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.
xvi. 19. *om.* δέ (1°).

Sometimes it gives readings which are solely or characteristically Latin:

i. 32. non solum qui faciunt illa sed etiam qui.
ii. 3. o homo *omnis*.
iv. 23. reputatum est ei *ad justitiam*.
iv. 24. Jesum *Christum*.
vii. 19. non enim quod volo *facio bonum*.
viii. 35. quis *ergo*.
ix. 5. *om.* ἀμήν.
ix. 25. et non dilectam dilectam et non m. c. m. c.
x. 18. *om.* μενοῦνγε.
xi. 5. *salvae* factae sunt.

Sometimes, on the other hand, it expresses the Greek more accurately than other Latin texts:

i. 26. nam *et*.
ii. 19. *et* confidis.

In a few cases it gives readings which are apparently unique, of the kind which are found in old Latin texts:

ii. 9. *et* tribulatio.
xi. 24. nam si *et* tu.
xiv. 20. *nolite*.
xvi. 9. adjutorem *meum*.

There remain a number of important readings, in which the Latin text agrees with Origen's Greek text or the commentary:

v. 14. in eos qui peccaverunt.
viii. 1. *om.* μή...πνεῦμα.
viii. 35. *Dei*.
viii. 37. *per* eum.
ix. 31. *om.* δικαιοσύνης (2°).
x. 15. *om.* εὐαγγ. εἰρήνην (?).
xii. 17. *om.* οὐ μόνον...ἀλλὰ καί.
xiv. 9. *vixit*.
xiv. 21. *om.* ἢ σκανδ. ἢ ἀσθενεῖ.

[b] See the remarks on *destinatus, praedestinatus*, lib. i. § 5, and on *subditus* (iii. 19), lib. iii. § 6.

To these perhaps may be added

xiv. 22. fidem *quam* habes.
xv. 15. *om.* ἀδελφοί.

It might appear at first sight that these readings are due to Origen's text of the epistle which Rufinus had before him, but it will be found that there is independent old Latin authority for every one of these readings, except that in x. 15, where, however, there is considerable variety of reading.

A careful consideration of this evidence leads to the conclusion, that we have substantially in the text of the epistle given by Rufinus an old Latin copy of the highest value, and characteristic renderings point out its affinities. It resembles closely, in its general form, the text of Sedulius, and of some of the copies used by Augustine. The extent and nature of the coincidence may be estimated roughly from the following peculiar phrases:

i. 15. quod in me promptus sum (comp. Ambrtr., Sedul.)
ii. 4. sustentationis et patientiae (Hier.)
ii. 8. diffidunt quidem...obtemperant.
iii. 9. quid ergo tenemus amplius? causati (Sedul. MSS.)
vi. 8. et convivemus ei (Sedul.)
vi. 12. ad obediendum desideriis eius (Aug.)
viii. 22. congemiscit et condolet (Sedul.)
ix. 22 f. apta in perditionem ut notas faceret (Aug., Sedul.)
xiii. 5. necesse est subditos esse (Sedul.)
xiv. 5. alter judicat alternos dies (Aug.)
xv. 15. commemorans vos per gratiam datam (Aug.)

Some renderings are apparently not found elsewhere, *e. g.*:

i. 11. ut aliquod tradam vobis donum spirituale.
iv. 17. ante eum cui credidit Deum.
xi. 14. in aemulationem immittam.
xv. 31. ut ministerium hoc meum acceptum fiat.
xvi. 5. initium Asiae.
xvi. 25. sacramenti saeculorum in silentio habiti, manifestati autem modo.

A comparison of these renderings with the corresponding renderings in the *Codex Boernerianus*, suggests that Rufinus probably adopted the Latin text of a Graeco-Latin copy, which had been in some details influenced by the Greek, but which preserved essentially its original complexion. The continuous Latin text cannot, however, be quoted as representing Origen's reading.

This is not the place to extend farther the inquiry into the textual characteristics of the biblical quotations in the translations of Origen's works. It will be sufficient to have called attention, in one signal example, to the singular and unexpected features of interest which they offer.

The commentary gives a continuous discussion of the text, often discursive, but still full of acute and noble conceptions. Some of the most striking passages may be indicated.

Book I. (c. i.).

§§ 4 ff. On the Sonship of the Lord.
§ 18. Responsibility.

Book II. (c. ii. 2–iii. 4).

§ 2. The duty of teachers. Comp. § 11.
§ 9. The law of nature.
§ 13. Spiritual circumcision.

Book III. (c. iii. 5–31).

§ 2. The universal sinfulness of man.
§ 6. The law of nature of universal obligation (p. 191 L., of great interest).
§ 8. Christ our propitiation.
§ 9. Justification by faith.

Book IV. (c. iv. 1–v. 11).

§ 1. The need of grace (non ex operibus radix justitiae sed ex radice justitiae fructus operum crescit, p. 241 L.)
§ 5. Faith of grace: the "likeness" of God to be gained.
§ 6. Hope.
§ 7. The experience of faith of Abraham fulfilled in the experience of Christians (pp. 283 ff. L., of great interest).
§ 9. Glory in tribulation.

Book V. (c. v. 12–vi. 11).

§ 1. The manifoldness of the divine treasures (pp. 322 ff. L., of great interest).
§ 2. Justification through Christ.
§ 6. The law of nature the occasion of sin.
§ 8. Baptism (and Confirmation) of infants.
§ 10. Spiritual death.

Book VI. (c. vi. 12–viii. 13).

§ 8. The operation of the law of nature.
§ 9. The conflict in man (ipse ea quasi in semet-ipso geri descripsit).
§ 12. The weakness of the law.
§ 13. The action of the Spirit through man.

Book VII. (c. viii. 14–ix. 33).

§§ 3 ff. The inheritance of Christians.
§ 7. The work of the Spirit.
§ 8. Foreknowledge not the cause of that which is foreknown.
§ 11. The discipline of suffering (p. 140, of great interest).
§ 13. St. Paul's spirit of self-sacrifice.
§ 17. Divine mysteries insoluble.

Book VIII. (c. x. 1–xi. 36).

§ 2. Christ and the Law.
§ 9. The several duties of men.
§ 10. The unity of rational beings.
§ 11. Purification by fire for those who neglect the Gospel.

Book IX. (c. xii. 1–xiv. 15).

§ 1. The worship of God.
§ 3. Gifts of grace according to the measure of faith here and hereafter.
§§ 25, 30. Civil duties.

Book X. (c. xiv. 16–end

§ 3. Things clean and unclean.
§ 6. Unselfishness.
§ 10. Progressive knowledge.
§ 14. Christians' help to Christians.

It may be added that Origen's treatment of the eighth chapter, as represented by Rufinus, is, on the whole, disappointing. It might have been expected to call out his highest powers of imagination and hope. His silence, no less than his rash conjectures as to the persons named in the sixteenth chapter, is a singular proof of the complete absence of any authoritative tradition as to the persons of the early Roman church.

For the passage (x. 43) which refers to Marcion's mutilation of the epistle by removing the doxology (xvi. 25–27) and (though this is disputed) the last two chapters, it must be enough to refer to the papers by Bp. Lightfoot and Dr. Hort in the *Journal of Philology*, 1869, ii. 264 ff.; 1871, iii. 51 ff., 193 ff.

1–2 CORINTHIANS.

(Eleven Homilies on 2 Cor.—H. C.)

Greek.

Jerome mentions (*Ep. ad Pammach.* xlix. § 3) that Origen commented on this epistle at length; and Origen himself refers to what he had said on 1 Cor. i. 2 (*Hom. in Luc.* xvii. *s. f.*).

A very important collection of notes on the first epistle is given in Cramer's *Catena*, vol. v. 1844, which deal with the following passages:

i. 2 (bis), 4, 7 (bis), 9 (bis), 10, 11, 17 (bis), 18, 20 (bis), 21, 22 f., 26 (ter).
ii. 1, 3, 5 f., 7, 9, 10, 14 f. (bis).
iii. 2, 3, 7, 9, 16, 21.
iv. 1 f., 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 20.
v. 5 (bis), 9.
vi. 2, 4, 9 f., 12, 13 (bis), 15, 18, 19 f.
vii. 1 f., 5 (bis), 14, 18 f., 21, 25.
ix. 7, 10, 15, 19, 23, 24.
x. 5, 6.
xii. 3, 28.
xiii. 1 f., 3, 4, 12.
xiv. 31, 34, 38.
xv. 2, 20, 37.
xvi. 10, 13.

It appears that the notes were taken from homilies (περὶ ὧν καὶ πρώην ἐλέγομεν, *c.* iii. 1; παρακαλοῦμεν καὶ ὑμᾶς ὦ παῖδες, *c.* vi. 9). Some of the notes contain passages of considerable interest, as that on the vicarious death of Gentile heroes (*c.* i. 18; comp. *Hom. in Joh.* tom. xxviii. § 14), on the sovereignty of believers (*c.* iii. 21), on evangelic "counsels" (*c.* vii. 25), on the public teaching of women (*c.* xiv. 34, with reference to Montanism). In other places Origen gives the outline of a creed (*c.* i. 9, 20), and touches on Baptism (*c.* i. 14) and Holy Communion (*c.* vii. 5). He describes the Jewish search for leaven (*c.* v. 7); and supposes that many books of the Old Testament were lost at the Captivity (*c.* ii. 9).

The text, as in all the notes in Cramer, is full of obvious blunders and requires careful editing, with a fresh collation of the MS.

GALATIANS.

(Fifteen Books; seven Homilies.—H. C.)

Jerome, in the Prologue to his Commentary on the Galatians, mentions that Origen wrote five Books on this epistle, as well as various Homilies and Notes (*tractatus et excerpta*), and that he interpreted it with brief annotations (*commatico sermone*) in the tenth book of his *Stromateis* (*Proem. in Comm. ad Gal.*; *Ep. ad August.* cxi. §§ 4, 6).

Three fragments of the Commentary are contained in the Latin translation of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

Jerome does not seem to have made much use of Origen in his own Commentary; but this work has not yet been carefully examined with a view to determine how far it is original.

EPHESIANS.

(Three Books.—H. C.)

Origen's commentary on the Ephesians may still be practically recovered. Jerome, in the *Prologue* to his own *Commentary*, says that "his readers should know that Origen wrote three books on the epistle, which he had partly followed" (*Illud quoque in praefatione commoneo ut sciatis Origenem tria volumina in hanc Epistolam conscripsisse, quem et nos ex parte secuti sumus*). The extent of his debt could only be estimated by conjecture, till the publication of the Paris *Catena* (Cramer, 1842). This contains very large extracts from Origen's commentary, sometimes with his name and sometimes anonymous, and in nearly all cases Jerome has corresponding words or thoughts. Nor is it too much to say that a careful comparison of the Greek fragments with Jerome's Latin would make it possible to reconstruct in substance a very large part of Origen's work; and it is strange that the work has not yet been attempted. The corresponding notes on the description of the Christian warfare (vi. 11 ff.) offer a good example of Jerome's mode of dealing with his archetype.

The comments of Origen are almost continuous, and deal with the following passages:

Chap. i. 1, 2, 4, 7–11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23.
„ ii. 1 ff., 6, 12, 13, 17, 19 ff.
„ iii. 1 ff., 12, 14, 15.
„ iv. 3, 6, 9–15, 17, 18, 20, 24–32.
„ v. 3–6, 10–12, 15–20, 29, 31, 32.
„ vi. 1, 9–16, 18, 19, 21, 23.

A fragment on Eph. v. 28 f. is preserved in the Latin translation of the *Apology* of Pamphilus. This is not found in the Greek notes.

PHILIPPIANS. COLOSSIANS. TITUS. PHILEMON.

(One Book on Philippians; two Books on Colossians; one on Titus; one on Philemon; one Homily on Titus.—H. C.)

Short fragments from the third Book on the epistle to the Colossians, and from the Commentary on the epistle to Philemon, and more considerable fragments from the Book on the epistle to Titus (Tit. iii. 10, 11), are found in the translation of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

No Greek notes on these epistles have been preserved.

1 THESSALONIANS.

(Three Books; two Homilies.—H. C.)

A considerable fragment from the third book of the Commentary on 1 Thess. is preserved in Jerome's translation: *Ep. ad Minerv. et Alex.* 9 (1 Thess. iv. 15–17).

HEBREWS.

(Eighteen Homilies.—H. C.)

Origen wrote Homilies and Commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews. Two fragments of the Homilies are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 25), in which Origen gives his opinion on the composition of the epistle.

Some inconsiderable fragments from the "Books" are found in the translation of Pamphilus's *Apology*.

CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

The quotations from Origen, which are given in Cramer's *Catena* on the catholic epistles, are apparently taken from other treatises, and not from commentaries on the books themselves: James i. 4, 13; 1 Pet. i. 4 (ἐκ τῆς ἑρμηνείας εἰς τὸ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ); 1 John ii. 14 (ἐκ τοῦ ᾄσματος τῶν ᾀσμάτων T. A'.).

APOCALYPSE.

Origen purposed to comment upon the Apocalypse (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 49), but it is uncertain whether he carried out his design.

B. Dogmatic Writings.[a]

On the Resurrection.

Delarue, i. 32–37.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 53–64.

Origen's writings "On the resurrection," which are said to have consisted of two books and of a dialogue in two books (Hier. *ap.* Ruf. *Apol.* ii. § 20; comp. Hier. *Ep.* xxxiii. 3 [H. C.]), preceded, in part at least, his essay on *First Principles* (c. 230). They were violently assailed by Methodius, and were considered by Jerome to abound in errors (*Ep.* lxxxiv. 7). Probably they excited opposition by assailing the gross literalism which prevailed in the popular view of the future life. The fragments which remain are consistent with the true faith, and express it with a wise caution, affirming the permanence through death of the whole man and not of the soul only. Thus Origen dwells rightly on St. Paul's image of the seed (*Fragm.* 2); and maintains a perfect correspondence between the present and the future (qualis fuerit uniuscujusque praeparatio in hac vita talis erit et resurrectio ejus), and speaks very happily of the "ratio substantiae corporalis" as that which is permanent.

On First Principles (περὶ ἀρχῶν. *De principiis*).[d]

(Four Books *Periarcon.*—H. C.)

Delarue, i. 42–195.
Lommatzsch, xxi.

Greek.

(1) Considerable fragments of books iii. iv., preserved in the *Philocalia.*

(2) A few others mainly in the letter of Justinian to Menas.

Latin.

(1) A complete translation by Rufinus, who took great liberties with the text.

(2) Fragments of a translation by Jerome, given in a letter to Avitus (*Ep.* 124).

The book *On first principles* is the most complete and characteristic expression of Origen's opinions. It was written while he was in the full course of his work at Alexandria. He was probably at the time not much more than thirty years old and still a layman, but there is no reason to think that he modified, in any important respects, the views which he unfolds in it. The book, it must be borne in mind, was not written for simple believers but for scholars, —for those who were familiar with the teaching of Gnosticism and Platonism; and with a view to questions which then first become urgent when men have risen to a wide view of nature and life. Non-Christian philosophers moved in a region of subtle abstractions, "ideas": Origen felt that Christianity converted these abstractions into realities, persons, facts of a complete life; and he strove to express what he felt in the modes of thought and language of his own age. He aimed at presenting the highest knowledge (γνῶσις) as an objective system. But in doing this he had no intention of fashioning two Christianities, a Christianity for the learned and a Christianity for the simple. The faith was one, one essentially and unalterably, but infinite in fulness, so that the trained eye could see more of its harmonies as it necessarily looked for more. Fresh wants made fresh truths visible. He who found much had nothing over: he who found little had no lack.

The book is the earliest attempt to form a system of Christian doctrine, or rather a philosophy of the Christian faith. In this respect it marks an epoch in Christian thought, but no change in the contents of the Christian creed. The elements of the dogmatic basis are assumed on the authority of the church. The author's object is, as he says, to shew how they can be arranged as a whole, by the help either of the statements of Scripture or of the methods of exact reasoning. And however strange or startling the teaching of Origen may seem to us, it is necessary to bear in mind that this is the account which he gives of it. He takes for granted that all that he brings forward is in harmony with received teaching. He professes to accept as final the same authorities as ourselves.

The treatise consists of four books. The composition is not strictly methodical. Digressions and repetitions interfere with the symmetry of the plan. But to speak generally the first book deals with God and creation (religious statics), the second and third books with creation and providence, with man and redemption (religious dynamics); and the fourth book with Holy Scripture. Or to put the case somewhat differently, the first three books contain the exposition of a Christian philosophy, gathered round the three ideas of God, the world, and the rational soul, and the last gives the basis of it. Even in the repetitions (as on "the restoration of things") it is not difficult to see that each successive treatment corresponds with a new point of sight.

In the first book Origen sets out the final elements of all religious philosophy, God, the world, rational creatures. After dwelling on the essential nature of God as incorporeal, invisible, incomprehensible, and on the characteristic relations of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to man, as the authors of being, and reason, and holiness, he gives a summary view of the end of human life, for the elements of a problem cannot be really understood until we have comprehended its scope. The end of life then, according to Origen, is the progressive assimilation of man to God by the voluntary appropriation of His gifts. Gentile philosophers had proposed to themselves the idea of assimilation to God, but Origen adds the means. By the unceasing action of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit towards us, renewed at each successive stage of our advance, we shall be able, he says, with difficulty perchance, at some future time, to look on the holy and blessed life; and when once we have been enabled to reach that, after many struggles, we ought so to continue in it that no weariness may take hold on us. Each fresh enjoyment of that bliss ought to enlarge or deepen our desire for it; while we are ever receiving or holding, with more ardent love and larger grasp, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (i. 3, 8).

But it will be said that this condition of progress, effort, assimilation, involves the possibility of declension, indolence, the obliteration of the

[a] It is not certain what the *Monobiblia*, of which Jerome speaks (*Ep.* xxxiii. 3), were. They may have been detached essays on particular points.

[d] The edition of Redepenning (E. R.), Lipsiae, 1836, is useful and convenient. The translation by Schnitzer, Stuttgart, 1835, has a suggestive introduction.

divine image. If man can go forward he can go backward. Origen accepts the consequence, and finds in it an explanation of the actual state of men and angels. The present position of each rational being corresponds, in his judgment, with the use which he has hitherto made of the revelations and gifts of God. No beings were created originally immutable in character. Some by diligent obedience have been raised to the loftiest places in the celestial hierarchy: others by perverse self-will and rebellion have sunk into the condition of demons. Others occupy an intermediate place, and are capable of being raised again to their first state, and so upward, if they avail themselves of the helps which are provided by the love of God. "Of these," he adds, "I think, as far as I can form an opinion, that this order of the human race was formed, which in the future age, or in the ages which succeed, when there shall be a new heaven and a new earth, shall be restored to that unity which the Lord promises in His intercessory prayer." "Meanwhile," he continues, "both in the ages which are seen and temporal, and in those which are not seen and eternal, all rational beings who have fallen are dealt with according to the order, the character, the measure of their deserts. Some in the first, others in the second, some, again, even in the last times, through greater and heavier sufferings, borne through many ages, reformed by sharper discipline, and restored ... stage by stage ... reach that which is invisible and eternal ..." Only one kind of change is impossible. There is no such transmigration of souls as Plato pictured, after the fashion of the Hindoos, in the legend of Er the Armenian. No rational being can sink into the nature of a brute (i. 8, 4; comp. *c. Cels.* iv. 83).

The progress of this discussion is interrupted by one singular episode which is characteristic of the time. How, Origen asks, are we to regard the heavenly bodies,—the sun and moon and stars? Are they animated and rational? Are they the temporary abodes of souls which shall hereafter be released from them? Are they finally to be brought into the great unity, when "God shall be all in all"? The questions, he admits, are bold; but he answers all in the affirmative, on what he held to be the authority of Scripture (i. 7; comp. *c. Cels.* v. 10 f.).

In the second book Origen pursues, at greater length, that view of the visible world, as a place of discipline and preparation, which has been already indicated. He follows out as a movement what he had before regarded as a condition. The endless variety in the situations of men, the inequality of their material and moral circumstances, their critical spiritual differences, all tend to shew, he argues, that the position of each has been determined in accordance with previous conduct. And God, in His ineffable wisdom, has united all together with absolute justice, so that all these creatures, most diverse in themselves, combine to work out His purpose, while "their very variety tends to the one end of perfection." All things were made for the sake of man and rational beings. It is through man, therefore, that this world, as God's work, becomes complete and perfect (comp. *c. Cels.* iv. 99). The individual is never isolated, though he is never irresponsible. At every moment he is acting and acted upon, adding something to the sum of the moral forces of the world, furnishing that out of which God is fulfilling His purpose. The difficulties of life, as Origen regards them, give scope for heroic effort and loving service. The fruits of a moral victory become more permanent as they are gained through harder toil. The obstacles and hindrances by which man is hemmed in are incentives to exertion. His body is not a "prison," in the sense of a place of punishment only: it is a beneficent provision for the discipline of beings to whom it furnishes such salutary restraints as are best fitted to further their moral growth.

This view of the dependence of the present on the past—to use the forms of human speech—seemed to Origen to remove a difficulty which weighed heavily upon thoughtful men in the first age, as it has weighed heavily upon thoughtful men in our own generation. Very many said then that the sufferings and disparities of life, the contrasts of the law and the gospel, point to the action of rival spiritual powers, or to a Creator limited by something external to Himself (ii. 9, 5). Not so, was Origen's reply; they simply reveal that what we see is a fragment of a vast system in which we can do no more than trace tendencies, consequences, signs, and rest upon the historic fact of the Incarnation. In this respect he ventured to regard the entire range of being as "one thought" answering to the absolutely perfect will of God, while "we that are but parts can see but part, now this, now that." And this seems to be the true meaning of his famous assertion, that the power of God in creation was finite and not infinite. It would, that is, be inconsistent with our ideas of perfect order, and therefore with our idea of the Divine Being, that the sum of first existences should not form one whole. "God made all things in number and measure." The omnipotence of God is defined (as we are forced to conceive) by the absolute perfections of His nature. "He cannot deny Himself" (ii. 9, 1; iv. 35).

But it may be objected more definitely that our difficulties do not lie only in the circumstances of the present: that the issues of the present, so far as we can see them, bring difficulties no less overwhelming: that even if we allow that this world is fitted to be a place of discipline for fallen beings who are capable of recovery, it is only too evident that the discipline does not always work amendment. Origen admits the fact, and draws from it the conclusion, that other systems of penal purification and moral advance follow. According to him world grows out of world, so to speak, till the consummation is reached. What is the nature or position or constitution of the worlds to come he does not attempt to define. It is enough to believe that, from first to last, the will of Him who is most righteous and most loving is fulfilled: and that each loftier region gained is the entrance to some still more glorious abode above, so that all being becomes, as it were, in the highest sense, a journey of the saints from mansion to mansion up to the very throne of God.

In order to give clearness to this view Origen follows out, in imagination, the normal course of the progressive training, purifying and illumination of men in the future. He pictures them passing from sphere to sphere, and resting in each so as to receive such revelations of the

providence of God as they can grasp; lower phenomena are successively explained to them, and higher phenomena are indicated. As they look backward old mysteries are illuminated: as they look forward unimagined mysteries stir their souls with divine desire. Everywhere their Lord is with them, and they advance from strength to strength through the perpetual supply of spiritual food. This food, he says, is the contemplation and understanding of God, according to its proper measure in each case, and as suits a nature which is made and created. And this measure—this due harmony and proportion between aim and power—it is right that every one should regard even now, who is beginning to see God, that is, to understand Him in purity of heart (ii. 11, 6 f.).

But while Origen opens this infinite prospect of scene upon scene to faith or hope or imagination, call it as we may, he goes on to shew that Scripture concentrates our attention upon the next scene, summed up in the words, resurrection, judgment, retribution. Nowhere is he more studiously anxious to keep to the teaching of the Word than in dealing with these cardinal ideas. For him the resurrection is not the reproduction of any particular organism, but the preservation of complete identity of person, an identity maintained under new conditions, which he presents under the apostolic figure of the growth of the plant from the seed: the seed is committed to the earth, perishes, and yet the vital power which it contains gathers a new frame answering to its proper nature. Judgment is no limited and local act, but the unimpeded execution of the absolute divine law by which the man is made to feel what he is and what he has become, and to bear the inexorable consequences of the revelation. Punishment is no vengeance, but the just severity of a righteous King, by which the soul is placed at least on the way of purification. Blessedness is no sensuous joy or indolent repose, but the opening vision of the divine glory, the growing insight into the mysteries of the fulfilment of the divine counsels.

In the third book Origen discusses the moral basis of his system. This lies in the recognition of free-will as the inalienable endowment of rational beings. But this free-will does not carry with it the power of independent action, but only the power of receiving the help which is extended to each according to his capacity and needs, and therefore just responsibility for the consequences of action. Such free-will offers a sufficient explanation, in Origen's judgment, for what we see, and gives a stable foundation for what we hope. It places sin definitely within the man himself, and not without him. It preserves the possibility of restoration, while it enforces the penalty of failure. "'God said,' so he writes, 'let us make man in our image after our likeness.' Then the sacred writer adds, 'and God made man: in the image of God made He him.' This therefore that he says, 'in the image of God made He him,' while he is silent as to the likeness, has no other meaning than this, that man received the dignity of the image at his first creation: while the perfection of the likeness is kept in the consummation (of all things); that is, that he should himself gain it by the efforts of his own endeavour, since the possibility of perfection had been given him at the first..." (iii. 6, 1).

Such a doctrine, he shews, gives a deep solemnity to the moral conflicts of life. We cannot, even to the last, plead that we are the victims of circumstances or of evil spirits. The decision in each case, this way or that, rests with ourselves, yet so that all we have and are truly is the gift of God. Each soul obtains from the object of its love the power to fulfil His will. "It draws and takes to itself," he says in another place, "the Word of God in proportion to its capacity and faith. And when souls have drawn to themselves the Word of God, and have let Him penetrate their senses and their understandings, and have perceived the sweetness of His fragrance ... filled with vigour and cheerfulness they speed after him ..." (*in Cant.* i.). Such a doctrine, so far from tending to Pelagianism, is the very refutation of it. It lays down that the essence of freedom is absolute self-surrender: that the power of right action is nothing but the power of God. Every act of man is the act of a free being, but not an exercise of freedom: if done without dependence upon God, it is done in despite of freedom, responsibly indeed, but under adverse constraint.

The decision from moment to moment, Origen maintains, rests with us, but not the end. That is determined from the first, though the conduct of creatures can delay, through untold ages, the consummation of all things. The gift of being, once given, abides for ever. The rational creature is capable of change, of better and worse, but it can never cease to be. What mysteries however lie behind; what is the nature of the spiritual body in which we shall be clothed; whether all that is finite shall be gathered up in some unspeakable way into the absolute,—that Origen holds is beyond our minds to conceive.

As the third book deals with the moral basis of Origen's system, so the fourth and last deals with its dogmatic basis. This order of succession in the treatise is unusual, and yet it is intelligible. It moves from the universal to the special; from that which is most abstract to that which is most concrete; from the heights of speculation to the rule of authority. "In investigating such great subjects as these," Origen writes, "we are not content with common ideas and the clear evidence of what we see, but we take testimonies to prove what we state, even those which are drawn from the Scriptures which we believe to be divine" (iv. 1). Therefore, in conclusion, he examines with a reverence, an insight, a humility, a grandeur of feeling never surpassed, the questions of the inspiration and the interpretation of the Bible. The intellectual value of the work may best be characterised by one fact. A single sentence taken from it was quoted by Butler as containing the germ of his *Analogy*.

MISCELLANIES.

Delarue, i. 37–41.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 65–78.

Before he left Alexandria Origen wrote ten books of miscellanies (Στρωματεῖς: comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 18).[a] In these he appears to have dis-

[a] In H. C. the title "Stromatum," without any further definition, is given after the Books on Leviticus and before those on Isaiah.

cussed various topics in the light of ancient philosophy and Scripture (Hier. *Ep. ad Magn.* lxx. 4). The three fragments which remain, in a Latin translation, give no sufficient idea of their contents. The first, from the sixth book, touches on the permissibility of deflection from literal truth, following out a remark of Plato (Hier. *adv. Ruf.* i. § 18: comp. *Hom.* xix. *in Jer.* § 7; *Hom. in Lev.* iii. § 4). The second, from the tenth book, contains brief notes on the history of Susanna and Bel (Dan. xiii. xiv.) added by Jerome to his commentary on Daniel. The third, from the same book, gives an interpretation of Gal. v. 13, which is referred to the spiritual understanding of the narratives of Scripture (Hier. *ad loc.* Compare also Hier. *in Jerem.* iv. xxii. 24 ff.)

LETTER TO JULIUS AFRICANUS ON THE HISTORY OF SUSANNA (Dan. xiii.).

This letter was written from Nicomedia (§ 15), and probably on the occasion of Origen's second visit to Greece (c. 240). It contains a reply to the objections which Julius Africanus urged against the authenticity of the history of Susanna, and offers a crucial and startling proof of Origen's deficiency in historical criticism. Africanus pointed out, among other things, that the writing must have been Greek originally, from the plays upon words which it contains, and that it was not contained in the "Hebrew" Daniel. To these arguments Origen answers that he had indeed been unable (φίλη γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια) to find Hebrew equivalents to the paronomasias quoted, but that they may exist; and that the Jews had probably omitted the history to save the honour of their elders. In thus vindicating the authority of the narrative, on the evidence of the current Greek Bible, he recognises the difference between "the Scriptures of the Jews" and "the Scriptures of the church," which became fruitful in confusion afterwards. He is unwilling to sacrifice anything which he has found held to be sacred. Providence, he held, must have provided for the edification of the church. It is well, too, to remember the words which bid us "not to remove the eternal landmarks (αἰώνια ὅρια) which those set who were before us" (§§ 4 ff.). If it is natural to admire the reverence of the scholar, made doubly sensitive perhaps by the controversies which he had unwillingly raised, it must be allowed that right lies with the aged Africanus, who could address Origen as "a son," and whose judgment was in the spirit of his own noble saying:—"May such a principle never prevail in the church of Christ that falsehood is framed for His praise and glory" (*Fragm. ap.* Routh, *R. S.* ii. 230).

C. THE EIGHT BOOKS AGAINST CELSUS.

Delarue, i. 310–799.
Lommatzsch.

The following MSS. of the *Books against Celsus* are known more or less imperfectly:

1. Cod. August. (Munich, *Cod. Graec.* lxiv.) saec. xvi. followed in the main by D. Hoeschel in the *Editio princeps.* (See Reiser, *Catol.* p. 38.)
2. Cod. Palatinus, used also by Hoeschel.[f]
3. Cod. Vatic. (Rome) Montfaucon, Bibl. MSS. i. 12 E. [Used by Persona for the Latin translation?]
4. Cod. Ottobon. (Rome) Montfaucon, *l. c.* i. 186 B.
5. Cod. Ambros. (Milan) 'c. Celsum volumina tria.' Montfaucon, *l. c.* i. 502 D.
6. Cod. Bodl. Miscell. 21 (Oxford). Saec. xv.
7. ————————, 36, 7 (Oxford). Saec. xvi. Bks. i. and part of ii.
8. Cod. Coll. Novi (Oxford). Saec. xvi. A gift of Card. Pole to the college.
9. Cod. S. Marci, 44 (Venice). Saec. xiv.
10. ————————, 45 (Venice). Saec. xiv.
11. ————————, 46 (Venice). Saec. xv.
12. Cod. Leidensis (Leyden). Fabricius, vii. p. 220.

Delarue says that his text was collated with eight MSS.:—"Regio, Basiliensi, Jobiano, qui nunc est ecclesiae cathedralis Parisiensis, duobus Vaticanis [recenti et vetere, ii. 11] et tribus Anglicanis" (i. p. 315), but he gives no further details. They probably included 3, 4, 6, 7, 8.

The MSS. agree not unfrequently in readings which are obviously corrupt, and differ from the text in the Philocalia; but as yet they have not been so examined as to determine their mutual relations. Elie Bouhéreau in his French translation of the work (Amsterdam, 1700) shewed great skill, with too much boldness, in dealing with the text; and Mosheim in the Preface to his valuable German translation (Hamburg, 1745) says justly: "Bouhereau, der nichts mehr als seinen Witz hat brauchen können, hat weit mehr kranke Stellen des Origenes geschickt geheilet als Carl de la Rue mit allen seinen acht alten Abschriften" (Pref. p. 8).

An edition of Books i.–iv. was published by Prof. W. Selwyn (Cambridge, 1872–4) with short critical notes and some emendations. The best English translation is that by Dr. Crombie, in Clark's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Edinburgh, 1869, 1872. The French translation by Bouhéreau, and the German translation by Mosheim (see above) are of considerable value.

The earlier apologists had been called upon to defend Christianity against the outbursts of popular prejudice, as a system compatible with civil and social order. Origen, in his *Books against Celsus*, entered upon a far wider field. It was his object to defend the faith against a comprehensive attack, conducted by critical, historical, and philosophical, as well as by political, arguments. He undertook the work very unwillingly, at the urgent request of his friend Ambrosius, but when he had once undertaken it, he threw into the labour the whole energy of his genius. Celsus was an opponent worthy of his antagonism [CELSUS]; and Origen has at least done justice to his adversary, by allowing him to state his case in his own words, and following him step by step in the great controversy. At first Origen proposed to deal with the attack of Celsus in a general form; but after i. 27 he quotes the objections of Celsus, in the order of their occurrence, and deals with them one by one, so that it is possible to reconstruct the work of Celsus, in great part, from Origen's quotations. It would be difficult to overrate the importance both of the attack and of the defence in relation to the history of religious opinion in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The form of objections changes; but it may be said fairly that every essential type of objection to Christianity finds its representative in Celsus' statements,

[f] Hoeschel says on his titlepage that he edited the Book "ex bibliothecis Elect. Palat. Boica et Aug." In his notes he refers several times to "Codex Palatinus." I am not aware that this MS. has been identified.

and Origen suggests in reply thoughts, often disguised in strange dresses, which may yet be fruitful.

No outline can convey a true idea of the fulness and variety of the contents of the treatise. It may however indicate the range of the discussion. Speaking broadly the whole work falls into three parts,—the controversy on the history of Christianity (books i. ii.), the controversy on the general character and idea of Christianity (books iii.–v.), the controversy on the relations of Christianity to philosophy, to popular religion, and to national life (books vi.–viii.). There are necessarily many repetitions, but in the main this view appears to represent the course of the argument. The lines of the discussion were laid down by Celsus: Origen simply followed him.

After some introductory chapters (i. 1–27), which deal with a large number of miscellaneous objections to Christianity as illegal, secret, of barbarous origin, inspired by a demoniac power, an offshoot of Judaism, Origen meets Celsus' first serious attack, which is directed against the Christian interpretation of the gospel history. In this case Celsus places his arguments in the mouth of a Jew. The character, as Origen points out, is not consistently maintained, but the original conception is ingenious. A Jew might reasonably be supposed to be the best critic of a system which sprang out of his own people. The chief aim of the objector is to shew that the miraculous narratives of the gospels are untrustworthy, inconclusive in themselves, and that the details of the Lord's life, so far as they can be ascertained, furnish no adequate support to the Christian theory of His person. The criticism is wholly external and unsympathetic. Can we suppose, Celsus asks, that He who was God would be afraid and flee to Egypt (i. 66)? that He could have had a body like other men (i. 69; ii. 36)? that He would have lived a sordid wandering life, with a few mean followers (i. 62)? that He would have borne insults without exacting vengeance (ii. 35)? that He would have been met with incredulity (ii. 75)? that He would have died upon the cross (ii. 68)? that He would have shewn Himself only to friends if He rose again (ii. 63)? For the rest he repeats the Jewish story of the shameful birth of Christ, and of His education in Egypt, where Celsus supposes that He learned the magical arts by which He was enabled to impose upon His countrymen. These illustrations sufficiently shew the fatal weakness of Celsus' position. He has no eye for the facts of the inner life. He makes no effort to apprehend the gospel offered in what Christ did and was, as a revelation of spiritual power; and Origen rises immeasurably superior to him in his vindication of the majesty of Christ's humiliation and sufferings (i. 29 ff.). He shews that Christ did "dawn as a sun" upon the world (ii. 30), when judged by a moral and not by an external standard (ii. 40): that He left to His disciples the abiding power of doing "greater works" than He Himself did in His earthly life (ii. 48); that the actual energy of Christianity in regenerating men,[g] was a proof that He who was its spring was more than man (ii. 79).

In the third and following books Celsus appears in his own person. He first attacks Christianity as being, like Judaism, originally a revolutionary system, based upon an idle faith in legends no more worthy of credence than those of Greece (iii. 1–43); and then he paints it in detail as a religion of threats and promises, appealing only to the ignorant and the sinful, unworthy of wise men, and, in fact, not addressed to them, or even excluding them (iii. 44–81). Here again Origen has an easy victory. He has no difficulty in shewing that no real parallel can be established between the Greek heroes (iii. 22), or, as Celsus had ventured to suggest, Antinous (iii. 36 ff.) and Christ. On the other side he can reply with the power of a life-long experience, that while the message of the gospel is universal and divine in its universality, "education is a way to virtue," a help towards the knowledge of God (iii. 45, 49, 58, 74), contributory, but not essentially supreme. But he rightly insists on placing the issue as to its claims in the moral and not in the intellectual realm. Christians are the proof of their creed. They are visibly transformed in character: the ignorant are proved wise, sinners are made holy (iii. 51, 64, 78 ff.).

The fourth and fifth books are in many respects the most interesting of all. In these Origen meets Celsus' attack upon that which is the central idea of Christianity, and indeed of Biblical revelation, the Coming of God. This necessarily includes the discussion of the Biblical view of man's relation to God and nature. The contentions of Celsus are that there can be no sufficient cause and no adequate end for "a coming of God" (iv. 1–28): that the account of God's dealings with men in the Old Testament is obviously incredible (iv. 29–50): that nature is fixed, even as to the amount of evil (iv. 62), and that man is presumptuous in claiming a superiority over what he calls irrational animals (iv. 54–99). In especial he dwells on the irrationality of the belief of a coming of God to judgment (v. 1–24); and maintains that there is a divine order in the distribution of the world among different nations, in which the Jews have no prerogative (v. 25–50). On all grounds therefore, he concludes, the claims of Christianity to be a universal religion, based on the coming of God to earth, are absurd. In treating these arguments Origen had a more arduous work to achieve than he had hitherto accomplished. The time had not then come—probably it has not come yet—when such far-reaching objections could be completely met. And Origen was greatly embarrassed by his want of that historic sense which is essential to the apprehension of the order of the divine revelations. His treatment of the Old Testament narratives is unsatisfactory; and it is remarkable that he does not apply his own views on the unity of the whole plan of being, as grasped by man, in partial explanation at least of the present mysteries of life. They underlie indeed all that he says; and much that he urges in detail is of great weight, as his remarks upon the conception of a divine coming (iv. 5 ff., 13 f.), on the rational dignity of man (iv. 13, 23 ff., 30), on the anthropopathic language of Scripture (iv. 71 ff.), on the resurrection (v. 16 ff.).

In the last three books Origen enters again upon surer ground. He examines Celsus' parallels to the teaching of Scripture on the know-

[g] Seen, for example, in one like St. Paul, of whom Celsus took no notice (i. 63).

ledge of God and the kingdom of heaven, drawn from Gentile sources (vi. 1–23); and after a digression on a mystical diagnosis of some heretical sect, which Celsus had brought forward as a specimen of Christian teaching (vi. 24–40), he passes to the true teaching on Satan and the Son of God and creation (vi. 41–65), and unfolds more in detail the doctrine of a spiritual revelation through Christ (vi. 66–81). This leads to a vindication of the Old Testament prophecies of Christ (vii. 1–17), of the compatibility of the two dispensations (vii. 18–26), and of the Christian idea of the future life (vii. 27–40). Celsus proposed to point Christians to some better way, but Origen shews that he has failed: the purity of Christians puts to shame the lives of other men (vii. 41–61).

The remainder of the treatise is occupied with arguments bearing upon the relations of Christianity to popular worship and civil duties. Celsus urged that the "demons," the gods of polytheism, might justly claim some worship, as having been entrusted with certain offices in the world (vii. 62–viii. 32); that the circumstances of life demand reasonable conformity to the established worship, which includes what is true in the Christian faith (viii. 33–68); that civil obedience is paramount (viii. 69–75). Origen replies in detail; and specially he shews that the worship of one God is the essence of true worship (viii. 12 f.); that Christianity has a consistent certainty of belief, with which no strange opinions can be put into comparison (viii. 53 ff.); that Christians do, in the noblest sense, support the civil powers by their lives, by their prayers, by their organization (viii. 75).

The spirit of the arguments on both sides is, it will be seen, essentially modern: in the mode of treatment there is much that is characteristic of the age in which the writers lived. Two points of very different nature will especially strike the student. The first is the peculiar stress which Origen, in common with other early writers, and not with them only, lays upon isolated passages of the prophets and of the Old Testament generally: the second, the unquestioning belief which he, in common with Celsus, accords to the claims of magic and augury (i. 6, 67; iv. 92 f.; vii. 67; viii. 58). But when every deduction has been made, it would not be easy to point to a discussion of the claims of Christianity more comprehensive or more rich in pregnant thought. Among early apologies it has no rival. The constant presence of a real antagonist gives unflagging vigour to the debate; and the conscious power of Origen lies in the appeal which he could make to the Christian life as the one unanswerable proof of the Christian faith (comp. *Praef.* 2; i. 27, 67 *s. f.*).

In addition to the passages of the treatise which have been already noticed, there are many others of great interest, which are worthy of study apart from the context. Such are Origen's remarks on the spirit of controversy (vii. 46); on the moral power of Christianity, its universality, and its fitness for man (ii. 64; iii. 28, 40, 54, 62; iv. 26; vii. 17, 35, 42, 59); on foreknowledge (ii. 19 ff.); on the anthropomorphism of Scripture (vi. 60 ff.); on the beauty of the ideal hope of the Christian (iii. 81); on the ideal of worship (viii. 17 f.; vii. 44); on the divisions of Christians (iii. 12 f.; v. 61); on spiritual fellowship (viii. 64); on future unity (viii. 72).

Compare, in addition to the general writers on Origen—

Aubé, B., *La polémique païenne à la fin du 11me Siècle*, Paris, 1878.
Keim. Th., *Celsus' wahres Wort* ... Zurich, 1873.
Pêlagaud, E., *Etude sur Celse* ... Paris, 1878.
Lagrange (F.), Abbé, *La Raison et la Foi* ... Paris, 1856.
Kind (A.), *Teleologie u. Naturalismus* ... Jena, 1875.

D. Practical Works.

On Prayer.

Delarue, i. 195–272.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 79 ff.

Origen's essay on prayer was addressed to Ambrosius and Tatiana (*φιλομαθέστατοι καὶ γνησιώτατοι ἐν θεοσεβείᾳ ἀδελφοί*, c. 33), in answer to inquiries which they proposed to him as to the efficacy, the manner, the subject, the circumstances of prayer. No writing of Origen is more free from his characteristic faults, or more full of beautiful thoughts. He examines first the meaning and use of *εὐχή* (§ 3), and the objections urged against the efficacy of prayer, that God foreknows the future, and that all things take place according to His will (§ 5). Divine foreknowledge does not, he points out, take away man's responsibility: the moral attitude of prayer is in itself a sufficient blessing upon it (§§ 6 ff.). Prayer establishes an active communion between Christ and the angels in heaven (§§ 10 f.); and the duty of prayer is enforced by the example of Christ and the saints (§§ 13 f.). Prayer must be addressed to God only, "our Father in heaven," and not to Christ the Son as apart from the Father, but to the Father through Him (§ 15). The proper objects of prayer are things heavenly, to which "the shadow"—things earthly—may follow or not (§§ 16 f.). These general reflections are illustrated by a detailed exposition of the Lord's Prayer, as given by St. Matthew, with reference also to the corresponding prayer in St. Luke (§§ 18–30). The last chapters (§§ 31–33) give interesting details as to the appropriate disposition, the attitude, the place, the direction (*κλίμα*), the topics of prayer. He who prays will by preference, Origen says, pray standing, with eyes and hands uplifted, and turned to the East.

The observations on the habit of prayer (§ 8), on the sympathy of the dead with the living (§ 11), on life as "one great unbroken prayer" (§ 12, *μία συναπτομένη μεγάλη εὐχή*), on the preparation for prayer (§ 31), are of singular beauty. Elsewhere Origen dwells on the power of the prayers of the church (*in Rom.* x. § 15), even for heathen benefactors (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 120).

The essay is found complete in one MS. only, *Cod. Holmiensis* of Trin. Coll. Cambridge. Delarue found the last chapters (31–end) in a Colbertine MS., and had the advantage of a collation of the Trinity MS. by the skilful hand of J. Walker, with Bentley's conjectural emendations.

The Exhortation to Martyrdom (*εἰς μαρτύριον προτρεπτικὸς λόγος*).

Delarue, i. 273–310.
Lommatzsch, xx. 227 ff.

In the persecution of Maximinus (235–237), Ambrosius and Theoctetus, a presbyter of Caesarea,

were thrown into prison. Origen addressed them in a book written from his heart: as a boy and as an old man he looked face to face on martyrdom. Their sufferings, he tells them, are a proof of their maturity (c. 1), and in some sense the price of future blessedness (2), for which man's earthly frame is unfitted (3 ff.). The denial of Christ, on the other hand, is the most grievous wrong to God (6 ff.). Believers are indeed pledged to endurance, which will be repaid with unspeakable joys (12 ff.). Moreover they are encouraged in their trials by the thought of the unseen spiritual witnesses by whom they are surrounded in the season of their outward sufferings (18 ff.), and by the examples of those who have already triumphed (22 ff.). By martyrdom man can shew his gratitude to God (28 f.), and at the same time receive afresh the forgiveness of baptism, offering, as a true priest, the sacrifice of himself (30; comp. *Hom.* vii. *in Jud.* 2). So he conquers demons (32). And the predictions of the Lord shew that he is not forgotten (34 ff.), but rather that some counsel of love is fulfilled for him through affliction (39 ff.), such as we can represent to ourselves by the union of the soul with God when it is freed from the distractions of life (47 ff.). Perhaps, too, it may be that the blood of martyrs may have some virtue to gain others, for the truth (50, *τάχα τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματι τῶν μαρτύρων ἀγοραθήσονταί τινες*: comp. *Hom. in Num.* x. 2; *c. Cels.* viii. 44).

E. Critical Writings [Hexapla].

F. Letters.

(Eleven "books" of Letters in all, two books of letters in defence of his works.—H. C.)

Delarue, i. 3–32.
Lommatzsch, xvii. 1 ff.

Eusebius relates that he had made a collection of Origen's letters, containing more than a hundred (*H. E.* vi. 36, 2). Of these two only remain entire, those to Julius Africanus and Gregory, and of the remainder the fragments and notices are most meagre. The famous sentence from his letter to his father has been already quoted (p. 98). In another fragment (Delarue, i. p. 3, from Suidas, *s. v.* *Ὠριγένης*) he gives a lively picture of the incessant labour which the zeal of Ambrosius imposed upon him. A third fragment of great interest, preserved by Eusebius, contains a defence of his study of heathen philosophy (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). Another important passage of a letter addressed to friends at Alexandria, in which he complains of the misrepresentations of those who professed to give accounts of controversies which they had held with him, has been preserved in a Latin translation by Jerome and Rufinus (Delarue, i. p. 5). Of the many letters which he wrote in defence of his orthodoxy, including one to Fabianus, bishop of Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36; comp. Hier. *Ep.* 41 (65)), nothing remains. In like manner his letters to Beryllus (Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 60), to his scholar Trypho (*id.* 57), to the emperor Philip and his wife (or mother) (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 36; Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* 54), have also perished.

To Gregory of Neo-Caesarea.

Gregory was as yet undecided as to his profession when this letter was written (c. 236–7; comp. pp. 101 f.). Origen expresses his earnest desire that his "son" will devote all his knowledge of general literature and the fruits of wide discipline to Christianity (c. 1). He illustrates this use of secular learning by the "spoiling of the Egyptians" (c. 2); and concludes his appeal by a striking exhortation to Gregory to study Scripture (*πρόσεχε τῇ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει· ἀλλὰ πρόσεχε*): "He that said knock ... and seek ... said also, Ask and it shall be given" (c. 3). Comp. Dräseke, *Der Brief d. Orig. an Gregorios ... Jahrb. f. Protest. Theol.* 1881 1.

The letter to Julius Africanus has been already noticed (p. 122).

G. The Philocalia.

Some notice must be given of this admirable collection of extracts from Origen's writings, to which the preservation of many fragments of the Greek text is due. It was made, as it appears, by Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil; and the former sent it to Theodosius bishop of Tyana, about A.D. 382, with a letter (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* cxv.) in which he says: "That you may have some memorial from us, and at the same time from the holy Basil, we have sent you a small volume of the 'Choice thoughts' of Origen (*πυκτίον τῆς Ὠριγένους Φιλοκαλίας*), containing extracts of passages serviceable for scholars (*τοῖς φιλολόγοις*). Be pleased to accept it, and to give us some proof of its usefulness with the aid of industry and the Spirit."

The Philocalia is of great interest, not only from the intrinsic excellence of the passages which it contains, but as shewing what Catholic saints held to be characteristic thoughts in Origen's teaching.

The book consists of xxvii. chapters, which treat of the following subjects:

1. On the Inspiration of divine Scripture. How Scripture should be read and understood. What is the reason (*λόγος*) of its obscurity, and of that in it which is impossible or irrational according to the letter (*κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν*).—Long extracts from the fourth book on *First Principles*, § 1–23; an extract from the *Commentary on Psalm* l. (li.); an extract from the *Second Homily on Leviticus*.

2. That divine Scripture is closed (*κέκλεισται*) and sealed.—Extracts from the *Book on Ps.* i.

3. Why the Inspired Books [of the Old Test.] are twenty-two.—Extract from the same *Book on Ps.* i.

4. Of the solecism and poor style of Scripture.—Extracts from the *Fourth Book on St. John.*

5. What is much-speaking, and what are "many books;" and that inspired Scripture is one Book.—Extracts from the *Fifth Book on St. John.*

6. That divine Scripture is one instrument of God, perfect and fitted (for its work).—Extract from the *Second Book on St. Matthew.*

7. On the special character (*τοῦ ἰδιώματος*) of the persons of divine Scripture.—Extracts from (1) the early *Book on Canticles*, (2) the *Fourth Homily on the Acts.*

8. On the duty of not endeavouring to correct the inaccurate (*σολοικοειδῆ*) phrases of Scripture and those which are not capable of being understood according to the letter, seeing that they contain deep propriety of thought (*πολὺ τὸ τῆς διανοίας ἀκόλουθον*) for those who can understand.—Extract from the *Commentary on Hosea.*

9. What is the reason that divine Scripture often uses the same term in different significa-

tions, and (that) in the same place.—Extract from the *Ninth Book on the Romans.*

10. On passages in divine Scripture which seem to involve some stone of stumbling or rock of offence.—Extract from the *Thirty-ninth Homily on Jeremiah.*

11. That we must seek the nourishment supplied by all inspired Scripture, and not turn from the passages (*ῥητά*) troubled by heretics with ill-advised difficulties (*δυσφήμοις ἐπαπορήσεσιν*), nor slight them, but make use of them also, being kept from the confusion which attaches to unbelief.—Extracts from the *Twentieth Book on Ezekiel.*

12. That he should not faint in the reading of divine Scripture who does not understand the dark riddles and parables it contains.—Extract from the *Twentieth Homily on Joshua.*

13. When and to whom the lessons of philosophy are serviceable to the explanation of the sacred Scriptures, with Scripture testimony.—*Letter to Gregory.*

14. That it is most necessary for those who wish not to fail of the truth in understanding the divine Scriptures to know the logical principles or preparatory discipline (*μαθήματα ἤτοι προπαιδεύματα*) which apply to their use, without which they cannot set forth the exact meaning of the thoughts expressed as they should do.—Extract from the *Third Book on Genesis.*

15. A reply to the Greek philosophers who disparage the poverty of the style of the divine Scriptures, and maintain that the noble truths in Christianity have been better expressed among the Greeks; and who further say that the Lord s person was ill-favoured; with the reason of the different forms of the Word.—Extracts from the *Sixth and Seventh Books against Celsus,*[h] c. Cels. vi. 1–5 (with a fragm. from i. 2); vii. 58–61; vi. 75–77 (with fragments from i. 42, 63; ii. 15; and one of uncertain source, p. 89 L.).

16. Of those who malign Christianity on account of the heresies in the Church.—Extract from the *Third Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. iii. 12–14, with fragments from v. 61, 63).

17. A reply to those philosophers who say that it makes no difference if we call Him who is God over all by the name Zeus, current among the Greeks, or by that which is used by Indians or Egyptians.—Extracts from the *Third and Fifth Books against Celsus* (c. Cels. i. 21–25; v. 45, 46; iv. 48 fragm.).

18. A reply to the Greek philosophers who profess universal knowledge, and blame the simple faith (*τὸ ἀνεξέταστον τῆς πίστεως*) of the mass of Christians, and charge them with preferring folly to wisdom in life; and who say that no wise or educated man has become a disciple of Jesus . . . . Extracts from the *First and Third Books against Celsus* (c. Cels. i. 9–11; 19b, 20; 12, 13; 62b–66; iii. 44–54; 73b, 74).

19. That our faith in the Lord has nothing in common with the irrational, superstitious faith of the Gentiles . . . . And in reply to those who say, How do we think that Jesus is God when He had a mortal body?—Extracts from the same (*Third*) *Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. iii. 38–42 a).

20. A reply to those who say that the whole world was made, not for man, but for irrational creatures . . . who live with less toil than men . . . and foreknow the future. Wherein is an argument against transmigration and on augury . . . —Extract from the *Fourth Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. iv. 73b–76a, 78–99).

21. Of free-will, with an explanation of the sayings of Scripture which seem to deny it.—Extract from the *Third Book of First Principles.*

22. What is the dispersion of the rational or human souls indicated under a veil in the building of the Tower, and the confusion of tongues . . . —Extract from the *Fifth Book against Celsus* (c. Cels. v. 25–28a, 35, 28b–32).

23. On Fate, and the reconciliation of divine foreknowledge with human freedom; and how the stars do not determine the affairs of men, but only indicate them . . . Extracts from (i.) the Third Book on Genesis, (ii.) the Second Book against Celsus (c. Cels. ii. 20b).

24. Of matter, that it is not uncreated (*ἀγέννητος*) or the cause of evil.—From the *Seventh Book of the Evangelical Preparation of Eusebius* (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* vii. 22).[i]

25. That the separation to a special work (Rom. i. 1) from foreknowledge does not destroy free-will.—Extract from the *First Book on the Romans.*

26. Of the question as to things good and evil . . . Extract from the *Book on Ps.* iv.

27. On the phrase: "He hardened Pharaoh's heart."—Extracts from unnamed books; and from notes on Exodus, and from the *Second Book on Canticles.*

The MSS. of the Philocalia are numerous. One at Venice (No. 47) is referred to the 11th century. A MS. at New College Oxford is of interest as having been presented to the Society by Cardinal Pole.[k]

It does not fall within the scope of this article to notice in detail the works which have been falsely attributed to Origen. Of these the most important are:

The Dialogue against the Marcionites (*Διάλογος κατὰ Μαρκιωνιστῶν ἢ περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως*).

Delarue, i. 800 ff.
Lommatzsch, xvi. 246 ff.[l]

[h] It will be noticed that the description of the sources of the extracts given in the book is not always exact or correct.

[i] The passage is quoted by Eusebius from "Maximus, a distinguished man." A large part of it is found in the "Dialogue of Adamantius," falsely attributed to Origen (Delarue, 1, 843 ff.; Lommatzsch, xvi. 341 ff.). Comp. Routh, *Rell. Sacrae*, ii. 77 ff.

It is by no means unlikely that this section was added to the text afterwards. The concluding note says that the passage is also found *ἐν τῷ Ὡριγένους πρὸς Μαρκιωνιστάς*, *i.e.*, the Dialogue of Adamantius, which they could hardly have attributed to him.

[k] See also § ix. note, p. 140.

[l] There is a MS. of the Dialogue in the Gale collection (O. 4.41) with the following note: "Collatus est hic Codex cum cod. ms. qui servatur in Bibl. Trin. Coll. Camb. Erat autem is descriptus ex cod. ms°. Regiae Bibl. Gall. et collatus cum alio ejusdem Bibliothecae libro ms°." At the end is the colophon: "Scripsit Petrus Goldmannus Scotus in bibliotheca Bodleiana anno redemptae salutis 1613." A loose sheet of conjectural emendations is included in the same volume.

Philosophumena, a fragment of a treatise "against all heresies."

Delarue, i. 872 ff.
Lommatzsch, xxv. 279 ff.

Commentaries on Job (three books), written after 311.

Delarue, ii. 850 ff.
Lommatzsch, xvi. 1 ff.

Philosophumena, published under the name of Origen from a Paris MS. by E. Miller, Oxford, 1851, but now generally attributed to Hippolytus.

It is probable that the *Lexicon of Hebrew names*, published under the name of Origen by Martianay (Hieron. iii. pp. 1203 ff., ed. Migne), has at least an Origenian foundation, and the interpretations deserve comparison with those scattered through Origen's Greek works. Comp. Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, vii. 226 f.[m]

V. View of Christian Life.

The picture of Christian life which is drawn in Origen's writings, is less complete and vivid than might have been expected. It represents a society already sufficiently large, powerful, and wealthy, to offer examples of popular vices. Origen contrasts the Christians of his own day with those of an earlier time, and pronounces them unworthy to bear the name of "faithful" (*Hom. in Jer.* iv. 3; comp. *in Matt.* xvii. 24). Some who were Christians by birth were unduly proud of their descent (*in Matt.* xv. § 26). Others retained their devotion to pagan superstitions — astrology, auguries, necromancy (*in Josh.* v. 6, vii. 4; comp. *in Matt.* xiii. § 6) and secular amusements (*Hom. in Lev.* ix. 9, xi. 1). There were many spiritual "Gibeonites" among them, men who gave liberal offerings to the churches but not their lives (*in Josh.* x. 1, 3). The attendance at church services was infrequent (*in Josh.* i. 7; *Hom. in Gen.* x. 1, 3). The worshippers were inattentive (*Hom. in Ex.* xiii. 2) and impatient (*Hom. in Jud.* vi. 1). Commercial dishonesty (*in Matt.* xv. 13) and hardness (*Sel. in Job.* p. 341 L.) had to be reproved.

Such faults call out the preacher's denunciations at all times. Origen deals with an evil more characteristic of his age when he dwells on the growing ambition of the clergy. High places in the hierarchy were now sought by favour and by gifts (*Hom. in Num.* xxii. 4; comp. *in Matt.* xvi. 22; *Comm. Ser.* §§ 9, 10, 12). Prelates endeavoured to nominate their kinsmen as their successors (*id.* xxii. 4); and shrank from boldly rebuking vice lest they should lose the favour of the people (*in Josh.* vii. 6), using the powers of discipline from passion rather than with judgment (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 14), so that their conduct already caused open scandal (*Hom. in Num.* ii. 17). They too often forgot humility at their ordination (*Hom. in Ezech.* ix. 2). They despised the counsel of men of lower rank, "not to speak of that of a layman or a Gentile" (*Hom. in Ex.* xi. 6).

Origen in particular denounces the pride of the leading men in the Christian society, which already exceeded that of Gentile tyrants, especially in the more important cities (*in Matt.* xvi. 8).

It is natural that a public teacher should dwell on vices rather than on virtues, but Origen's language must not be forgotten when an estimate is made of the early church.

Yet, according to Origen, traces still remained in his time of the miraculous endowments of the apostolic church, which he had himself seen (*c. Cels.* ii. 8, iii. 24; *in Joh.* tom. xx. 28, ἴχνη καὶ λείμματα; comp. *c. Cels.* i. 2). Exorcism was habitually practised (*Hom. in Jos.* xxiv. 1). Demons were expelled, many cures were wrought, future events were foreseen by Christians through the help of the Spirit (*c. Cels.* i. 46; comp. i. 25, iii. 36, viii. 58); and he says that the "name of Jesus" was sometimes powerful against demons, even when named by bad men (*c. Cels.* i. 6; comp. v. 45).

But this testimony must be taken in conjunction with the belief in the power of magic which he shared with his contemporaries. He appeals unhesitatingly to the efficacy of incantations made with the use of sacred names (*c. Cels.* i. 22, iv. 33 ff.; comp. *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 110), and otherwise according to secret rules (*c. Cels.* i. 24; *Hom. in Num.* xiii. 4; *in Jos.* xx. *fragm.* ap. *Philoc.* c. xii.)

Origen says little of the relations of Christians to other bodies in the state. The interpenetration of common life by paganism necessarily excluded believers from most public ceremonies, and from much social intercourse. The same influence made them ill-disposed towards art, which was for the most part devoted to the old religion (*c. Cels.* iii. 56; *De Orat.* 17), and had not as yet found any place in connexion with Christian worship (*c. Cels.* vii. 63 ff.). And it is remarkable that while Origen was pre-eminently distinguished for his vindication of the claims of reason (*c. Cels.* i. 13) and of Gentile philosophy, as being the ripest fruit of man's natural powers (comp. *Hom. in Gen.* xiv. 3; *in Ex.* xi. 6) and not their corruption (Tertullian), he still very rarely refers to the literature of secular wisdom in his general writings as ancillary to revelation. He even in some cases refers its origin to "the princes of this world" (*De Princ.* iii. 3, 2); and in an interesting outline of the course of Gentile education, he remarks that it may only accumulate a wealth of sins (*Hom.* iii. *in Ps.* xxxvi. 6). On the other hand, his directions for dealing with unbelievers are marked by the truest courtesy (*Hom. in Ex.* iv. 9); and in spite of his own courageous enthusiasm, he counselled prudence in times of persecution (*in Matt.* x. 23). Occasions for such self-restraint arose continually. For Origen notices the popular judgment, active from the time of Tertullian to that of Augustine, which referred "wars, famines, and pestilences"

The MS. in the Library of Trinity College which is referred to is marked B. 9, 10. The colophon is: "In gratiam praestantissimi et reverendissimi viri Isaaci Vossii I.V.D. describebam Lutetiae Parisiorum, Decembri 1647, ego Claudius Sarranius." The MS. was given by Voss to H. Thorndike.

[m] One apocryphal Homily *On Mary Magdalene* deserves to be noticed on account of its wide popularity. Chaucer says that:

> 'He made also, gon is a grete while,
> Origenes upon the Maudelaine."
> *Legend of Good Women*, 427.

But the *Lamentation of Marie Magdaleine*, which is often printed among his works, is generally held to be spurious.

to the spread of the faith (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 39). In especial he dwells upon the animosity of the Jews, who "would rather see a criminal acquitted than convicted by the evidence of a Christian" (*id.* § 16). Of the extension of Christianity he speaks in general terms, rhetorically rather than exactly. It was not preached among all the Ethiopians, especially "those beyond the river," or among the Chinese. "What," he continues, "shall we say of the Britons or Germans by the Ocean, Dacians, Sarmatians, Scythians, very many of whom have not yet heard the word?" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 39). Yet elsewhere he reckons inhabitants of Britain and Mauritania among those who held the common faith (*Hom. in Luc.* vi.).

As a general rule Christians declined public offices, not from any lack of loyalty, but as feeling that they could serve their country better through their own society (*c. Cels.* viii. 73, 75).

The church, according to Origen, is the whole body of believers animated by Christ, who, as the Divine Logos, stirs each member, so that without Him it does nothing (*c. Cels.* vi. 48). In the widest sense it has existed even from the Creation (*in Cant.* ii. p. 418 L.). Such a view, which makes the church coextensive with the existence of divine fellowship, carries with it the corollary, that "without the church there is no salvation" (*Hom. in Jos.* iii. 6). Origen, as has been seen, shewed practically his respect for the see of Rome, but he recognised no absolute supremacy in St. Peter (*in Matt.* xii. 11). He held indeed that he had a certain pre-eminence (*in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 5), and that the church was founded on him (*Hom. in Ex.* v. 4), but every disciple of Christ, he affirms, holds in a true sense the same position (*Comm. in Matt.* xii. 10).

In this connexion it may be noticed that Origen lays great stress upon the importance of right belief (*in Matt.* tom. xii. 23; *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 33; *De Orat.* 29). As a young man he refused every concession to a misbeliever in the house of his benefactress (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). In later years he laboured successfully to win back those who had fallen into error. But none the less his sense of the infinite greatness of the truth made him tolerant (*c. Cels.* v. 63). He ventured to say that varieties of belief were due to the vastness of its object (*c. Cels.* iii. 12); and his discussion of the question, Who is a heretic? is full of interest (*Fragm. in Ep. ad Tit.*).

Casual notices scattered through Origen's writings, give a fairly complete view of the religious observances of his time. He speaks generally of stated times of daily prayer, "not less than three" (*De Orat.* 12), of the days which they kept—"the Lord's days (comp. *Hom. in Ex.* vii. 5; *in Num.* xxiii. 4), Fridays, Easter, Pentecost" (*c. Cels.* viii. 22; comp. *Hom. in Is.* vi. § 2),—and of the Lenten, Wednesday, and Friday fasts (*Hom. in Lev.* x. 2). Some still added Jewish rites to the celebration of Easter (*Hom. in Jer.* xii. 13), and other traces remained of Judaizing practices (*Hom. in Jer.* x. § 2). Jewish converts, Origen says without reserve, "have not left their national law" (*c. Cels.* ii. 1, comp. § 3); though he lays down that Christ forbade His disciples to be circumcised (*c. Cels.* i. 22; comp. v. 48). Christians however still abstained from "things strangled" (*c. Cels.* viii. 30), and from meat that had been offered to idols (*id.* 24). Outward forms had already made progress; and there were those whose religion consisted in "bowing their head to priests, and in bringing offerings to adorn the altar of the church" (*Hom. in Jos.* x. 3).

Baptism was administered to infants, "in accordance with apostolic tradition" (*in Rom.* v. § 9, p. 397 L.; *Hom. in Lev.* viii. § 3; *in Luc.* xiv.), in the name of the Holy Trinity (*in Rom.* v. § 8, p. 383 L.;[n] comp. *in Joh.* tom. vi. 17), with the solemn renunciations "of the devil and of his pomps, works, and pleasures" (*Hom. in Num.* xii. 4)[o]. The unction (confirmation) does not appear to have been separated from it (*in Rom.* v. § 8, p. 381: "omnes baptizati in aquis istis visibilibus et in chrismate visibili"). As for the gift of the Holy Spirit, which comes only from Christ, Origen held that it was given according to His righteous will: "Not all who are bathed in water are forthwith bathed in the Holy Spirit" (*Hom. in Num.* iii. 1). Compare also *Sel. in Gen.* ii. 15; *Hom. in Luc.* xxi.; *De Princ.* i. 2; and for the two sacraments, *Hom. in Num.* vii. 2. Adult converts were divided into different classes and trained with great care (*c. Cels.* iii. 51).

Of the Holy Communion Origen speaks not unfrequently, but with some reserve (*Hom. in Lev.* x. 10; *in Jos.* iv. 1). It is remarkable that he does not mention it when he discusses the various modes of remission of sin (*Hom. in Lev.* ii. 4). The passages which give his views most fully are *in Joh.* xxxii. § 16; *in Matt.* xi. § 14; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* §§ 85 f.; *Hom. in Gen.* xvii. 8; *in Ex.* xiii. § 3; *in Lev.* ix. 10; *in Num.* xvi. 9. Comp. *c. Cels.* viii. 33, 57; *Hom. in Jud.* vi. 2; *Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxvii. 6; *Sel. in Ps.* p. 365 L.

The ruling thought of his interpretation is suggested by John vi.: "corpus Dei Verbi aut sanguis quid aliud esse potest nisi verbum quod nutrit et verbum quod laetificat?" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 85); "bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi non solum sacramentorum ritu sed et cum sermones eius recipimus in quibus vita consistit, sicut et ipse dicit, *Verba quæ locutus sum spiritus et vita est*" (*Hom. in Num.* xvi. § 9; comp. xxiii. § 6). The passage which is often quoted to shew "a presence of Christ in the sacrament *extra usum*," indicates nothing more than the reverence which naturally belongs to the consecrated elements (consecratum munus, *Hom. in Ex.* xiii. 3).

The kiss of peace was still given "at the time of the mysteries" (*in Cant.* i. p. 331 L.), "after prayers" (*in Rom.* x. § 33); and the love-feast (Ἀγάπη) was sufficiently notorious to form a subject of Celsus's attacks (*c. Cels.* i. 1); but the practice of "feet-washing," if it ever prevailed, was now obsolete (*in Joh.* xxxii. § 7; *Hom. in Is.* vi. § 3). It may be added that the use made of

---

[n] In commenting on Rom. vi. 3 in this passage he meets the question which may be asked, how it is that St. Paul speaks of baptism "in the name of Christ Jesus," "while baptism is not held to be lawful unless under the name of the Trinity."

[o] In *Hom. in Ezech.* vi. 6, there appears to be a reference to the use of salt and milk and the white robe. Comp. *in Rom.* v. § 8 *l. c.*

James v. 14, in *Hom. in Lev.* ii. 4, does not give any support, as has been often affirmed, to the practice of extreme unction.

The treatise *On Prayer* gives, as has been seen, a vivid picture of the mode and attitude of prayer. It was usual to turn to the east (*De Orat.* 31; *Hom. in Num.* v. § 1). Standing and kneeling are both recognised (*De Orat. l. c.*; *Hom. in Num.* xi. § 9; comp. *in Sam. Hom.* i. § 9). Forms of prayer were used (*Hom. in Jer.* xiv. § 14); and prayers were made in the vernacular language of each country (*c. Cels.* viii. 31).

Origen frequently refers to confession as made to men and not to God only (*Hom. in Luc.* xvii.; *De Orat.* 28; *Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxvii. § 6); and reckons penitence completed by such confession to a "priest of the Lord" as one of the modes for forgiveness of sins (*Hom.* ii. *in Lev.* § 4). At the same time he speaks elsewhere of public confession (ἐξομολόγησις) to God as efficacious (*Hom.* i. *in Ps.* xxxvi. § 5), a form of penitence to be adopted after wise advice (*Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxvii. § 6); and while he adopts the common but false view of Matt. xvi. 18, he supposes that the efficacy of "the power of the keys" depends upon the character of those who exercise it (*in Matt.* tom. xii. § 14).

Discipline was enforced by exclusion from common prayer (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 89); and for more serious offences penitence was admitted once only (*Hom. in Lev.* xv. § 2). Compare also what is said on "sin unto death" (*Hom. in Lev.* xi. 2). Those who had offended grievously after baptism were looked upon as incapable of holding office (*c. Cels.* iii. 51).

The threefold ministry is noticed as if it were universally recognised; and Origen speaks of presbyters as priests, and deacons as Levites (*Hom. in Jerem.* xii. 3). The people were to be present at the ordination of priests (*Hom. in Lev.* vii. 3). At the same time he recognises emphatically the priesthood of all Christians who "have been anointed with the sacred chrism" (*Hom. in Lev.* ix. 9; comp. *Hom. in Num.* v. 3; *in Jos.* vii. 2; comp. *Exh. ad Martyr.* 30).

Widows are spoken of also as having a definite place in the organization of the church (*Hom. in Is.* vi. § 3; *Hom. in Luc.* xvii.); and yet it does not appear that they were combined in any order (*in Rom.* x. §§ 17, 20).

As yet no absolute rule was made as to the celibacy of the clergy. Origen himself was inclined to support it by his own judgment (*Hom. in Lev.* vi. § 6). "No bishop, however, or presbyter or deacon or widow could marry a second time" (*Hom. in Luc.* xvii.): such Origen held to be in a second class, not "of the church without spot" (*l. c.*; but comp. note on 1 Cor. vii. 8). It was a sign of the difficulties of the social position of Christians that some "rulers of the church" allowed a woman to marry again while her husband (presumably a Gentile who had abandoned her) was still living (*in Matt.* tom. xiv. § 23).

Origen's own example and feeling were strongly in favour of a strict and continent life (comp. *c. Cels.* vii. 48; *Hom. in Gen.* v. 4), while he condemns false asceticism (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 10). He enforces the duty of systematic almsgiving (*id.* § 61); and maintains that the law of offering the firstfruits to God, that is to the priests, is one of the Mosaic precepts which is of perpetual obligation (*Hom. in Num.* xi. 1; comp. *c. Cels.* viii. 34). Usury is forbidden (*Hom.* iii. *in Ps.* xxxvi. § 11). The rule as to food laid down in Acts xv. 29, was as has been seen, still observed (*in Rom.* ii. § 13, p. 128 L.; *c. Cels.* viii. 30).

The reverence of Christian burial is noticed (*Hom. in Lev.* iii. § 3; *c. Cels.* viii. 30). Military service, according to Origen, was unlawful for Christians (*c. Cels.* v. 33, viii. 73), though he seems to admit exceptions to the rule (*id.* iv. 82).

VI. ORIGEN AS CRITIC AND INTERPRETER.[p]

Origen regarded the Bible as the source and rule of truth (*Hom. in Jer.* i. § 7). Christ is "the Truth," and they who are sure of this seek spiritual knowledge from His very words and teaching alone, given not only during His earthly presence, but through Moses and the prophets (*De Princ. Praef.* 1). The necessary points of doctrine were, Origen held, comprised by the apostles in a simple creed handed down by tradition (*De Princ. Praef.* ii.), but the fuller exhibition of the mysteries of the gospel was to be sought from the Scriptures. In this respect he made no sharp division between the Old and New Testaments. They must be treated as one body, and we must be careful not to mar the unity of the Spirit which exists throughout (*in Joh.* x. 13; comp. *De Princ.* ii. 4). The divinity of the Old Testament is indeed first seen through Christ (*De Princ.* iv. 1, 6).

1. *The Canon of Scripture.*—In fixing the contents of the collection of sacred books Origen shews some indecision. In regard to the Old Testament he found a serious difference between the Hebrew Canon and the books which were commonly found in the Alexandrine Greek Bible. In his *Commentary on the first Psalm* he gives a list of the canonical books (*αἱ ἐνδιάθηκοι βίβλοι*) according to the tradition of the Hebrews, twenty-two in number (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25). In the enumeration the *Book of the Twelve* (minor) *Prophets* is omitted by the error of Eusebius or of his transcriber, for it is necessary to make up the number; and the "Letter" (*Baruch* vi.) is added to Jeremiah, because (apparently) it occupied that position in Origen's copy of the LXX., for there is no evidence that it was ever included in the Hebrew Bible. The *Books of the Maccabees*, which (1 *Macc.*) bore a Hebrew title, were not included in the number (*ἔξω τούτων ἐστί*).

But while Origen thus gives a primary place to the books of the Hebrew Canon, he expressly defended, in his letter to Africanus, the use among Christians of the additions found in the Alexandrine LXX. (comp. p. 122). He was unwilling to sacrifice anything which was sanctioned by custom and tended to edification. His own practice reflects this double view. He never, as far as we know, publicly expounded any of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, while he habitually quotes them as having authority,

[p] In addition to the general works already referred to the essay of J. J. Bochinger (Argentor. 1829-30), *De O. allegorica S.S. interpretatione* may be noticed as impartial and full in detail. There is another essay on the subject by C. R. Hagenbach (Basil. 1823).

though he frequently notices, while he does so, that their authority was challenged.

So we find references to the *Books of Maccabees* (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 5; *in Joh.* xiii. 57); to *Baruch* (*Hom. in Ex.* vii. 2; *Comm. in Rom.* ii. § 7); to *Ecclesiasticus* (*in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 14; *Hom.* ii. *in Ps.* 39, § 7); to *Wisdom* (*in Joh.* xxviii. 13, εἴ τις προσίεται; comp. tom. xx. 4; *De Princ.* iv. 33); to *Tobit* (*De Orat.* 14; *Comm. in Rom.* viii. § 11); to *Judith* (*in Joh.* vi. § 16); to the *Additions to Esther* and to *Daniel*, in the letter to Africanus.

In addition to these books, which had a certain sanction in the church, Origen quotes also the *Book of Enoch* (*c. Cels.* v. 55; *De Princ.* iv. 35; *Hom. in Num.* xxviii. 2), the *Prayer of Joseph* (*in Joh.* ii. 25, εἴ τις προσίεται), the *Assumption of Moses* (*Hom. in Jos.* ii. 1), and the *Ascension of Isaiah* (*De Princ.* iii. 2, 1; *Hom. in Jos.* ii. 1; comp. *in Matt.* t. x. 18); and it is probably to books of this type that he refers in the interesting remarks on "apocryphal" books in *Prol. in Cant.* p. 325 L.

How far Origen was from any clear view of the history of the books of the Old Testament may be inferred from the importance which he assigns to the tradition of Ezra's restoration of their text from memory after the Babylonian captivity (*Sel. in Jer.* xi. p. 5 L.; *Sel. in Ps. id.* p. 371).

His testimony to the contents of the New Testament is more decided. He notices the books which were generally acknowledged in the church as possessing unquestionable authority; the *Four Gospels* [the *Acts*[q]], 1 *Peter*, 1 *John*, *thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*. To these he adds the *Apocalypse*, for he seems to have been unacquainted with its absence from the Syrian Canon (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25). In another passage, preserved only in the Latin translation of Rufinus (*Hom. in Jer.* vii. 1), he enumerates all the books of the received New Testament, without addition or omission, as the trumpets by which the walls of the spiritual Jericho are to be overthrown (*the Four Gospels*, 1*st* and 2*nd Peter*, *James*, *Jude*, *the Epistles* and *Apocalypse of St. John*, the *Acts* by St. Luke, *fourteen Epistles of St. Paul*). This enumeration, though it cannot be received without reserve, may represent his popular teaching. In isolated notices he speaks of the disputed books as received by some but not by all (*Epistle to the Hebrews*, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25; *Ep. ad Afric.* § 9; *James*, *in Joh.* xix. 6; 2*nd Peter*, *Hom. in Lev.* iv. 4; *Jude*, *in Matt.* tom. x. 17, xvii. 30); and it was according to his spirit to accept, in a certain sense, whatever tended to edification, though he appears to have limited doctrinal authority to the acknowledged books (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 28).

In addition to the "controverted" books which have found a place in the New Testament, Origen quotes most frequently and with the greatest respect the *Shepherd* of Hermas (e. g. *De Princ.* i. 3, 3, iv. 11; *in Matt.* tom. xiv. § 21; *in Rom.* x. 31, p. 437 L.).[r]

He quotes also or refers to the *Epistle* (i.) *of Clement*, "a disciple of the apostles" (*De Princ.* ii. 3, 6; *in Joh.* tom. vi. 36; *Sel. in Ez.* viii. 3); "the *Catholic Epistle of Barnabas*" (*c. Cels.* i. 63; *De Princ.* iii. 2, 4; comp. *Comm. in Rom.* i. § 18), the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (*in Joh.* tom. ii. 6, ἐὰν προσίεταί τις; *Hom. in Jer.* xv. 4; *in Matt.* tom. xv. 14, *Vet. int. Lat.*; comp. Hier. *de Virr. Ill.* 2), the *Gospels* "*according to the Egyptians*," and "*according to the Twelve Apostles*," "*according to Thomas*," and "*after Matthias*" (*Hom.* 1 *in Luc.*, "Ecclesia quatuor habet evangelia, haeresis plurima, e quibus ..." the *Gospel according to Peter*, the *Book of James* (*in Matt.* x. 17, τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου), *Peter's Preaching* (*in Joh.* xiii. 17; *De Princ.* Praef. 8, *Petri doctrina*), the *Acts of Paul* (*in Joh.* xx. 12; *De Princ.* i. 2, 3), the *Clementines* (*Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 77; *in Gen.* iii. § 14, αἱ περίοδοι), some form of the *Acts of Pilate* (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 122), the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*in Joh.* xv. 6), the *Teaching of the Apostles* (?) (*Hom. in Levit.* xi. 2).

Sayings attributed to the Lord are given *in Matt.* tom. xiii. § 2, xvi. § 28 (*Sel. in Ps.* p. 432 L. and *De Orat.* §§ 2, 14, 16; comp. Matt. vi. 33), xvii. § 31; *in Jos.* iv. 3. A few traditions are preserved: *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 126 (Adam buried on Calvary); *id.* § 25 (death of the father of John Baptist); *c. Cels.* i. 51 (the cave and manger at Bethlehem); *c. Cels.* vi. 75 (the appearance of Christ); *Hom. in Ezech.* i. 4 (the baptism of Christ in January).[s]

Anonymous quotations occur, *Hom. in Luc.* xxxv.; *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 61; *Hom. in Ezech.* i. 5; *in Rom.* ix. § 2.

2. *The Text.*—It will be evident, from what has been said, that Origen had very little of the critical spirit, in the modern acceptation of the phrase. This is especially seen in his treatment of the biblical texts. His importance for textual criticism is that of a witness and not of a judge. He gives invaluable evidence as to what he found, but his few endeavours to determine what is right, in a conflict of authorities, are for the most part unsuccessful both in method and result. Generally, however, he makes no attempt to decide on the one right reading. He is ready to accept all the conflicting readings as contributing to edification. Even his great labours on the Greek translations of the Old Testament were not directed rigorously to the definite end of determining what was the authentic text, but mainly to recording the extent and character of the variations. Having done this, he left his readers to follow their own judgment (*Comm. in Matt.* xv. 14: ἵνα ... ὁ μὲν βουλόμενος πρόηται αὐτά, ᾧ δὲ προσκόπτει τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὃ βούλεται περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν ἢ μὴ ποιήσῃ). [HEXAPLA.]

This want of a definite critical aim is more decisively shewn in his treatment of the New Testament. Few variations are more remarkable than those in Hebr. ii. 9: χάριτι θεοῦ and χωρὶς θεοῦ. Origen was acquainted with both, and apparently he was wholly unconcerned to

[q] This book is not specially mentioned, but Origen's usage is decisive as to the position which he assigned to it. The tacit omission is a good illustration of the danger of trusting to negative evidence.

[r] The statement of Tarinus, however (*Philoc.* p. 683), that Origen wrote a commentary on the *Shepherd* appears to be simply a false deduction from the word διηγούμεθα (*Philoc.* i. p. 22, 11).

[s] His statement as to the duration of the Lord's ministry, for "a year and a few months" (*de Princ.* iv. 5), cannot be included in this list. Comp. Redepenning *de Princ.* p. 49.

make a choice between them; both gave a good sense, and that was a sufficient reason for using both (*in Joh.* tom. i. 40: εἴτε δὲ χωρὶς θεοῦ ... εἴτε χάριτι ... *in Joh.* xxviii. 14: the Latin of *Comm. in Rom.* iii. § 8, v. § 7, *sine Deo*, is of no authority for Origen's judgment).

In other cases of less importance he notices the existence of various readings in the same manner: Matt. xvi. 20 (διεστείλατο, ἐπετίμησεν; *Comm. in Matt.* xii. § 15); Matt. xviii. 1 (ὥρᾳ, ἡμέρᾳ; *Comm. in Matt.* xiii. § 14); Mark iii. 18 (Λεββαῖον; *c. Cels.* i. 62); Luke ix. 48 (ἐστί, ἔσται; *Comm. in Matt.* xiii. § 19); Luke xiv. 19 (*Fragm. in Luc.* p. 241 L.); John i. 4 (some read τάχα οὐκ ἀπιθάνως ἐστίν for ἦν; *in Joh.* ii. § 13).

In Matt. xxvii. 17 Origen found Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν in his copy, but he inclined to the omission of Ἰησοῦν, with many copies, "that the name Jesus should not be applied [contrary to the other evidence of Scripture] to an evil-doer" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 121; comp. § 33; and schol. ap. Galland).

In noticing the variation in Luke xxiii. 45 he supposes that the phrase τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος (-λιπόντος) was introduced in place of καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος either from a false desire for clearness or by the malice of adversaries (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 134); and though he himself quotes the reading without remark elsewhere, the criticism is quite according to his style.

In discussing the scene of the cure of the demoniac (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26) he decides peremptorily, on geographical arguments, that Γερασηνῶν and Γαδαρηνῶν must both be wrong, and that Γεργεσαίων (Γεργεσηνῶν) must be read in all places, for in his time the scene of the miracle was shewn in the neighbourhood of Gergesa, though it does not appear certainly from his language that he found Γεργεσαίων in any evangelic text.

In Rom. iii. 5, if the Latin version of his commentary can be trusted, he seems to have found in his Greek copy κατὰ ἀνθρώπων (*Comm. in Rom.* iii. § 1, pp. 163, 167 L.). It is more difficult to determine whether the omission of μή in Rom. v. 14 (ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτ.) is simply due to Rufinus or not (*id.* v. § 1, p. 344 L.).[t]

Sometimes Origen indulges in conjectures without any adequate ground. Thus he suspects that the phrase in Matt. xix. 19, ἀγαπ. τ. π. σου ὡς σ. has been inserted, supporting the opinion by the fact that the words are not found in St. Mark or St. Luke (*in Matt.* xv. § 14). In Matt. v. 45 he thinks that ὑμῶν may be an addition of copyists (*in Joh.* xx. § 15). In Matt. xxvii. 9 he offers as an alternative explanation of the difficulty the substitution of "Jeremiah" for "Zechariah" by an "error of writing" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 117).

The following passages in the Latin translations may also be noticed: *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 43 (Matt. xxiv. 19): § 118 (Mark xiv. 61): *Hom. in Is.* ii. § 1 (Matt. i. 23); *Hom. in Luc.* vii. (Luke i. 46): *Comm. in Rom.* vi. § 7 (Rom. vii. 6).

The remarks on the variations of Latin MSS. are interesting in themselves but foreign to Origen—e.g. *Comm. in Rom.* iii. § 6 (Rom. iii. 19); vii. § 4 (c. viii. 22); ix. §§ 10, 12 (c. xii. 11, 13); ix. § 42 (Matt. xv. 20).

Of Origen's conjectures (if indeed it is simply a conjecture) the most famous is Βηθαβαρᾷ for Βηθανίᾳ, in John i. 28, which he maintained for local reasons. But when he says that Βηθανίᾳ was found σχεδὸν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις he implies that he found some other reading which may have been Βηθαβαρᾷ (Βηθαραβᾷ).

In spite of these drawbacks, which are practically of far less moment than appears from an enumeration of particulars drawn from a large area, Origen's importance as a witness to the true text of the New Testament is invaluable. Notwithstanding the late date and scantiness of the MSS. in which his Greek writings have been preserved, and the general untrustworthiness of the Latin translations in points of textual detail, it would be possible to determine a pure text of a great part of the New Testament from his writings alone (comp. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* t. ii.).

In some respects his want of a critical spirit makes his testimony to the text of the New Testament of greater value than if he had followed consistently an independent judgment. He reproduces the characteristic readings which he found, and thus his testimony is carried back to an earlier date. At different times he used copies exhibiting different complexions of text; so that his writings reflect faithfully the variations to which he refers generally. Griesbach called attention to the most conspicuous illustration of this fact. He shewed by a wide induction from the variations in St. Mark that the evangelic text which Origen used while writing his commentary on St. Matthew, which was one of his latest works, was of the type generally described as "Western" (of which D is the best representative), while that used by him in writing his earlier commentary on St. John was of an "Alexandrine" character in the wider sense (represented by B C L) (Griesbach, *Comm. Crit. Partic.* ii. pp. x. ff. 1811, with which may be compared his early essay *De codicibus Evangg. IV Origenianis*, 1771. *Opuscula*, i. 226 ff.).

But while Origen's quotations are of the highest textual value, great care is required in using the evidence which they furnish. He frequently quotes from memory, and combines texts; and in some cases gives several times a reading which he can hardly have found in any MS. (*e.g.* 1 John iii. 8, γεγέννηται). Illustrations of this perplexing laxity occur in *Hom. in Jer.* i. 15 (Matt. iii. 12, xiii. 39); *id.* iv. 2, v. 1 (Acts xiii. 26, 46); *id.* iv. 4 (Luke xviii. 12); *id.* v. 1 (Tit. iii. 5 f.).

3. *Interpretation.*—Origen has been spoken of as the founder of a new form of literature in Biblical interpretation; and justly, though others, among whom Heracleon was conspicuous, had preceded him in expositions of Scripture more or less continuous. Origen himself constantly refers to interpretations of his predecessors:[u] to Heracleon *in Joh.* ii. 8 and constantly; *in Matt.* x. § 22 (τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν τις), xiv. § 2 (*id.*), xvii. § 17 (νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι), xvii. § 28; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* §§ 31, 69, 75, 126; *Hom.*

[t] It may however be noticed that *c. Cels.* vi. 36 is not opposed to the present reading in Mk. vi. 3.

[u] Fabricius has given an important collection of writers quoted by Origen, *Biblioth. Graeca*, vii 244 ff. (ed. Harles).

in Luc. xxxiv. (*quidam de presbyteris*); *in Rom.* iv. § 10, p. 304 L., vi. § 7, p. 40 L.; *Hom. in Gen.* v. § 5, xv. § 6; *in Ex.* xiii. 3; *in Levit.* viii. 6; *in Num.* ix. 5; *in Jos.* xvi. 1, 5; *in Jud.* viii. 4; *in* 1 *Sam.* i. 1; *in Ps.* xxxvi., *Hom.* ii. 6, *Hom.* iv. 1; *in Jerem., c. Cels.* ii. 25.

It is probable that these references are in many cases to homilies or isolated treatises, but at any rate they give a striking view of the extent of Christian thought and literature in the 2nd century and at the beginning of the 3rd.

Origen's method of interpreting Scripture was a practical deduction from his view of the inspiration of Scripture. This he developed in the fourth book of the treatise *On First Principles*. Briefly he regarded every "jot and tittle" as having its proper work (*Hom. in Jer.* xxxix. fr. ep. *Philoc.* c. x.). All is precious; not even the least particle is void of force (*in Matt.* tom. xvi. 12). Comp. *Ep. ad Greg.* § 3; *in Joh.* tom. i. § 4. Minute details of order and number veil and yet suggest great thoughts (e.g. *Sel. in Pss.* xi. 370, 377 L.). It follows that in interpretation there is need of great exactness and care (*in Gen.* tom. iii. p. 46 L.; *Philoc.* xiv.), and scrupulous study of details (*in Joh.* xx. 29). Origen himself illustrates his principles by countless subtle observations of great interest—e.g. *in Matt.* xii. § 22 (c. iv. 10, ὀπίσω μου and στραφείς); *id.* § 35 (c. xvi. 28, γεύσασθαι θανάτου); xiii. § 31 (c. xvi. 19, οὐρανοί); xiv. 15 (c. ix. 9, ἀναστάς); xv. § 9 (c. xix. 15); xv. § 28 (c. xx. 4 ff.); *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 83 (c. xxvi. 24, δι' οὗ); *id.* § 90 (c. xxvi. 37, ἤρξατο); *id.* § 100 (c. xxvi. 50, φίλε); *in Rom.* v. § 6 (c. ii. 8, ὀργή); *Hom. in Gen.* iv. § 5, viii. § 1, xv. § 9, xvi. § 3; *in Levit.* xiv. § 3; *in Num.* xii. § 2, xiv. § 3, xvi. § 2, xxiv. § 2, xxvii. § 6; *in Ezech.* ix. § 2.

In these criticisms the skill with which he combines passages from different parts of Scripture in illustration of some particular phrase or detail is specially to be noticed—e.g. *in Matt.* c. xiii. § 3 (c. xvii. 4 f.); *id.* xiv. § 14 (c. xix. 1, ἐτέλεσε); *id.* xvi. § 4 (c. xx. 21, καθίσωσιν); *in Joh.* xxxii. 2 (p. 381 L., ἄριστον). Each term calls up far-reaching associations; and all Scripture is made to contribute to the fulness of the thought to be expressed.

One practical consequence followed from Origen's sense of the value of each word of Scripture. He recognised the necessity of learning Hebrew that he might be confident as to the original form of the records of the Old Testament. It must not however be supposed that he studied Hebrew with the spirit of a modern scholar. He seems to have contented himself with being able to identify the Hebrew corresponding with the Greek texts before him (comp. *Sel. in Pss.* xi. pp. 355 f. L.). Nor did he always take the trouble to do this. In his Homilies he constantly follows the Greek text, when it differs widely from the Hebrew, without marking the variation (e.g. *Hom. in Jos.* xxvi., a most remarkable example; *Hom. in Jos.* xxiv. § 1; *Hom. in Cant.* i. § 6, Cant. viii. 5).

In other cases he notes variations of the Greek copies without any reference to the Hebrew (*Hom. in Num.* xxviii. 4, Deut. xxxii. 8, a crucial example: comp. *Hom. in Ezech.* xiii. § 1; *in Joh.* tom. xiii. § 24, 1 K. xix. 12; *in Joh.* xx. § 20, Ps. xviii. (xix.) 10; *Hom. in Ezech.* xi. 1; *Hom. in Jer.* viii. 1, Job xxvi. 7); and he even appears to have obelized passages in consideration of the agreement of "the other editions" (αἱ λοιπαὶ ἐκδόσεις) alone (*in Joh.* xxviii. 13, Num. xxiii. 6).

Elsewhere he notes the variation of the Greek copies from the Hebrew (*Hom. in Cant.* ii. § 4, Prov. xxvii. 10; *Sel. in Pss.* p. 360 L.; *in Rom.* viii. § 5, Is. liii. 1; *id.* § 7, Ps. lxviii (lxix.) 22; *id.* § 11, Is. lix. 20; *Sel. in Pss.* p. 366 L.; *in Ezech.* vi. 4, xiii. 4; *in Jer.* xiv. 3); and in one place at least he notes the readings of "two Hebrew copies" (*Sel. in Pss.* xi. p. 393 L.).

Sometimes he implies that his knowledge of the Hebrew reading depends on the information of others (*Hom. in Num.* xvi. 4, "Hebraei habere se scriptum dicunt," Jonah iii. 5; *in Rom.* ii. § 13, p. 136 L.); and in especial he quotes what he learnt in conversation with "Iullus (Ἰούλλος) the patriarch" [of Alexandria?] (*Sel. in Pss.* pp. 352 ff.; comp. Hier. *Apol.* i. § 3, *Huillus*).

In one place he confounds the letters ה and ב, supposing that *Ahimelech* of 1 Sam. xxi. is called by a slight change *Abimelech* in the heading of Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.), "since the Hebrew letters *Caph* and *Beth* differ only by a small stroke" (*Sel. in Pss.* p. 363 L.). On the other hand, he notices the idiomatic usage of ו (*Hom. in Num.* xix. 3).

When he marks the variation he gives no paramount authority to the Hebrew text (*Hom. in Num.* xviii. 3, in "Hebraeorum codicibus ... reperi, quibus quamvis non utamur, tamen agnoscendi gratia dicemus etiam ibi quae legimus," Dan. i. 17; *Hom. in Gen.* iii. 5, "codices ecclesiae... Hebraea exemplaria..."), but keeps faithfully to the LXX (*in Cant.* i. p. 344 L., "nos LXX. interpretum scripta per omnia custodimus;" comp. note on Gen. iii. 24, p. 59 L.).

But though his critical knowledge of Hebrew was slight he evidently learnt much from Hebrew interpreters, and not unfrequently he quotes Hebrew traditions and "Midrash" (*Sel. in Gen.* ii. 8; *Hom. in Ex.* v. § 5; *in Num.* xiii. 5; *in Rom.* x. § 7, p. 397 L.; *in Matt.* xv. 5; *Sel. in Pss.* p. 374 L.; *Prol. in Cant.* pp. 289 f.; *Hom. in Is.* i. § 5, ix.; *Hom. in Ezech.* iv. 8, x. 3; compare an interesting note on the sacred name Ἰαή, *Sel. in Ps.* xi. p. 396 L.). He gives also an interpretation of "Corban" (*in Matt.* tom. xi. 9) and of "Iscariot" (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 78) from Jewish sources.

The most characteristic use which he makes of his knowledge is in the mystical interpretation of a series of names. These interpretations are often striking, even when they are based upon false etymologies (e.g. *Hom. in Jos.* xx. 5; *Hom. in Ex.* v.; comp. Redepenning, *Origenes*, i. pp. 458 ff.).

While Origen thus endeavoured to apply the principle that every word of Scripture has its lesson to all the sacred records without difference, he was met at once by the moral and historical difficulties of the Old Testament (comp. *De Princ.* iv. 1 = *Philoc.* 1 ff. throughout). To obviate these he systematized the theory of a "spiritual sense," which was generally if vaguely admitted by the church (*De Princ.* 1, *Praef.* 8). There is, he taught, generally, a threefold meaning in the text of the Bible, literal (historical), moral, mystical, corresponding to the three elements in man's constitution, body, soul, and spirit (*De Princ.* iv. 11; *Hom. in Lev.* v. §§ 1, 5). So it is

that Scripture has a different force for different ages and for different readers, according to their circumstances and capacities (*in Rom.* ii. § 14, p. 150 L.). But all find in it what they need.[x]

This threefold sense is to be sought for both in the Old and in the New Testament. The literal interpretation brings out the simple precept or fact: the moral meets the individual want of each believer: the mystical illuminates features in the whole work of Redemption (*Hom. in Lev.* i. §§ 4 f., ii. § 4; *De Princ.* iv. 12, 13, 22). There is then manifold instruction for all believers in the precise statement, the definition of practical duties, the revelation of the divine plan, which the teacher must endeavour to bring out in his examination of the text. Origen himself steadily kept this object in view. Examples of his method have been noticed in the brief analysis which has been given of his exegetical writings. It will be sufficient here to refer to *Hom. in Gen.* ii. § 6, xvii. §§ 1, 9; *in Ex.* i. § 4, iii. § 3; *in Lev.* v. § 5, vii. § 1; *in Num.* ix. § 7; and for the application of the method to the New Testament to *in Matt.* tom. xvi. § 12, xiv. §§ 2 f.; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 17 ff. 27.

Sometimes indeed he holds that only two of the three senses coexist, when the literal sense cannot be maintained (e. g. *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 43, 1 Tim. ii. 15; comp. *Hom.* v. *in Ps.* xxxvi. 5); and even when the letter is true, the ideal meaning is of greater importance (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* 77, Matt. xxvi. 6 ff.). At the same time Origen affirms generally the literal truth both of the Old and of the New Testament (e.g. *Frag. in Philem.* and *Frag. in Galat.* p. 269 L.; comp. *De Princ.* iv. 19).

It is easy to point out serious errors in detail in Origen's interpretation of Scripture. On these there is no need to dwell. It is however of importance to mark that which was his main defect, and the real source of his minor faults. He was without true historic feeling. He speaks of the difficulty of history (*c. Cels.* i. 42); and he seems to have given up all idea of realising the changing conditions of life during the fulfilment of the counsel of God. He had therefore no law of proportion to assist him in judging of the primitive phases of revelation. He refused to interpret life in the phases of its growth, and converted it into a riddle. For him prophecy ceased to have any vital connexion with the trials and struggles of a people of God; and psalms (*e.g.* Ps. l.) were no longer the voice of a believer's deepest personal experience.

In this respect Origen presents, though in a modified form, many of the characteristic defects of Rabbinic interpretation. It is not indeed unlikely that he was directly influenced by the masters of Jewish exegesis. Just as they claimed for Abraham the complete fulfilment of the Law, and made the patriarchs perfect types of legal righteousness, Origen also refused to see in the Pentateuch any signs of inferior religious knowledge or attainment. The patriarchs and prophets were, in his opinion, as wise by God's gifts as the apostles (*in Joh.* vi. 3); and the deepest mysteries of the Christian revelation could be directly illustrated by the records of their lives and words (*in Joh.* ii. 28), though sometimes he seems to feel the difficulties by which his position was beset (*in Joh.* xiii. 46; comp. *c. Cels.* vii. 4 ff.).

But while this grave defect is most distinctly acknowledged, it must be remembered that Origen had a special work to do, and that he did it. In his time powerful schools of Christian speculation disparaged the Old Testament or rejected it. Christian masters had not yet been able to vindicate it from the Jews and for themselves. This task Origen accomplished. From his day the Old Testament has been an unquestioned part of our Christian heritage, and he fixed rightly the general spirit in which it is to be received. The Old Testament, he says, is always new to Christians who understand and expound it spiritually and in an evangelic sense, new not in time but in interpretation (*Hom. in Num.* ix. § 4; comp. *c. Cels.* ii. 4). If in pressing this conclusion he was led to exaggeration, the error may be pardoned in regard to the greatness of the service. The principle itself becomes more fruitful when history and criticism are allowed the fullest activity, within their own sphere, in dealing with Scripture, a part which Origen was unable to give to them.

Moreover Origen's method was fixed and consistent. He systematized what was before tentative and inconstant (comp. Redepenning, *De Princ.* pp. 56 f.). He laid down, once for all, broad outlines of interpretation; and mystical meanings were not arbitrarily devised to meet particular emergencies. The influence of his views is a sufficient testimony to their power. It is not too much to say that the mediaeval interpretation of Scripture in the West was inspired by Origen; and through secondary channels these mediaeval comments have passed into our own literature.

Origen indeed was right in principle. "He felt that there was something more than a mere form in the Bible: he felt that 'the words of God' must have an eternal significance, for all that comes into relation with God is eternal: he felt that there is a true development and a real growth in the elements of divine revelation, it not in divine communication, yet in human apprehension: he felt the power and the glory of the spirit of Scripture bursting forth from every part." No labour was too great to bestow upon the text in which priceless treasures were enshrined: no hope was too lofty for the interpreter to cherish. This conviction Origen has bequeathed to us that it may be embodied more fully than he could embody it.

VII. ORIGEN AS A THEOLOGIAN.[y]

Origen was essentially the theologian of an age of transition. His writings present principles, ruling ideas, tendencies, but they are not fitted to supply materials for a system of formulated dogmas, after the type of later confessions. Every endeavour to arrange his opinions according to the schemes of the 16th century, can only issue in a misunderstanding of their general scope and proportion. This is sufficiently clear from the outline which has been already

[x] The relation of Origen's principles generally to those of the Alexandrine school has been discussed by Kihn, *Theodor v. Mopsuestia*, pp. 20 ff.

[y] In addition to works treating of Origen's opinions generally, the essay of P. Fischer, *Commentatio de O. Theologia et Cosmologia* (Halis, 1845), is worthy of notice.

given of his treatise *On First Principles*. The whole structure of this work, which presents a connected view of his intellectual apprehension of Christianity, is widely different from mediaeval and modern expositions of the faith. At the outset Origen gives a clear exposition of what were acknowledged to be the doctrines held generally by the church, corresponding in the main with the Apostles' Creed, which is of the highest interest (*De Princ. Praef.*); and starting from this he endeavours to determine, by the help of Scripture and reason, subjects which were left open or unexplored. But his inquiries and his results were profoundly influenced by his circumstances. They cannot be judged fairly when taken out of their connexion with contemporary thought. The book contains very little technical teaching. It is silent as to the sacraments. It gives no theory of the atonement: no discussion of justification. Yet it does deal with problems of thought and life which lie behind these subjects.

Origen found himself face to face with powerful schools, which within and without the church maintained antagonistic views on man, the world, and God, in their extremest forms. There was the false realism, which found expression in Montanism: the false idealism, which spread widely in the many forms of Gnosticism. Here the Creator was degraded into a secondary place; there God Himself was lost in His works. Some represented men as inherently good or bad from their birth: others swept away moral distinctions of action. Against all Origen sought to maintain two great truths which inspire all writings, the unity of all creation, as answering to the thought of a Creator infinitely good and infinitely just; and the power of moral determination in rational beings. The treatment and the apprehension of these two truths is modified for man by the actual fact of sin. The power of moral determination has issued in present disorder; and the divine unity of creation has to be realised hereafter. Origen therefore looks at the world as it is, and strives to find in revelation some solution for the riddles which it offers. His aim is to help his readers to gain a practical conception of what he holds to be the central truth of life, that the whole sum of finite being, even in its present state, offers an intelligible manifestation of the goodness and righteousness of God in every detail, not only consistent with but dependent upon the free and responsible action of each individual, which forms a decisive element in the fulfilment of the divine counsel (on the ideas of Foreknowledge, Providence, the Divine will, see *Philoc.* c. 25; *in Rom.* i. 3 p. 18 L.; *in Gen.* tom. iii. 6 p. 21; *in Gen. Hom.* iii. 2; *c. Cels.* ii. 20).

In the attempt to establish this conception Origen does not conceal or extenuate the evils which are everywhere visible in the world. He believes that Scripture throws light upon them, and that in obedience to its guidance we must seek knowledge of God, of the Incarnation, of the origin and differences of rational creatures in heaven and on earth, of the creation, and of the causes of the wickedness which is spread over the earth and (as it appears) elsewhere (*De Princ.* iv. 14).

1. *Finite Beings, Creation, Man, Spirits.*— He goes backward therefore: he endeavours to pass from the outward to the inward, from the temporal to the eternal. He argues that it is impossible to think of God without a creation: of a king without subjects; even as it is impossible to think of a Father without a Son (comp. Phot. *Cod.* 235). In doing this he dimly feels the contradictions which follow from applying words of time (like "always") to God. Though in one sense there always was a finite order (*De Princ.* i. *fragm. Gr.* 2), the world was not coeternal with God (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 4). Affirming this truth Origen thinks that we shall best realise the fact of creation, according to our present powers, by supposing a vast succession of orders, one springing out of another (*id.* ii. 1, 3). The present order, which began and will end in time, must, as far as we can conceive, be one only in the succession of corresponding orders (*De Princ.* iii. 5, 3). The word used for the foundation of the world (καταβολή) really implies that it owes its being to a "dejection," a casting down from some loftier state (*id.* iii. 5, 4; *in Joh.* ix. 5). It points to a fall in another order. To understand the actual constitution of things which we see we must consequently form some idea of a beginning, if such a word can be used.

"In the beginning," then, he writes, "when God created what He was pleased to create, that is rational natures, He had no other cause of creation beside Himself, that is His own goodness" (*De Princ.* ii. 9, 6; comp. iv. 35). This creation answered to a definite thought, and therefore, Origen argues, was definite itself. God "could" not create or embrace in thought that which has no limit (*De Princ.* ii. *fragm. Gr.* 6; ii. 9, 1; iv. *fragm. Gr.* 4). The rational creatures which He made were all originally equal, spiritual, free. There was no ground for their difference. But moral freedom, including personal self-determination, gave occasion to difference. Finite creatures, once made, either advanced, through imitation of God, or fell away, declined, through neglect of Him (*id.* ii. 9, 6).

Evil, it follows, is negative,—the loss of good which was attainable, the shadow which marks the absence or rather the exclusion of light. But as God made creatures for an end, so He provided that they should, through whatever discipline of sorrow, attain to it. He made matter also, which might serve as a fitting expression for their character, and become, in the most manifold form, a medium for their training. So it was that, by various declensions, "spirit" (πνεῦμα) lost its proper fire and was chilled into a "soul" (ψυχή), and "souls" were embodied in our earthly frames in this world of sense. Such an embodiment was a provision of divine wisdom by which they were enabled, in accordance with the necessities of the fact, to move towards the accomplishment of their destiny (*De Princ.* i. 7, 4).

Under this aspect man is a microcosm. (*Hom. in Gen.* i. 11; *in Lev.* v. 2: *intellige te et alium mundum esse parvum et intra te esse solem, esse lunam, etiam stellas.*) He stands in the closest connexion with the seen and with the unseen and is himself the witness of the correspondences which exist between the visible and invisible orders (*Hom. in Num.* xi. 4, xvii. 4, xxiv. 1, xxviii. 2; *Hom.* i. *in Ps.* xxxvii. 1; *in Joh.* tom. xix. 5, xxiii. 4; *De Princ.* iv. *fragm. Gr.* p

184 R.). He is made for the spiritual and cannot find rest elsewhere. Hence it is that Origen combats with unwearying earnestness every tendency to unite indissolubly present conditions with the future, or to trust to deductions drawn from the temporal and local limitations of present human observation. The grossness of Millenarianism filled him with alarm (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 2; comp. *Sel. in Ps.* xi. p. 449 L.). The literal assertion of anthropomorphic conceptions of God seemed to him to overthrow the faith (comp. *Hom. in Gen.* iii. 2; *Sel. in Gen.* i. 26). And those who are familiar with the writings and influence of Tertullian will know that Origen's opposition to materialism in every form was called for by pressing dangers.

As a necessary consequence of his deep view of man's divine kinsmanship, Origen labours to give distinctness to the unseen world. He appears already to live and move in it. He finds there the realities of which the phenomena of earth are shadows (comp. *in Rom.* x. § 39). External objects, peoples, cities, are to him veils and symbols of invisible things. And more than this. Not only is there the closest correspondence between the constitution of different orders of being, there is also even now a continuation of unobserved intercourse between them (comp. *de Princ.* ii. 9, 3).

Angels (see *De Princ.* i. 8, iii. 2, throughout) are supposed to preside over the working of elemental forces, over plants and beasts (*in Num. Hom.* xiv. 2; *in Jer. Hom.* x. 6; *c. Cels.* viii. 31; *De Princ.* iii. 3, 3), and it is suggested that nature is affected by their moral condition (*in Ezech. Hom.* iv. 2). More particularly men were, in Origen's opinion, committed to the care of spiritual "rulers," and deeply influenced by changes in their feeling and character (*in Joh.* xiii. § 58; comp. *De Princ.* i. 8, 1). Thus he maintained that there are guardian angels of cities and provinces and nations (*Hom. in Luc.* xii.; *De Princ.* iii. 3, 2), a belief which he supported habitually by the LXX. version of Deut. xxxii. 8 (*in Matt.* tom. xi. § 16; *in Luc. Hom.* xxxv.; *in Rom.* viii. § 8; *in Gen. Hom.* xvi. 2; *in Ex. Hom.* viii. 2; *in Ezech. Hom.* xiii. 1 f., &c.). Individual men also had their guardian angels (*in Matt.* t. xiii. 27; *in Luc. Hom.* xxxv.; *in Num. Hom.* xi. 4, xx. 3; *in Ezech. Hom.* i. 7; *in Jud.* vi. 2; *De Princ.* iii. 2, 4); and angels are supposed to be present in the assemblies of Christians, assisting in the devotions of the faithful (*De Orat.* xxxi. p. 283 L.; *Hom. in Luc.* xxiii.; *c. Cels.* viii. 64).

But while Origen recognises in the fullest degree the reality and power of angelic ministration, he expressly condemns all angel-worship (*c. Cels.* v. 4, 11).

On the other hand Origen held that there are spiritual hosts of evil corresponding to the angelic forces, and matched in conflict with them (*in Matt.* tom. xvii. 2; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 102; *Hom. in Jos.* xv. 5). He even speaks of a Trinity of evil (*in Matt.* xi. § 6, xii. § 20). An evil power strives with the good for the sway of individuals (*in Rom.* i. § 18); and thus all life is made a struggle of unseen powers (*e. g.* notes on Ps. xxxvii.; *in Joh.* xx. §§ 29, 32; *Hom.* xx. *in Jos. fragm.*).

One aspect of this belief had a constant and powerful influence on daily life. Origen, like most of his contemporaries, supposed that evil spiritual beings were the objects of heathen worship (*c. Cels.* vii. 5). There was, in his opinion, a terrible reality in their agency. Within certain limits they could work so as to bind their servants to them.

But the intercourse between the seen and unseen worlds was not confined, according to Origen's opinion, to the intercourse of angels and demons with men. He believed that the dead also influence the living.

The actions of men on earth last, in their effects, after the actors have departed (*in Rom.* ii. 4, p. 80 L.). Disembodied (or unembodied) souls are not idle (*in Matt.* xv. 35). So the "soul" of Christ preached to "souls" (*c. Cels.* iii. 43). And, in especial, the saints sympathize with man still struggling on earth with a sympathy larger than that of those who are clogged by conditions of mortality (*De Orat.* xi.; *in Matt.* tom. xxvii. 30; *in Joh.* tom. xiii. 57; iii. *in Cant.* 7). They help us not only by the examples of their lives and the lessons of their books, but also by their prayers (*Hom. in Num.* xxvi. 6; *in Jos.* xvi. 5); and they can pray with a better knowledge of our true wants than we have ourselves (*Exh. ad Mart.* 30, 38; *Hom. in Jos.* xvi. § 5; comp. *De Orat.* 14). But in this connexion Origen's silence as to prayers of the living for the dead is most remarkable. Prayers to the dead, like prayers to angels, are excluded by his view of the one object of all prayer (*c. Cels.* viii. 64). The innumerable hosts of spirits help us uncalled (*id.*).

Such views as have been indicated give a mysterious solemnity to the laws of creation (*c. Cels.* iv. 8), bound together in all its visible parts, and in all its parts bound to the invisible, and destined to judgment (*in Ezech. Hom.* iv. 1). Origen dwells upon them with devout partiality. He strives, not always successfully, to give them clearness and consistency. But he is happier in the assertion of his main principles, and he himself acknowledges that it must be so. The range of human observation, the scene of human experience, are, he repeats again and again, very small (*in Rom.* viii. § 10, p. 260; § 12, p. 280). Still we can trace correspondences in the periods of the divine dispensations (*in Matt.* xii. § 3; comp. *in Matt.* xv. § 31), and feel the dependence of phenomena one on another,[z] and the life and sympathy which unites all being (*in Rom.* i. 9, p. 35 L.; *De Princ.* i. 7, 5; 8, 2).

What has been said of Origen's opinions as to the wider relations of life, makes his view of man's position in the visible world more intelligible. His presence and condition here are due, as has been seen, to the fact of evil, of which the origin is referred to some unknown sphere (*c. Cels.* iv. 65; comp. *in Joh.* xiii. § 37). When placed in the world man, as a rational being, was still endowed with freedom, that is, moral responsibility (*in Num.* xii. 3). On this Origen insists with the greatest earnestness. (See *De Princ.* iii. = *Philoc.* 20; *id.* i. 5, 5 *s.f.*) But every one is sinful (*c. Cels.* iii. 69), a sign of which he sees in the baptism of infants (*Hom.*

[z] It is a characteristic illustration of this belief that Origen allows that there may be a true science of astrology, though not for us (*Comm. in Gen.* iii. § 9).

in *Luc.* viii. 3; *in Rom.* v. § 9, p. 397 L.), though all sins are not equal (*Hom. in Ex.* x. 3, *peccata ad damnum, ad mortem*); and grace is required for the doing of all good (*c. Cels.* vi. 78; comp. *Hom. in Num.* xx. 3). Every one also can justly be called to account for his corruption (*Hom. in Jer.* ii. 1).

But while Origen does not extenuate the effects of man's sin, he maintains a lofty view of the nobility of his nature and of his destiny (*c. Cels.* iv. 25, 30); and so he holds that the world has been made by divine wisdom to be a fitting place for the purification of a being such as man (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 1; 2, 2; 3, 1; *c. Cels.* vi. 44; comp. *in Rom.* viii. 10, p. 261); and that everything has been so ordered by Providence from the first as to contribute to this end (*De Princ.* ii. 1, 2). Man can, if he will, read the lesson of his life: he has a spiritual faculty, by which he can form conclusions on spiritual things, even as he is made to form conclusions on impressions of sense.

The body, so to speak, reflects the soul; the "outer man" expresses the "inner man" (*in Rom.* ii. 13, p. 142 L.). There is imposed upon us the duty of service (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 66), and there is the largest variety of offices (*in Joh.* t. x. 23), room being made even for the meanest (*Hom. in Num.* xiv. 2, p. 162 L.).

All this is determined by law, that is, by the will of God; and God has not left man without spiritual knowledge (*in Rom.* i. 16). All alike have a natural law within them (*id.* ii. 8, 9, iii. 6; *c. Cels.* i. 4; *Hom. in Num.* x. 3). This "law of nature" is the "law of God" (*in Rom.* iii. 2, p. 177 L.). God Himself cannot break it, since He would then cease to be God (*c. Cels.* v. 23). It follows therefore that alleged miracles must be brought to a moral test (*c. Cels.* ii. 51, iii. 27). True miracles are "signs" (*in Joh.* vi. 17). The perception of the "law of nature" comes with the development of reason (*in Rom.* vi. 8, pp. 43 f. L.); and he who loyally follows its injunctions, though he has not the faith of Christ, be he Jew or Gentile, will not lose an appropriate reward (*id.* ii. 7, p. 98 L.).

The visible creation thus bears, in all its parts, the impress of a divine purpose; and the Incarnation was the crowning of the creation, by which the purpose was made fully known, and provision made for its accomplishment (*De Princ.* iii. 5, 6).

2. *Theology. The Incarnation. The Person of Christ. The Holy Trinity. The work of Christ.* —On no subject is Origen more full or more suggestive than on this (*De Princ.* i. 2, ii. 6, iv. 31). No one perhaps has done so much to vindicate and harmonize the fullest acknowledgment of the perfect humanity of the Lord and of His perfect divinity in one Person. His famous image of the "glowing iron" (*De Princ.* ii. 6, 6) made an epoch in Christology. Here and there his language is liable to misconception, or even found to be erroneous by later investigations, but he laid down the outlines of the faith, on the basis of Scripture, which have not been shaken. He maintained, on the one hand, the true and perfect manhood of Christ, subject to the conditions of natural growth, against all forms of Docetism; and, on the other hand, he maintained the true and perfect divinity of the "God Word" (*θεὸς λόγος*), which was so united with "the man Christ Jesus," through the human soul, as to be one person, against all forms of Ebionism and Patripassionism (*De Princ.* ii. 6, 3).

Origen's doctrine of the Incarnation of the God Word rests in part upon his doctrine of the Godhead. "All," he held, "who are born again unto salvation, have need of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and would not obtain salvation unless the Trinity were entire" (*De Princ.* i. 3, 5). Hence he speaks of baptism as "the beginning and fountain of divine gifts to him who offers himself to the divinity of the power of the invocations of the adorable Trinity" (*τῶν τῆς προσκυνητῆς τριάδος ἐπικλήσεων*) (*in Joh.* vi. 17).[a] But there is, in his judgment, a difference in the extent of the action of the Persons in the Holy Trinity. The Father, "holding all things together, reaches (*φθάνει*) to each being, imparting being to each from that which is His own, for He is absolutely (*ὢν γὰρ ἔστιν*). The Son is less than the Father (*ἐλάττων παρὰ τ. π.*), reaching only to rational beings, for He is second to the Father; and, further, the Holy Spirit is less (*ἧττον*), and extends (*διικνούμενον*) to the saints only. So that in this respect (*κατὰ τοῦτο*) the power of the Father is greater in comparison with (*παρά*) the Son and the Holy Spirit; and that of the Son more in comparison with the Holy Spirit; and, again, the power of the Holy Spirit more exceeding (*διαφέρουσα μᾶλλον*) in comparison with all other holy beings." But to rightly understand this passage it is of primary importance to observe that Origen is not speaking of the essence of the Persons of the Godhead, but of their manifestation to creatures (comp. *De Princ.* i. 3, 7).[b] Essentially the three Persons are of one Godhead, and eternal. The subordination which Origen teaches is not of essence but of person and office. His aim is to realise the Father as the one Fountain of Godhead, while vindicating true deity for the Son and the Holy Spirit. In this respect he worked out first the thought of "the eternal generation" of the Son, which was accepted from him by the catholic church as the truest human expression of one side of the mystery of the essential Trinity.

Generally it may be remarked that Origen's specific opinions spring from a comparison of what man is and needs with the broad revelation of God in Scripture. Looking within he is conscious of personal existence, thought, hallowing, and in each relation he recognises the action of the one God.[c] He feels that, however imperfectly, the relations thus existing in himself correspond to something in the divine nature. So he interprets what Scripture and the rule of the church taught of the Holy Trinity. The Trinity of revelation answers to the trinity of being, but it is of the former that he treats: human thought can rise no higher with distinct conceptions.

---

[a] There can be no question as to the authenticity of this passage, and of the use of the word *Τριάς*. It must have escaped Redepenning's recollection when he wrote his confident note on the date of the term: *de Princ.* 1, 3, 4, p. 126.

[b] Compare Maréchal, *Concord. Pp.* c. v. § 9, and Bp. Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* c. ix. (reprinted by Delarue), on Origen's view of subordination.

[c] Comp. Meier, *D. Lehre v. d. Trinität*, i. 103.

(For fuller details on Origen's teaching on the Holy Trinity it must be sufficient to refer to *De Princ.* i. 5, 3; iv. 27 f.; *in Rom.* vi. 13, p. 158 L., viii. 4, p. 216 L.; *in Num.* xii. 1; *fragm. in Gen.* tom. i. p. 4 L.; *c. Cels.* viii. 12 ff.; and especially *in Joh.* tom. ii. 1 ff. For his doctrine of the Father, see *De Princ.* i. 1.)

The peculiar connexion which Origen recognises between the Son (the God Word) and rational beings establishes (so to speak) the fitness of the Incarnation. The Son stood in a certain affinity with rational souls; and the human soul with which He was united in the Incarnation had alone remained absolutely pure, by the exercise of free choice, in its pre-existence (*De Princ.* ii. 6, 5). Through this union all human nature therefore was made capable of being glorified, without the violation of its characteristic limitations (comp. *c. Cels.* iii. 41 f.). The body of Christ was perfect no less than His soul (*c. Cels.* i. 32 f.).

Fuller illustrations of Origen's views will be found in—*in Joh.* tom. xii. 25, 34, 36, tom. xxxii. 17; *in Matt.* tom. xv. 24, xvi. 8, xvii. 14 (ὑπόστασις); *in Rom.* iii. 8, p. 208 L., vii. 5, p. 107, 14, p. 158; *fragm. in Hebr.* p. 300 L.; *Hom. in Lev.* xiii. 4; *in Jer.* i. 7 (human progress); *in Ezech.* i. 10; *Hom. in Luc.* xix.; *in Rom.* viii. 4 (prayer to Christ); *c. Cels.* ii. 9. Compare also in addition to the general works on the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, H. Schutz, *Die Christologie d. Origenes, Jahrbb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1875.

The work of Christ was, Origen emphatically maintained, for all men and for the whole of man (comp. *c. Cels.* iv. 3 f.). It was therefore so revealed that it could be apprehended according to the several powers and wants of believers (*in Matt.* tom. xii. 36, 41, xv. 241, xvii. 19; *c. Cels.* iv. 15, vi. 68; *in Joh.* ii. 12). Christ became, in a transcendent sense, "all things to all men" (*De Princ.* iv. 31; *in Joh.* tom. xix. 1, xx. 28; comp. *c. Cels.* iii. 79). And there is still a present continuous manifestation of Christ. He is ever being born (*Hom. in Jer.* ix. 4). He is seen even now, as He was seen by the eye of faith, as each believer has the faculty of seeing (*c. Cels.* ii. 64, iv. 15, vi. 77; *in Matt.* xv. 7; *Hom. in Luc.* iii.). And as each reflects Him, he becomes, in the apostolic sense, himself a Christ, an anointed one (*in Joh.* tom. vi. 3 f.). For the union of God and man, which was accomplished absolutely in Christ, is to be fulfilled in due measure in each Christian (*c. Cels.* iii. 28; *in Joh.* i. 30), as Christ had made it possible (*in Matt.* tom. xiii. 9).

Origen thus insists on the efficacy of Christ's work for the consummation of humanity and of the individual, as a victory over every power of evil. He dwells no less earnestly upon the value of the life and death of Christ as a vicarious sacrifice for sin. He seeks illustrations of the general idea of the power of vicarious sufferings in Gentile stories of self-sacrifice (*c. Cels.* i. 31), and extends it to the case of martyrs (*Exh. ad Mart.* c. 42; comp. *in Joh.* tom. vi. 36; xxviii. 14). And though he does not attempt to explain how the sacrifice of Christ was efficacious, he frequently presents it as a ransom given to redeem man from Satan, to whom sin had made man a debtor. Christ, in His own person, freely paid the debt, by bearing the utmost punishment of sin, and so set man free, "giving His soul (ψυχή) as a ransom for him" (*in Matt.* tom. xvi. 8; *in Rom.* ii. 13, p. 140 L.; *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 135). At other times he regards it as a propitiation for the divine remission of sins (*Hom. in Num.* xxiv. 1; *in Lev.* i. 3; comp. *c. Cels.* vii. 17).

As a necessary consequence of his view of the connexion of all things, Origen held that the death of Christ was salutary for the whole world (*c. Cels.* iii. 17); and of avail for heavenly beings, if not for the expiation of sin yet for advancement in blessedness (*Hom. in Lev.* i. 3, ii. 3; *in Rom.* v. *s. f.*, p. 409 L.; *id.* i. 4; *Hom. in Luc.* x.). Thus in a true sense angels themselves were disciples of Christ (*in Matt.* tom. xv. 7).

At times indeed Origen speaks as if he supposed that the Word was actually manifested to other orders of being in a manner corresponding to their nature, even as He was revealed as soul to the souls in Hades (*Sel. in Ps.* iii. 5, xi. p. 420 L.). In this sense also he thinks that "He became all things to all," an angel to angels (*in Joh.* tom. i. 34); and he does not shrink from allowing that His Passion may be made available, perhaps in some other shape, in the spiritual world (*De Princ.* iv. *fr. Graec.* 2; comp. iv. 25, Lat.).

The work of the Holy Spirit, according to Origen, is fulfilled in believers. His office is specially to guide to the fuller truth, which is the inspiration of nobler life. Through Him revelation comes home to men. He lays open the deeper meanings of the word. Through Him, "who proceeds from the Father," all things are sanctified (*De Princ.* iii. 5, 8). Through Him every divine gift which is wrought by the Father and ministered by the Son, gains its individual efficiency (*in Joh.* tom. ii. 6). Thus there is a unity in the divine operations, which itself tends to establish a unity in created beings. (For the doctrine of the Holy Spirit generally see *De Princ.* i. 3, iii. 7; *in Joh.* tom. ii. 6.)

3. *The consummation of being.*—These characteristic lines of speculation lead to Origen's view of the consummation of things. All human thought must fail in the endeavour to give distinctness to a conception which ought to embrace the ideas of perfect rest and perfect life. Origen's opinions are further embarrassed by the constant confusion which arises from the intermingling of ideas which belong to the close of the present order (αἰών) and the close of all things. It is again impossible to see clearly how the inalienable freedom of rational beings, which originally led to the Fall, can be so disciplined as to bring them at last to perfect harmony. This however Origen holds; and though he is unable to realise the form of future purification, through which souls left unpurified by earthly existence will be cleansed hereafter, he clings to the belief that "the end must be like the beginning" (*De Princ.* i. 6, 2), a perfect unity in God. From this he excludes no rational creature. The evil spirits which fell have not lost that spirit by which they are akin to God, which in its essence is inaccessible to evil (*in Joh.* xxxii. 11, ἀνεπίδεκτον τῶν χειρόνων τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), though it can be overgrown and overpowered (comp. *De Princ.* i. 8, 3). And, on the other hand, freedom remains even when perfect rest has been reached, and in this Origen appears

to find the possibility of future declensions (*De Princ.* ii. 3, 3; *fragm. Gr.* ii. 2). Whether matter, the medium through which rational freedom finds expression (*De Princ.* iv. 35), will at last cease to be, or be infinitely spiritualised, he leaves apparently undetermined. The question is beyond man's powers (*id.* i. 6, 4, ii. 2, ii. 3, 3, iii. 6, 1).

Origen evidently feels that the same is true of many speculations which he follows some way. He warns his readers tnat he is dealing with subjects which man has no power to determine, though he cannot but look upon them and ponder them (*De Princ.* i. 6, 1 f., iii. 4, 5 *s. f.*). And so he presents, in imaginary outlines, the picture of the soul's progress through various scenes of chastisement or illumination (*De Princ.* i. 6, 3, iii. 6, 6, iii. 5, 6 ff., and Redepenning's note), till he can rest in the thought of a restoration in which law and freedom, justice and love, are brought to a perfect harmony (comp. *De Orat.* § 27, p. 227 L.).

This thought Origen pursues in his endeavour to form some theory of future punishments. All future punishments exactly answer to individual sinfulness (*in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 16), and, like punishments on earth, they are directed to the amendment of the sufferers (*c. Cels.* iv. 10; *Hom. in Ezech.* v. 1). Lighter offences can be chastised on earth: the heavier remain to be visited hereafter (*Hom. in Lev.* xiv. 4). In every case the uttermost farthing must be paid, though final deliverance is promised (*in Rom.* v. 2 f.).

In this connexion Origen looked forward to a fiery ordeal, through which men should pass in the world to come. Every one already baptized with water and Spirit would, he thought, if he needed cleansing, be baptized by the Lord Jesus in a river of fire, and so purified enter into paradise (*Hom. in Luc.* xxiv.). And in this sense also he looked forward to a (spiritual) conflagration of the world, by which all beings in need of such discipline should be at once chastised and healed (*c. Cels.* v. 15; comp. iv. 13).

On the other hand, since the future state is the direct fruit of this, there are, so Origen held, varieties of blessedness in heaven (*in Rom.* iv. 12), corresponding to the life of saints (*id.* ix. 3, p. 303), and foreshadowed by the divisions of Israel (*Hom. in Num.* i. 3; *id.* xxviii. 2; *Hom. in Jos.* xxv. 4). Speaking generally the believer after death enters upon a being of fuller knowledge and loftier progress (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 6). The resurrection of the body completes the full transfiguration, without loss, of all that belongs to his true self; and he begins a nobler development of body and soul—moral, intellectual, spiritual—by which he is brought nearer to the throne of God (comp. *De Princ.* i. 3, 8; *in Matt. Comm. Ser.* § 51; *Hom.* i. *in Ps.* xxxviii. § 8). The relationships of earth come to an end (*in Matt.* tom. xvii. 33: on this point Origen is not consistent). The visible ceases, and men enjoy the eternal, for which now they hope (*in Rom.* vii. 5).[d]

Thus human interest is removed from the present earth to its heavenly antitype. And it is probably due to this peculiarity of his teaching that Origen nowhere, as far as I have observed, dwells on the doctrine of Christ's return, which occupies a large place in most schemes of Christian belief. The coming of Christ in glory is treated as the spiritual revelation of His true nature (*De Princ.* iv. 25), though Origen says that he by no means rejects "the second presence (ἐπιδημία) of the Son of God more simply understood" (*in Matt.* tom. xii. 30).

VIII. CHARACTERISTICS.—A few words, necessarily fragmentary and inadequate, may be added to indicate Origen's position in the great line of Christian teachers; though the sketch of his works and opinions which has been given (apart from any comment) will be sufficient to convey a fair idea of his merits and of his failings. He is above all things a Christian philosopher. With a firmer conviction of the universal sovereignty of truth, a larger grasp of facts, and a deeper sympathy with the restless questionings of the soul than any other father, he claims for the domain of Christianity every human interest and power: he affirms that it is capable of co-ordinating all thought and all experience. He excludes indeed all irrational beings from the final unity to which he looks (*De Princ.* iii. 6, 2); but by giving a soul to the sun and stars he strives after a fuller feeling of fellowship between man and nature than his knowledge enables him to support.

It cannot be surprising that Origen failed to give a consistent and harmonious embodiment to his speculations. His writings represent an aspiration rather than a system, principles of research and hope rather than determined formulas. At the same time his enthusiasm continually mars the proportion of his work. His theorizing needs the discipline of active life, without which there can be no real appreciation of history or of the historical development of truth. The absence of a clear historic sense is indeed the spring of Origen's chief failures. Yet even in regard to the practical apprehension of the divine education of the world it is only necessary to compare him on one side with Philo and on the other with Augustine, to feel how his grasp of the significance of the Incarnation gave him a sovereign power to understand the meaning and destiny of life.

In the pursuit and expression of his great thoughts Origen sought knowledge from every

[d] None of Origen's opinions was more vehemently assailed than his teaching on the Resurrection. Even his early and later apologists were perplexed in their defence of him. Yet there is no point on which his insight is more conspicuous. By keeping strictly to the apostolic language he anticipated results which we have hardly yet secured. He saw that it is the "spirit" which moulds the frame through which it is manifested; that the "body" is the same not by any material continuity, but by the permanence of that which gives the law, the "ratio" (λόγος), as he calls it, of its constitution. No exigencies of controversy, it must be remembered, brought Origen to his conclusion. It was in his judgment the clear teaching of St. Paul. The subject has been carefully discussed by C. Ramers in a special essay: *Des O. Lehre von d. Auferstehung d. Fleisches*, Trier, 1851. His judgment is worth quoting:—"Die Lehre des Origenes von der Auferstehung . . . in allen wesentlichen Punkten mit der katholischen Lehre übereinstimmt . . . Und wie sonderbar auch die Lehre des Origenes in manchen Punkten . . . klingen mag, so möchte es doch vielleicht schwer zu entscheiden sein, ob sie . . . sonderbarer ist, als die Lehre, welche in späterer Zeit manche Scholastiker über diesen Punkt aufstellten" (§ 77 f.).

quarter, by conversation and by reading. His attendance on philosophic lectures at Alexandria has been noticed. And in different parts of his writings he presents parallels with the teaching of various schools of Greek thought (comp. Boehringer, pp. 226, 395, ff.). These may be due partly to the direct influence which they exercised upon him and partly to the speculative atmosphere of the time.[e]

But while Origen was ready to acknowledge to the fullest the claims of reason (comp. *Hom. in Luc.* i. p. 88 L.), he lays stress on the new data which are given by revelation to the solution of the problems of philosophy (*De Princ.* i. 5, 4). Again and again he points out the insufficiency of reason, of the independent faculties of man, to attain to that towards which it is turned. Reason enables man to recognise God when He makes Himself known, to receive a revelation from Him in virtue of his affinity with the Divine Word, but it does not enable the creature to derive from within the knowledge for which it longs. It follows that the capacity for knowing God belongs to man as man, and not to man as a philosopher. Origen therefore acknowledges the nobility of Plato's words when he said that "it is a hard matter to find out the Maker and Father of the Universe, and impossible for one who has found Him to declare Him to all men." But he adds that Plato affirms too much and too little (*c. Cels.* vii. 43). As Christians "we declare that human nature is not in itself competent in any way to seek God and find Him purely without the help of Him who is sought, of Him who is found by those who confess after they have done all in their power that they have yet need of Him . . ." (Comp. Clem. Al. *Cohort.* § 6.)

The fact that our results on earth will be to the last fragmentary and tentative does not interfere with the reality of the spirit which quickens the Gospel. "*Now*," he says, "we seek for a while, *then* we shall see clearly" (*De Princ.* ii. 11, 5). But both in the search and in the fruition the object is the same. The fulness of Truth, which is finally nothing less than a manifold revelation of God leading up to absolute fellowship with Him, is that towards which the believer is led by the Spirit alike through thought and feeling and action.

For Origen, while he looks upon knowledge as the noblest ambition and divinest reward of rational beings, never dissociates it from action. This made Christian philosophy the common possession of all. (Comp. *c. Cels.* vi. 2; iii. 44, ff.) No teacher of the present day could insist with greater earnestness upon the importance of conduct than he does. There is absolutely nothing in which he does not see ethical influences. His thought wearies itself in following out the effects of action, for all action is to be referred to God (*Hom. in Num.* xxv. 3). Without perpetuating the associations of the present, he strives to give definiteness to our conceptions of the continuity of the spiritual life. He carries the sense of responsibility up to the highest orders of finite existence. His system is a system of absolute idealism, but of idealism as a spring for action. "God cares," he says, "not only for the whole, as Celsus thinks, but beyond the whole in an especial manner for each rational being" (*c. Cels.* iv. 99). Thus in his doctrine of the re-incorporation of souls there is nothing accidental, nothing capricious, as in Plato's famous Myth. The belief, according to him, represents to human apprehension a judgment of Infinite Righteousness executed by Infinite Love. It is an embodiment, if I may so express it, of two principles, which he assumes as axioms—the first that every gift of God is perfect, and the second that God's gift to His rational creatures was not virtue, which it could not be by the nature of the case, but the capacity for virtue.

In the endeavour to fashion a Philosophy of Christianity it may be fully admitted that Origen did not practically recognise the limits and imperfection of the human mind which he constantly points out. His gravest errors are attempts to solve that which is insoluble. The question of the origin of the soul, for example, is still beset by the same difficulties as Origen sought to meet, but they are ignored. So too it is with regard to his speculations on an endless succession of worlds. Thought must break down soon in the attempt to co-ordinate the finite and the infinite. But with whatever errors in detail, Origen laid down the true lines on which the Christian apologist must defend the faith against Polytheism, Judaism, Gnosticism, Materialism. These forms of opinion without the Church and within it were living powers of threatening proportions in his age, and he vindicated the Gospel against them as the one absolute revelation, prepared through the discipline of Israel, historical in its form, spiritual in its destiny.

In this respect the principles which he affirmed and strove to illustrate have a present value. They are fitted to correct the Africanism which, since the time of Augustine, has dominated Western theology; and, at the same time, they anticipate in many ways difficulties which have come into prominence in later times. In the face of existing controversies, it is invigorating to feel that when as yet no necessity forced upon him the consideration of the problems which are now most frequently discussed, a Christian teacher, the master and the friend of saints, taught the moral continuity and destination of all being, interpreted the sorrows and sadnesses of the world as part of a vast scheme of purificatory chastisement, found in Holy Scripture not the letter only but a living voice eloquent with spiritual mysteries, made the love of truth, in all its amplitude and in all its depth, the right and the end of rational beings, and reckoned the fuller insight into the mysteries of nature as one of the joys of a future state.

Such thoughts bring Origen himself before us. Of the traits of his personal character little need be said. He bore unmerited sufferings without a murmur. He lived only to work. He combined in a signal degree sympathy with zeal. As a controversialist he sought to win his adversary and not simply to silence him (comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33). He had the boldest confidence in the truth which he held, and the tenderest humility in regard of his own weakness (*in Joh.* tom. xxxii. 18; *in Matt.* tom. xvi. 13). When he ventures freely in the field of interpre-

[e] A list of the authors whom he quotes is given in Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii.

tations, he asks that he may be supported by the prayers of his hearers. His faith was catholic, and therefore he welcomed every kind of knowledge as tributary to its fulness. His faith was living, and therefore he was assured that no age could seal any one expression of it as complete. In virtue of this open-hearted trust, he kept unchilled to the last the passionate devotion of his youth. And therefore he was enabled to leave to the Church the conviction, attested by a life of martyrdom, that all things are its heritage because all things are Christ's.

IX. EDITIONS.—The earliest edition of any part of Origen's works was an edition of the Homilies, which is described by Panzer (*Annales Typographici*, iv. 13; comp. p. 462, and Maittaire, i. p. 351) as *Homeliae B. Gregorii papae et Origenis Presbyteri ...*; and again by Maittaire (*Annales Typographici*, i. p. 355; comp. p. 351) simply as *Origenis Homiliae*, fol. 1475, without the place of publication or the name of the printer.[f]

This was followed by a Latin translation of the books against Celsus, made by "Christ. Persona, Romanus," and printed at Rome by Herolt, 1581. The dedication to the Doge and Council of Venice, contains a spirited appeal to a war against the Turks. The book was reprinted at Venice in 1514.

An edition of the Homilies on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, and Judges, "Hieronymo interprete," was published by Aldus at Venice in 1503; another edition followed in 1512.

The Commentary on the Romans, "Hieronymo interprete," was printed at Venice in 1506, and again in 1512.

The Homilies on Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Matthew (16), Luke (6), John (2), with the books on Job and Canticles, were printed at Venice, 1513 (Panzer, x. 40; Maittaire, ii. 242).

Meanwhile a collected [Latin] edition of the works of Origen had appeared. This was published at Paris by *Jacques Merlin*, doctor of the college of Navarre († 1541), and dedicated to Michael [Boudet], bishop of Langres, "*inter Francorum pares facile principi.*" The dedicatory letter, in which Origen is said to hold the same place among philosophical theologians (*inter theosophos*) "as the sun among the stars, or the eagle among birds," is dated 1512.

The contents of the edition are as follows:—Part I. Dedicatory Letter; a general *Index*; the *Homilies on Genesis* (17), *Exodus* (13), *Leviticus* (16), *Numbers* (28), *on Joshua* (26), *Judges* (9), 1 *Kings* (1). Part II. The *Commentaries on Job* (three books), *on Psalm* xxxvi. (Hom. v.), *Ps.* xxxviii. (Hom. ii.), *on Canticles* (Hom. ii. with a second, spurious, commentary), *on Isaiah* (Hom. ix.), *on Jeremiah* (Hom. xiv.), *on Ezekiel* (Hom. xiv.). Part III. Merlin's *Apology for Origen;* the *Homilies on St. Matthew* (35), *on St. Luke* (39); *Miscellaneous Homilies* (10); the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ten books); Jerome's notice of Origen (*De Virr. Ill.*). Part IV. Trithemius's notice of Origen; the *Books against Celsus* (8); *On First Principles* (four books); *Laments.*; Pamphilus's *Apology*; Ruffinus *On the falsification of Origen's Books; A Commendation of Origen*, by Jo. Badius, the original publisher of the work.

This edition was republished at Paris in 1519, 1522, 1530, and at Venice in 1516 (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, vii. 235).

The edition of Merlin was succeeded by that of Erasmus, who, at the time of his death (1536), was engaged upon an edition of Origen (Latin), which was issued by Beatus Rhenanus, and dedicated to Hermann, archbishop of Cologne, in the same year.

The edition of Erasmus is more complete than that of Merlin; as Erasmus translated into Latin the remains of the Greek commentary on Matthew, tom. xiii., xiv., xv., xvi., and added an interesting and characteristic criticism of Origen and his writings. This edition was reissued in 1571 by J. J. Grynaeus, and dedicated to T. Erastus, with the addition of Ambr. Ferrarius's translation of the *Commentaries on St. John*, and L. Humfrey's Latin translation of *The Dialogue against the Marcionites.*

For meanwhile two Latin translations of the Commentary on St. John had been published, the first by Ambrosius Ferrarius from a MS. in the library of St. Mark at Venice in 1551, and the second from a MS. of the Royal Library at Paris by Joachim Perionius, "about 1554" (Huet).

An edition by G. Genebrard next appeared at Paris, 1574 (reprinted 1604, 1619; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 235), which contains Perionius's version of the Commentary on St. John, and a version of the Philocalia by Genebrard, and of the correspondence with Africanus by Hervetus.

The first edition of any part of the Greek text of Origen was that of the beginning of the letter in reply to Julius Africanus, published by D. Hoeschel at Augsburg, 1602 (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 224). This was followed by an edition of the Books against Celsus, together with the Oration of Gregory, published at Augsburg in 1605 by the same scholar.[g] These were followed

[f] The book seems to have contained homilies of Gregory, Origen, and Leo, which were published separately or variously combined.

[g] Among the Gale MSS. in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is a MS. of the *Philocalia* which had been prepared for publication by D. Hoeschel. It is referred to by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 221, but the account is inaccurate. The title-page and colophon are worth quoting: "*Philocalia Origenis* ex ejus scriptis conciñata variis a Basilio M. et Greg. Nazianzeno, ex codice Cyprio descripta manu Graecae linguae studiosi, posita a regione Gilberti Genebrardi interpretatione. Illustrissimo et generosissimo Dn. Henrico Uuottonio, serenissimi et potentissimi Regis Magnae Britanniae apud Venetos Oratori, felicem ex Italia in Germaniam gratulatus reditum David Hoeschelius A.

"Opus hoc Origenis ἀνέκδοτον περικαλλὲς καὶ πολυωφελὲς L. M. observantiae ergo D. D."

It is not easy to fix the date of the "return" from Italy. It probably was after Sir H. Wotton retired from his post at Venice in 1610. The Greek text has at the close: Prid. Non. Sept. 1606. The Latin text, which is written on the first side of the same page, Anno 1604, Nonis Septembris.

On a fly-leaf is written: "Hoeschelius edidit libros Origenis contra Celsum cum suis annotationibus in quibus saepe citat hujus codicis verba quod ex eo quoque fecit Tarinus in notis ad Philocaliam.

"In hoc nonnulla sunt quae in libris contra Celsum non habentur quae tamen ibi habere oportuit.

"Collatus est hic codex cum alio Novi Collegii apud Oxonienses uti conjicio."

by the Philocalia, published by Jo. Tarinus in 1618–9 (and again 1624).

The *Books against Celsus* and the *Philocalia* were again revised and published at Cambridge in 1658 and 1677, by W. Spencer, Fellow of Trinity College.

Meanwhile seven Homilies on Jeremiah had been published from a Vatican MS. by M. Ghisler, Lyons, 1629; and the whole collection of nineteen Homilies (under the name of Cyril Alex.), from a MS. of the Escurial, by B. Corderius, at Antwerp, 1648 (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 214). To these was added the *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, published by J. R. Wetstein, Basle, 1674.

Hitherto there had been no collected edition of Origen's Greek writings. The want had been long felt; and as far back as 1635 the general assembly of French clergy had determined that editions of "John of Damascus, Origen, Maximus, Ephraem Syrus, among the Greek Fathers," should be published, "to serve as authorities in controversies of religion." The work was committed to Aubert, doctor of the Sorbonne. Collations of Italian (and so probably of other) MSS. were provided, which afterwards came into the hands of Tarinus (Huet, *Praef.*), but nothing more was done (Delarue, i. p. 5).

The purpose however was taken up in other quarters. Herbert Thorndike († 1672), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, contemplated a complete edition of the works of Origen (Huet, *Praef.*), for which he made important collections, still preserved in the library of his college, including the *Codex Holmiensis;* but the plan was not carried out. Probably Thorndike was deterred from executing it no less by the troubles of the times than by the knowledge that P. D. Huet, still a layman, but afterwards (1685) bishop of Avranches, was engaged upon a similar task.

The work of Huet (ORIGENIS *in sacras Scripturas Commentaria quaecunque Graece reperiri potuerunt*, Rothomagi, 1668, 2 tom., republished at Paris, 1679, and at Cologne, 1685), dedicated in remarkable language to Louis XIV., is the foundation of the critical study of Origen. It is however only a part of the original design, which included three sections:—(1) the ἐξηγητικά; (2) the treatises, συντάγματα; (3) the suppositious writings. Of the second and third parts nothing has been published.

Tarinus refused to allow Huet to use the collations of Italian MSS. which were in his possession, though he was through age unable to make any use of them himself (Huet, *Praef.*). Huet had therefore to trust to a copy of the *Cod. Holm.*, which he had made in Sweden, and to *Cod. Reg.*, for his Greek text of the Commentary on St. Matthew; and to the *Cod. Reg.*, with Ferrarius's Latin translation of the *Cod. Venet.*, for the Commentary on St. John.

Huet's collection of the Ἐξηγητικά does not include the fragments found in Catenae. He had originally intended to include these, but he abandoned the purpose, partly from the immensity of the work required for collecting them, and partly from the uncertainty which attaches to extracts often abridged, altered, and misnamed (*Praef.*). It is also greatly to be regretted that he did not reprint the old Latin version of the Commentaries of St. Matthew, which has a value of its own. Still, though his materials were imperfect and his work incomplete, Huet holds the first rank among the editors of Origen.

An addition to the published Greek works of Origen was made by the appearance of the treatise *On Prayer*, which was edited at Oxford, 1686, and republished, after the recension of R. D. Wetstein, at Amsterdam in 1694. These editions were followed in 1728 by a far more complete one of Reading, London 1728, enriched by the notes of R. Bentley (reprinted by Delarue, i. pp. 911 ff.).

Bentley seems to have worked much at Origen. A copy of Huet in the library of Trinity College contains a collation of the *Cod. Holm.* of the Commentary on St. Matthew, and also of the *Cod. Bodl.* of the Commentary on St. John, in his handwriting, with many conjectures; but I am not aware that he contemplated any edition of these writings.[h]

About the same time Th. Mangey (1684–1755), the editor of Philo (1742), was also engaged upon Origen; and notes and collections of his are preserved in the British Museum (*MSS. Add.* 6428).

In the meanwhile the resolution of the French clergy found a tardy fulfilment through the labours of the great Benedictines of St. Maur. B. de Montfaucon edited the remains of the *Hexapla* in 1715 (Paris), carrying far forward the work of Flaminius Nobilius (Romae, 1587) and J. Drusius (Arnhemiae, 1622). And the first two volumes of a complete edition of Origen (ORIGENIS *opera omnia quae Graece vel Latine tantum extant et ejus nomine circumferuntur*) appeared at Paris in 1733, under the editorship of Charles Delarue, a priest of the same society. (Tom. i. *Letters*, *Treatises*, with the spurious *Dialogue* and the *Philosophumena*. Tom. ii. Exegetical writings on the Old Testament as far as the *Psalms*, with the anonymous commentary on *Job*.) The work had been undertaken by the wish of Montfaucon, and these two volumes had been sent to the press as early as 1725 (t. iii. p. vii.). The work was dedicated to Pope Clement XII.

The third volume (exegetical writings on the Old Testament from *Proverbs*, and on *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke*) appeared at Paris in 1740, a few months after the death of the editor (Oct. 1739), who left however the fourth volume, almost ready for the press as it was hoped, to the care of his nephew Charles Vincent Delarue, whom he had invited to help him in his work. The fourth volume however proved to be in a most imperfect state. For six years the younger Delarue was called away to complete Sabatier's Latin Bible, and he was not able to issue the fourth volume of the Origen till 1759 (remaining exegetical writings on the New Testament, with an appendix containing Pamphilus's *Apology*, Gregory's *Panegyric*, Huet's *Origeniana*, and selections from Bull's *Defensio*).

It would be most ungrateful not to acknowledge the service which the two Delarues rendered to Origen; but their edition is very far from satisfying the requirements of scholarship. The collations of MSS. are fragmentary and even inaccurate. The text is left only partially revised. The notes are inadequate.

[h] He and his friend J. Walker communicated to Delarue Grabe's collections from English Catenae: Delarue, ii. praef. i.

But though this is so, the later editions of Origen's works have added very little to the completeness of the Benedictine edition. This is the more to be regretted, as large additions have been made, and still can be made, to the Origenian fragments. In the appendix to the last volume of Galland's *Bibliotheca*,[i] published at Venice in 1781 after his death, there are given copious notes of Origen on Job, Psalms, St. Matthew, and St. Luke, and some notes on the Pentateuch, the historical books of the Old Testament, and Proverbs.

Not less important are the additional notes from Catenae on the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the Acts, the Epistles to the Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, published by Cramer in his *Catena* (Oxford, 1840–1844), of which the notes on 1 Corinthians and Ephesians are of the highest importance.

To these must be added the notes on Proverbs published by Mai (*Patrum Nova Bibliotheca*, Romae, 1854) from a Vatican MS., and some other fragments noticed under the heads of the different books. Many fragments also have yet to be collected from *Catenae* (e. g. that on Pent. Josh. Jud. B. M. *Burn.* 34, 35, saec. xv.)

These materials have been either wholly neglected or only partially used in the latest editions of Origen; and the editors who came after the Delarues have done practically nothing to improve or illustrate the text of their author. The edition of Oberthür (Wirceburgi, 1780–1794) is a simple reprint of the Greek and Latin texts of Delarue. The handy edition of Lommatzsch (Berlin, 1831–1848) promised much of the highest interest (i. *Praef.*), but the promises have been unfulfilled. The textual indices scattered through many volumes are complete and serviceable, but with this exception (to which Petermann's account of the Venetian MS. of the Commentary on St. Matthew may be added: iii. iv. *Praef.*), the edition has no independent value. It contains none of the additional matter supplied by Galland and Cramer, but it gives the *Philocalia* which Delarue did not reprint.[k] Migne's reprint of Delarue, in his *Patrologia* (Paris, 1857) has the additions from Galland, most of the additions from Mai, and one fragment from Cramer as a supplement.

Enough has been said to shew that there is as yet no edition of Origen worthy of the subject, and no complete collection of his writings in any shape. To prepare such an edition would be a work for a society of scholars and for a university press. [W., 1882.]

ORIGENES (2), a layman, probably a professor of rhetoric, whose discourses and writings in defence of the truth during a time of persecution (which may be identified with the reign of Julian, when Christians were forbidden to teach secular literature) are highly commended by Basil, in a letter sent him by his sons, whose visit had caused him lively satisfaction. (Basil, *Ep.* 17 [384].) [E. V.]

ORIGENES (3), Platonic philosopher (*Dict. G. & R. Biog.*; Tillem. iii. 283, 284). [C. H.]

ORIGENIANI. Epiphanius, who makes the errors of the celebrated Origen the subject of the sixty-fourth section of his work on heresies, describes in his sixty-third chapter heretics whom he calls Origeniani, to whom he gives for distinction the epithet αἰσχροί; for he professes ignorance from what Origen they derived their name. He attributes to them no doctrinal errors, unless we count under this head a statement that they had in circulation among them the apocryphal acts of Andrew; but he states that though unmarried, and to outward appearance living the monastic life, they privately indulged in gross sexual impurity, only taking care to prevent a betrayal of it to the world through conception of children. Such a charge is easy to bring, but is difficult either to prove or to refute. Epiphanius states that these people themselves brought similar charges against the Catholics; and he also tells a story how the like accusation had been brought after his death against a Palestinian bishop who had been in the number of the confessors; but whether the charge was true or false Epiphanius will not venture to say. The theological animosities of the time made men on both sides so ready to believe evil of each other, that the historical enquirer may now feel himself justified in charitably disregarding such stories on either side. There is no authority independent of Epiphanius for the existence of such a sect of Origeniani; and he himself appears only to know of them by hearsay, and to have had but very vague information concerning them. The most probable account of the matter seems to be that the people of whom Epiphanius had heard were called Origeniani because they really were doctrinal disciples of Origen; and that a charge of immorality was brought against them by their opponents; but whether they had done or said anything to justify such a charge, is a point on which we have no trustworthy evidence. See August. *Haer.* § 63; Joan. Damasc. *Haer.* 42. [G. S.]

ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES.

I.—Controversy during Origen's Life.

We have already seen in the article on Origen, p. 100, that he was condemned at Alexandria during his life; the precise cause of the condemnation is less certain than the fact. Unquestionably, personal and formal irregularities entered largely into the complaint of Demetrius. Origen had preached at Caesarea, though not a priest himself, before an assembly of bishops and priests. He had accepted ordination in a foreign diocese without consulting his own bishop, as in duty bound; and though disqualified by the law of the church on account of a youthful indiscretion. It is true that no doctrinal charges are attributed to the time of this

[i] It may be worth while to notice that Galland was of French and not of Italian descent. In the license printed in his *Bibliotheca*, he is described as *Andrea Galland, Prete dell' Oratorio.*

[k] As Lommatzsch most unaccountably does not give the pages of Delarue, it may be well to mention that on an average one page of Delarue is equal to one and six-sevenths of Lommatzsch. The respective initial pages of the works are given above.

censure, but it must not be forgotten that Origen had already written the περὶ ἀρχῶν and the στρωματεῖς, embodying his characteristic doctrines; while there is no reason to suppose Demetrius to have been proof against the jealous prejudice excited by the power and fame of an ecclesiastical subordinate. At any rate, he took action against Origen, convened a council of priests and bishops, and obtained a decree expelling Origen from Alexandria, and forbidding him to reside or teach there, but leaving him his priesthood. Dissatisfied with these measures, Demetrius subsequently united with a few Egyptian bishops to deprive Origen of the priesthood also. Those who had voted with the bishop before now signed this new decree (cf. Photius, cod. 118, συνυπογραψάντων καὶ τῇ ἀποφάσει τῶν συμψήφων αὐτῷ γεγενημένων).[a]

To the account given above Hieronymus adds that Demetrius obtained a condemnation of Origen from Rome. (*Ep.* xxxiii.[b] Migne, *P.*, vol. xxii. [Bened. xxix]). If this be so, though there is little evidence to support the view, it must have been from a synod under Pontianus in A.D. 231 or 232. Doellinger (*Hippolytus and Callistus;* Eng. trans. pp. 244, foll., and p. 262) with Langen (*Römische Kirche*, pp. 267, 268), connects this condemnation with Origen's conduct in the controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus. One fact is clear: that the condemnation, if, or by whomsoever pronounced, could have had little weight even at Alexandria itself, since the doctrines and the personality impugned found devoted admirers and champions among the highest religious authorities in the city, even when Origen had removed, leaving his work to others.

II.—Origen's Followers at Alexandria.

(1) Heraclas, a pupil of Origen, succeeded his master at the catechetical school, and subsequently Demetrius in the bishopric (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi.; cc. 3, 15). He took no steps to effect his master's return, but we cannot therefore assume that he acquiesced in his condemnation. Doellinger (l. c. pp. 42–46) advocates the theory of a second expulsion by Heraclas, but the evidence of Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. 33) even when combined with the reference in a letter written three centuries later to a council at Alexandria (Mansi, vol. ix. p. 514), and one or two other vague illusions, is not of any real weight. The name of Heraclas was more famous than that of Demetrius, and the substitution might be easily made by careless or unscrupulous opponents. (2) Dionysius, who succeeded by similar steps to the bishopric of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. cc. 29, 30), shewed his fidelity to Origen by open sympathy with his master in misfortune (*ib.* vi. 46), and by sorrow at his death. (Steph. Gobar in Photius, *cod.* 232.) A little while before Origen's death, Dionysius inscribed his *De Martyrio* to him, and in the controversy with the Chiliasts he defended Origen's allegorical system of interpretation against the literalism of Nepos (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. cc. 24–25); and he with his master was claimed as an ally by the Arians through his use of the term ὑπόστασις, and for his alleged subordination of the Son. Basil actually attacked him as an Arian (Photius, *Cod.* 232), while he was defended by Athanasius in the treatise which bears his name (Athan. *De Sent. Dionysii de Synod.* c. xxiv. cf De Decret. Syn. Nic. c. xxv. Migne, *P.* vol. xxv. pp. 479, foll. and 515, foll.). (3) Theognostus, a celebrated teacher at Alexandria, wrote seven books, ὑποτυπώσεις, in imitation of Origen's περὶ ἀρχῶν, containing similar speculations with reference to the nature of the Son, the Holy Spirit, and angels (Photius, *Cod.* 106). On the third point his views were orthodox, on the second avowedly heretical; his speculations on the third were only academical exercises (Athan. l. c. Photius, *ib.*). (4) Another of Origen's followers at Alexandria was Pierius, a priest famous for his piety and learning. He was at the head of the Alexandrian school of his day, the teacher of Pamphilus, and the author of twelve books in which he taught the subordination of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, possibly also the pre-existence of the human soul. His devotion and resemblance to his great predecessor secured for him the title of the "Second Origen" (Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* c. 76, Photius, *cod.* 119, and Scholia; Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* iii. p. 425). [Fragments of the writings of Pierius and Theognostus are to be found in Migne, vol. x. pp. 239–246.]

III.—Controversy in Asia.

At Alexandria, as we have seen, the influence of Origen still remained supreme, but elsewhere, within a short period after his death, his doctrines were vehemently attacked. Foremost among the assailants was Methodius, formerly of Olympus, bishop of Patara in the early part of the 4th century. Socrates, alluding to Origen's foes, gives him a place in the "Quaternion of Revilers" (τετράκτυς κακολόγων), but states that in the Ξένων he recanted (ἐκ παλινῳδίας), expressing admiration for Origen (Socrat. *H. E.* vi. 13). Eusebius, as Walch points out (*Ketz.* vol. vii. p. 408. cf. Hieron. *c. Ruf.* 1, § 11), inverts this order of events; and the facts are quite uncertain, for we know neither the relative order of composition nor in whose mouth the recantation is placed. In dialogue Methodius would often state conflicting views, and in his other works such abusive expressions as ὦ κένταυρε are by no means rare when he refers to Origen.[c] The chief points that he attacked in the teaching of Origen were his views on the Creation, the relation of soul and body, Resurrection, and Freewill; but he also includes many subordinate elements in his hostile criticism. It often happens that Methodius, like many other critics of Origen, does not understand the principle which he attacks, and so bases the whole argument on a false foundation. For instance,

[a] Huet (*Origeniana*, I., ii. 15) states that the bishops who had voted with Origen at the first council were now compelled to sign the decree of Demetrius at the second. But in the phrase συμψήφων αὐτῷ, the word αὐτῷ refers to Demetrius, not to Origen, and the position of καὶ makes the meaning still more clear, *vid.* Migne, vol. xvii., p. 669, note (69).

[b] Migne, *Patrologia Graeco-Latina;* Migne, *P. Patrologiae cursus completus.*

[c] Vincenzi (vol. v. app. ii. p. 98) supposes that Methodius was convinced of misconception by the apology of Pamphilus and Eusebius.

he impugns Origen's doctrine of eternal generation. Origen had argued that if the Creator's existence in time were prior to the creation, this would involve change in the unchangeable; and that therefore the elementary interpretation of the Mosaic account was inadequate. Methodius replies that cessation from creation is change, and argues for the prior existence of the Creator on the analogy of the human sculptor and his handiwork, the statue. He does not apprehend that the term "creation" is an idea rather than an action; Origen would reply that there is no cessation of creative activity as also there is no beginning, and that the work of the Great Renewer is not limited to moments of time. Methodius also attacks Origen's saying that the body is the fetter of the soul, and was added to it after the fall of man from innocence and purity; that the clothes of our first parents (the "coats of skins") were their mortal bodies, and that the soul is the only essential part of man (vid. Migne, vol. xviii. p. 267). Methodius asks how, if the soul cannot sin without the body, the soul can have been sent into the body on account of sin; and if the body is a fetter, whether it is for the good or the evil? The good need no such restraint; and it does not check the evil, as we see in the case of Cain. In this same connection he also attacks Origen's doctrine of the Resurrection in a spiritual, not a material body, his allegorical interpretation of the "coats of skins," and his application of Ezekiel's prophetic promise (Photius, *cod.* 234. *De Resurr.*). Methodius seems also to have written against Origen with reference to the witch of Endor, and his explanation of the raising of Samuel. Methodius supposed Origen to believe that the soul of Samuel was in the power of Satan, and that the apparition was in reality the prophet's spirit. This theory may possibly have led to the charge of sorcery subsequently made against Origen, though the allegation was one which he shared with many other saints of pre-eminent learning. (*De Pythonissa*; *περὶ ἐγγαστριμύθου*. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* lxxxiii.) Another point of attack was the doctrine, that while in doing evil our choice is free to act or to refrain from acting, in thinking evil we are not free to admit or to repel temptation (Photius, *De Lib. Arbit.*, *cod.* 236 cf. *cod.* 234). From the reply of Pamphilus and Eusebius it would appear that Methodius also impugned the orthodoxy of Origen in his conception of the Divine Nature.

Antagonism intensified devotion; the books under ban were studied with increased ardour; nor did Origen's adherents allow the charges brought against their master to pass without challenge. Apologists were numerous (Photius, *cod.* 118). Pierius and Theognostus, already mentioned among Origen's successors, and other teachers of equal note, took up his cause. But the first place among these treatises belongs to the apology composed by Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea in the first decade of the 4th century, probably about A.D. 306. It was famous at the time, and nearly a century after its appearance it again became the subject of embittered controversy. Pamphilus had been a pupil of Pierius, but had subsequently removed to Caesarea, where he made his home, celebrated for sanctity, learning, and devotion to Origen, whose commentaries he had transcribed and studied with incessant care (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32). Eusebius had been attracted to him by kindred sympathies, and the pair continued in an intimate and lifelong friendship. With regard to Origen they were of one mind, and together they prepared a defence of his character and doctrine. Pamphilus seems to have been the originator; perhaps the first book was his sole work, but he was soon joined by Eusebius, and by the year A.D. 309, five books were completed and inscribed to Patermuthius and the confessors of Palestine—a dedication not inappropriate, seeing that part of the work had been composed in prison. After the death of Pamphilus in the persecution, Eusebius added a sixth book to the work, but of the whole only one book has come down to us, and that in the Latin translation of Rufinus (Photius, *Cod.* 118; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 33; Soc. *H. E.*, iii. 7; Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* lxxxv.). This apology must have comprised a general defence on the entire case, for though no doubt composed with special reference to Methodius, it also embraced the whole range of controversy, vindicating Origen's life (Euseb. l. c.), discussing in the second book the validity of his irregular ordination (*ib.* c. 36), and in the sixth the influence of his literary labours (*ib.* c. 36). Some of the charges advanced by Methodius are dealt with in the first book; the question of freewill was discussed in one of the later books now lost to us. The apology opens with a general introduction setting forth the principles of Origen, and then proceeding to details, vindicates him by appealing to his own words to refute the misrepresentations of his traducers. Much of the treatise, therefore, consists of quotations. Its contents have been described and its authenticity established in a preceding article. [EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA (23), § 28.] It is therefore only necessary to recapitulate the chief points on which issue was raised in Origen's behalf. The first set of charges refuted refers mainly to the Nature of the Divine Son. It is demonstrated that Origen believed (i) the Son to be of one substance with the Father; (ii) not produced out of the substance of the Father by extension ("per prolationem," *προβολῇ*) according to the Valentinian doctrine, which would divide and diminish the Divine substance; (iii) that Christ was not a mere man, and (iv) that his life on earth was not allegorical and illusory; (v) that there were not two Christs, one in heaven the other on earth. Then after vindicating Origen's method of interpreting scripture, it shews (vi) that he does not falsify the sacred narrative by allegorical exegesis. Lastly, it deals with his doctrines concerning the nature and destiny of the human soul, asserting (vii) Origen's belief in the resurrection of the body, and (viii) in the future punishment of the impenitent; (ix) it maintains the soundness of his views as to the condition of departed souls; and (x) that he does not teach that the souls of the wicked pass by transmigration into beasts. On essential principles, then, Origen's orthodoxy is asserted; it is, however, conceded that where the voice of the church is silent, e.g., on the relations of body and soul, his speculations are open to question. But the distinction between speculation and doctrine is insisted upon, and it is shewn that these theories are broached only in scattered

references, not advanced in a systematic treatise. On one point of primary importance the apology is silent. While it attributes the outcry against Origen to envy, ignorance, and stupidity, it makes no reference to any formal condemnation or forfeiture of orthodox reputation during his lifetime. In this matter therefore it gives us no clue to unravel the facts of the case. [The remains of this Apology are contained in Migne, vol. x., pp. 1557 foll., and in Caillau, *Coll. Eccl. Pat.* vol. xv. pp. 497, foll.] By anticipation the rejoinder to this defence (ἀντίρρησις), published by Antipater of Bostra, about A.D. 460, may be here mentioned. Fragments of this work survive in the Acts of the Second Nicene Council (Labbe, *Conc.* vol. vii. p. 367). In the passage there preserved Eusebius is attacked, but no mention is made of Pamphilus. Antipater admits the historical learning of the former, but denies his knowledge of doctrine on the score of his heretical tendencies. The doctrines of Origen to which he refers in the fragment are the pre-existence of souls, and the subordination of the Son. The treatise seems to have been accepted as an authoritative reply to Origenism, and to have been read by official command in churches. [In Migne, vol. lxxxv., pp. 1791 foll.]

IV.—Controversy in the Arian Period.

The Arian controversies of the 4th century roused a new storm against Origen. In the earlier part of the struggle indeed his name does not occur. The Arian party, though fortifying themselves with the sanctity of the martyr Lucian, made no reference to Origen, nor was he cited by Alexander, their chief opponent before Nicaea (Tillemont, vol. iii. p. 598; Soc. *H. E.* i. vi.; Huet, Origen., 2, 4. sec. 1, cc. 4–6; cf. Newman, Arians, i. sec. 3). But the appeal was inevitable. Before long by champions of orthodoxy he was denounced as "the Father of Arianism," while the Arians, catching the cue, sheltered themselves under his authority as countenancing their doctrine of the Logos. Some even attempted to set him in the place of Arius as the rallying-point of the party (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 26). On the other hand, Aetius, an Arian, in asserting the creation of the Son, attacks Origen together with Clement, as holding the orthodox position (Soc. *H. E.* ii. 35; Sozom. *H. E.* iv. 12). Suspicion, however, against Origen was aggravated by the character of his adherents. Dionysius of Alexandria lay under a similar charge of heresy; the sympathies of his apologist, Eusebius, were notorious; and Timotheus, a leader of the Arian party at Constantinople, in his devotion to the writings of Origen, was but a type of a numerous class (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 6). But while Origen's orthodoxy was impugned, his assailants exhibited the widest divergence of opinion as to the measure of his guilt. Eustathius of Antioch, a prominent opponent of the Arians, wrote a treatise against Origen, but only with reference to his interpretation of the story of the witch of Endor (*De Engastrimytho adv. Orig.* Galland, *Bibl. Pat.* vol. iv. pp. 541 foll.; Migne, vol. xviii. pp. 614–674). So that if Origen's views on the Trinity were really unsound, it is strange that they should have escaped impeachment by so zealous a champion of orthodoxy (cf. Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* c. lxxxv). Marcellus of Ancyra, on the other hand, in his reply to Asterius, to which Eusebius in turn rejoined, sets down Origen as the fountain-head of Arianism. The primary cause, however, of his antipathy, seems to be the admixture of pagan philosophy with Christian teaching to be found in the introduction of the περὶ ἀρχῶν and elsewhere; and Origen's most heinous offence is not heresy, but his perverse union of Platonism and Christianity. On more vital errors he is strangely silent (Eusebius c. Marcellum; Migne, xxiv. p. 754 foll., especially, p. 761). Hostility did not confine itself within these limits. Origen's profound learning and ascetic morality excited the enthusiastic admiration of the cultivated portion of the Egyptian monks (Epiph. *Haer.* lxiv. or xliv.; Migne, vol. xli.), and Pachomius, the founder of Egyptian monasticism, and leader of the anthropomorphist party, forbade his monks to read Origen's writings. He is said to have ordered the books to be cast out of the monastery into the river (Boll. *Acta Sanc.* Maii 14, vol. iii. p. 304, and App. xxv. p. 30), and the act would only be in keeping with the intense antipathy to Origen and his followers recorded by the biographer, who tells us that Pachomius was once visited by strangers, unsavoury even to an ascetic nose. The reason of their noisomeness [δυσωδία] was soon explained by an angel, who informed Pachomius that he had been entertaining Origenists unawares. The doctrines of that heretic in the heart were supposed to pollute the whole man from centre to skin (*Vita Pachomii*; Boll. *Acta Sanc.* Maii 3, Appen. 25, p. 53; cf. Doucin, p. 122; Tillemont, vii. pp. 206). Theodorus, his successor, seems to have been imbued with the same spirit. (*Ep. de Vita Theodori*, c. iii.)

Origen, on his side, did not lack friends among the greatest and wisest men of the age. Athanasius was foremost in vindicating his orthodoxy against the Arians, maintaining the enormity of imputing to Origen as fundamental beliefs that which he wrote merely in the form of suggestion for those who go deeply into the mysteries of existence. So far from agreeing with the Arians, Origen's sympathies, he asserts, are with the orthodox. The Arians believe that the Word was created out of nothing; Origen, that it was generated from the womb of uncreated light. They admit the Word to have existed before all ages, but not its eternity; Origen holds that it had no beginning but was coeternal (συναΐδος) with the Father. The Arians believed that the Word, like the rest of creation, was subject to change; Origen, that it was essentially immutable. The doctrine of subordination no doubt was a serious error, and Athanasius also combatted Origen's views about the nature of the soul and of sin; but these failings could not in his mind destroy the holiness of that wonderful saint (Athanasius, *De Decret. Syn. Nic.* xxvii.; *Ad Serap.* ep. iv. § 9 foll.; Migne, *P.* vol. xxv. p. 466; vol. xxvi. p. 650 foll. cf. Doucin, pp. 110, 111). Basil also in his treatise on the Holy Spirit claims Origen as orthodox on this crucial doctrine (*De Spiritu Sancto*, Migne, vol. xxxii. p. 203, § 61; Benedict. edit. vol. iii. p. 61), and though he admitted errors in some portions of Origen's works, he edited with Gregory of Nazianzum the φιλοκάλια, a volume of extracts selected from Origen's treatises on

important subjects (cf. Huet, *Orig.* II. iii. 6, 7; in Migne, vol. xvii. p. 1097). Gregory of Nyssa must also be included among his admirers and champions (Steph. Gob. in Photius, cod. 232; cf. cod. 233; Huet, *Orig.* II. iv. 1, § 6; Migne, l. c. p. 1121). To this company must be added Didymus, the teacher of Hieronymus, who was to prove one of Origen's most bitter assailants. His sympathy, however, was imperfect; and if we may accept the testimony of Hieronymus, not an impartial witness indeed, Didymus rejected the teaching of Origen as to the nature of the Trinity, holding the doctrine himself in the most rigidly orthodox form (Hieron. *adv. Rufin.* 1. § 6; cf. iii. § 13; Migne, *P.*, vol. xxiii. pp. 401 and 467). Didymus also wrote notes upon the περὶ ἀρχῶν, explaining apparent anomalies in an orthodox sense (Hieron. *Ep. ad Pamm.* lxxxiv. § 4 [=Bened. 41]), a proceeding which commended itself to many who, in spite of general admiration, viewed with suspicion Origen's extreme allegorical tendencies and the dubious passages in his great speculative treatises. While the controversy was still in this stage, Epiphanius, the venerable bishop of Cyprus, made his first appearance as an opponent of the Origenist party. His hostility was of no recent growth, for, while a monk in the Egyptian desert, he had allied himself to the party of Pachomius. At this time his power and reputation made him the most formidable antagonist that the Origenists had yet encountered since the attack of Methodius. In three separate works Epiphanius assailed the doctrines of Origen and his adherents, though his arguments had more vigour than novelty, recapitulating as they do the charges of his predecessor. (1) In his "*Ancoratus*," Ἀγκύρωτος (A.D. 374), Epiphanius includes Origen in the list of heretics (§ 13), and sets down as obnoxious tenets (*a*) his allegorical account of creation and paradise (§§ 54–5); (*b*) the doctrine that in the resurrection not the natural body will be raised, but a body of finer material here contained within it (§ 55); (*c*) Origen's interpretation of the phrase "coats of skins" as representing the human body (§ 62); (*d*) his subordination of the Son to the Father (§ 63). (2) In his great work against all heresies, πανάριον (A.D. 374–377), Epiphanius recurs to the attack, and in fuller detail, quoting Methodius at great length (*Haer.* lxiv. or xliii.).[p]

All the charges previously made by Methodius are reiterated in this work, and some new ones added (c. xii. Migne, vol. xli. pp. 1067, foll.) He asserts (*a*) that Origen teaches that the Son does not see the Father, nor the Spirit the Son, nor angels the Spirit, nor men angels. (*b*) That though Origen derives the Son from the substance (οὐσία) of the Father, he believes Him to have been created and made, bearing the name of Son, not by right but by favour; a direct encouragement to Arius (ἐκ τούτου ὁ Ἄρειος τὰς προφάσεις εἴληφε, c. 4). (*c*) That Origen maintains the souls of men to have existed as celestial spirits before the bodies in which they were imprisoned to punish them for sin (δέμας κέκληται τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸ δέδεσθαι τὴν ψύχην ἐν τῷ σώματι, c. xii.). (*d*) That Origen asserted Adam to have lost the Divine image at the Fall, and allegorised the χιτῶνες δερμάτινοι (*ib.*). (*e*) That he mutilates and debases the doctrine of the resurrection; for if the body does not rise, what will? The soul is not in the grave (*ib.*). (*f*) That by his allegorical method of interpret tation the sacred narrative is corrupted (*ib.*). (3) In his Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις (I. ii. 18; Migne, vol. xlii. p. 867) Epiphanius once again sums up his case against Origen under four heads: Resurrection; the nature of the Son; and of the Holy Spirit; allegorical interpretation of Paradise, Heaven, and all things; also stating that Origen taught that the kingdom of Christ would have an end. (4) This last accusation is repeated in an expanded form in a letter to Johannes, bishop of Jerusalem (Migne, vol. xliii. p. 379, §§ 4, 5). According to the writer, Origen believed that the devil would be restored to his former glory and made equal with Christ. So that if Satan shall be subdued, reasons Epiphanius, Christ will be subdued in like manner. But this is an inference without logic or reason. The struggle during this period was, as we have seen, almost entirely confined to literary controversy, and its issues were determined by the balance of conflicting personal authority, not by formal and authoritative decisions.

V.

In the next period the character of the controversy changes. Argument is enforced by action, and diplomatic intrigue becomes more potent than theological learning. We can trace three well-defined stages in the struggle. (1) The strife in Palestine between John of Jerusalem and Rufinus on the one side, and Hieronymus and Epiphanius on the other, Theophilus of Alexandria intervening. (2.) The personal quarrel between Hieronymus and Rufinus, arising out of the latter's translation of the περὶ ἀρχῶν. (3.) The conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and the Egyptian monks, leading to the controversy in which Chrysostom and Epiphanius were involved, and to the council held near Constantinople, in the year A.D. 403. The details have been given with such fulness in other articles that in many instances a mere reference may serve instead of repetition.

(1) Strife in Palestine.

Palestine, as we have already seen, had for long been a stronghold of the Origenistic party, and about the year 390 A.D. Origen's admirers in that country were powerful as well as numerous. John, the bishop of Jerusalem, had imbibed his doctrines among the devoted monks of the Nitrian desert, and the heads of the religious communities at Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives were imbued with the same spirit. At the former place Hieronymus and Paula respectively presided over the monastery and the convent; at the latter, Rufinus and Melania discharged the same functions; both

[p] In *Haer.* lxiii. (xliii.) Epiphanius mentions under the head of *Origenists* an impure sect in Egypt, though he admits that he cannot tell whether they sprang from Origen himself or from some other heretic of his name. The impure morality characteristic of the sect shows that with the genuine Origenists it can have no possible connection; though Doucin (p. 140) argues that men adopting Origen's conception of the body as the prison of the soul would naturally infer that its vices were unimportant (cf. August. *De Haer.* 42, 43).

societies being bound together in close and intimate friendship. Up to this time Hieronymus, without accepting all Origen's speculations, had studied his works with the religious and literary fervour of an enlightened disciple. He had translated treatises, he habitually used the commentaries. Attachment to the master drew him to the followers, and when he fled from Rome, though he visited Epiphanius, Origen's staunch opponent, he made his way to Isidorus at Alexandria, and listened to the lectures of Didymus. In a letter to Paula, written in 385 A.D. he strenuously maintains the cause of Origen against his assailants, attributing their zeal not to orthodoxy but envy, and Origen's condemnation to the supremacy of his learning and eloquence which meaner spirits could not brook. ("Pro sudore quid accepit pretii? damnatur a Demetrio episcopo. In damnationem eius consentit urbs Romana; ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum, non propter dogmatum novitatem, non propter haeresim, ut nunc adversus eum rabidi canes simulant; sed quia gloriam eloquentiae eius et scientiae ferre non poterant, et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur." (*Ep.* xxxiii.; [= Bened. 29.])

Dissension first arose with the arrival of the Egyptian monk Aterbius at Jerusalem in A.D. 392, who attacked Hieronymus and Rufinus for their devotion to Origen. Hieronymus, always morbidly sensitive to any imputation of heresy, repudiated the charge. He subsequently asserted that he had condemned the doctrines of Origen ("cum damnatione dogmatum Origenis satisfecissem," c. Ruf. iii. 33); but this was probably an exaggeration, for when Vigilantius soon after reiterated the charge, Hieronymus asserted the right to discriminate between the true and the false elements in the great speculative system (*Ep.* lxi. [= Bened. 36]). Inwardly however he was wavering, and the arrival of his friend Epiphanius in A.D. 394, who appears to have undertaken to extirpate the Origenistic heresy in Palestine, turned the scale, and Hieronymus at once appears as a partisan of orthodoxy. Full details of the personal wrangle which ensued may be found elsewhere. [HIERONYMUS (4); JOHANNES (216); EPIPHANIUS (1).] It is clear that Epiphanius at the outset contented himself with general denunciation of Origenism, not singling out Rufinus and Johannes for special censure. On the other hand, the conduct of the Origenist party in the church during the discourse of Epiphanius, and the menacing demeanour of Johannes; the warning that he sent to Epiphanius by his archdeacon, and his public attack upon anthropomorphic views in which the personal reference to Epiphanius was unmistakable, made a rupture only a question of time, and antagonism was intensified by a strenuous refusal twice repeated to condemn Origen and his doctrines. The subsequent conduct of Epiphanius intensified the irritation. Having failed to convince Johannes by argument, he endeavoured to crush him by isolation. With this end in view, he first induced the monks at Bethlehem to exclude Johannes with Rufinus and his other friends from communion, and, secondly, consecrated at Eleutheropolis Paulinianus, a brother of Hieronymus. Such conduct in an alien diocese was a serious encroachment upon the jurisdiction of the lawful bishop, and provoked indignant resentment.[q]

The pleas put forward by the partisans of Epiphanius in self-defence were futile, not to say frivolous (cf. Hieronymus, *Epist. c.* Johann. Migne, P. vol. xxii. *Ep.* 82; [= Bened. 39]), and the apology only supplied material for new controversy. Hieronymus, who throughout the quarrel is a zealous partisan of the bishop of Cyprus, translated his defence into Latin: the version disappeared, and Hieronymus accused Rufinus with having suborned an agent to steal it. (Hieron. *Ep.* lvii. (= Bened. 33); c. Ruf. iii. 84.) Johannes meanwhile is silent, his controversial zest having abated; but Epiphanius does not relax his efforts, and now writes the long letter to which allusion has already been made (Migne, vol. xliii. pp. 379, foll.), specifying the substance of his indictment of Origen. In answer to an appeal from Johannes, Theophilus of Alexandria, who was still an Origenist, makes an attempt to reconcile the disputants without success; for Isidorus, to whom the mission was entrusted, according to Hieronymus, acted with dishonourable partiality. (Hieron. *c. Johann.* §§ 37-39; *c. Ruf.* iii. § 18.) Johannes again writes to Theophilus, recounting the course of events, and the bishop of Alexandria takes advantage of a correspondence with Siricius of Rome to send on the letter with another from himself, charging Epiphanius with anthropomorphic heresy, not perhaps without reference to similar heretics in his own diocese. To this letter of Johannes, Hieronymus at once published an elaborate reply. (*Ad Pammach. adv. Johann. Ep.* lxxxiv. [= Bened. 41] cf. Palladius, *de Vita Chrysos.* § 16; Tillemont, vol. xii. pp. 186, 187.) Before this Rufinus had made his peace with his former friend, a harmony not destined to be permanent. The terms of reconciliation are uncertain. The account given by Hieronymus would lead us to suppose that any concession made was on the part of Rufinus, but such evidence without disinterested corroboration has little value. ("Iunximus dextras, ut vos essetis Catholici, non ut essemus haeretici," *c. Rufin.* iii. § 24; cf. § 33.) Probably the friends agreed to differ on the question in dispute. This reconciliation Archelaus, the governor of Palestine, endeavoured to extend to the other remaining foes, but his efforts were idle, the monks insisting upon the condemnation of Origen as an indispensable preliminary to any agreement ("ut futurae concordiae fides iaceret fundamenta," Hieron. *c. Johann.* § 40). Theophilus in a subsequent attempt had better fortune. After he had turned against the Origenists, A.D. 397-399, he wrote to Epiphanius, entreating for the cessation of strife. The advance was accepted (Migne, P. *Ep.* lxxxii. in Hieronymus; [= Bened. 39], and Theophilus went to Jerusalem and restored communion between the city and Bethlehem, allying himself with Hieronymus throughout the remainder of the controversy. (Hieron. *Epp.* lxxxvi.-xcvi.; = Bened. 59-63; 111; others unedited.)

[q] The two acts are really connected; one is a consequence of the other. Tillemont inverts the order, vol. xii., pp. 168, 170. Hieronymus did not officiate himself, and a priest was needed to keep up the services after the separation from Jerusalem. Cf. Vallarsi, Hieron i. p. 95; in Migne, P. vol. xxii. p. 95.

(2) Rufinus and Hieronymus.

Before peace had been made between the hostile parties in Palestine, Rufinus had left the scene of strife and had returned to Rome, where he soon became embroiled in a new quarrel, trivial in itself, indeed, but important as leading to a condemnation of Origen by a bishop of Rome. Without repeating all the history of the controversy given in other biographies [Hieronymus (4); Rufinus], we may record the main incidents. At the request of his friend Macarius, Rufinus translated first the famous apology of Pamphilus,—of which only the first book still survives,—and then the περὶ ἀρχῶν of Origen himself. In a preface to the former work he exhorted those who might look upon his conduct with suspicion to disregard all imputations of heresy, and to make the knowledge of truth their supreme concern. At the same time he explicitly affirmed his own belief in the Holy Trinity, and in the resurrection of the body. In an appendix he discussed the adulteration of Origen's works, contending that heretics, to support their own errors, had falsified the text with interpolations. The introduction to the second treatise struck a bolder note. Rufinus reminds his readers that in undertaking such a translation he is but following the example of Hieronymus himself, who had translated more than seventy treatises of Origen, describing him as the greatest teacher of the church after the apostles. Furthermore, he had adopted the method of Hieronymus in explaining obscurities, amplifying too concise passages, illustrating difficulties by quotations from other works, and suppressing heterodox passages as dangerous or spurious. His task completed, Rufinus left Rome for Aquileia, provided with letters from Siricius, who died in the same year, A.D. 398. The two treatises he left behind to do their work at Rome. The friends of Hieronymus at once took up the challenge—for such it really was—and Pammachius wrote to him from Rome, forwarding a copy of the translation and suggesting that Hieronymus should prepare a genuine version (Hieron. *Ep.* lxxxiii. Migne, =Bened. 40). Hieronymus replied, clearing himself of the charges, and stating, somewhat disingenuously, that he had never been an admirer of Origen, but had controverted his errors. He also denied the incriminated passages in the works of Origen to be spurious interpolations, and impugned the genuineness of the apology attributed to Pamphilus. (*Ep.* lxxxiv. (=Bened. 41)). Finally, he recapitulates the heretical doctrines of Origen as set down by Epiphanius, and adds that at Nicaea Origen had been by implication condemned as the forefather of Arianism. After an interval, Rufinus replied in his Apologia addressed to his friend Apollonianus.[r]

The treatise is, in the main, a vindication of his personal faith and a retaliation upon Hieronymus. In the first book, he reasserts his own orthodoxy as to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. He believes in the Trinity, but defends the statement which had been misinterpreted, that the Son does not see the Father ("non videt"). The Son knoweth the Father, he admits; but the Father is not visible to the eye of sense. He also professes his own faith in the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the body, adding with reference to this last doctrine that at Aquileia, his home, the definite phrase "huius carnis" was always used in place of the more common and vague expression. He then proceeds to explain how he had been induced to publish the translation of Origen's treatise, insisting that he had carefully guarded himself against all responsibility for error, and defending the integrity of his method of dealing with the text of the original. In the second book, stung by the charge that he had perjured himself in his profession of faith, he retorts upon Hieronymus that he had violated an oath by reading pagan writers, and Porphyry in particular, after a solemn renunciation of all such perilous erudition. Advancing still further along the same lines, he shews the inconsistency of Hieronymus, who had extolled Origen for virtue and learning, reviling his foes with equal vehemence, and was himself as a commentator largely indebted to Origen, especially in his treatise on Micah. He then vindicates the Apology of Pamphilus, the character of which had been impugned by Hieronymus in the heat of controversy, and asserts the genuineness of the work. But even accepting the theory of Hieronymus, he still maintains that the essential force of the defence is not impaired; for it proceeds by appeal to fact: every charge is refuted by Origen's own words. In conclusion, Rufinus leaves his opponent in this dilemma; that if Origen be condemned, he cannot escape, but as a translator and imitator must stand or fall with his former master.

This was but the beginning of strife. Through the influence of Marcella and other powerful friends of Hieronymus, Anastasius of Rome was drawn into the dispute. He was indeed entirely ignorant about Origen and his works, but recognised heresy in passages selected for his inspection. (Anastasius, Ep. ad Johann. *in Ep. et Dec.*, Migne, *P.*, vol. xx., pp. 68, foll.) He summoned Rufinus to Rome in 399 A.D. Rufinus did not obey the citation, but excused himself by letter, adding a new profession of orthodoxy and disclaiming any responsibility for the views of Origen. Dissatisfied with this reply, Anastasius proceeded to condemn Origen, and though not explicitly condemning Rufinus as well, he expresses his disapproval in the strongest terms. ("Nec dissimilis reo est qui alienis vitiis praestat assensum, illud tamen te cupio ita haberi a nostris partibus alienum, ut quod agat (sc. Rufinus) et ubi sit, nescire cupiamus, ipse denique viderit ubi possit absolvi." Anasta. ad Johann. vid. sup.) It has been alleged that other bishops joined in this condemnation, but the statement has little evidence to support it. Anastasius indeed in a letter to Simplicianus of Milan expresses a desire to unite with Theophilus in condemning the heretical doctrines of Origen, and asserts that "we established in the city of Rome" (nos in urbe Roma positi) do condemn anything contrary to faith found in the works of Origen; explaining that a priest, Eusebius by name, had

[r] Not "Invectivarum in Hieronymum libri duo," as the treatise has been wrongly entitled.

pointed out the blasphemous chapters, which, with any other (similar?) things set forth by Origen, had been condemned. Now "we" may or may not refer to other bishops; it is far more probable that the plural is used in an official sense. (Hieron. *Ep.* xcxv. Migne, *P.*, vol. xxii., p. 772, cf. vol. xx. p. 74.) At any rate it is certain that the condemnation did not take place at a formal synod, for only one such council was held at Rome during the pontificate of Anastasius—the synod convened against the Donatists in A.D. 400 (Mansi, vol. iii. pp. 1023, 1024, cf. Binius on a Carthaginian synod, ib. pp. 1023, 1024). After Anastasius had condemned Origen, the Emperor Honorius forbade his works to be read. (Hieron. *ad Pammach. et Marc.* Ep. xcvii.; Ad Theoph. Ep. lxxxviii. cf. Baronius, ad ann. 400, nn. 33–35; ad ann. 402, n. 29. Schroeckh, x. p. 194.) It is probable that several letters passed between Rome and the eastern churches with a view of securing a more general concurrence in the decision of Anastasius; how far the attempt succeeded cannot be determined. (Hieron. *c. Rufin.* iii. § 20, foll. Coustant, *Epp. Pont. Roman.* pp. 714, 719, 724. Migne, *P.*, vol. xx. p. 58, foll. (iv.) to Venerius of Milan, condemning Origen's works, l.c. p. 59; (ix.) *c. Ruf. in Orient.* ib. p. 62; and *Ep.* lxxxviii. ref.) Hieronymus exhorts Rufinus to acquiesce in this verdict, "et duos (sc. Theophilum et Anastasium) orientis atque occidentis προπαιοφόρους alacri sequamur incessu." (*c. Rufin.* iii. § 9.) The succeeding stages of the personal conflict are not essential to our immediate subject, and may therefore be ignored. The condemnation of Origen by Anastasius was the important result of the quarrel; it must certainly be accepted as a fact, and Rufinus in his reply to Hieronymus was not justified in discrediting it. (Cf. *c. Ruf.* iii. § 20.) The thorough ignorance of Anastasius is palpable, and his intervention was due to the influence of the partisans of Hieronymus and Epiphanius. The latter was the leading spirit in the movement. It is from him that Hieronymus adopts all his charges against Origen, for only one has even the semblance of originality, when in discussing the pre-existence of the soul, Hieronymus asks whether the human soul of Christ pre-existed before the Incarnation of the Divine Logos. If it did, then Christ must have had two souls, he argues, and so proceeds to attack Origen's interpretation of Philipp. ii. 5 (cf. Langen, *Römische Kirche*, pp. 649–663). All these charges are repeated in a letter to Avitus, dealing with the heresies of the περὶ ἀρχῶν. [Ep. cxxiv. (= Benev. 94.)]

(3) Theophilus and the Egyptian Monks.

While this controversy was in progress, the state of affairs at Alexandria had been transformed. Theophilus, who had made himself conspicuous by his antagonism to Epiphanius and his partisans in Egypt, had now changed sides, abandoning Isidorus with the "Tall Brethren" and his other allies among the monks of the Origenist faction. [Isidorus (28). Dioscorus (4). Ammonius (1). Euthymius (3). Eusebius (117).] A passage in his Easter letter of A.D. 399 had roused a storm of passion among the adherents of the anthropomorphist party. They had gathered in great force, and threatened the bishop with instant vengeance. In his alarm he evaded their anger by equivocation. "In seeing you," he said, "I see the face of God" [οὕτως ὑμᾶς εἶδον ὡς θεοῦ πρόσωπον]; implying his belief in the corporeal nature of the Deity; at their demand he also disclaimed all sympathy with Origen and his doctrines. (Gennadius, *De Script. Eccl.* xxxiii. Migne, *P.*, vol. 58. Soc. *H. E.* vi. 7. Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 11.) About the same time, Isidorus, whom Theophilus had put forward as a rival claimant against Chrysostom for the throne of Constantinople, quarrelled with his patron, unable any longer to brook his avarice and tyranny. (Isidorus of Pelusium, i. 152, 310, ed. Commel. 1605.) Theophilus sought unsuccessfully to retaliate by a false accusation. The monks of the Origenist party took sides against the bishop, and he in his rage made their religious views a weapon against them. (Theophilus, in Hieron. *Ep.* xcii. § 3. Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 12.) Theophilus first convened a synod at Alexandria, probably in A.D. 400, at which Origen and his books were formally condemned, not without resistance, if it is to this incident that Sulpicius Severus refers in his account of the shameful strife at Alexandria over the books and opinions of Origen. (*Dial.* i. 6, Galland, *Bibl.* viii. p. 404.) Theophilus next wrote to Anastasius (Hieron. c. *Rufin.* ii. § 22) and also addressed to the bishops of Cyprus and Palestine a letter preserved in the translation of Hieronymus, exhorting them to join in the crusade. Justinian in his letter to Mennas quotes a fragment of another epistle written by Theophilus, either from this synod or from another held about the same time at Alexandria or in the Nitra. It attacks Origen for heresy with regard to the pre-existence and fall of souls, and mentions Heraclas, wrongly as we have seen, as the bishop who expelled him from Alexandria. (Mansi, *Conc.* vol. iii. p. 973, foll.)

As a result of this appeal a synod was held at Jerusalem, and from it a reply was sent to Theophilus acquiescing in the condemnation of the heresies which he had mentioned, but stating that several of those doctrines were not known in Palestine (Mansi, vol. iii. p. 989; Supp. vol. i. p. 271). Another synod was held in Cyprus, and Epiphanius, at the request of Theophilus his old antagonist, united with him in putting Origen's works under a ban (Mansi, vol. iii. p. 1020, 1022; Hieron. *Epp.* xc. xci. xcii.; Soc. *H. E.* vi. 10; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 14). Chrysostom was proof against all pressure.[a]

The most important counts of the indictment brought against the Origenists by Theophilus are contained in the circular letter to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus mentioned above, and in his Easter letters of A.D. 401, 402, and 404; all of which are preserved in the translations of Hieronymus (*Epp.* xcii. xcvi. xcviii. c). Gennadius also mentions a large treatise ("unum et grande volumen") composed by Theophilus against the Origenists (*De Script. Eccl.* xxxiii. in

[a] Mansi, ll. c., sets these synods in 399, A.D., agreeing with Walch (*Kirchenversam.* p. 245), and Baronius ad. ann.; Pagi, in 401, A.D.; ad ann. n. 2, foll. cf. Hefele, *Councils*, vol. ii. § 112, Migne, *Dict. Conc.*, vol. i, pp. 82–85.

Migne, vol. lviii. pp. 1077, 1078); and Cyril of Alexandria a discourse; but both are lost.

In the synodal letter Theophilus first enumerates the heretical doctrines of the περὶ ἀρχῶν, viz. (a) It is true that the Son is similar to us, but false that He is similar to the Father. (b) He is as inferior to the Father as Peter and Paul are inferior to Him. (c) The kingdom of Christ will have an end. (d) The devil will at some future time be purified from evil, and will with Christ be made subject to some other power. The next heretical doctrine (e) that we must not pray to the Son either alone or with the Father, is taken from the Book of Prayer (περὶ εὐχῆς). The sources of the rest are not stated: they are as follows: (f) The body of the Resurrection will be not only material but mortal, and in the course of ages it will vanish into thin air. (g) The angels were not originally created in different orders for different service, but were higher spirits fallen in different degrees from their several estates ("diversis lapsibus et ruinis"). (h) The Israelites sacrificed to angels as the heathen to demons. (i) That Origen attributes to the heavenly bodies a fore-knowledge of events which the devil will bring about, thus approving of heathen astrology. (j) That Origen permitted and practised the use of magic. (k) That he denied that the Son of God became man, interpreting Philippians ii. 7, not of the Divine Word but of the human soul of Christ which came down from above. (l) That Christ will at some future time suffer for the redemption of the devil as he has already suffered for the redemption of man (Hieron. *Ep.* xcii. § 24). In the first Easter Letter (Hieron. *Ep.* xcvi.) of A.D. 401, Theophilus repeats several of the charges enumerated above. Thus (c) is repeated in §§ 5–7; (d) in § 8; (e) in § 14; (f) in §§ 9, 13, 15; (j) in § 16; and (l) in §§ 10, 11. Theophilus also combats the theory that the terrestrial system is merely the product of sin among the higher orders, that matter is in itself evil and vain, and that the soul was sent down to earth in punishment for sin in a previous existence (§§ 17–19). Theophilus adds as a result of this degradation of matter that the Origenists dishonour the honourable estate of matrimony (§ 18); but it is possible that for his own purpose he here identifies them with the impure sect mentioned by Epiphanius. The second Easter Letter A.D. 402 (Hieron. *Ep.* xcviii.) is still more vehement. With general abuse of Origen, whom it styles "the hydra of all heresies" ("hydram omnium haereseon") it combines several new statements of old charges. The points assailed are as follows: (i.) Origen's misuse of allegory. By allegorical shadows and empty images he robs Scripture of its truth (§ 10). (ii.) That through the fall of spirits from heaven God was compelled to create bodies to contain them, and that the terrestrial system is thus the outcome of sin (§ 10). (iii.) That man dies many times, soul and body undergoing incessant transformation by union or separation (*i.e.* a doctrine of μετεμψύχωσις in a modified form) (§ 11). (iv.) That angels were made principalities and powers according to merit after the fall of the devil (§ 12). (v.) That the operation of the Spirit does not extend to inanimate and irrational beings. This Theophilus controverts by the ordinances of Baptism and the Eucharist, for the efficacy of which consciousness is not essential (§ 13). (vi.) The distinction between the human and the divine soul of Christ. By this false doctrine, says Theophilus, Origen destroys the universal faith (§ 14). (vii.) That νοῦς, *i.e.* the higher intelligence, was corrupted to ψύχη (ψῦχος, κ. τ. λ.) because it had lost the fervour of divine love (§ 15). (viii.) That as the Father and the Son are one, so the Son and the soul which He assumed are one (§ 16). (ix.) That God created only so many rational creatures as He could govern, conceive, keep in subjection, and rule by providence (§ 18). The third Easter Letter (A.D. 404, Hieron. *Ep.* c.) only repeats charges already mentioned.

Theophilus meanwhile had enforced his arguments by more active measures. In A.D. 400, he proceeded through the Nitrian desert, denouncing the Origenist party and arming their foes to attack them. More than three hundred monks were driven into exile, among them the "Tall Brethren," who finally took refuge with about fifty companions at Constantinople (Soc. *H. E.* vi. cc. 7, 9; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. cc. 12, 13). Chrysostom, the bishop, though not admitting the fugitives into full communion, entertained them hospitably, and interceded with Theophilus in their behalf. The latter, acting either on false information or in eagerness to revenge his former disappointment, at once sent emissaries to Constantinople to accuse Chrysostom of having illegally admitted excommunicated monks to communion (A.D. 401). In the meantime the complaints of the monks had reached the emperor, Arcadius, and he summoned Theophilus to appear in his own defence. Unwilling to obey the summons in person, the bishop deferred his coming, but arranged that Epiphanius should go on in advance and use his great influence to discredit the accusers, who were imprisoned till the character of their charges could be established (A.D. 402). The history of the struggle which ensued has been told elsewhere, and only such incidents as bear directly upon the condemnation of Origenism will be repeated here. [CHRYSOSTOM (d) and (e). DIOSCORUS (4). EPIPHANIUS (1).]

Epiphanius, after provocation by irregularities not unlike those committed by him in Palestine, demanded that Chrysostom should expel Dioscorus and sign a condemnation of Origen's works. But for an emphatic warning he would, in the Church of the Apostles, have publicly anathematised Dioscorus, his companions, the books of Origen, and the bishop. Chrysostom, on his side, insisted that both parties should wait for the synod to judge between them (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 14; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 14. Cassiodorus, *Hist. Trip.* x. 12 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxix.). Epiphanius had already attempted to secure the adhesion of the bishops in the city, producing the decrees of the synod in Cyprus, and demanding their signatures in token of assent. Some yielded out of respect for Epiphanius; others, and prominently Theotimus of Scythia, gave an emphatic refusal (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 12; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 14; Cassiodorus, *Hist. Trip.* x. 11). Foreseeing failure, and having other reasons for suspicion, Epiphanius, after a final altercation with Chrysostom, set out for Cyprus and died at sea, A.D. 403 (Cassiodorus, *ib.* c. 12). Sozomen gives a

different account of the departure and death of the great leader. His story is that through the intervention of the empress, Eudoxia, the monks and Epiphanius had an interview, and while they pleaded that they had read his 'Αγκύρωτος, he admitted that he had not read the literature on their side. He was moved by their entreaties, and was reconciled to them before his departure; the recrimination between the two bishops is referred to an earlier occasion. This account is not corroborated by other evidence, and it seems improbable that Epiphanius, who was a sincere bigot, should have at the last come to suspect the character of the man who had for so long adroitly used him as a tool to gratify his personal resentment. (Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 15.)

Before long Theophilus himself arrived at Constantinople, attended by a crowd of satellites. He succeeded at once in reversing his position ("ex reo subito factus est auctor et iudex." Binius in Mansi, vol. iii. p. 1147). Nothing more is heard of the charge against him, and it is Chrysostom who is cited to appear before a council convened not at Constantinople but at Chalcedon, on the estate ("suburbium") of the imperial prefect, Rufinus (Synodus ad Quercum, ἐπὶ δρῦν). Paul of Heraclea presided, and of the thirty-six bishops present the majority were creatures of Theophilus. Even the eastern contingent included some avowed foes of Chrysostom.[1] It was with persons not principles that the council dealt. In the original indictment of Chrysostom the charge of Origenism does not appear in a single one of the twenty-nine clauses. Socrates and Sozomen agree in asserting that the question was not discussed at all by the assembly (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 15; Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 17). At a later stage of the proceedings, however, there was an indirect reference to the bishop's Origenistic tendencies. John, a monk, accused the bishop Heraclides of being an Origenist and a thief; and bishop Isaac in a list of seventeen offences includes three which bear distinctly upon the point in question, though in reality the doctrinal issue is entirely obscured by personal considerations. It was alleged that (i.) Chrysostom, to please the Origenists, had beaten and imprisoned the monk John; (ii.) that Epiphanius on that account had refused to hold communion with him; (iii.) that Chrysostom had received the Origenistic monks, whom Theophilus had excommunicated, though he would not release prisoners actually in communion with the church and possessing letters of commendation. The first of these allegations, setting aside the reference to Chrysostom's heretical tendencies, had already been discussed in dealing with the second clause of the original indictment. The council now proceeded to consider the other points, and finally condemned both Chrysostom and Heraclides. The verdict, however, had no reference to doctrine, but only to conduct and demeanour. It must also be remembered that another large gathering of bishops friendly to Chrysostom was held at the same time, and that the decisions of Chalcedon would certainly have been reversed but for the overwhelming influence of the imperial court, which sent the bishop into exile. Innocent of Rome, to whom the result of the council's deliberations was announced, expressed a distinct disapproval in a letter still preserved in part (Palladius, *De Vit. Chrys.* c. ii.; Mansi, vol. iii. p. 1095, cf. p. 1117; Coustant, Ep. Pont. Roman. p. 787). The unfortunate Egyptian monks play a very subordinate part in the conflict to which they had given rise. Dioscorus died before the council; Ammonius, about the same time. The remainder made no specific recantation of Origenistic views, but were readily received back into communion by Theophilus, who had already pronounced a panegyric over the grave of Ammonius (Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 17). How little he cared for the cause which he championed may be inferred from the fact, that he still continued to read the very books which he had ordered to be destroyed, justifying his conduct on the principle of discrimination, saying that he read "culling the flower and passing by the thorn" (Soc. *H. E.* vi. 17).

[1] The date of the synod is disputed, but there is a great preponderance of authority for 403 A.D., vid. Hefele, vol. ii. § 115; Harduin, i. pp. 1037, foll.; Baronius, ad ann. 403, nn. 17, 18, 19, cf. Migne, *Dict. des Conciles*, i. pp. 551, 559 ("Du Chêne"). For the Acts, cf. Photius, *cod.* lix.; Mansi, vol. iii. pp. 1141–1154; and Labbe, vol. ii. pp. 1323, foll.

VI.

After the council of Chalcedon, save for casual and individual utterances, the Origenistic controversy was at rest for a century and a half Some authorities, however, have recognised a condemnation of Origen's teaching in the proceedings of a synod at Diospolis, Lydda in Palestine, held in A.D. 415. The opinion of a council, small, meagre and disreputable (Hieron. *Ep.* cxliii.), cannot in any case claim any considerable weight; the facts moreover are far from clear. It appears that Pelagius was there brought to trial before fourteen bishops of Palestine on various charges of heresy, including an assertion that in the Day of Judgment sinners and the wicked would find no mercy, but would be utterly consumed (penitus exurendos) with everlasting fires. Pelagius vindicated his orthodoxy by appealing to Matt. xvi. 46, and added, "If anyone is of a different opinion, he is an Origenist" (et si quis aliter credit, Origenista est). The reply of the synod is ambiguous, though Pelagius was certainly acquitted on this as on the other charges. The words are these: "Hoc ergo synodus dixit non alienum esse ab ecclesia" (Baluze in Mansi, vol. iv. p. 316; Harduin i. p. 2009). Augustine applies the reference, i.e. in "Origenista est," to the doctrine of restoration, which, as he states, the church most deservedly abhors. The reply of the synod cannot, however, be understood as countenancing the assertion of Pelagius, that to hold a different opinion on the point was to be an Origenist and a heretic; nor does it prove that the doctrine of Origen about the punishment of the wicked has been "by itself condemned by the church." This indeed was Augustine's contention, but he was a consistent foe of Origen and his system (August. *De Gest. Pelag.* iii. n. 9, 10. Cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 17; *De Haer.* xliii.; and *Ad Orosium, c. Prisc. et Origen.* Migne, P. vol. xlii. pp. 670–678). The pronoun "*hoc*" must refer either to Pelagius's original assertion or to his vindica-

tion, not to an incidental detail in the reply. (For the synod of Diospolis, vid. Mansi, vol. iv. pp. 311–320; Harduin, i. p. 2009; Hefele, vol. ii. § 118; Pusey, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* pp. 134, foll.; Oxenham, *What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?* vol. ii. p. 12, foll. For the Roman Catholic view, vid. Père Daniel, *Recueil de divers Ouvrages*, t. i. p. 635.)

Two official references to the doctrines of Origen occur during the fifth century. Leo I. the Great, stated that in his opinion Origen had been justly condemned for his doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul (*Ep.* xxxv. Migne, P. vol. liv. p. 807); and a synod at Rome under Gelasius (A.D. 494? Hefele A.D. 409, vol. ii. § 217), at which a great number of heretical works were put in an *index prohibitorum*, allowed those writings of Origen and Rufinus to be read which Hieronymus had not rejected as hurtful. Eusebius, though censured for his defence of heresy, was tolerated for his general excellence. (Mansi, vol. viii. pp. 163–165; Migne, *Dict. des Conc.* ii. pp. 595–599.)

VII.—The Home Synod and the Fifth Council.

The last stage of the controversy is the most intricate of all, complicated as it is by confusion of documents and conflict of authorities. Upon the central point of dispute, whether Origen was condemned at the fifth general council or not, it is impossible to pronounce any opinion with more than an approach to certainty. The question is one which has divided ecclesiastical historians of all centuries. It will be convenient to state at the outset the chief contemporary authorities and documents from which our information is derived. They are as follows: (1) A letter of the emperor Justinian to Mennas, the primate of Constantinople, containing an elaborate indictment of the doctrines attributed to Origen, and concluding with a series of anathemas which can be divided into nine or into ten clauses (Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 487–534). (2) A series of fifteen anathemas, brought to light by Peter Lambeck of Vienna in the 17th century, and then included in the acts of the fifth council (Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 395, foll.). (3) A life of Sabas, a Palestine monk, by Cyril of Scythopolis; a good authority for the details of the local controversy, but not trustworthy beyond this limited range (in Coteler. *Monument. Sacr. Eccl. Graec.* vol. iii.). (4) The *Breviarium* of Liberatus (in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii.; and Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxviii). (5) Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 38 (Migne, vol. lxxvi. pt. 2, pp. 2771, foll.). References to authorities of secondary importance will be given in the course of the narrative.

According to Cyril's account, strife arose among the monks of the Palestine Laura about A.D. 520. Four monks of the New Laura had Origenist sympathies, and were therefore expelled by Agapetus, the head of the community. After an ineffectual appeal to their archbishop, they were secretly restored by Maimas, who succeeded Agapetus. (Cyril, op. cit. c. 36.) After the lapse of some time, Sabas, the head of the monasteries in Palestine, seeing the power of the Origenists on the increase, came to Constantinople about A.D. 530, and asked for a general expulsion of all those who avowed those heretical views. A favourable answer was made to his request, but Sabas died in A.D. 531, before any decided action had been taken to carry out the promise, and Origenism then spread from the New Laura among the other monastic communities, in large measure owing to the influence and support of Domitian and Theodorus Ascidas, who formerly held positions of power and honour in that body. These two leaders had succeeded in gaining the favour of the emperor Justinian, and were by him advanced to high office; Theodorus to the archbishopric of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Domitian to the bishopric of Ancyra, in Galatia. After their promotion, which occurred about A.D. 537, they still continued to reside at court, using all their influence to support their partisans in Palestine, where controversy was still fierce between the Origenists and the "Sabaites," as the orthodox monks were named by their foes. (l.c. c. 83.) Gelasius, the successor of Sabas, caused a treatise against Origen, that written by Antipater of Bostra, to be read in the monastery, and procured a new expulsion of the Origenists. (l. c. c. 84.) The ejected monks betook themselves to a certain Eusebius, present at that time in the country with authority, who decided that Gelasius must either restore the Origenists or expel their adversaries. (c. 85.) The latter course was adopted, and in their distress these assailants of Origenism appealed to Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch. [Ephraim (6).] He responded to their complaints, convened a synod, and condemned the leaders [τοὺς προασπιστὰς αὐτοὺς] of the Origenist party in person besides anathematising their doctrines. (c. 85, cf. Mansi, vol. ix. p. 23.)[u] Nonnus, the Origenist leader, and his supporters, indignant at this proceeding, endeavour to avenge themselves by an insult to Ephraim; bringing pressure to bear upon Peter, the patriarch of Jerusalem, to induce him to obliterate the name of their foe from the sacred triptych of Jerusalem. Peter on his part offered no open resistance, but engaged Gelasius and his friend Sophronius to draw up a treatise against the Origenists and in support of Ephraim. This work, when completed, he sent to the emperor, adding a letter of his own to enforce its argument. Justinian in reply condemned the Origenists in an authoritative decree, signed not only by Mennas, the patriarch of Constantinople, but by Theodorus and Domitian, who found it impossible for the moment to withstand the storm. (c. 85.) The edict, however, did not settle the conflict in Palestine, where another ejection was followed by a temporary compromise. (c. 86.) Gelasius made a fresh attempt to secure help from the emperor, and on his homeward way, having been thoroughly out-generalled by Askidas, died at Amorium. (A.D. 545?) (c. 87.) His vacant place was filled by Georgius, an Origenist, and for the time that faction prevailed. But Nonnus died and Georgius was disgraced. Cassianus followed, and was succeeded by Conon. (c. 88.)

[u] From the fragment of the acts preserved it appears that this council was not convened in response to the edict of Justinian, but by Ephraim on his own account. Cf. Mansi, l.c. and also p. 707.

By this time the Origenist party was rent by internal discord, and Isidorus, one of their leaders, took sides with Conon, a staunch opponent. (c. 89.) A new effort on the part of Conon and his friends was made at Constantinople, where Askidas caused them much annoyance. Their hostility was intensified by events at Jerusalem, where Macarius, an Origenist, had succeeded to the patriarchal chair at the death of Peter. The complaints of the monks reach the emperor, in spite of all intrigue, and his resentment is roused. The fifth general council is summoned, mainly owing to a treatise of Conon (λίβελλος). Origen is anathematised, his followers outlawed, and Macarius ousted. (c. 90.) Eustochius is sent to carry out the decrees of the Council in Palestine. He supersedes Macarius, and expels the Origenists completely. Peace is finally restored, all the bishops signing the anathemas. The account given by Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. cc 37, 38) differs fundamentally from the version of Cyril. The same names recur, but in very different circumstances. He asserts that Eustochius, the bishop of Jerusalem, had endeavoured to clear the Origenists out of Palestine, but was thwarted by Askidas who defended them. Eustochius, therefore, sends Conon and Rufus to Constantinople. They report to the emperor on the heresy of (i.) Origen, (ii.) Evagrius and Didymus. Then Askidas, to create a diversion from Origen, brings up the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The fifth general council was then held. It first condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, Evagrius and Didymus; subsequently letters from Conon, Eulogius, Syriacus, and Pancratius, were laid before the assembly, and then after discussion Origen was condemned as well.

Against this we may set the account of Liberatus. (*Breviarium*, 23, 24.) According to him, Pelagius, the Papal Apokrisiar, on his way back from Gaza to Constantinople, was met by monks from Jerusalem anxious to secure a condemnation of Origenist doctrine. As Pelagius was a rival of Askidas, their cause was in good hands. He took up the cause, and obtained from the emperor an edict of condemnation signed by Mennas and a number of bishops at Constantinople, presumably at an assembly of the Home Synod (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα). ("Iubente eo dictata est in Origenem et illa capitula anathematis damnatio, quam subscripserunt una cum Menna archiepiscopo episcopi apud Constantinopolim reperti," c. 23.) This letter of condemnation was sent to Vigilius of Rome, Zoilus of Alexandria, Ephraim of Antioch, and Peter of Jerusalem, all of whom united in signing its decrees; and so, adds Liberatus, "Origen was condemned when dead, after being condemned when alive" ("damnatus est mortuus qui vivens olim fuerat ante damnatus"). Askidas then in retaliation induced Justinian to write against the "Three Chapters," and to condemn Theodore of Mopsuestia who had vehemently attacked Origen's allegorical method.

To harmonise these three versions is impossible on the face of it; but accepting Cyril's account of the earlier incidents of the struggle, we may reconcile his story in the main with that of Liberatus, either identifying the treatise presented to Pelagius with that drawn up by Gelasius and Sophronius (cf. Hefele, vol. ii. pp. 787, 788), or supposing the one to have followed and supported the other (cf. Walch, Ketz., vol. vii., pp. 668, 669.)[x] We may also assume that it was in deference to this appeal that Justinian addressed his edict to Mennas for the general suppression of Origenism throughout the empire, probably between A.D. 541–543. That famous epistle (in Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 487, foll.; Labbe, vol. v. pp. 635, foll.) consists of three well-defined parts. In the first Justinian enumerates the most vital errors of Origen, referring specially to his views on the Subordination of the Son, the pre-existence and fall of the soul, the restitution of the wicked, and the plurality of worlds. Then in contrast to a series of passages selected mainly from the περὶ ἀρχῶν, he gives extracts from the Fathers, to demonstrate the palpable heresy of Origen. Lastly, he condemns the doctrines, the person, and the adherents of the heretic, in a series of anathemas which read as follows:—(i.) Whosoever believes or affirms that human souls pre-existed, i.e. that they were once spirits and holy powers, which weary of beholding God, became degenerate, and because their love grew cold were called souls (ψύχαι) and in punishment sent down into bodies, let him be anathema. (ii.)...that the soul of our Lord pre-existed and was united with the Divine Word before becoming incarnate and being born of the Virgin, etc. (iii.)...that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was first fashioned in the womb of the Virgin, and that the Divine Word was subsequently united with it and the pre-existing soul, etc. (iv.)...that the Divine Word became like all celestial orders, cherub for cherubim, seraph for seraphim, and so through all degrees, etc. (v.)... that in the resurrection bodies will be circular and not like ours (i.e. straight), etc. (vi.)...that the sun, moon, and stars, and the waters above the firmament, are spiritual and rational beings, etc. (vii.)...that Christ in after ages will be crucified for demons as He was for men, etc. (viii.)...that the power of God was limited, and that He created only so many worlds as He could comprehend, etc. (ix.)...that the punishment of demons and wicked men is but for a time, and will end in a universal restitution, etc. (x.) let Origen be anathema, and all who hold or teach his doctrines.

At the same time Mennas was directed by the emperor to convene a synod of the bishops and abbats under his jurisdiction, and to pronounce a formal condemnation of Origen in response to the imperial rescript; to send copies of the proceedings to all other ecclesiastical authorities, and to see that for the future no one should be ordained priest or abbat without first signing this condemnation. A similar edict was sent, as we saw above, to Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, and Jerusalem; and the mandate was everywhere accepted without open demur. At Constantinople Mennas assembled the bishops resident in the city ("episcopi apud Constantinopolim reperti." Liberat. l.c. c. 23), at a σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, which echoed the anathemas of the emperor with one consent. Even such prominent and powerful disciples of Origen as Askidas and Domitian were forced to bow before the

[x] Hefele also supposes Evagrius to have confused with this earlier treatise that presented by Conon and his friends ten years later (l.c.)

storm, and to sign the condemnation with their opponents.[y]

There is strong reason for attributing to this Home Synod, under Mennas, the fifteen anathemas discovered by Lambeck, and inserted in the proceedings of the fifth general council. Hefele has discussed the question with great care, and he decides with Walch (*Ketz.* vol. vii. pp. 671, foll.; vol. viii. pp. 281, foll.), Doellinger (*Church History*, Engl. Trans. vol. ii. p. 180), Dupin (*Nouv. Bibl.* vol. v. pp. 203, foll.), and others, that the heading of the Vienna manuscript (*τῶν ἁγίων ρξέ* [=165] *πατέρων τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἁγίας πεμπτῆς συνόδου κανόνες*) represents only untrustworthy tradition. Evagrius is the only historian who connects specific anathemas of Origen with the fifth council, and his other errors shew how little confidence can be placed in his unsupported testimony.[z] We have already seen how he confuses the treatise of Sophronius and Gelasius with that of Conon, and while he rightly couples the condemnation of Origen with the condemnation of Evagrius and Didymus, he attributes all the proceedings to the fifth council, where, whatever may have occurred about Origen, the case of the other two was certainly not considered. Evagrius, however, as Hefele suggests, gives us some guidance in the matter. Quoting from the acts which he attributes to the council, he gives with other extracts a reference in the fifth article to Theodorus Askidas and some opinion of his about the resurrection. Combining this with two other fragments preserved by Evagrius, Hefele comes to the conclusion, that the complete document from which they were taken corresponded in form to the letter of Justinian, and was in fact the reply of the synod to the imperial mandate, containing (1) the reply of the synod to the emperor, (2) quotations from the works of Origen and his followers, with the reference to Askidas, and (3) the series of fifteen anathemas. We know that Askidas was present at the fifth council and took part in its proceedings; if therefore, we attribute these anathemas to it, we must assume that he not only again assented to the condemnation of his own principles in a form still stronger than before, but allowed such a decree to be passed without strenuous resistance. Evagrius, again, connects the condemnation of Origen with the emperor's letter to Mennas; this is quite accurate, but on the other hand Mennas was dead before the fifth council was held. The confusion seems to have arisen from combining the acts of several synods under Justinian in one codex, a very common cause of error (cf. Garnerius, c. ii.; in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii. p. 168; in Migne, *P.* vol. lxviii). At the Home Synod under Mennas, Askidas was not present; he signed the decree, but took no part in the deliberations. Vincenzi, who will have no condemnation of Origen on any terms, stands alone in denying that the Home Synod under Mennas was held, but his arguments have little force (vol. iv. cc. xii. xiii. pp. 125, foll.). To that assembly at any rate the two series of anathemas must belong; and if Origen was condemned at the fifth general council, it was in another form and in a different manner. This supposition is strengthened by the close resemblance that exists between the two series of anathemas. The latter restates in ampler detail the heresies outlined in the first, developing specially the errors regarding the nature of Christ, and supplementing the emperor's statement with the fuller knowledge of trained theologians. Without reproducing the fifteen clauses in detail, it may be well to state in a brief summary the doctrines with which they deal. (1) The pre-existence of the soul, and its restitution to its original holiness. (2) The derivation of the rational creation from spirits, at first incorporeal and immaterial, but now differentiated by varying guilt into thrones, principalities, powers, and other orders. (3) That sun, moon, and stars are degenerate spirits. (4) The human body a penalty for sin. (5) As spirits fall, so they may rise. (6) When the other spirits sank to the level of men or of demons, only one abode in the love and vision of God; this became Christ, Lord of creation and life. The universe was made by the creative mind (*ὁ νοῦς, ὃν φασὶ δημιουργικόν*), not by the Holy Trinity. (7) Christ will pass through all orders of being, suffering for each as for men. (8) The divine word did not become incarnate, but the Creative Spirit which was in reality Christ. The divine word is called Christ only in a secondary sense on account of its union with the Creative Spirit. (9) The divine word did not suffer for men, but the *νοῦς, ὃν ἀσεβοῦντες λέγουσι κυρίως Χριστὸν, τῇ τῆς μονάδος γνώσει πεποιημένον*. (10) The body of Christ in His resurrection is circular, and so will ours be. (11) Judgment to come is the destruction of the body, and there will be no material resurrection. (12) All inferior orders of beings in heaven and earth are united to the divine word as closely as the *νοῦς*; the kingdom of Christ will have an end. (13) The soul of Christ pre-existed like the soul of man, and He is similar to men in substance and strength. (14) All rational existences will ultimately become merged in unity, and material existence will be brought to nothing. (15) The future life of spirits will be like their former life, and so the end of all things will be the same as the beginning.

Having thus settled the preliminary question, it now remains for us to discuss whether Origen was condemned in any shape or form at the fifth general council; for the fact that specific anathemas have been erroneously attributed to that assembly does not prove that no condemnation whatsoever was there pronounced against Origen and his doctrines. The reported proceedings of the synod at first sight seem to give a plain answer to our enquiry. In the acts of the eighth session, which was held on 2nd June, A.D. 553, the name of Origen occurs in a list of heretics condemned in the eleventh canon. It

---

[y] There is great diversity of opinion as to the date of this council. Baronius sets it in 538, A.D. ad ann., note 34. foll., Garnerius, in 541, A.D. He discusses the question at length in connection with the date of Pelagius's visit to Gaza, vid. Migne, *P.* vol. lxviii. pp. 1053, foll., and in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii. (Liberatus). Hefele supports 543, A.D. vol. ii. § 255, of Noris, *Dissert. de Quint. Syn.* vol. iv. pp. 990 (Ballerini). The date has been fixed as late as 545, A.D.

[z] The Anathemas preserved by Nicephorus, *H. E.* xvii., cc. 27, 28 [Migne, vol. cxliv. p. 283 foll.] are those which we know to be Justinian's, and sent to the Home Synod.

there stands side by side with the names of Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches. There is reason, however, to suspect the genuineness of the reference. The name of Origen, unlike the rest, does not occur in its due chronological order. But for this exception, the list includes only those heretics condemned at the first four general councils. In the Roman copy of the acts, the name of Origen is here omitted, nor does it occur with the rest in the emperor's confession of faith (§ 10) (cf. Migne, vol. lxxxvi. pt. 1, p. 1018; Hefele, vol. ii. § 274, pp. 893–899). Even if we admit that the fifth council added the name of Origen to those anathematised by the four preceding councils, it is difficult to explain how or when the assembly could have decided upon the preliminary censure before inserting his name in the condemned list. The widest difference of opinion prevails among historians. Noris, for instance, admits that the council was convened solely to discuss the "three chapters," but he suggests that before proceeding to their real business, they considered the case of Origen as well. De Marca, on the other hand, thinks that the condemnation of Origen came at the close of the sittings, and that the synodical acts, as we have them, are mutilated (*De Epist. Vigil.* c. xxiii. pp. 36, foll.; Diss. iii. edit. by Baluze, Paris, 1669). This is the view of Natalis Alexander also (*H. E.* saecl. tert. Diss. xvi. § 11). Some historians, again, suppose that Origen's doctrines were condemned only after a fair trial and discussion; others, that they were condemned without any such formality.

The evidence against the supposition that Origen was condemned at the fifth general council has been summarised with great care by the Rev. H. N. Oxenham, in the work entitled "What is of the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?" (Part ii.), a reply to Dr. Pusey's "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" The chief heads of the evidence are as follows:— (1) In the fifth council there is no mention of Origen except in one single place (canon xi.), and even this may possibly be an interpolated forgery. (2) No mention of Origen and his errors occurs in the edict of Justinian convening the fifth council, though he there enumerates the subjects for discussion (Labbe, vol. v. pp. 419, foll.; Mansi, vol. ix. p. 178, foll.), whereas in the letter to Mennas on the occasion of the home synod the errors are stated and the synod is asked to condemn them (Mansi, *ib.* p. 487, foll.). (3) Vigilius, the pope, in confirming the acts of the council, makes no allusion to any condemnation of Origen; and indeed throughout his letters from A.D. 540 to 554, there is no reference of the kind. Pelagius and Gregory are silent too, and it is not reasonable to suppose that if such a decision had been arrived at in the council three successive popes would have been silent on the point; the less so that Vigilius himself discusses at considerable length what the council had done (Mansi, vol. ix. pp. 414, foll.). (4) The reference supplied by the evidence of later councils (*e.g.* the seventh general council), historians and other writers is not sufficient to establish Origen's condemnation against the silence of the highest authorities.

The authorities quoted by Dr. Pusey (op. cit.) to sustain the opposite view may be divided into two sets. The first refer to a specific condemnation of Origen at the fifth council. The list includes (1) Cyril of Scythopolis (*Vita Sabae*, c. xc. vid. sup.) (2) Evagrius (*H. E.* iv. 37). (3) Maximus of Aquileia, in his address to the Lateran Council, A.D. 649 (Labbe, vol. vi. pp. 96, 97). (4) The acts of the Lateran Council itself (Labbe, vol. vi. pp. 75, foll. (5) Sophronius of Jerusalem in a letter to Sergius of Constantinople (Migne, vol. lxxxvii. part 3, pp. 3182–6). (6) Tarasius, in a letter read at the second council of Nicaea, and also an allusion in the definition of the council (vid. Conc. Nic. II. act. viii. Labbe, vol. vii. p. 684). (7) The profession of faith made by a bishop of Rome between A.D. 685 and A.D. 715 (Migne, *P*, vol. cv. p. 49). (8) Photius, cod. 18 and Ep. i. 8, ad Michael. Migne, vol. cii. pp. 643–6, and vol. ciii. pp. 42–58). (9) Nicephorus Callistus (*H. E.* xvii. 27, 28). Without giving all the passages quoted by Dr. Pusey, in which a general reference to a condemnation of Origen is to be found, but apart from any specific allusion to the fifth council, we may select two or three as illustrative of the whole body of testimony. (1) Victor Tununensis (Chron. ad ann. Migne, *P. L.* vol. lxviii. p. 959; Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xii. p. 231). (2) An imperial edict read at the sixth general council (Labbe, vol. vi. p. 1096). (3) A letter of Leo II. to the emperor Constantine (Labbe, vol. vi. pp. 1017, foll.).

It must be admitted that the value of each individual testimony taken separately is as a rule extremely slight, especially when we remember what intervals of time separated the writers from the events about which they wrote, and the ingenuous way in which one repeats the mis-statements of his predecessors. For all that, it is impossible to refuse to credit them with a certain amount of authority when taken collectively. They prove at the least the existence at a comparatively early date of a belief, that Origen had been condemned at or in connection with the Fifth Council. The evidence is not conclusive, but it is sufficient to deter us from a dogmatic denial that such a condemnation occurred. And without more convincing proof than any that has hitherto been given to support the theory, that the name of Origen as it stands in the Eleventh Canon is a subsequent interpolation, we must accept the clause as it stands. There is another passage in the proceedings of the council, which must not be left without notice. In the course of an argument supporting the legality of anathematising heretics after death, the following passage occurs: "Et multos quidem alios invenimus post mortem anathematizatos, necnon et Origenem; et si ad tempora Theophili sanctae memoriae recurrerit, post mortem inveniet anathematizatum; *quod etiam nunc in ipso fecit et vestra Sanctitas et Vigilius*, religiosissimus papa antiquioris Romae." Without the word "nunc," nothing would be more natural than to explain the passage as a reference to the Home Synod under Mennas; and Hefele, who does not obliterate a word when he is face to face with a difficulty, suggests that the reference in *nunc* is to past not contemporary history (vol. ii. § 270, p. 875). Vincenzi (vol. v. p. 88) has recourse to his usual theory of interpolation; while Noris, taking the word in its ordinary sense, supposes that the

speaker must refer to a condemnation of Origen passed at some earlier session, formal or the reverse (vol. i. p. 639). The passage at any rate makes against the theory, that the condemnation of Origen occurred at the close of the other business of the Council.

At this point it may be convenient to recapitulate the conclusions at which we have arrived, concerning the condemnation of Origen under the emperor Justinian. (1) That Origen was formally condemned at a meeting of the Home Synod held by Mennas at Constantinople about the year 541 A.D., and that the decrees were signed by many influential bishops elsewhere. (2) That to this council must be attributed the letter of Justinian, the anathemas which it contains, and the series of anathemas discovered by Lambeck. (3) That the Fifth General Council, though not commissioned to deal with Origen and his errors, may have passed judgment on the question incidentally, perhaps informally; and that, at any rate, we have no evidence sufficient to warrant us in expunging his name from the eleventh canon.

In whatever way the condemnation was pronounced, the practical measures taken to suppress the Origenist party in Palestine were most effective. The task was easier owing to the internal dissension which had appeared in their midst after the death of Nonnus, their leader, several years before the General Council. Cyril of Scythopolis, from whom we have already quoted, tells us that one of the sects into which the Origenist party split, called themselves "Protoktists" (Πρωτόκτιστοι), holding that the existing soul of Christ was the first and most perfect work of creation. By their opponents they were styled "Tetradites" (Τετράδιτοι), because by thus deifying the pre-existing soul of Christ, they added a fourth person to the Trinity. The other sect had the name of "Isochrists" ('Ισόχριστοι) attached to them, on account of their characteristic doctrine that all human souls will finally become like unto Christ's. Of the latter party Theodorus Askidas was the most prominent adherent. So bitter was the strife between the two forces that the Protoktists were driven to combine with the orthodox leaders against their fellow heretics: especially when on the death of Peter, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Macarius, a partisan of the Isochrist section, was promoted to the vacant place, mainly through the influence of Askidas. In their extreme danger, the minority went so far as to surrender the doctrine of pre-existence which was so essential an element in their system. After this the issue of the conflict was decisive. Macarius was ousted by order of the emperor. Eustochius was appointed in his stead. The New Laura made an attempt to secede, but the disaffected monks were promptly ejected by Eustochius, and others settled in their room. The other monasteries in Palestine were also cleared of Origenists. Finally, all the bishops of the country, Peter of Abyla excepted, signed the imperial edict of condemnation, and Peter was dismissed from office for contumacy. (Cyril, *Vita Sabae*, cc. 89, 90.) Though Askidas some years later succeeded in ejecting Eustochius in retaliation, the incident hardly belongs to the history of the Origenistic controversy, which at this point comes to a close. Origenism had been crushed in its stronghold, and though the doctrine has survived, finding champions and assailants in every century of the world's history, there has never existed since then a party organised on a similar basis, and using the name of Origen as their title and battle cry.

Authorities.—Original authorities have been already mentioned in the course of the narrative. Of works which deal with the Origenistic controversies in whole or in part, the most important are the following: Doucin, *Histoire des mouvements dans l'Eglise arrivés au sujet d'Origène et de ses doctrines* (Paris, 1700); an anonymous work entitled *Examen de l'Origénisme, ou réponse à un livre intitulé Sentimens différents de quelques théologiens sur l'état des âmes séparées du corps* (1733); Halloix, *Origines Defensus* (Leyden, 1668); Horbius, *Historia Origeniana, sive de ultima origine et progressione haereseos* (Frankfort, 1670); Huet, *Origeniana*, most accessible in the edition of Origen published by Migne; Vincenzi, *In Sancti Gregori Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova defensio*, 4 vols. (Rome, *Morini*, 1865). This is perhaps the most elaborate work, though not the most satisfactory, written on the subject. Among English works, the most valuable are Canon Farrar's *Mercy and Judgment* (cc. xi., xii., especially); the Rev. H. N. Oxenham's *What is the Truth with regard to Eternal Punishment?* (part ii.); and Dr. Pusey's *What is of Faith with regard to Eternal Punishment?* (pp. 129–153), to which the preceding book is a rejoinder. The works of Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*) and of Walch (*Gesch. d. Ketzereien*, vol. vii. pp. 363, fol., and vol. viii. pp. 280, fol.), are indispensable. Original documents and dissertations will be found in the collections of Labbe and Mansi. Of the historians the most serviceable are Doellinger, Neander, Herzog, Gieseler, and Schroeckh. Much information may also be obtained from Ceillier, Cave, Du Pin, and Tillemont. The dissertations of Garnerius, De Marca, and Noris, have been mentioned elsewhere. Of the special articles upon these controversies, by far the best is Dr. Hefele's in Wetzer und Welte's *Encyclopaedia* (*Origenistreitigkeiten*). The articles by Dr. E. de Pressensé, in Lichtenberger's *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses*, and by Moeller in Herzog's *Encyklopaedie*, are also worth consulting, with an article in criticism of Dr. Vincenzi's great work in the Tübingen *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1867, pp. 331, fol.; Migne's Dictionaries (*Hérésies—Conciles*) contain useful summaries. A treatise by Eberhard, *Die Betheiligung des Epiphanius an dem Streite über Origenes*, mentioned by Professor Lipsius of Jena, in his article on Epiphanius, I have unfortunately been unable to obtain. [A. W. W. D.]

ORION (1), bishop of Erythrum in Cyrenaica in the fourth century. When a very old man, his extreme gentleness brought him into contempt. On this account the inhabitants of two of the villages, Palaebisca and Hydrax, chose as their bishop in his stead Siderius, an officer of Valens, to protect them in their business affairs, and also to oppose a bold front to the Arians. Synesius (ep. 67) speaks of Orion as ὁ μακάριος. (*Pat. Graec.* lxvi. 1413 b; Tillem.

viii. 234; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 625.) [SYNESIUS.] [R. J. K.]

ORION (2), a wealthy and leading citizen of Aila on the Red Sea, said to have been restored after possession by a legion of devils through the prayers of Hilarion, the hermit of Palestine, in the end of the 4th century (Jerom. *Vit. Hilar.* § 18 [HILARION]). [W. H. F.]

ORION (3), addressed by Isidore of Pelusium in several letters (lib. i. epp. 264, 293), another (v. 193), a deacon (ii. 16), a monk (i. 181, 194, 195, 468, ii. 159, 268, iii. 45, iv. 137, 155). [C. H.]

ORONTIANUS (HORONTIANUS), addressed by St. Ambrose, *c.* 387, on the nature of the soul (ep. 34) and on some passages in St. Paul (35, 36); in 389 on the question why man, the most perfect of creatures, should have been formed last (43), and on the succession of God's creative acts (44); the epp. 77, 78 discuss the subject of the old and new dispensations, but their date is not apparent. (Ceill. v. 493, 496, 503.) [C. H.]

ORONTIUS (1), Jan. 22, martyr during the Diocletian persecution with Vincentius and Victor in Spain under the governor Rufinus. (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. 390–393; Ceill. xi. 306.) [G. T. S.]

ORONTIUS (2), a man of rank and landed proprietor, a friend of St. Augustine, but probably not yet having made up his mind to become a Christian. In his state of doubt he appears to have consulted Augustine, and to have asked permission to pay him a visit. (Aug. *Ep.* 257 al. 123.) [H. W. P.]

ORONTIUS (3), an Italian bishop and a Pelagian. He accompanied Julianus, of Eclana, in his exile, and with him visited Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the patriarch Nestorius. Cf. JULIANUS (15) in. t. iii. p. 470 of this Dictionary, where the story is fully told. He caused Anianus, the Pelagian, to translate St. Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Matthew. He dedicated the translation to Orontius. (Cf. Migne's *Pat. Lat.* xlviii. 626; Ceill. vii. 211.) [G. T. S.]

ORONTIUS (4), bishop of Seville, A.D. 462–472). (Florez, *Esp. Sagr.* ix. 138.) [F. D.]

ORONTIUS (5), bishop Elvira (Illiberitanus), subscribes the council of Tarragona in 516 (Hard. ii. 1044). But another reading makes him of Lerida (Ilerditanus). [C. H.]

ORONTIUS (6), bishop, probably of Lerida, signs seventh the canons of the Councils of Tarragona and Gerona, in A.D. 516, 517. In the former he is described as bishop "Eliberitanae civitatis" (Elvira, Granada), but this is probably a mistake for Ilerditanae (Ilerda, Lerida), as it is improbable that a bishop of Elvira should have attended so distant a council, whereas Lerida is near Tarragona. Further, the name Orontius is wanting in the lists of the bishops of Granada (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.*, ii. 115, 122; *Esp. Sag.* xlvi. 93). [F. D.]

ORONTIUS (7), bishop of Merida, was represented by a priest at the 6th Council of Toledo, in January A.D. 638. He also presided over the 7th and 8th Councils of Toledo, in A.D. 646 and 653. By his influence with king REKESVINTH he obtained the restoration of the province of Lusitania, of which Merida was the metropolis, to its ancient limits, which had been curtailed by the severance of the sees which fell within the Suevic dominions. These were Lamego, Viseo, Egitania, and Coimbra. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 349, 358, 385, 709; *Esp. Sag.* iv. 176, xiii. 214; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 140.) [F. D.]

OROSIUS, PAULUS, was a native of Tarragona, in Spain, as he himself says (*Hist.* vii. 22), though an expression in a letter of Avitus may be thought to connect him with Braga. (*Ep. Aviti*, Aug. *Opp.* vol. vii. p. 806; Baronius, vol. v. p. 435, A.D. 415.) When the Alani and Vandals were introduced into Spain, A.D. 409, Orosius, though his language is somewhat rhetorical, appears narrowly to have escaped their violence (*Hist.* iii. 20; v. 2; vii. 40). But a danger, more serious in his opinion than that of the barbarian invasion, soon threatened to disturb the church in Spain, viz., the heresies of the Priscillianists, and of the book by Origen περὶ ἀρχῶν, lately translated by St. Jerome, and which had been brought from Jerusalem by Avitus, presbyter of Braga in Portugal, at the same time as another book by Victorinus was brought by another Avitus from Rome. Both of these books condemned the doctrines of Priscillian, but both contained errors of their own. The book by Victorinus attracted but little notice, but the one by Origen, on which some remarks had been made by St. Basil, but whether the great father of that name is not certain, was much more widely read, both in Spain and elsewhere. Two Spanish bishops, Paulus and Eutropius, had already presented to the African church a memorial on heretical doctrines; but not including all that were now current in Spain, and to this St. Augustine had replied in his treatise *De Perfectione justitiæ Hominis* (*Opp.* vol. x. 294), and Orosius, in his zeal against error, proceeded, not as commissioned to do so by the church of Spain, but on his own account, to Africa, to consult St. Augustine as to the best manner of refuting these heretical doctrines, A.D. 415. Augustine speaks of him as young in years, but a presbyter in rank, zealous, alert in intellect, ready of speech, and fitted to be useful in the work of the Lord. He gave a partial reply to this appeal in his treatise *contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*, saying but little on the subject which forms its title. He referred Orosius to his books against Manicheism, and for further satisfaction, recommended him to go on to Palestine, the seat itself of the errors in question, and there consult St. Jerome, to whom he made him the bearer of two letters, one on the origin of the soul (*Ep.* 166.) [OPTATUS], the other on the meaning of the passage James ii. 10. (*Ep.* 167; see also *Ep.* 169, 13; *Retract.* xi. 44; *Consultatio* or *Commonitorium Oros.* and the reply of Augustine to the same *c. Priscill. et Orig.* opp. vol. viii. pp. 666–678, and Oros. opp. p. 1211, ed. Migne.) The letters were conveyed

duly by their bearer, and their receipt acknowledged in due time by St. Jerome; who, however, excused himself from replying to them at length on the ground of the pressure of troublesome business, by which, no doubt, he meant the debates in Palestine on the Pelagian controversy. including the attack made upon him by John of Jerusalem. (Hieron. *Ep.* 134; Aug. *Ep.* 172.) On arriving in Palestine, Orosius was kindly received by St. Jerome, and took up his residence at Bethlehem, desiring to sit at his feet and listen to his instruction. But being summoned by the clergy, he attended a synod at Jerusalem on July 28, in which he took his seat under the direction of John the bishop, and informed the assembly of what had taken place in Africa respecting Coelestius and Pelagius, viz., that Coelestius had been condemned by a council held A.D. 412 (Aug. *Ep.* 175, 176), and had abruptly departed from the country, that Augustine had written a book against Pelagius, and further sent a letter to the clergy in Sicily, treating of this and other heretical questions, which letter Orosius read to the meeting at the request of the members. He also quoted the judgment of St. Jerome on the Pelagian question, expressed in his letter to Ctesiphon and his Dialogue against the Pelagians. (Hieron. vol. i. *Ep.* 133; vol. ii. p. 495.) The proceedings of the meeting and the decision given by bishop John, will be found above (vol. iii. p. 280), but it may be added to this account that Orosius, apparently on the information of Posserius, Avitus, and Dominus ex duce, perhaps Domninus, believed the interpreter to be both ignorant and dishonest. (Orosius, *Apol.* 3–6; Cod. Theod. vi. 30, 19; Tillemont, vol. xiii. 254.) Forty-seven days after this, viz., on Sept. 13, the feast of the dedication of the church of the Holy Sepulchre (Holy-Cross day), when Orosius presented himself for the purpose of assisting bishop John at the altar, he was at once attacked by him as a blasphemer, a charge which Orosius not only denied, but refuted on the ground that as he spoke only in Latin, John, who only spoke Greek, could not have understood what he said. That there should be false witnesses in Jerusalem is not unlikely, but Orosius did not venture to accuse the bishop of seeking such. The rest of the book is taken up with arguments against Pelagianism, including two long passages identical with some in the book of Aug. *De Natura et Gratia*, c. 12–19, and 3–12, vol. x. p. 249. At the council of 14 bishops held at Diospolis (Lydda) in December of the same year, Orosius was not present (Aug. *De Gest. Pelag.* c. 16); but he returned to Africa early in 416, bearing with him probably the answer of St. Jerome to the letter of St. Augustine, perhaps also his book against the Pelagians, and also the supposed relics of St. Stephen, which had been discovered in the course of the previous December, and which at the request of Avitus he was to convey to the church of Braga, in Portugal. [LUCIANUS (15) vol. iii. p. 349.] Tillemont, vol. xiii. 262. He was also the bearer of a letter from Heros and Lazarus, which he laid before a synod assembled at Carthage about the month of June. (Aug. *Epp.* 175–180; Tillemont, l. c. 263.) He had also received from St. Jerome a letter to St. Augustine concerning the resurrection of the body; which, however, he had handed to Orosius for transcription, and did not deliver to Augustine at the same time as the other letters. (Aug. *Ep.* 180.) About this time, on the request of Augustine, conveyed to him by a deacon named Julian, he undertook his history, chiefly in order to confirm by historical facts the doctrine maintained by St. Augustine in his great work *De Civitate Dei*, on the 11th book of which he was at that time employed. We learn these facts from what Orosius himself says in his 1st chapter, and from a passage in the 5th book, that he wrote his history chiefly if not entirely in Africa. It could not have been begun earlier than 416, and must have been finished in 417, for it concludes with an account of the treaty made in 416 between Wallia, the Gothic king, and the Emperor Honorius. (Oros. *Hist.* v. 2; vii. 43; Clinton, *F. R.*) Having finished his task, Orosius proceeded to fulfil his undertaking of conveying to Spain the relics of St. Stephen. On his way he touched at Port Mahon in Minorca, and being deterred by the accounts of the disturbed state of Spain through the occupation of that country by the Vandals, left his precious treasure there and returned to Africa, after which time nothing more is known of his history. (Ep. Severi, Aug. *Opp.* vol. vii. *App.* Baronius, 418. 4.) Written within the space of little more than a year, and for a special historical purpose, this work of Orosius deserves to be called a historical treatise rather than a formal history, which indeed, it does not pretend to be, though as it includes a portion of the subject belonging to Scripture and to Jewish affairs, its area covers wider space than any other ancient epitome. Besides the Old and New Testaments, he quotes Josephus, the church historians, and writers, as Tertullian, Hegesippus, and Eusebius; and of other writers, Tacitus, Suetonius, Sallust, Caesar, Cicero, and he was no doubt largely indebted to Livy. But he was perhaps not well acquainted with Greek, and for Greek and Oriental history made use of the works of Justin, or rather Trogus Pompeius, and Quintus Curtius, and for Roman affairs, the works of Latin compilers, as Eutropius, Florus, and Valerius Paterculus, together with others of inferior value, as Valerius Antias, Valerius Maximus, and Aurelius Victor. The work in later times became known by the name of Ormesta (mundi) a title which under its various forms of Ormista, Ormesia, Hormesta, Hormista, caused much difficulty and many conjectures to later writers. The most likely explanation is that it represents in a contracted form Or. m. ista, i.e. *Orosii mundi istoria*, or perhaps *Orosii miseriarum* (mundi) *istoria*, but Pighius thought that the true word was Orchestra, i.e. a stage on which the affairs of the world are set forth, and to this conjecture Andrew Schott, one of the early editors, lent his authority, but the former view seems more probable. Written under the express sanction of St. Augustine, in a pleasing style and at convenient length, and recommended by church authorities as an orthodox Christian work, the history of Orosius became during the middle ages, the standard text-book on the subject, and is quoted largely by Bede, and other mediaeval writers. But while on the one hand he is for the last few years of his history a contemporary and so an original authority, and also undoubtedly supplies some points on which existing writers are defi-

cient (e.g. v. 18, p. 339, the death of Cato; vi. 3, 376, the acquittal of Catiline), it is disfigured by many mistakes, both as to facts and numbers, and by a faulty system of chronology, blemishes which in uncritical ages were not detected, but which more recent examination has brought to light. The general popularity which it enjoyed as the one Christian history, led no doubt to the translation of it made into Anglo-Saxon, by Alfred the Great, of which a portion was published by Elstob in 1690, and the whole, with an English version, in 1773, under the superintendence of Daines Barrington and J. R. Foster. This was reprinted in 1853 in Bohn's Antiquarian Library, under the direction of Mr. B. Thorpe. It was also translated during the 16th century into German and Italian. The 2nd chapter of the first book contains a sketch of universal geography, which is nearly identical with a work called the Cosmography of Aethicus, a writer of whom nothing certain is known. The system on which it is founded has borrowed no light from the work of Ptolemy, or other scientific geographers, but being protected by its supposed orthodoxy, became one of the principal authorities for mediaeval map-makers. (Bevan and Phillott, *Mediaeval Geography*. Introd.) The earliest printed edition of the history appeared at Augsburg, printed by Schüssler, 1471, from a good MS. Another, without a date, by Hermann of Cologne, at Vicenza, probably 1475, and others were printed in the 15th and the 16th centuries at Venice, Cologne, Paris and elsewhere. An edition by Fabricius, with notes, appeared in 1561, which was reprinted in 1575 and 1582. This was again reprinted, with additional notes, by Andrew Schott, at Mayence, in 1615, and embodied in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Lyons, 1677, vol. vi. But the best edition of the complete works of Orosius which has yet appeared is that of Havercamp, in 4to. Leyden, 1738, containing very many valuable notes, and engravings of coins illustrating the text. It was reprinted by Galland in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Venice, 1773, vol. 9; and by Migne, *Patrol.* vol. 31, Paris, 1846, with the engravings of coins. The history alone from Havercamp's edition, but without the engravings, edited by Dr. Brohm, was published in 2 vols. 8vo. at Thorn, 1877. Other works beside the history have been attributed to Orosius, but the only two which can claim good authority are the *Liber Apologeticus de Arbitrii Libertate*, and the *Commonitorium ad Augustinum*, already mentioned. The former is included in Havercamp's edition, and the latter in the works of St. Augustine, as mentioned above. [H. W. P.]

ORSISIUS (Orsiesius, Ἀρσίσιος), abbat of Tabenna, A.D. 350, in succession to Petronius. He soon transferred the burden to Theodorus, the favourite disciple of Pachomius (Soz. iii. 14; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14; Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 292, 324, 325, ed. 1866, *De SS. Pachom. et Theod.* ii. 18, and *Acta* §§ 74, 76; Tillem. vii. 479, 481). Two epistles addressed by Athanasius to Orsisius are printed among the *Works* of Athanasius (*Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 978). [G. T. S.]

ORTIGIUS, bishop, was expelled from his see by the Priscillianists in consequence of his defence of the Catholic faith (Idatius, *Chron.*). He was present at the first Council of Toledo (A.D. 400), which commanded that the churches from which he had been expelled should be restored to him (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 197). There is a difficulty about the name of his see; Idatius gives it as Celenae near Iria, but in the *Acta* of the Council of Toledo, Exuperantius is named as bishop of that place. Gams (*Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 393) conjectures that Idatius confused Aquae Celenae with Aquae Originum (Orense), and that Ortigius was really bishop of the last place. (*Esp. Sag.* xix. 9.) [F. D.]

OSA (Bosa, *M. H. B.* 618, note), the sixth bishop of Selsey; preceded by Aluberht, and succeeded by Giselhere (*M. H. B.* 618). Nothing is known of the date of Aluberht, and of Giselhere, only that he subscribed charters of 780 and 781. The name of Osa occurs in an undated grant of Nunna, king of Sussex, confirmed by Osmund the king and Osa the bishop, but very difficult to date (Kemble, *C. D.* 1001); in a dated grant of Osmund, Aug. 3, 765, attested by Osa, and probably genuine (*ib.* 1008); another grant of Osmund, attested by 'Osa archiepiscopus,' and evidently garbled (*ib.* 1009), but bearing the date of 770. All these are from the Chichester register and late transcripts. There is, however, in the Lambeth MS. 1212 (*the Canterbury Cartulary*), a grant made to Oswald, bishop of Selsey, of land in Sussex, dated in 772, and attested by Egbert king of Kent, Cynewulf king of Wessex, archbishop Jaenberht, Eadbert, Oswald, Diora and Wigheah bishops. This seems to be genuine, and to supply both a fixed date and a definite orthography for the name of the bishop. Osa, if this be genuine, was an abbreviation of Oswald, as Totta is of Torthelm, and Sigga of Sigfrith. [S.]

OSBALD, a "patrician" of Northumbria, addressed c. 793 along with king Ethelred and the dux Osberct by Alcuin (ep. 11 in *Pat. Lat.* c. 157), and no doubt the Osbald mentioned by Hoveden (t. i. p. 15, ed. Stubbs), anno 796, as succeeding Ethelred in the throne of Northumbria for 27 days, afterwards retiring to Lindisfarne, and finally taking refuge with the king of the Picts. The *Chronicle of Melrose* relates that "king Osbald," once a dux and patrician, became an abbat after his expulsion, died an abbat in 799, and was buried in the church of York. [C. H.]

OSBERCT, a dux, addressed c. 793, with Ethelred, king of Northumbria, and the patrician Osbald, by Alcuin (ep. 11 in *Pat. Lat.* c. 157); thought to be the Osbert, patrician of the Mercians, addressed in two other letters of Alcuin which are now unknown, but of which the fragments survive in William of Malmesbury (*G. R.* lib. i. §§ 70, 94, t. i. 103, 130, ed. Hardy), and are also printed at the end of Alcuin's letters. (*Pat. Lat.* c. 512.) [C. H.]

OSBRAN, anchorite and bishop of Clooncraff, co. Roscommon, died A.D. 752. (*Ann. Tig.*) [J. G.]

OSFRIDA, queen. [Osthryd.]

OSFRITH, son of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and Coenburga his wife, daughter of Cearl,

king of Mercia. He was born during the exile of his sire, and was baptized with his father at York on Easter day, 627 (Beda, ii. 14). He was a valorous soldier, and was slain with Edwin at Haethfelth in 633 (Id. ii. 20; *S. C.* 22, 45). [J. R.]

OSGEARN (OSGEOFU, OSGIFU, OSGIVA), a daughter of Oswulf, king of Northumbria in A.D. 758–9. In 768 she married Alchred, king of Northumbria (Symeon, *H. R.* sub anno). There is a letter from Alchred and Osgiva his queen to Lullus, preserved among the letters of Boniface (ed. Giles, 211–12). It is chiefly to ask his prayers for themselves and their friends, whose names they send, and to offer to him as a gift "duodecim sagos cum annulo aureo majori." Dr. Giles erroneously ascribes this letter to the year 758. There is nothing farther known of Osgearn. [J. R.]

OSHERE, king, viceroy, or ealdorman of the Hwiccii. He first appears in history as granting land at Ripple to Frithowald in 680, and in the charter terms himself king, although acting under the authority of Ethelred, king of Mercia (Kemble, *C. D.* 17). This charter is regarded as spurious, but in another (*ib.* No. 36), which has possibly a greater claim to authenticity, he again as king bestows lands at Penitanham for a monastery for Cutswitha. He also induced Ethelred to assent to a grant to Abbess Dunna at Withington, which many years after was confirmed by archbishop Nothelm (K. *C. D.* No. 82, 83). Little can be even conjectured of his history; he may have been a son of Oswald the brother of Osric [OSRIC, OSWALD], and have succeeded father or uncle in the viceroyalty, in or about 693. Between 704 and 709, we find the Hwiccii under the rule of Ethelhard and Ethelward (K. *C. D.* No. 55), who attest charters in conjunction with Ethelmund, Ethelric, and Ethelbert. Of these Ethelward (K. *C. D.* No. 56) and Ethelric (K. *C. D.* No. 57, 83) are called sons of Oshere, but they do not assume the royal title. A person of this name is mentioned by the lady Egburg in a letter to St. Boniface between the years 716 and 722, as her brother and as some time dead (*Mon. Mog.* pp. 63 and 64). If this Oshere could be identified with the king of the Hwiccii, Egburg might be the second abbess of Gloucester, who is called, however, the sister of Kyneburga and so of Osric. [EGBURGA, EADBURGA (4)] *Mon. Angl.* i. 542. [S.]

OSITHA, saint. [OSYTH.]

OSIUS, of Cordova. [HOSIUS.]

OSLAC, one of the younger sons of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria (A.D. 593–617), and Acha, sister of Edwin. During the reign of Edwin, Oslac and his brothers were exiles in Scotland and embraced Christianity at Iona. They returned to Northumbria on Edwin's death. (Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc. 209, 218; Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbæ*, i. 114; *S. C.* 20, 43.) [J. R.]

OSLAF (OSLAP), called in another place OSA, was a younger son of Ethelfrith and Acha, king and queen of Northumbria. When Edwin became king in A.D. 617, Oslaf and his brothers took refuge in Scotland and remained there during Edwin's life. It is believed that all of them embraced Christianity at Iona. (Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc. 209, 218; Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbæ*, i. 113; *S. C.* 20, 43.) [J. R.]

OSLAVA, the wife of Eormenred, son of Eadbald, king of Kent, and mother of the martyrs Ethelbert and Ethelred, and of the saints Eormenberga, Eormenburga, Eormengitha and Etheldritha. She is called by Florence of Worcester, in the appendix to the Chronicle "regina" (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 635) and "reginula" (*ib.* p. 627, note), which, as her husband is by that author termed "regulus," may show that he exercised a delegated authority over part of Kent during the reign of his father or brother. Nothing is known of Oslava's extraction or history besides, but, if her title of "regina" represents any dignity not derived from her husband, it is possible that she was the head of one of the minor Kentish principalities which, although united for two or three generations under Ethelbert and his successors, are traceable in the later disorganisation of the kingdom of Kent. (See KENT, KINGS OF.) [S.]

OSMUND (1), the fourteenth bishop of London (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 617; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* § 73). Nothing but his name and place in the list of bishops is known of him. His predecessor Heathobert is mentioned by Simeon of Durham (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 672) as dying in the year 801. Osmund was then probably consecrated in 801 or 802 by Ethelheard, who had retained jurisdiction over the diocese of London, and who returned from Rome with restored authority early in 802. Osmund attended the council held at Clovesho in October, 803, in which the restoration of the provincial jurisdiction to Canterbury was recognised, and some other measures taken; his name appears in the list of clergy approving the act which forbade the election of laymen as lords of monasteries (K. *C. D.* 1024), and is attached to that by which the dignity of Canterbury was restored (K. *C. D.* 185); as also to a Worcester charter of the same date (K. *C. D.* 183; *Councils*, &c., Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 542, 544–547). On this occasion Osmund, who subscribes as "Ego Osmund Lundonensis civitatis episcopus," was attended by one priest abbat, Heahstan; three priests, Wighard, Tidhun, and Freothered; and Ethelhelm, who is not further described. Osmund was present at a synod at Acleah in 805, in which it is possible that archbishop Wulfred was elected or consecrated (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 558). After that year we lose sight of him; his successor Ethelnoth appearing in 811. (See Kemble, as above.) [S.]

OSMUND (2), the fourth of the seven fictitious priors of Westminster, who are said, by Sporley, who wrote the history of the abbey in the 15th century, to have governed between the death of Ordbriht, the first abbat in 616, and the appointment of the second abbat Ordbriht, in 785. Osmund is said to have been prior for twenty-one years, and to have died in 705. Sporley may have used an earlier account, but the whole is fabulous, and belongs to a class of fiction which affords no instruction even in the exploration (*Monasticon Anglicanum*, i. 266). [S.]

OSMUND (3), king of the South Saxons. This prince, of whom very little is known, is mentioned by Florence of Worcester as king of the South Saxons in 758 (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 544). No other ancient historian mentions him at all; and as the South Saxon kingdom had been, since the reign of Ethelwalch, subject to or absorbed in Wessex, it is a little difficult to account for the mention of him by Florence. But although the historians are silent about him, his name occurs in the Selsey charters which in transcript are preserved among the registers of the see of Chichester; which also have preserved the names of other South Saxon princes from the reign of Ine onwards. If these charters are in any respect trustworthy, a South Saxon king named Nothelm was contemporaneous with Coenred the father of Ine (K. *C. D.* 995); he grants lands to his sister Notgitha in the year 692, and the grant is confirmed or attested by Nunna, king of the South Saxons, Wattus, a king, Coenred and Ine. Nunna, the next in order, is a historical personage, mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as a kinsman of Ine and his companion in war against the Welsh in the year 710 (*M. H. B.* p. 326; Flor. Wig. *ib.* p. 540); and by Ethelwerd (*ib.* p. 507) he is called a king. As Nunna is thus prominently mentioned in connexion with Ine, it is a little curious that his name was not inserted in any of the fictitious charters attributed to that monarch. On the other hand, however, the charters which claim to be issued by Nunna himself are corrupt or fictitious, and serve to prove little more than that Ine's kinsman was by tradition said to be king of Sussex [see NUNNA]. They date from 714. Of Wattus, the succeeding or contemporary king, nothing is known. To Osmund several charters are assigned, dated about or referable to the date given by Florence. In one (K. *C. D.* 1001) he confirms a charter of Nunna, in company with bishop Osa, who lived in 765. In another charter dated Aug. 3, 765 (K. *C. D.* 1008) he gives to his *comes* or *gesith* Walhere, lands at Ferring, Coponora and Titlesham for the construction of a monastery; this is attested by Osa. In a third charter a similar grant is made to another comes, Warbald, and his wife Tidburga, of land at Hanefeld; this is dated in 770, attested by Osa (archiepiscopus) and other bishops whose names may have been badly copied by the transcriber, and present some difficulties as they stand at present (K. *C. D.* 1009). In a grant of Offa to Oswald, bishop of Selsey (MS. Lambeth, 1212), dated 772, there appear three names among the subscribers, important in this connexion, *Osmund dux*, *Oswaldus dux Suth-Saxonum* and *Oslac dux*; the lands given are at Bixley, and the reversion is to Selsey. Osmund the ealdorman of this charter may be the Osmund rex of the Selsey grants. In 774 Ethelbert "rex Sussaxonum" makes a grant to Diosza (K. *C. D.* 1010), which looks suspicious in its present form; in 780 Oslac, dux Suthsaxonum, appears in authority (*ib.* 1012), and in 791 Aldwulf uses the same form. None of these names appear in the Mercian charters of Offa, or in those of the Kentish kings, except that of Ethelbert, who may have been a claimant of royalty in Kent as well as Sussex. (See Kemble, *C. D.* 144.) [S.]

OSRED (1), son of Aldfrith, king of Northumbria, and Cuthburh, sister of Ine, king of Wessex, was eight years old at the death of his father in A.D. 705. Eadwulf, an usurper, assumed the sovereignty for two months, when Osred was placed on his father's throne by Berhtfrith, the ealdorman, who loyally maintained him there. He won also a great battle against the Picts and Scots. There is little known about Osred from Beda, who observes his customary reticence when there was anything painful to record about those of whom he wishes to speak well (Beda, v. 18, 19, 22). Boniface, however, in a letter to Ethelbald (ed. Giles, pp. 132–9) lifts the veil, and tells us that Osred, and Ceolred, king of Mercia, came to an evil end as a just punishment for their excesses, among which he enumerates the forcible entry of religious houses and the abduction of nuns. Osred was slain in A.D. 717 in an ambuscade which was laid for him by his kinsmen near the sea, on the southern border of his kingdom (*S. C.* 38, 69–71; Wendover, i. 211). Ethelwulf, in his curious poem on the abbats of a cell of Lindisfarne, speaks of Osred's boyish promise and his subsequent evil deeds. He put many persons to death, and compelled others to seek refuge from him in monastic life (Symeon, ed. M. R., i. 268). [J. R.]

OSRED (2), son of Alchred, king of Northumbria, and Osgearn, or Osgeofu, succeeded Alfwold on the Northumbrian throne in A.D. 788. His career was a strangely unfortunate one. He had been king for a year when Ethelred, son of Ethelred Moll, returning to Northumbria, was advanced to his father's throne, and Osred, abandoned by all, was declared to have forfeited his rights (Symeon, *H. R.*) More than that, he was treated with ignominy. His head was tonsured like a monk, and he was put into a monastery—to be out of the way. He managed, however, to make his escape to the Isle of Man (Symeon, *H. E. D.* ii. 4). In A.D. 792 he was tempted from his exile by the promises of some of the Northumbrian thanes and secretly returned; but his friends and soldiers failed him at the crisis. He was captured by Ethelred, and was put to death by that monarch's orders at a place called Aynburg, on Sept. 14th, and his body was carried to the monastery at the mouth of the Tyne, the modern Tynemouth, and was there interred. (*S. C.* 48, 99.) [J. R.]

OSRIC (1), son of Ælfric, and cousin of Edwin king of Northumbria, succeeded that monarch in A.D. 633, but his rule only extended over Deira. Osric had been converted to Christianity and baptized by Paulinus; but, on his accession to the throne, he relapsed into heathenism. His reign was very brief, as, in the summer of A.D. 634, he was slain by the British chief, Ceadwalla. Osric was besieging York when Ceadwalla made an unexpected sally and destroyed the beleaguering force and its leader. The few months of Osric's reign were afterwards added to the regnal years of Oswald to obliterate the memory of his apostasy. Oswin, afterwards king of Deira, was Osric's son. (Beda, iii. 1, 14; *Vita S. Oswini*, cap. 1; *S. C.* 22, 45.) [J. R.]

OSRIC (2), king of the Hwiccii, and traditional founder of the monasteries of Gloucester

and Bath. He is mentioned by Bede (iv. 23) as ruling the province of the Hwiccii at the time of the appointment of bishop Oftfor to the see of Worcester, about the year 691. The historian gives him the title of king, and, as the Hwiccii were at the time under the rule of Mercia, he must have been a viceroy under Ethelred. Osric's career as an ecclesiastical founder began some years earlier; the charter by which he bestowed on the abbess Berhtana, a hundred *manentes* adjacent to the city of Bath, is dated Nov. 6, 676, and, being attested by Ethelred as well as by Theodore and the other bishops, must have been issued or confirmed by a witenagemot or an ecclesiastical assembly. The foundation of Gloucester is fixed in the year 681 (*Mon. Angl.* i. 541, 542), and, in the account of it given in the annals of Winchelcomb, Osric is described as a "minister" of king Ethelred, having a brother Oswald and a sister Kyneburga, who was the first abbess of Gloucester. The same very questionable authority identifies Osric with the prince who in 718 succeeded to the Northumbrian throne (Bede, *H. E.* v. 23, 24). This Osric is said to have been the son of Alchfrith, the friend of Wilfrid and rebellious son of Oswy, who disappears from history in the early years of Wilfrid's troubles (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 14). If it is right to identify the two Osrics, the king of the Hwiccii was the son of Alchfrith, grandson of Oswy, and by marriage nephew of Ethelred; an inference confirmed by the Pershore tradition that Osric and Oswald, his brother, were nephews of Ethelred (*Mon. Angl.* ii. 415). It is not impossible that this was the case; anyhow, the king of Northumbria was regarded as the founder of St. Peter's Abbey at Gloucester, and is stated in the chronicle of the abbey to have been buried there before the altar of St. Petronilla, having died on the 7th of the Ides of May, 729, the date given by Bede (*H. E.* v. 23). According to the chronicle (ad ann. 731) the Northumbrian Osric was slain, and Ceolwulf, the friend of Bede, succeeded in 731; but Bede tells us that Osric had determined that Ceolwulf should succeed him. (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23; W. Malmesb. i. § 53.)

If this identification is accepted, we may infer that Alchfrith, after his rebellion against Oswy, took refuge at his sister's court, and that his family were provided for in the remoter parts of Mercia until the tide changed, and the troubled times of Northumbria allowed Osric to compete for the crown. Even thus, however, it is difficult to account for Osric's disappearance from history from 691 to 718. Kyneburga, the first abbess of Gloucester, is said to have been his sister, and as her successor Eadburga was her sister, she must have stood in the same relation to Osric. But the whole of this material is very questionable, and little more can be inferred from it than that there was a traditional connexion between Gloucester and the Northumbrian kings, which was kept in memory by the later connexion with the archbishops of York, who claimed rights in Gloucester as late as the reign of Henry II. [S.]

OSSENI (Ossaei), a sect which Epiphanius (*Haer.* xix., xxx. 3, liii. 1) describes as distinct from the Essenes. He got his information however about these sects from two distinct sources, and does not see that the same persons are intended (Bishop Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 349). [Essenes; Elkesai.] [G. T. S.]

OSSENIUS, abbat. [Oissene.]

OSTALDUS, bishop of Tours from 765 or 6 to 777, according to the *Chronicle of the Archbishops of Tours*. (*Gall. Chr.* xiv. 33.) [C. H.]

OSTHRYD (Ostrithe, Osthfrida, Ostdrida, Ostrich, Ostgida), daughter of Oswy, king of Northumbria, and wife of Ethelred, king of Mercia, 675–704, to whom she was married as early as the year 679, and by whom she was mother of Ceolred, who succeeded to the kingdom in 709. It was by her influence that her husband was induced to refuse an asylum to Wilfrid, whom her brother Egfrith had expelled from Northumbria in or about the year 681. (Edd. *v. Wilfr.* cap. 41.) She is said by Bede (*H. E.* iii. 11) to have been an especial patroness of the monastery of Bardney, in which she buried the remains of her uncle St. Oswald, and where she occasionally resided. The historian tells of her giving to the abbess Ethelhild a portion of the dust of the pavement on which had been spilt some of the water used for washing St. Oswald's bones, which dust worked miraculous cures. Little more is known of Osthryd except her tragical death in 697, at the hands of the Southumbrians. It is possible that Osthryd may have exercised some powers of government in Lindsey, which had been a debateable ground between Mercia and Northumbria in her early years: and that her death may have occurred in a faction war. Ethelred's sway in Southern Mercia was exercised by an ealdorman, his nephew, Berchtwald (Edd. c. 39), who favoured Wilfrid; and there would be little difficulty in accounting for internal complications in the less consolidated district of the South Humbrians. But on this it is useless to theorise. Five years after the death of his wife Ethelred made over this province to Coenred, who succeeded to the whole kingdom two years later. (*Chr. S.* ad ann. 702, 704.)

Osthryd's name appears among the attestations of the fabricated Peterborough charter in the Chronicle; (*M. H. B.* 320; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 160.) She is named likewise in a spurious or interpolated charter of her husband bestowing land at Fladbury on Oftfor, bishop of Worcester, in expiation of the sins of his late wife and his own. (Kemble, *C. D.* no. 33.) Later writers have added nothing material to what is known of her from Bede (*H. E.* iii. 11; iv. 21; v. 24) and Eddius. Alcuin, in his poem on the saints of York, has however versified and amplified Bede's account of the translation of St. Oswald and the devotion of Osthryd, whom he calls Osthfrida. (*Mon. Alc.* ed. Dümmler, pp. 92, 93.) [S.]

OSTRUS (Ostrys), a Gothic count who commanded the barbarian guard with which Aspen, the powerful minister of the emperor Leo I. surrounded himself. He attempted to avenge the death of his master, but was obliged to fly into Thrace. The wits of Constantinople, unused to such fidelity to the unfortunate, remarked, according to the *Pasch. Chron.* p. 323

in Migne, *P. G.* t. xcii. col. 826, "No one is a friend of the dead save Ostrus alone." [LEO I.] [G. T. S.]

OSULFUS, a wayward disciple of Alcuin, mentioned in the Lives of Alcuin (ed. Duchesne, cap. viii. sec. 15, ed. Froben. cap. x. sec. 114), and supposed to be the person addressed by Alcuin in his Epp. 206, 207, Froben. 157, 158. (*Pat. Lat.* c. 64, 99, 481, 482.) [C. H.]

OSWALD (1) (OSUUALD, OSGUALD)—a name dear to the Northumbrian church and people—was a son of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria by Acha or Acca, daughter of Ella, and sister of Edwin, both of them Northumbrian kings (Beda, iii. 6). Oswald was born circa A.D. 605. When his father Ethelfrith was slain in battle in A.D. 616, Oswald and his brothers sought refuge in Scotland where they continued during Edwin's reign. Ethelfrith and his children were heathens, but, during their exile, Oswald and twelve companions were converted to Christianity and were baptized by the monks of Iona (Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113). Edwin fell in battle in A.D. 633, and his death was followed by the return of his kinsmen, two of whom, Osric and Eanfrith, had a brief tenure of royal authority. They were both of them slain by the British chieftain, Cadwallon, or Caedwalla, and then Oswald came to the forefront as the representative of his family and race. His first step was to collect an army and take the field against Caedwalla, encouraged, as Adamnan tells us, by an appearance and a promise of victory from Columba himself.

The contending armies met in A.D. 634, at a place called, by Beda, Hefenfelth, which has been identified with St. Oswalds, some seven or eight miles to the north of Hexham in Northumberland (*Memorials of Hexham*, Surtees Soc.; Nennius (54) calls the place Catscaul). In the early morning Oswald upreared with his own hands a wooden cross, hastily prepared, around which the king and his troops knelt in prayer. In the battle that followed soon after daybreak on the heath-clad hills which look down upon the valley of the Tyne, the Christians obtained a decisive victory. The host of Caedwalla was utterly routed, and its leader was pursued and slain at a brook called Denisesburna, a name which survived in the 13th century, and probably later. At a subsequent period, after Oswald himself had fallen in battle, the monks of Hexham made a yearly pilgrimage to Hefenfelth on Oswald's death-day, and prayed for his soul on the scene of his greatest triumph (Beda, iii. 2). A little chapel was reared by them on the spot, the representative of which still survives and perpetuates the victor's name. The cross itself was supposed to possess a peculiar sanctity. Before it was set up there was neither church, nor altar, nor cross in the whole of Bernicia.

The defeat of Caedwalla involved the recovery of Northumbria, the two parts of which were united in Oswald, and he added to them the northern parts of the island, Lindsey, and a preponderating influence in East Anglia, Wessex, and elsewhere, among the four races, which gave him the over-lordship of Britain such as was exercised by Oswy his brother, and Edwin their predecessor (Beda, iii. 6). Oswald was a valiant soldier when it was necessary to draw the sword, but in genius and disposition he was essentially a lover of peace, and the work of his life and heart was the diffusion of civilisation and religion. At York he resumed and completed the building of the minster which had been interrupted by Edwin's death (Beda, ii. 14, 20), but we hear of Oswald chiefly in connexion with the northern part of Bernicia. It was there that he resided, chiefly at Bebbanburg, the modern Bamborough. One of his first acts was to beg his old friends, the monks of Iona, to send a Christian missionary to labour among his people. A bishop was despatched to Northumbria of the name of Corman, who neither understood his flock, nor possessed the yielding persuasiveness that won men's hearts. He returned to Iona in disgust, and was replaced by Aidan, a man of a different calibre and a sweeter temperament, who became as popular as Corman had been distasteful (Beda, iii. 3). Aidan arrived in A.D. 635, and, to assimilate as far as possible his new home to his old, Oswald gave him the little island of Lindisfarne. In energy and devotion the king and the bishop were as brothers. When Aidan preached, somewhat in his northern accent and dialect, Oswald frequently acted as interpreter. The bishop was sometimes a guest at the royal table, not indeed as frequently as the king wished. One Easter day they were together when the tidings came that the banquetting hall was beleaguered by a crowd of beggars, dear to host and guest, waiting for what they could get. A silver dish filled with dainty cates had just been placed upon the table, when Oswald ordered its contents to be carried out to the expecting multitude, and the very dish itself to be broken into fragments and distributed in the same way. Catching hold of the king's hand, the good bishop exclaimed, "May this hand never decay" (Beda, iii. 6). I shall mention afterwards how this prediction is said to have been fulfilled.

Through the zeal and example of Oswald and Aidan, Christianity made rapid progress in Northumbria (Beda, iii. 3). But Oswald was also instrumental in spreading it in Wessex. Oswald sought as his wife a daughter of Kynegils, king of that district, and it was arranged that Kynegils should accept Christianity before the marriage took place. Oswald stood at the font as a sponsor for his future father-in-law, at Dorchester, in A.D. 635. One result of the marriage and the baptism was the establishment by the two kings of a bishop at Dorchester and the gradual evangelization of the district (Beda, iii. 7). Reginald (cap. 11), without stating his authority, gives Oswald's wife the name of Cyneburga, and says that they had an only son. This was Ethelbald, afterwards king of Deira.

Oswald had only a short reign. He was killed in battle on the 5th of August, 642, in the 38th year of his age "per dolum," as Nennius says (55). The fight took place at Maserfelth (Cocboy, in Nennius), an unknown site, but perhaps near Oswestry, i.e. Oswald's tree, in Shropshire. His foe was that bane of Northumbria the fierce Penda, the slayer of Edwin, and the friend of Caedwalla who fell at Hefenfelth in 634. Oswald and Penda were opposed in religion and everything else, and as Oswald had won Lindsey from Mercia, a struggle was sure to come sooner

or later. Nothing is told us of the battle, save that the gallant Oswald when, hemmed in by foes, he fell with his death-wound to the ground, implored the mercy of God on the souls of the soldiers whom he led (Beda, iii. 9, 12). Reginald gives a long account of Oswald's tree and how it acquired that name (capp. 17, 18). He says also that Whitchurch stands on Maserfelth. Penda, savage in his triumph, cut off the head and arms of his vanquished foe, and set them up on stakes or poles as a public spectacle. Within a little while they were taken down, and were carried into Northumbria. Oswald became, in course of time, one of the greatest of the Northern Saints. His noble achievements and blameless life, his intense zeal for Christianity gathered around his memory many loving sympathies. Beda mentions various miracles which were ascribed to him by the popular voice. The wooden cross on Hefenfelth, which was standing in the historian's days, was gifted with a wonder-working power (Beda, iii. 2). Out of Mercia, story after story came into the north, and even Willibrord of Frisia had his testimony to add (Id. iii. ix.–xiii., iv. 14; and Reginald, var. loc.)

The headless trunk of Oswald was removed by his niece, Osthryd, some thirty years after his death, to the monastery of Bardney in Lincolnshire. The monks, who were not exempt from tribal and national jealousies, refused to admit it at first within their walls, and ascribed their subsequent acquiescence to the appearance of a great column of light which they regarded as an interposition from heaven. They received the bones at last and duly enshrined them, hanging up over the coffin Oswald's royal banner of purple and gold which had been brought from Maserfelth (Beda, iii. 11). They erected also a stone cross at the head and feet of the grave (Reginald, cap. 43). Oswald's tomb was richly adorned by Offa, king of Mercia (Alcuin, *de SS. Ebor.* 388–90). In A.D. 909, the remains were carried from Bardney to Gloucester, where Archbishop Thomas II., of York, or Thurstan (*Mon. Angl. v. e.* i. 108) repaired the shrine in which they were placed (Reginald, cap. 44).

The hand (or hands), to which Aidan gave a promise of freedom from decay, possibly won for Oswald the title of Lamngwin, i.e. white or free hand (Nennius, 54). Beda says that they were carried to Bamborough, and were there reverently enshrined in a silver coffer, which was deposited in St. Peter's church, and that in his day the promise of Aidan was fulfilled (*H. E.* iii. 6). Symeon says, in two places (*Chron.* sub anno 774, and *H. E. D.* i. 1), that the right hand was preserved at Bamborough undecayed, and that an aged monk of Durham, of the name of Swartebrand, had frequently seen it; Reginald tells us that it was stolen from Bamborough and carried to Peterborough by a monk of that house (cap. 48).

Oswald's head was taken to Lindisfarne by Aidan, and was buried in the cemetery. Reginald (cap. 13) says that it was afterwards removed to Bamborough, and Aelred of Rievaulx told the same chronicler that it was afterwards taken from Bamborough by the direct order of Cuthbert himself (cap. 49). In A.D. 875, when the incursion of the Danes made the monks of Lindisfarne wanderers, the skull, with other reliques, was placed in Cuthbert's coffin, and went wherever it went. The founder of Lindisfarne became henceforth the companion of Lindisfarne's greatest bishop. At the translation of Cuthbert's remains in A.D. 1104, the head of Oswald was found and left with them (*Hist. Transl.*). In 1828, the last occasion on which Cuthbert's grave was opened, Oswald's skull was still there (Raine's *St. Cuthbert*, 187). The mediaeval sculptors always represented Cuthbert as holding the head in his hand, as if next to his heart, a pathetic memorial of undying love and gratitude.

The monks of Durham cherished among their reliques Oswald's sceptre and horn of ivory, and a portion of the coat of mail which he wore in vain at Maserfield, together with his banner or standard (List. in App. to Smith's *Beda*). Thrice a year they carried in solemn procession a figure of Oswald, of silver gilt, together with their most precious treasures (*Rites of Durham*, 88, 89). On one side of their conventual seal there was also a representation of Oswald's head. They picked up somewhere, after the fashion of the time, a Roman gem, a finely cut head of Jupiter Tonans, and the heathen deity did service for their great Christian patron and founder.

Several lives of Oswald are in existence, all of which are indebted to Beda. Reginald of Durham compiled a life, in three books, most of which is printed with the works of Symeon of Durham, by the M. R. It is remarkably diffuse. Reginald mentions several stories on the authority of (Aelred) abbat of Rievaulx, and a description of Oswald's personal appearance as narrated to him by Robert, of S. Peter's hospital at York, who had found it in an old book.

Among the Gale MSS. in Trin. Coll., Cambridge, there is a MS. Life of Oswald, in thirteen chapters, the first ten of which are copied from Beda. The eleventh chapter gives the curious story of a thief who broke into and plundered the church dedicated to St. Oswald at Farnham, in Yorkshire, and was struck with blindness. The twelfth chapter is the 44th of Reginald, largely added to by the record of a miracle said to have been wrought on a woman who preferred shearing corn to going to Gloucester to see the ceremony of the translation of Oswald's remains. Her sickle stuck fast to her hand.

There is also a MS. life in the library of the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough, which is wrongly ascribed by Sir Thomas Hardy to Archbishop Oswald.

Capgrave prints a brief life of the king derived from Beda. [J. R.]

OSWALD (2), the traditional founder of the monastery of Pershore. He is said to have been brother of Osric, and nephew of Ethelred, king of Mercia [OSRIC]; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 415. The date assigned to the foundation of Pershore is 689. Oswald may have been a viceroy or ealdorman of part of Mercia or of the Hwiccii, and if Osric was identical with the Northumbrian king of that name, Oswald may have been the ancestor of the Hwiccian dynasty to which the subsequent ealdormen belonged. [HWICCII.] [S.]

OSWALD (3), a West Saxon etheling, who had a struggle for the succession to the throne of Ine with Ethelhard, who, although of un-

recorded descent, obtained the crown on Ine's resignation. Oswald is described in the Chronicle (ad ann. 728) as the son of Ethelbald, the son of Cynebald, the son of Cuthwine, son of Ceaulin (*M. H. B.* 633). He was defeated by Ethelhard in 728, and died in 730. (*M. H. B.* 327, 328; Will. Malmesb. *G. R.* lib. i. § 38.) [S.]

OSWARD, brother of the Mercian king Kenred, in a spurious charter of Egwin, bishop of Worcester, A.D. 714. (Kemble, *C. D.* 64.) [C. H.]

OSWIN (1), son of Osric, who, after the death of his kinsman Edwin, had a year's tenure of the princedom of Deira. On his father's death, in A.D. 634, Oswin, then very young, was carried off for safety into Wessex, and there he remained until, on the decease of his uncle Oswald in 642, Oswy, another uncle, became Oswald's successor. But the people of Deira preferred the son of their old chief, Osric, to Oswy, and Oswin therefore became their king.

Oswin was just the person to attract the sympathies of Beda, who in a few touching words had delineated his character and personal appearance. Fair in face and tall in stature, with a pleasant address and a manner as courteous as his purse was open—these, for those rough times, were attractive words. Popular Oswin was besides, nay, so popular that all the best born in the district flocked to his court and service. Unlike his father, he was a devout Christian, and conspicuous among others by the grace of humility. Beda exemplifies this by the story of the gift of a horse to Aidan, which it is unnecessary to repeat (B. iii. 14). The simple-minded bishop recognised in Oswin a disposition congenial to his own, and told a companion of his that he was too good to live.

The words were prophetic. Seven years passed over and then the jealousy of Oswy, chafing at the division of his kingdom, broke out into war. The two kings took the field, but, before they met, Oswin, finding that the enemy far exceeded his own men in number, disbanded his army. This was done at a hill called Wilfaresdun, some 12 miles to the north-west of Catterick near Richmond, the position of which cannot now be traced.

Oswin left Wilfaresdun, accompanied by Tondhere, a most trusty knight, and made his way to the house of a still greater friend, as he thought, Count Hunwald, who lived at Ingetlingum, the modern Gilling, where he hoped to be able to conceal himself. Hunwald betrayed the secret of the two fugitives to Oswy, who sent Ethelwin, one of his attendants, to slay the refugees. This was done on the 20th August, 651 (Beda, iii. 14, 24).

As a small atonement for a great crime, queen Eanfleda induced her husband Oswy to give to Trumhere the site for a monastery at Gilling, in which prayer might be regularly offered for the eternal safety of Oswy and his victim (Beda, iii. 14, 24). Some remains of this religious house may be observed in the present church of Gilling. Authentic history ends at this point, but in the 12th century an anonymous monk of St. Albans wrote a life of Oswin, the object of which was to give a pedigree and renown to the monastery of Tynemouth, and under his facile pen new historical facts start into being. He tells us that after the murder at Gilling in 651, Oswin's body was carried by his murderers to the mouth of the Tyne, and was there interred in the oratory of the Blessed Virgin. There is satisfactory evidence of the existence of a religious house at Tynemouth at an early period, and there Osred king of Northumbria was buried in 792. Osred had no claim to sanctity, and the monk of St. Albans, finding his name in an old chronicle, may have converted Osred into Oswin, who was a different kind of person.

The monk of St. Albans records an appearance of Oswin (whose presence at Tynemouth was unknown) to a monk of the name of Edmund, bidding him tell Bishop Egelwin that he was interred there, and commanding him to translate his remains to a befitting shrine. All this, we are told, was done in the year 1065. In 1075 the church of St. Mary of Tynemouth, with the body of St. Oswin, was given by Waltheof, earl of Northumberland, to the prior and monks of Jarrow, or Durham, but in 1090 another earl of Northumberland, Robert de Mowbray, withdrew the gift of Waltheof, and made Tynemouth over to the abbey of St. Albans, greatly to the annoyance of Durham (Symeon, *H. E. D.* iv. 4). When Tynemouth was surrendered in the reign of Henry VIII., the visitors found there a feretory or shrine containing the body and vestments of Oswin, which, as he tells us, were held in great veneration (Gibson's *Tynemouth*, i.)

The *Life of Oswin*, which has been mentioned, is Julius A. x. in the Cottonian library. The greater portion has been published for the Surtees Society (*Biogr. Misc.*). The life consists of what we find in Beda, followed by an account of Oswin's translation and a number of miracles which are said to have attested his sanctity. The writer of the life was living at Tynemouth in the reign of Stephen, and gives us pictures of life and manners, which are of much value. There is an account of Oswin and his miracles in the Hagiology of John of Tynemouth. In the Cottonian library there was a very interesting relic of Oswin in Galba A, 5, which was cruelly damaged by the fire. It is described as "Psalterium Davidis characteribus Hibernicis vetustissimis: dicitur fuisse liber Oswini regis." [J. R.]

OSWIN (2) (OSWINI, OSWYN), a king of Kent according to some spurious charters in Kemble; one of which (*C. D.* 10) makes him a descendant of the royal line. On Jan. 27, 675, he grants the estate of Sturrie to his kinswoman the abbess Aebba (Kemble, *C. D.* 8; Elmham, *Hist. Mon. S. Aug.* 329, ed. Hardwick). He also grants her lands in Thanet (*C. D.* 10, undated). He subscribes the charter Suaebhard, king of Kent, Mar. 1, 676, without the title of king (*C. D.* 14). In July 689 he bestows lands in Liming on the monastery over which Adrian presides (*C. D.* 30). [SUEFRED.] There appears no good authority for this king. [C. H.]

OSWUDU (OSGUDU), one of the sons of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria, who on the death of their father in A.D. 617, took refuge in Scotland to escape from Edwin. The exiles were converted to Christianity at Iona and came back to Northumbria when Edwin died. (Beda, iii. 3; *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 113; Symeon, ed. Surtees Soc., 209, 218; S. C. 20, 43.) [J. R.]

OSWULF (1), son of Eadberht king of Northumbria, succeeding him on the throne in A.D. 758. His father voluntarily resigned it to him. Within the year he was wickedly slain by his household at a place called Mechil Wongtune (possibly Market Weighton) on the 24th of July. (Symeon, *H. R.* sub anno; *S. C.* 44, 89.) [J. R.]

OSWULF (2), a presbyter who attests charters of archbishops Ethelhard and Wulfred in 805, 811, and 813. (Kemble, *C. D.* 189, 195, 200.) [C. H.]

OSWY (OSUUIU, OSWEO, OSBIU, OSGUID, OSWEGIUS), a son of Ethelfrith, and a younger brother of Oswald, both kings of Northumbria, Oswy himself being an energetic sovereign, and an earnest propagator of Christianity. In the *Life of Oswin* he is called *nothus*, a statement, perhaps, which shews the animus of the writer, as it is unsupported by historical evidence (*Vita Oswini*, p. 3). Oswy was born about A.D. 612, and was educated and baptized in Scotland, probably during the exile of the royal family of Northumbria after the death of Ethelfrith (Beda, iii. 14, 29). On the decease of his brother Oswald in A.D. 642, Oswy succeeded him on the throne of Bernicia, that of Deira falling to Oswin, son of Osric. Ethelbald, son of Oswald, was too young to succeed his father. This division could not be palatable to Oswy; but he had enough to do at first to maintain his hold on Bernicia, which was invaded by Penda, the slayer of Oswald, with the help, probably, of the Cumbrian Britons. Penda attacked Bamborough, and tried to set the castle on fire by heaping against the wall the materials of the wooden huts which he found near. Aidan, as Beda tells us, was watching on Farne, and saw the flames and smoke ascending: "See, Lord, what mischief Penda does!" was his ejaculatory prayer; whereupon, we are told, the wind changed, and the flames and smoke scorched and blinded the aggressors instead of their intended victims (Beda, iii. 16). When this peril was over and Penda had retired, Oswy's jealousy of Oswin led him to commit the great crime of his life. The two kings were about to settle their disputes on the battle-field, when Oswin, conscious of his weakness, disbanded his troops and retired with a single attendant to Gilling, near Richmond, where they were both slain by one of Oswy's retainers, in obedience to his master's orders, on August 20th, 651 (Beda, iii. 14). Some time before this event Oswy had brought from Kent and married Eanfleda, daughter of king Edwin, the first Northumbrian whom Paulinus had baptized (Beda, iii. 15). The queen, troubled by the murder, induced Oswy, as a kind of atonement, to give some land at the scene of the crime for the erection and endowment of a monastery, over which Trumhere became abbat. In it the slayer and the slain were both prayed for (Beda, iii. 24). After this we find Ethelbald, son of Oswald, acting as ruler of Deira under the charge of Oswy, his uncle. This was, probably, a concession to the independent spirit of the district, and possibly a further acknowledgment of the wrong that had been done to Oswin.

Oswy's most dangerous rival was Penda, who had taken possession of Lindsey, an old appanage of Northumbria, but he had permitted Cyniburga, his daughter, to marry Alchfrith, Oswy's son. Penda gave the rule of the Middle-Angles to his son Peada, whom Beda highly commends. Peada, visiting the Northumbrian count, asked Oswy to give him in marriage his daughter Alchfleda. Oswy refused unless Peada and his people would become Christians. The young man assented, and was baptized before he returned home, and admitted missionaries into his kingdom (Beda, iii. 21), among whom Cedd was one.

About the same time (653–4) another successful effort was made by Oswy towards evangelizing the East Saxons. Sigebert, their king, was a friend of Oswy, and frequently visited him. Oswy availed himself of the opportunity to prevail by argument with his guest to embrace Christianity. The result was the baptism of Sigebert, and the despatch of a mission to the East Saxons which had great success (Beda, iii. 22).

Penda all this while was an active foe or a false friend to Northumbria. Oswy did his best to live in peace with his too-powerful neighbour. The attack of A.D. 642 seems to have ended in a compromise, perhaps in the surrender of Lindsey. A double marriage ought to have knit the two kingdoms together, but it failed to do so. Inroad after inroad from Mercia harassed the Northumbrians, who were also charged with being the aggressors to such an extent that Oswy was obliged to send Ecgfrith, his second son, as a hostage for his good conduct, to the Mercian queen, Kynwise. This concession failed, and, to avoid ruin, Oswy promised to surrender to Penda a vast treasure, which he distributed, according to Nennius, among his British allies. It was in vain. Penda refused to return, and essayed the devastation and destruction of Northumbria. Oswy, deserted by his men, sought the divine assistance, and as a pledge of his earnestness vowed, if victory were his, to devote his daughter, Elfleda, with a goodly dower, to a religious life. Thirty chieftains marshalled Penda's army, whilst Oswy, with his son Alchfrith, had a force one-third of the size; and, in addition to the paucity of his numbers, he had the mortification of knowing that his nephew, Ethelbald of Deira, was acting as a guide to the invader. The two armies met at Winwædfield in the district of Loidis (Nennius says, in *Campo Gai*). The Winwæd is probably the Went. The battle was fought on the 15th of November, 655, and resulted in the death of Penda and the destruction of his host. The grateful victor fulfilled his vow by placing his infant daughter, Elfleda, under the charge of Hilda at Hartlepool, to be prepared for her future life (Beda, iii. 24). He pressed forward also the spreading of Christianity in Mercia, and is associated by tradition, with Peada, his son-in-law, as co-founder of the famous monastery at Medeshamstede, the Peterborough of the present day (S. C. 25, 50).

The defeat of Penda threw Mercia into Oswy's hands, and he put the South Mercians under the charge of Peada, retaining the rest for himself. Peada, however, was short-lived, and in A.D. 658 the Mercians rejected the rule of Oswy, and made Wulfhere, a son of Penda, their king. Wulfhere regained Lindsey from Northumbria

(Beda, iii. 24). The kingdom of Oswy, however, which was cut off in the South, was pushed in the North over a great part of the territory of the Picts. Ethelbald, as was to be expected, lost Deira, over which Oswy made his eldest son, Alchfrith, viceroy.

The agents in Oswy's ecclesiastical reforms and missions were, in the first instance, the bishops of Lindisfarne and the adherents of the Scottish church. He showed himself, however, amenable to religious as well as civil progress and development. Benedict Biscop, one of the officers of his court, was indebted to Oswy for the site of the monastery at Wearmouth (*Vita Abb. W.* Beda). Wilfrith, one of the chief movers in the change, owed his advance in life to queen Eanfleda and Oswy's court, and, as time went on, became the friend and adviser of Alchfrith, and the spokesman for the adoption of the Italian views of discipline and order in contradistinction to the Scottish. Alchfrith and Eanfleda took Wilfrith's side; Oswy showed a more judicial spirit, and would not as yet desert his old friends. The Paschal question was made the *crux* between the two sides, and a great ecclesiastical synod assembled at Whitby in A.D. 664, under Oswy's presidency, to hear the subject argued, and come to a decision (Beda, iii. 25–6). The result, as is well known, was a sentence from Oswy in favour of Wilfrith's party. Wilfrith was now chosen bishop, and went to France to be consecrated, but in his absence the Scottish influence revived somewhat, and Chad, with the consent of Oswy, filled up the vacant see (Beda, iii. 27). It is quite possible that this ecclesiastical change had something to do with the fall and disappearance of Alchfrith, which took place about this time. Beda (iii. 14) mentions the alliance of that young prince with the Mercians against his father, another instance of the want of unity between the two districts which made up the kingdom of Northumbria.

In 667 we find Oswy taking counsel with Egbert, king of Kent, about the condition of the English church, and to them was due the mission of Wighard to Rome to be consecrated archbishop (Beda, iii. 29; iv. 1). Beda ascribes this act on the part of Oswy to his gradual recognition of the imperial position of Rome. Pope Vitalian's reply is addressed to Oswy alone, and is due to his position as Bretwalda, which honour he undoubtedly held. The letter itself is beset with difficulties, which it is unnecessary to discuss. Oswy had made various offerings to St. Peter. Vitalian returned them by the gift of a cross, with a key of gold, made out of the chains of St. Peter and St. Paul for queen Eanfleda (Beda, iii. 29).

The last official act recorded of Oswy is the permission that he gave, at the request of Theodore, to allow Chad to leave Northumbria and become the bishop of the Mercians (Beda, iv. 3).

The close of Oswy's life beheld him more and more under the influence of Wilfrith, and smitten with the glamour of Roman imperialism. Worn out although he was by infirmity, his face was set Romewards, and he longed to end his days in the great city, worshipping in its sacred shrines. He appealed to Wilfrith to be his companion on the journey, promising him a large reward. But he never left England. He died on the 15th of February, 670 (Beda, iv. 5), and was interred at Whitby, where the remains of Edwin lay, and where his wife and daughter were to be laid to rest beside him (Beda, iii. 24). It was his family minster, the mausoleum of his race at that time. His descendants preferred York to Whitby. In Oswy Northumbria lost a judicious ruler, and England a wise Bretwalda. Oswy could act with firmness when he chose, but throughout his career he won more victories by concession. Christianity found in him a firm friend and patron, and if the words that Beda puts into his mouth from time to time were really used by him, Oswy was able to give good reasons for the faith which he professed.

Oswy married (1) Ricmmelth. (2) Eanfleda, daughter of king Edwin. He and Eanfleda had many children, four sons and three daughters. Of the sons (1) Alchfrith, prince regent of Deira, married Cyneburga, daughter of Penda. (2) Ecgfrith succeeded his father, and died in 685. (3) Aldfrith was king of Northumbria, 685–705. (4) Elfwine died 679. Of the daughters, Alchfleda married Peada, son of Penda; Ostryth married Ethelred, of Mercia; and Elfleda was abbess of Whitby, and died in 713. [J. R.]

OSYTH, ST. (OSITHA, OSGITHA), Oct. 7, virgin and martyr of the East Saxons, who has given her name to a village in Essex. She is not mentioned in the authors included in the *Monum. Hist. Brit.*, and the earliest occurrence of her name is in Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum* (lib. ii. p. 146, ed. Hamilton), a work completed in 1125. The passage states that Richard, bishop of London, placed canons regular at Cic, in his diocese, the resting-place of the blessed Osgitha, a virgin famous for miracles. (For this monastery, see *Mon. Angl.* vi. 308.) These words do not affirm the existence of any previous foundation there by Osyth (cf. Camden, *Brit.* ii. 46, 59, ed. Gough). Bishop Richard (1108–1128) was contemporary with Malmesbury. St. Osyth's *Vita* was No. 115 in the now lost *Sanctilogium* of John of Tinmouth, c. 1366 (Smith's *Cat. Libr. MSS. Bibl. Cotton.* p. 29), from whence Capgrave adopted it into his *Nova Legenda*. From Capgrave Surius printed it with a few verbal variations (Oct. 7), and from Surius it was taken into the *Acta SS.* (7 Oct. iii. 936), where it is accompanied with an introductory essay and notes by Suysken. The manuscript of which this *Vita* is an abridgment is one of those described by Hardy (*ubi infra*). The *Vita* is anonymous, and was composed at a period later than Maurice, bishop of London (1086–1108), who is mentioned in it. According to this authority Osyth's father was king Frithewald, and her mother Wilteburga, a daughter of Penda king of Mercia, but she was brought up by the abbess Modwenna. The latter had founded two monasteries, at Pollesworch and Streveshal, near the forest of Arverna, and one of these (it is not said which) she retained in her own charge, placing the other under St. Editha, the sister of king Alfred. From the care of Modwenna Osyth passed into the service of Editha, and was finally bestowed by her parents, much against her will, upon Sigerus (Sighere), king of the East Saxons. After the marriage she persisted in repelling her husband, and at length during his absence

on a hunting expedition seized the opportunity of obtaining the veil from two East Anglian bishops, Ecca and Bedwin. Sighere not only consented to her act but bestowed upon her an estate at Chich, where she built a nunnery, over which she became abbess. If such was the fact, this was the earliest monastery in Essex. In 653 a crew of piratical Danes, out of East Anglia, which those pagans had devastated, landed at Chich, beheaded Osyth, and sacked the place. She was interred at Aylesbury, in the vicinity of which her parents resided, but eventually Maurice, bishop of London, had her relics conveyed to Chich. The *Vita* is burdened with prodigies. While under Editha's charge Osyth was blown off a bridge in crossing a river, and after being submerged three days rose out from the water alive and well, as Editha and Modwenna were calling to her. After decapitation she carried her own head in her hands three stadia to the door of the neighbouring church of SS. Peter and Paul; and on the spot where she suffered there sprang up a fountain with miraculous virtues. As to the persons of the story, Milteburga, the daughter of Penda, is otherwise unknown. Frithewald is taken by Suysken to be the Mercian subregulus Frithewoldus in Florence of Worcester's *Chronicle*, ann. 675 (*M. H. B.* 535 a), while others make him the same as Redoald, king of East Anglia. The story labours under incurable anachronisms, defying all Suysken's art. King Sighere and the two bishops come some twenty years, Alfred and the Danes above two centuries, before their time. Suysken makes this last king the Northumbrian Alfred, fetching him from a long distance, a suggestion which could be tolerated if the story went straight in other respects, and if Alfred, the son of Ethelwulf, with a sister Edith, did not otherwise figure in Lives of Modwenna (cf. Hardy, *Cat.* i. 98). Streveshal is suspiciously like Streaneschalh (Whitby), which also occurs in Modwenna's story (Hardy, *Cat.* i. 99). Editha and Pollesworch appear copies likewise of king Egbert's daughter Edith and her foundation the Warwickshire Polesworth. As to the final removal of her relics from Aylesbury to Chich, we must observe that it is described in the *Vita* not as one of those ecclesiastical functions known as translations, but as a nocturnal and furtive proceeding of a neighbouring workman alleging the saint's commands given in a vision, narrated in a legendary manner with impossible facts, showing that there was no authentic burial at Chich of anything at all of Osyth's, genuine or ungenuine; that the saint in fact is a name and nothing more, imposed on the place to create a fictitious sanctity for bishop Richard's monastery. Leland (*Itin.* vol. viii. pt. 2, fol. 92, Hearne's, p. 41) gives the heads of a *Life of Osyth* which he found, bearing the name of Vere, a canon of St. Osyth, assigning her martyrdom to the year 600. Suysken, in spite of his author's own express date, places the saint at the close of the seventh century; while others, as Butler, put her death in the great Danish year 870. Petrus Galesinius allows her a place in his *Roman Martyrology*, but Baronius does not admit her into his, although he narrates the martyrdom in his *Annals* (ann. 653 x.). Outlines of the story, in its varieties and in English, may be seen in Hardy's *Descriptive Catalogue* (*u. s.*); in Camden (*u. s.*), Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, Oct. 7; Morant's *Essex*, vol. i. p. 456; Wright's *Essex*, vol. ii. p. 772. [MODWENNA.] [C. H.]

OTHMAR (AUDEMARUS, AUDOMARUS, AUTMARUS, OTMARUS), first abbat of St. Gall, and called also "abbas Durgaugensis," from the "pagus Durgaugia," in which the monastery stood. Chief authorities are Walafrid Strabo's *Vita S. Galli* and *Vita S. Othmari* (Pat. Lat. t. cxiv, 1012, sq. 1031, sq.) with *Mabillonii Observationes Braeviae* from *Acta SS. ord. S. Bened.* t. iv. The *Vita S. Othmari* is also in Goldastus (*Alam. Rer. Scrip.* i. pt. ii. 277–84), and is said to have been written at the request of abbat Gozbert in the beginning of the 9th century. Goldastus (*Ib.* i. pt. ii. 285, sq. 494, sq.) gives also two books of his miracles by Iso magister. Like his namesake, St. Audomar or Omer, he was a native of Alemannia and was presbyter with Victor, count of Chur, when Waltramnus presented him to Pippin, Mayor of the Palace, or more probably to Charles, his father, about A.D. 720. Receiving, with many other gifts, the decayed monastery of St. Gall, he renewed its vigour, but incurred the hatred of certain princes, Warin and Ruthard, who accused him of immorality before Pippin, then king of France, and he was driven into exile at a town called Potamum, where the Rhine leaves the Lake of Constance. When taken ill, he was removed by a friend to Stein, where still a prisoner, he died in the 7th year of king Pippin, A.D. 759, and is said to have been abbat forty years. His feast is Oct. 16 (Usuard, *Mart. Auct.*), and he is sometimes called bishop and martyr, but properly he was neither. [J. G.]

OTHO, Roman emperor, A.D. 69. M. Salvius Otho, born A.D. 32, the son of L. Otho, who had been Proconsul of Africa, was conspicuous in early youth for licentious profligacy, and after his father's death was associated with Nero in his worst excesses. On the day which the emperor had fixed for the murder of Agrippina, Otho gave a splendid banquet to both in order to disarm suspicion (Sueton. *Otho*, c. 2). Their intimacy was however broken by their rivalry in the affections of Poppaea, and the jealousy of the emperor led him to assign to Otho the honourable banishment of a *legatio* in Lusitania (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 45, 46; *Hist.* i. 13) where he governed as *quaestor* with an unexpected equity and moderation (Tac. *Hist.* i. 13; Sueton. *Otho*, c. 2). On the death of Nero, and the election of Galba as his successor by the Praetorian Guards, Otho at first endeavoured to secure the favour of the new emperor in the hope of being adopted as his successor. Disappointed by Galba's preference of L. Piso, urged on by the pressure of heavy debts, and stimulated by the predictions of the soothsayers and magi, in whom he implicitly believed (Sueton. *Otho*, c. 4), gathering a band of soldiers, by whom he was saluted with the title of *imperator*, he led them to the forum to encounter Galba, who was deserted by his troops and murdered by a common soldier. Otho was welcomed by the populace in the theatre as another Nero (Plut. *Otho*, p. 1007), and joined that name to his own in his official letters (Plut. *Ibid.*). The night that followed found him

full of terrors and haunted by the spectre of the murdered emperor (Sueton. c. 7), but the senate had sworn fidelity to him, and so far things looked hopeful. Hearing that the legions in Germany had elected Vitellius as emperor before the death of Galba, and taken the oath of allegiance to him, Otho on the one hand proposed an alliance in marriage and a share in the empire, and on the other prepared for war. The chief strength of Vitellius, himself gluttonous and sluggish, lay in the support of Fabius Valens and Alienus Caesina, who commanded legions in Lower Germany. The provinces of Gallia Narbonensis, Gallia Lugdunensis, Aquitania and Spain declared for him, and Otho found it necessary to leave Rome for the north of Italy to check their progress. At first the army of Otho met with some partial and indecisive successes. His generals urged him to avoid a decisive action, but his impetuosity led him to risk all on the fate of a single battle. The two armies accordingly met not far from Bedriacum, near the confluence of the Adda and the Po, and Otho's troops were utterly routed. Making no further attempt at resistance he determined on suicide with a singular calmness, took leave of kinsmen and friends, wrote letters to his sisters, gave presents to his servants, burnt all letters that might have compromised his adherents, lay down for a few hours of sleep, and woke on the 15th of April to plunge a dagger in his heart. (Sueton. *Otho;* Plutarch, *Otho;* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii.; *Hist.* i. 2; Dion Cassius, lxiv., and we may add, as giving a vivid picture of the emperor's character and actions, Corneille's tragedy of *Othon.*)
[E. H. P.]

OTILO. [ODILO.]

OTREIUS (1), bishop of Melitina in Upper Armenia and metropolitan; one of the leading orthodox prelates in the latter part of the 4th century, the successor of Uranius. Euthymius, afterwards the celebrated abbat of Palestine, when a child of three or four years old was committed to his care by his parents, A.D. 379. He attended the orthodox council of Tyana, A.D. 367 (Labbe, ii. 99; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 12), as well as the oecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). At this time he was nominated, together with Gregory Nyssen and Helladius of Caesarea, one of the centres of orthodoxy for the diocese of Pontus (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 9; Socr. *H. E.* v. 8; *Cod. Theod. de Fid. Cathol.* xvi. tit. i. lex 3, tom. vi. p. 9). Basil wrote to Otreius, A.D. 374, after the exile of Eusebius of Samosata, suggesting that they should console one another under so great a calamity, Otreius sending him all the intelligence he could gain from Samosata, and Basil all he could learn from Thrace, the place of Eusebius's banishment. (Basil, *Ep.* 181 [316].)
[E. V.]

OTREIUS (2), bishop of Arabissus in Armenia, the place in which Chrysostom took refuge in 405 from the incursions of the Isaurians. Chrysostom had previously sent a presbyter, named Terentius, to him to obtain some relics of martyrs, of which he had a large store of undoubted genuineness (ἀναμφισβήτητα) for the use of Rufinus the missionary in Phoenicia, who required them for the consecration of the churches he was building. (Chrys. *Ep.* 126; Mansi, iii. 569; Le Quien, i. 445.) [E. V.]

OTRENUS ZOTICUS. [ZOTICUS.]

OTTILIA, abbess. [ODILIA.]

OUDOCEUS (OUDOC, OUDOCHUS, DOCHU), third bishop of Llandaff and one of the chief saints of Wales, being the last of the three, SS Dubricius, Teilo, and Oudoceus. He was son of Budic, who had fled from Cornugallia (Cornouailles) in Brittany, and, finding refuge in Demetia, Dyfed, or West Wales, in the time of king Aircol Lawhir, had married Anauued or Arianwedd, daughter of Ensic and sister of St. Teilo. Oudoceus was born in Cornugallia after Budic had been called to the throne. He was brother of St. Ismael and martyr Tyfei, and early devoted to religion and learning. On the occasion of a visit by St. Teilo to Brittany, Oudoceus accompanied him to Wales, and ultimately succeeded him in the see of Llandaff, probably in the second half of the 6th century. If facts are to be inferred from the Llandaff charters, he was a powerful bishop, receiving many gifts to the see from his contemporaries Meurig ap Tewdrig, Athrwys ap Meurig, and Morgan ap Athrwys, kings of Glamorgan, and exercising discipline upon kings or reguli at the synods of Llandaff (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 139, 143, 172; Wilkins, *Conc.* i. 17, 18). These synods appear to have been provincial and wholly disciplinary, the presence of the three great abbats, with their congregations, being specially registered. His consecration for the see has become a point of great interest, as it is said (*Lib. Land.* 84, 124, conf. Ussher, *Wks.* v. 109–10) that he was sent "ad Dorobornensem civitatem, ad beatum archiepiscopum, ubi sacratus est episcopus ecclesiae Landaviae, in honore Sancti Petri fundatae." But it is clear that this is a later controversial device for magnifying the position and prerogative of Llandaff in opposition to the rival sees; in itself it was impossible, if Canterbury were to be the place of consecration. He succeeded to a smaller jurisdiction than St. Teilo held, as Menevia was administered by St. Ceneu; he was partially a contemporary of SS. Cadoc and Gildas. But near the close of his life he retired from his see and lived in holy seclusion on the banks of the Wye. His feast is July 2. His dates are all uncertain, but his death probably occurred early in the 7th century, though Pinius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 2 Jul. i. 284) would prefer about A.D. 564.

Our authorities on the Life of St. Oudoceus are *Vita B. Oudocei Land. Archiep.* (in *Lib. Land* by Rees, 123 sq.) and Capgrave's summary (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 258), which appears also in the Bollandists' useful memoir (*Acta SS.* 2 Jul. i. 283–6); Cressy (*Ch. Hist. Brit.* xii. c. 9) translates from Capgrave and the Llandaff charters, and Ussher (*Wks.* vi. 81) quotes from them. (See also Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. 145–6; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 125; Wharton, *Angl. Sacra,* ii. 669; Godwin, *De Pr. Ang.* 619; Rees, *W. SS.* 253, 274.) [J. G.]

OUEN, ST. [AUDOENUS.]

OUSIA, recluse. [USIA.]

OVAN, ST., of Autun. [EVANTIUS (1).]

OWAIN ap Macsen Wledig, surnamed Vinddu, numbered among the Welsh saints, but of uncertain character and history; the Triads present him as a warrior chief, and elected to the throne of the Britons in the 4th or 5th century. (Rees, *W. SS.* 108, 115; Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 365.) [J. G.]

OWEN, ST. [AUDOENUS.]

OYAN, ST. [EUGENDUS (2).]

OZEAS, a presbyter, commended by Theodoret as a champion of godliness, by whom he sent a letter to Ibas, bishop of Edessa. (Theod. *Ep.* 132.) [E. V.]

P

PABO, surnamed POST PRYDAIN, Welsh warrior and saint about the beginning of the 6th century, buried at Llanbabo in Anglesey. (*Myvir. Arch. of Wales*, ii. 49; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 503, 527, 558; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 103, 167.) For the Llanbabo inscribed stone see Westwood, *Lap. Wall.* 192. [J. G.]

PACATULA. [GAUDENTIUS (10).]

PACATUS (1), LATINUS DREPANIUS (otherwise LATINUS PACATUS DREPANIUS), a Gallic rhetorician of the 4th century, author of a panegyric pronounced before the senate on Theodosius the Great, Sept. 1st, 391, which contains much information upon the facts of that emperor's life. [DREPANIUS, in *Dict. G. & R. Biog.*] [G. T. S.]

PACATUS (2) (PARATUS), Gallic poet, probably near Bordeaux, c. A.D. 431. He obtained from URANIUS an account of the death of Paulinus of Nola (see it in Boll. *AA. SS.* Jun. v. 172), but the poetical life of St. Paulinus intended to have been written by Pacatus, and based on this, does not appear to have been composed. (*Hist. Lit. Franc.* ii. 202, 204; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.* v. 170, 195, ed. Mansi; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 54.) [J. G.]

PACATUS (3), an ecclesiastical writer against Porphyrius, cited by John the Roman deacon, afterwards (as some think) pope John III. in his *Exposition of the Heptateuch*, printed in Pitra's *Spicilegium Solesmense* (vol. i. pp. 280, 281). Nothing further is known of this Pacatus (Ceill. xi. 334). [C. H.]

PACHO (Παχών, PACHOMIUS in Cassiod.), a solitary in Scetis, from youth to extreme old age, in the latter part of the 4th century, famed for his strength in the monastic virtues, having never been seduced, writes Sozomen, by the appetites of the flesh, the passions of the soul, or the wiles of the evil one, to desire the things from which it behoves a philosopher to abstain, (Soz. vi. 29; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* viii. 1; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* xi. 36; *Laus. Hist.* c. 29 and note in *Pat. Gr.* xxxiv. 1084). The account of him in the *Lausiac History* has been wrongly attributed to St. Nilus. (Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* t. x. p. 16, ed. Harles; Ceill. viii. 211.) [C. H.]

PACHOMIUS (1), ST., a monk of the Thebaid of Lower Egypt, in the 4th century A.D., the founder of the famous monasteries of Tabenna; one of the first to collect solitary ascetics together under a rule. Beyond a brief mention of him in Sozomen, who praises his gentleness and suavity (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 14), the materials for his biography are of questionable authenticity. His memory is specially revered in the Greek Church (*AA. SS.* Mai. 14; *Menol. Gr.* Mai. 15). Athanasius, during his visit to Rome, made the name Pachomius familiar to the church there through Marcella and others, to whom he held up Pachomius and his Tabennensian monks as a bright example (Hieron. *Ep.* 127, *ad Principium*). Rosweyd gives a narrative of his life in Latin, being a translation by Dionysius Exiguus, in the 6th century, of a biography said to be written by a contemporary monk of Tabenna (*Vit. Patr.* in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 227).

If we may trust this writer, Pachomius was born of wealthy pagan parents in Lower Egypt, before the council of Nicaea. He served in his youth under Constantine in the campaign against Maxentius, which placed Constantine alone on the undisputed throne. It was, as often in the early days of Christianity, the kindness shewn by Christians to himself and to his comrades in distress, which led him to become a Christian. Like many enthusiastic converts of that day, he attached himself to a hermit, celebrated for his sanctity and austerities. The narrative tells how he and Palaemon supported themselves by weaving the shaggy tunics ("cilicia"), the favourite dress of Egyptian monks, not unlike the hair-shirt of later ascetics. He became a monk, and many prodigies are related of his power over demons, and in resisting the natural craving for sleep and food. (*Vit.* cc. 40, 44, 45, 47, 48, etc., ap. Rosw. *V. P.*)

His reputation for holiness soon attracted to him many who desired to embrace the monastic life, and without, apparently, collecting them into one monastery, he provided for them the organisation, without which disorder must have ensued. The bishop of a neighbouring diocese sent for him to regulate the monks there. Pachomius seems also to have done some missionary work in his own neighbourhood. Athanasius, visiting Tabenna, was eagerly welcomed by Pachomius, who, in that zeal for orthodoxy, which was a characteristic of monks generally, is said to have flung one of Origen's writings into the water, exclaiming, that he would have cast it into the fire, but that it contained the name of God. He lived to a good old age (Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* ix. 14). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 287) give the *Acta* of Pachomius by a nearly contemporary author, in a Latin translation from the original Greek MSS., with notes and commentary by Papebroch. Here (*Acta*, § 77) Pachomius died about the time when Athanasius returned to his see under Constantius, i.e. A.D. 349 as computed by Papebroch [ATHANASIUS, p. 191 *b*